Social– Political Integrity in the 21st Century: Threats and Risks of the Digitalization

Mamychev Alexey Yurievich[1,2], Kim Alexander[3], Dremliuga Roman Igorevich[4], Surzhik Mariia[5] & Zheng Fuxue[6]

[1] Laboratory of Political and Legal Research, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia

[2] Department of Theory and History of Russian and Foreign Law, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia

[3] Department of International Relations and Law, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia

[4] School of Law, Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok, Russia

[5] Department of Land Management, Primorye State Agricultural Academy, Russia

[6] Department of Economics and Management, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia

Correspondence: Mamychev Alexey Yurievich, Laboratory of Political and Legal Research, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia; Department of Theory and History of Russian and Foreign Law, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. E-mail: mamychev@yandex.ru

Abstract

Socio-political problems are discussed in this article connected with the provision of socio-cultural integrity of the society in modern time of mass digitalization and introduction of the automatic and algorithmic systems. In the content of this article digitalization is considered as a global socio-political project, oriented for substitution traditional bases of identification and organization communities. This project is considered from critical position and is based, that its necessary state – oriented policy, directed for conservation and reproduction the historical memory, socio-cultural dominant of the development the society and also metapolitical and meta-legal foundation for sustainability of the political – legal organization in the 21st century.

The authors speak about the thesis about further convergence of the digital and cultural trends of transformations of socio-political system, when processes of digitalization will acquire more and more socio-cultural particularity of the development.

Keywords: power, unity, culture, politics, law, traditions, integrity, digitalization

1. Introduction

From the end of the 20th century, the common theme which was discussed in special literature and on different discussed platforms (forums, conferences, symposiums and so on) has become the statement of a crises of sociality justified by important and profound changes in socio-political vital activity. As a rule, vital activity is connected: first – with new technological challenges (Greenfield, 2018; Kelly, 2017) which change forms and methods of socio-political communications, identifications and unity of groups and communities (for example: new forms of settings and digital mobilization) (Volodenkov, 2015; Suvchuk, 2017; Ovchinnikov, Mamychev, Yatsenko, Kravchenko, Kolesnikov, 2020). That's why there is a question of matched answers to these challenges.

Second, with the change of value normative bases of social integrity and transformation of moral-ethical foundation of social cohesion (Mamuchev, 2020; Duff, 2012; Lin, 2012), third, with the development (Lektorsky,

2006; Srnichek, 2019) of crises of progressive ideology and capitalist forms of development worldview and ideological systems, which gave meaning and charity to the world explained the past, the present and future for many social groups, now they have lost their former dominant status and aren't legitimatical more for many social groups. That's why the loss of inherited value, the fear to lose speech before the face of incapacity to discover its potential (individual) as well as socio-political (Avanesyan A. 2019).

All these changes form new link between people, technologies, environment initiate new assemblies of material, biological and social contacts. To determine new trends of transformation of public life. All these trends are interpreted rather ambiguously in modern specialized literature.

On the one hand a deep crisis and even death of sociality and modernity is explained as a special historical and cultural project which was formed and developed by philosophers from age of New epoch (Nekleesa, 2011, Liotar, 1998). At the same time, they argue the imminent crisis of ideological, standard and ontological foundations of this project and settles a change of the last one by a new form of public – political organization, which is introduced as "post-social", post-humanitarian, "post-modern" world (Ritser, 2020). Mr. George Ritser, who used these variants in relation to sociology (but this mark we can use in common to socio-humanitarian field of discussions between these, who think, that our modern society is a modern world and those who approve that essential changes during last year ,we moved into the new "post modern" world. (Ritser, 2020)

It's obviously clear, that the ideological-semantic emptiness of the "new project" is identified by itself, through negation and deconstruction of all inherited from the previous epochs. These constructed projects mean and mark themselves through the prefix "post", which orient on thinking the opposition, negation, but also a claim for some future processes. It doesn't lead to the positive strategy of public-political development.

From the other hand, nowadays some research groups advocate evolutionary and convergent format of development public systems, substantiating joint action of different trends of development, which influence on transformation the public-political relations. In this situation equivalence of social, biological, ecological, digital and self-influence are accepted (Bennet, 2018). Research projects expel anthropocentric methodological position, consider social activity as well as the activity and paths of ecological, biological and digital development (Delanda, 2018; Butler, 2018; Latur, 2018). The main accent is considered as how these. trends resonate and amplify each other, jointly act in different situation.

While these tendencies are analyzed in the form of special assemblages, which don't form of stable systems and networks.

It's necessary to mark that they are added up into ontologically specific groups of different elements, which strengthen then each other and initiate definite events in public political vital activity. Besides they influence on the dynamics of different processes (economic, political, ecological, digital etc.).

Herewith, socio-cultural foundations of the society are the key foundation of transformation of social relation in political and legal dynamics. For example, the stable factor is socio-cultural particularity of specific society, in influences on different biological (for example – unique trends, connected with the development and introduction and the most important is the using of cross-cutting digital technologies and some other processes (Mamychev, Kim, Frolova 2020).

In this aspect some researchers describe this complex system of interaction of different tendencies and dominant of socio-political development in the way of the co-evolutionary paradigmatic attitude of the 21st century. "Co-evolution supposes the complex interaction as a functional unity of incoming parts with the safety of their substrate difference and independence. A person lives in the role of a subject; he uses technologies, which is the conversation of the human life on the Earth. Any ecological-anthropological movement for the conversation of nature as external that is human habitat as well as internal, spiritually-bodily, supposes the model of co-evolution (Kutyrev, Slyusarev, Husyainov 2020).

It can be claimed, that nowadays mentally-cultured foundation of our society are the key factors of modern transformation of public system, which can't be replaced and don't deny new technological system and digital technologies of interaction.

In this way cultural prototypes and stable believes and normative value orientations giving samples of public-political vital activity of people and models of public authority interaction, in modern researches actively acting and influencing actants are considered.

The last ones are in the interaction with specific practices and modern strategies, determining the shaping trends and directions of the subsequent socio-cultural transformations.

2. Traditional Foundations of Public and Political Integrity

The historical memory, traditions, cultural-symbolic space and state-legal experience of the society are considered the rod supports of any social and political integrity. The last ones are not only substantive bases of identification mechanism; it provides the connection between generations and continuity of socio-political evolution. Besides, they take part in the formation of symbolic unity of nation; form the image of the past, present and future in the society.

By and large it is symbolically constructed and reproductible unity, mainly determines the quavitative position of the life of people in their spatially temporal (i.e. direction of evolution political and socio-cultural life of the society, in spite of different cataclysms, radical transformations, happening during the development spiritual and moral system, conservation and reproduction dominated national ideas, symbols, images, attitudes and stereotypes and etc.) geographic and climatic specifics of deployment of socio-political processes and public authority interaction, which determine state-legal forms, organizations between parts, elements in unity.

Traditionally, the ideological and semantic basis of the state was the preservation of the historic memory and representation. Most clearly this system was formulated by K. Shmidt, the idea of the representation was formed that people who are the political unity, possess the highest and exalted more intensive view of being (existence), in contrast from natural co-existence of any groups of people.

Representation is not a standard but its like existential. To represent means to do visible and real something invisible existence by publicly present existence (Shmidt, 2010).

In this case, the historic memory and socio-cultural heritage are so called stable axial elements which were important components of the society, attracting in specific historical conditions and practices for reproduction and restructuring of public political integrity. Metaphorically telling, exactly data important elements were organic "building material" for organization or reassembling in new conditions of exact political legal system of the society, it has been provided the sustain ability and succession of socio- cultural evolution of the society.

From the beginning of the 20th century the main threat for historic memory and social and political integrity of the specific people was a paradigm of interests. This paradigm replaced many traditional, religious, spiritually moral and other social and cultural bases in socio-humanitarian knowledge. On this base a new platform of economic, political, social and philosophical, state-legal and many other knowledges has been formed in the society.

For example, the famous historian of ideas A. Khirshman explains that paradigma of Interest has become a new fundamental theoretical, methodological base for interpretation initial main principles of social development as different claims for building deep laws of movement, which will explain different points of evolution on the social dynamic processes.

The idea is paradigma of interests was used as clarification of enduring principles in the base of economic processes of change, producing, consumption and distribution as for understanding special economic and public changes. (Khirshman, 2010).

In its turn geopolitical "project of universal globalization, which moved and implemented in the society beginning from the middle of the 20th century was oriented for political standartization (spreading of democratic forms and their relations in the society imposing similar trends of political development to the detriment of sustainable social and cultural peculiarities of evolution), legal unification (not only close convergence or different legal systems and legal complexes, but the formation of the common ideologically conceptual base of their further development for example doctrine of human rights especially the concept of the "fourth" and "fifth" generation of human rights) and social cultural typing (in the form of spreading mass culture, the uniform lifestyles, universal socio-cultural values etc.

All these things have led to the whole abstraction from national-cultural legitimacies of development (which were marked in the role of delusions or mythical forms of thinking from traditional and civilized factors and dominant of evolution of the social organization of specific society.

That's why more than half a century the problem of universalist values which were discovered and described by philosophers in the epoch of Renaissance and they have the same interpretation in all socio-cultural contexts, but the recognition of the last one is the only one guarantee of providing of fair and sustainable development of the society and planetary civilization.

Franco Berardi is the popular Italian politician and philosopher approves, that a real democratic project can't have roots in culture and the can't express the belonging of their ideologies to any tradition; it is only the consequence of the widest specter of opportunities and decisions, it was born from the possibility of access to social institutes

for all individuals (as semiotic subjects which exchange by signs to join to universal rationality) (Barardy, 2019).

3. Threats and Risks of the 21st Century

At the beginning of the 21st century a new threat for preservation and the reproduction of historic memory of the society, its traditions and symbolic and ideological supports of social political integrity of the society has been already formed. (Grinfield A., 2018)

These threats are connected with the technological revolution and processes of integrity of public life. (Kelly, 2017)

In fact this valid project of integrity continues global tendency of the past century, oriented on massification and mythologization of the traditional socio-cultural dominants.

This active project of integrity oriented for "underground crawl" from civilized and ideological limits "essentially from ourselves, from own traditions its history from own civilization."

Two enemies were running one after another

1) Inspiring the threat system of principles and values

2) Granite fortress of elite people, its guard (Barriko, 2019)

The first forms of mass integrity were directed to these two points exactly and than to the great castles of power (schools, parliaments, churches) (Barikko, 2019)

Within the system of political organization of society it has got: first - the loss of dominant position on the traditional (national and also the development of new types of social and political mobility, digital and verticalized methods of providing political integration; second, to inadequacy of the traditional forms of political organization, public power relations, social and political communication and etc., modern trends of digital transformation of the society; third, to the ineffectiveness of forms of providing political integration and social and political mobilization social groups segments of the population etc., it will appear hybrid forms of the political leadership, together, combining established approaches, samples and methods of management decisions with the algorithmic and digital models.

It allows reflecting a resistance, readiness of national material (political existence of the nation) to any novation, receptions, borrowing.

Hence, for example researches have an inspiration to connect such a phenomenon, as a legal nihilism not with western form of political and legal thinking, It is based on the latent inconsistency between demands presented by actual legal culture and ancient typical understanding about law and legal ones.

This confrontation is the common attitude to the alien legal thinking and an alien model right in culture. (Nevazhzhai, 2000)

It should be noted, that at present time in European and American social political life autonomous digital algorithms and the robotic technologies, which access of public and political dynamics are intensively intruded into their culture.

They present optimal management decisions and development scenarios of development and the application of autonomous hardware complexes.

Besides, as grounds of motivational reasons of the modern political activity of youth (new generation or digital epoch), they are already not ideological and semantic elements, orientation to the value normative unity and social political integration, but an emphasis on forms of political self-thinking free designing and change boards of social communities, the development of online communications and virtualized places (in which social, political, processes are developing more and more).

The project of mass integrity is a problem, because it doubts, that socio- cultural reality the only important, which forms political experience, realize private and public interests of the person. Otherwise, this reality is not social, but "post-social, where digital algorithms and robotic technologies are used on the level as organizer and manager.

At present time digital technologies change as dynamic of political relations, taking away the boards between private and public interests and needs as well as political space, which is being filled by subjective and performative activities. (Lo Dg, 2015)

It is important that the last ones have not got social, cultural, ideological and meaning content, but political manifestation of social and political otherness and contextual, style forms (i.e. not form of life activity, oriented on preservation of the historic memory, the idea of common goodness, achievement of social solidarity etc., but styles of subjective or collective life, oriented on ourselves, on representation your otherness post humanitarian

and post- consumer culture). Is this context important history events socio-cultural symbols and images core and ethnopolitical dominants of the society are distorted and reinterpreted depending on goals tasks digital contents online performances etc.

It is clear, that the introduction of these technologies initiate new forms of political authority and hidden character of manipulation commercialization of data and their usage is selfish purposes. Destruction of value normative is spiritually ethical standards in the sphere of development and introduction cross-cutting digital technologies open the whole space for an abuse of power and subjective rights.

Researchers say, that modality of modern technologies reflects the algorithm easily was born in one context can be brought into another. It shows that very often commercial interests of the developer out weighs any thoughts of ethical character which he can have or care about fates of people who will be influenced by instruments made by themselves (this influence may be negative). It takes outside and clearly shows violence which always is hidden in the power and to see power's classification.

At the bottom of modern socio-political activity there are not ideologically semantic elements, orientation for value normative unity and socio-political integration but different forms political self-expression, free settings of mobile changing boards of social communities and development online communications. Public and political self-expression as a phenomenon acquires value normal measurement and becomes important for itself. It is not perceived you as a form and the way of achievement of any exact results public goals managerial tasks.

Here with different public and political events protects flesh mobs public-political performances don't serve to political unity and socio-cultural integration but they are directed on public demonstration and recognition the lifestyle or social scenes of any individual public groups.

Digital technologies and online culture nowadays born (not unevenly in different spheres of life activity or the society) a new differentiation and demarcation of people, connected by not social statuses, material or symbolic resources, but with the access to informative sources, Innovative technologies, to the "points of informative exchange" etc. in this case traditional social cultural basis and forms ethnopolitical identification are changed by difficult projected digital facts and dominants. The historic memory and socio-cultural dominants lose their "monopoly" for structuring social societies and ordering the public interactions. At the same time, it should be emphasize that digital technologies are not completely cleaned out, replaced and destroy socio-cultural forms of providing stability and integrality, sustainable symbols of the past, traditions and spiritually-moral standards and ethic demands, otherwise they converge with the last ones, adapt and reformat the history memory, cultural images and changeable demands online culture.

At present time, this convergence exactly is showed in structuring and identification online communities, construction of the virtual world and interactions of people in added reality.

However, those are distorted and reformatted depending on any direction of virtual communities. Another aspect of convergence is in developing another autonomic tendency: "converting into figures" a part of the tradition of forms of public/political interaction and national/cultural heritage, digital systems and autonomous algorithms (in the process of technic studying), besides universal digital matrixes of development got also socio-cultural specificity of development.

In other words, process of digitalization besides algorithmic and technological legitimacy acquires additional parameters: national and cultural dominance of development.

At this time digital space of public/political system reproduces specific characteristics of the development of the last one. In this aspect we see convergence of socio cultural and digital forms of practices and kinds of interaction; but end-to-end technologies (internet things, virtual and augmentative reality) "don't displace" and "replace" socio cultural images, performances, symbols, stable forms and practices, but converge with them. As a result the first and second adapt and use resources of each other.

Today, there are socio-political projects oriented for formation of new ideological systems and others corresponding to time of paradigm basis of the development of the society, policy, science, etc.

Thus, it is explained, "to understand new configuration forms of people's activity, technologies, interfaces, social interactions" it should find a new paradigmatic system.

So, with its help we can understand that it is more important to free man's activity in new conditions. (Barardy F., 2019)

However, from our point of view such backgrounds for a new value-nonmatter system in society as foundations of the new paradigm and worldview are not existed. On the assumption of today's reality, it is very difficult and

even impossible, to form a new paragmatic system on the base of abstract and universal values. It is necessary to have new circumstances (conditions).

4. Conclusions

So, based on the above, we can do a conclusion, that digital technologies and innovative way of the modern society doesn't take completely away and destroy socio-cultural forms of organizing stability and socio-cultural integrality, stable traditions, spiritual-moral standards and demands.

On the contrary, process of adaptation of socio-cultural foundations of the society and new digital forms of organization of socio-political relations are developing in different public system.

Moreover, developing and introducing digital algorism decisions acquire specific and character of the definite socio-cultural environment and itself machine learning takes place on images, settings and dominant of the environment.

Besides, socio-cultural forms from the one hand were and are in demand and important in the process of structuring and identification online communities, virtual world, forms and character of interaction in the added reality. But from the other hand – converting into figures a part of the traditional forms of the social and algorithms (in the process of the machine studying).

Besides "digital paths of development" they also get digitized socio-cultural specifics of evolution of specific public relations. That's why convergence of socio-cultural and digital forms, practices and ways of interaction is being watches, but cross-cutting technologies (internet, virtual and augmented reality "don't take away" and "don't replace" socio-cultural images, performances, symbols, sustainable forms and practices, but intertwine with them. As a result, the first and the second ones adapt and use resources of each other.

At present time the development of research strategy is in demand, which has the task: to examine tree tendencies in the modern political and legal organizations as equal and mutually influencing, changing socio-economic and political and legal reality. It supposes necessity to form the corresponding research dictionary. It permits to conceptualize and exactly describe: from the one hand, interaction and mutual influence of three tendencies; from the other hand – radical changes, is being happened in the society.

It also allows offering theoretical, methodological of modern life and in theoretical, practical plan to form prognostic models and scripts of their joint development.

Besides, at present time it is necessary to have the state program of preservation and reproduction in the society of metapolitical (traditions, customs, symbols, images, rites etc.) and meta- legal (Mental, psychological, moral and others) foundations of steadiness of political process and stable development of political and legal organization of the society.

In the 21st century the main competition will develop between different socio-cultural images, informational contents, virtual images (which will…) Construct on the base of national and cultural "material", has been made by the society in the process of its development and other symbolic resource of the policy. In its turn market competition (between goods, services, natural resource) will fade away on the second place, they will be replaced by a competition between projects (socio-cultural plans, providing semantic and ideological paradigm of modern development of digital and social intersubjective and virtual reality). So, the main resources, which will be able to vide harmonization of digital trends of development and real public and political relations, integration of social and cultural identifications and virtual forms of group interaction and online communities will be traditional symbolic systems and dominants of socio-cultural organization.

References

Avanesyan, A. (2019). *Metaphysics today*. Moscow, V-A-S press.

Barardy, F. (2019). *Soul at Work: From Alienation to Autonomy*. Moscow, Gryundrisse.

Barriko, A. (2019). *The game.* Moscow, Kolibri.

Bennet, G. (2018). *Pulsating Matter: The Political Ecology of Things*. Perm, Gile press.

Butler, G. (2018). *The psyche of power: the theory of subjection*. Sankt-Petersburg, Alatejya.

Delanda, M. (2014). *War in the era of intelligent machines*. Moscow, Kabinetnyj uchenyj.

Delanda, M. (2018). *New Philosophy of Society: Theory of Assemblages and Social Complexity*. Perm, Gile press. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350096769

Duff, A. S. (2012). *A normative theory of the information society*. N.Y., L.: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203137758

Greenfield, F. (2018). *Radical technology: the device of everyday life*. Moscow, Delo.

Kelly, K. (2017). *Inevitably. 12 technology trends shaping our future*. Moscow, Mann, Ivanov and Ferber.

Khirshman, A. (2010). *Rhetoric of reaction: perversion, futility, danger*. Moscow, Vysshaya Schola Ekonimiki.

Kutyrev, B. A., Slyusarev, V. V., & Husyainov, T. M. (2020). *Humanity and Technos: a philosophy of co-evolution*. Sankt-Petersburg, Alatejya.

Latur, B. (2018). *The politics of nature*. Moscow, Ad Margunem press.

Lektorsky, B.A. (2006). *Artificial Intelligence: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Moscow, IIntell.

Lin, P. (2012). *The Ethical and Social Implications of Robotics*. The MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England.

Liotar, G. F. (1998). *Postmodern state*. Sankt-Petersburg, Alatejya.

Lo Dg. (2015). *After Method: Disorder and Social Science*. Moscow, Institute Gaidar.

Mamuchev, A. Yu. (2020). *Sociocultural (archetypal and mental) foundations of the public-power organization of society*. Moscow, RIOR-INFRA-M.

Mamychev, A. Yu., Kim, A. A., & Frolova, E. E. (2020). "Future" as an attractor of modern political, legal and socio-economic transformations: an overview of the main problems and approaches. *Advances in Law Studies, 8*(5), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.29039/2409-5087-2020-8-5-3-17

Nekleesa, A. I. (2011). *The crisis of the modern world: new forms of sociality*. Moscow, Commission on Socio-Cultural Problems of Globalization.

Nevazhzhai, I. D. (2000). Types of legal culture and forms of legal consciousness. *Jurisprudence*, (2), 23-31.

Ovchinnikov, A. I., Mamychev, A. Yu., Yatsenko, T. S., Kravchenko, A. G., & Kolesnikov, Yu. A. (2020). Artificial intelligence in enforcement: epistemological analysis. *Journal of Politics and Law, 13*(2), 75-81. https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v13n2p75

Ritser, G. (2020). *Contemporary sociological theories*. Sankt-Petersburg, Piter.

Shmidt, K. (2010). *State and political form*. Moscow, Vysshaya Schola Ekonimiki.

Srnichek, N. (2019). *Platform capitalism*. Moscow, Vysshaya Schola Ekonimiki.

Suvchuk, N. V. (2017). Communicant. *Media reality: concepts and cultural practices*.

Volodenkov, S. B. (2015). *Internet communication in the global space of modern political governance*. Moscow, MGU press; Prospect.