



POLITICS ONLINE ПОЛИТИКА В СЕТИ

DOI: 10.22363/2313-1438-2025-27-3-417-429

EDN: JFKCLB

Research article / Научная статья

Transversality of Network Communications and the Choice of Behavior Strategy: Conceptual Dimension

Leonid V. Smorgunov 

Sociological Institute of the RAS — Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied
Sociology of the RAS, *St Petersburg, Russian Federation*

✉ lvsmorgunov@gmail.com

Abstract. The academic discourse examines how the specific features and attributes of network communication facilitate transversality in interactive exchanges. Scholars particularly emphasize two key phenomena emerging from networked communication: individuation (the personalization of participation) and network solidarity (collective identity formation). These dual phenomena develop within a communicative space characterized by cooperation, instrumental functionality, shared belonging, visual representation, personalization, and motivational stimulation. A central focus lies in how network communication achieves transversality through what we might term a “politics of difference” — the strategic intersection of diverse perspectives. This transversality manifests through several dynamic qualities: the contextual fluidity of communication processes, their inherent multidimensionality, the strategic adaptability of messages, critical receptiveness to opposing views, self-referential meaning-making, pragmatic interaction patterns, and permeability to institutional influences. Together, these characteristics fundamentally reshape behavioral strategy selection models. Where traditional public choice theory operates on causal logic, communicative transversality shifts strategic priorities toward: precautionary approaches (focusing on effects rather than root causes), trust-building through cooperation, and maximizing latent interaction potential.

Keywords: social network, network communication, individuation, network community, transversality, transversal politics, transduction, choice strategy, logic of connective action

© Smorgunov L.V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Conflicts of interest. The author declares no conflicts of interest.

For citation: Smorgunov, L.V. (2025). Transversality of network communications and choice of behavior strategy: Conceptual dimension. *RUDN Journal of Political Science*, 27(3), 417–429. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2025-27-3-417-429>

Трансверсальность сетевых коммуникаций и выбор стратегии поведения: концептуальное измерение

Л.В. Сморгунов 

Социологический институт РАН — филиал Федерального научно-исследовательского социологического центра РАН, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация

✉ lvsmorgunov@gmail.com

Аннотация. В центре внимания современных исследований — особенности сетевой коммуникации и ее признаки, обеспечивающие трансверсальность коммуникационного взаимодействия. Подчеркивается значение двух возникающих в процессе сетевой коммуникации феноменов — индивидуации и сетевой солидарности. Последние формируются в пространстве таких характеристик общественного пространства коммуникации, как сотрудничество, инструментальность, принадлежность, визуализация, персонификация, стимулирование и др. Особое внимание уделено трансверсальности сетевой коммуникации, основанной на политике пересечения различий. Трансверсальность сетевой коммуникации выражается в динамике контекстуальности коммуникационных процессов, их многомерности, манипулятивной множественности, критической открытости, самореферентности, коммуникационной прагматике и институциональной открытости. Все это создает условия для изменения моделей выбора стратегий поведения. В противоположность теории публичного выбора трансверсальность коммуникации ориентирует принципы стратегического выбора на предосторожность, воздействия на эффекты, а не причины, управление доверием на основе сотрудничества и ориентации на раскрытие потенциалов взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: социальные сети, сетевая коммуникация, индивидуация, сетевое сообщество, трансверсальность, трансверсальная политика, трансдукция, стратегия выбора, логика связанного действия

Заявление о конфликте интересов. Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Для цитирования: Сморгунов Л.В. Трансверсальность сетевых коммуникаций и выбор стратегии поведения: концептуальное измерение // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Политология. 2025. Т. 27. № 3. С. 417–429. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2025-27-3-417-429>

Introduction

In modern conditions, when network space is actively used as a source of information and communication, online interaction serves as a powerful tool for shaping political values and identities that influence political positioning and activity. Networked communication reveals both controlled and uncontrolled mechanisms of persuasive influence. A key feature of such interaction is the policy of transversality — a strategy of mutual coordination and intersection of social, cultural, generational, territorial, and other differences. Transversality can be understood in two interrelated aspects. The first is a model of media consumption, marked by a shift from monologic media formats to applications and news aggregators organized through fractalization (e.g., TikTok) or stream-based platforms with rapid switching capabilities (e.g., Telegram channels, podcasts). The second is a model of group interaction, where virtual platforms and local media operate as collaborative projects in terms of funding and editorial policy. For these communities, transversal (horizontal) interaction holds intrinsic value; they operate through minority logic and often deliberately avoid mass audiences. Thus, analyzing these platforms — including local collaborative media and Telegram channels — as networked designs of communicative action with varying degrees of controlled and uncontrolled mechanisms holds scientific significance. Equally important is identifying mechanisms of network communication capable of fostering a shared civil identity within the transversal framework of intersecting differences on social networks.

Network communication as a space of individuation

Contemporary communications are becoming a central factor that determines not only our attitude toward the world but are increasingly conceptualized as the very space where worlds are formed. Mediated through digital technologies, communication flows have become equivalent to the flows of life itself within complex assemblages of both human and non-human actors. In this context, communication extends throughout the multicomponent network society in a distinctive manner, striving to integrate disparate elements into formations that are at once stable yet dynamic, diverse yet unified, conflictual yet cooperative. The phenomenon of network self-organization has given rise to the conceptual framework of transversal solidarity politics, where the communicative dimension emerges as the predominant factor [Semetsky 2008; Jung 2009; Kangieser 2012].

The newest generation of user networks, built upon linked data and consolidated content, enables a transformation of communication processes toward streaming and live broadcast modalities. Crucially, these networked participation structures increasingly reveal the fundamental importance

of individuation — as networks accumulate the collective's potential energy within their architecture, energy that becomes actionable through individual catalytic interventions. This dynamic brings to mind Gilbert Simondon's framework, which conceptualizes the co-emergence of individuation and collective formation through transduction, creating spaces of "individualizing collectives". For Simondon, the developing individual's very being is constituted through the collective dimension. Importantly, the collective here is not a generalized aggregation of individuals through inductive processes, but rather emerges through the transductive unlocking of individuation in alignment with collective potentials. As Simondon argues: "The collective is not a substance or a form anterior to the individuated beings that would compel them, penetrate them, or condition them: the collective is the communication that envelops and resolves individual disparities as a presence that is the synergy of actions, the coincidence of futures and pasts as an internal resonance of the collective" [Simondon 2022: 242]. Initially, transduction comes from biology and genetics as a process of DNA transfer between cells using viruses, but later it is understood as any process of transferring cybernetic information between elements of a system using coded signals. When analyzing networks, including social ones, transduction means the transfer of similar information and communication signals along the links between nodes or vertices. Transductive transitions are also used in machine learning in the concept of graph transformation. Sometimes transduction is understood not simply as a process of information transfer, but as a process of transforming the context and the element in the transferred information. Transduction is procedural in nature. With its help, it is possible to characterize transitions from one state to another. G. Simondon considers this phenomenon using the example of the transition of liquids from a liquid to a solid or vaporous state. We consider transductive transitions in relation to working with information, since it is this that determines the degree of individuality, and the individual characterizes the ability to preserve or increase the information content [Simondon 2022]. In the course of the study, six information modes are distinguished: 1) the mode of the individual's functional autonomy to produce and disseminate information; 2) the mode of information centering, through which the individual manages information, modulates the environment for its dissemination and determines individuation; 3) the mode of changing the form of information, its transition from sound to text, from texts to visualization, from one form to the integration of forms: for example, a transition of this kind involves a change in the form of text communication (from printed text to capital letters and visualization) as a result of increasing emotional tension during a discussion and the use of a teaser; 4) the mode of thematic layering of information, when, for example, a change in topic occurs and the

meaning of communication within a single discussion based on the assumed connections between old and new topics that arise in the imagination of the commentator (user); 5) the centripetal information mode that determines the movement of communication flows to the individual, the consumption and processing of information signals by them, their individual acceptance; 6) the centrifugal information mode, its dispersion and distribution in the network. Transductive transitions are important mechanisms in the formation of structural connections in social networks during the formation and use of various information modes. It is precisely such transitions as transduction procedures in information modes that constitute the signification and meaning of individuation in social networks.

In this regard, the modern stage of communication is becoming trans-stabilizing, suggesting a state filled with the potential of new formations in the process of individuation moving toward solidary collectives. In a certain sense, such networks oppose the mechanization dreamed of by the representatives of the idea of the semantic web, capable of representing a certain logical conclusion on the basis of computation. Even today, network communication is not so much a process directed by machine-readable elements, as an open system of a transhumanist project, in which the individual remains the central link in the management of information flows by learning how to interact in a human-machine assemblage with other people. As Cornelius Castoriadis wrote, “the creation of instituting society, as instituted society, is each time a common world — *kosmos koinos*: the positing of individuals, of their types, relations and activities; but also the positing of things, their types, relations and signification — all of which are caught up each time in receptacles and frames of reference instituted as common, which make them exist together” [Castoriadis 1998: 370]. It should be emphasized that network communication does not simply arise around certain topics or values that are of interest to many or professed by many. It arises in a network space that creates the conditions and forms the potential for communication in action, i.e. is a co-public place for it. Such a common place-space of communication has the ability to unite differences without totalitarianism [Eriksson 2005]. Hence, social networks create a communal space of communication.

Community communication space

Today, networking is an essential characteristic of society, not only connecting actors and changing the nature of relationships between them, but also creating a different space for the implementation of life goals. Emerging groups create a community space of communication for multiplying social projects [Mikhaylenok, Nazarenko 2020]. In this regard, their life activity

is based on new forms of cooperation determined by the diversity of the network organization of interactions. On this basis, effective and active cooperation of people in politics arises, which must be recognized and supported. And finally, the advantage of plural democratic networks as spaces for experimentation and renewal can be combined with local life and learning so that local traditions are better understood and included in action, not as retrospective practices, but as a tool for finding progress. Political affiliation is a new word for political positioning, or rather, it captures the modern nature of a person's definition of themselves as a political being [Hall 2013]. Today there is no need for total identity with the collective; belonging to a clan-tribe is fixed by the practice of political action together with other members of the commune, who are not subject to exclusion. Political belonging in a network community does not know any exceptions at all [Christensen 2005].

Networks intensify the growth of new communication knowledge through intensive exchange, deconcentration and mixing of information flows. In networks, there is intensive interaction between its participants, allowing each of them to observe a different qualitative practice of communication based on the openness of the boundaries of communication. In this regard, networks facilitate the direct transfer of this experience and perform an important function of the demonstration effect of the spread of network communication. Networks arise, as a rule, around innovative communication centers. Such a center ensures the life cycle of a network organization, and therefore the possibility of spreading communication innovations. Networks are mobile in their structure and ensure a free flow of information and knowledge due to various communication structures — vertical, lateral, transversal. It is the latter that ensure freedom of communication and make it possible to connect different flows of knowledge, which increases the likelihood of the emergence of communication potentials. The emerging situation of multiplicity is interpreted here as an opportunity for *transversal communication*, which creates a space of interactions devoid of the previous (capitalist, liberal, colonial) practices of disciplining, domination, displacement and marginalization. “From this perspective notions of solidarity as universalism or solidarity as based on sameness are problematic. The relevance of transversal politics consists of the encompassment of difference through equality” [Agustín, Bak 2021: 859].

The main features of network communication are as follows:

1. Visualization (based on the crisis of representation, when a visual sign breaks away from what it represents and begins to live its own life; a multitude of signs subject to various interpretations). What is a sign? It is a reality presented in the relationship between communicants.
2. Personification (based on an identity crisis; represents a process of proto-individuation, according to Simondon).

3. Communication stimulation (involvement in network communication as a process of virtual reality of the world).
4. Transborderism (representing a crisis of local communication binding and violation of the sovereignty of place).
5. Hypertextuality (the interconnectedness of multiple texts that destroy dominant narratives).

The result of the development of network communication is expressed in the violation of the linear principle of the communication process, which assumes the cybernetic principle of transmitting signals to organize interaction from the source to the recipient; the transfer of the political to the communication sphere, often accompanied by affective polarization [Stukal, Akhremenko, Petrov 2022] and information (hybrid) wars; the loss of grounds for evidence-based communication through solid justification (reality, facts, logic, scientific evidence).

Can we consider this development as a process of destabilization of the order of communication and hope for a new order based on the previous rules (openness, deliberativity, representations, mediation, meaning and objectivity)? Isn't the current stage of communication trans-stabilization, presupposing a state filled with the potential of new formations in the process of individuation movement to new collectives, the main feature of which is the multiplicity of differences?

Transversality of network communication

The resulting situation of plurality is interpreted as an opportunity for transversal communication. Félix Guattari first proposed this term in the 1960s and further developed it in the direction of a postmodernist strategy of overcoming differences. In the 1990s, the feminist movement in Italy began to use the concept of “intersection of differences”, which Nira Yuval-Davis began to use as “transversal politics” in her book *Gender and Nation*, published in 1997. Several characteristics of transversal politics in general can be noted: transversality is not equal to a policy of overcoming differences; the latter are recognized if they do not interfere with equality; transversality recognizes borders and differences, but fights oppression within borders together with the oppressed (and not for their benefit); transversality permeates borders, establishing non-oppressed and non-alienated relationships of differences; transversal politics is a policy of large and small groups, based on solidarity actions; transversal politics is a militant politics of activity of groups striving for equality of the position of difference. At the same time, transversal politics is based on a number of premises [Yuval-Davis 2011: 12]. Firstly, an epistemology of standpoint, which recognizes that in each positioning the world is seen differently, and thus any knowledge based on only one positioning

is “incomplete” — which is not the same as saying that it is “invalid”. In this epistemology, the only way to approach the “truth” is dialogue between people of different positionings. Secondly, an important concept of transversal politics is the embracing of difference with equality. This means recognizing, on the one hand, the importance of difference, and on the other hand, that notions of difference should embrace, and not replace, notions of equality. Such notions of difference are not hierarchical. They presuppose an a priori respect for the positions of others, which includes the recognition of their distinctive social, economic and political power.

Third, transversal politics is based on a conceptual — and political — differentiation between positioning, identity, and values. People who identify themselves as belonging to the same collective or category may be very differently situated in relation to a range of social divisions (e.g., class, gender, ability, sexuality, life-cycle stage, etc.). At the same time, people with similar positioning and/or identity may have very different social and political values. The essence of transversal politics is to bring together intersecting differences on the basis of equality without oppression.

In this sense, transversal communication is characterized by a number of characteristic conditions of the modern design of interaction. First of all, it is necessary to note *the contextuality* modern communication processes, which is dynamic and creates the need for constant mobility of content and the form of its expression, i.e., meanings, values and justifications arise and are affirmed in changing contexts, they are mobile and tied to them. “Therefore”, as researchers rightly emphasize, “the practice of discursive communication is not limited to the search for a scientifically substantiated, objectively provable way of thinking inherent in a particular community, it certainly takes into account the context of relationships and life worlds that escape the attention of scientific objectification” [Alekseeva, Verkhovskaya 2023: 805–806]. *The multidimensionality of communication* is important, which involves various areas, spheres, levels, topics, and sequence of events. Nearby in the communicative space there are information flows describing seemingly significant and insignificant facts, the interpretation of which in a single flow creates consonance and resonance. *Manipulative multiplicity*, i.e., change of positions, opinions, judgments and beliefs based on turbulent fluidity, deterritorialization of positions creates the possibility of integrating changed beliefs and convictions into a strategy of searching for new justifications and building a unity of the worldview. The penetration of official propaganda into the modern communication space has given rise to the phenomenon of political correctness. In this regard, transversal communication opposes the latter by creating conditions of *critical openness* based on the acceptance of meaningful differences and the search for conviction on the basis of plurality

rather than totality. As James Bohman stressed, the space open to computer-mediated communication supports a new kind of distributive rather than unified public sphere with new forms of interaction. Distributive form means that the computer medium of the Internet decentralizes the public sphere; it becomes a plural society rather than a clearly unified and all-encompassing public sphere in which all interlocutors participate [Bohman 2004: 153]. In this regard, *self-reference* as the ability of communication participants to justify judgments by references to their own experience and to relate the world to their inner conviction is ensured by the possibility of a variety of comparisons with the experience of equal others. Although *the holographic principle*, which states that the world, consisting of processes and events, can be perceived only through representation, is often contrasted with the pragmatic turn in cognitive science, which asserts that cognition is practice, it can nevertheless be inscribed in the transversal characteristic of communication, if the latter is understood not as a preparation for the pragmatics of action, but as the practical action itself. In this sense, the world as a relationship presented in information can be interpreted from an anthropological position, when objectivity is only an informational condition of the relationship to the world, and not a characteristic of the world. And, finally, *institutional openness* is a condition of the transversal policy of communication, when the rules of communication are developed in its process. S. Fuller rightly pointed out that in such an uncertain society, “you will always have to get another chance to play a game whose rules can always be challenged” [Fuller 2021: 336]. This is where the question of human behavior strategies in the new network collectivity arises.

What is the strategy of behavior in the conditions of network transversality?

The theory of rational choice of behavior strategy was based on the principles of individualism, rationality and optimality. The availability of information was considered the main condition for choosing the strategy of interaction, which, for example, in the “prisoner’s dilemma”, was expressed either in cooperation or in conflict. The strategy of “nudging” was based on the desire to force the opponent to act in the right direction using the mechanism of rational forecasting based on backward induction. Principles of strategic choice in transversal networks communications are built on the conditions of the possibility of forming a transversal community that operates on the basis of the precautionary principle rather than the abstinence principle [for more details, see Latour 2005]. Often, unforeseen circumstances (contingency) are seen as conditions that threaten controllability and its network organization. This led to the principle of abstaining from action that involves risk and uncertain consequences. However, this approach

is an expression of the previous view of control according to the cause-effect principle, provided by science. In this respect, the work plan for overcoming these circumstances is an integral part of the network management and its security. Here, control relies entirely on the precautionary principle, which is opposed to the principle of abstinence.

In contrast to the linear orientation of the previous management system, when decision-making processes were at the center as ways of responding to emerging causal dependencies, the modern system of network action is focused rather on managing effects that arise under the influence of unforeseen circumstances [Smorgunov 2021]. In a complex society, it is impossible to establish the causal sequence of what is happening due to the large number of emerging connections and mutual influences. But it is possible to determine the connections and relationships themselves and try to regulate their possible effects. In this regard, digitalization is both the basis for the emergence of connections and relationships, and the possibility of their arrangement and regulation.

Trust management is also important, not discipline. In a modern network society, interaction is based on mutual acceptance of the conditions of open and trusting communication. Therefore, the problem is not the integration of disciplinary norms into the communication process, but the formation of a trusting space of interaction, when norms are the result of communication. Trust management here means creating conditions that reliably ensure interaction between people based on trust in each other. This is especially important in a situation of conflict or risk, when the possibility of contingent events and interaction factors increases. Trust management is possible on the basis of cooperation, and not a simple agreement on mutual obligations. It is this that is important for revealing the potential of possible actions.

In modern studies [Bennett, Segerberg 2012; Caraway 2016] a new concept of the system of development of communications in social networks was proposed — the logic of connective action, built on the priority of individualized relations. Developed in various studies of network behavior, the logic of connected action is generally characterized by a number of features that speak about the strategy of behavior of users of social networks. Thus, an individual builds his relationships in networks on the basis of personalized content, using a biographical approach to the offer and evaluation of network information. At the same time, the communication action becomes a self-motivating act based on the recognition of equality and the significance of diversity and difference in network contexts.

Joint communication production and exchange occurs on the basis of personalized expression, which can take the form of a transductive transition between speech, imagery, sound, and other modules of information transmission. It is important to note that the adoption of public measures or contribution to the

common good becomes an act of personal expression and recognition or self-affirmation.

Technological networks of personalized communication include more than just the exchange of information or messages; they themselves become organizational structures that manage and stimulate communicative action: communicative action becomes self-directing. M. Castells, characterizing virtual communities, wrote that they are interactive communications around common interests and goals, but sometimes communication becomes a goal in itself [Castells 2010]. Of course, if self-directed communicative action could be noted as a random fact at the beginning of the network development of society, then decades later it can be spoken of as a certain way of life. Note also that public goods themselves can receive a new theoretical definition, since in networks it is easier for so-called free riders (from the previous logic of collective action) to become participants in political networks that erase the boundaries between public and private. Social media activities are largely self-organizing without external central or “lead” organizational actors and their resources.

Conclusion

Thus, the properties of the network organization of communication in the context of the transversal policy of communication interaction were considered. In the digital network context (or based on the action of the network organization of communication), one can speak of the individuation of a person in a hybrid sociotechnical environment or of the processes of subjectivation in heterogeneous network assemblages, which complicates the processes of forming basic values and common civil identity. Individuation in the process of socialization in transversal network communities arises on the basis of transversal interactions and persuasive communication due to a flexible system of roles and functional differentiation.

The transformation of persuasive communication mechanisms is associated not only with the mobility of the content of communication messages (moral, psychological, logical and political factors), but also with the active use of complex network communication design (virulence, diffusion, centrality, openness, controllability). In modern conditions, when the network space is actively used by people as a source of information and communication, online interaction acts as a powerful means of forming political values and identities that influence political positioning and activity.

An important property here is the policy of transversality, i.e., the strategy of mutual coordination and intersection of social, cultural, generational, territorial and other differences. For communities, transversal interaction is valuable in itself; they act in a minority logic and often do not seek to reach a wide audience.

Hence the new strategies of behavior of social network users based on the logic of connective actions: effects management, precaution, trust management, self-motivation, stimulation by communicative action.

Received / Поступила в редакцию: 10.01.2025

Revised / Доработана после рецензирования: 18.02.2025

Accepted / Принята к публикации: 19.02.2025

References

- Agustín, Ó.G., & Bak, J.M. (2021). On transversal solidarity: An approach to migration and multi-scalar solidarities. *Critical Sociology*, 47(6), 857–873. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520980053> EDN: MZYDAA
- Alekseeva, T.A., & Verkhovskaya, Z.A. (2023). The “third generation” constructivism: Framing and communication. *RUDN Journal of Political Science*, 25(4), 801–816. (In Russian). <http://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2023-25-4-801-816> EDN: QKUFPR
- Bennett, W.L., Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139198752>
- Bohman, J. (2004). Expanding dialogue: The Internet, the public sphere and prospects for transnational democracy. *Sociological Review*, 52(1), 131–155. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00477.x> EDN: FLMUXH
- Caraway, B. (2016). OUR Walmart: A case study of connective action. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(7), 907–920. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1064464>
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society*. 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Castoriadis, C. (1998). *The imaginary institution of society*. K. Blamey (Trans.). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Christensen, P.V. (2005). Until further notice: Post-modernity and socio-territorial belonging. *International Review of Sociology*, 15(3), 553–554. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03906700500272566>
- Eriksson, K. (2005). On the ontology of networks. *Communication and Critical Cultural Studies*, 2(4), 305–323. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14791420500332451>
- Fuller, S. (2021). *Post-truth: Knowledge as a struggle for power*. Moscow: High School of Economics Publishing.
- Hall, S. (2013). The politics of belonging. *Identities: Global studies in culture and power*, 20(1), 46–53. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2012.752371>
- Jung, Y. (2009). Transversality and the philosophical politics of multiculturalism in the age of globalization. *Research in Phenomenology*, 39(3), 416–437. <http://doi.org/10.1163/0085555509X12472022364208>
- Kanngieser, A. (2012). And ... and ... and ... The transversal politics of performative encounters. *Deleuze Studies*, 6(2), 265–291. <http://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2012.0062>
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. NY: Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199256044.001.0001>
- Mikhaylenok, O.M., & Nazarenko, A.V. (2020). Network communities: Past and future. *Tomsk State University Journal of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science*. 56, 274–284. (In Russian). <http://doi.org/10.17223/1998863X/56/24> EDN: OQJLGI
- Semetsky, I. (2008). The transversal communication, or: Reconciling science and magic. *Cybernetics And Human Knowing*, 15(2), 33–48.
- Simondon, G. (2022). *L'individu et sa genèse physico-biologique*. Moscow: IOI. (In Russian).

- Smorgunov, L.V. (2021). Digitalization and network effectiveness of public governability. *Political Science (RU)*, 3, 13–36. (In Russian). <http://doi.org/10.31249/poln/2021.03.01> EDN: KHMUCH
- Stukal, D.K., Akhremenko, A.S., & Petrov, A.P. (2022). Affective political polarization and hate speech: Made for each other? *RUDN Journal of Political Science*, 24(3), 480–498. (In Russian). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2022-24-3-480-498> EDN: VLTQRN
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). Power, intersectionality and the politics of belonging. *FREIA Working Paper Series*, 75, 1–22. <http://doi.org/10.5278/freia.58024502>

About the author:

Leonid V. Smorgunov — Dr. Sci. (Philosophy), Senior Research Fellow, Sociological Institute of the RAS — Branch of the Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied Sociology of the RAS (e-mail: l.smorgunov@spbu.ru) (ORCID: 0000-0002-2581-2975)