

Ryszard SKARZYŃSKI
University of Białystok
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5669-0731

Elżbieta KUŻELEWSKA
University of Białystok
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6092-7284

From Political Mobilization to Political Security. How Has the Approach to Security Changed Over Centuries and Why Has It Depended on Political Relations?

Abstract: The paper discusses relations between political mobilization, security and political relations. Security is understood as a social phenomenon, clearly explained by Clausewitz in his book *On War*. According to Clausewitz, political relations are of key significance for understanding the phenomenon of security. This thesis is not challenged, however, it is necessary to explain why political relations are necessary.

The paper consists of four parties. The first part explores security and its evolution from a historical perspective. The second part analyses relations between a war and political mobilization. In our opinion, war is something more than simple continuation of politics by other means. Part three discusses the personal security, which was not a priority for the states. The problem of security appeared in its complex form only when people became ready to fight as a result of political mobilization, and with the creation of stable political organization. Section 4 describes political security and its consequences.

We conclude that the product of the global political mobilization is polyarchy which principally changes the problem of social and political security. Within the framework of regional polyarchy the system of security of states in the area occupied by it is possible. As a result of creating a global polyarchy the universal system of security has become real. The role of army has changed and to an ever decreasing extent fulfils the function of a traditional army. Mercenaries lost their importance (however, not completely) and later also the military troops acting on behalf of the state.

Key words: political mobilization, social and political relations, security, government, state, polyarchy

Introduction

Clausewitz, still popular, although not as widely read as before, wrote: “War is not merely a political act, but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse by other means” (Clausewitz, 1995, p. 23). The general saw war not only as a continuation of politics, but ultimately as an effect of political relations. This effect results from the structure of the society, and from the fact that social relations have assumed a special form, that is the form of political relations. People who enter into these relations pursue their interests through the use of military power means. According to Clausewitz, war is “an act of relationships between people,” or in other words “a social life phenomenon” (Clausewitz, 1995, p. 115). Thus, *On War* can be understood as a study of politics and strategy in the context of a social interactions network. This is where we find the timeless character of a treaty written two centuries ago. It is an important contri-

bution, not only in explaining the phenomena of struggle and war, but also their origin, as seen through the prism of society. This includes how it functions, with respect to security issues, not only the absence of threat, but reacting to threats in the way that makes it possible to keep them under control and, should an extreme situation occur, to win.

This paper aims to discuss the security as a social phenomenon, to show the evolution of social organization and to explain the relations between war and political mobilization and the relations between personal and political security. According to Clausewitz, political relations are of key significance for understanding the phenomenon of security. Here, this thesis is not challenged, although simply referring to Clausewitz's assertion may not be fully satisfactory to us.

In order to understand the social phenomenon of security the following research questions need to be answered: 1) how did political relations originate, how are they possible, how do they function and, first of all, what are they characterized by and why do they play such a significant role in security processes? 2) Why is the use of armed forces (which can grow to be large armies) largely restricted to those engaged in political relations? 3) Why, in certain configurations of political relations, is security assured through military force, but in others, such force is all but useless? In the paper the following research methods have been used: 1) historic – to explain the evolution of social organization in the context of security; and 2) comparative – to show the relations between the war and political mobilization as well as relations between personal and political security.

Security in a historical perspective

It is currently possible to answer the above questions, especially the first two, in the light of research concerning the evolution of social organization from the end of the 4th to the 2nd millennium BC. Getting familiar with archeological sources, and in particular decoding the inscriptions, of the Akkadian, Babylonian and Assyrian civilisations leads to the conclusion it was during this time that the transition from a social organisation based on blood ties, grouping a small number of individuals close to each other genetically, to an organization built in a totally different way, took place. Over the next millennia it extended throughout the world and nowadays the whole human kind functions not as a species, not as a federation of families, but as a community divided into political formations, or states (not nations), competing with each other in a life-and-death struggle, grouped within the framework of a system characteristic of polyarchy (Skarzyński, 2006, pp. 307–320). A vast majority of them have never been a nation state.

The origin of contemporary states is by no means singularly tied to nationalism. The process of shaping such imagined communities, called nations, influenced in the 19th and 20th centuries, the characteristics of a certain number of countries, but not the ma-

¹ Obviously, armed troops can be used by families or economic or even criminal organizations. However, only political associations have organized armies reaching the highest numbers of individuals at a given time and that is why only they count in the struggle for the world order. In other words, only political associations have a capability of mobilizing armed troops to the extent that allows for winning in the battlefield. In this context the story of Hansa is a great lesson.

jority of them. The states currently making up the structure of the global polyarchy are a product of the processes taking place since the first theocratic states came into being, followed by dynastic states until the contemporary states were created, where the largest states are not nation states, but those ruled by political parties, that is partocracies. They constitute a combination of state systems, where theocratic and dynastic states are still present. Are the nation states dominant among them or can the dominant role be attributed to the states falsely called nation states, being in fact party states which can be divided into democracies, oligarchies and dictatorships?

In the 4th century BC in the Middle East a type of ruler started to emerge who was not only the priest directing the worship of local gods, but was also responsible for keeping social order². Having their life centered around a place of worship, priests were the first politicians, although initially they were of local and low importance. As time moved on, their power grew. At the end of the 4th century, due to the growth of towns and an increase in social mobility (mainly connected with trade), rulers started to emerge who regarded themselves as deputies of the gods or even emissaries who were entrusted by the gods with a special mission: the task of taking control of the surrounding world. This later expanded to conquering the whole known world. On their behalf and in their honour. A special place was earned by the doctrine of “four quarters,” originally adopted by the Akkad rulers who were zealous in their efforts to conquer as much territory as possible and sacrifice it to their gods (Van De Mieroop, 2004, p. 64; Michalowski, 2010, p. 153). Later these patterns were adopted by the kings of Babylon and Assyria (Saggs, 1962, p. 258; Oded, 1992, pp. 9–24, 163–175).

The basic characteristics of the doctrine never disappeared, although in subsequent centuries it was called by different names. With time not only kings, but also gods ceased to matter. It had its periods of glory in the systems of ideas and in achievements of great powers which fought for their imperial position. At times some of them seemed to be close to unchallenged reign over the world accessible to them.

The fundamental premises of specific visions were stable, only the symbols behind them changed. In the 18th and 19th centuries “God” was replaced by nation and attempts were made to promote the master race and working class in its place. These symbols shortly succumbed to an attractive vision of democracy (with an even more attractive welfare state behind it), as it was, for instance, expressed in 1992 by Francis Fukuyama in his famous work *The End of History* (Fukuyama, 2009). His ideas fit perfectly into a triumphalism characteristic of American politics after the collapse of communism. This triumphalism provided lift for his nonsensical vision (so nonsensical that he denied it himself later). Fukuyama was the most successful (or the most convincing) glorifier of American greatness simultaneously with the American myth in a version adjusted to the imperial foreign politics. There were many glorifiers like that in the past. One of the most known among them was Vergil two thousand years ago.

The goals of seeking power and building an empire have proven to be an enduring constant in the story of civilisation. Today, when we look at the last few centuries of the history of our species, it seems to be the primary, non-reducible goal across the

² The process was reiterated in Rome, after the raids by Asian tribes and collapse of the empire when the bishops of this city became its political rulers and later started to build a papal state and papal empire (5th–18th centuries).

globe. Exploiting associations and attachments to great symbols, stirring emotions, uniting millions in a readiness to die, capable of attacking by every means, building their position tirelessly, and transposing this to territorial expansion and, in recent decades, space expansion. Currently, political entities which are a product of specific relations as Clausewitz aptly showed, pose the greatest threat to peace in the world, especially when announcing peacekeeping operations. They are kept under control only by the system of polyarchy, enhanced by the absurd capability for physical destruction which some of them, that is the most powerful countries, possess.

The breakthrough, which occurred between the 4th and 2nd millennium BC, came when people started to leave small social organisations based on close ties and affiliation, and dedicated to the management and worship of local gods. Instead they joined or formed larger social groupings with a common vision ultimately of empire, created and kept as gods and later God demanded. This process was therefore connected with a transition to monotheism. Plurality of gods was politically harmful. Where it was not overcome, the chances for building an empire were reduced. Monotheism was an effective adaptation to the requirements set by the battlefield which was shaped from the end of the 4th millennium BC. The aim of the struggle was the universal order, which could be justified by subsequent imperial visions.

Within the new structures families and tribes still existed, and the most robust of them even grew larger. Few of them took power thanks to the introduction and dissemination of the idea that privileges had been granted to a particular family by God. The story which illustrates this to us most clearly, due in part to the number of accounts and other historical resources produced and still remaining today, is the history of the House of Habsburg from the 2nd millennium which grew for several hundred years from an insignificant family to become the greatest European dynasty, with multiple branches (in fact the House of Habsburg and the House of Habsburg – Lorraine) after it created the myth of its supernatural connection with the Creator of the world (Wheatcroft, 2000). Probably the longest running dynasty was the House of Osman (13th–20th centuries). The length of their reign must inspire us to ask: how could it last so long? Consequently other questions must follow. What made this power last as it did? How or why was it not taken away from the House of Osman?

The history of dynasties from medieval to modern times (where the history of the House of Saud seems to be the most instructive) demonstrates the power that the most effective houses were able to generate. They achieved this through various means including marrying off their own daughters, and taking fertile and wealthy women as wives, who would provide and secure successors to the throne. Dynasties used all means available, means which they required to collect the proper resources. These resources were often in the form of political relationships (of relatives and their clients), which showed potential in the ability to manage resources (including both people, territories and natural resources), and saw justification for their actions in the vision of universal order, where the central position was commanded by the dynasty by the will of deity regarded as the Creator of the world.

However, the history of the very idea of monarchy seems to be more poignant. The interpretation of the concept altered in a specific way, more equated with the authority of king or emperor, when earlier in ancient Greece it had been understood simply as

monocracy – not in the sense of rule by a single person but one centre of power at a given territory). This had such an impact on people's psyches' that it defined their lifestyle and even belief in their own actions, allegedly performed due to the will of supernatural forces. This phenomenon was well studied in the 20th century (Bloch, 1998, Kantorowicz, 2007). Unfortunately today it seems to be considered rarely, if at all, when explaining the phenomena of state and nation. However it demonstrates that in the history of our species the origin and functioning of states was more connected with the belief in supernatural forces than the belief in the imagined communities, or nations, the latter of which is a far more recent development.

Between the 4th and 2nd millennium BC, local ties, based on direct contact between people, were complemented by relations functioning in a totally different dimension. Subsequent human communities gradually transformed into a composite mass of associations, capable of maintaining both political relations and warfare, specifically increasingly advanced military actions. Those communities who failed to keep pace were eventually forced to cede land, power and even identities, to those who could. After the fall of the Roman empire, when in its ruins many territorial political organisations of different importance were created, the process was subject to drastic acceleration (Howard, 1990). It was here that associations having hundreds of thousands, and later millions of members were shaped. They did not know each other personally but were united by visions which gave a sense of common fate and identity.

The above processes, initiated in the Middle East, took place in the subsequent millennia all over the world and led to the origin of the today's universal system of states, that is the global polyarchy.

Ancient and medieval states were most often governed by the most powerful families (houses also took the papal throne from the 8th to the 18th centuries, during the period of the greatest rise of papacy in political power). The most effective family relationships grew to form dynasties. Aiming to reach this status was a principal task of each ambitious family, even if all successors were killed one by one (these processes could be best illustrated by the history of Venice). However, the ultimate reference point were not ties between relatives, but gods. It was their gods that provided the inspiration for such goals, and to the glory of whom the world order was fought for. On the other hand, as societies organized into larger and more numerous groupings, communities started to rely increasingly less on family and house structures. They gradually lost their importance.

With time this importance was replaced by a new type of political organization, that is state structures capable of uniting millions of individuals deprived of a meaningful genetic tie, having the same, usually very hazy, but still moving vision of the world, and acting under external pressure. Heirs to the dynasties of old were political parties and a partycracy state succeeded to older versions of states shaped around families and hereditary leadership. In this new form of the state, families no longer had a claim for power as their position was totally delegitimized. They could, however, exert pressure on the state authority and delegate their representatives. This transformed the source and expression of their power, as story of the Kennedy family teaches us, given that their power had been built on trade in alcohol during the era of prohibition in the United States.

The state organization replaced the family organization, simultaneously becoming both an instrument of threat (for strangers) and a security institution (for kinsmen). It

fulfils these functions regardless of whether it is governed by priests or political parties.

Since the end of the 4th millennium BC competition for political power has been at the heart of all security related tensions. First, it was a source of problems in the Middle East, where the first states emerged. Today it shapes security concerns on a global scale. Religious, ethnic, national, class, racial and economic issues have always been, and continue to be important for security, but their meaning is defined by the requirements connected with the functioning of a political entity, that is a state compelled to function within the systems created by all countries through interactions with other entities. That is why religious, ethnic, national, class, racial and other factors can be considered as interests of the state, pursued to ensure its survival, security and possibly expansion.

Humanity has not largely shifted from polytheism to monotheism because God revealed himself to Jews and considered them to be chosen people. The idea of chosen people, which is the core principle of nationalism and racism, forced the Jewish community to adjust to challenges in subsequent eras, resulting in their maintaining a sense of separateness and sticking with those who shared their identity to survive, even if at a great cost. This strong communal identity is partly why it later became so widespread. Similar motivations were a foundation of the Christian and Islamic imperialism. It made it possible to build imperial power based on the idea of universal order. Since it was believed that all this happened by God's order, people were ready to die and their death seemed easy. Faith was a sort of desensitizer in a fashion similar to a belief in nation, race or class. However, the anesthesia was both weaker and less long lasting.

Family organization ultimately lost its importance as late as at the end of the 2nd millennium when kings and great dynasties could no longer cope with the changing problems related to the functioning of states.. Its place was taken by the state equipped with national, and later race or class ideology. Only on their ruins did the contemporary democratic state originate, built on the vision recorded in the human rights doctrine.

This is how the world shifted from the age of *pax Romana* to one of *pax Americana*, where God (or gods) was replaced by the Commonwealth of Nations. In the most technologically and economically advanced countries it was meant to eventually become the Commonwealth of Democratic Nations. The belief in universal democracy to be accepted by everyone, everywhere grew out of it. However, nobody asked whether all *wanted* democracy, but instead decreed it was the right and responsibility of all. In a way, it is not surprising. The builders of the "four quarters" empire also did not ask, but simply sent military troops to implement the new order. Nothing has changed in this matter apart from the fact that as a result of the development of new technologies and the rise of more and more complicated social structures, the security issues begin to be seen from a new perspective. The result of these processes is security-related research and the appearance of a new scientific discipline.

The process lasting from the 4th to the 2nd millennium BC, being a continuous political mobilization of subsequent communities of people grouped into territorial organizations, currently called "states," was perfectly recorded in the inscriptions forged in stone by the will of kings, as always to the glory of gods. That is why today, after decades of work done by archeologists, it is well known to us. The inscriptions show how the visions of rulers changed, on whose behalf they acted and what goals they set for themselves. The materials on this subject have been presented and analysed in numerous publications

(Saggs, 1962; Oded, 1992; Algaze, 1993; Michalowski, 1993; Postgate, 1995; Liverani, 1995; Maul, 1999; Johnson, Earle, 2006; Michalowski, 2010), illustrating the process of the early political mobilization and, as Clausewitz would put it, of wars growing out of specific social relations, which we can now cast as political relations.

Wars, and conflict in general, not least of which would be economic, were not only the effect of human ambitions and visions, but also of increasingly fast growth in population, economic expansion and the evolution of social relations reaching forms that allowed for an intensification of activity among a growing number of individuals. Thanks to these changes political powers grew and were forced to compete. At a certain point only destroying or assimilating another country gave a chance for further growth.

Great wars, engaging millions of individuals, were a final product of these changes. Without wars they would not have been possible as such undertakings require extreme political mobilization, whereas military mobilization is only their effect. The historical research brings to our attention the fact that a new form of human organization appeared, able to compete with others using every possible means in a life-and-death struggle. This was no longer the organization which united dozens or hundreds of individuals led by one commander relying on his relatives or well-known neighbours. Now complex, multi-level territorial structures emerged, grouping thousands and millions of people, complete strangers in terms of family or social ties, however united by a common worship of god and love for rulers acting by his will. The structures were subject to reproduction over generations (Creveld, 1999; Reinhard, 2000). Basically, it changed the way people lived, contributing, for instance, to a faster growth in population (Livi-Bacci, 2007, pp. 23–38) and demand for new technologies. Threats changed and the problem of ensuring security started to be seen in a new light.

The wars that politically organized people waged on each other posed new challenges for them. These were no longer minor conflicts or small skirmishes between neighbours, but well-planned and prepared campaigns, the aim of which was to totally overpower or destroy the opponent (Skarzyński, Wajzer, Staniucha, 2016). Complete destruction was logical in the times when the army was a self-equipping machine, introducing a new order in the ruins of the old one.

War and political mobilization

War is something more than a mere continuation of politics by other means. It goes beyond the phenomenon of the consequences of decisions taken by statesmen who set tasks for military troops they have at their disposal. As understood by Clausewitz, it is an effect and continuation of specific configurations of social relations, grouping people into associations competing with each other by every accessible means, that is special political associations, nowadays called states. It happens so, because political relations are a derivative of organizing society for purposes other than the economic and cultural. These goals manifest themselves in the act of political mobilization, when people are prepared to sacrifice everything as they fight for love of the one that is God, Ruler, Nation, Race or Class for them.

A great war, when armies of thousands and millions of individuals stand facing each other, is not possible without emotions. No wonder Clausewitz wrote that war as an act of violence belongs to the sphere of emotions (Clausewitz, 1995, p. 5). War may be an act of politicians' calculations, but people always take part in it not as a result of personal decisions, but under the influence of emotions they experience. Otherwise, they would not be willing to participate and die in it. Only few mercenaries fight for money, but their fight is mainly about avoiding it. For people to be ready to die *en masse* (as in the campaigns led by great leaders, such as Charlemagne, Cesar or Napoleon), these have to be very uplifting, irresistible feelings which do not allow for thinking about their own situation and a choice of action. These have to be ideas which desensitize participants to fear of personal pain and loss. It is this that allows ideas appearing to offer hope to work. They make it possible to have a costly political mobilization, the result of which is war, even when the likelihood of defeat is high, just like the war waged by Napoleon after his return from Elba.

Political mobilization is a mechanism that unites people and allows their behaviour to be controlled primarily by influencing their minds with the aid of specific visions, for instance religious, but also lay ones (ideologies). As a result of the support gained by leaders from the community expressing its feelings for the idea and rulers as well, they can demand the greatest sacrifice from them: not only to pay taxes, but to sacrifice their life in a struggle. In this way the large community of selfish individuals who until recently felt they belonged only to a family or tribe, transformed into an association which, feeling impelled to fight for establishing universal order, capable of using for that purpose every accessible means in their struggle with rivals (Skarzyński, 2010a, pp. 265–338).

As an effect of this change, people fight not only for their family and relatives, but also for strangers; first of all for strangers they feel bonded with by the joint vision of order, be it godly, national, racial, class or democratic. The fact that others have a different vision and pose a threat changes the importance of their own vision, upgrading it even more and inspiring more love for it, to the extent that people sacrifice themselves and their own family. It would not be possible if genetic relationships were dominant. After blood relations were pushed to the background, when loyalty to a ruler, dynasty and later to a political party was shaped, states could be formed, that is political associations and the power of unprecedented concentration, which could be expressed by a hitherto unknown capability of reshaping the world.

It is one thing to ensure security for the structures built on interests or ideas moving the feelings of a minority and another to ensure security for the associations based on mass feelings which inspire the minds of millions effectively, as in the case of Islam.

Apart from the uniting power of faith to ensure security, other factors are also important. An association of people gains a political status in the most advanced form not when it is self-sufficient (it does not exist as such), but when it feeds on necessary and available resources in an effective way, ensuring the provision of them from outside (Skarzyński, 2010a, p. 308). That is why its calling is war, and the pillage related to which, in a more advanced form of political organization, leads to a systematic exploitation of the conquered enemy, taking over all the resources and building an empire for the purpose of establishing a new world order: defined by gods, nation, race, class or democratic order. Colonialism is a natural effect of political mobilization, just like clientelism.

The vision has a significance for the people implementing it as it gives the sense of validity for their claims and the right to act; it gives a sense of superiority towards foreigners as well as obligation and mobilizes people to participate in far-reaching, risky and costly undertakings. In the historical process what counts is only the mechanism of mobilizing people. This is a constant, regardless of the beliefs held. It is defined not by morality, but marked by its unique nature, the situation of competition, social environment and finally by the specific political relations. They entail the necessity of a readiness to fight, also in its most extreme form, that is war.

Personal security

The security issue emerged already as an effect of human existence, given the fact that people can survive only in relations with others. Was, however, the issue of security a priority in the primary family organization? It should be doubted. The advantage must have been with the families and tribes which attached more importance to collective security. They developed and grew faster as their members were ready for sacrifice, because such individuals were more effective in protecting themselves and their own resources. At this stage of human development the biggest security problem was not the fight with foreigners, but with threatening elements and other animal species. This is when the primary readiness to sacrifice one's own life originated.

The problem of security appeared in its complex form only when people became ready to fight as a result of political mobilization, and with the creation of stable political organization (subject to reproduction from generation to generation). For a very long time security was not, however, a priority for the individuals grouped in organizations created as an effect of mobilization to establish universal order in compliance with the will of supernatural powers and the very organization. States did not emerge for that purpose. If security were a principal value, people would not attack each other and completely different social structures would appear. There would not be political associations, states and polyarchies. People would, first of all, care about mutual co-existence. In dynastic states the priority was to rule the world in the name of specific symbols, experienced emotionally and not leaving choice.

The problem of personal security, previously understood solely as a public phenomenon, later became a problem of political organization, when great symbols lost their importance. In fact, security as a problem to solve started to play a role only when it rose to be a social issue and started to be understood in the context of individuals and community, that is when democracy came into existence and people started to think about themselves more. It was, however, a long and complicated process, one which, as the history of the United Kingdom, France and the United States shows, does not necessarily lead to the creation of a democratic state of peace at all. Democratic states are, just like their predecessors, political entities, and their priority is a struggle for universal order.

It is not possible to explain the phenomenon of security without understanding that political mobilization is the very heart of the process being the effect of grouping people into various wholes, competing and fighting with each other by every means, which leads to shaping a new type of threat, a political one. This threat is complex in nature and

concentrates all kinds of threats that can be generated in social relations. The process of political mobilization ultimately decides about the importance of security in the life of individuals, their relationships, determining the fate of the whole human species, even if in reference to this form of its existence, one cannot talk about security, but merely about survival.

Has not security become significant only in the effect of great world wars when millions of people died and a belief emerged that all this made no sense? Has the current war with the “Islam world” (especially against ISIS) let us understand its meaning better?

In any way the analysis of security as a social phenomenon makes us draw a conclusion that in this case we deal with the state, and not with nation. Confusing the symbol with a real social phenomenon is a mistake which can lead the study of security astray.

The study of security is, first of all, a study of social phenomena and in particular on their specific class, that is the political phenomenon. They are a basis of other security-related research. This is why the sociological and political knowledge should be fundamental in education connected with security.

Political security

Political security is a fundamental and at the same time incomprehensible phenomenon, often completely disregarded if we take into account the literature on the subject. It is presented in such a simplified way that it makes us wonder on what basis authors formulate their theses. Military men who simply hold Clausewitz in disregard and, as we pointed out above, do not attach importance to the analysis of political issues, can be excused (Nowak, Nowak, 2015, pp. 46–53). Responsibility for this state of affairs should be attributed to political scientists, who rarely analyze the issue so fundamental for the study of security and even if they deal with it, they traditionally concentrate on politics and political power. It seems as if they do not realise that politics, political power and political security are political phenomena, created as an effect of evolution of social relations to reach the stage of political mobilization.

Political security is a more complicated phenomenon than presented in a considerable part of the political literature. First of all, the term “political security of state” is not really appropriate here as political security is the fundament of the state. Therefore the meaning of political security is inherent in the concept of state. Any “sector security” results from political security. The resources of each sector are only the state’s means and should guarantee state’s security.

Secondly, the traditional analysis of political phenomena in the context of power relations seems to be old-fashioned nowadays. Political security should not be considered through the prism of politics or power (Zalewski, 2013, pp. 16–28 and 168), but, as demonstrated earlier, of political association of people, that is a relationship aiming to establish universal order compliant with the vision they have. This is a much broader phenomenon. Political security is a function of political mobilization.

Thirdly, the phenomenon of political security cannot be limited to the state as the state is not the only political entity. There are also some priests’ associations (their natural goal is political power), dynasties and nowadays, first and foremost, political parties.

However, whether individuals are political entities is by all means disputable. Are these the citizens in a democracy (it should be doubted), or only great leaders? Are not perhaps the minor ones, such as Donald Tusk or Angela Merkel only puppets in the system of modern societies? This is an issue to be considered. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that such an outstanding politician as Bismarck observed that if a statesman does not adjust to the waves and ride them, he is doomed to failure.

It does not seem possible to “identify the political security with stability of power or, more broadly, political organisation of the society” (Zalewski, 2013, p. 249). It is about a much wider phenomenon, that is the safety of a people’s association which operates by inspiration to establish universal order in compliance with its own vision. Therefore, it has been subjected to political mobilization. Nowadays people live only within the framework of such entities which make up a global polyarchy, that is the system where religious, national and class divisions as well as dynastic loyalty, exclusion, economic and other dependencies are important. Only the proportions of their significance change. Ultimately, they are all channeled within the framework of political associations, different in substance from the economic, religious or ideological ones. Political associations are a focal point of all divisions and contradictions and they attack the enemy using every possible means, unlike any other entity. All this cannot be limited not only to power, but also extended to the political organisation of the society.

It is worth taking a closer look at these issues due to their enormous contribution to the theory of security. If it were to be created, for initiating and developing it, the knowledge related to the theory of political phenomena would be more important than the one connected with the theory of law, theory of politics or theory of military sciences, if the latter exists. One of the most important, and perhaps the main problem to solve through the theory of security will be the political security and relations between the political security and the security in specific sectors of social life.

In the beginning we should notice that it is not possible to explain any political phenomenon interpreting it only with the use of knowledge relating to other political phenomena. Only the theory of political phenomena allows for this (Schmitt, 2000, pp. 191–250). This kind of theory, showing how political phenomena appeared in human communities and how they function, in its advanced form allows for explaining the origin and types of political phenomena which are diversified (Skarzyński, 2012, pp. 313–331).

Political security, just like political power and politics, may be understood only when considering the political phenomena which appeared as an effect of the evolution of the social phenomena when the process of mobilizing human communities in the struggle to establish universal order was initiated. The struggle was to be waged not for material gratification, not because of hatred (even if it was often present, it was not a leading motif), but through a calling and via the use of all accessible means. Only in this way can we explain the phenomenon of security and formulate the theory of security as a social, not military or connected with defence phenomenon as the soldiers in army would expect.

Political mobilization leads to the appearance of political associations and the latter poses a new type of threat, coming from the entity which aims to win advantage and destroy the opponent in the struggle for the world order. This entity, especially when as-

suming the shape of a state, does not only attack with every means, but is also capable of controlling the resources giving a basis for generating striking forces. This entity poses a comprehensive threat, which means that its consequences manifest themselves in all spheres of social life and influence security in each sector.

Since the political entity acts through claims of love or loyalty for a god, race, class or nation, it is capable of putting the lives of millions of individuals at stake. That is why the entity may be effectively challenged only by another political entity, prepared to use the same means. It is obvious that people who believe to be fighting by the will of God, for Race, Nation or Class, cannot be conquered with money, scythes or rifles. Neither do cannons suffice if they are not operated by soldiers fighting because they feel called to do it. Here, life must be put at stake and everything is decided by the economy which provides energy and material resources for the struggle. However, sometimes the outcome of a fight is decided by a moral force, deriving its energy from the professed vision of God's, national, class or racial order. This is why the greater and the mightier do not always win, especially when they are aggressors, as the war in Vietnam showed.

A political association presents a so far unknown threat and at the same time provides an earlier unknown instrument to fight with threats. It is its readiness to mobilize and the organization built on it which allows for overcoming threats with every means in a planned and systematic way. This is why in the times of political mobilization, within the last six thousand years the whole human species has been subject to and still is subject to mobilization, which consists in grouping into states capable of both defending and attacking, whereas political security reached a fundamental status, because ensuring security in every other sector depends on it.

Where there is no political security, there is anarchy and security should be ensured individually or locally by human beings, families, tribes, bandit groups and other structures of this type. In these conditions, one cannot speak of public security.

Political security also has a sector character, but it concerns a sector of special importance which allows for the functioning and development of activities in other sectors. The political sector has a specific character. It does not create anything but derives means from all other sectors, totally on a voluntary basis and until the end when necessary, even if it leads to complete destruction. This is what its principal role consists in.

As a large number of threats cannot be combatted and they can only be subjected to more or less effective control, the entity which is able to undertake systematic actions in this respect turns out to be the most effective in ensuring security. The state is this kind of entity. This is the reason why associations of priests having political ambitions, big families and parties aim at creating a state or taking over the power in an existing state. In this way they do not only ensure glory and a means of support, but also security. The security of a human community in this kind of state is a derivative of an aspiration to security held by leaders and their associations, because they lead masses. It is worth remembering, however, that even today often their aim is not to ensure the security of state, but glory, fame and building an empire. These aims are from the very beginning inseparably connected with the functioning of political entities.

The state is a supreme institution of security within a dependent territory. Polyarchy, as a system of states, is a universal institution of regulating conflicts and coexistences of subjects grouped within its framework. It can support or even temporarily ensure

security at a regional and then global level. Only when the state comes into existence do organizations specializing in sector security start to work as it creates the conditions for their activity. It is when the police and army can act. The system of states in the form of polyarchy ensures conditions for the activity in the area occupied by many countries and later globally.

We can distinguish three main stages of the political security development. The first was initiated with the creation of states, which took a specific territory into possession, limiting their own rights to tax collection, administration of justice and military service obligation. Security ensured in the territory of a country like that was more or less limited. Usually it concerned the territory composed of different lands in respect of relations with other countries. Not all lands were protected in the same way and clearly delineated border lines did not exist. However, in the internal context of limiting violence and administration of justice, security was ensured only in selected enclaves located in towns (this is where the seed corn of public security was, although it usually lasted shortly). Outside of them there was anarchy.

The second stage was when state power established a monopoly on legal violence in the territory of the whole country and subjected the right to use weapons to strict regulations, enforced by the agencies of this country. The right to revenge and duel were abolished. The lines delineating between states were marked more clearly and protected by military means. This is when not only the sense of security grew, but also the system of protection of people against real threats was developed. Public security was developed more broadly.

The third one was when state became responsible for the social security of its citizens, that is for a minimum of necessary means of support. It changed the way human communities function in a fundamental way. What emerged was the phenomenon of informed right to safety, which may be a claim against the state. In the effect of these changes the members of a political association found that they had a right to safety, for instance in the form of a lasting public security (which until the 19th century was a very rare phenomenon), or even to the social security.

Conclusions

The product of the global political mobilization is polyarchy which principally changes the problem of social and political security. Within the framework of regional polyarchy the system of security of states in the area occupied by it is possible. As a result of creating a global polyarchy the universal system of security has become real. The role of army has changed and to an ever decreasing extent fulfils the function of a traditional army. First, mercenaries lost their importance (however, not completely) and later also the military troops acting on behalf of the state. They were transformed after the collapse of the communist system and the end of the Cold War on the one hand into interventionist forces, and on the other hand into a costume job (knighthood was subject to the same processes and in the 17th and 18th centuries it changed into a kind of a costume state). A lot of functions held by the army were taken over by the police. Its units dramatically develop its scope of manoeuvre. The growth of technologies and

destructive power cause that the use of traditional army in the battlefield no longer makes sense. It is diplomacy that starts to play a central role in ensuring security within the framework of polyarchy.

Every country as a territorial organisation functioning in the system of polyarchy faces the problem of ensuring internal and external security. Although these are different state functions, they are subject to the same politics and are closely related to each other. With regard to the fact that states in a polyarchy usually have the same or very similar political system.

In modern societies where people are divided into states, the fundament for all security is the political security manifesting itself in the stability of government and administration at its service, capable of fulfilling their internal and external functions, which also means ensuring security in particular sectors of social life.

Since the state is a universal form of organizing human communities, the basis for the theory of security if it ever appears (as an original theory of scientific discipline and not a copy of theories of other scientific disciplines), should be the theory of political security.

Correct methodological research on any sector security should always start with the study of political security as it is the fundament of security in each sector of social life. Otherwise, this kind of research will be left hanging in the air and will not help to explain the studied phenomena.

Bibliography

- Algaze G. (1993), *The Uruk World System: The Dynamics of Expansion of Early Mesopotamian Civilization*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bloch M. (1998), *Królowie cudotwórcy. Studium na temat nadprzyrodzonego charakteru przypisywanego władzy królewskiej, zwłaszcza we Francji i w Anglii*, Wydawnictwo Bellona, Warszawa.
- Clausewitz C. (1976), *On War*, Princeton University Press.
- Crevelde M. (1999), *The Rise and Decline of the State*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fukuyama F. (2006), *The End of History and the Last Man*, Free Press, New York.
- Howard M. (1990), *The Franco-Prussian War. The German Invasion of France, 1870–1871*, Routledge, London–New York.
- Johnson A., Earle T. (2006), *The Evolution of Human Societies. From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*, Stanford.
- Kantorowicz E. (2007), *Dwa ciała króla. Studium na temat nadprzyrodzonego charakteru przypisywanego władzy królewskiej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Liverani M. (1995), *The Deeds of Ancient Mesopotamian Kings*, in: *Civilization of the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. M. Sasson, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, pp. 2353–2366.
- Livi-Bacci M. (2007), *A Concise History of World Population*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden.
- Maul S. (1999), *Der assyrische König – Hüter der Weltordnung*, in: *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East*, ed. K. Watanabe, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 201–214.
- Michalowski P. (1993), *Memory and Deed: The Historiography of the Political Expansion of the Akkad State*, in: *Akkad, the First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions*, red. M. Liverani, Sargon, Padova, pp. 69–90.

- Michalowski P. (2010), *Masters of the Four Corners of the Heavens: Views of the Universe in Early Mesopotamian Writings*, in: *Geography and Ethnography: Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern Societies*, eds. K. A. Raaflaub, R. J. A. Talbert, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, pp. 147–168.
- Nowak E., Nowak M. (2015), *Zarys teorii bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Difin, Warszawa.
- Oded B. (1992), *War, Peace and Empire: Justifications for War in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, L. Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Postgate J. N. (1995), *Royal Ideology and State Administration in Summer and Akkad*, in: *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. M. Sasson, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, pp. 395–411.
- Reinhard W. (2000), *Geschichte des Staatsgewalt. Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte Europas von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, C.H. Beck Verlag, München.
- Saggs H. (1962), *The Greatness that was Babylon: A Sketch of the Ancient Civilization of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley*, Hawthorn Books, New York.
- Skarzyński R., Wajzer M., Staniucha W. (2016), *Politics and Vision: Social Evolution and the Origins of the Political*, "Social Evolution and History" 15(1), pp. 126–163.
- Skarzyński R. (2006), *Anarchia i policentryzm. Elementy teorii stosunków międzynarodowych*, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomicznej, Białystok.
- Skarzyński R. (2010), *Powstanie polityki i początki prehistorii stosunków międzynarodowych*, "Studia Politologiczne" 17, pp. 13–34.
- Skarzyński R. (2012), *Podstawowy dylemat politologii: dyscyplina nauki czy potoczna wiedza o społeczeństwie? O tradycji uniwersytetu i demarkacji wiedzy*, Wydawnictwo Temida 2, Białystok.
- Van De Mierop M. (1999), *The Government of an Ancient Mesopotamian City: What We Know and Why We Know So Little*, in: *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East*, ed. K. Watanabe, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 137–161.
- Welles S. (2002), *The journey of man. A genetic Odyssey*, London
- Wheatcroft A. (2000), *Habsburgowie*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków.
- Zalewski S. (2013), *Bezpieczeństwo polityczne. Zarys problematyki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego, Siedlce.

Od mobilizacji politycznej do bezpieczeństwa politycznego. Jak zmieniło się podejście do bezpieczeństwa na przestrzeni wieków i dlaczego zależało od stosunków politycznych?

Streszczenie

Artykuł analizuje relacje między mobilizacją polityczną, bezpieczeństwem i stosunkami politycznymi. Bezpieczeństwo rozumiane tu jest jako zjawisko społeczne, tak jak to wyjaśnia Clausewitz w swojej książce pt. *O wojnie*. Według Clausewitza stosunki polityczne mają kluczowe znaczenie dla zrozumienia zjawiska bezpieczeństwa. Ta teza nie jest kwestionowana, niemniej wymaga uzupełnienia, dlaczego stosunki polityczne są koniecznym elementem dla zrozumienia zjawiska bezpieczeństwa.

Artykuł składa się z czterech części. Pierwsza część dotyczy bezpieczeństwa i jego ewolucji z perspektywy historycznej. Druga analizuje związki między wojną a mobilizacją polityczną. Naszym zdaniem wojna to coś więcej niż zwykła kontynuacja polityki w inny sposób. Część trzecia omawia bezpieczeństwo osobiste, które nie było priorytetem w polityce państwowej. Problem bezpieczeństwa pojawił się w jego złożonej formie dopiero wtedy, gdy ludzie stali się gotowi do walki w wyniku mobilizacji politycznej i stworzenia stabilnej organizacji politycznej. W części 4 analizie poddano bezpieczeństwo polityczne oraz jego konsekwencje.

Wnioskujemy, że produktem globalnej mobilizacji politycznej jest poliarchia, która zasadniczo zmienia problem bezpieczeństwa społecznego i politycznego. W ramach regionalnej poliarchii moż-

liwy jest system bezpieczeństwa państw w obszarze przez nie zajmowanym. W wyniku stworzenia globalnej poliarchii uniwersalny system bezpieczeństwa stał się rzeczywistością. Rola armii uległa zmianie i w coraz mniejszym stopniu spełnia funkcję tradycyjnej armii. Najemnicy stracili znaczenie (choć nie całkowicie), a później także oddziały wojskowe działające w imieniu państwa.

Słowa kluczowe: polityczna mobilizacja, stosunki społeczne i polityczne, bezpieczeństwo, władza, państwo, poliarchia