CULTURE & SECURITY

JULIUSZ PIWOWARSKI
Wyzsza Szkola Bezpieczenstwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego "Apeiron", Krakow (Poland)
e-mail: science2@apeiron.edu.pl

The *Budo Charter* as a modern component of personal cultural security

Abstract

Background. The author presents the *Budo Charter* in the context of its position in the *cultural security* system, in particular its influence on personal cultural security. *Budo* is a system that combines numerous stlyes of widely-understood martial arts, originating from the traditions cultivated in Japan. In contrast to ancient and Mediaeval *bujutsu*, which comprises an array of Japanese war techniques and combat methods, *budo* cultivates a spiritualised, psycho-physical type of *bujutsu*.

Problem. *Budo* constitutes an important element in the continuity of Japanese *cultural security*. As *budo* puts a strong emphasis on self-fulfilment and education, it is important to note that subjects of actions attaining self-fulfilment, by following the way of the warrior are not only found in Japanese socio-cultural tradition. The same phenomenon can be found in China and Korea, and the method is currently commonplace internationally, thus influencing numerous *national security cultures*.

Methods. The problem has been analysed by triangulation from two points of view – that of *security studies*, pioneered in Poland by Marian Cieslarczyk, and that of the *humanist theory of martial arts*, developed by Wojciech J. Cynarski.

Results and conclusions. Modern *budo* instils a concrete, utilitarian value in a broad audience across the globe. After all, cultural security only has purpose when it does not exclusively serve the *state*. It becomes more of an art of life that a martial art, without eschewing its old capabilities, enabling its practitioners to attain a sense of security which is important for them as *subjects of security*.

1. Introduction

Budo is a relatively unique social phenomenon. It combines numerous styles of widely-understood martial arts, which originated from the traditions cultivated in the Land of the Rising Sun [Nakiri 2015: 11-25]. In contrast to ancient and Mediaeval *bujutsu*, which comprises an array of Japanese war techniques and combat methods, *budo* cultivates a spiritualised, psycho-physical type of *bujutsu*. It constitutes an important element of the continuity of the Japanese *cultural security*.

From the point of view of the subdisciplines of the *humanist theory of martial arts* developed by Wojciech Cynarski [Cynarski, Piwowarski 2016; Cynarski, Obodynski 2003; Cynarski 2000; 2004; 2006; 2012b] and *security culture*, pioneered in Poland by Marian Cieslarczyk, *budo* puts a strong emphasis on the self-fulfilment and educational aspect of human activity.

It is important to note that subjects of actions attaining self-fulfilment by following the way of the warrior is not only to be found in the Japanese socio-cultural tradition. The same can be found in China and Korea, and the method is currently commonplace among all nations of the world, constituting a factor which influences numerous *national cultures of security*.

The main feature of the *budo* multisystem is its advanced cross-disciplinary approach and the myriad of forms it assumes. The *budo*-based evolution of the axiological sphere and the effect of socio-cultural systems, the fields of multidirectional practice of self-development, transgression and transcendence are described by *security anthropology*, which originates from the *humanist theory of martial arts*, as well as by the *security studies theory* as seen from the point of view of *social studies – cultural security*.

2. *Budo* and the personal approach to cultural security

The basic premise of *security* is related to defining humans as personal beings. The dignity of a person constitutes a

basic term not only for ethics, but is also related to the issues tackled by sociologists of morality.

Therefore, threats to *personal security* have material grounds, but can also assume the form of attempts to objectify humans by assuming control of their consciousness and altering it so as to enable the achievement of particular interests of the state or certain social groups. *Personal security*, which is determined by axiology, which places humans at the centre of all deliberation, cannot be analysed in isolation and without taking into account structural security. It manifests in the reassurance of developing the potential of particular individuals by utilising *security* management elements, primarily by the *nation state* and its capabilities.

Cultural security is interpreted in various manners in the literature. If we assume that the term is part of the field of *management* and denotes the "process of coordinating collective efforts for the achievement of organisational goals by humans, using techniques, in organised structures, based on set tasks" [Kaczmarek, Sikorski 1999: 38], then this approach can also be applied to all organisations operating within the field of *cultural security*. Therefore, it can be said that management understood in this manner comprises conscious, rational and desired shaping of mutual dependencies between the above-mentioned elements of the *cultural security* organisational system, and influences the creativity and effectiveness of individuals and groups in this field[1].

Thus, *cultural security* is the above-mentioned function of *national security culture* (nsc), which constitutes the entirety of recorded, material and immaterial human achievement which serves the broadly-understood *national identity*. It renders it possible to maintain, restore (if lost) and improve the level of security of a given individual or collective security subject.

National security culture and *cultural security* constitute a field of social influences which comprise three streams of individual, social and material energy [Piwowarski 2012: 3-8]:

1. The mental-spiritual stream (individual *security subjects*),
2. The social-organisational-legal stream (group *security subjects*, e.g. families, social groups, nations),
3. The physical (material) stream.

It follows from the above that individual humans who are citizens of a nation-state, and who constitute personal carriers of the culture of national security, constitute subjects of action, which can be described as more than just "persons of culture". The same applies to the subject of the culture of national security, which is a particular, established achievement of a nation, a particular resource of a nation-state, and is not limited to the works of national art, theatres, museums, cul-ture centres etc. Individuals who are personal carriers of a *national cultural security* are citizens of *nation-states*. It is my opinion that they may be an example of a systemic pattern for individual security subjects, which comprises:

1. An active security subject,
2. A passive security subject,
3. An entitled security subject,
4. A destructive (socially harmful) security subject.

For the level of *national security culture*, which determines whether the entire supersystem of *national security* functions properly, the proportions in which the above-mentioned types of *individual security subjects* appear in *society* is of high importance, as well as which of those is dominant considering the current state of *national bonds* and *national consciousness*. It is also important whether it applies equally to *difficult situations* and whether the attitudes of the dominant types of subjects extend to everyday lives of *citizens*, *social groups*, *the nation* and their *state*.

A high level of *national security culture* can be achieved when its individual carriers, the citizens, are the dominant *active security subjects*. This new research category introduced by me will be explained in more detail in the following chapters of this paper.

The same also applies to the collective approach to *active society*, popularised and researched by Amitai Etzioni and of which I, too, am a proponent[2]. As Etzioni points out (a fact that is difficult even for libertarians to object to), an individual "human does not exist unless he exists socially; that what he is depends on his social being, and the utility of that social being is inextricably bound with who he becomes. He does possess the ability to control his internal being, and the main road to *self-control* leads to joining others, similar subjects in social actions" [Etzioni 2012: 22]. According to Amitai Etzioni, "social individuals may be collectives or associations," and "being active means being in control; being passive is being controlled" [Etzioni 2012: 24]. Amitai Etzioni claims that an *active subject of action* should possess three attributes [Etzioni 2012: 24]:

1. **Being conscious (identity)**, being a well-informed social actor – a subject of action,
2. **Involvement of the subject** – is related to having one or several goals which the social actor desires

---

[1] *Sectors of security* – thematic areas into which analysed processed are ordered in *security studies*, serving as horizontal extensions of the idea of security [Buzan 1991].

[2] Amitai Etzioni (true name: Werner Falk, born 1929 in Cologne, Germany) – a remarkable American sociologist of Jewish descent, whose main interest was the sociology of organisations. He was a leader and an intellectual patron of American communitarianism. Etzioni's family fled from Nazi Germany to Palestine, Etzioni was raised in a *moshav*. He was an activist of social democrats' movement; he also fought for the independence of Israel. In the late 1970-ties, he became an advisor of J. Carter, President of the United States. Etzioni's works highlight the importance of the balance between the rights and the duties, as well as between the autonomy of individuals and social order. [*Cf.* Etzioni 1994; Etzioni 2009]

and strives to achieve in his or her life as an *active subject of action*,

3. **Possession of sufficient power by the *subject of action***, which is necessary to implement changes in the social collective to which he or she belongs.

The above collective concept of A. Etzioni will be utilised by me to present my own approach in this paper, one which focuses on the idea of the *active security subject* – both individual and collective.

In 1994, the United Nations Development Programme published its report on *social development* and the levels of *human security*. The document presents a completely new approach to *security* due to the fact that it focuses on humans (hence *human security*) [Michalowska in Symonides 2010: 227], and not the *state*, as it had hitherto been the case. The term *security* had for centuries been related to conflicts between *states*, threats to their borders and armed or unarmed conflicts for peace. According to the UNDP report, for the majority of humans on Earth, the lacking sense of security stems from concerns related to

everyday living conditions, not from fear caused by any events unfolding around the globe.

By observing the *social reality* and assessing it from the point of view of culturalism, human rights and freedoms which are a requirement for individuals to feel secure refer, among others, to the following capabilities of each *individual security subject* – a citizen of a *nation-state*:

1. Unrestricted participation in the cultural life of *society*;
2. Partaking of national art;
3. Development and popularising research and culture;
4. Participation in scientific progress and reaping its benefits;
5. Freedom of thought, consciousness and religion;
6. Legal prohibition of inciting nationality, race or religion-based hatred;
7. Prohibition of discrimination due to race, skin colour, language, religion, nationality;
8. Rights and protection thereof for national, ethnic and religious minorities;
9. Rights of individuals to protect their own interests arising from research, literary or artistic endeavours of which the individual is the author.

Roger Vernon Scruton studies primarily the extramaterial sphere of western *culture*, including *security culture*, which forms a pillar of the western cultural sphere. He points to the fact that "when anthropologists write about *culture*, they mean common customs and [material and extramaterial] artefacts, to which a given [*social*] *group* owes its cohesion. Ethnologists define *culture* more broadly, including all intellectual, emotional and behavioural characteristics passed down via teaching and *social relations*, and sociologists use the term to denote the thoughts and customs which render it pos-

sible to define the *group identity* of a given *nation* and define the borders of social space" [Scruton 2010: 15].

Members of the elite of each *nation-state society* constitute the vanguard of the builders of *national culture*. However, a very beneficial element of *social cohesion* and the pedagogical and educational policy of the *state* is the situation in which, despite fact that "*culture* is created by the elite, its meaning can be found in common [to *society* at large] feelings and aspirations" [Scruton 2010: 15]. Thus, its availability, influence and reception are not only limited to those *social circles* which managed to attain elite status.

The above clearly matches the research on the development of *security culture* initiated on a large scale in Poland by Marian Cieslarczyk from "before *security studies* even formally existed" [Cieslarczyk 2000: 7].

Security culture is also related to reflection, which is a much-needed element as regards displaying and understanding the sublime *nature* which is extracted by *national security culture* from the features of *culture*. It should be added that this also applies to the personal level, which is the domain of the *1st stream of national security culture* – the stream which form the beginning of laying the groundwork for the theoretical and practical aspects of *national security*.

3. The legal basis of cultural security

The legal protection of *national heritage* is contingent upon the administration, i.e. the *2nd stream of national security culture*. This heritage functions naturally in *social reality* – it is a synthesis of the creative efforts of a nation encompassing all *three streams of the nsc*, defined in the form of the following triad: **ideas-organisation-artefacts**, which represents the spectrum of the spheres of the *mental, socio-cultural* and *material carriers* of the *1st* and *2nd streams of the nsc*.

In Poland, the status of the legal protection of *national heritage* is determined by the applicable provisions [Journal of Laws 1997, No 141 Item 943]. The analysis of the tasks of administrative divisions within the context of the myriad of the *functions of the state* directs *cultural security* towards matters related to the ability of the *nation state* to defend its own *cultural identity* and its *national culture* and *heritage* in a way which renders possible unrestricted *social development* in this field and based on that culture and heritage.

Within this context, it is also important to remember that *security studies* are very trans- and interdisciplinary in nature. As an example, Tomasz Aleksandrowicz claims that "the interdisciplinary nature, which extends far beyond *social studies*, manifests as [...] a constituent of the identity of *security studies* [2015: 56]. It is important to remember that interdisciplinarity is defined as "the interaction of two or more disciplines". It can

manifest as both "simple exchanges of ideas", as well as "mutual integrations of concepts, methods, procedures, epistemologies, terminologies and data, leading to organising research and teaching which is relatively broad in scope" [*Interdisciplinarity* 1972: 25-26]. Stanislaw Sulowski claims that "the term *transdisciplinarity* can be considered synonymous with *interdisciplinarity*, but is sometimes understood as an advanced form of interdisciplinarity. [2015: 32].

It is important to emphasise that an individual, "isolated" research discipline is virtually incapable of answering to all questions related to as complex a phenomenon as *cultural security* [Such-Pyrgiel 2013]. Undoubtedly, one may attempt to deconstruct the field of *national security* (*state security*) into its various subsystems, depending on the stated goal of the *systemic analysis* used and the division criteria employed, and, as a result, confirm the above-mentioned thesis according to which *cultural security* constitutes an important part of *national security* and comprises all conditions and institutions which protect a *state* and its citizens from phenomena which pose a threat to their *national culture* and the accompanying sense of *national identity*, which is irreplaceable even with the highest level of *human capital*. In certain conditions, *human capital* can itself be a threat (!). This happens whenever *subjects of actions* who possess broad knowledge, high skills, talent and extensive experience lack competencies as regards *ethical* and *legal culture*. The level of these competencies at the motivational level (implementation) is closely related to the sense of *national identity* – its existence or nonexistence. *Subjects* which do not strongly self-identify as parts of *society* constitute hindrances or even threats to *national security culture*. Semantically, the term *identity* is close to terms such as identification and self-identification, and can encompass both the personal and group level (i.e. the religious, ethnic or national level). On the national level, *cultural identity* is a factor which shapes a positive sense of nationalism – patriotism which unifies the historical memory of a nation, facilitating the citizens' identification with their own *state* and its political goals [Kukulka 1999: 9].

The term *culture* appears in acts of law and other lower-rank legal instruments. The usage of *culture*-related categories in legal provisions of various ranks by the legislature has been steadily increasing. This is due to the growing importance of *cultural security*. It is a matter of the *culture* ingrained in the history of a given *nation* and the humanity-wide values which, let me emphasise this again, greatly transcend the spheres of literature, art or personal etiquette.

Protecting national heritage is listed among the primary values on which the Constitution of the Republic of Poland is based, and the *state* (Article 5) is responsible for its protection. At the same time, in Article 6, the legislator lists creating the conditions necessary for disseminating and equal access to culture, which is the source of the Polish nation's identity, its continued existence and development, as one of the main tasks of our democratic state. The relations of Poles living abroad to their national heritage are an integral part of this identity (Article 6.2). These provisions are complemented by the constitutional right to artistic freedom, freedom to partake of culture, as well as the right of national and ethnic minorities to preserve and develop their own languages, customs, traditions, develop their own cultures and protect their religious identity [*Constitution* 1997: art. 5, 6, 35, 73].

As I have already mentioned, *national cultural security* should be associated not only with universal, constitutional values, but also with government bodies and the important role they have in the *national security system*. [Piwowarski 2016]

The simplest classic version of the *national security system* divides into two elementary subsystems. These include th e *internal security subsystem* and the *external security subsystem* [Kitler 2012: 25; Chojnowski 2015: 24-26]. The internal security subsystem should counteract all threats which may limit or render impossible the unconstrained and stable growth in the main areas of public life [Gierszewski 2013: 16], including cultural life.

According to Bernard Wisniewski, the *state internal security* system is a set of government and public administration bodies which is part of the *national security system*, and encompasses an entire spectrum of methods related to protecting the constitutional order, life and health of citizens and the wealth of a given nation from lawless acts, as well as the results of natural and technological disasters. [Wisniewski 2004: 62] It appears that the above definition does not encompass all necessary elements – numerous other conditions need to be met in order to guarantee the ability of the *state* to counteract *cultural threats*, among others. Understood as such, *cultural security* is related to the striving of the *state* towards ensuring the proper functioning of institutions responsible for solving cultural issues of protective nature, which are important from the point of view of the *national security system*. It should also be noted that *cultural security* has been included in the list of Polish strategic *security policy* goals. *Cultural security* constitutes part of *socio-cultural security*, the aim of which is to create the best conditions possible for universal and stable social and economic development of the country, the wealth of its citizens and to preserve its *cultural heritage* and develop its *national identity*. Protecting cultural heritage and national identity thus becomes a strategic goal of the *national security system*.

An important element of the legal basis of the *cultural security* of the Republic of Poland are Acts of law and other lower-rank legal instruments (implementing provisions, ministerial provisions, normative acts) related to protecting culture in Poland. The principal legal act

in this regard is the Act of 15 February 1962 on protecting culture and its amendments, the most important of which is the general amendments of 1990 and 1996 on museums [Journal of Laws 1962 No 4 Item 16; 1990, No 56 Item 332; 1996, No 106 Item 496; 1997, No 5 Item 24]. The act specifies culture to be "historical artefacts" (which, according to experts, constitutes a narrowing of the term), claims that it constitutes a "national treasure" and obliges "all citizens" to protect it. This obligation should be treated as an educational postulate. The real obligations are imposed by state bodies and local authorities, which themselves are obliged to create the legal, organisational and financial conditions necessary to protect culture (Article 1.2). The act also imposes obligations on owners and users, whose task is to maintain the cultural artefacts in their possession in the appropriate condition (Article 1.3). The act also specifies the goal of protecting culture, which is to preserve it, properly maintain it, use it in a socially deliberate manner and render it available for research, educational and pedagogical purposes, so that it serves science and the popularisation of knowledge and art, constitutes a lasting element of cultural development and constitutes an active constituent of the life of modern society (Article 3.1.). Within the meaning of the act, protecting artefacts of culture consists in securing them from destruction, damage, being vandalised, lost or taken outside the country, creating the conditions necessary for their lasting preservation, developing proper research documentation, lists and registries, as well as preserving, restoring and rebuilding them based on scientific principles [*Ustawa o ochronie dobr kultury* 1962, art. 3.2].

Another important act from the point of view of the *cultural security* of Poland is the Act on the Polish language of 7 October 1999, which concerns the protection of Polish and its use in the public sphere and legal acts on the territory of the Republic of Poland [*Ustawa o jezyku polskim* 1999]. Other legal acts important for the culture protection system in Poland include:

— The Act of 21 November 1996 on museums [Journal of Laws of 20 January 1997 No 5 Item 24];
— Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 23 April 1963 on maintaining a register of artefacts and the central registry of artefacts [Journal of Laws No 19 Item 101; amendment in JoL of 1986 No 42 Item 204];
— The object, scope and forms of protecting and preserving artefacts, the rules of developing the national programme of artefact protection and preservation, financing maintenance work, as well as how artefact protection bodies should be organised are specified in the Act of 23 July 2003 on protecting and preserving artefacts [*Ustawa o narodowym zasobie archiwalnym i archiwach* 2011];
— Regulation of the Minister of Culture and Art of 11 January 1994 on the rules and mode of issuing approvals for the maintenance of artefacts and archae-

ological and excavation works, their conditions and the qualifications of the entitled personnel [Journal of Laws No 16 Item 55; *Ustawa o ochronie zabytkow i opiece nad zabytkami* 2003];
— Regulation of the Minister of Culture and Art of 10 July 1963 on the detailed mode of acquiring movable artefacts by the state [Journal of Laws No 32 Item 183];
— Resolution of the Council of Ministers No 179 of 8 December 1978 on using immovable artefacts for utility purposes [Official Journal of the Republic of Poland No 37 Item 142];
— Regulation of the Minister of Culture and Art of 30 June 1965 on the mode of submitting applications and issuing certificates and approvals for moving works of art across borders (Journal of Laws No 31 Item 206).

Among the already-identified strategic goals of the *Polish state* as regards *security* are actions which should be performed for the purpose of protecting spiritual and material national heritage, actions aimed at protecting national identity, as well as ensuring the conditions necessary for a secure development of the spiritual and material heritage in all spheres of national activity (Points 12 and 16). After all, culture, "as an integral element of the survival and development of every society", must be the object of particular care from the *state* [Dadelo *et al.* 2015].

In the *Strategy of National Security of the Republic of Poland* developed in 2007, "as an integral element of the survival and development of every society, remains an object of particular state care" [*Strategy of National Security of the Republic of Poland* 2007: 5-6, 35]. The *sector strategy* for the execution of the *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland* adopted by the Council of Ministers on 23 December 2009 and the *Political and Strategic Defence Directive of the Republic of Poland* from the same year were developed in parallel to the above [*Political and Strategic Defence Directive of the Republic of Poland* 2009]. The above issues are also touched upon in the *Strategy for the Development of the National Security System of the Republic of Poland 2022* of 9 April 2013 [*Strategy for the Development of the National Security System of the Republic of Poland 2022* 2013].

Actions taken with relation to national heritage and developing culture-related infrastructure have been considered as extremely important for shaping national identity and as "serving to meet the need of the younger generation to discover its historical roots and rendering society aware of the historical, generational and territorial continuity of the Republic of Poland" [*Strategy of the Defence of the Republic of Poland* 2009: 15]. Protecting cultural heritage and national identity is provided for by numerous legal acts, but despite that fact the term *cultural security* itself does not appear in legal or institutional contexts, even though it does appear in *security* and *cultural* terminology.

The essence of *protective actions* is to create the conditions ensuring a *nation-state's* effectiveness as regards

maintaining constitutional order in the country, the *state's* interior stability (which also constitute *recorded elements* of social achievement, matching the definition of *national culture*), but also to protect both collective and individual material and immaterial artefacts of culture [cf. *Strategy of National Security* 2014: 33].

The essence of *cultural actions* in the *security* sphere is not only to create secure, good living conditions for citizens, but primarily to ensure harmonious spiritual and material development of individual citizens, the nation and its state as a whole [*Strategy of National Security* 2014: 38-39].

This renders it possible to freely build and record the nation's heritage in the full material and extramaterial extent of national culture, not limited erroneously to the sphere of *high culture*[3].

Therefore, *budo* and its adepts participate in processes of socio-cultural exchange while being subjected to interesting alterations, enabling them to successfully continue the harmonious development of *security subjects* on the personal (individual) and structural (collective) levels. It should be added that the fact that this resource of *security culture* is constantly in use by modern-day uniformed services is not without importance [Piwowarski, Czajkowski 2017].

Nowadays, the idea of *budo* is frequently compared to and juxtaposed with the western idea of competition in sports. Modern *budo* (*gendai budo*), developed by masters-teachers [Stevens 2001] such as Kano Jigoro (*judo*), Funakoshi Gichin (*karate-do*) and Ueshiba Morihei (*aikido*), has enabled numerous ways to self-improvement [Gierszewski, Piwowarski 2013] for *security subjects* since its inception. These ways include education and sports, self-fulfilment without competing in sports, frequently combined with a para-religious and social path to self-improvement [Stevens 2001], and also the path which focuses exclusively on the spiritual development of *security subjects*.

Since the times of the first *budo* masters, who introduced the ancient Japanese martial arts to the social world of modernity, *Judo* was not the only art which has changed – old, traditional *karate* (in most of its forms) evolved into a very sports-heavy direction, and *aikido* is nowadays divided into numerous schools which teach using different methods and for various purposes.

Particular schools and styles of *karate* also have their own ideologies – sport and non-sport types, as well as full-contact and noncontact.

It was probably the need of the inheritors of the *budo* tradition to preserve the unique specificity of this tradition and the identity of Japanese martial arts that spurred the local experts not only to establish numerous institutions for protecting and promoting *budo*, but also to formalise in a possibly up-to-date manner the main principles of their kind of *security culture* message, which was unique in its form but also "utilised" all over the world, and which is the topic of this paper. This spurred the creation of the *Budo Chart*. It promotes the main values and goals which should be pursued by practising modern *Japanese martial arts*, while taking into account the very complicated, post-modern *social reality*, which is suffering a crisis of values at the moment[4].

The Budo Charter (*Budo Kensho*)

Feliks F. Hoff, an experienced German trainer and leader of *kyudo*, a competitive form of swordfighting, presented the *Budo Charter* at the *European Budo Symposium* which took place in the German city of Moers (1998). The Charter was created by Japanese martial arts experts. The document was presented to the world by the *Nippon Budo Shingikai* organisation on 23 April 1987. Thus, the warrior code will soon be celebrating its thirtieth birthday. Below is the authors' own translation of the contents of the document.

The topicality of the premises of the *Budo Charter's* message

The principles discussed above are still in use in Japan. [Bennett 2009; Sasaki 2009: 12-19; Uozumi, Bennett 2010] For the past 50 years, they have been developed by the *Japanese Budo Academy*, and under the auspices of the *Dai Nippon Butoku Kai* national organisation for more than one hundred years.

In modern times, this does not only apply to Japan. The contents of the declaration are present in the ideologies of numerous martial arts schools and organisations,

---

[3] *High culture*, or *elite culture* – the most significant part of the *symbolic culture* of a given nation. Rooted in the resources of a *national culture*, it constitutes the basis for the transmission of spiritual and intellectual tradition as well as the organisational and material heritage of the *society* of a given *nation-state*. *High culture* is created by *national* creative elites consisting of individuals competent both in the creation and the reception of arts owing to proper education; however, it is potentially targeted at all the citizens. *High culture* is transmitted by such institutions as schools, theatres, art galleries, libraries, philharmonics, as well as informative media, accessible to everyone in *democratic* countries [*cf.* Zarnowski and Zagorski 2014].

[4] The *social world* is created by collective actions undertook as part of social communication using certain *symbols*. It manifests itself in the *actions*, on the basis of which *individual subjects of security* negotiate the rules of social interactions, social roles, language behaviours, and the ways of communication. According to Edmund Husserl's ideas, as well as their further implementations in Alfreda Schutz's approach to sociology, further developed by his continuators, *social world* is not an objective *being*: it is construed within society. Within such an approach, accents are put on the ways of experiencing *social reality* e.g. by means of socialisation or religious experiences [Schutz 1967].

both purely Japanese, of Japanese origin, as well of other origins but incorporating elements of martial arts developed in the land of the samurai.

The old, furious *bushido*, at times appearing even ruthless and bloodthirsty in its original form, is a thing of the past. As an example, civilised societies reject the duty of ritual revenge, honour killings and other such cruel customs of old.

That which is truly grand in the *security culture* tradition discussed here was preserved thanks to the efforts of Nitobe Inazo and modern-day popularisers of *budo*, and still inspires martial arts practitioners and experts from across the globe, including Matthias von Saldern [Saldern 1993; 1998; Sasaki 2009], Feliks F. Hoff [1998], Deborah Klens-Bigman and Raymond A. Sosnowski [2008], Dave Lowry [2006; 2009; 2010], Bradford Keeney and Hillary Keeney [2014].

The *Budo Chart* itself contains an ethics canon which, in a sense, is analogous to the rules of fair play in western sports. If, for the purpose of interpreting the complex socio-cultural reality, we assume the multidimensional anthropological, ethical and educational perspective [Szmyd 2011], the similar should apply to explicating the currently-existing codes of chivalry and the systems which descended from them and function to this day. From the point of view of the humanist, systemic anthropology of martial arts, *budo* is an education system with high pedagogical qualities and the potential to enable *security subjects* to meet the highest need of self-fulfilment [Cynarski 2012a], which stems directly from the traditional military culture of honour. This axiology is nonconfessional and universalist for *cultural security*, whose system of institutions and social relations performs a specific function. This function is supposed to reduce the probability of undesired social phenomena occurring, including limiting the risk related to the survival of *national culture*, including *national identity*, decreasing its value (*cultural impoverishment*) and the following weakening of *national bonds*.

Therefore, the following question should be answered: is it possible to view the Budo Chart within the context of *cultural security* without touching upon *personal security*? A detailed analysis of this issue leads to the following conclusion: attempting to separate these two manifestations of security for the purpose of their separate analysis could be considered as a violation of the humanist fair play approach. Modern *budo* instils a concrete, utilitarian value in a broad audience across the globe. The value is that of a *subject of action*, which possesses the three attributes defined by Amitai Etzioni: the consciousness of being, the involvement of the subject and it possessing sufficient power. After all, cultural security only has purpose when it does not exclusively serve the *state*. It becomes more of an art of life that a martial art, without eschewing its old capabilities, ena-

bling its practitioners to attain a sense of security which is important for them as *subjects of security*, and primarily as the creators and depositaries of the achievements which constitute *culture*, i.e. humans. Thus, it should be analysed and implemented within the aspect of *personal security*.

Sources

1. *Polityczno-Strategiczna Dyrektywa Obronna Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [Political and Strategic Defence Directive of the Republic of Poland 2009] (2009), Monitor Polski 2009 nr 48 poz. 705 [Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland 2009 No. 48 Item 705] [in Polish].

2. *Konstytucja RP z 2 IV 1997 r.* [Constitution of the Republic of Poland from 2nd April 1997] (1997), *Dziennik Ustaw z 1997 r., Nr 78, poz. 483, z pozn. zm.* [Journal of laws 1997 No. 78 Item 483 and subsequent amendments] [in Polish].

3. *Strategia Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego* [Strategy of National Security] (2014), Warszawa: Biuro Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego [National Security Bureau] [in Polish].

4. *Strategia Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [Strategy of National Security of the Republic of Poland] (2007), Warszawa: Biuro Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego [National Security Bureau] [in Polish].

5. *Strategia Obronnosci Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. Strategia sektorowa do Strategii Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [Strategy of the Defence of the Republic of Poland. Sector strategy accompanying the Strategy of National Security of the Republic of Poland] (2009), Warszawa: Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej [Ministry of National Defence Republic of Poland] [in Polish].

6. *Strategia Rozwoju Systemu Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej 2022* [Strategy of National Security of the Republic of Poland 2022] (2013), Monitor Polski 2013 poz. 377 [Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland 2013 Item 377] [in Polish].

7. *Ustawa o jezyku polskim* [Act on the Polish language] (1999), Dziennik Ustaw z 1999 r., Nr 90, poz. 999, z pozn. zm. [Journal of laws 1999 No. 90 Item 999 and subsequent amendments] [in Polish].

8. *Ustawa o narodowym zasobie archiwalnym i archiwach* [Archives Act] (2011), Dziennik Ustaw z 2011 r., Nr 123, poz. 698 [Journal of laws 2011 No. 123 Item 698] [in Polish].

9.   *Ustawa o ochronie dobr kultury* [Cultural Goods Protection Act] (1962), Dziennik Ustaw z 1962 r., Nr 10, poz. 48, z pozn. zm. [Journal of laws 1962 No. 10 Item 48 and subsequent amendments] [in Polish].

10.   *Ustawa o ochronie zabytkow i opiece nad zabytkami* [Historic Monuments Protection Act] (2003), Dziennik Ustaw z 2003 r., Nr 162, poz. 1568, z pozn. zm. [Journal of Laws 2003, No. 162, Item 1568 and subsequent amendments] [in Polish].

References

11. Aleksandrowicz T.R. (2015), *Tozsamosc nauk o bezpieczenstwie* [in:] S. Sulowski [ed.], *Tozsamosc nauk o bezpieczenstwie*, Torun, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszalek, pp. 51-68 [in Polish].

12. Bennett A. [ed.] (2009), *Budo: The Martial Ways of Japan*, Nippon Budokan Foundation, Tokyo.

13. Buzan B. (1991), *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester.

14. Chojnowski L. (2015), *Bezpieczenstwo. Zarys teorii*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pomorskiej, Slupsk [in Polish].

15. Cieslarczyk M. (2000), *Spoleczenstwa i spolecznosci na przelomie wiekow – od bezpieczenstwa kultury do kultury bezpieczenstwa*, Lecture delivered at XI Ogolnopolski Zjazd Socjologiczny Conference, Rzeszow–Tyczyn 2000 [in:] A. Filipek (2014), *Elementy teorii i praktyki transdyscyplinarnych problemow bezpieczenstwa*, vol. II, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego, Siedlce [in Polish].

16. Cynarski W.J. (2000), *Sztuki walki budo w kulturze Zachodu*, Wydawnictwo WSP, Rzeszow [in Polish].

17. Cynarski W.J. (2004), *Teoria i praktyka dalekowschodnich sztuk walki w perspektywie europejskiej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszow [in Polish].

18. Cynarski W.J. (2012), *Antropologia sztuk walki – spojrzenie filozoficzne*, "Rozprawy Naukowe AWF we Wroclawiu", no. 36, pp. 90-103 [in Polish].

19. Cynarski W.J. (2006), *Recepcja i internalizacja etosu dalekowschodnich sztuk walki przez osoby cwiczace*, Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, Rzeszow [in Polish].

20. Cynarski W.J. (2012a), *Antropologia drogi wojownika. Studia i szkice z socjologii i filozofii sztuk walki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszow [in Polish].

21. Cynarski W.J. (2012b), *Martial arts Phenomenon – Research and Multidisciplinary Interpretation*, Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, Rzeszow.

22. Cynarski W.J., K. Obodynski [eds.] (2003), *Humanistyczna teoria sztuk i sportow walki – koncepcje i problemy*, Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, Rzeszow [in Polish].

23. Cynarski W.J., Piwowarski J. (2016), *Japanese Security Culture in the Global Village. The Budo Charter as a Modernized Element of Ancient Military Tradition*, "Security Dimensions: International and National Studies", no. 20, pp. 30-50; doi: 10.24356/SD/20/1.

24. Dadelo S., Versinskas R., Piwowarski J., Dadeliene R. (2015), *The most commonly used arrest and self-defence actions arsenal by different officers of internal services*, "Archives of Budo", vol. 11, pp. 285-291.

25. Etzioni A. (1994), *Spirit of Community. The Reinvention of American Society*, Touchstone, New York.

26. Etzioni A. (2009), *New Common Ground: A New America, A New World*, Potomac Books – University of Nebraska Press, Washington,

27. Etzioni A. (2012), *Aktywne spoleczenstwo*, Zaklad Wydawniczy NOMOS, Krakow [in Polish].

28. Gierszewski J. (2013), *Bezpieczenstwo wewnetrzne. Zarys systemu*, Difin, Warszawa [in Polish].

29. Gierszewski J., Piwowarski J. (2016), *Theoretical Basics of Societal Security*, "Security Dimensions. International & National Studies", no. 18, pp. 30-48.

30. Hoff F.F. (1998), *Uber den Sinn des Budo und Bushido in der heutigen Zeit* [in:] M. von Saldern [ed.], *Budo in heutiger Zeit*, Universitat Luneburg, pp. 65-79 [in German].

31. *Interdisciplinarity: problems of teaching and research in universities* (1972), Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD, Paris, pp. 25-26.

32. Kaczmarek B., Sikorski Cz. (1999), *Podstawy zarzadzania. Zachowania organizacyjne*, Przedsiebiorstwo Specjalistyczne "Absolwent", Lodz [in Polish].

33. Keeney B., Keeney H. (2014), *Seiki Jutsu: The Practice of Non-Subtle Energy Medicine*, Healing Arts Press, Rochester.

34. Kitler W. (2012), *Bezpieczenstwo narodowe RP*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa [in Polish].

35. Klens-Bigman D., Sosnowski R.A. (2008), *The Way of the Bow: The Kyudo Path to a Disciplined Mind*, Cliff Road Books, New York.

36. Kukulka, J. (1999), *Pojmowanie i istota tozsamosci narodowej pod koniec XX wieku* [in:] S. Bielen, W.M. Gorski [eds.], *Nowa tozsamosc Niemiec i Rosji w stosunkach miedzynarodowych*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa, pp. 11-15 [in Polish].

37. Lowry D. (2006), *In the Dojo: A Guide to the Rituals and Etiquette of the Japanese Martial Arts*, Shambala Publications, Boston.

38. Lowry D. (2009), *The Karate Way: Discovering the Spirit of Practice*, Shambala Publications, Boston,.

39. Lowry D. (2010), *The Essence of Budo: A Practitioner's Guide to Understanding the Japanese Martial Ways*, Shambala Publications, Boston.

40. Michalowska G. (2010), *Bezpieczenstwo ludzkie* [in:] J. Symonides [ed.], *swiat wobec wspolczesnych wyzwan i zagrozen*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa, pp. 227-234 [in Polish].

41. Nakiri F. (2015), *Concept of Budo and the history and activities of the Japanese Academy of Budo*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 11 -25; doi: 10.14589/ido.15.1.2.

42. Piwowarski J. (2012), *Trzy skladowe kultury bezpieczenstwa (Slowo wstepne)*, "Kultura Bezpieczenstwa. Nauka – Praktyka – Refleksje", no. 9, pp. 3-8 [in Polish].

43. Piwowarski J. (2016), *Transdyscyplinarna istota kultury bezpieczenstwa narodowego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pomorskiej, Slupsk [in Polish].

44. Piwowarski J., Czajkowski W. (2017), *Cultural and social determinants of environmentaly responsible behaviour in emergency situation,* International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference Surveying Geology and Mining Ecology Management. Conference Proceedings, volume 17, SGEM 2017, Sofia, pp. 149-156.

45. Saldern M. von (1993), *Bushido – Ethik des japanischen Ritters*, Verlag der Universität, Landau [in German].

46. Saldern M. von [ed.] (1998), *Budo in heutiger Zeit*, Universitat Luneburg, Luneburg [in German].

47. Sasaki T. (2009), *Budo (the martial arts) as Japanese culture: the outlook on the techniques and the outlook on the human being* [in:] W.J. Cynarski [ed.], *Martial Arts and Combat Sports – Humanistic Outlook*, Rzeszow, Rzeszow University Press, pp. 12-19.

48. Schutz A. (1967), *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston.

49. Scruton R.V. (2010), *Kultura jest wazna. Wiara i uczucie w osaczonym swiecie*, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznan [in Polish].

50. Such-Pyrgiel M. [ed.] (2013), *Bezpieczenstwo spoleczne w XXI wieku w ujeciu socjologicznym, pedagogicznym, prawnym i nauk o zarzadzaniu*, WSGE, Jozefow [in Polish].

51. Sulowski S. (2015), *O rozwoju badan i postulacie interdyscyplinarnosci w naukach o bezpieczenstwie* [in:] S. Sulowski [ed.], *Tozsamosc nauk o bezpieczenstwie*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszalek, Torun, pp. 20-39 [in Polish].

52. Stevens J. (2001), *Trzej mistrzowie budo: Funakoshi, Kano, Ueshiba*, Diamond Books, Bydgoszcz [in Polish].

53. Szmyd J. (2011), *Odczytywanie wspolczesnosci. Perspektywa antropologiczna, etyczna i edukacyjna*, Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne – Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM, Krakow [in Polish].

54. Uozumi T., Bennett A. [eds] (2010), *The History and Spirit of Budo.* IBU Budo Series, vol. 1, IBU, Katsuura.

55. Wisniewski B. [ed.] (2004), *Bezpieczenstwo wewnetrzne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa [in Polish].

56. Zarnowski J., Zagorski S. [eds.] (2014), *Elity polskie*, SSP Stopka, Lomza [in Polish].