

# Basic Doctrinal Approaches to Defining the Concepts “Security” and “National Security”: in Search for Integration

Galina S. Belyaeva<sup>1</sup>, Aleksandr G. Nikolaev<sup>2</sup>, Aleksandros N. Pasenov<sup>3</sup>, Leonid P. Rasskazov<sup>4</sup>, Vladimir V. Tabolin<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy Street, Belgorod, 308015, Russia  
Email: belyaeva\_g@bsu.edu.ru

<sup>2</sup>Management Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia, 8 St. Zoe and Alexander Kosmodemyanskikh, Moscow, 125993, Russia,

<sup>3</sup>Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy Street, Belgorod, 308015, Russia,

<sup>4</sup>Federal State-funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education «Kuban State Agrarian University», 13, Kalinina Street, Krasnodar, 350044, Russia

<sup>5</sup>State University of Management, 99, Ryazansky prospect, Moscow, 109542, Russia

**Abstract:** This article deals with the analysis of issues regarding the basic doctrinal approaches to understanding national security. It is determined that addressing this issue serves as the basis for sustained social development, being the dominant of societal life, security, of course, cannot remain unchanged in various conditions of its transformation, therefore its content needs constant updating, scholarly studying. The points of view of scientists on the research problem set forth in the work allow for the identification of the two main components in the content of national security: national interests (or, according to some scientists, the interests of security objects) and threats to these interests. These elements are decisive in establishing the essence of both national security as a whole and its main types.

This article was prepared with financial support of RFBR project № 19-011-00720.

**Keywords:** law, security, national security, basic approaches to definition, national interests, threats to national interests and security.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Security (in all its forms – state, national, economic, environmental, informational, demographic, etc.) is one of the most important categories of modern science and practice. At the same time, being the dominant of societal life, security, of course, cannot remain unchanged in various conditions of its transformation, therefore its content needs constant consideration, scientific examination.

Etymologically the term “security” means: 1) a secure condition or feeling; 2) a thing that guards or guarantees; 3) the safety of a State, company, etc., against espionage, theft, or other danger; an organization for ensuring this; 4) a thing deposited or pledged as a guarantee of the fulfilment of an undertaking or the payment of a loan, to be forfeited in case of default; 5) a certificate attesting credit or the ownership of stock, bonds, etc (Oxford English Dictionary, 2015).

Security can also be defined as the state and tendency to develop the protection of the vital interests of society and its structures from internal and external threats, as a result of social activities to ensure the safety of an individual, society, and state.

In the Russian legal encyclopedias, security (social, state, national – from the English safety, security) is interpreted as “a position of protection of the vital interests of an individual, society and state from internal and external threats. The main objects of security: individual – their rights and freedoms, society – its material and spiritual values; state is its constitutional system, sovereignty and territorial integrity.” This definition is based on the concepts of “Securely” (no danger, not dangerous) and “securely” (a situation in which there is no danger) (Malko, 2007).

Foreign definitions of national security are the following: “A nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war” (Romm, 1993); “National security then is the ability to preserve the nation's physical integrity and territory; to maintain its economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms; to preserve its nature, institution, and governance from disruption from outside; and to control its borders” (Brown, 1983); “National security... is best described as a capacity to control those domestic and foreign conditions that the public opinion of a given community believes necessary to enjoy its own self-determination or autonomy, prosperity and wellbeing” (Maier, 1993); “[National security is the] measurable state of the capability of a nation to overcome the multi-dimensional threats to the apparent well-being of its people and its survival as a nation-state at any given time, by balancing all instruments of state policy through governance... and is extendable to global security by variables external to it.” (Paleri, 2008); “[National and international security] may be understood as a shared freedom from fear and want, and the freedom to live in dignity. It implies social and ecological health rather than the absence of risk... [and is] a common right” (Ammerdown Group, 2016; aubaye et al, 2018).

All of them, in aggregate, demonstrate a foreign approach to the definition of national security as the protection of the interests of individuals, society and the state from internal and external (international) threats. And in this, in general, the domestic and foreign approaches to the definition of national security are similar.

In conjunction with the foregoing, in this paper it seems appropriate to identify some doctrinal approaches to the definition of security and national security in order to use these results in practice in order to optimize the mechanism for ensuring national security under the conditions of today (Jaramillo, 2018).

## **II. METHODS**

The methodological basis of the study is based on the application of various general scientific methods and methods of scientific knowledge (analysis, synthesis, deduction, induction, system-structural, formal-logical approaches), as well as particular scientific methods – formal-legal and interpretative.

## **III. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

A historical feature of the development of the concept “state security” in our state is the fact that it has not been used at the official level for a long time and was first enshrined in “The Regulation on Measures for the Preservation of Public Order and Public Peace” only in 1881 (Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire, 1885).

In the Soviet period of the existence of our state, the concept of “security” was used in relation to state security and in this context was officially comprehended in the text of the Constitution of the

USSR (clause “и” of article 14 of chapter 2) and began to be used in official acts of the bodies of the Soviet state and in Soviet legal literature (The 1936 Soviet Constitution. Date Views 21.11.2019).

In the 90s of the 20th century, as a reaction to the need to develop a new concept of security in the Russian Federation, questions about the essence of the concepts of “security”, “state security”, and “national security” got a new meaning in legal science. The official state security concept expressed in the adoption of a number of official documents was formed.

The concept of “national security” in Russian legislation was enshrined in the Federal Law “On Information, Informatization and Information Protection” in 1995 (Corpus of Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation, 1995).

This law and subsequent regulatory legal acts (Concepts and Strategies of National Security) enshrined a fundamentally new for our country progressive approach to the problem of security, based on the recognition of the highest value of the rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of individuals and society.

In legal science, since the 90s of the last century, attempts have also been made to systematize approaches to the definition of security in general and national security, in particular (Galina et al., 2017; Galina et al., 2017; Galina et al., 2018).

For example, S. Z. Pavlenko has systematized the following approaches to the definition of security: 1) “a state of protection of individual, societal and state interests”; 2) “lack of danger”; 3) “specific activities of state bodies”; 4) “a certain condition” (Pavlenko, 1998).

A. I. Pozdnyakov, in turn, identifies three main approaches to defining security: “1) official, in terms of which security is defined as the protection of interests (including national) from threats; 2) systemic-philosophical, the supporters of which focus on the need to maintain integrity, stability, sustainability, normal functioning, sustainable development of the system (country, state, society as a social system); 3) axiological within framework of which security means the protection of values belonging to the subject (country, society, collective, individual) from significant damage to it” (Pozdnyakov, 2006; Nejad et al 2018).

Another point of view on the problems of systematization of approaches to determining security is presented in the works by M.V. Bondarenko, according to which the concepts of security, based on their content, are conditionally divided into two main groups: a) protective, based on comparing danger and security, their dialectics; here security is defined as “a hypothetical absence of danger, real protection from dangers, the ability to reliably resist dangers and threats”; b) security and functional: security is considered from the standpoint of the internal organization, functioning and development of any object, system, their interaction with the environment. Security here appears not only as “the ability of someone or something to protect, defend themselves, but, first of all, as a property of an object, a system to survive, develop and improve, their ability to maintain their special qualities, as the absence of contradictions in functioning and the development of an object, a system that can lead to their destruction” (Bondarenko, 2010).

The foregoing allows for the identification of the two main components in the security content: national interests (or, in the opinion of some scientists, the interests of security objects) and threats to these interests. From our point of view, these elements are decisive in defining the essence of both national security as a whole and its main types:

- the interests of an individual, society and state are potentially valid;
- these interests need constant protection, since they are permanently under the influence of constant threats, in the absence of which the very reason for the existence of the concept “security” is called into question as a means of eliminating the latter. By analogy, if there were no crimes, punishment would not be needed.

That is why, both national interests and threats to them are decisive in the construction of most interpretations of national security presented in modern legal literature. The only difference is that some authors focus on national interests, while others focus on threats to such interests.

Here are the examples that prove our judgments.

So, N.S. Nizhnik defines security as “defenses against threats”, according to whom security is “the state or position of a security object when there is no danger for it, that is, changes in properties for the worse”; “a state that provides sufficient economic and military power of the nation to counter threats to its existence, emanating both from other countries and from within its own country”; “real ability to be free from external danger” (Nizhnik, 1991).

E. A. Oleinikov, in turn, defines national security as “the protection of the vital interests of individuals (citizens), society and state, as well as national values and lifestyles from a wide range of external and internal threats that are different in nature (military, economic, environmental, political, informational, etc.)” (Oleinikov, 2005).

Similar positions concerning the definition of national security as “a social phenomenon (state) aimed at protecting (overcoming) threats” are presented in the works of other scholars. In general, this vector in the study of national security was widespread in publications of the late 20th century, which was due to the search for new ways to solve acute social problems, such as preventing the threat of self-destruction of an individual, society, economy and state under the influence of crises; overcoming socio-economic contradictions through evolutionary transformations, etc.

The above view of the problems of national security, that is, as threats resistance, the ability of the state to repel them, providing protection against them, was reflected in the RF Law “On Security” of 1992, as well as “Basic Principles of the State Strategy in the Field of Ensuring Economic Security ” adopted by the Security Council of the Russian Federation in 1995 (Basic Framework of National Strategies in Economic Safety, 2019).

The recognition of the priority of the interests of an individual, society and state (national interests) in the definition of security is the basis of the second direction in determining the essence of national security.

So, K. Kh. Ippolitov, refuting the focus on threats, states the following: “focusing on the threat, as the initial key element of the concept and content of national security, makes us hostages of these threats, which is explained, first of all, by the fact that the threat is secondary, it is a manifestation not of dangers, but what something more substantial, giving rise to the emergence and development of dangers and threats, as the signs of manifestation of dangers” (Ippolitov, 2003).

In our opinion, we can agree with this approach, for it is more constructive to focus on national interests (their priority and development) as the goal of ensuring security in the state.

We share V.V. Mamonov's viewpoint, according to which national security is "a set of internal and external conditions for the existence of an individual, society, state, ensuring a decent life for citizens, protecting the interests of society, the sovereignty of the people, excluding the possibility of forcibly changing the constitutional order". Thus, the essence and content of security by this author is revealed both through "protecting the state from external attacks and consolidating the military power of the state", and through the existence of "a set of certain conditions in society provided by the state and aimed at realizing the existential interests of an individual and society on the whole" (Mamonov, 2002).

Within the framework of this general (integrative) approach, national security can be represented as a state of protection of individuals, society and state from a wide range of internal and external threats, which ensures the realization of constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens, worthy of the quality and standard of living, sovereignty, independence, state and territorial integrity, sustainable socio-economic national development. Of course, security is determined by limitations. (Ivanova et al., 2019; Svetlana et al., 2018; Makogon et al., 2017).

#### IV. SUMMARY

1. In Russian legal encyclopedias, security (social, state, national) is interpreted as a state of protection of the vital interests of an individual, society and state from internal and external threats. The main objects of security: person – their rights and freedoms, society – its material and spiritual values; state – its constitutional system, sovereignty and territorial integrity. This approach, in general, is also characteristic of foreign research in this direction.

2. In the content of national security, the two main components can be distinguished: national interests (interests of security objects) and threats to these interests. These elements are decisive in the construction of most interpretations of national security presented in modern legal literature. The only difference is that some authors focus on national interests, while others – on threats to such interests.

3. Accordingly, the three main approaches to the definition of national security can be distinguished: a) based on the priority of threats to national interests; b) consisting in the primacy of national interests; c) the so-called "Integrative" approach, in which national security can be represented as a state of security of an individual, society and state from a wide range of internal and external threats, which ensures the realization of constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens, worthy of the quality and standard of living, sovereignty, independence, state and territorial integrity, sustainable socio-economic development of the state. This approach is implemented in the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Oxford English Dictionary (2015). (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. September 2015. Date Views 21.11.2019.  
<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199571123.001.0001/acref-9780199571123>
- [2] Malko, A.V. (2007). Concise Law Dictionary. M., P. 59. [in Russian]
- [3] Romm, J. J. (1993). Defining national security: the nonmilitary aspects. Pew Project on America's Task in a Changed World (Pew Project Series). Council on Foreign Relations. p. 122.

- [4] Brown, H. (1983). Thinking about national security: defense and foreign policy in a dangerous world. As quoted in Watson, Cynthia Ann (2008). U.S. national security: a reference handbook. Contemporary world issues (2 (revised) ed.). ABC-CLIO. p.281.
- [5] Maier, C. S. (1993). Peace and security for the 1990s. Unpublished paper for the MacArthur Fellowship Program, Social Science Research Council, 12 Jun 1990. As quoted in Romm, p. 5.
- [6] Paleri, P. (2008). National Security: Imperatives And Challenges. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill. p. 521.
- [7] Ammerdown Group (2016). "Rethinking Security: A discussion paper" (PDF). rethinkingsecurity.org.uk.
- [8] Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire. (1885). The 3d Edition. SP., 1885. Vol. I. Issue 350. [in Russian]
- [9] The 1936 Soviet Constitution. Date Views 21.11.2019. Date Views 21.11.2019. <https://www.departments.bucknell.edu/russian/const/36cons01.html>.
- [10] Corpus of Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation. (1995). №8.
- [11] Galina S. Belyaeva, Ekaterina V. Butova, Yuliya A. Krylova, Viktoriya S. Kirilenko & Oksana V. Shmalij. (2017). Basic Approaches to Legal Security Understanding and Its Provision at an International Level. *Journal of Politics and Law*, 10(4), 192-196.
- [12] Galina S. Belyaeva, Valeriy P. Belyaev, Olga V. Grechkina, Vladimir I. Shepelev & Sergey Yu. Chapchikov. 2017. Conceptual Bases of State Management in the Sphere of National Security: The Anglo-American Approach. *Journal of Politics and Law*. Vol. 10. № 4. P. 207-211.
- [13] Galina S. Belyaeva, Lyudmila V. But'ko, Ivan N. Kuksin, Valeriy N. Samsonov, Elena V. Safronova. (2018). Basic approaches to the definition of legal security: history and modernity. *Revista Publicando*, 15(2), 1445-1453.
- [14] Pavlenko, S. Z. (1998). Security of Russian State as a Political Problem: Dissertation for Doctor of Political Science. M., 94-99. [in Russian]
- [15] Pozdnyakov, A. I. (2006). The System of Basic Notions of the Theory of National Security in the Context of Value (Axiological) Approach. *Russia's Security in the 21st Century*. M., [in Russian]
- [16] Bondarenko, M. V. (2010). Security as a Social Category: Formation of Conceptual and Categorical Framework. *Theory and Practice*. Orel: Orel Law Institute of RF Interior Ministry. P. 8-19. [in Russian]
- [17] Nizhnik, N. S. (1991). National Security: Conceptual Foundations and Phenomenological Characterization. SP., P. 131. [in Russian]
- [18] Oleinikov, E. A. (2005). *Economic and National Security*. M., P. 156. [in Russian]
- [19] Basic Framework of National Strategies in Economic Safety. Date Views November 21, 2019. [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_92725/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_92725/).
- [20] Ippolitov, K. Kh. (2003). Peculiarities of National Security Implementation. M., P. 161. [in Russian]
- [21] Mamonov, V. V. (2002). *Constitutional Framework of National Security of Russia: Monography*. Saratov. P. 111. [in Russian]
- [22] S. Ivanova, O., S. Chalykh, I., V. Makogon, B., P. Rasskazov, L., & M. Vasekina, E. (2019). Investigation the role of religious organizations in system of general education: forms of state-confessional interaction. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4):818-821.
- [23] Svetlana E. Nesmeyanova, Tatiana V. Ryabova, Lyudmila A. Tkhabisimova, Maxim I. Tsapko, Boris V. Makogon. (2018). Modern Paradigms of Legal Understanding and the Development of Legal Consciousness in Supply Chain (Case Study of Russia). *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 7(5), 796-800.

- [24]Makogon, B. V., Savel'eva, I. V., Lyahkova, A. I., Parshina, A. A., & Emel'anov, A. S. (2017). Interpretation of legal responsibility as a universal instrument of procedural legal restrictions. *Turkish Online Journal of Design Art and Communication*, 7, 328-332.
- [25]Taubaye, Z., Rivers, W., Mussabekova, U., & Alimbayeva, A. (2018). Peculiarities and problems of eponyms (on the material of Kazakhstani periodicals). *Opción*, 34(85-2), 221-236.
- [26]Jaramillo, L. E. S. (2018). Malware Detection and Mitigation Techniques: Lessons Learned from Mirai DDOS Attack. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 3(3), 19.
- [27]Nejad, H. E., Ehsan, H., & Mirkiani, S. (2018). Engineering Education Reform; Thinking Globally, Acting Locally. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 6(04), 54-58.