Rolanda Kazlauskaitė-Markelienė, Audronė Petrauskaitė[*]
The General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania

Civil Society and National Security: A Theoretical Survey of the Problem

The article provides a theoretical analysis of the interaction between the state national security policy and civil society in order to find out the causes arising from the contradictions of this interaction. Grounded on the survey of the development of the conception of civil society and civil consciousness, the controversial nature and complexity of the problem are disclosed. Causes of the contradictions between civil society and the national security system are analyzed in the context of a civil identity conception on the basis of the analysis of value-related priorities. The historic integrity of civil society and the state, as the subject of national security, is surveyed in the discourse of both traditional and contemporary theories. The article presents the insights of the authors on further interaction of civil society and the state in the area of the defense of national security interests.

Introduction

Since the start of the global antiterrorist campaign – after September 11, 2001 – threats to both international and national security have become a constant topic of discussion. During the recent years, politicians, public men, scientists, and representatives of international and public organizations more and more often have been speaking about threats to civil society. Not only international terrorism, but also fighting against international terrorism is being named as threatening phenomena, causing danger to modern civil society[1]. Fighting against terrorism, concerns related to safeguarding the security of the state, national security and defense tasks make state institutions, far from rarely, restrict the rights and freedoms of citizens. Such restrictions or, moreover, prohibitions become dangerous to society and the democratic state since they impede its civil development and formation and development processes of its civil consciousness. However, civil society itself sometimes is treated as

---

[*] *Dr. Rolanda Kazlauskaitė-Markelienė* is a Head of the Humanities Department of the Military Academy of Lithuania. Address for correspondence: Šilo 5a, LT-10322 Vilnius, Lithuania, tel: +370 5 2103566, e-mail: rolanda.kazlauskaite@mil.lt. *Dr. Audronė Petrauskaitė* is an Associated Professor of the Humanities Department of the of the Military Academy of Lithuania. Address for correspondence: Šilo 5a, LT-10322 Vilnius, Lithuania, tel: +370 5 2103567, e-mail: audrone.petrauskaite@gmail.com.
[1] Threats to civil society from war on terror, http://www.neurope.eu/articles/90134.php, 22 09 2010; *Sociologai: gyventojų pilietinį aktyvumą slopina iš jo kylančios grėsmės.* (Sociologists: civil activeness of the population is suppressed by threats arising from it). http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/2009-01-20-sociologai-gyventoju-pilietini-aktyvuma-slopina-is-jo-kylancios-gresmes/29340, 6 09 2010.

a premise creating favorable conditions for terror attacks[2]. While analyzing the interaction of the state national security policy and civil society, the latter does not seem to be unambiguosly positive: civil society is a guarantor of the national security of the state; on the other hand tasks of the national security policy can become and are indicated as one of the most important threats to modern civil society itself[3].

In order to disclose contradictions that emerge as the result of the interaction between civil society and state national security, it is necessary to analyze not only the determinants of this interaction, but also the essence of civil society itself. The analysis of the conceptions of civil society, civil consciousness, civil self-awareness and civil identity would help reveal the complexity and contradictoriness of civil society as a public and political phenomenon and also perceive the ambiguous relationship with the system of the national security of the state.

The Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the Basics of National Security stipulates that "The system of Lithuania's national security is based on the activities of the state institutions and participation of every citizen of Lithuania, on the open civil society, aware of the dangers and its responsibility, civic minded and prepared to defend the freedom of Lithuania"[4]. Human and citizen's rights, freedoms and personal security are pointed out to be among the main objects of the national security, whereas citizens, their associations and organizations alongside the state and its institutions of national security and defence as well as other institutions as subjects for ensuring the national security. The Law has established a direct dependence between the national security system of Lithuania and Lithuania's civil society; their interaction seems natural and self-explanatory and that constructs the integrity of relations between the national security policy of the democratic state and the creation and development of its civil society. Tasks of national security policy of the State in Lithuania are not directly associated with the threat to civil society and political activeness. Actual threats to the population of the country lie in the fact that, by participating in civil actions, they can lose their jobs, be treated as oddities in their neighbourhoods, be verbally attacked, slandered, suspected of self-serving stimulus in their actions or their lives can be threatened[5]. The identification of threats to civil consciousness indicates that the civil society of our country is only in the initial stage of its formation. Lithuania's situation presupposes the actuality and conceptuality of the creation of civil society as the aim as well as the problem.

---

[2] Sauter M., Carafano J.J., Homeland security– a complete guide to understanding, preventing, and surviving terrorism, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2005, p.3.

[3] *Indicators of threats to civil society,* http://www.civicus.org/csw/csw-early-warning-system/indicators-of-threats-to-civil-society, 23 09 2010.

[4] *Lietuvos Respublikos Nacionalinio saugumo pagrindų įstatymas,* Valstybės žinios, 1997, Nr. 2-16. Relevant wording from 28 11 2009.

[5] Degutis M., Ramonaitė A., Žiliukaitė R. „*Lietuvos visuomenės pilietinės galios indeksas",* 2007 metai, http://www.civitas.lt/lt/?pid=74&id=78, 2 09 2010.

A versatile analysis of factors and processes of civil society formation is important for present-day researchers; however, the case of Lithuania makes it imperative to pay particular attention to the relationship and interaction between the civil society of the country and the national security system. In the discourse of problems of the Lithuanian civil society now under formation, we can single out two aspects: first, the attitude of the citizens to the issues of national security and defence; second, the role of the national security system in creating and developing civil society in the country. At present, the issues of national security and state defence are practically eliminated from the theoretical discourse of civil consciousness concept and active citizenship conception. In the insights presented by Lithuanian scientists, civil consciousness of the population is most often understood as their active involvement in the political life of the country, in the solution of social and economic problems, in the activity of communities, etc. In the program documents, submitted by civil organizations, the problems of the national security of the state are most often limited to the tasks of ensuring energy security[6]. However, in the "Long-Term Program on Civil and National Development" approved by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, it is pointed out that civil consciousness is "awareness of the person's rights, responsibility and obligations to the democratic State, activity for the good of society, defence of the rights, freedoms and democracy of co-citizens, striving for the welfare of Lithuania"[7]. This definition of civil consciousness covers a very wide spectrum of civil activity of the population – including their participation in the solution of problems of national security and defence of the state. Therefore, it is not clear why tasks of ensuring the defence and security of the state are not integrated (ignored or simply forgotten?) into the conception of the activeness of Lithuanian citizens.

The aim of the article is to provide a theoretical survey of the interaction between the national security policy of the state and civil society, to disclose causes arising from the contradictions of this interaction, grounded on the analysis of the problematic nature of the development of the conception of civil society and civil consciousness and relations of the individual and collective identity of the personality within the context of the conception of civil identity.

---

[6] *Programa Lietuvai - Pilietinės visuomenės pasiūlymai,* http://tautostaryba.lt/Programa-Lietuvai-Pilieti-nes-visuomenes-pasiulymai/%28offset%29/10, 03 09 2010.
[7] Ilgalaikė pilietinio ir tautinio ugdymo programa,
http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter2/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=283042&p_query=&p_tr2, 03 09 2010.

1. National Security, Values and Civil Identity: the Problem of Mutual Relationship.

It is difficult to unambiguously define the concept of the national security of the state because both in the scientific literature and everyday-life discourse its interpretation is rather diverse. Traditionally, the conception of national security implies both the conception of safeguarding the sovereignty of the State by employing political, economic and military powers as well as the diplomatic capabilities of the country and its defensive means from the danger which also include defense from external adversaries and other threats and safeguarding of state secrets[8]. However, as B. Buzan claims "the very nature of the security concept precludes from formulating its accurate definition"[9] because it integrates in itself various phenomena (military, political, economic environment protection, etc.) of State and security life as well as different security levels (i.e. individual, national and international).

The national security of Lithuania is understood as the creation of conditions for a free and democratic development of the Nation and the State, the protection and defence of the independence of the State of Lithuania, its territorial integrity and constitutional order, whereas the national security system of Lithuania shall be the aggregate of approved for this purpose provisions, principles and forms of activities of the State and the citizens, measures, laws and other legal acts, as well as the institutions established by the State for this purpose, principles of their activity and means of their mutual interaction[10]. The definition of the national security of Lithuania encompasses the level of national security and in essence focuses on the sectors of the state's political and military life, i.e. where state institutions have established themselves the strongest. However, the conception of national security itself, developed in the Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the Basics of National Security, also covers other areas of the state and society life, i.e. economy, culture, ecology, demography, public order, etc. Long-term programmes of enhancing national security, approved by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania (for example, ensuring environmental safety, rational use and protection of national resources, support for natural population growth, crime prevention and control, national program for fighting against corruption, protection of cultural heritage, etc.) reflect those problems of our country which are perceived as threats to the security of the existence of the Nation and the State. As David A. Baldwin claims, in contemporary society, national security interests are more often associated with states' policy on issues of domestic and foreign policy than the very conception of national security and it is because of that that in solving national security

---

[8] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_security#National_security_and_rights_.26_freedoms; http://encarta.msn.com/dictionary_1861696682/national_security.html, 23 11 2010.
[9] Buzan B., *Žmonės, valstybės ir baimės,* Vilnius: Eugrimas, 1997, p. 49.
[10] *Lietuvos Respublikos Nacionalinio saugumo pagrindų įstatymas,* Valstybės Žinios, 1997, No. 2–16. Relevant wording from 28 11 2009.

issues priorities are granted to human rights, economic interests, criminality, social injustice, etc., but not to the traditional threat to national security – i.e. external military threats[11]. This means that priorities of national security are determined by people or their groups according to the system of their values or taking into consideration the nature of threats to certain values.

One of the essential theoretical premises of the conception of national security should be the conception of values and hierarchy in terms of the person and the State. It is the values-related aspect of national security that is emphasized in both early definitions of national security which were formulated by Walter Lippmann, Arnold Wolfers, the National Security Council of the USA and later treatments by Amos Jordan and William Taylor[12]. As early as fifty years ago, Arnold Wolfers pointed out that the concept of national security (like that of national interest) is very suitable in the political discourse of international relations to define the exclusiveness of political objectives[13]. The scientist stressed the moral dilemma that politicians have to constantly solve in the political discourse of national security: the relation of national values that must be defended with fundamental values, such as freedom, justice and peace[14]. Scientists Charles Andrain and Joseph Smith claim that the problem of values becomes particularly important from the point of view of the national security system of each state because states for which such values of democracy as tolerance, citizens' rights and freedoms become priorities are much more resistant to external and internal threats since values consolidate society, presuppose respect and trust for state institutions of the country and strengthen its political system[15]. Paul Bracken, while exploring the problematics of mutual relations between society and the military, states that the contradictoriness of the interaction between the USA civilian part of society and military personnel is determined by different value systems of these two parts of society, the compatibility of which is achieved by focusing attention on national values as a priority[16]. Thus, it is possible to claim that values can consolidate society, by becoming the guarantor of the national security of the state, but can also divide it by becoming a threat to the national security system. Yet, it becomes undefined which of the values is the consolidating and which one the disintegrating factor; which values – universal, democratic or national – should

[11] Baldwin D. A. The concept of security. Review of International Studies (1997), 23, 5–26, *http://tau.ac.il/~daniel/pdf/37.* , 10 01 2011.

[12] Romm J.J. *Definning National Security. The Nonmilitary Aspects,* N.Y.: Concil of Foreighn Relations Press, 1993, p. 5.

[13] Wolfers A. "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol, *Political Science Quarterly*, 67 (1952), p. 483, http://instituty.fsv.cuni.cz/~plech/Wolfers_BS.pdf, 01 14 2011.

[14] Wolfers A. "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol, *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(1952), p.500, http://instituty.fsv.cuni.cz/~plech/Wolfers_BS.pdf, 14 01 2011.

[15] Andrain Ch. F., Smith J.T. *Political Democracy, Trust, and Social Justice*, USA: Northeastern University press, 2006, p.123-135.

[16] Bracken P. Reconsidering Civil-Military relations, *US Civil-Military Relations In Crisis or Trasition?* Ed. By Snider D.M., Carlton-Carew M.A., Washington D.C.: The Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1995, p. 156.

become values-related priorities in enhancing the national security system of the state. Therefore, the values-related issue in the national security system in essence becomes the issue of values-related priorities and at the same time a problem for enhancing the national security system of the country.

Essentially, the problematics of values-related priorities and values-related orientations is directly associated with the interaction between the national security and civil society because it can determine both the contradictoriness of their interests and their unanimity. From the theoretical point of view, if such values of modern civil society as respect, freedom, tolerance, justice and the like[17] become priorities of the state (i.e. national values), there should not exist any contradictions between the interests of the national security system and civil society because national interests of the country and the interests of civil society should coincide. By the way, the main condition of this compatibility is a mature civil society. On the other hand, the declaration of obscure "national values" as priorities can become a perfect front for state authority institutions to cover narrow interests (private, corporal or of certain interests groups) under the umbrella of the defense of national security interests of the country. A legitimate question arises: what are national values, what is their relation to civil and individual values? Since value-related priorities are closely connected with tasks and objectives of the national security policy of the state and values-related orientations are one of the essential composite parts of both individual and personal identity, the conception of civil identity and its manifestation in contemporary society becomes very significant. The statement, claiming that at the clash of individual and collective identities, essential value-related differences determining contradictions between the civil society and the national security system are formed, can become an object of discussion. Philosophers, pedagogues, historians, psychologists, sociologists, representatives of political and other sciences present different definitions of identity. Identity is the expression of the individuality, property and exclusiveness of the personality, since each individual must himself construct his identity and its expression in terms of the family, society, state and the world. In the opinion of Peter Jarvis, identity, just as thinking, is a social construct acquired through experience[18]. On the other hand, the phenomenon of identity cannot be perceived as something uniform, stable and constant because personalities construct their individual identities throughout their lives, and this process is affected by very diverse factors (national, social, religious, cultural, regional, professional, etc.)[19]. As Christopher Lasch points out, in contemporary society, identity features change, because both persons and things lose their definiteness

---

[17] *European values and Identity. A reflection for an Indispensable Discussion,* http:// tt.europeanideasnetwork.com/files/European%20Values%20and%20Identity%20Revised%20March.pdf, 12 09 2010.

[18] Jarvis, P., *Mokymosi paradoksai*. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, 2001, p.41.

[19] Grigas, R., *Tautinės tapatybės drama*, http://www.elibrary.lt/resursai/Ziniasklaida/LLKC/liaudies_kultura/Lk06_2.pdf, 09 10 2010.

and continuity[20]. According to Martin Zilinek, in modern democratic society, national consciousness and the cultural identity of the nation can be interpreted only in a multicultural context, since the culture and national values of each nation naturally interact with other cultures and value-related systems of other nations. Thus, the identity of the modern individual is not the result of the personality, but that of the influence of identities of various social groups (ethnic, national, state, continental). It is the interaction of the latter that should be treated as the civilization of humankind[21].

In the opinion of Manuel Castells, identity categories can be divided into two groups: imposed and created. The former have historical and geographic roots. The latter are created in the process of constructing a social action while seeking spirituality and meaning. Material for constructing identity is supplied by history, geography, biology, production and reproduction institutions, collective memory and personal fantasies, power apparatuses and religious revelations. Individuals process these materials and rearrange their meaning according to social definitions that "make up the basis of the system of their own structure as well as space and time"[22]. Gellner, while analyzing modern civil society and its connections with civil society of the ancient city and other forms of its historical development, emphasizes that one of the essential features of modern civil society lies in the conception of individual identity: the identity of the modern individual has been chosen and not imposed/ascribed[23].

Describing modern society as a network society, Castells claims that at the end of the 20th century, as a balance for globalization and cosmopolitanism processes, the world saw an explosion of a wave of massive numbers of cultural identities, which gave birth to the ambiguous interaction of state institutions, social movements and different identity forms[24]. Castells, emphasizing the influence of collective identity on modern political processes, provides the insight that the content and meaning of collective identity for the shaping of individual identity determine the nature and aims of the factors constructing it. The scientist points out the forms of the creation of modern identity, i.e. the legitimizing identity, the resistance identity, the project identity[25]. Dominant institutions of society, having the aim to expand and rationalize their domination over social actors, introduce legitimizing identity. The author points out that on the basis of legitimizing identity civil society is established which is named as the aggregate of organizations and systematized and organized social actors which reproduces identity rationalizing sources of structural do-

---

[20] Lasch, Ch. The Minimal Self; Psychic Survival in Troubled Times. London: Pan Books. 1985.
[21] Zilinek M. National Consciousness, Multiculturalism and Democratic Citizenship: Value Phenomena in the Formation of the Moral Identity of a Personality, *Civil Society as Democratic Practice/*Ed. By Perez A.F., Gueye S. P., Yang F., Washington D.C.: Cardinal Station, 2005, p. 277.
[22] Castells M., *Tapatumo galia*, Vilnius: Poligrafija ir informatika, 2006, p. 23.
[23] Gellner E., *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Rivals*, http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/liberty.html, 29 09 2010.
[24] Castells M., (note 22) p. 18.
[25] Ibid, p. 20-24.

mination. Resistance identity "is construction of defense identity with reference to dominant institutions and ideologies when the value-related solution is granted a contrary meaning and at the same time borders are strengthened"[26]. The identity in question stimulates the establishment of communities based on collective responsibility. Social actors, on the basis of project identity, arising from community resistance and using all culturally available resources, shape a new identity, defining their status in society, and at the same time seeking to transform the whole social structure. Supporting Gramsci's conception of the dual nature of civil society, Castells sees in institutional identity an interaction between the power of the state and institutions of civil society, whereas in the resistance identity he finds what separates these institutions. However, the scientist states that in network society institutional identity has been struck by a fundamental crisis and project identity, arising from resistance, is becoming dominant. The new collective identity is shaped by dissociating itself from both civil society and state institutions. Castells's conception seeks to substantiate the hypothetical idea that in the contemporary world the conception of civil society is losing its traditional cultural, social and local definition. However, additionally, the mentioned civil identity theory discloses the mutual interaction mechanism of civil society and the state: civil consciousness, as the expression of individual and collective identity, is affected by two identity forms – legitimizing and resistance. Therefore, civil society as a counter to the power of the state is determined by objective differences (social, cultural, political, religious, etc.) of these two identities.

Having summarized the supplied theoretical insights, it is possible to state that the concept of national security in scientific literature is not sufficiently defined and implies many contradictions and problems. Yet, at the same time it is possible to claim that the State is the primary national security object[27]. However, the system of the national security of the state is an inherent part of its political system since, as has been mentioned before, the state with its national security, defense and other institutions and citizens of the state constitute an aggregate of the holistic national security system and integral subject-object interaction. Nonetheless, the issue of value-related priorities is capable of destroying that integrity and creating favorable conditions for the realization of various threats.

2. Integration of Civil Society and the State in the Discourse of Traditional Theories

Differences of value-related orientations and complex mechanisms of the formation of civil identity cannot completely explain the contradictoriness

---

[26] Ibid, p. 25.
[27] Buzan B., *Žmonės, valstybės ir baimės,* Vilnius: Eugrimas, 1997, p. 34–57.

in the activity objectives of the national security system and civil society. In order to perceive the relationship between civil society and the national security system of the State, it would first of all be necessary to find out its relationship with the state political system and its institutions. In the development of the European civilization, this relationship has kept changing, as by the way, the very conception of civil society and civil consciousness.

Aristotle formulated the initial concept of civil society as the idea of political community, i.e. *koinonia politike* – a society of free, equal citizens who have influence on the management of the state. The identifying of civil society with political community is not accidental: each citizen of Ancient Greece identified himself with the state, its political, social, economic, and cultural life. In his conception Aristotle grants the idea of political society not only political, but at the same time also an ethnic meaning because political communities consider the establishment of harmonious and just social environment by employing powers of state institutions and laws as the objective of their activity. John M. Cooper provides the insight that Aristotle's "politike koinonia" should also be analyzed as "politike philia", which is understood as a special feeling of communality, political friendship (or partnership) and solidarity without which a results-bearing political activity in the state and success of the political community are impossible[28]. Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Arato emphasize that "politike koinonia" is a unique example of collective community (or joint organization) in which striving towards separate objectives is based on the communal ethos[29]. Thus, we can state that Aristotle's conception of civil consciousness covers the amassed political operation of all community members for the benefit and good of the whole community (and at the same time of each individual), paying attention to the fact that the individual is not excluded from the whole community.

In Ancient Rome, the conception of civil society and concept of civil consciousness changed: it was begun to identify civil society with public affairs by separating them from private, family ones. The concept "societas civilis", introduced by Cicero, though being the Latin translation of Aristotle's "politike koinonia", is identified with "res publika" and is defined as a "multitude of people, having a unanimous opinion of legal norms and common interests, a gathering"[30]. These changes were determined by transformations that had taken place in the outlook of the individual and social changes in the life of the state (i.e. the separation of individual life from the public one). Cicero bases the conception of civil society on the feeling of communality which is characteristic of people and makes them curb their individual, often egotistical interests, for the good of the whole community. Thus, Cicero was the first in

---

[28] Cooper J. M., Political Animals and Civil Friendship in *Aristotle's Politics. Critical Esseys*, p.85-91, http://books.google.com/books?id=bO0d- , hXxEfQC&pg=PA86&dq=politike+koinonia&hl=lt&ei=qrq-TLDZE8GbOvLywVI&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&res, 25 09 2010.
[29] Cohen J. L., Arato A. *Civil Society and Political Theory*, USA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1994, p. 84.
[30] Ciceronas, Apie valstybę, see *Filosofijos istorijos chrestomatija*, Vilnius: Mintis, 1977, p. 430.

the European tradition to identify civil consciousness with communal interests by opposing them to the personal aims of individual activity, yet meanwhile perceiving civil society as the organization of individuals and their groups coordinating, with the help of laws and state institutions, individual interests for the good of communal ones. Notwithstanding this "separation", in Cicero's conception, the state itself is not separated from civil society and, in essence, these concepts are identified as the same because state institutions had to solve communal (i.e. "public") affairs. Thus, in this respect, Cicero remains faithful to Aristotle's conception of civil society[31]: and the concepts *politike koinonia* and *societas civilis* imply both the state and society, thus determining the unity of civil and political society.

In the Middle Ages, the problem of society was not given much attention; however, the growing socio-political separation among state institutions, the governing elite and the major part of society made thinkers seek answers to questions regarding the legitimacy and morality of state institutions. Representatives of Christian philosophy (Thomas Aquinas, Nicolaus Cusanus), trying to substantiate the relationship between the authorities and society guided themselves by the standpoint that the state with its political institutions is an unquestionable given and a "natural expression of human morale"[32] which predetermined the conception of civil consciousness as loyalty to the authorities. Thinkers of the Middle Ages, though trying very hard to retain the ancient tradition of the unity of the state and civil society, gave a stimulus for the development of the philosophical, social and political thought while looking for answers to questions about the relationship of the state and society and developing the idea of civil society construction.

The modern era was notable for the breakthrough in natural sciences, huge changes in production, political and social life that in their own turn determined new reflections on the idea of civil society. The premises of the existence of a transcendental state were not a sufficient basis for new socio-political and economic realities; therefore, thinkers (Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Emile Durkheim, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, etc.) tried to understand the essence of the relations between the state and society while analyzing the origin of the individual and the state and the dimension of their mutual relations. Supporters of the conception of social agreement (social contract) were the first to separate civil society from the state attributing to both the functions of social and political life regulator: the function of state institutions is to normalize the life of community members vertically, whereas the function of civil society is to arrange the relations among people horizontally. According to Hobbes, the nature of the state is natural, just as the nature of the rights and freedoms of each separate individual, because the main function of state institutions is to restrict the latter for the sake of the objectives of peace and

---

[31] Khihnani S. The Development of Civil Society in *Civil society. History and Possibilities*, UK: Cambridge University press, 2001, p. 11-32.
[32] Seligman A., *The Idea of Civil Society*, N.Y. : A Divission of Macmilan Inc., 1992, p. 15-17.

common defense[33]. In Locke's view, to prevent abuse of power against society members, civil society is indispensable as a counter to state institutions. The philosopher identifies civil society with political community whose activity aim is restriction of political powers of state authorities[34]. Regarding human civil rights as inherent and identifying civil society with political community, thinkers of the Enlightenment epoch perceived civil consciousness as a natural human political activity, restricting egotistical interests of individuals and the excessive authority of institutions for the benefit of the overall good. It should be pointed out that Hobbes was among the first philosophers to bring attention to the aspect of the relationship between state security and civil society, giving priority to the former (i.e. state security and defense matters) as a reflection of common interests of society (also, the affairs of civil society itself).

The new development stage of the conception of civil society is related to G.W.F. Hegel's and Alex de Tocqueville's scientific insights. These thinkers identify civil society with a new development stage of Western civilization (i.e. the paradigm of liberalism and democratic state), entirely separating it from the conception of the functions of state power institutions and political society. Tocqueville saw civil society as a community defending private business interests and public matters within the boundaries of civil law and he treated political society as the defender of general interests of the state and the whole society. Analyzing the interaction between political and civil society, he is aware of the mutual influence and interaction of the activity of these two forms of society organization: civil society facilitates the activity of political associations, while political society strengthens the positions of civil organizations and communities within society[35]. Hegel singled out three activity segments and areas of interest of modern society, i.e. family, civil society and state[36]. He rejected the synonymy of political community and civil society characteristic of the ancient tradition, relating the preconditions of the formation of the latter to the changes in modern society, i.e. with market economy demands and ambitions of individuals to better satisfy their needs, seeing within that harmonization of the principles of individualism and universalism. In Hegel' opinion, as a phenomenon of modern society, civil society is an association whose members share common activity with the intention of satisfying their private individual needs, at the same time restraining their individual egoism for the sake of common interests[37]. In the philosopher's conception, civil society is regarded as the basis for the politico-economic system and a connecting segment between "polis" (national state) and "oikos" (family).

Hegel's conception of civil society was developed in the theories of Karl

---

[33] Hobbes T., *The Leviathan,* UK: Cambridge Univeristy Press, 2003, p. 121.

[34] Locke J., *Of Civil Goverment: The Second Treatise,* Rockville, Md.: Wildside Press, 2008, p. 50-55.

[35] Tocqueville A., *Democracy in America,* Part II, Cambridge: Sever and Francis, 1864, p. 140-145.

[36] Hegel G. W. F., Philosophy of Mind: Translated from the Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences, N.Y.: Cosimo, 2008, p. 121.

[37] Ware R. B., Hegel: The Logic of Self-Consciousness and the Legacy of Subjective Freedom, UK: Edinburgh university press, 1999, p. 177.

Marx and Antonio Gramsci, where the dividing line between the two structural types of modern society – civil and political – was still more radically defined. Marx determined civil society as a form of a public system which depends on the development of production forces and production relations as well as the level of consumption, and he pointed out that the political state depends on civil society[38]. Emphasizing the economic determination of civil society as a social phenomenon, Marx claims that it is the basic phenomenon of society life and, at the same time, he separates it from the superstructure, i.e. the state. Gramsci grounds his conception of civil society on criticism of the conception of the traditionally formed state, claiming that the state cannot be regarded as a merely legal and political formation. In his conception, the state is a combination of two social forms – political and civil – as well as also a result of historic interaction and of organic unity and opposition. The statement by Francesco Guicciardini that for the existence of the state two vitally important things are necessary, i.e. the armed forces and the church, which, according to Gramsci, may be interpreted in different ways: as force and agreement, state and church, politics and morality, law and freedom, etc., and as political society and civil society[39]. It means that if political society (its conception includes not only bodies of state power, but also its political institutions and the legal system) is formed and functions on a coercive basis, then civil society is a matter of consent. Gramsci's conception of civil society encompasses all forms of private, "non-state" public life (i.e. family, education system, trade unions, etc.) and eliminates the Hegelian civil society associations with market economy and production relations. In Gramsci's view, civil society comprises the basis of modern political society because a modern state may function and implement its political objectives and tasks only with the help of the institutions of civil society (i.e. not only force, but also agreement is necessary). Some researchers find a certain contradiction in this conception of civil society: according to Eugeniush Gorsky, the relations of the Gramsci civil and political society are intertwined in too complicated a way and his conception of civil consciousness also presupposes the political nature of an individual, encompassing the conscious activity of an individual and his participation in the political life of the state and also becoming of a citizen as part of the state[40]. It should be pointed out that this contradiction can be seen not only in Gramsci's, but also other thinkers' (Durkheim, Hobbes, Lock, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Tocqueville, etc.) concepts: attempts to separate political and civil societies inevitably encounter their mutual ties, influence and interaction.

Having summarized the early conceptions of civil society, we can claim

---

[38] Wood A. W., *Karl Marx,* 2nd edition, NY: Routledge, 2004, p. 66.
[39] Gramsci A., From Selections of the Prison Notebooks in Virginia A. Hodgkinson, Michael W. Foley, Ed., *The Civil Society Reader*. USA: Tufts University Press, 2003, p.191 (190-202).
[40] Gorsky E., Civil Society, Pluralism and Universalism, *Polish Philosophical Studies, VIII,* Washington D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2007, p. 9.

that the traditional conception of civil society implies a holistic approach to the personality as a person, citizen, politician, member of a community and society. Such attitude determines the unity of society and state interests. It means that in the absence of difference between civil society and political society, there is no contradiction or conflict between the national security system and civil society: all state matters (including threats to it) are regarded as representation and defense of the interests of citizens. When reflecting on the changed socio-political situation, the thinkers of the Enlightenment epoch were searching for the dividing line between the state and civil society. The separation of the latter from the political one inspired the thinkers and researchers to analyze the interaction of civil society, as a social institute, with state institutions and state policy and, consequently, with the national security system.

3. The Discourse on the Conception of Modern Civil Society

Historical practice shows that with the change in social conditions, the concept of civil society and civil consciousness also changes. Reflecting on the historical experience of theoretical development, the modern conception of civil society and civil consciousness shows the widest spectrum of attitudes. Civil society and civil consciousness have been studied in the context of both political and social theories, emphasizing both personal identity and behavior and the relationship of these phenomena with state institutions and political phenomena. Although the historically formed essential conceptions of civil society in modern science have acquired new theoretical insights, the traditional dilemma of the politicality vs. non-politicality of civil society remains most urgent to researchers.

Ernest Gellner claims that civil society is becoming theoretically more real than democracy. In his view, the conception of civil society includes the aggregate of different non-governmental institutions which are strong enough to counterbalance the state, but only as long as it does not prevent it from fulfilling its role of a peacekeeper and arbitrator of the interests of the majority of society. Gellner considers modern society as the preventer of state dominance and society division, at the same time the indicator of the limitation of political and social impact of this measure[41].

In his analysis of the peculiarities of socio-political relations in industrial society, Ralf Dahrendorf stresses that the relations between state economic powers and political institutions are entwined in a very complicated way. Analyzing the particularities of social relations in industrial society, he points to production relations as prevailing and emphasizes their authoritarian cha-

---

[41] Gellner E., *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Rivals*, http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/liberty.html, 29 09 2010.

racter. In Dahrendorf's opinion, modern political society is constructed accor-
ding to the analogue of production relations. He claims that political society is
analogous to industry according to the number of influenced individuals, the
character of the influence and the intensity of the effect[42]. He identifies political
society with the state, at the same time separating it from civil society. Being
one of the key representatives of the conception of "social conflict", Dahren-
dorf denies the functionalist theories of "social equilibrium" and notes that
modern (i.e. industrial) civil society is a community of non-state institutions
and organizations whose activity is aimed against state institutions and also
against political society[43].

David Harvey maintains that under conditions of neo-liberalism, the
movement of non-governmental organizations is growing, expanding, crea-
ting an integral organism oppositional to state powers which is called "civil
society", and which gives the illusion of being a power plant of political and
social transformations[44]. According to Harvey, within the conception of civil
society, wide scope non-governmental movements are trying to fight against
the ruling political parties, state institutions, seeking, at the same time, to retain
the dimension of sociality (i.e. non-politicality), thus losing the relevance of
their role and their importance in the solution of political problems and social
matters[45].

Continuing and developing Hobbes' conception of civil society, Robert
David Putnam points out that when people start cooperating without any co-
ercion, they join together by common interests. He maintains that belonging to
civil society primarily implies active participation in public matters. However,
Putnam supports Toqueville's idea that civil society strengthens rather than
weakens a democratic state: the activeness of citizens and public organizati-
ons enforces state institutions and the government to comply with the value
system of the democratic state, and take decisions which reflect the interests
of the majority of society[46]. In this way, civil society becomes both an objective
of individuals and a political tool.

According to Alasdair C. MacIntyre, members of civil society are united
not only by common interests, but also by common moral values[47]. It is from the
definition of the conception of civil consciousness in a definite community that
the perception of justice arises, based on which concrete requirements for poli-
tical institutions are set. MacIntyre claims that it is imperative for civil society
to have confidence in power. Taking a decision and choosing one variant from

---

[42] Dahrendorf, R., *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Leland Stanford Junior university,
California, 1959, p. 143.
[43] Dahrendorf R., *Modernusis socialinis konfliktas*. Vilnius: Pradai. 1996, p. 65.
[44] Harvey D., Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development,
Verso, NY, London, 2006, p. 23.
[45] Harvey D., *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, UK, 2005, p. 200.
[46] Putnam R. D., *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press,
USA, 1993, p. 182.
[47] Tester K., *Civil Society*. Routledge, London, 1992, p. 169.

several alternatives, a member of civil society must have sufficient information about strong, weak and problematic sides of the possible alternatives[48].

The conception of the integrity of civil and political societies is expanded by Terence H. McLaughlin's theory of the perception of citizenship where four features of the content of the conception of citizenship are distinguished: individual identity; virtues required by citizenship; political involvement expected from the individual; social prerequisites necessary for effective citizenship[49]. The range of the features varies from minimal to maximal expressions of the concept's features. In the minimalist view, identity is regarded from a merely formal, legal, juridical viewpoint. In the maximalist view, identity is a far wider concept perceived in social, cultural and psychological aspects, because a citizen must perceive himself as a member of the existing community with a shared democratic culture, duties, responsibility and rights, a sense of the common good, fraternity, etc. In the minimalist view, virtues, e.g. loyalty, responsibility, are primarily interpreted as being, by their nature, in a definite place at a definite time. By contrast, in the maximalist view, a citizen is required to have a broader perception of loyalty and responsibility; virtues are extended to more general and universal perceptions, such as justice, equality, employment, so as to create better social conditions for all citizens. Political activeness, as one of the manifestations of citizenship, in the minimalist view, regards a citizen as a private individual who is required to vote wisely, whereas the maximalist view gives priority to active participation of a citizen in the democratic process. According to the minimalist view, a guarantee of formal legal status is sufficient for social prerequisites. In the maximalist view, different forms of social problems should be taken into account in pursuing the ideals of equality and the good. Thus, according to McLaughlin, the maximalist conception of civil consciousness which requires a citizen to have a comprehensive understanding of democratic principles, values and rules, willingness and ability to participate in the political processes of the democratic state, implies, in essence, that civil society is identified with political society.

Having surveyed various conceptions of civil society, a wide spectrum of opinions and major trends of the conception of interrelations of civil and political societies can be seen. Scientists of the postmodern epoch follow, in essence, the theoretical attitudes which were formed during the Enlightenment epoch and later became traditional: civil society is regarded as an aggregate of a wide activity spectrum (ranging from economic to cultural matters), encompassing non-state organizations and various associations, reflecting common interests of separate individuals and acting against the dominance of state institutions in the democratic state. McLaughlin, Putnam and MacIntyre tend to treat modern civil society as an integral segment of a postmodern democratic state, at the same time identifying it with political society. The position of the mentioned

---

[48] MacIntair A. C., *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?*, Duckworth, UK, 1988, p. 383.
[49] McLaughlin, T. H. *Šiuolaikinė ugdymo filosofija: demokratiškumas, vertybės, įvairovė*. Kaunas: Technologija, 1997, p. 72-75.

scientists envisages active participation of citizens in all political decisions of state matters, thus determining the non-contradictoriness between the interests of civil society and the national security system. A very strict definition of civil society as nonpolitical society is characteristic of the conceptions by Gellner, Dahrendorf, and Harvey. The conception of civil society as an opponent of state power institutions might presuppose its separation from the state political system and, consequently, from the national security system. However, the supporters of the conception of "non-politicality" of civil society do not dissociate from the determination of the political activity of civil movements and organizations. Thus, tackling the dilemma of "politicality vs. non-politicality", civil society conceptions do not offer an adequate explanation of the causes of the opposition between civil society and the national security system of the state.

Developing the theories of Hobbes and Locke and providing conceptual insights into the issues of modern state and national security, Barry Buzan analyses the problems of national security within the discourse of the relationship between state and personal security[50]. Buzan emphasizes the fact that the contradiction between individual and national security is unavoidable, because this contradiction is rooted in the very nature of the state and individual relations: implementing the role of a representative of collective interest and a regulator of socio-political life, the state becomes both a guarantor of individual security and, at the same time, a source of a threat to individual security. On the other hand, in Buzan's opinion, an individual himself may become a guarantor of state national security and a source of threat to it. Buzan does not directly analyze the problem of the relationship between national security and civil society; however he claims that "it is possible for individuals to set up or join organizations of many kinds aimed at improving their security", which "can be political in nature, working as pressure groups on governments and trying to turn state policy in directions more conducive to the security needs of the individuals involved"[51]. Thus, according to Buzan, individual security is supplemented by an additional level of collective interest which, interposing itself between the individual and the state, involves in the domestic model of security not only polarization between the individual and state, but also their reciprocal interaction. A link with the conception of civil society can be seen in the conception of Buzan's "level of collective interest". The researcher's position implies the necessity of politicality of civil society as a representative of the collective interest and does not oppose it to its state power institutions. In Buzan's view, social organizations should be treated as representatives of collective interests of separate individuals, as an intermediary between an individual and the state in the area of the implementation of national security policy goals. Additionally, Buzan identifies the level of interest of individual security guarantee with the collective one; however, he identifies social (i.e.

---

[50] Buzan B., *Žmonės, valstybės ir baimės*, Vilnius: Eugrimas, 1997, p. 69-93.
[51] Ibid. , p.88.

civil) organizations but not the state and its institutions as a representative of the collective interest. This attitude not only implies dissociation between an individual and state, but also presupposes the opposition of civil society (as a representative of individual interests and a guarantor of individual security) to state institutions (which are identified with a representative and defender of national security interests).

In the academic discourse of Lithuania, the paradigm of civil society is analyzed within the context of political science (Vaidutis Laurėnas, Saulius Šiliauskas, Jolanta Palidauskaitė, Mindaugas Degutis, etc.), sociology (Romual-das Grigas, Anelė Vosyliūtė, etc.), philosophy, cultural science and educology (Bronislovas Bitinas, Irena Zaleskienė, etc.). In the academic discourse of Lithu-ania, the conception of civil society is based on the analysis of the relationship between an individual and the state.

In the opinion of some researchers, civil society, its formation and de-velopment in Lithuania is closely related to the processes of the formation of the national state; therefore, the conception of civil consciousness is tightly connected with the manifestation of nationality and patriotism in the world outlook of an individual and his development process. Libertas Klimka holds the opinion that civil consciousness stems from a spiritual bond with the native place that gave a person his life, native language, primary socialization and cultural medium[52]. Meilė Lukšienė offers a definition where civil consciousness means seeking a compromise between an individual and the state which in certain forms enables him to live within a big community and retain cultural identity[53]. Other scientists (Alfonsas Vai vila) voice an attitude which more clo-sely corresponds with the contemporary context and argue that contemporary civil consciousness implies consciousness and involvement of a citizen in the creation of national state institutions, using them, adjusting them to the protec-tion of his rights and needs, and a voluntary commitment to his state as to the common good[54] . In Grigas' opinion, civil consciousness is hardly conceivable without national consciousness; therefore, participation in the creation process of the nation, the consolidation of nationalism and civil consciousness as well as expression of these features constitute an essential part of the meaning of human existence[55]. The discourse on the harmony between civil consciousness and nationality is reflected in the Long-Term Program on Civil and National Development, approved by the Seimas of Lithuania, where civil consciousness is defined as "a person's perception of his rights, responsibility and duties in a democratic state, activity for the good of society, defense of the democracy

[52] Klimka, L. Pilietiškumas ir tautiškumas: laiko dimensijos ir aktualijos // *Tautiškumas ir pilietiškumas: atskirtis ar dermė?*, Vilnius: Vilnius Pedagogical University, 2007 p. 131.
[53] Lukšienė, M. *Jungtys.* Vilnius: Alma litera, 2000, p. 245.
[54] Vaišvila, A. Pilietiškumas: demokratijos viltis ar persona non grata? // *Tautiškumas ir pilietiškumas: atskirtis ar dermė?*, Vilnius: Vilnius Pedagogical University,, 2007, p. 110-132.
[55] Grigas, R. Nacionalinis sąmoningumas šiandien: jaunuomenės pasirinkimo drama // *Tautiškumas ir pilietiškumas: atskirtis ar dermė?*, Vilnius: Vilnius Pedagogical University, 2007, p. 13-17.

of co-citizens' rights and freedoms, seeking well-being for Lithuania"[56]. Such scientific discourse presupposes the unity between civil society and state.

In the opinion of other researchers, the new geopolitical situation of Lithuania and new global processes in the international arena prevent the harmony between nationality and civil consciousness, open up new aspects of the conception of civil society. According to Zaleskienė, the relationship between a concrete citizen and the state, as a key component of civil consciousness, is disappearing because states are losing clearly defined boundaries, new integral formations are emerging and, therefore, civil consciousness is perceived in too narrow a sense[57]. Vaidutis Laurėnas claims that the rise and development of civil society in Lithuania may be characterized by contradictoriness, i.e. non-politicality vs. politicality, systematicity vs. non-systematicity, consolidation vs. fragmentation, locality vs. globality. Although the researcher states that political coordination of civil society cannot be centralized and state-dependent, he believes that the emergence of the political component of civil society is necessary since "separation between civil society and the state does not offer a greater chance for their interaction and, consequently, for the modernization of the two"[58]. In his opinion, in the conditions of modern globalization, nationalism, as a foundation of civil society, is insufficient because in Lithuania nationalism primarily stimulated anti–systematicity of civil society and lessened the role of the state in the process of its formation.

The paradigm of civil society prevailing in Lithuania presupposes the unity between civil society and the state, which, in its turn, determines the common interests of civil society and the national security system. Such scientific discourse does not offer an explanation for the occurring contradictions. However, the analysis of the conception of civil society made by Laurėnas could lead to the assumption that the genesis of the contradictions between civil society and the national security system lies in the political system of the state, i.e. the contradiction which occurs while distinguishing between political power institutes and goals and the manifestation of the activity of civil society.

The theoretical insights presented in the chapter presuppose the questions: If social (or civil) organizations defend collective interests of citizens of the state, then whose interests do state power institutions defend? Is state national security a collective interest of all citizens (or the majority) or is it a collective matter of state institutes? No comprehensive answers to these questions have been presented. It may be ascertained that contemporary scientific theories have not gone far from Hobbes and Locke's ideas related to the state, civil society and national security. A boundary between a civil community and

---

[56] *Ilgalaikė pilietinio ir tautinio ugdymo programa,* http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter2/dokpaieska. showdoc_l?p_id=283042&p_query=&p_tr2, 03 09 2010.

[57] Zaleskienė, I. Jaunimo pilietiškumas: tarp teksto ir konteksto // *Tautiškumas ir pilietiškumas: atskirtis ar dermė?*, Vilnius: Vilnius Pedagogical University Publisher's, 2007, p. 146-152.

[58] Laurėnas V., Pilietinės visuomenės dilemos Lietuvoje, Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas. 2003, 1, p. 5-22.

state institutions, though theoretically substantiated, in contemporary global society has no longer sufficient grounds to account for the differences in value orientations, conflict of interest and contradictoriness in activity goals. The world has become too complicated and multifaceted, whereas individual and social relations have intertwined too much. Therefore, it is difficult to identify all the factors affecting the interrelation between civil society and the national security system; likewise, it is difficult to determine civil society itself as well as the concept, goals and tasks of the state security system.

Final Remarks

The theoretical insights presented in the article suggest that the conception of civil society and civil consciousness is pluralistic, not combinable into one definition, tolerating interests of different layers of society and granting them the right to express their political and social attitudes and ideas as well as participation in the country's life and state management. Comparative historical analysis proves that the theories of civil society and civil consciousness encompass a wide range of viewpoints, attitudes and actions from conscious identification with the state or community to the involvement in its political and social processes expressed by a positive or negative action. Notably, although various theoretical trends emphasize different elements of the phenomenon of civil consciousness, they do not deny the importance of other theoretical trends.

As a social phenomenon, having become a reality of postmodernism, civil society remains an object of contemporary scientific discussion: under the conditions of pluralism, the definitions of civil society have acquired new theoretical reflections, retaining the traditional controversial attitude to its relationship with political society and the state.

The contradictoriness of the interests of civil society and the national system of the state may be explained by the controversial conception of civil society. However, the genesis and development of civil society does not reveal the main differences between the state policy pursued by the institutional state governing apparatus and the interests of civil communities and movements. It can be stated that civil society is political in both its goals (to represent and defend common interests of the people of the state, democratic system, universal human values, etc.) and the character of its activity (civil activity is, in essence, political like that of state power institutions). This viewpoint might also presuppose the unity of interests between civil society and state national security.

The analysis of the conception of civil identity is also an insufficient basis to maintain that the interests of national security and civil society are incompatible. Since contemporary identity is multifaceted, composed of many components, variable, capable of being a matter and result of personal choice,

open, susceptible to different external effects and modern society has become so complicated that it is impossible to retain a single identity in it, the civil identity of an individual may become the main identity, uniting all members of society and their groups. To this end, the interaction between civil organizations and state institutions is necessary.

As a political phenomenon of the tradition of ancient democracy and the republican system, civil consciousness presupposes a constructive interest of state power institutions in further development and expansion of civil society. Dealing with practical everyday problems and controlling the authorities, contemporary society forms the aggregate of fairly strong groups to counterbalance the dominance of the state, to represent and defend the interests of individuals and social groups, including the issues related to individual and collective security. Cooperation between civil society and state institutions in a democratic state may be based on common national security interests of the state.

However, state institutions, pursuing their own narrow interests, often try to control civil initiatives and the activity of civil communities, which leads to distancing and self-distancing of the latter from political power and political activity. The de-politicization of civil society is a dangerous phenomenon: on the one hand, in this way civil society becomes a source of threat to the state itself, its power institutions and the national security system; on the other hand, confining of the activity of civil society to merely economic, social, cultural and similar communal interests becomes a threat to civil society itself because it creates distrust in the very essence of the conception of civil consciousness.

Contemporary civil society is not an opposition to democratic power institutions nor is it a loyal element of the political system. Civil society is an autonomous and integral part of the political system of the democratic state.

Vilnius, October-November 2010