

Leszek Fryderyk Korzeniowski

Institute of Political Science of Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland

SECURITOLOGY – SECURITY OF A SUBJECT

Abstract

Subjective security (security of a subject) is a state of a subject, his potential and abilities of adequate reaction to hazards as well as an issue of protecting a subject from any hazards.

The first scientific analyses of security issue have been known for eighty years now, however, formally science on security as an academic subject was registered (in Poland) just in 2011, in a new distinguished area and field of social science.

Science is an intentional activity of man aimed at exploring the world we live in. Scientific knowledge is based on searching constant relations between facts (colloquial knowledge restricts to occasional relations).

Keywords: *security, threats, objective state, science on security, practical sciences*

Preface

So far, for the dominant part of science world, the issue of security has been undermined and considered as a side effect of other sciences. In recent years, however, the issue of security has become the leading and crucial subject discussed during numerous science conferences, research projects and publications. Some of the researchers regard security as the subject of analysis whilst making good use of methodology suitable for traditional science and its overall scientific heritage.

We should emphasise the fact that the subject of research on *securitology* includes security of a subject (man), security of a small, social group, security of society (a large, social group) and security of mankind. Narrowing the term “security”, it concerns mainly the term of “national security”. The authors who tackle the problem of security from the perspective of political science or military sciences, do not spot the fact that the problem of individual human security and social groups has been the main issue of many deliberations made by philosophers, sociologists, scientists in the field of security and many others.

Security means that it is an **objective state** that performs the **function** of measuring the level of **threats** and a **defence potential**, which is perceived subjectively by individuals or groups. (Hofreiter 2006; Korzeniowski 2005; 2008; 2012; Kwiatkowski 2011; Leszczyński 2011; Zalewski 2010).

The state of security is a function of many variables that we can present by means of the following formula:

$$S = f (Z_1, Z_2, \dots Z_n) P_o$$

where:

S – state of security

Z₁, Z₂, ... Z_n – threat 1, threat 2, (...) threat n

P_o – defence potential

Such definition of a security comprises two main concepts. One concept is regarded to be a negative attitude, but the other one is considered as a positive attitude.

A negative approach refers to the lack of threat or threats.

A positive approach refers to a defense potential (certainty of survival and the ability to a creative activity of a subject).

Likewise, Andrzej Misiuk (2013, p. 13) states: “(...) by the term human security, we perceive such state of lack of threats to any human interests, which enables proper functioning of any individual in the society (...)”.

Canadian political scientist and Director of Centre for International Governance Innovation in Ontario Fen Olser Hampson defines security of an individual as the lack of dangers for key values in the following categories: human rights, human security (*freedom for fear*) and balanced human development (*freedom from want*) (Hampson et al. 2002, p. 16-17).

Let's assume that the definition is a defining statement, so what does *definiendum* mean (concept, name, defining term) by designates (characteristics) of *definiens* or that a constitutive content is good enough for correct defining, so for these particular reasons we need to clarify each concept as well as each term of definition.

The meaning of the concept of “security” (*definiendum*) is characterised by attributes (*definiens*):

- * **subject**, together with his defensive potential and ability to active performance,
- * **state**: an objective situation, depending on the lack (low level of) hazard,
- * **a subjective feeling** resulting from perceiving an objective situation.

Subject of security (defined by some people as a means of conveying ideas, carrier, subject, object) that is a subject of a situation, which is influenced by the effects of hazards, receives stimuli and reacts (in this context: a subject of a situation being affected by hazards, receives stimuli and reacts.)

Subjective security is a state of a subject, his potential and abilities of adequate reaction to hazards as well as an issue of protecting a subject from any hazards. Security of a subject being in danger is in fact, an answer to the question: security of *who, what?* or in other words: a protection of *whom, what?*

Taking into consideration a kind of endangered subjects, we can actually distinguish (security of *whom?*):

- Security (protection) of **an individual** (man) or **group of citizens** (a small group, society, mankind);
- security of *what?*;
- Security (protection) of **nature** (environment, animals, plants etc.);
- Security (protection) of **properties** (building, bridge etc.);
- Security (protection) of **monies** (safes, finances etc.);
- Security (protection) of **information** (data, correspondence, letter etc.).

A similar subjective approach to this matter is already shown in publications by Josef Žóltaszek (1931, p. 46), who by defining subjects of security in 1931, thus shifted our attention to physical individuals, legal individuals, social associations as well as state unions.

Without embarking into the deeper ontological, epistemological and axiological deliberations about the nature of the value like security, it should be stressed just like a philosopher and an axiologist that a constructive power of values refers to a human being and to them only but with the recollection of human existence in three dimensions:

1. the life of another human being,
2. the life of a group of people who create a social group (a society),
3. the life of human species (the mankind).

Security of **an individual** (individual hazard) is based on the lack of hazards of a single person whereas security (hazard) of **a group** concerns two or more people.

Mankind, society and small social groups are systems, which are made up from sub-systems, where each of these sub-systems may be explored as complex systems consisting of sub-systems – and so on until we reach a human individual.

Securitology makes a good use of methods applied in sociology and science on management, but on the level of a single individual – methods of psychology and other human sciences.

In science on management, a social system (**organisation**) is distinguished from environment as **a group of mutually cooperating people who aim at obtaining a synergy effect and achieving their purpose** (Korzeniowski 2010, p. 2013).

Attributes characteristic among each organisation are as follows:

- * a common goal and a feeling of bond among the whole organisation, and its particular members (in this context: for the sake of safety);
- * human resources, properties, finance, information;
- * structural organisation – internal layout, location and co-dependence of system properties;
- * co-operation of structure elements and particular members of organisation to achieve a goal;
- * separation from other organisations in any environment, marked more or less by a distinct limit;
- * organisational culture – values, norms, principles as well as the rules, which determine behaviour of people in the processes occurring in the system, and also in the processes of joining and leaving the system (in this context: security culture);
- * and among other things, (but only in hierarchical systems) management regulating the behaviour of structure elements.

Man (subject) means a human being, rational being who is aware of his personality, needs, expectations and opportunities that uses a symbolic language, which allows creating culture and stands out from other creatures as he has the highest level of mental and social development whilst belonging to a society and immanent part of the remaining systems of reference.

Personal security and individual sense of security (depending on individual personality characteristics and our personal experience as well as of our relatives) becomes the most important, constitutional value.

In penal law, an individual hazard is based on endangering a single person or a small group, whereas a common hazard depends on providing a particular hazard either direct or indirect for many people who do not necessarily need to be strictly identified. Bringing a particular, common threat may be affected by for instance causing a road crash, fire, pulling down the building, flooding or earthquake, rocks or snow, explosion of fireworks or flammable materials or another sort of releasing energy, spreading of poisonous substances both suffocating or burning, rapid release of nuclear power or ion radiation, epidemic threat or possibilities of spreading contagious disease, producing and launching harmful substances on the market, food products, medicine or other products commonly used, interfering of automatic processing, gathering or sending information (or acting in a different way, and particularly dangerous circumstances as well as placing on the ship or air bus any device or substance edangering security of people (Ustawa z 6 czerwca 1997 r. Kodeks karny, 1997, art. 163, 165, 167, 173).

A small group of society is in fact singled out by sociologists for the sake of direct knowledge and communication among group members as well as by taking into account views and needs of particular individuals (Turowski 2001). Research carried out on the sense of security reveals the fact that the smaller community is, the bigger feeling of security we actually have. People know their local environment from their own experience and observations, and extreme or untypical news broadcasted by the media is of less importance.

A local community is a sort of a community of people inhabiting a common territory, relatively self-sufficient, which is based on the stable system of mutual bonds and social interactions, and being characterised by a strong feeling of belonging of individuals to a group as well as the identification of individuals with a group. A local community is a form which covers the whole life of inhabitants, and enables them to satisfy their basic needs of existence and security. A distinctive feature of local communities is

a special, social bond shaping a sense of belonging among members of society, as well as their identity, and sometimes even pride and security.

A large group of society (a collection of people creating society, state, nation) is an organisation of the region community, nation and citizens, which came into existence in order to protect life and other values of any individual. By comparison, we actually have such a constitutional order, which places security of citizens on the same level as the independence of the Republic of Poland.

Humanity (mankind) is not only a large group of society, but also symbolic and materialistic works of people, as well as historic continuity. Without community of people, the existence and culture of man is impossible. “All mankind is us, whether we like it or not” (Beckett 1982, p. 90).

In the Constitution of the Republic of Poland from 1997, security is regarded in terms of a **subject** and obligation of state: “the Republic of Poland (...) secures freedom and human rights of citizens as well as **security of citizens...**” [bolding and dots by Author] (Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z 2 kwietnia 1997 r. 1997, art. 5), and **state security** (ibidem, art. 31, § 3; art. 45, § 2; art. 53, § 5; art. 61, § 3; art. 126, § 2; article 130), security of state borders (art. 26, § 1). Among other things, we can distinguish security of work conditions (art. 66, § 1; art. 233, § 3) and consumer security (article 76).

Sciences on security derive from a Latin word *securitas* meaning security. The suffix *logos* means science and thus the term securitology is a science or sciences on security (Korzeniowski 2008, p. 33; 2012, p. 49).

Officially, sciences on security as scientific branches were at first registered in the field of arts at the beginning of 2011 and subsequently in newly formed areas and in the new formed field of social science together with defence studies, media studies, political science, public policy, cognitive studies and social communication, education, psychology, sociology (Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z 8 sierpnia 2011 r. w sprawie obszarów wiedzy, dziedzin nauki i sztuki oraz dyscyplin naukowych i artystycznych 2011).

Contemporary division of social reality into particular disciplines, which uses separate research methods, has in fact no justification in the light of today’s globalization and new threats facing our societies. This was especially emphasized by Fernand Braudel, a French historian of modern times, in 1971, who once stated: “I am convinced there are no fundamental frontiers between arts. Each of them is like a gate left open for the whole social reality that leads to all rooms and floors of the house, provided that a researcher does not abandon his attempt to discover it for the sake of his neighbours,

who are experts; so we need to seize every opportunity to use their own gates and stairs” (Braudel 1971, p. 233).

It is obvious that the use of methodology of various fields of science does not actually mean thoughtless coping of the heritage of these sciences and attributing of their effects to itself. Making good use of various science methods and going across the borders between them is a widely known process in contemporary science which examines the well-known phenomena on many occasions, but on the other hand with the main focus on exploring them again so that we can understand them better. This is actually how all the unquestionable today’s science on management, economic psychology, biophysics, astrophysics and many others have been developed.

In literature, however known as pseudo – scientific literature, the term “security” is often applied changeably to the terms described by means of using adjectives, which accessively narrow the scope of the defined term (*definiendum*), in which *definiens* largely refers to an intuitional comprehension of the term security in a colloquial language.

Such distortion of the meaning of the term security is found in the publications by Gary King and Christopher J.L. Murray, who introduced the concept of *individual human security* – IHS – in 2001, which implies a proportion between a life expectancy in which man can try to achieve something rationally and the fact that he can spend the rest of his life in a country generating poverty (King, Murray 2002). Any particular IHS comprises of *human security* in any society.

In the field of law, narrowing or misinterpreting of the term “security” is often found. It directly refers to the term described as public security when *definiens* determines the concept of security (Kawka 1939; Zaborowski 1977) or replaces the term state (situation) by using the term system. (Public) security is (...) “a system of hierarchy and social relationships (...), which provides protection of society and individuals from dangers resulting from rapid human actions, as well as powers of nature” (Bolesta 1973, p. 121).

Włodzimirz Fehler, after reviewing various definitions of public security cites such peculiar examples (Fehler 2010, p. 29): “**public security** may be interfered in such extent that it can include the whole system, but in some circumstances it may function as a **danger** to the society. In other cases, it may function in terms of a common **danger**” [bolding by Author].

Hence, the author Stanislaw Pikulski (2000) applies in *definiens* the term public security as designates of security (thus making a mistake *idem per idem*, as well as by using designates of danger, which brings about the fact that the situation is contradictory.

Fehler also points out that, it is not the case of overlooking a correction, as the identical part of such publication was released in another publication of Stanislaw Pikulski (2002).

In addition to that, a similar example was found by Fehler in description by Kazimierz Rajchel, which states that public security is a **real condition inside the state**, which is regulated by the rules of law and outside the law, **which enables** normal functioning of a state organization, realization of its interests, preserving life and belongings of any individuals in such organization, as well as it protects us from a **threat to the security** [bolding by Author] of human rights and laws of any individuals (Rajchel 2005).

However, the authors of such proposals make a mistake, in case when definiens determines “public security” by applying designates of security (whilst making a mistake referred as *idem per idem* as well as by using designates of danger, which in turn causes a definition to be contradictory.

In the field of political science (an area of social science), narrowing the term security, it concerns mainly the term of national security.

Variance of a concept in time

The analysis of the subject literature leads to the conclusion that, together with the passing of time, the concept of safety changes. “The old concept of safety included, basically, political and military aspects. Nowadays, it includes also economic dependencies and interdependencies, the problems of raw materials availability, ecology, demography, social and humanitarian aspects, problems of a country identity preservation, and provision of its proper role in the civilization development in the contemporary world. The essence of safety should be seen in its connection to the phenomenon of threat which, on one hand means a certain psychical state or consciousness resulting by the way phenomena are perceived which, subjectively, are being estimated as unprofitable or dangerous, on the other hand, the objective factors causing the states of uncertainty and anxiety” (Korycki 1993).

Likewise, Janusz Stefanowicz made the same mistake when he wrote that firstly in our contemporary world, we can see the rapid growth of technology, but at the same time there is an increasing number of threats, which have considerably changed the scope of comprehending security. In the past, however, security was regarded in terms of a military concept, but nowadays, it has extended its concept to some vital, non-military aspects such as political, economic, ecological etc.

Secondly, theology of security has considerably changed. Not only the prime will of survival but also the preservation of a state commonwealth and its citizens, as well as the protection of freedom, national identity and system play a crucial role as they all perform the function of security policy.

Thirdly, there is even growing dependency between a national security and order, which becomes a common issue (Stefanowicz 1996).

In the above examples, the authors who tackle the problem of security from the perspective of political science or military sciences, do not spot the fact that the problem of individual human security and social groups has been the main issue of many deliberations made by philosophers, sociologists, scientists in the field of security and many others.

References

- Beckett S. (1982), *Waiting for Godot*, Grove Press, New York
- Bolesta S. (1973), *Pozycja prawna MO w systemie organów PRL*, Departament Szkolenia i Doskonalenia Zawodowego MSW, Warszawa
- Braudel F. (1971), *Historia i trwanie*, Czytelnik, Warszawa
- Fehler W. (2010), *Bezpieczeństwo publiczne jako składnik wewnętrznego bezpieczeństwa państwa*, „Bezpieczeństwo Teoria i praktyka” No. 1-2
- Hampson F.O., Daudelin J., Hay J.B., Reid H., Marting T. (2002), *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*, Oxford University Press, Ottawa
- Hofreiter L. (2006) *Securitologia*, Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M.R. Štefánika, Liptovský Mikuláš
- Kawka W. (1939), *Policja w ujęciu historycznym i współczesnym*, Zakład Administracji i Prawa Administracyjnego U.S.B., Wilno
- King G., Murray Ch.J.I. (2002), *Rethinking Human Security*, “Political Science Quarterly” Vol. 116, No. 4
- Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z 2 kwietnia 1997 r., Dz.U. 1997 nr 78 poz. 483, with amendments
- Korycki S. (1993), *Bezpieczeństwo polityczne*, in: *System bezpieczeństwa Polski, materiały z konferencji naukowej 4-5 listopada 1993 r. w AON*, WSO, Warszawa
- Korzeniowski L.F.: (2012), *Podstawy nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, Difin, Warszawa
- Korzeniowski L.F. (2010), *Menedżment. Podstawy zarządzania*, EAS, Kraków

- Korzeniowski L.F. (2008), *Securitologia. Nauka o bezpieczeństwie człowieka i organizacji społecznych*, EAS, Kraków, <http://www.sbc.org.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=13871&dirids=66>
- Korzeniowski L. (2005), *Securitology. The concept of safety*, "Comunikations" No 3
- Kwiatkowski S. (2011), *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem w sytuacjach kryzysowych*, Akademia Humanistyczna im. Aleksandra Gieysztora, Pultusk
- Leszczyński M. (2011), *Bezpieczeństwo społeczne Polaków wobec wyzwań XXI wieku*, Difin, Warszawa
- Misiuk A. (2013), *Instytucjonalny system bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego*, Difin, Warszawa
- Pikulski S. (2000), *Podstawowe zagadnienia bezpieczeństwa publicznego*, in: *Prawne i administracyjne aspekty bezpieczeństwa osób i porządku publicznego w okresie transformacji ustrojowo-gospodarczej*, (eds.) Bednarek W., Pikulski S., Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn
- Pikulski S. (2002), *Bezpieczeństwo to wspólna sprawa: ochrona bezpieczeństwa publicznego – rozwiązania systemowe w skali kraju i regionu*, (eds.) Fiebig J., Róg M., Tyburska A., Wydaw. Wyższej Szkoły Policji, Szczytno
- Rajchel K. (2005), *Zarządzanie ochroną porządku i bezpieczeństwa publicznego w państwie*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Rzeszowskiej, Rzeszów
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z 8 sierpnia 2011 r. w sprawie obszarów wiedzy, dziedzin nauki i sztuki oraz dyscyplin naukowych i artystycznych, Dz.U. 2011 nr 179 poz. 1056
- Stefanowicz J. (1996), *Przedmowa*, in: Stańczyk J., *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, ISP PAN, Warszawa
- Turowski J. (2001) *Socjologia. Małe struktury społeczne*, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, Lublin
- Ustawa z 6 czerwca 1997 r. Kodeks karny, Dz.U. 1997 nr 88, poz. 553, with amendments
- Zaborowski J. (1997), *Prawne środki zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego*, Departament Szkolenia i Doskonalenia Zawodowego MSW, Warszawa
- Zalewski S. (2010), *Bezpieczeństwo polityczne państwa*, „Rozprawa naukowa“ nr 106
- Żółtaszek J. (1931), *Naukowa organizacja bezpieczeństwa*, "Przegląd Organizacji", No. 6