

UDC 316.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2707-9147.2025.108.3>

**YU. V. ROMANENKO**

Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor,

Professor at the Department of International Media Communications

and Communication Technologies

Educational-Scientific Institute of International Relations

of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

## **ON EXOCULTURE AND EXOPOLITIES AS CRISIS FACTORS OF SOCIOGENESIS: TOWARDS THE FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM**

*The article defines that the cultural system of a group can consist of both homogeneous and heterogeneous meanings, but it is not so much the content of these meanings that is important, but the method of their production. In this aspect, the community can adhere to two basic strategies.*

*The first strategy assumes authentic meaning production, which is stretched out in the form of a long cultural evolution required both for the production of meanings and their structuring (crystallization), the construction of the enculturation system, stratification-institutional continuation and consolidation, and ultimately – personal acceptance of these meanings as authentic.*

*The second strategy assumes the reception and "implementation" of both cultural systems and their individual fragments and contents. This strategy of introduced cultural genesis (let us call it this way, not having a more situationally acceptable concept) corresponds to a failed and/or inconsistent meaning production, which takes place due to a failed value authentication of the community. In the framework of our study, we will conditionally call it exoculturaria.*

*The author has stated that the term "exoculturaria" itself is not established in the socio-humanitarian dictionary, and therefore requires primary scientific semantization (endowment with meanings). The cultural authenticity of a community is the ontological and conceptual opposite of exoculturalism, the cultural import of both meanings and human capital, mediating the transfer of these meanings.*

*It is noted that political authenticity as a continuation of cultural authenticity is, in turn, the opposite of exopolitics, the political import of institutions of centralized management and self-organization of society, as well as political elites acting as subject-bearers of such institutional practices. It is indicated that exoculturality as a counter-attribute of cultural authenticity for certain communities means self-emasculation of historicity, a ban on authentic logos, and therefore, a hidden or open struggle with cultural and political elites. Thus, exoculturality reflects the doom of a community to total (end-to-end, conditioned by the peculiarities of the cultural system) corruption as an expression of the total dysfunctionality of imported meanings and the depotentiation of imported meaning producers.*

*Attention is focused on the fact that the continuation of exoculturality as an attribute of a community that prefers cultural introduction (import of culture)*

*to authentic meaning production is exopolarity, corresponding to political introduction. The absence of a system of authentic meaning production also presupposes the absence of organic polity and statehood as its institutional sector.*

**Key words:** exoculture, exopoly, exoculturality, exopolarity, authentic meaning production, cultural authenticity, political authenticity.

**Problem statement.** In the formation of any social community, from a microgroup to a nation or alliance of nations, the constitutive role is played by an authentic or introduced (brought in) culture. The cultural system of a group can consist of both homogeneous and heterogeneous meanings, but it is not so much the content of these meanings that is important, but the method of their production. In this aspect, a community can adhere to two basic strategies.

The first strategy assumes authentic meaning production, which is stretched out in the form of a long cultural evolution required both for the production of meanings and their structuring (crystallization), the construction of an enculturation system, stratification-institutional continuation and consolidation, and ultimately, the personal acceptance of these meanings as authentic.

The duration, contradictoriness and painfulness of this process, its stretching out over centuries turns out to be fully justified and "paid off" by the results of cultural construction. An authentic cultural system is a key "guarantor" (not in the subjective, but in the systemic-depersonalized aspect) of consensus between elite groups and the masses in terms of value loyalty and internalization of certain components of value consciousness. Elites and masses in the conditions of an authentic cultural system can confront each other due to the inevitable impossibility of realizing certain meanings in practice. Nevertheless, an authentic cultural system guarantees that there are no contradictions between the former and the latter in terms of articulating values in their forms familiar to everyday consciousness.

An ordinary citizen of Germany and his fellow countryman-lawyer may have different levels of legal understanding. Nevertheless, with conceptual and theoretical differences, they will most likely not question the need for a Constitution and the implementation of legality. Such stability in ideas will be ensured not by political or legal mechanisms, but by cultural attitudes derived from authentic values. Authenticity of meaning production is the primary condition of the value legitimacy of a cultural system as a totality. Authenticity in the content aspect is an attribute of any autopoietic system that does not allow external semantic inputs to mix with its axiostases created in the processes of internal semantic processing in the production of meanings. Authenticity corresponds to the community's support for the axiostases created as a result of its reflexive work, which form the centering core of the cultural system.

Again, a community that is authentic in its culture, although it cannot completely get rid of the crisis, in times of crisis has a reserve of strategic

strength, supported by freedom and fidelity in the choice of axiostases. Authenticity is not just an attribute of stable sociogenesis, but also a condition of any victory over chaos and hostile environment of both a group and an individual, since a subject free in his loyalty and faith in axiostases receives such a victory as the crown of his completeness and integrity. Victory does not represent the result of any rational-volitional efforts and such super-strain, as is usually believed. A subject integrated in a totalitarian manner within himself, having achieved internal loyalty to himself in the subordination of values, theories and practices, has already internally conquered the world and is quietly approaching his triumph without explosions, blood, victims and fires. Subordination to him of a part of external reality only confirms the authenticity of his cultural poiesis.

Authenticity in the social and psychological aspect presupposes steadfastness in overcoming the eroding fear that seeks to attack the centering core of the subject's cultural system. But what can precede such overcoming if not love for these very axiostases, without which the subject cannot even imagine life? He cannot imagine life so much that death itself seems blissful in comparison with life without these axiostases. Love makes the subject authentic, and therefore free in his value choice. It also ensures the transformation of a coward and a traitor into a hero and a man, since the difference between the first and the second is the difference between a self-alienated subject, looking for other people's axiostases (value supports) and a subject producing authentic axiostases and showing love in choosing between the produced and the introduced in favor of the first. And this love for the values produced, in the words of the author of the book "Song of Songs", is "strong as death", since no force can resist the unconditional factuality of love in its freedom.

The second strategy presupposes the reception and "implementation" of both cultural systems and their individual fragments and contents. Such a strategy of introduced cultural genesis (let's call it this way, not having a more situationally acceptable concept) corresponds to the failed and/or inconsistent meaning production, which takes place due to the failed value authentication of the community. In the framework of our study, we will conditionally call it exoculturia.

The term "exoculturia" itself is not established in the socio-humanitarian dictionary, and therefore requires primary scientific semantization (endowment with meanings). The cultural authenticity of a community is the ontological and conceptual opposite of exoculturality, the cultural import of both meanings and human capital that mediates the transmission of these meanings. Political authenticity as a continuation of cultural authenticity is, in turn, the opposite of exopolitics, the political import of institutions of centralized governance and self-organization of society, as well as political elites that act as subject-bearers of such institutional practices.

**Analysis of the latest research and publications.** The very concept of exoculture in scientific literature is poorly used and peripheral. In part, it

is used by representatives of postcolonial studios, in part – by researchers studying cybertecture, artificial intelligence and ufological studios.

Thus, E. Pavel analyzes the opposition of exoculture and endoculture as a contrast between the "I" and the "Other", the colonized and the colonizers. The author believes that "when colonizers form an endoculture, the differences between them and the colonized (exoculture) give rise to racism, oppression and prejudice." This gives grounds for colonizers as bearers of exoculture for many racial prejudices and for an arrogant and contemptuous attitude towards bearers of endoculture, their stigmatization as representatives of a "lower and primitive, even barbaric culture" [p.246]. As the researcher notes, referring to examples from the novel by E. Walker, "exploitation and slavery represent another facet of the clash between the dominant power and the colonized nation. On the other hand, when the endoculture is formed by the dominant nation or group under pressure from the exoculture, the result is either submissive silence or an explosion of rebellion. Resistance becomes subversion, opposition or mimicry" [5, c. 246-247].

E. Pavel refers to the research of G. Spivak, positioned in the paradigm of Marxist feminism. G. Spivak operates with the concept of exoculture in the context of a phallocentric culture, where "the relationship between a woman and silence can be built by women themselves; Spivak notes that "racial and class differences fall under this accusation." The author notes the effect of double erasure of sexual and socio-historical differences among the subordinates (colonized), noting both the absence of history among the latter, resulting from the absence of the history of the right to speech, and the even greater accompanying shadowing [6, c.82-83].

In the context of such an understanding, Spivak speaks of double repression, double oppression, which women have to endure when confronting the "double hostility of two exocultures: the patriarchal culture and the culture of the colonizers, because of which they were discriminated against" [6, c.82-83].

D. Duner, although he does not directly use the concept of exoculture, speaks of it in the context of a cognitive-semiotic study of intelligent life in other worlds. For the researcher, "the organism's cognition is also adapted to the consciousness and culture of its fellows, to understand and interact with other individuals, to understand emotions, thoughts and motives, and so on in the psychological and sociological interaction that forms this particular "exoculture" [3, c. 440]. Banias suggests a more appropriate term, "exoculture," understanding it as a group culture that "exists in its otherness without the need to compare itself to others. This exoculture is a model of difference: ideologically independent, without structures, rules and standards, free to create its own reality and recreate it again and again. The UFO exoculture is an alien living in plain sight on Earth, causing surprise, bewilderment and horror in those who are committed to the status quo" [2, c. 721, 724].

In general, exoculture as a concept is understood as a system of imported cultural meanings, which, when reproduced, construct an alternative reality in relation to endoculture (autochthonous culture), usually alien in terms of value to the latter. At the same time, the presented authors do not use the concept of exoculture and in the dictionary of socio-humanitarian studies this concept can be considered unused and poorly represented.

In Ukrainian sociology, exoculture and exopolitia (without mentioning the concepts themselves) are analyzed in the context of external influence in the dissertation of E. Gugnин. The author conceptualizes external influence as transgressions of two types. The first type of transgression, corresponding to high and medium levels of social cohesion, the author defines as a transgression of "culture-institutions (orders, power)", and the second type of transgression, corresponding to medium and low levels of cohesion – as a transgression of "economy (products / services) – population (people)". The first type of transgression is characterized by the direction of external influence with the autonomy and clear intentionality of the social system (group of systems) as a subject of influence, technological goal-rationality and predictability of results. The second type of transgression is characterized by weakened intentionality (direction), weaker predictability of the results of transgressions, weakness or absence of appropriate technologies on the part of society with limited subjectivity of external influence [1, c. 3].

The author previously analyzed individual aspects of exoculturality and exopolitarity in an article devoted to the differential analysis of dictatorship and despotism in elitology and sociology of politics [4, pp. 24-38]. However, the subject of the article seems, in the context of the above, to be little studied.

**Presentation of the main material.** In this article, the author will understand exoculturism as a phenomenon associated with the inability or weakened ability of a community (we are talking primarily about large socio-historical communities) to produce meanings of internal origin, or authentic meanings. With such inability or weakened ability, such a community is forced to both "import" foreign meanings and subjects of meaning production. Such a community, due to certain circumstances, blocks or suppresses internal elitogenesis and allows the import of cultural and/or political elites, that is, turns itself into a non-historical one. The resulting impossibility/inability of a community to live an authentic history, and therefore to be doomed to a ghostly development consisting of imitation of foreign values, concepts and practices, corresponds to crisis sociogenesis. In one of the publications, the authors turned to the study of central (cultural) corruption, which is a generalized indicator of cultural crisis, manifested in all social subsystems, institutions and communities.

It would be worth once again clarifying the very concept of central (cultural) corruption as culturopathy, the emergence of which is associated with the refusal of the community (but also the individual) from authentic meaning production. At the same time, such a refusal is accompanied by

a preference for a conscious desire for the societal unconscious over societal consciousness, and therefore, a conscious desire of the community to remove autochthonous (authentic) cultural and political elites from authentic meaning production.

In common parlance, individuals who live in accordance with the described strategy are spoken of as people living "with someone else's mind." This name, however, does not reflect the absence of the trinity of value-theory-practice, but clearly indicates the self-prohibition of such individuals to use their own thinking to solve any problems. Within the framework of dialectical-materialistic methodology, this is precisely the order in which "the tail wags the head." This is precisely the path of the fool-community, which reasons exclusively about its own experience and "deriving" both theories and values from it. For the path of the fool is the path of a society that behaves like an individual and in which an individual "twists" society and institutions, which become dependent on its subjective problems and complexes.

In a rational society of intelligent individuals with authentic cultural genesis, "the head twitches the tail", therefore theories become building blocks of axiospheres, derivatives of the latter, and practices – derivatives of the first and second. For here normal culturization occurs, in which the individual gets used to internal work in order to make his own author's synthesis from the values and theories offered to him, which will provide the individual with rational, and not stupid practices. And the problem turns out to be somewhat more complex than the one usually discussed in connection with the dominance of mass society over elites and high culture, observed in the information society.

Exoculturality as a counter-attribute of cultural authenticity for certain communities means self-emasculation of historicity, a ban on authentic logos, and therefore a hidden or open struggle with cultural and political elites. Thus, exoculturality reflects the community's doom to total (end-to-end, conditioned by the peculiarities of the cultural system) corruption as an expression of the total dysfunctionalities of imported meanings and the depotentiation of imported meaning producers.

The continuation of exoculturality as an attribute of a community that prefers cultural introduction (import of culture) to authentic meaning production is exopolitarity, corresponding to political introduction. The absence of a system of authentic meaning production also implies the absence of organic polity and statehood as its institutional sector.

Exopolitarity expresses the inability of a community to self-organize at the level of normative and instrumental-technological consciousness. It corresponds to exoculturism to the extent that imported and introduced values are capable of destroying any political self-organization, which can only be derived from authentic values.

Organic polity, as a rule, grows out of society itself in the form of its institutional continuation, which means the possibility of opposing civil

society to the state. The very fact of opposition becomes the basis for the social modernization of the community. In the absence of organic polity and the presence of exopolitics, the state of the modern (bourgeois) type as a service social institution in relation first to the industrial and financial oligarchy, and later to the middle class, practically does not develop. Thus, the community is fixed at the pre-modern stage of development with its accompanying archaic structures built on slavery, feudalism or other potestary relations.

Exoculturia is followed by cultural colonization and cultural de-elitization with its accompanying inauthentic history of the community, with living in a ghostly other existence imposed by the colony-metropolis. Exopolitics is followed by political colonization, meaning the transformation of politics into privatism, and the state into a private corporation serving it in a mode of unlimited extraction of resources and unbridled parasitism on the body of the colonized community. The cultural introduction and import of both culture and politics, as well as its subjects, continues in the political introduction and import of politics and political institutions.

Culturopathy continues in politopathy and the inability to institutionalize the state from self-organization, that is, to separate facts from values. Politics is formed where the potestary component of centralized power is not considered a fact by self-organized civil society. On the contrary, civil society as a bearer of authentic culture reconsiders any "facts of naked force" as illegitimate, that is, not derived from the value references of this society.

Thus, cultural introduction and exoculturality indicate the absence of self-organization, and therefore the absence of politics, since politics as a sphere of empirical consciousness follows theories and value consciousness. But cultural introduction and exoculturality correspond to a failed, incomplete or distorted value choice. That is why politics in the conditions of cultural import is not formed as a subsystem of instrumental centralization of power subordinated to the spheres of value consciousness. On the contrary, by subordinating the spheres of value consciousness, it depotentiates the latter, turning them from systems of spiritual search and freethinking into varieties of propaganda. Due to this circumstance, politics degenerates into privatism, a castrated version of a subsystem with permanent corruption. In privatism, institutional relations between actors are replaced by private (personal) relations, which normalizes despotism or despotoid relations. Despotism in a broad sense means a cultural, social and political order, in the conditions of which there is a direct conversion of emotions of certain actors into political decisions and actions.

Despotism is characterized by variability associated with emotional life, as well as impulsiveness, chaos and discontinuity of power-organizing activity, which presupposes the stake of despots or despotoids on terror and/or the use of a phobic component as a basis for manipulating objects of control. The very fact of cultural and political tolerance of despotism in any context corresponds to the cultural and political infantilism of both the one

who allows it and the one at whom it is directed.

One of the illustrative examples of exoculturality can be Byzantium in the aspect of relations between the church and the state. Being a relic of the Roman Empire, Byzantium faced Christianization and the emergence of the Christian church under the patronage of the Roman state. The Roman consul who had become the Emperor of Byzantium found no better solution than to turn the Christian clergy into bureaucracy. The nationalization of the church itself represented a combination of exopolitics and exoculture at the same time. It was about the value incompatibility of Christianity and Roman potestarianism.

And here it is clear that in the conditions of complete chaos, barbarization and natural economy of the western part of the Roman Empire, its Christianization was progressing much more productively than in Byzantium. In the western provinces of the Roman Empire, a network of decentralized states emerged, created by the tribal elite of the barbarians, later Gauls, Franks, Anglo-Saxons, who later turned into early feudal monarchs. The instability of these monarchies did not dispose them to dominate the Catholic Church, which was able to autonomize as a meaning-producing and value-authorizing institution and usurp the functions of legitimizing political power. In such conditions, an autopoietic subordination between culture and politics was formed, since autopoiesis is possible with vertical relations between culture and politics, but not vice versa.

The subordination of politics in relation to culture accompanies autopoiesis as a process of forming a functional social totality, since it presupposes a period of incubation of value knowledge in the space of the church as a value-authorizing institution. Such incubation presupposes the highest status of value knowledge in relation to empirical knowledge, which presupposes, at a minimum, the initial subordination of the political field to the cultural one (represented by the Christian church, and then by the universities that branched off from it).

But in Byzantium, the model of heteropoiesis prevailed, since the incubation of value knowledge in the conditions of continuous state intervention in church affairs led to the destruction of the normal subordination between the cultural and political fields. The political field, represented by the state, began to dominate the cultural field, which led to the corruption of Christianity itself and the inability to resist the totalitarian Islamic culture of the Ottoman conquerors.

It is characteristic that the reception of Byzantine Orthodoxy first by the Russian Empire, then by Ukraine also took place under the conditions of a force regime, i.e. under the strong influence of the potestary-political component. Instead of a slow soaking up of Christian values, a gradual institutionalization of the Christian church, Kievan Rus experienced forced Christianization, accompanied by the imposition of Byzantine Orthodoxy, the import of writing and clergy, texts and ritual practices. Monasteries turned into such centers of education, but their Christianizing activity, due

to the imposition of political instruments, turned out to be, to a significant extent, deformed and curtailed.

The mutual curse of the Pope of Rome and the Patriarch of Constantinople was not just an "act of separation" of two clerics. It marked a value choice between a protracted evolutionary Christianization of the West and a forced extraordinary Christianization of countries that found themselves under the influence of Byzantine Orthodoxy. Papocaesarism, which developed in the conditions of barbarian states, reflected the value and institutional corruption of Christianity by the Catholic clergy. The Catholic Church created a real monopoly on the trade in holiness and legitimacy, forming and abolishing political unions at its own discretion and not disdaining direct participation in business projects and military adventures.

In the presence of systemic corruption, the split between value consciousness, beliefs and practices became so provocative and obvious that it created a demand from society both for the abolition of such a state and for the reformation of Catholicism. The Reformation revealed the underbelly of institutional Christianity with its offshore areas of lawlessness, combined with the decorum of pathetic declarations of fidelity to the Holy Scripture. All the appeals of the Catholic priesthood in relation to ordinary believers turned out to be one blatant contradiction of their real way of life, filled with corruption.

The urban (bourgeois) society that had matured to this period demanded that value consciousness and social practices be brought into line, which became the prologue to the Reformation and the emergence of Protestantism. Protestantism itself was not just a new movement and the basis for a new confessional identity. It made it possible to overcome heteropoesis, and therefore, to overcome the central (cultural) corruption in the cultural and political systems of the countries that decided on the reformation. Thanks to the Reformation, Christianity ceased to be an exocultural phenomenon, and its meanings were translated into secular Christianity, which, in a profane-secular form, entered the key axiospheres of the cultural systems of societies in the West and Northern Europe. Such an "incarnation" of Christian values meant, on the one hand, their scientific and rationalistic degeneration. On the other hand, it was in such a scientific-regenerative and rationalistic version that Christianity was able to fulfill its cultural-(value)-homogenizing role in relation to the value consciousness of Europe. In such a value consciousness, society turned into a kind of panopticon, which was based on the value consensus of freedom, equality, justice and solidarity. Accordingly, overcoming the exoculturality of Christianity actualized the problem of overcoming the exopolitism of the state. The fact is that a significant number of feudal states in Europe were formed as a result of the conquest of Roman provinces by barbarian tribes, which created the foundation for feudal fragmentation.

But the subsequent formation of centralized feudal monarchies did not lead to the overcoming of exopolitarity, since the class society corresponding to them continued to be a factor in cultural and political corruption. This

circumstance acted as a kind of irritant for urban (bourgeois) communities, which continued to be in the status of subjects, which did not correspond to their transformed value consciousness.

**Conclusions.** The contradictions between the value consciousness of the political elites of the estate-feudal society and the emerging elites of the urban community can be described within the framework of the dichotomy "rationalism/potestarianism". These value systems are oriented toward two basic paradigms of truth: argumentative and postulative. The difference between the two paradigms of truth in this case is not simply an epistemological divergence. It consists in the value orientation of the process of cognition toward the "truth of knowledge and communication" and the "truth of power and suggestive consensus", which culturally demarcate pre-modern and modern, as well as the "Latin Catholic" and "Greek-Byzantine" paths of development of relations between the cultural and political field. "The truth of knowledge and communication" presupposes the prospect of continuity between the church and its derivative value-authorizing institutions (universities and subsequently secondary schools and mass media that branched off from them). In the cultural paradigm of "the truth of knowledge", value-authorizing institutions function as communication platforms where the critically thinking public is aggregated.

The replication of critically thinking publics destroys any irrational conventions, i.e. agreements that are unclear for critical thinking as the foundation of social connections. Subsequently, this circumstance minimizes the possibilities of direct implantation of any concepts, discourses, frames and stereotypes and accompanies a decrease in the influence of any suggestive propaganda. In fact, the very definition of modernity as a cultural and social paradigm of "the truth of knowledge and communication" could be quite reasonable. The very formation of citizenship denotes the prospect of forming a personality type – a citizen – oriented toward counter-suggestion, and therefore, toward the denial of exoculturism.

Citizenship, in contrast to citizenship, corresponds to the subject as a personality type for whom exoculturism (that is, the introduction into his consciousness of certain external meanings produced by someone else's consciousness) is culturally, socially and mentally acceptable. Citizenship is incompatible not only with exoculturism, but also with exopoly, since the latter is a continuation of the former.

For the subject, the suggestively influencing power organically corresponds to his mental dispositions, since the subject's consciousness is depotentiated in the aspect of self-organization, and therefore, active subjectivity. The subject's consciousness is subjectless precisely in the aspect that it recognizes meanings-values primarily as a product of implantation and reception, and therefore, his mental dynamics are primarily externally initiated. The consciousness of a citizen is subjective precisely in the aspect that it recognizes meanings-values primarily as a product of authentic meaning-production.

"The truth of force and suggestive consensus" corresponds to the absence of continuity between the church and the value-authorizing institutions derived from it. Such a model corresponds to a nationalized church, which is initially formatted by the state and turns from a space for discussions into an instrument of corporate propaganda.

That is why the institutions of inculcation, which are sociogenetically derived from the church in the era of modernity, are formed here not as discussion platforms, but as spaces for disciplining subjects and implanting a controlled consensus. Thus, instead of a critically thinking public, a reactive-conformist environment is created in them, and the replication of such environments within society, in turn, preserves both exopolitics and exoculturia. Due to the reactive-conformist environments in the Greco-Byzantine path of development of relations between the cultural and political fields, an inversion occurs in the form of subordination of the cultural field to the political one. Thus, the conservation of pre-modernism and potestarianism in Christianity occurs, which means that the latter, with a high probability, cannot be reformed.

Reformation in Christianity becomes impossible not only because of the suppression of discussions, but also because of the substitution of hierocracy by bureaucracy. The priesthood, transformed into bureaucracy, becoming incapable of freethinking and intellectual pluralism, can no longer be the leader of urban (bourgeois) communities. Thus, a modification of the social landscape of cities also occurs. Cities cease to be spaces of self-government, but turn into settlements of subjects, that is, into exopolititarian settlement communities, deprived of any initiative in building a civil society. The latter circumstance is constitutive for the collapse of the value consciousness of society, its internal and external colonization and insurmountable central (cultural) corruption.

### Bibliography

1. Гунін Е.А. ТЕОРЕТИКО-СОЦІОЛОГІЧНА РЕФЛЕКСІЯ ЗОВНІШНЬОГО ВПЛИВУ НА СОЦІАЛЬНІ СИСТЕМИ. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора соціологічних наук. Спеціальність 22.00.01 – теорія та історія соціології. Запоріжжя, Класичний приватний університет, 2021, 502 с.
2. *BOOK REVIEW*. The UFO People: A Curious Culture by MJ Banias. White Crow Productions/August Night Books [www.augustnightpress.com](http://www.augustnightpress.com), 2019. 202 pp. Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 33, No. 4, 2019, pp. 716–725.
3. Dunér, D. On the Plausibility of Intelligent Life on Other Worlds: A Cognitive-Semiotic Assessment of  $f_i \cdot f_c \cdot L$ . *Environmental Humanities* 1 November 2017; 9 (2): 433–453. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-4215379>
4. YU. V. ROMANENKO, I. A. SVYATNENKO. DESPOTIES AND DICTATURAS IN POTESTAR AND TOTALITAR SOCIETY: PROBLEMS OF DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS IN ELITHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF POLITICS (PART 1). Соціальні технології: актуальні проблеми теорії та практики, 2022, Вип. 96, с.24-38.

5. PAVEL, E. PERICULTURE AND POSTCOLONIALISM. INSIDE THE *COLOR PURPLE*. Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braov Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies • Vol. 4 (53) No.1 – 2011, p.243-250.
6. Spivak, G. C. *Can The Subaltern Speak?* In: C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Macmillan Education: Basingstoke, 1988, pp. 271-313.
7. Stanley, D. Introduction: The Social Effects of Culture. *Canadian Journal of Communication* 2006 31:1, 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2006v31n1a1744>
8. Walker, A. *The Color Purple*, Pocket Books, New York, 1985. 142 p.

**Романенко Ю. В. Про екзокультурію та екзополітію як кризові чинники соціогенезу: до постановки проблеми**

У статті визначено, що культурна система групи може складатися як з однорідних, так і з різномірних значень, але важливий не стільки зміст цих значень, скільки спосіб їхнього продукування. У цьому аспекті спільнота може дотримуватися двох основних стратегій.

Перша стратегія передбачає автентичне продукування значень, яке розтягається у формі тривалої культурної еволюції, необхідної як для продукування значень, так і для їх структурування (кристалізації), побудови системи інкультурації, стратифікаційно-інституційного продовження та консолідації, і зрештою – особистісного прийняття цих значень як автентичних.

Друга стратегія передбачає рецепцію та «впровадження» як культурних систем, так і їхніх окремих фрагментів та змісту. Ця стратегія впровадженого культорогенезу (назвемо його так, не маючи більш ситуативно прийнятого поняття) відповідає невдалому та/або непослідовному продукуванню значень, яке відбувається через невдалу ціннісну автентифікацію спільноти. У рамках нашого дослідження ми умовно називатимемо це екзокультурією.

Автор стверджує, що сам термін «екзокультурія» не є усталеним у соціогуманітарному словнику, а тому потребує первинної наукової семантизації (наповнення значеннями). Культурна автентичність спільноти є онтологічною та концептуальною протилежністю екзокультуризму, культурного імпорту як значень, так і людського капіталу, що опосередковує передачу цих значень.

Зазначається, що політична автентичність як продовження культурної автентичності є, у свою чергу, протилежністю екзополітики, політичного імпорту інститутів централізованого управління та самоорганізації суспільства, а також політичних еліт, що виступають суб'єктами-носіями таких інституційних практик. Вказується, що екзокультурність як контрапріоритет культурної автентичності для певних спільнот означає самознечіння історичності, заборону на автентичні логос, а отже, приховану чи відкриту боротьбу з культурними та політичними елітами. Таким чином, екзокультурність відображає приреченість спільноти на тотальну (наскрізну, зумовлену особливостями культурної системи) корупцію як вираз тотальної дисфункціональності імпортованих значень та депотентифікацію імпортованих виробників значень.

Увага зосереджена на тому факті, що продовження екзокультурності як атрибута спільноти, яка надає перевагу культурному впровадженню (імпорту культури) над автентичним виробництвом значень, є екзополітарністю, що

відповідає політичному впровадженню. Відсутність системи автентичного виробництва значень також передбачає відсутність органічної політики та державності як її інституційного сектору.

**Ключові слова:** екзокультура, екзополітичність, екзокультурність, екзополітарність, автентичне виробництво значень, культурна автентичність, політична автентичність.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 16.11.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 12.12.2025

Дата публікації: 31.12.2025