MODERN SECURITY PARADIGM

Jarosław Gryz

National Defence University, University of Lodz

Abstract. Knowledge about the surrounding world, social reality, its functioning consists of many different theories, laws, notions and concepts of the surrounding world. In this respect, the security paradigm as a toll of knowledge has many explanatory functions. The point is that only some of them are true and only in particular, often accidental circumstances. Hence differentiating whether they are true or not carries a risk and possibility of an error. The consequences manifest themselves in any aspect of human activity and it concerns also the security paradigm of a subject and their activities. The article rise up those issues and try to bring answers.

Trying to describe reality, in order to systematize it and give it an understandable form, is as much tempting, due to the bulk of the challenge, as it is discouraging, because of the idea of activities which should or may be connected with this task. The purpose of this type of activities may be easily questioned by indicating the number of determinants which should be taken into consideration and inability to include them all in the undertaken discussion. Hence what makes one face this challenge? Paradoxically, the image of reality is like an image in a toy telescope, in which, when one looks against the light, images overlap and change while keeping some of their own features. So does the reality which, while undergoing changes, possesses its own, unique and at the same time repetitive features. Although during observation they may be distorted, the impression of some repeatability remains, which is underlying for understanding of what surrounds us. It is the basis for understanding which leads to cognition and explanation of events, phenomena, processes as well as megatrends which create human social reality. This link between cognition and understanding, or rather the willingness to notice it in the area of broadly understood subject's security has become the basis for this discussion.

1. The notion of a security paradigm

Writing about the security paradigm as the interpretation of reality cognition it is necessary to refer to the phenomenon of a dominant trend of reality cognition, the conceptual basis of cognition. In this place spontaneously appears, so to speak, a postmodern understanding of social reality in which lack of continuity, the incidental nature of events, chaos, turbulent character, disorder and lethargy, hybrid nature of processes, phenomena and events become a synonym of the description of the surrounding world governed by coincidence and anarchy. Moreover, globalization processes, accelerated information exchange, dependence on information exchange seem to prove the classical motto *scio me nihil scire*. However, in this anarchy and lethargy, unpredictability, chaos we notice involuntarily some tendencies, trends

and megatrends which by describing organize the conceptual picture of the world. It happens so because we notice their repetitiveness or some characteristics. It can be said that they are underlying for the ideas and actions taken in order to ensure the security of a subject. Security expressed as existence – lasting – survival, establishing existence and individual, social and civilization development, building our paradigm of knowledge and ignorance.

Knowledge about the surrounding world, social reality, its functioning consists of many different theories, laws, notions and concepts of the surrounding world. The point is that only some of them are true and only in particular, often accidental circumstances. Hence differentiating whether they are true or not carries a risk and possibility of an error. The consequences manifest themselves in any aspect of human activity and it concerns also the security paradigm of a subject and their activities.

With reference to the above a question arises – what constitutes the basis of activity or inactivity of different entities and communities, including first of all those organized into states? What is the reason why in particular situations they react or not in a way which is or is not predictable? The answer is extremely simple or complicated, depending on the reference to reality. It is the knowledge or ignorance about the surrounding world, implications of processes, phenomena, events which take place in the world, connected with experience, individual personality traits of political decision makers and societies which they represent. The answer becomes even fuller if we indicate psychological aspects of human communities which constitute the basis for judgment, morale and organizational culture, which are underlying for undertaken activities. Knowledge and ignorance seem to be of fundamental importance in determining the form of individual and collective security of human communities. This is due to the fact that they together constitute a vision of a human being, his or her understanding of what they experience, who they are and how they act in order to influence the course of events, create particular circumstances, which when multiplied constitute a form of phenomena and direct them into becoming processes which change the world.

The security paradigm, and at the same time the paradigm of danger for an individual, community and societies, their organization in the surrounding world, which they change in accordance with their idea or leave in the encountered form, is the basis for individual and collective identity. This identity, expressed as psychological and physical characteristics, is transformed under the influence of many stimuli, first of all information and ideas they contain. In so far as physical stimuli are an object of direct experience, the psychological stimuli shape our understanding of the surrounding world. Their compilation, fixed or volatile in time, has a decisive influence on actions undertaken by individuals, communities and societies. This is where one may seek the cause and effects of successes or failures of undertaken actions or inaction and thus the cause of the change in the "picture of reality". At the same time

it retains some constant elements which are the consequence of human nature and social organizations an individual lives in, which influencing the individual's senses change their perception. This aspect of constant learning about reality determines the scope of understanding of reality, one's knowledge and the knowledge in process of development, its comprehension and practical usage, in the increasingly more complex world of social relations.

The security paradigm of an individual, social groups, society, nation, always remains an incomplete group of terms, definitions, propositions, axioms – theories forming a given area of knowledge or ignorance. It is incomplete because it constantly undergoes changes in the course of permanent learning or acquiring knowledge available from elsewhere. One determinant resulting from the above needs to be emphasized at the same time – the determinant of this cognition – its operand – mainly, inability to show the multidimensional character, complexity and coherence of a subject's security. This situation has significant cognitive implications, because it determines the scope of cognition, and at the same time – systems of notions which are used to describe and define reality. Their contents carry a message which sometimes is incomplete, incomprehensible or only partial. This message determines a utilitarian character of knowledge, and also the ability to use it. **Due to the above, it is easier to find that we are dealing with some abstract security paradigms of a subject which express particular features connected with this subject, rather than a paradigm as such describing the security of a subject in a holistic way**. This kind of understanding is presented by T. Khun, who links the notion of a paradigm in science with particular scientific achievements, and not with universal notions, laws and points of view. This procedure, in fact, describes and defines the "area" of a paradigm, making it a basic notion which cannot be reduced to its logical components. It basically concerns interpretation of reality and to a certain extent its characteristics[1].

Having stated the above fact it is possible to formulate a question: *what are its sources*? The character of a world view and the way of using notions play a decisive role despite the fact that some groups of own features of a given subject will constitute the basis for its definition. One faces this situation in the case of different research problems which we are able to link with groups of formulated and described, and sometimes even only outlined, rules, traditions of cognition and finally experiences. Their relation usually results from some similarities, following the knowledge which has affected a given community or finally models adapted for particular needs of explanation. The above described state of affairs overlaps with knowledge and ignorance about the surrounding reality, source of cognition. It is affected by the reception of the surrounding world from the angle of a research tradition in which we have been

---

[1]   T. Kuhn, *Struktura rewolucji naukowych*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warsaw 2001, p. 34-36, 88-100.

educated or which has affected us. It results in the existence of two phenomena determining the character of the security paradigm of a subject – subjects. The first consists in discussions around theses, assumptions which allow to establish research schools on security with a leading role of individuality[2]. The second consists in creating, on the basis of a scientific debate on security, a paradigm particular for given times and having universal features. **Two significant elements which define the security paradigm of an individual need to be indicated in this place. Firstly, its form has a universal "core" of the theory of cognition and explanation of reality. Secondly, this "core" undergoes different interpretations – depending on the intention, believes or proposed theses, which makes it seem that the security paradigm of a subject does not have one form but many forms**. The result is the existence of individual characteristics of a paradigm in many different research approaches, often treated selectively. It is assumed, however, that they are identical.

Having assessed the state of affairs, it can be said that nowadays there are many schools, and sometimes traditions associated with them, of understanding the security of a subject which discourse with each other[3]. This discourse reveals the essentials of a security paradigm which describes reality, subjects it includes as well as their form and character of interaction. It is worth indicating here two elements determining its form. They are: the object of cognition and the way of cognition. In the first case, we are dealing with a permanent dispute between epistemological realism and epistemological idealism. In the second case, we are dealing with the dispute about the way of cognition. Hence one may observe that **the security paradigm of a subject is universal at the level of cognition of events, phenomena, processes, trends and megatrends, but not at the level of explanation which accounts for basic differences in understanding it**. It is essential to notice that the paradigm undergoes change in time under the influence of different stimuli, coming from the social reality, which by replacing previous sources of knowledge create the following ones, underlying new theories and their groups. A group or groups of theories of cognition undergo redefining then.

An interdisciplinary character, being a basis and at the same time the cause of the change of the security paradigm, needs to be pointed out here. As K. Popper indicates, theories establishing our knowledge and ignorance are subject to four solutions allowing to check cohesion of a system of knowledge. Firstly, they are subject to a logical comparison of conclusions; secondly, to verification of the logical form of a theory by determining its character; thirdly, to comparing it with other theories; and finally, to using conclusions which may be drawn from a given theory – a group

---

2   R. Floyd, *Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: Bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh School of security studies*, "Review of International Studies", 2007, 33, p. 327-350.
3   J. Huysmans, *Security! What do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier*, "European Journal of International Relations", 1998, 4:2, p. 226-255.

of theories[4]. Theoretical structures forming the security paradigm undergo change under the influence of knowledge coming from so many sources that – as it has already been stated – it undergoes constant modification too. This modification is inherent the nature of changes of the surrounding reality, but only the synthesis of knowledge acquired from many sources makes a significant difference for our idea of the surrounding world, the nature of security – danger, which affects or will affect us. As T.S. Khun indicates, transformation of knowledge, whose result is the revolution of notions, has a complex, multidimensional character. It builds at the same time new categories of cognition[5].

Referring to the security paradigm over millennia, centuries or decades it is not possible to indicate theories which created, changed or replaced the existing ones by building paradigms of cognition. Attributes of cognition need, however, to be indicated as they define who a Human is, what describes Him. Firstly, it is communication and the means of communication; different forms that define the ways of understanding of the world – from verbal to non-verbal; secondly, abstract thinking whose derivatives are ideas and models of reality. They are the basis for constructing a spatial vision of the surrounding world. Thirdly, as a derivative of abstract thinking, tools which are used to transform it. Consequently, **the basis of the security paradigm of a subject are: communication, ideas, tools which are used to ensure existence, development and fulfilling the desires, as well as feelings and passions**[6]. In the light of the above, referring to security of a subject four elements may be indicated. They are:

1. Communicating, the area of communication, tools;
2. Ideas, ideologies, dogmas, doctrines;
3. Tools used to realize communication, ideas;
4. Feelings, convictions, experiences.

Those four elements complementing each other create the basis of knowledge and theory of cognition. They also have an utilitarian use in the context of developing security of a subject, its transformation and design, as future desired states, thus defining the character of security, area of security, forms of security which define the subject and object of security. Moreover, they are in themselves the source of cognition.

Currently what may be indicated are only the directions of thinking underlying the construction of the area of the security of a subject and the self-identification of a subject in this reality. The reflection of this state of affairs are changes in the security paradigm which have occurred only in the last two decades. The views of

---

[4] K.R. Popper, *Logika odkrycia naukowego*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warsaw 2002, p. 26.

[5] T.S. Khun, *Przewrót kopernikański. Astronomia planetarna w dziejach zachodu*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warsaw 2006, p. 15.

[6] K. Darwin, *O pochodzeniu człowieka*, Jirafa Roja, Warsaw 2009.

such authors as: F. Fukuyama, B. Buzan, S.P. Huntington, R. Kagan, have redefined the notion of security, changing the idea of the surrounding world overlapping by with the previous ones by: Herodot, Tukidydes, N. Machiavelli, H. Grotius, F. Bacon, J.J. Rousseau, H. Spencer, K. Darwin, J.S. Mill, F. Nietzsche, E.H. Carr, H. Morgenthau, K.R. Popper, K. Waltz, M. Wight, H. Bull, R. Clin, R. Gilpin, S. Krasner and many others. This does not mean that only the listed ones have created universal theories which by merging have formed the security paradigm of a subject and its idea. In principle, **the security paradigm of a subject has been built on theories which, depending on the cognitive (research) perspective, have been selected in order to confirm or falsify particular theses and assumptions connected with them**. Hence there is nearly an unlimited number of interpretations of what is e.g. individual and collective security, security of the society and nation, finally security of the international community. **In any case, however, there are four elements which form the security paradigm: security subject, security object, environment in which security is ensured or realized and interactions between the listed ones**. These elements are investigated individually or together, only sometimes in the scope of some characteristics identical with them. It indicates the system nature of the security paradigm in which variables – dependent variables and operands – form a store of knowledge.

2. The essence of the security paradigm

    The security paradigm – comprising the security subject, security object, the environment in which security is ensured or realized and interactions between the listed ones – **refers to three domains which overlap and by merging form a context for cognition and the concept of this cognition**. The first domain is an individual and the surrounding world – the world of human activity, human products in the world of nature and their overlapping. The second domain is the environment in which an individual lives – social and natural. The third one is the world of ideas thanks to which this individual recognizes oneself in the surrounding reality (ideas and ideologies built on their basis may be differentiated due to their specificity and characteristics which define human activity, activity of a community, society and nations)[7]. These three domains overlap and form the context in which a subject of security identifies his or her own place. In this light, cognition affecting the subject, knowledge and experience constitute the basis of the security paradigm in the axiological, epistemological and ontological aspect. The philosophy of scientific cognition is at the same time a decisive determinant. The example may be here the presentation of reality by R. Ingarden or the disputes about the object and subject of

---

[7]   K. Mannheim, *Ideologia i utopia*, Wydawnictwo Test, Lublin 1992, p. 31-83.

cognition[8]. This is the source of the understanding of security as a state and process in which it is transformed[9].

With reference to the above we may differentiate individual characteristics of the security paradigm resulting from the philosophy of science and determining its understanding.

The first is the security of a subject identified statically as a kind of a "frame" in which social reality has been captured. This way of presenting is the most obvious as observation allows to identify individual characteristics of the surrounding world.

The second concerns the fact that security is understood as a dynamic social process in which subjects aim at improving mechanisms which are supposed to ensure their security[10]. It needs to be emphasized that they do it through social life structures at state institutions and organizations confirming and transforming social order both at the level the state and international relations[11]. This characteristic is present in any context of the security paradigm, irrespective of the fact whether it refers to the security subject, object or the environment.

The third characteristic, underlying the other two, is the scope of cognition and understanding of reality and what we find in it, which is affected by knowledge, experience and ability to use them. This last characteristic determines the way of describing security in axiological terms. The security of a subject is expressed in the positive and negative aspect. The first is understood as the aim of a positive character, that is connected with building, a constructive change of reality in which security is to be ensured. The second is understood as the aim of a negative character, connected with the lack – elimination – of threats to life, survival[12].

2.1. Perception and understanding of reality

The bases underlying perception of reality are atavistic reactions of understanding it[13]. In fact, they constitute the basis for the cognition of reality. This atavism, in the case of the security paradigm of a subject, is expressed in the notion of

---

[8] See R. Ingarden, *Spór o istnienie świata*, tom I, PWN, Warsaw 1960, vol. II, PWN, Warsaw 1961; J. Dębowski, *Bezpośredniość poznania. Spory – Dyskusje – Wyniki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2000.

[9] J. Stefanowicz, *Bezpieczeństwo współczesnych państw*, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, Warsaw 1984, p. 18.

[10] J. Kukułka, *Bezpieczeństwo a współpraca europejska: współzależności i sprzeczności interesów*, „Sprawy Międzynarodowe", PISM, 1982 no. 7, p. 31.

[11] C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, s. 225-268; cf. E.H. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis. An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, 1919-1939, Palgrave Macmillan, December 2001.

[12] J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Warsaw 1996, p. 17-18.

[13] K. Mannheim, *Ideologia i utopia...*, H. Spencer, *Jednostka wobec państwa*, Liber 2002; C. Robin, *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

a threat[14]. It is otherwise a universal measure of defining and developing the existence of a subject, and in this context its security, irrespective of the positive or negative understanding of its nature. Security, as it has already been emphasized, is understood not only statically – as a given state, but also as its dynamic change, which is expressed in the continuum of time and space, as a characteristic scale of reference and assessment. Therefore, the states of our consciousness may be indicated as an elementary determinant of cognition of subject security, as interpretation which forms and defines this subject's security paradigm. It concerns not an individual human being, but the whole communities. As is emphasized by B. Czarnecki and W. Siemieński, psychological aspects and their relation with material factors are dominant[15]. This relation defines the way of perceiving reality. An example in this respect may be the Cold War period, when central notions defining the security paradigm included: threat[16], fear[17] and counteracting them in the international forum[18]. The change of character of the security environment, in this case the international one, influenced the ways of defining it; and peace, stability and cooperation became synonyms[19].

Currently the notions defining subject security are very complex and are not self-contained, but surrounded by other notions which allow to explain the essence, cause and effects, actions undertaken or inaction. It is of crucial importance for understanding of reality, events, phenomena, processes, trends and megatrends which it includes, if only in the context of every day media information. Its form which shapes the audience's opinion oscillates between fiction and fact, commentary and opinion, finally between persuasion and propaganda. It has an impact on the security paradigm and the theories that form it. As is indicated by B. Reeves, C. Nass, "(…) Considering media message as equivalent to reality is neither rare nor unreasonable. It is common, easy to trigger, does not belong to sophisticated devices, does not disappear upon reflection. The phenomenon of media equation concerns anybody and manifests itself often and consistently"[20]. E. Czapska claims that human interaction with computers, television and new media are in principle social and natural just as reactions taking place in real life[21]. It defines

---

[14] K. Darwin, *O pochodzeniu człowieka…*, p. 48 and next.

[15] B. Czarnecki, W. Siemieński, *Kształtowanie bezpiecznej przestrzeni publicznej*, Difin, Warsaw 2004, p. 11.

[16] J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, op. cit.

[17] H. Brown, *Thinking About National Security*, Boulder 1983, p. 4; B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, Brighton 1991, p. 18-35.

[18] R. Ullman, *Redefining Security*, "International Security" 1983, no. 1, p. 133.

[19] A. Rotfeld, *Europejski system bezpieczeństwa in statu nascendi*, PISM, Warsaw 1990.

[20] B. Reeves, C. Nass, *Media i ludzie*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warsaw 2000, p. 15.

[21] E. Czapska, *Przekaz medialny a rzeczywistość*, „Realia i co dalej…", dwumiesięcznik społeczno--polityczny, June, no. 3 (18) 2010. Internet source: http://realia.com.pl/dzial_8/artykul_86.html, accessed 5.08.2010.

the context of reality cognition and at the same time subject security which the theories constituting the security paradigm are referred to.

At the same time the universal character of cognition itself needs to be emphasized as a characteristic category defining existence as well as concrete issues which are connected with them[22]. Thanks to that, numerous theories and conceptions of cognition determine the character of this existence and at the same time the interpretation of the security paradigm of a subject. De facto, they create a characteristic system of cognition. In this system, in a way which may seem chaotic, different, independent, but in fact overlapping, conceptions coexist. They concern a security subject, object and environment, character of interaction, and finally the way of cognition, the structure of notions which we use to describe the above. This system overlaps with philosophical traditions through which the security paradigm is described. Here can be found the crucial difference in perceiving security expressed by different schools or in disputes on its essence, components, what we identify with individual, national and broader security, organized and chaotic (anarchic), being a consequence of frequently insubordinate human activities, like in the case of wars or conflicts[23].

The basis of understanding security is reason[24]. It needs to be emphasized at the same time that currently the 18th century understanding of the world with the use of senses is expressed by the science of cognition (cognitive science). It represents numerous fields of science, among others: logic, philosophy of mind, psychology, neurobiology, linguistics, physics, and artificial intelligence. Principal research areas in the scope of this field are: knowledge, language, learning, thinking, perception, awareness, making decisions and intelligence. Reason is not used here only for the purpose of asking philosophical questions and inquiries, but first of all to verify the surrounding reality in the context of security – danger which is carried by the subject's own activities and activities of other subjects. This is because it is in fact a measure of reality, although it may be sometimes difficult to select the right evaluation scale. This reason is, at the same time, a determinant which, according to A.H. Maslow, defines the character of human activity identified with relation to the individual's needs. Hence security seen from the perspective of an individual constitutes his or her most basic need[25].

---

[22] S. Kasprzysiak (tł. i wstęp), *Będziesz poznawał*, (in) C. Giorgio: *Narodziny filozofii*, Res Publica & Oficyna Literacka, Warsaw–Cracow 1991, p. 11.

[23] H. Münkler, *Wojny naszych czasów*, WAM, Cracow 2004, p. 17-24.

[24] T. Reid, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind*, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, July 2007, p. 1-4, 127-137; T. Ried, *Active Power in General*, no. 1 of Essays on the Active Powers of Man, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, October 2007, p. 1-11, 21-29; T. Reid, no. 1 of Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, May 2008, p. 27-36.

[25] A.H. Maslow, *Motivation and personality*, New York 1954, p. 15-21.

In the context of the security paradigm, the need of security is expressed by the category of personal security. Numerous authors have at the same time indicated its character. It is worth quoting here these views which establish the security paradigm of individuals and social groups. R. Zięba has identified social security (referred to international relations) as the fulfillment of the needs of: existence, survival, confidence, stability, entirety, identity, independence, protection of the level and quality of life[26]. The same author has indicated that it concerns also different types of subjects, from individuals to huge social groups. He has equated security with social organizational structures (institutions) such as states and the international system (in the light of what has already been said, the term international community as a manifestation of community comprising aspirations of subjects to ensure security, its transformation in accordance with their own ideas seems to be more adequate due to the wide scope of the notion)[27]. R. Rosa has indicated the security of an individual and structural security (of social structures) identified with social institutions[28]. These categories indicate at the same time two important aspects of cognition underlying the security paradigm: a) individual security; b) the security social structures. In the first case, it concerns the basis of any security in social reality. In the second case, specific social structures within which this security may be ensured.

Referring to the first case mentioned above – personal security – what defines the scope and character of activities aiming at ensuring this security, are according to J. Świniarski different types of challenges which determine human activities. In accordance with his interpretation their source may be found in the beginning of our civilization, precisely in the Roman tradition (truth, good, beauty, justice). He claims that, "(…) universal challenges mark the history of mankind and are the object of practical wisdom which belongs to the area of thought of practical philosophy, that is the one concerning human activities and acts which change the world"[29]. J. Świniarski indicates at the same time the fundamental determinant defining the cognition of social reality, including identification of individual and community security. It is the culture of a particular community. Culture which forms different human communities including their ultimate forms – civilizations. This type of

---

[26] R. Zięba, *Pojęcie i istota bezpieczeństwa państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, „Sprawy Między-narodowe", PISM, 1989 no. 10, p. 50.

[27] Idem, *Teoria ogólna bezpieczeństwa państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, (in) *Stosunki między-narodowe w XXI wieku. Księga jubileuszowa z okazji 30-lecia Instytutu Stosunków Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw 2006, p. 936-939.

[28] R. Rosa, *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Bellona, Warsaw 1997, p. 15-23.

[29] J. Świniarski, *Rodzaje wyzwań we współczesnym świecie. Próba systematyzacji filozoficznej*, (typescript), 1997.

interpretation is shared by S.P. Huntington who has indicated the determinant of individual, social and international security as fundamental[30].

When referring to the second case – social structures within which security may be ensured and realized – their character needs to be indicated. One of the fundamental human needs, the need to affiliate, is underlying for the establishment of social structures and the process of socialization of individuals. It is also the basis of the theory of power – from parental to political power. Referring to the input of the socialization of social life into the security paradigm, it may be useful to mention spheres of security it forms. They are the security of: 1) an individual; 2) a social group; 3) a social community; 4) society; 5) nation; 6) civilization; 7) an international community. Each of the listed entities has its own characteristics which security may be referred to. Each of the listed subjects is at the same time a part of another one, defined by identity and cultural tradition. The idea behind functioning of the listed subjects is order, which has a dual form:

I.   Social order, shaping the character of human relations where hierarchy is inherent in the nature of political power[31].

II.   International order whose synonyms are peace and stability. Characteristics of this kind of order are best depicted in the Charter of Paris for a New Europe adopted on 21 November 1990 which included the interpretation of international relations of that time, that is ideas of international order based on respecting human rights, democratic institutions and cooperation between countries – signatories[32].

Taking into consideration the above described cases it is important to indicate that the security paradigm of a subject is formed by specialized social structures whose task is to ensure, create and design future states of security. In the course of historical processes their specific forms have been shaped which is a consequence of the ultimate known form of social organization that is the state. The state being the subject which includes all these elements constituting individual and collective security. These days, as the result of socialization of social roles directly connected with the security of a subject, they include: police, army, other specialized services aiming at respecting and ensuring this security. Functions of the above mentioned services describe not only the character of conducted activities, but also play an important role of strengthening social order and these days also international order. In the context of the identification of their place in the security paradigm of a subject these services play an important role of political tools which, by using force, strengthen or change the nature of social

---

[30]   S.P. Huntington, *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego*, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA, p. 41-54.

[31]   C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite...*, op. cit., p. 3-29.

[32]   *Charter of Paris For a New Europe*, Paris, 19-21 November 1990.

order[33] and also international order[34]. Consequently, they function in it as operands, by definition shaping the idea of reality in which the security of a subject is ensured and created. In the light of the above, administrative structures play a particular role as their role is not only to use tools (police, army, others) which are to ensure security, but also to create, design future, desired states of social reality.

Indicating organized social structures as a component of the security paradigm inevitably leads to a discussion concerning states, relations between them and the environment in which they take place.

Referring to the states, their components need to be indicated as they determine the scope of cognition, and at the same time the scope of the security paradigm of a state. The basis for this indication shall be the Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States of 26 December 1934 adopted by a group of American countries. It says that a state is a person of international law having the following qualifications:

a) permanent population;

b) defined territory;

c) government;

d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states[35].

These five qualifications, in the past and now as well, have constituted the basis for defining whether a state is secure or not with reference to activities of other subjects. What is taken into consideration is the fact whether any of the listed qualifications of a state is being put to the test – defined as a challenge, which may consist in a threat to one or a few or all of them. On this basis the knowledge is built concerning activities of other subjects, as well as ways of counteracting them by using opportunities taking into consideration existing or potential risks[36].

The basis for defining the security paradigm of a state is its continuity in time and space. This continuum is simultaneously related to a centre – centers of power which define directions of an internal and external policy of the state. The synonyms of these directions are the notions of sovereign political power – sovereignty and its consequence – independence. As S.D. Krasner emphasizes in the current conditions they are changed in accordance with the interpretation which is attributed to a state and its role in the international relations[37].

---

[33] T. Parsons, *System społeczny*, Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos", Cracow 2009, p. 24-49.

[34] R. Tarnogórski, *Interwencja w Iraku a prawo międzynarodowe*, PISM, „Biuletyn" nr 19 (123)/2003, p. 783-785.

[35] *Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States*, signed at Montevideo, 26 December 1933, art. 1.

[36] J. Gryz, „*Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej" – rola i znaczenie w kształtowaniu bezpieczeństwa państwa*, „Zeszyty Naukowe AON", no. 4(57) 2004, p. 57-61.

[37] S.D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press 1999, p. 6-10, 12-25.

In the aspect of its internal security those who hold power aim at stability, sustaining or evolution of social and economic as well as political relations, depending on conditions in which the policy is implemented and depending on the historical context. Using the criteria defined by B. Szmulik and M. Żmigrodzki the object of protection, ensuring security are:

– interaction between the governing and the governed;
– groups holding material resources;
– groups appointing the centres of political power;
– relations between social groups;
– protection of a production profile;
– population status;
– groups supervising functioning and activity of state bodies[38].

In the aspect of international security of a state, its activities are conducted with the use of diplomacy and its attributes (political, economic, military, cultural, information). These activities aim at ensuring survival and functioning of the international system[39]. In the case of relations between states, three types may be indicated. The first type refers to unilateral activities, the second to bilateral and the third to multilateral activities. Consequently, the security paradigm assuming the form of the international security paradigm refers first of all to the character of relations of international relations participants. These participants (defined usually as the international community encompassing all subjects participating in the relations and sometimes only influencing them) have impact on the form of international relations through the character of interaction which simultaneously defines the form of international security. It simultaneously needs to be emphasized that the form of activities determines their character.

With reference to the above, the security paradigm of a subject comprises the description social reality in which we can find the description of:

1) the state of subject security, the scope of this security – both subjective and objective, specific due to the subject's attributes;
2) dynamics of changes which the subject experiences;
3) the process of shaping security, that is evolution of conditions of subject security under the influence of the activities of the subject, of other social subjects and different transformations of their environment.

This allows to create an approach on the basis of which it is possible to try to show the universal character of the paradigm. As a result, the characteristics of the

---

[38] B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki, *Typ i forma państwa*, (in) B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki (ed.), *Wprowadzenie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2004, p. 51.

[39] J. Kukułka, *Bezpieczeństwo a współpraca europejska: współzależności i sprzeczności interesów*, „Sprawy Międzynarodowe", 1982 no. 7, p. 35.

security paradigm will depend on: the character of assumptions; multiple criteria assumed; the context of security.

2.2. The security paradigm of a subject

Talking about the security paradigm of a subject it is first necessary to identify its components, because they decide about what kind of security it is, in what way it is identified and ensured, both in the individual and collective aspect. The security of a subject, similarly to an organization of human communities, due to its specificity, has at the same time unique character. This observation allows to formulate a claim that the security of a social subject is appropriate only for this subject, which means that so is its security paradigm. The forms assumed by the security of a subject, individual and collective security are of a decisive character.

Indicating individual – personal security, it may be developed by the categorization as group security (e.g. family), broader community (e.g. local, religious, ethnic, other), society (within the framework of a state organization), nation (as a specific social body) and also according to the ways of ensuring and organizing security as social structures' security (political, economic, military, ideological, ecological, other). Relating security to international relations, what may be indicated is international community (regional, global, other) which due to its specificity constitutes a separate subject. Identifying any of these communities it is impossible to omit its territorial character or the lack of thereof, e.g. in the case of dispersion, the character of internal interaction and relations with other communities. Taking into consideration the character of the above mentioned communities, it is necessary to idicate their attributes resulting from: location (geographical, natural environment) or disparity; products of material culture and immaterial culture; organization; ideologies; morale[40]. These are not all attributes of communities which may be identified with them, but they indicate in a traditional way what determines the security of a subject. In this context, the basic form connected with the security paradigm of a particular community is its conceptualization. It is expressed as the idea of security, ideology and activity directives developed on their basis. It is, as it were, an original and at the same time an ultimate form of the security paradigm of any social subject. It has a lot in common with the organization of human communities, their organizational culture, capabilities, ability to use its attributes synergically and also their development in time and space.

---

[40] N.J. Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, New York 1942; D.S. Papp, *Contemporary International Relations. Framework for understanding*, New York 1984, p. 308-309; A. Dawidczyk, *Paradygmat siły w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, tapescript, Warsaw 2002, p. 11.

What governs human communities is of fundamental importance for their security. This observation allows to indicate two elements which are original and at the same time they are consequences of subjects' activity. They include:

   a) community activities which basically focus on ensuring its existence – sustainability and survival – as well as social, economic, military, cultural development, and other;
   b) concepts of these activities. These activities are based on: 1) values; 2) needs; 3) interests; 4) objectives[41].

Their interpretation may be found in ideology[42]. It fulfills at the same time its role of "cement" which allows ensuring security of social subjects, because it interprets reality carrying the message concerning the role, place, function of a subject in structures which ensure social security. It happens through different levels of social communication and political marketing coming down to the use of social engineering (among others, through propaganda), shaping social norms which lead to legitimization of the existing state of affairs or its change. It is manifested by:

   – knowledge about how to achieve the desired state of affairs;
   – knowledge about the ways of transforming social reality (individual and collective);
   – acquiring and having abilities to implement planned changes in social reality, as a result of undertaking effective activities[43].

These elements are combined in a synergic way within strategies of action of subjects and within strategic security management (usually through objectives).

What determines understanding of the position of the subject of social security is the way of perceiving the dynamics of changes affecting the subject or existing in the subject's sphere. This dynamics is the effect of social and natural processes in the form of increasingly complex interactions. It may be at the same identified with the processes of:

   a) influences, understood as the results of different sequences of activities in which security subjects aim at protecting values they identify with, at fulfilling

---

[41] The above order: values, needs, interests, objectives is according to the author the most appropriate in the context of the security of a social entity. Because it results from the socialization of social life where values impost the form and character of needs, interests, objectives. In literature on the subject one may find both confirming as well as different interpretations of the above list. J. Gryz, *Strategia bezpieczeństwa narodowego Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej – rola i znaczenie w kształtowaniu bezpieczeństwa państwa*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Obrony Narodowej", Warsaw 2004, no. 4 (57), p. 56-74; A. Dawidczyk, *Planowanie strategii rozwoju sił zbrojnych*, PhD thesis, ZN AON appendix, Warsaw 2006, p. 155-195; W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe. Podstawowe kategorie, dylematy pojęciowe i próba systematyzacji*, Towarzystwo Wiedzy Obronnej, „Zeszyt Problemowy" no. 1 (61) 2010, p. 27-41.

[42] K. Mannheim, *Ideologia i utopia…*, op. cit., p. 85-140.

[43] J. Kurczewski, *Problemy analizy działań socjotechnicznych*, (in) *Socjotechnika*, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw 1968, vol. 1, p. 57.

needs and at the realization of their interests and objectives. These activities are manifested as: cooperation, competition and struggle;

b) correlations, understood as the results of connections (political, economic, military, social, other) created by sharing (of work, goods, other) in the social environment. They result from the relation of security subjects' interests which are realized by cooperation;

c) institutionalization, understood as the activity of groups of people (organized systems of human activity in the conditions of sustainability and repeatability) as well as of communities they create and which are defined by customs, norms and the law. The effect of this process are institutions, including purposefully united groups of people who are properly prepared and equipped;

d) internationalization, understood as the internationalization of values, needs, interests and objectives which a given community identifies with within the framework of cooperation, competition, rivalry, struggle. The basis of this process is exchange of material and non-material goods in different spheres of human activity.

Ordering of these processes shows a characteristic gradual development of social relations which lead to the establishment of increasingly complex forms. In the aspect of the security paradigm, it concerns organized communities, from the level of a local to an international community. It is worth emphasizing here that gradual development of the above mentioned processes takes place both within a given community as well as in relations with other communities, which has been described by J. Kukułka[44].

Considering the security paradigm of a subject it is impossible not to mention the international influence and conditions which have impact on the paradigm. Their global, regional or local character defines the context of the security of a social subject; and moreover, complexity and overlapping of what is treated as internal and external security. It concerns any sphere of activity of a social subject.

The components mentioned so far in this discussion constitute the security paradigm of a social subject which is related to many variables. These variables, depending on the context of activity of a subject, take the form of dependent variables or operands. Looking at dependent variables it may be indicated that they are those which concern organized communities (e.g. as states). It results from the fact of developing the area of security within these communities. This development includes the elements forming the security of a subject – subjects "here and now", as well as designing their future states of security. At any moment this security is the result of past states, processes which may take place in the future and events which will generate new phenomena. The influence on all those factors is a consequence of

---

[44] J. Kukułka, *Teoria stosunków międzynarodowych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw 2000.

knowledge, capabilities and abilities of a security subject. This knowledge, capabilities and abilities may appear insufficient for designing future states of security or adapting the subject to new challenges, threats, chances and risks. Hence there are operands which security subject cannot affect or influence directly or indirectly.

What needs to be indicated here are dependent variables and operands which determine the form of security of a social subject – a state. These dependant variables, by interacting with each other, define the security paradigm of a subject, because they generate phenomena and processes which define the character of security of a subject from the angle of social order and broader international order. Social phenomena and processes manifest themselves in the form of constant changes or, depending on the situational context (often historical), in attempts to stop the changes and maintain the existing status quo. The transformations of social order developed as a consequence of this dynamics are connected with challenges which carry risks. They have a decisive influence on the character of social order and its form. The ability on the part of decision makers to act in the face of challenges and risks connected with them decides about the fact whether they become chances or threats for the security of a subject. It needs to be emphasized at the same time that the discussed dependent variables may take a form of operands, which remain outside the influence of a security subject. They may take a form of activities of another subject (e.g. during a war) or result from the impact of natural forces (e.g. disasters). Generally, in a situation where a security subject is not able to face, deal with risks, counteract threats and use chances its instability occurs which leads to crises of different forms and intensity[45]. These crises may be at the same time overcome by themselves or with the help of other subjects. The lack of ability to overcome them may be of decisive importance for the existence of the subject, its sustainability, survival in time and space.

In the light of the above, taking into consideration functioning of human communities we may indicate three states which determine the way of perceiving by a security subject its security, the security of other entities and the environment in which interaction takes place. They include states of peace, crisis and war, easy to differentiate by way of a definition. The problem appears in a situation of transferring from one state to another or the situation when – like nowadays – the three states occur simultaneously only in different configurations. In this respect as an example may serve peace experienced by the western hemisphere with simultaneous occurrence of results of the financial crisis of 2008 and the engagement in a conflict in the form of the war in Afghanistan. In this situation the security paradigm of security subjects coming from this hemisphere will be at the same time similar, sometimes

---

[45]   J. Gryz, *Policy and strategy of the state*, Strategic Impact, National Defence University „Carol I" Printing House, Bucharest, Romania, no. 3(24)/2007, p. 79-90.

identical and simultaneously in many cases radically different (e.g. when comparing the security of the United States and Poland). The differences result not only from the scale of the subjects, their characteristics, but above all from the fact that the security paradigm is shaped under the influence of different dynamics of social relations. It needs to be emphasized that all the mentioned states – peace, crisis, war – involve conflict, although its nature, forms are changeable, depending on the level of social evolution in time, its aspirations, social and political solutions used, and finally the ability to adapt and implement changes: creativity. The nature of conflict is presented in the context of the processes of its gradual development in time[46].

Conclusions

The security paradigm of a subject has explanatory functions in the form of: the definition of the essence, scope, character, specificity of the security of a subject; creating the spatial, multicriteria picture of the security environment; rationalization and directing activities of a subject. The research on the paradigm leads to:
- assuming constant, resulting from the paradigm, characteristics of reality, the security environment of a subject (anarchic nature of the security environment, sensitivity and susceptibility of subjects, the evolution of threats, a normative character and the institutionalization of the security of entities);
- defining directions of activity defining the security of a subject (e.g. banning aggressive war and arms control, international terrorism and many others);
- combined or separate examination of areas (spheres, dimensions) of security: political, economic, social – cultural, military.

The result of this research is the definition of the essence, scope, character and specificity of subject security both in its external and internal aspect, with relation to conditions (determinants) present in the environment of the subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. H. Brown, *Thinking About National Security*, Boulder 1983.
2. B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, Brighton 1991.
3. E.H. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis. An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, 1919-1939, Palgrave Macmillan, December 2001.
4. *Charter Of Paris For a New Europe*, Paris, 19-21 November 1990.
5. B. Czarnecki, W. Siemieński, *Kształtowanie bezpiecznej przestrzeni publicznej*, Difin, Warsaw 2004.

---

[46] J.H. Turner, *Struktura teorii socjologicznej*, PWN, Warsaw 2004.

6. E. Czapska, *Przekaz medialny a rzeczywistość*, „Realia i co dalej...", dwumiesięcznik społeczno-polityczny, June no. 3 (18) 2010.

7. K. Darwin, O *pochodzeniu człowieka*, Jirafa Roja 2009.

8. A. Dawidczyk, *Paradygmat siły w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, tapescript, Warsaw 2002.

9. J. Dębowski, *Bezpośredniość poznania. Spory – Dyskusje – Wyniki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2000.

10. R. Floyd, *Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: Bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh School of security studies*, "Review of International Studies", 2007.

11. C. Georgio, *Narodziny filozofii*, Res Publica & Oficyna Literacka, Warsaw–Cracow 1991.

12. J. Gryz, „*Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*" – *rola i znaczenie w kształtowaniu bezpieczeństwa państwa*, „Zeszyty Naukowe AON" no. 4(57) 2004.

13. J. Gryz, *Policy and strategy of the state*, Strategic Impact, National Defence University „Carol I" Printing House, Bucharest, Romania, No. 3(24)/2007.

14. S.P. Huntington, *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego*, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA 1998.

15. J. Huysmans, *Security! What do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier*, "European Journal of International Relations", 1998.

16. R. Ingarden, *Spór o istnienie świata*, tom I, PWN, Warsaw 1960, vol. II, PWN, Warsaw 1961.

17. W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe. Podstawowe kategorie, dylematy pojęciowe i próba systematyzacji*, Towarzystwo Wiedzy Obronnej, „Zeszyt Problemowy" no. 1 (61) 2010.

18. T.S. Kuhn, *Struktura rewolucji naukowych*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warsaw 2001.

19. T.S. Kuhn, *Przewrót kopernikański. Astronomia planetarna w dziejach Zachodu*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warsaw 2006.

20. S.D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press 1999.

21. J. Kukułka, *Bezpieczeństwo a współpraca europejska: współzależności i sprzeczności interesów*, „Sprawy Międzynarodowe", PISM, 1982 nr 7.

22. J. Kukułka, *Teoria stosunków międzynarodowych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw 2000.

23. K. Mannheim, *Ideologia i utopia*, Wydawnictwo Test, Lublin 1992.

24. A.H. Maslow, *Motivation and personality*, New York 1954 (reprint 1987).

25. *Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States*, signed at Montevideo, 26 December 1933.

26. H. Münkler, *Wojny naszych czasów*, WAM, Cracow 2004.

27. T. Parsons, *System społeczny*, Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos", Cracow 2009.

28. D.S. Papp, *Contemporary International Relations. Framework for understanding*, New York 1984.

29. K.R. Popper, *Logika odkrycia naukowego*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warsaw 2002.

30. B. Reeves, C. Nass, *Media i ludzie*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warsaw 2000.

31. T. Reid, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind*, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, July 2007.

32. T. Ried, *Active Power in General*, No. 1 of Essays on the Active Powers of Man, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, October 2007.

33. T. Reid, No. 1 of Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man, Copyright Jonathan Bennett, May 2008.

34. C. Robin, *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

35. R. Rosa, *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Bellona, Warsaw 1997.

36. A. Rotfeld, *Europejski system bezpieczeństwa in statu nascendi*, PISM, Warsaw 1990.

37. *Socjotechnika*, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw 1968.

38. J. Stańczyk, *Współczesne pojmowanie bezpieczeństwa*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Warsaw 1996.

39. J. Stefanowicz, *Bezpieczeństwo współczesnych państw*, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, Warsaw 1984.

40. *Stosunki międzynarodowe w XXI wieku. Księga jubileuszowa z okazji 30-lecia Instytutu Stosunków Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw 2006.

41. H. Spencer, *Jednostka wobec państwa*, Liber 2002.

42. N.J. Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, New York 1942.

43. B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki (red.), *Wprowadzanie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2004.

44. J. Świniarski, *Rodzaje wyzwań we współczesnym świecie. Próba systematyzacji filozoficznej*, (typescript), 1997.

45. R. Tarnogórski, *Interwencja w Iraku a prawo międzynarodowe*, PISM, „Biuletyn" no. 19 (123)/2003.

46. J.H. Turner, *Struktura teorii socjologicznej*, PWN, Warsaw 2004.

47. R. Ullman, *Redefining Security*, International Security 1983, no. 1.

48. C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, Oxford Press 1956.

49. R. Zięba, *Pojęcie i istota bezpieczeństwa państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, „Sprawy Międzynarodowe", PISM, 1989 no. 10.

Streszczenie. Znajomość współczesnej rzeczywistości, a w niej zagadnień bezpieczeństwa, jest istotna zarówno ze względów poznawczych, jak i utylitarnych. W tym zakresie paradygmat bezpieczeństwa stanowi swoiste narzędzie poznania i eksplanacji. Rzecz w tym, że tylko niektóre obszary poznania i formy eksplanacji są prawdziwe i tylko w określonych okolicznościach. Zawsze występuje ryzyko błędu, a konsekwencje tego występują w różnych odniesieniach do podejmowanych przez człowieka działań. Artykuł ukazuje powyższe zagadnienia i stara się – przynajmniej w przypadku niektórych – udzielić odpowiedzi.