

UDC 321.01

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21564/2663-5704.54.265732>

Matsyshyna Iryna Vitaliivna, Doctor of Political Sciences, Associate Professor,
Professor at Political Science and Public Administration Department,
Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsya, Ukraine
e-mail: mivbravo@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2988-620X

CHANGE IN NATIONAL SECURITY MARKERS IN OFFICIAL POLITICAL DISCOURSE: UKRAINIAN CONTEXT

Discourse analysis allows us to identify markers of change in values, which is a sign of democratic development. However, this does not mean a radical change in values, but rather their correlation with the economic, social, cultural dimensions of society. When it comes to national security as the value of the country, then here we can see the dichotomy of the collective «we» with the individualistic «I». In democratic societies, the priority of national security is higher than the values of self-expression, while the authorities guarantee human rights and freedoms.

The study provides a theoretical analysis of the nature of official political discourse. The influence of discourse on the political system through the category of «security» is considered. At the first stage, the theoretical and methodological analysis is conducted in terms of social practice of G. Deleuze and M. Foucault. At the second stage, a comparative analysis of the concept of national security of Ukraine was conducted. At the third stage, markers of the value components of Ukraine's national security were identified, which both presidents have used. This allowed us to understand the discourse practice of official political discourse as a strategy to influence the political system.

Keywords: *security, V. Zelenskyy, P. Poroshenko, discourse, protection, state.*

Problem setting. Official political discourse represents itself through sign-symbolic interactions, thanks to which interpretations (as discourse strategies of the power) are carried out. If discourse (as detailed communication) allows the contractual relationship in society, than its symbolic interactions establish social connections through symbols. As discourse researcher G. Seidel writes, discourse is «a dynamically linguistic, and above all, semantic space in which social meanings are produced or challenged» [1, p. 44].

Analysis of recent research and publications. Many discourse research concepts exist related to critical discourse analysis (CDA) and discourse strategies. L. J. Phillips and M. W. Jorgensen have attempted to systematize theoretically the

models of discourse. In their work «Discourse analysis as theory and method», researchers consider three approaches among scientists: the theory of discourse by E. Laclau and C. Mouffe (the world is formed by values); critical discourse analysis (N. Fairclough, TeunA. Van Dijk – discourse as a social practice of text exchange); and discourse psychology (J. Potter, M. Wetherell, S. Widdicombe, R. Wooffitt as language strategies of influence) [2]. Analyzing the postmodernist concept of discourse analysis, we can identify a number of important scientific approaches that consider discourse as linguistic communication [3; 4] or as a social practice of the subject [1; 5; 6]. Philosophers-analysts, who relied on linguistic analysis, focused on the language, which helps to project the universe. L. Wittgenstein [7] introduced the concept of «language game», and his follower John Austin [8] identified three levels of language: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary ones. This allows us to distinguish the official political discourse formed by the government, among other types of discourses. It is the locutionary level, where the subject of the linguistic act (in the form of the political elite) is in its center, which establishes a certain grammar of expression for the sake of control over power. And the illocutionary level, which has not the subject, but the object in its center, which the linguistic act is directed to, and it becomes a strategy of oppositional or counter-discourse. The perlocutionary level enhances the effect of communication in these two lines of discourse. John Searle [9], who developed a study of locutionary acts by D. Austin, emphasizes that the speech act requires participation of the addressee and the consignor, who have language competence and knowledge of the world, in the communication.

The purpose of the article. Interactions of official political discourse have stable expressions, which allows identifying the main strategies for promoting meanings, producers of interpretations, internal and external reasons for transporting frames through narratives of political processes to influence the political system.

In this study, we want to focus on the nature of official political discourse and consider its impact on the political system through the category of «security». At the first stage, a theoretical and methodological analysis of the official political discourse and political system will be carried out. Here we will rely on the methodology of G. Deleuze and M. Foucault, where we understand the discourse as a social practice of political actors. In the second stage, we will make a comparative analysis of the concept of national security of Ukraine. It is reflected in the Decrees of the two Presidents of Ukraine – P. Poroshenko (2014-2019) and V. Zelenskyy (from 2019 to today). In the third stage, we will highlight the markers of the value components of Ukraine's national security used by both presidents. This will allow us to clarify the discourse practice of the official political discourse as a strategy to influence the political system.

Paper main body.

1. Official political discourse and political system

In order to investigate the relationship between the official political discourse and the political system, it is necessary to dwell on the characteristics of the study of the political system itself, to understand the logic of its development. Therefore, the phenomenology of Jacques Derrida – his destructive approach – helps to «decompose», or, let us say, to «dissect» the political system into separate parts and find common ground between them. The concept of «deconstruction» came as a result of a combination of German philosophy by M. Heidegger and French philosophy by G. Deleuze. Gilles Deleuze pointed to the state of the universe, when many millennia ago all the sizes of objects amounted to zero. That is, the time when both emotions and things were in the same atom. He calls this state «singularity». However, discourse, in his view, is not a formless instance, but a «discourse of the purely informal» [10, p. 146]. The main thesis of the researcher who studied the logic of meaning, is that difference always precedes identity. While most scientists have focused on the identity, which the difference emerged from, the singularity is the only birthplace of the universe. It creates the equal conditions, and because of that the differences appear, and then they unite. The unification of differences into coherent whole, according to G. Deleuze, is a fact of dictation opposed to the very differences that give rise to freedom. Therefore, the logic of meaning of Gilles Deleuze, as Michel Foucault later wrote, is built on the physical and metaphysical, and it forces to understand and accept the super-being. «Physics: discourse dealing with the ideal structure of bodies, mixtures, reactions, internal and external mechanisms; metaphysics: discourse dealing with the materiality of incorporeal things – phantasms, idols, and simulacra» [11, p. 298]. In the study, it is an official political discourse. Its pragmatics, on the one hand, structures the political system, and on the other hand, the phenomenon of its symbolic structures is a metaphysical phenomenon.

The concept of «discourse», as socially constructed knowledge according to M. Foucault, is a way of social practices that reproduce meanings. In this logic, the phenomenological and poststructuralist directions of research indicate a symbolic level of influence on the political system. In other words, returning to G. Deleuze, it is the metaphysical influence on the physical. Different semiotic models are recognized through political events in which the discourse strategy of the symbolic is embedded. Political discourse, as a mechanism for the functioning of interpretations, consists not only of signs and of symbols, but also has an impact on political behavior through the symbolic exchange due to the political communication. Therefore, the studying of political discourse at the level of symbolizing the political process, allows not only revealing ways to influence the audience through symbols, but also finding a direct link between political institutions

and symbolic interactions and their impact on the political system. They establish a correspondence between political ideas and their practical implementation. To analyze political discourse, it is necessary to explore discourse practice and its key aspects: the political process; the time space it takes place in; formal and informal actors in the development of political discourse; the territory of distribution and influence of interpretations; and government resources. Therefore, the main search method as a «deconstruction» of the political system will help to explore the various structural elements of discourse as the context of the political text.

The subject becomes the subject of politics through official political discourse, by reflecting on political events as narratives around which political discourse has been built. From here one can see the levels of formation of official political discourse, which influence the construction of political reality:

1) political reality receives connotations through sign-symbolic interactions that simplify the meaning of political processes for the establishment of a social contract through collective thinking in order to influence collective behavior;

2) sign-symbolic interactions create frames and are transmitted by political actors through narratives (retelling of political events), determining the markers of authenticity as a value of society;

3) the official political discourse as a stable set of statements about the meanings of political processes, transforms the values of society into collective norms through the interpretation of the political elite for the sake of establishing a social contract. This affects the loyalty of the majority of society to political power. Acceptance or non-acceptance of the terms of the social contract proposed by the authorities has its consequences in collective behavior. Which, in turn, affects the change of reality.

In this sequence, official political discourse contradicts unofficial one, which is less stable in its own statements, has fewer resources to influence the collective perception of meanings. Nevertheless, unofficial discourse forces the government's discourse to respond to information flows through vertical, horizontal, and proportional communication. The main purpose of official political discourse is to influence the collective perception of the proposed values and meanings in order to establish a coherent political text.

Therefore, the official political discourse maintains the stability of the political system, the change of which affects the loss of the political elite. Hence, it uses discourse practices related to the technology of promoting meaning for the stability of the political system.

From the point of view of J. Habermas, there are three norms of existence of social systems:

1) when the discourse of statements aspires to legitimacy (for example, official statements of the country's leaders);

2) when regulatory parameters change depending on productive forces;

3) when the level of development of society is measured by the ability to learn [4, p.19–20].

If the perception of discourse happens (even at the level of critical understanding), then other two norms will also be under the vector of control of power. Both productive forces and the ability to learn will be formed according to the same given scenario. Then, the political regime as a form of political process will initiate the level and quality of change. Understanding legalizes *linguistic acts*, interprets them in a given direction and the very actions of individuals become a conscious norm for themselves. Therefore, the functions of the official political discourse are not only in the development of normative and educational processes, but in the formation of value components of society.

2. National security of the country: comparative analysis

Due to the symbolic structures of the discourse, values are formed around which a political text is built. R. Inglehart in his work «Modernization and Postmodernization: cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies» [12] points to mass participation, interpersonal trust, tolerance of minorities, and freedom of speech, as the main conditions for the stability of democracy. However, researching values from 2010 to 2014 together with Christian Welzel, he showed that in a democracy, values tend to change, which is a consequence of changing economic, social, cultural dimensions of society. Scholars point to existential security as the main value of modern society, which is a consequence of the transition from traditional values to secular-rational ones. If the traditional values relate to religion, the relationship between parents and children, respect for authority, then secular-rational values pay less attention to religion, traditional family values and authority. More attention is paid to economic and physical security.

Based on the cultural map of Inglehart-Welzel, who have pointed out that the socioeconomic development is linked with a broad syndrome of distinctive value orientations, asserts that there are two major dimensions of cross cultural variation in the world:

- 1) Traditional values versus Secular-rational values and;
- 2) Survival values versus Self-expression values.

In our study, the second parameter of values is of interest, where the value of survival contrasts the values of self-expression. According to researchers, «survival values place emphasis on economic and physical security. It is linked with a relatively ethnocentric outlook and low levels of trust and tolerance» [13].

The national security of the country one can understand as the value of survival. So, we propose to carry an analysis of the Decrees of the Presidents of Ukraine P. Poroshenko and V. Zelenskyy «*On the decision of national security and defense of Ukraine*» [14; 15]. The aim of the practical analysis of these two documents was to identify the vectors of change in values in the context of the official political discourse of Ukraine's national security.

It is known that the discourse of national security of the country should be connected, first of all, with national interests of the country [16, p. 186]. For Ukraine, the concept of «national security» is connected with geopolitical challenges, as the country depends on international politics both geographically and economically [17, p. 489–490]. Hence, we expect for guarantees of internal security in law enforcement agencies, such as special services, the military, and the diplomatic corps. However, the citizens' own responsibility, their critical attitude to the consumption of information, has become relevant in recent years. The activities of public organizations, as well as the involvement of opinion leaders in the development of media literacy culture, influenced the initiative of the President of Ukraine V. Zelenskyy to update the education system in the country. «Media literacy lessons should appear in our school curriculum. And those who have graduated from school long time ago (these are our parents, our grandparents), we must teach them what is information hygiene, what are fakes, what is propaganda, how in a few sentences or even with words, someone can control their minds, control their hearts», the president said during his speech at the All-Ukrainian Forum «Ukraine 30. Culture. Media. Tourism» [18]. To establish the vector directions of changing the value of security in the official political discourse of Ukraine, we have identified three components:

Level 1: who «we» are. In the decrees of both presidents, one can find signs of Ukrainian markers, which are used in documents as «Ukrainian...» in the context of security. It is interesting that in P. Poroshenko's document «Ukrainian...» is reflected 9 times, while in V. Zelenskyy's document – only 4 times. If the first president emphasizes more on the «Ukrainian state» and «Ukrainian people», than the second president uses the adverb «Ukrainian» more in the cultural sense (*Table 1*).

Table 1

Categories of understanding the country in the context of «Ukrainian...»

«We»	P. Poroshenko	V. Zelenskyy
people	2	-
state	2	-
economics	1	1
language	1	-
history	1	-
society	1	-
informational space	1	-
culture	-	1
nation	-	1
art	-	1

Source: Made by the Author

Level 2: protection issues. We tried to find out the categories of subjects of protection. Here we distinguish two groups:

Group 1 – subjects of the national security of Ukraine. The documents list both political institutions and other institutional categories of the country, as well as citizens and public associations. In Poroshenko’s Decree, the search word «protection» is used 28 times. The document clearly states that «protection will be provided by the effective Armed Forces of Ukraine, other military formations formed in accordance with the laws of Ukraine, intelligence, counterintelligence and law enforcement agencies of the state, the dynamic development of Ukraine’s economy». In V. Zelenskyy’s Decree, the word «protection» is used 20 times and it is no longer about the subjects who should be responsible for the defense of the country, but about the tools to ensure protection. Such tools include the following:

- modernization;
- ensuring recovery;
- building an effective system;
- increase efficiency;
- improvement.

Both presidents use their own categories of protection: social, civil, systemic, physical, legal ones. It is interesting that the global pandemic COVID-19 introduced its own category of protection in the Decree of V. Zelenskyy. It is the category «biological», which is used in the document as a synonym for «biosafety».

Group 2 – objects of protection in the context of national security of Ukraine. We found out that Poroshenko’s security worldview is based on the defense of the country, while V. Zelenskyy appeals more to individualistic dimensions of security. Therefore, V. Zelenskyy uses more such features of objects of protection as «person», «individual», «citizens» (*Table 2*).

Table 2

Objects of protection in the concept of national security

What should be protected?	P. Poroshenko	V. Zelenskyy
Rights, freedoms and legal interests of citizens	1	3
Property rights		2
National interests	2	1
Protection of state border	2	2
Protection of territorial integrity	2	-
Protection of Armed Forces	1	-
Protection of state secrets	1	-
Protection of national market of labor sources	1	-
Environmental protection	1	-
Protection of economic concurrence	1	-

Protection of critical infrastructure	2	-
Protection of property interests	1	-
Protection of national values	1	-
Protection of information	3	-

Source: Made by the Author

Level 3: who «they» are. We defined the marker «they» through the search word «threat». In the context of both documents, the concept of «threat» occurs through opposition either to other countries or to other phenomena. The «friend-enemy» vectors are set equally in the documents of both presidents (European Union/ European countries v. Russia/Russian Federation/militarization of the temporarily occupied Crimea). However, there is a difference in the phenomena. V. Zelenskyy considers the following external and internal factors as the main threats to national security and national interests of Ukraine (*Table 3*).

Table 3

External and internal factors of threats to national security of Ukraine. V. Zelenskyy

External	Internal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – cyber threat; – artificial intelligence technologies; – international terrorism; – drug trafficking; – human trafficking; – religious and ideological fundamentalism; – infectious diseases; – military invasion; – coronavirus; – intensification of the «competition between the United States of America and the People’s Republic of China for world leadership»; – energy and information «weapons» of the Russian Federation; – reconnaissance and sabotage activities (of the Russian Federation); – destructive propaganda. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – weak rates of rearmament of the Armed Forces of Ukraine; – insufficient efficiency of state bodies, which complicates the development and implementation of effective policies; – low level of well-being; – crime; – inconsistency and incompleteness of reforms; – corruption; – insufficient protection of property rights, slow development of market relations; – insufficient level of competition; – domination of monopolies; – lack of investment; – irrational use of natural resources; – threatening demographic situation; – increase in the number of violations of migration legislation; – strengthening the emigration of the people of Ukraine.

Source: Made by the Author

For P. Poroshenko, most of the external factors hindering the development of the country, are related to Russia's aggression on the territory of Ukraine, while for V. Zelenskyy, global problems become a problem for Ukraine (*Table 4*).

Table 4

**External and internal factors of threats to national security of Ukraine.
P. Poroshenko**

External	Internal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – aggressive actions of Russia; – military aggression, participation of regular troops, advisers, instructors and mercenaries in hostilities on the territory of Ukraine; – reconnaissance and sabotage activities; – temporary occupation of the territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol; – building up military groups near the borders of Ukraine; – blocking Ukraine's efforts to counter the monopolization of strategic sectors of the national economy by Russian capital; – trade and economic war; – information and psychological war; – lack of effective external security guarantees for Ukraine; – information war against Ukraine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – unformed security and defense sector; – institutional weakness; – insufficient resource provision and inefficient use of resources in the security and defense sector; – activities of illegal armed groups, increase in crime, illegal use of firearms; – corruption and inefficient public administration system; – outdated model of public institutions; – lowering of living standards; – monopoly-oligarchic model; – lack of clearly defined strategic priorities; – criminalization of the national economy; – excessive dependence of the national economy on foreign markets; – inefficient public debt management; – intensification of migration processes as a result of hostilities; – ineffective energy efficiency and energy supply policy; – lack of a holistic communication policy of the state; – insufficient level of media culture of the society; – physical and moral obsolescence of the system of protection of state secrets and other information with limited access; – negative environmental consequences of the Chornobyl catastrophe, etc.

Source: Made by the Author

After comparing these two tables, we can conclude that the security discourse in the official political discourse put the Russian Federation on the first place as a country that poses an external threat to Ukraine after the occupation of Crimea and the unfolding of military events in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts. Under President V. Zelenskyy, the security value has shifted to the level of global problems, where the Russian Federation poses a threat to the country at the level of global problems. The extent to which the change in such a vector has become politically conscious, and whether the change in the guidelines of external threats to Ukraine affects its foreign policy, is the subject of research for further investigation. Nevertheless, there is a specific connection.

Both presidents understand the concept of «state border of Ukraine» as an internationally recognized statement, which has the highest priority for the state and is a guarantee of peaceful democratic development of Ukraine. However, in the Decree of President P. Poroshenko, the concept of state «border» is used in the context of «protection», «defense». And in the Decree of V. Zelenskyy it is used only with «protection...», which may indicate the activities of certain structures operating in other countries, protecting the borders of the country.

V. Zelenskyy uses the concept of «sovereignty» as «restoration», «defense», and «provision». It is close to such values as «peace» and «territorial integrity». P. Poroshenko understands «sovereignty» with the categories of «protection» and «guarantee». It is a fundamental value of the country and it is used with other values, such as independence, territorial integrity, dignity, democracy, man, his rights and freedoms, rule of law, welfare, peace and security (Decree of the President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko) (Table 5).

Table 5

Category of «country» in the context of security

	P. Poroshenko	V. Zelenskyy
Territorial integrity	2	8
Border	6	11
Sovereignty	7	8
State (noun)	7	19
state (adj.)		

Source: Made by the Author

Conclusions

Understanding discourse as expanded communication, the model of the British sociologist and Marxist supporter Stuart Hall most accurately shows the meaning

of the symbolic in the transmission of interpretations in the political field. According to the scientist, there are three levels of participants in communication:

- At the first level, the political elite provides certain interpretations of events that are packed into symbols. The elite controls them.
- On the second level the elites connect, which L. Althusser calls «the ideological State apparatuses»: religious, ethical, legal, political, aesthetic, etc. institutions that ensure the control of ideology [19, p. 92].
- At the third level, recipients of information become active transmitters of information. The role of the recipient of information at this level enhances the communication further.

Therefore, difficulties may arise in finding the main values for the Ukrainian nation, which fill the structure of the political text through the sign-symbolic interactions of the discourse. Who owns the retransmission of meaning through the symbol, who controls it and who is responsible for the formation of everyday practices? Is the problem of national security and authenticity, as the main values of the Ukrainian nation today, in need of tough sanctions, or is it a litmus test for those who are in power? The search for answers to these questions determines the horizon of scientific research in the analysis of political processes through markers of security discourse.

The construction of political reality as a factor in the activity of official political discourse and political discourse in general, has its threats and challenges with the help of symbolic structures:

1) symbols, as the capital of a social group, can fall into disrepair along with the group that relies on them. Therefore, every economic, social, political and cultural change becomes a challenge to change the symbolic;

2) political communication forces political institutions to be active participants in communication. They produce certain symbolic structures of discourses to stabilize the political system. Understanding discourse as a process of connotation of reality through interpretations, a certain behavioral collective model is constructed;

3) the symbol has its own codes and decodings, which activate the second group of communication participants – recipients of information. The further fate of the political system is possible from the contractual and opposition levels;

4) at the heart of political decision-making today there is the main value – national security. When political institutions develop a political discourse around this value, it is possible to justify harsh methods and even elements of violence (which can be a sign of authoritarian democracy). Hence, it is customary to divide the symbols into normative and cognitive, where some establish rules at the level of political institutions, while others form ideas and collective expectations. Moreover, normative symbols can be so strong during the crisis that they overlap personal ideas to get out of the collective state of crisis;

5) civil society, as a carrier of political discourse, takes an active part in political communication and discourse practices. It is through symbols that social activity is produced in society. Between political institutions and public institutions, the winner is the one who has a minimal difference between symbols and real actions. Otherwise, imitation leads to inflation, both political and social. Therefore, the rules and mechanisms of functioning of political and public institutions unite society under the terms of a social contract, which is established by the conventionality of signs through sign-symbolic interaction. It does not matter on what dimension it happens: vertically, horizontally or proportionally within the discourse. The main thing is that symbols and institutions function at the level of rule-making practices and do not blur the boundaries of responsibility. There are norms that must be obeyed and there are symbols that declare these norms through discourse. And this is the effect of snapping.

The crisis occurs when symbols are under question. Hence is the growing distrust towards the institutions that produce them. The opposite reaction occurs: distrust towards institutions breeds distrust towards symbols, and hence political discourse will produce the emptiness of a political text. The values declared through interpretations do not establish meaning, but produce voids in the center of the political text. Policymakers suggest other symbols that are represented as an example of the order in which the text is established. Therefore, the symbolization of the political system becomes a means of struggle. Because of informal discourse practices, formal institutions are forced to be either liquidated or rebooted through sign-symbolic interaction. If the ruling elite manages to maintain a dialogue with the counter-elite, there is a snapping effect; if not, it loses its symbolic resource and ability to control the political system. Therefore, the further development of the political system depends on the strategies of political institutions and the level of expanded political communication within the discourse, where the totalitarian discourse of symbols covers all spheres of life in order to preserve political stability. The media, as one of the main channels and participants in such communication, form their media discourse as part of political discourse. The media discourse shows, in what form unpopular political reforms are proposed, how evidence is retransmitted and facts and symbols are used, for what purpose a certain public opinion is established, which encourages the projected joint action. All this becomes a sign of an open, closed or transitional political system.

REFERENCES

1. Seidel, G. (1985). Political discourse analysis. In Dijk, T. A. van (Ed.). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 4. Discourse analysis in society, Pp. 43–60). London; Orlando: Academic Press.

2. Jorgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
3. Benveniste, E. (1971). Subjectivity in language. In Benveniste, E. *Problems in general linguistics* / Translated by Mary Elizabeth Meek, Pp. 223–230. Coral Gables, Fla., University of Miami Press.
4. Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* / translated by Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nicholsen; introduction by Thomas McCarthy. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
5. Bataille, G. (1978). *L'expérience intérieure*. Paris: Gallimard.
6. Foucault, M. (1994). *Histoire de la sexualité. T. I: La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
7. Wittgenstein, L. (1969). Philosophische Untersuchungen. In Wittgenstein, L. *Schriften* (Vol. 1). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
8. Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* / edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa. 2d ed. Oxford [Eng.]: Clarendon Press.
9. Searle, J. R. (2003). *Rationality in action*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
10. Deleuze, G. (1990). *The logic of sense* / translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale ; edited by Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press.
11. Foucault, M. (1998). *Treatrum Philosophicum*. In Taylor, V. E., & Winqvist, C. E. (Eds.). *Postmodernism: Critical Concepts* (Vol. III. Disciplinary Texts: Humanities and Social Sciences, Pp. 295–316). London; New York: Routledge.
12. Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization : cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
13. Inglehart – Welzel Cultural Map. Retrieved from <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp>.
14. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy № 287/2015 «Pro rishennia Rady natsionalnoi bezpeky i oborony Ukrainy vid 6 travnia 2015 roku «Pro Stratehiiu natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy» [Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 287/2015 On the decision of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine dated May 6, 2015 «On the National Security Strategy of Ukraine»]. Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/2872015-19070> [in Ukrainian].
15. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy № 392/2020 «Pro rishennia Rady natsionalnoi bezpeky i oborony Ukrainy vid 14 veresnia 2020 roku «Pro Stratehiiu natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy» [Decree of the President of Ukraine On the decision of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine dated September 14, 2020 «On the National Security Strategy of Ukraine»]. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/392/2020#n7> [in Ukrainian].
16. Khoma, N. M. (Ed.) (2015). *Suchasna politychna leksyka : entsykloped. slovnyk-dovidnyk* [Modern political vocabulary: encyclopedic dictionary-reference book] / [I. Ya. Vdovychyn, L. Ya. Uhryn, H. V. Shypunov ta in.]. Lviv: Novyi Svit–2000 [in Ukrainian].
17. Levenets, Y., & Shapoval, Y. (Eds.) (2011). *Politychna entsyklopediia* [Political encyclopedia]. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo [in Ukrainian].
18. U shkolah mayut' z'yavitisya uroki mediagramotnosti – Zelens'kij [Media literacy lessons should appear in schools – Zelensky]. Ukrinform. 09.03.2021. Retrieved from

<https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/3204521-u-skolah-maut-zavitisa-uroki-mediagramotnosti-zelenskij.html> [in Ukrainian].

19. Althusser, L. (2006), Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). In Sharma, A., & Gupta, A. (Eds.). *The anthropology of the state: a reader* (Pp. 86–111). Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub.

Мацшишина Ірина Віталіївна, докторка політичних наук, доцентка, професорка кафедри політології та державного управління, Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса, м. Вінниця, Україна

ЗМІНА МАРКЕРІВ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ В ОФІЦІЙНОМУ ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

Дискурс-аналіз дозволяє виявити маркери зміни цінностей, що є ознакою демократичного розвитку. Однак це не означає радикальної зміни цінностей, а радше їх співвідношення з економічним, соціальним, культурним вимірами суспільства. Коли йдеться про національну безпеку як цінність країни, то тут можна побачити дихотомію колективного «ми» з індивідуалістичним «Я». У демократичних суспільствах пріоритет національної безпеки є вищим за цінності самовираження, а влада гарантує права та свободи людини. У дослідженні здійснено теоретичний аналіз природи офіційного політичного дискурсу. Розглянуто вплив дискурсу на політичну систему через категорію «безпека». На першому етапі проводиться теоретико-методологічний аналіз з точки зору соціальної практики Ж. Дельоза та М. Фуко. На другому етапі було проведено порівняльний аналіз концепції національної безпеки України. На третьому етапі визначено маркери ціннісних складників національної безпеки України, якими користуються обидва президенти. Це дозволило зрозуміти дискурсивну практику офіційного політичного дискурсу як стратегію впливу на політичну систему.

Ключові слова: безпека, В. Зеленський, П. Порошенко, дискурс, захист, держава.

Мацшишина Ірина Віталіївна, доктор политических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры политологии и государственного управления, Донецкий национальный университет имени Василия Стуса, г. Винница, Украина

ИЗМЕНЕНИЕ МАРКЕРОВ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В ОФИЦИАЛЬНОМ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ: УКРАИНСКИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

Дискурс-анализ позволяет выявить маркеры изменения ценностей, что является признаком демократического развития. Однако это не означает радикальное

изменение ценностей, а скорее их соотношение с экономическим, социальным, культурным измерением общества. Когда речь идет о национальной безопасности как ценности страны, здесь можно увидеть дихотомию коллективного «мы» с индивидуалистическим «Я». В демократических обществах приоритет национальной безопасности выше ценностей самовыражения, а власть гарантирует права и свободы человека. В исследовании проведен теоретический анализ природы официального политического дискурса. Рассмотрено влияние дискурса на политическую систему через категорию «безопасность». На первом этапе проводится теоретико-методологический анализ с точки зрения социальной практики Ж. Делеза и Фуко. На втором этапе проведен сравнительный анализ концепции национальной безопасности Украины. На третьем этапе определены маркеры ценностных составляющих национальной безопасности Украины, которыми пользуются оба президента. Это позволило понять дискурсивную практику официального политического дискурса как стратегию влияния на политическую систему.

Ключевые слова: безопасность, В. Зеленский, П. Порошенко, дискурс, защита, государство.

