

355.45:303.023.23-021.288 Review

TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTS OF SECURITY

ТРАДИЦИОНАЛНИТЕ И СОВРЕМЕНИТЕ КОНЦЕПТИ

НА БЕЗБЕДНОСТА

Gojko Pavlovic, MA, Internal Affairs College Banja Luka, Republika Srpska

[gojko.pavlovic@education.muprs.org](mailto:gojko.pavlovic@education.muprs.org)

Marjan Djurovski, MA, Faculty of Security Skopje, Macedonia

[mjurovski@fb.uklo.edu.mk](mailto:mjurovski@fb.uklo.edu.mk)

**Abstract:** In this paper authors try to point out to that fact that the changes that have happened on the international scene after the Cold War caused the changes of ideas, especially of the concept of security in general. That is why it is said that traditional concepts of security are not any more able to explain or handle the complex nature, aetiology and phenomenology, of contemporary security challenges, risks and threats. The paper will first present traditional concepts of security, and then it will introduce certain points according to which the security is being defined in contemporary conceptual sense, and in the end it will explain contemporary concepts of security.

**Key words:** security, traditional and contemporary concepts

**Апстракт:** Во овој труд, авторите се обидуваат да го истакнат фактот дека промените кои се случија на меѓународната сцена по Студената војна предизвикаа промени во идеите, особено во генералниот концепт на безбедноста. Од таа причина се вели дека традиционалните концепти на безбедноста веќе не можат да ја објаснат и да се справат со комплексната природа, етиологија и феномен на современите безбедносни предизвици, ризици и закани. Оваа книга прво ќе ги презентира традиционалните концепти на безбедноста и потоа ќе воведи и одредени поенти во согласност со кои се дефинира безбедноста во современа смисла, за на крајот да ги објасни современите концепти на безбедноста.

**Клучни зборови:** безбедност, традиционални и современи концепти

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Security, as a condition for survival and activity of the individual, society, state and international community, is one of the fundamental social functions, the fact being evidenced by the

continuous preoccupation with achieving security throughout the history of mankind. However, a multi-dimensional and complex notion, such as security, has not

---

had the same meaning throughout history, meaning that defining security and its content in traditional and contemporary concepts quite differs (Tatalovic, 2006: 64). Therefore, bearing in mind that security is a dynamic phenomenon, the concepts of referent values to be protected, imposed threats, compromised subjects and the ways and means of protection, have also been changed (Mijalkovic, 2009a: 65).

For this reason, the introduction of the term "security concept" stresses that the security is an open and dynamic system where concept, that is, idea of security stands for a long-term process and, in terms of needs and values, a desired environment, something that is yet to be (Kekovic, 2009: 144).

Security concepts<sup>29</sup>, in fact, represent the theoretical and practical ways of protection, and improvement of specific reference values and interests of certain categories of security subjects, which were established on the basis of relevant security practices, primarily with a view of its improvement. As a matter of fact, the concepts of security are products, but also a mean, of security theory and practice (Mijalkovic, 2009a: 65-66).

### **TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS OF SECURITY**

The idea of security originated in the heart of European political thought of the seventeenth century. It is an idea whose political significance, as well as the meaning of the very word, has changed continuously throughout history, mostly implying the state and the goal of an individuals, groups and countries. Thus, the most consistent sense of security, in this period, was that it represented a state or a goal which created a special relationship between individuals and the state (Rothschild, 1995: 60-61).

The concept that the state is seen as a main provider of security (Bailes, 2007: 1) can be traced back from Hobbes' concept of the legitimate government, which was created by the consent of the people through the social contract, up to Weber's idea of the state monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force. Together, these attitudes represent the basic philosophical pillar of state's role in creating and maintaining a monopoly over the means of force. Namely, since the Peace Treaty of Westphalia (Schreier&Caparini, 2005: 1), signed 1648, it has been adopted the idea that the state is the one that must ensure and provide security to its citizens. The two main principles having arisen from this treaty are the sovereignty and equality of the nations. The state, therefore, has taken a monopoly over the use of force in order to secure its citizens and to ensure its sovereignty against internal and external threats (Pavlovic, 2011a: 5).

<sup>29</sup> For more on the analysis of the notion, scope and contents of security see: Baldwin, David, "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies*, No 23, British International Studies Association, 1997, pp. 5–26.

---

Thus, Thomas Hobbes, known as "a theoretician of security and order" (Milosavljevic, 2011: 57), states in his *Leviathan* that the purpose of the state is the individual security. "I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition; that thou give up, thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner. This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a commonwealth; in Latin, *civitas*. This is the generation of that great leviathan, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that mortal god to which we owe, under the immortal God, our peace and defense. For by this authority, given him by every particular man in the Commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him that, by terror thereof, he is enabled to form the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad." (Hobbes, 1885 - according to Bosnjak and others, 1954: 194- 195).

Furthermore, the term security gained a new public prominence in the early, liberal period of the French Revolution. Natural rights of man consisted of liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression<sup>30</sup>. Thus, security is still the state of the individual, but now their natural right. Also, the security, as one of the fundamental natural and imprescriptible rights of man, was pointed out to in the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1793 (Stojanovic, 1989: 26-27).

<sup>31</sup>

Article 2 of the Declaration states that the aim of society is the common welfare. Government is instituted in order to guarantee to man the enjoyment of his natural and imprescriptible rights which are equality, liberty, security, and property. Article 8 of this Declaration emphasizes that security consists in the protection afforded by society to each of its members for the preservation of his person, his rights, and his property (Pavlovic, 2011b: 296-296). Thus, security is conceived in terms of liberty from personal jeopardy, which should be provided by the civil society. It means that the individual, i.e. personal safety, in the spirit of the liberal thought of the Age of Enlightenment, represents a personal and collective good. It is

a state and a goal of an individual, which can be achieved only in a kind of collective endeavor (Rothschild, 1995: 62-63).

Later on, the security of an individual was considered as a political epigram, as a security of the nation. Thus Rousseau, like Locke and Montesquieu, described the social

---

<sup>30</sup> Article 2 of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, French National Assembly from 26. 08. 1789. (Fr: La Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du citoyen).

<sup>31</sup> The Constitution from June 24th 1793 or so-called Second Declaration. Namely, after the monarchy was abolished in France, the Convention drafted a new Constitution known as The Montagnard Constitution whose introductory part consisted of the special declaration of rights so-called Declaration Jacobine. This Jacobin declaration kept the basic positions of the 1789 Declaration, but also introduced substantial amendments, so that number of articles increased from 17 to 35.

---

contract as a result of the desire of individuals for security of life and liberty, and pointed out that it represents the main problem which the institutions of the state should provide the solution to (Rousseau, 1964: 290). In Jeremy Bentham's opinion, the security is seen as a condition for the general welfare, the fundamental social objective, a political joy consisting of survival, abundance, equality, and security, of which the most important is security (Bentham, 1837: 302 - according to: Burke, 2002: 12).

According to the above mentioned, in the scientific analysis of those disciplines where security was a major area of research, the issue of security was, for very long time, related to the state. The traditional definitions of security started from the observation of the military power of the state and the general order of those states, and were based on three basic assumptions: the belief that the state is responsible for the security; security policy was directed toward the preservation of the existing situation; military threats required efficient and effective military defense which was the primary interest (Tatalovic, 2004: 50 – in: Vignjevic, 2004: 45–55). The fact that the sovereign state was an exclusive object, but also the subject of safety and security, contributed to the relative stability and predictability of international relations, thus making a sovereign state a major part of the international system whose foundations were laid, and that has essentially stayed unchanged, from the Peace of Westphalia until our days (Simic, 2002: 22). In the period of the bipolar international system, according to the most researchers, the security was seen and defined as “objective state and subjective feeling or conviction”

---

(Dimitrijevic, 1973: 43), so that one was able to talk about security only when "there were no threats imposed to specific default values" (Wolfers, 1952: 485).

It can be confidently claimed that not only the object of the security that was clearly recognizable, but also the nature of the threats, as well as the subject which took care that, by certain procedures, ways and means, it eliminated threats and provided a desirable state of default values, as well as a sense of serenity. Therefore, since the establishment of the international system of states, and throughout the period of bipolarism, the security was almost exclusively observed in military terms, while the main object and the subject of the security idea and system was a sovereign state. Thus, only through increasing its own military power or accessing to relevant associations, the states sought to completely exclude or reduce, as much as possible, the possibility to be defeated in an armed conflict (Simic, 2002: 23). Concerning the above stated, one can note two traditional concepts of security (Mijalkovic, 2009a: 61):

---

a) the concept of national security – the one of the state-centered character where the central place is occupied by traditional vital state values which are taken care of by the state through its security system, and

b) the concept of international security - the one of the international character where the values of the international community and security of the international regions are promoted and which are taken care of by the states through their international relations, cooperation or through certain international organizations. The traditional concepts of international security are: balance of power, collective security and world government (See more: Bajagic, 2007: 39-51).

Therefore, it can be concluded that, in traditional terms, security was observed in the spirit of the orthodox concept of the national security, as well as the traditional concept of the international security, which was based on the principles of state-centered security (Mijalkovic&Keserovic, 2010: 62) and that the basic assumption of the traditional concept of security was that the state was secure only when it would achieve a balance between military threats and its own military capabilities to react to them (Simic, 2002: 24).

### **MODERN CONCEPTS OF SECURITY**

At the end of the last century Barry Buzan expressed the view that the traditional concept of security through studying force (realist school, security is the goal) and peace (liberal, idealistic school, security is a consequence) is not the most appropriate for the understanding that notion, and that such an approach does not provide a clear definition of

security. Specifically, B. Buzan said that security should be considered in more comprehensive manner, that is, more openly had it had been observed up to that point, or members of the previous frame of observation, and that a clear difference should be made between concept of security and concept of national security (Buzan, 1991: 24).

Specifically, the end of the Cold War and the collapse of bipolarism affected the manner in which the concept of security was observed, and especially meaningful discussions were led about the nature and the meaning of security. One group of authors insisted on expanding the concept of security through the inclusion of new, broader potential security threats, primarily economic development, environmental degradation, human rights violations and large migratory movements. Another group of authors, starting from the broader dimensions of security, insists on expanding the agenda of security studies by including into researches a number of security segments such as individual or human security, national security or security of the society, as well as regional, international and global aspects of security issue. On the other hand, the third group of authors stuck to the traditional state-centered approach to security issue inserting into it new forms of

---

security (common security, collective security, cooperative security, etc) thus creating new theoretical models of multilateral interstate security relations, which could lead to clarification of the security issue in interstate relations (Tatalovic, 2004: 47).

Furthermore, the end of the twentieth century was marked by global changes that have contributed to the activation of the process of transferring traditional powers entitled only to the state to the private sector. Nowadays it has been increasingly spoken and written about the privatization of security as a phenomenon that is widespread and accepted more than it has been in any previous period in the history of the modern national state (Small, 2006: 4). Today we are witnessing the fact that various companies, individuals, international organizations, NGOs and even the government itself use the services and trust the private sector and let it take care of their security (Pavlovic, 2011a: 6).

So, after nearly four hundred years, the state and its institutions are not the only entities that take care of the internal and external security of its citizens (Petrovic, 2007:

13). Westphalia system of nation-states, as the undisputed pillar of the international order, has been replaced by a much more complex reality that put back to the scene the privatization of the war and conflict (Schreier&Caparini, 2005: 1), and a sector, a private one, operating on a commercial basis, appeared in a security system. The theory states that this new model of providing military and security services enables governments and public institutions to increase their efficiency by concentrating on the most important tasks, while responsibility for less important tasks is transferred to the private security sector (Richards&Smith, 2007: 3-5).

Therefore, today, apart from the state, there are many other subjects that are significant for the security, such as individuals, social and private groups, non-governmental organizations,

---

international organizations, etc, and they all can act on the national, but also on the international scene (Mijalkovic, 2009a: 79).

The changes after the Cold War<sup>32</sup> were those that largely motivated scholars of security studies to significantly broaden the concept of security from the traditional, statecentered, one towards a new, global or transnational focus. Security is now seen and understood as a complex issue that is necessarily related to the influence of man to the changes in the global environment, as well as to the influence of global change to man's behavior (see more: Rothschild, 1992 and Grizold: 1992).

As it was said by D. Simic, "it is the act of introducing of the individual, as an independent entity of global relations, that represents a "tectonic line", a differentia specifica of the new global security order in statu nascendi against all present and previous organizational principles and forms of national and international security" (Simic, 2002: 17).

---

<sup>32</sup> Primarily, here is referred to the disintegration of the political environment and the process of globalization and interdependence which is expanding rapidly.

---

Therefore, the broadening of the security research field certainly implies broadening of the content of the security notion in all directions beyond the particular nation-state, i.e.: upwards - towards international institutions, downwards - towards regional or local governments and sideward (left and right) – towards non-governmental organizations, public opinion and the media, and the abstract forces of nature or the marketplace (Basic&Stoett, 2003: 152).

When defining security in contemporary conceptual sense the main disputes stem from a question on the values that should be protected nowadays (physical and material security, political independence, territorial integrity, international peace, and similar), as well as from the effort to define the basic entity that is the subject of protection (citizen - the individual, state, international community, social security, economic system, the environment, etc.) (Dragisic, 2009: 163).

Essentially all these questions can be brought down to a couple of the following: (Mijalkovic, 2009b: 56-57):

- a) security for whom? - first of all, it is necessary to identify the center of security construction, and the role of so-called "referent object" or "referent subject" of protection can be given to the individual, social groups, the state and the international system (Baldwin, 1997: 13);
- b) security for which values? – it is necessary to identify the values and interests that are the

subject of protection or the object of jeopardy (Baldwin, 1997: 13-14);

c) security from whom/ what threats? – it involves the identification of the sources, subjects and forms of compromising protected values which may be natural, human or technological in their nature (see more: Vejnovic&Sikman, 2007);

d) who provides security? - it is necessary to identify the entities that protect the mentioned values (see more: Rakic&Vejnovic, 2006) and

e) the manner of providing security? - it is necessary to identify the methods, means and activities that will be deployed to protect specific, vulnerable values (Baldwin, 1997: 16).

Based on the above mentioned, various concepts or notions of security are being created, according to which the security in the contemporary conceptual sense is defined as (Mitrovic&Pavlovic, 2012: 20):

a) the security of man - the individual, people and society (see more: Bajagic, 2007);

b) the security of the state, or national security (see more: Mijalkovic, 2009a);

---

c) international security (see more: Pendarovski, 2009) - modern concepts: security of the community, security regime, security complex and cooperation in security (Simic, 2007: 165-193);

d) the global security (Gacinovic, 2007: 3-23).

Therefore, the breakdown of the bipolar security structure has caused significant changes of "Cold- War" security factors. The circle of non-state subjects that have an impact on the security has significantly expanded at the expense of reducing the role of the state.

At the same time, there has been a change in the security sources and threats. Also, the number of objects occupying the security focus has been significantly expanded, as well as the manner, means and instruments for achieving security. The subjects of security concerns, in addition to national security, are now the security of individuals, common security, as well as international and global security (Vejnovic&Obrenovic, 2012: 66).

### CONCLUSION

Instead of a conclusion, here we provide a comparative overview of those elements that are included in the traditional concepts of security, i.e. national and international security, and contemporary concepts of security, i.e. security of people, countries, international security, and global security.

Thus, making a comparison of the contents of traditional and contemporary concepts of security it can be observed that (Mijalkovic, 2009a: 66):

- the focus of traditional concepts - or so-called state-centered security, consists of: state's territory and boundaries, external security of the state, military factor of the

security, human factor, East-West relations, the willingness of the state to act, and the central role of the state in the security;

- the focus of modern concepts consists of - individuals and community, internal security of the state and transnational security, multidimensional security factors, natural and environmental factors, global security, preventive and revitalized role of the state, and the presence of non-state or private security entities.

It is obvious that the old, "Cold –War", theoretical concepts and practical models of security are obsolete, and that the remodeling of the up-to-present ideas and practices of security in the new socio-political relations and a variety of risks that are difficult to identify, has become an imperative for the present and the future (Vejnovic&Obrenovic, 2012: 66).

---

### LITERATURE:

1. Bailes, Alyson, „The Private Sector and the Monopoly of Force“. In: Bailes, Alyson, Schneckener, Ulrich, Wulf, Herbert (Ed.), *Revisiting the State Monopoly on the Legitimate Use of Force*, Policy Paper – №24, DCAF, Geneva, 2007, p. 1–9.
2. Baldwin, David, „The Concept of Security“, *Review of International Studies*, No 23, British International Studies Association, 1997, p. 5–26.
3. Bentham, Jeremy, „The Principles of Civil Life“, in: Bowring, John (ed), *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, Vol. 1, Simpkin, Marshall, London, 1837.
4. Bosnjak, Branko and others, *Antologija filozofskih tekstova s pregledom povijesti filozofije*, Zagreb, 1954.
5. Burke, Anthony, „Aporias of security“, *Alternatives*, Vol. 27, Issue 1, 2002, p. 1–27.
6. Buzan, Barry, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold World Era*, New York-London, 1991.
7. Bajagic, Mladen, *Osnovi bezbednosti*, Belgrade, 2007.
8. Basic, Nedžad, Stoett, Piter, *Sigurnosne studije u tranziciji*, Bihac, 2003.
9. Vejnovic, Dusko, Obrenovic, Predrag, *Defendoloski (zastitni, bezbjednosni i odbrambeni) izazovi u medjunarodnim odnosima sa pogledom na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, Banja Luka, 2012.
10. Vejnovic, Dusko, Sikman, Mile, *Defendologija*, Banja Luka, 2007.
11. Gacinović, Radoslav, „Klasifikacija bezbednosti“, *Nauka, Bezbednost, Policija*, No 2, 2007, p. 3–23.
12. Grizold, Anton, *Medjunarodna sigurnost: Teorijsko-institucionalni okvir*, Zagreb, 1992.
13. Dimitrijevic, Vojin, *Pojam bezbednosti u medjunarodnim odnosima*, Belgrade, 1973.
14. Dragisic, Zoran, „Sistem nacionalne bezbednosti – pokusaj definisanja pojma“, *Vojno delo*, No 3, 2009, p. 162–176.

15. Kekovic, Zoran, Teorija sistema bezbjednosti, Banja Luka, 2009.
  16. Mijalkovic, Sasa, „Nacionalna bezbednost – od vestfalskog koncepta do posthladnoratovskog“, Vojno delo, No 2, 2009b, p. 56–57.
  17. Mijalkovic, Sasa, Keserovic, Dragomir, Osnovi bezbjednosti, Banja Luka, 2010.
  18. Mijalkovic, Sasa, Nacionalna bezbednost, Belgrade, 2009a.
  19. Milosavljevic, Bogoljub, Uvod u teoriju ustavnog prava, Belgrade, 2011.
- 
20. Mitrovic, Ljubinko, Pavlovic, Gojko, Sistem bezbjednosti Bosne i Hercegovine – pravni aspekti i aktuelno stanje, Banja Luka, 2012.
  21. Pavlovic, Gojko, „Zastita ljudskih prava kao imperativ bezbednosne funkcije drzave“, Strani pravni život, No 3, 2011b, p. 284–299.
  22. Pavlovic, Gojko, Pravo privatne bezbjednosti – uporedna studija, Banja Luka, 2011a.
  23. Pendarovski, Stevo, Međunarodna bezbednost, Skopje, 2009.
  24. Petrovic, Predrag, „Privatizacija bezbednosti u Srbiji“, Bezbednost Zapadnog Balkana, No 4, 2007, p. 13–21.
  25. Richards, Anna, Smith, Henry, Addressing the role of private security companies within security sector reform programmes, Saferworld, London, 2007.
  26. Rothschild, Emma, „What is Security?“, Daedalus, Vol. 124, No. 3, Summer 1995, p. 53–98.
  27. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, “Du Contract Social”, in: Oeuvres Complètes, vol. III, Gallimard, Paris, 1964.
  28. Rakic, Mile, Vejnovic, Duško, Sistem bezbjednosti i društveno okruženje, Banja Luka, 2006.
  29. Schreier, Fred, Caparini, Marina, Privatising Security: Law, Practice And Governance Of Private Military And Security Companies, DCAF Occasional Paper No. 6, Geneva, 2005.
  30. Small, Michelle, Privatisation of Security and Military Functions and the Demise of the Modern Nation-State in Africa, Accord, Occasional Paper Series: Volume 1, Number 2, 2006.
  31. Simic, Dragan, „Savremene teorije bezbednosti“, U: Jankovic, P. (Ur.): Antologija tekstova sa Skola reforme sektora bezbednosti, Belgrade, 2007, p. 165–193.
  32. Simic, Dragan, Nauka o bezbednosti – savremeni pristupi bezbednosti, Belgrade, 2002.
  33. Stojanovic, Dragan, Osnovna prava coveka, Nis, 1989.
  34. Tatalovic, Sinisa, „Koncepti sigurnosti na pocetku 21. stoljeca“, Medjunarodne studije, year 6, No 1, 2006, p. 60–80.
  35. Tatalovic, Sinisa, „Novo razumijevanje sigurnosti i sigurnosno okruzenje na jugoistoku Europe“, Vignjevic, Branko (ur.), Demokratski nadzor i kontrola nad bezbjednosnim sektorom u regionu, Zbornik radova, M-impeks, Banja Luka, 2004, p. 45–55.

36. Hobbes, Thomas, Leviathan or the Matter, Form and Power of Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil, George Routledge and Sons, London, 1885.

37. Wolfers, Arnold, „National Security as an ambiguous symbol“, Political Science Quarterly, vol. 67, No. 4, December 1952, p. 481–502.