RUDN Journal of Philosophy. ISSN 2313-2302 (Print), ISSN 2408-8900 (Online) 2025 Vol. 29 No. 2 267–281
Вестник РУДН. Серия: ФИЛОСОФИЯ http://journals.rudn.ru/philosophy

Современное общество и социальная безопасность

Contemporary Society and Social Security

https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-267-281
EDN: PYCRKP

Research Article / Научная статья

The Phenomenon of Security: Socio-Philosophical Context

Olga V. Dzhavad ✉, Marina L. Ivleva

RUDN University, Moscow, Russia
✉dzhavad_ov@pfur.ru

Abstract. This research delves into the socio-philosophical dimensions of security, assessing its metaphysical and existential aspects and considering how existential threats reshape philosophical perspectives in the contemporary society. The relevance of this study is underscored by the urgent need to understand how traditional and non-traditional security threats – ranging from military conflicts to cybercrime and climate change – impact societal structures and individual freedoms. The paper highlights the intersection of social structures and security, revealing how security is instrumentalised by various actors, including governments, to control or influence social dynamics. Moreover, it emphasizes how media representation and public fear can influence political decision-making, urging a critical examination of how security discourses are constructed and whose interests they serve. By integrating socio-philosophical perspectives, this paper establishes a framework for understanding security as a multifaceted phenomenon. Notably, this research underscores the role of cultural, psychological, and ethical dimensions in shaping public understanding and policy responses to security threats. Key findings illustrate that contemporary security cannot be narrowly defined; rather, it necessitates an integrated approach encompassing political, economic, social, and environmental considerations and a re-evaluation of traditional security models to address contemporary challenges such as cybersecurity threats and digital ethics. Ultimately, this work argues for highlighting the necessity of interdisciplinary approaches in developing contemporary security strategies effectively addressing fluctuating dynamics of the international agenda.

Keywords: societal security, identity, social justice, inequality, cultural differences, digital ethics, environmental security, Hobbes' trap

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.
Contribution of authors. All the authors contributed equally to the conception, preparation and writing of the manuscript.

Article history:
The article was submitted on 11.12.2024
The article was accepted on 06.03.2025

For citation: Dzhavad OV, Ivleva ML. The Phenomenon of Security: Socio-Philosophical Context. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy.* 2025;29(2):267–281. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-267-281

Феномен безопасности: социально-философский контекст

О.В. Джавад ✉, М.Л. Ивлева

Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Россия
✉dzhavad_ov@pfur.ru

Аннотация. Исследование посвящено социально-философским аспектам безопасности, оценке ее метафизических и экзистенциальных аспектов и рассмотрению того, как экзистенциальные угрозы меняют философские взгляды в современном обществе. Актуальность данного исследования подчеркивается насущной необходимостью понять, как традиционные и нетрадиционные угрозы безопасности – от военных конфликтов до киберпреступности и изменения климата – влияют на общественные структуры и индивидуальные свободы. Статья подчеркивает пересечение социальных структур и безопасности, показывая, как безопасность используется различными акторами, включая правительства, для контроля или влияния на социальную динамику. Более того, в статье подчеркивается, как репрезентация СМИ и общественный страх могут влиять на принятие политических решений, призывая к критическому изучению того, как конструируются дискурсы безопасности и чьим интересам они служат. Интегрируя социально-философские перспективы, данная работа создает основу для понимания безопасности как многогранного явления. Примечательно, что данное исследование подчеркивает роль культурных, психологических и этических аспектов в формировании общественного понимания и политических реакций на угрозы безопасности. Основные выводы показывают, что современная безопасность не может быть определена узко; скорее, она требует комплексного подхода, охватывающего политические, экономические, социальные и экологические соображения, а также переоценки традиционных моделей безопасности для решения современных проблем, таких как угрозы кибербезопасности и цифровая этика. В конечном счете данная работа доказывает необходимость междисциплинарных подходов к разработке современных стратегий безопасности, эффективно реагирующих на изменчивую динамику международной повестки дня.

Ключевые слова: общественная безопасность, идентичность, социетальная справедливость, неравенство, культурные различия, цифровая этика, экологическая безопасность, ловушка Гоббса

Конфликт интересов. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Вклад авторов. Все авторы внесли равный вклад в разработку концепции, подготовку и написание рукописи.

История статьи:
Статья поступила 11.12.2024
Статья принята к публикации 06.03.2025

Для цитирования: *Dzhavad O.V., Ivleva M.L.* The Phenomenon of Security: Socio-Philosophical Context // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Философия. 2025. Т. 29. № 2. С. 267–281. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-267-281

Introduction

In modern society, the phenomenon of security occupies a central place in social and philosophical debates. In a continuously changing world with its multiple challenges and threats, the understanding of security is gaining new horizons, expanding the traditional framework of interpretation. Security as a category has long remained a subject of concern and interest not only for states and international organisations, but also for each individual.

The socio-philosophical aspects of this phenomenon lead to the need to assess the impact of security on everyday life, identity and social structures. Philosophical reflections allow for a deeper understanding of the metaphysical and existential components of security, its moral and ethical dimensions. Questions related to the nature of threats, methods of prevention and survival strategies form the basis for a wide range of studies and discourses.

This paper proposes to examine the socio-philosophical context of the security phenomenon, focusing on the interaction between society and the individual, as well as the role of philosophy in shaping new approaches to security in the context of global change and uncertainty.

Social philosophy often explores various aspects of security through the lens of human society and interactions. For example, social contract and security, exploring how ideas of social contract shape understandings of security by balancing freedom and the need for protection. Social contract theory, developed by philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes [1; 2], and Jean-Jacques Rousseau [3], suggests that individuals agree to certain restrictions on freedoms in exchange for security and social order created by the state.

In considering the relationship between security and identity, it is significant to analyse how individual and collective identities influence the perception and politics of security in society. The works of Samuel Huntington [4], Ernest Gellner [5], Benedict Anderson [6] explore how national, cultural or ethnic identity affects the perception of threats and the level of security. Political decisions in certain situations at different historical stages of statehood may reflect the need to protect a certain identity.

In this regard, it is worth mentioning the topic of social justice and security, namely the study of the relationship between the social equation, human rights and security, including how inequality can threaten public security. The works of theorists such as John Rozl [7], Amartya Sen [8], and Nancy Fraser [9] examine the relationship between the equitable distribution of resources and security, how the presence of social and economic inequalities can lead to instability and conflict, which threatens both the personal security of citizens and national security as a whole.

In the second half of the XX century, within the framework of cultural differences and the phenomenon of the concept of societal security that appeared much later, such scholars as Edward Said [10], Clifford Girtz [11], as well as Samuel Huntington [12] in his famous article 'Clash of Civilisations?' in the journal 'Foreign Affaires' in 1993 share ideas about how cultural and religious differences affect the concepts and strategies of security in different societies, as well as the role of culture and religion in shaping perceptions of security, what may be accepted in one society may be perceived as a threat in another.

As early as the beginning of the 21st century, research on the psychology of fear in the context of security theories, how fear and psychological aspects influence security decision-making and societal reactions became popular. The work of scholars such as David Altheide [13], Barry Glassner [14], and Cass Sunstein [15] analyses how fear – often fuelled through media or social media – influences mass consciousness and political security decisions. It is these studies that in many ways laid the groundwork for new trends in security studies going forward. Largely due to the development of technology and the proliferation of social media, new trends in security studies have emerged that are also certainly worthy of consideration from a social philosophy perspective. For example, the concept of environmental security provides a basis for developing a socio-philosophical approach to security in the context of climate change and human impact on the environment. The challenges, according to researchers such as Jared Diamond [16] and Thomas Homer-Dixon [17], that arise from environmental changes such as climate change, resource depletion, and their impact on global and national security, including migration challenges, which is particularly important in consideration of the current agenda of most countries in the African continent and some countries in the Greater Middle East.

To pursue this issue, it is relevant to note the most recent trends that have begun to emerge in the second decade of the twenty-first century – digital ethics and Internet security – aim to explore primarily ethical issues related to security in the digital age, including data privacy and cybersecurity. Issues relating to data privacy, the right to personal information, and ethical dilemmas arising from the use of technology for security, including the abuse of surveillance of citizens' privacy in large metropolitan areas, are raised in the works of Shoshana Zuboff [18], Eli Parizer [19], Bruce Schneier [20].

The most recent studies by Andrew McAfee [21] and Eric Brynolfsson [22], Cathy O'Neil, Yuval Harari [23] in the field of emerging technologies and related security issues focus on the impact of modern technologies on citizens' sense of security, naturally considering various aspects of such a technological innovation, which has already become an integral part of our lives, as artificial intelligence, which is studied also in the framework of the impact of new technological evolution, massive hackerism, as well as economic and socio-economic factors.

These examples emphasise the variety of aspects that can be considered when exploring the socio-philosophical foundations of the security phenomenon.

Main body

The issue of security as a subject of close attention in contemporary academic research took shape after 1945, predominantly in Western countries and as part of the international relations discipline. The common understanding of security, rightly considered the cornerstone of any coherent definition of the term, is based on people's confidence in the continuity of access to resources and opportunities critical to their survival and well-being [24]. Security thus encompasses a wide range of threats to existence, from global pandemics and authoritarian regimes to military invasions.

B. Buzan and L. Hansen note that there has been a 'conceptual shift' that has made it possible to explore a wider range of policy issues, including the importance of social cohesion and the relationship between military and non-military threats and vulnerabilities [25]. This conceptual shift involves, firstly, recognising the historical and cultural variability in the understanding of 'security'. First of all, this was expressed in the shift of emphasis from the requirements for compliance and security, from the sphere of 'high' (international) politics to the sphere of 'low' (domestic, local) politics. Secondly, a process of rethinking the very phenomenon of security was initiated. This process consisted in the transition from the perception of security as an illiberal and undemocratic political phenomenon requiring strict management and regulation to its understanding as a necessary condition for civilised and dignified life. In other words, security was no longer perceived solely as an instrument of state coercion and was seen as a significant component of ensuring human rights and freedoms. This rethinking has also led to a broadening of the range of security threats to include not only military and political, but also economic, social, environmental and other factors affecting people's well-being.

Security is a fundamental guarantee of order and risk management and is based on the operational tools of public administration. The focus is directed towards 'national security', that is, the defense of the nation and the state in the dynamic context of all hazards in the internal and external framework. But national security is not just a static state of defense, it is a continuous process of adaptation to changing conditions, requiring constant analysis, forecasting and reassessment of risks. National security should be understood as a risk management culture, which

clearly reveals the specificity of reaction to the external environment, mentality, inherent to the nation and the nation-state receptions of threats and dangers. The executive power dominates in the process of ensuring this state of defense. It is it, and not the legislative power, that has all the information about security parameters, intelligence and its sources, as well as all the instruments of its provision – the army, police, intelligence, etc. It is the executive power that has the first duty to ensure security. It is the first responsibility of the government to provide security. And the main concern of the state in this regard becomes the provision of military security.

Throughout the Cold War period, military security was at the centre of strategic studies, the essence of which was to form a correspondence or complementarity between military power and political goals of the state. Military security made political independence possible and also ensured other types of state security, such as economic, energy, social, etc., as well as other types of state security. Without a robust military defense, economic stability and social well-being become vulnerable to external threats and blackmail. Energy security, in turn, is increasingly dependent on geopolitical stability and resource control, which also requires military force to protect national interests. Military security thus acts as the foundation on which the entire national security system is built.

The ambiguity of the Hobbesian tradition is evident in the fact that 'military security,' understood as solely a threat to the state and population from the armed forces of other states, can become tyranny [1]. A national government may use the armed forces for a variety of purposes, including suppressing insurgencies, fighting terrorism, ideological differences, nationalism, opposition, and so on. In this regard, an important aspect is the establishment of clear boundaries and mechanisms to control the use of military force in order to avoid abuses and preserve democratic principles [16]. A system of checks and balances should be developed and implemented to ensure that the armed forces are subject to civilian control and operate in strict compliance with the law.

In some cases, the armed forces of a state may themselves pose a real threat to the government and carry out, for example, military coups. History knows many examples where the army, instead of defending the state, has overthrown legitimately elected governments, establishing a military dictatorship [23]. This emphasises the importance of maintaining a high level of professionalism, loyalty and political neutrality in the armed forces. In this sense, military security leads to 'power-political, oligarchic, authoritarian and other similar trends, and tendencies in society' [26. P. 157–158]. Excessive concentration of power in the hands of the military can lead to the restriction of civil liberties, suppression of political opposition and establishment of an authoritarian regime. This means that the distinction between foreign and security policy as instruments of interaction with the external environment, and domestic policy in the Hobbesian tradition becomes less essential. The blurring of the boundaries between foreign and domestic politics creates the danger of security instruments being used to address domestic political

objectives, which undermines democratic institutions and exacerbates social contradictions [26].

One of the problems is that the traditional understanding of security does not correspond to contemporary realities. It is rather crucial how a state interprets security, whether narrowly or broadly, which determines the scope of the national agenda and prioritisation. Broad definitions of security can be an advantage, covering all possible threats, but they also present a difficulty, adding many questions and little clarity in prioritising areas [27]. After the end of the Cold War, the concept of security had to include environmental, human and gender dimensions. This required breaking the link between security and defense and military aspects, as over-expansion of the concept risks losing the distinction between security and insecurity. National security could in fact become a 'basket case' of all potential threats to the state and society. Defining security as a state in which people can realise their goals without hindrance and threats leads to the risk of uncontrolled use of forceful measures as an instrument of socio-political control [28].

To avoid such a turn of events, critical security studies has set itself the goal of developing a logical structure of arguments for identifying the phenomenon of security, i.e. the logic of security. Anything that does not fit into it is not security and, therefore, is taken out of the framework of state control mechanisms. This is how the second interpretation tradition of the security phenomenon took shape in socio-humanitarian knowledge. While the first one we call ontological, focusing on the essential characteristics of security, the second one is epistemological, focusing on how we cognise and conceptualise security [28]. The ontological approach is often reduced to the search for universal and objective criteria of security, while the epistemological approach focuses on how different actors construct and interpret threats and dangers [28]. This dichotomy illustrates a fundamental difference in understanding the very nature of security: whether it is an objective reality existing independently of our perception, or whether it is a socially constructed concept dependent on context and perspective [28].

The Copenhagen School serves as an archetypal example in which scholars such as B. Buzan, O. Wæver, J. de Wilde, and others approach the study of security by exploring its new characteristics, practices, and institutions aimed at overcoming power dynamics [29. P. 4–5]. Within this school of thought, the state is conceptualised as a cultural entity that simultaneously embodies the role of 'self/subject', defining what constitutes security, and the role of 'object', confronting threats caused by insecurity, which it itself has created. Consequently, the state occupies the position of subject-object and plays a privileged role in creating and maintaining discourses of security and insecurity [29. P. 10–12]. Security is thus portrayed as a product of a creative act, akin to an artificial, constructed desire that serves a functional purpose. It should be noted that interest in cultural dimensions in security studies has been largely fuelled by critical studies and constructivism. These concepts have contributed to an understanding of core

normative values, such as freedom, that underpin the platform on which the phenomenon of security can exist and on which relevant debates can unfold [29. P. 40–41].

The constructivist approach thus not only offers an alternative understanding of security, but also challenges traditional notions of the state, power and international relations. It emphasises the role of ideas, norms and identities in shaping the behaviour of states and in determining what is considered a threat [29. P. 53]. Rather than seeing security as an objective given, constructivists argue that it is the result of social and political processes in which different actors struggle to define what is relevant and what requires protection. This implies that security is not a static concept but constantly evolves in response to changes in the political and social context.

Moreover, the critique of traditional approaches to security offered by the Copenhagen School and other currents of critical studies is not limited to academic debates. It has significant practical implications [25]. If security is a socially constructed concept, this means that we can and should critically evaluate those conceptions of security that dominate political discourse. We should ask questions about whose interests they reflect, what values they promote, and what alternative approaches to security might be possible. Such critical analysis can help us avoid situations where security is used to justify restrictions on civil liberties, the militarisation of society or external aggression.

The evolution of the understanding of security from a narrow, military-centred approach to a broader one that includes non-military threats and values has created a tension between ontological and epistemological approaches. Critical security studies, and especially the Copenhagen School, offer valuable tools for analysing how the notion of security is constructed and how it is used for political purposes [25]. By emphasising the role of culture, norms and identities, they allow us to better understand the complex relationships between security, power and society. It is necessary to remember that security is not simply a matter of defense against external threats, but of building a just and sustainable world in which everyone can live in dignity and security.

The securitisation theory proposed by the Copenhagen School is a deep and multidimensional concept that illuminates how political elites can use their power to define and construct security threats. This theory argues that such elites develop a perception of what exactly constitutes a threat, which helps to legitimise certain security measures and policies that they implement. This means that the process of securitisation is not simply a reaction to pre-existing threats, but rather an active process in which the state itself constructs its own security and (un)security, which in turn requires the development of appropriate policies.

A significant part of this theory is the understanding of security as a context in which there is a confrontation with a hard power personified by Leviathan, which represents traditional notions of power and political control [1]. Security, according to the views of researchers such as Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, is opposed to the

exceptional conditions associated with emergency politics and is an alternative to the normal processes of political life that are not subject to the dominance of force. Security policy thus begins to be perceived as a status and normative process that aims to protect certain values identified as relevant to the state and society.

The Copenhagen School has attempted to develop well-defined criteria for situations that can be regarded as dangerous by identifying 'codes of danger' and establishing analytical boundaries for notions of security. This, in turn, should minimise the risk of a situation that could be described as a Hobbes' trap – a constant threat where increasingly stringent measures must be used to ensure security [1]. However, theorists also raise the possibility of a trap called 'Everything Becomes Security', where security policy can become an end in itself rather than a means.

Securitisation, seen as a new socio-philosophical approach to security issues, is based on J. Austin's speech act theory and also partly on Judith Butler's work on the performativity of gender. Performativity is expressed in the fact that an utterance itself performs a certain action. For example, the chairman of a meeting opens the meeting with his words, thereby creating a new reality. Jacques Derrida in his work 'Signature-Event-Context' also points to the performative power of not only oral but also written utterance: he argues that the written form requires subsidiarity and 'citativity' [30; 31].

Securitisation theory establishes when an existential threat arises that requires an extraordinary political response. It identifies the stages in which the securitising speech act is performed and a logic of security is formed. This logic includes urgency, necessity and exceptionality, following which the securitising step is operationalised. Key to the success of these performative acts are the so-called 'conditions of success', which include the credibility of the securitiser and the context of utterance [25]. A successful securitising utterance implements the security logic under optimal conditions and leads to expected outcomes, which is effectively the execution of a pre-determined code whose outgoing consequences must be known. This determinacy of events within the theory emphasises the importance of understanding the sociopolitical context in which actions and utterances shape our perceptions of security and threats.

However, the original formulation of securitisation theory developed in the 1990s, with its emphasis on 'speech acts' and the concept of 'conditions of success' of the securitisation process has encountered many difficulties, both technical and substantive. There are a number of aspects concerning the adherence to speech act norms as well as criteria for the success of the securitisation act. Of significant importance is an understanding of the specifics of the 'conditions of success' that may not be realised in principle. It is also worth considering the fidelity of the securitiser's assessment of the audience's reaction to the speeches delivered.

To overcome these problems, a new paradigm has been proposed that shifts the focus of securitisation from its textual and internal side to its contextual and external side. This led to the development of a new externalist approach, which

began to develop in parallel with the internalist approach laid down by O. Wæver. In particular, T. Balzac theorises the externalist approach in his work The Three Faces of Securitisation. He argues that the meaning we attach to the notion of security does not arise in isolation, but is formed in dynamic social and linguistic contexts [30; 31].

According to Balzac, the process of securitisation requires careful consideration of multiple factors, including 'context' and the psycho-cultural characteristics of the audience. External events play a central role in our understanding of security, and some of them can disrupt entire political communities, regardless of how language is used. Three sets of factors are significant aspects of acts of securitisation: audience, context and securitising agent. The following must be taken into account: a) the audience's belief system and its willingness to trust the securitising agent; b) the 'zeitgeist' and the specificity of the particular situation that may affect the interpretation of the message; and c) the securitiser's ability to choose appropriate words and language. The cumulative effect must integrate with the surrounding context and balance mutually constitutive agents and structures.

It is crucial to understand that one should not limit oneself to analysing the institutionalised and sedimented discursive structures that shape the production of security meaning, as the founders of the Copenhagen School suggest. It is necessary to avoid turning the meanings found into immutable concepts that are timeless. Without a deep understanding of the psychology of key decision-makers, their 'self-understanding', beliefs, cognitive biases, mental strategies, personality traits and interpersonal relationship patterns, it is impossible to explain the many aspects of any security decision.

In the context of critical security studies, two other schools stand out, which to some extent complement and develop the ideas of the Copenhagen School. These are the Welsh or Aberystwyth school of C. Booth, R. Wyn Jones and C. Firke, based on the postulates of the Frankfurt School, and the Paris school of D. Bigot, inspired by P. Bourdieu's habitus theory and J. Derrida's deconstruction [32]. Significant for K. Booth is the fact that for millions of people the main source of security threat is their own state, not an abstract 'Enemy'. On this basis, a concept of security is needed that promotes the 'flourishing' of man in various forms, ensuring his emancipation from political groupings.

Both approaches emphasise that universal criteria of security cannot be precisely defined. They must be developed on the basis of analysing specific contexts, otherwise security policies risk becoming cycles of violence and permanent insecurity. This is also discussed by D. Bigo, who emphasises the dialectic of security and insecurity. He emphasises that no one knows the outcome of political action in advance, as there are many politicians and their interpretations of security. In the end, the struggle unfolds over which interpretation will be more meaningful to different audiences and which one will ultimately be recognised by them [33].

Here, a paradox arises: while ensuring the security of one object, one cannot ignore that this may put another in an insecure position. Security, thus, is not always a positive concept, as it depends on time frames and other conditions, which limits the possibilities of participants in the decision-making process in the field of security. Thus, D. Bigot initiated the discussion on the 'professionalisation' of (non)security management by focusing on the systems of meanings that exist within security [34].

In the light of contemporary discussions on threats and challenges viewed through the prism of security, the concept of 'civilised security' proposed by J. Loader and N. Wocker attracts special attention. Loader and N. Walker [35]. These researchers emphasise that security should be seen as a public good that should serve the interests of the population and act as an alternative to Hobbes' concept of Leviathan, where security is perceived more as an instrument of control rather than as a basis for a democratic society [1].

Loader and Walker point out that there is a certain 'pathology' in the construction of security, which manifests itself through four key aspects: paternalism, consumerism, authoritarianism and fragmentation. Paternalism here acts as a mechanism whereby special security services justify their expanded powers on the basis of unrealistic or distorted perceptions of the will of the electorate. This creates a distorted perception of democracy, where citizens' choices become secondary. Consumerism, in this context, reflects the imposition of harsh security measures on society that often contradict the principles of democratic control. This phenomenon arises in response to fear provocations planted in the minds of voters. Thus, the authorities manipulate the fears of the population, forming public sentiments that favour the adoption of authoritarian measures [35].

Authoritarianism, as the third aspect, is characterised by repression on the part of the executive, seeking to gain the approval of voters through a demonstration of force. This creates an atmosphere where a 'strong hand' is perceived as necessary to preserve order, which in turn leads to a diminished interest in democratic processes and citizens' rights [36]. Fragmentation completes this series of negative phenomena, manifesting itself in the partial provision of societal and human security, while spending on military security and the army is steadily increasing. This, in turn, creates a paradoxical situation in which the very essence of the democratic order suffers as the next security measures are put in place, and social structures are restructured, with democracy becoming a mere appearance [37].

Perhaps the most disturbing thing about this pathology of security is that instead of constructive development and implementation of democratic forms of politics, society begins to transform into an authoritarian system based on fear and control [38]. The techniques used in this paradigm are similar to those described as 'harnessing', where the secret managerial mechanisms necessary to achieve political goals serve only to wrap society in the illusion of choice and independence. Security thus loses its true status as a complex social and political phenomenon, becoming an instrument aimed solely at controlling the population. It is based on

the existing institutional mechanisms, on the traditions of secrecy and prerogative of the executive power, which are enshrined as a historical norm [39]. Because of this, it is impossible to realise the ideal of complete security in a democratic society. Achieving such a state would imply the absence of both freedom and values, which are the essence of a democratic system.

As Reinhold Niebuhr rightly pointed out, 'politics will, until the end of history, be the sphere where conscience and power meet'. In this complex system, where the ethical and coercive factors of human life are intertwined, security becomes not just a matter of defense, but an arena where the interests of power can conflict with the moral aspects of society, creating difficult compromises [40. P. 4]. The study of security requires the application of abstract schemes and simplifications, as this phenomenon is intertwined with a multitude of social ties and communications. However, the key question remains: how to define the concept of security accurately when the number of its definitions is so large that the concept itself has become over-extended? In modern society, security professionals are not only traditional experts, but also representatives of various professions, including doctors, teachers and even ordinary citizens. This is of particular importance when analysing this issue from the point of view of social philosophy [41].

Conclusion

In today's world, the socio-philosophical concept of national security is undergoing significant changes. In addition to traditional military threats, non-traditional challenges such as cybercrime, terrorism, pandemics, climate change and economic instability are becoming increasingly prominent. These threats tend to have no clear boundaries and require an integrated approach that brings together the efforts of various government agencies, the private sector and the international community. Cybersecurity, for example, is becoming critically important to protect national infrastructure, financial systems and citizens' personal data. Combating terrorism requires close co-operation between intelligence and law enforcement agencies of different countries. Preventing and combating pandemics requires coordinated efforts in health, logistics and economics. Climate change is a long-standing threat that requires global co-operation and the development of sustainable solutions.

Thus, ensuring national security in the 21st century requires not only a strong military, but also a developed economy, strong institutions, an educated population and an effective risk management system. National security should be comprehensive and take into account not only military, but also economic, social, environmental, informational and other aspects. The creation of such a system requires constant dialogue between the state and society, as well as broad international cooperation.

In conclusion, we can say that the socio-philosophical aspect of the security phenomenon is complex and multifaceted, requiring constant analysis and

adaptation to changing conditions. Ensuring security is a priority task of the state, but requires a balance between the need to protect national interests and the observance of democratic principles, civil and social freedoms. Successful national security can only be achieved through a comprehensive approach that combines the efforts of various government agencies, the private sector and the international community. Thus, we can conclude that the goal of the critical approach to the study of security – the destruction of the traditional Hobbesian logic – has not yet been achieved. Leviathan continues to be a symbol of this logic, reproducing the main features and patterns associated with the 'nuclear' meaning of security, which persists under any conditions. Specific meanings of security are shaped by a multitude of factors that influence security practices in different contexts and settings.

References / Список литературы

[1] Hobbes T. *Leviathan, or, The matter, forme, and power of a common wealth, ecclesiasticall and civil*. London: Printed for Andrew Crooke; 1651.

[2] Locke J. *Two Treatises of Government: In the Former, The False Principles, and Foundation of Sir Robert Filmer, and His Followers, Are Detected and Overthrown. The Latter Is an Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent, and End of Civil Government*. London: Awnsham and John Churchill; 1698.

[3] Rousseau J-J. *On the Social Contract; or, Principles of Political Righ*. Amsterdam; 1762.

[4] Huntington SP. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster; 1996.

[5] Gellner E. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press; 1983.

[6] Anderson B. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso; 1983.

[7] Rawls J. *Theory of justice*. Harvard: University Press; 1971. DOI: 10.4159/9780674042605

[8] Sen A. *The Idea of Justice*. London: Penguin Books Ltd; 2009. DOI: 10.4159/9780674054578

[9] Fraser N. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Columbia University Press; 2008.

[10] Said E. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1978.

[11] Geertz C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books; 1973.

[12] Huntington SP. The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*. 1993;72(3):22–49. DOI: 10.2307/20045621 EDN: BOCJXP

[13] Altheide DL. Terrorism and the Politics of Fear. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*. 2006;6(4):415–439. DOI: 10.1177/1532708605285733

[14] Glassner B. The Construction of Fear. *Qualitative Sociology*. 1999;22(4):301–309. DOI: 10.1023/A EDN: BCEANJ

[15] Sunstein CR. *Laws of Fear: Beyond the Precautionary Principle*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press; 2005. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511790850

[16] Diamond J. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking/ Penguin Group; 2005.

[17] Homer-Dixon T. *Environment, scarcity and violence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1999.

[18] Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs; 2019.
[19] Pariser E. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You?* New York: Penguin; 2011. DOI: 10.3139/9783446431164
[20] Schneier B. *Data and Goliath: The Hidden Battles to Collect Your Data and Control Your World*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company; 2015.
[21] Brynjolfsson E, McAfee A. *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company; 2014.
[22] O'Neil C. *Weapons of Math Destruction, How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. New York: Broadway Books; 2016.
[23] Harari YN. *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*. New York: Vintage Books; 2018.
[24] Glasser MA, Polyachenkov AV, Novik NN. Security expertise in the modern world: opportunities and problems. *Philosophical Sciences.* 2021;64(6):33–54. (In Russian). DOI: 10.30727/0235-1188-2021-64-5-33-54 EDN: IJEMQA
Гласер М.А., Поляченков А.В., Новик Н.Н. Экспертиза безопасности в современном мире: возможности и проблемы // Философские науки. 2021. Т. 64. № 6. С. 33–54. DOI: 10.30727/0235-1188-2021-64-5-33-54 EDN: IJEMQA
[25] Buzan B, Hansen L. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511817762 EDN: UREMWJ
[26] Herz JH. Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*. 1950;2(2):157–158. DOI: 10.2307/2009187
[27] Sussex M. Understanding National Security: The Promises and Pitfalls of International Relations Theory. In: Clarke M, Henschke A, Sussex M, Legrand T, editors. *The Palgrave Handbook of National Security*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2022. P. 23–52. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-53494-3_2
[28] Fischer RJ, Green G. *Introduction to Security*. Boston, MA: Butterworth Heinemann; 2004.
[29] Buzan B, Wæver O, De Wilde J. *Security: A New Framework for An*alysis. London: Lynne Renner Publishers; 1998.
[30] Derrida J. Signature Event Context. In: *Fields of Philosophy*. Kralechkin DY, transl. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt publ.; 2012. P. 376–378. (In Russian).
Деррида Ж. Подпись Событие Контекст // Поля философии / пер. с фр. Д.Ю. Кралечкина. М. : Академический проект, 2012. С. 376–378.
[31] Derrida J. The Theatre of Cruelty and the Closure of Representation. In: *Writing and Distinction*. Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt publ.; 2000. P. 430–431. (In Russian).
Деррида Ж. Театр жестокости и закрытие представления // Письмо и различие. СПб. : Академический проект, 2000. С. 430–431.
[32] Balzacq T. The three faces of securitization: Political agency, audience and context. *European journal of international relations*. 2005;11(2):171–201. DOI: 10.1177/1354066105052960 EDN: JRSMYJ
[33] Booth K. Security and Emancipation. *Review of International Studies*. 1991;17(4):313–326. DOI: 10.1017/s0260210500112033
[34] Bigo D, Tsoukala A. *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11*. London: Routledge; 2008. DOI: 10.4324/9780203926765
[35] Loader I, Walker N. *Civilizing security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511611117
[36] Glasser MA, Ivleva ML. Societal security and religion in postcolonial Africa. *State, religion, Church in Russia and abroad*. 2022;40(3):136–167. (In Russian). DOI: 10.22394/2073-7203-2022-40-3-136-167 EDN: MNCLGY

Гласер М.А., Ивлева М.Л. Социетальная безопасность и религия в постколониальной Африке // Государство, религия, церковь в России и за рубежом. 2022. Т. 40. № 3. С. 136–167. DOI: 10.22394/2073-7203-2022-40-3-136-167 EDN: MNCLGY

[37] Glaser MA, Ivlev VYu, Novik NN. Discourses of biopolitics and human security in the context of new challenges and threats to humanity. *Voprosy Filosofii.* 2021;(2):42–52. (In Russian). DOI: 10.21146/0042-8744-2021-2-42-52 EDN: CPRBZV
Гласер М.А., Ивлев В.Ю., Новик Н.Н. Дискурсы биополитики и безопасности человека в условиях новых вызовов и угроз человечеству // Вопросы философии. 2021. № 2. С. 42–52. DOI: 10.21146/0042-8744-2021-2-42-52 EDN: CPRBZV

[38] Glaser MA. *Studies on philosophy of history, politics, security: in three volumes*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Publishing and Trading Corporation Dashkov & Co.; 2021. (In Russian).
Гласер М.А. Исследования по философии истории, политики, безопасности: в трех томах. Т. 1. М. : Издательско-торговая корпорация «Дашков и Ко», 2021.

[39] Chernyak AZ, Ivleva ML. The Ethics of Conflict in Changing World. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*. 2024;28(3):872–884. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2302-2024-28-3-872-884 EDN: WQOIQF

[40] Gulyaev RV. *Revolution or dictatorship: Hannah Arendt and Carl Schmitt on the essence of the political*: dissertation for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences. Available from: https://www.hse.ru/data/2013/12/26/1337226020/dis%20guliaev.pdf (accessed: 04.12.2024). (In Russian).
Гуляев Р.В. Революция или диктатура: Ханна Арендт и Карл Шмитт о сущности политического: дисс. … канд. филос. наук. Режим доступа: https://www.hse.ru/data/2013/12/26/1337226020/dis%20guliaev.pdf (дата обращения: 04.12 2024).

[41] Niebuhr R. *Moral man and immoral society: A study in ethics and politics*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press; 2013.

About the authors:

Dzhavad Olga V. – Senior Lecturer of the Department of Social Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, RUDN University, 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St., Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0003-4498-0664. SPIN-code: 5617-9987. E-mail: dzhavad_ov@pfur.ru

Ivleva Marina L. – DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Head of the Department of Social Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, RUDN University, 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St., Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0003-2901-7503. SPIN-code: 3861-0829. E-mail: ivleva_ml@pfur.ru

Сведения об авторах:

Джавад Ольга Васильевна – старший преподаватель кафедры социальной философии, факультет гуманитарных и социальных наук, Российский университет дружбы народов, Российская Федерация, 117198, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6. ORCID: 0000-0003-4498-0664. SPIN-код: 5617-9987. E-mail: dzhavad_ov@pfur.ru

Ивлева Марина Левенбертовна – доктор философских наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой социальной философии, факультет гуманитарных и социальных наук, Российский университет дружбы народов, Российская Федерация, 117198, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6. ORCID: 0000-0003-2901-7503. SPIN-код: 3861-0829. E-mail: ivleva-ml@rudn.ru