

NATIONAL SECURITY CULTURE AND STATE POWER

Juliusz Piwowarski ¹

ABSTRACT

Security is based upon fixed values, which are preserved in three dimensions of an individual, social, external and internal character. These are: mental (spiritual and psychological), organizational and legal, and material one. Security culture is a phenomenon of the most pluralistic structure, and thus it is adequate to the attributes (transdisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity) of the discipline of security studies. The phenomenon of security itself can be identified in dependence of the context as one of the following concepts: state without dangers, value, development process, development function, and finally – specific social construct. The paper covers the issue of national security concept in the area of transdisciplinary researches of security studies. As the national security is of great importance not only for contemporary security studies, but also for security of modern states, it is important to understand the mechanism and conception of this phenomenon. The objective therefore was to accentuate the importance of perceiving this phenomenon widely, including among others also the cultural aspect of the state security.

Keywords:

Power, position, security, international relations, foreign policy

1 THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY

In the face of unquestionable need of interdisciplinarity of security studies it is conducive that nowadays „apart from methodologists, very few care about methodological separateness or autonomy (independence) of individual scientific disciplines, for now the antidemarcationist attitude preponderates, which is bias in favor of both crossing boundaries and interdisciplinarity (transdisciplinarity). This goes on in a peculiar atmosphere of postmodernism, which abuts with formal and methodological carelessness in the aura of increasingly intrusive marketization of science”².

¹ Juliusz Piwowarski, PhD. Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron” w Krakowie 31-123 Kraków, ul. Krupnicza 3, tel: 012/422-30-68, e-mail: science@apeiron.edu.pl

² A. Bronk, S. Majdański, *Kłopoty z porządkowaniem nauk: perspektywa naukoznawcza*, „Nauka” nr.1/2009, p. 47.

Hence, in order to formulate a complete definition of security, this key concept for security studies along with basis both questions and aspects it's composed of have to be recapitulated. Security, which is not only comprehended as a certain state but also depicted ab initio dynamically is associated rather with "ongoing social process, within which entities as they act, they are striving to improve mechanisms that provide them with the sense of safety"³. In turn a holistic definition formulated in CRISD APEIRON⁴ by Juliusz Piwowarski, explains in a following, spectral manner the research category (and a concept) of security – in the Ingarden's perspective, from the epistemological, axiological, ontological and sociological point of view:

Security is for a specific individual or collective entity, a multi-layer phenomenon, which concerns him directly or not, and a conception, spectrum of which is created by four following components⁵:

- desired state i.e. the level of effectiveness of controlling threats, which are possible in a given place and time to values important for a given entity; in other words, security is a state that reflects the result of potentials' difference – self-defense potential on the one hand and threat potential on the other, which exist in a specified space-time (epistemological aspect).
- value, which fulfills our both basic and higher needs, i.e. those that never cease (meta-needs) with self-fulfillment on the top of hierarchy of needs (axiological aspect)
- development process, which is man's meta-need and enables personal and social growth of potential that increases autonomic defense of subjects of security; from the ontological point of view, concept of security functions close to that process (ontological aspect.).
- social construct, an effect of existing of social bonds, interactions and interdependences able to face numerous threats in certain community, which is one of security subjects (sociological aspect).

2 SECURITY CULTURE

Below provided was a spectral definition of security culture by Piwowarski-Zaplatynskyi: *Security culture* is a phenomenon that enables to accomplish following objectives:

1. Efficient control over possible threats to certain subject, which results in an optimal state of danger to this entity (in certain time and place);
2. Restoring security of a certain subject when it was lost;
3. Optimization of levels of multi-sectorally formed and examined process of development of security subject, which aims at harmonization of sectors in the context of prioritizing goals of the entity;

³ J. Kukulka *Bezpieczeństwo a współpraca europejska: współzależności i sprzeczności interesów*, [in:] „Sprawy Międzynarodowe”, Warszawa 1982, p. 31.

⁴ CRISD APEIRON – Cracow Research Institute for Security & Defence APEIRON.

⁵ J. Piwowarski, *Ochrona VIP-a a czworokąt Bushido. Studium japońskiej kultury bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] *Bezpieczeństwo osób podlegających ustawowo ochronie wobec zagrożeń XX wieku*, ed. P. Bogdalski, J. Cymerski, K. Jałoszyński, Szczytno 2014; J. Piwowarski, *Prolegomena do badań nad kulturą bezpieczeństwa*, „Security Economy & Law”, no. 2, Kraków 2013, p. 10-11.

4. Efficient stimulation of consciousness of a higher need in both social and individual scale – the need of self-fulfillment and creation of trichotomous development – a) mental, b) social, and c) material within supporting beliefs, motivations and attitudes that cause individual and collective actions, which have influence on increase of potential of autonomic defense (self-defense) of individual and group subjects of security.

Discussing security culture one should start from the basis of functioning of individuals, social groups, communities and entire societies. This basis is *the culture* built by humankind over the centuries. Culture is the sum of elements, which compose the material and non-material possessions of humankind consolidated over the centuries. Robert Scruton proclaims that “culture counts”⁶. However so that we can proclaim toward others that “culture counts”, we must first start from ourselves.

3 THREE DIMENSIONS OF SECURITY CULTURE

Security culture can be analyzed in three dimensions:

1. First dimension – certain ideas, value system and spirituality of a human being⁷;
2. Second dimension – relates to operations of organizations and to legal systems, inventiveness, innovations etc.;
3. Third dimension – includes all material aspects of human existence⁸.

Marian Cieślarczyk names the above components of security culture “the pillars of security culture”⁹. The researcher describes them respectively as: the mental and spiritual pillar, the organizational and legal pillar, and the material pillar. Components of these pillars partly interpenetrates, e.g. knowledge, which is a component of the first pillar, apart from values and rules respected by a man is in a rational understanding also an element of the second pillar, which is of organizational and legal character and is associated with a widely understood technical thought.

4 POSITION OF STATE

By the term “position” we understand some specific location of a certain entity in a defined space. It is a designation of place, meaning, order and a kind of stratification. International position is an “objective phenomenon”, which reveal the actual position of a given state in relation to other states, in other words, it is about defining moderately precisely the status, range, adequate order of potential (power) of state in the international system.

Position of state should be considered through the prism of various factors and analyzed continually in the context of changes of other states’ power. Core

⁶ R. Scruton, *Culture Counts: Faith and Feeling in a World Besieged*, New York 2007.

⁷ Cf. J. G. Bennett, *A Spiritual Psychology*, Coombe Springs Press, Sherborne 1974; R. A. Emmons, *The psychology of ultimate concerns: Motivation and spirituality in personality*, Guilford Press, New York 1999.

⁸ A. Kłoskowska, *Socjologia kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2007, p. 103 and fol.; A. Kroeber, *Istota kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2002, p. 195 and fol.

⁹ M. Cieślarczyk, *Fenomen bezpieczeństwa i zjawisko kryzysów postrzegane w perspektywie kulturowej*, [w:] *Jedność i różnorodność*, E. Reklajtis, B. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (ed.), ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2010, p. 96 and fol.

mechanisms allowing for increasing position of the discussed genre of *security subject* are located within the internal policy of a *national state*, which serves building power of the state's interior.

In turn various activities in the field of foreign policy allow for obtaining beneficial conditions within the surrounding of *state-security subject*, in order to accelerate the economic increase, extension of the military potential and finally – activation of scientific and technical and socio-cultural development of a state. These elements determine complimentary development of national state and allow for fulfilling needs of citizens and effectively building the position of security subject in relation to realities of international political stage¹⁰.

5 POWER OF STATE

The category of position corresponds to another key term, i.e. *state's power*¹¹. As Jean-Baptiste Duroselle notices, the main objective of foreign policy is development and increase of state's both power (*puissance*) and wealth (*richesse*). To understand the essence of the international balance of power it's essential to explain the term "power", which is closely associated with the *position of national state* on the international political stage¹². John George Stoessinger claims that power is the state's ability to use its material and non-material resources in a manner that will influence other state's behavior. In turn, Hans Joachim Morgenthau defines power as such genre of relations between numerous actors of international political stage, in which actor A disposes of abilities to control mind and activities of B. Raymond Aron, on the other hand, understands power as an ability of a certain state to impose its will to other states¹³. It's better, however, to treat state's power in the categories of the amount of social energy processed in a unit of time, which manifests in such amounts as e.g. GDP or military expenses.

According to Mirosław Sułek power of state is about the genre of power produced by certain society, i.e. a *nation* of a specific *state*. In his researches Sułek propose the following typology of power: general (dispositional) power and military (coordinative) power¹⁴. Joseph Nye proposes yet another typology: hard power and soft power¹⁵.

In fact there is a lot of typologies of power, among which worth mentioning are also the following: M. and H. Sprouts' distinction to active power and dormant power¹⁶; Raymon Aron's one to: offensive power and defensive power.

In his typology Hans Morgenthau divides the genres of state's power in a manner that can be directly associated with potentiality of national security culture and

¹⁰ R. Zięba, *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa*, Wyd. Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2005, p. 53.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 145.

¹² M. Sułek, *Globalny układ sił*, [w:] *Rocznik Strategiczny 2007/2008*, Wydawnictwo Scholar, Warszawa 2008, p. 334-352.

¹³ R. Aron, *Pokój i wojna między narodami*, Wydawnictwo Centrum Adama Smitha, Warszawa 1995, p. 74.

¹⁴ See: M. Sułek, *Podstawy potęgowości...*, op. cit., chapter IV.

¹⁵ See: J. S. Nye, *The Changing Nature of World Power*, "Political Science Quarterly" 1990, vol. 105, Issue 2 (Summer), p. 177-192; *Soft Power. Jak osiągnąć sukces w polityce światowej*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2007.

¹⁶ M. i H. Sprout, *Toward a Politics of the Planet Earth*, Publisher: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York 1971, p. 165-169.

its three pillars, two of which (mental and spiritual pillar and social and organizational one) are a non-material possessions of nation being the resources of the national state. He distinguishes: non-material power and material power¹⁷.

In the subject literature we observe some skepticism regarding possibility of quantifying and measuring power. Nonetheless it is worth to measure it, because "as we understand the real balance of power in the world, [...] we will avoid the necessity of taking up pointless activities"¹⁸. According to Ryszard Zięba one of the purposes of state's foreign policy is increase of its both position and prestige. This purpose expresses coexistential interests of state resulting from the following needs: significance and place among other nations; to participate in the international system; to reaffirm sovereignty, to compete; to cooperate and to increase its role.

Increase of power and higher position of state together concur to strengthen its security and force. Position is closely associated with state's prestige, which is evaluated subjectively¹⁹. Hence the purpose of state's foreign policy is an increase of power and thereby also of the international position and prestige.

Unfortunately we must agree with Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Thompson ascertaining that the value of power, which would define moderately precisely the position of state, still could not have been measured. Hence it should be noted that taking quality factors into account is on one hand problematic, but on the other it is very needed. Problematic – for they are determined on a not entirely objective basis, which is confirmed by S. Celine introducing a variable that was supposed to define the motivation factor. And although they turned out to be important (since when trying to rank states only basing on the quantitative criterion, the results did not objectively reflected the reality) they unfortunately remained doubtful and hard to put in a quantitative framework²⁰.

Taking motivation or strategy into account in mathematical models is not an easy task and these doubts gave rise to the thesis that measuring power "is more of an art than a science" (D. S. Papp)²¹. On the other hand basing solely on quantitative factors, which are less controversial, has also some inadequacies.

There were also attempts to find one factor of quantitative character, which to the greatest extent determines the position of state. A method that followed this idea was based on creating developed indexes of states' potentials and then summing them. Attention should be drawn to the list of attributes of individual state systems created by R. Rummel²², or to power index by O. Morgenstern, K. Knorr and K. Heiss, which contains the web of associated factors.

The power and the position of a state can be scientifically considered and classified in both a synthetic manner and a sectorial conceptualization. Synthetic state's power defines general, overall power and position of state – the one we observe

¹⁷ H. Morgenthau, K. Thompson, *Politics Among Nations...*, op. cit., p. 9 and fol.

¹⁸ E. Todd, *Schylek imperium. Rozważania o rozkładzie systemu amerykańskiego*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG, Warszawa 2003, p. 225.

¹⁹ J. Kukułka, *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, PWN, Warszawa 1982, p. 44.

²⁰ Z. J. Pietraś, *Międzynarodowa rola...*, op. cit., p. 32.

²¹ D. Milczarek, *Pozycja i rola UE w stosunkach międzynarodowych. Wybrane aspekty teoretyczne*, Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2003, p. 131.

²² R. Rummel, *International Pattern and National Profile Delineation*, [in:] D. Bobrow, J. Schwartz (red.) *Computers and the Policymaking Community. Application to International Relations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs 1968, p. 197-202.

outside. Sectorial powers are the components of the synthetic power, which are defined in individual branches. Many classifications of the power indicators were created. G. Fisher divided power indicators into: psychological, political, and economical.

R. Aron on the other hand into: state's political space, available knowledge and materials determining good arming, amount of people required to serve in the army, and ability to take up collective activities. J. G. Stoessinger enumerates measurable factors: population, regime, geography; and hardly measurable ones: nation's morale or ideology²³.

On the Polish ground, conducting similar researches on the question of power, I. Wycichowska highlighted following attributes: economical potential, military potential; natural and human resources, and possibilities to influence international environment²⁴. S. Bieleń mainly indicates factors that can be unambiguously measured, e.g.: GDP; amount of people; army size etc.²⁵ M. Sułek enumerates following factors: demographical and spatial; economical; military²⁶.

The genre of typology proposed by Sułek, in author's opinion, best allows to avoid, conducting a scientific analysis, a danger of emergence of a non-scientific factor, i.e. subjectivism. Moreover such an analysis can be authenticated due to presenting adequate numerical values. Hence there are three pure forms of power of one-dimensional profile: economical; military; demographical and spatial. Apart from the pure forms, indicated can be also forms of power resulting from combination of the three forms, which give powers of a mixed character.

For measuring power mainly used are mathematical models, which are constructed to understand better the surrounding reality. Regardless of the criticism of the mathematical models applied to measure state's powers, it should be noted that their advantage is the comparability of the results obtained.

6 CONCLUSION

1. Multidimensional power implies the state's position as a power or a superpower and it is considered as the most stable in opposite to the one-dimensional one.
2. Basing on the above considerations author proposes, for the purposes of the security studies, to name the capacious sociological conception of *culture of security and defense* by Marian Cieślarczyk alternatively the *culture of security and power of security subject*.

²³ See: M. Sułek, *Podstawy potęgonomii i potęgonometrii*, WSEiA, Kielce 2001 oraz M. Sułek, *Metody i techniki badań...*, op.cit.; M. Sułek, *Parametry potęgi (siły) państw – stałe czy zmienne?*, [in:] *Państwo w teorii i praktyce stosunków międzynarodowych*, (red.), M. Sułek, J. Symonides, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2009.

²⁴ I. Wycichowska, *Ewolucja mocarstwowości w stosunkach międzynarodowych oraz L. Kasprzyk, Ekonomiczne aspekty mocarstwowości*, [in:] B. Mrozek, S. Bieleń (ed.), *Nowe role mocarstw*, Wyd. Książkowe "Linia", Warszawa 1996.

²⁵ S. Bieleń, *Podmiotowy aspekt równowagi międzynarodowej*, [w:] *Stosunki międzynarodowe i polityka. Wyzwania końca stulecia. Księga Jubileuszowa na 65-lecie Profesora Bogusława Mrozka*, ELIPSA, Warszawa 1995, s. 27. p. 27.

²⁶ Cf. M. Sułek, *Podstawy potęgonomii...*, op. cit., p. 35-37 i 87-97.

3. Identity of a scientific discipline until now was based on fulfilling conditions of absoluteness and separateness²⁷. There are causes however, for which the new branch of science, i.e. security studies, requires a serious consideration, for as S. Zalewski notices, new tendencies emerged and are continuously strengthened, which concern a scientific approach to the question of security, e.g. institutional development of researches on this question conducted in institutions created strictly for this purpose. These are e.g. National Security Bureau of the Republic of Poland, Risk Studies Committee of Polish Academy of Sciences, European Association for Security, Cracow Research Institute for Security and Defense Skills APEIRON, and finally – Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, which is popularly called the Copenhagen School.
4. Copenhagen School and researchers at the head of it, e.g. Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde met the growing interest of scientists and politicians in the manner of functioning of the phenomenon of security within the global policy, which charts e.g. directions of changes of individual states' national security. Their approach was groundbreaking as it was announced, and now still remains topical and inspires researchers. Sectorial dimensions of security seems to describe the current international situation on the global political stage best, and this perspective was also used in the present paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] ARON, R.: *Pokój i wojna między narodami*, Wydawnictwo Centrum Adama Smitha, Warszawa 1995.
- [2] BALCEROWICZ, B.: *Siły zbrojne w państwie i stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Wydawnictwo Scholar, Warszawa 2006.
- [3] BENNETT, J. G.: *A Spiritual Psychology*, Coombe Springs Press, Sherborne 1974.
- [4] BIELEŃ, S.: *Podmiotowy aspekt równowagi międzynarodowej*, [in:] *Stosunki międzynarodowe i polityka. Wyzwania końca stulecia. Księga Jubileuszowa na 65-lecie Profesora Bogusława Mrozka*, ELIPSA, Warszawa 1995.
- [5] CIEŚLARCZYK, M.: *Fenomen bezpieczeństwa i zjawisko kryzysów postrzegane w perspektywie kulturowej*, [in:] *Jedność i różnorodność*, E. Reklajtis, B. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (ed.), ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2010.
- [6] CIEŚLARCZYK, M.: *Kultura bezpieczeństwa i obronności*, Wyd. AP, Siedlce 2010.
- [7] CLINE, R. S.: *The Power of Nations in the 1990s: A Strategic Assesment*, Lanham 1994, p. 5.
- [8] GERMAN, F. C.: *A Tentative Evolution of World Power*, "Journal of Conflict Resolution", vol. 4, 1960.
- [9] KŁOSKOWSKA, A.: *Socjologia kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2007, p. 103 and fol.; A. Kroeber, *Istota kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2002.

²⁷ *Metodologia badań bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, [in:] *Bezpieczeństwo 2010*, vol. 2, ed. P. Sienkiewicz, M. Marszałek, H. Świeboda, AON, Warszawa 2011.

- [10] KUKUŁKA, J.: *Bezpieczeństwo a współpraca europejska: współzależności i sprzeczności interesów*, [in:] „Sprawy Międzynarodowe”, Warszawa 1982.
- [11] KUKUŁKA, J., *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, PWN, Warszawa 1982.
- [12] LESIE, G., LARSON, R., GRUMAN, B.: *Order and Change: Introductory Sociology*, Oxford University Press, New York – London – Toronto 1973.
- [13] NYE, J. S.: *The Changing Nature of World Power*, “Political Science Quarterly” 1990, vol. 105, Issue 2 (Summer), p. 177-192; *Soft Power. Jak osiągnąć sukces w polityce światowej*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2007.
- [14] PIWOWARSKI, J.: *Ochrona VIP-a a czworokąt Bushido. Studium japońskiej kultury bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] *Bezpieczeństwo osób podlegających ustawowo ochronie wobec zagrożeń XX wieku*, ed. P. Bogdalski, J. Cymerski, K. Jałoszyński, Szczytno 2014.
- [15] SCRUTON, R.: *Culture Counts: Faith and Feeling in a World Besieged*, New York 2007.
- [16] SPROUT, M. and H.: *Toward a Politics of the Planet Earth*, Publisher: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York 1971,
- [17] STOESSINGER, J. G.: *The Might of Nations. World Politics in Our Time*, Random House, New York 1962.
- [18] SUŁEK, M.: *Globalny układ sił*, [in:] *Rocznik Strategiczny 2007/2008*, Wydawnictwo Scholar, Warszawa 2008, p. 334-352.
- [19] SUŁEK, M.: *Parametry potęgi (siły) państw – stałe czy zmienne?*, [in:] *Państwo w teorii i praktyce stosunków międzynarodowych*, (red.), M. Sułek, J. Symonides, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2009.
- [20] SUŁEK, M.: *Podstawy potęgonomii i potęgonometrii*, WSEiA, Kielce 2001 oraz M. Sułek,
- [21] SUŁEK, M.: *Prognozowanie i symulacje międzynarodowe*, SCHOLAR, Warszawa 2010.
- [22] THORESEN, C. E., Harris A. H. S.: *Spirituality and Health: What's the Evidence and What's Needed?* [in:] “Society of Behavioral Medicine Pressę, Stanford University, Stanford M. Sokolik M. (ed.) *Wybrane zagadnienia duchowości. Perspektywa psychologiczna*, Wydawnictwo Mantis, Olsztyn 2006.
- [23] VIRMANI, A.: *Global Power from the 18th to 21st Century: Power Potential (VIP2), Strategic Assets & Actual Power (VIP)*, Working Paper No. 175, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, 2005, <http://www.icrier.org/pdf/WP175VIP8.pdf> (access: 14.04.2008), p. 7.
- [24] WYCIECHOWSKA, I.: *Ewolucja mocarstwowości w stosunkach międzynarodowych oraz L. Kasprzyk, Ekonomiczne aspekty mocarstwowości*, [in:] B. Mrozek, S. Bieleń (ed.), *Nowe role mocarstw*, Wyd. Książkowe "Linia", Warszawa 1996.

Článok recenzovali dvaja nezávislí recenzenti.