

Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2021, Volume 12, Issue 3, pages: 77-95 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3/328>

The Phenomenon of National Security within Postmodern Cultures: Interests, Values, Mentality

Leonid KRYVZYUK¹,
Bohdan LEVYK²,
Svitlana KHRYPKO³,
Alla ISHCHUK⁴

¹ Doctor of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of military intelligence, analysis and forecast of social and political processes, Deputy Director of the Military Arts Department, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Army Academy, leonid.krivzyuk@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-9094-4061

² Doctor of Historical Sciences, senior research officer, director of the Regional Research and Education Center “Holodomor, Holocaust: Interethnic Dialogue” at Lviv Polytechnic National University, levykbs@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-5100-0834

³ Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor at the Philosophy Department, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine), s.khrypko@kubg.edu.ua, ORCID 0000-0001-9426-4549

⁴ Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Kyiv, Ukraine), allaishchuck@hotmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7825-4295

Abstract: The article is devoted to defining the essence of security, particularly national security, its interpretation, main features, structure, and factors. The research focuses on the main concepts of the modern understanding of national security and defines national security according to recent research. The authors have performed a structural and functional analysis of the system of national security of Ukraine, which would be an adequate counteraction to threats to vital national interests. The article examines the multi-vector interpretation and representation of the security phenomenon with an increased focus on the axiological paradigm of postmodern society analysis. The cardinal role of postmodernism is considered as a manifestation of postmodern culture in the value dimension of social-political existence. Postmodernism, on the one hand, enabled new vectors of analytical understanding and perception of the security phenomenon. On the other hand, it introduced an imbalance and determined the crisis factor in the space of classical perception of security guarantors due to violating the established foundations and traditions (especially in the perception of the state institution). The rejection factor is seen as a core feature of postmodern social-political reality. The emphasis is given to the problem of the security standard in the security studies and the idea of the mutual determination of both national interests and national values. The article states the importance and priority of historical memory and the phenomenon of mentality in the context of future analytical discourses in the scope of Ukrainian security studies.

Keywords: *security; national security; security studies; national interests; national values; post-reality; social-political reality.*

How to cite: Kryvzyuk, L., Levyk, B., Khrypko, S., & Ishchuk, A. (2021). The Phenomenon of National Security within Postmodern Cultures: Interests, Values, Mentality. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3), 77-95. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3/328>

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of security immanently, *a priori*, refers to the ever-pressing issues that have always been important to people. It becomes acute in the context of hazard, which destroys the foundations of personal, social, and state existence. “The problem and the risk of postmodern warfare consist of the fact that it is difficult to capture due to its complexity, which includes and aims at the realms of politics, military, economy, society, information space and infrastructure of an opponent.” (Ehrhart, 2017) Security and hazard implicitly resonate with the contextual problems of national interests, values, priorities, incentives, and motivations of the being itself. Security as a philosophical category implies the fact of protecting the existence of the nation, humanity, the individual, and the family. It means protection of their immanent essence, conditions of existence, and life in general. The category of existence (being) gives a sense of understanding of the true values and interests.

The diverse problems related to security as a social phenomenon have always aroused public discussions. This issue attracted such great thinkers of the past as Ovid, Heraclitus, Cicero, Tibullus, Horace, Seneca, Augustine of Hippo, Niccolò Machiavelli, Hugo Grotius, Saint-Simon, Montesquieu, and others, who associated security issues exclusively with state entities and the risks of external threats. With the emergence of national states and their transformation into the main subject of international relations, security as a geopolitical phenomenon has acquired the nature of *national security*. The English philosopher and political thinker Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) believed that national security was not just the center of government activity; it was the main point of a government’s existence. Without it, according to Hobbes, any government (state) is impossible at all.

In ancient Rome and Egypt, there used to be the priority of *national security* as a paradigm of state existence, legal support of citizens and society. Cicero put the problem of security at the forefront, saying that “first of all, we observe how various species defend themselves against violence and hazard with their weapons... avoid any threatened injury and to direct their gaze easily in any direction they desire” (Cicero, 1999). At the beginning of the XIX century, the concept of national security was developed as a fundamental basis for protection against Napoleon wars by creating the Holy Alliance of European powers as a legal consolidation of statehood in Europe, the security of individuals and society (Rothschild, 1995; Nikitin, 2015).

The axiological paradigm of updating the core concepts of “national security” is influenced by the historical and political experience of certain state entities, the nature of political regimes and geopolitical circumstances, the specifics of the international situation in a particular historical period, the goals of foreign and military policy, and other factors.

The Ukrainian vector of the problem shows that even the national humanists of the late XVI – early XVII centuries were aware of the need to create their own state “which would defend the life and freedom of the Ukrainian people with political, diplomatic, cultural, and finally military means” (Lytvynov, 2000). The current geopolitical realities of Ukraine (the loss of the Crimea, the military conflict in the East of the country, the subjective experience of some citizens regarding the loss of property, work, and security) keep the problems of national security up-to-date both in Ukrainian and international context.

Most modern scholars re-think the social cross-section of the phenomenon of instability. In particular, they focus on the following: “Contemporary societies have to function in the face of new challenges, dilemmas and crises. The events of recent years have shown that, although the sources of these challenges are different (economic crises, ethnic conflicts, civil wars, technological changes, security conflicts with other states, global pandemics), they have a common ground, based on the dichotomy of perception of social reality by social subjects. Some perceive it as a result of social action, others as a result of social expectations and desires of members of society. On the one hand, this perception of social reality fuels adaptive efficiency, that is, the ability of society to survive in a changeful set of problems and difficulties. On the other hand, it contributes to the manifestations of destructive social practices –a decline of social trust, aggravation of social conflict, increase in social inequality, etc.” (Yereskova et al., 2020).

Safety issues are considered from various analytical vectors by O. Afonina, V. Abramov, G. Sytnik, V. Pasichnyk, Ya. Malyk, S. Siomin, V. Smolianiuk, V. Lipkan, and many other modern researchers. In particular, the staff of the Department of National Security of the National Academy for Public Administration points out previously unresolved parts of the general problem. They note “*the understanding of the need to improve the system of national security of Ukraine takes place in theory, but it is not sufficiently implemented in practice. The Law of Ukraine “On the fundamentals of national security of Ukraine”, which defines the basic principles of state policy aimed at protecting national interests and ensuring in Ukraine the security of individuals, society, and the state from external and internal threats in all spheres of life, was adopted in 2003. The definition of the main*

terms cannot stand up to any criticism; they were formulated carelessly. For example, national interests are defined through values – “vital material, intellectual and spiritual values”. There is no concept of “a national security system” and so on” (Abramov & Afonina, 2010).

The security issue, directly or indirectly, cannot be considered now beyond the cultural realities of postmodernism. The researchers of postmodernism, including A. Toynbee, R. Inglehart, J.-F. Lyotard, Z. Bauman, A. Rathmell, G. Bell, Ihab Hassan, W. Welsch, P. Koslowski, O. Panarin, V. Voronkova, V. Gorbatenko, D. Zatonsky, N. Tereshchenko, T. Shatunova, A. Postol, J. Williams, and others, study postmodernism from different perspectives and observe its manifestations in the economic and social-political spheres, cultural life, lifestyle, technology, multi-projects, etc.

R. Dodonov, V. Dodonova, B. Levyk, S. Khrypko, O. Alexandrova, S. Siomin, and others draw attention to the importance of historical memory, the traditional dimension of the phenomenon of mentality in understanding the security of existence. A. Lobanchuk focuses on the European dimension of Ukrainian identity, semantics, way of thinking, and European choice of national policy: *“Every modern nation and country tries to identify itself in the world and starts a dialogue with representatives of other cultures and civilizations on questions of originality and uniqueness. A right for the self-identification, the realization of society's mental spirit is given to every modern country. Rapid evolution of consciousness requires acceleration of reforms of political and social processes that are continuously influenced by global infosphere and intensification of cognitive and intellectual creative abilities of human as the result of information technologies' usage, which promote the change of outlook and even the change of the modern world, including the paradigm of educational and methodological processes.” (Lobanchuk, 2018).*

The article seeks to revise the importance and significance of the phenomenon of security in the current realities of postmodern society; to analyze the axiological multi-vector nature of postmodern semantics; to model and determine problematic thematic reflection to the final core statement – security is a basic need of life in the hierarchy of aspirations and desires.

The objectives of the article include identification of the key focus areas of national security research needed to create a system of institutional knowledge; disclosure of the problem of risks, challenges, and other factors related to the national security of Ukraine; setting of a problem vital for the general public – the development of the National Security Law.

The methodological objective of the article uses structural analysis to trace the specifics and semantics of interpretations of the category “security” and to consider the phenomenon of “national security” as a legal and

philosophical category. Contextual coverage of certain social and political shifts, which occur during the transformation of the modern society into a postmodern one, understanding of the problem of simulacra, kitsch, information phantoms, and similar phenomena that are extremely popular with the young people today, along with re-thinking of the postmodern “metamorphoses” of the state, power transformations, changes in the system of values, identity and social structure in the context of globalization – all these make up the predictive focus of the author's attention.

The focus is on the priority of the mental factor in understanding and implementing national security and representing the range of national interests and values.

2. Security as a multi-vector phenomenon of the priorities of existence

Security is a unique and even extraordinary phenomenon. As it functions, it may be unnoticed, and its problems may not be considered. However, the security issues become very prominent once threats of breaking this security become real. Security (just like life, health, air, or happiness) is not noticed when it exists. People tend to take everything for granted, but they begin to realize its importance and appreciate it when it is about to be lost. This paradigm of value-based understanding of the security phenomenon makes it appropriate to emphasize the instrumental and methodological relevance of A. Maslow's pyramid. Thus, within the context of the priorities of the hierarchy of human needs, security issues can be considered as those that define “*a person's need for confidence, the stability of life, protection from what may be harmful*” (Malyk, 2002). According to the theory of the hierarchy of human needs, the need for a safe life is brought to the foreground after satisfying the physiological needs for food, water, sleep, and other things that are necessary to maintain life in general. After all, if a person is closed in on multi-vector hazard, which causes the loss of foundation of life when food provision or sleep safety becomes urgent, this cannot be considered a fulfilling life. If the matter of survival becomes a hot issue, then life itself becomes a question. So, we state that security is the basic need of life in the hierarchy of aspirations and desires, needs and priorities. Otherwise, the very fact of life is rather questionable. We should agree with the contextual opinion of the modern researchers on this topic – “*...security is a condition for ensuring other human needs: social needs, the need for respect and self-expression... security is one of the basic human needs, which consists primarily in the need for the protection of a human life, ensure the stability of the conditions of its existence, and the satisfaction of its other needs depends on it*” (Pasichnyk, 2011). Safety is a determinant of life continuation. That is why the fact of security,

the guarantee of security, the search for modes and ways to ensure security have been relevant for everyone in any period – from ancient times to the current postmodern society.

From antiquity, through the modern era and to postmodernity, the established topic-specific philosophical reflection on the theory of security studies represents an obvious emphasis on the governmental paradigm of interpretation. This trend revises the priority of the phenomenon of national security, where the governmental component is determinative and mandatory in its importance. G. Sytnyk, the modern researcher of security issues, while summarizing the views of the classics of ancient philosophy, approaches the universal idea with the idea that “*security provides the citizens of the state with appropriate conditions for their self-realization, the protection of their lives, freedom, and property from violations by an individual, an organization of society or the government*” (Sytnyk, 2007). To understand modern issues of security in terms of a variety of changes, Andrew Rathmel claims that “intelligence bureaucracies in contemporary Western societies tend still to be bastions of modernist meta-narratives of state power, state sovereignty and national security as well as being formalized modern hierarchies” (Rathmel, 2002). That is why it is necessary to study the postmodern approach along with the perspective of the security theory. “Analysts will need to use fresh assumptions and fresh visions of the future to engage in pattern discovery, to forge closer links with policymakers in order to enhance their sensitivity to the issues, and to engage in systematic probing strategies to elicit knowledge and understanding of adaptive responses.” (Dunn Caveltly & Mauer, 2009). Deepa Kumar mentions “national security culture” when it comes to “the ideology of the cultural products of the national security state”. (Kumar, 2017).

National securities are connected and cannot be isolated from country to country. “National security is not the exclusive property of intelligence communities or national governments. National security interests are subject to supra-national democratic rule-of-law processes and standards, which now include human rights instruments/actors (ECHR) and post-national (fundamental rights) institutions like the European Union and its fundamental rights acquis.” (Bigo et al., 2013) To understand the background of security itself, we will look into the meaning of the term represented in the local language (Ukrainian). In the local research, the genesis of the concept of “national security” is based primarily on the etymology of the term “security”, which is determined by the semantics of the Ukrainian language (security means the absence of danger, integrity, reliability), dialectics and comparison of security and hazard, as well as on

the formalized concept of “national security”. That is why, in our opinion, national security in analytical discourses generally does not act as a derivative of the nation. Here are some definitions of national security, none of which claims to be complete. So, for example, encyclopedic articles represent the following statements:

- national security is “the ability of a country to preserve sovereignty, political, economic, social, and other foundations of public life, and to act as an independent subject of international relations” (Korniievsky, 2011);

- national security is “internal and external threat protection of vital interests of individuals, state and society, state borders, territorial integrity, social-political structure, cultural values, and everything that is the essence of the material and spiritual life of the country” (Tupchienko, 2004).

The legislative version (which has been in use since 2003) is somewhat overloaded with details and clarifying remarks. However, it demonstrates the ability of the state forces to outline the practical and analytical context of national security issues:

- national security is “the protection of vital interests of a person and citizen, society and the state, which ensures the sustainable development of society, timely identification, prevention and neutralization of real and potential threats to national interests in the areas of law enforcement, anti-corruption, border activities and defense, migration policy, health, child protection, education and science, scientific, technical and innovative policy, cultural development of the population, ensuring freedom of speech and information security, social policy and pension provision, housing and communal services, financial service market, property rights protection, stock markets and securities turnover, fiscal and customs policy, trade and business, banking services market, investment policy, audit activities, monetary and exchange rate policy, information protection, licensing, industry and agriculture, transport and communications, information technologies, energy and energy-saving, functioning of natural monopolies, use of natural resources, land and water resources, minerals, protection of the environment and other areas of public administration in case of potential or real threats to national interests” (On Fundamentals of National Security of Ukraine, 2003).

The new draft law “On national security of Ukraine” proposed in early 2018 offers a more concise version:

- “national security of Ukraine is the protection of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, democratic constitutional order and other national interests of Ukraine from real and potential threats.”

And in this case, we return to the initial question: what is the meaning of understanding national interests and national values? After all, they work as a ground for the concept of national security.

3. The interdependence of national interests and values in postmodern reality

There is a legislative definition of the term “national interests of Ukraine”. According to article 10 of the “National Security of Ukraine Act”, the national interests of Ukraine are vital interests of a person, society, and the state, the implementation of which ensures the state sovereignty of Ukraine, its progressive democratic development, and – what is more – safe living conditions and the well-being of its citizens. At the same time, the emphasis is on ensuring the fundamental national interests of Ukraine, which are proclaimed as follows:

- state *sovereignty* and territorial integrity, democratic constitutional system, prevention of interference in the internal affairs of Ukraine;
- *sustainable development* of the national economy, civil society, and the state to ensure the growth of the standard and quality of life of the population;
- *integration* of Ukraine into the European political, economic, security, legal area, membership in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, development of equal mutually beneficial relations with other states (Law of Ukraine, 2020).

At the same time, as modern researchers of the theory of security studies note, “the authorities have not offered a normative legal act that would give an exhaustive list of national interests during the entire period of state and political independence of Ukraine” (Smolianiuk, 2018). State documents are generally limited to “priorities of national interests”, “vital national interests”, and “fundamental national interests”. Such a variety of discourses significantly expands the multi-vector space of explaining national interests yet deprives them of the necessary clarity of their verbal form and definition. M. Mykhalchenko explains the reason and content of the crisis factor regarding the generally accepted definition of national interests. “National interests in Ukraine are still at the stage of formation, so they do not form a balanced system. In the internal context, there is an acute ideological and value, political, and economic confrontation between various social forces, political parties, and social-political leaders over the hierarchy of national interests, their content, and implementation mechanisms” (Mykhalchenko, 2011). In the foreign political context, the situation is aggravated by hybrid war and its information component (fakes, pseudo-

news, a series of fibs, outright manipulation, etc.). Local analysts usually emphasize the following: in an external sense, it is impossible not to take into account the European choice of the Ukrainian nation and the active opposition of the Russian Federation on this issue, which was practically manifested in the occupation of part of the territory of Ukraine in 2014 (the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol), as well as the unleashing of military aggression in the East of Ukraine (Trebin, 2014). As a result, we have the current situation – the mentioned constants significantly increase the complexity of the generally accepted definition of national interests, which could be supported by all population categories throughout Ukraine. We have to limit ourselves to the “framework” principles of defining national interests. This approach has both its supporters and critics.

The situation with the definition of *national values* is discursive and, for many reasons, more than difficult. These values are not represented at all in the National Law as a separate regulatory deployment. In terms of security studies analysis, the authors include the following national values of Ukraine to be considered: religious commitment, multi-confessionalism, multi-ethnicity, multiculturalism, family values, territorial integrity, natural environment, scientific-educational and scientific-technical potentials, state sovereignty, cultural and material assets of the people (the economic potential, in particular), democratic institutions as a prerequisite for ensuring equal rights of the peoples living in Ukraine, progressive social-political development as well as defining features of national character (love of freedom, hard work, tolerance, benevolence, peacefulness, selflessness in defending the Motherland, a sense of social justice, democracy, a tendency to preserve traditions) (Abramov, Sytnyk, Smolianiuk, 2016). It is quite natural that, due to the extrapolation of national values to the specific historical conditions of the national development, the corresponding national interests are formed. The high-priority interests are proclaimed at the official level.

Value discourse regarding national interests and priorities takes on a specific meaning in the current postmodern world, or as it is also commonly called – the realities of postmodernity. We need to agree that every generation, in every era, believes that it is going through a special, exceptional, extraordinary, unlike anything else, transition period – the specific difficulties, exclusive crisis, unique changes, exceptional circumstances, etc. Each generation and each epoch always revise in their way the issues of personal and social security, and especially *national security*. This is the truth of life. Each era has its heroes and buffoons, its light and dark pages, its criteria for evaluating events and actions, etc. But everything

that is to come presupposes the past. However, the modernity will define whether the past is to be praised or rejected, glorified, or disgraced. And these realities are relevant for any era. As for current realities, we cannot but agree that “*the modern world in which we live in recent decades is radically different from the ideals that humanity has been striving for over the past two centuries. The modern world has many names in various theories, one of which is the postmodern world*” (Postol, 2010). As Williams states, we have to consider postmodern as a situation that “implies a lack of certainty about absolutes. Postmodern values are relative, and without common standards one person’s “truth” is as valid as another’s. The situations in which militaries operate are more ambiguous, with greater difficulty determining right and wrong. Barriers separating institutions, and even nations, are more porous, and national sovereignty is not absolute.” (Williams, 2008) This relativity also implies that “the state can no longer be the only factor that is a “referent object” of security.” (Dalby, 2000). Despite the desire or lack of desire, any subject of the modern world (individual or community) intersects with extremely specific conditions and circumstances of postmodern society. Postmodernism, on the one hand, stimulated 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 institution of the state) – introduced an imbalance and determined the crisis factor in the space of classical perception of security guarantors. Postmodern threats forced to revise traditional point of view on the concept of national security and demands to be based on comprehensive approach on the issues of security and defense (Petrauskaitė & Kazlauskaitė-Markelienė, 2018). However, if the state structures and society want to open up a dialogue, then it is not a problem to find harmony and security. In this regard, modern researchers claim: “At the same time, it is undeniable that any human community, regardless of the existing institutional conditions, has a resource that allows it to influence the actions of the state. This resource can be described as dialectics of control and can be expressed radically in various types of protests, and with a positive attitude of the social group and desire for constructive interaction, it grows into the ability to control the network of established contacts on the basis of such non-institutional (and therefore not subject to any external constraint) phenomena as cohesion, trust, solidarity and mutual responsibility. The latter circumstance makes possible and relevant the search for tools that would constructively ensure the reproduction of social responsiveness (Mazuryk, 2013, p. 5), and in this regard the analysis of social activity forms inherent in contemporary Ukrainian society can be considered as search for ways to overcome

destructive manifestations of postmodern condition of Ukrainian society.” (Yereskova et al., 2020)

Emphasizing rejection as a core feature of postmodern socio-political reality, it is impossible to ignore such a phenomenon as the virtual world of the culture of being. So today, the postmodern world has radically adjusted the seemingly established factors and priorities of human coexistence. The rapid development of computer technologies has radically transformed the foundations of communication ethics, state information policy, technology for transmitting information, etc. The phenomenon of virtual communities deserves attention in terms of the problems of information culture and information security. From the traditional socio-cultural viewpoint, these virtual communities are not just an extraordinary phenomenon - but rather a powerful communicative tool with the elements of a simulacrum, kitsch, and other postmodern innovations.

Virtual reality, according to the context and goals of creation, can act for a person in various capacities:

- it can be an information and communication environment and an artistic and aesthetic space; create a game situation while including fragments of real life into it, which will increase the complexity of understanding and evaluating what is happening;
- it can form a unique psychological condition that reveals a world of new emotions and sensations in a person, blurs the boundaries between the real and the unreal; it can also be a special educational environment;
- it can act as a quasi-society - as a specific type of “unrealistically existing” socio-cultural space, a kind of the existential mode of “homo virtualis”.

As a result, the virtual community as an innovative subculture represents quite specific and mostly negative contexts of its activities. Thus, for example, this causes the formation of a new generation of people who identify with other people that simultaneously “co-exist” in two spaces - social and virtual - but prefer to work and relax, communicate and have fun online. Moreover, these people do not belong to oppressed minorities or groups ignored by society. Virtual culture gradually forms a type of personality, whose formation and development are largely determined by network interactions.

Undoubtedly, virtual culture has a special impact on children and adolescents who are not mentally mature yet. The creation of virtual duplicates and frequent changes in roles can further increase the loss of interest in real life. A virtual community is a place where an individual feels free from the social barriers that arise due to the physical embodiment of

identity. Virtual communities with all the complex postmodern factors and constants are undoubtedly an attractive phenomenon. It is no coincidence that some virtual communities already have millions of people, but there is also a certain danger. After all, virtuality often becomes a characteristic feature of a person who gradually loses the ability to self-actualize in society. This can be more than dangerous. It is for a reason that the attention of researchers is now drawn (as a negative factor) to the desire of an increasing number of people to spend more and more free time in virtual space, and not in the real world, where they can and should (not only for society but also for themselves) realize their desires and reveal their capabilities because the culture of any society is always based on the will and creativity of individuals. Today, virtual time is becoming a time of anonymous sociality for many people due to a combination of social and virtual time. Therefore, society and the state should be aware of the full range of dangers and risks of long-term human presence in a quasi-society, take responsibility for cultural forms and practices replicated in information and communication systems, behavioural models. It is necessary to consider the qualitative characteristics of artificial environments setting the socio-cultural program to develop a modern person. That is why the problem of the ecology of communicative culture as such becomes particularly relevant. After all, the passion for cultural innovations (such as virtual communities) should not cancel out the established traditional norms and rules of cultural communication. After all, it is the communicative component that unites the past, present, and future.

The problem of simulacra, kitsch, information phantoms, and similar phenomena are extremely popular with young people nowadays. We note that the overload of simulacra in culture and social and political life, although it looks interesting and reflective, potentially poses a great threat to all manifestations of security: state, national, economic, informational, political, public, etc. Simulacra cannot be the basis of security a priori. This is rather a product of risks and challenges, which are to be adequately responded to by the state security system. (This idea can be illustrated by the example of Ukrainian anthroponymy – if the names of the political and military elite embody a namesake that is not authentic to the national tradition, then what kind of state independence or security is there to talk about? Modern researchers say in this regard: *“Today, under ethnic and cultural contradictions, military conflicts, crisis, and blurring of identity, this topic receives a new perspective, reveals important, sometimes unexpected, aspects of modern communication. Separatist tendencies have disrupted the constancy of the state and cultural space of Ukraine, and the postmodern social-political fashion for new names (or nicknames, call*

signs) has disrupted the sophistication and constancy of the culture of national anthroponymy” (Levyk et al., 2020; Khrypko & Iatsenko, 2019).

The specific nature of postmodernism as a social and political reality reveals the need for *historical memory*, respect for historical foundations and significance of the national mentality. These phenomena should be seriously taken into account when developing the state and national security system. After all, the historical memory of a nation can deeply mix historical trauma – a deep emotional and psychological impression caused by cruel forms of violence, the destruction of an established way of life, as well as its negative impact on the psyche, behavior, memory of individuals and social groups. The consequences of historical trauma are so devastating that they destabilize the entire social system and affect all citizens and social communities (Dodonova et al., 2019). Historical trauma is imprinted in the national mentality, and the significance and effectiveness of the latter in the area of national security is more than relevant at any time. After all, “*mentality is a social phenomenon that reflects a specific “style” of worldview in an ethnic and national context, which absorbs the long process of spiritual existence of society in more or less stable geopolitical, landscape, social and cultural conditions*” (Khrypko, 2009).

The fact of the national mentality is the fact of the existence of a nation and the basis for the real or possible security of this existence. The mentality is a concept that emphasizes the following characteristics:

- it notes the dimension of “otherness”, “separateness”, “authenticity” of the nation or its subject;
- it connects the past with the present and outlines predictive features for the future in a national and historical context;
- without existing in isolation from its carriers, the phenomenon of mentality (which focuses primarily on the ethnic factor) carries a positive grain of patriotic meaning and national self-sufficiency;
- it implies the complexity of characteristics and their comprehensive interaction, which encourages one to search for information or at least to think about national roots, sources of spirituality, place in history, etc. (Khrypko, 2003).

Disappearing along with the nation, mentality confirms itself as the life-giving and cordocentric core of a single ethnic group, because it cannot remain only in the concept as religion, in cultural monuments as spirituality, in historical information as vanished nations and peoples. So, the mentality is an eternal chance of life-giving, which is available to the nation even despite the effective policy of genocide, official non-recognition, or prohibition. It is available until the mechanism of self-destruction is “launched”, which reveals national self-oblivion and self-humiliation. Finally,

claiming the importance and priority of the mentality factor in the development of national security, we will emphasize again that the reproduction and improvement of state manifestations of mentality should ground not on criticism, shame, and defamation of the past periods of spiritual hard times (just as the versatile process of spiritual revival of Ukraine). The focus must be on a reinterpretation of the spiritual lessons of the past. It will enrich the manifestations of the humanistic and spiritual core of national mentality for the sake of the true revival of Ukraine and its decent place in the world history of Mankind. And humanity, as we all know, chooses the strongest ones.

4. Conclusions

In Ukrainian legislation, the spheres of ensuring national security include internal policy, foreign policy, military, social, humanitarian, economic, scientific and technological, information, environmental spheres, as well as the spheres of state security, civil protection of the population, and state border security. At the same time, the legislation deals indirectly or does not deal at all with the energy, financial, demographic, migration, ethnic and national, maritime, and food security of Ukraine. The term “confessional (interfaith) security” does not appear at the state level, although its significance has been steadily increasing. This, in turn, makes the need for relevant religious studies in the field of security studies more acute.

The national security system is an integral part of the European and global (universal) security system. Therefore, it is possible to advance a reasonable hypothesis: when forming collective security systems, elements of the national security systems of individual countries are implemented and harmonized under certain principles of functioning of the higher-order security systems. That is why the objective necessity today is to change the concept of international security law, taking into account the statements of the theory of national security. It is vital to go beyond the artificial limits of international law, which plays an important but not defining role.

The integration processes into collective security systems make it necessary to fill national legal systems with new standards designed to harmonize in a certain way both the security relations, which in this case will unite states, and their corresponding security legislation. Moreover, these standards should be considered in several aspects. According to the first aspect, a safety standard is a regulatory document that fixes a set of norms, rules, terms, concepts, and requirements that are mandatory to ensure the security of an object or standardization process (Lipkan & Lipkan 2008). According to the second aspect, which mostly axiomatically prevails in the

security environment, the concept of a standard does not have specific content. It refers to certain rules and regulations that correspond to other pre-defined parameters. Such vague and not clearly defined terms are “NATO standards”, “European standards”, “international standards”, “industry standards”, “security standard”, etc. Undoubtedly, this approach implies that it is possible to develop unified terminology, specific products, methods for measuring the level of security, identifying threats, methods, ways, and means of ensuring security, security techniques, etc. However, it is the vague meaning that is to be eliminated by the national security law, which will give the categories a clear legal content to be legitimized and, accordingly, will not only be equally understood by subjects of legal relations but will also be applied in their practical activities (Lipkan, 2009). It is the national security law that can stabilize and guarantee the security as the idea and the fact.

Security as a philosophical category implies the fact of protecting the existence of a nation, humanity, individual, or family – protection of their immanent essence, conditions of existence and life in general. A sense of understanding of the true values and interests can be seen through the lens of the category of existence. From a predictive point of view, security can be analyzed by the protection constant of such spheres of the existence of humanity, nation, ethnic group, ethnic or social group, family, individual as *spiritual existence in social dimensions* (spiritual values, faith, morality, identity, culture, mentality); *material and objective existence* (material conditions of existence in the economic, economic and everyday spheres); *social and historical existence* (real social and international relations and agreements in a certain historical time, geopolitical details of international cohabitation); *subjective and personal existence* (unique individual experience, exclusive specific personal manifestations of existence aimed at a specific personality). The category of security through the prism of the philosophy of existence is a wide scope for future interdisciplinary research.

Ukrainian realia confirm that state bodies are asymmetric about the essential origins of national security. The latter is considered a state of protection of national interests but not the national values of Ukraine. In national legislation on national security issues, national values are mentioned only indirectly. However, the importance of national values cannot be overestimated: both an alternative understanding of the essence and content of national security come as a natural understanding of security itself. Not only do the authorities understand national values differently, but the same can be said about people living in different regions of Ukraine. It also adds

confusion to the overall formation of the security culture in the state and society.

Postmodernism successfully reflected the extreme state of public consciousness, which implies a revolution and reassessment of the values, the transformation of ideals. In any case, the destruction of established values, the leveling of value taboos will end with the formation of new universal boundary values. Thus, unquestionable respect for national ideals and, more specifically, the ideas of security will take a prominent place in the ideological culture of humanity in general and Ukrainians in particular. Interpretations, definitions, and conclusions should carry a positive load. Criticism does not assert the truth. The appreciation of other values, experience, and achievements should not be accompanied by defamation of national values but should provide for the greatness and memory of the latter.

One of the priority factors in the theory of security studies should be the analysis of the phenomenon of national mentality. After all, the fact of mentality is a guarantee of the existence of a nation. The phenomenon of mentality is unique because it synthesizes the known and unknown, the recognized and hypothetical, the effective and sensually emotional, the past and future, which manifests itself in every moment of national existence despite the desirability or undesirability or inappropriateness of these manifestations. So, the mentality is a synthesis of process and phenomenon. Being involved literally in every moment in the life of the nation and not existing apart from its carriers (subjects), the mentality certifies the genetic layer of itself as a process of formation. Refracting through certain historical circumstances, it can be seen as a phenomenon, the specifics of which depend on a specific historical period that focuses attention on certain characteristic features and manifestations relevant for this particular time.

We can conclude that a cursory analysis of existing scientific sources in Ukrainian science does not make it possible to form a complete and thorough idea of either the phenomenon of national security or the possible constructions of the national security law. The real state of security of society is defined by existing or potential threats, which are necessarily associated with the current assessment of the nature of these threats and the predicted assessment (both internal and external). But it is utopian to create rational counteractions to threats for all occasions; they cannot be fixed in legal acts. *“A legislator cannot know the future for sure. The national memory is able to predict it.”* (Levyk et al., 2020).

Legislation can be formed only on established patterns and, of course, only on some part of the causes and consequences of threats and

hazards. Therefore, the law can only construct general principles – the constancy of identifying, knowing, and overcoming threats. Mental, cultural, and historical memory can capture keep forever what is beyond the power of legal documents and become the basis for implementing the idea of national security and national dignity.

References

- Abramov, V., & Afonina, O. (2010). Natsionalna bezpeka yak filosofska kategoriia [National security as a philosophical category]. <http://academy.gov.ua/ej/ej11/txts/10avibfk.pdf>
- Abramov, V., Sytnyk, G., Smolianiuk, V. (2016). Globalna ta natsionalna bezpeka [Global and national security]. *The National Academy of State Administration*.
- Bigo, D., Carrera, S., Hernanz, N., Jeandesboz, J., Parkin, J., Ragazzi, F., & Scherrer, A. (2013). *Mass surveillance of personal data by EU member states and its compatibility with EU law*. <https://www.ceps.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/No%2062%20Surveillance%20of%20Personal%20Data%20by%20EU%20MSs.pdf>
- Cicero. (1999). *O gosudarstve; O zakonakh; O starosti; o druzhbe; Ob obiazannostiakh; Rechi; Pisma* [On the State; On laws; Cato the Elder on Old Age; Laelius on Friendship; On Duties; Speeches; Letters]. Moscow: Mysl.
- Dalby, S. (2000). *Geopolitical Change and Contemporary Security Studies: Contextualizing the Human Security Agenda*. <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/46517/WP30.pdf>
- Dodonova V.I., Dodonov R. A., Aleksandrova O. S., Popovich O. V., Omelchenko Y. V. (2019). Strategy and Tactics of Behaviour of Subjects and Objects of Historical Trauma. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie*, 2(36), 153-164. https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/id/eprint/29682/1/V_Dodonova_Romania_2019_IFF.pdf
- Dunn Cavelty, M., & Mauer, V. (2009). Postmodern Intelligence: Strategic Warning in an Age of Reflexive Intelligence. *Security Dialogue*, 40(2), 123-144. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0967010609103071>
- Ehrhart, H.-G. (2017) Postmodern warfare and the blurred boundaries between war and peace. *Defense & Security Analysis*, 33(3), 263-275. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2017.1351156>
- Khrypko, S. (2009). *Etnokulturna tsarina dukhovno-religijnykh obrysiv ukrainskoi mentalnosti: ustalenosti ta innovatsii* [Ethnic and cultural sphere of spiritual and religious outlines of the Ukrainian mentality: foundations and innovations]. Monograph. Kyiv: Dragomanov National Pedagogical University.
- Khrypko, S., & Iatsenko, G. (2019). Philosophy of a Name: Ukrainian Context. *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy*, 9 (2), 437-451. <http://doi.org/10.18491/beytulhikme.1477>

- Khrypko, S. (2003). *Spiritual and Religious Features of Ukrainian Mentality*. National Pedagogical University Named after M.P. Dragomanov Press.
- Kornievskiy, O. (2011). *Natsionalna bezpeka*. *Politychna entsyklopediia* [National security. Political encyclopedia]. 489-490. Kyiv: Parliamentary Publishing
- Kumar, D. (2017). National Security Culture: Gender, Race and Class in the Production of Imperial Citizenship. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 2154–2177. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/6699/2039>
- Law of Ukraine “On National Security of Ukraine” (2020), art. 3, cl. 3. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2469-19>
- Levyk, B., Aleksandrova, O., Khrypko, S., & Iatsenko, G. (2020). Geo-policy and Geo-psychology as Cultural Determinants of Ukrainian Religion, Mentality, and National Security. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(3), 217-225. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i3.2761>
- Lipkan, V., & Lipkan, O. (2008). *Natsionalna i mizhnarodna bezpeka u vyznachenniakh ta poniattiakh* [National and international security in definitions and terms]. Kyiv: Text.
- Lipkan, V. (2009). *Osnovy prava natsionalnoi bezpeky* [Foundations of the national security law]. *Law of Ukraine*, 1, 108-116.
- Lobanchuk, O. (2018). Synchronic Approach to Comparative Research of Ukrainian Cultural Space in European Context. *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy*, 8 (2), 681-690. [http://www.beytulhikme.org/Makaleler/511596894_15_Lobanchuk_\(681-690\).pdf](http://www.beytulhikme.org/Makaleler/511596894_15_Lobanchuk_(681-690).pdf)
- Lytvynov, V. (2000). *Renesansnyi humanizm v Ukraini* [Renaissance humanism in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Osnovy. <http://litopys.org.ua/lytv/lyt.htm>
- Malyk, Y., et al. (2002). *Ekonomichna bezpeka Ukrainy: vnutrishni ta zovnishni chynnyky* [Economic security of Ukraine: internal and external factors]. Textbook for universities. *Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv*.
- Mazuryk, O. (2013). *Sotsialnyy audyt: teoretychni zasady ta tekhnolohiya zastosuvannya v Ukraini* [Social audit: theoretical principles and technology of application in Ukraine]. Donetsk: Eastern Publishing House.
- Mykhalchenko, M. (2011). *Interesy natsionalni*. *Politychna entsyklopediia* [National interests. Political encyclopedia]. 295-296. <https://archive.org/details/Politychna/mode/1up?view=theater>
- Nikitin, Yu. (2015). *Natsionalna bezpeka Ukrainy v suchasnykh umovakh: ryzyky i factory vplyvu* [National security of Ukraine under modern conditions: risks and influence factors]. *Judicial Science*, 2, 141-147. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/jnn_2015_2_19

- On Fundamentals of National Security of Ukraine: Law of Ukraine (2003). Vidomosti of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 39. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/go/964-15>
- On National Security of Ukraine: law draft of Ukraine as of 28.02.2018. http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=63531
- Petrauskaitė, A., & Kazlauskaitė-Markelienė, R. (2018). National security, values and postmodern society. *Challenges to national defence in contemporary geopolitical situation*, 1, 121-127. <https://doi.org/10.47459/cndcgs.2018.18>
- Postol, A. (2010). Postmodernizm yak suchasna suspilno-politychna realnist [Postmodernism as a modern social-political reality]. *ZDIA Humanitarian bulletin*, 42, 69-79. https://old-zdia.znu.edu.ua/gazeta/VISNIK_42_8.pdf
- Pasichnyk, V. (2011). Filosofska kategoriia bezpeky yak osnova novoi paradygmy derzhavnogo upravlinnia natsionalnoiu bezpekoiu [Philosophical category of security as a foundation a of a new paradigm of the state administration for national security]. *Academic papers collection*, 7 (*Democratic Governance*). http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeVr_2011_7_7
- Rathmell, A. (2002). Towards postmodern intelligence. *Intelligence and National Security*, 17(3), 87–104. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02684520412331306560>
- Rothschild, E. (1995). What is Security? . *Daedalus*, 124(3), 53-98. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027310>
- Smolianiuk, V. (2018). Systemni zasady natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy [System foundations of the national security of Ukraine]. *Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University Bulletin*, 2(37), 108-126. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vnuuaup_2018_2_11
- Sytnyk, G. (2007). Natsionalna bezpeka Ukrainy: teoriia i praktyka [National security of Ukraine: theory and practice]. Textbook: Khmelnytsky.
- Trebin, M. (2014). “Hibrydna” viina yak nova ukrainska realnist [“Hybrid” war as a new Ukrainian reality.]. *Ukrainian society*, 3(50), 113–127. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Usoc_2014_3_13
- Tupchienko, L. (2004). Natsionalna bezpeka. Politologichnyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk [National security. Political encyclopedia dictionary]. Kyiv: Geneza, 386-387.
- Williams, J. A. (2008). The Military and Society Beyond the Postmodern Era. *Orbis*, 52(2), 199–216. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orbis.2008.01.003>
- Yereskova, T., Mazuryk, O., Tymofieieva, H., & Opryshko, T. (2020). Social Activity of Contemporary Ukrainian Society: Threat to Internal Stability or Possibility of Social Dialogue. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 144-173. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/227>