

# WIDE COMPREHENSION OF SECURITOLOGY IN STUDIES ON CULTURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY

*Juliusz Piwowarski*

## ABSTRACT

The article concerns issue of the concept of national security in the transdisciplinary research area of security studies. Recalled were the most important definitions of national security and culture of national security to accentuate how the comprehension of this concept varies in modern countries and depends on the conception of *nation* characteristic for a state.

National security is of great importance for contemporary security studies and for the security of each state, therefore it is important to understand the mechanism of this phenomenon as well as the conception itself. The objective was also to accentuate how important it is to perceive this phenomenon widely i.e. taking into account also a cultural aspect of the state security.

## KEYWORDS

Security culture, state security, security studies

Change of the research perspective in social sciences is necessary in the modern world. A new dynamic version of constant social evolution replaces the vision of self-regulative social system. Every dynamic vision requires application of a diachronic approach. This kind of researches on society during constituting, require a focus on the historical factors which shapes the reality. Therefore currently more and more popular and required is cultural analysis of the reality, since ideas, meanings and symbols become its central points and furthermore, the global society is being replaced by a regional society, which as a primal institution creates cultural patterns.

Therefore the level of national security depends on real abilities of the strength embedded in multicomponent national culture. National culture consists of particular elements, which create the national security culture cultivated by the population of the state territory and state structures, due to a multigenerational transmission.

Anglo-Saxon approach to security studies (and international studies) prefers so-called political conception of nation. According to the conception of the phenomenon termed *nation*, the state was established as first. Then, out of people, who lived on the territory of the state, the nation was formed. The most representative is the example of United States of America. On the European continent, looking closely at the history of other European nations, we may consider Germans as such example, for they waited long for the historical moment of unification.

For the purpose of this elaboration author refers to the political conception of the nation, despite of taking into account the important role of ethnic elements in building the identity of the most of contemporary national states – from Great Britain, Germany, Ukraine, Czech Republic, Slovakia and France to Poland, India, China or Canada, USA, and Russia.

Holistic approach to national security includes two types of components<sup>1</sup>:

1. internal elements of national security;
2. external elements of national security.

Processes of developing national security are dichotomous, i.e. they go in internal structures of nation (society of a country) and in the environment of certain country, which is international, where the threats, challenges and chances for the safety of a nation or a state arises.

Let us recall the concise definition of the state security by Berkowitz and Bock: "national security is an ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats"<sup>2</sup>.

Different definition of state security we may find in Encyclopedia Britannica:

<sup>1</sup> Cf.: L. Freedman, *The Concept of Security*, [in:] M. Hawkesworth and M. Kogan (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, Routledge Publ., London/New York 1992, vol. 2 p. 733.

<sup>2</sup> M. Berkowitz, P. G. Bock (ed.), *American National Security: reader in theory and policy*, New York 1965, p. X.

“national security is protection of a certain country from the threat of a conquest by an external power - the same protection of life rights and interests of a country in international relations available for citizens of every well-organized national community in its interpersonal relations”<sup>3</sup>.

Taking into account the first of abovementioned definitions of national security one consider the axiology and decide which values are to be protected by the nation and the state in the context of internal and external aspects of security. The scope of national security is defined within equation with the scope of national interest. The most important is of course the need and value of surviving<sup>4</sup>. American scholars, who deal with the discipline of security studies, distinguish also other values, necessary for the possibility of building the culture of national security by the society and the state:

- sovereignty and independence of the state;
- physical survival of the living power of a nation (society) - despite of the possibility of activation of deadly threats;
- efficient social and economic system and elasticity, dynamic and development of this system;
- consistent system of ideas (sociocultural system) and the ideology of a state;
- stabile, respected and high position of the state on the international politics arena;
- sufficient, in opinion of citizens, standard of life.

When it comes to Polish researchers of the state security values of the national needs are as follows<sup>5</sup>:

- political values;
- ideological values;
- culture and civilization values
- social values.

National security is comprehended as a state achieved by a country in result of specified organization of defense and protection against external and internal threats. This state may be defined within the level of assurance of obtaining the sense of security through anticipation, identification, controlling and possible threats counteracting. This level of assurance is a result of the ratio of defense potential of a state to actual size of threats against the

nation living in it<sup>6</sup>.

Contemporary conceptions and definitions of security are a result of redefinition of traditional approach to this category. It is not only a “system of circumstances due to which a state is not going to be an object of attack, or at least such attack would have no chance of succeeding”<sup>7</sup>. Contemporary the definition of security culture has been expanded in internal and external aspects.

Richard Ulman, making a review and analyzing threats against security of the USA came to a conclusion that now it would be a mistake to focus merely on identifying and neutralizing military threats. There is a need of spectral (holistic) regard on the whole range of phenomena, which may influence decline in the quality of existence of the society, as well lead to substantial limits, when it comes to the freedom to choose alternative solutions by the authorities due to further development.

National security is strongly associated with international security. Internal security of other countries is now related, or even is an external aspect of national security of states. The reason was globalization and threats, which Roman Kuźniar defined as “external attack realized from the inside”<sup>8</sup>. As Karina P. Marczuk notices, this phenomenon created the need and possibility for international cooperation, which regards internal security of national states<sup>9</sup>. According to Marczuk, holistic considerations on security of an entity in Copenhagen theory of security sectors assume that “problems of the security of specified group of participants of international relations have to be treated comprehensively, inseparably. Therefore referring to internal security [a state] in wide comprehension, we may assume that it is not [or it does not have to be] a separate category, but along with external security it creates holistic security of a state entity.

According to R. Zięba “internal security means stability and harmony of specified organism or system (collective entity) – and to compare – external security

<sup>3</sup> Encyclopedia Britannica, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1956, v. 20 p. 265.

<sup>4</sup> R. E. Osgood, *Ideal of Self-Interest in America's Foreign Relations*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1953, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Cf.: A. D. Rotfeld, *Bezpieczeństwo Polski a bezpieczeństwo Europy*, [in:] A. D. Rotfeld, *Międzynarodowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa Polski*, PWN, Warszawa 1986, p. 15-18; Z. Berent, *Pokój międzynarodowy i bezpieczeństwo – próba definicji*, [in:] „Sprawy międzynarodowe”, 1988, no. 6, p. 120.

<sup>6</sup> Cf.: *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2002 p. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Dictionaire Diplomatique, Akademic Diplomatique Internationale, Paris, vol. III, term: *securite*.

<sup>8</sup> R. Kuźniar, *Niebezpieczeństwa nowego paradygmatu bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] R. Kuźniar, Z. Lachorski (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe czasu przemian: zagrożenia-koncepcje-instytucje*, Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, Warszawa 2003, p. 225.

<sup>9</sup> Cf.: K.P. Marczuk, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Od bezpieczeństwa państwa do bezpieczeństwa*, ASPRA, Instytut Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2012, p. 46, 47.

[is] lack of threat of other entities”<sup>10</sup>.

As Andrzej Misiuk noticed, in the literature on the subject from before 1989, the internal aspect of state security was leading to underlying the need to secure the legal and regime issues. Due to that used was mainly such term as *security and public order*. The internal affairs resort was dealing with this area. Activity of this resort was associated to political functions, which aimed to provide *status quo* in terms of legal and political order and to maintain the public order<sup>11</sup>.

Discussing the *narrow* approach to *internal state security*, it can be concluded that it was mainly associated to ability of state apparatus to maintain and protect the first of defined above parameters – *security and public order*. It was related to the branch of *security studies*, defined as rationalism. It has to be emphasized though that realism in relation to the internal aspect of state security is prevalently based on negative approach to security phenomenon, as it exhibits inviolability of state borders, sovereignty of a national state, stability of authority, *status quo* related to state ideology, a regime defined in constitution, etc<sup>12</sup>.

The origin of modern realism is associated with American tradition of *security studies*. Internal security of a state is based on providing efficient protection of “constitutional order, live and health of citizens and national wealth against illegal actions and results of natural and technical catastrophes”<sup>13</sup>.

Further attempts of redefining the idea of security have led to perceiving it as a social construct and a culture of sectors of security (*sectors of security* - “thematic” areas of security studies), which was a breakthrough made by the Copenhagen School. The fact is that this breakthrough resulted in proportional researches on national security issues (starting from the needs of individuals to needs of nations) and not only a “state-centric” ones.

One should consider, basing on abovementioned assumptions, how does it affect the

studies on security, taking their interdisciplinary character into account. Now there is a need to perceive this phenomena not only in a state dimension, but also local and regional ones, which motivates the cultural analytical space. On the one hand it is associated with natural process of local community formation, on the other with conditioned dynamic technical development, which is an impulse for sense of world-wideness, but at same time for awareness of cultural diversity.

*Ipso facto* the necessity of multi-ascpectuality of security culture studies places them in the field of transdisciplinary studies and hence they provide us the more complete picture of the object of studies i.e. security.

## REFERENCES

1. Berent Z., *Pokój międzynarodowy i bezpieczeństwo – próba definicji*, „Sprawy międzynarodowe”, 1988, no. 6.
2. Berkowitz M., Bock P. G (ed.), *American National Security: reader in theory and policy*, New York 1965.
3. *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w ujęciu systemowym i zadań administracji publicznej*, B. Wisniewski, S. Zalewski (ed.), Bielsko-Biala 2006.
4. *Dictionaire Diplomatique*, *Akademic Diplomatique Internationale*, Paris, vol. III, term: *securite*.
5. *Encyklopedia Britannica*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1956, v. 20.
6. Freedman L., *The Concept of Security* [in:] M. Hawkesworth and M. Kogan (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, Routledge Publ., London/New York 1992, vol. 2.
7. Kuźniar R., *Niebezpieczeństwa nowego paradygmatu bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] R. Kuźniar, Z. Lachorski (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe czasu przemian: zagrożenia-koncepcje-instytucje*, Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, Warszawa 2003, p. 225.
8. Marczuk K. P., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Od bezpieczeństwa państwa do bezpieczeństwa ludzi*, ASPRA, Instytut Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2012.
9. Misiuk A., *Administracja spraw*

<sup>10</sup> R. Zięba, *Kategoria bezpieczeństwa w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*, [in:] D. B. Bobrow, E. Halizak, R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku*, Fundacja Studiów Międzynarodowych Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa 1997, p. 3-4.

<sup>11</sup> Cf.: A. Misiuk, *Administracja spraw wewnętrznych w Polsce (od połowy XVIII wieku do współczesności): zarys dziejów*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn 2005, p. 221.

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem, p. 40-42.

<sup>13</sup> *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w ujęciu systemowym i zadań administracji publicznej*, B. Wisniewski, S. Zalewski (ed.), Bielsko-Biala 2006, p. 26.

- wewnętrznych w Polsce (od połowy XVIII wieku do współczesności): zarys dziejów, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn 2005.
10. Osgood R. E., *Ideal of Self-Interest in America's Foreign Relations*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1953.
  11. Rotfeld A. D., *Bezpieczeństwo Polski a bezpieczeństwo Europy*, [in:] A. D. Rotfeld, *Międzynarodowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa Polski*, PWN, Warszawa 1986.
  12. *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2002.
  13. Stańczyk J., *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1996.
  14. Zięba R., *Kategoria bezpieczeństwa w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*, [in:] D. B. Bobrow, E. Halizak, R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku*, Fundacja Studiów Międzynarodowych Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa 1997.

### AUTHOR:

**Juliusz Piwowarski, Ph.D.** – Rector and lecturer of the School of Higher Education in Public and Individual Security “Apeiron” in Cracow.