

Valeriy Nikolayevskyy

Ph.D. in Sociology, Post Doctorate Associate  
at Department of Sociology, V.N. Karasin Kharkiv National University

## CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

**The author proposes a** systematization of the results of the review of publications on security issues in the social sciences and humanities, which allowed several major areas of research. The paper also deals with construction of a model of social security as an indicator of generalized social homeostasis, created as a result of balancing the functions of basic social institutions. It's proposed to apply a structural functionalism and neofunctionalism as dominant methodology for interpretation of social security as a social institution homeostasis' control and social sustainability of the social environment while maintaining constancy intrasystem parameters. There was determined inequivalence of different types of social security in providing social homeostasis by their correlation with the four types of social subsystems (institutions): semantic, reproductive, regulatory and transmission also.

The paper argued that the leading role in ensuring social homeostasis play a meaning- (religious, ideological, cultural) subsystems, corresponding to the value stabilization of society. At the same time, the article emphasizes that meanings and values produced by these institutions' subjects (actors) initially embedded through socialization and communication (transmission) subsystems and are subject to secondary fixation at the level of social action through regulatory social institutions (politics, law). The final element of social security is to ensure the homeostasis of the lowest level of social order (institutes of economics and the family).

Author justified the position on the understanding of the social security system as independent institution one within the framework of the two models of the social world: systematic and stochastic. It is indicated that the system map of the social world meets modernist paradigm of sociological theorizing, which is characteristic for the consideration of social security as a factor of change that promotes social cohesion, rather than its decay. Whereas stochastic map of the social world corresponds to a postmodern paradigm, main characteristic feature of which is looking at and perception of social security as part of polycentric social reality.

*Keywords:* security, social security, social danger, functional, neo-functional paradigm.

У статті системаізовано результати огляду публікацій з проблем безпеки у соціогуманітарних науках, зокрема в соціології. Виокремлено основні напрямки відповідних досліджень, запропоновано модель соціальної безпеки як синтетичного індикатора соціального гомеостаза, урівнювання функцій базових соціальних інститутів. У контексті побудови цієї моделі автором застосовані методології структурного функціоналізму та методологія неофункціоналізму, що дозволило інтерпретувати соціальну безпеку як соціальний інститут контролю соціального гомеостаза та забезпечення стабільності соціального середовища за умов збереження стабільності інтрасистемних параметрів соціуму. Підкреслено нерівнозначність різних типів соціальної безпеки в забезпеченні соціального гомеостаза в контексті їхнього співвіднесення з чотирма типами соціальних підсистем (інститутів): смислоутворюючих, репродуктивних, регуляторних та трансмісійних.

Визначено провідну роль у забезпеченні соціального гомеостаза смислоутворюючих (релігійна, ідеологічна, культурна) підсистем, що сприяють ціннісній стабілізації суспільства. Підкреслено, що створені цими підсистемами (інститутами) смисли та цінності первісно впроваджуються завдяки соціалізаційним та комунікаційним (трансмісійним) підсистемам та підлягають вторинному закріпленню на рівні соціальної дії за допомогою регуляторних соціальних інститутів (політика, право).

Зроблений висновок про те, що аналіз соціальної безпеки як самостійного субсистемного інституту може здійснюватися у рамках двох моделей (мап) соціального світу: системної та стохастичної. Підкреслено, що системній мапі соціального світу відповідає модерністська парадигма соціологічного теоретизування та розгляд соціальної безпеки як чинника змін, що сприяє забезпеченню соціальної цілісності, а не її

розпаду. Що стосується стохастичної моделі, то їй відповідає постмодерністська парадигма і розгляд соціальної безпеки у поліцентричній соціальній реальності.

**Ключові слова:** безпека, соціальна безпека, соціальна небезпека, функціоналізм, неофункціоналізм.

В статье систематизированы результаты обзора публикаций по проблемам безопасности в социогуманитарных науках, в частности в социологии. Выделены основные направления соответствующих исследований, предложена модель социальной безопасности как синтетического индикатора социального гомеостаза, уравнивания функций базовых социальных институтов. В контексте построения этой модели автором использованы методология структурного функционализма и методология неофункционализма, что позволило интерпретировать социальную безопасность как институт контроля социального гомеостаза и обеспечения устойчивости социальной среды при сохранении стабильности интрасистемных параметров социума. Подчеркнута неравнозначность различных типов социальной безопасности в обеспечении социального гомеостаза в контексте их соотношения с четырьмя типами социальных подсистем (институтов): смыслообразующих, репродуктивных, регуляторных и трансмиссионных.

Отмечена ведущая роль в обеспечении социального гомеостаза смыслообразующих (религиозная, идеологическая, культурная) подсистем, способствующих ценностной стабилизации общества и легитимности социального порядка. Подчеркнуто, что созданные этими подсистемами (институтами) смыслы и ценности первично внедряются благодаря социализационным и коммуникационным (трансмиссионным) подсистемам и подлежат вторичному закреплению на уровне социального действия через регуляторные социальные институты (политика, право).

Сделан вывод о том, что анализ социальной безопасности как самостоятельного субсистемного института может осуществляться в рамках двух моделей карт социального мира: системной и стохастической. Отмечено, что системной карте социального мира соответствует модернистская парадигма социологического теоретизирования и рассмотрение социальной безопасности как фактора изменений, который способствует обеспечению социальной целостности, а не ее распаду. Что касается стохастической модели, то ей соответствует постмодернистская парадигма и рассмотрение социальной безопасности в полицентрической социальной реальности.

**Ключевые слова:** безопасность, социальная безопасность, социальная опасность, функционализм, неофункционализм.

The problem of social security has always been and continue to be in the focus of different areas of social knowledge. Numerous scientists including the historians, philosophers, political scientists, environmental scientists, economists, legal scholars, sociologists etc. turn to its analysis and reflection. For sociology various aspects of social security (such as intradisciplinary and interdisciplinary) are of current interest. These aspects relate to the definition of the essence of social security, development and implementation of its maintenance' policies and strategies.

Analysis of scientific literature enable to say that at the initial stage of security problems' study different notions on the issues of social security existed. During the evolution of social science the understanding of the nature and essence of social security constantly elaborated and corrected all along.

The maintaining of security in a human society at all times has been imperative with security being a crucial social institution requiring substantial working resources. There is no doubt that safe (security) societies have always been marked by some specific peculiarities of their harmony, stability, and synergy and intrasystem order.

Increased relevance of studying the essence of the concept of «security» in the context of

its ideological, philosophical and sociological understanding is due to several factors. Amongst them complexity and inconsistency of nowadays processes of geopolitical and geoeconomic transformations, global problems of humankind, key socio-political and socio-economic changes in many countries, other (new) challenges and threats to the stability of society (global or national).

A task of creating a complex theory of social security, from a sociological point of view, is the most difficult one; and lack of integrated sociological research makes it even more complicated.

Background knowledge about the origin of social security can be seen in mythology, religion, philosophy, general in the history of science. Thereby, methodology, sociological and socio-philosophical approaches to the analysis of social security is based on a number of scientific works representing different periods of socio-political research. Provisionally they can be divided into the following main groups: classical sociological and philosophical works; works on theory and methodology of security; political science and securitological research.

The first group is represented by classical philosophical and sociological theories written by Aristotle, Plato, Thucydides, and T. Aquinas, Bacon,

Fourier, Grotius, Hegel, Hobbes, Kant, Locke, Machiavelli, Marx, Montesquieu, Saint-Simon, Spinoza. In these theories an analysis of genesis of social dangers, challenges and threats; difficulties related to prevention of these threats to the state (state authority), threats to the society and individuals is provided. Authors analysed criteria of optimal (perfect) statehood against demands of freedom, equality and social justice.

The second group – the founders of positivism, structural functionalism and neo-functionalism (Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Sorokin, Luhmann). We can dwell on models of social integration and a balanced structure of society; autopoiesis; harmony of social systems and independent social institutions; societal status and hierarchy built institutional clusters. These key ideas are essential for the research, if we are to improve the concept of structural functionalism and neofunctionalism linked to the idea of social security as social homeostasis' and homeostatic autopoiesis status' controlling method, as opposed to hetero static autopoiesis of the frame of society with its hierarchy built non integrated institutional clusters.

Numerous studies and works which fill third group predominantly are focused on issues of national security in the context of activity of national security bodies, defence and law enforcement agencies. Designate some of them: [1-19].

Our separate attention is drawn to school of critical analysis of security known as «Copenhagen School» or securitological research. Initially, the task of their research was to overcome a traditional (largely Realist and Neorealist) concept of security originating from narrow objectiveness of a positivist approach meaning a state centred concept of security being a significant part of military involvement. Since the 1980-1990s more political scientists, scholars in international relations, sociologists have contributed their scientific data to securitology. They focus on theories of a security model and key elements of social security [see, for instance, 20-30].

Despite a high level of generalization the outcome of this scientific research shows features of a mosaic and fragmental approach. It mainly focuses on certain types of social security such as economical, political, ecological, informational and military. The research lacks systematic approach to finding solutions of technological issues of ensuring social security, which in its turn creates a certain vague impression of the whole idea.<sup>1</sup>

1 In this context it is worth to note the human security discourse also. This a relatively new area of intellectual exploration, which is rather dynamic, and its thought-provocative potential to the social security analysis (mark at least concept «securitability» proposed by human security scholars [31]) requires more in-depth study and is outside the objectives of the paper.

The fourth group of studies is devoted to the concept of social security as attribute of social sphere and of system of social security (social protection). Amongst them are works by T.Ye. Beydina, O.V. Buryanov, I.F. Hnibidenko, F.M. Kolot, V.I. Lykov, O. Novikova, V.S. Plotnikov, H.I. Osadchaya, V.V. Rogovoy, V.D. Roik, V.V. Serebryannikov, M.Yu. Shvetsov, R.H. Yanovskiy, etc. [32-39]

Taking into account all these concepts, paradigms and scientific approaches I choose structural functionalism and neofunctionalism represented in works by T. Parsons and R. Merton, as well as that by J. Alexander, R. Bales, S. Eisenstadt, N. Luhmann, E. Shils, N. Smelser. [see, for instance, 40-51]

Also, general sociological research presented by works of Ukrainian and Russian sociologists of vital methodology importance for this study. The focus of their research is a nature, structure and functions of culture, social institutions, technologies, sense-making, which is crucial for understanding of essential, institutional and stratified determinants of social security [for instance, 52-65].

Social security is a variety of social status and social process in which society as integral unit and its main subsystems are balanced (or trying to become balanced) from the point of view of their structural and functional significance against the society as integral unit and against each other (subsystems). That is why my working definition reflects the idea that any structural or functional excessiveness as well as deficiency, which can be observed in any quantitative increase/decline of activity of any social subsystem or expansion of its functions beyond its subsystem boundaries will act as indicators of social danger in a number of deviations. The latter can be linked to politics and law (etatization, corruption), economy (stagnation, inflation, consumer's deficit), morals (moral anomaly), ideology (ideological anomaly, ideological monopolisation), as well as environment which surrounds social medium and can be a source of ecological disasters.

As opposed to the above statement the author's understanding of social danger lies in socio systematic or subsystematic status of deviation, which destroys structural functional harmony of the society in separate units of social environment by breaking up semantic, regulatory, reproductive and transmission activity of the frame of society (or its parts or social subsystems) against the frame of society or environment.

By referring to T. Parsons who studied blocks of adaptation, goal achieving, latency and integration in a social system structure and to approach by R. Merton on the same subject, basing on A. Hurevitch's [66] system analysis method-

ology, as well as on Y. Romanenko's [67] fractal socioanalysis theory, it's proposed in the paper to extend it (social system's structure) by adding four more social subsystems which produce respectively four functions, such as semantic (meaning-orientation and meaning-producing), regulatory, reproductive and transmission ones to it.

While formulating main theoretical points of social security, it is important to have respect to the results achieved by Ukrainian and Russian researchers in the fields of legal studies, public administration, economics, philosophy, political science: V.A. Bachinin, I.P. Bayrak, I.F. Binko, L.N. Chikinova, S.I. Holovaschenko, O.V. Hrabovskyy, V.H. Kremen, S.A. Panarin, D.I. Polyvyanny, N.N. Rybalkin, H.P. Sytnyk, N.Ye. Yatsenko, V.K. Zbarskyy, etc. [see, for example, 68-73]. Most of them suggest that a definition of social security should be of legal nature; however referring to this can be quite beneficial for sociology from a scientific point of view.

Since Parson's definition of the social system states that it acts as part of a wider system of action (smaller parts include the cultural system, the personality system and the system of the organism), it allows us to interpret the four subsystems according to their individual functions. To enable a system of action to survive it must be flexible to adopt; flexible to attain its goal and integrity and flexible to be able to keep its image; in other words, it must satisfy the four functional imperatives.

The opposite to these functions is disadaptation (hypo adaptation), prevention of goal achieving or its loss (de-intentionalisation), disintegration and anomy (hyponomy as its primary phase). During their systematic performance they become sources of a social danger, meanwhile realization of the four functions corresponds to social security.

The novelty of the approach is based on creating a structural functionalism and neofunctionalism model of social security as generalised indicator of social homeostasis formed as a result of balancing functions of basic social institutions. In this context it is worth to talk more on some key statements which have been achieved in course of this research.

Firstly, it was applied structural functionalism and neofunctionalism as dominant methodology which allows to interpret social security as social institution of social homeostasis's controlling process and social sustainability of social environment. At the same time constant intersystem parameters of the society are kept intact providing dynamic response of environment, flexible restructuration and functional differentiation of the system. [74-77] Secondly, it to focus on inequivalence of various types of social security in providing social homeostasis by means of relating them to the four types

of social subsystems (institutions): semantic, regulatory, reproductive and transmission systems. The semantic subsystems i.e. religious, ideological and cultural ones play a vital role in ensuring social homeostasis. They correspond to value stability of the society and provide a legitimate social order as a whole.

At the same time, the ideas and values created by above mentioned institutions are initially implemented through subsystems of socialization and communication (transmission) and then undergo their secondary implementation on the level of social action with the help of regulatory social institutions (politics, law). The final point of social security is social homeostasis of the lowest level of a social order (institutes of economy and family).

It's fruitful to analyze social security as independent institutional component within the boundaries of two basic (maps) models of the social world: systematic and stochastic. Evidence supports that social security as institution of social homeostasis' control process depends on social actors who receive leading parts in creating social reality throughout history. When we say about a definition of social security in the context of a systematic map of the social world, it's seems to me, that such a map corresponds to a modern paradigm of a sociological theory, main feature of which is social security as changing factor ensuring to its integrity and not its destruction.

Maintaining of social security in a modern paradigm of a sociological theory mainly depends on presence of influential integral institutions and actors contributing to integrity of societal systems. And focus on the order and stability, and vectors of social security transformation in the context of its institutional support as well turns into final research on social security in this paradigm.

As to social security in relation to a stochastic map of the social world, from my point of view, latter corresponds to a postmodern paradigm of a sociological theory, main characteristic feature of which is perception of social security as part of polycentric social reality, which in its turn is interpreted as something relative, something like space of fluctuations', configurations' and paths' genesis. This enable to interpret social homeostasis as artificial harmony. [78]

Stochastic and postmodern paradigms in social security research i.e. interpretive or *verstehende* sociology, symbolic interaction, phenomenology, ethnomethodology as well known are focused on micro issues of people's interaction, interpersonal communication, behaviour and motivation, but also they paying little attention to evaluative criteria of social security.

Another issue which is thought-provoking (and important) to analyze is the basic social se-

curity function. To my opinion, we are to proceed from the fact that any social organization has its own boundaries of space and time which are determined by its economics, politics, culture, ideology, education and other social institutions and so a basic social security function of the society is maintenance of social environment and prediction of social time.

Social danger and threat as dysfunction are also those issues which it's necessary to pay more attention to. Applying a structural-activity approach we can find that such a dysfunction is equal to disruption of stability and rhythmical process of a certain activity. However, it's important to mention the fact that stability or a rhythmical process can fluctuate to increase its function (hyper function), which means an increased activity of a formation (construction) or a system (subsystem). This can be caused by reaction to increased intensity of external factors or by adaptive reaction to extreme (destructive) circumstances. Another fluctuation can be a hypo function, an inadequate activity of a formation (construction) or a system (subsystem) which causes basic life and security disruption.

To my opinion, we have to understand social security as stability of the society in which a societal system retains its integrity as well as its ability to self-development in spite of negative external and internal challenges (factors). In this context one can apply structural functionalism and neofunctional approach to social homeostasis as social system condition linked to institutional maintenance of its stability with social security acting as regime of social subsystems' optimal functioning, the regime contributing to maintenance of social order legitimacy. And the effectiveness of a social security system is recorded in a stability coefficient which reflects correlation of a number of factors the object is capable of coping with to a number of factors the object fails to cope with [79, p.111].

If we look at social security in the context of system dimension we have to take into account that it is based on two approaches. Various types of danger such as economical, demographical, political, etc. fall into the first one. The other approach focuses on hierarchy and subordination between various types of danger. In any particular case of the social system we can question the priority of a certain type of security. For instance, where should we start when it comes to demographical issues in the society? Should we revise youth families' benefit system, start promoting a healthy life style or improving employment practice? The answer to this question can be obtained as a result of analysis of leading structural and functional social subsystems forming peculiar subordinated and hierarchy based constellations which can be specific for every kind of social system.

Various kinds of social systems have been studied in available references [42;66;75;77;78;80-85]. Some of them are: formational (primitive communal, slave-owning, feudal, capitalist and socialist); civilisational (Anglo-Saxon, European, Euro-Asian, Far East Asian (Confucian-Taolist), Mid-East Asian (Arabian-Muslim and Jewish), Indo-Buddhist)); typology of development phases (preindustrial, industrial, post-industrial society). Based on the above classification it's possible to point out specific constellations for every kind of social system focusing on peculiarities of strategic subsystems of the society and leading to them security sphere together with subordinate subsystems and relevant (subordinate) types of security.

If we look on social security in the context of functional approach we can say that a leading subsystem represented by a relevant institution forms a core of social homeostasis' control, on which a relevant type of society social stratification is based. The type of stratification and linked to it its leading social subsystem determines regime of social security and social technologies necessary for its maintenance. Moreover, the three types of stratification correspond to four basic types of regime of establishing and maintenance of social security, i.e. repressive, corporative, societal-etic and information-communicational.

From my point of view, the more primitive a social structure is the more external force factors are present. In this case, force factors act as main social technology of ensuring security with military and political institutions playing a leading role in the society. Social homeostasis formed within the boundaries of a caste ridden society and its security level look very unstable because its leading social party has to spend a great amount of resources to keep various social groups within their physical boundaries. On the other hand, constant decline of a security level is caused by constant lack of universal socio-normative systems which could protect the society from excessive repression. The described above regime of ensuring social security in the society with military and political institutions dominant involvement is called repressive.

As state powers evolve especially during the period of mature feudalism and absolute monarchy with relevant estate systems of the society, the repressive regime is taken over by a corporative regime of social security, when social security does not only spread on parties of military social institutions but on other social groups. Appropriate social security is guaranteed to these groups as long as they do not cross their function boundaries. Growth of the corporative security regime is mainly referred to growth of law as social institution and to transition of the society from a potestarian to corporate model of legal regulation. The latter creates conditions for ensuring social

homeostasis through the system of privileges and politico-legal immunity for its feudal elite.

In a bourgeois society with its market economy, democracy and constitutionalism a new type of social stratification (a class social stratification) is formed. A class state with a societal-etatistic regime of social security corresponds to this stratification. This regime of ensuring social security is stand by a civil society and ability to have a social dialogue in conflict situations caused by various dysfunctions of social institutions. On the other hand, during this regime social security is ensured not only by repressive parties but by a civil society. A key function of such a society becomes social control over the state in which political parties, non-government organizations; pressure groups and local communities play a leading role. All participating parties receive carte blanche to react in time to any kind of threat (political, economic, ecological, informational, psychological) with the state itself dealing with any military threat and breach of territorial security. Also the state keeps the right to take necessary security measures in extraordinary circumstances (ecological and man-made disasters, terrorist acts, etc); in other words, its role is reduced to minimise risks when security environment is being formed.

The analysis of theoretical and methodological research of security in social sciences and humanities gives us the following results.

Firstly, the comparative analysis of leading political-philosophical, socio-philosophical, socio-ecological, etc. concepts of security over the period of modern and postmodern time throws light on fluctuations of vectors of a definition of social security in the context of nature of power as regulating force of a social system.

Secondly, a definition of security in scientific and philosophical discourse can be only revealed within person security, group security and social security as a whole. On one hand, they act as split-level types of security, on the other hand, they are perceived as complementary and interdependent ones.

Thirdly, the concept of security is revealed through processes of globalisation which are accompanied by crashes of nation state identifications and civilization crises as well showing the necessity of handling security issues within the complex analysis of its various types (ecological, economical, informational, military, political, etc). It also makes us accept security as universal concept within the scope of social and cultural systems and persons as their micro-level representatives.

In a social and humanities discourse the concept of social security can play a leading role because it is linked to social mapping of reality, therefore to parameters of homeostasis of a social system as a whole. All concepts of security in a socio-humanistic discourse including its socio-phil-

osophical, politically-legal and religious-soteriological branches, can be divided into three groups: a) power centred (with a focus on power), b) person centred (with a focus on persons), c) environment centred (with a focus on factors of environment).

As was mentioned above the elucidation of the nature and role of security in a contemporary social life leads to analysing of its concept antithesis which means social danger. Any danger is viewed as an opportunity of negative influence of the events, conditions and processes on the social «body» and its «organs» (subsystems). As a result of it the society can suffer losses which will not only damage its state, but also will contribute to redirection of its development towards dysfunctionism (dysfunction condition) (character, speed, forms, etc). If security means functionalism and, therefore, functional status of a relevant social institution, then danger means dysfunctionism, i.e. hypo functional or non-functional status of a social institution, a social subsystem or a society as a whole.

A non-functional status of a social institution (social subsystem, society) emerges when a social institution (subsystem, society as a whole) fails to meet certain demands as a result of a conflict between socio-normative basis of these demands and real demands or as a result of decline of resource potential of a social institution itself caused by some social or environmental processes.

There is enough evidence to allow us to talk about security of the society, security of its subsystems and social institutions when the latter fulfil their functions; and social danger when the latter does not fulfil their functions or over-fulfil them. Condition of security and its dominance determines security as attribute of a stable social system and functional institutions and subsystems as well. At the same time, condition of danger determines danger as attribute of a non-stable (chaotic) social system and non-functional (hypo functional) social institutions and social subsystems. Since social security is formed as complex process of protection of fundamental necessities related to relevant functions of social institutions, we would like to analyse the latter in the context of their functions, hypo functions and dysfunctions.

From a technological point of view one can study social security in the context of a social policy and a social state as institutions ensuring and guaranteeing social homeostasis. A social policy acts as a key factor in social function implemented by a social state because roots of latter go back to a social policy. Hence, it makes sense to state that a social state is an instrument of social policy implementation to manage social sphere of the society, to meet material and socio-cultural necessities of its members, to regulate processes of social differentiation of the society, including incomes of active population and unemployed, disability

citizens. It allows every member of the society to fulfil their most important socio-economical rights, and first of all, their right to have a quality life so necessary for normal reproduction and development of a person.

Macro blocks of a social policy are social equalisation, levelling (distribution and redistribution) and social protection. Social protection is an important instrument of a social policy of a social state. It includes a social insurance (often is used identically to social security) covering individuals and their families in case of risks and unpredictable circumstances (illness, unemployment, injuries, etc); social benefits for people with low income, big families, victims of force major situations, refugees, etc; financial help for first time property buyers or scholarships for students, etc.

A peculiarity of a social policy is that it is important for its final results to reach every social party (subject). According to this a micro level turns out to be a main link of implementation of social policy measures. In a social state initiative groups of local communities are responsible for this. Implementation of social function is directly linked to an economical policy of the state which is one of the basic mechanisms of a social state' function.

Everybody's welfare as essential rule of a social state depends on how high its economical level is. It guarantees a minimum cost of living for its citizens. That is why a key social function in a social state is to create a solid economical foundation. According to existing world's models, the most effective one is the so called socio-oriented market economy. Market mechanisms provide economical effectiveness; and the state is responsible for social distribution of market economy results through taxation, banking and budgeting.

An economical policy of a social state involves the following features: strengthening of market transformation of a nation; creating of a relevant regulatory and legal framework and infrastructure; promoting equal development and cooperation between state and private sectors of economy (no discounts or privileges); encouraging of a charity activity. An economical policy of social society must be able to combine measures of state regulation and competition as well as development of individuals' initiative to provide their own welfare.

Along with that, a life in a social rule-of-law state gets disrupted by a number of challenges and threats to social security. They require special counterprograms on behalf of a civil society to influence the state, which is done by providing public control over government organizations, authorities as a whole; by supervising an administrative apparatus by a representative body; by involving non government organizations in law making; by creating special conditions for various social groups to participate in decision making with regards to social security. Apart from

that, it is vital for a civil society to get involved in creating of concepts of security of its nation-state, creating of science based social policy of the state by attracting nongovernment foundations, scientific research centres, think tanks, whose mission is to research and analyse the status of social security of the country and to advise on best ways to improve it.

Thereby, a contemporary social state's activity in the context of social security should be interpreted as a system unity of two interconnected and complementing each other directions such as social development and social protection. Theoretical assumption of the concept of protective function of a social policy should be based on a socially acceptable quality of life and adjustment of its guarantees according to its social standards and norms.

So, as was emphasized in the paper the author offers an attempt of construction of structural-functional model of social security as an indicator of generalized social homeostasis, created as a result of balancing the functions of basic social institutions. First, the author applied structural functionalism and neofunctionalism as dominant methodology for interpretation of social security as a social institution to control homeostasis and social sustainability of the social environment while maintaining constancy intra-system parameters, provided that the dynamic response of the medium, flexible and functional differentiation restructuring of a system. Second, it was talked about inequivalence of different types of social security in providing social homeostasis by their correlation with the four types of social subsystems (institutions): semantic, reproductive, regulatory and transmission. It was underlined that the primary role in ensuring social homeostasis play a meaning- (religious, ideological, cultural) subsystem, which are corresponded to the society' values stabilization and to ensure the legitimacy of the social order as a whole.

It was proposed to understand the system of social security in the logic of the social world map also. It was displayed that the system map of the social world meets modernist paradigm of sociological theorizing, which is characteristic for the consideration of social security as a factor of change that promotes social cohesion, rather than its decay. At the same time, these institutions' created entities meanings and values which are implemented primarily through socialization and communication (transmission) subsystems and are subject to secondary consolidation at the level of social action through regulatory social institutions (politics, law). And the final link of social security is to ensure homeostasis lowest level of social order (institutes of economics and the family).

Further analysis of the social security of society (in case of Ukraine) not only as theoretic

concept but also as social problem even more urgent, because it is exposed to severe stress during the reform process. As a result, one can see significantly expand the range and variety of internal and external challenges and threats to the person, society, state, etc. Experiencing a crisis of governance, the degradation of the economy, antagonizing the social structure, an acute decline in the quality of life of people to create an extensive source of tension in society.

Relevance of the work is also due to the conservation and, in some cases, increasing the risk for Ukrainian society trends of socio-, economic and political development: mainly raw nature of

production and exports; extremely high level of corruption, problematic return of old and new growth of external debt; instability of political power; as well as destruction of traditional values; acute social inequality of society; low quality of life; criminalization of society; separatism, etc.

But it seems that also no less important is the following: the lack of contemporary Ukrainian society stable social protection of the vital interests of a large part of society is due not only multifactorial and complex nature of emerging threats and challenges, but also by the nature of the subjects of social security, particularly their perception of these challenges and threats in key spheres of life.

#### References

- Arbatov A. *Natsionalnaya bezopasnost Rossii v mnogopolyarnom mire // Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya*. – 2007. – Nr.10. – Pp. 21 – 28. (in Russian)
- Belov P. H. *Metodologicheskiye aspekty natsionalnoy bezopasnosti Rossii*. – M.: Izd-vo FTSNTP «Bezopasnost», 2002. (in Russian)
- Bezopasnost Yevropy / Zhurkin V.V. (Ed.)*. – M.: Ves mir, 2011. (in Russian)
- Bodruk O. *Ukraina v systemi mizhnarodnoy bezpeky*. – K.: NIPMB, 2003. (in Ukrainian)
- Burkin A. I. *Natsionalnaya bezopasnost Rossii / A. I. Burkin, A. V. Vozzhenikov, V.N. Sineok*. – M.: RAGS, 2008. (in Russian)
- Czaputowicz J. *Bezpieczenstwo miedzynarodowe: wspolczesne koncepcje*. – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2012. (in Polish)
- Dillon M. *Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought*. – L. – N.Y.: Routledge, 1996.
- Explaining the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy Theory in Action / Kurowska X.; Breuer F. (Eds.)*. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Furashev V. M. *Natsionalna bezpeka Ukrainy: shlyakhy zabezpechennya, rol i mistse suspilstva. Yevroatlantychnyy kurs / V.M. Furashev, S.F. Dzherdzh*. – K.: Synopsys, 2009. (in Ukrainian)
- Hofmann S. *European Security in NATO's Shadow. Party Ideologies and Institution Building*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Jordan A. *American National Security. 6th Edition / A. Jordan, Jr. Taylor, J. William, M. Meese, S. Nielsen*. – Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Kokoshyn A. A. *Politiko-voennoye i voyenno-strategicheskkiye problemy natsionalnoy bezopasnosti Rossii i mezhdunarodnoy bezopasnosti*. – M.: Vysshaya shkola ekonomiki, 2014. (in Russian)
- Lipkan V. A. *Teoriya natsionalnoy bezpeky*. – K.: KNT, 2009. (in Ukrainian)
- McNamara R. *The Essence of Security: Reflections in Office*. – N. Y., 1968.
- Prokhozhev A. A. *Obschaya teoriya natsionalnoy bezopasnosti*. – M.: Izd-vo RAGS pri Prezidente RF, 2002. (in Russian)
- Smeshko I. *Natsionalna bezpeka Ukrainy: vyklyky doby globalnykh transformatsiy / Ihor Smeshko // Yevroatlantika*. – 2013. – Nr.1-2. – Pp. 26 – 29.
- Tendency of national security in the Baltic sea region / Makstutis A. (Ed.)*. – Vilnius: The General Jonas Zemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania, 2006.
- Voenno-politicheskiye issledovaniya v Rossii: spravochnik / NP RSMD; I.S.Ivanov (Ed.)*. – M.: NP RSMD, Ves mir, 2014. (in Russian)
- Wolfers A. *National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol // Political Science Quarterly*. – 1952. – Nr.67(4). – Pp. 481 – 502.
- Boin A. *Preparing for the World Risk Society: Towards a New Security Paradigm for the European Union / A. Boin, M. Ekengren // Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. – 2009. – Nr.17(4). – Pp. 285 – 294.
- Critical Security Studies / Vaughan-Williams N.; Peoples C. (Eds.)*. – N.Y.: Routledge, 2012.
- Critical Security Studies and World Politics / Booth K. (Ed.)*. – Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005.
- Buzan B. *Peace, Power, and Security: Contending Concepts in the Study of International Relations // Journal of Peace Research*. – 1984. – Nr. 21(2). – Pp. 109 – 125.
- Buzan B. and de Wilde J. *Security: a new framework for analysis / B. Buzan, O. Waever, J. de Wilde*. – L.: Boulder, 1998.
- Handbook of Security Studies / M. Cavelti, V.V. Mauer. (Eds.)*. – London: Routledge, 2009.
- Neocleous M. *Critique of Security*. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- On Security / Lipschutz R. (Ed.)*. – N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Stone M. *Security According to Buzan: A Comprehensive Security Analysis / Security Discussion Papers Series*. – Nr. 1. – Paris-N.Y.: CUP, SIPA – N.Y., 2009.
- Taureck R. *Securitization Theory and Securitization Studies // Journal of International Relations and Development*. – 2006. – Nr.9. – Pp. 53 – 61.
- Williams M.C. *Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics // International Studies Quarterly*. – 2003. – Nr.47. – Pp. 511 – 531.
- Human Security. Human Development Report 2002/2003*. – Riga: UNDP Latvia, 2003.
- Beydina T. Ye. *Sotsialnaya bezopasnost (regionalnyye aspekty) / T.Ye. Beydina, V. I. Lykov, M. Yu. Shvetsov*. – Chita: Izd-vo ChitGU, 2001. (in Russian)
- Buryanov O.V. *Sotsialnaya bezopasnost rossiyskogo obschestva*. – Rostov n/D, 1999. (in Russian)
- Novikova O. *Sotsialnaya bezopasnost v Ukraine: vozmozhnosti chelovecheskogo razvitiya*. – LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2012. (in Russian)
- Osadchaya H. I. and Roik V. D. *Sotsialnyye aspekty ekonomicheskoy bezopasnosti Rossii / H.I. Osadchaya, V.D. Roik*. – M.: Mysl, 2006. (in Russian)
- Plotnikov V.S. *Sotsialnaya bezopasnost v perekhodnom obschestve: soderzhanie i mekhanizmy obespecheniya. Tekst avtoresh. dis. kand. sotsiol.nauk*. – Novosibirsk, 2004. (in Russian)
- Serebryannikov V. V. *Sotsialnaya bezopasnost Rossii: kontseptualnyy podhod*. – M.: TsSI ISPI RAN, 2005. (in Russian)

38. Sotsialna bezpeka: teoriya ta ukrainska praktika / I. F. Hnibidenko, F.M. Kolot, V.V. Rogovoy (Eds.). – K.: KNEU, 2006. (in Ukrainian)
39. Yanovskiy R.H. Globalnyye izmeneniya i sotsialnaya bezopasnost. – M.: IZD-vo «Akademiya», 1999. (in Russian)
40. Alexander J. The Modern Reconstruction of Classical Thought: Talcott Parsons. – N.Y.: Routledge, 2014.
41. Alexander J. Smyshly sotsialnoy zhizni. Kultursotsiologiya. – M.: Izdatel'skaya i konsaltingovaya gruppa «Praxis», 2013. (in Russian)
42. Eisenstadt S. N. Tradition, change, and modernity. – New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
43. Luhmann N. Ponyatiye riska // THESIS. – 1994. – Nr. 5. – pp. 135–160. (in Russian)
44. Luhmann N. Ponyatiye obschestva // In: Luhmann N. Problemy teoreticheskoy sotsiologii. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteya, 1994. – Pp. 25–42. (in Russian)
45. Merton R. On Theoretical Sociology. – N.Y.: The Free Press, 1967.
46. Neofunctionalism / Alexander J. (Ed.). – Beverly Hills: Sage, 1985.
47. Parsons T. Some Considerations on the Theory of Social Change // Rural Sociology. – N.Y.: The Free Press, 1961. – Pp. 219-239.
48. Parsons T. O strukture sotsialnogo dejstva. – M.: Akademicheskij Project, 2000. (in Russian)
49. Parsons T. O sotsialnykh sistemakh. – M.: Akademicheskij Project, 2002. (in Russian)
50. Parsons T. Working Papers in the Theory of Action / T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, E. Shils. – Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.
51. Parsons T. Economy and Society / T. Parsons, N. Smelser. – Glencoe (IL): The Free Press, 1956.
52. Arseyenko A. Perspektivy evropejskoy arkhitektury bezopasnosti v kontekste situatsii v sovremennom mire // Sotsialni vymiry suspilstva. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats. – K.: Instytut sotsiologii NAN Ukrainy. – 2002. – Nr.5. – Pp. 464–482. (in Russian)
53. Filippov A. F. Sotsiologiya prostranstva. – Spb.: Vladimir Dal, 2008. (in Russian)
54. Fomchenkova H. A. Institutstionalizatsiya bezopasnosti molodezhi v usloviyakh transformatsii rossijskogo obschestva. Dissertatsiya ...d.sotsiolog.n. – Spb.: SPbGU, 2014. (in Russian)
55. Holovakha Ye.; Panina N. Sotsialnoye bezumiye. – K.: Abris, 1994. (in Russian)
56. Khyzhnyak L. M. Peretvorenniya organizatsiy v umovakh sotsialno-ekonomichnykh zmin. – Kh.: Osnova, 1999. (in Ukrainian)
57. Kutsenko O. D. Obschestvo neravnykh. Klassovyy analiz neravenstv v sovremennykh obschestvakh: opyty zapadnoy sotsiologii. – Kh.: Vydavnychy tsestr Kharkivskogo universitetu, 2000. (in Russian)
58. Kutuyev P. V. Kontseptsii rozvytku ta modernizatsii: evolyutsiya doslidnytskykh program sotsiologichnogo dyskursu. – K.: Stal, 2005. (in Ukrainian)
59. Kuznetsov V. N. Sotsiologiya bezopasnosti. Formirovaniye kul'tury bezopasnosti v transformiruyushchetsya obschestve. – M.: Respublica, 2002. (in Russian)
60. Ligha M. B. Kachestvo zhizni kak osnova sotsialnoy bezopasnosti. – M.: Hardariki, 2006. (in Russian)
61. Osipov H. V. Sotsiologiya i gosudarstvennost (dostizheniya, problemy, resheniya) / H. V. Osipov, V.N. Kuznetsov. – M.: IZD-vo Ekzamen, 2005. (in Russian)
62. Sillaste H. Sotsialnaya bezopasnost lichnosti, obschestva i gosudarstva // Bezopasnost Yevrazii. – 2000. – Nr.1. – Pp. 7–31. (in Russian)
63. Sokuryanskaya L. H. Studenchesstvo na puti k drugomu obschestvu: tsenostnyy diskurs perekhoda. – Kh.: Kharkovskiy natsionalnyy universitet imeni V.N. Karazina, 2006. (in Russian)
64. Sovremennoye ponimaniye zhiznennykh sil cheloveka: ot metafory k kontseptsii (stanovleniye vitalistskoy sotsiologicheskoy paradigmy) / S. I. Hrigoryev, L. D. Demina (Eds.). – M.: IZD-vo MGSU, 2000. (in Russian)
65. Yanitskiy O. N. Ekologicheskiye katastrofy: strukturno-funktsionalnyy analiz. – M.: IS RAN, 2013. (in Russian)
66. Hurevitch A. Ya. Vvedeniye v analiz sotsialnykh sistem. – M.: INFRA-M, 2001. (in Russian)
67. Romanenko Yu.V. Smyshloproduktivnaya v sotsialnykh sistemakh. – K.: E ta E, 2005. (in Ukrainian)
68. Bachinin V. A. Entsiklopedia filosofii i sotsiologii prava / V. A. Bacinin. – Spb.: IZD-vo R. Aslamova «Yuridicheskij tsentr Press», 2006.
69. Bezpeka // Bayrak I. P. Slovnnyk-dovidnyk pravovykh, politologichnykh, sotsiologichnykh ta ekonomichnykh terminiv / I. P. Bayrak, V. K. Zbarskiy, O. V. Hrabovskyy et al. – K.: Milenium, 2008. – P. 273. (in Ukrainian)
70. Kremen V. H. Politychna bezpeka Ukrainy: kontseptualni zasady ta sistema zabespechennya / V. H. Kremen, I. F. Binko, S. I. Holovaschenko. – K.: MAUP, 1998. (in Ukrainian)
71. Bezopasnost na Zapade, na Vostoke i v Rossii: predstavleniya, kontseptsii, situatsii / S. A. Panarin, D. I. Polyuyannyy (Eds.). – Ivanovo: Ivanovo gos. un-t, 2013. (in Russian)
72. Rybalkin N. N. Filosofiya bezopasnosti. 2-e izd. – M.: Olma-press, 2002. (in Russian)
73. Sytnyk H. P. (2012). Derzhavne upravlinnya u sferi natsionalnoi bezpeky. Kontseptualni ta organizatsiyni zasady. – Kyiv: NADU. (in Ukrainian)
74. Giddens A. Politics, Sociology and Social Theory: Encounters with Classical and Contemporary Social Thought. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
75. Giddens A. Ustroeniye obschestva. Ocherk teorii strukturalitsii. – M.: Akademicheskij Project, 2003. (in Russian)
76. Giddens A. Posledstviya sovremennosti. – M.: «Praxis», 2011. (in Russian)
77. Giddens A. Sociology. 7th Ed. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.
78. Beck U. Obschestvo riska. Na puti k drugomu modernu. – M.: Progress-Traditsiya, 2000. (in Russian)
79. Vozhenikov A. V. Natsionalnaya bezopasnost: teoriya, politika, strategiya. – M.: NPO «Modul», 2000. (in Russian)
80. Beck U. Vlada i kontrvlada u dobu globalizatsii. Nova svitova politychna ekonomiya. – K.: Nika-Tsentr, 2011. (in Ukrainian)
81. Bestuzhev-Lada I. V. Alternativnaya tsivilizatsiya. – M.: Chero, 2003. (in Russian)
82. Eisenstadt S. N. Revolyutsiya i preobrazovaniye obschestv. Sravnitel'noye izucheniye tsivilizatsiy. – M.: Aspect-Press, 1999. (in Russian)
83. Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. – N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
84. Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World / P. L. Berger, S. P. Huntington (Eds.). – Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002.
85. Postkommunisticheskiye transformatsii: vektory, izmereniya, soderezhaniye / O. Kutsenko (Ed.) – Kh.: IZD-vo Kharkovskogo universiteta, 2004. (in Russian)