Danger and Security: History and Present

Fazliddin Ravshanovich Ravshanov[1]; Habibullo Yakubovich Azimov[2]

[1] Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Academic Affairs, Head office of JSCB "Agrobank" of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

[2] Lecturer, Independent Researcher, Tashkent State Oriental Studies Universities, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article focuses on the theoretical analysis of changes in the content of the concept of risk and security, the expression of the concept of security in international relations, the concept of risk and security in historical processes, which has a long history. The article analyzes a number of modern approaches to these two concepts from a scientific point of view, focusing on the underlying causes, including the transition of military threats to a secondary basis in the system of these bases, the impact of conflicts in practice.

Keywords: Security; Threat; Individual; National Security; Environmental; Epidemiological; Biological; Interstate Threats and Insecurity; Military Threats; Military Threat Factors; Modern Manifestations of Danger and Security; The System of Causes That Cause Them

Introduction

Just as the concept of security applies to every moment of a person's life, material well-being is also his constant concern. States, like human beings, seek to preserve peace and prosperity in the first place. The difference in this regard is that if a person as an individual phenomenon first focuses on himself and calls it life, asa a product of social thinking the state focuses all its attention on society and the country and calls it politics.

The concept of security, which embodies the essence of the categories of peace and prosperity, as the basis of political action, has been expressed differently depending on the threats that exist in different periods of the peoples and states of the world. However, the French Revolution and the Treaty of Westphalia, which laid the political foundations for the security of modern society, elevated the notion that "security is the national security of the state against external threats" to its priority.

That is, the most basic threat to a particular society or state is defined as a military threat. This is because other types of threats to the country, such as economic, cultural, ideological, spiritual and others, can be overcome without losses based on the concerted actions and aspirations of society and politics. But

military threats are an event that destroys all other types of aspirations. Accordingly, becoming more militarily powerful has long been a guarantee and a priority for all nations. However, as human history has proven thousands of times, the military might of one state also represents a threat to the security of another.

The policy of global threat, divided by the United States and the USSR after the Second World War against the background of security, has been at the forefront of the activities of states and international organizations, ideological dimensions and political movements. The Cold War strategy affected the political and social development of both blocs. The globalization process, which has shaken the world, has exacerbated security threats to such an extent that military threats have now become a secondary phenomenon, a surprising shadow of many threats.

On this basis, the concept of security should be considered today as a defense in the process of ideological, technological development and changes associated with globalization. Because in the global system, security is ultimately assessed not only by military power, but also by economic pressure, ideological, cyber and terrorist subversion, environmental, drug trafficking, financial and cultural barriers, resistance to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and technological progress. Thus, the notion of a security threat under the influence of globalization no longer fits the definition of self-determination. Now it is necessary to reinterpret this definition.

In the current context, the concept of security is increasingly moving towards its original foundations. It gives the impression that humanity is approaching decline as it develops. Accordingly, security today, by its very nature, means being protected from any kind of impossibility, torture, and death (or extinction) for existence and life.

The Main Findings and Results

If we look at this definition from the point of view of interstate and international relations, it becomes clear that the modern global world has all kinds of security aspirations or the concept of global security. That is, while different conceptual and theoretical approaches to security express different views of participants according to their political and social structures, they give rise to similar perceptions of the threat in terms of purpose. Accordingly, David Baldiu argues that a different definition of security is important in two ways. First, it contributes to prudent policy analysis by making it easier to compare one security policy with another. Second, it facilitates relationships by creating a common ground between people with different views.

In international relations, the state, foreign policy, power and security are key concepts. If we prioritize human security as the reason for the emergence of the state structure, we can better understand the importance of the security concept. This is because the concept of security in international relations is considered and analyzed in its entirety with a range of human, universal and regional understandings at the center.

However, at the present time, individual interests at the state level remain the main enemy of the overall security issue. In this sense, despite the fact that international relations are improving, security is one of its main sectors, humanity has not yet been able to create the concept of global security and its practice. From the point of view of the current relationship, it will not be able to create it in the near future.

Although the concept of security is widespread in international relations, there is no single definition. There are only various vague comments, interpretations and interpretations. This is due to the fact that the need for security varies. In international relations, food, health and shelter issues are now

partially conceptually generalized as basic security needs. However, realities such as war, peace, the state, social strata, migration, terrorism, epidemics, unemployment, and other common conceptual trends are being pushed aside, bringing issues with a territorial basis to the global level. In so doing, they are either undermining the overall security aspirations for humanity or over-expanding their content. The result is the ineffectiveness of international relations, especially diplomatic relations.

For these reasons, it is not possible to give a general definition of risk. Defining the concept of security requires taking into account many realities, processes, and redefining its concept depending on changing circumstances. This situation prevents the comprehensive recognition of both the concept and its unique definition. However, the use of the phrase "to avoid dangers and fears, to be free from any threat" in many definitions of security also indicates that there are theoretically general concepts. As can be seen here, there is a correlation between the concepts of security and threat.

In the minds of the peoples and nations of the world today, the concept of security largely means the elimination of the possibility of mistrust. The possibility of insecurity, on the other hand, means violence, deprivation, and poverty. The possibility of insecurity is expressed by the concern and danger of people, including states, by indicating the risk that has arisen or may arise. The type, proximity, and scope of the threat determine the security action against the threat. In fact, the concept of universal security is fragmented on this basis.

According to Arnold Wolffers, who has conducted important theoretical research on the discipline of international relations, security is the fear that values will be threatened and that values will be subjectively attacked. However, this definition does not adequately represent the concept of security, because security is not determined only by the human factor itself. Protecting and preserving an entire entity combines the goals of ensuring its multi-faceted security. As a result, security acquires the content of a specific protection complex. That is, a single threat necessitates multiple security measures, and this will dramatically increase their global distance as people, including states, in the process of global rapprochement.

In the field of international relations, the concept of security has a different meaning than the concept used on a daily basis. While the concept of security refers to social and personal security in society, in the international arena it mainly represents the policy of power. The relevance of the problem to international security is determined by whether it has a traditional military or political approach, regardless of its degree or style (taking into account current cyber, epidemiological, biological, and economic factors). In this sense, security is about the survival of the state, and there is a threat to life. More than that, the concept of security makes it legitimate to take emergency measures to eliminate a threat.

Since ancient times, states have focused on the concept of security as the main goal, and accordingly, they place too much emphasis on the issue of power. This has become the basis for all subjects in the system of international relations to be armed with different and specific security measures and, consequently, to limit themselves. All participants in the system have different perceptions and perceptions of security and accordingly they evaluate security differently.

The main reason for these differences is the strength of the subjects in the system of international relations, their internal dynamics, the level of foreign policy acceptance, their capabilities and their impact on regional global processes. In this context, the concept of security in international relations can be divided into several levels:

a)   Complete or relatively complete security of the international system;

b)   Security of geographic or functional subsystems and regions;

c)   State security;

d)   Public safety;

e)   Security of social subgroups;

f)   Personal safety.

This is where the whole range of security against any threat comes into play, and it clearly demonstrates how complex the holistic concept of international security is.

Although security is literally defined as feeling free from fear and threats, staying away from dangers and dangers, practical life presents too many elements that are important in its content. Accordingly, it can be said that security has both physical and psychological dimensions in addition to subjective and objective definitions. Throughout history, the physical dimensions of security have been taken into account and the protection and defense of the country's borders from threats, attacks and attacks by others has been recognized as the most important element of national security.

Arnold Wolfer's division of security into subjective and objective is a typical approach in field research. But Wolffers 'approach that objective security is a situation where there is no risk, and subjective security is a situation where the risk of a danger is unexpected and fearless, is noteworthy. In a word, it means that objective security means not doubting that there is no danger, and subjective security means believing that there is no danger of doubt.

By these definitions, subjective security is a much more ambiguous concept than objective security. According to Barry Buzan, the biggest security problem is the uncertainty caused by uncertainty, abstraction and fear.

In the social sciences, the concepts of security are contradictory and the concept is described. The key point of security analysis is that individuals, societies, states, and other participants in the process feel free from threats. Because of the anarchic nature of international relations, anxiety about life creates a commitment to security. A state's sense of security requires that it "be able to avoid attacks by other countries or to successfully defend itself in the event of an attack". National security, which has historically been largely explained by military power, has been cited extensively in sources over the summer. Its main goal is to develop military capabilities and capabilities to withstand the attacks of other states.

In his analysis, Barry Buzan put forward the concept of security, which includes political, economic, social, environmental and military directions. The concept of security requires finding answers to questions such as what is against and why. As the international system evolved, each participant's perceptions of security changed depending on their position in it, and this posed a threat to the security notions of other states. This situation has created a more dangerous environment in the international arena.

Security means "Securitas" in Latin. Composed of a combination of the concepts of "se" and "cura", the word means "to be free from anxiety and to be at peace". Anxiety does not have to have any objective basis. The ancient Romans accepted the word "Securitas" as a means of avoiding danger, safety

and security. If this basis is not found, the notion of negligence, carelessness and negligence has arisen. From the first century BC, Securitas reflected the content of ensuring the security of the individual and society on the basis of the protection of the emperor, and became the basis for the creation of the "Peace of Rome" - Pax Romana. Pax Romana has been used as both an ideological and a political concept and a concept expressed under it.

If we look at the historical development of security, one of the main ideas goes back to the beginning of religious wars. In the pre-monotheistic pre-monotheistic religions, security depended on conquest and plunder. Along with monotheistic religions, the impact of actions such as jihad and crusades on security began to come to the fore. The inter-religious wars observed in the world, especially in Europe, on the one hand, and the sectarian wars on the other, have made religion an element influencing international security. Religion still plays an important role in the formation and maintenance of security today. Terrorist acts in the name of religion have a strong impact on security issues as a significant threat to inter-religious conflict.

Conclusion

In short, the concept of security has come a long way since the emergence of man, from the most elementary relationships to the most complex system, as in the modern world. In the process, it has laid the groundwork for humanity to create thousands of manifestations of dangers, their types, methods, mechanisms, how to resist or eliminate it, and how to avoid it, because it has an incessant effect on the mind. In this sense, it can be said that security efforts have also had a major impact on the growth of human consciousness, thinking and knowledge.

But increasing security also provides an increase in the same number of risks. If in historical times the greatest threats were clearly seen as wars, and in international relations the prevention of these wars has been shown to be the most important and clear task of security, current concepts of risk and security cover an unimaginable number of visions and tasks that are becoming increasingly difficult to understand even systematically. This has led to the devaluation of a number of social agreements that are part of international security. In turn, this devaluation paves the way for the discrediting of many high-ranking organizations.

Accordingly, there is a need to revise the current international rules, agreements and other documents on risk and security in current world politics. In this situation, the concept of risk and its manifestations must be clarified, and the principles of the international community's attitude towards the nation must be radically renewed. Only in such a development of the world would it be possible to find an answer to the question of whether danger ultimately overcomes security or overcomes security, to shed some light on the future of the world, and perhaps to regulate the course of future human development.

References

Der Derian, J. (1995). The Value of Security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche, and Baudrillard. *On security*, *25*.

Buzan, B., Buzan, B. G., W'ver, O., Waever, O., & Buzan, O. W. B. (2003). *Regions and powers: the structure of international security* (№. 91). Cambridge University Press.

Azimov, H. Y. (2019). The emergence of the Syrian crisis and the impact of the external forces on it. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*, (4), 92-97.

Paris, R. (2001). Human security: paradigm shift or hot air? *International security*, *26*(2), 87-102.

Ravshanovich, R. F., Tuigunovich, R. F., & Yakubovich, A. H. (2020). Amir Temur and Turan States. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*, (5 (7)).

Baylis, J. (2008). The concept of security in international relations. In *Globalization and environmental challenges* (pp. 495-502). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Azimov, H. Y. (2021). Emergence Of New Threats To Turkey's National Security During The Syrian Crisis:"Euphrates Shield" Movement. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, *3*(01), 42-48.

Bilal Karabulut, Rethinking Security in the Globalization Process, Ankara: Barısh Kitabevi,2015, s.10.

Baylis, J. (2008). Uluslararası ilişkilerde güvenlik kavramı. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, *5*(18), 69-85.

CAGRI, E. (2001). The Us's Understanding of National Security. Ankara University SBF Journal,*56*(04).

Azimov, X. Я. (2020). Turkish-Russian Relations During the Syrian Crisis. Lessons of Imam Bukhari,*1*(2), 86-88.

CAGRI, E. (2001). Us-Nin National Security Understanding. Ankara University SBF Journal,*56*(04).

Ziyadovich, D. R. (2019). Transforming Societies and New Management Concepts in World Politics. *Uzbekistan Journal of Oriental Studies*, *1*(1), 104-112.

Azimov, H. Y. (2019). The Problem of Moro Muslims. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (6), 519-521.

Azimov, X. Ya. (2020). The Kashmir problem: history and today. QarDU News,*1*(1), 180-185.

Arı, T. (2002). International relations theories. Istanbul: Alfa Publications.

Azimov, H. Y. (2021). The Kurdish Factor in Turkish-Syrian Relations Until the "Arab Spring". In *Topical Issues of Modern Science and Education* (pp. 218-220).

Ravshanov, F. (2018). Tolerance: history and development. *The Light of Islam*, *2018*(1), 17.

Arı, T. (2004). *Iraq, Iran and the US preventive war, oil and hegemony. Alpha / Actual Bookstore.*

Ravshanov, F. R. Tolerancy and Perspectives of Development.

Mitzen, J. (2006). Ontological security in world politics: State identity and the security dilemma. *European journal of international relations*, *12*(3), 341-370.

Madaminova, D. (2020). Migration Process and Problems in North Africa and the Middle East. In *Social Sciences in the Modern World: Political Sciences, Sociology, Philosophy, History*. (pp. 80-85).