

VALUE AND REGULATORY FOUNDATIONS FOR DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONS: THEOLOGICAL AND CONSERVATIVE LEGAL ASPECTS

Abstract

This paper examines the value-normative transformation of the modern social system and analyzes the impact of digitalization processes on social relations and their development. The content of the article substantively analyzes the key areas of digitalization of social relations; the authors mark out in each of these areas positive and negative effects on the sustainable development of the socio-cultural integrity of society. The empirical material used in this work includes expert assessments and analytical materials related to the digital transformation of traditional religious systems and the value-normative foundations of society. The research perspectives presented in this paper evaluate and interpret all the events and processes under consideration from the conservative legal point of view, from the standpoint of the significance of the socio-cultural environment, sustainable traditional institutions and values for coding and predicting the digital transformation of society in the 21st century.

In the conclusion of the study, the authors substantiate the adequacy of the doctrinal and legal model of society's development called "digital etatism" from the perspective of ensuring stable socio-cultural development and the integrity of the social system.

Keywords: big data, blockchain, state, artificial intelligence, politics, law, religion, traditions, digitalization, evolution.

Introduction

At the present time, digitalization is a key driver of the development of social relations, politico-legal, spiritual and cultural life of modern societies. Digitalization is a very complex and multi-level phenomenon of the modern era; it affects almost all spheres of institutional organization and types of social practices and transforms public and private human activity, exerting a significant impact on changes in the worldview and value-normative structures of society.

Current practice shows that radical changes are taking place in society with regard to value-normative preferences (Avanesyan, 2019) and the moral foundations of social interaction (Kha-

brieva & Chernogor, 2020); there is a steady increase in the importance of digital technologies as the foundation of the contemporary socio-economic, political, legal and cultural life of society (Baldwin, 2018). Moreover, there is a loss of public confidence in the basic institutions and traditional formats of private and public interaction.

Digitalization has drastically changed the traditional spiritual and moral foundations of civilization and is transforming the religious institutions and cultural dominants of social systems. In the overwhelming majority of cases, these changes are justified in public discourse as qualitative changes that contribute to improving public interaction and creating more mobile and conven-

ient tools for public and private interactions. For example, it is noted that “digitalization and, partly, robotization of traditional religious associations have become integral factors of everyday life, the objective and purpose of which is to organize and accomplish the mission for which they were created – the missionary or communicative activity of the religious community. To help people find themselves in the world of innovative technologies and social upheavals” (Akhmedov, 2021, pp. 15-16).

This work substantively analyzes the key areas of digitalization of social relations and identifies its positive and negative effects on the sustainable development of the socio-cultural integrity of society. The empirical material used in this work includes expert assessments and analytical materials related to the digital transformation of traditional religious systems and the value-normative foundations of society. Consideration of these value-normative foundations serves as the basis for the conservative legal modeling of adequate state policy avenues in the field of social relations’ digitalization. This is related to the research optics presented in this work, viz. all the events and processes under consideration are evaluated and interpreted from the conservative legal point of view, from the standpoint of the significance of the socio-cultural environment, sustainable traditional institutions and values for coding and predicting the digital transformation of society in the 21st century.

The Main Areas of Digitalization: Theological and Conservative Legal Interpretation

In this part of the article, we identify and substantively examine four main areas of the digital transformation of social relations and also analyze the positive and negative effects that arise in each of these areas.

1. *Digitalization and automation of key public institutions and sustainable types of practices associated with the translation of analogue infor-*

mation into the digital format, and the digitization of standard analogue processes and of formalized routine and monotonous procedural activities, etc.

The key positive trends in the development of this area are simplicity, ease, speed and efficiency of storage and use of data, information and acquired knowledge; instant access to the achievements of mankind (cultures and civilizations), which significantly enriches the worldview of people, contributes to the development of tolerance and respect, improves the process of working out and making socially significant decisions; simplifies many routine processes, frees up social time and resources, and provides mobility of interaction and quick exchange.

Moreover, many traditional religions use digital technologies to disseminate undistorted information and meaningful interpretation of the value-normative and moral foundations of a particular religious teaching. Islam, Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Buddhism quite actively use new communicative formats both within their communities and for the fulfilment of messianic ministries (Smirnov, 2017). In general, it should be noted that many traditional institutions are changing their communicative format in view of the fact that the life of modern people is changing dramatically, and so are their ways of world perception and forms of existence. In this regard, innovative technologies do not so much transform traditional institutions as “the tradition itself draws them into its structural fabric” (Chistov, 1986, p. 46), turning innovations into a traditional instrument of social interaction.

In turn, the following negative trends should be marked out: the insecurity of data, hidden information, as well as a high potential for manipulating this information, and most importantly, the impossibility of public control and the influence of various communities on automated processes (for example, bureaucratic procedures, automation of electronic document flow, autonomous expert evaluation of financial, social or other reliability, etc.). Also, from the viewpoint of con-

servative legal thinking, the biggest common threat of this area of digitalization is that there emerge effects of the shadowing of public-power processes and various power-managerial decisions based on autonomous algorithmic (expert) systems, which ultimately leads to the formation of a digital shadow elite, and of hidden tools of digital power domination, including the spread of effects of power abuse, digital dominance, etc.

2. *Ensuring the openness of the processes associated with the organization and actualization of public authority, a high level of information awareness and accessibility of available public services* that are provided by various organizations and institutions (religious, political, economic, legal, etc.), as well as convenience and comfort of social participation and action, interactive nature and mobilization of social resources. In addition, one of the main reasons for technological changes is the focus on ensuring, with the use of digital technologies, a high level of transparency (openness) and online accessibility of public institutions in society, particularly public authorities, the formation of effective mechanisms of public influence and control over the functioning of these mechanisms, as well as the development of cultural and political institutions' commitment to improving the quality of public services and social responsibility.

Moreover, innovative forms ensure people's effective involvement in the social process, in the activities of certain social institutions, whereas innovative technological solutions expand civic participation and ways of collective interaction. Network digital forms of integration are a powerful tool for integrating and articulating social expectations, social and collective needs, public and private interests.

At the same time, this technological orientation, from a conservative legal point of view, supersedes the basic socio-cultural and spiritual-moral foundations of the functioning of public institutions in society and replaces the civilizational orientation of these institutions to the technological requirements and needs of the devel-

opment of technical systems. This leads to the formation of the so-called transhumanist transformations of social and spiritual nature and to systemic institutional distortions, i.e. when the existing social institutions do not perform or do not properly implement those functions and tasks for the implementation of which they were actually created (Mamychev, Mordovtsev, & Ovchinnikov, 2015). For example, "thanks to the blockchain functions, it is planned so that people themselves will vote and approve changes in the main documents of their religion (influence their value-normative, semantic and dogmatic provisions, transforming them for the modern era of digital transformation – authors' note), collectively determine their own spiritual mentors and honestly collect and track cash flows for the needs of their church and congregation" (Tsentsura, n.d.).

The focus on the formation of convenient digital services and platform solutions creates the illusion of space of choice and spreads the effect of primitivization of religious and other spiritual and moral systems: "if we consider the religious situation in terms of the "religious economy theory", its own omnicanality is also revealed, that is, an approach to communication with a consumer of religious services in which clients choose the most convenient channel for receiving a religious product: an Internet resource, a mobile application, an ordinary visit to church" (Smirnov, 2019, p. 143).

On platform solutions, projects for the formation of digital religions, new "technological symbols of faith" emerge on a systematically regular basis, as well as projects for digital salvation of man and digital immortality (Zabiyako, 2012) related to the digitization of consciousness and connection of people to a new digital reality, which is usually guided by general artificial intelligence. Moreover, similar ideas are put forward by some members of the academic community, various popularizers of science, representatives of IT corporations, etc. For example, Professor Dimitar Sasselov of Harvard Universi-

ty believes that “Our wishful hope for continuity and preserving our identity runs contrary to the realities of our planetary existence... If our future is to be long and prosperous, then we need to develop artificial intelligence systems, in the hope to transcend the planetary lifecycles in some sort of hybrid form of biology and machine” (Brockman, 2017, p. 37).

In the opinion of Professor Frank Tipler of Tulane University, it is innovative technologies and, above all, artificial intelligence systems that will solve all the problems of mankind (violence, conflicts, limited resources, etc.) and overcome the biological limitations of man: “Eventually it will be the AI’s and human downloads (basically the same organism) that will colonize space... A human download can think as fast as an AI, and compete with AI’s if the human download wants to” (Brockman, 2017, p. 40).

In the same way, Paul Davies from the University of Arizona (USA) believes that “Designed Intelligence will increasingly rely on synthetic biology and organic fabrication, in which neural circuitry will be grown from genetically modified cells, and spontaneously self-assemble into networks of functional modules. Initially, the designers will be humans, but very soon they will be replaced by altogether smarter DI systems themselves”, and then “instead of sidelining themselves, humans modify their brains (and bodies) using the same technology as when creating AI”, which in consequence will lead to two scenarios: either people “subsequently hand over this enhancement management to DI, achieving a type of superhuman status that can exist alongside (yet remain inferior to) DI”; or “one can imagine DI and AHI (augmented human intelligence) merging at some point in the future” (Brockman, 2017, p. 50). Similar versions with the emergence of a new subject of history are presented by the famous Israeli Professor of History Yuval Harari from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In his view, the development of digital- and biotechnologies will lead to a new evolution circle and the emergence of new creatures -

Homo Deus, with new ideological and value-normative foundations (Harari, 2017).

The socio-legal basis for the new creatures is evolving within the framework of the concept of somatic rights, which is often called “human rights of the fifth generation”. They are designed to record the possibility and ability of people to freely and responsibly make legally significant subjective decisions and actions regarding their own bodies with the use of a wide range of achievements in the field of biotechnology, genetics and other innovative technologies (Kruss, 2000). In this aspect, “somatic rights, which are closely related to the physiological essence of man and are dependent on scientific progress, are a product of society’s development and require an appropriate mechanism of legal support” (Potseluev & Danilova, 2015, p. 7). And, above all, this regulation should include moral foundations since the uncontrolled growth of technological innovations can generally raise the question of human identity, giving rise to new socio-technological or biogenetic entities, the evolution of which was discussed above.

Let us mark out another group of negative trends arising from the development of this area of digitalization, viz. a change in value-normative preferences and an increase in the importance of digital technologies as the foundation of the modern social system and its various processes (political, legal, cultural, economic, spiritual, etc.). This also entails a loss of public confidence in traditional social institutions and traditional formats of social interaction.

3. *Implementation of technologies of blockchain, big data and oriented machine learning (artificial intelligence systems) in modelling and forecasting social processes and various social events (economic, political, legal, etc.)*, including the use of these technologies both at the level of expert systems (collection, processing and presentation of data for making power-managerial and other socially significant decisions) and at the level of legitimizing the results of political, legal and other activities.

It is obvious that recent technological changes significantly improve the quality of building models of social development based on a huge array of data (using Big Data technologies), as well as algorithmically generated analytical and expert materials (autonomous expert systems based on designed artificial intelligence). This makes it possible to formulate fairly objective and adequate socio-political forecasts, socio-economic strategies, sociocultural models and specific programs for improving various spheres and sectors of public life in a rather mobile way.

In addition, machine complexes and algorithmic solutions ensure objectivity in decision-making, filtering out cultural, historical, ethnic and other prejudices, clichés, etc., and blockchain (distributed ledgers) and big data technologies will be able to ensure the authenticity of data and information and improve the system of anticipatory lawmaking and socio-political forecasting and the system of taxation, health care, social security, education, etc.

As a negative trend from the development of this area of digitalization, we should mention a number of contradictory and risky practices which are intensively developing in modern public life and form a whole range of threats to the spiritual and cultural security of the nation.

First, software packages and digital autonomous algorithmic systems replace the real socio-cultural process with virtual events and digital processes, algorithmically constructed information, digital pastors, politicians, etc. Currently, algorithmic solutions make it possible to simulate any social processes in the digital space and experience a variety of experiences. It is important to emphasize that according to the Thomas theorem, if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences (social, psychological, emotional, etc.). At the same time, the digital space is focused mainly on the experience that radicalizes spiritual, moral and socio-legal restrictions existing in a particular society, creating worlds and situations in which the user can have an “exciting experience” of overcoming all re-

strictions and the emotional effect of his illusory power, which leads to fundamental gaps between the current socio-cultural reality and the digital one. The latter also dents the importance of basic social institutions, social responsibility, etc.

Second, this is the virtualization and illusory nature of the social process, where real human voices, opinions, public/civic positions are lost in an “avalanche” of digital bots and fakes, generated comments, etc., which leads to the complete disappearance of such phenomena as “public opinion”, “social expectations” and so on. In this context, S. V. Volodenkov rightly notes that “working with comments on publications, managing the perception of a message using tools of commentary activity is becoming widely used mechanics of digital manipulative and propaganda practice. Moreover, this manipulative and propaganda practice actively uses cyber simulacra - virtual personalities that function in social media and simulate the representation of real-life network users” (Volodenkov, Voronov, Leontyeva, & Sukhareva, 2021, p. 26).

Another example of the destruction of the social system’s moral foundations is the system of cyber simulacra of Matt Liston, the ex-founder of the Augur digital platform, who publicly claims that the digital religion “0xΩ” (Zero x omega) he has created is not aimed to conflict with the traditional religious systems, but, on the one hand, it takes traditional forms and techniques of religious experience and transfers them to the digital environment, replacing religious institutions with digital simulacra; and, on the other hand, it represents the experience of free interaction of “adepts” outside the system of religious dogmas, spiritual and moral restrictions, and so on. Thus, the main feature of this cyber-religion is that “it is universal, all-embracing and practically invulnerable and gives almost equal rights to all believers. This favourably compares it with the other religions, with their division into priests-leaders and obedient flock, the complex and often corrupt hierarchy, taboos and dogmas. Here, the voice of every parishioner is important

and can be heard, used to express one's opinion, without the risk of getting lost in the crowd" (Martynenko, 2018).

In the framework of the conservative legal aspect, it should be added that there is another negative trend in this area: regimes of democratic legitimation (an allusion to the ideological and conceptual foundations of a democratic regime and an adequate institutional and legal embodiment of the democratic idea) is replaced with socio-technological legitimation (argumentation through the discourse of convenience, interactivity, forward-mindedness, etc.), which ultimately leads to the destruction of the value-normative and institutional foundations of the modern principles, mechanisms and regimes of the rule-of-law state.

4. Digital forms and interactive methods of public-power and other social communication in the individual-society-state system, as well as 24/7 online monitoring and control over any social processes, events, social tensions and conflicts.

It is also one of the leading areas of digitalization, which was initially associated with fundamental changes in the social organization and its qualitative improvement thanks to innovative technologies. The main orientation of the technologies is associated with the involvement of society in making various managerial decisions in the framework of various public institutions (public, religious, political and other organizations, as well as, primarily, in the framework of the functioning of public authority institutions). In addition, innovative digital technologies should have a positive effect on ensuring mass participation in the discussion of socially significant initiatives; they are to ensure comprehensive control over the functioning and performance of various social institutions and of public authorities and their officials.

Another positive effect from the introduction of digital technologies is associated with the formation of convenient digital public services, other public and state interactive platforms and sites.

For example, it is no coincidence that this area is becoming today the main one in the digitalization of traditional religious systems. For example, Orthodoxy is introducing various mobile applications (an electronic prayer book, an interactive Orthodox calendar, Orthodox messengers, etc.), digital platforms and services (Russian Orthodox Church Online, Father Online, and Mother Online). Islam actively uses social networks for development and communication; there are various Internet portals and Muslim services which provide undistorted information about Islam, its spiritual and moral values and norms; "there are a lot of applications in the App Store and Play Market, ranging from those that remind of prayer times and help determine directions to Mecca to those in which one can read the Quran and various Hadiths" (Tsentzura, n.d.). An even wider variety of services, digital platforms and algorithmic applications are used in Catholicism and Buddhism.

It appears that this tendency will be expanding and deepening since, according to Vakhtang Kipshidze (2017), Chairman of the Synodal Department for Church Relations with Society and the Media, "modern society is of informational nature; the ROC cannot ignore information technologies. Just as in his time the St. Apostle Paul went to the Roman forums to be heard, so modern successors of the apostolic authority are called to appear where their word can be heard. IT is a means to put your word across".

Let us mention another positive trend in this area of digitalization of social organization - this is the creation and implementation of autonomous algorithmic systems of oriented machine learning that ensure social, political and legal order, the prevention of socio-political conflicts and illegal actions (machine monitoring systems, predicative law and justice, etc.).

The negative trends in this area of digitalization of social relations are as follows:

- development of the effects of prejudice of artificial intelligence systems and machine failures/errors in oriented machine learning,

which entail massive discrimination of citizens (on the grounds of gender, race, ethnicity, religion and other social attributes), defragmentation of the socio-cultural integrity of society and a more radical “digital stratification” of society;

- targeted dissemination of contextual and individualized information, news, fakes, etc. that are not reliable or impartial, while digital public services create a distorted picture of public reality, the illusion of easy control, real importance and significance of public participation;
- development of manipulative technologies focused on the creation of imaginary contradictions, information construction of public opinion and social problems/conflicts, accentuation through digital media of the attention of society, target groups and individuals on “profitable” problems and possible ways for their solution;
- prevalence of commercial interest in the development and implementation of end-to-end digital technologies. In this regard, Adam Greenfield (2018) rightly notes that “a developer’s commercial interest so often overwhelms any concern they may have preserved for ethical behaviour, or concern or the fortunes of anyone affected by the tools they bring into being. It surfaces and makes plain the violence that has always been implicit in the power to see and the power to sort. Most specifically, it demonstrates how assumptions that have framed urban experience since humans beings first gathered in cities are being undermined by newly emergent technical capability” (p. 324).

Therefore, the absence, first of all, of social and legal control and a decline in the importance of spiritual and moral standards allow for the increasing introduction of various algorithms for “group event detection” or determination of “space-time clusters of rebellion”, “scalable anomaly”, “preemptive control”, and so on (Greenfield, 2018, p. 325), which are presented

as effective systems for ensuring social and legal order, but basically, they cover the commercial interests and goals of the digital shadow elite.

Conservative Legal Modeling of Areas of Digitalization of Social Relations

As mentioned above, the digitalization of social relations in its essence and focus is not a transient process of transition from analogue instruments and information sources to innovative digital forms and methods of communication, but a more fundamental process affecting the key institutional foundations and worldview structures of society. Moreover, in contrast to the previous industrial revolutions, which also significantly transformed social institutions, value-normative structures and determined new vectors of development, etc., the fourth industrial revolution, “following the same path”, at the same time brings about a fundamentally new thing - the creation of a new dimension or a new type of reality in which social processes and events unfold (Schwab, 2019).

So, unlike the previous eras, when the daily life of people proceeded in biological, physical and intercommunicating (religious, socio-cultural, national, etc.) realities, our epoch is shaping the fourth- dimension - digital reality. According to many researchers and analysts, starting from the late 20th century, there have been increasingly distinct tendencies associated not only with the formation of a new digital format (measurement) of the life of society but also the processes of adaptation of a new digital reality to other dimensions of human life. First of all, this is seen, on the one hand, in contradictions and conflicts between the socio-cultural reality (its value-normative, institutional and other foundations) and the digital reality (new electronic forms, technological principles and norms, digital culture, etc.); and, on the other hand, in their interaction and convergence. In the latter case, we are talking about the fact that in contemporary society, there is the convergence of socio-cultural and

digital forms, practices and methods of interaction, and end-to-end technologies (the Internet of things, virtual and augmented reality) do not “displace” and do not “replace” value-normative structures, but, on the contrary, they are intertwined with them, and, as a result, both the former and the latter adapt and use each other’s resources.

Whereas in the early 21st century, the overwhelming majority of the processes of social relations’ digitalization were interpreted negatively as the main threat of destruction of the value-normative framework of society, the intensified introduction of digital technologies into the daily life of society and increased confidence in them have changed the perspective of their assessment. Even conservative public institutions are beginning to view digital reality as an integral and significant dimension of the modern social life of people, organizations and the state. For example, the Catholic theonormative doctrine interprets the digital space as the main sphere and form of human life and identifies its positive and negative effects. Thus, in his third encyclical, “*Caritas in Veritate*”, Pope Benedict XVI characterizes the digital environment as an expanding space of people’s everyday life today: “The digital space is a reality in the lives of many people today... Technology - it is worth emphasizing - is a profoundly human reality, linked to the autonomy and freedom of man” (Pope Benedict XVI, n.d.).

In general, this perspective of considering digitalization is dominant in the traditional value-normative worldview structure. In other words, it is usually interpreted as: first, a certain transitional process, which marks the transit of social organization from one qualitative state to another, the transition from industrial development to digital; second, as a process of changing analogue technologies to end-to-end digital tools, in which the usual forms of social communication and instrumental ways of human life are changing and expanding due to the introduction of innovative end-to-end digital technologies.

In the first case, digitalization is viewed primarily in the instrumental aspect as a process that is quite “traditional” for industrial revolutions; it presupposes the replacement of “old” tools used in social life by new technologies. Each industrial revolution creates more and more perfect and effective tools of production, communication, data collection and processing and expands sensory, bodily, mental and other abilities and skills of a person. And the modern stage is not particularly different in its directionality from the previous ones, since it is focused on the technical transformation of human instruments, where “man is perfecting his own organs, whether the motor and sensory, or is removing the limits to their functioning” (Freud, n.d.). This is a new circle of human change “not so much biologically as technically” (Mazin, 2018, p. 46), of perfecting technologies that improve or functionally replace man.

In the second case, the emphasis is on the formation of a new, digital reality of the development of society, religion, politics, law, etc. Here digitalization is interpreted as a broader concept; it is not limited to a set of processes associated with the development, implementation and operation of digital technologies and tools. This concept reflects these processes plus the formation of new ideas, values, attitudes, forms and models of relations, institutions, etc.

Nevertheless, it is important here that any technology and any tool created by man can be used either for a good cause or for a bad cause; the key factor holding back the development and spread of the above-mentioned negative trends is an adequate system of social and legal restrictions and the spread of general spiritual and moral standards, general and professional deontological (moral and ethical) codes in the field of digital transformation of social relations. Vakhtang Kipshidze (2017), Chairman of the Synodal Department for Church Relations with Society and the Media, righteously states that “any technology can be used for the greater good; therefore we use IT to the extent that it contributes to our goal

of Christian ministry. At the same time, there are technologies that, unfortunately, can certainly be used to destroy human dignity. If the task of technology is to absorb a person's consciousness, limit his communication to the virtual world, deprive him of the beauty of contemplation of God's world and of living human communication - then, alas, this is no longer a tool, but a trap for human freedom".

In the socio-legal design of the future development of society, end-to-end digital technologies and innovative forms in the organization of social interaction radically change (not evenly yet in different spheres of society) the political, legal and economic landscape of society's organization and "introduce" new differentiation and delineation of people who are connected not so much with socio-cultural statuses, material or symbolic resources as with access to information resources, innovative technologies, "points" of information exchange, etc.

At the same time, all these technologies and innovative forms do not completely erase or destroy the socio-cultural forms of organizing stability and socio-cultural integrity, sustainable traditions, spiritual and moral standards and requirements. On the contrary, it is necessary to model and implement mechanisms that ensure the processes of adaptation of the socio-cultural foundations of society and new digital forms of evolution of social systems. We believe that today socio-cultural forms, on the one hand, are much in demand in the process of structuring and identifying online communities, the virtual world and interaction in augmented reality; on the other hand, digital systems and algorithms (in the process of machine learning), in addition to the "*digital trajectories of development*", also receive "digitized sociocultural peculiarity of the evolution of specific social relations" (Sociocultural (archetypal and mental) foundations of the public-power organization of society, 2020).

Therefore, we maintain the position that in modern society, there is a convergence of socio-cultural and digital forms, practices and methods

of interaction, and end-to-end technologies (the Internet of things, virtual and augmented reality) do not "displace" and do not "replace" socio-cultural and spiritual and moral images, representations, symbols, stable forms and practices, but, on the contrary, are intertwined with them and, as a result, both the former and the latter adapt and use each other's resources.

In this regard, the most adequate doctrinal basis for the development of the state and society in the digital era is the so-called "*digital etatism*". This doctrine assumes that digitalization processes unfold in a certain national and cultural environment and that complex algorithmic systems designed in society should serve the purposes of this environment and ensure its safety and integrity. This stimulates the development of national digital platforms that use information networks to monitor, prevent and counter various risks, challenges, and threats.

Unlike global digitalization and digital unification projects, it is substantiated herein that the emerging national networks should be controlled and regulated within the sovereign jurisdiction of a particular state since it ensures, on the one hand, protection of citizens' and organizations' data from their free use and, on the other hand, protection of the national and cultural specifics of society and the adequacy of the development of end-to-end digital technologies to the unique trajectories of the development of certain civilizational systems. For example, Chinese researcher Zhao Hongrui (2020) notes on this point that "virtual network technologies need to be guarded, guided and monitored, and this protection will serve the purpose of protecting network information on the basis of coercive law... only sovereign coercive force can exercise compulsory jurisdiction, and ordinary treaty actions other than sovereignty cannot establish a universal order" (p. 36).

In the framework of digital etatism, emphasis is put on the processes associated with ensuring stateness in the context of digital challenges and threats. They presuppose not so much attention

to the sovereign qualities of state power (to independently determine and implement the priorities and directions of external and internal policy of the state) as to the possibilities and ability of “systemic counteraction to the processes of penetration into key spheres of life of the state and society from external actors of geopolitical confrontation” (Volodenkov et al., 2021). Digital security and digital sovereignty in this context are becoming key factors to ensure the sustainable functioning of various processes in society (economic, political, legal, cultural, etc.).

In addition, another aspect is associated with the transformation of the traditional doctrinal political and legal foundations of the institution of the state; first of all, we are talking about the basic categories that describe the essence of this institution and its differences from other forms of public organizations and political subjects. Thus, today many basic categories such as “public authority apparatus”, “territory”, “population”, “sovereignty”, “legitimacy”, “legality”, and others are being substantially transformed. End-to-end digital technologies change the principles and modes of implementation of public authority, alter the forms and methods of public-authority communication in the individual-society-state system, destroy the traditional formats of sociopolitical identification and maintenance of the socio-cultural integrity and value-normative unity of the social system and give rise to new ones.

Conclusion

So, it is evident today that complex social forecasting and socio-legal modelling do not use only the “social” and “humanitarian” as a fundamental element and the dominant trend of power and management activity. Today, traditional socio-cultural forms and characteristics of social organization and public administration technologies are not fundamental either in the dynamics of modern social systems or in the doctrinal and programmatic priorities of their evolution. Technological requirements and innovative prospects

for restructuring modern societies are becoming more attractive and significant for today’s economic, political and technological elites.

Currently, at issue is the status of new drivers of social development, which are still difficult to define with the traditional concept of “subject” (digital personalities, digital platforms, digital algorithms and other digital actants) and which significantly affect the political iteration and dynamics of the political process. In addition, the key centres of mobility, forms and technologies of social-legal and public-authority communication are being restructured; the key resources of social organization are also changing; the most important of them are data generated by the population, organizations, mechanisms, and algorithms. It is data that become the basis for the constant circulation of information and content and the base for the modern “digital formation”.

At the same time, digital platforms are becoming a new “value-normative” and “institutional framework” that integrates various environments of social interaction (economic, political, legal, cultural, etc.) and also forms a new balance and priorities for the interaction of realities (digital, sociocultural, biological, and physical).

From the perspective of ensuring stable socio-cultural development and the integrity of the social system, the most adequate doctrinal and legal model is “digital etatism”. In the framework of this model, digitalization processes are assessed, interpreted and oriented towards a specific national-cultural environment, and complex autonomous algorithmic systems are designed with consideration to the peculiarities of this environment and the needs to ensure its safety and integrity. This approach steers the development of national digital platforms and information networks to protect the data of citizens and their organizations, helps preserve the national and cultural specifics of society and ensures the development of end-to-end digital technologies in the context of unique evolutionary paths of civilizational systems.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the RFBR Grant No. 21-011-44228 “Law and Legal Consciousness in the Theological Dimension: History and Modernity”.

References

- Akhmedov, R. M. (2021). *Digital religion i traditsionnyye religioznyye tsennosti. Osobennosti sootnosheniya (po materialam elektronnykh resursov)* (Digital religion and traditional religious values. Features of the correlation (based on materials from electronic resources), in Russian). Moscow: UNITY-DANA.
- Avanesyan, A. (2019). *Metafizika segodnya* (Metaphysics today, in Russian). Moscow: V-A-C Press.
- Baldwin, R. (2018). *Velikaya konvergentsiya: informatsionnyye tekhnologii i novaya globalizatsiya* (The Great convergence: Information technology and new globalization, in Russian). Moscow: Delo Publishing House, RANEPa.
- Brockman, J. (2017). *Chto my думаем о машинах, которые думают: Ведущие мировые ученые об искусственном интеллекте* (What do we think about machines that think: Today’s leading thinkers on the age of machine intelligence, in Russian). Moscow: Alpina non-fiction.
- Chistov, K. V. (1986). *Narodnyye traditsii i folklor: ocherki teorii* (Folk traditions and folklore: Theory essays, in Russian). Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the N. N. Miklouho-Maclay Institute of Ethnography. Leningrad: Science.
- Freud, Z. (n.d.). *Nedovol'stvo kul'turoy* (Dissatisfaction with culture, in Russian). Retrieved from https://librebook.me/civilization_and_its_discontents/vol1/1
- Greenfield, A. (2018). *Radikal'nye tekhnologii: ustroystvo povsednevnoy zhizni* (Radical technologies: The design of everyday life, in Russian). Moscow: Delo Publishing House, RANEPa.
- Harari, Yu. N. (2017). *Homo Deus. Kratkaya istoriya budushchego* (Homo Deus. A brief history of the future, in Russian). Moscow: Sinbad.
- Khabrieva, T. Ya., & Chernogor, N. N. (2020). *Budushcheye prava. Naslediye akademika V. S. Stopina i yuridicheskaya nauka* (The future of law. The legacy of Academician V. S. Stepin and legal science, in Russian). Russian Academy of Sciences; Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation. Moscow: INFRA-M.
- Kipshidze, V. (2017). *IT-strategiya Russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi* (IT strategy of the Russian Orthodox Church, in Russian). Retrieved from https://www.cnews.ru/articles/2017-03-29_itstrategiya_russkoj_pравoslavnoj_tserkvi
- Kruss, V. I. (2020). *Lichnostnye ("somatichek") prava cheloveka v konstitutsionnom i filosofsko-pravovom izmerenii: k postanovke problemy* (Personal (“somatic”) human rights in the constitutional and philosophico-legal dimension: to the problem statement, in Russian). *Gosudarstvo i pravo* (State and Law, in Russian), 10, 43-50.
- Mamychev, A. Yu., Mordovtsev, A. Yu., & Ovchinnikov, A. I. (2015). *Natsional'no-kul'turnye osnovy rossiyskoy gosudarstvennosti i pravovoy politiki* (National and cultural foundations of Russian statehood and legal policy, in Russian). Vladivostok: VSUES Publishing House.
- Martynenko, A. (2018, June 4). *Poyavilas' pervaya v mire religiya, osnovannaya na blokcheyne, na russkom yazyke* (The world’s first blockchain-based religion

- appeared, in Russian. *Tekhnokul't* (High technology news, science and technology, in Russian). Retrieved from <https://www.techcult.ru/technology/5386-religiya-na-baze-blokchejna>
- Mazin, V. (2018). *Mashina vliyaniya* (The machine of influence, in Russian). Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House.
- Pope Benedict XVI (n.d.). *Entsiklika "Karitas in veritate"* (Encyclical "Caritas in Veritate", in Russian). Retrieved from https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/ru/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate.html
- Potseluev, E. L. & Danilova, E. S. (2015). *Ponyatiye i vidy lichnykh (somaticheskikh) prav cheloveka* (Concept and types of personal (somatic) human rights, in Russian). *Elektronnyy nauchnyy zhurnal. Nauka. Obshchestvo. Sostoyaniye* (Electronic scientific journal. The science. Society. State, in Russian), 1(9). Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ponyatie-i-vidy-lichnostnyh-somaticheskih-prav-cheloveka/viewer>
- Schwab, K. (2019). *Chetvertaya promyshlennaya revolyutsiya* (The fourth industrial revolution, in Russian). Moscow: Publishing house Exom.
- Smirnov, M. Yu. (2019). *Tsifrovizatsiya kak "obnulyeniye" religiy* (Digitalization as "Zeroing" of religions, in Russian). *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A. S. Pushkina* (Bulletin of the Leningrad State University. A.S. Pushkin, in Russian), 3, 137-146.
- Smirnov, M. Yu. (Ed.) (2017). *Encyclopedic dictionary of sociology of religion*. Saint Petersburg: Platonic Philosophical Society.
- Sotsiokul'turnye (arkhetipicheskie i mental'nye) osnovy gosudarstvenno-vlastnoy organizatsii obshchestva* (Sociocultural (Archetypal and mental) foundations of the public-power organization of society, in Russian). (2020). Moscow: RI-OR: INFRA-M.
- Tsentzura, K. (n.d.). *Blokcheyn-propovedniki i giki-buddisty. Pyat' samykh populyarnykh tsifrovyykh religii* (Blockchain preachers and Buddhist geeks. The five most popular digital religions, in Russian). Retrieved from <https://techno.nv.ua/it-industry/pjat-samykh-populyarnykh-tsifrovyykh-relihij-2475250.html>
- Volodenkov, S. V., Voronov, A. S., Leontyeva, L. S., & Sukhareva, M. (2021). *Tsifrovoy suverenitet sovremennogo gosudarstva v usloviyakh tekhnologicheskoi transformatsii: soderzhanie i osobennosti* (Digital sovereignty of the modern state in the context of technological transformations: Content and features, in Russian). *Polilog* (Polylogos, in Russian), 5(1). Retrieved from <https://istina.msu.ru/publications/article/357578773/>
- Zabiyako, A. P. (Ed.). (2012). *Kiberreligiya: nauka kak faktor religioznykh transformatsiy* (Cyber religion: Science as a factor of religious transformations, in Russian). Blagoveshchensk: Amur State University.
- Zhao, H. (2020). *Kiberprostranstvo i suverenitet. Vvedenie v zakonodatel'stvo o kiberbezopasnosti* (Cyberspace and sovereignty. An introduction to cybersecurity legislation, in Russian). Moscow, Saint Petersburg: Nestor-History.