

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v9i4.2810

Citation: Levyk, B. (2020). National Security Transformation in the Context of Postmodernism as Modern Cultural, Social, and Political Reality. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(4), 176-183. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i4.2810>

National Security Transformation in the Context of Postmodernism as Modern Cultural, Social, and Political Reality

Bogdan Levyk¹

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to define the “security” concept, understand its historical content as methodological base of state national security, consider the phenomenon of “national security” and demonstrate that the legal foundation of the national security should be based on the traditional cultural and mental factors. The article also considers the postmodern state “metamorphosis” and concepts related to it.

The author mentions that there is a lack of the appropriate methodological base for generalization, systematization and classification of information on the national security in scientific discourse. To resolve this, hermeneutic methodology and structural analysis have been used to achieve the stated purpose.

The article concludes that Postmodernism, on the one hand, enabled new vectors of analytical understanding and perception of the security phenomenon, and on the other hand – by violating the established foundations and traditions (especially in the perception of the state institution) – introduced an imbalance and determined the crisis factor in the space of classical perception of security guarantors. The rejection factor is seen as a core feature of postmodern social-political reality. The article states the importance and priority of dealing with the problem of historical memory and actualizing the phenomenon of mentality in the context of future analytical discourses in the scope of Ukrainian security studies.

Keywords: Postmodernism, postmodernity, security, national security, national idea, social changes, challenges, threats, nation, state, identity, pluralism.

¹ Doctor of Historical Sciences, Senior Scientist, Director of Regional Scientific and Educational Center “Holodomor, Holocaust, International Dialogue” L’viv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine.

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5100-0834> E-mail: levukbs@ukr.net

Introduction

Every generation in each epoch considers that it endures a special, exclusive, extraordinary, specific transition period with special difficulties, exclusive crisis, unique changes, special circumstances, etc. Each generation and epoch always highlights the personality and social security perspective, especially – ***national security***. This is a fact of life. Each epoch has the heroes and clowns, the bright and dark pages, personal and only personal evaluation criteria of actions and events, etc. Nevertheless, everything that is coming implies the past. The past can be glorified or rejected, can be sung or berated; everything depends on the details of modernity itself. The realities are urgent for any epoch.

Regarding the present realities, we need to agree that *“the modern world, where we are living, has dramatically changed from the ideals to which the humanity has aimed at for the last two centuries. The modern world has a lot of names in the different theories, one of them is **the world of postmodern**”* (Postol, 2010, p.69). Any subject of the modern world (individual or community) deals with the very specific conditions and circumstances of the postmodern society despite the existence of his intention. This includes the following:

- Excessively exaggerated modernity in all value dimensions of being that destroys the stability of traditional factors;
- Tendencies of post-humanism in educational and worldview culture that eliminate the stability of moral authorities;
- Excessive postmodernist feminism in interpersonal relations hooked the traditional honor code of the masculine gender (as the “masculine factor” traditionally guarantees personal and territorial security);
- Fashion to the new samples of semiotic culture and lexical modality that absolutely destroys the traditional culture of interpersonal communication and mutual understanding (for instance, value image of a police officer devaluation and the total crisis of trust to the law-enforcement authorities that is in their general acceptance as a symbol of corruption and lawlessness instead of their acceptance in the light of law, secure, protection);
- “Explosion” of the postmodern analytical methods that are revealed in the value priorities of philosophic and political culture;
- The rapid development of the new information and communication technologies that are a direct embodiment of "society of knowledge" and liquidity of the modern "network society"...

All the abovementioned factors have embodied the urgent necessity of a multi-directional study of postmodern spirituality and post-secular society. The natural historical inclination to stability (embodied in the idea of national security and international law) and more distinctive spreading of separatist tendencies (embodied in the realities of different states and particularly in Ukraine) further demonstrates the complexity, controversial nature, and value of the postmodern world. The Ukrainian dimension of the issue is factually (and not just at the level of hypothesis or analytical futurology) proved by the modern social and political realities. Nowadays, the issue is of new importance, it reveals the crucial and unexpected dimensions of modern communication under the circumstances of ethnic, cultural contradictions, military conflicts, and a crisis of national identity diluting.

An explosion of separatist tendencies violated the stability of Ukrainian state and cultural space, postmodern social and political fashion for new names (nick or code names) undetermined cultural balance of national anthroponomics (Khrypko & Iatsenko, 2019). The factual territorial loss, separatist tendencies enforcement, protracted hybrid war (which is called “strange” even among the military personnel), disability or lack of wish from the side of the authorities and society to call the things by their proper names, everything abovementioned leads to creation of different simulacra, kitsch, invented problems in the sphere where they should not be presented a priori.

The purpose of the article is to follow different definitions of “security”, understand the philosophical content of “security” as a methodological base of state national security and consider the phenomenon of “national security” as a legal and philosophical category in the light of structural analysis and hermeneutic methodology. The objective of the paper is to demonstrate that the legal foundation of the national security bases should be built on the traditional cultural and mental factors, which should be taken into account as well. The study attention is systematically drawn to the contextual highlighting of social and political transformations that occur during the transition from the modern society to the postmodern one. Moreover, the postmodern state “metamorphosis”, power transformations, value, identity, and social structural changes under globalization are considered in the paper.

Discussion and Results

The history of “security” definitions is characterized by the multi-dimensional context of its usage and relevance of the issue simultaneously. Security is inevitably inherent in life. Consequently, a fact of security, guarantees of security, search of security’s ways are urgent for everyone in any period of state development – from the ancient times till the postmodern society. Such categories as “personal security”, “social security”, “regional security”, “territorial security”, “state security”, “international security”, “information security”, “political security”, “economic security”, “technological safety”, “energy security”, “environmental security” are widely used in the history of analytical reflection regarding national security. Moreover, the concepts of “geopolitical security”, “language security”, “national and cultural security”, “security of national memory and history” are urgent under Ukrainian geopolitical realities.

The consideration of the abovementioned concepts should be initiated from the analysis of the definition “security”. It includes the following:

1. All abovementioned dimensions of security in general;
2. It is a root of all definitions as the following spheres of security’s application depends on the common security principles;
3. All other contexts are just analytical ideas, considerations, and far from reality without the literal fact of “security”.

V. Pasichnik has drawn attention to the risks’ negation and urgency of such statement, he claims: *“The researchers frequently analyze national or international security and their components without the philosophical consideration of “security” itself. It leads to the terminological chaos, discrepancy in definitions and simplified understanding of the concept”* (Pasichnik, 2011).

The problem is caused by partial or total absence of the appropriate methodological base that should be a determinant of generalization, systematization, and classification of all presented material; permit to define regularities and interconnections between the definitions of national security. Furthermore, there are analytical *“difficulties in national security consideration as a systematic*

phenomenon", namely, the difficulties are in the process of "*national security system's establishment*" (Pasichnik, 2011).

Security is a unique phenomenon. Security (as well as happiness) is unnoticeable and taken for granted when everything is good and, on the other hand, when it has been lost, people actively reconsider it. Security has been an issue for deep considerations since ancient times. Having considered the ideal social structure and means of management, Aristotle presented *civil security* as the main criteria of the ideal society. Such security is achieved by two ways: the first one is a divisional way (security is based on the equal criterion application to equal people and implies good distribution according to person's dignity, his contribution to the common work), the second way is a way of equation (that implies an equal criterion application to unequal people, usually it occurs in public legal acts, enforcement of sentences, compensation for losses, etc.) (Kuchta & Romaniuk, 1997). According to Benedict Spinoza "*peace and security*" is the main aim of civil society establishment (Spinoza, 1957). J.-J. Rousseau claimed that the main care of a state should be "*care for self-preservation*" (Rousseau, 1969). Thomas Hobbes highlighted the importance of security factor, namely, he mentioned that a war of all against all happened under the natural life circumstances. Human fear for personal security is a consequence of the war. A man is forced to seek the means of collective security against the mentioned threats; as a result, a state is created to which a human transfers a part of his natural rights (Kuchta & Romaniuk, 1997). Such value tendency of security and its guarantee from the state institution was considered by John Locke. The thinker claimed that each human had a right to manage and protect his personal life, freedom, property, treasure... Nevertheless, the rights were not always secured under the natural conditions as not all people respected the rights of others. Furthermore, everyone could understand the right on his own.

A man could not apply the right in the case of external aggression. People created a state to secure themselves by signing a social agreement. A state, as an embodiment of social agreement, was not created only for rejection of personal rights in favor of it, but for the higher level of personal rights' security that was impossible under the natural conditions (Kuchta & Romaniuk, 1997). A list of statements and considerations of the famous thinkers can be continued, it only proves a fact of urgency of security issue. It is not questionable that the thinkers understand security as the "*ability to secure the safe conditions of human living and development*" from the Ancient times to the Modern times (Pasichnik, 2011). Having generalized the views of classical ancient philosophy, the modern researcher G. Sytnyk reached the universal conclusion: "*security is citizens' provision of appropriate circumstances for self-realization, protection of their lives, freedom and property against infringement by other people, society or state*" (Sytnyk, 2007, p. 20). Having accepted the statement's validity, the modern analytics reached a conclusion that "*the main attention should be paid to the problem of life protection and to the circumstances a life depends on, namely freedom, property, etc. The circumstances of self-realization and development are further*" (Pasichnik, 2011). A. Maslow's hierarchy of needs should be mentioned here. The necessity of security is considered as "a human need in stability, protection from anything that can cause harm" (Malyk, 2002) in the context of the hierarchy of human needs. Following the idea of implication dual nature of Maslow's hierarchy in connection with security issue, a conclusion can be drawn that the wish to protect human life is prioritized after the physiological needs for food, water, rest, and warmth fulfillment that are necessary for physical life support. Nevertheless, we can agree that food security or rest safety is crucial if we are talking about a full, integral, healthy life. Consequently, the second part of basic needs is **safety needs** according to Maslow. Otherwise, the fact of life is doubtful. We can agree that "... security is a condition for human needs' fulfillment: social needs, necessity to be respected and express

own personality... security is one of the basic human needs that is necessary for human life protection, stable conditions of existence, as a result, the other needs' fulfillment depends on it" (Pasichnik, 2011).

The genesis of "**national security**" is based on the etymology of the term "security" that is determined by the semantics of Ukrainian language (security is absence of danger, safety), dialectic nature and comparison between security and danger as well as by **legally enforceable concept of "national security"** for national scientific school. That is why national security is not derived by the nation. The European democratic model, to which Ukraine is constitutionally aimed at, focus on the political theory "*nation-state*".

According to the French historian Ernest Renan: "*Nation is first of all a soul, a spiritual principle. It has two parts. The first is the common heritage of the rich past memories. The second is the present consent and wish of common living. The determining factor for a nation is not a set of some particular features, but subjective feeling of communities' affiliation that all members of the nation should possess. The essence of the European nation is the feeling of self-awareness. It can lose or change their external features without any loss of uniqueness that transfers it to a nation*" (Renan, 2000).

The Ukrainian nation should be considered as an ethnic and social community with the established self-awareness of their identity, common historical fate, national, material and spiritual values' commitment, as well as territorial, language, social and economic unity based on the European model of the theory of nation, and developing the axiological paradigm of scientific and practical phenomenon of Ukrainian national security. The national security is determined as a social feature (attribute) regarding social integrity, relative stability, civil harmony, and characterizes social validity and developmental sustainability of social and political system in this way of problematic reflection. We should agree that "Ukrainian national security" is initially the security of all vital interests of the Ukrainian nation. Any decentralization regarding the objects, subjects, and principles of security, priorities and threats to the national interests, state policy, etc. is an extremely complicated professional intellectual process that should not be performed by the randomly elected politicians, but by the experienced scientists who base on the constant communication with all interested parties (Siomin, 2019).

According to the existing legislation, in particular the paragraph 9, Article 1 of the Law of Ukraine on National Security of Ukraine, the national security is determined as security of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, democratic constitutional process and protection of the other national interests of Ukraine against real and potential threats (The Law of Ukraine..., 2018). According to the paragraph 10 Article 1 of that law, **the national interests** of Ukraine are vital, crucial human, social and state interests, the realization of which secures national sovereignty of Ukraine, its progressive democratic development as well as creates safe living conditions and citizens' welfare.

The special stress is on the fundamental national interests of Ukraine that are proclaimed to be the following:

- national sovereignty and territorial integrity, democratic constitutional way of development, prevention of interference in the international affairs of Ukraine;
- *sustainable development* of national economy, civil society and state for living standards security of the population;
- Ukrainian *integration* into European political, economic, security, and legal space, becoming a member of the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization,

development of the equal mutually beneficial cooperation with other countries (The Law of Ukraine..., 2018).

The integration processes of collective security specify the necessity of new standards in national legal systems that can harmonize the relations in the security sphere as well as reveal a need for the appropriate legislation in that field. The security standards should be accepted according to some aspects. Due to the first aspect, **a standard of security** is a regulatory document that records the complex of norms, rules, terms, and requirements that are mandatory for secure provision (of an object or process of standardization) (Lipkan & Lipkan, 2008). According to the second aspect that is axiomatically prevailed in the field of security, the term “standard” does not have any particular content. It reveals some rules, requirements that are correlated with others regarding the defined parameters. Such vague terms that do not have clear definitions are “standards of NATO”, “European standards”, “international standards”, “field standards”, “security standards”, etc. Such an approach should be taken into consideration as it concerns the opportunity of common unique terminology establishment; particular production provision; methods of security’s level measurement; threats identification; methods, means and ways of security’s establishment; security technologies enhancement, etc. However, the term vagueness should be eliminated by **the law of national security**, within which the categories will obtain clear legal meaning, will be legitimized, and consequently, will be equally understood by the subjects of legal relations as well as will be applied to the practical activity (Lipkan, 2009). **The law of national security is able to stabilize national security as an idea and guarantee it as a fact.**

The analytical, inter-sectoral discourse regarding the issues of security and national security can be (and factually is) the crucial and interesting sphere of thematic reflections, problematic considerations, and bold intellectual decisions... Unless danger becomes a fact of reality. Till the whole system of national security cracks; the result is the loss of territory, property, human lives... These are the realities of Ukrainian life. A social right of security guarantee and national security become urgent.

The realities of danger highlight a fact that all communicative and analytic “zest” of postmodern – multi-value, contextual irony, unexpected definitions, game of meanings, ambiguity, fragmented consciousness and culture, de-canonization, visibility, illusion of being in lieu of realistic being, collage nature of things, intuition predominance over rationality, imagery, problems of characterization – is negated in human consciousness and communication as the life necessities become much more urgent (where a man does not have time and place for all kinds of simulacra and kitsch). The complexity of the situation is exacerbated by a fact that “the existed experience of personal (exclusive) methods’ development of national security’s level evaluation demonstrates that the process does not have any logical completeness as well as practical implementation in Ukraine. The main drawbacks are the lack of unique approach and subjectivity in national security’s level evaluation, shortage of financial resources and tools for constant monitoring. Even if we are able to develop the exclusive system of national security’s level evaluation, a process of its international recognition will be rather problematic” (Siomin, 2019).

We can state that the modern scientists of national security issues consider security as a state or necessity to protect human interests and values. Such an approach is rather simplified, stereotypical, and utilitarian. According to it, there are some acquired values and interests and if the values and interests are in danger, then security becomes increasingly valuable (speaking metaphorically, the importance of a doctor is actualized when a person is ill and his life is under threat).

The concepts of “security” and “national security” are broad philosophical categories that are at the level of being which a fundamental philosophical category is. According to V. Pasichnik, it means

that “security and national security should be considered through the main problems of being such as to be or not to be; to life or die; to exist or stop the existence. The utilitarian approach highlights the possession of some good. Being of other human, social group, nation, and humanity in general can be sacrificed for the sake of some good. Security consideration via being (as a philosophic category) focuses on some subject’s existence (person, society, state, nation, humanity in general), and the existing good is considered as means for existence support (nature, man, society, state, nation, humanity, namely the natural, social and spiritual forms and manifestations of being in their integrity, close interconnection and interdependence) and not as the objective itself” (Pasichnik, 2011).

Consequently, we can state that security is a state of being, values and interests’ protection of a subject (object) of security (namely, a man, nation, community, state...) against threats and danger, according to which the optimal conditions of life, development and self-realization are secured. National security correlation and consideration encourage a national idea (national project) application through which a nation will consider its being and in correlation with which national values and interests will be defined.

Conclusions

The existed analysis of the scientific resources provides an opportunity neither for holistic view development regarding national security, nor for any presented constructions of a law of national security. The real state of social security is determined by the real and potential threats connected with the modern evaluation of the threats’ character as well as the anticipated evaluation of internal and external threats. Nevertheless, it is irrational to create the contra-actions to all possible threats as it is impossible to establish them legally. A legislator is not able to know future. The legislation can be partially based on the established patterns and only a part of reasons and consequences of threats and dangers can be legalized. As a result, law can contain only general principles of stability in identification and elimination of threats.

The system of national security is a part of the European and global (universal) security system. Consequently, implementation and harmonization of other countries’ national security system elements occur according to the principles of security system of the higher-order in the process of a collective security system establishment. Nowadays, the objective necessity is a change of law conception of international security, taking into consideration the points designed by the theory of international security with openness to international law, the role of which is crucial, but not decisive.

Security as a philosophical category involves a fact of personal, family, community, national being protection; protection of their inherent essence, living conditions, and life in general. The true values and interests are considered via a category of being. Security can be analyzed in the light of being, is a crucial concept for the spheres of personal, community, social, ethnic, national being, namely *spiritual being in the social dimension* (spiritual values, faith, moral, identity, culture, mentality); *material being* (material conditions of living); *social and historical being* (real social and international relations, negotiations in the particular historical time, geopolitical nuances); *personal being* (unique personal experience, exclusive, particular manifestations of being). The category of security considered through the philosophy of being is a broad field for further interdisciplinary research.

The postmodernism successfully reflected the boarder-line state of social consciousness that implied values’ reconsideration and ideals’ transformation. Stability destruction, value taboos’ negation will be finished by establishment of *the new universal values* where will be undoubtedly

respect to *the national ideas* and particularly to *the ideas of security* that should occupy an appropriate place in global and Ukrainian worldview culture. The interpretation, definitions, and conclusions should be positively oriented. The truth cannot be based on criticism. The process of other values, experience, and achievement's appreciation should not be accompanied by the national values' criticism, but should focus on memory regarding personal and national values.

References

- Khrypko, S., & Iatsenko, G. (2019). Philosophy of a Name: Ukrainian Context. *BEYTULHIKME: An International Journal of Philosophy*, 9(2), 437–451.
- Kuchta, B., & Romaniuk, A. (1997). *The Bases of Political Science. Part 1: From the History of Political Thought from the Ancient Time to Nowadays*. Lviv: Kalvaria. (in Ukrainian)
- Levyk, B. (2016). Change of the geopolitical choice of independent Ukraine (current historical aspect). *Skhid*, 4(144), 57-61.
- Lipkan, V. (2009). The Bases of Law of National Security. *Journal – Law in Ukraine*, 1, 108-116.
- Lipkan, V., & Lipkan, O. (2008). *National and International Security in the definitions and concepts*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- Malyk, Ya. (2002). *Economic Security of Ukraine: Internal and External Factors*. Lviv. (in Ukrainian)
- Nikitin, Yu. (2015). National Security in Ukraine under the Modern Conditions: Risks and Factors of Influence. *Legal Science*, 2, 141-147. (in Ukrainian)
- Pasichnik, V. (2011). Philosophical Category of Security as a Base of the New Paradigm of State Administration of National Security. *Democratic governance*, 7. (in Ukrainian)
- Postol, A. (2010). Postmodernism as Modern Social and Political Reality. *Humanistic Bulletin of ZDIA*, 42, 69-79. (in Ukrainian)
- Renan, E. (2000). What is the nation? Retrieved from <https://zbruc.eu/node/59455> (in Ukrainian)
- Rousseau, J. J. (1969). *The Social Contract* Moscow: Thought. (in Russian)
- Siomin, S. (2019). The Concept of Axiological Paradigm of the Main Principles and Value Basis of National Security Provision in Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://niss.gov.ua/en/node/19> (in Ukrainian)
- Spinoza, B. (1957). *The Collected Works in 2 Volumes, V.2*. Moscow: Thought. (in Russian)
- Sytnyk, G. (2007). *National Security of Ukraine: Theory and Practice*. Khmelnytskyi-Kyiv: Kondor. (in Ukrainian)
- The Law of Ukraine on National Security of Ukraine (2018). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2469-19> (in Ukrainian)