

The concept of national security in the light of Aristotle's philosophy of Politics

Концепція національної безпеки у світлі філософії політики Арістотеля

Jacek Mrozek * 1 A

*Corresponding author: Ph.D, Director of the Elk Campus Branch, e-mail: j.mrozek@op.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7260-3308

Piotr Gawliczek ² A

Ph.D, Assoc. Professor, e-mail: pgawliczek@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0462-1168

Яцек Мрожек * 1 A

*Corresponding author: Ph.D, Директор філії Elk Campus, e-mail: j.mrozek@op.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7260-3308

Пьотр Гавлічек ² A

к.т.н., доц. професор, e-mail: pgawliczek@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0462-1168

^A University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

^A Вармінсько-Мазурський університет в Ольштині, Польща

Received: December 10, 2022 | Revised: December 21, 2022 | Accepted: December 31, 2022

DOI: 10.33445/sds.2022.12.6.3

Purpose: to present the main assumptions of Aristotle's Politics through the prism of the category of national security. Also, to reflect on the characteristics of political systems presented by Aristotle as the basis for the search for the essence of the functioning of the state, as well as an attempt to describe the perfect state (*politeia*).

Method: the research was conducted using the following general scientific and special methods: the historical method during the study of the development of the political systems by Aristotle in chronological order; the method of analysis and synthesis related to the functioning of the state by Aristotle, abstract-logical method – for formulating theoretical generalizations and research conclusions.

The results of the study: in the history of socio-political thought, Politics should be perceived as an important work that was the first to scientifically deal with the entire spectrum of issues of internal and external politics, tasks faced by rulers and citizens, goals of the state, and factors of its stability and development.

Theoretical implications: deepened unique perception of the state, in line with the spirit of antiquity, in which the boundary between politics and ethics is not clearly drawn. It really matters, as seen from the current approaches to the roles the state is able or supposed to play. That's why it is worth treating the research as a good starting point for analyzing the tasks of the state, including national security.

Практична цінність дослідження: the results of the research can be considered, while analyzing the socio-political theory of Aristotle, as a supporter of the democratic system - looking for inspiration and parallel solutions for the political culture of current liberal democratic societies.

Papertype: theoretical.

Key words: National Security, Aristotle, Ethics, State, Law.

Мета роботи: представити основні положення політики Арістотеля крізь призму категорії національної безпеки. Також поміркувати над характеристиками політичних систем, представлених Арістотелем як основою для пошуку сутності функціонування держави, а також спробою описати досконалу державу.

Метод дослідження: дослідження проводилось за такими загальнонауковими та спеціальними методами: історичним під час вивчення розвитку політичних систем Арістотелем у хронологічній послідовності; метод аналізу та синтезу, пов'язаний з функціонуванням держави за Арістотелем, абстрактно-логічний метод – для формулювання теоретичних узагальнень та дослідницьких висновків.

Результати дослідження: в історії суспільно-політичної думки «Політику» слід сприймати як важливу працю, яка вперше науково висвітлила весь спектр питань внутрішньої та зовнішньої політики, завдань, що стоять перед правителями та громадянами, цілей держави, та фактори її стабільності та розвитку.

Теоретична цінність дослідження: поглиблене унікальне сприйняття держави, що відповідає духу античності, в якому межа між політикою та етикою не проведена чітко. Це справді має значення, як видно з нинішніх підходів до ролей, які держава може або повинна відігравати. Тому до дослідження варто ставитися як до гарної відправної точки для аналізу завдань держави, зокрема у сфері національної безпеки.

Practical implications: результати дослідження можна розглядати, аналізуючи соціально-політичну теорію Арістотеля, як прихильника демократичної системи - шукаючи натхнення та паралельні рішення для політичної культури сучасних ліберальних демократичних суспільств.

Тип статті: теоретична.

Ключові слова: національна безпека, Арістотель, етика, держава, право.

1. Introduction

This article draws on the thought of Aristotle, a philosopher rightly regarded by his contemporaries as a forerunner of the socio-political sciences. His insights into social life, the result of his study of a whole spectrum of issues encompassing the phenomena of the physical, natural, social, and mental worlds, provide interesting comparative material in inquiring into the essence of national security. We should not be deceived in this inquiry by the fact that the very concept of 'national security' is not to be found

in the *Corpus Aristotelicum*¹, it is not a term of the ancients, although the subject of state security, its stability and development was as important to them as it is today. Let us therefore look at what Aristotle's views as laid out in the *Politics* have in common with the subject of national security as understood today.

2. Results and discussion

2.1 Definition of the term 'national security'

Etymologically, 'security' means a state free from anxiety, creating a sense of certainty, calmness, otherwise it is a state of "no care" from the Latin *sine cura*, *securitas* – certainty, security. In analyses of the term "security", the most common subdivisions are national security (identified with state security) and international security (Korzeniowski, L.F., 2012; *Contemporary Security*, 2005). The concept of national security is sometimes used interchangeably with the concept of "state security", which is justified by the fact that the state community determines the existence of the nation. Security is an important existential interest of every state and directly translates into the shape of domestic and international policy. Thus, it can be said that the state's security policy influences the overall policy of the state and thus shapes its *raison d'être*. Considering the basic criteria of national security, the following qualities of state existence should be taken into account:

- survival (state, ethnic, biological);
- territorial integrity;
- political independence (in the political sense);
- quality of life (satisfactory standard of living, civil rights and freedoms, cultural development, sound environment, etc.) (Łastawski, K., 2005).

In the consideration of national security, it is stated that the state has as its main objective the security of the individual, social groups and the whole nation. With the development of civilisation, more and more tasks related to the security of citizens fall on the state organisation. State functions are, in general, the directives and directions of the state.

In Polish state policy, the broadest possible definition of security is national security, which also includes other types of security. Therefore, in Polish law, the term 'national security' is interpreted as an umbrella term, which includes state security, security of citizens, internal security, external security and even public security, as the provisions of the 1997 Constitution of the Republic of Poland do not include the term 'national security'. Instead, the legislator uses the term "state security". The category of state security is also found in the Constitution of the Republic of Poland in various forms, it is defined as "public security", "security of citizens", "internal security" (Czupryk M., Dunaj, K., Karpiuk, M., Prokop, K., 2016).

Let us note that state security is not a concept that lends itself to unambiguous definitions. In the most general terms, it can be said that it usually refers to an indication of the absence of a threat, which enables the secure existence of the state and its development. At the same time, it is worth emphasising that state security is a secondary value to the security of individuals and social groups and subjects of international law, although it is certainly not a simple sum of them. It can be defined as the state's ability to defend its recognised values against internal and external threats, in particular the survival of the state, securing its territorial integrity, preserving the biological existence of its population and maintaining its political independence (sovereignty) (Czupryk M., Dunaj, K., Karpiuk, M., Prokop, K., 2016).

National security is defined in legal language by referring to possible threats, defining them as destructive and undesirable states to which both the individual and the state are susceptible. A threat will primarily be a state manifested by a negative assessment of phenomena perceived as

¹ Aristotle's lectures, or so-called scholarly, acromatic writings, constitute the *Corpus Aristotelicum*.

unfavourable or dangerous. Just as in the case of the security of the individual one can speak of threats of an internal and external nature, so it is also the case for the state. An internal threat to the state, as one aspect (type) of security threat, consists in the emergence of a specific state of affairs, a set of circumstances of various kinds, occurring in all areas of its internal activity, which cause or may cause disruption to its internal stability and harmonious development in various areas of its activity, including the weakening or even loss of its ability to survive in the international environment. The external threat to the state, on the other hand, consists in the emergence of a specific state of affairs, a set of external circumstances of various kinds, which cause or may cause a disruption of its external stability and harmonious development in its various fields of activity, including the weakening or even loss of the possibility of survival in the international environment (Czupryk M., Dunaj, K., Karpiuk, M., Prokop, K., 2016).

Philosophy provides us with effective tools to study national security from many perspectives. On the ground of ontology, we can reflect on the predictability of security, its relation and quality to other variables; on the ground of the theory of cognition, we can search for the determinants and cognitive properties of the scope of security; in the area of anthropological issues, we can relate the issue of security to individual and social life; on the axiological level, we ask about the value of security, which appears here as what is particularly valuable, desirable, as a need and as what should be. All these perspectives are part of the discussion on the concept of national security, which is an attempt to clarify its essence. No matter how adequate these findings may be in the theoretical sphere, national security is a concept primarily in the realm of social practice, and as such it must focus on results that are applicable to state or social life. Thus, it belongs to the sphere defined by Aristotle as the usefulness or achievable good that results from the most elementary needs in any community.

2.2 Aristotle as theorist of socio-political life

Aristotle (384-322 BC) was certainly not the first thinker in the ancient world to initiate structured reflections on socio-political life. He was preceded in this respect by philosophers such as Heraclitus, Archelaos, Pythagoras, Democritus, Protagoras, Kallikles, Thrasymachus, Xenophon and, above all, Socrates and Plato. Socrates (469-399 BC) is considered to be the one who turned ancient Greek philosophy towards ethics and politics. Plato (427-347 BC), while a pupil of Socrates, was interested in ethical and political issues, as reflected in his greatest dialogue *The State* (Platon, Państwo, 1958).

The Greeks undoubtedly had reason to wonder about political matters, their own country devastated by the internal friction of rival polis (city-states) competing for supremacy, threatened by the Macedonian empire growing on the fringes, was gradually losing its sovereignty. This situation was widely discussed among the Greek intellectual elite. The Athenian aristocracy, led by Plato, openly criticised the rule of the people (demos) by sympathising with the monarchical system, as long as it was not a tyranny. Aristotle, who spent more than half of his life in Athens, took an intermediate stance – he recognised the weaknesses of the democratic system, while at the same time considering it to be the primary – along with oligarchy – form of government.

In Aristotle's conception of systems, the most perfect form was a mixed system composed of democratic and oligarchic components, which constituted a polytheia (Platon, Państwo, 1958). In Aristotle's view, the polytheia is more akin to a democracy than to an oligarchy, as it is based on the middle class, making it the most durable of all political systems. Aristotle's model was partly Athenian democracy, however, the times in which he lived were already the decline of democracy and the political power of the Athenian state. The defeat in the Peloponnesian War had consequences, resulting in the loss of the dominant position of the maritime union and thus depriving Athens of its subordinate vast territories and the possibility to exploit the union cities.

After the civil wars of the 4th century, the country became depopulated, the population impoverished, manufacturing and trade largely restricted. The agricultural economy declined due to the destruction of irrigation systems, orchards, gardens and olive groves were burnt. Plato described the effects of these wars as the warring parties set fire to each other's houses and ravaged the fields: "neither one nor the other love their state. For, after all, one would not dare with another to shear the mother and the hostess bare" (Platon, Państwo, 1958). The economic crisis of Athens and other Greek cities meant the loss of previous military strength and the disappearance of the common army. Under these conditions, Macedonia had a far easier path to take control of Greece. When Aristotle wrote his *Politics* Alexander's march to the East had become a reality, Aristotle's laudatory attitude to monarchy notes that: "the state (...) needs a good law and a ruler who would take care of it, who would induce people to act well: the wicked and vile by fear, the noble and of a generous nature by shame. The law is maintained universally only by a universally recognised ruler" (Aristotle, 2001).

Against the backdrop of the emerging political changes in the ancient world, the emergence of the universal monarchy of Alexander the Great could not go unnoticed. Aristotle's personal sympathies – as he was known to have been the young Alexander's teacher of the future ruler of the empire – did not obscure the philosopher's research attitude. Aristotle's school for the study of the essence of the state analysed 158 regimes, examining the constitutions of states not only Greek. The classifications that emerged from these distinguished many forms of government, from monarchic to oligarchic to democracy. This research produced the first such complex, empirically-based social theory. Although it is a theory of the state that recognises slavery, it is nevertheless a representation not only of the standards of the age, but a certain model for the functioning of societies and systems. In addition to the *Politics*, Aristotle's research also resulted in an extensive body of work dealing with the systems of 148 states, of which the democratic system of Athens is the only one that has survived to the present day (Aristotle, 1973).

2.3 The uniqueness of Aristotle's Politics

The *Politics* is unique in many respects, differing in form, methodology and content from philosophical works of the period. Unlike Plato's work, which uses the form of a dialogue in presenting a philosophical argument, the *Politics* takes the form of a methodical lecture prepared for the purpose of teaching, reaches for theorems and definitions, clarifies the range of concepts discussed, draws on rich empirical material, uses comparative research, methods known as induction and deduction. In Aristotle's rich legacy, it takes its place among the practical writings (along with ethics, economics, rhetoric and poetics).

Aristotle justified the distinction between theoretical and practical sciences by the different attitude of inquiry and final results. All reasoning aimed at practical activity relates to concrete situations and need not be characterised by the exactness with which we deal in mathematics, Aristotle noted, adding that it is acquired with age, mainly through experience (Aristotle, 2007). In broad terms, practical knowledge encompasses the theoretical foundations as well as the practical skills that make this knowledge useful. This is what distinguishes it from experience, which can never escape a certain randomness. According to Aristotle, politics is based on experience, knowledge and the ability to manage the state, and is a kind of art (Aristotle, 2007). In Book V of *Politics*, Aristotle refers to these practical skills: "Those who are to hold the highest offices should possess three qualities: first, love for the existing system, then the greatest possible aptitude for the occupations connected with the office, thirdly, virtue and justice adapted in every system to that one" (Aristotle, Letter to Alexander the Great, tran, 2001). The process of becoming a politician itself is spread over many years; with experience comes knowledge, the intake of which should begin at an early age.

Politics, i.e. the science of the state, took its place in Aristotle's division of the sciences as

the chief practical science; it includes areas of knowledge important to the functioning of the state, such as military strategy, economics and rhetoric. It may come as a surprise to contemporaries that rhetoric, or the art of speaking, is mentioned here. Applying for official positions in Greece and Rome depended on the artistry of speaking whether from the tribune or in court. Antiquity produced many statesmen who were excellent speakers, such as Marcus Tullius Cicero (Cicero). The impression made on the audience, i.e. the reception of the speech, depends to a large extent on the ability to deliver the speech, which, by the way, every politician should be fluent in. This, in turn, influences the formation of a collective and national consciousness.

The distinction between the theoretical and practical sciences sets a boundary in the approach to cognitive results – through theory we pursue the truth, while we owe the effectiveness of action to practical skills. Both branches of knowledge, however, serve the benefit of man, which in Aristotle's understanding means the realisation of the good (τὸ ἀγαθόν). In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle defines the good as that which everyone desires: "happiness is the highest good, and that which is morally most beautiful, and the highest delight, and these are not separate things... for all these qualities are contained in the best actions; and these actions or one of them, namely the best, constitute, in our opinion, happiness" (Aristotle, *Letter to Alexander the Great*, tran, 2001). It turns out, however, that happiness is hardly attainable without external goods; it is impossible or at least not easy to perform morally beautiful acts while being deprived of adequate means, Aristotle notes (Aristotle, *Letter to Alexander the Great*, tran, 2001). At the same time, this realist position proclaims that happiness is something universal and attainable under certain conditions, namely with 'a certain kind of learning and diligence' (Aristotle, *Letter to Alexander the Great*, tran, 2001). There is no contradiction in this understanding, since Aristotle's genius – as André Comte-Sponville says – recognises the fluctuation of happiness, there is a moral and spiritual happiness largely dependent on us, but there is also a relative happiness over which we have no control. In other words, one cannot be happy in extreme suffering or danger (Comte-Sponville A., 2008). Aristotle distinguished three basic ways of finding happiness: a life devoted to pleasure; a life in which honours and honours are sought through public activity; and a contemplative life devoted to self-improvement (Nowak A., 2020). Although these are different paths, they all serve to achieve a different kind of happiness (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001).

Aristotle begins his *Politics* with the words: "Since we see that every state is a certain community, and that every community comes into being for the attainment of a certain good (for everyone in every action is motivated by what appears to them to be a good) it is clear that, although all communities pursue a certain good, this is done above all by the foremost of all, which has the most important task of all and includes all others. This is the so-called state, that is, the community of states" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). The establishment of the good as the chief aim of the state, as well as of the moral endeavours of individual people, is the finding of Aristotle, who, following Plato and many ancient philosophers, sees the compatibility of politics with ethics. Consideration of what justice (*dikaíosýne*) and other social virtues are had already become a subject of discussion in the pre-Socratic period. For Aristotle, 'justice is the fundamental virtue of social life, which must be followed by all others' (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). It is also, according to him, the root concept from which further duties, moral and political norms are derived. Justice is identical with ethical courage, Aristotle states, with which he demonstrates that the scope of this concept is considered both in terms of duties towards the community and individual subjective values (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. 2007).

As a promoter of education, he does not stop at theoretical indications; "the man who is to be ethically brave should be carefully brought up and accustomed to what is good, and if he is to spend his life in decent occupations and neither against his will nor in accordance with it do anything wrong, this is possible for people living according to the precepts of some reason and some proper order (...)" (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. 2007). This order can only be owed to the law,

which is why it is best if education becomes state by law. The model of state-implemented education was Sparta in antiquity. It began at the age of seven and included boys and girls alike, children from families irrespective of wealth status; the same rules of upbringing applied to all, "the same games, the same exercises, the same common table. Children and young men were divided into companies, headed by the bravest of the young; the orders of the chiefs, the punishments they imposed were obeyed without a word of criticism – this upbringing was a true school of obedience (...) Strict moral discipline fostered the type of Spartan citizen who in time became loud and respected throughout Greece: indifference to the comforts of the flesh, contempt for softness and effeminacy, fortitude in sufferings, unflinching courage in dangers, sobriety and modesty – these are the qualities acquired by a barracks upbringing" (Kot S., 2004).

Approving and recommending state education, Aristotle advocates what we today call civic education, "a good citizen should possess the ability both to listen and to govern. (...) Prudence, however, is a virtue proper only to those who govern. For other virtues seem to belong to both the subordinate and the ruler. For the subordinate is, as it were, the maker of flutes, while the ruler is the flute player who uses the flute" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). And since the tasks in the state of the various social classes are different, education should be adapted to future duties and roles.

Aristotle considers at length the question of power in the state. The problem of governance concerns not only political power, but also the roles played in society, in the small community and in the family. These roles arise from the characteristics of the society in which Aristotle lived, the foundation of which is based on a patriarchal and slave system. Aristotle takes a distinctly conservative position on these issues. In Book I of the *Politics*, he propounds a thesis that was difficult to defend even in the ancient world, namely that some people are born to rule and others to be subordinate (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). If these roles are designated by nature, it should become the concern of the state to prepare the rulers (lawmakers, legislators) accordingly. The art of governing the state itself, the art of politics, should be learned from statesmen, politicians-practitioners who have extensive experience in this field. The art of governing the state cannot be taught only from textbooks, a collection of laws or state constitutions. Aristotle is trying to show that in politics, theoretical knowledge must be transformed into skill in order to be, in today's language, successful. The future politician must have a practical knowledge of farming, administration, commanding, speaking, public speaking, etc. (Aristotle, *Economics*, trans, 2001).

The practical and sober attitude to political issues represented by Aristotle differs significantly from Plato's approach. In his *State*, Plato immortalised an image of an ideal land that does not exist in reality. It is a model of a community built on a strict allocation of tasks among the citizens, it is only fair, Socrates believed in Plato's dialogue, that each social stratum: the productive, the warlike and the governing should be entrusted with their respective competences. Ruling belongs to the philosophers by virtue of the most harmonious mental disposition and knowledge they possess. A precisely functioning state machine, whose aim is to be the good of the whole, was to educate and educate in accordance with the realisation of the highest ideas. In the name of realising the perfect state, it prioritised the happiness of the state over the happiness of individuals. The abolition of private property and the family were among these solutions, in short, quite radical.

The starting point of Aristotle's systematic consideration of the state is quite different. Above all, he emphasises social facts, he does not seek an ideal. This is probably why Aristotle's lecture on the science of politics became a model for political writers and rulers for many centuries, including the French King Charles V or the Polish King Sigismund III (Banaszczyk T., 1985). The influence of the *Politics* began in the 15th century, at which time as many as thirteen editions of the work were published, and numerous translations and commentaries appeared. If Plato's philosophy dominated social thought until the 12th century, the time of Aristotle began after Christianity assimilated Aristotelianism in the form given to it by St Thomas Aquinas. In the commentary on the French translation of the *Politics* for Charles V, it is written that it contains almost natural, universal

and eternal laws on which the particular norms are based, so that no one who does not know the Politics can govern the state well (Banaszczyk T., 1985). This sentence confirms the widespread reception of Aristotle's theory in Western modern thought. The contribution of this work is thus indisputable and grounded not only in Aristotle's authority but in its real influence on socio-political thought.

2.4 Socio-political categories in Aristotle's Politics

Among the basic political concepts is, of course, the concept of the state. Aristotle begins his Politics with a definition of the state. According to it, the state is a community for the attainment of utility (Aristotle, Politics, tran, 2001). Deriving the genesis of the state from natural causes, the coming together of people into groups out of necessity (for survival), Aristotle proclaims his momentous truth – man is by nature created to live in a state (Aristotle, Politics, tran, 2001). The attribute of man is speech, the ability to use language distinguishes the human being from other living beings and testifies to the possession of reason, the consequence of which are cognitive, creative, moral, aesthetic abilities, etc. Thus, only humans can create a social organism complex enough to be self-sustaining and capable of development. However, an organised community can only be sustainable if social bonds are present: justice, friendship and others. Justice, as a regulator of life in a community in the broader sense, means the application of law, which establishes order in the community, "law is the establishment of a certain order, good laws must therefore be equivalent to good order" (Aristotle, Politics, tran, 2001). Friendship, on the other hand, which for Aristotle is a kind of coexistence (philanthropy), is a kind of bond between people and states, and is even more highly valued than justice, "for harmony seems to be similar to friendship, and harmony is what legislators strive for most, wishing to remove as far as possible the disputes and quarrels that are a symptom of enmity. And people who live in friendship have no need of justice at all, but people who are just nevertheless still need friendship, and the most appropriate form of justice is, it seems, a friendly attitude" (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, trans, 2007). Aristotle thus suggests that where there is friendly coexistence between people or nations, the law can be applied less strictly, a peaceful attitude then prevailing over a reluctant and hostile one. Within the state, friendship becomes the basic regulator of social relations, uniting people and binding them together in mutual cooperation for the common benefit. It can therefore be said that justice and friendship as social virtues link ethics (morality) to the field of economics and politics in Aristotle's conception (Banaszczyk T., 1985). Friendship here does not only mean benevolent feelings or, as it is sometimes termed, 'the ethics of benevolent feelings', but it constitutes cooperation, common economy and the organisation of life. The simplest and most elementary example of such an organised community is the family (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, trans, 2007).

The characterisation of individual states leads in Aristotle's political theory to a description of different types of polity (polytheia). According to Aristotle, a state system is "the arrangement in a certain order of powers in general, and above all of the supreme power over them all. This supreme authority is the government of the state everywhere, and therefore the state system is expressed in the government" (Aristotle, Politics, trans, 2001). It is the polity that constitutes the identity of a given state; it is, according to Aristotle's concept of hylemorphism, the form of the state, its essence. On this basis, Aristotle divided and categorised the different types of government into:

- 1) kingship (basileía), i.e. monarchical, one-power rule;
- 2) aristocracy (aristokratía), i.e. rule by more than one, although still by a few, its advantage being that, in relation to one-power rule, rule by more people is less prone to error (Aristotle, Politics, trans, 2001); timocracy (a fusion of democracy and oligarchy), i.e. the most perfect system, which Aristotle also defines as polytheia.²

² The term 'polytheia' is used by Aristotle in a broader sense to refer also to any of the regimes.

In addition to the above types, Aristotle's classification also included the extreme forms of government: tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. The latter are less stable and more prone to degeneration. In his conception of systemic change, Aristotle follows a different path from Plato. The thought on the cyclical transformation of regimes expressed in the *State* goes back to archaic beliefs upholding the reproduction in social life of the cycles of nature – emergence, development and perishing (Tatarkiewicz W., 2005). Its proponents were many ancient philosophers, including: Anaximander, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, Empedocles, the Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. Aristotle takes a descriptive and research stance as a historian, and is therefore critical of Plato's concept of the transformation of regimes, according to which timocracy is followed by oligarchy, from which democracy arises, and which passes into tyranny (Platon, *Państwo*. 1958). Aristotelian methodology focuses on a distributive description of phenomena, in the study of social change individual instances of change are taken into account, thus avoiding hasty generalisations, which Plato was not immune to.

2.5 National Security and Aristotle's Politics

In the *Politics*, the problem of the permanence of regimes comes to the forefront of reflections on political change. Aristotle is primarily interested in the question of what factors build the stability of states and what factors cause their decay. This is undoubtedly an issue relevant to national security. The general thesis expressed in Book II of the *Politics* states: "For if a polity is to be sustained, all the members of the state must strive to be and remain themselves" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Drawing attention to the dynamic structure of the state organism, which is never static, but vital and constantly subject to change, goes beyond the era and is a momentous remark of sociological and political significance. Aristotle tries to explain the dynamics of the functioning of the state on the basis of philosophy in the dichotomous division between form and matter. This makes it possible to explain the phenomenon of changeability while preserving the identity of the state, even though the matter constituting the state, i.e. its area, population, social groups, strata, classes, undergo transformations, it is the system (*eidos*) that makes it possible to preserve its permanence. In Aristotle's philosophy, the concept of form is one of the basic ones, especially in logic and mathematics; in biology, it denotes a species, i.e. a group of individuals of a given kind and a constitutive element of a given object or a factor of a phenomenon that makes the thing or phenomenon what it is, despite the many changes it undergoes, in other words it retains its identity (A dictionary of Aristotelian terms, 1994). In Aristotle's system, it is the form (*eidos*) that is the essence of every thing and its first substance: in order to know any entity, one must inquire into its 'formal cause', which leads to the discovery of the fundamental cause of the entity in question, to which the other two causes – causal and purposive – can be reduced (A dictionary of Aristotelian terms, 1994). Aristotle explains the meaning of state substance as follows: "If the state is a certain community, namely a community of citizens within a polity, then if the polity changes in kind and differs from the previous one, the state too will necessarily not be, as it seems, the same; similarly, after all, we speak once of a comic chorus, the other of a tragic one, although they are often the same people" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001).

The shape and order of the state becomes the canvass of national security especially in systemic transitions. In the *Politics*, more attention is paid not so much to the moment of upheaval introducing a new system as to its maintenance. As Aristotle states, this is not an easy thing to do, unless there is strong support for a particular regime in the state through laws and customs (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). The rulers should make it an object of care to do everything they can within the framework of the law to ensure the stability of the polity. Hence, the advice that Aristotle sees includes reliance on the principle of distributive justice, realising the equality of rights of all citizens. Stability for Aristotle – a lover of the ethic of moderation – lies in ensuring a balance of states, the best solution being to rely on a middle class to guarantee that the middle state

outnumbers both extreme states and one. In such a system, the fear that the rich will join forces with the poorest by acting against the middle class disappears (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Another factor is the rule of law, which should be respected by rulers and citizens: "For the violation of the law undermines the state imperceptibly, just as small expenditures, however often repeated, ruin fortunes. For the sum total of expenditure escapes notice by not doing it all at once, and reason is thus misled" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). To the question of who should govern – Aristotle clearly answers – the laws, and the laws properly framed (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Those who govern can usefully resort to propaganda qualities, using the psychological factor to strengthen the prevailing system, "those who have the maintenance of the system at heart should create a mood of apprehension, so that the citizens may be on their guard and not neglect to keep watch over the system, like a night watch for safety; moreover, even distant dangers should be presented to them as imminent" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). The leaders should strive to prevent friction within society, to settle disputes and feuds among the powerful and influential by legal means (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Above all, the aim should be to create by means of laws such an order that no one social stratum rises above the others (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Aristotle does not stop at general indications and gives examples of the transformation of individual regimes, as well as advice on how to preserve the durability of states. Aristotle assigns a special place to education as a means of social influence. One must agree with the philosopher that: "The most important thing, however, for ensuring the permanence of regimes, more important than anything mentioned so far, although today neglected everywhere, is education adapted to the regime. For the most glorious laws, resulting from the unanimous resolution of all citizens, are of no use if people do not get used to them and are not brought up in the spirit of the system" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001).

The above recommendations addressed to the legislators constitute the first pillar guaranteeing the protection of the system, the second lies in the duties of the citizens, and here again we enter the area of ethical issues. Aristotle writes more about this interdependence when drawing a picture of the best state. This is not an ideal identical to Plato's perfect state, but for the state "the best system in its conditions" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Aristotle also views the purpose of the state differently from Plato – the purpose is the welfare of the citizens. An explanation is needed here as to what this good is? For it is used to be understood in the sense of the one supreme good (Tatarkiewicz W., 2005). However, as the ancient Greeks understood it, there are many goods that lead to happiness and a life of dignity, and this is the meaning of the good that Aristotle shares. According to Aristotle, there are three kinds of goods: external goods, bodily goods and spiritual goods, and the necessary condition for happiness is the combined possession of all of them (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). The best state, therefore, will be one that ensures the realisation of all these goods by its citizens, although even this alone is not enough if the citizens do not feel responsible for their own moral development. Aristotle emphasises this dependence: "It is connected with this on the same principles that the best state is a happy state and one that succeeds well. But no one can prosper who does not do well. There is no good deed either in man or in the state without virtue and reason. Virtue, justice and reason have the same meaning and form in the state as they must have in every man, if he is to call himself reasonable, just and temperate" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001).

Among the specific issues concerning the security of the polytheia, Aristotle points out that the goal of the state should never be imperial, relations with neighbours should be exemplary, and forcing citizens to fight wars with other states, apart from defensive war, have too many negative sides. Therefore, "although all devices calculated for war should be considered good, they do not absolutely constitute the ultimate goal of the state, but are only means to it. Rather, it is the task of the brave legislator to take care how the state and the people who make it up, as well as any other community, will be able to organise their lives well and achieve the happiness that is possible for

them" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). The next indications for the functioning of a polytheia include natural factors such as location, territory, number of inhabitants. For optimum and self-sustaining existence, the state should not occupy too vast a territory, as such a country is difficult to manage, and similarly when the population is too large, as "no state that is considered well arranged is indifferent to the growth of the popular mass" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans, 2001). Refraining from excessive population growth must be on the mind of the state, since it does not improve the life of such a community, just as insufficient numbers threaten the existence of the state. It can be said that Aristotle initiates with his indications an important field of socio-political science, which is the demographic strategy of the state.

3. Conclusion

The phenomenon of state life, is based, according to Aristotle, as we said earlier, on the nature of man - man was created to live in the state, he is part of the state (*zōon politikón*). A component of this nature is the ability to distinguish between good and evil, justice and injustice, as well as the basis for the creation of the family and the state. States and social communities arise out of the necessity of fulfilling basic needs and realising goods, among which we find those related to material survival and higher goods, referred to as cultural or national goods. If we speak of national security then, in Aristotle's notion of philosophy, it refers to social qualities whose aim is the good of the state. Aristotle speaks of the good of the state when he states: the object of politics, i.e. the science of the state (*polis*), is the highest good of man, it is the same for the individual and for the state, and even the good of the state is a greater and more momentous thing than the good of the individual man (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans, 2007). The sciences with state security as their object in Aristotle's typology would fall into the category of practical sciences, defining the factors and conditions for the realisation of national security, but would also be treated as part of the sciences of politics, governance and the management of state organs, and even as part of educational and socialisation practices affecting most aspects of social life. This understanding of national security is extremely broad, comprehensive and multifactorial. In Aristotle's philosophy, which appreciates the practical dimension, many observations begin by looking at small and grassroots matters. The action of the home and family community becomes a model for the community of several families, a village, a neighbourhood and finally the whole country. This inclination towards small, local matters, taking into account the problems of the grassroots levels, can be a model for the regulation of national security, which, as we know, does not begin immediately in the collective consciousness, but in the thinking and perception of the individual, from which the concern for the security of the whole nation also begins.

The most important function of the state, which we can learn from Aristotle's *Politics*, is to unify and order human action and behaviour by regulating and upholding the law. Violation of the law, whether by citizens or rulers, directly threatens national security, and the law is an instrument of pure reason (divested of desires and therefore non-egoistic and above particularism) to which all governments and regimes adhere, taking them as their model. This message should be regarded as a still valid achievement of Aristotle's political theory, worth not only preserving, but actively defending.

4. Фінансування

Це дослідження не отримало конкретної фінансової підтримки.

5. Конкуруючі інтереси

Автори заявляють, що у них немає конкуруючих інтересів.

References

- Aristotle, Economics, trans. Ludwik Piotrowicz, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.
- Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, trans. Daniela Gromska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2007.
- Aristotle, Letter to Alexander the Great, trans. Bogumiła Świstalska, in: id., Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.
- Aristotle, Politics, trans. Ludwik Piotrowicz, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.
- Aristotle, Rhetoric, trans. Henryk Podbielski, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.
- Aristotle, The Political System of Athens, trans. Ludwik Piotrowicz, PWN, Warsaw 1973.
- Aristotle, Encouragement to Philosophy, trans. Kazimierz Leśniak, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.
- Banaszczyk T., Studies in Aristotelian socio-political theory, Scientific Papers of the University of Silesia, Katowice 1985.
- Comte-Sponville A., J. Delumeau, A. Farge, The most beautiful story of happiness, trans. E. Burska, Pax, Warsaw 2008
- Czupryk M., Dunaj, K., Karpiuk, M., Prokop, K. State security legal and administrative issues, Faculty of Law and Administration UWM, Olsztyn 2016.
- Eliade M., Sacrum, myth, history, trans. A. Tatarkiewicz, PIW, Warsaw 1993.
- Korzeniowski L.F., Fundamentals of security sciences, Warsaw 2012;
- Kot S., History of education, vol. 1, From ancient Greece to the mid-eighteenth century, Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak, Warsaw 2010.
- Xenophon, Greek History, trans. W. Klinger, Ossolineum, Wrocław 2004.
- Łastawski K., The concept and main determinants of national and

Список використаних джерел

- Arystoteles, *Ekonomika*, przeł. Ludwik Piotrowicz, w: tenże, *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- Arystoteles, *Etyka Nikomachejska*, przeł. Daniela Gromska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2007.
- Arystoteles, *List do Aleksandra Wielkiego*, przeł. Bogumiła Świstalska, w: tenże, *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- Arystoteles, *Polityka*, przeł. Ludwik Piotrowicz, w: tenże, *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- Arystoteles, *Retoryka*, przeł. Henryk Podbielski, w: tenże, *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- Arystoteles, *Ustrój polityczny Aten*, przeł. Ludwik Piotrowicz, PWN, Warszawa 1973.
- Arystoteles, *Zachęta do filozofii*, przeł. Kazimierz Leśniak, w: tenże, *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- Banaszczyk T., *Studia z Arystotelesowskiej teorii społeczno-politycznej*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice 1985.
- Comte-Sponville A., J. Delumeau, A. Farge, *Najpiękniejsza historia szczęścia*, przeł. E. Burska, Pax, Warszawa 2008
- Czupryk M., K. Dunaj, M. Karpiuk, K. Prokop, *Bezpieczeństwo państwa zagadnienia prawne i administracyjne*, Wydział Prawa i Administracji UWM, Olsztyn 2016.
- Eliade M., *Sacrum, mit, historia*, przeł. A. Tatarkiewicz, PIW, Warszawa 1993.
- Korzeniowski L.F., *Podstawy nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, Warszawa 2012;
- Kot S., *Historia wychowania*, t. 1, *Od starożytnej Grecji do połowy wieku XVIII*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak, Warszawa 2010.
- Ksenofont, *Historia grecka*, przeł. W. Klinger, Ossolineum, Wrocław 2004.
- Łastawski K., *Pojęcie i główne wyznaczniki bezpieczeństwa narodowego i*

- international security, in: Contemporary security, ed. W. Fehler, Wyd. Scientific Grado, Toruń 2005, pp. 10-29.
- Nowak A., *Between Disorder and Captivity. A Short History of Political Thought*, Biały Kruk, Kraków 2020.
- Plato, *Państwo*. With the addition of the seven books of the Laws, trans. W. Witwicki, PWN, Warsaw 1958.
- Basic categories of national security, ed. Żukowski A., M. Hartliński, W.T. Modzelewski, J. Więclawski, Olsztyn 2015;
- A dictionary of Aristotelian terms, ed. K. Narecki, PWN Scientific Publishing House, Warsaw 1994.
- Tatarkiewicz W., *On Happiness*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2005.
- Contemporary Security, ed. W. Fehler, Wyd. Scientific Grado, Toruń 2005.
- międzynarodowego*, w: *Współczesne bezpieczeństwo*, red. W. Fehler, Wyd. Naukowe Grado, Toruń 2005, s. 10-29.
- Nowak A., *Między nieładem a niewolą. Krótka historia myśli politycznej*, Biały Kruk, Kraków 2020.
- Platon, *Państwo. Z dodatkiem siedmiu ksiąg Praw*, przeł. W. Witwicki, PWN, Warszawa 1958.
- Podstawowe kategorie bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, red. Żukowski A., M. Hartliński, W.T. Modzelewski, J. Więclawski, Olsztyn 2015;
- Słownik terminów Arystotelesowych*, oprac. K. Narecki, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1994.
- Tatarkiewicz W., *O szczęściu*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2005.
- Współczesne bezpieczeństwo*, red. W. Fehler, Wyd. Naukowe Grado, Toruń 2005.