

Security component of states' stability on a national and international level

Žarko OBRADOVIĆ¹, Miroslav MLADENOVIĆ²

Abstract: The paper analyses the issue of political stability in the context of changes in the positions of major political actors. The altered role of the nation-state in the conditions of globalisation inevitably reflects on the understanding of the security phenomenon. On the other hand, the number and characteristics of security challenges and threats have increased significantly. In addition to the previously present problems, there has been an increase in drug trafficking, illegal migration, human organ trafficking, an escalation of piracy, and the criminalisation of various spheres of life. In the last two years, the world has also faced a new global security problem, this time in the field of health — the COVID-19 pandemic. Practice has shown that (in most cases) the nation-state has become weaker and less independent, and its corresponding state-centric security system is inefficient, costly, cumbersome, and inadequate to many new threats. The strength of this conclusion stems from the analysis of the functioning of the national security system in the case of terrorist attacks, but also from the study of the mechanisms used for overthrowing sovereign states under the decisive influence of external factors.

Keywords: political stability, state, security, national security system, non-state security.

¹ Associate Professor, Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, zarko.obradovic@fb.bg.ac.rs

² Full Professor, Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, m.mladenovic@fb.bg.ac.rs

Political stability

“Our 20th century was perhaps the most dramatic period in human history from the aspect of the destiny of people, nations, ideas, social systems, and civilizations.

Nonetheless, it was a century of human passion and suffering – a century of hope and despair, illusion and enlightenment, delusion and disappointment, joy and sorrow, love and hate...

It was, perhaps, the last human century. In order to replace it, there is a heap of centuries of superhuman or posthuman history;

History without hope and despair, without illusions and enlightenment, without delusion and disappointment, without joy and sorrow, without love and hatred”.

(Zinoviev 1997).

The word “stability” (from the Latin *stabilis*, which means constant, stable) refers to the strengthening, or bringing to a stable state, or maintaining a stable state of various phenomena and processes. In systems theory, stability refers to a system’s ability to function reliably without changing its structure and to remain in balance despite various attempts to break it down.

Analogously, we can define political stability as a state of the political system in which it develops normally and functions efficiently without changing its structure, regardless of the actions of external and internal factors. An important feature of stable systems is the ability of political entities to maintain impacts and changes within acceptable limits, as well as to quickly restore any major disturbances to a state of equilibrium without changing the identity and essence of the system. According to the creator of the structural-functional approach, Talcott Parsons, “a system is stable if it is in relative equilibrium, if the relationships between its structure, internal processes, and the environment are such that the properties that make up that structure do not change” (Parsons 1993, 93). According to him, an important feature in the stability of the system is its ability to adapt to different actions by external factors (Parsons 1993). In other words, a political system that, during its functioning, violates the elements of its identity, i.e., comes into conflict with its own nature, loses the property of stability. Political stability is most strongly affected by the sudden changes, transition periods, and “shocks” in the economic, political, and social spheres of society, as well as the frequent changes of ruling elites.

System stability is a relative term best observed through comparisons with other systems. During the comparative analysis of the stability of political systems, one should consider the following: the length and permanence of certain

organisations, institutions, and procedures; their role and importance in the social consciousness; the level of external threats; the degree of harmonisation of different political entities and the elite and counter-elite groups on the most important and fundamental issues of the community. The level of instability of a political system can be determined by the degree of entropy of its parts. According to the Russian political scientist, Lokosov, every social system has a certain degree of entropy for every vital parameter beyond which the system as a whole collapses. Prior to that, we can observe that the main subsystems of society are approaching their limited values, which is a clear indicator that society is in crisis.

According to Ivar Kolstad, political instability can be threefold. The first type of instability refers to the lability of a government and the frequent change of political elites. The second is related to the level of political violence and protest activities in society caused by violence. The third form of instability is not focused directly on the stability of the regime itself, but on the instability and inconsistency of the policy it pursues (Kolstad 2008).

Political stability can be viewed in two ways: as a state and as an ability or function. According to the first approach, political stability is “the state of the political life of a society manifested through the reliable functioning of all political institutions that exist in that society, through respect for legal, political, and moral norms and the most important social traditions built through history and peaceful conflict resolution, which enables the system to function efficiently and develop while preserving its structure and qualitative characteristics” (Irhin 2002, 338). The definition of political stability as a function refers to the ability of the system to function and be maintained without significant, especially sudden changes. Practically, it is the ability to reconcile different interests, build mechanisms of cooperation, tolerance, and understanding, and coordinate group and corporate political activity.

According to Professor Vasilik, “political stability is a constant state of society that ensures it functions efficiently and develops in conditions of external and internal influences while preserving its structure and ability and controlling the processes of social change... The state of political stability cannot be seen as permanent, unchanging, and given forever. Political stability is manifested as a qualitative state of social development, as a certain social order governed by the system of ties and relations that express a common pursuit of goals and means for their realisation. At the same time, stability represents the ability of the subjects of socioeconomic and political life to oppose internal and external factors aimed at disintegration and neutralisation of the system” (Vasilik 2005, 217–218).

As already pointed out, the stability of the system can be affected by a number of factors. Political destabilisation is possible both “from the top” and “from the bottom”. Threats to political stability can be linked to the weaknesses of the regime itself, i.e., to the conflict potential within the ruling elite, as well as to the protesting mood in society itself. Strong and efficient political institutions can prevent the consequences of dissatisfaction in a timely manner and thus prevent it from leading to political instability. In contrast, weak political institutions are unable to cope with forms of destabilisation “from below”, which often leads to the disintegration of the political system.

However, political instability, except under the influence of internal factors, can also occur as a result of the activities of external forces. In the modern world, both causes of instability are related and conditioned. On the one hand, many internal problems, traditionally considered intrastate, take on an international character, while on the other hand, the destabilisation of certain relatively stable political systems can be caused externally by other states with the support of the internal opposition.

The state as the basic subject of the political system

Regardless of all the factors that can influence the condition and character of a political system and the fact that it is a set of many factors and subjects, the state still has the main and unavoidable role in ensuring political stability. Like most important political phenomena, we encounter the notion of the state with very different, often contradictory meanings (Mladenović 2002). One of the objective reasons for that is, of course, its distinct interdisciplinarity.

The philosophical understanding of the state is based on the perception of the relationship between an individual and the community in which that individual, as a rational being, lives and influences the lives of others. The essence of the ancient political-philosophical view (especially with Plato and Aristotle) comes down to the understanding that an individual is not enough by himself and that he must therefore live in community; that an individual is by nature a state-building and social being; that the measure of the greatness of a truly human community is its self-sufficiency (autarky); and that the condition for the existence of such a human community is the structural separation of the public and private spheres. An important feature of the state is its purposefulness. Therefore, it precedes an individual who, without the state, is either a “beast or god” (Aristotle), since the former does not need the state yet, and the latter does not need it

anymore. Living politically in the ancient period meant searching for what was useful and just for the whole community. The state, therefore, was not a collection of randomly gathered individuals, but an order based on justice. And for Hegel, the state is “a whole that purposefully precedes its parts: the family and civil society” (Tadić 1996, 316).

Within the legal approach to the state, the ideas of rational natural law dominate, from which, over time, the notions of “legal state” and “rule of law” have developed. The philosophical basis of these understandings is the “theory” of the social contract, according to which the state is the result of a hypothetical contract between free and equal citizens and holders of power. As the contract is a legal relationship based on the autonomy of the contracting parties, their full equality is assumed. Unlike the philosophical approach to the state’s creation, the legal point of view emphasises the individual before the community. This anti-state “germ” later evolved into numerous understandings according to which the state is a necessary evil rather than a common good, such as by Thomas Paine (Paine 1989).

Most representatives of the “theory” of the social contract believe that state power must be limited in favour of individuals and that citizens have the right to resist if the ruler violates the agreed norms. By overcoming the absolutist rule, the “theory” of natural law and the social contract is transformed into the concept of constitutional law; that is, it manifests itself in the form of constitutionality and legality. The form of community conceived in this way later acquired the characteristics of a “legal state”. At the same time, the issues surrounding the content of the rights remain essentially irrelevant.

The political interpretation of the state’s creation starts by determining the real relations of power between social groups in the community and considering various aspects of the struggle for dominance in a particular area. During the period following the disappearance of absolutist monarchies, that is, at a time when there is a clearer differentiation between secular and spiritual authority, more serious teachings about the state as a “rule or command of the people” (Machiavelli) have developed. Since class monarchies were rather unstable forms of unity, the state —*statio* (from the Latin *status*—state, that which is permanent and stable), “as a political creation, emerges only when the unstable and inconsistent government becomes permanent and stable” (Tadić 1996, 321). The pre-state situation, which Thomas Hobbes describes as *Bellum omnium contra omnes*, was a condition of primary equality because everyone had equal rights to all. The state government, which prevents conflicts between people and guarantees security, i.e., protects limited freedoms, in turn, demands absolute obedience. Viewed in this way, it is, in essence, an organised form of inequality,

which, according to Hobbes, is not unjust because it curbs the passions and lusts of people that can lead to mutual extermination. For the Russian philosopher Nikolai Alexandrovich Berdyaev, a state is an institutionalised form of inequality consciously accepted because “a huge mass of people do not like freedom at all and do not seek it”, and since it is “afraid of freedom” (Berdyaev 1991, 57), it consciously gives in to someone who can, in return, guarantee its peace.

Understanding power as the victory of human reason over instinct is the first reasoned form of state legitimacy. In essence, resolving the relationship between the position of individuals and the purpose of the community, i.e., the problem of tension between freedom and order, is one of the central issues in the science of politics from Socrates to the present day.

“The problem is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before. This is the fundamental problem to which the *Social Contract* provides the solution”, Jean-Jacques Rousseau points out in his famous work “Social Contract” (Rousseau 1978, 101).

The establishment of such a community, in essence, is a process of institutionalisation of that kind of political power that ensures its survival by relatively democratic means (persuasion, rewarding, spiritual manipulation). Since the state of power has always been relative and temporary, the social group that exercises political power must constantly take care of its maintenance. The great Jean Jacques warns: “the strongest is never strong enough to be the master forever unless he transforms strength into right and obedience into duty” (Rousseau 1978, 96). The danger of losing the position of power arises from the eternal dilemma: whether it is necessary and what justifies the power of a man over another man. What influences people to follow other people’s orders and obey them even when they are not in line with their interests? For Bertrand de Jouvenel, “he who knows the reasons for subservience knows the inner nature of political power” (Encyclopedia 1993, 596).

Ensuring a political power’s activity on generally accepted principles entails, in essence, establishing the **legitimacy** of that political order. It is legitimate only if there is an agreement between the way of governing and the vision of order formed by the citizens themselves. No government can count on the stability and permanence of the system unless there is at least a minimum of internal or intimate consent of the subordinates. The etymological meaning of the term “legitimacy” (from the Latin noun *lex*—law, and the adjective *intimus*—close, immediate) indicates the need to harmonise the right to govern with the duty to

obey. “If the consensus and the will of the ruler and the subject are the same”, emphasises Johannes Althusius, “their life is happy and blessed” (Encyclopedia 1993, 595). In the conceptual relationship with the term *lex* (law), there is also the concept of **legality**, applied in the sense of what is in accordance with the law. In the tradition of Roman political philosophy and classical jurisprudence, the terms “legitimacy” and “legality” were mostly used as synonyms and represented the basic quality of valid rule. The development of the doctrine of legal and political positivism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to a clearer separation of the meanings of these terms. German classical political philosophy directs the essence of the problem in the direction of the differentiation of legality and morality. Immanuel Kant, for example, thinks that legal behaviour is not determined by motives, but only by fear of harm or sanction, i.e., an external commandment that deprives us of our own responsibilities of choice. In contrast, moral behaviour is determined by the internal principles of “pure will”, which gives itself the force of law. Representatives of the political theory of the Enlightenment associate legitimacy with Jean Bodin’s sovereignty. Only a government that is in the interest of the common good and in which the ruler is the result of the free choice of the citizens is legitimate.

The ideas and ideals of natural-legal theory underpin the political-philosophical conceptions of the modern European state and the legitimisation of power. The basic thesis, in that sense, is related to the activity of reason as an inner human characteristic that is able to control and humanise human nature, inclinations, and behaviour. When considering modern political conceptions of legitimacy, we cannot ignore Max Weber’s theory that the legitimacy of a government should answer the question on what ultimate principles its validity rests. Every power, including power as an institutionalised power, must be justified in order to maintain its stability and permanence.

In essence, power is “legitimate if the mass of subordinates accepts it with explicit or tacit consent and if they perceive it as lawful and impartial” (Tadić 1996, 321).

The legitimacy of the state (political power) is an extremely changeable and volatile category that must be proven on a daily basis. However, this does not occur only at the national level, but rather at the international level. New worldwide changes imply a considerable growth in the necessity for an analytical notion of the “global risk society” (Stojanović, Đorđević 2017). The crisis of legitimacy is manifested by the inability to ensure mass loyalty and internal integration. Regardless of whether it has a democratic character or manifests itself in an authoritarian form, political power is inextricably linked to power, which, among other things, is used to prove its legitimacy. Legitimacy necessitates

legitimation, emphasises Ljubomir Tadić (Tadić 1996), implying that the government must constantly demonstrate the legitimacy of its existence. Power, as an essential feature of the government, in this sense, can be manifested as supremacy or a possibility (Čupić 1997).

Modern ruling elites in the struggle to achieve “mass loyalty” are increasingly trying to avoid the use of means of gross coercion that cannot have lasting meaning. Instead, they use more perfidious methods. As early as the 17th century, Machiavelli’s student, Arnold Clapmarius, explained to his master that fraud was the most reliable means of state skill. The basis of such a rule is empty rights (*iurainania*), which give subjects the impression that they have what they really do not have. In essence, each political power institutionalises its own forms and mechanisms of legitimacy. “If within the political system, there are opportunities (political capacity) to acquire the necessary material goods, provide a predominant influence on political communication, and periodically renew support in the field of the cultural subsystem, then the conditions are created to meet the prerequisites of procedural legitimacy” (Encyclopedia 1993).

Regardless of the theoretical conception or empirical character of an organised social community, in each of them, in a milder or sharper form, one of the fundamental aspects of the “first principle of politics” is clearly manifested, and that is the opposition of those who rule and those who are ruled. “The logic of power, i.e., hierarchy and domination, indirectly incorporates the individual into its pyramid and expects from him only precisely defined functional actions and behaviour” (Čupić 1997, 148). On the other hand, the individual-citizen has always tried to strengthen and maintain his full political and legal subjectivity in relation to state bodies and to make political power his own creation.

The sovereignty of the state in the conditions of globalisation

The second important feature of state power is sovereignty. Regardless of the period and the concept in question, sovereignty in practice has always been limited by various influences. Today, the notion of complete freedom of action by the state, even in theory, seems quite unrealistic. The area of internal sovereignty is significantly narrowed by numerous international agreements. In practice, the state itself has established numerous areas of self-restraint, even in areas traditionally considered basic elements of sovereignty: regulating imports and exports of goods, setting customs and taxes, enacting rules for electing and

establishing government institutions, regulating freedoms and rights, and even deciding on the emission of money. Even the “sacred rule” of property is suppressed in the countries of the European Union by the abandonment of their own currency and the introduction of the euro. And the right to decide on war and peace, which for centuries has been considered the main feature of sovereignty, is today largely under international control. We are witnessing that the internal issues of the state, in which no one has interfered so far and which have been regulated only by internal law and customs, have significantly narrowed. Electoral processes, normative solutions, principles of organisation of the most important state institutions, and even the formation of government bodies, especially in the so-called countries of unconsolidated democracies, are heavily and often openly influenced by other states and international organisations. All of this beautifully demonstrates how little internal affairs have been left to the state to govern independently through the use of various kinds and methods of political technology.

Voluntary acceptance of international agreements, which, among other things, means limiting the sovereignty of rulers and states, is not new. From the Holy Alliance from the first half of the 19th century, through military blocs and various economic associations, it can be concluded that the processes of internationalisation are not new. However, the prevalence and strength of these processes, then and now, cannot be compared. Today, they are ubiquitous throughout the world. Economic alliances used to be rare, with fewer members. At the moment, it is the most frequent form of connecting states. Some of them, such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Trade Organisation, include most countries in the world. Many issues related to traditional internal problems are being resolved today by close and frequent contact between the leaders of some of the most influential countries in the world. A few countries can stay aside and have the privilege of pursuing independent domestic and foreign policies. The situation is paradoxical to the extent that even the governments of individual countries are more oriented and more accountable to international institutions than to their own citizens, by whose electoral will they have been formed.

It should be noted, for the sake of the truth, that most countries voluntarily agree to limit their own sovereignty, expecting real political, economic, and other benefits as a reward. The number of those deprived of part of their sovereignty in the process of “imposing democracy” is not small. As a result, the state ceases to be the primary entity on its own territory capable of using legal coercion to maintain its own order. The regulation of a man’s and citizen’s liberties and rights, environmental policy, financial regulation, informing and creating public opinion, the educational system, and so on are all taken away from the state.

Despite the fact that the state remains the fundamental unit of historical, political, cultural, and economic existence, many powerful forces are causing it to gradually lose some of its traditional positions and give way to larger supranational institutions. This trend will certainly continue in the future. However, it would be incorrect to conclude that this is a one-sided and unambiguous process. Essentially, sovereignty will decrease and disappear in many segments, but there are also elements in which it will be preserved and even increase. Therefore, it is unjustified to rush to declare the death of the nation-state. It will be one of the leading entities for a long time to come because, as some researchers point out, the sudden shortening of sovereignty and the annulment of traditional state functions can easily lead to chaos (Kilibarda, Mladenović and Eisenhammer 2014). Global trends have given rise to a large number of new non-traditional security risks and have confirmed old, but also modified, security issues in the security space, in which infectious diseases occupy a very high position. Cyclical pandemics, which have caused five major threats in the last two decades—SARS, MERS, Ebola, bird flu, swine flu, and the current COVID-19 pandemic—were a reality in the twenty-first century. This type of risk, with the impossibility of its complete control, is primarily a consequence of climate change, globalisation, urban movements, socio-economic context related to the crisis, poverty, and migrant movements in the field of endemic risks (Jeftić, Mandić 2020, 266). This especially refers to new forms of the viruses, such as the case of COVID-19, which affected the whole world and which is why a pandemic was declared. The state has, perhaps more than ever in the last two decades, proved to be the most important factor of action, which can take all the measures necessary to stop the spread of the virus and protect people's lives (Obradović, 2020b, 128).

In all this, it must be borne in mind that the division of the world into the centre, semi-periphery, and periphery remains the basis of relations in the international community. In that sense, modern states can also be viewed in relation to this "caste division" (M. Pečujlić). According to Professor Vučina Vasović, all countries in the era of globalisation can be classified into four groups. The first group consists of large and powerful states that are the leaders, founders, and helmsmen of globalisation. Moreover, their power goes beyond the limits of international law and the power of international organisations. The second group includes some smaller and weaker countries that enjoy the support, help, and protection of the most powerful. The third group is composed of countries that powerful international factors regard as neutral, while the fourth group consists of countries that have fallen out of favour with some large and powerful countries due to some unfortunate circumstances (Vasović 2010). In other words, sovereignty today is a largely relativised notion. This is best confirmed by NATO's

aggression against the FR Yugoslavia in 1999. Although, in essence, a local issue of a sovereign country, the right of members of the Albanian minority in Serbia and the FR Yugoslavia was internationalised. It served as a motive for the bombing of a sovereign country, separating part of its territory and placing it under international and civilian-military administration (Obradović 2017, 627–644; Obradović 2020a, 176–200).

State and society

When we look at the whole of the social community (and not just the state), we must not forget that the logic of any political power, and even of a theory (except liberal), is directed against the independence of the individual as a basic factor of the social community. Power, by its nature, is always based on hierarchy, mediation, and domination, and it accepts autonomy, uniqueness, independence, and diversity only to the extent that they do not endanger the basic principles of its functioning and survival. The result is, among other things, shaping the individual to live in a community tailored to its ruling elite.

For Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and others, human nature can be manifested and fully realised only in the community. Hegel believes that true independence consists “in the unity and permeation of individuality and generality, because generality acquires concrete reality also on the basis of the individual, just as the individual and special subject only in general find an unshakable basis and the true content of their reality” (Hegel, 1970). At the other end of this spectrum are Nietzsche and his followers, according to whom the individual is sovereign, similar only to himself and free from all influences and norms imposed on him by the community in the form of generality and universality. In essence, “living in a community allows a person as an individual to grow into an individual as a person, but at the same time, it opens up the possibility of a person losing their identity and drowning in one of the many social groups. The drama of an individual’s life in a community is full of perils and risks since society simultaneously cultivates and enslaves him” (Čupić 1997, 148).

Apart from belonging to the community, which the individual selects based on its affinities and requirements (with the exception of the “natural”), the individual is also a member of society. Although the categories “community” and “society” have a number of commonalities and, according to many criteria, similar features, the terms they denote are not synonymous.

By “community”, we mean a group of people connected by relatively strong ties of interest, spiritually close and consciously committed to acting together. Important features of the community are a sense of commitment to the collective and solidarity among members.

“Society” is a broader concept and, as Max Weber points out, it is based on a rational compromise of interests and their connection. In relation to the community, there are categories in society, such as private interests, competition, uniqueness, etc., that are more present than solidarity and togetherness. Society is the broadest and most complex human association that encompasses all forms of connecting people in a certain area, where numerous social processes take place and various social creations are formed. When we talk about the social community today, in addition to the state, the functioning of civil society deserves special attention.

During the ancient period, the terms “politeia” (a Greek term) and “res publica” (a Latin term), which correspond to today’s notion of civil society, referred equally to the state and society. The term “civilis societas” was also used by Marcus Tullius Cicero, denoting a human community that is sufficiently developed and organised (it has its own cities and institutions) so that citizens can live and work in it guided by existing laws.

The relationship between the state and civil society today is one of the most important indicators of the character of a political system. In his famous work “Two Treatises of Government”, John Locke views society as an independent entity, i.e., a political body that elects and controls its own government. The government thus formed has very limited rights in relation to the community. According to him, society is primary, and the government is only a necessary institution that must adhere to established rules in its work and is always subject to control. The distinction between civil society and the state was most strongly expressed by Thomas Paine, emphasising that society is “the product of our desires and the state of our mistakes; society encourages our happiness by positively uniting our feelings, the state by negatively limiting our shortcomings. One encourages socializing. The other creates differences. Society protects, the state punishes” (Paine, 1989).

The relationship between the state and civil society depends on a number of economic, political, and spiritual characteristics of society. In his book “Democracy and Civil Society”, John Keane singles out some of the most important models of these relationships. The first, which is theoretically related to Hobbes, gives primacy to a state that in fact unites both political power and civil society in a single factor of negating the natural state and ensuring acceptable peace for all.

This model is expressed through the **security state**. The second version, which is closest to Locke's conception of the organisation of society and the state, solves the relationship between civil society and the state through the institution of the rule of law. The **constitutional state** corresponds to this model. The third conception, most strongly advocated by Thomas Paine, gives a distinct advantage to civil society over the state. Here, only the most necessary social activity is left for political power, and its embodiment is the **minimum state**. In addition to these three basic models, a whole range of different variants of the relationship between the state and civil society can be set, which correspond to the **universal state**, the **liberal-democratic state**, or any other state (Mladenović 2002).

Despite various prophetic announcements and ideological revelations, the state remains the centre of political life in the (post) modern era. It is the state that creates and maintains the interconnectedness of individuals in modern society and defines the unity and scope of various institutions, while the traditional relations of order and obedience, authority and legitimacy, continue to be imposed as necessary. At the same time, every political creation, such as the state, realises its identity in comparison to other, similar political bodies. In short, states are always particularistic and, as such, are usually exclusively inclined political entities. The purpose of their existence is to establish a certain ("true", "authentic", etc.) order that overcomes the anarchy of lawlessness and is in accordance with the conceived but achievable idea of justice (unity with the cosmic order, God's providence, general equality before the law, etc.). The entire history of political philosophy has been a constant debate over which political order is truly best suited to man and his nature. At the same time, the notion of freedom always comes to the fore, of course, with different interpretations and numerous mutual exclusivities. The modern age has contributed to that centuries-old debate with an old motive, now shaped in a new way and, as such, especially emphasised security (Cvetković 2010).

State and non-state elements of the security system

Nowadays, due to a number of historical circumstances, the word "security" has become one of the most frequently used and exploited terms. In the colloquial understanding, the term "security" is understood as the desired state of the non-existence of threats, a state characterised by the absence of danger and fear, and a state of achieved stability and security and the imperative to achieve them. The phenomenon of security appears in a multitude of forms and contexts, which

explains its various forms and contents. Etymologically, the term “security” comes from the Latin word *securitas –atis*, which means the absence of danger, security, safety, certainty, self-confidence, fearlessness, protection (*securus* – Latin – safe, secure, reliable, fearless, confident, steadfast, firm, loyal, true, etc.) (Stajić 2008).

Although there is no consensus in science about the approach to the phenomenon of security, and even less in terms of its definition, the scientific community is almost unanimous that the term “security” is a term with multiple meanings, i.e., used to denote a much wider number of phenomena than its traditional meaning, which was primarily related to the survival of the state and the protection of its sovereignty primarily from external threats and war. Also, it is generally accepted that this is a socially constructed concept that gains its specific meaning only within a certain social environment, i.e., security cannot be separated from the general context in which the state and society exist and function.

In the earlier period, security was the exclusivity of the state, but the character and depth of the socio-political and historical-civilizational changes in international relations in the last decade of the previous century conditioned (and imposed) a radical change in security theory and practise, primarily the concepts of national and international security. Today, security, as a multi-layered phenomenon structured in many different ways, encompassing all spheres of state and social existence, does not represent only the state of an entity in the absence of threats and fears (conflicts, threats, physical violence), but an instrumental, separate, indivisible value, as a way to achieve something. In addition to the state, national, political, and military spheres, it also contains the social, economic, cultural, moral, ideological, normative, and other elements. The majority of the factors stated have aided in the de-sovereignisation of a huge number of countries in the Eurasian landmass, which occurs as a result of tectonic shifts in the modern security environment (Fatić 2012).

In modern conditions, security is becoming the subject of the theoretical preoccupations of a large number of authors and theorists of all profiles and orientations, which has resulted in the consideration and knowledge of security phenomena in a much broader context, as well as the emergence of many different theoretical approaches.

However, the proliferation of security theories and concepts has not resulted in the constitution of a reliable, generally accepted model in the interpretation of this term and the phenomenon to which it refers. The amplitudes of theoretical considerations range from traditional, realpolitik, and the so-called state-centric model, to a wide range of more liberal approaches that revise the traditional

definition of security and shift the focus from the state to the social community and the individual. Proponents of the theory of human security criticise the traditional security paradigm that emphasises the state as a reference object of security, stating that it is anachronous and insufficient in terms of the security of citizens and their well-being and must be replaced by the concept of so-called human security, which deals with the lives of citizens, their dignity, rights, and freedoms, and sustainable development, which, in one word, is focused on people – individuals.

As stated, during the development of the international community, security models have changed and evolved. So, nowadays, the term “security” has multiple meanings, i.e., it is used to denote a far broader term than the “traditional” meaning associated with the military segment of a state, i.e., the absence of conflict (war) (Stajić 2008).

Scientific efforts to determine new parameters of the concept of security are only one side of the security dimension, while the other side is the institutional framework through which security is achieved, as well as the definition of reference objects of security. From the functional, organisational, and normative aspects, the process of creating a security system is extremely complex, and its growth into a new quality is determined and conditioned by connecting the political, economic, social, cultural, and legal dimensions. However, this process is not paced or uniform, but acts asymmetrically and varies in intensity and effects, which is a direct consequence of the fact that security issues are articulated on several levels: local, regional, international, and transnational, based on different standards, which implies the conclusion that one cannot speak of coherent and universal models and patterns of security systems (Milosavljević 2014).

On the other hand, modern events in the world have largely contributed to the fundamental re-examination of the concept of response to possible security breaches. Terrorist attacks in the United States have radically changed the scale of values of the subjects of the security protection system. The myth of the global hegemony of the United States and the omnipotence of its armed forces has been shattered. Until 2001, the difference in US military power over all other subjects of international relations gave the American administration hope that it would dominate the international scene for a long time to come and be the undisputed judge in all international disputes in which it had an interest. However, after the terrorist attacks on its territory, the vulnerability of the United States has become a new factor in world politics. Doubts that did not exist before have now arisen! The question is: why does the United States have the most powerful weapons (tracking from space, colossal warheads, invisible planes, global radar command systems, etc.) when an opponent, armed with a knife, can simply buy a ticket for

a domestic airline and endanger thousands of American citizens? Before our eyes, there has been a radical change in the nature of security risks and threats. Despite the \$50 billion spent on US intelligence services, there is still no accurate information and reports on who carried out the attack, who coordinated it, for what goal, and with what objectives (Mijalkovski, Konatar 2013). With the terrorist act, the terrible truth was revealed: the traditional system of deterring adversaries simply does not work any longer.

It turned out that the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, whose unique efficiency and power were constantly reckoned with, was, in fact, an ineffective military and foreign policy instrument for modern conditions. Namely, NATO was founded as a military organisation that is the guarantor of the security of Western countries. At the end of the 20th century, NATO formally became a factor of global security and an essential factor of security in the interests of Western countries. In modern conditions, it turned out that his organisation was not enough for a successful operation. Of course, even now, the data on military potential are frightening, but time is increasingly confirming that the old alliance is capable of solving only old tasks. You cannot threaten your opponent with destruction if he is not afraid of dying!

The opposition of world civilizations came to the fore. Until September 11, the differences in culture, language, and traditions of the seven world civilizations were mainly the subject of ethnology and cultural studies. After September 11, civilizational differences became one of the major factors in world politics. The world is shifting its gaze to the East! The civilizations of Islam, China, and Hinduism have all become increasingly active in recent years. Fukuyama appears to have been a tad premature in his broad judgement regarding the end of history! Huntington's claim of the clash of civilizations turns out to be based on various factors. Alexander Zinoviev said that "the time will come when the mullah from the Eiffel Tower will call on Allah!" (Zinoviev 2011).

True, in earlier periods, considering the elements of the security system, we talked about its three basic elements: the state, society, and individuals. Undoubtedly, most of the time, the main factor was the state. It took practically all the care of ensuring external and internal security, thus suppressing the other two subjects. Modern events in the field of security, and above all the new challenges and threats that appear in the world, inevitably indicate the need to think about new solutions in the field of security, including changing the positions of key actors. There were solutions in different epochs and in certain parts of the world that deviated from the usual cliché, such as the system of national defence and social self-protection in the SFRY, but these attempts remained unfinished, lonely, and without significant impact on the environment.

The new security situation in the world again suggests thinking about the re-composition of the national security system in the sense of more complete engagement and non-state institutions. This is all the more important because, as previously said, the state's political role in modern times has altered dramatically. Starting from the fact that civil society is not the same as the state and that these two elements of the human community can be in different relations, we come to the conclusion that, depending on the model of relations between them, we can talk about the redistribution of basic actors in the national security system. Only the simultaneous and coordinated functioning of state and non-state elements of national security can ensure the stability of the system and protect society and the state from divisions, social upheavals, riots, and other forms of threats.

Concluding remarks

Some authors argue that if the balance of power system is replaced by a unipolar world, the system itself will be more stable and secure (e.g., Kindleberger 2013). But if we observe the post-Cold World international relations that have been marked by such polarity, not only has this polarity not led to a more stable and secure international system, but, on the contrary, it has led to the greatest insecurity and uncertainty of humankind since the times of the Second World War.

Security challenges have their projections, regardless of whether we observe them on a national or international front, which, in principle, can narrow or even disable the possibilities of purposeful state action. The reasons for this cannot be reduced solely to the process of globalisation that has made national borders porous and the possibility of reactions narrow. We must take into account the security threats the state faces in current circumstances. National defence systems are sometimes unable to recognise real threats to national security and, more often than not, also lack adequate capabilities for adequate and timely action.

In a unipolar world, the possibility of small states defending their sovereignty from threats stemming from hegemonic powers and their allies seems virtually impossible. On the other hand, in a multipolar world, the possibility of unilateral action by one or more states is significantly smaller, but one should bear in mind that this does not mean that security threats to other states are non-existent. Besides already existing security challenges and threats, the world now finds itself in front of new and, up to that point, unknown challenges and threats. Among them, the most significant ones are: an uncontrolled escalation of armed conflict;

the global economic crisis; international terrorism; the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; an increase in drug trafficking; illegal migrations; criminalisation of different spheres of social life; and, as the pinnacle of mass endangerment, the COVID-19 pandemic.

Therefore, no matter how much one state strengthens its security system, it is objectively not able to confront new security challenges alone. Cooperation with other states, data exchange, coordination of joint activities, as well as joint action in general, represent the only ways to successfully confront security challenges and achieve the stability of the national security system.

This is all the more true given the current position of the nation-state, viewed in the context of globalisation, which is characterised in many areas by a reduction in its regulatory function in favour of other social subsystems. This means that the essence of state sovereignty has been largely changed and, in some cases, even questioned.

Globally, it can be said that the total power of nation-states has remained the same, but it is distributed asymmetrically. While some countries have virtually lost their sovereignty and become “fragmented” states, others have risen above the usual possibilities for the nation-state and become the “functional equivalent of a world government.”

References

- Berdyayev, Nikolai A. 1991. *Self knowledge*. Moscow: Kniga.
- Čupić, Čedomir. 1997. *Politics and Evil*. Belgrade: Čigoja Press and Faculty of Political sciences. [In Serbian].
- Cvetković, Vladimir. 2010. „On shaping and the meaning of security sciences“. In. *Risk, power, protection: introduction to security sciences*, edited by Vladimir N. Cvetković, 705-726. Belgrade: Službeni glasnik RS. [In Serbian].
- Fatić, Aleksandar. 2012. “The phenomenon of ‘de-sovereignty’ of Eurasian and Balkan area in a security perspective”, *Međunarodna politika*, 63(1), 16-30. [In Serbian].
- Group of authors. 1993. *Encyclopedia of political culture*. Belgrade: Savremena administracija. [In Serbian].
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 1970. *Aesthetics vol. 1*. Belgrade: Kultura. [In Serbian].
- Irhin, Yuri, V. 2002. *Political Science*. Moscow: Jurist.

- Jeftić, Zoran and Mandić, Goran. 2020. "Place and role of the Military in response to the pandemic". In: *Infectious diseases as a global security challenges – COVID 19 pandemics: reality and consequences*, edited by Zoran Jeftić and Mihajlo Kopanja, 256-283. Belgrade: Faculty of Security Studies and Institute of International Politics and Economics. [In Serbian].
- Kilibarda, Zoran, Mladenović, Miroslav, and Ajzenhamer, Vladimir. 2014. *Geopolitical perspectives of the contemporary world*. Belgrade: Faculty of Security Studies. [In Serbian].
- Kindleberger, Charles P. 2013. *The World in Depression, 1929 1939*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Kolstad Ivar. 2008. „Political Instability, Indices of“. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Available at: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3045301969.html>.
- Mijalkovski, Milan and Konatar, Veselin. 2013. "Terrorism and intelligence power of the state", *Journal of International Politics*, 143: 277-292. [In Serbian].
- Milosavljević, Slađan. 2014. *Russia and 'peace': National security strategy of the Russian Federation – geopolitical, energy and military aspects*. Belgrade: Akademska misao and Innovation center of Faculty of Security Studies. [In Serbian].
- Mladenović, Miroslav. 2002. *Protection of workers' rights*. Belgrade: NIC "Vojska". [In Serbian].
- Obradović, Žarko. 2017. „Kosovo frozen conflict (from local to global and back)“. In: *Globalizaion and Glocalization*, edited by Uroš Šuvaković, Vladimir Čolović and Olivera Marković-Savić, 627-644. Kosovska Mitrovica and Belgrade: Faculty of Philosophy, University of Priština. [In Serbian].
- Obradović, Žarko. 2020a. "Geopolitical interests of great powers in the Balkans during the last decade and the Kosovo Question". In: *Challenges of the contemporary world: strategic action of states or the resultant of global and local processes and causes*, edited by Zoran Jeftić and Nenad Stekić, 176-200. Belgrade: Faculty of Security Studies, Institute of International Politics and Economics and Institute for Strategic Studies. [In Serbian].
- Obradović, Žarko. 2020b. "New Coronavirus Pandemic: consequences in the international community". In: *Infectious diseases as a global security challenges – COVID 19 pandemics: reality and consequences*, edited by Zoran Jeftić and Mihajlo Kopanja, 122-144. Belgrade: Faculty of Security Studies and Institute of International Politics and Economics. [In Serbian].
- Paine, Thomas. 1989. *Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Parsons, Talcott. 1993. *The concept of society: The components and their interrelations*. Moscow: Thesis, Theory and history of economic and social institutions and system. [In Russian].
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1978. *The Social Contract*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga. [In Croatian].
- Stajić, Ljubomir. 2008. *Foundations of security system with the foundations of researching security phenomena*. Novi Sad: Faculty of Law. [In Serbian].
- Stojanović, Stanislav and Đorđević, Branislav. 2017. "Global risk society and the protection of national interests of Republic of Serbia", *International Problems* 69(4). 465-482.[In Serbian].
- Tadić, Ljubomir. 1996. *Science on politics*. Belgrade: BIGS. [In Serbian].
- VasilykMihail A. 2005. *Political Science*. Moscow: Gardariki. [In Russian].
- Vasović Vučina. 2010. "Globalization, state and democracy". In: *State and Democracy*, edited by M. Podunavac, 437-458. Belgrade: Službeni glasnik and Faculty of Political Sciences.[In Serbian].
- Zinoviev, Alexander. 1997. *Global "human hive"*. Available at: <http://www.zinoviev.ru/ru/zinoviev/zinoviev-tcheloveinik.pdf>. [In Russian].
- Zinoviev, Alexander. 1997. *The West, and the Phenomenon of Westernism*. Available at: http://modernlib.ru/books/zinovev_aleksandr_aleksandrovich/zapad_fenomen_zapadnizma/read. [In Russian].

Žarko OBRADOVIĆ
Miroslav MLADENOVIĆ

**BEZBEDNOSNA KOMPONENTA STABILNOSTI DRŽAVA
NA NACIONALNOM I MEĐUNARODNOM PLANU**

Apstrakt: U radu se analizira problematika političke stabilnosti u kontekstu promena pozicije glavnih političkih subjekata. Izmenjena uloga nacionalne države u uslovima globalizacije, neminovno se odražava i na poimanje i stanje fenomena bezbednosti. S druge strane, broj i karakteristike bezbednosnih izazova i pretnji značajno se povećao. Pored, od ranije prisutnih problema, došlo je do povećanja narkotrafikinga, nelegalnih migracija, porasta trgovine ljudskim organima, eskalacije piraterije i kriminalizacije različitih sfera života. Zadnje dve godine svet se suočio i sa novim globalnim bezbednosnim problemom, ovog puta u oblasti zdravlja – pandemijom kovida 19. Praksa je pokazala da je (u većini slučajeva) nacionalna država postala slabija i nesamostalnija a njoj odgovarajući, državocentristički sistem bezbednosti, neefikasan, skup, glomazan i neadekvatan mnogim novim pretnjama. Snaga ovakvog zaključka proističe iz analize funkcionisanja sistema nacionalne bezbednosti u uslovima terorističkih napada, ali i iz izučavanja mehanizama rušenja suverenih država pod presudnim uticajem spoljnih faktora.

Ključne reči: Politička stabilnost, država, bezbednost, sistem nacionalne bezbednosti, nedržavna bezbednost.