

Political Dialogue as a Tool for Protecting People's Rights and Ensuring State Safety in an Era of Change

Svitlana Vnuchko ^{1*}, Viktor Teremko ², Anna Stychynska ³,
Nataliia Perepelytsia ⁴, Dmytro Nelipa ⁵

^{1,2,3,4} Department of Politology, Faculty of Philosophy,

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine.

⁵ Faculty of Philosophy, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine.

* Corresponding author's E-mail: vnuchko@knu.ua

© Author(s)

OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, Ontario International Development Agency, Canada.

ISSN 1923-6654 (print) ISSN 1923-6662 (online) www.oidaijsd.com

Also available at <https://www.ssm.com/index.cfm/en/oida-intl-journal-sustainable-dev/>

Abstract: The relevance of the research is determined by contemporary challenges, which are accompanied by constant human rights violations, encroachments on sovereignty and state security, as well as recent events on the international stage caused by geopolitical instability. The focus is placed on the fact that political communication serves not only as a means of interaction between the government and society but also as a tool for shaping legal and moral justifications for restricting rights in emergency situations. Considerable attention is given to democratic values, which are upheld by corresponding mechanisms of political communication, ensuring necessary oversight over global challenges. The main emphasis is placed on how political discourse can be strategically employed to legitimize the restriction of human rights under the pretext of ensuring national security. Significant attention is given to Kremlin rhetoric, which represents a type of political communication accompanied by the justification of aggressive foreign policy and territorial expansion, thereby violating the rights and freedoms of Ukrainian citizens. In this context, the Ukrainian perspective becomes particularly important, specifically the role of political communication during martial law, which ensures the stability of national and informational security in Ukraine. The findings of the study demonstrate that political communication is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that serves as the foundation of international geopolitical and informational stability. Political communication shares commonalities with general communication processes while also possessing distinct characteristics: it permeates all levels of communication – from intrapersonal to global; each political system establishes its own network of political communication in accordance with its capabilities; there is a direct correlation between a society's level of economic development and the development of its political communication structures – the latter is determined both by the technological level of information transmission and the fundamental ideology of the political system; the nature of political communication in a society and its level of development are shaped by the overall and political culture of that society, as well as by its values and norms.

Keywords: globalization, political communication, human rights, national security, narratives, informational influence, migration.

Introduction

The establishment and development of communication as a whole play a crucial role in shaping social processes and influencing globalization. The changes occurring today under the influence of information technologies and the introduction of new mechanisms of political communication have a direct impact on the development of democratic institutions and enable the formation of political dialogue between states to ensure international security. Therefore, communication is considered a key factor in protecting human rights and ensuring national and informational security. Communication enables society to access information, forming information flows that facilitate the establishment of international connections [1]. Scholars note that the formation of civil society is directly linked to the establishment of communication and the subsequent development of its mechanisms [2]. Moreover, it is essential to consider that globalization influences relations between states, and in this context, communication serves as the foundation and basis for cooperation within the framework of international law. Therefore, political

communication has developed specific interaction schemes, namely: between states, between state institutions, and society [3]. In international practice, it is believed that the advancement of political communication enables the formation of new vectors for human rights development, the enhancement of stability in international partnerships, and the consolidation of democratic values in developing countries.

Within the framework of international discourse, political communication is considered a driving force of social progress, enabling the resolution of social misunderstandings, the implementation of new modern norms and values, and ensuring the stable functioning of human rights. Alongside digital technologies, political communication provides society with the opportunity to actively participate in decision-making and shape the security and information sectors of the state through public oversight. However, it is important to consider that any changes may also lead to negative consequences, posing challenges to the international order, such as human rights violations, cybersecurity threats, wars, conflicts, and disinformation [4]. Therefore, high-quality and effective political communication allows for the regulation of information flows and the reduction of informational noise, contributing to the strengthening and consolidation of democratic principles.

Within the framework of sustainable development, both in the digital environment and in the functioning under new globalization challenges, political communication serves as the foundation of the socio-political environment and international democratic principles. Given the retrospective analysis, both civil society and the government have an equal influence on decision-making regarding matters of national importance. Consequently, there is a need for an in-depth analysis and reconsideration of the role of political communication – where the application of critical analysis and the re-evaluation of international communication principles within politics are essential. For instance, within the study of the communicative foundations of power, Arendt [5] assigned a central role to communication processes, viewing power as a process of multilateral institutional interaction within the communicative space, aimed at organizing coordinated social actions based on the priority of public interest over private interest.

When discussing communicative concepts of power, it is also essential to refer to the research of Habermas [6] and his theory of communicative action, according to which politics is expressed through a system of communicative actions that facilitate interaction between political actors. Habermas, in this context, contrasted two primary types of power – one that emerges through political communication within society and administrative power, whose legitimacy is ensured through the management of political communications. However, the monopolization of the latter ultimately undermines the legitimacy of administrative authority.

For instance, Murray's concept [7, 8] of “The Strange Death of Europe” explicates the fundamental crisis of European political communication, which, operating within the paradigm of uncritical humanitarianism, has institutionalized discursive practices that a priori preclude the articulation of alternative positions on immigration policy. The author argues that the European political establishment, by incorporating the dogmas of social constructivism and left-liberal universalism, has gradually de-transcribed national narratives, replacing them with the construction of an ideological framework in which criticism of migration processes is reduced to the moral delegitimization of the critic. Consequently, the processes of public opinion formation have undergone radical distortion, rendering not only discussions on the long-term socio-cultural implications of mass migration impossible but also undermining the legal protection of indigenous communities as subjects of sovereign self-determination.

Murray [7, 8] demonstrates that this discursive shift has led to a latent yet structural erosion of fundamental national security mechanisms. European states, fearing accusations of xenophobia or reactionary nationalism, have voluntaristically dismantled instruments of social cohesion, thereby disabling an adequate response to the growing threats of ethno-religious conflicts, segregation, and legal dualism. The de facto implementation of ideologically driven regulatory norms, which inherently subordinate the indigenous population within the hierarchy of societal priorities, has resulted in a situation where Europeans have become subjects of systemic marginalization within their own states. Thus, within the coordinates of contemporary European political discourse, a paradoxical inversion occurs: while migrant groups, nominally beneficiaries of inclusion policies, are effectively incorporated into a quasi-privileged social caste, the indigenous population finds itself hostage to a normative regime that increasingly restricts its right to a critical discourse on its own national future.

Political communication, in the discursive dimension of contemporary globalized reality, emerges not only as an attributive element of democratic expression but also as a crucial instrument of ambivalent interaction between governmental institutions, civil society, and supranational regulatory entities. In the context of polycentric transformations of the international order, accompanied by increasing fragmentation of the political space and the escalation of conflictogenic tendencies, the correlation between the protection of fundamental human rights and the imperatives of national security acquires particular conceptual urgency. Global cognitive-informational processes,

driven by digitalization and the multiplicative expansion of communicative flows, enable both the evolution of citizens' political agency and the manipulative instrumentalization of public consciousness in the interests of geopolitical actors, thereby forming an ambivalent matrix of risks and threats. The dichotomy between universalist normative constructs of human rights and the contingent nature of national-state priorities necessitates the search for new analytical models capable of synthesizing methodological intentions from political theory, strategic communication, and security studies. Thus, political communication in the era of global transformations emerges not only as a mechanism for articulating governmental narratives but also as a multidimensional category that simultaneously represents both instruments for ensuring democratic freedoms and tools of political control in the face of hybrid challenges.

Literature Review

Political communication functions as a constitutive element in shaping the state discourse concerning the correlation between the protection of fundamental human rights and the imperatives of national security, particularly in the context of global transformations necessitating a conceptual reassessment of traditional mechanisms of state sovereignty and legal guarantees for individuals. In this regard, it serves not only as a discursive-pragmatic instrument for articulating state policies but also as a mechanism for legitimizing normatively restrictive measures justified by doctrinal categories within the security paradigm. In contemporary research, the analysis of human rights, state security, and the impact of political communication is acquiring a new scientific dimension. Wars, the escalation of hybrid threats, the formation of information-psychological conflicts, and emerging migration challenges prompt scholars to engage in new studies and scientific analysis. For instance, European researchers, including Cameron [9], Clifton et al. [10], and Colomina et al. [4], emphasize that political communication serves as the foundation for the stable functioning of national security and as a direct basis for ensuring human rights in modern conditions. In his research, Cameron [9] conducts an in-depth analysis of the implementation of the European Convention on Human Rights and the various strategies developed by the European Union. Additionally, Clifton et al. [10] examine the process of disinformation as a detrimental factor influencing democratic processes within the state, directly violating human rights.

One of the most problematic aspects of political communication lies in its manipulative potential, which enables the strategic construction of public narratives concerning existential threats, thereby legitimizing normative restrictions on civil rights and freedoms. By employing various methods of cognitive-discursive influence, state institutions can impose the concept of the inevitability of stringent measures, legitimizing them through an appeal to crisis situations. Western scholars, such as Perloff [11], Denton [12], Roy [13], and Nai et al. [14], focus on the media dimension of political communication, particularly in the context of electoral processes and information influence technologies. Perloff [11] explores the threats associated with the digital information ecosystem, including the proliferation of fake narratives, information terrorism, and manipulative algorithms. Denton [12] analyzes political discourse strategies within presidential campaigns, whereas Roy [13] examines communication mechanisms in armed conflicts and peacebuilding operations. Empirical analysis of discursive practices, particularly the anti-migration rhetoric of the Trump administration, illustrates that political communication frequently serves as a social instrument for electoral mobilization through the intensification of public fears and the construction of the "other" as a source of threat [15].

Within the framework of the Ukrainian discourse and in light of contemporary international challenges, the issue of political communication has gained particular significance. In the context of the Russo-Ukrainian war, questions of national security and the protection of human rights in Ukraine are closely intertwined with issues of security, countering disinformation, and hybrid threats. Political communication within the state must be directed towards the establishment and development of a normative-legal discourse that aligns with international standards and ensures comprehensive protection for Ukrainian citizens under critical conditions. Ukrainian researchers, including Bokoch [1], Drotianko [3], Kanishchev [16], Dubov [17], Tymoshenko and Makarenko [18], as well as Likarchuk et al. [19] and Likarchuk [20], have explored the interconnections between political communication, human rights, and informational security in their works. These scholars address how political communication counters disinformation campaigns, lays the groundwork for the development of digital globalization, and operates within the framework of Ukrainian public governance. For instance, Dubov [17] conducts a theoretical and methodological analysis of political communication, highlighting its role as an integral component of Ukraine's state information policy. Meanwhile, his colleagues, Ukrainian researchers Kanishchev [16] and Likarchuk et al. [19] and Likarchuk [20], examine the significance of transforming the digital environment through the lens of political communication to combat fake news and disseminate accurate information about the Russo-Ukrainian war within the international arena. In light of the above, the Ukrainian scholarly discourse has become a foundation for addressing contemporary issues in the sphere of political communication on the global stage. The challenges faced by Ukraine have provided a new impetus for academic inquiry into the mechanisms of political communication, which directly impact the national and

informational security of the state, as well as the protection and promotion of human rights under the conditions of global changes and new geopolitical challenges posed by Russia.

The *aim* of the article is to determine the role of political communication in ensuring human rights and national security in the context of global transformations. The main tasks have been formulated, namely: to reveal the essence of political communication as the foundation of national security and the guarantee of human rights stability.

Methods

The methodological foundation of the conducted research is based on the combination of several methods, namely specialized and general scientific ones, which comprehensively characterize the relevance of the study. Among the general scientific methods, systemic and structural-functional analysis were used. A special method, dialectical, involved considering the phenomenon under study as a unity of opposites that are in constant development and interaction.

The integration of such a methodological complex allows for a multifaceted approach to understanding political communication and, at the same time, reveals its specific features within the framework of human rights and national security. For instance, the dialectical method made it possible to reveal various aspects of the interconnections between national security strategies and the protection of human rights, which, in turn, allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the concept of “political communication” and its practical dimension in a multifaceted context. This methodological justification of the research is based on various principles: multidimensionality, applied relevance, a stable system, and a strong theoretical foundation.

The key methodological approaches include: the systemic and structural-functional methods, which allow for an examination of political communication as a factor in ensuring national security and human rights, revealing the mechanisms of their interaction in the context of globalization; the system analysis method, which enables an assessment of political communication as an integral component of the global informatization of social life and a mechanism of international interaction; the discursive approach, which provides an opportunity to explore the characteristics of the communicative space and define the essence of political narratives that influence the formation of public consciousness and political processes.

The multifaceted nature and interconnection of issues related to national security, human rights protection, and effective political communication are examined through an interdisciplinary approach, allowing for the integration of the theoretical and methodological potential of political science, sociology, law, psychology, and other social sciences.

Results

The modern political process emerges as a multilevel, polystructural, and polysemantic dynamic of interactions between agents of macro- and micro-political discourse, each of whom performs specific functions within the globalized space of power relations. Political communication, in this sense, functions as an attributive mechanism for the transmission of ideologemes, the regulation of political intersubjectivity, and the integration of social systems within the coordinates of normative legitimation of power dispositions [10]. Information, in this context, evolves into a structural-forming factor that not only accumulates knowledge about political reality but also serves as a means of cognitive architectonics of socio-political representations [21]. Through communicative mechanisms, the transmission of political heritage, the operationalization of civic orientations, and the immanent structuring of the political field occur, determining the behavioral patterns of mass subjects.

The gradual transformation of Western societies under the influence of profound civilizational shifts, triggered by the cataclysms of world wars, processes of institutional democratization, and innovative breakthroughs in communication technologies, has determined the emergence of political communicology as an autonomous scientific direction [22]. Accordingly, political communication appears as a complex, multimodal system of socio-psychological and semiotic management, within which informational influences construct the epistemological frameworks of collective consciousness and modify the behavioral representations of individuals in the political space.

National security and human rights constitute two inseparable components of contemporary political discourse, constantly interacting with one another. Political communication, as a phenomenon, shapes public perceptions of these concepts, directing mass consciousness toward a balance between state security interests and fundamental individual freedoms [23]. Governments frequently employ communication technologies to legitimize their security-related decisions, as evidenced in the rhetoric of Western leaders during counterterrorism campaigns. For instance, the introduction of the Prevent Strategy in the United Kingdom was positioned as a necessary mechanism for combating extremism, despite raising concerns regarding potential human rights violations [13]. Similarly, in France, following

a series of terrorist attacks, political communication by the government emphasized the necessity of strengthening state control over citizens' private lives, provoking resistance from human rights organizations. Political actors, by appealing to societal fears, construct narratives that legitimize stricter measures, creating a sense of inevitability among citizens [24]. This tendency is particularly characteristic of democratic societies, where legal frameworks must navigate complex interactions with security challenges.

Political communication, as a constitutive element of the architectonics of modern state-building, assumes the status of a key mechanism for articulating securitization discourses, which, in turn, determine the parameters of interaction between national security imperatives and the normative regulatory framework of human rights in the context of global transformations. As demonstrated by the conceptual framework of the Copenhagen School [25], the process of securitization is not merely a reflexive act of identifying threats but rather a complex sociolinguistic phenomenon, within which political actors engage in the performative legitimization of exceptional measures – often leading to the erosion of democratic procedures and legal guarantees. Political communication, serving as one of the fundamental instruments for constructing the discursive space of legitimizing power narratives, assumes particular significance in the process of securitization as a mechanism for articulating existential threats that necessitate an immediate institutional response from state governance actors. In this context, according to the analytical frameworks of the Copenhagen School, the semiotic designation of certain phenomena as threats to sovereignty and human rights facilitates the formation of societal consensus regarding the implementation of exceptional measures, which may significantly alter the balance between security imperatives and democratic values [26]. Thus, political communication reveals a dialectical antagonism between the securitization logic, which seeks to instrumentally monopolize power discourse under the guise of sovereignty protection, and the humanistic paradigm of human rights, which prevents the arbitrary reduction of fundamental freedoms even in the face of crisis challenges.

In this regard, critical deconstruction of discursive manipulation strategies is of particular significance, as such strategies may legitimize authoritarian practices, transforming security narratives into a mechanism for power concentration and the curtailment of civil rights. Consequently, political communication, as a determinant of securitization processes, necessitates systemic reflection and intellectual verification to maintain a balance between institutional stability and democratic imperatives. Nevertheless, political communication often contains a manipulative component, particularly when it is used to justify restrictions on human rights under the pretext of protecting national security. This phenomenon can be illustrated by U.S. policy following the September 11, 2001, attacks, when the administration of George W. Bush, through strategic public communication, fostered a perception of the necessity for the Patriot Act. A relevant example of securitization is legislation that significantly expanded the powers of security agencies but also sparked extensive debates regarding violations of U.S. constitutional rights [12]. Similar tendencies can be observed in authoritarian regimes, where manipulative political communication becomes the primary instrument for legitimizing repressive measures [27]. For example, in Russia, following the annexation of Crimea, state propaganda promoted the notion of an “external threat” to justify legislative changes that severely restricted freedom of speech and the activities of non-governmental organizations [14]. Thus, the manipulative dimension of political communication evolves into a potent instrument of political control, wherein the government delineates the permissible boundaries of discourse within the public consciousness.

In the context of global migration, the interrelation between national security and human rights becomes even more complex, as political communication on this issue is often based on conflicting narratives. A compelling example is the policy of the Trump administration, whose rhetoric on migrants was grounded in the construction of an image of “threat” to American statehood. As noted by Morris [15], Trump’s communication strategies relied on a rigid dichotomy of “us versus them”, where immigrants were depicted as a potential danger to social stability, the economy, and crime rates. Statements about “caravans of illegals” allegedly bringing crime and drug trafficking contributed to the cultivation of fear of the external “other” within society.

The theory of securitization, fundamentally expanding the epistemological horizons of security studies, demonstrates that the construction of a threat narrative is not an inherent characteristic of objective reality but rather a discursive practice determined by power-communicative mechanisms. Institutionalized actors, possessing the habitus of political legitimacy, articulate certain phenomena as existentially dangerous, manipulating semantic categories such as “threat”, “crisis”, or “danger” to remove the issue from the sphere of democratic discourse and deliberative mechanisms. In this context, the process of securitization emerges as a socially constructed dynamic that legitimizes extraordinary measures which, transcending normal legal procedures, gain societal acceptance through performative speech acts and structural power asymmetry. Accordingly, the constitution of security discourse not only reflects the political conjuncture but also drives the transformation of the normative-legal landscape, creating conditions for the erosion of democratic institutions under the guise of a pseudo-legitimate national security imperative.

Securitization as a speech act demonstrates that verbal constructions do not merely serve a descriptive function but rather perform an ontological structuring of social reality, transforming the phenomenological parameters of threat into normatively entrenched categories. Specifically, the designation of the migrant camp in Calais as “the Jungle” is not a neutral reflection of its empirical characteristics but instead fulfills a performative role in shaping a discursive space where disorder and criminality are construed as inherent attributes of the site, thereby legitimizing the implementation of exceptional measures derived from dominant security narratives [28]. The political utilization of this discourse served to justify measures such as restrictions on asylum programs and the construction of a border wall with Mexico. At the same time, as human rights organizations have pointed out, such communicative tactics contradicted international norms on refugee protection, undermining fundamental humanitarian principles [12]. Therefore, political communication in the realm of migration becomes an arena of contestation between state security arguments and the moral-legal imperatives that define the civilizational progress of society.

In the contemporary globalized world, characterized by multifaceted political turbulence, the escalation of transnational threats, and the ambivalence of security strategies, political communication emerges as a pivotal mechanism for articulating authoritative narratives aimed at balancing the imperatives of national security with the necessity of adhering to internationally recognized human rights standards [29]. It functions not only as an instrument of structural legitimation for governmental decisions but also as a means of influencing mass consciousness through intricate discursive constructions, meta-narratives of threats, and mechanisms of political mobilization [9]. In this context, the issue of semiotic manipulation becomes particularly significant, as political actors, invoking an exaggerated concept of “existential danger”, may deliberately narrow the spectrum of civil rights and freedoms, substituting liberal democratic values with the primacy of state integrity [30].

The relevance of this issue is dictated not only by the intensification of hybrid threats – encompassing information warfare, political populism, and systemic disinformation – but also by the transformation of governance paradigms, which, in times of crisis, increasingly adopt characteristics of normative exclusion legitimized through political communication [11]. Consequently, the systematic analysis of the interdependence between political discourse, security practices, and human rights mechanisms is not merely an academic endeavor but also a practical tool for identifying latent mechanisms of power usurpation under the pretext of safeguarding national security. The proposed table provides an analytical delineation of the key dimensions of political communication in this context, highlighting its strategic mechanisms and examining the potential challenges that democratic institutions may face amid conditions of persistent security instability (Table 1).

Table 1. Discursive Structure of Political Communication as an Instrument of National Security Legitimation and Human Rights Recontextualization in the Epoch of Global Transformations

Discursive Dimension	Substantive Framework	Strategic Communicative Mechanisms	Implications and Systemic Challenges
Political Communication as a Mechanism for the Legitimation of Security Measures	In the context of contemporary global threats, political communication functions as a pivotal instrument for articulating the discourse of necessity regarding the implementation of restrictive measures, justified through rhetoric centered on collective welfare, institutional stability, and counteracting hybrid threats.	Deployment of conceptual frameworks such as “state interest”, “national consolidation”, and “inevitability of preventive actions”.	The inherent risk of constructing autocratic narratives that may subvert fundamental human rights under the pretext of safeguarding national security.
Manipulative Dimensions of Political Communication in the Realm of National Security and Human Rights	Political elites employ discursive technologies to shape public demand for the curtailment of civil liberties in exchange for security guarantees. Through semantic manipulation and strategic	Appeals to historical threats, construction of antagonistic identities, mythologization of existential dangers.	The potential erosion of democratic institutions, the reinforcement of paternalistic societal expectations regarding the role of the state in individual autonomy.

	framing, the conceptual boundaries of rights and restrictions become blurred, fostering an environment of latent coercion.		
Migration Policy as a Nexus of Tension Between National Security and Human Rights	Approaches to shaping migration are developed and subsequently operate under the influence of interactions between humanitarian values and the activities of relevant institutions, as well as the State's current legislation, which must necessarily comply with international standards. Any approach to the migration process must be considered through the lens of security and the protection of citizens' rights. Such communication enables the provision of protection to individuals while adhering to legal norms.	Utilization of “the cultural Other” trope, problematization of economic burdens, reinforcement of sovereign control rhetoric.	Risks of fostering xenophobic attitudes, intensification of social conflicts, delegitimization of international human rights norms.
Political Communication in the Context of Armed Conflict: Legitimation of Military Actions	In situations of armed aggression, political communication serves as a primary instrument for mobilizing society, constructing national identity, and justifying military interventions as the sole viable means of safeguarding sovereignty. This is accompanied by the strategic deployment of propagandistic narratives aimed at fostering patriotic consolidation.	Deconstruction of adversarial messaging, activation of national historical memory, accentuation of existential threats.	Escalation of societal polarization, the risk of entrenching a mono-ideological public sphere, complicating post-conflict reintegration efforts.
International Political Communication in the Sphere of Human Rights and National Security	Contemporary diplomatic discourse is increasingly shaped by the notion of “humanitarian sovereignty”, whereby states must navigate the tensions between international legal imperatives and domestic political realities. The competition for control over global narratives determines the legitimacy of various political actions.	Deployment of categories such as “law enforcement protection”, “the necessity of global governance”, and the construction of “shared threats”.	Fragmentation of the international legal framework, potential for selective interpretations of human rights to serve geopolitical interests.
Digitalization of Political Communication as a Determinant of Human Rights and	The advent of advanced information technologies has fundamentally reshaped political communication, simultaneously reinforcing democratization processes and	Implementation of algorithmic governance of the information sphere, intensification of state oversight over	The normalization of mass surveillance, the proliferation of sophisticated disinformation campaigns, and the

National Security Dynamics	expanding the scope of state surveillance. The discourse on censorship, digital authoritarianism, and mass opinion manipulation has emerged as a critical point of contention in balancing freedom of expression with security needs.	digital communication channels.	potential for systemic manipulation of public discourse.
Post-Crisis Transformations in Political Communication: Reconfiguring National Security and Human Rights Paradigms	In the aftermath of crises, political communication is instrumental in redefining the social contract, reassessing the conceptual foundations of security and human rights in alignment with emerging geopolitical realities. This process involves the normalization of legal and political shifts, which may either consolidate or erode democratic principles.	Utilization of narratives such as “restoration of national order”, “adaptation to the new geopolitical landscape”, and “universality of democratic values”.	The potential institutionalization of authoritarian practices, the emergence of new political-legal paradigms that recalibrate the balance between security imperatives and human rights protections.

Source: developed by the author based on [7, 8, 12, 14, 24, 27]

Within the framework of contemporary democratic society, the ontological-axiological matrix of social existence is constituted by such pivotal categories as ideological and political pluralism, the unrestricted freedom of opinion articulation, and the autonomy of mass media, which function as fundamental communicative mediators of political discourse [19, 20]. By performing a broad spectrum of social functions, these values construct a polycentric mechanism of informational exchange that intermediates interactions between civil society and governmental structures, thereby establishing conditions for the democratic representation of societal interests. The implementation of these legal prerogatives initiates the formation of a distinctive political discursive culture, which, emerging within the context of electoral processes, acquires qualitatively novel attributes [31]. This entails not merely conventional information transfer but also an institutionalized impact on the construction of governing bodies through mechanisms of electoral volition, which, in turn, determines the modification of communicative suggestive strategies concerning public opinion.

According to Ordenov [32, 33], the fundamental politico-legal vector of citizen participation, as well as that of other electoral process actors in the domain of informational interaction during pre-election campaigns, is the realization of the guaranteed right to electoral agitation, which serves as the dominant instrument for the democratic legitimation of the governmental mandate.

The political communication of V. Putin regarding the protection of the russian-speaking population constitutes a fundamental element of the strategic discourse aimed at legitimizing Russia’s foreign policy and security narratives. By appealing to the concept of the “russian world” (russkiy mir), Kremlin rhetoric instrumentalizes humanitarian categories to justify revisionist geopolitics and the projection of power in neighboring states. The use of claims about the “oppression” of russian-speaking communities as a casuistic argument for interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign states demonstrates a deliberate manipulation of the human rights paradigm. In this way, under the guise of ensuring national security, russia constructs the concept of “defensive aggression”, which legitimizes the use of political and military instruments. The expansion of this discourse is accompanied by information and propaganda campaigns that portray Russia as the “last bastion of traditional values”. Simultaneously, such communication not only mobilizes the domestic electorate but also constructs new boundaries of political subjectivity within the Russian-speaking space. Thus, the discourse of protection serves merely as a facade for the realization of imperial ambitions and the revision of the established international order.

The issue of human rights in the context of national security in Ukraine under martial law acquires a polyvalent significance, intertwining questions of sovereignty, international law, and humanitarian resilience. The aggression, accompanied by massive violations of fundamental rights, transforms state institutions toward militarized

mobilization, often generating a dilemma between legal norms and security imperatives. At the same time, war exacerbates the phenomenon of forced migration, leading to the dispersion of human capital and altering the socio-demographic configuration of the region [34, 35]. The imperative of international policy in supporting Ukraine is determined not only by global security realities but also by moral and legal categories that appeal to principles of justice and the right to self-determination. Under these circumstances, the state is compelled to balance between democratic institutions and the necessity of strict regulation of strategic resources to counter the aggressor. The legal aspects of martial law serve not only as an instrument for managing crisis processes but also as a point of intersection between national and international legal discourse. Consequently, the challenges posed by war require a comprehensive understanding both in the security domain and in the broader context of fundamental human rights.

Discussion

In the course of historical development, a set of cognitive-informational patterns or political consciousness forms has emerged, ensuring the reproduction of corresponding institutions. These include various models of ideologies, sentiments, values, symbols, doctrines, official norms, and oppositional evaluations [17]. Their personification in the perceptions of different actors constitutes the essence of the political process. The core of this process lies in the fact that, through the transmission and exchange of messages, political entities engage in communicative acts with various counterparties, establishing the necessary contacts and connections that enable them to assume diverse political roles [36]. At the same time, targeted interactions between individuals who exchange and consume various pieces of information, knowledge, and messages integrate different levels of the political system, allowing distinct structures and institutions of governance to perform their specific functions in managing the state and society, thus ensuring the reproduction of the social system.

On the one hand, political communication is a necessary instrument of governance that helps societies comprehend real threats and respond adequately to challenges. Governments in democratic states must implement effective information campaigns to secure public support for decisions aimed at ensuring security. Without active political dialogue, achieving societal consensus on measures that may temporarily restrict certain rights would be impossible [16, 37]. For instance, in cases of terrorist threats or large-scale migration crises, certain restrictions may be justified if they adhere to the principle of proportionality and have a clear legal foundation. However, there is a significant danger of political communication being abused when the state deliberately cultivates a sense of threat to justify repressive measures. History has shown that governments frequently exploit security rhetoric to curtail civil liberties, particularly during crises. States may intentionally exaggerate dangers to garner public support for strict policies that, in reality, undermine democratic principles [38]. Therefore, the key issue remains the search for balance: how to ensure national security without transforming the state into a mechanism for suppressing human rights under the guise of communicative strategies.

Political communication is a dynamic phenomenon that evolves in response to the development of mass communication technologies in contemporary society. Technological transformations play a crucial role in shaping the possibilities and functional parameters of political communication, directly influencing its content and operational structure. Among the key characteristics of modern political communication, which are fundamental to understanding this phenomenon, its role as an instrument for ensuring human rights and national security in the context of global changes should be highlighted:

1. Non-systemic informational and communicative influence, characterized by randomness, inconsistency, and irregularity, cannot be classified as political communication. This, in turn, makes it possible to exclude a significant portion of informational noise inherent in contemporary political practices from further analytical consideration. Such an approach is essential in the context of ensuring human rights, national security, and accounting for the impact of global transformations on political processes.
2. Any communicative process within a modern political system cannot be one-sided by nature, as the effectiveness of communication is conditioned by the necessity of considering the response of the target audience. Moreover, the formation of a space for communicative co-participation, within which independent meaningful concepts, perceptions, images, and values are constructed, represents a crucial factor in political governance under conditions of global transformations. In this context, communicative technologies of interactive propaganda and horizontal informational-communicative interaction among political actors play a key role, contributing not only to the dissemination of political narratives but also to the protection of human rights within the political discourse.

3. Given the diversity of interests and needs among participants in political communication, communication itself acquires a competitive character, unfolding within a sphere of struggle for the dominance of specific values, images, perceptions, and meanings that serve as instruments for advancing the interests of respective actors. The globalization of the informational space leads to a substantial increase in the number of participants in political communication, further intensifying its competitive dynamics. At the same time, national security remains a critical aspect, as information confrontation can have not only ideological but also strategic consequences for state policy.

4. The effective functioning of political communication necessitates a well-developed infrastructure that includes informational resources, communication channels, political content generators, and technological instruments. Their combination determines the scale and level of political communication, which correlates with the parameters of the available infrastructure. At the same time, in contemporary conditions, the technological component of the communicative infrastructure assumes paramount significance, directly influencing the effectiveness of processes aimed at ensuring human rights in the context of global transformations.

5. Political communication fosters the formation of a virtual space filled with competing values, images, perceptions, ideas, and meanings that shape how political reality is perceived by participants in communicative interaction. One of the key consequences of the interaction between competing ideological, value-based, and meaning-related components within a unified communicative space is the creation of a political pseudo-reality. This pseudo-reality emerges as a result of the integration of competing content into a single virtual construct, the substantive characteristics of which may significantly diverge from the initial communicative intentions of any individual actor. Consequently, the struggle to shift the pseudo-reality, constructed through political communication, in a direction favorable to a particular actor constitutes the essence of contemporary informational confrontation. The dynamic nature of pseudo-reality necessitates the continuous maintenance of its ideological, value-based, and meaning-related components within the space of political communication, a factor that, in the context of global transformations, may have significant implications for national security.

6. The competitive nature of ideologies, meanings, symbols, and values transmitted within the communicative space fosters a tendency toward the radicalization of their political content. Notably, even such a concept as tolerance may, in the contemporary political discourse, undergo radicalization and be instrumentalized for political struggle. At the same time, in this context, ensuring human rights emerges as a fundamental criterion for assessing the democratic nature of political processes [7, 8, 12, 14, 18, 24, 27, 30]. The debate over the balance between national security and human rights in wartime contexts remains a contentious issue in both political and academic discourse. Proponents of stringent security measures argue that exceptional circumstances justify temporary restrictions on civil liberties to ensure state survival. Conversely, critics warn that such justifications often serve as pretexts for authoritarian practices and long-term erosions of democratic norms. The case of Russia's political rhetoric exemplifies how security narratives can be weaponized to rationalize aggressive foreign policies under the pretense of humanitarian protection. At the same time, Ukraine's experience demonstrates the difficulty of maintaining democratic integrity while responding to existential threats. The international community faces a dilemma: how to support security efforts without compromising fundamental rights and legal norms [39]. Addressing these challenges requires a multidimensional approach that integrates legal, ethical, and strategic considerations to prevent the misuse of security discourse in justifying violations of sovereignty and human dignity.

Conclusion

The mechanisms of communicative interaction determine the expansion of the individual's cognitive domain, facilitating the continuous accumulation of noospheric meanings and the accessibility of novel informational constructs. This, in turn, transforms the paradigm of decision-making, enabling the subject to transcend the unidimensionality of strategic choices and incorporate pluralistic approaches in the process of social adaptation. Simultaneously, such a dynamic engenders antagonisms and discourse polarization, which, although intensifying competitive processes, also establishes preconditions for their harmonization through the universality of communicative mechanisms that mitigate asymmetries in access to their institutional and heuristic resources. The distinctive attributes of contemporary civil society correlate with the devaluation of obsolete worldview-axiological constructs, which are being supplanted by adaptive, dynamically reflexive models of social identification. A determining imperative in this context is the internalization of communicative experience acquired through discursive

interactions, accompanied by the integration of novel cognitive formations. The potential axiological dissonance, which is inevitable within the polyvectorial structure of civil society, can be subjected to constructive neutralization through the institutionalization of effective communicative strategies. Consequently, the new ontological parameters of social existence and the transformation of societal macrostructures are determined by communicative modalities that constitute modernized models of social interaction.

National security and human rights are fundamental categories that exist in a state of dynamic interrelation, with political communication playing a crucial role in shaping public discourse. Governments, through communication strategies, can not only inform citizens but also manipulate public opinion, justifying restrictions on rights under the pretext of ensuring security. Taking into account international practices, particularly diverse strategies for combating extremism, counterterrorism policies, and the implementation of modern cybersecurity mechanisms in France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, it can be argued that the world is undergoing constant changes, most of which are negative and pose a threat to international order. The increasing activity of states with authoritarian regimes, particularly Russia, necessitates the implementation of new mechanisms, strategies, and standards of political communication to counter disinformation.

The persistent and unchanging Russian discourse since 2014 regarding the so-called protection of the Russian-speaking population serves as a strategic tool for undermining Ukraine's national security. On the international level, we observe a distinctive form of political communication from Russia that legitimizes interventionist policies and infringes upon the sovereignty of neighboring states. In contrast, Ukraine is developing a unique system of political communication that effectively safeguards national and information security during wartime while establishing a framework for the protection of human rights in emergency situations. Notably, since the beginning of 2025, we have observed a growing intersection between national security and human rights, particularly in the context of migration. For instance, Donald Trump's administration serves as an example of how rhetoric can portray migrants as a security threat, thereby legitimizing strict immigration policies.

The process of political communication is continuous; however, its intensification is observed during electoral periods, when a wide range of strategies is employed to influence the electorate in order to gain its support. Political communication is carried out through mass media, politically organized entities, and informal channels.

A distinctive feature of the modern political sphere is the active integration of technological functioning principles, which standardize, unify, and systematize political processes and relations. This influence is particularly evident in the sphere of political communication. The rapid advancement of technical means of information transmission has shifted the center of political interaction towards electronic mass media, accompanied by commercialization, theatricality, a tendency toward sensationalism, and factual distortions, which, in turn, contribute to the overall irrationalization of the political world. These phenomena underscore the need for further scientific inquiry and constitute a subject of ongoing research in the field of political communication.

References

- [1] Bokoch, Y. (2017). Research on political communication in the context of societal transformation. *Scientific Journal of the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University*, 21, 21–27. <http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/19572>
- [2] Skiba, I. P. (2023). The transformation of communication language under the influence of the informatization processes of society. *Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies. Collection of Scientific Papers*, 2(38), 94–100. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18121>
- [3] Drotianko, L. H. (2024). The uniqueness of human existence in contemporary social communications. *Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies. Collection of Scientific Papers*, 1(39), 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.39.18424>
- [4] Colomina, C., Sánchez Margalef, H., Youngs, R., & Jones, K. (2021). The impact of disinformation on democratic processes and human rights in the world. *Brussels: European Parliament*, pp. 1–54. <https://doi.org/10.2861/59161>
- [5] Arendt, H. (2018). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226586748.001.0001>
- [6] Habermas, J. (1985). *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society*. Beacon Press.
- [7] Murray, D. (2018). *The Strange Death of Europe: Immigration, Identity, Islam*. Bloomsbury.
- [8] Murray, D. (2025). *On democracies and death cults: Israel and the future of civilization*. Broadside Books.
- [9] Cameron, I. (2021). *National Security and the European Convention on Human Rights*. Brill.

- [10] Clifton, M.-J., Rab, S., & Scorey, D. (2024). *Building Bridges in European and Human Rights Law: Essays in Honour and Memory of Paul Heim CMG*. Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509952618>
- [11] Perloff, R. M. (2025). *The Dynamics of Political Communication: Media and Politics in a Digital Age*. (4th ed.). Routledge.
- [12] Denton, R. E. Jr. (2025). *The 2024 presidential campaign: A communication perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [13] Roy, S. (2025). *The Handbook of Conflict and Peace Communication. Global Handbooks in Media and Communication Research*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [14] Nai, A., Grömping, M., & Wirz, D. (2025). *Elgar Encyclopedia of Political Communication. Elgar Encyclopedias in the Social Sciences Series*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [15] Morris, H. E. (2025). *Apocalyptic Authoritarianism: Climate Crisis, Media, and Power. Journalism and Political Communication Unbound*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197807705.001.0001>
- [16] Kanishchev, H. (2024). The mechanism of the state in the context of human rights in the information society. *International Science Journal of Jurisprudence & Philosophy*, 3(1), 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjip.20240301.02>
- [17] Dubov, D. V. (2016). Strategic communications: Problems of conceptualization and practical implementation. *Strategic Priorities. Series: Politics*, 4(41), 9–23. <https://ippi.org.ua/sites/default/files/dubov.pdf>
- [18] Tymoshenko, V., & Makarenko, L. (2022). Political and legal guarantees of human and civil security. *Law Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs*, 4(12), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.56215/04221204.09>
- [19] Likarchuk, N., Järvis M., Varenyk, O., Malykhina, S., & Konopliannykova, M. (2022). Current Trends and Current Issues in the Training of Marketing Communications Managers. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 1(42), 522–528. <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.1.42.2022.3646>
- [20] Likarchuk, N. (2024). The Information State in the Context of International Security and Global Identity: Challenges and Prospects. *International Relations: Theoretical and Practical Aspects*, (14), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-745X.14.2024.319359>
- [21] Lacatus, C. (2024). Balancing Legalism and Pragmatism: A Qualitative Content Analysis of Human Rights Language in Peace Agreements. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 16(1), 325–341. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huad038>
- [22] Upadhyaya, P. (2018). Human Rights for Sustaining Peace. *Journal of the National Human Rights Commission, India*, 17, 147–163. <https://www.prio.org/publications/11162>
- [23] Kālin, C. H. (2024). *Citizenship and Human Rights: From Exclusive and Universal to Global Rights*. Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509950270>
- [24] Macnamara, J. (2025). *Public Communication and Public Policy: Reviving Democracy by Recalibrating Public Communication*. (1st ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- [25] Does, A. (2013). Securitization theory. In: *The construction of the Maras*. Graduate Institute Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.iheid.719>
- [26] Stritzel, H. (2014). Securitization Theory and the Copenhagen School. In: *Security in Translation. New Security Challenges Series*. (pp. 11–37). Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137307576_2
- [27] Edelstein, D., & Pitts, J. (2025). *The Cambridge History of Rights*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009019521>
- [28] Eroukhmanoff, C. (2018). *Securitisation theory: An introduction*. E-International Relations. <https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/72393>
- [29] Peresh, I. Ye., & Barna, O. (2022). The Right to Peace in the System of Human Rights. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 5, 88–89. <http://journal-app.uzhnu.edu.ua/article/view/270336/265696>
- [30] Hillert, L. (2024). Human Rights and Peacebuilding: Bridging the Gap. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 16(1), 302–324. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huad037>
- [31] Bulhakov, D. O. (2024). Communication activities of government bodies. *Political Culture and Ideology*, 3, 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.31558/2519-2949.2024.3.4>
- [32] Ordenov, S. (2020). Political communication and the language of media in the post-industrial era. *Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy & Culture*, 40(2), 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.40.19326>
- [33] Ordenov, S. (2023). The transformation of the concept of human rights in the political language of communication. *Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies. Collection of Scientific Papers*, 2(38), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18108>

- [34] Sidorkina, O. M. (2024). The personality in the context of modern challenges (a communicative aspect). *Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies. Collection of Scientific Papers*, 1(39), 65–69. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.39.18459>
- [35] Ploger, G., & Soroka, S. (2025). Political communication. In: *Handbook of innovations in political psychology*. (pp. 354–373). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803924830.00026>
- [36] Wolfsfeld, G. (2022). *Making sense of media and politics: Five principles in political communication*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003176657>
- [37] Pendalchuk, Y. V. (2024). Theoretical foundations of political communication formation. *Modern Scientific Journal*, 3(1), 144–148. <https://doi.org/10.36994/2786-9008-2024-3-18>
- [38] Kleshnya, H. M. (2021). Cyber-social society: The new rhizome. *Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies. Collection of Scientific Papers*, 1(33), 45–51.
- [39] Dabizha, V. V. (2024). Political communication as a tool of scientific diplomacy. *Modern Scientific Journal*, 6(4), 104–111. <https://doi.org/10.36994/2786-9008-2024-6-13>

