

# Metaphysical Technologies of the Security Concept: Ethical-Political Discourse

Irma BAGRATIONI<sup>1,\*</sup>, Ibraim DIDMANIDZE<sup>2</sup>, Diana AKHVLEDIANI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Ninoshvili St. 32, 6010, Georgia,

<sup>2</sup>Centre of Languages & Information Technologies, Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Ninoshvili St. 32, 6010, Georgia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Education, Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Ninoshvili St. 32, 6010, Georgia

Correspondence: \*irma.bagratiioni@bsu.edu.ge

## Abstract

The metaphysical technology of the security concept implies a mental-conceptual system of ontological definition of security as a state of being and establishing its conceptual criteria, which allows for planning through a rational algorithm and establishing principled approaches to avoiding and overcoming threats through formal methods, including mathematical deduction. The discussion part, through a review of scientific and literary sources, focuses on the specifics of the metaphysical concept of security in order to identify axiological analytical needs. The results highlight the relevance of the study with scientific novelty, in particular, the contribution of ethical-political discourse to the modern framework of the ontological concept of security. The conclusions and findings demonstrate the practical value of the research, namely, the inevitability of transforming the ethical-political discourse as a subject of reflection on universal scientific knowledge, in the perspective of understanding and evaluating pragmatic security problems.

**KEY WORDS:** Security, concept, metaphysical, ethical-political discourse, ontological security, state, mathematical, moral, defense, algorithm.

**Citation:** Bagrationi, I.; Didmanidze, I.; Akhvlediani, I. Metaphysical Technologies of the Security Concept: Ethical-Political Discourse. In Proceedings of the Challenges to National Defence in Contemporary Geopolitical Situation, Brno, Czech Republic, 7-10 September 2026. ISSN 2538-8959, <https://doi.org/10.47459/cndcgs.2026.58>

## 1. Introduction

The ethical discourse of security concepts can be understood as an analysis of the consequences of alternative understandings of dangerous harm or physical danger in the process of determining the state of freedom, and its political aspect as a practical paradigm of the sustainability of state consciousness and systemic responsibility. It is within the ethical-political discourse of the security concept that it is possible to ascertain the conformity of the rules of protection from or resilience to potential threats to an individual or state system with moral laws.

It is well known that the activity of the state's defense system base is carried out based on certain strategic mechanisms. The latter, in turn, are conceptually developed according to the principles of an appropriate ethical-theoretical framework and are supported by certain methodological tools, thereby demonstrating the ability to ensure the practical implementation of the security and defense infrastructure.

As the history of political philosophy shows, moral actions can be risky and, therefore, states often prefer to act unethically. Mainstream political theories provide a fundamental framework for understanding the state, power, and international relations. They explain how political systems operate and function. The fundamental mainstream currents are: Liberalism, which focuses on individual freedoms and human rights and believes that the state should serve to protect the rights of citizens; Realism, which emphasizes power politics and state interests, believes that in an anarchic world, states are focused only on their own survival, security, and strengthening of power; Critical Theory, which focuses on social inequality and believes that political institutions serve the interests of the ruling class, not the individual; and Constructivism, which argues that political reality and state behaviour are determined not only by material interests, but also by ideas, norms, culture, and identity [1]. At least, that is what mainstream political theories claim. But one of the most important theses of the metaphysical theory of security is that states pursue political courses to satisfy their self-identity

needs, even when these actions compromise their physical existence. But the question naturally arises: why do states strive for immoral actions if they involve danger and imply danger? Because personal stability is more important than physical security. Such an answer is the fundamental argument that ontological security theorists argue in the paroemic tone of political discourse. So it becomes interesting to consider how the metaphysical understanding of security differs from the traditional notion of security. In other words, let us show what kind of response, feedback, and appreciation the unconventional and, at the same time, ideological-formal understanding of the idea of security has received in the history of conceptual thinking, and on what kind of basic background based.

## 2. Methods

The research on the technological foundations of metaphysical security in the paper is structured according to a certain targeted conceptual scheme:

The essential research problem was identified by us in the form of a specific question: What significance does the phenomenon of discourse have in the attempt to metaphysically establish the concept of security? The research process was carried out using the traditional theoretical-empirical methodology of forming social sectorial knowledge, especially through hermeneutic analysis of sources. Theoretical and worldview literature reflecting European philosophical and political thought related to the research interest was analyzed.

The focus of the research vector is on the influence of ethical discourse in political philosophy, which views the state as the main political guarantor and ethical subject of security. The main goal of our research has become the systematization of metaphysical understanding, which has presented the ethical-political aspect of certain structural components of the conceptual system of security. More specifically:

- Humanistic model of security: the focus is not so much on the security of the state system, but rather on the security of the individual.
- Modern scientific theories: The conceptual assessment of security is focused on the sustainability of political value and ethical cooperation.
- Conceptual backgrounds of the strategic mechanism: operating with interdisciplinary, including formal-algorithmic and historical-legal strategies to protect and maintain a stable system

## 3. Discussion

Metaphysical security can be understood as the continuity and order of the events of existence. However, in most scientific political literature, the definition of the metaphysical concept of security is quite different: "Self-preservation is a prerequisite for achieving any goal of the state. The motive of self-preservation is considered as the basis for action in a world where the security of states is not protected by anything" [1].

In the case of ontological security, this is order and continuity - this is the conclusion made by the American political scientist Kenneth Waltz in his study "Theory of International Politics". And for the neorealist worldview, which supports the traditional version of the concept of security, security begins with survival [2]. An American Professor of Political Science at the University of Utah Brent J. Steele as an offensive realist agrees with Waltz's defensive realism that the fundamental goal of states is survival [3]. The mainstream literature on international relations, from liberal theory to constructivism, is saturated with the above-mentioned survival principle, despite minor differences. In parallel, according to the metaphysics of security, when an individual is hopeless, it means that his own identity does not satisfy him, that is, in other words, "to be metaphysically secure means to have answers to fundamental existential questions" [4]. With this in mind, „we would like to answer an important question: all ethical and legal problems will be solved by metaphysical technology, or some will remain for the state“ [5]. This leitmotif guides our discourse, starting with the rationalism of a French philosopher and mathematician Rene Descartes, where metaphysics determines ethics, while politics is secondary and subordinate to the unwavering protection of state order, and focusing on the materialist-empirical approach of the representative of English political philosophy Thomas Hobbes, where the starting principle of state power is the innate qualities and needs of man.

Rene Descartes' political concepts, fragmentarily recorded in his work "Meditations on First Philosophy", are based on the so-called "temporal morality", which means that until a person can achieve true metaphysical knowledge, a moderate and pragmatic political morality is necessary. Descartes considered reason to be the primary and main guideline in state governance, and the basis of politics was not chaotic emotions, but the language of mathematical precision and logic. The main focus of Descartes' "Discourse on Method" is metaphysics, which is inseparable from Mathematics in his famous metaphor: "All philosophy is like a tree whose roots are Metaphysics, whose trunk is Physics, and whose branches are Mathematics" [6]. In politics, with the main echoes of Cartesian rationalism, we must assume that true security can only be achieved through mental intuition and mathematical deduction, and that empirical experience is hindering and unreliable. Mathematics is the only logical tool that is free from all errors. Thus, political order and security, as a rational project, are based only on reasonable laws that can be planned like mathematical algorithms.

In the case of Thomas Hobbes, we have a clearly systematized model of metaphysical concepts, combined with rational political philosophy and formulated in his main treatise, Leviathan. The main concept of the treatise is the syndrome of the state of nature, in which freedom and equality are the characteristics of man. This is a war of all against

all; since there is no supreme power to which everyone would submit, people feel defenseless. The main driving force of man is the fear of violent death; no one can impose any moral restrictions on him. At this time, the state is an artificial entity that ensures order and security, because its power is absolute and is reinforced by contract [7].

A study of the political thought of Descartes and Hobbes shows how both intended to introduce mathematically correct language in the defense of the state system. The point is that, according to the deep conviction of both Descartes and Hobbes, the stable functioning of the state, the control of internal peace, and the provision of a defense mechanism can only be achieved through the operational implementation of the language of mathematical precision, which excludes all illogicality and nonsense. Both philosophers argued that the recurrence of civil wars and the weakening or even collapse of state defense capabilities are due to the establishment of linguistic ambiguity and chaotic semiotics. Despite identical arguments, they presented different methods of solving the problem posed and the competence of mathematical language. We summarize the comparison of the discussed strategies of Descartes and Hobbes in the Table 1.

Table 1. The role of mathematically correct language in defense and security.

| Comparison criteria            | René Descartes' Metaphysical Conception                                                                             | Thomas Hobbes' Metaphysical Conception                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mathematical Model of Language | <b>Analytic Geometry:</b><br>language should resemble geometric axioms that are clear and unambiguous               | <b>Arithmetic calculation (Computatio):</b><br>Language is a code, where reasoning is the addition and subtraction of names |
| Main Threat to Self-Defense    | <b>Individual illusion:</b><br>People cannot think with strict logic, they tell fantasies and destroy order         | <b>Religious-scholastic Manipulation:</b><br>Ambiguous language creates parallel power and causes war.                      |
| Method of Language Reform      | <b>Internal rationalization:</b><br>Each thinker must clear his/her own mind of absurd concepts                     | <b>State standardization:</b><br>the holder of the highest power forcibly imposes unified, mandatory meanings of words =    |
| Educational Institutions       | <b>Academic isolation:</b><br>Purging philosophy from scholasticism so that science can develop peacefully          | <b>Total reform of university:</b><br>the education system must become a forger of the "code" of civil obedience =          |
| Ultimate Goal for Self-Defense | <b>Intelligent citizen:</b><br>A citizen who, through mathematical logic, understands that revolution is irrational | <b>Unshakable "Leviathan":</b><br>a state where ideological subversion is impossible because everyone has one "language"    |

Here we must note that the essential metaphysical elements of Descartes' approach are intuition, deduction, and rational restraint. For him, language, corrected with mathematical precision, is considered the main mechanism of an infallible weapon for purifying the mind. He believes that the essence of the state's defense system lies in the ability to realize internal security, that is, in the wisdom to distinguish between truth and error.

The question is, how does this principle work in the defense system? When a citizen acquires the competence of analytical thinking, this means that he is able to break down his problem into its simplest parts, as is done in geometry, and therefore "he no longer falls into radicalism" [6]. Descartes' "temporary morality" motivates a person to verify his actions with mathematical precision, to reject all illusions in a law-abiding manner, thereby protecting his country from chaos.

As for Hobbes's approach, here we see the monopolization of the linguistic code by the ruler; more specifically: for Hobbes, mathematically correct language is considered a direct tool of civil engineering. Accordingly, "if we allow people to determine the meaning of words for themselves, they will always be at war" [8]. How does this principle work as a defense tool? At Hobbes' request, the agenda should have been to dismantle the scholastic orientation and vague conceptual apparatus of both the university and church systems as a facilitator of rebellion against the ruler. Instead, in his opinion, the state should introduce a "civil doctrine of mathematical precision" [8] If it becomes possible for the concepts of "justice" or "treason" to have only one meaning, which is mathematically strictly defined by the ruler, then it is expected that ideological sabotage and the organization of civil war will become technically impossible, which, naturally, is the best guarantee of the country's defense [9]. Given the interest of our research, it is interesting to read "Conversations on Thinking" by the modern Georgian philosopher Merab Mamardashvili, from his famous lecture series, in particular, 'Lecture 23' with a title "On Metaphysics". According to the Georgian thinker, Metaphysical thinking, as a unifying act of consciousness, determines a person's place in the world; and ethics is considered a process as the context of the practical expression of cognition. In this discourse, security does not mean physical protection, but the internal, spiritual qualitative state of a person, so that he can preserve himself through thinking, through the principles of morality:

"Why do I call thought metaphysics? – For one simple reason: when I want to distinguish thought from ideology: We are accustomed to treating thought as a tool or a means to an end. Whereas in reality such a tool is our way of thinking, and the goal in this case becomes the retention of thought with the help of an already existing tool. This metaphysical sense of life ultimately determines the realm of human morality: Morality, like thought, is autonomous (unique) - there are no

reasons for its existence in the world; Moral action, like thought, either exists or does not. A moral act is characterized by respect for the moral law as such and the fulfillment of duty, which gives a person not a theoretical, but a vital confidence for the management of his own freedom" [10].

If, while listening to a lecture, we were to ask the following question: "How does metaphysics connect ethics and security?", we believe we would get an answer in this form: The metaphysical problem of security and the ethics of human freedom are two sides of the same coin. Metaphysical security is not physical survival, but the preservation of the integrity of the soul and consciousness. This security is directly proportional to the extent to which a person practices the Ethics of Freedom. In our opinion, "this conception insisted upon negative liberty as the political complement to the human capacity for free choice, and made matching metaphysical claims" [11].

Accordingly, the search relationship can be explained by several clear principles:

- *Inner support against external chaos*: The metaphysical threat is the degradation of man, his captivity to illusions, fears, and other people's ideologies. Escape from this threat is possible only through the ethics of freedom - when a person refuses comfortable automatisms and chooses to own himself.
- *Fear as the enemy of security*: When a person seeks only physical or social security (guarantees, stability), he is ready to give up his freedom and turn into a puppet. For Mamardashvili, this is a metaphysical catastrophe. True security requires overcoming fear and taking the ethical risk of acting freely.
- *Responsibility as a protective shield*: The ethics of freedom means recognizing that you are the sole cause of your actions. When a person accepts this responsibility, his consciousness becomes invulnerable to external manipulation. This responsibility is precisely the guarantor of metaphysical security.
- *Being in oneself (authenticity)*: If a person does not think and act ethically (with one's own inner truth), one loses touch with being. You are metaphysically safe only when you are authentic—when your thoughts, words, and deeds are one.

Thus, metaphysical security is achieved not through isolation or defense, but through the ethical act of freedom. A person is safe when no one and nothing can take away from him or her what he or she is.

Merab Mamardashvili, in his lecture course entitled "Kantian Variations", directly answers the question of how freedom, ethics, and metaphysical security are intertwined. For him, Immanuel Kant is a thinker who showed that a person is only safe and free when he acts autonomously. The point is that Immanuel Kant's "Metaphysics of Morals" does not consider the peaceful life of people to be the natural state of their existence; rather, it is the opposite, that is, the natural state implies, if not war, at least the systematic threat of war. Accordingly, peace must be achieved on purpose [12]. In the context of war, Kant introduces the concept of hostility and defines it in two ways: first, that we can only treat as hostile someone who violates our rights by deed, and second, that whoever we recognize as an enemy must be characterized by a civil state. The point is that by entering this state, social reality guarantees a person security.

Kant's point of view is interpreted in a peculiar way by the contemporary Italian philosopher Julius Evola in his study "The Metaphysics of War", where he rejects the idea of security in the modern bourgeois sense and contrasts it with the concept of spiritual heroism, according to which the pursuit of security is considered weakness, and taking on danger and risk is the highest existential manifestation of personal self-realization. With that In Chapter Six "The Army as a World View: The Ethical Aspect" the main principle of Evola's metaphysical worldview reflects a critique of peace and security, namely: in his opinion, peaceful existence and security, as a comfort zone, lead to mental degradation and spiritual death [9].

For our part, we will note that when evaluating Immanuel Kant's ethics, the connection between the concepts emphasized above, through the discussion of ontological security, is revealed in several key aspects:

- *Ethical autonomy as a metaphysical defense*: According to Kant, moral action should not be conditioned by external guidance or heteronomous dictates—fear, benefit, fear of punishment, or expectation of reward. Kant emphasizes that when a person acts according to external laws, he is immune to manipulation. True metaphysical security is achieved only when a person is the author of his own moral law, that is, autonomy is achieved.
- *The categorical imperative as a structure of consciousness*: The categorical imperative - "Act so that your conduct becomes a universal law" - is not a dry rule, but a form of consciousness. It is an effort by which a person renounces his selfish fears, that is, a narrow understanding of his own physical safety, and chooses a higher order of being [12].
- *Freedom as the only metaphysical reality*: Like Mamardashvili, Kant believes that freedom cannot be theoretically proven, but it becomes real at the moment of an ethical act. When a person makes a moral choice without any external guarantees, he goes beyond the physical world, that is, the category of cause and effect, and enters the space of metaphysical freedom [13].
- *Moral Duty and Overcoming Fear*: In Kantian ethics, "Duty" confronts human inclinations and fears. According to him, when a person fulfills his moral duty, he is freed from the existential fear of death and destruction. This is the highest security—when spiritual integrity is more precious than biological survival [12].

As it turns out, according to Immanuel Kant, an ethical act is a person's discovery of the "divine" or noumenal beginning within themselves, which, in Merab Mamardashvili's language, means finding the only space where a person is absolutely inviolable and free. It is noteworthy that the inseparable synthesis of ethics, metaphysics, and security is based

on the idea of law in Gustav Radbruch's philosophy of law. According to his conception, the supreme goal of law is expressed in universal justice, which has metaphysical and ethical foundations, although it is constantly in a state of balance with the legitimate certainty of security.

The main aspects of Radbruch's concept can be interpreted in the following order:

- The triad of the idea of law, the specificity of which is determined by its fundamental values;
- The concept of Justice - with the establishment of formal equality and universal objective norms;
- The concept of Purposefulness - with the consideration of collective benefit and social interests;
- The concept of Legal Certainty - with the stable and positive understanding of law, whereby the law is provided with a clearly predictable and enforceable nature [14].

It seems that in Radbruch's conception, the unity of metaphysics and ethics with security aims to clearly distinguish between legality and illegality. More specifically:

- The access to metaphysical values implies elevating universal inherent values to a metaphysical level and placing the principles of natural law above positive legislation.
- Ethical justice recognizes morally valuable standards that prioritize human dignity and require the impeccable protection and establishment of the principle of equality.
- Legal security is focused on the stability of the law in order to eliminate disorder and arbitrariness [14].

Thus, in Radbruch's doctrine, security is considered the main goal of positive law. But in the case when positive law, disguised in the name of security, turns into injustice by ignoring the ethical minimum and diminishing individual natural rights, by virtue of the "Radbruch formula", the force of law is subordinate to it and formal priority is given to ethics and justice. Here we must also take into account the radical difference between legal certainty and moral justice, that is, the stability of the law and the law's compliance with ethical norms.

#### 4. Research Results

The Study shows that the history of political philosophical thought has repeatedly offered metaphysical instructions as a theoretical basis for an ontological understanding of security. Based on the purpose of the research, the fundamental concepts of the most prominent representatives of the Cartesian doctrine, i.e. rationalist philosophy, on the one hand, and the state of nature theory (*Status naturalis*), on the other hand, are discussed, in other words, the metaphysical technologies of forming the concept of ontological security are vividly illustrated in the fundamental philosophical texts of the thinkers we have selected, namely:

- Rene Descartes' treatises – „Discourse on the Method“ & „Meditations on First Philosophy“ - laid the foundation for the era of rationalism in political philosophy. Their core idea - questioning everything and arriving at truth solely through pure mental analysis - is considered the cornerstone of creating an ideal state based on reason; true clarity and infallibility, which constitute the bedrock of any political and social justification, are achieved only through the application of universal mathematical methods, wherein the state order is conceptualized as a precise mathematical model, and its management and security systems rely on algorithmic regularities and strict, logical sequences
- Thomas Hobbes's "Leviathan" as a symbol of a pessimistic worldview, embodies the immanent nature of the human race - the eternal striving for political stability. It is the realization of this natural longing that is embodied in the provision of security by the state system, which includes both existing military-political and conscious spiritual-mental power.
- The moral-ethical spirit of Immanuel Kant's 'Categorical Imperative' in "Metaphysics of Morals" with two contextual parts: "Metaphysical Principles of Jurisprudence" and "Metaphysical Principles of the Doctrine of Virtue", where discussion of guaranteeing the country's security implies the absence of international law and peace must be achieved on purpose.
- Gustav Radbruch's postulate in "Five Minutes of Legal Philosophy" under the concept of natural law: the most unjust laws are void of legal force. According to the "Radbruch Formula" justice must transcend legal authority, which contradicts the positivist logic that underlies witnessing Nazi violence.
- Merab Mamardashvili's existential "Conversations on Thinking" explains: Metaphysics can be considered a very strange technology for constructing conceptual thought in the realm of free will. It appears to us as an act of universal human existence, a phenomenon of thought as an event in the world; it is in its elusive system that we see how the socio-political context shapes the ethical tools in our thinking.

In the philosophical dictionary, the concepts of "self-defense and security" are understood in the sense of the background of both the physical and moral and social existence of a person. As it turns out, in different eras, different theoretical worldviews considered these concepts not so much in the narrow, legal sense of security, but in a more metaphysical sense as the ontological certainty of personal freedom, intellectual potential, and the content of the state. To illustrate this, we have included key excerpts from individual thoughts with relevant concepts in Table 2.

Table 2. Metaphysical Understanding of Defence and Security: Basic Conceptual Similarities and Differences

| Thinker                    | Work = Concept                     | Metaphysical Understanding of Defence and Security                                                                                                            | Basic Similarity                                                                                                    | Essential Difference                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Rene Descartes</b>      | "Meditations on First Philosophy"  | Security is based on the strength of one's mind and thinking: "Cogito, ergo sum". Mental defense against error is the highest guarantee.                      | They consider intelligence and security of thought to be the main conditions for achieving defense.                 | He sees security in the internal, epistemological realm, not in the socio-political.                                       |
| <b>Thomas Hobbes</b>       | "Leviathan"                        | Self-defense is a natural right, and the main instrument of security is the "Leviathan" (the state), which protects people from "the war of all against all." | Defense and security are viewed as objective realities and a necessity for the physical survival of the individual. | Security is achieved by partially surrendering individual freedom (social contract) in favor of the state.                 |
| <b>Immanuel Kant</b>       | "Metaphysics of Morals"            | Security is a result of the legal order, while self-defense is a moral (intelligible) concept based on human autonomy and freedom.                            | Shares the view that security and defense are impossible without the state and law.                                 | For Kant, security and defense are a moral duty and a rational goal aimed at universal peace.                              |
| <b>Gustav Radbruch</b>     | "Five Minutes of Legal Philosophy" | Legal security is the foundation of order. It protects people not only from the arbitrariness of the state, but also from the injustice of the law.           | Security is directly linked to justice and fundamental human rights.                                                | It focuses on how the state and law itself should be protected from unjust laws.                                           |
| <b>Merab Mamardashvili</b> | "Conversations on Thinking"        | Protection/self-defense of one's inner freedom and mind. Security means being in alignment with oneself in thinking and not running away from oneself.        | Based on Cartesian rationalism security is the result of mental and philosophical activity.                         | It is focused on the existential and conscious protection of the individual from external violence and ideological dogmas. |

As we can see, the main conceptual similarities can be considered: the primacy of reason, since for all the thinkers considered, defense and security require a conscious and rational approach, and also the need for law, since they equally agree that the perfect guarantee of external security is institutional order. And the emphasis of the difference is on the external and internal spheres: for Descartes and Mamardashvili, security is an internal, mental equilibrium, while for Hobbes, Kant, and Radbruch it is an external, socio-legal process. The method is also different: Hobbes sees security in the centralization of power, Descartes in a rational order, Kant in the categorical imperative and morality, and Radbruch in a legal state that protects human rights. The balance between security and justice is most clearly discussed in the works of Thomas Hobbes and Gustav Radbruch: both see clearly what the consequences of blind obedience to the law or extreme subjectivism are. The analytical and historical-comparative data presented in the paper in tabular format highlight the conclusions of our research, namely: for what purpose and with what load, the ontological problems relevant to modernity were analyzed in favor of a metaphysical understanding of security.

Based on the goals of our research, the reflection of the theoretical-axiological consequences of the ontological practice of security in the context of ethical-political discourse is connected with the mathematical foundations of the metaphysical formalization of defense - by solving the following main tasks. Finding formal concepts of metaphysical standards in security ontology and selecting the appropriate mathematical apparatus for working with their bases: analytical comparison and algorithmic analysis, as shown by the data in the Table 1 and Table 2. For greater clarity, we present excerpts from the reviewed scientific sources: logical-analytical data confirm both the historical similarities and the different formalized archetypes of metaphysical approaches within the ethical-political discourse of security. More specifically:

The thinkers we have discussed understand and analyze security as a necessary prerequisite for both physical survival and mental and moral autonomy. However, when we analyze „the essence of the history of the evolution of the paroemic views on the question of the moral existence of the cognitive mental risks in the process of the logical decision-making“[15] they are presented with radically different archetypal bases: for Hobbes in the form of power, for Descartes in

the form of rationalism, for Kant, in the form of the categorical imperative, for Radbruch, in the form of justice, and for Mamardashvili, in the form of freedom of consciousness. A summary outline of the conceptual differences regarding the archetypal basis of the ontological foundations of security is presented in the form of a detailed diagram in the Table 3.

Table 3. Archetypal differences of security concepts from an ethical perspective

| Author + Basic Concept                               | Archetype                                                 | Ethical Aspect                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rene Descartes' Safety of mind                       | <i>"Methodical defense"</i> :<br>Rationalist security     | The prerequisite for security is the overcoming of doubt and the achievement of universal reliability of cognition. "I think, therefore I am" is the basis of absolute truth. Accordingly, security becomes the protection of the mind from irrational errors. A person is safe when his ethical choices and appropriate behavior are carried out not by blind faith, but by correct, logical reasoning                                      |
| Thomas Hobbes' Physical survival                     | <i>"Leviathanian defense"</i> :<br>Institutional security | In the state of nature, "man is a wolf to man," that is, there is a "war of all against all" and a constant fear of destruction. In order to physically save himself, man renounces his natural rights and enters into a "social contract," thereby transferring power to the state, or Leviathan. So, morality here is subordinate to law and order, that is, the guarantor of ethical behavior is the state itself, which creates security |
| Immanuel Kant's Moral autonomy                       | <i>Deontological defense</i> :<br>Obligatory security     | The basis of security as a guarantee of human dignity is the "categorical imperative": act so that your rule of action becomes a universal law. That is, true security is not simply physical survival, but also the spiritual and moral freedom of a person. And the state must legally ensure the inviolability of individual freedom                                                                                                      |
| = Gustav Radbruch's The formula of justice           | <i>Formal defense</i> :<br>Legal security                 | The agenda is to balance security and justice in a reasonable manner. That is, positive law is preferentially implemented even in cases of injustice, except for the exception when the edge of injustice becomes unbearable. Accordingly, the morality of security fluctuates within the framework of the rule of law, which guarantees the protection of the individual in conditions of totalitarian disorder                             |
| Merab Mamardashvili's Transcendence of consciousness | <i>Phenomenological defense</i> :<br>Existential security | Man is in danger of alienated existence. Security and freedom are achieved only when a thinking act of self-awareness and the formation of a personality within oneself takes place. The ethical here coincides with the responsibility of the thinking subject before himself. Physical or political security is valuable only when it does not limit the inner freedom of man                                                              |

As for principled congruences and Ideological connections in an ethical context, from this perspective, we can group the concepts of the thinkers we have discussed into pairs based on common criteria.

A summary outline of the conceptual convergences regarding the archetypal basis of the ontological foundations of security is presented in the form of a detailed diagram in the Table 4.

Table 4. Conceptual similarities and connections from an ethical perspective

| Rene Descartes                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Immanuel Kant                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Thomas Hobbes                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Gustav Radbruch |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>The Supremacy of Reason:</b><br>the main basis of human security and morality is one's own reason and the ability to use it correctly. They free the ethical framework from the influence of external factors, such as dogmatic pressure |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>Escape from external danger:</b><br>Hobbes recognizes the state as an instrument of physical survival, while Radbruch recognizes law as a system of norms underlying the state - a guarantee of public order and security |                 |
| Immanuel Kant                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>Protection of autonomy and freedom:</b><br>Security is not just a physical barrier. True security is the protected and preserved human dignity, in Kant's case - before the law, and in Mamardashvili's case - in the depths of consciousness |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                 |
| Merab Mamardashvili                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                 |

## 5. Summary of Findings

Summarizing our results, based on theoretical-conceptual analysis, we have linked in more detail the metaphysical existence of security and the mathematical foundations of the defense mechanism, namely:

- Rationalist ideology, founded on the universal order of mathematical logic and the universal method of mathematical thinking (perfectly realized in the Cartesian concept of Rene Descartes), has, from its contemporaneity (Thomas Hobbes' treatise) onwards, in a form interpreted many times, to the present day (Merab Mamardashvili's famous philosophical lectures), retained a certain influence on the worldview of metaphysical security.
- Within the scope of interest in ethical-political discourse, the investigation of strategic security mechanisms in the dimension of conceptual- metaphysical foundations and with an interdisciplinary focus, in particular against the background of a formal-algorithmic approach, acquires special value.
- The formal-algorithmic approach allows the research problem to be theoretically solved through a precisely defined and strictly consistent operation, and the desired result to be achieved.
- It is the formal-algorithmic thinking model that offers security ontology the potential for action principles in favor of the traditional arsenal of ethical-political reflection, namely: unambiguous determination, concrete effectiveness, and universal logic. More specifically:

## 6. Conclusions

The presented conceptual approach analyzes the metaphysical concept of security within the ethico-political discourse, where the state, its defense, and the subject's ontological security transcend traditional moral boundaries and intertwine with mathematical methods, while systemic defense and algorithmic mechanisms shape a new reality in which Mathematics and algorithms redefine the very foundations of Ethics.

Despite their differing conceptual technology proposals, all the thinkers we examined in our study, with their own analytical approach, view the state's Defence system as a rationally constructed, understandable, and manageable mechanism, and thus unanimously recognize the strategy of a unified approach that we used as a starting point in the context of our findings:

- The metaphysical understanding of security and stability originates in the awareness of the limitations of absolute freedom, which in turn leads to the alleviation or, to some extent, elimination of such evil passions as a feeling of distrust, the image of the enemy, and undefined aggression.
- The metaphysical model of security and stable existence attributes precisely the guaranteeing authority and the inviolability of moral power to state consciousness.
- The state is the only space within which internal security, a system of order, and a stable structure can exist, ensuring the peaceful potential for life and development.
- At the same time, the metaphysical approach does not exclude, and indeed allows for, and recognizes that, systemically, the state is not always able to cope with both internal and external threats.
- We can safely call the basis for achieving universal security and global stability, on the one hand, the effect of international consensus, and the centralization of supranational institutionalism, on the other.

Each of the thinkers we have discussed has a specific focus on security: with Thomas Hobbes, security is viewed as survival, with Immanuel Kant as legal guarantee, with Rene Descartes as internal, mental defense, with Gustav Radbruch as legal security, with Merab Mamardashvili as constitutional or security of consciousness. Security in their metaphysical concepts develops from physical protection (Hobbes) to legal order (Kant, Radbruch) and finally moves to the level of protection of consciousness, reason and human dignity (Descartes, Mamardashvili). Ultimately, true security implies not simply protection by force, but the rule of law and the existence of a free-thinking individual.

Focusing future work on the ontological conception of Mission Management will allow us to outline the algorithms and mathematical foundations of the prerequisites of a metaphysical knowledge system as rational instruments of state defense in the formalized concepts of political philosophy.

**Acknowledgements.** The co-authors would like to thank the first author of the paper, Assistant Professor Irma Bagrationi, from Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, for her direct and active participation in the creation of the idea for the paper and its scientific, stylistic, technical, and visual editing.

## References

1. Petriashvili K. Critical Thinking as an Important Factor in the Formation of a Military Leader, *Scientific Journal of David Aghmashenebeli National Defence Academy of Georgia: Military Papers*, №3. Gori: 2024, pp. 126-132. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61446/mp.3.2024.8500>
2. Waltz K.N. *Theory of International Politics*, Volume One, First Edition. Long Grove, Illinois, Waveland Press, 2010, pp. 90-105. - URL: [https://www.biblio.com/9781577666707?srsId=AfmBOopa\\_5xXNmKzTM4MkYcFWr63a-RrQE2bp0XYJ7ZIneMIZjx\\_R8vT](https://www.biblio.com/9781577666707?srsId=AfmBOopa_5xXNmKzTM4MkYcFWr63a-RrQE2bp0XYJ7ZIneMIZjx_R8vT)
3. Steele B.J. Ontological security in international relations: Self-identity and the IR state (New International Relations). Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge, 2014, pp. 54-72. - URL: <https://www.amazon.com/Ontological-Security-International-Relations-Self-Identity/dp/B010WHHA2Q>
4. Gehl, K.M., Porter M.E. *The Politics Industry: How Political Innovation Can Break Partisan Gridlock and Save Our Democracy*. Harvard Business School, Cambridge, MA, 2020, pp. 110-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12587>
5. Didmanidze I., Bagrationi I. Ethics of Information Technology in the Context of a Global Worldview, In: MCIT 2021. Rivne, 2021, pp. 38-41. <https://doi.org/10.31713/MCIT.2021.10>
6. Descartes Rene. *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Translator: Sergi Danelia, Tbilisi: "iBooks", 2021. - 59 pages. – URL: <https://ibooks.ge/books/metafizikuri-ganazrebani/1079>
7. Szczurek T., Gornikiewicz M. Security in the Philosophical Thought of Thomas Hobbes. *European Research Studies Journal*, 2025, XXVIII (1), pp. 67-78. – URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ers/journal/vxxviii/2025i1p67-78.html>
8. Hobbes T. *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil: The First Part: Of Man*. London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1651, pp. 9-60. – URL: <https://historyofeconomicthought.mcmaster.ca/hobbes/Leviathan.pdf>
9. Evola J. *Metaphysics of War: Battle, Victory and Death in the World of Tradition*. The Third English Edition. United Kingdom: Arktos Media Ltd. 2011, pp. 47-54. – URL: <https://ia801200.us.archive.org/20/items/EvolaFR/JuliusEvola-theMetaphysicsOfWar.pdf>
10. Mamardashvili M.K. *Conversations on Thinking*. Editor and compiler: E.M. Mamardashvili. Moscow: Merab Mamardashvili Foundation. 2015, pp. 496-499. - URL: <https://mamardashvili.com/ru/work/published-by-fund/besedy-o-myshlenii2>
11. Bagrationi I., On the Risks of Ethical Decision-Making from the History of the Political Thought, *Cybernetics and Computer Technologies*, Issue 4. Kyiv. 2021, pp. 89-94. - URL: <https://doi.org/10.34229/2707-451X.21.4.9>
12. Qvortrup M. Kant's Political Philosophy. *Philosophy Now: a magazine of ideas* [online]. 2022. Available from: [https://philosophynow.org/issues/150/Kants\\_Political\\_Philosophy](https://philosophynow.org/issues/150/Kants_Political_Philosophy)
13. Mitzen J. Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2006, 12(3), pp. 341–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066106067346>
14. Radbruch G. Five Minutes of Legal Philosophy (1945). *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 2006, 26 (1), pp. 13–15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/ggi042>
15. Didmanidze I., Bagrationi I., Trusevich I. From the History of Information Ethics: the Culture and Risks of Organizing Political Information, In: *Modern Challenges and Achievements in Information and Communication Technologies 2025/Transactions*, 4, 2026, pp. 249-256. - URL: <https://papers.4science.ge/index.php/mcaaict/article/view/416>

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of CNDCGS 2026 and/or the editor(s). CNDCGS 2026 and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.