Theoretical Issues of "Security" Concept

Aleksandr I. Sidorkin[1] & Denis V. Iroshnikov[1]

[1] Department of «Theory of Law, History of Law and International Law», Russian University of Transport, Moscow, Russia

Correspondence: Denis V. Iroshnikov, Department of «Theory of Law, History of Law and International Law», Russian University of Transport, Moscow, Russia. Tel: 79-1-0616-0909. E-mail: dv-iroshnikov@mail.ru

Abstract

The development of ideas about the category of "security" has come a long way, correlated with the development of human civilization. Initially conceived as a biological reaction, aimed at one's own life preservation from the all-encompassing world danger for the ancient man, security moves from the category of biological reaction to the category of the thinking process with the development of mental activity, reflecting not only the response to the preservation of life, but also the anticipation of threat appearance danger. According to the authors, the qualitative transition of security comprehension from everyday life and practicality to the scientific aspect takes place at the turn of the 16th-17th centuries due to the rapid development of science and technology during this period of time. The scientific interest in the formal-logical interpretation of security understanding and the desire to develop appropriate terminology that adequately reflects the essence of security is especially evident in the philosophy by F. Bacon and B. Spinoza. However, neither during this period, nor during subsequent periods, the science has developed an established (academic) concept of security. The existing numerous concepts of security are nothing more than empirical in nature and reflect not the essence of security phenomenon, but the person's subjective perceptions of it.

Keywords: security, national security, legal category, definition, cognitive methods, theoretical construction

1. Introduction

Arguing about the category of "national security" that is often mentioned nowadays, one should pay attention to the key word "security" in this conjunction-term. Considering the life of modern society as a set of social phenomena, it is necessary to single out the most important ones among those, to which "security" is referred, of course. Separating "security" from the general mass of social phenomena, we define what it is, in other words, we clarify its essence and thereby give it a definition.

At first glance, it may seem superfluous to clarify once again the concept of "security" for so long and so well known to people almost from the moment of the man's birth as part of earthly nature, first at the level of instinct to preserve one's life itself, and then with the advent of rational man and the attempts to conceptualize "security." The opponents of "well-known" understanding can refer here to the opinion of the Polish Scientist M. Dobroselsky who wrote at that time that any attempt to define the concept of "security" clearly is doomed to failure and has no practical significance, since it is impossible to foresee all elements of the structure or processes guaranteeing safety in all possible situations (Dobroselsky, 1972; 1977).

However, as some scholars rightly point out, the apparent clarity of a concept does not exclude the need for its scientific definition (Noy, 1962). It should also be noted that, for objective reasons, security issues are put by modern society at the center of international life, and the way in which civilization develops depends on the ways of their resolution.

We emphasize that that security has become the main object of modern international relations and international law for objective reasons.

Scientific path is the most reasonable and even the only way to comprehend the concept of "security" recognized by modern researchers. One cannot but agree with Cormac Hurley and P.S. Van Oorschot that the achievement of progress in the field of "security" concept knowledge requires a truly scientific approach, but too little attention is given to this (Herley & van Oorschot, 2018). Therefore, following European scientists, we will try to analyze different approaches to the definition of "security" and answer the question whether this term can be defined at all.

2. Methods

The study of "security" definition is impossible without a set of scientific methods of knowledge. Here the primary importance is taken by the materialistic approach to the phenomena of the surrounding reality, that is, the method of cognition, which is based on materialist dialectics. The task of researching the ideas about the essence of "security" concept requires the identification of those fundamental features that are characteristic of the latter and make it possible to speak of it as an inter-branch concept. However, a simple listing of essential features makes it impossible to reveal the essence of the concept. Therefore, when you define the essence of a concept, it is necessary to use the methods of the science of logic, which recommends the studied, defined concept to be brought up under a different, more general concept, to which this concept is subordinate and the part of the volume of which it is constituted, and then to reveal the feature that distinguishes the defined concept from other concepts also subject to this general concept, and also included in its scope.

The cognition of the modern understanding of security suggests that this concept is interdisciplinary. In this regard, the use of the historical method by the analysis of security idea development stages in certain branches of science is the starting point of the study, which allows, later, to bring the analyzed industry concepts under a more general concept and get the idea of "security architecture" in general (Hamida et al, 2015).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Security Awareness Genesis: From Biology to Sociology and Law

With the advent of "homo sapiens," the idea of security determines the entire subsequent existence of humanity. The understanding of security was progressing along with the degree to which a person has realized himself as an individual and as a member of a social collective, and society as a whole. The need to ensure own security (self-preservation) was originally laid by nature in any biological organism. A man is not an exception in this regard. Therefore, the need for security is immanent to any kind of human activity, it is associated with the very essence of human nature as a rational being. When "the first thought of a rational creature begins to distinguish it from the rest of the surrounding natural world", the idea of safety from a biological instinct "flows" into the social plane and makes a person not only perceive his mortality, along with all other living creatures, but also take appropriate preventive measures to preserve their lives, that is, security measures (Chkhartishvili, 2001). Thus, the idea of security is related to the very beginning of human thought. At this stage of human existence, the idea of security was coordinated with a very simple moral standard: "do not do to others the things you do not want to yourself." S.I. Beglov said that this simplest moral standard laid the first guarantee of personal safety (Beglov, 1988).

In a tribal society, it was the clan that ensured the safety of the individual. The first postulates of security were perceived through traditions, customs, rituals, and other categories of ancient social life. The more a person obeyed the regulations of the clan and tribe, the more security he had according to his fellow tribesmen. The professor at the University of Glasgow U. Makkechni pointed out that Common Tribal Law has prepared an excellent ground for the subsequent perception of the right by a man as a member of the state and the legalization of relations that previously existed in ancient societies (Mac Kechnie, 1896). However, at some stage of human civilization development, the norms of personal ethics, which regulated security, began to diverge from the practice of the ruling groups and the state increasingly.

D.N. Kalachev rightly notes that with the emergence of the state it assumes the functions and powers of the chief security guarantor, since citizens, voluntarily or compelled to trust their security to the central government (Kalachev, 2014). However, emerging states, in the words of the English philosopher of the seventeenth century T. Hobbes were the subjects of "unsettled territories" (Hobbes, 1989). Therefore, the understanding of security initially acquires an "international" character, as the protection of its citizen interests from the claims of other states (Kolobov, 2008). But the state was forced to play this role alone, "according to T. Hobbes, relying only on its own strength" (Hobbes, 1989). Thus, national aspect appears in understanding of safety.

It will take almost 250 years before the idea of "national security", flashed in T. Hobbes reflections, acquires a complete scientific design in the form of the doctrine by Hans Morgenthau and his school of pragmatism, which

reduces the understanding of security as a military-forced way of its provision (Morgenthau Hans, 1955). However, one should understand that "national security" appears in G. Morgentau's doctrine not as an independent category, but as the main, driving element of the "security" category itself, which is still of "international character", since "national interests" are the main factor in the implementation of external state policy. It is not by chance that, according to his terminology, "permanent, fundamental interests", such as protection of territorial integrity, population, and state institutions from external danger, are the dominant interests of security according to G. Morgentau. At the same time, the ideas by G. Morgentau on identification of the so-called "transient, intermediate interests" allowed for the first time, on the one hand, to argue that the category of "security" is not static at the scientific level, and on the other hand, gave rise to the question whether it is possible to formulate a sustainable notion of "security" in the context of constantly changing "transient" security interests (Morgenthau, 1952).

Subsequent critics of pragmatism doctrine did not discern these two innovations in the approach to the definition of security, focusing on the "military-force" component of this doctrine. So, in particular, a narrow understanding of security meaning by G. Morgentau's followers, was criticized by the globalist movement established in the 60-70-ies of the twentieth century, which began to consider security as a complex category, which includes, apart from the actual security of society from military conflicts and economic crises, environmental security, the security of resources necessary for the existence of mankind and so on. But the theory of globalism itself, in its understanding of security, is still far from perfect and has not escaped internal contradictions. On the one hand, following James Rosenau throwing the state from the pedestal of the only security guarantor into a row of "autonomous power actors", acting "only as one of the players" providing security, on the other hand, for example, Yale H. Fergusson and Richard W. Mansbach pointing to the fact that any phenomenon, including security, can be viewed from different points of view and this approach gives many partially correct interpretations; they write simultaneously about the "primacy of perception" of this term, characteristic "for those who decide" (meaning here civil servants, and state represented by them). At the same time, the aforementioned authors try to reject the "persistent statecentrism" in the security assessments provided by the concept of Alexander Wendt Ferguson (Rosenau, 1987; Yale, 2004).

A new vector in the discussion of security understanding emerged in the 80-ies of the twentieth century, when Princeton University professor Richard Ulman and Anglo-Canadian scientist Barry Buzan talked about the security of the person himself, arguing that the state previously positioned as the main guarantor of security acts as a source of danger to the individual (Ullman, 1983; Buzan, 1983). However, these views can hardly be called a completely new word in the science of security. In essence, these authors reanimated a very old discussion known since the Enlightenment (whether the state is good or evil for a person), adding to it the problems of security understanding. The state, according to the concepts of liberal humanists, exploited the "cynical theme of the eternal state of insecurity" from the very beginning of its existence by elevating to the rank of state wisdom and doctrine such postulates as, for example, "a man is an enemy to another man", "the more weapons - the more security", and security was personified by a "palisade of protective measures around everything and everyone ... a bet on intimidation" (Beglov, 1988). Naturally, the human person in these conditions, his rights and interests could be violated by the state at any time, as soon as an obvious or imaginary threat to security was created, according to state practicality and selfishness.

3.2 Reflection of View Differences on Safety in Terminology

In the process of genesis and the subsequent development of views on security, the search for effective means of its provision, the lexical meaning of the term "security" changed. One should agree with the opinion by R.V. Chetvertkov, who believes that "security" is a dynamic, flexible concept, never permanent, capable of self-development and self-implementation (Chetvertkov, 2019).

The indisputability of the fact that the fundamental principle of science, which developed the most common definitions that perform methodological functions in the study of certain phenomena, is philosophy, does not require additional proof. The genesis of European philosophy is associated with the period of ancient Greece. Although the writings of the ancient Greek philosophers Aristotle, Democritus, Plato and Socrates, mention the term "security", this problem was not considered fundamental at that time and had no complete philosophical understanding. The merit of ancient Greek philosophy should be recognized in this case as the term "security" was introduced into the lexicon of science.

It is believed that one of the first lexical meanings of the term "safety" was given in 1190 by the dictionary of the English philosopher Robert Grossetest, who by this term meant the calm state of mind of a person who considered himself protected from any danger (Goncharenko, 2018). In this definition, we see the emphasis on a

calm state of mind as security. And this is far from coincidental, since the science of this period was the "undivided kingdom of theology." Hence the calm state of a person's soul (spirit) is put at the forefront of security philosophy.

Only at the turn of the XVI-XVII centuries the term "security" in the philosophy of F. Bacon and B. Spinoza receives a new interpretation as "a state of mind, a situation of calm resulting from the absence of real danger, as well as material, political conditions, relevant bodies and organizations contributing to the creation of this situation". Scientific interest in the formal-logical interpretation of security understanding and the desire to develop appropriate terminology that adequately reflects the essence of security was due to the rapid development of science and technology during this period of time. Now ignorance threatened by danger and hidden threat. So, in particular, overcoming of ignorance (uncertainty) in the great geographical discoveries was aimed, among other things, at mankind navigation safety provision. Geographical discoveries were impossible without the development of science (mathematics, astronomy, cartography). Thus, security was increasingly involved in the scientific orbit and required the development of its scientific definition. Therefore, it is far from accidental that one of the first scientific definitions of security appears in the works by F. Bacon and B. Spinoza, who sought to justify the importance of science to ensure the security of the country and society (Bacon, 1977; Spinoza, 1999).

Pointing out that every material thing should be clothed in a form by which F. Bacon meant the definition, he points out that the latter is "the essence of the human mind invention." In other words, definitions are the products of scientific thought. Developing the definition of security, F. Bacon, in particular, wrote that the definition should reflect the essence of a thing, its internal immanent cause or the nature of its properties, as well as its difference from other things. Scientific definition, in contrast to the ordinary, is always regulated and subject to methodologically verified self-control. Definition is the standardization of thing existence conditions. It must satisfy the conditions of principal verifiability and have predictive power. The relationship of definition parts is based on the laws and norms of logic (The Works of Lord Bacon).

Is it possible to recognize the attempt to develop the definition of security, undertaken by F. Bacon, as successful? We believe that the main drawback of the philosopher's reasoning lies in the desire to give some attribute to the concept of security, and this, in its turn, leads to the denial of the need to ensure security, since it turns out that it is immanent per se.

Subsequently, science tried to develop a variety of security concepts. But let us ask the question: "Is there such a concept today that adequately reflects modern ideas about this phenomenon, such as, for example, the concept of "theft" for many centuries reflecting the essence of the phenomenon as the secret embezzlement of another's property, regardless of the political structure of society, form or state system type?". Alas, the answer is still negative. A sure sign of a well-established (academic) concept of security absence is the constant transformation of scientific ideas about this phenomenon (although it sometimes seems that the very concept of security changes, rather than the views of science). The main methodological error here lies in the assertion that the periodic refinement of security concept is a positive phenomenon, contributing to the development of the theory itself following the evolution of human civilization (Rybalkin, 2002). It would be possible to agree with such statements if it was the question of recognizing only the empirical nature of "security" concept, which reflects not the essence of security phenomenon, but the person's subjective ideas about it. Hence, there are also incorrect reasoning in theory that security can manifest itself in its various forms within the modern world (national, state, cyber, etc.). Thus, security is identified with one of its types, and this phenomenon is considered not by its concept essence, but only in a special manifestation (Nuriyev et al, 2018; Shukla, 2017; Bahremand, 2015).

4. Summary

The ideas of security were interpreted differently during different historical periods of society development.

In antiquity, security cannot be associated with the thought process, since it was a biological reaction at the dawn of mankind aimed at saving one's own life from the all-encompassing danger for the ancient people around the world. With the development of mental activity, security moves from the category of biological reaction to the category of thinking process, reflecting not only the response to the preservation of life, but also the anticipation of danger threat. The first regulatory standards for security provision are the customary law of the tribe and clan.

Hellenic philosophy, having included the term "security" in scientific circulation, was not developed in its scientific research.

There are first attempts to develop the concept of "security" in the Middle Ages. However, in the conditions of

theology dominance, the main emphasis in the understanding of security was made on human soul calmness preservation, which could only be achieved when you address God.

The Epoch of New Time marked the qualitative transition of security understanding from everyday life and practicality to the scientific plane, which was promoted by the rapid development of science and technology during this period of time. The scientific interest in the formal-logical interpretation of security understanding and the desire to develop appropriate terminology that adequately reflects the essence of security is especially evident in the philosophy by F. Bacon and B. Spinoza.

In contemporary world, the state-centered model of security awareness is replaced by epy model of "non-traditional" understanding of the "person-centered" nature of security.

However, despite the development of a large number of safety definitions during the period of New and Newest time, the objective essence of this phenomenon has not been disclosed yet. Thus, instead of the theoretical concept of security, we deal only with the multitude of subjective ideas that are in the concept status.

5. Conclusions

The article studies the evolution of views on the category of security and the reflection of these views attempting to formulate the definition of security. According to the authors, the methodology of the study allowed us to obtain the results with originality and novelty, which can be used for the further scientific development of theoretical safety problems.

References

Bacon, F. (1977). Works: in 2 volumes. V. 1. - Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, Thought. pp. 17-18.

Bahremand, A. (2015). The concept of translation in different teaching approaches and methods. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 3*(1), 5-9.

Beglov, S. I. (1988). Own security, someone else's security. *International life,* (4), 44.

Beglov, S. I. (1988). Own security, someone else's security. *International life,* (4), 38.

Buzan, B. (1983). *People, States & Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations* (2nd ed.). Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI); Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. Of North Carolina Press.

Chetvertkov, R. V. (n.d.). *Development of ideas about the security of Russia (XI-XVII centuries)*. Retrieved June 15, 2019, from http://old.ihst.ru/~biosphere/Mag_1/Save.htm

Chkhartishvili, G. (2001). *Writer and suicide.* M.: New Literary Review. p. 18.

Dobroselsky, M. (1972). Peaceful coexistence and European security. *International Life,* (5), 48.

Dobroselsky, M. (1977). *The issues of peaceful coexistence theory and practice.* M.: International relations. p. 98.

Ferguson, Y. H., & Mansbach, R. W. (2004). *Remapping global politics. History's revenge and future shock.* Cambridge: Cambridge univ. press. pp. 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491344

Goncharenko, L. P. (2018). *Economic security: the textbook for universities* (2nd ed.). ext. and rev. M.: Yurayt, p. 10.

Hamida, E. B., Noura, H., & Znaidi, W. (2015). Security of Cooperative Intelligent Transport Systems: Standards, Threats Analysis and Cryptographic Countermeasures. *Electronics,* (4), 404. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics4030380

Herley, C., & van Oorschot, P. C. (2018). Science of Security: Combining Theory and Measurement to Reflect the Observable. *IEEE Security & Privacy, 16*(1), 12-22. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2018.1331028

Kalachev, D. N. (2014). Security: the evolution of the concept. *Trends and management, 4*(8), 385.

Kolobov, O. A. (2008). Security of individual, society and state: Monograph. In Acad. V. (Ed.), *Nizhny Novgorod: FMO / ISI NNSU* (pp. 250). AGPI publishing house named after A.P. Gaidar.

Leviathan, H. T. (1989). Or matter, form and power of the church and civil state. Compositions: in 2 volumes; V. 1. M. p. 93-94.

Mac Kechnie, W. (1896). *The state and the individual, an introduction to Political Science, with special reference to Socialistic and Individualistic Theories.* Glasgow: J. MacLehose and sons. p. 309.

Morgenthau, H. (1952). *In Defence of the National Interes.* New York. p. 92.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1955). *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace* (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf. p. 29.

Noy, I. S. (1962). *The issues of punishment theory in the Soviet criminal law.* Saratov: Publishing house of Sarat. University. p. 107.

Nuriyev, M., Sovetkanova, D., & Seysenbayeva, Z. (2018). Achievements and new challenges in the area of education of independent Kazakhstan. *Opción, 34*(85-2), 337-352.

Rosenau, J. N. (1987). *Governance without government: systems of rule in world politics.* Los Angeles: University of South California.

Rybalkin, N. N. (2002). *Security philosophy: Monograph* (2nd ed.). corr. and add. M.: OLMA-PRESS. p. 12.

Shukla, S. (2017). Innovation and Economic Growth: A Case of India. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 5*(2), 64-70. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2017.521

Spinoza, B. (1999). Political treatise. Works: in 2 volumes. V. 2. SPb.: Nauka. pp. 254-298.

The Works of Lord Bacon, vol. II. – London, MDCCCLXXIX. pp. 437, 450-455, 502.

Ullman, R. (1983). Redefining Security. *International Security, 8*(1), 133. https://doi.org/10.2307/2538489