JUSTYNA KUREK-SOBIERAJ[*]
Akademia Sztuki Wojennej, Warszawa, Polska

ACADEMIC SYMPOSIUM ON METHODOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF MILITARY SECURITY

On 27 January 2022, the War Studies University hosted an academic symposium on methodological determinants of military security.[1] The event was organised by the State Security Institute in the Faculty of National Security, under an ongoing research project titled "Methodological Determinants of National (State) Security".[2] The symposium served to enable scholarly discussion of contemporary perceptions of military security, changes of priorities, and challenges in academic research. It featured a debate involving professors and military officers, chaired by Professor Waldemar Kitler, DEng.[3] The speakers were Professor Witold Lidwa,[4] Dr Piotr Milik,[5] Professor Jacek Pawłowski,[6] Lt. Gen. Bogusław Samol,[7] Professor Ryszard

---

[*] **dr hab. Justyna Kurek-Sobieraj**, War Studies University, Warsaw, Poland

iD https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-8754-5243 ✉ j.kurek@akademia.mil.pl

[1] The symposium was organised by Lt. Col. (Res.) Dr Grzegorz Lewandowski and the Department of Military Security, of which he is the head.
[2] The project is led by Dr Justyna Kurek, head of the Department of System Security.
[3] Professor Waldemar Kitler, DEng, professor at the War Studies University, director of the State Security Institute, chairman of the executive board of the Defence Knowledge Society (TWO).
[4] Professor Dr Witold Lidwa, professor at the War Studies University, long-serving head of the Department of Internal Security.
[5] Dr Piotr Milik, deputy director of the Law Institute at the War Studies University.
[6] Professor Dr Jacek Pawłowski, professor at the War Studies University, long-serving dean of its Faculty of National Security.
[7] Lt. Gen. Bogusław Samol, director of the Institute of Military Strategy in the Military Faculty of the War Studies University.

Szpyra,[8] Lt. Gen. Dr Sławomir Wojciechowski,[9] and Professor Marek Wrzosek.[10] Contributions were made by Col. Dr Dariusz Majchrzak,[11] Dr Grzegorz Lewandowski, and Lt. Col. Dr Mariusz Kozioł.[12]

The debate concerned three key questions relevant to the shape of current and proposed scientific research in the area of military security, namely: What should determine the limits of the definition of military security – does it concern legally protected goods under the Constitution, the tasks of the state as a guarantor of security in countering military threats, or perhaps values and interests derived from primary supranational principles, often viewed as "natural rights"? Is or should the notion of military security be universal in nature, or should it be determined by a dynamic perception conditioned by historical experiences and current existential threats to the state? Finally, what are the key needs of academic research in the area of military security and the limitations on the dissemination of its results, and what are the roles of historical research, comparative studies, and inter- and multidisciplinary research?

Introducing the debate, the chairman **Waldemar Kitler** said: "We must recognise the need for a dynamic view of security issues in the rapidly developing security environment, both internal and, above all, external. What is happening outside the state gives rise to challenges and dilemmas that deviate from the standards that we have had to deal with in the past. Moreover, we can see all around us what kind of things are happening in military and non-military contexts together with changes in concepts, values, and the goods subject to protection. At the same time, we must keep in mind that the necessary security measures under these conditions require a new and often innovative approach."

On the first topic, the determinants of military security, the chairman proposed first to consider the question of the limits of the definition of military security.

Witold Lidwa spoke on this issue: "In determining the limits of the definition of military security, it is first necessary to find an answer to the question: what is military security – perceived as a field or sector of national (state) security – and what is it not? What distinguishes

---

[8] Professor Dr Ryszard Szpyra, professor and chairman of the Council for the Security Science Discipline at the War Studies University.
[9] Lt. Gen. Dr Sławomir Wojciechowski, former commander of Multinational Corps Northeast, professor at the War Studies University, Institute for Strategic Studies.
[10] Professor Dr Marek Wrzosek, professor at the War Studies University, member of the Council for Scientific Excellence.
[11] Col. Dr Dariusz Majchrzak, associate professor at the War Studies University, vice-rector for military affairs.
[12] Lt. Col. Dr Mariusz Kozioł, deputy director of the Institute for Foundations of Security.

it from security conceived in general and from other sectors or fields of security? In seeking such distinguishing features, we cannot overlook the legal regulations relating to matters of security, and appearing, naturally, in the basic act that is the Constitution (Article 5 of the Constitution). From the wording of this provision derive the duties of the state authorities with respect to the state as a whole and to the nation, understood as all citizens of that state. These duties are set out in the first sentence of the cited article, indicating the duty to protect independence and the inviolability of territory. This duty refers to all subjects with a role in security, and in particular to the armed forces, whose purpose is set forth in Article 26 of the Constitution – which states that they serve to protect the independence and indivisibility of parts of the state's territory and to ensure the security and inviolability of its borders, which is a direct reference to the duties arising from the aforementioned Article 5 of the Constitution, since that same document indicates the responsibility and competences of the executive in these matters, where, with regard to security, significant powers are assigned to the President of the Republic of Poland and the Council of Ministers, indicated in Article 146 as responsible for ensuring external security and providing general direction in matters of defence. Thus, one of the pillars of military security consists of the obligations set out in the Constitution and in lower-level legislation. For these reasons, military security must be viewed through the lens of vital fundamental values: preserving territorial continuity and integrity, the survival of the nation and the national identity; however, another determinant should certainly be the precisely defined purpose of military security. This purpose should distinguish military security from security in general, and from other types of security. And then thirdly – to indicate the means and methods to be used with respect to these and to the existing situation. Acknowledging that the definitions of military security used in the academic world do not always meet the requirements of correct definition, it seems necessary to attempt to establish a framework for definitions and to propose regulating definitions."

Piotr Milik referred to research that he had conducted[13] on issues relating to the arms trade in the context of determinants of military security, and noted that: "The determinants of military security are divided into positive determinants – building the military security of the state – and negative determinants, namely threats to that security." Referring to the positive

---

[13] P. Milik, *Determinanty bezpieczeństwa militarnego państwa – międzynarodowy transfer broni i technologii militarnych*, Warsaw 2018.

determinants – that is, the positive factors that build the military security of the state – he distinguished the state's internal defensive potential, and secondly the international environment. "As part of the state's internal defensive potential, we should note such elements as the state's armed forces, numbers, supplies, structure, command, training, morale; then military equipment, production and transfer, and moreover the economic potential and the social and cultural potential of the state's military security. These are the factors that make up the state's internal defensive potential, and then there is the international environment, which includes bilateral diplomacy, membership of military alliances and collective security organisations, and the building of a positive image of the state in the international arena. On the other hand, among the negative factors, namely threats to the state's military security, we should distinguish internal threats to the military security of the state and external threats to that security. Among the internal threats we should refer to economic social unrest, separatist aspirations of social groups, and ethnic and cultural conflicts, while the external threats to the military security of the state include the threat of the use of force, armed attack by external forces, asymmetric conflict, hybrid warfare, information warfare, territorial claims, armed conflicts taking place in the neighbourhood of a neutral state, and militarisation in the state's immediate vicinity, namely an arms race." Seeking to give a precise definition of state military security from the perspective of international security law, **Dr Milik** said "Military security is a state of the absence of military threats, above all the absence of the threat of armed attack. Here, however, it is necessary to pause to consider the notion of armed attack, and as I noted previously, my comments will be from an international law perspective."

He went on to say that the experiences of the last twenty years have expanded our perspectives to include the perception of new phenomena that necessitate the revision of many concepts. For example, when the notion of armed attack was defined in the UN Charter, the way it was defined was determined by the experience of the Second World War. However, the experiences of the past two decades have brought new phenomena to light. To illustrate the current needs in defining new phenomena, **Dr Milik** cited the example of the term "armed attack". As he pointed out: "An armed attack may be, for example, a terrorist attack. The 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were nothing new. Terrorism is a phenomenon as old as humanity itself. However, the quality of this type of threat has changed. The scale of that attack (more than three thousand civilian fatalities) was unprecedented, and for this reason it was stated in an address to the nation immediately after the event that the

United States had been militarily attacked. The consequence was the sending of troops to Afghanistan. This rhetoric identifying the terrorist attack as armed aggression was subsequently accepted by the international community. Another example is the events of 2016 in France. Then also, the events were described as an armed attack. In that case, the attacks were carried out by a group of several Islamic State terrorists who fired at people on the streets of Paris. The incident resulted in about a hundred deaths. Thus, in the case of the New York event there were three thousand victims, and in France there were one hundred victims. However, both cases were considered armed attacks. So this means that military security, provided in the first place by the armed forces, should respond to the type of threat posed today by terrorist attacks. In addition to terrorism, it has also been put forward, notably in 2016 at the NATO summit in Warsaw, that a cyberattack could be considered an armed attack and justify the use of the armed forces. These are two examples of new phenomena illustrating the problems involved in defining the notion of an armed attack."

Speaking on the determinants of military security, **Bogusław Samol** referred to "the functioning of the concept of 'danger' in science and in academic discourse. Due to historical factors, in particular Poland's experiences up to the regaining of independence after 1989, even state security was viewed through the lens of the use of armed strength, and specifically armed combat and the use of the armed forces. It was emphasised that it was the armed forces that secured or provided security for the state. As a consequence of the changes that have taken place – and as is particularly evident in the discourse conducted at the University of National Defence – not only has scientific research work begun, but publications and studies on military security have appeared as a result, particularly those by **Professor Kitler**[14] and **Professor Pawłowski**."[15] Referring to the views expressed in the subject literature, **Lt. Gen. Samol** said

---

[14] Cf. e.g. **W. Kitler**, *National Security. Theory and Practice*, Warsaw: TWO 2021; Domena nauk o bezpieczeństwie – aspekty teoretyczne, metodologiczne i systemowe [in:] *Jednoczenie wiedzy w naukach o bezpieczeństwie*, A. Glen (ed.), Siedlce: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego w Siedlcach 2020, pp. 11–40; Domena bezpieczeństwa źródłem refleksji nad przedmiotem i celem nauk o bezpieczeństwie w klasyfikacji nauk [in:] *Granice tożsamości nauk o bezpieczeństwie: perspektywa materialna i formalna*, T.G. Kośmider, W. Kitler (eds.), Warsaw 2017, pp. 80–95; Pojęcie i system prawa wojskowego [in:] *Prawo wojskowe,* W. Kitler, D. Nowak, M. Stepnowska (eds.), Warsaw 2017, pp. 51–72; System bezpieczeństwa narodowego (państwa) [in:] *Podstawy bezpieczeństwa narodowego (państwa)*, J. Pawłowski (ed.), Wydawnictwo Akademii Sztuki Wojennej 2017, pp. 547–595.

[15] Cf. e.g. **J. Pawłowski**, M. Kuliczkowski, B. Zdrodowski, *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa*, Toruń 2020; O tożsamości dyscypliny naukowej "bezpieczeństwo" i potrzebach edukacyjnych [in:] *Współczesne potrzeby i wymagania edukacji dla bezpieczeństwa,* J. Kunikowski, A. Araucz-Boruc, G. Wierzbicki (eds.), Siedlce 2018, pp. 11–30; Bezpieczeństwo – dyscypliną naukową i kierunkiem studiów (and) Definiowanie i uwarunkowania

that there is no doubt that "military security is a part or a kind of national security. Today we already make distinctions between political security, economic security, health security and a number of other types of security. And so the sense of security is perceived in the context of the functioning of the state." **Lt. Gen. Samol** referred to problems of definition, citing the issue of media coverage of the situation in Ukraine: "Often, military security is commonly identified in the literature with the use of armed forces, whose task, of course, is to counter and resist aggression and thus defend the state. But at this point, it should be noted that the term or expression 'military security' is not generally used. When considering the events that are presented in the media space that concern the causes of armed conflicts between states – an example at the moment being the situation involving Ukraine – which result in this situation, they are presented as actions of a military nature, and in colloquial language the general word 'security' is used. Instead of using the precise notion of military security, statements by politicians and the media point to the phenomenon of the gathering of troops near the border or even large-scale manoeuvres as a threat to the security of Poland, Europe or even the world."

Lt. Gen. Samol went on: "Military security is a kind of national security. Therefore, there is a need to introduce the term not only into scientific discourse, but into the language used in both the media and the military. When considering the meaning of the notion of military security, we must ask whether it should be equated only with the deployment and use of armed force in defence of the interests of the state. Or should the notion be expanded to include peacetime action by the state in preparing the armed forces and state structures – not only physical force, but also state structures and society – to take action in the event of armed aggression from outside? Or maybe just in relation to preparations? Are these preparations also an element of peacetime deterrence of a potential aggressor, since the state takes legal and organisational measures to prepare its forces to repel aggression? Should military security be identified with non-kinetic actions? For example, how should the phenomenon of information warfare be treated? Are these kinetic actions? Non-kinetic? Does military security also relate to such concepts as, for example, the war in cyberspace, which threatens the security of the state in case of activity by hackers, under conditions where the actions of hackers from other states may affect the organisation or functioning of the state. Should such

---

bezpieczeństwa narodowego (państwa) [in:] *Podstawy bezpieczeństwa narodowego (państwa)*, J. Pawłowski (ed.), Wydawnictwo Akademii Sztuki Wojennej 2017, pp. 17–61.

actions also be perceived as part of military security? The military might say that if there is a strike on command systems and computer systems – systems of communication with command posts – is that not also the action of an enemy? Such actions may not be kinetic in nature, but they can be equated with military strikes. How should we approach the notion of electronic warfare? Do we have a problem locating it definitively in cyberspace? Or should we categorise these actions as part of military operations? Because these and similar phenomena must be viewed in the military context, it seems to me that we must accept the thesis that armed forces and resources are designated by the state to secure its interests in fighting in the state's defence. It is widely asserted that the armed forces are the basic element of the state's defence system, designed for the effective realisation of security and defence policy. At this point, let us turn our attention to the notion of the state's security policy, which may relate to a full range of activities in the areas of both internal and external security, in the context of threats from external actors, namely states and international organisations, as well as internal threats within the state – including natural dangers, since even in such a case the legal system provides for such possibilities. We have the possibility of using the armed forces at least in the context of combating the effects of various disasters; but are these activities of a military nature, to be placed in such a category of operations? Do such operations become elements of military security merely because use is made of representatives of the armed forces, soldiers? Such a view of military security would certainly be too wide an interpretation."

Lt. Gen. Samol went on to refer to the words of Professor Witold Lidwa: "Defence policy derives from Article 5 of the Constitution, where it is laid down that the Republic guards the independence and inviolability of its territory, ensures freedom and, among other things, human rights. However, if we focus on the first sentence of this article and the phrase 'guards the independence and inviolability of its territory', then we certainly have in mind the use of armed forces. But is it only the use of armed force? Subsequently, Article 26 of the Constitution defines the duties of the armed forces, which serve to protect the independence of the state, the integrity of its territory, and the security and inviolability of its borders. Here in this article we see explicitly that the role of the armed forces is to defend the state against aggression from outside. The Constitution does not guarantee so much as prescribe certain boundaries, and sets certain limits to this definition. When we refer to Article 5 of the Constitution, are we talking only about the armed forces, or about the duties of the state and the state authorities with respect to society and the nation in preparing for defence against aggression? We will

further consider whether military security applies only in times of war, when we act to repel aggression, or also in times of peace when we make preparations – preparing the state as a whole, and therefore its structures, including the armed forces, to repel a threat and to repel a potential aggressor." **Lt. Gen. Samol** summed up by highlighting that "these definitions are primarily determined by individual provisions of the Constitution. However, it is necessary to consider not only how to define the notion of military security but, on the other hand, how to promote it in society, especially in public debate."

Marek Wrzosek, referring to the question of the limits of the definition of military security, pointed to five of its key aspects: "The first aspect is military security as an area of national security or state security. Here, of course, there is some debate as to whether it is a fundamental area." Agreeing with Waldemar Kitler that military security came first and took historical precedence, **Professor Wrzosek** said: "Military security, or even security more broadly, not only military, was understood as the ability of a nation to protect its values. It was common to emphasise the aspect of protection from external threats and therefore – since according to this definition the survival of the state should be protected, and territorial integrity and political independence should be ensured – this no doubt included maintaining a high standard of social life. Now we move on to the second aspect – the Constitution. The basic legal definition of the duties of the armed forces is found in the Constitution, as has already been clearly highlighted by Witold Lidwa and Bogusław Samol. The Constitution sets forth the pillars – the need to protect independence, territory, and also the security and inviolability of borders. That being the case, the third element is the purpose – that is, what goal military security is to serve, and here we must thank Professor Lidwa, who raised the question of forces and resources and the manner of use of the armed forces."

Professor Wrzosek went on: "It is often forgotten that apart from our actions in the sense of the use of military force, we have international obligations, and so there is certainly the defence of our borders, as this is our internal obligation, as well as supporting our allies in case they are attacked, and participating in operations abroad. And here we must highlight the significance of military strategy as a derivative of the strategy of national security. Another key element that should be pointed out is the state's role as a guarantor of security in the area of combating military threats. We can propose here that the duties of the state should be derived from national interests in the field of security. Thus, a key question is how national interests are pursued by military means. And the last element is what we call threats. Threats are treated

as a baseline for planning. Of course, this planning is for the event of specific situations. This issue has already been addressed indirectly by Professor Milik, who pointed out the negative factors that go to define military security. We often look at the absence of a condition of threat before aggression, understood in this case precisely as an armed attack. But we also view the situation in terms of the capabilities of the armed forces. And then another question has to be asked: are we certain that the armed forces are capable of repelling terrorist attacks, or that we are capable of resisting an attack on computer systems? It may be worth recalling here General Samol's observation that defence is not just a matter of the armed forces. The armed forces have defined tasks in a military sense. These tasks do not necessarily include all non-military elements. I would also note that if we are looking for a definition, then what we determine or what gets defined will be military security in a given language. This means that we should rather not adopt American, British, Russian or German solutions, because we express our own definition in this area. And whether it is a state of awareness or a state of forces and resources, or an organised system, that is for us to understand as citizens of the Republic.

Ryszard Szpyra strongly emphasised the need to focus not only on theory and pure research, but also on applied research as a way of transforming legal regulations into practice. He pointed out: "The Constitution and the law are not scientific theories, and these two worlds should not be mixed. If we try to do pure research based on the Constitution and existing regulations, we will fall into the trap of creating local Polish theories. And when the law or the Constitution changes, the whole theory will collapse. The purpose here is to try to create independent theories, to pursue scientifically objective research from the point of view of such theories. Our task is to do research from the perspective of security science, which is classified among the social sciences. What, then, is its essence? What distinguishes security science from strategy, from geopolitics, from the art of war, from defence, from international relations? All of these sciences study similar areas; we are trying to create a kind of 'stew' by taking small pieces from different fields and trying to create a universal theory on that basis. That is, we are actually dealing with practical advice for practitioners. But what is missing here is a methodology, because it is methodology that says how this research is to be organised, how it is to be viewed, how it is to be classified and ordered. What are the consequences of considering a particular viewpoint."

Professor Szpyra referred to the results of his research[16] in which he made a systematic study of these matters. He also noted that in many cases there is a shortage of precise definitions. He gave as an example the definition of weapons, noting that when defining notions, we often come up against a certain barrier. "For example, I have not been able to find a good definition of 'weapons'. In fact, attempts to define the term are avoided. If we have no definition of 'weapons' then we are also unable to accurately define and specify the limits of 'armed struggle'. These problems further imply problems with defining the concept of war. The problem I observe is also the fact that, colloquially, we are beginning to view all phenomena as war. On the other hand, it can also be said that without the use of armed forces there is no war, because there is no armed combat. Here, however, the question arises whether the sole criterion for defining war is the use of armed forces. The Soviet Union disintegrated without the use of armed forces; no one invaded it, but it disintegrated and also lost territory in a sense. Therefore, I propose that we not focus on the wording of the Constitution, but try to understand what military security is in the context of security science, in the context even of national and state security. If we try to determine what national security is through the lens of security science and not through the lens of strategy or international relations or in any other context, then we arrive at a certain specificity of security science. The question is whether we have such a specific position that we can say that our perception is a little different. This is why I point out that we should try to make efforts to build an independent theory, so that it will be universal whether in relation to the American situation or the Polish situation or other examples. A good theory is able to explain what is happening. The world is anxious; it doesn't really understand what is happening – but when there is a good theory, that theory can explain it. Therefore, I would appeal for more effort to be made to create such a scientific theory."

Referring to the determinants and limits of military security, **Sławomir Wojciechowski** said: "The Constitution, the tasks of the state and also the values are incidental things that are interrelated. So first we have aspirations, interests, values, and these are made concrete in the Constitution – an instrument that ranks as the highest social contract. The state is merely an 'instrument' of a defined community, serving to realise its aspirations. To date, military issues have been defined mainly in terms of matters of threats and the duties of the state, but it seems that the only thing I can add to what has been said before, on what should determine the limits

---

[16] R. Szpyra, *Bezpieczeństwo militarne państwa*, Warsaw: AON 2012.

of the definition of military security, is a notion that I use – and I am somewhat close here to certain experiences from academic strategic studies – and that is strategic culture. Strategic culture understood as the totality of traditions, values, attitudes and types of behaviour, including customs and symbols, as well as the specific ways in which states adapt to their environment and solve problems related to the use or threatened use of force – that is, issues that are close to military security. If we wanted to say what determines the limits of the definition – in addition to those aspects that I have mentioned – it is this strategic culture, which affects or relates to values and interests, and is expressed in the Constitution and is realised by the state that serves the community to which that strategic culture belongs.

Jacek Pawłowski, referring to the views expressed in the debate, and particularly the ideas presented in the subject literature and in the speakers' published works, said: "Analysing the various scholarly works and materials published in recent years, including by the guests speaking in today's debate, in the context of defining national security – state security – but also the particular areas and types of security, especially military security, I believe that an adequate basis exists and that one can confidently attempt to give a contemporary definition for them." He went on: "First, addressing the question of military security in the context of the limits of the definition of security is somewhat problematic, as the limits of definition in this case are very broad, as is evidenced by the views presented by the speakers, who have in fact alluded to both subject-based and object-based approaches. And this, in my opinion, should be given particular attention, as the difference is quite significant. In addition, I would seek the limits of the definition of military security based on an analysis in which it is interpreted primarily through the lens of state and process. Military security is mainly an area of security, when we analyse it in the context of (national) security. When we are speaking of state security, however, it rather represents a type of security. This is the conclusion that presents itself following analysis of the findings contained in the subject literature. After analysing various definitions, including those from a recent publication by Professor Kitler titled *National Security: Theory and Practice*,[17] I am convinced that this approach to defining military security precisely through a process-based approach, and with regard to state and process, may be among the good solutions.

---

[17] W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe. Teoria i praktyka*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo TWO 2020.

It should also be added that the limits of the definition are also linked to the combatting of external and internal threats. Threats play a very significant role here, and in a general sense must be emphasised in the process of definition, in both external and internal aspects, but also in the context of the forces and means used to attain goals that make it possible to counter such threats. Threats can lead to the use of military force, with the goal of controlling territory and limiting sovereignty. A state of security, however, is achieved as a result of organised protection and defence against threats. Referring to the much-discussed question of protected goods under the Constitution, as well as the values and interests about which Professor Szpyra has spoken quite critically here, I believe that this is in some way correct. It is necessary to separate the issues which I brutally refer to as what is necessary to present security issues in a propagandistic manner and to accept them in the face of threats on the occasion of national holidays, or referring to the Constitution and other values and interests which are very important or most important within the state and which are also defined in those documents. On the other hand, I would like to add that in this process of defining military security, which is the subject of our considerations, we should also take into account the tasks of the state as a guarantor of security in relation to the countering of threats, especially military ones."

Summing up this part of the debate and referring to the questions posed, **Waldemar Kitler** drew attention to the boundaries that had been cited, testifying to how varied is the understanding of military security, and noted that "most certainly the notion, or the understanding and perception of the phenomenon as a whole, in which there is a wide variety of aspects, ranging from material and technical factors, threats, from technical capabilities, military capabilities, to arms races and other elements."

The chairman noted the pertinence of the cited example of "armed attack". **Professor Kitler** cited the example of the definition contained in the Hague Convention, pointing out: "The Convention in effect in 1933 included a definition of 'armed attack'. It also referred to the case of support given to armed bands, which may not necessarily take the form of military armed forces. The definition emphasises elements such as 'armed forces' or 'troops', but above all the element of 'aggression', which means that an expanded definition of armed attack has been in place for a very long time. However, there are new contemporary phenomena to which we should pay attention, and which arise precisely from the employment or even direct use of violence in cyberspace." He stressed the importance of the dilemmas indicated with regard to defining the domain of military security, because a colloquial understanding can indeed lead to

many simplifications and misstatements. In scientific theory, as he pointed out, we build models, schemes and concepts that we use, and thus we can distinguish military security from national security or state security or political security, which does not mean that these notions do not have close relationships with each other." **Professor Kitler** also emphasised the words of "warning" that had been sounded during the debate in the context of emphasising legal grounds and the shaping of research based on the wording of laws: "We must keep in mind the necessity in scientific theory of using language that is universal, or primarily explains what meaning in a given language a certain expression has, because that is what is involved in making definitions."

Professor Kitler further noted the multifaceted aspects that the experts had highlighted. As the chairman provocatively suggested, it might be said that in such a perspective "military security is any use of force, but in that case why call it military? Then perhaps we have reached a point where all of these aspects can be encompassed under one notion of 'great security'? However, since we view these problems in the context of the adjective 'military', it may nevertheless have that meaning and imply connotations of a military type. Perhaps in the past or in ancient times, military security could refer to such phenomena as the invasion of foreign territory, the taking of loot and captives, and the seizing of another entity's territory – a phenomenon defined in the Constitution – that is, in the expression 'direct armed attack'. But since times are now changing, it may be that it is not fact of an attack by the military that is most important, but the military is to be the main actor. But if so, is military security a security against the military activity of another party in international relations? Or against any kind of force?" **Professor Kitler** went on: "We usually refer to military security having in mind another entity that may use armed violence against us, it does not necessarily have to be physical force, or more precisely, kinetic force. Thus, the participation of another entity (party) is a necessary condition. Military security as a concept was shaped through custom and then codified under international law. It follows that we are dealing with contracting stakeholders, and this should have the attribute 'military'."

Turning to the second of the questions posed, **Professor Kitler** offered a reflection on the universality of the definition. "Should the definition be universal in nature? Should it represent a consensus accepted not only in security science, but also in related sciences?"

Bogusław Samol, referring to the statement about the risk of building definitions based on current regulations and the consequences for scholarship resulting from the

changeability of regulations, expressed his approval of such a view. He pointed out: "The universality of a definition serves to enable the conduct of scientific research taking into account the possibility of rapid change, whether in national or even international law. Another issue is the study of military security in the context of changes in political relations in the state: the approach to a given state's security issues may be different depending on its strategic positioning, understood as alliances and policy – whether this be security policy or, as is often said colloquially, defence policy. We must also bear in mind that we are witnessing changes in the international security environment accompanied by an emerging set of threats. The definitions must be universal enough to allow their further adaptation to changing circumstances. It is also important that a definition have a practical dimension. A definition is intended primarily to educate and to prepare the political authorities of the state in relation to its preparations to resist potential aggression not only in times of war – that is, a concrete use of armed force – but also the role of the state in directing defence, including in peacetime. There is a consensus among us on this issue as well. If the authorities prepare the state well, including the armed forces, structures, the public, and at the same time other aspects of the state's operation function correctly, then these actions have a deterrent effect on a potential aggressor, who will think long and hard about whether he wants to achieve some political goals and gain benefits from that, and what price he will have to pay." At the same time, **Lt. Gen. Samol** drew attention to the need to prepare the political authorities, including the military authorities, to attain a precise understanding of the essence of military security. Education must apply also to other discourse participants – including the media. He said: "There is no doubt that science and the scholars who deal with this problem will understand these matters perfectly, although in spite of the consensus existing on many issues, even among scholars one can observe proposals to move towards systematising the concepts. I believe that meetings like ours today serve such an exchange of views."

Marek Wrzosek, referring to what had been said previously, pointed to the presence of certain common features. He said: "There is no controversy in stating that military security is an area of state security. Nor should it be disputed that military security refers to the ability to counter various military threats. A certain problem in terms of information is the distinguishing of the scope of the notions, because in many situations when talking about military security we refer to issues relating to armed forces. I will also remind you that there was a time when there existed military science, and there was even a category, referred to as a discipline, concerning

the defence of the state. So, if we were to follow this line of reasoning, then in addition to the field that deals with the ability to resist military threats, one would have to indicate that the means to do this is military force – but not exclusively, because questions of military alliances have also been raised here. After all, armed forces operate differently when they are part of an alliance than when they act independently." Referring to the contributions of previous speakers, **Professor Wrzosek** continued: "The limits of the definition must certainly be marked out based on state and process. I believe that the transformation of these three basic ingredients into the form of a state and process can consequently lead to a reasonably coherent definition of military security that will be understood by all."

Jacek Pawłowski said on the question of universality: "We should seek better and better ways of interpreting and defining military security, imparting it a universal character, as it is a term commonly used in all areas of the activity of states and international organisations. We must continue to work on perfecting the definition of military security still further and making it even more universal. I think we are not in any doubt about that. Military security, and its perception in particular, are very profoundly conditioned by historical experience, and the Poles have much to say in this regard. The history of our country and our nation is inextricably linked to military threats and military security, as well as the provision of such security. This issue is even existential in nature. Our experiences in this matter run very deep. I would thus point out that in considering questions of the universality of the notion of military security, account should be taken of the aspect of historical experience in relation to our country and, of course, experience in the international context. I believe it is important to emphasise this vast baggage of experience, which other states – especially European and allied states – also carry in this regard. In all of this there must also be a place for the experience arising from contemporary conflicts and the wars that the world is experiencing at the turn of the century."

Witold Lidwa stressed the need for universality in the definition of military security. He claimed provocatively: "Accepting that there is no real definition of the notion 'military security', it is worth considering the meaning of the words that constitute it. Not so much doctrine but also the 'Dictionary of Security Terms'[18] defines 'security' as a state of affairs – a state of an absence of threats to peace and confidence. In turn, the element 'military' means related to armed forces. It is a word of Latin origin and has that meaning. Therefore, combining

---

[18] *Słownik Terminów z Zakresu Bezpieczeństwa*, J. Pawłowski, B. Zdrodowski, M. Kuliczkowski (eds.), Toruń 2020.

the meanings of these two words into a single term, 'military security' can be read as the absence of a state of threat from an aggressor's armed structures, or a state of lack of threats achieved through the possession of armed forces capable of effectively deterring and countering military threats. In both definitional meanings, we see the condition of effective resistance of threats coming from armed forces, a potential aggressor, and thus military threats. I therefore propose that military security should refer to military threats, namely those that arise from the possibility of the use of military potential by possible aggressors. These threats usually include the direct or indirect use of armed forces. Indirect forms of the use of armed forces mean that they are used without engaging in armed combat, and thus for intimidation or demonstration of strength, while direct use usually means armed aggression, the forms of which, according to a United Nations resolution, include seven situations recognised as acts of aggression. I will not list them all here, because they are widely known. They include invasion, armed attack, occupation, etc. Considering these threats – the indirect and direct ones – it does not seem justified to make the notion of military security dependent on changing threats, because as I mentioned earlier, the assurance of military security concerns the countering of military threats, and not all threats to security. The countering of all threats is the domain of national security or state security, not military security."

Sławomir Wojciechowski pointed out a certain inconsistency in academic studies: "We have created the category of military security, but we are expanding its meaning beyond the military domain. This makes its definition difficult. The process of defining security itself is difficult and complicated, and many aspects are unresolved. It is asserted that it – security – is either a state or a process, and for good measure different views are possible. And analogously for military security. As I have found in analysing the existing literature, military security has been defined mainly via definitions of security, as a derivative of them. Military security is also a derivative of threats. Therefore, I also lean towards adopting a scientifically universal definition of military security, which requires an analysis of basic notions such as 'military', 'armed', and not just an analysis of the notion of 'security' – that is, questions of where it is located and what it is divided into. Considering, for example, documents of a strategic nature, like the 'Security White Book' – in these documents the notion of military security does not appear at all. There is also a terminological problem at the boundary between the notions of military security and defence. Another unresolved question is how to distinguish actions that can be described as 'armed' from those that lack such an attribute."

Piotr Milik said that, adopting the research perspective to which he is closest, namely universally binding international law or international security law: "The notion of military security should and does have a general or universal character, accepted by the international community. That community shares common experiences, and on that basis we create a shared network of concepts. On the one hand, the concept of military security should be universal, but at the same time, military security should be defined in response to current threats of an existential nature faced by the state. This results from the fact that social relations and international relations are constantly evolving. And with the evolution of social relations, international relations, the threats to military security are also evolving, as we can observe. This, in particular, implies evolution of the means of armed combat." **Dr Milik** expressed his agreement with Professor Lidwa, indicating that the pillar of military security is the armed forces, "and this military security is connected directly with the armed forces. However, those armed forces create within their structure forces responsible for cyberspace defence. Therefore, undoubtedly, cyberspace also poses a new threat or challenge to military security, and therefore we must constantly define military security anew or at least keep its definitions up to date."

Ryszard Szpyra responded: "The manner in which something is defined depends on the purpose of the definition, and any form of definition implies compromises. An example is the definition of 'cyberspace' drawn up by West University for the purpose of American–Russian negotiations. The goal was for both sides to understand each other, and that requires compromise." The key question is for what purposes we create definitions. Ideally, it would be possible to create a definition for practical purposes that would be accepted by all. However, we know that this is not always possible, because there are differences in culture, civilisation, and so on. Some things are understood differently by the Chinese, Russians, and representatives of Western civilisation. Even we have our own national and historical experiences that determine the way we look at things. In the past there was military science, then defence, international relations, the art of war, and in the past, definitions were decided within these disciplines. Now, with the emergence of security science as a field within the social sciences, we are making such decisions. When creating a definition, we must not forget in what context the definitions are formulated, and account must be taken of the fundamental results of the discipline in question."

The chairman, **Waldemar Kitler**, recalling the words of Cyprian Norwid, "when everyone is speaking no one will ask what the meaning of a word is or how to read the word", pointed out that in scholarly discourse we must first make decisions as to language and the understanding of certain concepts. He went on: "The fact that a definition is laid down in an act of parliament, for the purposes of that act and the matters it regulates, does not mean that it is already a scientific definition. It is a legal definition, that is, a definition adopted for the purpose of legal regulation. It does not constitute a definition of a different kind, but we can see very well how many succumb to this weakness, and the 'scientific mortal sin' is committed by numerous academics."

Finally, the chairman asked speakers to address the third of the questions posed, concerning key needs for scientific research. Referring to a project being carried out at the State Security Institute, he raised the issue of, among other things, assessment of the state's preparedness, including that of the armed forces and the public, in case of threats and the possibility of countering aggression.

Bogusław Samol pointed out, on the question of the scope of dissemination of research results: "It should not be confined only to the academic field. Research should be applied in practice, used in practice at national level in this area of defence preparations, and also for the purpose of educating society." Referring to and highlighting the words of **Lt. Gen. Wojciechowski**, **Lt. Gen. Samol** noted the need to build a so-called strategic culture based on cultural awareness and historical experience. "It is strategic culture that will serve in the future as a tool to educate society and to prepare it in a moral and patriotic sense. It is very important for the state to prepare to defend its own existence. In my view, we must make use of historical experiences, things that also took place in the past. We cannot cut ourselves off from the past. Moreover, attention should be paid to the development of the technologies used in building modern missile systems and modern systems of warfare. They should be analysed in the context of their use as tools. These problems should also be part of research in the field of military security, since as historical experience shows, it is these new technologies, new weapon systems – just like in the past, some decades ago, with the emergence of weapons of mass destruction – that influence and impact the state of military security. Because we today, having a rare discussion on military security, can point out the role of technology and combat systems in shaping that security."

Ryszard Szpyra and Witold Lidwa, referring to the key needs in research, raised the issue of "how to ensure the safety of the object of security, that is, in our case, how to ensure the military security of the state." As Professor Lidwa pointed out, "this is a fundamental question for which there is never a sufficiently good answer, and it should be a signpost for further questions and the shaping of more detailed research."

Referring to the outcomes of the debate, Dariusz Majchrzak noted that recent experience clearly shows how important security is for society as a whole. He pointed to a number of challenges that had been mentioned in the debate. "Military security is the ability to ensure the primary national interests of a state, to achieve its political goals, and to provide its institutions and citizens living within its borders with independence, sovereignty, self-determination, and the opportunity to solve its own problems using the existing political system. This capability will most often take the form of military strength, and will always be turned against military aggression from a potential outside actor. If we are talking about military security, then there is no security without a potential threat. In that case, if we talk about a military threat here, it should also be defined in some way. In general, of course, we can say that a threat is the likelihood or occurrence of negative phenomena that affect a given entity in a negative way, which consequently result in its disturbed functioning and the inability to achieve its statutory, fundamental mission goals." Referring to the concept of "military threat", Col. Majchrzak said that at least two conditions must be met. "First of all, as Professor Lidwa pointed out, the threat must be directed against the key interests of the state, that is, we are talking here about those interests that strike directly at political goals, at such interests as are related to the existence of a given state, with its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The second condition is the use of armed forces by one of the parties."

Finally the chairman thanked the experts present, and in summing up, pointed out that there were certain common elements in what had been said – for example, the notion of "military security" is linked to threats of a military nature. It is therefore essential to understand the concept of "threat". As Waldemar Kitler continued: "This is an important matter, although it does not mean that this concept of ''threat' must be contained in the definition. The question must be asked whether military security – that is, certainty and awareness of existing and future states of affairs, as well as processes, that guarantee that armed violence will not occur – can be based only on the use of violence. Or might the threat to use armed force be sufficient? We should further consider what this threat to use armed force might result from: political

aspirations? logistical expansion, as exemplified by events in eastern Europe? What might armed violence stem from? Might it result from the usurper's zeal or the irresponsible behaviour of leaders who do not respect international law, that is, from a failure to observe international law? Can its use also stem from fierce rivalry and the spill-over of an economic dispute into armed conflict? Recalling the classic definition of a 'threat', that a threat is a state of affairs and a set of various circumstances that make it possible for some disruption to occur to the functioning of a given entity, we reach the conclusion that a military threat is not necessarily the actual use of armed violence, but something that may lead to its use, often not being strictly military in nature."

Summing up the debate, it should be noted that the speeches of the invited experts undoubtedly confirmed the validity of the statement put forward by Waldemar Kitler at the outset about the ned for a dynamic view of security issues in an evolving security environment. Despite the multiplicity of issues referred to by the speakers, this viewpoint seems to have represented a consensus among the experts, and was acknowledged as correct considering the changing circumstances and new phenomena that constantly require us to review the boundaries of concepts in the field of security, while continuing to perfect the definitions proposed in scientific discourse. The examples given by Piotr Milik, Bogusław Samol and Sławomir Wojciechowski, among others, illustrated that the experiences of the last twenty years have expanded our perspectives to include the perception of new phenomena that make it necessary to revise multiple notions – for example, that of "armed attack". New challenges posed to the state, in the face of changes in the quality and scale of threats from phenomena such as "terrorism", for example, give rise to new expectations made of the state as, on the one hand, a guarantor of security, and on the other, an entity whose authority covers the offensive use of armed forces to repel those threats. Under these conditions, from the perspective of ongoing scientific research, it is essential to pose questions about boundaries. As Witold Lidwa pointed out, it is necessary to define what military security is and what it is not, and this appears particularly important given the widespread convergence in the perception of different areas of security. Therefore, it is necessary continuously to reconsider what distinguishes it from security conceived in general and from other areas of security. Among the invited guests, there was a consensus that the determinants of military security are certainly a key issue. As Jacek Pawłowski rightly pointed out, the limits of definitions are determined, among other things, by the notion of threats. These play an enormous role, and in

a general sense must be emphasised in the process of definition. However, this notion of threats, as Marek Wrzosek rightly said, includes not only internal and external threats determined by national circumstances; they often also result from international obligations. Thus, the guests' contributions certainly confirmed the key significance of the Constitution, including Article 5, and other regulatory documents from which are derived the national and international obligations of the state and its organs in the area of military security. For these reasons, as was clearly stated in the course of the debate by Professor Lidwa, military security must be viewed through the lens of the vital fundamental values of preserving the continuity and integrity of territory, the survival of the nation and the national identity. It is also worth emphasising, by way of conclusion, the accurate observations of Ryszard Szpyra, who drew attention to the need somehow to break away from the attachment to theory and pure research, and to focus on applied research as a way of transforming legal regulations into practice. Pure research must serve only as a starting point for profound scientific study of the problem of how to ensure military security.

_____