

SOCIAL SCIENCES

UOT 316.33

STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY PROBLEM

Orujov A.

*Doctor of Philosophy, associate professor, doctoral student of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of ANAS
Senior Methodist of the Education Department of the Academy of the Ministry of Emergency Situations,
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7998-207X>
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10515043>*

Abstract

National security is the ability of a nation to meet its needs for self-preservation, self-reproduction, and self-improvement with minimal risk of harm to the core values of its current state. According to another definition, national security is a set of officially accepted views on the goal and state strategy in the field of ensuring the security of the individual, society and the state against political, economic, social, military threats and as well as external and internal threats of other states. In this article, it is noted that the problem of national security is one of the most actual and complex problems in modern social and political science, and therefore the study of its structural elements has particular importance. Also, in the article, the structural components related to the scope of the national security problem has been studied by giving a separate classification.

Keywords: national security, national interest, political culture, regional security, state security.

Introduction: First of all, it is necessary to clarify the six categories in which national security is divided according to the scope of our research.

- International security
- Geographical or regional security
- State security
- Public safety (security)
- Safety (security) of public groups
- Security of individuals [9. p.11-13].

The mentioned areas of security are perceived as interconnected and parallel. Just as the security of the state covers the field of international security, and regional, public, and individual security are also concepts of security that are considered in parallel with state security.

When talking about the structural composition of national security, it is necessary to pay attention to three main points.

The first is the public's perception of security. The public mass (nation, people, society, groups, parties, voters, etc.), which is decisive in all areas of security, plays the role of base. The structures of national security are formed taking into account the political, strategic and threat culture adopted by each nation.

Second, the structural view is made up of both political and legal views and interests of states.

The third is international and domestic legal standards.

Security is one of the main, even the most important organizational principles of modern states. Historically, security was organized according to the power potential of states, but in modern times, these standards are set according to the principles of international law and the balance of interstate political relations. National security, which is the central and key term of the international relations system, is the main determining factor in making internal and external political decisions for a state. Decision-makers have a

duty to inform their public of any internal and external political decisions that are contrary to national security policy, disclose their harm, and include measures against them on the agenda [24. p.212].

I. Political system and political culture

First of all, political culture is the parliament, government, political parties, political power, elections, constitution, etc. institutions that regulate the integrity, operation and management of the political mechanism within the political system in which each people lives. It covers all cultural presence, opportunities and behavior of determining political factors. According to G.M.Patrick, four main terminological frameworks are defined within the framework of political culture.

- The concept of "objectivity" termed by David Easton
- The concept of "subjectivity" brought up by Almond, Verba and Powell
- The concept of "heristic" (study) formed by Lisian V. Pyei
- The concept of "comprehensive" introduced by Fagen and Tusker [1.p.39].

The concept of objectivity introduced by D. Easton is based on the view or idea that political culture is independent of individuals, but takes into account their unity. According to him, the political existence of a nation depends on its history and social-moral relations, economic and political activities. That's why, political culture is perceived as a kind of reflection of public behaviors of individuals in front of politics.

Almond and Verba, two researchers who analyze political culture on the basis of subjectivity, in their works entitled *"The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations"* point out the need to take into account each nation's character and historical behavior in the formation of political culture. In this sense, the authors state that political cultures are determined by three main characteristics:

First, it forms a narrow or parchial political culture (parchial political culture), which mainly reflects views connecting rural, urban and country types, and the attitude of citizens towards the central government based on this concept is far from being active and effective.

Second, citizens belonging to the political culture based on subjection and obedience (subject political culture) consider themselves a part of the central government and political system. The common enemy or threat defined by the center is clearly perceived by the citizens in the same category. Citizens with this view are not active even if they join the political authorities.

Citizens belonging to the political culture accepted in the third place (participant political culture) had an effective political identity. Citizens belonging to such a political culture judge the decisions made by the central governments and states, and try to determine the truth of the created image of the enemy or threat [2.p.17].

Interestingly, it is difficult to find a country with a political culture that is included in the last ranking. Although the European nations are included in this list, they have taken their place at the political authorities without judgment in the face of the black propaganda about terrorist attacks and Islamophobia that occurred in the 21st century.

Rye's ideas on the debate about the determinants of political culture for national security are also interesting. According to him, nations in political cultures, whether mass or individual, mainly react within the national unity to which they consider themselves to belong. Rye calls this "national identification" [18. p.77].

II. National security and strategic culture

The second determining factor in national security is the strategic culture. Strategy which derived from the Greek word "stratos ago" or "strategus", is a military term. In modern times strategy that went beyond the concept of military or military power began to cover other non-military factors. Along with the popularization of the term "culture", the behavior of peoples and nations began to be evaluated within the framework of strategic culture. The first theoretician of modern strategic culture was Carl von Clausewitz. According to him, the strategy is "an exam of moral and material powers". Clausewitz created this concept for war or threat. According to him, the war is a half of two wills. That is, the will to wage war is culturally determined by psychological factors" [10. p.163-173; p.3].

The fact that the peoples of the world saw themselves as part of the Soviet and counter-strategic culture from what parameters during the Cold War is a clear proof of this. A major leading force among strategic culture studies is the behavior that results from decision makers in different societies thinking differently and acting differently under similar conditions and decision stages [16. p.17].

One of the main reasons why strategic culture is decisive in the concept of national security is the attachment of nations to what identity they see themselves as a part of historical, cultural, moral, and religious point. For example, since the Turkish people perceive themselves on a different front against the Greeks in the strategic cultural sense, they show a strategic reaction in

the decisions made by the state towards Greece in accordance with their past and the historical process they have gone through [23. p.69].

The researchers who talk about a role of strategic culture in national security issues mainly point the attitude of three generations.

The attitude of the first generation is based on Jacques L. Snyder's concept of strategic culture. According to Snyder, "strategic culture is the sharing of sense reflexes and ideas of already accepted behavioral attitudes and conditions that members of a society possess and share with each other through education and training in their strategic styles" [19. p.8].

For example, representatives of the generation that spent a large part of their lives in the USSR have the same strategic cultural attitude in all matters related to the United States. This generation is considered to be the generation before 1980, and it should be taken into account that this generation played an active role in defining the concept of national security in a number of countries.

The second generation is accepted, generation with different strategic interests and views, formed after 1980. According to Johnston, there is a leadership-politics parallel in the strategic behavior of this generation in the face of national security issues. According to this generation's understanding, there is a deeper and hidden goal behind every political behavior. Leaders have different political goals than their stated ones. This indicates legal maneuvers and methods of the state in front of the enemies [12. p.39].

The third generation is the tough, picky, and definitely non-ideological generation that formed after 1990. Global security interests are above national and regional interests for this generation with more liberal-minded minds. Interestingly, the concept of security is more relevant to this generation than to the other two generations. Because in the global world, with the emergence of common, global forms and components of security (global warming, terrorism, chemical weapons, water problems, etc.), a new culture of security began to flourish [13. p.41].

According to Johnston, the advantages of the strategic culture of the third generation are even greater. Because the third generation's approach to security is variable, unlike the deterministic view of the first generation, and the casprological view of the second generation. For them, cultural relations are meaningful and important not because of historical and national values, but because of experiences. It is interesting that security for the third generation is perceived in global terms, and not in national and regional framework. In many cases, the views of this generation are inversely proportional to the understanding of the states about national security [17. p.8]. Johnston defines this generation's idea as "neorealist" [13. p.42].

III. National security. Social crowd and threat culture

The concept of threat which is the third factor determining public opinion in national security comes from itself. This is shortly called threat culture. As you know, researchers studying security issues in international relations recommend focusing on the cultural

views to which the masses are attached. Because this paves the way for the emergence of constructivist theories in the structural solution of security. People's concept of threat or threat culture is based on the logic of friend and enemy. Carl Smith explains his understanding of politics on the basis of "friend and enemy". According to him, the world that emerged after the First World War "is not a political union, but a political majority" [20. p.84].

In matters of national security, many states determine their behavior based on their people's traditional understanding of friend and foe. At the international level, this created the concept of "current friend and enemy change in international relations"., states define their relations for the sake of security and benefit among themselves according to this change. For example, the traditional "fear of the Turks" in the mentality of the European peoples plays an important role in the European Union's behavior towards Turkey. Also, in international organizations such as NATO and the Shanghai Economic Community, the concepts of friend and foe are defined according to strategic goals [6. p.65].

According to Katzenstein, the threat understood as a threat to one state in international relations is evaluated by another state in the same framework as the concept of alliance. This comes from "an epithet created by autonomous power politics" [14. p.3].

As a result, the basis of national security is the political, strategic and threat culture of the public in connection with threat. This is generally called security culture. In this case, the security culture is evaluated in six items:

- a) Security culture refers to the values shared by all individuals or the entire group of society at a group or higher level;
- b) Security culture is closely related to formal security issues in a society;
- c) Security culture is formed with the participation of society members;
- d) Security culture affects the behavior of society members;
- e) Security culture is formed by experiences gained from incidents, mistakes and wars, as well as reconciliations in a society;
- f) Security culture is very strong, stable and resistant to change [3.p.47-48].

The state is considered the main factor in national security. The state is considered a kind of security provider, its structural determinant and forming element. National security for national states is as important as national interests and national goals. Each state manages to protect its national interests and achieve its goals in proportion to ensuring its national security.

National power includes all the material and moral elements that a state will use to ensure its national interests and achieve its national goals. The elements that determine the national power of the state are the following: political power, economic power, military power, demographic power, geographic power, psycho-socio-logical and cultural power [4.p.29-30].

It is clear from this that power is the main factor in ensuring national security for states. Therefore, for a

long time, that is, until the 1990s, from the time when the issue of security was on the agenda, state power and state authority were understood as related to power. Here, too, military power was considered the main element. However, after 1990, especially with the "new concept of security" formed by the Copenhagen school, the identification of security with power is perceived. So, all the sources of power mentioned above began to form the scope of national security [5. p.5].

Barry Buzan emphasizes each of these parameters as the main elements of the safety net. Therefore, the main elements of national security are: political security, economic security, public or social security, military security, environmental security, geographical security [8. p.96-97].

According to Buzan, the most important feature of the new concept of security is the formation of parts of power and security structures known in a general sense and the presence of these parts in an effective condition [7. p.58].

Geographical factors sometimes create natural and unnatural hazards. For example, Cuba's military potential is the biggest threat for the United States, which has the largest military power in the world, and hurricanes, which every year have a big impact on the state budget and threaten the lives of many citizens, are also a source of danger [25. p.397].

Until the 21st century, when security was mentioned, the main factor was the states, as well as security areas, military and political issues were brought to the attention. But in the last few decades, states have begun to cease to be the main point of threats. This is because traditional concepts of security have been replaced by biological security, environmental pollution, terrorism, the limitation of the world's natural resources, migration, economic problems (hunger, famine, drought), mass infectious diseases, bacteriological weaponization, knowledge terrorism, etc. Currently, the sides of the concept of threat, which constitutes a risk for national security, are changing rapidly. Modern forms of threats such as blocking the bank and security systems of the state through computers, stealing knowledge archives have appeared. Such mass suicides, counter-propaganda campaigns targeting a certain institution of a state or the moral values of a people also create socio-psychological dangers. In this sense, some social organizations and movements aimed at solving social problems are affected without any reason or are perceived as part of a global threat. Animal rights and green protection organizations are unknowingly becoming an element of threat through the direction of certain networks. It turns out that in the current conditions, the borders of the concept of national security as a threat have expanded twice, and in return, the concept of threat has become more sensitive.

IV. Globalization and national security issues

In the globalized world, threats based on global security began to surpass national security. The new global relationship system has created a chain of virtual relationships in parallel. Along with the increase in the number of Internet users, permanent concepts and values have begun to form in virtual relationships. In 1995, there were 16 million Internet users in the world, and in

2000, this number increased to 360 million, and in the following 12 years, to 2.5 billion. Between 2000 and 2012, there was a 566 percent increase in the number of Internet users [26]. In 2018, this number reached 5 billion.

Virtual relations require the creation of virtual security networks, the creation of new forms and rules of control over mass social information networks. All these require expenses that exceed the capabilities of a state. In such a case, there is a need to create new global rules and concepts of security.

Along with social media, the concepts of "soft power" or "soft threat" also started to gain relevance. The connection of social media tools to global structures, the use of these networks by some powers to transmit and receive their understanding to the other side, also creates inequalities in the concept of global security. So, parallel to global relations, global competition is expanding.

Traditional national security structures were under state control. These structures were mainly implemented by: police organization, gendarmerie forces, army units and security organization.

These structures performed the regulatory role of the internal regulation of the security of each state. Those regular powers were regulated in accordance with the international law norms along with the rights of the states.

International law (*raison d'être*) and the main principle in its interaction constitute the characteristics and needs of the international political order. Within this order, there should be common terms on how to communicate in cases of coexistence or global enmity. No matter how scattered and different these views are, currently the international legal system has managed to form a certain pattern of its own [21. p.31-32]. M. Hart and A. Negri based on this point of view that "right (repeating the many forms that money acquires in the capitalist system) does not carry any value of its own like money, important conditions for the reproduction of social works, capitalist society, division of labor and colonization it is made up of the values it produces day by day [11. p.22]. The reason for this is not the issues raised by international law, but the world system to which the law is bound. Thus, modern international law is a product of a certain state and its emergence dates back to the times when capitalist production was effective. In the process of creating international law, it is mainly the emergence of capitalist states after monarchist states. Therefore, international law itself is unable to fully meet the general security of the world, since it is based on the security of capitalist industrial relations [22. p.19-20].

V. International parameters and national security factor

International law protects the rights of states based on the principle of reciprocity, protecting their rights, defending the rights of their citizens outside the country, and the right to common defense. All of these mentioned settings involve security issues. Looking at it from this framework, security in the world is currently perceived in three stages: country security (domestic, territorial, state), regional security (interstate, common

security), global security (migration, terrorism, nuclear-biological weapons, climate, human rights and so on.).

The country security is in the first place in the security system. Country security is divided into several categories: domestic security, territorial or geographical security and state security.

The main structural aspect of internal security is that each country has its own security organization. Ensuring the safety of citizens, guaranteeing their rights and freedom, preventing internal conflicts, etc. constitutes the main areas of internal security. Territorial or geographic security covers areas related to the protection of a state's national identity and existence. State security aims to eliminate the threats directed to the legal, political, economic and national principles defined in the constitution of each era. State security agencies, especially internal and external intelligence, control this area.

The main field of national security is intelligence, that is, the activity of intelligence agencies. Intelligence agencies are considered a primary aspect of national security.

Each state determines its own intelligence and intelligence mechanism. Information and events that are not intelligence for a state may be vital for another state. There are also states where intelligence controls the political and social life of the entire state. Stalin era USSR is an example in this regard. Intelligence systems and agencies are considered to be the main organization in the protection, and promotion of the values of security, which both form the concept of national security and set its parameters. In intelligence systems whose main activity is based on the information-analysis-evaluation prism, the protection of the state and the nation is above all kinds of profit, and the control bodies are carried out in this framework.

Intelligence systems are threat and threat prevention forces. After perceiving, evaluating and analyzing of the incidents such as crisis, rebellion, changing the constitutional values of the state, coup, conspiracy, creating unauthorized power and profit groups, threats, pressure, violence, developing action plans that will influence the main leaders and bodies of the state and so on by the intelligence groups, they take measures if necessary. The measures taken by intelligence groups may not always be unilateral, internal interference, redirection, receiving information, etc. action forms are among the methods used by intelligence.

Intelligence agencies define their activities in a chain of sharing, regulating and taking action with other agencies. In this sense, intelligence is considered the most operative aspect of security in matters of national, regional and global security.

The second stage of security is territorial or geographical security. Geographical or territorial security covers a specific area in national security. It includes many areas from urban security to security of energy sources and natural phenomena. According to researcher Wendt, there is an affinity between issues of territorial security and issues stemming from human nature. Since security is the basis of the human phenomenon, the security of the territory belonging to a

person and groups of people is the main condition of human destiny. For this purpose, many countries have formed their Geographical Information System. Geographical Information Systems are currently successfully applied in many fields, including the military field. From terrain analysis systems to satellite systems, from computer systems to various technological systems, Geographical Information Systems are widely used in security fields [15. p.3-4].

Conclusion

States constantly monitor regional security as well as their own national security standards. Each state has its own security thresholds, concepts, parameters and common control mechanisms of the region in which it is located. In the neighborhood relations, the states are obliged to take into account the security of the surrounding states as well as themselves, and adjust their own internal and national security accordingly. In this sense, regional security is the guarantee of internal security, as well as the key to global security.

The last structural stage of security is international security. Already in our modern world, international security issues are rapidly being formalized in the form of standardization, centralization and mutual assistance, leaving the framework of common concepts. Terrorism, global warming and climate change, migrations, human rights, national rights, nuclear and chemical weapons are governed through the legal standards of international security.

References:

1. Akşit Gizem. İslam ülkeleri ve siyasal kültür ekseninde Türkiye'de başkanlık sisteminin değerlendirilmesi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul 2016, 178 pp.
2. Almond G.A., Verba S. The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations, 3. Edition, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California, 1963, 379 pp.
3. Başurğan Aynur. Ulusal güvenlik politikaları ve güvenlik kültürü arasındaki ilişkililiği ortaya çıkartmaya yönelik ölçek geliştirilmesi, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kahramanmaraş, 2018, 223 pp.
4. Bayat Mert, Milli güç ve devlet, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1986, 453 pp.
5. Baldwin David. The concept of security, Review of International Studies, vol. XXIII, No: 1, 1997/13, p. 5
6. Birdişi Figen ve Başurğan Ayşe. Güvenlik politikalarının konstrüktivist bir unsuru olarak güvenlik kültürü ve Türkiye örneği, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 4, (4), 2017, 58-78 pp., p. 65.
7. Booth Ken. Güvenlik ve özgürleştirme, Avrasya Dosyası Güvenlik Bilimleri Özel, 9, (2), 2003, 51-70 pp.
8. Buzan Barry and Hansen L. The Evolution of International Security Studies, United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 402 pp.
9. Dedeoğlu Bilal. Uluslararası güvenlik ve strateji, İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2003, 185 pp.
10. Clausewitz Carl von. Savaş üzerine, çeviren H.Fahri Çelikler, İstanbul: ALFA Yayınları, 2018, 768 pp.; Lantis J.S. Strategic culture: from Clausewitz to constructivism, defence threat reduction agency advanced systems and concepts office, united states government agency, 2006, 31 pp.
11. Hardt Michael, Negri Antonio. Dionysos'un emeği devlet biçiminin bir eleştirisi, çeviren Ertuğrul Başer, İstanbul: İletişim yayınları, 2007, 464 pp.
12. Johnston A.L. Cultural realism: strategic culture and grand strategy in chinese history, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1995, 328 pp.
13. Johnston A.L. Thinking about strategic culture, International Security, 19, (4), 1995, 32-64 pp.
14. Katzenstein P.J. The culture of national security: norms and identity in world politics, Columbia University Press, New York 1996, 562 pp.
15. Kopar Attila. Coğrafi bilgi sistemlerinin askeri uygulamaları ve iç güvenlik hareketi kavramı, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul: 1999, 109 pp.
16. Lahi Aynur. Stratejik kültür ve dış politika: AB ve ABD'nin Kosova politikalarının analizi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara: 2012, 197 pp.
17. Neuman I.B., Heikka H. Grand strategy, strategic culture, practiceI the social roots of nordic defence, Cooperation and Conflict, 40, (1), 2005, 5-23 pp.
18. Rye L.W. Political culture and political development, Ed. L.Oye and S.Verba, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1965, 583 pp.
19. Snyder J. L. The Soviet strategic culture: implications of limited nuclear operations, the rand corporation, a project air force report prepared for the United States Air Force Rand, Santa Monica, 1977, 40 pp.
20. Schmitt Carl. Siyasal kavramı, çeviren Ece Göztepe, İstanbul: Mets yayınları, 167 pp.
21. Shaw Malcolm N. Uluslararası hukuk, çevirenler İbrahim Kaya, Yücel Acer, M.Turgut Demirtepe, G.Engin Şimşek. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2018, 1006 pp.
22. Tümay Hasan. ABD'nin ulusal güvenlik doktrinleri'nin uluslararası hukukta kuvvet kullanımı bağlamında irdelenmesi, İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Malatya 2020, 123 pp.
23. Uz Zaman R. Strategic culture: A cultural understanding of war, Comparative Strategy, 28,(1), 2009, 68-88 pp.
24. Walt S.M. The renaissance of security studies, International Studies Quarterly, 35, (2), 1991, 211-239 pp.
25. Wendt Alexander. Anarchy is what states make of it: The social power.Politics, International Organization, Vol. 46, No.2, Spring, 1992, p. 397
26. <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.html> (last review, 26.03.2014).