

UDC 173:327

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v057.2025.3>*L. H. Voronovska*ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2815-2500>*Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,**Lecturer at the Department of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines**National University of Civil Protection of Ukraine*

SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL PRECONDITIONS OF FORMATION OF THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY

Problem statement. Security is one of the basic human needs, the satisfaction of which is determined by the level of development of the state, its political, socio-economic, cultural components, the level and quality of life in a particular society. In the history of socio-philosophical thought, the problem of security of the individual, society, and the state has always been a priority in comparison with other problems that required attention from scientists. At the same time, the spectrum of scientific concepts was quite significant – from the recognition of the primacy of guarantees of the existence of the state apparatus and the equality of rights to the security of the individual, society, and the state, to the need for the exclusive right of the individual to a safe existence.

In the history of the development of knowledge about security, several stages are distinguished, at each of which scientific ideas about the essential content of the concept of security evolved, constantly changing, subject to adjustment. Such ambiguity of scientific positions regarding understanding the essence of security is connected with the prevailing scientific picture of the world, the existing worldviews, which represent general ideas about the structure of social reality, the laws of its functioning and development. In the modern system of scientific knowledge, several scientific pictures of the world are distinguished: mythological (which is characterized by anthropomorphism, which manifests itself in endowing natural phenomena with spiritual and even bodily properties of a person); mechanistic (determines the natural environment and society as mechanisms, all components of which perform functions intended only for them); scholastic (within which nature and society are treated as a certain code, a text that can be read and deciphered); statistical (considers nature and humanity as the interaction of natural, cultural, economic, political, socio-domestic, social, personal-individual, and group forces); systemic (define the natural environment and society as organized systems, subsystems consisting of mobile, dynamically changing elements capable of ensuring the integrity and viability of both individual subsystems and the large system as a whole); dianthropic (treats reality as a fair where fluctuations occur, a

combination of forces that determine the signs and characteristics of the elements of reality, allowing us to understand the multidimensional, polycentric world in dynamics). On the border between the systemic and dianthropic picture of the world, synergetics is actively developing, the key idea of which is a holistic understanding of the unity of the individual, nature and society, a characteristic of the process of functioning and development of the biopsychosocial essence of man. The indicated scientific pictures of the world and the corresponding methods of cognition determine the formulation of the object and subject of the sociology of security as a branch of sociological knowledge, its understanding of the vital forces of man and society, the functioning of their safe living space, thereby setting the foundation for various sociological paradigms of security, methods of social thinking in general.

The need for an analysis of the socio-philosophical foundations of security is due to the fact that its implementation will allow not only to form general scientific provisions about such a complex social phenomenon as security, but also to reveal its general properties, relationships and laws of formation, development and functioning. Solving the problems of this level, the process of determining the methods of scientific knowledge of security will provide an opportunity to apply them to create conditions for preserving the real security of social systems, their integrity, sustainable development and effective functioning of the individual, society and the state.

Analysis of research and publications. The works of V. Balakhonskyi, M. Liha, N. Pavlova, I. Shchetkina are devoted to the study of the philosophical, sociological and historical foundations of the formulation of the problem of security in the history of science. The philosophical foundations of the concept of security were studied by E. Litvinov, while V. Horlinskyi devoted his works to the study of security as an object of axiological reflection. The essence and evolution of philosophical, sociological, religious, cultural and psychological aspects of the perception of security were studied in their works by O. Baranovskyi, O. Viktorov, V. Kuznetsov and others.

Among Ukrainian scientists who have studied the concept of security at the present stage,

the works of S. Lysenko should be highlighted. He develops the problem of future trends in information security taking into account artificial intelligence technologies; I. Fedun works in the field of economic security of Ukraine; V. Kopanchuk studies state policy in the field of public/national security and protection of public order in conditions of hybrid war; O. Panchenko analyzes information security of Ukraine in the context of challenges and threats, including legal aspects; A. Kumeiko highlights the problem of defining the category of "state security" as an object of legal protection; D. Kamenskyi and A. Vozniuk study legal and economic aspects of national and economic security of Ukraine at the present stage.

A significant contribution to the study of the concept of security in wartime in Ukraine was made by V. Aleshchenko, who deals with the informational and psychological security of the individual in wartime; Ya. Tiutiuma works on the topic of Ukraine's role in ensuring European security in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war; A. Taranenko analyzes such a phenomenon as "cognitive security" in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war; V. Telehin is the author of a work on the influence of economic policy on ensuring the national security of Ukraine in the context of armed conflict.

At the same time, in the vast majority of modern scientific works on security problems, there are attempts to begin considering the specified problem on the basis of modern methodological approaches, while the socio-philosophical heritage in this area often remains unnoticed by researchers.

The purpose of the article is to clarify the socio-philosophical foundations of the emergence and development of the concept of security, to identify its evolution from basic forms of human self-preservation to modern socio-cultural and civilizational dimensions, and to determine its role as a fundamental value of modern civilization.

Presentation of the main material. Early class societies are characterized by the dominance of a mythological worldview. Philosophical ideas of the pre-Socratic era defined man as the measure of all things, a perfect creation of nature, a global value, while nature was considered as the first cause of everything existing on Earth endowed with reason.

In the era of the development of classical ancient philosophy, security was studied as the identity of the law, its provision was an exceptionally important task of the state, while human activity had to be directed, first of all, on self-preservation.

An interesting interpretation of security was proposed by Democritus, linking it with the possibility of a person's adaptation to the conditions of their surrounding environment, including the

social one. He saw the reason for the unification of people in society in the need to protect each specific individual [9, p. 109].

A similar approach to understanding security was developed by Aristotle, who considered the division of power into legislative, executive and judicial as the basis of state security. Reflecting on the dangers that threaten the existence of the state and social well-being, Aristotle actually created their typology based on the separation of interest groups and needs. In this case, subjective factors became important, namely: the personal or individual abilities of subjects to manage the state and social processes. The main threat to citizens, in his opinion, was the wrong state system and property stratification. That is why Aristotle considered the democratic structure of the state to be the safest, since the rule of the people and their feeling of their power are essentially a guarantee of security. His opinion on the importance of reducing social tension due to property inequality, which is a destructive principle in relation to social stability, is interesting. Developing technologies for ensuring security, Aristotle, first of all, paid attention to the possibility of the middle class coming to power, the presence of reasonable sizes of the state territory, the configuration of borders, as well as the creation of special social institutions for the protection of the state [1].

Plato, having typified the state system, considered democracy the weakest of all correct forms of organization of society. Democracy is the rule of the majority for the sake of the majority, but its weakness lies in the fact that decisions are made not by the wisest, but under the pressure of the crowd. The greatest threat to a democratic system is tyranny: the longer democracy lasts, the crueler the return of society to a controlled state will be. The ideal state, according to Plato, is the achievement of harmony between the relations of man and society through the establishment of a just and safe order. All other forms of state system, in comparison with the ideal, are potentially dangerous both for the individual and for society as a whole. Even freedom as the norm of a democratic state and its highest value is, in its excessive manifestation, a direct threat to the individual and leads to their enslavement and dissolution in tyranny.

According to Plato, the state should pay due attention to the soldiers who ensure its security. Equating the concept of security with the categories of justice, prudence, help, salvation, he develops a systemic concept of security, based on the explanation of the existence of an objective relationship between the security of the individual and the state, which is determined by the moral nature of the human being. As an object of personal and

social security, justice determines the need to form a collective system of its protection from internal and external threats. That is, the state, according to Plato's logic, is genetically connected with personal needs for security and a just order that supports it. Preservation of the principles of justice as the ethical basis of security in society and interpersonal relations requires a certain behavior of the individual, which is regulated not only by internal moral guidelines, but also by social-regulatory, legislative and institutional norms. Thus, people's awareness of justice leads to the need to form a collective system of its protection from internal and external threats. The security of the individual is the harmony of its relations with society. Man, as a social, political being, is responsible for the security of society, the state as a whole and their own security in particular. Among the mechanisms that ensure the security of the state, Plato included the upbringing and formation of people's moral qualities, the provision of all the benefits of life to citizens by the state, which they honestly earned through everyday work [5, p. 292].

During the reign of the Roman Empire, the understanding of the essence of security changed radically – the formation of a security system was clearly carried out to ensure the safe existence of the ruling elite of the state. A similar position was defended by the representative of Hellenistic philosophy Epicurus, who considered security as the highest value, the criterion for achieving the greatest satisfaction [9, p. 133].

According to Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, in conditions of constant threat to human well-being, health and life, the only correct way to guarantee security is a calm life, moderate humility to fate, satisfaction of only basic needs. He proposed to realize higher needs in understanding safe human existence through the manifestation of concern for the welfare of the state and other citizens, the protection of the empire from the invasion of foreigners. Thus, spiritual needs were considered higher than material, and social needs were considered higher than personal.

Cicero saw the basis of the stability of the security of the Roman state in the fact that its political system combined elements of monarchy (the need to introduce a dictatorship), aristocracy (senate) and democracy (popular assembly). The main threat to a secure existence is the alienation of the state apparatus from the Roman people, since the true state is the property of the people, and the people is a community of individuals united by common interests and agreement on issues of law [11].

Seneca considers common sense, a courageous and energetic spirit, nobility, endurance and readiness for any twists of fate as the basis of an individ-

ual secure existence. Life is happy if a person does not show distrust, takes care of satisfying their physical needs, accepts the gifts of fate, without being their slave. Seneca believes that the result of such a setting of the spirit is peace and freedom, the elimination of any reasons for irritation and fear [6, p. 47].

A significant contribution to the development of the socio-philosophical paradigm of security was made by representatives of the Middle Ages (F. Aquinas, J. Fidanza, A. Milanskyi, etc.), who argued that only God, acting as the source of all good, is able to guarantee security. The mechanisms for ensuring a secure existence are closely related to the process of preparing oneself and one's loved ones for life in the other world through baptism, righteousness, absolute harmony with the will of God, and the submission of personal will to the principles of divine order. Faith, humility, hope for salvation, service to God and neighbor, and love are the main Christian virtues that ensure a person's secure existence.

Developing Aristotle's ideas, A. Augustine also linked security with social inequality, somewhat rethinking it. He puts forward the thesis that property inequality of citizens is an inherent phenomenon that should be accepted, but emphasizes the fundamental equality of people in front of God and calls on them to live in peace and security. Interpreting danger, he reduces it mainly to sin. Sin and punishment are perceived by A. Augustine as the main threats to man. In the philosophical thought of the Renaissance, a significant contribution to understanding the essence of the concept of security was made by N. Machiavelli, who considered the separation of politics from culture to be the leading danger to the functioning of society. He saw the essence of the state in ensuring the common good, which would be the embodiment of national interests. There are two types of threats to the security of the state – one from within, from citizens, the other one – from without, from neighbors. External dangers can be overcome with the help of the army and allies. If the external source of danger is eliminated, then peace will remain within, provided that it is not disturbed by secret conspiracies. He considers the formation of the collective will of the nation to be the only mechanism for managing state security.

Unlike N. Machiavelli, F. Bacon identified and investigated the sources of the formation and development of a culture of security, in particular, he included the contradictions of the current legislation among them.

The era of modern times was marked by the emergence of a mechanistic picture of the world. B. Spinoza saw the leading goal of the functioning

and development of civil society in maintaining peace and security of life. In his opinion, the state of security of society is not only the absence of war, but also the unity of souls, the consistency of people's interests, national harmony in order to minimize fears and general troubles. Civil order is established naturally as a result of concluding a social contract [8, p. 44].

T. Hobbes, sharing Aristotle's views, argued that social equality is the leading cause of conflicts and wars, since each citizen tries to defend his rights, people's lives are mainly built on the principle of "war of all against all." Equating society and the state, he considers the latter as a human creation, the main meaning of whose existence is to replace the natural state of "man is a wolf to man" with the principles of a social contract. The state, according to T. Hobbes, should be considered as the best means of stabilizing life and developing society. After the creation of state institutions that protect the property and life of citizens (court, authorities, army, etc.), a security system arises, and the state itself is the most effective social project for satisfying the needs of citizens in security. Rethinking the ideas of T. Hobbes, we can argue that such a transition means the flow of the personal security of the individual as a selfish entity into social security at the expense of restricting rights and freedoms, because in his understanding security is an unconditional value, a factor not just in the survival of a particular individual, society, but of the state, civilization as a whole.

J. Locke, clarifying the reasoning of T. Hobbes, developed a new approach to the analysis of security, which included the study of processes and phenomena that destroyed the mechanism of state governance.

He defines personal security as a leading value, because only by ensuring the safety of life, freedom of conscience and protection of property of an individual citizen, can we talk about the possibility of full-fledged functioning of state social security.

Ch.-L. Montesquieu developed the idea of the need, in the interests of state and public security, to separate the three branches of power (executive, legislative and judicial). In addition, he argued that liberal-humanistic values and principles of a stable social order (condemnation of despotism, defense of civil and personal freedom, religious tolerance, political moderation, gradual changes) are necessary and sufficient conditions for the preservation and support of social security [10, p. 89].

The theory of the social contract of J.-J. Rousseau differs significantly from the views of T. Hobbes and J. Locke. In his opinion, the natural state of people should be interpreted as a state of original harmony with nature. Man does not need any social

restrictions, morality, systematic work, because the ability to self-preservation keeps them from the state of "war of all against all". However, the population is growing, geographical conditions are changing, society is stratified into poor and rich, powerful and displaced, who begin to be at enmity with each other, so people need civil peace: a social contract is concluded, according to which power over society passes to the state. The basis of state power should be the will and freedom of each individual. Therefore, J.-J. Rousseau puts forward the idea that the bearer and source of power is the people, who can and must displace the power that violates the terms of the social contract. The sovereign is not the state, but the people, because its representatives create laws, change them and adopt new ones.

In the conditions of the split of civilization, the mechanistic scientific picture is replaced by a stochastic one, which is based on complexity, irreversibility, uncertainty and nonlinearity. This picture of the world seeks to explain that the multivariate nature of the historical process is determined not only by risks, but also by the ability to influence real development scenarios, to ensure the safe existence of the state, society, and the individual.

Further development of the study of the essence of security was carried out within the framework of the theoretical developments of thinkers of the Enlightenment. Thus, P. Holbach saw the leading goal of security in preventing dangerous developments and ensuring life-affirming relations between man, society and the state. Therefore, for a safe existence, it is necessary to bring people together, to transform them into truly social beings on the basis of the objective interrelationship of the security of the individual and the security of the nation as a whole. Ensuring security involves the correct choice of an activity strategy, which should be based on the principles of objectivity, specificity, and scientific forecasts of social reality. Among the criteria for a safe existence, P. Holbach included the state of balance of power and freedom, the balance between all types of social activity. Thus, he tried to give a detailed description of security standards that correspond to the national, global development of international relations: not to harm others; the development of such human virtues as justice, humanity, sincerity; providing assistance to those in need; the ability to sacrifice one's own interests for the sake of others; recognizing the right of others to self-preservation; adhering to the principle of balance of power of different states.

In the concept of I. Kant, achieving a state of safe existence of society is possible through the existing relationship between the state citizenship of people within the nation, international law, and

the right of universal citizenship. The best analogue for building a safe society based on the norms of public law is a republican system that complies with the principles of pure law (freedom of every citizen, equality, recognition of a single general law) and the universal principle of freedom. I. Kant created a project of the League of Nations, designed to develop a bill of peace and security, protection of human rights throughout the world. The idea of building a legal state and eternal peace, security based on justice and equality, can be realized by recognizing the principles of freedom of each individual, as well as the state (ethno-ethnicity, culture). The security of the existence of a social system depends on people's ability to be guided by common sense, farsightedly foreseeing the consequences of the choice of life strategy made by them. G.V.F. Hegel in his works outlined the philosophical foundations of the security of the individual, the state and property. The leading role in ensuring the security of the individual and society is played by the state, because it is thanks to the state that a person forms the habit of a safe existence, which becomes his second nature. Analyzing the problems of security, Hegel focuses on the following principle: the security of an individual guarantees the security of society, that is, in fact, we are talking about the so-called integral security, which the state must provide. The state's refusal to perform this function inevitably leads to the degradation of the totality of all social relations, the destruction of social order. A significant decrease in the level of moral, legal and cultural restrictions contributes to the manifestation of selfishness, instincts, violence. This is the root cause of the entire spectrum of dangers and threats to the existence of the individual, social groups, the state, civilization and humanity as a whole [3, p. 42].

In the 21st century, the concept of security acquires a new, universal meaning. If earlier it was associated mainly with the military or political sphere, that is, the understanding of security as a military-political category related to national sovereignty and state defense dominated, today security is considered as a multidimensional phenomenon that encompasses the economic, energy, environmental, informational, social and spiritual dimensions of human existence.

Modern society lives in conditions of uncertainty, global challenges and rapid technological changes, therefore the formation of ideas about security becomes not only a scientific or political, but also a deeply philosophical issue – a question about the essence of human existence in a world of risk.

Currently, security is one of the basic conditions for the existence of man and society. In a philosophical sense, it means a state of security of being, pre-

serving the integrity of an individual, community or state. This is not only the absence of danger, but also the presence of stability, predictability, harmony.

From the point of view of ontology, security is an element of objective reality that determines the boundaries of possible human existence. Epistemologically, it is formed through the awareness of risk – a person learns security through the opposition of danger. Axiologically, security becomes one of the highest values of the modern world, because without it, freedom, development and creative activity are impossible.

At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, ideas about security are changing radically. Even newer concepts appear – information security, cybersecurity, environmental security, human security.

A person is considered not only as an object that needs protection, but also as a security subject who themselves create the conditions for their protected existence.

Globalization, the development of information technologies, the emergence of artificial intelligence and biotechnology form a new, complex architecture of dangers, in which objective and virtual threats are intertwined.

So, in the modern world, the concept of security has a dual nature. Firstly, this is the objective reality of security – the actual state of protection of a person, society or state from threats (military, economic, environmental, technological). Secondly, the subjective reality of security as a person's feeling of their own security, trust in social institutions and predictability of the world. In the 21st century, this balance is often disrupted: even with a high level of security, people can feel unsafe due to information pressure, fear, manipulation or traumatic experience of war.

Thus, perceptions of security are increasingly dependent on the media, social networks and the global information space. Among the socio-cultural factors of the formation of modern perceptions of security, the following should be highlighted: media and information technologies, which create a new symbolic reality, where perceptions of security are formed through images of threats; global problems of humanity (ecological crisis, pandemics, wars), which form a sense of common vulnerability and the need for collective responsibility; the digitalization of society, which generates new types of risks – cybercrime, loss of privacy, dependence on artificial intelligence, and the psychological dimension of security, which comes to the fore: a person seeks not only physical protection, but also emotional stability, trust, and confidence in the future.

In conditions of martial law, aggression and hybrid threats, Ukrainian society is experie-

ncing a process of deep rethinking of the concept of security.

Security becomes not only a political or military problem, but a value of national consciousness, part of the cultural code.

A culture of security of consciousness is being formed – the ability to think critically, resist disinformation, maintain psychological stability.

Security becomes a common issue of the state, community and each individual who is aware of their own responsibility for preserving life, freedom and dignity.

Conclusions and prospects for further research.

In summary, we note that the era of antiquity is characterized by the formulation of the problem of the relationship between security and socio-political relations in society. Security was considered through the prism of the collapse of the foundations of archaic society, which was accompanied by epidemics, wars, revolutions, that is, it was interpreted as the protection of the state and its citizens from numerous external threats. All these processes discredited the belief that adherence to customs and traditions guarantees the security of society. Existing approaches to understanding the essence of security were diametrically different, because some thinkers considered it as the highest value of the state, the law, while others considered it as an opportunity to meet the needs of the functioning of the individual, and then of the entire society as a whole. The leading mechanism for ensuring the security of the functioning of society was the prevention of property stratification, providing all citizens with the same rights, freedoms, and benefits necessary for their vital activity. Medieval philosophy is characterized by the interpretation of security as an attribute of divine providence, one of the leading functions of religion. In this regard, ideas about the principles of safe existence have changed radically: the ancient principle of self-preservation of the individual and the state was transformed into the principle of salvation of the soul. Such an understanding of the essence of security leads to the loss of its social orientation.

The Middle Ages were as well characterized by the lack of direct cognitive interest in understanding the security of society, which is explained by the insufficient development of reflection at that time. However, even then the foundations of methodological approaches to understanding the essential content of the concept of security began to form, which were actualized and found concrete embodiment a little later.

The mechanistic knowledge of the world allowed thinkers of the New Age to expand the boundaries of their ideas about the world, to highlight the principles of safe human interaction with nature and the social

environment, as a result of which new approaches to understanding the essence of security mechanisms were formed. At the same time, the priority task was to ensure security by eliminating and preventing the emergence of phenomena that hindered state governance. The philosophy of the Enlightenment is characterized by a statistical scientific picture of the world, in accordance with which security was considered as a balance between systems and subsystems, which, having a direct connection with human existence, determine and define the nature of the interdependence of the safe existence of a particular person and society as a whole. Historical experience shows that one of the highest goals of any state is the security of the country, the system of social relations, the social order and ensuring the comprehensive protection of citizens. Ensuring the safe existence of people and society as a whole cannot occur without establishing rational connections and relations between people, between people and nature, as well as without taking into account natural and other external influences on people.

The socio-philosophical origins of the development of the concept of security create the necessary conditions for the formation of the most general ideas about security as an objective reality, the further study of which with the use of general scientific and special methods of cognition will allow us to formulate the basic laws, scientific principles of security system management. In turn, the practical implementation of these principles will allow us to preserve the integrity and direct the sustainable dynamic development of security systems for the safe existence of the individual, the effective functioning of society and the state.

The formation of ideas about security in the modern world is a process that combines the objective reality of threats and a person's subjective perception of their place in the world of risk.

Security today is not just a state of protection, but also a dynamic balance between stability and change, between control and freedom, between technological development and humanistic values.

True security is possible only when society not only protects itself from dangers, but also creates conditions of trust, solidarity and responsibility. In this sense, security is not just a state, but a higher dimension of culture and maturity of civilization.

Bibliography

1. Аристотель. Політика / пер. з давньогр. та передм. О. Кислюка. К.: Основи, 2000. С. 15–34.
2. Барановський О.І. Фінансова безпека в Україні (методологія оцінки та механізми забезпечення). Київ: Київський національний торгово-економічний університет, 2004. С. 23–29.
3. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Феноменологія духу / пер. з нім. П. Таращук, наук. ред. пер. Ю. Кушаков. Київ : Основи, 2004. 548 с.

4. Горлинський В.В. Феномен безпеки як об'єкт аксіологічної рефлексії / Мультиверсум : Філософський альманах : збірник наукових праць / Інститут філософії ім. Г.С. Сковороди НАН України. Київ : Український Центр духовної культури, 2004. Вип. 40. С. 157–168.
5. Платон. Діалоги / пер. Йосип Кобів, Юрій Мушак. Київ : Фоліо, 2024. 352 с.
6. Сенека Луцій Анней. Моральні листи до Луція / пер. Олексій Кононенко. Київ : Фоліо, серія «Світова класика». 2023. 544 с.
7. Соціологія безпеки: хрестоматія / Н. Г. Коміх. Дніпро: Дніпровський державний університет внутрішніх справ, 2024. 124 с.
8. Спіноза Б. Теологічно-політичний трактат / пер. Володимир Литвинов. Київ : Фоліо, 2018. 416 с.
9. Тофтул М.Г. Сучасний словник з етики. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2014. 416 с.
10. Філософія : підручник / О.Г. Данильян, В.М. Тараненко. Харків : Право, 2014. 492 с.
11. Цицерон. Про закони. Про державу. Про природу богів / пер. Андрій Содомора. Київ : Апріорі, 2019 р. 364 с.

Summary

Voronovska L. H. Socio-philosophical preconditions of formation of the concept of security. – Article.

The article examines the socio-philosophical origins of the formation of the concept of security. The ambiguity of the scientific interpretation of the essence of the concept of security is associated with the existence of different pictures of world knowledge. In the era of antiquity, security, on the one hand, was considered as the highest value of the state, law, on the other hand, as an opportunity to satisfy the basic needs of the individual and society. In the Middle Ages, security was identified with the attributes of divine behavior, acting as one of the functions of faith. In this historical period, the principle of salvation of the soul replaced the ancient principle of self-preservation of the individual and the state. The mechanistic picture of world knowledge made it possible to expand the idea of the world order in the era of modern times, in particular, to highlight the principles of safe interaction in the systems of the individual-nature, the individual-society, which made it possible to realize the need to study security and the mechanisms for ensuring it in society and the state. The Age of Enlightenment was marked by the emergence of a statistical picture of the world, which considered security as a balance between systems and subsystems related to social reality, determining the nature of the interdependence of the safe existence of the individual and society.

The formation of ideas about security in the modern world is a process that combines the objective reality of threats and the subjective perception of a person's place in the world of risk. Security today is not only a state of being protected, but also a dynamic balance between stability and change, between control and freedom, between technological development and humanistic values.

True security is possible only when society not only protects itself from dangers, but also creates conditions for trust, solidarity and responsibility. In this sense, security is not just a state, but a higher dimension of culture and maturity of civilization.

The development of security theory is based on socio-philosophical ideas, creating the necessary conditions for the formation of ideas about security as an objective reality, the study of which will allow us to formulate patterns and scientific principles of security system management, ensuring the safe functioning and development of society and the state.

Key words: security, society, state, objective and subjective reality, picture of the world.

Анотація

Вороновська Л. Г. Соціально-філософські витоки становлення концепта безпеки. – Стаття.

У статті розглядаються соціально-філософські витоки становлення концепта безпеки. Неоднозначність наукового тлумачення сутності поняття безпеки пов'язана з існуванням різних картин пізнання світу. В епоху античності безпека, з одного боку, розглядалася як найвища цінність держави, права, з іншого, як можливість задоволити основні потреби особистості та суспільства. У середні віки безпека ототожнювалася з атрибутами божественної поведінки, виступаючи як одна з функцій віри. У цей історичний період на зміну давньому принципу самозбереження особи і держави прийшов принцип порятунку душі. Механістична картина пізнання світу дала змогу в епоху Нового часу розширити уявлення про світоутрій, зокрема висвітлити принципи безпечної взаємодії в системах особистість-природа, особистість-суспільство, що дало змогу усвідомити необхідність вивчення безпеки та механізмів її забезпечення в суспільстві та державі. Епоха Просвітництва ознаменувалася появою статистичної картини світу, яка розглядала безпеку як рівновагу між системами та підсистемами, пов'язаними із соціальною реальністю, визначаючи характер взаємозалежності безпечної існування особистості та суспільства.

Формування уявлень про безпеку у сучасному світі є процесом, що поєднує об'єктивну реальність загроз і суб'єктивне сприйняття людиною свого місця у світі ризику. Безпека сьогодні – це не лише стан захищеності, а й динамічний баланс між стабільністю та змінами, між контролем і свободою, між технологічним розвитком і гуманістичними цінностями.

Справжня безпека можлива лише тоді, коли суспільство не лише захищається від небезпек, а й створює умови довіри, солідарності та відповідальності. У цьому сенсі безпека є не просто станом, а вищим виміром культури та зрілості цивілізації.

Розвиток теорії безпеки базується на соціально-філософських ідеях, створюючи необхідні умови для формування уявлень про безпеку як об'єктивну реальність, дослідження якої дозволить сформулювати закономірності, наукові принципи управління системою безпеки, забезпечити безпечно функціонування та розвиток суспільства і держави.

Ключові слова: безпека, суспільство, держава, об'єктивна і суб'єктивна реальність, картина світу.

Дата надходження статті: 11.11.2025

Дата прийняття статті: 21.11.2025

Опубліковано: 30.12.2025