

**Peer-reviewed academic journal**

**Innovative Issues and Approaches in  
Social Sciences**

**IIASS VOLUME 15 (2022)**

## **Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences**

IIASS is a double blind peer review academic journal published 3 times yearly (January, May, September) covering different social sciences: political science, sociology, economy, public administration, law, management, communication science, psychology and education.

IIASS has started as a Sldip – Slovenian Association for Innovative Political Science journal and is being published by ERUDIO Center for Higher Education.

### **Typeset**

This journal was typeset in 11 pt. Arial, Italic, Bold, and Bold Italic; the headlines were typeset in 14 pt. Arial, Bold

### **Abstracting and Indexing services**

COBISS, International Political Science Abstracts, CSA Worldwide Political Science Abstracts, CSA Sociological Abstracts, PAIS International, DOAJ, Google scholar.

### **Publication Data:**

ERUDIO Education Center

Innovative issues and approaches in social sciences, 2022,  
vol. 15

ISSN 1855-0541

**Additional information:** [www.iiass.com](http://www.iiass.com)

# DISCUSSION OF SECURITY AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON IN A CHANGING SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Gregor Garb<sup>1</sup>

## **Abstract**

Due to the effects of globalization and the responses to it, the current strategic geopolitical environment is rapidly and fundamentally changing and becoming volatile and unstable. Therefore, it is expected and understandable that such consequences also have an influence on changing priorities in ensuring security dilemmas. It is becoming increasingly clear that the established state-centric view, understanding of security threats and responding to them with military force can no longer follow the security needs of modern society. Thus, two approaches have been identified for defining security in recent decades. In the traditional concept of security, the interests, values, needs, and rights of individuals and social groups are subordinated to the interests of the state, while modern perspectives follow a changed security environment, which also affects changes in security referent objects. Instead of the state, ie. non-state actors, are becoming more and more imperative. The diversification of threats, and the people behind them, are generating new challenges for the security communities, as well as to society as a whole. Therefore, it would be completely unacceptable and wrong to push the nation-state into the background and understand other referent objects in terms of security only as the most important ones.

**Keywords:** referent objects, security paradigm, traditional and modern security perspectives, multidimensionality of security

---

<sup>1</sup> Gregor Garb, Ph.D. is an assistant professor, researcher and consultant (garbgregor5@gmail.com)

## **Introduction**

Due to the consequences of the asymmetry of globalization processes in the broadest sense and the responses to them, the rapidly changing modern security environment is becoming increasingly interconnected, multidimensional, complex, and uncertain.

Multipolarity, a wide range of threats and threats to the growing role of non-state actors, the instability of the geostrategic environment, the global erosion of democratic values and human rights, international law and multilateralism, the assertion of unilateral interests, and the limited ability of the international community to respond point out the key elements in long-term changes within the balance of economic and military powers.

As a result, in the current increasingly volatile strategic geopolitical environment, we are facing a variety of sources of threats and security risks that are geographically emerging at the national, supranational, and global levels. According to their nature and character, they are multidimensional, interdependent/independent, interconnected, synergistic, complex, often difficult to predict, characterized by multiplier influence and effect. Their holders are mostly non-state actors.

Awakening various forms of rivalry between regional and major global powers, difficult to find and reach political compromises, the emergence of new forms of threats and risks posed by rapid technological progress, the information revolution and globalization processes and effects represent a new, modern paradigm of threatening.

So far, the old paradigm was based on the concept of threatening by the superpower and its allies, the capacity of conventional forces, and the importance of the role of nuclear weapons. After the collapse of the bipolar system in the early 1990s, it was replaced by a new paradigm that highlights modern sources of threats and risks to various referent security objects.

All this diversity of processes and accompanying effects, including security risks posed by rapid changes in society, but also new opportunities and challenges, have triggered a number of unstoppable existing national security systems, marked by a new,

modern security paradigm which caused rapid changes within the role of the state while ensuring the security of its citizens or inhabitants (Garb, 2014: 88).

Furthermore, it makes sense to state a few general facts as to why the modern security paradigm:

- Threats (or sources of threat) were in the period after the end of WWII until the end of the Cold War, clearly defined and uniformly understood or perceived.
- After the end of the cold war, we are talking about a changed or changing, in terms of temporal and spatial determinants, security environment.
- There is no conceptual consensus on the typology, content, forms, and sources of contemporary threats.
- The diversification of threats, and the people behind them, are generating new challenges for the defence and security communities, as well as to society as a whole.

According to K4P (2022), changing security paradigm is based on Megatrend which represents a long-term driving force that is observable now and will continue to have a global impact in years to come. The driving forces of the Megatrend change over time. New era, new trends. They indicate a direction of change in values and needs which is driven by forces and manifests itself already in various ways within certain groups in society.

Nowadays, we can discuss new trends mainly on:

- Future battlefields<sup>2</sup>.
- Space becomes a new era of expansion<sup>3</sup>.
- Changing conflict causalities<sup>4</sup>.
- Shift in the geopolitical landscape<sup>5</sup>.

### **The Concepts of Security as a Social Phenomenon**

Perception and understanding of security in modern society are subject to modified forms of sources of threat, which spread the concepts of security from traditional, where the security of the state or national security is imperative, to modern, which are associated primarily with the security of the individual, communities, social environment and ecosystem, as well.

---

<sup>2</sup> This trend focuses on technologies that could be considered ‘emerging’ compared to the present status of the military arsenal/weapon collection. However, most of these technologies are already quite mature (for e.g., drones, hypersonic missiles, wearable sensors and autonomous systems) and are already changing modern warfare when they are used).

<sup>3</sup> The race for ‘space supremacy’ is another field where competition is rapidly growing and there is an increased number of satellite systems and missions to Mars and the Moon. The new Space era that we are living in today is a dynamically and rapidly evolving innovation landscape - where increasing numbers of diverse actors and disruptive technologies are leading to new services and applications. In parallel, it is bringing new political and societal issues that require novel legal and regulatory reform.

<sup>4</sup> The root causes of conflicts are complex, difficult to research and always evolving. As societies change, so too do reasons for internal and external tensions. Some of the change happens in long standing trends that experience a shift in focus, while others are born from disruptive new technologies, radically shifting behaviour, or the destructive results of human activity.

<sup>5</sup> World geopolitics is changing; the United States of America are disengaging from their traditional role of enforcer of the geopolitical order, leaving room for the rise of others. Among these global changes, there is a growing awareness in the EU of the importance of strengthening common defence capabilities and geo-economics instruments.

Contemporary expert discussion on security is focused or based primarily on:

- Referent objects or Security for whom;
- Sources of threat or who or what threatens security (Security from what);
- Security mechanisms by which security is ensured or what are the means of achieving security (Security by what means).

Although Baldwin (1997: 12-17) adds some other questions related to security<sup>6</sup>, previously mentioned are fundamental and at the same time a starting point for the discussion of security issues.

When determining a security threat, we must always think of the relationship between understanding the security of a referent object and identifying the sources of threat to the same referent object. Buzan (1991: 17) considers that security in its objective sense is a criterion for the absence of threats to acquired values, and in subjective terms, it is the absence of fear that the acquired values would be attacked or threatened in any way.

The security of the referent object can also be understood as the relative absence of potential threats, or security does not exist at all if there is no perception of its threat. Endangerment and vulnerability are therefore the opposite of security. The terminological definition of a certain phenomenon thus depends on the subjective understanding and conception of security, interests, stability, peace, and values, or on our perception of the temporal and spatial dimensions.

Contemporary security studies understand security threats as any condition in which the referent object is not guaranteed its balanced physical, spiritual, mental, and material existence and functioning. This can be understood as the presence of any phenomena or events that potentially threaten the quality of existence, development, and operation of the referent object.

There are two approaches to defining security in recent decades.

---

<sup>6</sup> Questions such as: For which values; How much; From what threats; At what cost; In what period of time.

The traditional (realistic) concept of security stemmed from a bipolar confrontation between superpowers and nuclear weapons, and later from tensions between emerging countries in Asia and Africa, when interstate violence became a major or central global problem (Bajpai, 2002: 21). The traditional approach determines security, where national or state security is imperative, as a threat of using military force to protect the country from external sources of threat. In the focus of security discussions are the state and its security interests, with an emphasis on the defence of territory, sovereignty, and government, and in an anarchic and hierarchically arranged environment is secured primarily by military force (Waltz, 2000).

Emphasizing the role of the state and military power in terms of ensuring its security is a fundamental feature of the realistic traditional approach to deal with security that prevailed during the Cold War. Such an approach provided the foundation for understanding and justifying wars, alliances, blockades, imperialism, and other international topics, especially current political ones.

When studying the traditional concept of security, it makes sense to highlight two starting points. The first is to identify security with the security of its citizens and inhabitants. During this period, it was considered that the safer the country is, the safer its people are. The interests of the state also prevailed, or in other words, the interests, needs, and rights of individuals and social groups were subordinated to the interests of the state. The security of the population seemed self-evident, conceived as part of the security of the state (Bajpai, 2000:36). The second starting point is related to the referent object and the mechanisms for protecting its safety.

As mentioned, the referent object was the state, whose security is ensured by military capabilities, and the security analysis became an analysis of ways or mechanisms to ensure the security of the state. This way of thinking comes from the characteristics of the Cold War period, in which a political constellation was precisely defined, where it was known exactly what the situation of the opposing parties was and where the military force was responsible for addressing security challenges (Baldwin, 1997: 9).

Contemporary expert discussions on security follow the changed security environment, which also affects the changes of security referent objects. Instead of the state, the individual, communities,

ecosystem, critical infrastructure, etc. ie non-state actors, are becoming more and more imperative.

Consequently, modern security approaches focus on human security, where the referent object is primarily an individual, the main goal of security is his safety, protection, and well-being. The values protected by human security are personal security and freedom (Bajpai, 2000: 38-39). The ultimate goal is the protection of human dignity, so it needs freedom from fear (protection from violence) and freedom from needs (protection from deprivation). The desired end state is to provide current and future generations with fair access to development capabilities, in addition to surviving and meeting basic needs, to enable them to develop their abilities and live a quality life, with dignity.

The whole political reality after the end of the Cold War period, which also includes the effects of globalization and the emergence of failed states, caused and demanded a human-oriented concept of security. Approaches to human security have grown mainly from the ethical need to respond to a changing environment. Threats to human security are divided into traditional ones, mostly through the use of military force, and non-traditional ones, which are prevalent and growing in number.

Diversification of threats determines the main challenge in defining security mechanisms. Preventive action to reduce vulnerability and eliminate deeper causes of threat, non-coercive measures to reduce human vulnerability, and also corrective measures, if prevention is not sufficient, are appropriate mechanisms for ensuring human security.

Among the preventive measures, Bruderlein (2002: 2) classifies various actions and procedures to ensure sustainable human development, which are also measures to prevent conflicts, which are characterized by multilevel and multilateral approaches in favour of those at risk. Failure of safeguard actions requires the corrective procedure, including the collective use of force, as a secondary means of ensuring security. Prerequisites for human sustainable development and security are, in addition to the protection of people in the community, education, training of people and the community.

Ensuring sustainable human development, which requires peace, economic, social, political, legal, and environmental development, means protection against scarcity. In addition to protecting mechanisms, sustainable human development is only a part of human security, which ensures freedom from necessity, helps to prevent violence and conflicts, and therefore also contributes to freedom from fear.

As mentioned, security is mutually complementary and not exclusive, therefore it is unnecessary to talk about its absoluteness. It is much more understandable to discuss the security paradigm, especially from a temporal and geospatial distance, in terms of its added value, and to see it as a contribution to modern security risks and efforts to ensure an adequate level of security for different referent objects.

In support of these considerations, Bajpai and Garb in Table 1 present a contrast between the traditional and modern security approaches, which show differences and contradictions between traditional views, where security is the priority of protecting national territory and broader political interests, and contemporary thinking, where human and environmental security is the main focus of modern security discussions and, according to them, it is the cornerstone for establishing stable social environments at all levels.

Table 1: Comparison of traditional and contemporary security approaches

	Traditional approach	Contemporary approach
Referent object (Security for whom)	Mainly: national state.	Mainly: individual/human, communities and ecosystem
Type of security	National security. Societal security.	Human security. Societal security. Environmental security.
Security of what values	Territorial integrity and national independence.	Individual security and freedom. Quality of life. Human development. Durability and stability.
Security from what threats	Direct threats from other countries.	Direct threats from other countries.
Security by what means	<p>Force, as the primary instrument of security, is used exclusively for the security of the state.</p> <p>The balance of power is important. The power of the state is valued by military capabilities.</p> <p>Alliance and internal relations are a priority, not cooperation between individual countries.</p> <p>Norms and institutions have limited value, especially in the field of security and the military.</p>	<p>Force as a secondary instrument is used primarily in the collective sense of security. The individual-oriented security is imperative.</p> <p>The balance of power has limited value. Soft power is becoming increasingly important.</p> <p>Cooperation between countries, international and non-governmental organizations can be effective and lasting.</p> <p>Norms and institutions are important. Democratization and representation in institutions contribute to efficiency.</p>

Source: modified from Bajpai (2000: 48) in Garb (2014: 92).

Postmodern or more complex approaches to addressing security, where non-state actors are beginning to be included, can be traced back to the early 1970s. However, the contemporary understanding of security in its full meaning can be attributed to the end of the Cold War period and the processes in the international community that followed when an individual/human and his security, communities, and environmental security, as well are becoming more and more dominant.

These more complex security definitions need to be understood as a consequence of rapid social development, a changing international environment, and a changed traditional concept of threats, as well.

During the Cold War period, prevailed the traditional view of security issues based on the concept of external enemies, the state was a fundamental referent object, and where the main role was played by power in a realistic approach and peace from idealistic approach. However, security was dependent mainly on the military and political dimensions.

The traditional, simplified and narrow, military/political understanding of security and its threat has been replaced by a new one. The non-traditional, broader understanding, which defines the security of the referent object as a condition and activity that, in addition to military and political, is also expressed in economic, social, health, humanitarian, environmental, cultural, etc. areas or dimensions. This means we can talk about the multidimensionality of security as a social phenomenon.

Such increases the complexity of understanding security and its threat by expanding the dimensions of security horizontally, followed by an increasing number of referent objects and their threats vertically. This means from the nation-state to the individual, gender, race, communities, nation, environment, the international community, civilization, etc.

A large number of referent objects may lead us to conclude that in modern security studies we cannot talk about a consensus on who referent objects are, as there is too much intertwining and interdependence between them, nor can we identify sources of threat to a specific referent object.

In addition, it should be born in mind that referent objects are not necessarily only endangered objects, but can also be potential sources of threat to other referent objects. From this, I can conclude that this period is marked by an increase in the number of non-military sources of threat, but also by an increase in the number of referent objects that are potentially endangered. New understandings of security and its threat, if we follow this analogy, will be able to emerge in the future only due to an increase in the number of referent objects rather than due to sources of threat, whether actual or perceived.

The theoretical approach that is worth mentioning and coincides with the process of globalization is also neoliberalism. Focused mainly on the area of security, Neoliberalism, whose main representatives are Keohane and Nye, is basically founded on the same assumptions as structural institutionalism. According to them, besides the countries as main actors in the international system, the role of the non-state actors becomes very influential, prominent and effective.

Neoliberals have taken approaches that international institutions are indeed promoting cooperation and stability between countries, but they are not in themselves a strong enough guarantee for the transformation of international relations. The necessity for cooperation arises mainly due to the interdependence in various fields, which in functional terms have become internationally political.

Two key factors of the theoretical approach are state participation and complex interdependence (Keohane and Nye, 1989: 24). Cooperation resulting from rational behaviour, where countries strive for absolute benefit, is best achieved through institutions that act as intermediaries between countries and, together with regimes, help regulate and run the international system (Lamy, 2007: 275). Interdependence arises mainly from its complexity of ways of connecting social communities, which include interstate, supranational or non-governmental elites, and supranational relations of recognition of other actors, where supranational organizations find their place (Keohane and Nye, 1989: 25).

Methods and means of achieving cooperation range from the introduction of strong trade ties to the threat of economic sanctions. From a security point of view, institutions are desirable as they reduce the costs associated with negotiating, enforcing international

law and certain agreements, gathering information, and resolving conflict situations (Navari, 2008: 39).

In this approach, military security is no longer dominant in regulating relations in world politics. More and more challenges are coming from the domestic politics of each country. This also results in diminishing roles of military force that the state does not use against other countries in the region, especially when complex interdependence has prevailed over certain unresolved issues. In particular, the use of military force is inappropriate for the use of non-military objectives, such as economic and environmental. Of course, there is the possibility of using military force, but usually, the final cost is too high in relation to the desired effect and goal, and the result is uncertain to the end. Nevertheless, military force is an indirectly useful argument, both for intimidating a state non-member union and for improving negotiating positions within the union.

Unlike other modern approaches already mentioned, neoliberal does not set the role of the individual as the main actor in international relations and in ensuring International Security. Regardless of the appearance of other actors, countries still have a key role to play and a common interest expressed in the design and operation of international institutions to ensure global security.

The Copenhagen School also contributed to a broader understanding of security, introducing the concept of securitization in international relations, which is a synthesis of constructivism and classical political realism in dealing with international security. Securitization is a process in which referent objects and sources of threat are problematized in terms of security, and as effective consequences, appropriate mechanisms are established to respond to them effectively. This means that an individual matter that cannot identify itself as a threat can only become a security issue when it is recognized as such by the public, which is not necessarily due to the existence of a real security threat but can only be presented as a threat.

The basic purpose of securitization is therefore an analytical explanation of why political elites in the decision-making phase treat individual social processes and events as threats and consequently react in a way that may be inconsistent with traditional norms and rules (Buzan et al, 1998: 23).

The school represents an alternative security paradigm within the traditional approach. The alternative stems from deepening the concept of security to non-military threats and non-military aspects of security and expanding the concept to enable the analysis of processes that threaten security at the transnational level. Despite increased attention to the security of the individual, the state remains the main referent object of security, as evidenced by the thesis that the individual can achieve the required level of security only in a strong country with a high level of internal stability and cohesion operating within the developed international community (Buzan et al., 1998). The school also developed the idea of Social Security, which, in addition to National Security (dualism), demonstrates the ability of society to maintain its own traditional patterns such as language, culture, religion, national identity, and customs (Smith, 2005: 33-34).

The theorist Knudsen (2001: 355-368) criticized the Copenhagen school with his critical thinking on the spread of security, whose main thesis is based on the de-securitization of securitization. His critical view of the expansion of security is fundamentally a critique of securitization and the importance and role of the state, its military, and political power, in international and security theories. According to him, the extension of the concept of security to non-traditional security aspects and actors, as well as the inclusion of identity and cultural factors, has significantly reduced the ability to explore different levels of conflict, especially when violence prevails. Security discussions have focused too much on broader security dilemmas, neglecting the importance of the state and its collective role, which includes the creation of threats.

The main idea of securitization is aimed at raising awareness of the limitations of threats and the importance and role of political and decision-making elites, which from their own perspective and own interests shape national security policy, which is not self-evident. In turn, de-securitizations are processes in which a political community downgrades or ceases to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and reduces or stops calling for exceptional measures to deal with the threat. Excessive emphasis on the role of politicians and decision-makers is one of the foundations of his critique, although Knudsen is not a priori opposed to the individual innovative approaches of the Copenhagen school in addressing certain social processes and challenges.

According to Knudsen, the country must remain a central subject of study in international relations and security discussions. He substantiates his claim by saying that the state is the main stakeholder of a certain geographical area and also approves and legitimizes the existence and operation of individual actors within its borders. In terms of power, the state is still above other actors and their capacities, gives form and framework to a common identity and culture, and at the same time represents one of the fundamental conditions for the existence, development, and functioning of the people living in it.

In his critique of expanding security, Knudsen advocated the concept of Cooperative Security, which Carter et al. (1992) argued for a security policy that in practice represents a peaceful treatment of conflicts not only with resilience to threats and violence but with proactive involvement and participation. negotiations, finding constructive solutions, and implementing preventive measures. The challenge to the concept is to get involved in the processes of those conflicts in which political actors choose a policy of power rather than cooperation in relation to the opponent.

Discussions continued even to the point that an individual would replace the state as the primary referent object. Such considerations were justified by the fact that the interests of the state and its inhabitants are not the same and that there is a likelihood that the protection of state interests endangers the security of its inhabitants. They argued that in a large number of countries, security is a mean to achieve their goal rather than a goal itself.

Such differences between countries, in terms of levels of development, make it impossible to properly address security within a general and unified concept. Booth offered a solution in which an individual is placed at the centre and where it prefers its emancipation. Security, therefore, means the absence of threats, and emancipation represents the liberation of individuals and social groups from challenges that make it difficult to exercise free choice.

The changed security situation has encouraged, also due to, according to some theorists, excessive emphasis on the concept of human security, the need for rethinking, thoroughly considering individual forms of security and ways to ensure them (Liotta, 2002:

474-476). In his thinking, Liotta critically evaluates the contrast between security as a primary state issue or State-Centric Security on the one hand and security which is directly related to an individual (Human Security) on the other. According to him, and agreed with most modern theorists<sup>7</sup>, the security debate, especially after the events of September 11, 2001, in the United States, has gone too far in the opposite direction, which could lead to a boomerang effect due to loss of balance. He sees the solution in restoring balance and focusing on National Security, where the military forces would still play a key role, as well as on Human Security, where so-called non-traditional security elements would play a more prominent role.

However, the indisputable fact is that the diversification of threats, and the people behind them, are generating new challenges for the security communities, as well as to society as a whole, which cannot be ignored.

These security threats and accompanying challenges will have an impact in the future and indirectly determine relationships and decisions, especially at the strategic level. Westing (in Liotta, 2002: 477) called such concept of security, which is conditioned by a multilevel perception of multiple interactions, as Comprehensive Security.

The complexity conditioned by the interaction of different levels of interaction between security and security aspects determinates, among other things, that the military and political aspects of security are not the only or best means of ensuring the security of individuals, countries, and regions.

In order to be able to evaluate security correctly and appropriately, it is necessary to distinguish between connectivity and dispute of interests and effects, on the other side. Understanding the complexities of comprehensive security answers, the question of the level of interactions in their relationship to different security aspects and thus proves that there are interrelationships between levels and security aspects that go beyond traditional State-Centric understandings of security.

---

<sup>7</sup> Such as: Negri, Bajpai, Hardt, Newman, Rosenau, Ali

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

The process of globalization related to social development brings not only positive consequences for society in terms of expanding trade, communications, freedom, democracy, respect for human rights, etc., but also negative sides, especially in the form of new security threats to modern society.

Outcome of social openness and freedom of movement, as well as almost unlimited transport and communication accessibility, significantly contribute to the spread of so-called global security threats.

The diversification of threats, and the people behind them, are generating new challenges for the defence and security communities, as well as to society as a whole. Modern society is becoming increasingly aware of the fact that survival, quality of life and human development, together with sustainability and stability of renewable natural resources, are endangered social values.

The diversity of processes in the modern international environment and the accompanying effects, including security risks posed by rapid changes in society, but also new opportunities and challenges, have triggered many unstoppable processes within the existing national security paradigm, which change the role of the state in ensuring the security of its citizens or inhabitants.

The imperative of primary debates on security issues today is no longer military sources of threat to nation-states, but security challenges that are relatively difficult to identify and cover a wide range of sources of threats and risks (social, economic, ethnic, ecological, military, etc.).

The fundamental feature of modern security threats and risks is basically their non-military nature, which means that they do not threaten traditional national interests in a way that the state could respond to with the existing military force. At the same time, these are contemporary complex and multifaceted challenges that countries, as a rule, cannot solve other than in close cooperation with the rest of the international community.

Such a perception of the modern security environment and the consequent understanding of global security is also influenced by

many processes that have caused a number of important changes in international relations at the regional and global level, triggered many processes, and thus fundamentally reshaped the political and security image of the world and society. All this has unequivocally influenced the treatment of security as a social phenomenon.

Changes in the concept of security are the result of changed (new, modern) sources of threat as well as new actors in ensuring security. The changes were equally influenced by the perception of the actual sources of threat, as well. The mentioned expansion and development of security treatment represent one of the essential steps in the study of current social changes, relations and processes. Thus, two approaches can be traced in defining security in recent decades.

The traditional realistic concept of dealing with security, which fundamentally defended the exclusive national security and interests of the state as a referent object, sovereignty, and territorial integrity as endangered values and sources of threat primarily other countries with their military force.

As a result of the changed security environment non-traditional more modern concepts of dealing with security began to develop. The individual and his interests, needs, rights and freedoms, the rule of law, non-state social entities, and the environment as referent objects become the imperative of modern concepts.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the established state-centric view and understanding of security threats and responding to them with military force can no longer follow the security needs of modern society.

In the modern security paradigm, we can see a double rearrange from the state-centric security perspective, on the one hand, we face supranational security, while on the other there is a growing tendency to ensure individual (human) security or a shift to the concept of individual security.

Thus, security is becoming a fundamental civil right that requires the state to synthesize a wide range of state and social policies. However, due to the diversification of security threats, it would be completely unacceptable and wrong to push the country into the

background and understand other security referent objects as the only and most important.

There is no doubt that human security is gaining an increasing and visible role in political relations as well, but it does not in any way displace or replace the traditional concept of national security.

The right of a state to defend itself against the threat of military force is completely unambiguous, and at the same time, this state has a duty to protect its citizens and inhabitants from internal threats and shortages.

The security of both referent objects is equivalent, but in a real-life, it is a matter of coexistence and complementarity of both concepts of security or a correlation between the responsibility and rights of the state and the rights and duties of its citizens and inhabitants.

The concept of human security emphasizes the protection of the population and social groups from threats to survival and requires the responsibility of the state to its citizens and inhabitants, whose rights and fundamental freedoms are essential to the defence of its sovereignty.

In this way, the security of the people of the country became part of national security. Namely, the security of the state is ensured not only by military capabilities but also by the organization of society in relation to threats and risks, the implementation of legislation, and ensuring human sustainable development.

In modern society, it is difficult to gain or achieve something without facing a certain level of risk, so referent objects tend not to avoid risks but to face and accept them and gain a lot.

## Resources

- Bajpai, K. Human Security: Concept and Measurement. 2000, URL=[«http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/Human\\_security\\_concept\\_and\\_measurement.pdf»](http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/Human_security_concept_and_measurement.pdf) (20. 1. 2022).
- Baldwin, D. The Concept of Security. Review of International Studies 23 (1), Cambridge University, 1997, pp: 5-26.
- Bilgin, P. Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security. International Studies Review, št. 5 (2), pp: 203-222.
- Bruderlein, C. The role of none-State actors in building human security – the case of armed groups in intra-state wars. Project Paper, Centre for humanitarian dialogue. Geneva, 2000, URL=[«http://www.humansecuritynetwork.org/docs/report\\_may2000\\_2-e.php»](http://www.humansecuritynetwork.org/docs/report_may2000_2-e.php) (28. 1. 2022).
- Buzan, B. People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International security Studies in the post-Cold War Era (II.). Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York, 1991.
- Buzan, B., Waeber, O., De Wilde, J. SECURITY: A new framework for analysis. Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, 1998.
- Carter, A. B., Steinbruner, J. D., Perry W. J. A New Concept of Cooperative Security. [The Brookings Institution](#), Washington, D.C., January 1992.
- Garb, Gregor (2014). Vpliv globalizirane varnosti na obrambne sisteme v primerljivih državah. Krško: 1A internet.
- Keohane, R.O., Nye, J.S. Power and Interdependence. HarperCollins, New York, 1989.
- K4P, URL=[«https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/changing-security-paradigm\\_en»](https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/changing-security-paradigm_en) (5.2.2022).
- Knudsen, O.F., Post-Copenhagen Security Studies. Security Dialogue, SAGE Publications, 2001, Vol. 32(3), pp: 355-368.
- Lamy, S. Sodobni večinski pristopi: neorealizem in neliberalizem. IN: Baylis, J., Smith, S. (ed.). Globalizacija svetovne politike, FDV, Ljubljana, 2007, pp: 263-289.
- Liotta, P.H. Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security. Security Dialogue, SAGE Publications, 2002, Vol. 33(4), pp: 473-488.
- Navari, C. Liberalism. IN: Williams, P.D. (ed.). Security Studies: An Introduction, Routledge, New York, 2008, pp: 29-43.
- Nye, J.S. Transnational Relations, Interdependence and Globalization. IN: Brecher, M., Harvey, F.P. (ed.). Realism and Intuitionism in International Studies, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 2005, pp: 160-173.

Smith, S. The Contested Concept of Security. IN: Booth, K. (ed.).  
Critical Security Studies in World Politics. Lynne Rienner  
Publishers, Boulder-London, 2005.

Waltz, K. N., Structural realism after the Cold War. International  
Security, Belfer Center, Cambridge, 2000, vol. 25(1), pp: 5-41.