

Modern Theory of National Security: Its Object and Subject

Alexander I. Melikhov¹, Gennadiy S. Pratsko², Svetlana V. Studenikina², Olga G. Kazantseva², Irina V. Orlova²

¹ Volgograd Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia, Volgograd, Russia

²Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Author Note

Alexander I. Melikhov

Volgograd Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia, 130, Istoricheskaya st., Volgograd, 400075, Russia

e-mail: M-13913@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0001-8987-713X

Gennadiy S. Pratsko

Don State Technical University, 1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, 344000, Russia

e-mail: stl13913@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-7875-0085

Svetlana V. Studenikina

Don State Technical University, 1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, 344000, Russia

e-mail: stud.svetlana@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0002-3757-1259

Olga G. Kazantseva

Don State Technical University, 1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, 344000, Russia

e-mail: kazantseva10@mail.ru; ORCID: 0000-0002-8332-1058

Irina V. Orlova

Don State Technical University, 1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, 344000, Russia

e-mail: oi578125@mail.ru; ORCID: 0009-0004-6735-1363

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alexander I. Melikhov, Volgograd Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia, 130, Istoricheskaya st., Volgograd, 400075, Russia

e-mail: M-13913@yandex.ru

Abstract: The paper proposes the authors' theory of security based on the achievements of natural sciences, according to which the state of security as a survival model can only be provided by a self-sufficient and independent subject, in other cases we should talk about the security of subjects who have created a collective security subject. The object of security, i.e. what it affects, are the useful and dangerous properties of the surrounding world and the security subject itself. The object of security, i.e. what it affects, are the useful and dangerous properties of the surrounding world and the security subject itself. The object of security, i.e. what it affects, are the useful and dangerous properties of the surrounding world and the security subject itself. All unknown properties are considered dangerous. Since the security subject independently and self-sufficiently ensures its security, it is also the object of security. Threats to security are manifestations of dangerous properties of the surrounding world and the security subject itself. Subjects unable to survive on their own create or join an actual subject of collective security, endowing it with their properties for its sovereign survival. They themselves act as the forces and means of ensuring security, moving to a new model of survival – protection on the part of the subject of collective security.

Within the framework of the proposed theory of “security” – this is a model of collective survival through independent and sovereign satisfaction of vital needs for self-preservation, self-maintenance and self-reproduction through the protection of their own and involved forces and means engaged in obtaining, processing and understanding (forecasting, identification, analysis, evaluation) of information and knowledge about the dangerous and useful properties of the security subject and the world around him (in the form of other subjects and the environment), their manifestations in the past, present and future, with the subsequent implementation of the information and knowledge obtained for the prevention and control of established hazardous properties, the development and application of a set of operational and long-term measures for goal-setting, identification, prevention and elimination of their manifestations, as well as localization and neutralization of their consequences.

Keywords: Security, national security, survival model, multinational people of Russia

JEL code: sF-52, H-56, K-42

Almost all researchers of the security phenomenon rightly argue that at present the concept of security has become quite vague. The reason for this is the variety of forms of security manifestations, as well as the incorrect use of the term "security" in theory, as a result of which there are different definitions of security in the humanities (Koltsov, 2006), (Chapchikov, 2018). These definitions, as a rule, only partially reflect the content of the concept of “security” and do not disclose its objective essence. A similar attempt was made by one of the authors of this study (Kostyuchenko and Melikhov, 2019). However, the absence of an essential concept of security and a fully justified conceptual apparatus in this branch of knowledge complicates the theoretical study of specific forms of manifestation of the security phenomenon in various spheres of society.

Therefore, we believe that the theoretical support of national security should begin with the development of a general concept of the legal institute of national security, its adoption as a governing paradigm by representatives of science and practice of all branches of military and law enforcement activities.

Security in Russian science is defined as “a property (attribute) of the system”, “protection from threats”, “absence of danger”, “freedom from threats”, “situation”, “a measure of the relationship between the factors ‘threat’ and ‘vulnerability’”, “a system of guarantees ensuring sustainable development, protection of basic values”, “a certain state of all participants in public relations”, “the state of relations between subjects”, “a set of factors”, “ability”, “result of activity”. The lack of unity in the interpretation of the concept of security indicates the presence of a tendency to use the term “security” in various interpretations in the domestic humanities.

Currently, various interpretations of the concept of “security” are proposed in science, which is due to the lack of a clear distinction between vital interests, values and needs of subjects who use this term. In this regard, there is a need for scientific differentiation of vital human needs as objective conditions for the survival and self-preservation of the people, embodied in the theory of security, and subjectively understood interests of individuals and social groups.

Materials and Method

In the theory of state and law, the human dimension of political and legal reality is reflected in the organic theory of the state, which emerged in the second half of the XIX century, in which a politically organized society is likened to a biological organism, where each organ is designed to perform a certain function, and the content of social life is explained by analogy with the laws of anatomy and physiology. Organic theory considered the state and law not as a product of someone's conscious activity, which was characteristic of the mechanistic theories of earlier times, but as an organism that arose as a result of the natural successive development of mankind in natural conditions, i.e. on the basis of the principle of historicism, taking into account the succession links between the past, present, and future.

In connection with the penetration of knowledge of natural sciences, humanitarian sciences, the concept of organicism is gaining popularity recently, not only in philosophical (Shkurin, 2013), but also in legal literature (Grachev, 2017), (Zelenova, 2019), which, along with such well-established phrases as “organs of internal affairs” (internal organs or visceral sphere of a living organism), led to the emergence of the terms “anatomy of law” (Fuller, 2009), “pathology of law” (Namnyaseva, 2017), statements “terrorism is a disease” (Plugatyrev, 2005), etc.

An appeal to organic theory can contribute to an adequate definition of the concept and content of national security as a vital need of the multinational people of the Russian Federation, since the objective vital human needs for self-preservation, self-maintenance and self-reproduction established by natural sciences, reflected in the most diverse spheres of society, require the necessary theoretical understanding.

The very first vital need of the organism is *self-preservation*, i.e. protection and maintenance of the physical integrity of the organism. The next vital need of the organism is *self-reproduction*, associated with the immanent need to have offspring and take care of it. And, finally, the third need of this kind is *self-maintenance* as the preservation of the functional integrity of the body and the maintenance of its efficiency, which, in turn, include the demand for sensory influx and obtaining the necessary information, the need for emotions and pleasant sensations (hedonistic need). The objectivity of the identification of these needs has been confirmed by evolution and numerous experiments. Living organisms that were deprived of any of these vital needs either died in the early stages of life, or, growing up to reproductive age, most often did not leave offspring. The absence of such needs in humans was eliminated by natural selection (Zhukov, 2014).

The analysis of vital needs, without the satisfaction of which a person cannot feel safe, enriches our ideas about it as a social phenomenon and expands the temporal and spatial framework of scientific research of its various aspects.

The pattern we have identified is due to the fact that human consciousness is born in a state of information vacuum or entropy.

Entropy in science is a measure of chaos, disorder, the degree of unpredictability, unforeseen development, information uncertainty in the system. Cognition is an immanent

direction of human activity, an explicit form of denial of entropy, i.e. filling the primordial vacuum of consciousness with information and knowledge about their own properties and qualities of the surrounding world, necessary for the survival of man and humanity. With regard to the problem of the survival of individuals, it is only necessary to remember that man is a social being, not endowed with the ability to independently satisfy his needs for self-preservation, self-sufficiency and self-reproduction. Therefore, the only model of its survival is collective security.

Results

Existing and potential threats is ultimately aimed at the survival of the social system, the individual, society and the state (Nizhnik and Akhmedov, 2001), (Kolokoltsev, 2005). The survival of the state-forming people, Security as a condition for the survival of society and the state strategy of protection against who constitute a state-organized society, is the goal for which it is necessary to achieve a state of its security. Its survival is provided by the realization of vital needs – self-preservation, self-reproduction and self-maintenance, i.e. by ensuring security.

Human nature has three survival strategies – to run, to defend, to pretend to be dead. But it has not developed such a security strategy as “non-resistance to evil” (Tolstoy, 1983). This explains the fiasco of numerous Tolstoyan colonies, which disappeared when the First World War began, and then the Civil War, when it was necessary not to suffer and wait for survival, but to try to actively interact with the habitat, fighting it or leaving it (Zhukov, 2014).

The modern security strategy includes all the above components: a) defense as an increase in its useful properties in order to prevent attacks on lives or the possibility to repel them; b) avoiding or evading danger as one of the options for its prevention; c) fighting with danger in the present, including the ability to “pretend to be dead” (temporary admission of defeat), sacrificing their existence in the present to ensure their existence in the future.

Now we give an intermediate definition of the concept of security as a model or strategy of survival, in which the vital needs of self-preservation, self-maintenance and self-reproduction of the subject in his infinite being, i.e. in the present, past and future, regardless of the change in the properties of the subject and the world around him and the manifestation of these properties. Security is overcoming the dependence of the survival of the organism on the external properties of the surrounding world and its internal changes.

Discussion

Many experts involved in management theory consider security to be the objectively necessary function of all social systems, including the state, where it is carried out by the police and various intelligence and counterintelligence services. They proceed from the fact that the state of security is a manifestation of the objective nature of social systems as their ability to maintain stability, i.e. all the qualities necessary for their vital function under various negative influences. In this case, security is understood as a certain property of the system that arises as a result of self-regulation or self-organization of the system. In the state-legal dimension, the property of the state to ensure its security and independence has been called sovereignty.

Survival requires an extreme degree of pragmatism of the security of the subject in relation to the surrounding world, considering it either as a danger or as a means and conditions of its survival, which is an important methodological aspect of security as a strategy for the vital function of the system as a whole (Lingart, 1954), (James, 2013). There are two survival strategies – individual and collective. The individual is built on egoism as a principle of behavior. The collective survival strategy combines altruistic and egoistic principles of behavior. By default, all properties of the surrounding world are considered dangerous until otherwise determined.

The most important feature of security management is the fact that its subject and the main object of security always coincide, since in this case we are talking about the state as a self-sufficient and sovereign entity. In other models of survival, for example, in the model protection, the object of protection and its subject are different, since the subject of protection, as a rule, are the forces and means of security provided by those subjects who possess them, i.e., with the involvement of third-party forces and means, the concepts of the subject of security and its forces and means of security will differ, not coincide.

In this regard, we will clarify the concept of “subject of security”. Since security means the independence of survival, the subject of security is also the main object of ensuring security.

Individual security is a survival model in which the subject and the object of security, as well as the forces and means of ensuring security coincide. Figuratively, this model can be called “Every man for himself”.

When the surrounding world changes, as well as when the security subject loses its own useful properties as a result of repelling external and internal threats, the security challenge for the subject is formed as such a threat (manifestation of dangerous properties), in which it risks losing its subjectivity, i.e. becoming a means of ensuring its security. Therefore, a subject must respond to a threat to its security either by changing its properties, which can confirm its subjectivity and thereby ensure its own security, or switch to a model of ensuring collective security.

Existing in natural conditions, a person can independently satisfy only part of his vital needs, since in terms of his being he is not self-sufficient, he needs to interact with his own kind for his reproduction in the future. It is impossible to reproduce yourself alone. This determined the collective form of human existence as a phenomenon. Moreover, according to the latest research of biologists, natural selection did not occur at the level of the individual, but at the level of the genus or tribe. At the same time, the collective form of existence is peculiar to people not because of close kinship, not because of reciprocity, not because of moral education, but because of the objective necessity of “group selection”: cooperating groups succeed, but selfish ones do not (Ridley, 2013). Therefore, "a tribe comprising a large number of individuals endowed with highly developed feelings of patriotism, loyalty, obedience, bravery and concern for others, i.e. those who are always ready to help others and sacrifice themselves for the common good, should prevail over most other tribes. This will be natural selection” (Darwin, 1953). It is the collective form of survival that is characteristic of man, and, consequently, the collective model of ensuring security, since no “organ” of our

conditional body can exist outside the system of the whole “body”. In the collective security model, risks as labor costs for providing vital needs are shared among all participants, increasing the likelihood of their survival.

In the model of collective survival, in addition to the main subject-the object of ensuring security, there is an actual operational object of ensuring security – an object, subject or process that, depending on specific circumstances, has the most promising opportunities (a set of useful properties) to ensure its survival and the existence of its forces and means. They transform depending on changes in the internal properties of the subject and object of security and the external properties of the surrounding world. For example, a submarine is an object of security at depth, since its survival ensures the existence and survival of its crew, which in extreme natural conditions is both the subject and the object of security. In turn, the process of supplying oxygen to the submarine lying on the bottom is also an object of security, since only this makes possible the survival of the crew and the preservation of the submarine as a combat unit.

Based on this, individuals are forced to switch to a collective model of survival or security. Being not self-sufficient in this respect, they combine their efforts and individual qualities, forming a self-sufficient object of security relevant to the surrounding world, in which non-self-sufficient individual subjects, combining their efforts, invent forces and means of ensuring security and receive the necessary defense and protection from a new collective subject, which ensures their existence and increases the possibilities of their survival. At the same time, defense and protection are selected into a special security subsystem with a special subject that does not coincide with the object.

In other words, there are security models in which the survival of a collective object is ensured not by the defense and protection of internal forces and means of its security, but by external forces – private military companies, military blocs, etc. However, in this case, it is necessary to distinguish between the processes of ensuring security through the use of useful properties of the surrounding world (for example, the use of private military companies to save their own population) and the existence of a non-self-sufficient subject who, using other people’s forces and means for his survival, sooner or later will become part of a collective subject whose forces and means he uses.

Currently, mass culture creates the illusion of self-sufficiency and self-satisfaction of a person’s vital needs, regardless of society and the state as collective forms of his being. In such conditions, attempts to consider, study, and even more so to ensure in practice the security of society, the individual and the state separately from each other, as some independent phenomena or institutions, are dead-ends. Man, society and the state separately are not currently viable subjects of security as a model of survival.

The only currently relevant collective entity capable of ensuring security in our country is the multinational people of the Russian Federation, which has its own state form. Internal structural formations on the territory of our country – federal subjects, municipalities, citizens and their associations, etc. – are not able to do this. All of them are only legal forms of existence of the multinational people of Russia and at the same time the forces and means of ensuring its security. The terms “defense” or “protection” should be applied to these forces and means. To

designate forces as animate objects with legal capacity – “defense”, and for security means as inanimate objects or processes – “protection”. Together, defense and protection create a state of security of the individual, society and the state, achieved through their joint activities to ensure the security of the multinational people of Russia.

Security is a subjective concept meaning satisfaction with the results of assessing and maintaining the state of self-satisfaction of the vital needs of the multinational people of the Russian Federation and their survival, since a person feels protected when there is an umbrella of nuclear protection over him, law and order are ensured and the products of joint labor are obtained, which, separately from each other, a person, society and the state cannot provide. The sense of security (psychological security of the individual) arises when a person consciously, while maintaining responsibility, influences the circumstances of life in order to provide conditions for his mental balance and harmonious development. The historical existence of the multinational people of Russia, individual Russian citizens, as well as the entire society and state depends on such a survival model of living people and existing society and state, in which their forces and means are directed to mutual preservation of memory and provision of vital needs not only in the present, but also in the future.

Conclusion

The future is built by people not only and not so much for their further existence, but for descendants – as a continuation of the existence of their genetic and social properties. In this regard, individualism, egoism are the way of destroying man and humanity as phenomena. For example, people and states take loans to provide for their secondary needs in the present, thereby jeopardizing the provision of vital needs for themselves and their children in the future. Modern capitalism has demanded that people lose the future for the sake of a happy present, so the current security model is primarily aimed at preserving the future. The priority of preserving the past and the present has shown its inconsistency.

To ensure the security of the nation, all forms of its existence – man, society, the state – must adhere to a different model of survival: protection. It is, in fact, a refusal to independently satisfy vital needs as some part of its subjectivity, a refusal to delegate them to a collective subject in exchange for the possibility of using other qualities - externally in the interests of this subject, but in fact for the purpose of its survival and continued existence.

It should be noted the difference between “survival” as an independent satisfaction of vital needs and “existence” as a life in conditions in which the satisfaction of your vital needs depends not only on you. Security forces – people, society, the state – “exist”, but they will “survive” only if national security is successfully ensured. The “prize” in the game “security” is survival. Survival is the result of security as an independent realization of vital needs for self-preservation, self-reproduction and self-maintenance.

It should be emphasized that the subject of security is not specific living people, society or the state in their present, but their ethno-social entities in the historical existence of the state-forming people.

The essence of a person is expressed in his natural and social components, where genes

act as a set of innate properties acquired by him as a result of long-term selection, and the acquired social properties are produced in the form of knowledge, traditions, values of the people of which he is an integral part, as well as a number of results of the evolution of collective forms of human existence, such as family, denomination, the state, etc. If a person in his existence is a physical carrier of genetic information, then these forms of society's existence act as carriers or locus of useful social properties acquired by him. It is their preservation and transfer that is the task of security in the light of the constitutional provision on man as the highest value of the state (Article 2 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation). The rejection of individual egoism in favor of the survival of the nation ensures the preservation of the essence of man and the various forms of his collective existence, first of all, society and the state.

References

- [1] Chapchikov, S.Yu. (2018). Conceptual foundations of national security and the mechanism of its provision: theoretical and legal research. *Doctoral dissertation*, Kursk, 165.
- [2] Darwin, C. (1953). *The origin of man and sexual selection*. Essays. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 5, 244.
- [3] Fuller, L.L. (2009). Anatomy of Law. *Russian Yearbook of the Theory of Law*, 2-2009, 204-319.
- [4] Grachev, N.I. (2017). Organic functions of the state: the experience of conceptual reconstruction of the theory of state functions. In collective monograph I.V. Rostovshchikov, V.A. Rudkovsky, Yu.A. Gavrilova (Eds.) *Legal justice: problems of theory and practice*, 391-403. Volgograd: Volga.
- [5] James, W. (1997). *The will to believe*. Moscow: Republic.
- [6] James, W. (2013). *Pragmatism: a new name for some old ways of thinking*. 3rd ed. Moscow: LKI Publishing House.
- [7] Kolokoltsev, V.A. (2005). Ensuring the state interests of Russia in the context of the concept of national security. *Doctoral dissertation*, St. Petersburg, 101.
- [8] Koltsov, V.A. (2006). Philosophical foundations of the concept of national security. *Abstract of the candidate's dissertation*, N. Novgorod, 2.
- [9] Kostyuchenko, N.I. Melikhov, A.I., (2019). Modern problems of the formation of the theory of national security and its teaching, due to the absence of the concept of the phenomenon of "security" and sections on the foundations of the theory of social systems and control theory. *Bulletin of the Volgograd Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia*, 3(50), 146-151.
- [10] Lingart, I. (1954). *American Pragmatism*. Moscow: Foreign literature.
- [11] Namnyaseva, V.V. (2017). Pathology of criminal law: perspective or reality? *Philosophy of Law*, 3 (82). Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/patologiya-ugolovnogo-prava-perspektiva-ili-realnost> (Accessed 10 July 2023).
- [12] Nizhnik, N.S., Akhmedov, Ch.N. (2001). *The law enforcement system as a subject of ensuring the security of the individual, society and the state*. St. Petersburg, 158.
- [13] Plugatyrev, I. (2005). Terrorism is a disease. *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, May 14.
- [14] Ridley, M. (2013). *The Origin of Altruism and Virtue: from Instincts to Cooperation*. [trans. Moscow: Eksmo.
- [15] Shkurin, I.Yu. (2013). *Fundamentals of the logistic theory of civilization*. Moscow: Sputnik.
- [16] Tolstoy, L.N. (1983). *Collected works: in 22 volumes*. Moscow: Fiction, 1978-1985. Novellas and short stories, 1903-1910 / [comment by M. N. Boyko].
- [17] Zhukov, D.A. (2014). *Wait, who's leading? Biology of human and other animal behavior*, 1, 408. Moscow: Alpina non-fiction.
- [18] Zelenova, N.A. (2019). Organic theory of the origin of the state. *Contentus*, 8(85), 80-87.