

SAMPLE

POLITICAL SCIENCE LITERATURE REVIEW

STATE AND SECURITY FUNCTION OF THE STATE

Apart from the state, power and politics, are unquestionably among the key concepts of Weber's opus. These are also the most important concepts for understanding state terrorism in theory, but also in practice. The functionalist perspective of the power of Max Weber is often selective and instrumental to the interpretation of state monopoly on the force. Thus, from the context of Weber's opus, the distinct definition of the state contributes significantly to the understanding of the state in which it is incompatible with terrorism, or where terrorism is viewed solely through the perspective of non-state actors. Power, which is crucial to the use of force in the Weber definition, contains two very important elements. The power, which is the result of the social interaction of actors, implies that individuals or groups that own it impose and carry out their will, despite the resistance of those over whom it is carried out. This points to the fact of a constant sum of power, i.e. a ratio in which those possessing power have so much to what extent they have no relation. So how much the power of one's power increases the power of others and vice versa. Another important feature of Weber's idea is the tendency to use power to achieve one's own interests or groups where the sum of power in society is not considered constant, but it can grow but also diminish. Namely, for Weber the most important mean of politics is force, and it derives from power. Each policy is based on use or threats by using force. The force is, therefore, the basis of the existence and source of the state, and the state is one that has a legitimate monopoly on the use of force (Weber, 1965). This, the first, clear and simple definition of the state in the dominant, realistic theory of international relations, and thus of security studies, is taken literally without disturbing the content itself. The state as a central political and security actor places the right to power and power without further inquiry. With such a perception of the state where there is no clear boundaries or the content of the force available to the state, it is not possible to speak of a terrorist state. By literal understanding of Weber's idea, the state

is allowed a lot, and perhaps everything. Deeper consideration of Weber's character and works can be said with certainty that Weber's vision of the state was not a state of unlimited power, separate from legal and moral practices.

Force unquestionably plays an important role in politics, but there are different modes of use and limitation of force by the state itself. Hence, if a state uses force or intimidates it, if that same force emerges from the framework of the rule, that is political, legal and moral, and if it seeks to achieve this political goal, we argue that it is a rift between normative and empirical. Terrorism is an organized use of force and violence or threats by using violence that through the intentional spread of fear or terror, based on anticipated reactions of widespread psychological effects, strives to achieve political goals. The state can also find the role of sponsorship of such a force, which also exits the framework of its norms. Many thinkers have left their theoretical space for the terrorist action of states in their deliberations.

Even in the 17th century some of the most important European thinkers considered security as the basic function of the state, and so too the very emergence and development of the state were observed through the prism of security. The root of the word security comes from Latin *securus*, and in translation there are several different variants such as "carefree", "reliable" and "safe". A society without security leads to an uncertain state, so it is no surprise that every state seeks to make its individuals, and thus society, safe. Her endeavors extend both internally and externally and as far as essential relationships within the society of a state are equally important to relations with and between states as well. To achieve this goal, the states have set and still come forward for the various strategies and tactics available to them, including by force and force. Interestingly, the paradigm is that safety as beauty – a subjective and elastic term that signifies "no more or less than what a subject who speaks about it" Williams (2008, p. 1). In other words, beauty and security are also in the eye of the observer. Anyway, ontological and epistemological security discussions are not the subject of this work, but to understand the issues we are dealing with, it should be emphasized that security is a social construct that often has different meanings for different individuals, societies, states, supranational associations and other actors.

For example, comparing security in Israel and Andorra or Iraq and Switzerland means comparing qualitatively but also quantitatively, very different phenomena that encompass a wide range of meanings for the states and societies of the mentioned countries. Security is a feeling and a state, but security is both a process and an activity. This is a variable category whose quality and quantity varies. Security can be influenced by numerous threat factors, so the ability to overcome these threats is threatened. Looking at security as an activity, there is a double relationship, one concerning man and man, and the other concerning man and nature. In order for this activity to be successful, especially in the modern world when humanity is at a high level of development, strong interconnectedness, and therefore equal and numerous sources of threat which simultaneously threaten many and sometimes all, security must be a meaningful and aware activity focused on the preservation of societies and individuals.

Here it is worth highlighting the fact that there are different views on security, i.e. different schools within the framework of the theory of international relations as well as a rough division on a traditional and modern security watch. By the traditional view, security is viewed predominantly through the prism of the state's military power and the state's power to preserve and / or increase the level of security of its citizens. This is a so-called realistic approach to international relations, according to which the state is a central security actor, and the force is a constant and irreplaceable factor that depends on the development of the state, but also of the world. According to the standpoint of this course, based on Edward H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau, or by representatives of "classic realism" (Jorgensen, 2010, p. 80), the state can only exercise its interests by force, and above all the interest is a national interest. This position is extremely important for understanding the subject of state terrorism and, therefore, it should be borne in mind that the realistic perception of security was dominant throughout the 20th century, and today this direction plays an important role in the sphere of international relations. In addition to the military sphere and force, security has expanded to four other important areas - economic, political, social and ecological (Buzan, 2009, p. 107 - 119). As levels and areas are interconnected, and therefore interdependent. Barry Buzan introduced his ideas of expanding and deepening security for the first time in 1991, in the unavoidable *Security People, States and Fear*, which had a significant impact on security studies, and in particular on understanding and trying to define national security. Apart from Buzan's sectoral security expansion, another concept from the factory of the so-called Copenhagen School is remarkably significant in the new (critical) concept of security, which is the "securitization" of Ole Wæver's author. He argued that security can be viewed as a "speech act" (Wæver, 2011, p. 468). Securitization is a social process where a certain issue, phenomenon or problem is identified as a security problem. Discursive practices of social actors are key in the political and social constructions of security.

REFERENCES

- Weber, M. (1965). *Politics as a vocation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Williams, D. P. (2008). *Security Studies: An Introduction*, in Paul D. Williams (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 1-12.
- Jorgensen, K. E. (2010). *International Relations Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buzan, B. (2009) *People, States and Fear: An agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Wæver, O. (2011). *Politics, Security, Theory*. *Security Dialogue*, 42 (4-5), 465-480.