



Publisher

<http://jssidoi.org/esc/home>



---

INSIGHTS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECURITY CONCEPT\*

Radoslav Ivančík<sup>1</sup>, Vladimír Andrassy<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Academy of the Police Force in Bratislava, Sklabinská 1, Bratislava, Slovakia

<sup>2</sup>Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Štefánik, Demänová 393, Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia

E-mails:<sup>1</sup> [radoslav.ivancik@akademiapz.sk](mailto:radoslav.ivancik@akademiapz.sk); <sup>2</sup> [vladimir.andrassy@aos.sk](mailto:vladimir.andrassy@aos.sk)

Received 1 February 2023; accepted 5 May 2023; published 30 June 2023

**Abstract.** The prosperity and development of human civilization and the sustainable growth of individuals, social groups and states have never been more strongly dependent on national and international security than in today's dynamically changing and globally interconnected world. For this reason, security research plays a significant role in the development of human society as a whole, especially in these turbulent and changing times, characterized by the global and regional security environment crisis and by increasing tensions in international relations. What does this development and its perception mean for one of the primary functions of the modern state, which is to ensure its security and the safety of its citizens, and what is the impact on research in this area? Following this, the development of the methodology of political science in the context of the development of the very concept of security is the subject of the presented discussion, a study in which, using appropriate methods of applied scientific research, we rely primarily on security science theory and theory of international relations. The methodology presented by us is based on a heuristic approach in research in political science (international relations). At the same time, it represents an analysis, synthesis and comparison of possible starting points processed in theoretical studies and practical constructs of authors who reflect the concept of security from the system theories' point of view. At the same time, the study's authors aim to open a discussion on new hypotheses and possible scenarios for the future development of political and security science.

**Keywords:** security theory; science; concept; human society; state; international relations

**Reference** to this paper should be made as follows: Ivančík, R., Andrassy, V. 2023. Insights into the development of the security concept. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 10(4), 26-39. [http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2023.10.4\(2\)](http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2023.10.4(2))

**JEL Classifications:** F52, F59, H56, H59, K22

**Additional disciplines:** Security

---

\* *This scientific paper was prepared within the framework of APVV project ID APVV-20-0334 "This is not true, but it could be: Conspiracy theories and hoaxes in the modern development of Slovakia in the European context".*

## 1. Introduction

The prosperity and development of human civilization, as well as the sustainable growth of living and quality of life of the inhabitants of our planet, have probably never been more strongly dependent on the level of security of states and their citizens than in today's dynamic, changing and interconnected world. For this reason, research on safety and its dimensions play a critical role in the development of human society, especially in these turbulent and changing times, characterized by deteriorating global and regional security environments and increasing tensions in international relations.

On the one hand, the possibility of a global missile-nuclear apocalypse has been substantially reduced in previous years, as well as the risk of a classic, symmetrical war between two or more states. Still, on the other hand, there has been a significant increase in asymmetric security threats in the form of international terrorism, illegal mass migration, cross-border organized crime, cyberattacks on private and public computer networks and systems, activities of foreign intelligence services, etc. These threats, which have come to the fore, especially in the new millennium, are much more diversified, structurally more complex, and difficult to predict. Their growing scope and nature only confirm the need for more profound security research in search of solutions to eliminate them.

The current security threats are very different from those we have become accustomed to and according to which states have shaped their security strategies, policies, and doctrines. This is at least confirmed by a significant stream of authors writing about security and international relations (Baldwin, 1995; Buzan, Waeber, Wilde, 1998; Ayoob, 2005; Bailliet, 2009; Purpura, 2011; Jurčák et al., 2020; Trifunovic et al., 2021; Barabash, Beinoravičius, Valčiukas, 2022; Szabó, 2023; Tvaronavičienė, 2023; Waszkiewicz, Taksás, 2023).

While in the past, states were the only relevant players; today, they must share their influence with many other non-state actors at higher and lower levels. The activities of organized non-state actors and, in some cases, small groups or even individuals can cause damage of the same significance and scope as the armies of other countries.

Moreover, globalization has significantly complicated the situation in recent years, which is a highly dynamic multidimensional process in which political, economic, social, technological, security, military-strategic, environmental, cultural, religious, and other factors intersect and interact. The development of globalization so far shows that economic factors have a decisive influence on its course, which significantly influences others. On their basis, a new system of international economic, political, security, and social relations is emerging (Ivančík, 2011). As a result of globalization, there are not only changes that affect stability and security, but at the same time, they bring new risks and problems and make society more vulnerable (Kurilovská, Müllerová, 2021; Dušek, Kavan, 2022; Hajdúková, Marr, 2022).

The newly formed security environment, influenced by deepening globalization, is a direct consequence of the declining importance of territoriality in the international system. At the same time, states were clearly defined by their territory in the past and had direct control over who and what crosses their borders; today, they no longer have such opportunities. This is especially true in Europe, where European integration has eroded the privileged position of the modern state even more than in other regions, as it has moved many of its functions to a supranational level. It is no longer possible to separate the internal space of the state from the area outside it. Both dimensions intersect.

Similarly, the boundaries between internal and external security are blurred. Internal threats, such as organized crime or terrorism, are taking on an international dimension (e.g. Agbaje, 2022).

Today acts that can directly threaten and disrupt the stability of the state's security system can be committed from the other side of the globe. External threats thus come less and less from the armies of other states but

increasingly from the interests of non-state actors or migratory flows caused by civil wars or the failure of the essential functions of states in neighbouring and more distant regions. These threats thus bring a new perception of the security threat to states, which they must reflect on and create tools against these threats.

What do these changes and their perceptions mean for one of the primary functions of the modern state, which is to ensure its security and the safety of its people? What is the impact on research in this area, both in the development of the methodology of political science and in the context of the development of the very concept of security? This is the subject of the presented article, in the elaboration of which, using suitable methods of applied scientific research, we rely primarily on the theory of security science and international relations. The methodology presented by us is based on a heuristic approach in research in political sciences (international relations), synthesis and comparison of possible starting points processed in theoretical analyses and practical constructs of authors who reflect the concept of security from the point of view of system theories.

## **2. Background of security concept development**

In the interest of a comprehensive view of the development of the concept of security, it is necessary to go back several decades and mention that the thought began to change from the first half of the eighties. The academic debate on the concept of security, started by Ullman (1983), gained momentum after the end of the Cold War and became one of the main topics in international relations research. It was conducted at two partially different levels, focusing on the very concept of security and its transformation on the one hand and the content of the security review on the other.

In the debate on the concept of security, many scientists (e.g. Buzan, 2016) and politicians (e.g. Butrus-Ghálí, 1995) believed that the concept of security needed to be reconsidered. Some even considered security a controversial concept arising from the substance of the case (Smith, Archarya, 2002). It was then tough to agree on the definition of such a concept; according to Buzan, it was utterly impossible in principle because there was (and still does not exist) any neutral, unified, and generally accepted definition of security (Smith, Archarya, 2002, p. 1). Other scientists preferred maintaining the status quo, as there was no reason to change the security concept. For example, Baldwin (1997, p. 6) argues that four basic questions: "Security of what? Security of what values? Security against what threats? Security by what means?" were formulated at the beginning of the second half of the last century, sufficiently define the concept of security, and in any way, according to him, they have not lost their significance.

Baldwin raises a few other closely related basic questions: How much security? For what price? In what time horizon? Although these issues are essential in formulating a specific security strategy and security policy of a given state, they are optional for basic research into the content of the concept of security. In this context, Baldwin himself acknowledges that, although the questions remained the same, the answers to them, and thus to the content of security, changed after the end of the Cold War (Baldwin, 1997, p. 23). According to some authors (e.g. Lutterbeck, 2005, p. 235), this "new security agenda" is significantly broader than the previous one from the time of the bipolar division of the world. Attention is no longer focused only on the state but also other levels, and the concept of security is gradually deepening. Of course, in this context, the nature of the security threats faced by the various reference objects is also changing while the concept of security is being broadened and deepened.

## **3. Deepening the security concept**

As the concept of security deepens, the answer to Baldwin's first question: "Security of what?" changes. In addition to the state, entities above and below the state level also become reference objects. One of the first swallows in this direction was the so-called Palme Report (ICDSI, 1982), led by former Swedish Prime Minister

Olof Palme at the United Nations in the early 1980s. According to this report, the only way to deal with the security dilemma is to take joint action by the participating states. This "common security" is qualitatively different from individual states' security. Similarly, Shaw (2000, p. 14) speaks of the "reconstruction" of national security into international security - the security of the system of states.

The reference object, in this case, can also be a particular selected group of states, not the whole system, including all states. For example, rising ocean levels due to climate change pose an existential threat to several countries low above the world's seas. A group of these states can be considered as one reference object because they face the same danger<sup>†</sup>

However, international organizations can also be a reference object. A typical example is the North Atlantic Alliance, which, under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, considers an attack on one of its member states to be an attack on the Alliance as a whole (NATO, 2019).<sup>‡</sup> Similarly, the European Union considers terrorism an act committed to seriously destabilize or destroy the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of its Member State and the Union as a whole (EU, 2008).<sup>§</sup>

Groupings of states or international organizations, which are overwhelmingly made up of states, are not too much of a challenge to the state's dominant position as a reference object of security. However, it can also become "institutions", such as religion. The most famous terrorist group today, al-Qaeda, is defending its activities by supporting the belief - in Islam and its values. Objects that do not relate to states at all and include everything essentially and everyone can also be considered endangered - this is the case of reference objects such as "humanity" or "environment" (Belan, 2016; Majchút, 2018; Jurčák, 2020).

Deepening the security concept within the security research framework will most likely meet with new reference objects below the state level. This is mainly due to empirical findings based on the fact that there are significantly more national than interstate armed conflicts worldwide. Some authors even argue that virtually all armed conflicts are internal, and federal, ethnic, religious, and communal tensions are significant factors in their emergence (Murphy, Weiss, 1999, p. 116). This, of course, is a fundamental problem for any state-centred approach, which is based on the fact that the state is a basic level, a cornerstone for its citizens' security, and the state's protection automatically means the safety of its citizens.

Kaldor (2012), on the margin of this approach, states that at the end of the twentieth century, a new type of organized violence developed, manifesting itself in a higher proportion of national conflicts. This type, which she calls "new wars", consists in blurring the distinction between classical war (violence between states or politically organized groups for political reasons), organized crime (violence between private individuals for personal reasons) and human rights violations on a large scale (violence of states or politically organized groups against individuals). These conflicts are referred to as internal or civil wars. Still, the fact is that they involve a large number of cross-border connections, so it is difficult to distinguish what is internal and what is external, what is aggression and what is repression, and what is local and what is global.

The key is the erosion of the state monopoly on violence from two sides. On the one hand, the state is weakened by forming military forces into pacts and alliances. At the same time, its ability to use power unilaterally is reduced by various international standards. On the other hand, the state is threatened by the privatization of

---

<sup>†</sup> For more details, see: The Alliance of Small Island States is an intergovernmental organization of low-lying coastal and small island countries. AOSIS was founded in 1990 before the Second World Climate Conference. The main purpose of the Alliance is to strengthen the voices of small island developing states in tackling global warming. (<https://www.aosis.org>)

<sup>‡</sup> For more details, see NATO. 2019. Washington Treaty from 4 April 1949.

<sup>§</sup> For more details, see EU. 2008. Council Framework Decision 2008/919/JHA of 28 November 2008 amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism.

violence. These "new wars", as Kaldor (2012, p. 2) called them, reduce state revenues, whether as a result of crisis or crime, privatize violence between various organized crime groups or paramilitary groups, or private military and security companies as a result of which political legitimacy disappears (Herbert, 2006, p. 28).

Just as academic and political voices have emerged calling for a reassessment of national security for common or international security above the level of the nation-state, there is an alternative concept for security threats below the status of the state. The so-called "human security" leaves any group reference object and focuses on a possible minor factor - the individual.

However, human security is a vague concept that means something different to everyone. It is possible to find not only a range of different definitions but, in particular, a range of different contents and definitions, from relatively narrow to broad, covering many aspects of human life. However, all approaches include several common elements: they shift attention to the individual as a reference object, define the threat as a threat to the individual's quality of life, and at the same time, involve non-state actors and turn away from traditional and exclusive interest in military conflict (McDonald, 2002, p. 279).

There are currently two significant schools of human security based on the following stakeholder programs: the approach of the Government of Canada and the approach of the United Nations Development Program. Canada's approach to human security, considered "narrow," is defined negatively as the absence of a physical threat to an individual. According to Shani, such a definition conforms to the Western liberal tradition of equality before the law and is also a right enshrined in the UN Charter (Shani, 2009, p. 4). In this context, Bailliet (2009, p. 182) adds that it is a definition based on the importance of the state and the promotion of good governance.

The broad definition of human security in the United Nations Development Program, also promoted by Japan, seeks to "protect the core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and fulfilment of human life". It is a positive definition, a set of living needs of all people, their fundamental rights and freedoms (Shani, 2009, p. 5). At the same time, it is a definition that goes far beyond the Canadian approach. As Biscop (2005, pp. 11-12) points out, the physical dimension (freedom from fear) is accompanied in this broad sense by other dimensions: economic (freedom from scarcity), political (participation in government, rule of law, respect for human rights, etc.) and social (access to education, health care, clean environment). According to this concept, a safe environment can only be said to be met if the needs of individuals in all four areas are met.

#### **4. Extension of the security concept**

Classical state-centrist theories, especially realism and neorealism, are narrowly defined at the state level and in the question of the nature of threats. For the realists, the state's primary interest is to preserve its existence; for the neorealists as well, but in addition, they add to it the preservation of the power position vis-à-vis other states. The factor primarily influencing the position of power is the same for both approaches - it is the state's military power. However, realism is also interested in the economic and demographic base.

The extended concept of security recognizes far more sources of threat, whether for states or other reference objects (Buzan, 2000). In this sense, the economy or economic prosperity becomes an independent value that can be endangered and defended. The economy is the basis of the state's defence, providing the resources needed to build the armed forces, their quality, quantity, armaments, equipment, training, and the state's defence infrastructure and defence system, etc.\*\* As threats against which it is necessary to intervene actively, it is

---

\*\* For more details see: Ivančík, R. 2012. *Alokačná a technická efektívnosť financovania obrany v Slovenskej republike*. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, 2012. ISBN 978-80-8040-444-4.



possible to present, for example, a disruption of the stability and functionality of the financial system.<sup>††</sup> Or an interruption of the supply of critical raw materials.

Other existential threats then appear at higher than state levels. For example, realists say the Alliance of island states may feel safe because any other form does not threaten it. Still, if their territory disappears below rising sea levels, it will only help them a little. Environmental threats usually extend beyond the borders of one state and, in some cases, can even be understood as threats to the whole of human civilization and to man as a species (Podesta, Ogden, 2007). The specificity of these threats is that, with a few exceptions, they are not caused by states but by non-state actors, groups, individuals, or the way of life of most of the human population.

Many new types of threats concern the sub-national level. It can threaten individuals' health (McLean, 2008) or their way of life, which changes as a result of migration (Collyer, 2006). Through their activities, terrorist groups endanger the lives of individuals, as does organized crime. In addition, its growth in the state administration may threaten the political establishment and democratic participation of individuals in the management of society. A specific risk can also be the state itself, which can be a source of oppression - not only physically but also economically and, in the case of minorities, also culturally. Efforts to extend the security concept are not primarily directed against the state. It also recognizes the relevance of traditional military threats, not only as exhaustive but as a subset of societal threats (Brimmer, 2006).

All these threats are invisible from a state-centrist, realistic point of view. Nevertheless, the media is full of daily news and information about economic crises, environmental or energy security, or the threat of terrorism. This creates a gap that needs to be filled. One of the possibilities is constructivist approaches, which are not limited to the predetermined nature of threats, but on the contrary, they always try to construct them again. One of the most influential attempts at systematically interpreting the extended security concept is the securitization theory developed by the so-called Copenhagen School (Weaver, 2000).

Securitization is identifying a problem as an existential threat, allowing the use of extraordinary means. It is a more robust version of politicization, where the issue becomes the subject of political debate and is also identified as a security threat. Successful securitization means that the population accepts the safe interpretation of the phenomenon and agrees to the use of extraordinary means, such as violence, restriction of rights, stricter regulations, etc. Unlike the realism theory, the idea of securitization is not limited to the context of security. It is constructed by public debate, and what is considered a security issue today may not be among tomorrow's threats, meaning that the issue is desecuritized (Buzan, 2000).

This approach makes it possible to include almost any topic under the term security if it is successfully securitized in public discourse. Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde (1998) identify five different security sectors in their work. In addition to the military industry, which includes the classic security of the realistic direction, there is also political, economic, social, and environmental security. Securitization theory has found its place in the analysis of the concept of security precisely because it allows for a flexible response to ongoing changes and includes topics that classical theories cannot cope with (Higgott, 2004).

After the end of the Cold War and the bipolar division of the world, the content of the security concept expanded in two directions: a) in-depth by including a range of non-state actors and b) in scope by including a range of topics other than threats of force. In this context, however, it should be noted that such an extension of the security concept is not accepted without reservations, and several objections are raised against it.

---

<sup>††</sup> For more details see: Mikušová Meričková, B., Nemeč, J., Murray Svidroňová, M., Pischko, V. 2017. Analysis of the Relationship between the Size and Structure of Public Expenditure and Socio-economic Development. *Journal of Economics*, 65(4)

## 5. Criticism of new approaches to security

Efforts to expand the content of the security concept have, of course, met with reservations. The criticisms raised can be divided into two primary groups. To those who question the precondition for expanding the concept of security, i.e., that reality has changed, and it is necessary to respond to it. And to those who criticize how the new directions approach the issue. Some authors fall into both groups.

Ripsman and Paul (2005, p. 201), based on research into defence spending, the use of human resources, and national security doctrines, believe that globalization does not affect states' security policies as much as many authors claim, and states still focus on traditional notions of security. Walt (1991, p. 213) says that the existence of other threats to national security does not mean that the danger of war has disappeared. Similarly, several other researchers disagree with moving the state to the edge. He believes that his role in.

For example, Shaw (2000, p. 20) operates in the sense that power must still be understood concerning the state, even in the world of global institutions, because states create these. Likewise, non-governmental organizations, as well as sub-state actors, enforce their influence primarily through state institutions. Miller (2001, p. 25) points out that the new perspectives are based on inaccurate considerations, as inter-state conflicts still exist and arise. States are still the most potent military actors with no justice or hegemon. Like Shaw, he points out that although some international institutions, such as the justice and the hegemon, seek to behave, such as the UN Security Council, the fact is that it is made up of states that exercise a veto if necessary and thus block the adoption and implementation of decisions that are not in line with their interests.

Ayoob (2005, p. 9) presents the view that the academic discourse overestimates the nature of economic, technological, and normative changes that affect security while underestimating the strength and resilience of the state and its role as the primary provider of security. According to him, the state's role is critical in decision-making. Ayoob (2005, p. 21) seeks a compromise between the theory of securitization and the state's prominent position, arguing that the securitization will not succeed unless it threatens state institutions or state borders/or to a regime acting on behalf of the state. In other words, for any phenomenon to be securitized, it must first be politicized.

In their works, some authors argue that the state, defined territorially, is in decline. For example, Thompson (2006, p. 255) challenges the conclusion that the state is in fall due to the expansion of various humanitarian interventions and post-Cold War missions. She believes that external sovereignty has little to do with the Westphalian system of territorially defined states because the original treaties did not contain anything like that, and the later treaties nevertheless allowed states to intervene in the affairs of other states. She cites as an example Roosevelt's amendment to the Monroe Doctrine, which allowed the United States to intervene in the internal affairs of the countries of the Western Hemisphere or on the European continent.

According to some authors, the territorial delimitation of the state may even be desirable. Kofman (2007) points out that public goods (collective goods.\*\*\*) are indivisible and territorial, as public goods, such as clean air or security, are not tied to citizenship or loyalty but to a given territory. Their funding must then be centralized from public resources so that, if necessary, resources can be transferred from one budget chapter to another. Finally, public goods are financed from the expected general budget. A transparent system is then needed to decide on the use of public resources. Thus, a territorially sovereign state can be a normatively optimal way of organizing political life, which enables democratic control on the one hand and ensures the efficiency of public

---

\*\*\* For more details see: Mikušová Meričková, B., Stejskal, J. 2014. Value of Collective Consumption Goods. *Politická ekonomie*, 62(2), ISSN 0032-3233.

administration on the other. At the same time prevents duplication by merging into a common territorial framework.

The second line of criticism of the new approaches concerning the content of the concept of security does not call into question their initial assumptions but asks whether their idea is correct. Bailliet (2009, p. 212), for example, believes that while the Copenhagen school broadened the notion of security from a global perspective, the main reference object of Buzan's security analysis remains the nation-state. The question, therefore, arises as to whether new approaches are helpful when examining a unique situation from an old perspective. In addition, several critics question their scientific significance. For example, Kolodziej (1999, p. 24) considers rejecting the rational actor model as an effective analysis tool meaningless. However, he acknowledges the need to reflect on the socio-economic, domestic, and normative context.

However, many authors believe that the endless expansion and deepening of the security concept undermines the intellectual cohesion of the entire research sector. It also makes it much more difficult to design any solution (Walt, 1991, p. 213). Freedman (1998, p. 53) agrees with this, warning that all problems should be labelled as something other than security, as this would lose the focus of the entire science department. According to critics, this has already happened with the concept of human security, which is so vague, incoherent, and challenging to function that it could be more helpful in formulating political or research goals (Tarry, 1999).

For the same reason, Baldwin (1997, p. 21) criticizes securitization, claiming that the security concept loses its applicability. It is also questionable to what extent new approaches can be applied universally. In this context, Thompson (2006, p. 252) believes that the universality of values is doubtful and will remain so. Ayoob (2005, p. 20) points out that new approaches are challenging to use in exploring third-world countries, where the state may sometimes threaten its people. However, its weakening or failure poses an even greater danger to the population because the state remains a key security provider. Therefore, he fears that new research findings may be detrimental to practical policy. Some other authors also point out this, especially in connection with the so-called paradox of human and national security. At the same time, states that strengthen their national security are reducing the human security of their people by investing in armaments or paying less attention to human rights instead of developing them. Otherwise, a state investing in the prosperity and well-being of its population cannot ensure its physical security, which may be threatened by other states or even non-state actors (McDonald, 2002, p. 289). This process can also work at the international level. Liotta (2002, p. 479) describes the "boomerang effect", where strengthening the national security of developed countries reduces human security in the developing world, which in turn threatens the national security of developed countries.

## **6. Discussion on the position of the state and the concept of security**

As indicated in previous chapters, there is an intense discussion on security and its review. It manifests itself in extending security content to "new" security threats, such as cyber or environmental, critical infrastructure threats, threats posed by organized crime, migration or terrorism. However, these topics, apart from cyber threats, are familiar. All of them have been among the problems that states have had to deal with in the past. Therefore, although attempts are being made to restore them, it is more of a new perception (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2005, p. 60). However, this does not change the fact that this new perception of some security threats affects the reactions of politicians and academics.

Despite the opposition of some staunch realists, it is more than evident that the situation has changed compared to the Cold War and needs to be addressed in some way. At the same time, however, rejecting all existing knowledge and approaches is impossible because they still play an essential role in describing reality. Some resign straight to the search for a theory. Terriff (1999, p. 243), for example, argues that theories are always a step behind real politics and are, therefore, not valuable for predicting change and direction. The end of the Cold War



clearly showed this in realism, but even the new theories look less promising. However, it makes sense to explore theory and concepts because they are one of the sources of practical policy. It was demonstrated and confirmed in practice by mutually guaranteed destruction during the Cold War. So, what should the theory look like? Many academics are inclined to the so-called "golden mean", which recognizes that while states remain key, they are forced to coexist with other actors and adapt to a new environment where national borders play less role (Miller, 2001).

However, this middle way does not have a profiled approach or school where academia can discuss the details against shared assumptions, as with the debate on neorealism and neoliberalism in the 1980s and 1990s. The discussion is still quite broad, and unification on basic postulates is still very far away. This is also evidenced by the fact that academics have yet to agree on whether the current situation is historically unique or whether looking for connections with the past is possible. Some argue that human society is at the beginning of the first truly global age (Booth, 2005, p. 28). Others find surprising parallels with the present in the past, for example, between Carr's concept of security (Carr, E. H. 2016) just after World War II and the current widespread concept of security (Rotschild, 1995, p. 57). This is also confirmed by Brodie (Baldwin, 1995, p. 122) when he shows that for the first researchers in the field of security studies, security was a derived value that only makes sense in combination with other worthy discussions of defence and protection. This is still a very current topic of including domestic policy in security studies, a matter of course at the department's beginning.

The sharp division between national and international affairs was long ago considered a "serious obstacle to clear thinking." It is a question of whether the Cold War was not just a deviation from the emerging trend we are currently returning to. This would be evidenced by the work of Bigo, which shows how the border function was destabilized before World War II with the emergence of ultra-specialized agencies operating across countries (such as Interpol) and how the Cold War reversed this trend (Bigo, 2006, p. 393). Therefore, the question arises as to whether a comprehensive safety theory is possible.

Sørensen (2005, p. 87) considers that no. According to him, the world consists of three types of states at different stages of development, which he describes as post-colonial, modern and post-modern. Each class has a slightly different way of working; other dangers endanger it, and it has other options to respond to them. According to him, the post-colonial state has problems controlling its territory due to the instability of the internal organization and the weakness of state institutions. The post-modern state is subject to multilevel governance in the context of transnational and international relations. It is no longer a national community but a community of citizens and opinions, where collective loyalty is increasingly projected outside the state.

Most economic activities are set in cross-border networks, and the national economy is far less self-sufficient than before. Topics such as recognizing the universality of human rights, restrictions by international institutions or the opening of globalization by pressure primarily affect post-modern states (Ripsman, Paul, 2005). In this case, the resignation to a unified approach makes it possible to circumvent the objections of many representatives of realism, who pointed out the relevance of traditional instruments and policies in many parts of the world, such as the Middle East or the Taiwan Strait.

## **Conclusions**

The current stage of development of human civilization is influenced by several tendencies, challenges and threats prevailing in all spheres of society, which force individual actors to reconsider their attitude to security, mainly to ensure favourable conditions for their further development. However, many current manifestations of human behaviour and action threaten the conservation of humans as a biological species. For this reason, the requirement to ensure security is becoming a priority. Man, as an individual and humanity as a whole, must seriously consider the consequences of his activities, not only in the military and security field but also in the

political, economic, social, environmental, energy, technical/technological or cultural spheres. This requires understanding security as a multidimensional phenomenon logically and causally linked to all areas and spheres of human existence.

Our research to date and the analysis and synthesis of the above considerations and opinions show that safety is a complex theoretical and praxeological problem that can be viewed from multiple perspectives. Therefore, defining the security concept is complex and unambiguous. The academic community perceives security differently and differently as an expert from practice. The economist's view of security is different, the politician's view is different, and the soldier, security or IT expert, or ecologist has a different idea. One understands it as a state, the other as a manifestation, the third; as a result, the fourth as a category and the fifth entirely differently. As indicated, more significant or minor differences exist between the particular theoretical directions.

That is why there is currently - and cannot be - no unified and generally accepted uniform definition of security when defining security. This is also why there has yet to be a universal consensus on the content of the security concept. And this is also the reason why it is necessary to distinguish and consider the existence of several dimensions of security (military, political, economic, social, environmental, information, energy, etc.), respectively, the presence of several levels of security (individual, group, state, Alliance, international, etc.).

The consensus is that security can never be absolute; it is always relative and directly proportional to external threats or risks. It cannot be viewed from an extreme position because no entity can guarantee security. What may be safe at one point may no longer be safe after conditions or circumstances change or become a high risk or even dangerous. If a phenomenon or process is safe for one subject, it can be hazardous for another issue. It follows that security is always associated with specificity, that is, with a particular person, group, or thing, with a particular phenomenon or process, with specific conditions, circumstances, relationships, with a clear space and time, and with a particular form and quality.

Whether we examine security from any point of view, whether economic, political, social, military, environmental, information, energy, or even existential, whether we are trying to solve theoretical or practical problems, or whether we are trying to solve them on an individual or collective level, or local, state, regional, global or Alliance level, one thing is sure, in the historical context, the issue of security has been, is and - taking into consideration the dynamics, unevenness, instability, uncertainty and difficult predictability of the further development of human society - will always be highly topical.

## References

- Agbaje, F. I. 2022. Toward querying the national peril of kidnapping in Nigeria. *Insights into Regional Development*, 4(4), 155-165. [https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2022.4.4\(9\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2022.4.4(9))
- Ayoob, M. 2005. Security in the Age of Globalization: Separating Appearance from Reality. In Aydinli, E., Rosenau, J. N. (eds.): *Globalization, Security, and the Nation State*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, ISBN 978-0-79146-401-4, pp. 9-26.
- Bailliet, C. M. 2009. *Security: A Multidisciplinary Normative Approach*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 383 p. ISBN 978-90-04-17296-8.
- Baldwin, D. A. 1995. Security Studies and the End of the Cold War. *World Politics*, 48(1), 117-141. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.1995.0001>
- Baldwin, D. A. 1997. The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210597000053>

- Barabash, Y., Beinoravičius, D., Valčiukas, J. 2022. Invisible Constitution as an instrument of consolidation of nation and defence of democracy. *Insights into Regional Development*, 4(3), 110-126. [https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2022.4.3\(7\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2022.4.3(7))
- Belan, L. 2016. Vlastnosti bezpečnosti. In *Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2016 – zborník vedeckých a odborných prác zo 7. medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie*. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl generála M. R. Štefánika, ISBN 978-80-8040-568-7, 31-37.
- Bigo, D. 2006. Internal and External Aspects of Security. *European Security*, 15(4), 385-404. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662830701305831>
- Biscop, S. 2005. *The European Security Strategy and the Neighbourhood Policy*. Brussels: Royal Institute for International Relations.
- Booth, K. 2005. Two Terrors, One Problem. In: Aydinli, Ersel – Rosenau, James. N. (eds.): *Globalization, Security, and the Nation State*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005, ISBN 978-0-79146-401-4, pp. 27-48.
- Brimmer, E. 2006. From Territorial Security to Societal Security: Implications for the Transatlantic Strategic Outlook. In: Brimmer, E. (ed.): *Transforming Homeland Security: U.S. and European Approaches*. Washington: Center for Transatlantic Relations, ISBN 978-0-97664-344-9, pp. 23-42.
- ButrUs-GhÁli, B. 1995. Let's Get Together to Halt the Unraveling of Society. In *The New York Times*, 1995. [online]. [cit. 25.8.2021]. Available on the Internet: <https://www.nytimes.com/1995/02/10/opinion/IHT-lets-get-together-to-halt-the-unraveling-of-society.html>
- Buzan, B., Waever, O., Wilde, J. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 239 p. ISBN 978-155587-784-2.
- Buzan, B. 2000. The Logic of Regional Security in the Post-Cold War World. In: Hettne, B. et al. (eds.): *The New Regionalism and the Future of Security and Development*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, ISBN 978-0-3336-8713-0, pp. 1-25. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-11498-3\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-11498-3_1)
- Buzan, B. 2016. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boulder: Rienner, 2016. 318 s. ISBN 978-1-78552-244-4.
- Carr, E. H. 2016. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 233 p. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95076-8>
- Collyer, M. 2006. Migrants, Migration and the Security Paradigm: Constraints and Opportunities. *Mediterranean Politics*, 11(2), 255-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629390600682974>
- Dalgaard-Nielsen, A. 2005. Homeland Security and the Role of the Armed Forces: A Scandinavian Perspective. In: Borchert, Heiko (ed.): *Weniger Souveränität – Mehr Sicherheit. Schutz der Heimat im Informationszeitalter und die Rolle der Streitkräfte*. Hamburg: Verlag E.S. Mittler & Sohn, 2005, ISBN 978-3-8132-0844-3, pp. 59-75.
- Dušek, J., Kavan, Š. 2022. Management and implementation of territorial cooperation programs on the example of ESUS. In *25th International Colloquium on Regional Sciences – Conference Proceedings*. Brno: Masaryk University, ISBN 978-80-280-0068-4, pp. 2012-2021.
- EU. 2008. Council Framework Decision 2008/919/JHA of 28 November 2008 amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism. Brussels, 28.11.2008 [online]. [cit. 22.8.2021]. Available on the Internet: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32008F0919>
- Freedman, L. 1998. International security: Changing targets. *Foreign Policy*, 110, 48-63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1149276>
- Hajdúková, T., Marr, S. 2022. Vývoj kriminality v Českej republike a Slovenskej republike počas rokov 2010 až 2020 vo vzájomnom porovnaní. *Police Theory and Practice*, 30(3), 3-21.
- Herbert, W. 2006. The challenges to re-establishing a public monopoly of violence. In: Glasius, Marlies – Kaldor, Mary (eds.): *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: Project, Principles, Practicalities*. London: Routledge, 2006, ISBN 978-0-415-36745-X, pp. 20-39.
- Higgott, R. 2004. US Foreign Policy and the 'Securitization' of Economic Globalization. *International Politics*, 41(2), 147-175. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800073>
- ICDSI. 1982. *Common security: a blueprint for survival*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982. 202 p. ISBN 978-0-67145-879-9.

- Ivančík, R. 2011. Fenomén zvaný globalizácia. *Vojenské reflexie*, 6(1), 32-49.
- Jurčák, V. et al. 2020. Teoretické prístupy k skúmaniu bezpečnosti. Ostrava: Key Publishing, 134 p. ISBN 978-80-7418-358-4.
- Kaldor, M. 2012. New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era. Malden: Polity Press, 224 p. ISBN 978-0-7456-5562-8
- Kofman, D. 2007. The Normative Limits to the Dispersal of Territorial Sovereignty. *The Monist*, 90(1), 65-85. ISSN 0026-9662.
- Kolodziej, E. A. 1999. Security studies for the next millennium: Quo vadis? *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20(3), 18-38.
- Kurilovská, L., Müllerová, J. 2021. Environmental Risks in Crisis Management by Nuclear Accidents. In 21st International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM 2021 – Conference Proceedings. SGEM International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference, 2021, ISBN 978-619-7603-34-7, pp. 191-196.
- Liotta, P. H. 2002. Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, 33(4), 473-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010602033004007>
- Lutterbeck, D. 2005. Blurring the Dividing Line: The Convergence of Internal and External Security in Western Europe. *European Security*, 14(2), 231-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662830500336193>
- Majchút, I. 2018. Súčasný bezpečnostný aspekt. In Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2018, zborník vedeckých a odborných prác z 9. medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, s. 233-241. ISBN 978-80-8040-568-7.
- McDonald, M. 2002. Human Security and the Construction of Security. *Global Society*, 16(3), 277-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320220148076>
- McLean, S. J. 2008. Microbes, Mad Cows and Militaries: Exploring the Links between Health and Security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), 475-494. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010608096149>
- Mikušová Meričková, B., Nemeč, J., Murray Svidroňová, M., Pischko, V. 2017. Analysis of the Relationship between the Size and Structure of Public Expenditure and Socio-economic Development. *Journal of Economics*, 65(4), 320-333. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.polek.947>
- Mikušová Meričková, B., Stejskal, J. 2014. Value of Collective Consumption Goods. *Politická Ekonomie*, 62(2), 216-231.
- Miller, B. 2001. The Concept of Security: Should It Be Redefined? *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 24(2), 13-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390108565553>
- Murphy, C. N., Weiss, T. G. 1999. International peace and security at a multilateral moment: What we seem to know, what we don't, and why. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20(3), 116-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523269908404233>
- NATO. 2019. Washington Treaty from 4 April 1949. [online]. [cit. 22.8.2021]. Available on the Internet: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\\_texts\\_17120.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm)
- Podesta, J., Ogden, P. 2007. The security implications of climate change. *The Washington Quarterly*, 31(1), 115-138. <https://doi.org/10.1162/wash.2007.31.1.115>
- Purpura, P. P. 2011. Security: An Introduction. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 637 p. ISBN 978-1-4200-9284-4.
- Ripsman, N. M., Paul, T. V. 2005. Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis. *International Studies Review*, 7(2), 199-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2005.00481.x>
- Shani, G. 2009. Introduction: Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World. In: Shani, G. et al. (eds.): Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World. Critical and Global Insights. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, ISBN 978-1-349-28228-9, pp. 1-14. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230592520\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230592520_1)
- Shaw, M. 2000. The Development of "Common-Risk" Society: A Theoretical Overview. In: Kuhlmann, J. – Callaghan, J. (eds.): Military and Society in 21st Century Europe: A Comparative Analysis. Picataway: Transaction Publishers, 350 p. ISBN 978-0-8258-4449-8.

Smith, S., Archarya, A. 2002. The Contested Concept of Security. In *The Concept of Security before and After September 11*. In Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, 32 p. No. WP023.

Szabó, Z. 2023. African peacekeeping operations in recent years. *Insights into Regional Development*, 5(1), 72-85. [https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2023.5.1\(5\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2023.5.1(5))

Tarry, S. 1999. Deepening' and 'Widening: An Analysis of Security Definitions in the 1990s. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 2(1) ISSN 1488-559X. [online]. [cit. 28.8.2021]. Available on the Internet: <https://jmss.org/article/view/57850/43523>

Terriff, T. 1999. Change, security and surprise. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20(3), 231-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523269908404237>

Thompson, H. 2006. The Case for External Sovereignty. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2006, Vol. 12, No. 2, ISSN 1354-0661, pp. 251-274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066106064509>

Trifunovic, D., Kazanský, R., Nečas, P. 2021. T Conceptualization of Terrorism as a Modern Form of Political Violence. *Politické Vedy*. 24(2), pp. 108-124. <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2021.24.2.108-124>

Tvaronavičienė, M. 2023. A Review of the Book "Conflict and Peace in Western Sahara: The Role of the UN's Peacekeeping Mission (MINURSO) Edited by János Besenyő, R. Joseph Huddleston, and Yahia H. Zoubir. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.47459/jssi.2023.13.9>

Ullman, R. H. 1983. Redefining Security. *International Security*, 8(1), 129-153. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2538489>

Walt, S. M. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35(2), 211-239. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2600471>

Weaver, O. 2000. What is security? – The securityness of security. In: Hansen, B. (eds.): *European Security 2000*. Copenhagen: Political Studies Press, ISBN 978-1-4039-0527-7, pp. 222-254.

Waszkiewicz, G., Taksás, B. 2023. Military Spending Among European NATO Members. The Importance of Strategic Factors after 2014. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 13, 53-63. <https://doi.org/10.47459/jssi.2023.13.5>

**Funding:** This work was supported by the Agency for the Support of Research and Development on the basis of Contract no. APVV-20-0334.

**Data Availability Statement:** More information and data can be obtained from the authors on a reasonable request.

**Author Contributions:** The authors contributed equally, they have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.



**Radoslav IVANČÍK**, COL GS (ret.), Assoc. Prof. Dipl. Eng., PhD. et PhD., MBA, MSc. is an associate professor at the Department of Informatics and Management, Academy of the Police Force in Bratislava, Slovakia.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2233-1014>

**Vladimír ANDRASSY**, LTC (ret.), Assoc. Prof. Dipl. Eng., PhD. is an associate professor at the Department of Security and Defence, Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Štefánik, Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1207-300X>

Make your research more visible, join the Twitter account of ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES: @Entrepr69728810

---

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and VsI Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Center

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access