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Abstract

Security sciences and scientific disciplines (as well as all natural and social sciences), depart from those philosophically determined basic principles that are grouped into theories of the being (existence) of security occurrences (ontology of security), for understanding of safety occurrences (gnoseology of security) and the values and valuation of safety occurrences (axiology of security), whereby presuppose the recognition and appreciation of security occurrences, and vice versa - the recognition of security occurrences presupposes the existence and valuation of what is known, and also the valuation assumes the existence of security occurrences and the methodological and methodological possibility of their recognition. On the aforementioned philosophical basis and methodological direction - our philosophical, i.e., ontological analysis and synthesis of security (as an idea, condition, value, need, interest, function, organization and system) begins with the long-known ontological fact that security as a practice is as old as the human race, arising from the materialization of human emotions and the urge for self-preservation (the instinct of fear and the biological mechanism of survival of the organism), and the assumptions that man's first thoughts were utterly practical, that is, life itself had to be safe first and foremost - food, heat, protecting against catastrophes and avoiding danger were the first goals of reason, but also a long-established anthropological finding that the need for protection, security and safety
is based on the basic natural laws of the struggle for existence - a sufficiently firm basis for the fact that the need for safety and security is one of the basic needs of people.

In this paper we are making an effort to try and open up a debate regarding ontology of security as a separate philosophical discipline aimed at the continuous acquisition and promotion of a reference framework of chronological, current and anticipatory knowledge of the importance, the being and the idea of security (as a condition, value, need, interest, function, organization and system), as well as on the basis of security on the necessity, determinacy, continuity, importance and development of the social-security existence (human being) and humanity as an emergent form of it existence by virtue of its enduring, existential and natural-social need for security.
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INTRODUCTION OF A POSSIBLE WAY TO FOUND THE ONTOLOGY OF SECURITY AS A SEPARATE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCIPLINE

Security sciences and scientific disciplines (as well as all natural and social sciences), derive from those philosophically determined basic principles that are grouped into theories of the being (existence) of security phenomena (ontology of security), for understanding of safety phenomena (gnoseology of security) and the values and valuation of safety phenomena (axiology of security), whereby presuppose the recognition and appreciation of security phenomena, and vice versa - the recognition of security occurrences presupposes the existence and valuation of what is known; also, valuation assumes the existence of security occurrences and the methodological and methodological possibility of their recognition (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, pp. 152-153). Contextually, we state that we will try to achieve a scientific-philosophical grouping of certain basic, philosophically determined attitudes about the being (essence, core) and the being (existence) of security phenomena, aiming at - establishing the ontology of security which as a separate philosophical discipline would develop philosophical-scientific complementarity, non-contradiction, but also qualitative difference from the science of security (asphaliology) (Mojanoski, 2010) (Asphaliology is a science that systemizes the existing knowledge and with the scientific – research methods, assumptions, techniques and instruments it verifies the scientific knowledge, establishes the educational
laws and contributes to improve the human security training). Consequently, we will note that the grounded and developed ontological categorization of security phenomena through which the security of the reality is concretized, among other things, also points to the thinking and understanding of security as a historical phenomenon, which in its various stages of history has achieved its phenomenological practicality, value, need, interest, function, organization and system.

Also, the ontological categorization of security has been referred to as the central issue of the ontology of security to determine the relationship between the social-security being, that is, the existence of man and the being itself (essence, base) of security (as state, value, need, interest, function, organization and system). The stated central question of the ontology of security develops a further infinite (logically funded) philosophical-security thought process of ontological questioning. - where is security, what world does it belong to: the world of the real, the exact, or the world of the thoughtful, the ideal? (Kambovski, 2010, p. 170) (The methodological approach to the question is taken and adapted on the basis of: Vlado Kambovski, Philosophy of Law. Otherwise, due to the limited textual space, we are unable to present in the paper other (possible) ontologically open and asked questions by us.)

In this context, we will state that despite the established diferencia specifika of the philosophy of security, hence the ontology of security from the separate security sciences and scientific disciplines (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019) (For the determination of the specificity of the philosophy of security from the theory of security, ie from the separate security sciences and scientific disciplines (with general and specific orientation) which are teachings about the occurrence of (specific) threatening and stimulating security phenomena in a certain time and space, as well as for determining the differential specificity of the philosophy of security from safety teachings on methodologies, tactics and techniques for prevention, prevention, detection, research and clarification of criminal offenses (crimes and pre atrocities), the detection and apprehension of their perpetrators and the security treatment of victims of criminal offenses).

However, these philosophical disciplines cannot be separated from the general theory of security as a purely security discipline used by the methods of the social sciences, and in particular, the security sciences. From a methodological point of view, we place the basic hypothesis of ontology of
security in the existence of a difference between security phenomena as they are (i.e., as they exist, i.e., being) and as they should exist, on which the philosophy of security differs, in particular security ontology can build its axiological analysis of the essence of security. On the other hand, it is indisputable that any philosophizing about security, its importance and being, can be developed only in the context of existing, being and manifest security phenomena. However, if in the essence of security as an existence we can penetrate based on experiential / empirical knowledge, in the essence of security, we can penetrate only with the speculative method (according to Kant, with "pure reason", as opposed to empirical reason. aimed at security practice) (adapted according to: Kambovski, 2010, p. 110). Such an approach is immanent in the philosophical views of importance and being developed since Parmenides: in an empirical sense, importance cannot be perceived as a totality, and we come to its notion only through opinion (Bošnjak, 1985, p. 81).

ELEMENTARY PHILOSOPHICAL - ONTOLOGICAL CATEGORIES AS A BASIS OF THE CATEGORY SYSTEM OF THE ONTOLOGY OF SECURITY

Our philosophical, that is, ontological analysis and synthesis of security (from which the ontological categorization of security arises) (as idea, condition, value, necessity, interest, function, organization and system) starts with the formerly known ontological fact that the security in practice is as old as the human kind, becoming with the materialization of the human emotions and instinct of self – maintenance (instinct of fear and biological mechanism for organism existence) (Miјалковић, 2009, p.13), (Anžič, 1977, p. 35), (Dillio, 1996, p.17), as well as for the assumptions that the first estimations of the human were very rational, i.e. the life foremost should have been safe - food, heat, protection of natural disasters and escaping danger, were the first goals of the mind (Блекхо, et al., 1995, p. 11), but in previously determined anthropological establishment that the need for protection, security and assurance is based on the basic natural laws of the existential fight - which is the most reliable basis of the fact under which the necessity of security and assurance presents one of the basic needs of the human (Termiz & Milosavljevič, 2008, p. 343). In this ontological – security fact, the being of the security and the idea of security are expressed and
they are in causal relation with **natural – social need of the human for security** (individual/ singular security is included in the social security), i.e. for **social – security existence (being) of the human in social shaped security reality**, as well as the **importance (essence) of the security** (the human, tribe, group, municipality, the country and the world), i.e. the **essence** of the security by which the difference of the **security appearances** are being determined, i.e. the security of other social appearances according to its importance, as well as their ontological relations and mutual influence with it (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, p. 156). The listed **categories** we have identified them as **elementary philosophical-security, ie philosophical-ontological and theoretical categories** and they are the basis for constituting the **categorical system of philosophy of security, hence the ontology of security as a separate philosophical-security 2019 discipline**. (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, p. 156).

On the basis of the assumptions that the first estimations and the first goals of the human mind were – that the life, foremost should have been safe, the ontological establishment of the security that we will start with defining the **idea of security**. Namely, perception, **sense and visualization of the safety appearances** are sensuous, and the term, the court, and the conclusion are **rational shapes of acknowledgement**, whereby these two degrees of acknowledgement differ in quality and in correlation of their characteristics and cognitive value (Крстић, 1988, p. 198). On the basis of the above mentioned, **the idea of security** will be defined as **determined and basic term, undefined for other terms**, which scope and content differ from the immediate sensual knowledge, i.e. they are noticed as a result of combined theoretical and rational opinion funded on the socially-secured empirical or the same to be combined with theoretical materials which are directed to theoretical outcomes, which opinion can be creative, critical, exhaustive and directed towards developing an idea for naturally – social need of the human and his social security existence, as well as finding relations and establishing relations among security and other social, natural and technical aspects that enables creation of future module for knowledge funding that will enable solution of rational and theoretically security issues/ problems. (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, p. 157). However, **before-securing, meta-securing – presents the idea of security and the security values**, and without their knowledge and validation there cannot be a functionality for the safety theory and the safety
practice, i.e. the functionality cannot be enabled for the security scientific studies and organization and performance of the security measures and activities. An essential element of the cognitive interest of the philosophy of security, and hence of the ontology of security, are: 1) the idea of security, which, like the idea of peace, in its essence and vocation is a world idea (Bubanja, 1987, p. 7); 2) its reflection - the reflection of the initial stage of the creation of security relations, processes and conditions (which are not created solely by natural action!) – namely, security relations, processes and conditions generated by a social entity are preceded by the idea of security. The philosophy of security, ie the ontology of security, should identify and determine the rational reasons and the importance (essence) of security, that is - identify and address something that precedes experience, ie something that precedes a specific security relationship and process, the specific security situation of a particular reference object, as well as the formation of a specific security structure of the society (or its individual elements) or the upgrade of that security structure (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, p. 157).

The social-security existence of man is one of the categories determined by both ontological and sociological categorization of the security. The term existing (in its scope and content) can be understand as appearance shape of human’s existence on the basis of the implementation of the natural – social need of security which shape of existence has its own image in a condition that is relative, but has enough absence of physiological, psychological and social failures crucial for the human and the's organism functioning, as well as for the human’s behavior oriented to meeting the lack of security (Аризанкоски, 2010, p. 116). In theoretical construction, the term social – security existence of the human, can be found as naturally – social need of security as separate, crucial and essential element that is determined in the abovementioned definition with aspects accepted of some authors related to the explanations if the security is social or natural need. However, just like some authors would mention, throughout the activities that covers the knowledge and the skills of the society, individuals, groups and communities that make that society, the culture and the civilization, their needs, as well as the ways of their satisfaction has been developed and changed (Termiz & Milosavljević, 2008, p. 345). In addition, it can be said that the basic physiological, existential needs are natural but had been transformed in social needs. Their satisfaction stays to be natural
necessity, but the ways of their satisfaction became social (cultivated and civilized) (Termiz & Milosavljević, 2008, p. 345). For basic need, categorized as social security need and assurance, it can be mentioned that it is complex, mixed naturally-social need, that is met in mixed, naturally-social, individual and collective way (Termiz & Milosavljević, 2008, p. 345). We will point out that the usage of security can be dominant to the extent of taking the role of organizer of the entire human behavior (Kuvačić, 1976, p. 9).

Socially-secured existence of the human happens in socially shaped security reality, by which the entire security content in one social space or system can be understood, whereby they are all in condition of mutual influence of the elements in the social system that they developed unbreakable links and relations (Аризанкоски, 2010, p. 113). In theoretical construction of this term, there is a theoretical elements of secured contents, which, in fact are security aspects discovered with precise safety of the society and with them can be easily understood sensually-available shapes of mutual action of individuals or social groups as well as of their mutual action with the nature or the technical systems, by which consequentially there is threatening or stimulation of their physiological, psychological and social needs (Аризанкоски, 2010, p. 113).

If philosophy is more precisely a discipline that consists in creating concepts (Kambovski, 2010, p. 176), the ontological determination of security is achieved by determining the scope and content of its term. In the philosophical or ontological determination of the essence, the essence of security, one of the possible methodological ways is to determine the definition of security. Namely, in addition to determining the central issue of ontology of security, we believe that one of the key issues of security ontology is the question - what is meant by the term security? (adapted, according to: Kambovski, 2010, p. 170). Does that term denote the security specified in the empirical categories of security practice: 1) practical existence of a specific security situation, security process or security relationship; 2) practical and safe enjoyment of a specific value or practical maintenance, realization and promotion of a specific security value; 3) practical satisfaction of the natural and social need for security; 4) practical

* That mechanism is clearly included in the studies of the neurosis, and socially it is pointed out in a situation of panicking, disasters or war.
maintenance and promotion of specific security relevant relevant interest; 5) practical realization of the security function; 6) practical establishment and realization of the organization of performing the security function; 7) practical functioning of a specific security system; 8) practical application of legal norms that regulate the security area; etc.; Otherwise, we will mention that with the stated empirical categories from the security practice, the security reality is formed, i.e. the security existence.

The ontological analysis and synthesis of security is preceded by a semantic discussion in the direction of scientifically legitimate and usable clearing of the terminological plurality regarding the concept of security. – otherwise, in our opinion, this does not mean the absence of terminological plurality, because it positively contributes to maintaining the vitality of science and scientific disciplines! To this end, among other things, we consider it necessary to accept Wittgenstein's thesis: Everything that can be conceived can be said (Kambovski, 2010, p. 176); the limits of language, hence the limits of opinion, so that the philosophy of the "uttered" is a theory of reason! (Kambovski, 2010, pp. 176-177). In this regard, as well as based on the ontologically grounded definition of human socio-security existence, we performed one of the possible definitions of individual / individual (human) security which is a basic categorical concept of security formed by theoretical and practical constructions of protection and promotion of the safety of the individual (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019). However, individual/singular (human) security is defined as current (temporary) or relatively permanent (longitudinal, extended) individual, optimally-qualitative, established, i.e. improved and developed functional-beneficial condition of the human in which he meets its socially-natural need of security of being (existence) in precise socially shaped security reality, i.e. in certain social, national and international environment, as a result of enough absence of physiological, psychological and social lack, crucial for human and the human’s organism function, i.e. as a result of sufficient and optimal protection of certain, precise or potential social, natural and technical threatening (challenges, risks and threats) after its psycho-physical status, and its moral and healthy integrity, after its materially – existential status, and its commonly-accepted and standardized freedom and rights, as well as his legitimate values and interests (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019). Through the general and security history of the humanity, the security from its primary and individual
(self)protective behavior, during the time has been transformed and modified into collective (group, tribal, social, national and international) protective action (function) (Мијалковић, 2009, p. 14), so correspondingly we will mention that the human security is integrated in the *social security*, which presents precise and potentially changeable situation in certain socially-secured space where there are consequences because of the influence of the social, natural and technical threatening and stimulations, that are not being existentially threatened, but they stimulate the social development and protection of the social values, whereby the members of the society have elementary, real and relatively possible ability of realization and protection of their values, needs, interests, freedom and rights which can be found in certain and generally accepted frame (Аризанкоски, 2010, p. 114).

Based on our methodological and concrete, philosophical approach, initially, in establishing the *philosophy of security* (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019), and consequently on the *ontology of security*, which approach, among other things, allowed us to set the basic hypothesis of ontology of security which hypothesis presupposes the existence of a difference between security phenomena as they are (ie, as *they exist, that is, they live*) and as they *should* exist, on which difference this new philosophical-security discipline (in emergence and development) can build its *axiological analysis* of the essence of security, confirms the long-established and well-known fact about security-stimulating and security-threatening phenomena. In this regard, we will note that security is a constitutive and immanent component of *human praxis* and *dispraxisia* (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019). From a philosophical point of view, human praxis is an action, an activity that is valuable and humanly expedient, as a way of human existence (Tanović, 1972, p. 16), that is, an existence that we have defined from a security point of view as a social-security existence (being) of man. In contrast to praxis, dispraxia, from a philosophical point of view, implies bad work, trouble, and everything that signifies the reduction of man - in terms of value, deviation from his essential possibilities to be at the level of human activities as conscious, free and purposeful activities by the human measure of changing the world (Tanović, 1972, p. 16), that is, from a security point of view, we can, among other things, guarantee the endangerment of generally accepted and justified human freedoms, rights, values, goods and interests - or the endangerment of concrete referent object of security (individual / individuals, social groups, states, unions of states and
the international community as a whole) (Mojanoski & Arizankoski, 2019, p. 159). Based on the fact that all segments of human life, with a certain degree of probability, can be endangered, for philosophical-scientific purposes of structuring and in this paper we used the following concrete and framework conception of human threats as an individual (Termiz & Milosavljević, 2008, pp. 352-353): 1) **physical threatening** - physical harm, including life deprivation; 2) **psychotic-emotional threatening** - non-excepting, disabling, not responding to emotions, denial, frustration of the positive emotions related with the family, with the close people, to the local group (neighbors, coworkers, colleagues and etc.), nation and people in general; 3) **psychotic-intellectual threatening** – missing out and prevention to create an adequate system of chances for education and teaching through disorder and diffusing of self-consciousness and veneration of the autochthonic values and etc.; 4) **oriental - valuable threatening** - danger of the existing valuable system and imposition of other orientated system values; 5) **interesting - economic threatening** – regarding the legal and moral threatening of the permitted acquirement and material goods management, their creation and materialization of the knowledge, skills and creative abilities; 6) **threatening of the requirements realization, freedom, rights and abilities in the scope and work of the labor** - and enabling development and growth of the human abilities, as well as their free manifestation; infringement of a part or of the total value of working result of the human; enabling free organization and coalition of working with others; as well as free alignment because of the data protection related with the work; and 7) **threatening the information - communication field** – enabling or difficulties of gathering, emission and realization of information and communications; as well as selected, shortened and prevented, or false informing, which can cause threatening of the psychophysical, healthy and moral integrity of the human and disabling his proper behavior, opinion and conclusion.

Based on the above-mentioned expansion of the basic philosophical-ontological categories, we establish **the ontology of security** as a special philosophical-security discipline that we will temporarily define as a **philosophical-security discipline and antithetical hierarchical orientation towards continuous acquisition and promotion**. for the relevance, essence and idea of security (such as state, value, need, interest, function, organization and system), as well as for the security of security for the necessity, determination, continuity, importance and development of the
social-security existence of man and humanity as an emerging form of his existence based on the satisfaction of his permanent, existential and natural-social need for security.

CONCLUSION

The paper presented the essential assumptions for establishing the ontology of security (as a special philosophical-security discipline in emergence and development) in order to develop the philosophy of security, and we single out the following concluding observations:

1. We establish the **ontology of security** as a special philosophical-security discipline that we have temporarily defined as a **philosophical-security discipline aimed at continuous acquisition and improvement of the reference framework of chronological, current state and security, anticipatory knowledge of being, value, need, interest, function, organization and system**), as well as the basis of security on the necessity, determination, continuity, importance and development of social security o existence (existence) of man and humanity as an emerging form of his existence based on the satisfaction of his permanent, existential and natural-social need for security.

2. The ontological categorization of security directs us as a **central question** of the **ontology of security** to determine the **relationship between social-security existence, ie the existence of man and the being (essence) of security** (as a state, value, need, interest, function, organization and system).

3. Knowledge and acceptance of the scientific usability of philosophical and, in particular, **ontological assumptions of security science (asphaliology)**, i.e. the **philosophy of security**, and consequently, the **ontology of security** is a basic precondition in the process of **scientific research on security phenomena** as well as the **practical implementation of specific security measures and activities**. It should be noted that every security researcher in general, in addition to having acquired different types of (pre) knowledge about the subject, theory, research method and language of security science, it is also necessary to have acquired prior knowledge and in the field of **security philosophy** (but also from **other sciences and scientific disciplines belonging to other scientific fields, areas and regions**) which with their security-scientific usability will provide a complex and rational approach to safe research current phenomena. Consequently, we will
conclude that there is scientific, social and educational justification for establishing ontology of security as a separate and authentic philosophical-security discipline in emergence and development.
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