

SOCIOCULTURAL VULNERABILITY OF THE SECURITY OF LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

Vytautas ŠLAPKAUSKAS

Mykolas Romeris University

E-mail: slapkauskas@mruni.eu

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9637-6672

DOI: 10.13165/PSPO-24-35-22

Abstract. *Security is one of the most important human needs, which can only be satisfied by other people, and only from the outside. It lacks leads to human frustration and resistance (A. Maslow). Before the war in Ukraine, the development of European societies took place in peaceful conditions. Therefore, the war in Ukraine caused by the Russian Federation actualized the problems of meeting the security of liberal democratic societies. The subject of this study is the internal tensions inherent in liberal democracy, which can intensify when insecurity spreads in society. The purpose of the research is to reveal the socio-cultural vulnerability of the security of liberal democracy.*

The satisfaction of security is explained based on the closely parallel evolution of the human mind and community (F. Hayek), in which the culture of being of human groups was formed - common rules of behavior and groups turned into communities. This sociocultural evolution has weakened in liberal democratic societies. The socio-cultural vulnerability of the security of liberal democracy is caused by the formation of "new individualism" and consumer society. In the process of formation of a new individualism and consumer society, the concept of security is transforming from general security to individual security. In this process, the socio-cultural nature of common security inevitably weakens.

When the development of society takes place in a state of peace and there is no external threat to national security, we hardly notice the transformation of general security towards individual security. However, the growth of external threats to the nation forces us to turn to common security, which is developed by fostering the socio-cultural ties of society members.

Keywords: *security, liberal democracy, new individualism, freedom, moral relativism, consumer society.*

Introduction: sociocultural relevance of security satisfaction

Security is the most important value of people, because the main need of every person is to avoid threats to his life, health, freedom, and property, regardless of his age, group and national affiliation or other features related to the existence of a person and their groups. The satisfaction of security and other basic needs promotes the development of human growth towards self-realization. Their lack leads to human frustration and resistance, because "needs for security, belonging, love and respect can only be met by other people, and only from the outside. This means significant dependence on the environment. A person in such a position cannot really be in command of himself and in control of his destiny" (Maslow, 2011, pp. 103-104).

The satisfaction of security is explained based on closely parallel evolution of the human mind and community (Hayek, 1998, p. 34-35), in which the culture of survival or being of a group of people was formed - common rules of behavior and groups of people turned into communities. This means that the satisfaction of the need for security is determined by the joint development of two interwoven phenomena - social and cultural. Therefore, the satisfaction of the need for security is of a sociocultural nature, which does not disappear with the development

of new experiences of the culture of security satisfaction. Every community and state strive for its members to adopt the socio-cultural experience of security satisfaction they have accumulated.

After World War II, several generations of people grew up in Western Europe without experiencing the burden of war and the painful losses it caused. Their socio-cultural development took place in the context of the formation and development of liberal democracy, the essential signs of which are the expansion of the scope of individual freedom and human rights protection. The socio-cultural development of society is the transfer of cultural heritage and new achievements to younger generations of people and their involvement in active social and cultural activities. In this development, the socio-cultural attitude of the society was formed, that only those effects of human relationships, their interaction, and activities, which guarantee the peaceful realization of the basic needs of man and his social development, are tolerable.

In a liberal democracy, the need for security is met through the protection of human rights, the development of which leads to changes in the culture of public security. This is illustrated by the 20th century. The "Quiet revolution" that took place in the Western world in the second half: 1) shifted from a strong focus on material values and physical security to a greater concern for the quality of life; 2) the political skills of societies expanded, allowing them to play a more important role in making important political decisions (Inglehart, 2016). In the process of the "Quiet Revolution", the concept of quality of life was linked to the pacifist cultivation of peace, which became an important part of the social way of life. On the other hand, this new political orientation gradually limited the socio-cultural preparation of societies by military means to ensure the development of national security.

The socio-cultural experience of Central Eastern European societies was formed in the context of a long-term loss of security, the development of which was determined by the Second World War and the Soviet occupation. Almost 35 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, only one generation of people grew up that did not experience severe material and spiritual deprivation. This young generation are consumers of individual freedom and eternal peace. However, the thinking of previous generations of people is related to the traumatic memory of security losses, e. g., Lithuanian society (Šlapkauskas, 2022, p. 2-5). This memory conditions the different reactions of the societies of Central Eastern European countries and their groups to the aggression of the Russian Federation's war in Ukraine and its evaluations. The countries on the eastern edge of the European Union experienced the strongest Soviet occupation, so their societies provide a lot of help to Ukraine.

From 2022 February 24 The Russian Federation is waging a war of brutal aggression in Ukraine. It also threatens the European Union with a long-term hybrid war, as it pursues a political goal - to reduce the support of European states to Ukraine (Russia plotting sabotage across Europe, intelligence agencies warn (ft.com)). According to Frank G. Hoffman, "Hybrid threats incorporate a full range of different modes of warfare including conventional capabilities, irregular tactics and formations, terrorist acts including indiscriminate violence and coercion, and criminal disorder. Hybrid Wars can be conducted by both states and a variety of non-state actors. These multi-modal activities can be conducted by separate unit, or even by the

same unit, but are operationally, and tactically directed and coordinated within the main battlespace to active synergistic effects in the physical and psychological dimensions of conflict. The effects can be gained at all levels of war" (Conflict in the 21ST Century, 2007, p. 8).

Russian threats must be taken seriously, and we must be prepared to deal with them properly. This requires the collective unity of the countries of the European Union. However, some of them are unable to recognize the need for active collective efforts to block the possibilities of hybrid warfare. It can be said that the emergence of this approach is influenced by different socio-cultural concepts of security in their societies.

The object of the study is the internal tensions inherent in liberal democracy, which may increase in the process of actualization of public security. **The purpose of the research** is to reveal the socio-cultural vulnerability of the security of liberal democracy. **Research methods:** the research is based on document analysis and historical comparative methods.

The contradictory nature of liberal democracy

Liberal democracy has two origins - liberalism and democracy. Combining them into a unified concept is not as simple as it may seem from the popularity of this term. Modern theories of democracy focus on values such as "society" and "equality", while liberalism focuses on the values of "individual" and "freedom". Thus, liberalism and democracy are characterized by a different logic of thinking - democracy is more focused on collective decisions, and liberalism - on individual ones. Therefore, the functionality of a liberal democracy is achieved through a continuous dynamic political compromise between the individual freedoms promoted by liberalism and a democracy based on the principle of the majority. On the one hand, thanks to the protection of human rights and freedoms, the "tyranny of the majority" is avoided, because democracy does not in itself guarantee respect for minorities and the rights of individual individuals. But on the other hand, the absolute idea of equal freedom can turn into an ideology of distorting the freedom of most members of society, called the dictatorship of tolerance or political correctness. This dictatorship limits sociocultural opportunities to foster public involvement in the defense of national security.

The idea of democracy was formed before the idea of freedom. Democracy is directly represented by the Greek word "democratic", whose root meanings are "demos" (people) and "Kratos" (power). Although the definition of democracy as people's government is the starting point for examining the essence of democracy, it cannot be defined unambiguously. The analysis of the concept of "popular rule" provides fodder for the creation of conflicting conceptions of democracy, since the problems of defining democracy arise from each element of this phrase - the people and the government (Held, 2002, p. 15-16). Many questions have led to the fact that the meaning of democracy is not and will never be completely clear.

Fundamental problems arise from the dynamic nature of both aspects of the concept of "people's governance". The rudiments of "people's rule" are formed when a group of people

turns into a political community, i.e., realizes the equality of members of their community. Such a process can take place spontaneously within the group or be organized from the outside.

From the point of view of the spontaneous development of the social order, the beginnings of democracy are formed in the evolution of the connection between the human mind and communality, which was caused by the need to constantly meet the needs of nutrition and security. It is impossible to realize them individually or through the methods of mutual aggression between individuals, because only joint action ensures the survival of a group of people. In this evolution, the rules of social behavior, their functioning mechanisms and the social structure of human groups were formed - institutions of social behavior and forms of management of human existence related to their development. For example, the Germanic peoples were characterized by a form of communal government called the "moot", which existed as a family and functioned as peace and was associated with the establishment of justice. Wise men ("knowers", "witnesses") used to express their opinions to preserve the common assembly of families, and the people tried to defend themselves by acting collectively against criminals (Berman, 1999, p. 78-90; History of European Mentality, 1998, p. 449-454). Moot sought to protect the existing order in accordance with justice expressed by the rules of common conduct - custom. Another feature of the Moot is also important: it existed as a sphere of decision-making unity in which pluralism of opinion was tolerated. Therefore, a procedure revealing the position of the majority was necessary. This was characteristic not only of the Germanic peoples, but also of all the peoples of Northern and Western Europe, as their legal systems were similar from the 6th to the 10th century (Berman, 1999, p. 79).

In the general evolution of the human mind and communality, the customary - procedural political and legal - order of successful decision-making was formed, guaranteeing the functionality of the will of the people's government. Man determines the nature of the political order need to realize himself as a man whose existence has meaning. This meaning is based on two statements: 1) man is a social being; he is such that he can live well only in a community of his own kind. According to Aristotle, man is a political animal, naturally designed to live in society. He is a sociable being by nature, with feelings such as love, friendship, pity, and a sense of justice and injustice. Outside of life together, these feelings have no meaning. This means that human humanity is inseparable from human relationships; 2) man is a complex and hierarchical being. He is given the characteristic that he controls himself through the highest - rational - part of himself. Because man has a mind, his soul is different from the soul of other animals. Man must act like a "reasonable animal", living according to reason, which is associated with goodness. Thus, political activity is based on the needs of community life and, in a broader sense, human nature. For the well-being of people, it is necessary that the community be politically organized, i.e., would have political power (Beneton, 2009, pp. 27-28).

In the process of the formation of a political authority, the activities of personalities increasingly intervene in the spontaneous (customary) evolution of the political order and turn it into an organizational development in which the elite and leaders of the government establish themselves. Government can be both democratic and non-democratic. In both cases, leaders

must emerge who are capable of mobilizing community members to achieve specific goals. Competition between leaders within the government can promote and limit the process of democracy formation. Therefore, the promotion of political equality of community members must inevitably become the basis for spreading the relevant ideology. However, the real promotion of equality between the ordinary members of the political community and its leaders can acquire "double standards". As a result, there is always a danger that "people's rule" can transform into authoritarianism and/or into other forms of group totalitarian rule.

In other words, democracy is characterized by an internal constant tension between "people" and "government", the strength of which is expressed by the nature of the relationship between society (people) and government. Their relationship can be cooperative, competitive, formal, totalitarian and of a different nature. 20th century the sad experience of the two world wars only confirms that undemocratic political regimes not only usurp the rights of the people themselves, but also pose a military threat to the development of their society and neighboring states. Therefore, the goal of the International Charter of Human Rights is to limit and control the internal erosion of democracy. But that is not enough. Societies themselves must actively foster democracy.

Liberalism is a concept of conflicting meanings, the meaning of which has changed historically. Its essence is the idea of equal freedom and the requirement of social conditions for its implementation. Therefore, liberalism usually refers to attempts to uphold the values of freedom of choice, reason, and tolerance in the face of tyranny, an undemocratic system and religious intolerance. Liberalism sought to free the state from religious control and civil society (personal, family and business life) from political interference. Liberalism gradually came to be associated with the doctrine that individuals should be allowed to freely exercise their preferences in religious, economic, and political matters. Thus, under the influence of various factors, the political philosophy of modern times will evolve, which is not unified, but it is united by the same rejection: the entire previous tradition is rejected as unrealistic and harmful. This rejection is based on the emancipation of the individual's will, which is called the spirit of the New times. The main source of the individual's emancipated will is the new status of the individual's mind.

The individual perceives himself as an active, functioning subject. This status stands out in many respects: 1) the spirit of the new age asserts the autonomy of the mind, which means rejecting not only the principle of authority, but also the ultimate goal. The efforts of the modern spirit have created the claim that man is sovereign - he is the expert in meaning; 2) a fully autonomous mind is also conquering. This means that with the help of science and technology, the mind seeks to control nature and manage society with the means of rational organization; 3) the new orientation of the mind is associated not only with conquest, but also with service. The mind begins to serve increasingly unlimited freedom and releases the reins of human desires. The modern mind comes to this conclusion: nature is pure freedom; it is shaped by history and history shapes it, or it is shaped by the individual efforts of each. Man is the creator of himself. This means that the will overshadows nature. The mind acts: it is no longer vital,

but instrumental, controlling the means in pursuit of human power to be used to make life longer, more comfortable, more enabling, or power for its own sake (Beneton 2009, pp. 63-64).

The new conception of the individual or "new individualism" involves two things: "On the one hand we have in mind the speaking, thinking and willing empirical subject, i.e. the individual representative of the human family, that makes up every society, and, on the other hand, it is an independent, self-sufficient – and therefore essentially non-social – moral entity, which is the subject of our highest values and which figures primarily in our modern ideology of man and society. In this sense, there are dual societies. In the case where the Individual has become the highest values, I speak of individualism; otherwise, when society is held to be the value, I speak of holism" (Dumont, 2002, p. 37).

In the framework of the formation of new individualism, the question is raised how to rationally organize the social world so that it serves human emancipation? On the other hand, the need to foster public safety forces us to formulate the following question alongside this question: how is it possible, with the emancipation of the individual's will, to create general rules of social coexistence that would help security and peace prevail? This is a fundamental political question of modern times, the answer to which must be sought in creating the harmony of dual societies in constantly changing socio-cultural conditions. According to P. Beneton, the connection between the emancipation of the individual's will and the creation of rules of social behavior is possible if it is formalized by a liberal decision, which consists of two parts (Beneton, 2009, pp. 71-72):

1. Emancipation of people's material desires. Individuals are not united by ideas, but by interests. When economic activity is freed, people want to cooperate because it is in their interest. The market system has political values: it loosens the reins by allowing the expression of innocent passions, that suppress dangerous passions. Properly understood egoism does not lead to the acceptance of necessary constraints, as T. Hobbes expected, but to free cooperation, when mutual interests neutralize different ideas.

2. Institutional protection of freedom-autonomy. This protection takes place through the development of the institution of human rights and the domestication of political power: power is dangerous, so the powers of government must be distributed and limited by law, thus rendering them harmless. In addition, the protection of freedom-autonomy is further strengthened by neutralizing conflicting opinions on morality and religion. To weaken the political power of the Church, questions of morality and religion are left to the realm of private life and personal conscience.

The political mind of modern times, searching for ways to create general rules of social coexistence that would limit the emancipation of the individual's will as little as possible, had to become instrumental and procedural - suitable to serve both the protection of freedom, autonomy, and democracy. The autonomy of liberty means that everyone, based on common instruments and procedures, can govern himself and freely pursue his own interests and personal happiness. In other words, instrumental and procedural thinking creates opportunities for the emancipation of the individual, which is and remains individual, but at the same time

turns into a universal phenomenon. But the concept of "government by the people" boils down to procedural democracy.

At the center of modern political thinking is the individual and his rights, with which pragmatic goals are pursued - create minimal tools to limit the "war of all against all" and the will of the majority to the extent, which would a safe existence of individuals is possible. Therefore, it can be said that the concept of human rights is important not so much from a value point of view, but more from an instrumental point of view. It is no coincidence that the classical philosophy of liberalism is based on the idea that the "war of all against all" can be stopped only by a state created by the agreement of free individuals, which can interfere in their lives according to predetermined rules and only to the extent of protecting them from destruction and violence (Berlin. 1995, p. 160).

Thus, liberal, or modern political thinking is focused on the creation of instrumental opportunities for the realization of individual interests. Those individual and group interests whose implementation does not violate human rights and freedoms can be most successfully identified and legalized. The moral and religious ideas that previously united individuals are rejected as hindering the emancipation of the individual's will. On the contrary, it is claimed that every individual can construct his own values based on the protection of human rights and the connection between interests. The promotion of moral relativism paves the way for the formation of a new individualism. The absolutization of the role of individual values marks newly emerging communities of interests with a sign of temporality and inevitably leads to at least three fundamental political challenges:

1) in the arena of the implementation of interests getting stronger not so much cooperation, but more competition and subordination, in the context of which the connection of common cultural values and rules of behavior is inevitably weakened. For example, inter-party-political quarrels in the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania and the media have expanded to bullying in schools and various forms of socio-cultural mobbing in organizations and social networks.

2) The interplay of moral relativism and competition of interests permeates the legislation of all levels of government and self-government and limits its transparency. On the one hand, the aim is to prevent corruption and other illegal behavior by creating and/or tightening the relevant prevention rules. But on the other hand, the growth of prevention increases the power of authorities. And this contradicts the liberal approach to increasing the power of state institutions.

3) in the context of the establishment of moral relativism, the atomization of society inevitably increases and its integrity decreases. As a result, the possibilities of passing on the experience of security satisfaction to new generations also decrease. Thus, these challenges are inevitable and permanent negative shadow companions of liberalism, increasing the tension between liberalism and democracy.

Changes in the relationship between freedom and law in liberal democracies: transition from general to individual security

Examining the social development of Western societies from a historical comparative point of view reveals the connection between the break in the social development of the society and the intensification of the forms of political coercion. For example, tyranny—a form of despotism—emerged inevitably in many ancient Greek cities, when the disintegration of the aristocracy and the formation of civil society took place. Wealthy citizens in the 7th-6th centuries b. c. Cr. did not yet have the political experience to govern themselves. This circumstance was often used by some democratic leader to become a sovereign autocrat, protecting the people from the noble nobility [Antikos žodynas, 1998, p. 508]. The modern concept of dictatorship was formed on the basis of democracy and a sophistic worldview when the idea of the connection between individualism and power was understood. "Defending" democracy through appropriate political rhetoric often was and continues to be a way to gain individualistic power rather than serving society and the state.

But, on the other hand, the breaks in social development caused individuals and society to fight more actively for their freedom. In the context of ongoing changes in thinking, Giambattista Vico was the first to introduce a strict parallel between human history and the creation of the physical universe: man is the creator of the "state world" (*monde civile*), as God is the Creator of the physical universe (Brague, 2005. P.191-200). Immanuel Kant was the first to raise the profound question: what is man? He revealed that the practice of freedom without moral theology arises from natural causes, and that transcendental freedom requires the independence of this mind itself from all the conditioning causes of the sense-perceived world. The analysis of the canon of pure reason leads I. Kant to the conclusion that only the practice of freedom based on moral theology makes a person a person (Kant, 1996, p. 546-560). Thus, it can be said that by nurturing moral values, people strive for equal freedom, on the basis of which they help each other to meet the need for security and create a democratic state.

Legitimation of the connection between equal freedom and social order. The humanization of freedom requires state laws that correspond to the moral value of man and his dignity. Everyone must follow such laws. The implementation of legal protection of the individual's right to freedom creates a common basis for individual and national security, on which national security is developed. Any exceptions to the exercise of equal freedom lead, to social discrimination and insecurity. When between the state and citizens are in strong conflict, internal disorder can threaten the state's cohesion in such a way that it is problematic to apply the concept of national security in general (Buzan, 1997, p. 91).

Prior to the emergence of liberal democracy as a political regime, both the primacy of the individual (since the time of P. Abelard) and the primacy of the state were theoretically postulated. According to T. Hobbes, people created states in order to "defend themselves from foreign invasion and from mutual attacks, thus protecting themselves and endeavoring to survive and feed themselves by their labor and the fruits of the earth, and to live satisfactorily." Similarly, J. Lok said: "The main and great motive for people's consent to obey the government

is the preservation of property" (property here means lives, liberties, and wealth), which in its natural state is "very insecure" [Buzan, 1997, p. 72].

England was the first to legalize the right of individuals to freedom. On the basis of disputes in the courts of this country, until the end of the 16th century, the decisions of the judges established the rule of law and the protection of human rights, which turned into the principles of the English constitution. Albert Venn Dicey wrote that at all times since the Norman Conquest, English political institutions had two characteristics: 1) the omnipotence or undisputed supremacy of the central government throughout the country. She was the guarantor of law and order; 2) the rule of law, which is closely related to the first feature. This rule of law guarantees people's rights and includes three related things: 1) no person shall be punished or cannot by law to suffer or to experience material loss, under the law, except in the case where there is a clear violation of the law, and this is established in the ordinary legal way in the general courts of the country. In this sense, the rule of law is opposed to every system of government that rests on the broad and discretionary powers of those in power, secured by coercion; (2) no man is above the law, whatever his rank or position, subject to the common law of the realm and the jurisdiction of the common courts; 3) the protection of personal freedoms is the result of generalizations of general court decisions, from which the general principles of the constitution are derived. In many foreign countries, the opposite is true: the protection of individual liberty is derived from the general principles of the constitution (Dicey, 1998, pp. 131-135).

In the countries of the European continent, the establishment of the rule of law began at the end of the 18th century. Unlike in England, the legitimacy of the idea of freedom did not come from summaries of court decisions, but from the publication of symbolic legal documents - the US Constitution (1787) and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789). These documents conditioned the formation of constitutionalism - political and state law science current, which in the 20th century. influenced the waves of creation of liberal democratic constitutions in the countries of the European continent. But their intellectual power was not enough to create democratic states. On the contrary, in 1789-99 during period, political and terrorist violence against individuals and their groups prevailed in French society. Various forms of violence increased again in European countries in the 20th century in the first half: there were two world wars, in which millions of people died.

Especially the atrocities of World War II, the Holocaust and the deportation of people and ethnic groups organized by the Soviet regime to Siberia allow us to say that the ideological implementation of any coercion turns into contempt for the value of human life and desecration of its dignity. This leads to the obligation to constantly control and limit the threats to the individual's security arising from the state on an international scale. Therefore, in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted, the Preamble of which states: "recognition of the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the basis of freedom, justice and peace in the world" [Human Rights, 1991, p. 12]. The goal of the implementation of human rights is to prevent aggression among all natural

and legal persons on a global scale and guarantee the establishment of long-term peace on the basis of the protection of individual freedom.

Thus, the legal guarantees of human rights and freedoms and their implementation are the legal basis for creating mechanisms of control and deterrence of threats to the safety of the individual. It is the implementation of civil and political human rights and freedoms that limits the influence of state power on people [Human rights in International Law, 1992, p. 205–272], inhibits and limits the powers of the state [Robertson, 1993, p. 1–64]. On the other hand, the constitutional recognition of human rights and freedoms is not a one-time act and requires continuous moral efforts from society to protect the equal rights of all its members, to solve issues of their implementation [Šlapkauskas, 2002, p. 192].

The countries of the Central Eastern European only freed themselves from the Soviet occupation at the end of the Cold War and ratified international human rights protection documents. Based on them, the countries created their constitutions, which correspond to the spirit of liberal democracy. According to E. Jarašiūnas, in the 20th century in the second half, the trend of unification of constitutionalism emerged, the western concept of the constitution takes hold in many countries of the world, constitutional justice in the European system of constitutions is combined with the American one, the common standards of human rights become an indisputable imperative, the socio-economic aspects of the life of the individual and society become more and more prominent in constitutional law (Jarašiūnas, 2002, p. 50).

Weakening of public security due to the prevailing negative freedom of individuals. In the development of Western civilization, two opposing concepts of freedom were formed: 1) freedom subject to order and 2) the concept of freedom as the absence of constraints. The spread of freedom within the boundaries of a functioning social order corresponds to a classical community, where patterns of social behavior express shared values. The concept of freedom as the absence of constraints was formed in society's struggle against coercion arising from control and subordination. Liberation from the coercion of rule is understood as liberation from the legal duties imposed by the rulers, as a return to the state of justice.

The adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 gave hope for a change in the evolution of legal politics from egoistic state positivism to broader solidarity. But this did not happen, because the states very quickly became aware of the legal status of human rights, which expresses the mandatory minimum of social morality. From the point of view of modern political thinking, such a "mandatory minimum", on the one hand, obliges legal policy subjects to pay a lot of attention to the implementation of human rights, but on the other hand, the political philosophy of liberalism encourages us to avoid speaking publicly about greater moral duties that exceed the requirements of human rights. Therefore, A. Jokubaitis emphasizes that "human rights require narrow moral thinking that defends only negative freedom. Gradually, any higher moral obligations that go beyond not harming others are forgotten" (Jokubaitis, 2008, p. 132).

In the conditions of liberal democracy, the interest of the young generations of society in negative freedom was determined not by a protest against real or alleged state coercion, but by the growth of the quality of life in the 20th century. in the fifties. In the context of economic

growth and increasing opportunities for human social development, social trust in government institutions and prospects for the quality of individual life have strengthened. Thus, two intertwined social processes took place: 1) the growth of trust in government institutions led to the increase in the social role of state control institutions and 2) the decrease in the role of social control of society itself, manifested in the "liberation of individuals and its groups from the screws of traditional morality". It is the increase in the protection of human social, economic and cultural rights, and the weakening of the social role of morality and religion in society that presupposed a favorable social context for the formation of a consumer society. In this context, the economic power of the states of the Western world increased to such an extent that they began to seriously promote the idea of modern (technical) law as a tool for wide-scale social and economic planning: "law is now recognized as a means of implementing power, a tool of government" (Cotterrell, 1997, p. 64).

It is very important to emphasize that the nature of the relationship between the state and society has changed in the aforementioned processes. Previously, the relationship between the state and society was formed on the basis of institutions of social behavior (morality, religion, law). Now the shrinking of the social role of morality and religion was compensated by the state by increasing the social role of law, which was supposed to be "supposedly" neutral from a value point of view. It is possible to achieve this because law is valuable and instrumental in nature. The emphasis on the instrumental nature of law was linked to the expectations of the consumer society - to expand the legal possibilities of creating individual quality of life under market conditions.

Later, economic growth was replaced by its stagnation, which was caused by the 20th century. the transition from the industrial era to the information age that began in the 1960s and lasted until the 1990s. The United States and other developed countries have undergone a profound transformation from industrial to information societies; knowledge has replaced mass production as the basis of wealth, power, and social interaction. At the same time, Western societies have endured increasing levels of crime, massive changes in fertility and family structure, decreasing levels of trust, and the triumph of individualism over community. Just as the Industrial Revolution brought about momentous changes in society's moral values, a similar Great Disruption in our own time has caused profound changes in our social structure (Fukuyama, 1999). Thus, during this period, the safety of the US public was severely degraded. Although it sounds paradoxical, the formation of a consumer society and an instrumental approach to law continued under these conditions.

The transformation of law into a set of technical rules is intended to be explained by the need to promote the growth of the state's economic power and protect the social guarantees available to members of society. But in fact the 20th century at the end of the 1960s, social policy "created as many new problems as it managed to solve. Liberal policy weakened family, ethnic and community ties, destroyed the work ethic. The pursuit of equality only made solving problems more difficult, and the liberal belief that every problem has its own political solution, proved unfeasible" (Parsons, 2001, p. 155).

The liberal democratic society's "liberation from the shackles of morality and religion" enabled the state to turn law into a modern tool of political power, which constructs a liberal legal order. When law is seen as a mere tool of the state's political power, it is at the same time seen as independent of other systems of social regulation, especially the support of morality and custom. It is no longer considered that the law is effective because of its harmony with the customs of the nation. The opposite is argued: the effectiveness of law comes from the concentration of political power. A modern legal system is understood as a special set of government power mechanisms using a rationally developed legal doctrine, which is created, interpreted, and applied by specialized state legal institutions. But the connections between law (as norms applied by state institutions to make decisions) and morality (as patterns of thinking and behavior that actually exist in the general society) seem to be weakening in people's minds and eventually disappearing. For legislators and ordinary citizens, law becomes a purely technical regulation that often lacks a clear moral element (Cotterrell, 1997, p. 66).

The separation of law from morality and customs eventually leads to its actual disappearance from the consciousness of many citizens because they do not have the necessary competence to know and master technical law. Different social interpretations of compliance with the same legal norms circulate in the groups of society. On this basis, legal pluralism is formed and there is a greater spread of manifestations of legal nihilism. The state, in order to create law as an effective and independent instrument of social control and leadership, ends up with the opposite result: technical law is unknown to society and therefore not socially effective. It can be said that as the absolutization of the instrumental approach to law increases, the social significance of positive law decreases and the possibilities of expressing individual opinions expand. Everything is possible that does not violate human rights and freedoms. In these conditions, e.g., in Lithuania, individuals expanded their freedom without awareness of legal responsibility (Šlapkauskas, 2009, p. 318-319). Without the awareness of legal responsibility, the increasing scope of negative freedom of individuals destroys the connection between the values of the common culture and the norms of behavior. In other words, when individuals avoid obeying the general norms of social behavior, public safety decreases. The vulnerability of security in liberal democratic societies is especially evident during crises and other extreme situations.

Moral relativism and consumerism versus democracy and common security

Ignoring the role of morality in social relations "paves the way" not only for moral pluralism, but also for the competition of democratic models. Under the conditions of the development of moral pluralism, the model of pluralistic democracy gradually takes hold. This model is based on the idea that democracy is more effective when the nation participates in governance through the competing interests of individual groups in society. According to the pluralist model of democracy, democracy is a system, in which many organizations acting independently of government, pressuring her and even challenging her own interests (Janda, Berry, Goldman, 2004, pp. 16-24). Thus, the pluralist theory of democracy focuses attention on

organized groups and puts forward a new criterion for democratic governance: the government must be sensitive not to public opinion, but to organized groups of citizens. This means that the construction of a liberal legal order becomes an object of manipulation by competing groups. Therefore, it inevitably moves away from its social purpose - to guarantee the dynamic balance of freedom and security for the majority of society members.

Two essential factors - moral relativism and refusal of market regulation at the state level (Fukuyama, 2004, p. 119-122) motivate members of society to become aware of the "instrumental mind". The "instrumental mind" is the most important feature of modern thinking. This is the kind of rationality that we use to determine the most economical means to achieve our goals. Its success criteria are maximum efficiency, the best cost-benefit ratio, the application of which gradually covered all areas of life, including the legal system: it is possible to deliberately act contrary to the requirements of legal norms, because it is calculated that the done action brings more benefits than the sufferings arising from maximum legal liability. The hope is often to avoid or at least reduce the scope of legal liability by manipulating the absolutism of human rights and freedoms, such as trade secrets, information, freedom of expression, property, and other rights.

The application of the criteria of "instrumental reason" formed in the process of interaction between moral relativism and the market gradually took over democracy itself. The connection between democracy and global commercialization has expanded the circle of subjects of democracy and led to the creation of a controversial concept of the citizen-consumer. According to Fareed Zakaria, the commercialization of democracy leads to the death of government: now people express themselves more as consumers; it determines their power, so commercialization has become the other side of democratization. Those forces are twins that push the wave of democracy away. The dual nature of democratization – giving power to people as citizens and as consumers – allows us to explain why few dare to criticize the transformation of democratic culture in society (Zakaria, 2003, p. 224). Now, the democratic culture of the US public has declined to such an extent that there is a need for its future to examine the political process of the death of democracy in the United States of America (Levitsky, Ziblatt, 2018).

Thus, the reunion of moral relativism, the market and democracy changes democracy itself and the structure of society: the consciousness of Western societies has been dominated by commercialism and a consumer society takes over, the values of which mark human relations with a sign of ambiguity: they desperately seek and at the same time avoid long-term liabilities, because this condition limits freedom (Bauman, 2007, p. 9). Consciousness tamed by commercialism values all relationships as consumer goods. For example, the legal order is perceived as a commodity for individual consumption, as an object of negotiations between the state and interest groups. This means that modern liberal democracy has already moved away from the 20th century. the concept of democracy, which emphasized the service of the government to the security of the nation and the expansion of its opportunities for prosperity. Consumer democracy took hold.

Consumer democracy is associated with serving the interests of individuals and their temporary groups. It is based on the political and economic competition of organized groups.

The protection of human rights is the legal basis for the political and economic competition and limitation of the subjects of this consumer democracy or post-democracy (Crouch, 2000). Therefore, it is important to emphasize that consumer democracy is functioning elections are held, the government falls, and human rights protection works. But the feeling of temporality that has prevailed in it does not encourage the political authorities to take responsibility for the strategic decisions that can determine the successful or unsuccessful development of the state.

The sense of the temporary nature of the government is determined not only by its periodic elections, but also by the ambiguous nature of consumer democracy: on the one hand, the unlimited expansion of consumerism has become a stimulus for the creation of individual freedom and public well-being, but on the other hand, this expansion has led to dangerously growing environmental degradation and geopolitical tensions. Therefore, the need to create opportunities to meet the need for common security has returned to the political agenda of liberal democracy. Their creation requires large financial resources, the burden of which members of liberal society do not want to share. In other words, the weakened socio-cultural ties between the members of a liberal democratic society limit their ability to successfully agree on necessary and permanent investments in the creation of common security. Therefore, it can be predicted that the decision-making powers of state management will be sought to be taken over by a narrow government elite now or in the near future. The new redistribution of government powers will be explained by the need to take responsibility for the further development of the state. Thus, the socio-cultural vulnerability of the security of liberal democracy conditions the formation of a wave of political authoritarianism.

Conclusions

The nature of liberal democracy is controversial. This is determined by the combination of different logics of thinking: democracy is focused on collective decisions, and liberalism is focused on individual ones. Therefore, the functionality of a liberal democracy is achieved through a constant political compromise between the protection of individual liberties and a democracy based on the principle of the majority. In liberal democratic societies, this compromise is limited by their different socio-cultural experiences of fostering freedom and the traumatic memory of the past. Therefore, the security concepts of Western and Central Eastern European societies do not match.

States try to compensate for the decline of the social role of morality and religion in societies by expanding the social role of technical or "supposedly" neutral law. The separation of law from morality and customs eventually leads to its actual disappearance from the consciousness of many citizens because they do not have the necessary competence to know and master technical law. Therefore, informal pluralistic interpretation of legal norms and manifestations of legal nihilism are spreading in societies.

The reunion of moral relativism, market, and democracy changes democracy itself and the structure of society: 1) democracy turns into consumer democracy; 2) members of society

avoid obligations that may limit their negative freedom. In societies, the concept of common security is transiting towards individual security.

Weakened sociocultural ties between the members of a liberal democratic society limit their ability to successfully agree on necessary and permanent investments in the creation of common security. Therefore, it can be predicted that the decision-making powers of state management will be sought to be taken over by a narrow government elite now or in the near future. The new redistribution of government powers will be explained by the need to assume responsibility for the further development of the state and general security. The socio-cultural vulnerability of the security of liberal democracy conditions the formation of a wave of political authoritarianism.

References

1. Antikos žodynas (1998). Vilnius: Alma littera.
2. Bauman, Z. (2007). Likvidi meilė: apie žmonių ryšių trapumą. Vilnius: Apostrofa.
3. Berlin, I. (1995). Vienovė ir įvairovė. Vilnius: Amžius.
4. Beneton, P. (2009). Politikos mokslo įvadas. Vilnius: Mintis.
5. Berman, H. J. (1999). Teisė ir revoliucija. Vakarų teisės tradicijos formavimasis. Vilnius: Pradai.
6. Bague, R. (2005). Pasaulio išmintis. Žmogaus visatos patyrimo istorija. Vilnius: Aidai.
7. Buzan, B. (1997). Žmonės, valstybės ir baimės. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
8. Conflict in the 21ST Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars, 2007. By Frank G. Hoffman. Arlington: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.
9. Cotterrell, R. (1997). Teisės sociologija. Įvadas. Kaunas: Dangerta.
10. Crouch, C. (2005). Post-democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press.
11. Dicey, A. V. (1998). Konstitucinės teisės studijų įvadas. Iš anglų kalbos vertė Lolita Raudienė ir Ridas Petkus. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
12. Dumont, L. (2002). Esė apie individualizmą. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
13. Europos mentaliteto istorija (1998). / Sudarytojas Peter Dinzelbacher. Vilnius: Aidai.
14. Hayek, F. (1998). Teisė, įstatymų leidyba ir laisvė. I : Taisyklės ir tvarka. - Vilnius: Eugrimas.
15. Held, D. (2002). Demokratijos modeliai. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
16. Human rights in International Law. Legal and Policy Issues (1992). Edited by T. Meron. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
17. Fukuyama, F. (1999). The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order. Free Press.
18. Fukuyama F. (2004). State Building – Governance and World Order in the 21st Century. Cornell University Press.
19. Inglehart, R. (2016). The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
20. Janda K., Berry J. M., Goldman J. (2004). The Challenge of Democracy. Government in America. Updated and abridged by Kevin W. Hula. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

-
21. Jarašiūnas E. (2002). Žvelgiant į Lietuvos Respublikos 1992 m. Konstituciją platesniame konstitucionalizmo raidos kontekste // *Jurisprudencija*, t. 30(22).
 22. Jokubaitis, A. (2008). *Politika be vertybių*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto TSPMI.
 23. Kant, I. (1996). *Grynojo proto kritika. Iš vokiečių kalbos vertė Romanas Plečkaitis*. Vilnius: Mintis.
 24. Levitsky, S., Ziblatt, D. (2019). *Kaip miršta demokratijos. Istorijos pamokos ateičiai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
 25. Maslow, A. (2011). *Būties psichologija. Iš anglų kalbos vertė Visvaldas Legkauskas*. Vilnius: Vaga.
 26. Parsons, W. (2001). *Viešoji politika*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
 27. Robertson, G. (1993). *Freedom, the individual and the law*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
 28. [Russia plotting sabotage across Europe, intelligence agencies warn \(ft.com\)](https://www.ft.com).
 29. Šlapkauskas, V. (2022). *Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Definition of, and Research into, Security of a Small State // Europe Alone: Small State Security without the United States / edited by David Schultz, Aurelija Pūraitė, Vidmantė Giedraitytė*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield International.
 30. Šlapkauskas, V. (2009). *Kodėl Lietuvoje nesiformuoja pilietinė visuomenė // Teisė ir demokratija. Demokratija Lietuvoje: tarp Vakarų ir Rytų (1990-2007 m.). Kolektyvinė monografija*. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas.
 31. Šlapkauskas, V. (2002). *Pasitikėjimas – teisės socialinio veiksmingumo veiksnys // Jurisprudencija: mokslo darbai*. T. 24(16).
 32. Zakaria, F. (2003). *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York.
 33. *Žmogaus teisės. Tarptautinių dokumentų rinkinys (1991)*. Vilnius.