HUMAN ASPECTS OF SECURITY

Anastasia KRAVETS
National Technical University, Dnipro, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2433-5836

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2021.1.22

BIOPOLITICAL REFLECTION ON HUMAN SAFETY: UKRAINIAN AND BELARUS EXPERIENCE

In the 21st century, the concepts of biopolitics and biopower are becoming increasingly important. This fact is connected both with the global changes of bios – the world in which modern man exists and with the changes of the man himself, which is transformed, in Shevchuk's terminology, into "bios politicos" (Shevchuk, 2013: 120). Thus, the key interrelated concept are: "bios politicos" can mean as part of the general system of bios, its highest manifestation, and, at the same time, as a subject and object of politics. But he is not just a subject and object of politics. He is an active figure, who is able to initiate deep political transformations.

Bios, in principle, can exist without bios politicos, and biopolicy (biopolitics – theoretical aspects, biopolicy – practical definitions) can't. The main task of biopolicy should not be to manage the life of "bios politicos" with the help of disciplinary techniques, but to promote life in all its forms and manifestations.

The **key question**: can "bios politicos" exist and function effectively in conditions of danger, in conditions where every word, every action that is unacceptable to the disciplinary authorities can lead to punishment or even death?

The main task of biopolicy is the protection of human life and its multiplication. This means that the government must give society a sense of individual and collective safety. Accordingly, we get another key concept – the concept of human security. And this concept can be fully realized under the conditions of the existence of biopolitical and biopower, which should replace disciplinary authority.

The **key thesis** is the following: the most striking example of the implementation of the concepts of biopolitics and biopower from Eastern Europe (Central Europe) is Poland and the Baltic countries: Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, where disciplinary power (or in Foucault's language "power over life") decades transformed into power for life – biopower (power for life). Today the policy of these countries is biopolicy.

As for other Eastern European countries, Ukraine and Belarus deserve the most attention. **The key hypothesis** is that today Ukraine is very close (or seeks to get closer) to the implementation of the concepts of biopolitics and biopower. It is difficult to pinpoint the beginning of the transformation process, but it is safe to say that 2014 is certainly an illustration of the "bios politicos" resistance to disciplinary action, despite disciplinary techniques, including the threat of death. This year we have taken as a starting point the transformational changes of Ukrainian society towards biopower and biopolitics. Belarusian society, after the 2020 presidential election, has shown such a high level of consolidation and awareness, non-acceptance of discipli-

nary techniques in the form of threats, violence and punishment, that we can assume the beginning of transformational change. It's should be noted that both the Ukrainian and Belarusian authorities have demonstrated the implementation of all possible techniques of disciplinary action, including the threat of death.

In Ukraine, the disciplinary authority has been defeated, and in Belarus it continues to function. Thus, there is a deep crisis of power in Belarus: on the one hand, disciplinary power, on the other – Belarusian society. It is quite possible to overcome the crisis thanks to the profound transformational changes demanded by the Belarusian society, changes of policy to biopolicy, power to biopower.

Of course, Russia can be added to the analysis too, but it demonstrates a complete, we would even say total, rejection of any biopolitical transformations. We clearly trace all the features of the disciplinary power, which M. Foucault called for to abandon in the XIX century. However, unlike Ukraine and Belarus, it is clear that Russian society, despite isolated, sometimes large-scale, protests, is not yet ready for such transformations.

ESSENCE OF THE CONCEPT OF BIOPOLITICS, BIOPOWER AND "BIOS POLITICOS"

The implementation of scientific analysis involves the definition of **key terms and categories**: biopolitics, biopower, bios politicos. V. Shevchuk defines "bios politicos" as follows: "Man, on the one hand, appears as a form of biological life that is subject to manipulation by the authorities, and on the other – as one who exercises constant control over life" (Shevchuk, 2013: 120).

We generally agree with S. Kostyuchkov, who notes that: "An extremely wide range of characteristics and definitions of man… should be considered as a cognitive reflection of the anthropocultural process of the emergence of new features of modern man. Such definitions are seen as a reaction to radical changes in economic, political and social life" (Kostyuchkov, 2016: 5). But bios politicos must be an active figure, who is able to initiate deep political transformations.

In the process of scientific analysis, **important questions** arise: 1. What should be bios, in particular its political dimension, in order for a person of the XXI century – "bios politicos," the highest manifestation of "bios" – to live and develop in all spheres of life; applying all their skills and abilities, while feeling freedom and protection from the state? 2. How should politics and government change in order to meet the aspirations and ideas of "bios politicos"?

The answer to this question must be a profound transformation of the current mechanisms of power, politics should turn into biopolitics, and power should be transformed into biopower. Accordingly, two more key concepts "biopolitics" and "biopower" are introduced, which need to be conceptualized.

R. Blank believes that in a broad sense, biopolitics is interpreted as one of the life sciences (Blank, 2014: 1). R. Esposito in defining the concept of biopolitics, notes that it consists of two concepts "bios," which he interprets as a form of life, and "politics," which is defined as a specific area of human activity. Accordingly, "biopolitics is the politics of life" (Esposito, 2008: 88).

V. Shevchuk interprets biopolitics as a paradigm of the political world: "Within the biopolitical approach, politics is defined as the management (or even manipulation) of biological nature, especially man" (Shevchuk, 2013: 120). S. Kostyuchkov defines biopolitics as follows: "Biopolitics explores the impact of political measures on the processes of modernization of the range of material and spiritual needs of modern man, which are formed within the processes of domination – subjugation" (Kostyuchkov, 2016: 10).

Let's emphasize the most important – the concept of bios and the concept of life. These two fundamental concepts are basic and will be repeated and analyzed throughout the study. The main task of biopolicy should not be to manage the life of "bios politicos" is to promote life in all its forms and manifestations. Biopolicy is the protection of human life and its multiplication. This means that the government must give society a sense of individual and collective safety. Accordingly, we get another key concept – the concept of human security. This concept can be fully realized under the conditions of the existence of biopower, which should replace disciplinary authority.

Thus, further scientific analysis is not possible without analyzing the concept of biopower. The author of the term "biopower" is M. Foucault, who insists that in the second half of the XVIII century, a new technology of power appeared, which uses tools other than disciplinary power. According to M. Foucault, biopower arose as a result of the need to reform the current system of a disciplinary authority, primarily in relation to the use of coercion and control. In this case, biopower is seen as a "profound rethinking of existing mechanisms of power," and biopolitics as "the transformation of the policy of sovereignty into a policy of life" (Fuko, 2005: 106).

In the process of scientific analysis of "bios politicos," biopolitics, biopower and the transformational changes they predict, two other **important questions** arise: 1. Can biopower if not exist, then at least arise in a disciplinary setting? 2. Is it even possible for biopolitics to exist as a policy of life in a state whose leadership actively uses disciplinary techniques of management, coercion and punishment? 3. Can "bios politicos" exist and function effectively in conditions of danger, in conditions where every word, every action that is unacceptable to the disciplinary authorities can lead to punishment or even death?

In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to analyze in more detail what are "biopolitics" and "biopower." It should be noted that it is difficult for us to use the Ukrainian version of the term "biopolitics," as both theoretical constructions and the practice of implementing the concepts of "biopolitics" and "biopower" in a specific political space are analyzed. That is why it will be expedient to use the terms "biopower" and biopolitics to theoretically substantiate the need for transformational change, while their practical implementation will be denoted by the English term "biopolicy."

As M. Foucault says: "Biopower is a productive form of power relations exercised by the population (rather than individual bodies) in a preventive form to maximize productivity, in contrast to the coercion characteristic of sovereign (supreme) power" (Fuko, 2005: 106). M. Foucault opposed biopower (as creativity and resistance) to the supreme power (command, domination). In this case, biopower is: "A biopolitical form of power that has the capacity for freedom and transformation" (Fuko, 2005:

107). Thus, M. Foucault opposes coercion as a means of exercising power in its disciplinary form. Instead, he proposes a new form of government – biopolitical, based on freedom and the possibility of transformation: disciplinary power is "power over life," while biopower is "power that promotes life" (Fuko, 2005: 154).

Biopower as a new form of power in the political sphere, characterized by creativity and resistance, the ability to freedom and transformation, productive and liberating potential, protection of man and his freedom, and the ability to multiply life. Accordingly, the current relations of power should be changed in accordance with the concepts of biopolitics and biopower, aimed at protecting life and freedom of "bios politicos," coordinate relations between government and society, ensure security and opportunities for self-realization "bios politicos" in all spheres of society, leaving the latter the opportunity for resistance and transformation.

Thus, in addition to the concept of "life," the prerequisites for the existence of biopower are, of course, freedom (individual and collective) and the ability to transform. If the disciplinary authorities show a complete rejection of transformation, it will inevitably lead to a crisis. After all, the XXI century is a century of "bios politicos," biopolicy and biopower, which must coexist organically not only within a particular country, but also in the global dimension, in the general system of "bios." **The initial condition for ensuring an organic existence is a sense of security.**

In addition to the protection of life in all its forms and manifestations, at the center of biopolicy is the concept of internal freedom "bios politicos," which can be realized in all spheres of life. According to M. Lazzarato, the new biopolitical form of power allows: "To defend the freedom of the subject, which is necessary in order to establish relationships with himself and with other people" (Lazzarato, 2000). Thus, M. Foucault's opinion is a "radical alternative to the transcendent ethics of communication and human rights" (Lazzarato, 2000). As M. Lazzarato notes: "If we assume that power is the purpose of life, then M. Foucault was interested in finding what resists this power, escapes from its control. creativity, which is manifested in the activities of political institutions and parties since the nineteenth century" (Lazzarato, 2000).

In this context, M. Lazzarato asks the following questions: can we understand the development of biopolitics as a need to ensure strategic coordination of forces, rather than as the organization of unilateral relations of power? What do we need in order to emphasize the difference between the principles and dynamics of supreme power and biopower? And he answers it as follows: "The relationship between the last two is acceptable only on the basis of multiple and heterogeneous actions of forces. Without the introduction of the concepts of freedom and resistance, the mechanisms of modern power remain unclear, and the analysis will be inexorably reduced to the logic of political science" (Lazzarato, 2000).

In the modern world, according to M. Lazzarato, the biopolitical interpretation of power is consolidated by the existence of many consensus relations, the relationship between forces that the government "coordinates, institutionalizes and structures" and goals that can't be reduced to the use of "pure and simple" force. The main political problem of our time is that there is not one source of supreme power, but many forces that interact with each other in a relationship of domination/subjugation. It is necessary

to analyze the "small mechanisms" that are subsequently "invested, colonized, used, transformed and legalized in the form of more general mechanisms, in the form of world domination" (Lazzarato, 2000).

Thus, biopolitics acts as strategic coordination of power relations. Strategically, biopolitics is not a simple ability to make laws or legitimize sovereignty. Biopower from beginning to end is not a true source of power, because the coordinates and goals of power do not belong to it in full, but come from outside: "Biopower is always born as something other than itself" (Lazzarato, 2000).

RESISTANCE, FREEDOM, TRANSFORMATION AND HUMAN SAFETY

Accordingly, the focus is on the conditions under which the transformation of politics and power into biopolitics and biopower is possible, namely: internal freedom "bios politicos," the ability to resist and the desire to change things, to carry out a profound transformation of existing mechanisms.

I. Tukalenko, in the context of the study of biopolitical transformations of human rights, notes: on normalizing guidelines and practices (Tukalenko, 2015: 265). M. Foucault insists that: "We must distinguish between power relations as strategic games between freedoms (in which the subjects seek to control the behavior of objects, and the latter try to avoid this) and domination, which is usually referred to as power and is defined as the ability to structure the field of action of others in order to intervene if necessary" (Fuko, 2005: 154).

Note that it is necessary to have two elements – the subjects who exercise power and the objects that recognize and support it. Returning to the Belarusian realities, we note that today "power as the ability to structure the field of action" (Foucault, 2005: 154) is not able to do so, in addition, objects (a large part of Belarusian society, active and conscious) flatly refuse to recognize and support.

At the same time, according to M. Foucault, it is important that the forces resisting have the desire and inspiration to resist the will of the subjects who seek to control the behaviour of objects: "In order to create and reproduce, to transform the situation, to take an active part in this process, that is, to resist" (Fuko, 2005: 154). Thus, the individual simultaneously resists power and creates new forms of life. As M. Foucault notes: "Resistance was conceived in terms of denial, but resistance is not only a denial but also a creative process. In order to create and reproduce, in order to transform the situation, one must actively participate in this process, is resist" (Fuko, 2005: 154).

A. Negri states that power in biopolitical form is always between resistance and control. Its productive, creative, and liberating potential contributes to more desirable forms of globalization: "Legal models of sovereignty are thus the subject of political criticism by the state itself, characterized by the variability of relations of subordination, resistance, and disobedience" (Negri, 2007). Thus, among the main characteristics of biopower should be singled out the ability to resist, freedom and transformation. Biopower must be able to control not only individuals but also the population as a global mass, as well as the many living beings that make up the overall "bios" system

(Negri, 2007). At the same time, A. Negri notes that the purpose of his research is to discuss the problem of labor organization in the context of the formation of a new postmodern political field in bios: as each of these spheres of public life "became politics" (Negri, 2007).

Thus, biopolitics gradually permeates all spheres of life, which later become platforms for the implementation of the social policy of the state. The goal of the state, at the same time, is better management of the labour force, and biopolitics is a kind of grandiose "social medicine," which deals with the control of the population as a way to "manage life"; the latter now becomes part of the sphere of power (Negri, 2007).

I. Tukalenko in the context of the study of biopolitical transformations of human rights, notes: "It is going on cardinal changes of the power paradigms of control, the absolute limit of which was the ability 'to force to die' and biopolitical control as the ability 'to force to live' and multiply under strict state control and even tutelage" (Tukalenko, 2015: 266). Importantly: "These political strategies of biopower have formed the basis of those legislative initiatives that have declared new standards of quality of life and the responsibility of the state to ensure their minimum to every citizen of a democratic welfare state" (Tukalenko, 2015: 266).

It should be emphasized that protest, or the ability to resist, is one of the defining characteristics of biopower. It is resistance that is the driving force behind the transformation of politics into biopolicy and power into biopower.

It should be noted that none of the above-mentioned authors speaks directly about the concept of safety, however, they all speak about the protection of life that should be carried out by the state. And not even just to protect human life, but its maximum multiplication. **The ability to transform is generated by the individual's sense of inner freedom, which in turn is based on a sense of security.** It looks like this: every person, every citizen can resist and seek change in society, in the state because he has the right to do so, and this right is protected by the state itself. A state that does not aim at total control and subjugation, but at protecting the life and freedom of man and citizen. In this case, we can talk about the **local dimension within one state, or the global dimension, where the human right to protection of life and liberty** is recognized by most countries. The only question is whether this recognition is formal or factual.

M. Foucault emphasizes the global nature of biopolitics: "Biopolitics acts as a new scientific problem – a political problem and a problem of power. Biopolitics generates mechanisms that have certain functions that are different from disciplinary ones. Among them: predictions, statistical calculations, global dimensions, which determine the general phenomena that find their meaning in the global dimension" (Fuko, 2010: 119).

Thus, biopower implies a complete renunciation of strict control and punishment. It aims to protect life, not the threat of death, its vocation – to protect life, not to take away in case of disobedience. Biopower is not controlling, domination and punishment, it is the coordination of power relations, taking into account the aspirations, consciousness, moods and feelings of those for whom it exists – "bios politicos."

POWER OVER LIFE/POWER FOR LIFE: UKRAINIAN AND BELARUSIAN EXPERIENCE

Let's return to the Ukrainian realities, especially since one of the key hypotheses of the study is that after the events of 2013–2014, Ukraine came very close to implementing the concepts of biopolitics and biopower. If we take the general chronology of events and political transformations caused by these events, it looks like this: 1) on the 20th of November 2013 protests in support of Ukraine's European integration began, which were significantly intensified after the refusal of the President of Ukraine to sign the Association Agreement with the European Union and the brutal crackdown on protests on Independence Square in Kyiv; 2) then the demands of the protesters have been changed, they have demanded the resignation of the President and the government; clashes between protesters and law enforcement officials continued throughout December 2013; 3) in January 2014 the government resigned; in February 2014, law enforcement officials used weapons, killing hundreds of protesters; 4) The President of Ukraine has flown from the country; on February 23, the Ukrainian parliament assigns the duties of the President of Ukraine to the speaker of parliament.

This very brief chronology makes it possible to analyze how the transformation of disciplinary power took place, which used all possible levers of influence to ensure obedience. A key role in this process was played by a conscious part of Ukrainian society (what we call "bios politicos"), which refused to obey despite the use of disciplinary techniques, including not just the threat of death, but actual death. This is a clear example of how "self-organized communities" in the language of O. Krivitchenko or "multitude" in the language of M. Hard and A. Negri (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70) can not only make themselves heard, but also transform politics and power into biopolitics and biopower.

O. Krivitchenko analyzes the phenomenon of "Euromaidan" from the standpoint of postmodernist concepts of the masses as communities, namely – within the biopolitical project "multitude" in the theory of M. Hard and A. Negri (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70). It should be emphasized that O. Kryvitchenko leaves the term "multitude" untranslated because there are no corresponding analogs in the Ukrainian language, and it is impossible to translate simply as "crowd" or "mass:" "The closest is the term 'plurality' to a certain extent the essence of this concept, because it is not just about the quantity, but also about the quality of the education itself" (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70). We emphasize that the "quality of education," in our opinion, is one of the defining characteristics of "bios politicos."

Following A. Negri, O. Kryvitchenko understands biopower as: "One that extends its control not only to the political dimension, but also tries to cover all spheres of life. Thus, biopolitics captures the influence of power on life as a resistance to control by the government" (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70). Accordingly: "A new community is a 'multitude' – an active social entity that does not simply exist in terms of cooperation of individuals" (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70).

Regarding the term "multitude" as an active, conscious actor, we fully agree, but in the context of biopolitical analysis, we prefer the term "bios politicos."

O. Krivitchenko views Euromaidan (as a protest) from the standpoint of the interests and aspirations of its participants, in particular, European integration, protection of rights and freedoms, anti-corruption component, etc. (Krivitchenko, 2014: 70).

But this phenomenon needs a more global approach. It should be noted that from the very beginning, the protests on Independence Square were of a European integration nature. That is, the main slogans were to support the European integration aspirations of Ukrainian society. That is why these events were called Euromaidan. And only after Viktor Yanukovych refused to sign the Association Agreement with the EU and the brutal dispersal of students, the nature of the protests and the demands of the protesters changed. After all, the current authorities used the most severe disciplinary techniques – punishment for freedom of expression (which, incidentally, is enshrined in the constitution) and a threat to the life and health of citizens who gathered for a peaceful protest to express their civil position. After that, thousands of conscious citizens, activists, whom we actually call "bios politicos," gathered in Kyiv to protect their civil rights and freedoms. And here we were talking about a complete reset of the political system. After all, there were slogans about the impeachment of the President and the resignation of the government. Ukrainian society demanded transformational changes. "Bios politicos" flatly refused to live under disciplinary authority, protested, showed disobedience, the ability to resist and self-organization. And this inevitably evokes a sense of pride for the Ukrainian nation, for the fact that Ukrainian society, despite the worst manifestation of disciplinary power – the threat of death or even worse – death itself during the shooting of activists on the Maidan, won the right to freedom and the right to life. The right to live in conditions when power is not a threat of death (disciplinary power) and power is respect for life (biopower). Because disciplinary power, which controls all spheres of society, is not life, it is existence. Life is a feeling of inner freedom and security that every democratic country must guarantee to every citizen.

Of course, Ukraine is still far from Poland and the Baltic countries, which, in our opinion, have fully implemented the concepts of biopolitics and biopower. These are countries for citizens, not citizens for the country. This is the power for life. This is freedom and security. This is all that Ukrainian society so desperately needs and aspires to. A society that has proved in practice that it is worth more than the "threat of punishment in case of disobedience," that it can and is able to defend its interests, rights and freedoms. A Pole, a Latvian, a Lithuanian, an Estonian and a Ukrainian are "bios politicos." Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian politics are biopolitics. Ukrainian, unfortunately, is still in transit. Citizens are already there, and the political system is still on the way. Of course, there are many obstacles along the way in both the political and economic spheres: economic instability, corruption, external debt, ongoing decentralization, and much more. However, we hope that the state of Ukraine will be able to overcome all difficulties and transform politics and power into biopolitics and biopower.

As for Belarus, everything is much more complicated right now. The resistance of the disciplinary authorities is much stronger. The large-scale public protests, which began on August 9, 2020 and were accompanied by violent actions by law enforcement agencies, including deaths, escalated into local protests, when Belarusians gather in small groups in backyards. The leader of the Belarusian opposition, S. Tikhanovska, was forced to leave the country and set up a Coordination Council outside her country. Does this fact indicate a complete victory of the disciplinary authorities? Has Belaru-

sian society given up its desire to protect its rights, its freedom, its choice? Is this the victory of "power over life" (disciplinary power) over "power for life" (biopower)? The answer is no. As Yu. Panchenko notes: "After all, the Belarusian dictator still has many challenges ahead – from new sanctions by Western partners to the need to implement the transit of power" (Panchenko, 2021). Belarusian society in the face of its active, conscious citizens has already demonstrated the ability to resist and self-organize. In addition, most countries did not recognize Lukashenko's secret inauguration on September 23, 2020. The United Kingdom, Canada and the Baltic states, and later the EU and the United States, imposed sanctions on Lukashenko and other officials involved in possible election fraud and brutal crackdown protests. Disciplinary authority is doomed. It's only a matter of time. The prospect that almost all Eastern European countries have renounced (or are in the process of renouncing) disciplinary action against biopower cannot but be gratifying. We hope that the 21st century will be a turning point, when there will be no example, no manifestation of disciplinary power in the European part of the Eurasian continent, when finally, all European nations, or better nations, will live in power and politics for life – biopower and biopolitics. When every person and every European citizen will feel safety, and this feeling will be provided by the state.

As M. Foucaul says: "We understand the general idea or program of a society in which the optimization of various systems; where tolerance for individuals will be established… where, finally, the state's invasion of society will be expressed not in the enslavement of individuals from within, but in the impact on their environment" (Fuko, 2010: 119).

CONCLUSION

Summarizing the above, we note that the focus of scientific analysis of the biopolitical reflection of human safety is the concept of "bios politicos" as an active subject of political activity. A subject, who can capable of initiating political transformations of politics and power into biopolitics and biopower. Transformations are mean as a deep rethinking of the current mechanisms of power, due to the ability to resist and transform, complete abandonment of disciplinary techniques (coercion, total control, death threats) to protect life and individual freedom in all spheres of life, strategic coordination of power relations and more. Every person, every citizen should feel the safety that the state guarantees. Thus, biopolitics is a policy of life, a policy capable of protecting and multiplying it. Biopower is a new form of power, characterized by creativity and resistance, the ability to freedom and transformation, the protection of individual freedom, and the ability to multiply life. The most striking example of the implementation of the concepts of biopolitics and biopower from Eastern Europe (Central Europe) is Poland and the Baltic countries. Ukraine is very close (or seeks to get closer) to the implementation of the concepts of biopolitics and biopower because the disciplinary authority has been defeated. But in Belarus, it continues to function. Accordingly, the current relations of power should be changed in accordance with the concepts of biopolitics and biopower, aimed at protecting life and freedom "bios politi-

cos," coordinating relations between government and society, providing opportunities for self-realization "bios politicos" in all spheres of life society, leaving the latter the opportunity for resistance and transformation.

In this form politics and power must exist in the 21st century in Eastern Europe. It is biopolitics and biopower today that is the response of the conscious subject – "bios politicos" to the crisis of disciplinary power, its techniques of domination, control, and violence. Only biopolitics and biopower allow "bios politicos" to exist and develop freely in their country, to realize their knowledge and aspirations, to be realized in all spheres of life knowing that the main task of the state is to protect his life and freedom. Such freedom will give a powerful impetus to self-development and self-realization, which will inevitably lead to both political stability and economic growth because the latter is a guarantee not just of existence, but of a full life "bios politicos."

REFERENCES

Blank R. (2014), *Biology and politics: an introduction. Politics and the life science: the state of discipline*, United Kingdom.

Chomu stukhly protesty u Bilorusi i shcho tse oznachaie – ohliad ZMI (2020), https://www.bbc.com/ukrainian/press-review-54905097 (29.05.2021).

Esposito R. (2008), *Bios. Biopolitics and Philosophy*, Minneapolis.

Fuko M. (2005), *Nuzhno zashchyshchat' obshchestvo: kurs lektsyy prochytannyh v Kollezh de Frants v 1975–1976 uchebnom hodu*, Sanct Petersburg.

Fuko M. (2010), *Rozhdenye byopolytyky: kurs lektsyy, prochytannykh v Kollezh de Frans v 1978–1979 uchebnom hodu*, Sanct Petersburg.

Kostyuchkov S. (2016), *Mistse i rol' suchasnoyi lyudyny u planetarnomu butti: biopoltychna interpretatsiya*, http://ekhsuir.kspu.edu/bitstream/123456789/3176/1/23.pdf (14.06.2020).

Kostiuchkov S. (2016), *Biopolitychni kontseptsii yak rezultat implikatsii biolohichnoho i sotsialno-filosofskoho znannia*, http://ekhsuir.kspu.edu/bitstream/123456789/3157/1/4.pdf (14.06.2020).

Kryvitchenko O. (2014), *Yevromaydan-maydan yak biopolitychni spil'nosti novoho typu, shcho samoorhanizuyut'sya*, "Hrani", No. 6.

Lazzarato M. (2000), *From biopower to biopolitics*, http://www.generation-online.org/c/fcbiopolitics.htm (14.06.2020).

Negri A. (2007), *The Labor of the Multitude and the Fabric of Biopolitics*, "Mediations", http://www.mediationsjournal.org/articles/the-labor-of-the-multitude-and-the-fabric-of-biopolitics (14.06.2020).

Panchenko Yu. (2021), *Lukashenko yde u nastup: shcho stalosia iz protestamy u Bilorusi*, https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/articles/2021/03/29/7121478/ (29.05.2021).

Shevchuk D. (2013), *Polityzatsiya zhyttya v konteksti biopolityky: sotsial'no-filosofs'kyy analiz*, "Naukovi zapysky", Vol. 13.

Somit A., Peterson S. (2005), *The Failure of Democratic Nation Building: Ideology Meets Evolution*, New York.

Peterson S., Somit A. (2011), *Biology and politics: The cutting edge*, United Kingdom.

Potapenko Ya. (2018), *Retseptsiia Yevromaidanu v suchasnomu ukrainskomu sotsiokulturnomu dyskursi*, https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/potapenko_retseptsiia.pdf (29.05.2021).

Tukalenko I. (2015), *Vplyv biopoltychnykh transformatsitsy na evolyutsiyu prav lyudyny*, "Hileya", Vol. 100.

Vannek L. (2021), *Internet-tekhnolohii u protestakh v Ukraini ta Bilorusi: tendentsii i porivniannia*, https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/internet-tekhnolohiyi-u-protestakh-v-ukrayini-ta-bilorusi/31082739.html (29.05.2021).

Human security in theory and practice (2009), https://www.unocha.org/sites/dms/HSU/Publications%20and%20Products/Human%20Security%20Tools/Human%20Security%20in%20Theory%20and%20Practice%20English.pdf (20.05.2021).

ABSTRACT

Biopolitical reflection is seen as a way of understanding the specifics of being "bios politicos." It's means as the understanding the transformational processes in bios and involve the appropriate political reaction, and internal changes "bios politicos," its self-realization as a subject and object of policy, able to initiate profound transformations of politics and power in biopolitics and biopower. The concept of "bios politicos," his life, freedom and safety are in the focus of scientific analysis. The key question: can "bios politicos" exist and function effectively in conditions of danger, in conditions where every word, every action that is unacceptable to the disciplinary authorities can lead to punishment or even death? The aim is to prove that politics and power in the 21st century in Europe cannot and should not exist in a disciplinary form. Their transformation is possible due to the activity of a person as a conscious subject of social and political activity. The complex nature of the scientific problem involves the use of appropriate methods that combine different types of systems analyses: system-structural analysis, system-functional, system-historical analysis, as well as the method of rational reconstruction and prognostic method. The key hypothesis is that today Ukraine is very close (or seeks to get closer) to the implementation of the concepts of biopolitics and biopower. 2014 is certainly an illustration of the "bios politicos" resistance to disciplinary action, despite disciplinary techniques, including the threat of death. Belarusian society, after the 2020 presidential election, has shown such a high level of consolidation and awareness, non-acceptance of disciplinary techniques in the form of threats, violence, and punishment, that we can assume the beginning of transformational change. It is biopolitics and biopower today that is the response of the conscious subject – "bios politicos" to the crisis of disciplinary power, its techniques of domination, control, and violence. Biopolitics and biopower allow "bios politicos" to exist and develop freely in their country, to realize their knowledge and aspirations, to be realized in all spheres of life knowing that the main task of the state is to protect his life and freedom.

Keywords: bios, bios politicos, biopolitics, biopower, life, human safety, resistance, freedom, transformation

BIOPOLITYCZNA REFLEKSJA BEZPIECZEŃSTWA CZŁOWIEKA: DOŚWIADCZENIA UKRAIŃSKIE I BIAŁORUSKIE

STRESZCZENIE

Refleksja biopolityczna jest postrzegana jako sposób na zrozumienie specyfiki bycia „bios politikos." Oznacza to rozumienie procesów transformacyjnych w „bios" i pociągających za sobą odpowiednią reakcję polityczną oraz zmiany wewnętrzne „bios politikos", jego samo-

realizację jako podmiotu i przedmiotu polityki, zdolnego do inicjowania głębokich przemian politycznych i władzy w biopolityce i biowładzy. Pojęcie „bios politikos", jego życie, wolność i bezpieczeństwo znajdują się w centrum analizy naukowej. Kluczowe pytanie: czy „bios politikos" może istnieć i funkcjonować skutecznie w warunkach zagrożenia, w warunkach, w których każde słowo, każde działanie nieakceptowane przez władze dyscyplinarne może prowadzić do kary, a nawet śmierci? Celem jest udowodnienie, że polityka i władza w XXI wieku w Europie nie mogą i nie powinny istnieć w formie dyscyplinarnej. Ich przemiana jest możliwa dzięki aktywności człowieka jako świadomego podmiotu działalności społecznej i politycznej. Złożoność problemu naukowego wiąże się z zastosowaniem odpowiednich metod łączących różne rodzaje analiz systemowych: analizę systemowo-strukturalną, systemowo-funkcjonalną, systemowo-historyczną, a także metodę racjonalnej rekonstrukcji i metodę prognostyczną. Kluczową hipotezą jest to, że dziś Ukraina jest bardzo bliska (lub dąży do zbliżenia) realizacji koncepcji biopolityki i biowładzy. Rok 2014 jest z pewnością ilustracją oporu „bios politikos" wobec działań dyscyplinarnych, pomimo stosowanych technik dyscyplinarnych, w tym groźby śmierci. Społeczeństwo białoruskie po wyborach prezydenckich w 2020 r. wykazało tak wysoki poziom konsolidacji i świadomości, nieakceptowania technik dyscyplinarnych w postaci gróźb, przemocy i kar, że możemy założyć początek transformacji transformacyjnej. To biopolityka i biowładza są dziś odpowiedzią świadomego podmiotu – „bios politikos" na kryzys władzy dyscyplinarnej, jej techniki dominacji, kontroli i przemocy. Biopolityka i biowładza pozwalają „bios politikos" swobodnie istnieć i rozwijać się w swoim kraju, realizować swoją wiedzę i aspiracje, realizować się we wszystkich sferach życia, wiedząc, że głównym zadaniem państwa jest ochrona jego życia i wolności.

Słowa kluczowe: bios, bios politikos, biopolityka, biowładza, życie, bezpieczeństwo człowieka, opór, wolność, transformacja

Article submitted: 12.03.2021; article accepted: 26.06.2021.