OBJECTIVE SECURITY

Colonel (r) Professor engineer Eugen SITEANU, PhD[*]

Abstract: It seems that the new world order is collapsing and international security is no longer what it once was because humanity has been concerned with subjective security. That is why we intend to define a new concept of security - objective security based on achieving security awareness. In order to substantiate the science of security and objective security, we must go through the stages explained by Hegel: the stage of consciousness and the reason of security, the stage of the spirit in which reason turns into spirit and the stage of objectifying security. The phenomenology of security is the description of the objective forms in which the science of security appears, of the process of knowing the insecurity / security and the disclosure of errors. In the methodology of the scientific research of insecurity / security it is necessary to never forget that "the truth is the whole", and the phenomena of insecurity / security always become something else. That is why the insecurity / security phenomenon must be analyzed as a historical phenomenon with respect to data and facts, and the insecurity / security knowledge represents a process in which the dialectical method explained by Hegel is used: the security philosophy method is dialectical because the method is the structure of the whole.

Keywords: objective security; subjective security; security science; security phenomenology; dialectical method; security philosophy method.

1. Introduction

The issues of people's and humanity's life and security have been a constant concern for scientists ever since the oldest ages until the present day. Thus, security has been the subject of a significant amount of scientific papers under the shape of various syntagms: minimal security; maximal security; obligatory security; sufficient security; opportune security; absolute security; total security; vital security; optimal security; durable security etc. Other concepts have also emerged, such as complete/thorough

[*] Professor, PhD, corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, tenured member of the Romanian Committee of History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (CRIFST) of Romanian Academy, E-mail: esiteanu@yahoo.com.

security, which is a new concept devised by associate professor engineer Gheorghe Ilie, PhD[1].

In this respect, we are proposing a different concept, another syntagm: *objective security* which we are going to justify with scientific arguments as follows. In order to define this concept, we are going to use the ideas of great philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel expressed in his work „Phenomenology of Spirit", published in 1807, and in some of his other works in which he dealt with his philosophical system called „objective idealism", Hegelian dialectics and „the universal spirit".

2. The Security Concept

The security of man, system, communities, nations, etc. is their qualitative property / capacity / capability to preserve the functional and structural characteristics under the attack of aggressive / destructive factors / entities which produce dysfunctional actions or destruction and hazards to the health and life of people, as well as material and information damage. Their functioning within a security system depends on the external environment and the degree of safety in functioning, the capacity of reshaping parameters and the property of the system, communities and nations to resist threats and risks through high viability and the capacity to mitigate disruptive activities. Thus, security comprises three main components: 1) for preservation (avoidance, diminishing, and reshaping); 2) for functional and structural re-adjustment; 3) for security in functioning of systems, nations, etc. In order to ensure the security of systems, nations, etc. continuous security measures must be taken, as security mechanisms tend to become worn out and outdated (technologically or morally). So, they become vulnerable to criminal pressures, any security mechanism being prone to being compromised by the enemy. The security analysis has to take into account the primordial character of the cause as compared to the effect (the paradigm of causal determinism)[2] and the anticipated causal connections: mistakes, exceptions, and crimes/errors[3]. In order to ensure their secure functioning, systems have to abide by the following

---

[1] Gheorghe Ilie, *Risc și securitate – articole, comunicări și prelegeri*, Vol. I, Editura UTI Press, București, 2015, pp. 11-12.

[2] *Ibidem*, p. 28.

[3] *Ibidem*, p. 29.

requirements: they need to be organized in a linear, horizontal or hierarchic manner; they should have possibilities of parametrical re-shaping; they should have anticipated causal connections and tolerance or a regulatory mechanism to serve as moderator, amplifier or limitation.[4]

3. Phenomenology of Security

This is a description of shapes that are taken by the security science, an expression of the process of acknowledging the insecurity/security process and the revelation of errors. In other words, the phenomenology of security is the „theory regarding the occurrence" of the security science, that is, the acknowledgment of security, as well as their extremely complex dynamics. By experimenting whatever is objective, as a process, the researcher or his/her conscience gets to turn it into self-conscience (being fully aware of oneself). The person thus becomes in his/her interiority and exteriority, aware of oneself. The road to the security science starts from this „sensitive conscience" (from unmediated reality)[5]. The first stage of the phenomenology of the spirit is the phenomenology of conscience (the phase of self-awareness).

The security phenomenon can only be approached in relation to the other phenomena which are continuously changing according to the (gnoseological) laws that determine these changes. Using a dialectical expression, Hegel surprised the phenomenon of exploitation and dehumanization[6].

Hegel rejected subjective idealism on justified grounds, not only because it is wrong, just as any idealism, but especially because it is subjective. Likewise, we reject it too as it cannot be used in the security theory and cannot explain the phenomenon of security. Even if the human being tends not only towards its unmediated, pragmatic and sensitive reality, but also towards its ideality and its becoming. The ideal is part of life and is one of the most precious qualities of human existence and becoming. There is, of course, an ideal of security, or, more exactly, an ideal security which is probably never going to be accomplished. Yet, such a horizon exists. And

---

[4] Idem.
[5] C.I. Gulian, *Hegel. Tînărul Nietzsche. Mircea Eliade*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1992, p. 24.
[6] *Ibidem*, p. 26.

the closer we are striving to get to it, the farther it gets from us. This does not necessarily mean that we are never going to be able to reach it.

In the security theory we need to use not only observation, perception and sensation, but also thinking, imagination, creative capacity, namely the whole potential available to the person and humanity, the only one which is not degradable. The security concept keeps crystalizing the essential for the things and beings studied, for the objective reality, as well as for acknowledging the phenomena that are connected to security.

In security studies, we first and foremost need an analysis of dialectics, understood most of the time as a sort of realm of the *„becoming of morality"*[7], as a dynamic, complex and contradictory process undertaken by any person in order to reach ethical objectivizing[8]. In this respect we will emphasize the reflection of democratic and enlightenment assumptions and those of durable development, as well as on the necessity of always subordinating the individual ethos to the general (national) one. The reason is that man is not an isolated being, fallen from the skies, separated from connections and determinations, even though each person is unique and unrepeatable on the Earth and even in the Universe; on the contrary, man is a social being very much relying on community, society, their objective reality and the immense cognitive space generated by humanity.

The security analysis should also take into account the issue or phenomenon of objectivization which is the essential issue in the whole array of security matters. By ethical objectivization we understand the spiritual development stage in which security conscience is realized as a rational self-conscience in the sense explained by Hegel. In addition, it is necessary to acknowledge the connections between the morals and the laws of each nation, as well as their connections with the relations of beneficial production, knowledge, creation and construction or of necessary destruction. Here we are dealing with the unity among the citizens of a nation created by the labor relations established in common. This unity is expressed by those morals and laws mentioned above. Obviously, any people's laws show what each citizen is and does, or at least this is the way it should be understood as in this context, through these relations, each

---

[7] Idem.

[8] Idem.

citizen has and feels the certitude of all others, including his/her own, on condition that the respective people/nation is free.[9]

We will resume the explanation for the security phenomenology which represents not only the theory of forms of expression of security science, which is generally covered by security theory, but especially the fact of security, namely security as a phenomenon and as a process, as dynamics and essential condition of balance, management of conflicts, dialectics of becoming within the space of protecting and preserving the systems of values in which we live. In order to build the grounds of the security science, several steps need to be taken: the stage of conscience and reason of security, the stage of the spirit and the objectivization. The stage of the spirit is that one in which reason is turned into spirit, which embodies objective reality and is superior to reason as it is *„essence in itself and for itself"*[10]. By elaborating on this idea, Hegel comes to the manifestation of the will for social justice according to the principle „vox populi, vox Dei", which justifies rebellion against illegitimate wealth as absolute power necessarily leads to the decay of society.

Within the dialectics „master-servant", the servant gets to build a conscience that will rise against oppression /enslavement.[11] In the security theory, errors are shown as effects of *„defection, exceptions and crime"*[12], as well as of the incapacity to also become aware of the other causes of errors by decision-makers or those who perform security analyses and cannot understand and explain the phenomenon of insecurity/security, the energetic-information-spiritual-psychological-para-psychologic relations and the instructive-adaptive capacity of large systems, nations, states, alliances etc.

4. Objective security

Using the method of dialectics / dialectic reason, Hegel combined theoretical reason with practical reason within a whole *„starting from the*

---

9 Hegel, *Fenomenologia spiritului*, București, Editura Academiei, 1965, p. 201.
10 *Ibidem*, pp. 202-239.
11 C.I. Gulian, *op. cit.,* p. 29.
12 Siteanu Eugen, Naianu Bedros, Ilie Gheorghe, *Fiabilitatea produselor tehnice*, Editura AISTEDA, București, 2000, p. 144.

structure of objective reality"[13] and reaching a philosophy of crisis. Similarly, if we analyze security / insecurity using the same method and we combine theoretical reason with the practical one in analyzing the phenomenon of security / insecurity we come to a philosophy of objective (historic) and subjective security / insecurity reality, just as Hegel made up that *„philosophy of (historic) objective and subjective crisis"*[14] and the predicates of the categories of reality or the „predicates of the Absolute". The eminent German philosopher also performed an *„analysis of categories of the real world – of measure, quantity, quality, possible, real, essence etc. "*[15], which, obviously, need to also be at the basis of security/insecurity analysis and the theory of security /insecurity (security / insecurity science), just like all the other domains of the dynamics of society. All these are essential for an objective, global vision of the security of the world and for a philosophy of security / insecurity that derives from the spiritual necessity of the whole. That is why we need to surpass the traditional logic, the new scholastic, to call it so, taken from history, in order to reach the objective (historic) reality / security according to ontology, once Hegelian, today almost irreversibly lost due to the crisis caused by insufficiently thought actions. As a result, security analysis should focus on the coalescence of issues (social, political, military, economic, ethical, cultural etc.) pertaining to the phenomenology of security / insecurity.

This combination of issues is necessary as one cannot separate the issues of security / insecurity and deal with them alone as all the issues in this world and this Universe are interconnected. Therefore, security analysis needs an encyclopedic spirit and a unitary vision, taking into consideration the relativity / historicity of any philosophical system of security / insecurity. In this respect, we need to understand the use of dialectical methods and comprising wholeness in the security analysis.

The Hegelian idea of capitalizing the collective spirit (from ancient culture) leads us to understanding its idea regarding „the necessary historic character of all the phases of evolution" of every little thing, including of the conscience of national/international security, which we are also

---

[13] C.I. Gulian, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[14] Idem.
[15] Idem.

attempting to shed some light on, inspired by the philosophical thinking of the great system maker. In light of Hegelian, anti-Hegelian or post-Hegelian dialectics, we also need to interpret – to its own benefit – the history of security, as a history of the spirit of balance, conflict management and their way to everything or, sometimes, such as nowadays on the Earth, towards nowhere. The new security, which we are so concerned about, is nothing but the old preoccupation of mankind to survive in an environment in which, man has always been not only comrade, friend, and companion, for better and for worse, but also a fierce wolf for the other man.

In order to solve security issues we need to start from *„the necessity to clarify the fundamental ethical question: what should we do?"*[16]

The concept regarding the relation between philosophy and security needs to be analyzed in the same manner in which Hegel made the *„concept about the relation between philosophy and life"*[17]. Following in a consistent manner the stream of ideas connected by Hegel, we reach the conclusion that the basic principle in the security analysis is neither the subject not the object, but rather the „transcendental" principle of existence as a whole for objective acknowledgement of security phenomena (social, political, economic, military, ecological, demographic, historic phenomena), which are all of them historic!

As it is well known, in the history of mankind there were various regimes: slave-states, feudal, capitalist and socialist. The Republic of Rome became the Roman Empire and both of them embraced slavery. A state of wealthy people *„led by the wealthy to the advantage of the wealthy. As such, it was doomed to collapse in disaster"*[18]. The process of disintegrating the Empire was long-lasting and it happened because the *„Empire had lost its reason of being and was doomed anyway*[19]. Roman emperors changed with high frequency through assassinations devised by people who were rich enough to be able to buy off the guards (Praetorians) and assassinate the emperor. Sometimes practorians themselves decided the emperor who had to be assassinated, e,g, Carracala and Caligula.

---

[16] *Ibidem,* p. 20.

[17] *Ibidem,* p. 21.

[18] Hendrik Willem van Loon, *Istoria omenirii,* Traducere din engleză de Cornelia Dumitru, Editura Humanitas, București, 2017, p. 123.

[19] *Ibidem*, p. 139.

The Northern border of the Empire was no longer defended by indigenous Roman troops, but by foreign mercenaries who were not willing to sacrifice themselves for Rome. This was followed by the invasions of the Huns coming from Asia, and the Goths did not withstand the bloody attacks of the Huns and fled towards the South, towards Rome. Emperor Valens did not manage to stop the Goths and their king, Alaric attacked Rome. They were followed by the Vandals who plundered Rome, the Burgundians, Oriental (Eastern) Goths, Germans, Francs, and finally, Odoacre, the commander of Germanic mercenaries who, in 475, deposed emperor Romulus Augustulus of his throne, proclaimed himself governor of Rome, being presently recognized by the emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire. After a few years, the king of Oriental Goths, Teodoric, assassinated Odoacre and proclaimed the kingdom of Goths that lay on the territories of the former Western Roman Empire. After approximately one century there was an invasion of Longobards, Saxons, Slaves, and Avars who dismantled the kingdom of Goths and created a new state with the capital in Pavia.

Roma had been destroyed, Roman wealthy people had been driven away from their luxurious villas. The old Roman roads, bridges and aqueducts had also been destroyed. Commerce was difficult and the civilization in the Western part of Europe was shaking, in danger of disappearing. For centuries, migratory peoples literally destroyed the West subject to crimes, arson, looting and devastating wars. Still, in the Eastern part, the old Empire continued to exist for many centuries.

Yet, Europe was saved from total extinction by Christianity, by the Christian church (catholic and orthodox), by the humble people who believed in Jesus Christ from Nazareth who was killed by Roman authorities for fear of instigating to rebellion or revolution. Thus, the faith of millions of Europeans saved the civilization built up along the millennia by Egyptians, Babylonians, Greeks, Tracs, Dacian-Romans. Nowadays, history repeats itself, this time at global scale. The possibility of a nuclear war or of an atomic catastrophe that might destroy the entire mankind exceeds the danger of being attacked by migratory peoples along past millennia. We are witnessing a mixture between the old and the new, an overlapping of continuity and transformations. Along with capitalist and socialist regimes, we can still see slavery and feudal regimes. In our world there are probably around ten million slaves, as well as barons, counts, dukes, serfs, etc.

Within the EU over a million of „slaves" are being exploited, out of which 50-75% are of Romanian origin. The blame for that can be put on Romanian authorities as well as on the authorities of the European Union states in which these people are exploited. EU institutions themselves cannot be exonerated of the guilt of exploiting these people and violating human rights, such as the right to life, freedom, dignity etc. We can undoubtedly say that: *„the more things change, the more they remain the same"*[20].

Dictators, some of whom completely insane, have been rulers of different states for years and years, such as Nero, Caligula, Caracalla, Hitler, Stalin, Idi Amin (Uganda), Noriega etc.

Political assassinations have happened for thousands of years, including the assassination of politicians or artists for political reasons, as there was the case of John Lennon (former Beatles lead-singer) who was actually singing about peace when he was shot down in New York (1980).

Palestinians and Kurds became two peoples without a country. Thus OEP and PKK were born, respectively the Organization for Palestine Freedom and Communist Kurt Party. They strike Israel, respectively Turkey, through terrorist attacks. International terrorism does not come solely from the Middle East, but also from other areas of the globe, such as, for instance, North Ireland, Italy (Red Brigades, Right-Wing Terrorists etc.) and so on.

Terrorism gives rise to a state of fear, it stresses hatred between the sides in conflict and prevents the settlement of political (international) problems. Solutions may only result from dialogue, tolerance, cooperation and mutual respect.

A lot of terrorist attacks were generated by the explosive situation in the Middle East, especially by fundamentalist groups.

The massive waves of migrants from Africa and the Middle East to Europe led to a rise in xenophobic and racist phenomena and of extreme right-wing movements in the West, especially in Germany, France, Austria.

Osama bin Laden, the leader of al-Qaida, declared war on the United States and triggered the terrorist attacks upon the twin towers of World Trade Center, in New York and the Pentagon, on September 11, 2001. A

---

[20] *Ibidem*, p. 580.

month after that, President Bush obtained the approval of the Congress to bomb Afghanistan (al-Qaida camps). Then, the Congress adopted USA Patriot Act, which gave the President higher authority for combating terrorism. Thus, Bush had the power to use pre-emptive strikes, and the chosen target was Iraq, as Iraq, Iran and North Korea were declared by Bush as belonging to the „Axis of evil" and Iraq had „weapons of mass destruction", although international inspectors found no such thing. Ten years after the invasion of Iraq, the Times confirmed: *„The war in Iraq was not necessary, but costly and detrimental on all sides. It was based on flawed information manipulated for ideological purposes"*.

The phenomenology of security is the evolution of the spirit ever since awareness is raised (threats, risks and vulnerabilities) up to acknowledging security/insecurity through concept; it is thus the way conscience has to flow towards becoming spirit and the way of the latter towards acknowledging insecurity/security.

Formalism, the use of patterns and schemes are erroneous methods of analyzing security/insecurity as they do not answer to the special complexity of security issues.

In the history of security, phenomenology is that turning point in which Hegel combined social, political, military, spiritual, and gnoseological issues, as well as the methods of solving these issues for the objective acknowledgement of security / insecurity phenomena in our age.

5. Conclusions

The international security or the global security of the third decade of the third millennium cannot be understood with the mind of a single man, but with the minds of those participating in trans-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research. Thus, it is necessary to perform not a usual (traditional) analysis, but a security analysis which might examine and analyze the suffering, the tragedy, and the despair of billions of people, of those 90% of the Earth population, that are in a permanent state of insecurity, in opposition to the approximately 10% or, more precisely, the 1-10% for whom efforts are made in order to ensure all forces and means capable of conferring a security, if not absolute, at least sufficient, and definitely a kind of welfare, a good life sheltered from worries and imminent threats.

The secret of insecurity or lack of security resides in the multitude of errors, in the frequent confusion between cause and effect, in the moral and ideological confusion and especially that between political beliefs and their consequences and that between theory and reality.

Security is now moving into a new realm not yet explored, that of new social, economic, political, military life, of philosophy, law, religion, state issues etc. All these, in Hegel's view, are spiritual issues as the spirit was proclaimed by the great philosopher as a primordial quality. However, we need not to lose from sight the *„synchronous nature of social reality and of spiritual history of society"*[21] which are essential dialectical aspects of the security / insecurity phenomenon.

So, the security / insecurity phenomenon has to be analyzed as a social and historic phenomenon by respecting dates / information and facts. Acknowledging security / insecurity is a process that uses the dialectical method for acknowledging social, political, economic, ethnic, ecological, and aesthetic phenomena.

The phenomenology of security resorts to historic illustrations from various historic ages, to the philosophy of history *„through the mediation of the history of culture"*[22] and through establishing a connection between *„subjective spiritual experience and that of mankind"*[23]. The phenomenology of security needs to inextricably link theoretical issues with those of life and avoid irrationalism and intuitionism. The methodology of research in the domain of security/insecurity needs to always take into account the fact that „truth is the whole", but *„the whole is only the essence which is fulfilled through its development only"*[24]. Therefore, acknowledging the security phenomena happens only by studying them both as static and developing wholes. The security / insecurity phenomena keep turning into something different. Through dialectical thinking, we can turn phenomena in security notions/ concepts still keeping the concrete movement of security / insecurity phenomena. Reflecting the security processes is only possible by „moving" notions; the method of security

---

[21] *Ibidem*, p. 22.
[22] Idem.
[23] Idem.
[24] Hegel, *Fenomenologia spiritului*, Editura Academiei, București, 1965, pp. 17-18.

philosophy is dialectics as the method is the structure of the whole.[25] The mere empirical observance and formalization are processes that *„miss the essence of reality which is movement, life, contradiction"*[26].

The spirit *„is the unmediated truth; it is the ethical life of a people"*[27].

Security in general and particularly national security could always be found between Hegelian dialectics and the dialectics of the imperative as well as that of the possible, namely between man's ideals and what he can achieve. These are the two limits of security in any historic age.

Acknowledging security has to start with the abstract general as, according to Hegel, the dialectical research method is actually *„acknowledging the lack or shortage of conscience of beginnings, as abstract generality, the conscience that the object* (investigated, a.n.) *requires moving on, determining the general."*[28] For the dialectical method of security, the general appears under two descriptions: as a beginning and then as ending, namely as an end and a goal of acknowledging security, the general being the „concrete whole", as the great German philosopher stated. He also explained how we could get from the simple (abstract) general to the concrete one, taking it into consideration that the initial general may not be as simple and abstract as we usually believe. Following his reason, acknowledging security needs to start with „the general-itself", that is, with the human being that comprises every determining „in-itself, undetailed". The result is that the concept of security / insecurity *„has to unfold, to acquire detailed characteristics, to determine, to become a concept in itself"*[29]. So, the research method needs to start from the assumption that *„the beginning, or the absolute as a beginning, is already a concrete, objective whole"*[30]. In his vision, subjective thinking does not create the whole, because the concrete whole belongs to the object of security, of security phenomena, and the dialectical method of investigation is meant to discover the whole of security and recreate it so as to reflect all the connections and interactions (internal and external) in time and space, of the

---

[25] *Ibidem,* p. 33.
[26] Idem.
[27] *Ibidem,* p. 200.
[28] C.I. Gulian, *op. cit.,* p. 109.
[29] Idem.
[30] Idem.

security / insecurity phenomena. Next, Hegel wrote *„The concrete whole which makes up the beginning possesses in itself the beginning of moving forward and development"*[31]. He is also the one who explains it: *„The initial whole comprises the distinction between moments, connections, yet undifferentiated"*[32]. In this sense, acknowledging security and our investigation have the mission to find the differentiation and determination, and the essential presupposes that the determination of security be discovered in the object of security itself.

The dialectical denial of security will bring to the forefront *„contrary entities and their mutual succession one into another"*[33] such as, for instance, the singular and the general. So, the positive has to be maintained in its negative, namely, security has to be maintained in the insecurity of mankind, while the *„contents of the assumption made in its result, this is the most important thing in the reasonable acknowledging"*[34] of security. The dialectics of security does not allow for a fixed (immutable) or frozen security as any unmediated security is going to be, at the same time, mediated, that is, in relation to something else as any positive turns into its negative and *„mediation is the negative of unmediated and, as such, it maintains it and comprises it in itself"*[35]. Thus, security sends to its opposite – insecurity, which obviously sends once again to security, as the thesis always turns into an anti-thesis. The negative thesis shows the connection between the negative and the positive and *„finding the positive in the negative"*[36]. According to what Hegel stated, we need to have the capacity to perceive and discover the real negative (real insecurity), the battle of contraries, the negative (insecurity) fighting the positive (security). He calls this capacity the „turning point" in the movement of the *„concept* (of security, a.n.), *the source of self-movement, both real and logical"*[37]. Through this, the opposition between the concepts of security and reality are annihilated, the barrier that exists between „rigid logic and dialectic reality"

---

[31] Hegel, Știința logicii, tradusă de D. Roșca, Editura Academiei, București, p. 831.
[32] C.I. Gulian, *op. cit.,* p. 109.
[33] Idem.
[34] Idem.
[35] Idem.
[36] Idem.
[37] *Ibidem*, p. 110.

is also annihilated. We can say that, this leads to the emergence of truth, the unity between the concept of security and reality. After the first denial we move on to analyzing the second denial. This means annihilating the contradiction being the second assumption or the synthetic assumption. In comparison, the first denial is analytical and the second is „re-establishing the initial unmediated, but having as a sequence the dialectical process which, formally, can be regarded as a triad: thesis-antithesis-synthesis"[38], namely, in our case: security-insecurity-synthesis.

The second negative is denial of the denial (suppressing contradiction). Suppressing contradiction is just as little as contradiction itself, namely the action of exterior reflection, in other words: *„the most intimate and objective moment of life* (of security, a.n.) *and of the spirit"*[39].

The researcher needs to make an important effort of thinking not to miss anything or, as Hegel said: in order to *„catch all the moments, all the sides, and contradictions"*[40] of security, analytically perceived by our reason. Then, each discovery, each information previously noticed in the concept has to be generalized in such a manner so as to apply and develop the security concept. Therefore, the researcher has to show a lot of patience in the process of security acknowledgement. Impatience and haste, which ignore that acknowledging the truth represents security-insecurity and forgetting the fact that it is a complex and fully imperious process for acknowledging security, will only lead to disaster.

Intuitively, it is possible to perceive a representation of the whole represented by security, but the concrete whole can only be obtained through security science.

---

[38] C.I. Gulian, *op. cit.,* p. 110.
[39] Idem.
[40] Idem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GULIAN C.I., *Hegel. Tînărul Nietzsche. Mircea Eliade*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1992.

HEGEL, *Fenomenologia spiritului*, Editura Academiei, București, 1965.

HEGEL, *Ştiinţa logicii*, tradusă de D. Roșca, Editura Academiei, București.

ILIE G., *Risc şi securitate – articole, comunicări şi prelegeri*, Vol. I, Editura UTI Press, București, 2015.

SITEANU E., NAIANU B., ILIE G., *Fiabilitatea produselor tehnice*, Editura AISTEDA, București, 2000.

Willem van Loon H., *Istoria omenirii,* Traducere din engleză de Cornelia Dumitru, Editura Humanitas, București, 2017.