

UDC 327

M. Horemuz, PhD., ass. prof., Catholic Univ., Department of Political Science, Ruzomberok, Slovak Republic

CHANGES IN THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY AND THEIR IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

М. Хоремуз. Зміни в концепції безпеки та їх вплив на міжнародні відносини. Закінчення холодної війни і біполярного протистояння означає фундаментальну зміну характеру світової політичної системи. Паралельно з розпадом СРСР йшло формування нової політики, влади і особливо безпеки в системі міжнародних відносин. Ця нова конфігурація відразу призвела до змін у концепції безпеки, в першу чергу, з точки зору їх змісту. Нові загрози безпеці відбивались в реакції держави у вигляді адаптованої політики безпеки. У системі міжнародних відносин, у регіональних і глобальних організаціях доходить до "створення" нового зміненого порядку денного. Нове середовище безпеки у міжнародних відносинах створює різні неясні ситуації, які вимагають адекватних ресурсів і реагування.

Ключові слова: міжнародні відносини, глобальна безпека, безпека довкілля, політика безпеки, загрози та ризики безпеки.

М. Хоремуз. Изменения в концепции безопасности и их влияние на международные отношения. Окончание холодной войны и биполярного противостояния означает фундаментальное изменение характера мировой политической системы. Параллельно с распадом СССР шло формирование новой политики, власти и особенно безопасности в системе международных отношений. Эта новая конфигурация сразу привела к изменениям в концепции безопасности, в первую очередь, с точки зрения их содержания. Новые угрозы безопасности отражались в реакции государства в виде адаптации политики безопасности. В системе международных отношений, в региональных и глобальных организациях доходит до "создания" новой измененной повестки дня. Новая среда безопасности в международных отношениях создаёт различные неясные ситуации, которые требуют адекватных ресурсов и реагирования.

Ключевые слова: международные отношения, глобальная безопасность, безопасность окружающей среды, политика безопасности, угрозы и риски безопасности.

M. Horemuz. Changes in the Concept of Security and their Impact on International Relations. Ending of the Cold War and the bipolar confrontation meant a fundamental change in the nature of the world political system. In parallel with the dissolution of the USSR the formation of the new policy, power and especially the security configuration in the system of international relations war under way. This new configuration led to immediate changes in the concept of security primarily in terms of their content. New security threats and risks appeared which were reflected in the reactions of states in the form of adapted security policies. In the system of international relations, in regional and global organizations it comes to the "creation" of new (changed) agenda. New security environment in international relations produces a variety of vague situations that require adequate resources and response.

Keywords: International relations, Global security, environmental safety, Security policy, Security threats and risks

Introduction. Considerations regarding security and the resulting practical steps and negotiations are an integral part of human existence since its inception. These deliberations always correspond to the technological and material level of knowledge. The issue of security in the field of international relations is currently the subject of relatively intense research and empirical-analytical data, publications and studies. There is no country in the world, which would neither pay attention to nor reflect on such crucial questions as the security of its territory, population, government and constitutional policy in its state-political (security) plan. Although attitude of the states, mostly representatives in the field of security studies that are still considered as decisive players in international relations, remains strongly differentiated depending on different variables. These variables have the characteristics of political, economic, military, religious and socio-cultural factors but the primary aim is as in the past

the preservation of the physical existence of the state (population), its territorial integrity and independence (constitutional establishment) [1].

The nineteen nineties were the key period for the area of security policy and its development and in a broader sense for the evolution of international relations. It was a period of fundamental and dramatic changes in the political and security map of the world, but primarily in the perception and interpretation of security, security threats and risks, the creating and shaping of the security policy of individual states, international and regional organizations and groupings [2].

In the connection of analyzing and investigating security it is necessary to say that the previous system and mechanisms of international security started to show in a more intricately structured way and in a globalized environment not always efficient and not always flexible to new stimuli. Moreover, after 1990 regional instability of some areas began to grow at a faster rate, which had an impact on national security of specific states, which in turn closely correlated with regional and international (global) security [3]. Within the environment of international relations and security the process of globalization played a significant role, on the one hand this began to “disrupt” traditional national sovereignty in an increasingly intensive manner, but also caused a quantitative (qualitative) increase in the number of subjects of international relations, as well as their interactions and the direct and indirect relationships.

Structural Assumptions of Security in International Relations. In the development of theoretical views on security in the late 20th century two concepts of security, perspectives and approaches to it were formed. These two approaches are referred to as the traditional and the new understanding of security appear within the theory of international relations. According to F. Škvrnda, the traditional understanding of security presents a closer look at its concept and sometimes is marked as “negative” because security is defined as being in contrast to danger, especially at the absence of external threats. The main attribute of this view of security is the focus on the state, which is seen fundamentally as a security subject. The new (modern) understanding of security presents a broader view, which is also referred to as “positive” because the security is defined as security itself. Security is characterized as a multifaceted and comprehensive process that builds on a narrower understanding. The new concept of security is still in a period of formulation although the open question in it remains the issue of global security, security in a globalizing world [4].

The current approach to the issue of security is accompanied by significant changes to the traditional interpretation in two ways, its immediate content, as well as the broadening and deepening of security in the vertical and horizontal dimensions. These changes are reflected not only in the political and military agenda of individual states, but also affect the broader international and regional context. The most significant transformation in the security environment is demonstrated in the move away from the traditionally preferred principle of national security and its gradual reshaping to the concept of regional and international (global) security. The shaping of global security and the question of its future form constantly encounters problems with comprehension regarding national interests, relationships and the placement of individual subjects of increasingly more complicated and often undecipherable international processes, whose number still grows [5]. Through this process the whole system assumes attributes of a complex system, and therefore it is essential to examine and investigate it. Naturally all of these dynamically ongoing changes give rise to the necessity of a comprehensive analysis of the security problem, both for individual states and for the entire international (global) community. The complexity and integrity of the security issues are corresponding; or rather they are an inevitable result of the parallel political, security, economic and socio-cultural processes in international relations that exhibit a high degree of dynamism and mutual interdependence. If the scope, depth and structuring of security are considered, it can be concluded that security analysts are considering more complicated situations in theoretical and methodological assessment of its various aspects and factors, not only in terms of their representation, but mainly because of relevance. Because security is a more complex concept there is a need to analyze it in the relational and multi-disciplinary perspectives. It is also due to the fact that nowadays security is “measured” not only within military guidelines but also within economic, social, environmental and cultural parameters. The widening of the range of the stu-

died socio-political phenomena in the new (forming) security environment of the postbipolar period has become an important element to such appraisals of the security reality [6].

Structural assumptions that are directly related and affect security issues in international relations currently undergo more complex developmental processes while their objective prognosis and evaluation is often difficult to grasp or notice even in the context of immediate scientific verification. Careful scientific and complex analysis of any particular reality requires in-depth knowledge of the existing social reality and its independent variables, including possible external indicators that affect the investigated social phenomenon, process and structure. On this basis, it may be presumed that the closer prognosis for security issues will be a decisive causality based on relationship between security and the future nature of international relations, where the main players continue to remain territorial states despite constant ongoing “erosion” [7]. Power and military strength will remain the key independent variable that is linked to a realistic (neo-realistic) security plan and that at least in its initial stages will in its final assessment of the state, acquire (power) more flexibility and variability. It is not possible to dismiss the fact that the future shape of international relations will affect the way the security-strategic aspect of world order will be organized — that means how will (organized) violence be controlled. In this respect, it is also possible to objectively believe that states will remain in future as the primary players in international relations that will have the legitimacy to use coercive measures in the form of violence, such as were defined by M. Weber, even in those cases when the legitimacy of the use of coercive powers shifts to the international (global) or regional institution to which this right is ultimately only derived from the national member states.

On the basis of the aforementioned facts over the last decade in security studies the adaptation became the priority research problem of institutions of the state security system (sector) to changed conditions after the end of a bipolar confrontation. In this regard discussions have begun regarding security sector reform, which should bring an increase in efficiency (internal and external) of state security on the one hand and the already discussed more consistent subordination of the security sector to legitimate political leadership and an increase in transparency to civil society on the other. At the same time, along the reform of the security sector, there has been an increase in the need to strengthen and improve the security community [8]. It is therefore understandable that the anchoring of security through institutional reform is not only an issue at the national level, but in parallel the process of formation (adaptation) of a new security system and sector at regional and global level will also take place. The process of supplying protection and national security as elemental political and territorial institutions in international relations will have a continuous and complex character in the future, and will be affected mainly by the level of its efficiency and ability to engage in the processes to form (reshape) a new (regional, global) security environment. Tendencies toward a shift of responsibility to upper organizational elements in connection to the continuing development of international cooperation and integration has an effect as well as insufficiently resolved issues identifying the dividing line between opposing categories such as national vs. supranational, particular vs. universal. The extent of this shift therefore will be mainly dependent on the final settlement of this dichotomous relationship.

Perspectives for Further Development of Security in the Context of Dynamically Changing Paradigms of International Relations. In the prevailing multidisciplinary approach in the field of international relations there is not any central issue of a single (universally valid) paradigm, which would have an all-embracing and timeless validity. The current form of international relations and security fully reflects the existing pluralism of paradigms as the theoretical and methodological approaches in international relations.

A new and complex analytical framework for the security agenda of the 21st century is a result not only of the new social reality, but also the very diversification of the security agenda. This is one of the historical paradoxes — the security theory is now being developed in accordance with the security agenda and includes not only the traditional military and political components, but also a new element of evaluation of other factors (economic, religious, ethnographic, environmental, etc.), which usually waited in the background, possibly having had only a complementary function and in its pre-

vious form had not played a decisive role. Liberal revision of security agenda currently comes from finding links between the needs of the state, different social groups and the individual. In the 21st century for the first time security at the level of the individual as one of the analytical levels of the security research is strongly articulated [9]. Just as the dimension of human individuality is brought into the theory of international relations, this new element in recent years has led to the necessity of analyzing and understanding international relations in new differentiated categories and semantic dimensions. This dimension of human individuality is the result of an accent on (acceptance of) human rights and their declaration as a fundamental universal principle on which contemporary international law is founded and promoted. The incorporation of human rights into the field of international relations and thus de facto into the security field, and their application as universal value on the other hand leads to marking the dividing lines between states and civilization and cultural regions (circles), which derive their value systems from different postulates based on historical traditions and beliefs, positions of power and so on. Human rights nevertheless become the instruments for reference and defending them becomes part of the security policy of democratic states and their security organizations [10].

Although in the present globalized world distinct tendencies towards polycentricity are evident, in world politics and international relations a non-classical multipolar world is formulated, which is in its inner nature a multi-level structure with prominent internal dynamics of development. Global political, security and economic issues requiring a multilateral solution and new international instruments and institutes are primarily highlighted in the multipolar world. Today in international relations as in the past a major role is still played by the military strength factor, since in the solution of the problems of international security little tendency toward diplomatic and institutional methods for solving global international problems has been demonstrated. The current reanimated realistic (ie neo-realistic) form of international relations does not envisage in this respect any significant structural transformation; therefore the combination of the above "counterpart" methods will remain unchanged. On the other hand, it is possible to anticipate the increasing role of economic factors, which will increasingly form direct or indirect coercion as an effective instrument for achieving the targeted objectives. The future international political agenda (including security) will therefore be by its scope and nature not only more complicated, but more and more complex, while by its own solution it will necessarily have to be reflective of and affected by individual aspects and the dimensions of this socio-political phenomena, especially in terms of their internal structuring. The questions in this regard remain. How will the existing system be able to manage this agenda? What will the impact of the agenda be in terms of the overall functionality of the international system?

Changes in security theory itself are noticeable in parallel with the development of theories and paradigms in international relations. The diversity and specificity of the security agenda means that in the field of theories and paradigms in international relations we meet with a new type of social reality that requires corresponding methods which are mainly systemic in nature when it is studied. In this regard the following question arises: To what extent is the accepted theory of international relations able to explain past changes and prepare us for future changes? In general it is a question of the ability of the theory to deal with temporality for in fact time passes and its passing means continuous change. To allow for temporality means that each theory of international relations creates a real challenge with which it can deal only partially and at a certain price. In the foundations of any theory there is a denial of temporality. Theories try to offer timeless schemes which would clearly allow users to organize the flow of events [11]. The character of the existing (objective) social reality and as accurate as possible and fitting knowledge of things remains in the future the subject of description.

A major problem of researching security in the future can become the reality that in accordance with the principle of a multidisciplinary approach any universal theory in social and political sciences, however it would be equipped with interpretative methods and instruments would not be in a position to provide a complete and comprehensive picture, (reflecting) a thorough representation of the social (political, economic, security) reality in its entirety without being subject to temporal considerations for all of its dimensions. Although prospects for further development of security in the area of interna-

tional relations must be analyzed not only in order to capture the growing diversity and multifaceted nature of political, economic, security, cultural, religious, and in the broader context the entire social reality, this could be used as a basis to develop procedures of compliance with those of different perspectives in assessing and solving current and future political and security problems.

Utilizing the above approach also responds to current scientific ideas about building a world in which the processes of continuous systemic self-organization take place. In the past fifty years despite the drastic changes that have affected the area of international relations and security (and not only these areas) we can assume that states remain those players in international relations which also in the future will be the institutional structures that will concentrate several components of power (military, political, economic, cultural) and at the same time will retain the monopoly for the legitimate (and legal) use of violence. A possible consequence of termination of the state monopoly of legitimate use of violence could mean potentially violent rivalry of non-state players who act at different levels - local, national and transnational. I. Hlaváč in connection with defining the concept of internal security points out that commercial entity whose activity is usually focused on the protection of property (buildings) and the individual have in recent years become new elements on the scene of internal security. Establishment of commercial security in the security system and the possible resignation of state in supplying of certain security activities (though only in the area of internal security) can bring dilemmas associated with the commercialization of security in general and that also will overlap into the area of external security — the international one [12].

Also for this reason a certain amount of “*privatization*” of security cannot be completely ruled out in the future [13]. Privatization of the security in this way will mean not only a fundamental competence shift of focus from “state” to non-state players but also will lead to the transfer of responsibility and willingness to pay for security costs. The human factor in this respect undoubtedly remains crucial and the most important one, in the absence of which it is not possible to examine any political and security reality. Basically the technologies are the result of human knowledge. In this context one should not overlook the inner essence of the human as an individual (his/her thinking, action), which is essentially constant, for as in the past also in the future this essence will reflect the power aspects, or rather attempts to name and solve existing problems and relations especially through a power scheme and formula, as it is typical for realistic (neo-realistic) theory of international relations.

In this context, P. Barša and O. Císař believe that the reanimated realistic form of security theories also means that national interests in the future will begin to involve themselves more in universal interests than before. International relations will be more often subordinated to unilateral procedures and individual states will defend their interests especially through these unilateral procedures. Through multipolarity coming to the fore throughout the world a number of factors and categories emphasize realism — egoism of national interests, a constant concern for security, the weakness of international institutions, finding of advantages, the use of power and threats - but with such important differences that within the bounds of the security community the use of force and military balance would play only an indirect role [14].

Conclusions. Even though making prognoses of any development is always limited by a great number of equivocality factors and their future internal structure and mutual configuration cannot be predicted with precision, it is in the present possible to describe some concrete ongoing trends [15]. On the international scale, we are witnesses of abrupt changes of security environment which becomes more and more unstable, unpredictable and ephemeral and which creates directly proportional causal relation with the transformation of security risks and sources of threat. For that reason, the result of these qualitative and quantitative changes in the area of security is the growing importance of asymmetrical threats and risks which are more numerous, diversified, having different impact and intensity. It has become evident that the complexity of the international system based on heterogeneity and growth of equivocality factors will in future require greater adaptability and flexibility in the responses of all actors of the international system. In spite of the more flexible analytical framework in which the concept of security, as well as the system of international relations itself, occurs, the positive influence

on new security threats and risks will be more complicated and challenging. That is mostly because of the quantitative growth of non-state actors and their role in the process of creation of public agenda and supporting the interests.

References

1. Hofreiter, L. Bezpečnosť, Bezpečnostné riziká a ohrozenia [Security, Security Risks and Threats]: Monograph / L. Hofreiter. — Žilina: EDIS, 2004. — 146 p.
2. Eichler, J. Mezinárodní bezpečnost na počátku 21. století [International Security at the Beginning of 21st Century]: Monograph / J. Eichler. — Praha : AVIS, 2006. — 303 p.
3. Baldwin, D.A. The concept of security / D.A. Baldwin // Review of International Studies. — Cambridge: British International Studies Association, 1997. — Vol. 23. — pp. 5 — 26.
4. Škvrdna, F.K sociologickým aspektem chápania medzinárodnej bezpečnosti [The sociological aspect of the understanding of international security] / Š. Waisová et al. // Bezpečnost a strategie. Východiská — Stav — Perspektivy. — Pelhřimov: Aleš Čenek, 2003. — pp. 23 — 40.
5. Eichler, J. Příspěvek do diskuze o pojmech hrozba a riziko. [Contribution to the debate on the terms threat and risk] / J. Eichler // Mezinárodní vztahy. — Prague: Institute of International Relations, 2001. — Vol. 3 (36). — pp. 72 — 82.
6. Buzan, B. Security: A New Framework for Analysis / B. Buzan, O. Waever, J. De Wilde. — Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1998. — 239 p.
7. Eichler, J. Mezinárodní bezpečnost v době globalizace. [International Security in the Age of Globalization]: Monograph / J. Eichler. — Praha: Portál, 2009. — 328 p.
8. Ušiak, J. Theoretical Definition of Security from the Perspective of Non-military Aspects. / P. Terem, Š. Volner, L. Rýsová, P. Čajka, M. Bolečeková, J. Ušiak (eds.) // Research of non-military aspects of security. — Banská Bystrica: Matej Bel University, 2011. — pp. 8 — 33.
9. Lasicová, J. Globálny a regionálny aspekt bezpečnostných sektorov [Extending the Concept of Internal Security] / J. Lasicová, J. Ušiak, M. Dobřík // Formovanie nového strategického postavenia SR. — Banská Bystrica: Matej Bel University, 2008. — pp. 107 — 118.
10. Frank, L. Bezpečnostní politika [Security Policy] / L. Frank, P. Zeman (ed.) // Česká bezpečnostní terminologie. Výklad základních pojmů. — Brno: Mezinárodní politologický ústav Masarykovy univerzity, Ústav strategických studií Vojenské akademie v Brně, 2002. — pp. 9 — 16.
11. Drulák, P. Teorie mezinárodních vztahů [Theory of International Relations]: Monograph / P. Drulák. — Praha: Portál, 2003. — 224 p.
12. Hlaváč, I. Rozšíření konceptu vnitřní bezpečnosti [Extending the Concept of Internal Security] / I. Hlaváč, M. Balaban, et al. (eds.): Proměny konceptu vnitřní bezpečnosti. — Praha: Karolinum, 2006. — pp. 35 — 50.
13. Bureš, O. Privatizace operací na udržení míru [The Privatization of Peacekeeping] / O. Bureš // Mezinárodní vztahy. — Vol. 2. (41). — Prague: Institute of International Relations, 2006. — pp. 143 — 157.
14. Barša, P. Anarchie a řád ve světové politice. Kapitoly z teorie mezinárodních vztahů. [Anarchy and Order in World Politics. Chapters in the theory of international relations]: Monograph / P. Barša, O. Císař. — Praha: Portál, 2008. — 560 p.
15. Hofreiter, L. Možnosti predikcie vývoja v bezpečnostnom prostredí [Possibilities to Predict Developments in the Security Environment] / J. Ušiak, J. Lasicová, D. Kollár // Security Forum 2012: International Scientific Conference. — Banská Bystrica: Matej Bel University, 2012. — pp. 9 — 16.

Reviewer Dr. techn. sciences, Prof. of Odesa nat. polytechnic univ. Gogunsky V.D.

Received April 21, 2013