

Bogusław Jagusiak

Military University of Technology (Poland)

ORDID: 0000-0001-5453-1649

e-mail: boguslaw.jagusiak@wat.edu.pl

Paradigms of the Sick, Healthy, and Normal Security in Social Sciences

Abstract: One of the many divisions of security exposed in the literature dealing with it is the ambivalent division into positive and negative security, which sometimes, somehow combined and mutually limiting, manifest themselves in normal and real security. Starting from this distinction, I develop their descriptions based on Erich Fromm's explanations of a healthy, sick, and normal society. Simultaneously, I argue that sick societies pursue negative security by preferring war and destruction, while healthy societies pursue positive security by preferring love, peace, and creative activity. It is a preference based on striving, in the case of a healthy society and positive security, "to be", as Fromm states, and in the case of a sick society and negative security, "to have", and finally, in the case of normal security, to mutually limiting "to have" and "to be". I deepen this description by referring to the thought of Bertrand Russell, in which positive and good security is defined "as one that should be by itself", and negative and bad "as one that should not be by itself". On the other hand, by bolding and broadening this description, I associate positive security (based on "to be") with the concept of "civilisation of love", "civilization of life", and "civilization of brotherhood", while negative security (embedded in "to have") with "civilisation of killing", "civilisation of overkilling", and "civilisation of death", and finally, normal security (embedded on mutually limiting "to be" and "to have") with the liberal civilisation of security and control.

Keywords: *sick society and security, healthy society and security, normal society and security, biophilic way of life, necrophilic way of life*

Introduction

In the Polish ministerial classification of fields and scientific disciplines since October 1, 2018, in social sciences, among the eleven disciplines, there is a recently added discipline called security sciences, which previously, together with defence sciences, was included to humanities (*Klasyfikacja dziedzin...*, n.d.). The humanities and social sciences have dealt with security in various ways as a category, need, and value important in the lives of individu-

als and social groups. As a result, there are numerous distinctions in the literature dealing with security. Among them, there are frequent ambivalent divisions such as, for example, internal and external security, national and international, enlightened and unenlightened, personal and structural, military and non-military, etc. There is also a division into negative and positive security (Nye, 2009; Marszałek-Kawa & Plecka, 2019). In the understanding of the former, risks are pointed out and the latter highlights challenges, although in the literature dealing with security, there sometimes is an inaccuracy, or even a logical error, when talking about “opposing challenges”. This inaccuracy is based on the fact that according to the norms of linguistic correctness – emphasised by, e.g., Ryszard Zięba – challenges are taken up, not opposed (Zięba & Zajac, 2010, p. 49). It is because the threats belong to the group of negative phenomena and the challenges rather to positive or potentially positive phenomena. In other words, while threats are the negative (dark and rather bad) side of security, challenges are the positive (bright and rather good) side of security. If we consider the species difference indicating threats as negative security and the challenges as positive security, then there is a hypothetical connection of the latter – whose specificity are challenges, desires, and dreams – with healthy safety, and the former – whose specificity are threats, fear, and obsessive fears – with the sick security – pathological. In this context, two ambivalent security paradigms can be highlighted, namely, first, grounded in threats that seeks to identify security with efforts to eliminate them – the absence of threats – and second, embedded in challenges that identify security with efforts to take up and exacerbate them – taking up challenges.

In the argumentation of securitology (in particular), security is achieved by two basic methods based on universal principles of the functioning of the world, among which, already for Empedocles, are Hatred (consisting in disconnecting and destroying) and Love (consisting in combining and creating – Świniarski & Kawalerski, 2019), and today, in the modern physics of the Universe, such phenomena as, on the one hand, annihilation (disappearing), and on the other hand, creation, stagnation, and striving for temporary balance (Penrose, 2017, pp. 69–71). While the principle of Hatred and annihilation can be naturally applied to threats (negative phenomena), the principle of Love and creation has natural embedding in taking up challenges (positive phenomena), and the principle of moderation and maintaining a balance between threats and challenges can be applied to normal and real phenomena. Undoubtedly, in the culture of our civilisation, the negative phenomena (threats) for many include war, terror, death, and hunger, while the positive phenomena (challenges and desires) include peace, stability, and prosperity achieved through their own work. Although there are also those who promote the opposite view that war belongs to positive phenomena and peace to negative phenomena in social life. The justification for these views is based on the recognition of human nature and its realisation, which sometimes is considered good or bad, positive or negative, enlightened or unenlightened, rational or irrational, healthy or sick, etc. In the twentieth century, it became popular and even fashionable in humanities and social sciences to recognise not so much the nature of man as his psychic life according

to Sigmund Freud, who embedded this life in two subconscious drives, on the one hand, to life and love (Eros), and, on the other hand, death and destruction (Thanantos), which are corrected by (rational) consciousness and (cultural) supraconsciousness. Psychoanalysis initiated by him has become a fashionable method of cognising, treating, and explaining various social and cultural phenomena. In this explanation, he noted that while the object of people's aspirations in the past was happiness – which Aristotle considered the highest good because all people aspire to it – modern people – according to Freud's statement – strive for its substitute, which is security. But this security – as noted by the proponent of psychoanalysis, Erich Fromm – can be apparent or real, and their confusion makes up the security, which he calls normal (from the borderline of apparent and true). He considered the first healthy, the second sick (pathological), and the third normal (the borderline of health and disease). The general vision of the first is the desire to “be”, the second to “have”, and the third is the confusion expressed in the search for some equanimity between “to be” and “to have”. Manifestations of these types of security are three systems of organising social life: system A preferring “to be” (healthy and biophilic); system B preferring partly “to be” and partly “to have” (normal and on the borderline of health and disease); system C preferring “to have” (sick and necrophilic).

1. The Paradigm of the Sick “to Have” and the Healthy “to Be” in the Implementation of Security

The type of security implementation is related to the popular distinction promoted by Erich Fromm and others to: (1) sick societies (antagonistic and based on the desire “to have” and possess property) and (2) love societies, i.e., healthy (non-antagonistic and based on the desire “to be” loved and to love – Fromm, 1996). For, as Fromm writes: “A healthy society fosters the human capacity to love one's neighbour, the capacity for creative work, for the development of reason and objectivity (...). An unhealthy society creates mutual hostility, distrust, turns a person into a tool that others use” (Fromm, 1996, p. 8). Undoubtedly, from the common-sense point of view of human needs, desires, and aspirations, there should be no sick societies, only healthy ones. The latter realise the good that, as Bertrand Russell puts it, appears in “what should be in itself”¹. According to him, at the basis of human activity, there are twofold and irrational impulses, which he divided into, on the one hand, good and positive, and on the other hand, into bad and negative. They manifest themselves, the first, “in behaviour with the best possible effects”, and the second, “in the behaviour with the worst possible effects”. The best possible effects are manifested in scientific activity, art,

¹ According to Bertrand Russell, the ethical tradition distinguishes between good and evil. Because good and evil are abstract concepts that he proposes to make concrete: recognising as a concretisation of good “that, which in itself should exist” and as evil “that, which by itself should not exist” (Russell, 2009, paragraphs 4 and 5).

love, and valuable creation. They are conducive to progress and peace. The worst possible effects are manifested in destruction, death, destruction, and military belligerence. They inhibit and destroy the progress and achievements of civilisation (Russell, 1920, pp. 7–10). Thus, it can be concluded that the “best possible behaviours” and those that “should exist by themselves” construct what we associate with health and are challenges to human safety and the structures created by him, while the “worst possible behaviours” and those that “should not exist by themselves” and are threats to them. Behaviours of this kind make up the social environment, which in Fromm’s recognition sometimes is necrophilic, preferring possession, aggression, death, and the “war of all against all”, or biophilic, preferring being, love, life, and “love of each with all”. For him, preferences for necrophilic behaviour favour a sick society, and preferences for biophilic behaviour favour a healthy society. Simultaneously, he stated that there are two main and opposite ways of realising security and existence (apparent or certain):

- (1) A necrophilic modus, which assumes deriving satisfaction from life through *possession*,
- (2) A biophilic modus (opposed to the first), by *being* that manifests itself in empathy and the fullness of love from which a man derives satisfaction.

In his opinion, the first way is pathological and gives birth to a sick society (filled with aggression, greed, and exploitation), while the second is healthy and gives birth to a healthy society (filled with love, affirmation of life, and “joy shared with another human being, that is, the deepest form of human happiness” – Fromm, 2012, p. 159). Only through this second orientation can we survive in the modern world and build a lasting peace or “state of harmony” that is only possible if the structures of possession are replaced by the structures of being. He argues for the validity of this statement by asking the question: *If I am what I have and I will lose it, what will I be?* (Fromm, 2012, p. 151). And answering it, he says: *If I am who I am and not what I have, no one can deprive me of certainty or threaten my security and sense of identity* (Fromm, 2012, p. 152). That is why Fromm proposes a society in which the desire to own is reduced to a minimum because one thing can be owned by many people and enjoyed together. People in such a society do not feel the desire to possess because possession alone does not give them true happiness but at most some substitute for apparent, delusional, and uncertain happiness. True, certain, and “healthy” security is given by the biophilic modus (affirming being), while apparent, uncertain, and “sick security” is given by the necrophilic modus (affirming possession and death). Undoubtedly, possessing (“to have”) fuels greed, jealousy, hostility, and destruction. “The modus of possession and the resulting jealousy necessarily lead to interpersonal antagonisms and conflicts” (Fromm, 2012, p. 156). Thus, being jealous (of “having”) leads to war, economic pressures, and warnings, which are threats in themselves. That is why, according to Fromm, wars break out of the desire to own (“to have”) more and more goods. It is true that “there are also times of peace” in sick societies but they are impermanent and constitute a “temporary phenomenon” that is a period of “gathering strength, rebuilding industry and armies” and a “ceasefire” (Fromm,

2012, p. 156). This “transitory phenomenon” of peacetime between wars generates normal security, on the verge of war and peace. However, in a sick society, the desire of possessing (“to have”) more than a neighbour breeds aggression and war. Given that a sick society is inherently unjust, there are no objectively just wars for Fromm. Each is evil, unjust, and instigated by sick societies. He emphasises that the division into just and unjust wars (introduced by the exploitative governments and the Catholic Church) is used by each side of the conflict to present its actions as constituting a defence against attack and are therefore just. That is why war is presented as defensive, Fromm argues, because it is *a priori* just. According to Fromm, it is caused by two issues: (1) the belief of those unwilling to kill that it is a war in defence of their life and freedom, to manifest their identity (subjectivity) implied from “to be”; (2) persuading everyone to take part in war and killing to manifest their identity (subjectivity) implied by “to be” (Fromm, 2015, p. 19). However, the false and manipulative persuasion is not supported by the written history of human nature, which indicates that wars are conducted because of real conflicts of interest related to possession (“to have”), not to “to be” and the defence of identity. However, from the earliest times and beginnings of civilisation, what led and motivated the leaders of states to wars was the “land they wanted to cultivate, wealth, slaves, raw materials, markets, expansion, and defence”. This tendency is intensified throughout history, as underlined by Fromm by highlighting Q. Wright’s (1965) table, according to which the European powers conducted 87 battles in the sixteenth century, 239 battles in the seventeenth century, 781 battles in the eighteenth century, 651 battles in the nineteenth century, and 892 battles took place in 1900–1940 (Fromm, 2012). Undoubtedly, the increase in battles and war orientation testifies to the fact that Western societies are increasingly sick – pathological – which inevitably leads to their destruction and death (disappearing). According to Fromm, healing them requires a change of orientation from “to have” and the pursuit of profit (greed) to the “to be” orientation and intensifying love for oneself and others.

However, the choices of “to have” and the pursuit of profit characteristic of Western civilisation are not the only choices. Fromm searched for alternatives to these choices by studying 30 modern the so-called primitive tribes. Based on this research, he distinguished three typical social systems entangled in a choice that is:

- 1) a biophilic and life-affirming system (“being”), providing true security, which he called system A (healthy);
- 2) a system of non-destructive-aggressiveness providing normal security by “benign aggression”, which he called system B (borderline of health and disease – normal);
- 3) a necrophilic and destructive system oriented towards “having”, providing apparent security, which he called the C system (sick).

Tribes with system A are healthy, focused on preserving life and development, with minimal hostility and violence. In them, the institution of war does not exist or plays a negligible role. There is freedom to (subjectivity), liberty, trust, and tolerance towards others. On the other hand, in tribes with the system B, there are elements of competition, hierarchy, male

aggression, and individualism. Finally, the tribes with the system C use violence, malicious aggression, and cruelty towards members of their own tribe and others. In the system C, war is treated as a pleasure and distinction. There is an atmosphere of hostility, fear, perfidy, opportunism, competition, private property, and strict subordination, both structural and functional (Sinugina, 1981, pp. 85–99). Modern Western societies appeared to Fromm as the development of the system C.

System A is the choice most suited to human nature. Indeed, as Fromm writes: “The purpose of life, which corresponds to the nature of man within the framework of his existence, is the ability to love, to use reason, objectivity and humility, to maintain contact with the external and internal world free from distortions (...). Contact with reality, getting rid of fiction, humility and objectivity in perceiving things as they are, not talking about things that distract us from reality – this is the essential basis for a sense of security, a sense of self, without the need to use any support to replace our sense of identity” (Fromm, 2016, p. 29). On the other hand, the capacity for love, the sense of healthy and true security, and one’s own self (identity) causes that: “A being destroys because it cannot create” (Fromm, 2016, p. 105).

According to Fromm’s recognition, the man of the industrial civilisation of the twentieth century, which is sick, feels helpless and lost, which is why he escapes from the *freedom* to “be” himself (self-determination, assembly, influence on power and the choices of his political representation) constituting the subjectivity of man. This escape constitutes the objectivity of man, which is a prehuman freedom *from* being oneself – dependent and enslaved. This *freedom from* is a semblance of true freedom to “be” oneself and consists in accepting coercion on the part of the authorities, its interference in private life, persecution, war, and terror. Thus, the true freedom to be a subject shapes and creates positive, true, and healthy security, while apparent freedom and acceptance of being an object (thing) shapes negative, apparent, and sick security. Characteristic of Western civilisation preferring the social system C, it manifests itself in the escape from positive and true subjective freedom. This true freedom is shaped by a biophilic way of life expressed in true (healthy) security. Escape from this true freedom is a return to a negative and apparent freedom that consents to the objectification and enslavement of man. This negative and apparent freedom shapes the necrophilic way of life expressed in apparent (sick) security (Fromm, 2016, pp. 92–108). This illusory (apparent) security – in his opinion – is manifested and implemented by:

- 1) sadism, which enforces total domination (sado);
- 2) masochism, which is necessary for sadism and is total submission (maso);
- 3) destructiveness, which is destruction and forces the elimination of threats, including other people;
- 4) automaton conformity, which is the full submission to the group, institutions, and authority of other people in an illusory voluntary way (Fromm, 2021).

This realisation in Fromm’s developed recognition of a sick society is one, which is associated with narcissism and egoism (from individual self-glorification to the attitude of

group egoism, including the nationalist attitude), destructive action rooted in incest, lack of self-esteem, socio-herd conformity, and irrational action, without reverence for reason (Fromm, 2001, pp. 73–74; 1966, pp. 62, 84–86, 95–96).

On the other hand, the sources of a healthy society and this kind of security lie in a healthy love, and this is the one expressed by the “interpersonal unity” achieved by “merging with another person”; a unity “based on the preservation of one’s own wholeness and individuality”, which is, at the same time, an “active force” and breaks down the walls separating a man from his fellow human beings, “... makes him overcome the feeling of isolation and separateness ... allows him to be himself and preserve his own wholeness...”, in which “...two beings become one, and yet they remain two”. This Fromm’s love is a “conjunction, not an alternative”. It is about, as Fromm maintains, a man that should love productively, which means for him that he loves himself and others, affirms his life and the life of others, his happiness and the happiness of others, his development and the development of others, his personal security and the safety of others – structural. However, if a person chooses from these conjunctions only either self-love (narcissism) or exclusively sacrificing himself for others, and treats them as alternatives, then, according to the author of *The Art of Loving*, “...cannot love at all”. Looking at the contemporary world from the perspective of his theory of love, Fromm also stated that this is a world of domination of nationalism, sick patriotism cultivating narcissistic and idolatrous self-glorification of national communities, not healthy patriotism implied by the thought of loving one’s own nation and love for all humanity. However, a balanced love for oneself, others, and one’s own people and other nations, is a healthy love. It lies at the heart of social system A, a healthy society and true security that is rooted in a biophilic way of life that prefers “to be”. At the heart of social system C, a sick society and apparent security, lies its embedding on a necrophilic way of life that prefers “to have”. This necrophilic way of life and preference for “having” manifests itself in death, killing, and aggressive destruction.

2. The Paradigm of the Sick Society of the “Civilization of Killing” and the “Civilization of Death” and Negative Security

The peculiarity of negative security is the acquisition of survival, survival, development, and the improvement of community life (state and social) through a war aimed at acquiring or defending property (its possession) with deadly consequences. In literature, the “civilisation of killing” is considered one that allows killing and treats it as a natural way of realising life – security. “Civilisation of death” is a term first used by Pope St. John Paul II as opposed to the term “civilisation of love” used by Pope Paul VI and Erich Fromm. Specific distinguishing features of the “civilisation of death”, often identified with the “culture of death” in moral theology, are such phenomena occurring in social life as: abortion, euthanasia, murder, genocide, contraception, and methods of *in vitro* fertilisation (*Cywilizacja śmierci*, n.d.). Pope St. John Paul II mentioned these phenomena mainly in his encyclicals: *Veritatis Splendor* and *Evangelium Vitae*.

According to moral theology, axiology, and for those who deal with the “civilisation of death” and the “civilisation of killing”, they belong to the evil ones, i.e., those that rather “should not be”. For a man should not kill another man, according to the commandment of the Decalogue: “thou shalt not kill”. Death as a threat is contrary to life. According to the anticipation and hope of many, it will eventually be eliminated or somehow controlled. Such anticipation of the final victory of good and peace is already found in the teachings of Zarathustra (living around 1000 BC), whom, among others, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844–1900) recognised as the first philosopher. This precursor to the tradition of Greek philosophy, Zarathustra, argued that the world is an arena of struggle about what is good, because immortal (Ahura Mazdy – The Wise Lord), and what is bad, because mortal (Angra Mainju – devoid of good and wisdom of evil, deceitful, and harmful being). The result of this struggle, in his prophecy, was to be the final victory of goodness, immortality, and the establishment of peace. He treats this conviction and prophecy of war as evil and a fact that in the future will be replaced by good as peace and victory over death: there is war, but there will be peace. It resonates with the ancient belief that the purpose of war (and primordial evil) is peace (and useful good), or that if you want peace (good) prepare for war (evil or lesser evil), or – as Gaston Bouthoul’s polemology highlights – that if you want peace (good), know war (evil) to eliminate it (and it) from the community life of people. Undoubtedly, in this tradition, not only the Persian one, war was treated as something that belongs to the past and present, and peace as something that belongs to a better, desired, and good future (Skladanek, 1989). This tradition has been adopted by Western culture, arguing that we are able to get out of the “civilisation of death” and the “civilisation of killing”; to abandon killing (of people and animals) and “defeat death” in favour of a biophilic way of life. But in this culture, there are also those who argue the opposite. One of them is, for example, Ludwik Gumplowicz (1838–1909), who in his work entitled *System socyologii* writes: “(...) rape and conquest are necessary conditions for all social development; they stand at the beginning of a long series of social transformations, as necessary means, impossible to replace” (Gumplowicz, 1887, p. 25). In his opinion, we are not able to eliminate war and killing from social life because it would require a change in human nature or – as Gumplowicz argued – a new and another moral revolution. For him, the first moral revolution consisted in the fact that before the first moral revolution, nomadic tribes invaded agricultural tribes after the harvest period and killed everyone to take over their food. The first moral revolution consisted in the fact that these nomadic tribes, instead of killing, began to enslave and exploit agricultural tribes, thus limiting killing. Gumplowicz’s line of thinking raises the question of what can replace slavery and exploitation, violence, and coercion in social life? Although the quoted thinker himself did not see such a possibility (Szacki, 1983, pp. 406–432). For the purpose of wars” (...) always is the same, namely ... exploitation of strangers ... not an idyllic state of peace..., eternal war was the normal state of mankind forever (...). In order to satisfy one’s own needs” (Gumplowicz, 1887, p. 25). Ludwik Gumplowicz argues that the original cannibal wars were initiated to “make a good feast for ourselves”. At a higher

level of development, they were replaced by wars aimed at making the defeated “working cattle” – slaves – and at an even higher level, “to extend the dominion over the conquered”, to obtain tribute and contribution. Therefore, in Gumplowicz’s view, the progress of civilisation is associated with the abandonment of first cannibal wars, and later slave wars, and finally, exploitation (exploiting the conquered) wars. The evolution of wars in history consists in the fact that the elimination (killing) of the vanquished was replaced by their exploitation (enslavement) (Gumplowicz, 1887, p. 25). Thus, killing was replaced by exploitation. But in the look of, for example, Michał Hempoliński, we are not able to get out of the “civilisation of killing”, although we can come out of the “civilisation of overkilling”, i.e., from the civilisation in which people abuse the method of killing as the easiest and simplest to solve existential problems (Hempoliński, 1999, pp. 51–67). On the other hand, contemporary theologians are morally inclined towards a positive response, expressed in the concept of replacing the “civilisation of death” with the evangelically proclaimed “civilisation of love” and draw attention to the inadequate translation of the fifth commandment of the Decalogue. In their opinion, the translation mentioning the prohibition of premeditated murder seems more adequate. However, Cain, the first Old-Testament killer of man, shepherd, and brother, who killed animals also for ritual purposes, was not punished. On the contrary, he gained a guarantee that he would not be killed out of revenge. Thus, the victim, his brother and the farmer, Abel, sometimes is understood as consent to acts of killing, insofar as these acts are guided by a noble purpose (Bocian, 2014, pp. 188–191).

In the view of the authors of the Old Testament, the man who killed without any biological necessity, and thus, began the civilisation of killing was ABEL, the second son of Adam and Eve, the younger brother of Kaim. Engaged in pastoralism, Abel killed animals to fulfil biological needs – for consumption – and religious-cultural requirements – to offer sacrifices by burnt offerings to Yahweh. The Lord looked upon such sacrifices in the Old Testament, and they pleased Him, especially the smell of burnt animal bodies. “He did not want to look” at the sacrifices of agricultural produce made by Kaim who was engaged in agriculture. From this, it can be inferred that Yahweh’s lack of approval for the sacrifice of agricultural produce was the reason for Kaim’s murder. Kaim the farmer, competing for approval and sympathy, killed Abel the shepherd. Despite this murder, Kaim was assured by Yahweh that whoever killed him would “take sevenfold vengeance”, and, the “Lord also gave a mark to Kaim, lest he kill him, whoever meets him” (ks. Rdz 4,12; 4,17 – *Księga Rodzaju*, 2003, p. 10).

In anthropological interpretations, the Old-Testament story of the first two sons of Adam and Eve sometimes is understood as a permission for acts of killing and an explanation of the conflict between the traditional society of the pastoral tribes (represented by Abel) and the new and progressive agricultural society, and later the urban society (represented by Kaim). The descendants of Kaim – a brother’s first assassin – turned out to be not what the creator wanted them to be. Therefore, they were punished with total annihilation – the flood – with the exception of Yahweh’s chosen farmer, Noah, who after the flood, offered a burnt offering like Abel. Yahweh feeling the fragrance of burnt offering made to Him by

Noah: "...said to himself: I will no longer curse the earth for the sake of men, for man's disposition has been evil since his youth. Therefore, I will never again destroy all that lives as I have done" (Rdz 8,7). Thus, Yahweh pledged to limit total killing in the management of the world, as expressed in the biblical flood. However, regretting that he had created man, he reduced the duration of his life from more than nine hundred to 120 years (Adam still at the age of 130 conceived a third son named Seth to fill the void left by Abel, and Noah lived 950 years – Hempoliński, 1999, p. 51).

As stated by Michał Hempoliński, according to "(...) the evidence available to archaeology and historical anthropology, there is no doubt that for at least several thousand years, we have been living in the civilisation of killing ... in which the basic way of biological survival, as well as solving problems of a social nature (i.e., problems of power and mutual relations between communities of different cultures), is killing (war) or the threat of killing. This method has been recognised as the simplest and most effective (...), it has been adopted in all cultures known to us, and in European and Mediterranean culture, it has been confirmed and sanctified by all the Old-Testament religions, that is, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam". This sanctification of the price causes that "(...) for two thousand years, we have not been able to record moral progress, that is, increasing individual or group morality". In order to get out of the "civilisation overkilling", one must – according to the quoted author – first of all, "(...) consistently and on a large social and international scale, stop cruelty to humans and animals, and adopt as the supreme criterion of moral value the principle: as little suffering as possible, and as little killing as possible" (Hempoliński, 1999, pp. 51–52, 66–67). According to more extreme views, the exit from the "civilisation of death" and the "civilisation of killing" requires a transition to a "civilisation of love" that is able to create a healthy society that realises healthy security based on biophilic behaviours. This transition is undoubtedly another and fourth moral revolution in which the possibility was not believed by Gumpłowicz. This fourth moral revolution can be conceived as one that was distilled from the original civilisation of killing and barbarism, then the civilisation of slavery, and the civilisation of exploitation of others, to crystallise today in the civilisation of love and brotherhood. One of the most important of this crystallisation is Pope Francis' encyclical *Fratelli Tutia* (meaning, we are all brothers)².

² On October 3, 2020, Pope Francis published an encyclical *Fratelli Tutii* (we are all brothers) in which footnote 242 states: "St. Augustine, who developed the idea of a "just war", which we no longer support today, also said: "The greatest title to glory is precisely the annihilation of war by word, instead of killing people with the sword, and through peace, not war, seek peace or its maintenance"" (Epistula 229, 2: PL 33, 1020), and Lactantius stated that "Killing a man will always be a crime". Therefore: "We can no longer think of war as a solution because risk will probably always outweigh the hypothetical utility attributed to it. In the face of this situation, it is very difficult today to maintain the rational criteria that have been developed in previous centuries to talk about the possibility of a "just war". No more war!" (Pope Francis, 2020).

3. The Paradigm of a Healthy Society of the “Civilisation of Love” and the “Civilisation of Life” and Positive Security

In the description of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church (the authoritative teaching of the truths of the faiths of this church – Arduoso, 2000), the concept of the “civilisation of love” appearing – as I have already mentioned – in the teaching of Pope Paul VI, then developed by Pope St. John Paul II, includes all people, which in the teaching of Pope Francis, is also referred to as the civilisation of fraternity. According to the evangelical family, the world, man, and society were created out of love, which is manifested in peace, stability, and harmony, as well as cooperation and fraternity. In this view, the civilisation of love and brotherhood, peace, and health, is part of the four pillars-primacies: (1) persons over things; (2) mercy over justice; (3) “to be” over “to have”, and (4) ethics over technology (*Cywilizacja miłości*, n.d.). On the other hand, the “civilisation of love” opposed to the “civilisation of death”, destruction, and disease is one characterised by the primacy of: (1) things over persons; (2) justice over mercy; (3) “to have” over “to be”; (4) technology over ethics.

The paradigms of the civilisation of love and fraternity are embedded not only in the social teaching of the Catholic Church, but also in the reflections and concepts of the already mentioned Fromm and Russell. However, in Bertrand Russell’s diagnosis, at the root of human activity, there are twofold and irrational impulses, which he divided into, on the one hand, good and positive, and, on the other hand, bad and negative. They manifest themselves, the first, in the behaviour “with the best possible effects”, and the second, in the behaviour “with the worst possible effects”. The best possible effects are manifested in scientific activity, art, love, and valuable creation. They are conducive to progress and peace. The worst possible effects are manifested in destruction, death, and belligerence. They inhibit and destroy the progress and achievements of civilisation (Russell, 1920, pp. 7–10). At the same time, he notes that: “Most of man’s actions, which flow from vital impulses, can be divided into two groups: the first are actions inspired by the creative impulse, the second – acts guided by the instinct of possession. The first favour the development of the individual and those whose impulses and conditions of life are similar to those of the individual; the second are directed against a group with different impulses or living in different conditions. (...) We have divided people’s impulses and desires into those that are creative and those that are the embodiment of the instinct of possession (...). The most valuable life is one in which the creative impulses play the greatest role, and the impulses of possession play the smallest. (...) The state and property are the powerful embodiment of the impulse of possession; therefore, they are directed against life and give rise to war. To possess means to take or maintain for oneself something of value that can no longer be used by anyone else; to create is to give the world something valuable that no one else could otherwise use. (...) The highest principle, both in politics and in private life – should be to support all that is creative, and to weaken all impulses and desires centred around possession. What leads to conflict is the impulses of possession” (Russell, n.d.). Creative impulses lead to peace and the absence of conflicts.

Moreover, according to him, a feature of human nature implied by negative impulses and desires “is the constant being in conflict with something” (Russell, 1951, p. 13). It manifests itself in three types of struggle: (1) the struggle between man and nature, which results in man keeping alive, but which increases as technology advances; (2) the struggle of man against another man – negative – the “struggle of all against all”, (3) the struggle of nations, which Russell calls war (Russell, 1951, p. 13) and defines it as conflict of “... two groups, each of which seeks to kill and mutilate as many people as possible on the other hand, in order to attain some object of its desire. This object is, generally speaking, power or wealth” (Russell, 1933, p. 67). Technical progress intensifies these types of combat. Thus, the feature of human nature implied by positive impulses and desires is the opposition to being in conflict with something, that is, the absence of conflict (peace). Hence, one can indicate the lack of human conflict (peace) with: (1) nature, (2) other people, (3) other nations. While the European nations are the most belligerent, the least belligerent and the most peaceful are the Chinese (Marszałek-Kawa, 2019). “If the whole world were like China, it would make him happy, but as long as other nations unleash their energy in war, the Chinese will not be alone, they will imitate our vices to some extent” (Russell, 1957, p. 80). Therefore, for Russell, the negative impulses that give rise to wars are generated by: (1) the technicalisation of the struggle against nature; (2) fighting with other people; (3) the struggle with other nations. On the other hand, positive impulses conducive to peace are generated by: (1) peace (no conflict) with nature; (2) peace (no conflict) with nature; (3) peace (no conflict) with other nations.

It is well-known that Russell, in his *Skeptical Essays*, notes that the technicality associated with the development of all machinery “(...) deprives us of two things that are undoubtedly important components of human happiness, namely, self-abandonment and “irregularity”” (Russell, 1957, p. 80). This development deepens the conflict between spontaneous human nature and the “regular” and (...) monotonously working machines (technical products). This conflict has always existed “but it has not had in the past the intensity or virulence that it has in our times” (Russell, 1957, p. 63). In this era, this conflict has been intensified and its effects are increasingly worse (bad) of all possible because “(...) the greater degree of savagery manifested in modern warfare is to be attributed to machines” (Russell, 1957, p. 63). However, this technicalisation affects: (1) the organisation of huge armies, with an increasing power of destruction; (2) the launch of an efficient propaganda machine, which induces aggression (“war fever”); (3) inhibits creativity and spontaneity and the “irregularity” of people’s nature (enslaves them); (4) wilderness, barbarism, and levelling of scruples towards killing.

These people, enslaved by technological progress, try to free themselves from it, easily succumb to the “war fever”, which “makes people treat favourably to the thought of war because they see in it the possibility of relief” (Russell, 1957, p. 63). This was the case before World War I. At that time, Russell states, there was such a great drive for war (such a great “war fever”) that none of the governments of the time was able, either by moral or administrative means, to tame it and direct it to the peace circuits (Russell, 1957, p. 63).

In January 1915, in the text entitled *The Ethics of War*, Russell distinguishes four types of wars: 1) colonising (civilisational); 2) for priorities (within civilisation – “civil wars”); 3) in self-defence; 4) for prestige. However, none of them is fully just to him, although they sometimes are justified to varying degrees.

Ad 1) He defines **colonisation** (civilisational) **wars** as those whose “purpose is to drive the entire population out of a territory and replace it by the invasion of the population of another race”. If this invasion produces the best results of all possible results, and thus promotes progress, it can be justified because it is the victory of the “better” (more common-sense) over the “worse” (more irrational and not common-sense). The “better” for him is the liberal Western civilisation, which he treated as the most rational of all.

Ad 2) He defines **priority** (“domestic”) **wars** as those whose purpose is to reject certain beliefs (religious or political) that harm or hinder progress and are so-called civil wars. If the rejection of certain beliefs (especially those without tolerance and common sense) produces the best results of all possible results, and thus promotes progress and tolerance, then it can be justified, although the victory of given priorities (“better” or “worse”) excludes others (“better” or “worse”).

Ad 3) He defines **wars of self-defence** as those that have no common-sense justification, although they are generally recognised as just by each of the warring parties, each of which seeks to conquer and destroy the opposing side. For Russell, this is a mindless (irrational) hypocrisy that, instead of defending people and property, causes their destruction, which is the worst effect of all possible. It is a war that is all wrong and, in its essence, unjust.

Ad 4) He defines **wars for prestige** (for hegemony) as those whose purpose is to resist the humiliation and suffering associated with evident failure and to manifest heroism and pride. For Russell, such a war was World War I, which gave the worst effect of all possible because instead of a lasting peace by the humiliation of Germany, it gave birth to the next World War (Russell, 1915, pp. 127–142).

One can interpret the enlisted types of choices of behaviour towards oneself and others that manifest themselves in wars as those that are justified: (1) ethically, (2) morally, (3) unethically (aethically), (4) immorally (Schopenhauer, 2015). The justification may lie in the fact that wars: (1) colonising – promote better life, development, and progress; (2) about priorities – promote the chosen way of life and leading values. Russell doubts the possibility of justifying wars; (3) in self-defence – because they promote mutual destruction and are thus aethical; (4) for prestige (hegemony) – because they promote the exploitation of some at the expense of others, and are thus immoral.

For Russell, none of the types of wars is ethically good because none of them has the best possible effect. Each of the wars is bad, and thus has the worst effects possible: the worst effects has the war in self-defence (recognised universally as just and somehow ethically justifiable), less worse than it and less bad is the war for hegemony, even less worse than the war for hegemony is civil war, and the least worse is civilisational war, whose positive value



Fig. 1. Possibilities of justifying wars according to B. Russell

Source: Own study

is the bringing of progress and civilising the uncivilised – a war westernising the world. This view is illustrated in Figure 1.

Considering wars especially in self-defence to be immoral and steeped in hypocrisy, Russell suggests “passive resistance” instead of armed war. According to him, this hypocrisy lies in the fact that such a war brings the death and destruction of civilisation instead of defence. Simultaneously, he believes that “passive resistance” and disobedience require more courage from taking up armed struggle, and that its application in practice allows to preserve national heritage, life, and property. Failure to engage in armed struggle deprives a possible aggressor of the possibility of justifying intervention. He argues that if a state does not have armed forces, the aggressor has no basic pretext for assault. The lack of military resistance from the invaded state would make the armed struggle pointless. Such a military expedition would have been absurd from the beginning and would have caused among the military not so much pride in victory as disgust (Russell, 1915, pp. 23–30). The occupied, despite the repression, can (and should) boycott the decision and the laws imposed by the occupier in the general strike. Such a method of fighting the occupant seems difficult but the armed struggle seems much more dangerous and entails many more casualties in the population and property. Passive resistance, according to Russell, can provide better protection for what is good than armed struggle because it does not expose soldiers to the loss of health and life during armed war. Replacing the armed forces with passive resistance requires the involvement of all citizens and the creation of institutions that adequately prepare citizens for passive resistance. Possible repression of the occupant to the death penalty of the disobedient will still cause less losses than undertaking an armed struggle. Thus, it

protects what is good much better than armed struggle also in the so-called self-defence (Russell, 1915, pp. 23–30).

“War fevers” and wars are favoured by nationalist leadership (dividing nations into better and worse) and fanatics (dividing views into better and worse). For Russell, there are nations and views that are more rational (choosing the best of all possible effects) or more irrational (choosing the worst of all possible effects). The choice of war always is one that results in the worst of all possibilities³. In the argument of nationalism and fanaticism, the worst of all possibilities concerns the others (the bad). In the argument of liberalism, the best of all possibilities applies to everyone. From the perspective of liberalism, nationalism and fanaticism give birth to behaviours that should not exist – they are evil. On the other hand, the opposing behaviours that should exist are those that favour the freedom and equality of people, do not adore their own people (treating all as free, sovereign, and equal), and critically treat the complete rightness of their own politics, ideology, and religion; according to the principles of critical thinking: “Never be completely sure of anything” and “Do not have respect for the authority of others, for you can always find opposing authorities”. Nationalism and fanaticism (which should not exist) with varying intensity are found in the motivation for every kind of war (for colonisation, prestige, self-defence, and hegemony).

Russell develops the views presented in *Skeptical Essays* (1932) in his work *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* (1954), in which he puts forward four basic conditions for a lasting peace ensuring the healthy global security of civilisation (security that “by itself should be”):

- 1) the establishment of a world government (a global state) with armed forces of a rather police nature;
- 2) the just development of prosperity, so that some states do not envy the prosperity of others, for jealousy favours the immoral;
- 3) limiting the birth rate and keeping it at the same level or allowing only a minimal increase in births;
- 4) granting the individual more initiative (freedom) in social and private life (Russell, 1954, p. 228).

These are the conditions that, in terms of securitology as the latest security science embedded in social cybernetics (Świniarski & Kawalerski, 2019), they recommend in the following areas: (1) sociostructure (global law, the rule of law, and world government); (2) socioenergy (equitable development of global prosperity and abundance); (3) sociomass (minimum birth rate increase), and (4) socioculture (freedom in social and private life).

³ Pope Francis draws attention to this, by stating that: *It is so easy to choose war, using all kinds of excuses, seemingly humanitarian, defensive, or preventive, also resorting to the manipulation of information. Indeed, in recent decades, all wars have allegedly been “justified” (...). Attempts are also made to justify “preventive” attacks or hostilities, which easily entail “more serious evil and confusion than the evil that must be removed”* (Pope Francis, 2020).

Ensuring healthy security and global peace requires a new thinking – as we read in Russell-Einstein Manifesto of July 9, 1955. It “means abandoning the old and traditional thinking manifested in the Roman maxim: *Si vis pacem para bellum*, in favour of thinking manifested in the maxim: *Si vis pacem para pacem* (if you want peace, build peace or prepare for peace and not war). Either we learn to think in a new way and survive and develop and improve our lives and those of others, or we do not learn (continuing the old thinking) and will perish. War can no longer be a continuation of politics. Although difficult to attain, peace is nevertheless possible, according to Russell. In order to do this, we need to change our upbringing, our economic system, and even our moral code” (*Manifest Russell-Einsteina*, 1955). There is no doubt that the “most effective of all possible rational choices is peace, the effect of which is the citizen’s concern for himself and others (fellow citizens). Such concern is carried out by the state, which pursues rationalised internal and external selfish interests. By pursuing internal interests, it cares about the security of citizens by limiting their freedom, and external interests about their security by limiting the freedom of other states to their enslavement or dependence by means of armed wars” (Russell, 1957, p. 178). In order to eliminate wars between states (nations), Russell postulates – as I have already mentioned – the creation of a single world state. This creation is facilitated by the fact that “society has become far more organised than in the past” (Russell, 1957, p. 178), and modern means of technology make communication between people bring them closer, enabling the exchange of cultural goods and values. “From these two premises – a closer social organisation and a greater unity of the world – it follows that if our civilisation is to develop, there must be a central authority that controls the whole world. Otherwise, the reasons for dispute will multiply, and wars will become more violent thanks to the intensification of the civic spirit” (Russell, 1957, p. 178). According to Russell’s assumptions, this central authority will not be like national governments, but will be a kind of “unification of financiers” who, with their financial power, will influence the peaceful development of the world. He also considered the possibility of creating a universal state under the auspices of the United States or the United States and the Soviet Union. “Until then, the division of the world between the US and the USSR will continue” (Russell, 1957, p. 180). However, this coexistence cannot last indefinitely, and, as he anticipates, “at the latest during the twenty-first century, there must be a catastrophe, or the creation of a central power to govern the whole world” (Russell, 1957, p. 182). Historical experience shows that integration in the past was carried out mainly by force. “Therefore, I suppose that the central authority will be brought to life by force or the threat of force, but not by a voluntary organisation such as the League of Nations, which will never be strong enough to break the resistance of the great powers” (Russell, 1957, p. 182).

As specific functions of the central (world) government, Russell considers necessary for the harmonious development of the world and ensuring healthy security:

1. Watching over the provision of peace and eliminating possible wars by “refusing loans”;

2. Disposing of territories and allocating them to individual nation-states (regulation and settlement of territorial disputes);
3. Controlling over the birth rate – “backward nations will have to limit their population growth, just as more civilised nations do”;
4. Concentrating natural resources in the possession and disposition of the central government and “determination of raw material rations” (Russell, 1957, pp. 180–190).

These functions, which monopolise finances, disposing territories and raw materials, and natural growth, create opportunities for increased prosperity and continuous progress and elimination of wars in international relations. These are political, demographic, and economic functions. At the disposal of this government, instead of armed forces (enabling war), there should be a police force concerned with the rule of law and public order – peace among the citizens of the world.

4. Normal Safety Paradigm

Normal safety in Fromm's ascents best corresponds to the social system B, which is on the verge of a healthy and sick system. It oscillates between “to be” and “to have”. If a healthy system is based on love and peace and a biophilic way of life that prefers “to be”, and a system that is sick of war, killing, and destruction, and a necrophilic way of life that prefers “to have”, then an intermediate or borderline system of the first two (system B) is set on their mixing and some synthesis of the two that limit each other. This limitation is sometimes expressed by the normal security characteristic of the system B, which is shaped by – to use Fromm's terms – already “benign aggression”, already “non-destructive-aggressiveness”, already the maximisation of “to be” (biophilicity) and the minimisation of “to have” (necrophilicity). Such normal and real security from the point of view of common sense is, according to Russell, security “in which creative impulses play the greatest role, and the impulses of possession the smallest” (*Co możemy uczynić?*, n.d.). Thus, normal and real security can be defined as one that is implied both from maximising love and peace (“to be”) and minimising hatred, war, and destruction (to “have”). Such a paradigm of normal and real security permeates the social sciences, which in its recognition, colour its two ambivalent sides, both healthy and sick, both pacifist and military, both positive and negative, etc. Such a coloration is particularly emphasised by securitology as the latest science of security identified with transcendental synthesis, already this (sick) war and (healthy) peace, already this (sick) negative security (implemented by war and destruction and necrophilic a way of life that prefers “to have”) and positive security (realised through the pursuit of peace and a biophilic way of life that prefers “to be”), etc. This transcendental synthesis describes normal and real security, which is situated between the sick (negative, realised by destruction) and the healthy (positive, realised by construction). It is a description that absolutises the role in social life, on the one hand, of violence, force (power), and war, and the pursuit of a necrophilic way of life,

on the other hand, the renunciation of violence, love, peace, and the pursuit of a biophilic way of life, and finally, a third, a balance synthesising necrophilic and biophilic aspirations (real aspirations limiting both war and peace; both violence and renunciation of it; both the control of the rulers over the governed and the governed over the rulers⁴).

Therefore, in the context of the social sciences, especially securitology, it is possible to have a healthy and peaceful positive security that favours the biophilic way of life that creates the Fromm's "civilisation of love" described as those that, in the area of: (1) sociomass – replicates and favours (intensifies) subjectivity and freedom to "be" oneself, and minimises the possession ("to have") and objectification of people, or their objectification; (2) socioenergy – is conducive to eliminating the aspirations for differentiated possession ("to have"); (3) socio-structure – is conducive to eliminating the imperious role of the state in social life; (4) socioculture – prefers the freedom to "be" oneself in private and social life, individuality, and individual identity. Thus, sick and embedded in war negative security (in this perspective) is one that, in the area of: (1) sociomass – replicates and favours (intensifies) the objectification of people by reducing them to things depriving them of a biophilic way of life; (2) socioenergy – intensifies the pursuit of differentiated possession ("to have"); (3) socio-structure – is conducive to the intensification of the imperious role of the state in social life and the enslavement of both individuals and social groups; (4) socioculture – prefers nationalism and fanaticism, mutual hostility, and the satisfaction of having ("to have") and profiting from the exploitation of others.

On the other hand, it is also in this perspective that a healthy and peace-based positive security that prefers "what should be by itself" can be described as one that, in the area of (1) sociomass – controls the increase in birth rate by minimising it; (2) socioenergy – controls the equitable development of the well-being of a global society by maximising it; (3) sociostructure – controls through world government (central) the global community by applying global laws and implementing the liberal rule of law to maximise it; (4) liberal socioculture – ensures liberty in social and private life, maximises the freedom of "being", individuality, and identity. Thus, sick and war-based negative security (in this perspective) is that, which, in the area of: (1) sociomass – does not control and minimise the birth rate, tolerating its maximisation; (2) socioenergy – does not control the equitable development of global societies or ignores injustice in this development, and even maximises injustice; (3) sociostructure – is nationally and ideologically diverse and permeated with nationalism (which Russell defines as the collective worship of one's own people, which favours the "oppression of others and conquering wars") or fanaticism (which is for him a belief in the absolute rightness of his own policy, ideology, or religion); (4) socioculture – ignores freedom in private and social life and even maximises its limitations.

⁴ Proponents of biopolitics define the security era as one in which the government controls the citizens and the citizens control the government, which expose ideologies in contemporary liberal democracies (Krysowaty & Świniarski, 2020, pp. 11–29).

And finally, in the view of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church, the civilisation of love and fraternity, peace and social health is part of the already mentioned four pillars-primacies, which are in the area of: (1) sociomass – conducive not to prepare people for their subjectivity (“to be”) but to eliminate their objectification and treatment as things that someone possesses (“to have”); (2) socioenergy – conducive to the merciful and altruistic sharing with others of prosperity and what one possesses (“to have”) – fraternal sharing with those in need of wealth, abundance, and prosperity; (3) socio-structure – fosters such a decentralised organisation of social and political life in which “to be” (subjectivity) dominates over “to have” (objectification and enslavement); (4) socioculture – conducive to the primacy of ethics that favours truth, goodness, beauty, and justice over technology, which favours effectiveness and efficiency in the intensification of possession (“to have”) (*Cywilizacja miłości*, n.d.). On the other hand, the “civilisation of death”, destruction, and illness, opposed to the “civilisation of love”, is one that characterises in the area of: (1) sociomass – favouring people to enslave them (objectification), and eliminating their empowerment and “being” themselves; (2) socioenergy – to foster fraternal sharing with those in need of wealth, abundance, and prosperity; (3) socio-structure – to foster a centralised organisation of social and political life, in which possession (“to have”) dominates over “to be” – an organisation in which some exploit and enslave others (brothers); (4) socioculture – to foster the dominance of effective and efficient technical skills over ethics, which devalue truth, goodness, beauty, and justice and affirms the falsehood, evil, ugliness, and injustice associated with the enslavement of one by others.

The absolutisation of health or disease is not conducive to security understood as a dynamic state recognising mutual limitations, moderation, and the principle of the “golden mean”. Undoubtedly, the absolutisation of the necrophilic way of life manifested in destruction and the war for the acquisition of property (territory, wealth, and things) finds many arguments in the material experiences of the history of the human race, and the biophilic way in constructive work and life in peace, which serve the production of property (work, creation of abundance, and empowerment of man, because it is work that somehow created man – John Paul II, 1981, p. 9⁵) finds many arguments in the idealised and rationalised understanding of man’s vocation as a man. Between these extreme absolutisations, oscillating between them, it seems to situate the way of real, normal life, realised by the necessary war and work – as Aristotle (2004, p. 207) already put it in *Politics* – finds many arguments in a realistic view of man and society.

Undoubtedly, there are many of these justifications in social sciences. Especially securitology refers to four leading concepts: (1) idealistic ones – identifying security (positive and healthy) with the first dream and challenge of the human race to produce property

⁵ St. John Paul II in his Encyclical on human work (*Laborem Exercens*) stated: *Work is man’s good – the good of his humanity – because through work man not only transforms nature, adapting it to his needs, but also realises himself as a man and, in a certain sense, becomes man more.*

and live in peace; (2) materialistic-empirical – identifying security (negative and sick) with the first human work carried out by the art of hunting (acquiring property) and the art of war (not only acquiring but also defending property); (3) realistic – identifying security (normal and real) with peace and war (production, acquisition, and defence of property), their mutual limitation, manifested by the fact that the history of the human race is the history of peace (production and exchange of property) interrupted by wars (acquisition and defence of property) or the history of wars interrupted by peace (suspension of hostilities to facilitate the production and exchange of property); (4) constructivist – identifying security (implemented) with the will and action of people. However, there are many arguments for the correctness of the view exposed by constructivist concepts that security increasingly depends on the will and actions taken by people, which, according to Carl Jung, are entangled in the archetypes and symbols of the two sons of God, namely, the first, Lucifer (evil and it can be said that manifesting in the pursuit of Fromm’s “having” and Russell’s that “which by itself should not exist”) and the second, Christ (good and one could say manifesting in the pursuit of Fromm’s “being” and Russell’s that “which by itself should exist”) (Jung, 1993). The existence of these archetypes and symbols was experimentally confirmed by Philip George Zimbardo, proving that the will to choose good and evil depends on them manifested in the social environments that determine the “transformation from angel to devil” (Zimbardo, 2008). The archetypes and the symbols prefer the way of life, already a biophilic, “such as it is necessary to be of itself” symbolised by Christ; already a necrophilic, “as it should not be by itself” symbolised by Lucifer, already oscillating between the preferences of a way of life that gives normal and real security on the borderline of positive and negative security.

Literature:

- Ardusso, F. (2000). *Magisterium Kościoła*. WAM.
- Arystoteles. (2004). *Polityka*. PWN.
- Bocian, J. (2014). Piąte przykazanie dekalogu i nakaz miłości nieprzyjaciół a „słuszna wojna”. In T. Kośmidr, K. Gąsiorek, & C. Smuniewski (Eds.), *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła II w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*. Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II.
- Fromm, E. (1966). *Szkice z psychologii religii*. KiW.
- Fromm, E. (1996). *Zdrowe społeczeństwo*. PIW.
- Fromm, E. (2001). *O sztuce miłości*. Rebis.
- Fromm, E. (2012). *Mieć czy być?* REBIS.
- Fromm, E. (2015). *Serce człowieka: Jego niezwykła zdolność do czynienia dobra i zła*. Vis-a-vis/Etiuda.
- Fromm, E. (2016). *Patologia normalności. Przyczynek do nauki o człowieku*. Vis-a-vis/Etiuda.
- Fromm, E. (2021). *Ucieczka od wolności*. Vis-a-Vis/Etiuda.
- Gumplowicz, L. (1887). *System socjologii*. Spółka Nakładowa.
- Hempoliński, M. (1999). *Czy zdołamy wyjść z cywilizacji zabijania?* In J. L. Krakowiak (Ed.), *Ekologia ducha*. Centrum Uniwersalizmu przy Uniwersytecie Warszawskim, Polska Federacja Życia.
- John Paul II. (1981). *Laborem exercens*. Pallottinum.

- Jung, C. (1993). *Archetypy i symbole. Pisma wybrane*. Czytelnik.
- Klasyfikacja dziedzin i dyscyplin naukowych w Polsce. (n.d.). https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Klasyfikacja_dziedzin_i_dyscyplin_naukowych_w_Polsce
- Krysowaty, A., & Świniarski, J. (2020). *Bezpieczeństwo w „społeczeństwie nadzoru”*. Elipsa.
- Manifest Russela-Einsteina – Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów nad Przyszłością*. (1955). <https://ptsp.pl/manifest-russela-einsteina>
- Marszałek-Kawa, J. (Ed.) (2019). *Państwo w obliczu współczesnych wyzwań. O cyberbezpieczeństwie i innych zagrożeniach na przykładzie wybranych państw azjatyckich*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Marszałek-Kawa, J., & Plecka, D. (Eds.) (2019). *The Dictionary of Political Knowledge*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Nye, J. S. (2009). *Konflikty międzynarodowe. Wprowadzenie do teorii historii*. Wyd. Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Penrose, R. (2017). *Moda, wiara i fantazja w nowej fizyce Wszechświata*. Copernicus Center.
- Pismo Święte Nowego i Starego Testamentu. Biblia Tysiąclecia*. (2003). Pallottinum.
- Pope Francis. (2020). *Fratelli tutti*. http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/pl/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20201003_enciclica-fratelli-tutti.html
- Russell, B. (1915). The Ethics of War. *International Journal of Ethics*, 25(2).
- Russell, B. (1915). War and Non-Resistance: A Rejoinder to Professor Perry. *International Journal of Ethics*, 26.
- Russell, B. (1920). *Why men fight? A method of abolishing the international due*.
- Russell, B. (1933). *Przebudowa społeczna*.
- Russell, B. (1951). *New Hopes for a Changing World*.
- Russell, B. (1954). *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*.
- Russell, B. (1957). *Szkice sceptyczne*. KiW.
- Russell, B. (2009). The Elements of Ethics (1910). In *Philosophical Essays*. Routledge.
- Russell, B. (n.d.). *Co możemy uczynić?* <http://humanizm.net.pl/comozemy.html>
- Schopenhauer, A. (2015). *O podstawie moralności. Vis-à-Vis/Etiuda*.
- Sinugina, L. (1981). *Agresja czy miłość. Prezentacja poglądów Ericha Fromma*. KAW.
- Składanek, M. (1989). *Mitologia Iranu*. WaiF.
- Szacki, J. (1983). *Historia myśli socjologicznej, parts I and II*. PWN.
- Świniarski, J., & Kawalerski, P. (2019). *Drogi i bezdroża securitologii*. WAT.
- Zięba, R., & Zajac, J. (2010). *Budowa zintegrowanego systemu bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski. Ekspertyza*.
- Zimbardo, Ph. G. (2008). *Efekt Lucyfera: Dlaczego dobrzy ludzie czynią zło?* PWN.

