

The Formation of Healthy Socio-Legal and Sociocultural Relations in the Age of Globalization

B N Kagirov^{1,a*}, H Pashayev^{2,b}, Yu V Tabakaev^{2,c},
O P Karnaukhov^{3,d}, and K A Kuzmenko^{2,e}

¹ Altai State University, 61 Lenina prosp., Barnaul 656049 Russia

² Gorno-Altai State University, 1 Lenkina str., Gorno-Altaysk 649000 Russia

³ Barnaul Law Institute of the MIA of Russia, 49 Chkalova str., Barnaul 656038 Russia

^{a*}marischa-klas@list.ru, ^bP_khalik@mail.ru, ^ckfls@gasu.ru, ^dkarnauhov.Oleg@bk.ru,
^eKkuzmenko22@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Keywords: healthy and unhealthy society, valueological approach, globalization, globalization strategies, sociocultural relations, socio-legal relations

Abstract: The urgent issue of healthy (valueological) sociocultural and socio-legal relations in the era of globalization is analyzed in the paper. Relying on the works of famous philosophers and sociologists who note the existence of opposing globalization strategies in the 21st century (noospherism and globalism-mondialism), their sociocultural basis is indicated. The most important role of the sociocultural foundations of society, ensuring its harmonization and recovery, is defined. In the socio-legal sphere, the authors identify three macro-socio-legal spheres of society, including in the era of globalization: norm-creating, (normosphere), marginosphere, and criminosphere. From the standpoint of general legal relations, they coexist in every society, including in a society of a globalizing sociosphere (which is in a state of instability and uncertainty). In a healthy and healing society, there is a high sociocultural level of the population, the normosphere is maximum, and the marginosphere and criminosphere are minimized. In an unhealthy society, on the contrary, the sociocultural level of the population is very low and continues to degrade; the normosphere is minimized; and the marginosphere and criminosphere grow and begin to prevail. The authors argue that the noosphere strategy of global social transition is aimed at creating a healthy, valueological sociosphere of the 21st century.

1. Introduction

The beginning of the XXI century was marked by a qualitatively new era in the development of society, its sociosphere, which is most often referred to as the era of globalization. This era has brought many benefits to mankind, as well as a set of global problems of nature and society, and therefore the attitude to globalization is very ambiguous, often polar. It is impossible to deny the facts of the growth of many conflicts in different social spheres, very rapidly changing, such as sociocultural, socio-legal, socio-political, socio-economic, socio-environmental, etc. This means the deformation of many social relations, in medical terms, their painful condition. First of all, this is due to the destruction of stable, historically long, traditional relations, which are replaced by rapid variability, or social transition as instability with a high degree of uncertainty.

S. S. Chistyakova, a researcher of these planetary social transformations, notes the following: “Since the second half of the 20th century, humanity has come to a deeper awareness of the relevance of globalization processes... Modern transformations taking place in society, set the task of philosophical and culturalological understanding of the new reality. The study of culture in the context of globalization processes has become very relevant and in demand” [14].

Thus, the famous Russian researcher of globalization processes, philosopher A. N. Chumakov, who wrote a trilogy of monographs on this topic and developed the author’s concept of globalization, writes in the final book of this trilogy “Global world: A conflict of interests” (2018) the following. “The modern world, which

entered the era of multidimensional globalization from the second half of the 20th century, is becoming increasingly integral, interdependent, global” [15]. However, the sociosphere turns out to be riddled with contradictions: “new problems are constantly added to unresolved previous problems and contradictions. <...> Inadequate perception of the global world significantly increases the risks of instability and instability of social development both within individual states and on a global scale” [15].

In this regard, today, the problem of improving public relations at the level of different countries, as well as globally, is very acute. No quick, positive solution to this problem has been found. In this article, the authors will express their views on this problem from the standpoint of scientific and philosophical knowledge and socio-philosophical knowledge.

The purpose of the article is to identify the current social strategies in the field of sociocultural and socio-legal relations. The following tasks follow from this: 1) to consider the essence of the valueological approach (from the standpoint of health - unhealth) to modern society; 2) to highlight relevant issues of social health in relation to sociocultural and socio-legal interactions within countries and in international relations; 3) to offer an author's vision of social transition from a socio-valueological perspective.

2. Materials and Methods

Since the article is of a socio-philosophical nature, the material is an array of general modern knowledge about society, presented in the light of its balanced social and socio-natural relations (socio-valueological nature, from the Latin term “valeo” is the way to health) and, on the contrary, unbalanced and conflict relations. Scientific and theoretical approaches and methods applied. These are such methods as dialectical, system-structural, ecological approaches, a philosophical approach to global modeling, as well as methods of scientific analysis, comparison (comparative), scientific and philosophical integration of the results, social forecasting.

3. Results and its Discussion

First, we turn to a general analysis of the sociocultural foundations of social life. In the most general terms, in a broad sense, culture is an integral life support, the foundation of human beings and society at any historical stage of its existence. Culture creates the integrity of a harmonious spiritual and material existence of people in society [5]. Along with classical domestic and foreign authors, who laid the foundations of modern cultural studies, modern humanities experts have made an undoubted contribution to the knowledge of general issues of culture, cultural studies [5]. Also, an understanding of the relationship between culture and civilization is important in the knowledge of sociocultural processes in the era of globalization. We can agree with researchers V. V. Khalev, V. I. Parshikov, E. V. Ushakova that the following fundamental difference between these phenomena [13]. On a large evolutionary-historical scale, civilization has a common development vector. But within the framework of the existence of a particular civilization, when considering it as a social organism of a sociosystem, in the ontogenesis of the system, it can have both a development and decay vector (at the final stages of the system's self-movement).

In other words, civilization can carry both progress and regression. On the contrary, authentic culture is spiritually oriented towards perfection in any historical periods of sociogenesis, and it is it that allows accumulating the spiritual forces of society during periods of social regression or the collapse of civilization and directing society to a higher form of its existence. In other words, the sociocultural vector of transition has a positive axiological orientation, and the civilizational vectors of the sociosystem can be both progressive and regressive. Namely, in civilization, “an objective factor (in the cycles of self-movement of systems) can act in the direction of both progress and regression of a sociosystem” [13].

Accordingly, in the civilizational aspect, a globalizing society, in its individual parts (in different regions, countries of the planet), can be progressive and developing, and in others, it can be regressive, decaying, dying. In other words, a globalizing civilization can be, on the one hand, valueological (healing, healthy, harmoniously creating), and on the other, anti-valueological, i.e., painful, conflictogenic, decaying, and dying. In the first case, as a result, the general sociocultural and socio-legal harmonizing order is built in the sociosphere. In sociological ideas, this is expressed in the concept of the noosphere. In the second case, as a result, the system of potential and real sociocultural and socio-legal conflict is built in the sociosphere, with the external apparent integrity of the global society (but filled with internal contradictions). In sociological

ideas, this is reflected in the concept of elitist mass society and globalism-mondialism [4]. Based on various, mainly polar civilizational concepts of noospherism and globalism-mondialism, at present, society is entering the global stage of political and legal risks in a stable and unstable society (O. A. Andreeva) [1]. Different social strategies are being formed in the sociosphere. These are strategies such as globocentrism and etocentrism (K. A. Kuzmenko [6; 7]).

From socio-valeological positions in society, we can distinguish the following main macro-social spheres of a socio-legal nature. These are polar macro-socio-legal spheres: the norm-creating sphere (normosphere) and the criminogenic sphere (H. P. Pashayev [10]). In addition, it is necessary to highlight the intermediate, standing between them, the marginal macro-socio-legal sphere (marginosphere) [11]. It must be remembered that the term marginality is a sociological concept that means intermediateness, “borderline,” uncertainty, instability of a person's position in society. Between the marked triad of macro-socio-legal spheres, there is a dialectical relationship, including one that allows us to evaluate their place and role from the standpoint of a healthy and unhealthy globalizing society. So, if the normosphere prevails in society, it turns out to be the most balanced internally and externally, valueological in general. On the contrary, if the marginosphere and criminosphere grow in society, we can talk about the anti-valeological nature of this society, about the general morbid state of society.

Also, we should correlate these macro-social-legal spheres with law, legal norms in society. The law highlights the basic norms of the relations of people in society, which characterize the normal balanced, healthy life of society. They are associated with the norm-creating sphere. Also, there are legal norms reflecting offenses, i.e., deviations from the normal, balanced healthy life of society, including very significant, criminal. In fact, these are the norms characterizing pathological social phenomena and processes in the criminosphere and partly in the marginosphere. “The criminosphere is associated with the concentration of criminal elements in it, ready for acts of crime, violence, or directly committing them,” one prominent researcher notes, “Here, specific social relations of a negative nature with respect to the life of people of the norm-creating sphere are taking shape.

Such a negative phenomenon, for example, is a socially dangerous criminal assault (crime)” [11]. The marginosphere includes individuals, as well as social groups and strata of marginalized people, i.e., those entities that for one reason or another fell out of normal public life. This includes people who have lost their jobs, families, loved ones, their own business, land, apartments, homelands, refugees, etc. They turn out to be rejected, alienated from normal life, together form desocialized elements and layers. I. V. Lysak rightly writes the following about this, “A characteristic feature of the Western information society is total alienation, the essential features of which are as follows: the alienation of a person from him/herself, from other people and from society as a whole, ... alienation is a powerful determinant of human destructive activity” [9]. We can add that in the current conditions of globalization and endless reforms in our country, marginalization is also increasing dramatically.

Thus, with a sphere-based macro-socio-legal approach to the analysis of a globalizing society, we can identify an important common feature, such as its dual normal-anomalous or valeological-anti-valeological existence [11]. It should also be emphasized that in the norm-creating sphere, all social institutions work normally; people receive decent upbringing and education, have a fairly high level of general and legal culture. In the marginosphere, for a significant part of the mass of the population, the most important and vital social benefits are becoming increasingly inaccessible. The educational level and the general social culture are sharply reduced. And in the criminosphere, the principles of existence are already actually being developed that are opposite to those that exist in the norm-creating sphere. Humane culture disappears, it is replaced by anti-human, inhuman. And in the criminal sphere, legal laws are specifically studied only in order to circumvent them more and more skillfully. The surrogates of the “culture” present here are deconstructive in general.

It should be emphasized that in a globalizing society, the culture of general social management of society acquires an important role. In socio-philosophical terms, it is possible to identify forms of partial and holistic control, which have fundamentally different foundations. Namely, “in the historical development of society, two different types of initial control cells formed: holistic and partial” [3]. The first type arises in the patriarchal family of the communal system, where all members of the group are with the need to unite into voluntary integrity. The second type takes place in partial control systems, originating in the bowels of the

slave system, where initially only a small part of the vital functions of the upper stratum is provided, first of all, accumulative and domineering, and the entire control system is differentiated by the type of “friend or foe” (B. N. Kagirov) [3]. In the strategy and legal culture of noospherism, holistic control prevails, and in the strategy and legal culture of globalism-mondialism, partial civilizational control prevails.

4. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that in the era of globalization, a number of civilizational, sociocultural, and socio-legal contradictions are sharply aggravated. In essence, civilizational strategies are divided into the opposite: life-affirming harmonious and disharmonious-destructive. In order to avoid the second scenario of a globalization strategy, the highest sociocultural values developed by humanity, should be fully developed and really implemented in people's lives. Social management needs to be developed not of a partial egocentric type, but of holistic governance at a global level, relying on the highest values of culture developed by mankind. Since only they are able to heal society, saving it from serious conflicts in the era of globalization. In this regard, we will pay attention to the thoughts of famous domestic culturologists. So, G. P. Vyzhletsov, in his work "The Axiology of Culture," points to the most important value aspect of culture. He argues that the countless achievements of higher forms of culture unite around the concept of value. It is the values of the culture that reveal its central significance, namely: taking up the main values of social life and turning them into a creatively leading and saving force that can determine the graceful exit of the country and nation from the crisis in the era of complex changes [2]. T. S. Lapina characterizes the importance of culture. “As a valuable asset, culture is accumulative, and this is the main wealth of mankind created by it. In the course of cultural processes, essential human forces are formed and developed ...” [8].

Thus, there are alternative strategies and ways of globalization. But the path to a healthy society is only one, namely through a return to the highest values of culture and the elimination of the main antagonistic conflicts within society and between society and nature.

References

- [1] Andreeva, O. A. (2016). The dialectic of political and legal risks in the conditions of stable and unstable social development: An analysis of conceptual approaches. *Philosophy of Law*, 6(79), 27-31.
- [2] Vyzhletsov, P. G. (1996). *Axiology of culture*. St. Petersburg., Russia: SPbSU.
- [3] Kagirov, B. N. (2006). *Theoretical and methodological aspects of the integration of knowledge about management* (Abstract of Dissertation of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences). Kemerovo, Russia: Kemerovo State University of Culture and Arts.
- [4] Kagirov, B. N., & Karnaukhov, O. P. (2019). Public and legal order in society and in the context of professional training for internal affairs bodies in the new global conditions. In *Philosophical and pedagogical problems of modern education* (pp. 114-117). Barnaul, Russia: AltSPU.
- [5] Kokina, M. N. (2019). The problem of preserving domestic traditions in the constitutional and legal culture of Russia. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Development of the Noosphere*, 9, 48-81.
- [6] Kuzmenko, K.A. (2019). The problem of state sovereignty in noospheric civilization: The example of Russia. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Development of the Noosphere*, 6(8), 17-69.
- [7] Kuzmenko, K. A. (2019). Correlation of the constitutional foundations of globocentrism and etocentrism (the example of Russia). *Bulletin of the Institute for the Development of the Noosphere*, 7(9), 5-47.
- [8] Lapina, T. S. (2017). The nature of the philosophy of culture: A modern option. *Cultural Studies Analytics*. Retrieved from <http://www.analiculturolog.ru/>.
- [9] Lysak, I. V. (2004). *Philosophical and anthropological analysis of the destructive activity of modern man*. Rostov-on-Don, Russia: NCSC HS Publishing House; Taganrog, Russia: TRTU Publishing House.
- [10] Pashayev, H. P. (2007). *Socio-philosophical analysis of the ratio of norm-creating and criminal spheres of public life* (Dissertation of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences). Barnaul, Russia: AltSU.
- [11] Pashaev, H. P., & Ushakova, E. V. (2019). The problem of extremism and terrorism in the aspect of normal and abnormal in society. In H. P. Pashaev (Ed.), *Collection of Materials of the All-Russian (with International*

Participation) Scientific-Practical Conference “Modern Youth and the Challenges of Extremism and Terrorism in Russia and Abroad” (pp. 107-112). Gorno-Altaiisk, Russia: GASU.

- [12] Tabakaev, Yu. V., Krasnova, N. N., & Kuzmenko, K. A. (2017). Socio-philosophical analysis of modern problems of the interaction of global, public administration and law: Educational aspects. *Philosophy of Education*, 73(4), 39-47.
- [13] Khalev, V. V., Parshikov, V. I., & Ushakova, E. V. (2014). *Transition in the system of social and natural existence: Philosophical and methodological analysis*. Novosibirsk, Russia: Publishing House of the SB RAS.
- [14] Chistyakova, S. S. (2007). *Globalization of culture: Genesis, typology, modern meanings* (Dissertation of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences). Belgorod, Russia.
- [15] Chumakov, A. N. (2018). *Global world: Clash of interests*. Moscow, Russia: Prospekt.