

ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SECURITY CULTURE ANALYSES WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF SELECTED ELEMENTS OF THREAT AND SECURITY TYPOLOGY

JULIUSZ PIWOWARSKI*
ŁUKASZ TRZCIŃSKI**

ABSTRACT

Both security sciences and security studies have traditionally mainly focused on the state as the most important security subject; however, as *anthropology of security* and the idea of *human security* assert, it is the security of a human individual that should be highlighted as well. The authors start from discussing the typologies of threat and security. This leads them to focusing on the idea of *human security*, a concept first proposed by researchers and then taken up by international organizations. The concept of human security, combined with *anthropology of security*, constitutes a scientific basis for the shift from the state-centric to the anthropocentric approach to security.

* Assoc. Prof. Juliusz Piwowarski, Ph.D., University of Public and Individual Security “Apeiron” in Krakow, Kraków, Poland; correspondence address: Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron” w Krakowie, Krupnicza 3, 31-123 Kraków, Poland; email: rektor@apeiron.edu.pl

** Prof. Łukasz Trzciński, University of Public and Individual Security “Apeiron” in Krakow, Kraków, Poland.

The authors corroborate this stance by discussing a range of definitions of the concept of security, which focus on either more general or more specific aspects of security. They favour the more universal understanding of the concept and conclude that security, being the same type of anthropological social construct as other humane values such as beauty, happiness, love, etc., and a phenomenon relating to a great extent to the quality of human existence, should possess its universal essence.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 14.11.2019 Accepted: 6.12.2019

Keywords

anthropology of security, human security, security culture, typology of security, typology of threats

When studying *security* in relation to a particular subject, it is necessary to distinguish between the subject's *internal security* and *external security*. This distinction between the internal and external constituents of *security* relates to all, not only individual, scale levels of *security subjects* (individual humans).

Thus, the distinction between the internal and external constituent of *security* can also relate to individual humans and social groups, social organisations and structures, state institutions and structures, as well as, most importantly, the entirety of people, citizens of a state constituting a *nation*, which, in its entirety, generates and possesses its largest institution, i.e. the *nation-state*. Both the discipline of *security sciences* and that of *security studies*, a subdiscipline of *political science* which conducts research from the perspective of *international relations*, have treated *nation-states* as the dominant *security subjects* for thousands of years.

Human existence is constantly subjected to two phenomena which, from the point of view of humanity, stand in opposition to one another. One of them is a *hazardous situation*, also referred to as the *state of danger*, and the other is the *state of security*. The latter encompasses conditions construed by *security subjects* as *high-certainty situations*. It is *threat*, however, that is the key issue studied by security researchers, anthropologists and securitologists. Without *threat*, the phenomenon of *security* cannot occur in the minds and lives of humans. In other words, *security* is a complementary phenomenon to *threat*. Therefore, a *subject of action* builds their own *self-defence*, both

individual and collective, as human readiness to respond to *threats* in a proper and effective way.

A threat to a security subject is a potential loss or decrease of a value (non-material or material, important from the point of view of the subject), or a short-term or permanent loss of the subject's potential to develop further in a broad sense, whether the subject is cognisant of this or not.¹

Fehler claims that “intuitively, *threat* is the opposite of *security* and refers to a situation such that values important to a subject become difficult to access, are eroded or even annihilated”.²

Criminology expert and researcher Brunon Hołyst believes that *threat* occurs when “an individual begins to fear losing that which they value highly, most importantly their life”.³ Based on Hołyst’s definition, we believe that *threat* refers to circumstances in which a *security subject* encounters a hazardous factor – a *state* (static in nature), *situation* (a set of circumstances) or *process* (dynamic in nature), which decreases the level of certainty of further existence and development.⁴ Military terminology refers to *threat* as a “situation in which there is an increased probability of loss of life, health, freedom (including the freedom to develop) or material property”.⁵ Psychologist and praxeologist Piotr Gasparski points to the fact that threat is a “situation which may, with some probability, bring harm to an individual”.⁶ Praxeologist Roman Kalina offers a definition according to which “in relation to a particular subject, *threat* is the conscious or unconscious danger of either losing a particular object or value (e.g. life, health, property, sovereignty, loved ones etc.) or temporarily or relatively permanently losing the ability to develop in a broad sense”.⁷

¹ J. Piwowarski, *Nauki o bezpieczeństwie. Zagadnienia elementarne*, Kraków 2016, p. 29.

² W. Fehler, *Zagrożenie – kluczowa kategoria teorii bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa*, K. Jałoszyński, B. Wiśniewski, T. Wojtuszek (eds), Bielsko-Biała 2007, p. 34.

³ B. Hołyst, *Wiktymologia*, Warszawa 1989, p. 482.

⁴ *Inny słownik języka polskiego*, M. Bańko (ed.), Warszawa 2000, p. 1213.

⁵ *Leksykon wiedzy wojskowej*, Warszawa 1979, p. 510.

⁶ P. Gasparski, *Psychologiczne wyznaczniki zapobiegania zagrożeniom*, Warszawa 2003, p. 23; *idem*, *Związek doświadczeń z ocenami prawdopodobieństwa zagrożeń i aktywnością profilaktyczną*, [in:] *Zachowanie się w sytuacji ryzyka*, R. Studenski (ed.), Katowice 2004, pp. 149–161.

⁷ R.M. Kalina, *Ogólne kategorie klasyfikacji i charakterystyki zagrożeń zewnętrznych*, [in:] *Człowiek w sytuacji trudnej*, B. Hołyst (ed.), Warszawa 1991, pp. 80–81.

Threat is a phenomenon which can be perceived differently by individuals, depending on the situation in which a particular *security subject* is and the source of the threat in question. It is possible to distinguish between the following types of *threats to security subjects*:

- objective or subjective *threats*;
- internal or external *threats*;
- *threats* can be selective, individual;
- they may affect small and large groups of people, *group security subjects*;
- *threats* may be abstract and fully concrete;
- potential and active *threats*;
- static or dynamic *threats*.

Taking into account the achievements of *security sciences* and the criteria used in this paper, we propose the following typology of the types of *security threats*:

- 1) **military** threats;
- 2) **political** threats;
- 3) **socio-cultural** threats related to national consciousness and correlated with national identity in its individual and social aspect;
- 4) **economic** threats: **economy and finance**;
- 5) **legal and administrative** threats such as the consequences of faulty laws, inconsistencies and “regulatory bloat”, i.e. excessive regulation, bureaucracy, oppressiveness and the arrogance of officials;
- 6) **ecological** threats;
- 7) **resource** threats (divided into manufacturing industry resources, fuel and energy resources, as well as food and water);
- 8) **technogenic** threats;
- 9) **cybernetic** threats;
- 10) **health-related and social** threats.

Threats evolve in tandem with the global development of civilisation. The basic distinction between military and non-military, external and internal is still important and valid, but due to the reality of the socio-cultural-political world of the 21st century, it is too general and insufficiently precise. Possessing experience, knowledge and skills to accurately identify expected external and internal *threats* may render it easier for a *security subject* to take effective preventive, protective and defensive actions.

Internal security, according to Kitler, refers to a state, a set of internal circumstances, which ensures the stability and harmonious development

of a particular *security subject* (individual human, group, *state*, *nation*)⁸, enabling them to achieve control over various disruptions and hazards, guaranteeing freedom from threats in their creatively-determined, social functioning.

External security, on the other hand, in relation to a particular *security subject* (individual human, group, *state*, *nation*), refers to circumstances of external nature resulting in no negative effects for the *subject*. Possible negative actions are not only *threats* from other participants of social life or international relations, but also other actions which may weaken the power and position of a given *security subject*, or disrupt or threaten the process of their continued, planned development and functioning.⁹

Internal security is understood by securitologists to involve striking a balance between *threats* resulting from internal factors and the ability of the *state* to protect its internal values: cultural, socio-spiritual, social, ideal, economic, ecological, demographic and political.

As an example, such internal threat-generating factors include riots and social unrest, unchecked football hooliganism, natural disasters, petty and border crime, organised criminal activity including terrorism, degrading ecosystems, alcoholism, substance abuse, forgery and corruption in the public and private sector. The constituents of this sphere of security include ensuring *public order*, *population protection*, e.g. from natural and ecological *threats* and disasters, epidemics of unidentified diseases, as well as counteracting crime and protecting state borders.¹⁰

External security, according to securitology scholars, is a concept which requires focusing on the needs and significance for it to occur – for the occurrence of a state of balance and of the processes that lead to a dynamic balance between *threats* caused by external factors and the defensive potential of the state. External factors include armed forces belonging to hostile neighbouring states, international terrorism, proliferation of WMDs, authoritarian regimes, uncontrolled migrations and organised international crime.

The constructivist aspect of the causes of security constitutes the base for interpreting the phenomenon as either active or passive in nature.

⁸ W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie, uwarunkowania, system*, Warszawa 2011, pp. 24–25.

⁹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰ H. Nowak, *M. Nowak, Zarys teorii bezpieczeństwa narodowego. Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, Warszawa 2011, p. 19.

Passive security is a result of circumstances which are unrelated to the capabilities and actions of a *security subject*. This type of security occurs when a *security subject* exists in an environment which is secure for them in and of itself, without the need for any additional actions aimed at ensuring security. It appears that this type of situation tends to be referred to in English as “safety”.

Active security refers to a state which is intentionally created by a subject. An individual or group *security subject* strives to satisfy their need for a secure existence. In order to survive as a species, humanity had to constantly create certain material and non-material *security artefacts*, including means, techniques, methods, structures, strategies, as well as certain technical tools, engineering and procedures. The same is true for the ontogeny of humans. After reaching maturity, an individual must ensure their own secure existence. In addition to possessing certain *security artefacts* which enable them to overcome adversity and threats, the *security subject* is forced to learn how to form certain behavioural and action patterns which may facilitate achieving *security*. Conducive to achieving that end are socio-cultural patterns and the *security culture* in which the *subject* exists, develops, acts and experiences.

It is important to note that **security** is **agentive in nature**, and when it is analysed from the agentive point of view by researchers, it refers to its creators, bearers and beneficiaries, i.e. humans. The essence of *security* lies in optimising the life situation of a given individual or collective *security subject*.

In a similar fashion, for analytical purposes, it is also necessary to take into account the object-based perspective, which renders it possible to study **object-based security**, i.e. to research important areas of human life which constitute individual sections of the spectrum of human *security* types. In relation to a given individual, group or collective, the terms political, military, socio-cultural, economic, ecological, technogenic, resource, legal, social, health and cybernetic security can be used.

We have now touched upon the issue of security typology. The division into agent-based and object-based security, quite similar to the distinction between internal and external security, forms the base for all further security typologies. At the same time, these divisions are the most anthropologically significant ones in relation to researching *security*.

It should be noted that *security* in its agent-based aspect refers to individual humans; human collectives (*social groups*); organisations and institu-

tions; territorial structures such as cities, villages, municipalities, counties, provinces, states, groups of states.¹¹

The object-based approach refers to, among others, political, military, economic, socio-cultural, ecological, resource (manufacturing industry and energy resources, food and water), information and cybernetic, social, health, legal and administrative security.¹²

Jarmoszko claims that the above classification, which is agent and object-based in nature, requires additional reference. “From the anthropological point of view on research, it appears incomplete. After the exclusion of the object-based aspect from the further discussion ..., it is possible to postulate the addition of the typology of *territorial-spatial security* (encompassing the aggregates of *security subjects* located in a very specific space in which they occur naturally), and to elaborate upon the typology of agent-based security”.¹³

The agent-based security category would encompass the following dimensions if Jarmoszko’s approach to the typology of security is to be taken:

- the *agentive-personal* dimension (person – individual human);
- the *agentive-communal* dimension (human social collectives, which are communal in nature; human social groups: the family, the local community, society, nation, international society in a given region, e.g. the Visegrad Group);
- the *agentive-institutional* dimension (social structures: public institutions, companies, social organisations, states, coalitions of states).

Territorial-spatial security, in turn, would comprise:

- common security;
- public security;
- local security;
- international security;
- regional security;

¹¹ W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe...*, op. cit., pp. 24–25.

¹² Cf. R. Zięba, *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego: koncepcje – struktury – funkcjonowanie*, Warszawa 1999, pp. 30–31; see also W. Pokruszyński, J. Piwowarski, *Teoria bezpieczeństwa*, Kraków 2014, pp. 127–142.

¹³ S. Jarmoszko, *Antropologia bezpieczeństwa*, Siedlce 2018, p. 40. As regards the relationship between the agentive-based security (personal and communal) and territorial-spatial security, see e.g.: R.P. Curiel, S.R. Bishop, *A metric of the difference between perception of security and victimisation rates*, “Crime Science”, 2016, no. 5, art. no. 12, DOI 10.1186/s40163-016-0060-y.

- global security;
- space security.

The object-based security category is less susceptible to typological “modifications”. As pointed out by Jarmoszko, *security* can relate to the general areas of life and individual or social functioning, thus it is possible to distinguish between political, military, economic, social, health, cultural, ideological, ecological, information, social, professional, interpersonal and communication security. It is also possible to construct an object-based classification of security according to concrete categories of human activity and, e.g. in relation to a given human individual, distinguish between the security of their sleep, play, work, consumption, sex, movement etc. The noticeable differences in this case are both verbal and substantial. The *security sectors* described above are studied by *social scientists*, including securitologists, i.e. researchers from the field of *security sciences* or *security studies* (a subdiscipline of political science).¹⁴

Until recently, Cold War-era theoretical discussions approached *security* (as a research category) primarily within the context of military and political issues, the most important of these being the sovereignty of the *state*.

The “horizontal” expansion of security is a process initiated by securitologists after the Cold War in order to overcome the *challenges* related to the expansion of the function of the *state* within the context of its security. The term was no longer limited to military matters.¹⁵ The expansion of the scope of research to include the impact of *security* on political, social, cultural, economic, ecological, health, resource, information, IT, social and other matters required expanding beyond the traditional boundaries within which it was perceived, i.e. war, peace and sovereignty.

The “vertical” expansion of security consisted in an increased interest in *security*-related matters among researchers dealing with *social* issues. The accompanying theoretical base indicated that several scales of *security*

¹⁴ S. Jarmoszko, C. Kalita, J. Maciejewski, *Nauki społeczne wobec problemu bezpieczeństwa (wybrane zagadnienia)*, Siedlce 2016, p. 69.

¹⁵ D. Fischer, *Non-military aspects of security*, Aldershot 1993; S. Jarmoszko, *Odmiany ryzyka społecznego w kontekście procesów globalizacji – próba konceptualizacji*, [in:] K. Pająk, A. Zduniak (eds), *Edukacyjne wyzwania początku XXI wieku*, Warszawa – Poznań 2003, pp. 104–114. Cf. also: S. Gordon, *The protection of civilians: an evolving paradigm?*, “Stability: International Journal of Security and Development”, 2013, no. 2(2), no. art. 40, DOI 10.5334/sta.cb.

subjects can be distinguished other than the *state*, such as *individuals*, *social groups*, *local communities*, *society-nations* and their *states*, *regions* and the *societies* and *international societies* living there. The *Copenhagen school* was instrumental in breaking new ground in security theory.¹⁶ Security theories of the Copenhagen school, developed by scholars such as Buzan, Weaver and de Wilde¹⁷, and the accompanying **expansion of security** involved the fleshing out of numerous issues which had previously been “left by the wayside”, issues related to research on freedom from *threats*.

The bases for the security of constituent subjects, previously overshadowed by the *security of the state*, the dominant *security subject*, began to be analysed in-depth. This constituted a return to studying the intricacies of *human security*, approaching the issue from the anthropological angle.

This initiated the development of the idea of *human security*, among others. The term was promoted by a set of activities which were part of the *United Nations Development Programme* – in particular those described in a document of 1994 titled *Human Development Reports*.

Official documents of the UN Commission for Human Security use the term to refer to ***freedom from want and freedom from fear***, i.e. freedom from poverty and freedom from violence. As an example, Eriksen claims that the category of *human security* has an extremely important role to play with regard to transforming the social theory and building intellectual bridges which are necessary to establish connections between various research trends in the *social sciences*.¹⁸

Taken literally, *human security* refers to the security of ordinary, individual humans. As a result of the above-mentioned process of redefining *security*, it is now more frequently interpreted as “the security of humans”, and is no longer only limited to *state* structures. The term encompasses both individuals and human collectives.

Originally, *human security* was understood as an *idea* which shifts the focus in matters related to economic development and international law

¹⁶ J. Piwowarski, *Transdyscyplinarna istota kultury bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Słupsk 2016, p. 233 *et seq.*; K.P. Marczuk, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne w poszerzonej agendzie studiów nad bezpieczeństwem*, [in:] S.J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1996, pp. 68–69.

¹⁷ B. Buzan, O. Weaver, J. de Wilde, *Security: A New framework for Analysis*, London 1998.

¹⁸ T. H. Eriksen, *Human Security and Social Anthropology*, [in:] *A World of Insecurity. Anthropological Perspectives on Human Security*, T. H. Eriksen, E. Bal, O. Saleminck (eds), London – New York 2010, p. 2.

from instrumental goals such as *economic growth* and the *rule of law* towards issues such as the *development of humanity* and *human rights*.¹⁹

Michałowska points to the need to introduce the category of *human security* into the world of research. Her justification for this is based on an important, if unfortunate, fact that “*state security* is not [always] tantamount to the *security* of those living in it”.²⁰ As an example – a state which itself is secure can automatically generate certain threats to the existence of its citizens – this has happened and is happening today, for example, in totalitarian states.

The United Nations has a strategic role to play in legitimising the relatively new idea of *human security*. The Commission on Human Security published a report in 2003 titled *Human Security Now*. The Commission was headed by Sadako Ogata, former High Commissioner for Refugees, and winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics, Amartya Sen. After the report was published, the Advisory Board on Human Security was established, tasked with implementing the recommendations contained in the report.

The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs established the Human Security Unit, which took over the responsibilities of the Advisory Board on Human Security and combined them with managing the UN Trust Fund for Human Security.

The Organisation of American States adopted the *Declaration on Security in the Americas* in 2003, which mentions *human security* in points 4 and 28. Point 4 stipulates that *human security* must be ensured by respecting human dignity and human rights, promoting socio-economic development and education and combating poverty, disease and hunger. Point 28 of the *Declaration* mentions threats to *human security*, e.g. the illegal manufacturing and selling of weapons, ammunition and explosives, which may be used by terrorists or bandits to undermine the rule of law.

The idea of *human security* unambiguously places humans at the centre of all polemics, debates, analyses, political actions, reviews, syntheses, and the interests of securitology researchers. Humans are the most important element in this context as they are the ones who need to free themselves from *threats* to the values they hold as important. From this perspective,

¹⁹ D. Winslow, *Human Security. Inaugural lecture*, Amsterdam 2003, [qtd. in:] T.H. Eriksen, *Human Security...*, *op. cit.*, p. 3; cf. also *Routledge handbook of human security*, M. Martin, T. Owen (eds), 1st edition, London 2013.

²⁰ G. Michałowska, *Bezpieczeństwo ludzkie*, [in:] *Świat wobec współczesnych wyzwań i zagrożeń*, J. Symonides (ed.), Warszawa 2010, p. 227.

the *state* constitutes a powerful instrument, but “only” an instrument – one which is supposed to ensure a desirable state of well-being not for itself, but for humans. The fundamental values to be protected as part of *human security*, including human life and all types of personal security, can be threatened not only by external elements (exogenous factors) but also by internal elements (endogenous factors). The concept of human security comprises the following basic elements:

- 1) *Human security* is universal in nature, and is important to all humans across the globe; numerous threats are common to all humans – e.g. unemployment, drug trade, crime, pollution, and human rights violations.
- 2) The constituents of *human security* are interconnected; when human security is threatened in one part of the globe, it is also highly probable (as in what is known as the *butterfly effect*) that the threat will also affect other places and nations; hunger, disease, environmental pollution, terrorism, human and drug trafficking, and ethnic conflicts are no longer isolated processes and events which can be confined to the borders of a given country.
- 3) The idea which is now referred to as *human security* directs the attention of researchers towards humans and the conditions of their existence, how humans exists as part of *societies*, whether they are free to make choices and have unrestricted access to the necessary material goods and social potential, and whether they live in peace and away from conflicts.²¹

The development of the *anthropology of security*, combined with research on *human security*, corresponds to the need for dismantling that which constitutes a state-centric and politico-centric approach to conceptualising *security*.

The foundation and core of the realist approach to *security* is the human – individuals and social groups (chief among them being the family unit), not the *state*, a huge apparatus that operates systematically and tends to be “conveniently” dehumanised by researchers and politicians. Other types of security include *personal security* and *communal security*. This distinction

²¹ B. von Tigerstrom, *Human Security and International Law: Prospects and Problems*, Oxford 2007. On the security-related existence of humans as parts of societies, in particularly regarding their active role in maintaining local security and resilience, see e.g.: P. Marana, L. Labaka, J.M. Sariegi, *A framework for public-private-people partnerships in the city resilience-building process*, “Safety Science”, 2018, 110, pp. 39–50, DOI 10.1016/j.ssci.2017.12.011.

shifts the research and implementation focus away from dehumanised, formal-systemic theoretical constructs relating primarily to public constructs, and towards thinking, self-reflecting and feeling humans, and even humanity as a whole.²²

Security is defined in various ways by Polish and foreign scholars. Taking into account the epistemological, ontological and methodological aspects of *security* research, one must agree with the following construal by Williams of what it means to be “free from threats”:

Security constitutes a state of “control over that which threatens our values – particularly over threats which, when left unchecked, would jeopardise the survival of particular subjects in the short-term. It is [however] important to remember that, even though security and survival are frequently related, the two terms should not be conflated; while survival is an existential state, the state of security involves being able to pursue one’s political and social ambitions”.²³

A definition similar to that of Williams has been proposed by Zięba. According to the Polish scholar:

The *security* of a given subject is “the certainty of the existence and survival, asset ownership, functioning and development of a subject. That certainty not only is a result of a lack of threats (their non-occurrence or elimination), but also occurs as a result of the creative activity of a given subject and changes with time, i.e. it is a social process in nature”.⁹⁵

In relation to the “certainty” mentioned by Zięba, which is a key element of this definition, firstly, within this context it is also possible to add the certainty of receiving help – personal, collective, or even broader, social help when in a *difficult situation* – as one of the conditions necessary for *security* to occur. Secondly – an important issue from the perspective of *practical sciences* – the word “certainty”, from the scientific point of view, is not the optimal term unless used in relation to *ideal types*. It would thus be more apt to replace the word “certainty” in this otherwise well-formed definition with the expression “high level of probability”. This is because the reality that we study is, “in reality”, ambiguous. As stated by Marx and frequently

²² Cf. E. Newman, *Human Security and Constructivism*, “International Studies Perspectives”, 2001, no. 2, pp. 239–251.

²³ P.D. Williams, *Badania bezpieczeństwa. Wprowadzenie*, [in:] *Studia bezpieczeństwa*, P.D. Williams (ed.), Kraków 2012, p. 5.

reiterated by Bauman, “certainty has evaporated”.²⁴ However, looking from the anthropological perspective, it is important that the author of the definition combines the description of the essence of the phenomenon with highlighting the activities which result in the **state of security**.

Piwowarski proposes a processual definition of security which focuses on the activity and not the passiveness of “consumers of security”, i.e. *security subjects*.

In the dynamic sense, security is a social process which involves constant actions taken by a security subject aimed at improving the mechanisms of security culture, ensuring an objective and optimal level (lack or reduction) of threats to the subject’s security.²⁵

The definition developed by Koziej is yet another useful example:

“Security comprises the theory and practice of ensuring to a given subject survival (existence) and possibility to pursue own interests in a hazardous environment, in particular by seizing opportunities (favourable circumstances), accepting challenges, reducing risks and counteracting (preventing and combating) all types of threats to the subject and its interests”.²⁶

The initial part of the definition is probably a result of applying a certain mental shortcut. Indeed, *security* cannot only be a “theory and practice” – from the processual point of view, it may begin with selecting a theory of action before transitioning into theory-based practice and finally becoming (or not) the effects of the theory’s application.

It is also common practice to create definitions of *security* in relation to particular subjects. Let us list the most important of those. Kitler writes that “[n]ational security is the highest *value*, a national *need* and the priority *goal* of the *state*, individuals and social groups, in addition to being a process which involves a variety of means for ensuring long-lasting, undisturbed national (*state*) existence and development, including protecting and defending the *state* as a political institution and protecting individuals [humans] and the whole of society, their wealth and natural environment from *threats* which would significantly curtail their functioning or which would have

²⁴ Z. Bauman, *Płynna nowoczesność*, translated by T. Kunz, Kraków 2006; *idem*, *Wspólnota. W poszukiwaniu bezpieczeństwa w niepewnym świecie*, translated by J. Margański, Kraków 2008; *idem*, *Życie na przemiał*, translated by T. Kunz, Kraków 2004.

²⁵ J. Piwowarski, *Nauki ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

²⁶ S. Koziej, *Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej: aspekty strategiczne*, [in:] “Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna”, 2013, no. 1, p. 144.

a deleterious effect on wealth which is of particular value”.²⁷ The author is unambiguous in his conflation of *national security* and *state security*.

Glen also conflates the categories of *national security* and *state security*. He considers *security*, from the objective perspective, as “the part of a *nation* and *state* in which humans, the artefacts which they create and the environment influence one another and exchange matter, energy and information, resulting in a high probability of positive events, with threats remaining at an acceptable level – a level which enables [not only] the state [but also its citizens] to function normally”.²⁸

As pointed out by Jarmoszko, Gryz’s definition of *state security* involves the universalisation of its referent, as it states that “it is the unthreatened, internal and external stability of the [dominant security] *subject*, enabling it to meet its existential (existence, persistence, survival) and developmental (progress, advancement of civilisation) needs in time and space (within its own territory and without) as part of individual and collective actions, in a [given] environment (local, regional, macro-regional, global) with other subjects by:

- 1) *protecting* and *defending* the status quo from possible consequences of various challenges and threats, and
- 2) striving to bring about desirable states of *reality* in the future”.²⁹

Stańczyk states that “from the synthetic point of view, *security* can thus be described as the objective certainty of guaranteed, inviolable survival and freedom to develop”.³⁰ It is apparent that, even though the *essence of security* can be condensed into such short, principled claims, a holistic description of the *security* phenomenon, with its complex contextuality, is characterised by a high level of complexity, necessitating an expanded narration which begins by replacing the word “certainty” used above with the expression “high level of probability”.

In the summary to his analysis of various definitions of *security*, Kołodziejczyk points to the increasing importance of multi-dimensional interpretations. “Such approaches construe *security* as a function of multiple

²⁷ W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁸ A. Glen, *Ontologiczno-metodologiczne aspekty pojmowania bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, [in:] *Metodologia badań bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, v. 3, P. Sienkiewicz, M. Marszałek, H. Świeboda (eds), Warszawa 2012, p. 26.

²⁹ J. Gryz, *Wstęp*, [in:] *Strategia bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski*, J. Gryz (ed.), Warszawa 2013, p. 13.

³⁰ J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1996, p. 19.

variables, for example in a three-dimensional system: agent-object-space, as well as a function which points to numerous other possible avenues (dimensions) for exploring this social phenomenon”.³¹ Kołodziejczyk also points to certain elements which are frequently ignored by securitological research, such as the *gradability of security* and its multi-dimensional nature, which manifests in, among others, dichotomies such as:

- agent-based vs object-based;
- internal vs external;
- aspectuality vs complexity.

In his research aimed at formulating a universal paradigm for studying *security*-related matters, Gryz writes that he refers to such a version of depicting and explicating “social *reality* which contains the descriptions of:

- the *state of security* of a [given security] subject, the *scope* of their *security*, both from the agent-based and object-based perspective, which is unique due to the subject’s attributes;
- the *dynamism of changes* experienced by a [given security] subject, the process of forming *security*, i.e. the evolution of the circumstances determining the subject’s *security* resulting from the actions of the subject, other social subjects and various environmental transformations”.³²

That which lies at the foundation of the functioning and development of the *anthropology of security* is thus also an immanent part of this paradigm – it is the necessary space and engineering, primarily social (but not only), which are both of utility when constructing the phenomenon of *security*, a unique instrumental value which is remarkable in that it enables humans to gain access to all the other values necessary to satisfy their needs.

Nearing the conclusion of this article, it is important to note that Drabik (among others), in his discussion on the *imperative of agency*, points out, as part of his reflections on the essence of *security*, that **it is not possible to talk about security as such, as if one tries to do so, defining the referent of the term becomes barely impossible**. According to Drabik, when considered as a »pure« concept, *security* loses its meaning and it becomes difficult to establish a relation between the signifier and the signified. The term thus becomes a general concept, a banality which, as nominalists put it, has no

³¹ A. Kołodziejczyk, *Bezpieczeństwo jako fenomen społeczny*, “Zeszyty Naukowo-Teoretyczne Wiek XXI”, 2005, no. 2(16)/3(170), p. 84.

³² J. Gryz, *Paradygmaty bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] *Metodologia badań bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, P. Sienkiewicz, M. Marszałek, H. Świeboda (eds), v. II, Warszawa 2011, p. 132.

reflection in *reality*, turning into a mere linguistic sound used for symbolic communication.³³

Jarmoszko, on the other hand, within the context of Drabik's opinion, claims that the following fundamental question needs to be posed:

Can a scholar of security agree with this stance completely and without any objections?

Solving the problem posed by Jarmoszko is deceptively difficult. Approaching the matter from the anthropological perspective, we can, however, start by accepting that the weakness of the current theoretical discourse on the *essence of security* is insufficient universalism. Security research is, in turn, saturated with definitions of "real" tools and referents, for example *state security* and *international security*, and not of *security* interpreted as a universal phenomenon.

However, when the idea is expanded in the above direction and a more in-depth scholarly analysis is conducted inspired by the above question, the latter may prove to be a futile endeavour. Just as it is necessary in certain situations to define the *security* of particular *subjects*, it is possible to recognise the need for an occasional universalist interpretation of this unique construct.

As pointed out by Jarmoszko, on the basis of his analysis of the relevant literature, "[currently] there are definitely not enough of such approaches and analyses – considering the oversupply of excessively general and reified publications".³⁴

It is indeed true that *security* is not a unique entity – *a fact sui generis* – as it is also a state a particular *subject* is in, observed in a particular place at a particular time. However, *security*, this "equivalent of happiness", as security philosopher Janusz Świniarski describes it, as a phenomenon which relates to a great extent to the quality of human existence, should possess its universal essence.

It is the same type of anthropological social construct which we attempt to intellectually grasp when faced with such humane values as *beauty*, *happiness*, *love*, *truth*, *work*, *religion*, and also *fighting* for a righteous cause.

³³ Cf. K. Drabik, *Podmiotowy wymiar bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie naukowej deskrypcji*, [in:] *W poszukiwaniu tożsamości nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, J. Piwowarski, J. Gierszewski (eds), Warszawa 2018; *idem*, *Bezpieczeństwo personalne i strukturalne w perspektywie filozoficznej*, [in:] *Natura bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie personalnej i strukturalnej*, K. Drabik (ed.), Warszawa 2013.

³⁴ S. Jarmoszko, *Antropologia bezpieczeństwa*, Siedlce 2018, pp. 46–47.

When faced with the multifarious nature of *security subjects*, researchers can define *security* for every such subject separately.

REFERENCES

1. Bauman Z., *Płynna nowoczesność*, translated by T. Kunz, Kraków 2006.
2. Bauman Z., *Wspólnota. W poszukiwaniu bezpieczeństwa w niepewnym świecie*, translated by J. Margański, Kraków 2008.
3. Bauman Z., *Życie na przemiał*, translated by T. Kunz, Kraków 2004.
4. Buzan B., Weaver O., de Wilde J., *Security: A New framework for Analysis*, London 1998.
5. Curiel R.P., Bishop S.R., *A metric of the difference between perception of security and victimisation rates*, "Crime Science", 2016, no. 5, art. no. 12, DOI 10.1186/s40163-016-0060-y.
6. Drabik K., *Bezpieczeństwo personalne i strukturalne w perspektywie filozoficznej*, [in:] *Natura bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie personalnej i strukturalnej*, K. Drabik (ed.), Warszawa 2013.
7. Drabik K., *Podmiotowy wymiar bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie naukowej deskrypcji*, [in:] *W poszukiwaniu tożsamości nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, J. Piwowarski, J. Gierszewski (eds), Warszawa 2018.
8. Eriksen T.H., *Human Security and Social Anthropology*, [in:] *A World of Insecurity. Anthropological Perspectives on Human Security*, T. H. Eriksen, E. Bal, O. Salemink (eds), London – New York 2010, pp. 1–19.
9. Fehler W., *Zagrożenie – kluczowa kategoria teorii bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa*, K. Jałoszyński, B. Wiśniewski, T. Wojtuszek (eds), Bielsko-Biała 2007, pp. 34–42.
10. Fischer D., *Non-military aspects of security*, Aldershot 1993.
11. Gasparski P., *Psychologiczne wyznaczniki zapobiegania zagrożeniom*, Warszawa 2003.
12. Gasparski P., *Związek doświadczeń z ocenami prawdopodobieństwa zagrożeń i aktywnością profilaktyczną*, [in:] *Zachowanie się w sytuacji ryzyka*, R. Studenski (ed.), Katowice 2004, pp. 149–161.
13. Glen A., *Ontologiczno-metodologiczne aspekty pojmowania bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, [in:] *Metodologia badań bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, v. 3, P. Sienkiewicz, M. Marszałek, H. Świeboda (eds), Warszawa 2012, pp. 20–31.
14. Gordon S., *The protection of civilians: an evolving paradigm?*, "Stability: International Journal of Security and Development", 2013, no. 2(2), no. art. 40, DOI 10.5334/sta.cb.

15. Gryz J., *Wstęp*, [in:] *Strategia bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski*, J. Gryz (ed.), Warszawa 2013, pp. 11–18.
16. Hołyst B., *Wiktymologia*, Warszawa 1989.
17. *Inny słownik języka polskiego*, M. Bańko (ed.), Warszawa 2000.
18. Jarmoszko S., *Antropologia bezpieczeństwa*, Siedlce 2018.
19. Jarmoszko S., *Odmiany ryzyka społecznego w kontekście procesów globalizacji – próba konceptualizacji*, [in:] K. Pająk, A. Zduniak (eds), *Edukacyjne wyzwania początku XXI wieku*, Warszawa – Poznań 2003, pp. 104–114.
20. Jarmoszko S., Kalita C., Maciejewski J., *Nauki społeczne wobec problemu bezpieczeństwa (wybrane zagadnienia)*, Siedlce 2016.
21. Kalina R.M., *Ogólne kategorie klasyfikacji i charakterystyki zagrożeń zewnętrznych*, [in:] *Człowiek w sytuacji trudnej*, B. Hołyst (ed.), Warszawa 1991, pp. 78–92.
22. Kitler W., *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie, uwarunkowania, system*, Warszawa 2011.
23. Kołodziejczyk A., *Bezpieczeństwo jako fenomen społeczny*, “Zeszyty Naukowo-Teoretyczne Wiek XXI”, 2005, no. 2(16)/3(170), pp. 67–86.
24. Koziej S., *Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej: aspekty strategiczne*, [in:] “Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna”, 2013, no. 1, pp. 143–168.
25. *Leksykon wiedzy wojskowej*, Warszawa 1979.
26. Marana P., Labaka L., Sariegi J.M., *A framework for public-private-people partnerships in the city resilience-building process*, “Safety Science”, 2018, 110, pp. 39–50, DOI 10.1016/j.ssci.2017.12.011.
27. Marczuk K.P., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne w poszerzonej agendzie studiów nad bezpieczeństwem*, [in:] S.J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1996, pp. 66–78.
28. Michałowska G., *Bezpieczeństwo ludzkie*, [in:] *Świat wobec współczesnych wyzwań i zagrożeń*, J. Symonides (ed.), Warszawa 2010, pp. 227–234.
29. Newman E., *Human Security and Constructivism*, “International Studies Perspectives”, 2001, no. 2, pp. 239–251.
30. Nowak H., Nowak M., *Zarys teorii bezpieczeństwa narodowego. Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, Warszawa 2011.
31. Piwowarski J., *Nauki o bezpieczeństwie. Zagadnienia elementarne*, Kraków 2016.

32. Piwowarski J., *Transdyscyplinarna istota kultury bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Słupsk 2016.
33. Pokruszyński W., Piwowarski J., *Teoria bezpieczeństwa*, Kraków 2014.
34. von Tigerstrom B., *Human Security and International Law: Prospects and Problems*, Oxford 2007.
35. *Routledge handbook of human security*, M. Martin, T. Owen (eds), 1st edition, London 2013.
36. Stańczyk J., *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1996.
37. Williams P.D., *Badania bezpieczeństwa. Wprowadzenie*, [in:] *Studia bezpieczeństwa*, P.D. Williams (ed.), Kraków 2012, pp. 1–14.
38. Zięba R., *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego: koncepcje – struktury – funkcjonowanie*, Warszawa 1999.

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS:

J. Piwowarski, Ł. Trzciniński, *Anthropological Aspects of Security Culture Analyses Within the Context of Selected Elements of Threat and Security Typology*, “Security Dimensions”, 2019, no. 32, pp. 108–126, DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0014.1149.

Licence: This article is available in Open Access, under the terms of the Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0; for details please see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the author and source are properly credited. Copyright © 2019 University of Public and Individual Security “Apeiron” in Cracow