

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF SECURITY SCIENCE METHODOLOGICAL BASES

Dr. sc. Saša Milojević.,
sasa.milojevic@kpa.edu.rs

Dr. sc. Boban Milojković.,
boban.milojkovic@kpa.edu.rs

Bojan Janković M.A.
bojan.jankovic@kpa.edu.rs
The Academy of Criminalistic and Police Sciences, Belgrade,

Abstract

The paper deals with the following: (1) the security science concept, (2) the security science constituents, and (3) the possibilities of the security science research. According to this, it has been concluded that: (1) security agencies and their activities should be developed scientifically; that this development in security science knowledge is acquired by scientific methods; and that it offers proven knowledge to legal regulation. It is true that the activities of security agencies are not studied by security science only. Since these activities are very complex, they became the subject of numerous sciences and scientific disciplines. Each of them investigates the activities of the security agencies from its own aspects and allows security science to use the obtained results. However, that does not deprive them from obligation to come to key knowledge by their own research endeavors, (2) that knowledge of security has its constituent sciences. However, the subject has not been clearly and precisely defined yet, while the theory, method, and language are in the process of development. This means that security science is at the beginning of its constitution and development. It may develop faster or slower, depending on the systematic study of its subject area and meta research and; (3) the ability of scientific research of security phenomena is conditioned by theoretical fund and security science language. New scientific knowledge on security phenomena is essentially dependent on the quantity and quality of existing theoretical funds of security science. The fact is that security science have neither a complete nor a unique theory; they are a unity of often remote theories about narrower parts of security science' subject. Some are primarily theoretical and some are applied. Each of them has the character of a doctrine and (or) legal regulations; they are made of a series of attitudes, instructions and principles. There is a lack of correct definitions of the scientific laws that have the capital role in the research of security phenomena. This is why the research is very complex and unreliable, while the results are conditional and hypothetical.

Keywords: *Security science, security, methodology*

Introduction

In different modalities, security emerges together with the organized societies, especially – states. In ancient Greece (Athens), there were so-called antinomy, guards, sentinels and the like, as part of an ideally arranged state, in transition from oligarchy to democracy¹. Although the concept (and term) “security” has changed throughout its long history of the state and law, it has kept the essential determinants of their own content and meaning. It is true that some guidelines were specific to the security of individual states or political systems; some lasted and faded, while others have remained universal and represent the definition backbone of this complex term.² Moreover, since that time, states, as well as the highly organized groups, corporations and state organizations have become complex systems; the security functions have significantly expanded and acquired a form of a system. Therefore, it is no longer possible to understand security and its function using common sense and experience, without a serious scientific approach. This is the source of the numerous attempts by many to start a “science of security”, or “theory of security”, or “security affairs management”, or “security psychology”, etc. There is no doubt that there is scientific knowledge in these attempts, but there is also conceptual and especially terminological confusion. However, it is inherent to any field of knowledge while trying to become a science.

Without any aspirations to give a complete answer to many open questions of such a young science in this paper, the following should be considered: (1) the concept of security science, (2) constituents of security science and (3) the ability of research subjects of security science.

The term of the science of security (security science)

In order to discuss the dilemmas of security science, first, we must define the term “security”. Respecting the numerous authors who have established more or less correct definitions of this term, it seems that the most acceptable definition was given in the Military Lexicon. According to it “...Security can be defined as a state, organization, and function. Security as a state represents the protection of property, values, heritage, and society. In the political and security terms, it covers the entire protection of a state from all forms of subversive activities of foreign and domestic enemies and other

¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, Kultura, Belgrade, 1960, p. 212–216

² Bogoljub Milosavljević, *Science of Police*, Police Academy, Belgrade, 1997, pp. 3–21

harmful activities and influences. In relation to where the danger of the protected property comes from, it can be external and internal. External security refers to the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of a state, while the internal refers to the smooth functioning of the concrete constitutional order, and socio-political, economic, and legal systems and the protection of other goods and objects of protection. As a protection mechanism, security uses different organizational forms (government and community agencies and organizations) and different features, based and regulated by constitutional and other legal acts and decisions of political authorities.”³ “As a function, security is an inseparable attribute of the state and involves the execution of security activities, to protect certain values, regardless of the social system, political system or a form of government. The function of security and security organizations make the security system.”⁴

The security science should encompass all aspects of security. Members of the security agencies must be viewed as persons, as subjects of psychological study, or subjects of legal authorities in various legal disciplines, or assets used in the security system, which is the main subject of the technical sciences. Thus, we can say that the security science is interdisciplinary and summarizes the knowledge of various social and even natural sciences. As a science in the beginnings of its development, it inevitably relies on the already proven knowledge and methods of the so-called collateral sciences.

However, the goal of developing security science is to constitute an authentic science, with distinctive constituents. In addition, reliance on the already developed sciences not only facilitates, but also complicates the path to an authentic science. Namely, the social phenomena related to security have been studied and are still studied by these collateral sciences, primarily by sociology, psychology, and criminology. The security science is still “in the arms” of these sciences, from which it is difficult to withdraw without, at the same time, breaking the sensitive connections of knowledge of the universe. Specific knowledge of the security science and the methods by which that subject can be researched should be taken from the collateral sciences. Starting from this knowledge and with (adjusted to the subject) methods, we should start the research subjects of the security science to obtain authentic knowledge of this science.

It should be kept in mind that the public, the scientific one as well, does not accept with enthusiasm constitution of new sciences. This is the case with the security science. Disputes are not uncommon, even irony

³ *Military Lexicon*, VIZ, Belgrade, 1981, p 56.

⁴ S.Kovačević, *The Fundamentals of the System of SSP*, VŠUP, Belgrade, 1980, p.14.

sometimes, at the mention of this science. Opponents that are more serious mostly think that security is studied within the other sciences and that there is no basis for the constitution of a special science. The others, however, see the security agencies as a tool in the hands of government, reducing them to mere application of force. It is understood that such views are superficial, and often politically dosed. Modern knowledge of security should be developed as a science because of several facts:

- Security has become an extremely complex social phenomenon. In fact, the social phenomena in which the security agencies have an important and often delicate role are complex. The range of these phenomena is very wide, from quite simple, for example humanitarian, to very complex, for example, armed. At the same time, their authorization is strictly regulated, but the application of these powers lies in their responsibility. This means that, the use of force, especially the use of weapons, lies in a precise evaluation of the situation, particularly in assessing the possible consequences. The knowledge and conscience of the security is on a test. Because of all this, the security science should establish knowledge and develop the moral code of conduct in delicate social phenomena, for example, civil riots.
- Agglomeration has increased immensely⁵, with all derivatives of civilization. Generations of immigrants have not adapted to urban life; there are numerous social, psychological, and political problems of individuals. Being unable to resolve these problems, individuals or groups indulge in the deviant behavior, not hesitant to use weapons. Since the social prevention is weak, the security agencies are left to cope with the growing and often meticulously planned crime. For the success of this fight, it is needed to possess knowledge and skills greater than the knowledge and skills of criminals. These security agencies should be provided with science; without science, common sense will remain on the surface, unable to compete with cleverly planned crime.
- In a complex multiethnic and multicultural environment, there are numerous problems among the various informal groups. Often, the tense relations between these groups lead to a conflict with serious political consequences and victims. Regardless of the effect of political factors for these conflicts to cease, the security agencies are left a delicate part of the work on the immediate calming. It is not enough, and sometimes even physically possible to neutralize the

⁵ Agglomeration or wider city area is an expanded area of the city, which consists of a number of city and suburban areas, which together comprise a continuous urban area.

frustrated groups, it is necessary to act with reason, force of argument and even emotions. To make all these effective, members of the security agencies must be broadly educated, familiar with the mass psychology, psychopathology, and culture of certain informal groups, i.e. they need their scientific knowledge.

- Security agencies are forced to carry out an intensive fight against terrorism by increasingly common phenomenon of terrorism. To be successful in this, they need military knowledge, especially about weapons, tactics in anti-terrorist fight, management and command, fortification, and a number of actions toward a hostile population, propaganda, etc. In addition, units of the security agencies must be skillful in battle, i.e. prepared enough to take their actions smoothly, quickly, vigorously, and courageously. Science provides support for all this; without science, it would be difficult to expect success.
- The man in the security agencies is not an object, much less the means; he is the subject because he is thinking and bringing decisions in given circumstances. He is expected to be initiative and inventive. Of course, it excludes arbitrariness and disorganization, and promotes the ability of individuals to contribute to the performance of tasks. Because of the unquestionable autonomy that members of the security agencies have in complex tasks, a specific, scientifically established organization is required. It provides a unique routing of the security agency units and their members in performing complex tasks in the maintenance of public order, especially in anti-terrorist operation tasks.

The constituents of the security science

It is known that some area of knowledge can be referred to as a science only if it has a clearly defined subject (which is not studied by other sciences as a core subject), then, theory, method and language. As much as the constituents are defined and developed, that much a science has been developed (constituted).

1). **The subject** is the most important constituent of any science. Knowledge is always associated with a subject and makes sense if it is relevant. Sciences are authentic if they have their own subject of study. Therefore, when reviewing the scientific status of security science, the question is whether they have a genuine and clearly defined subject of study. According to Lj. Stajić, Ph.D., the subject of this science could be determined in the most general sense as “the security of our society in the

broadest sense”⁶. If security is understood as a state, function, and organization, then the subject of security science may be limited to three areas:

- The state of security, as the presence or absence of any risk of compromising the values, achievements, and the entire society. In this sense “...subject matter includes all forms and sources, as well as holders of endangering the country...”⁷
- Security function, i.e.:
 - security and protection of the state sovereignty;
 - securing and protection of the independence and territorial integrity;
 - conduction of international politics and international relations;
 - exercise and protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens.⁸
- Security organization, which may most consistently be identified through the work of security agencies in:
 - the domain of public security, and
 - the domain of national security.

Because of such a broadly distinctive subject of the research, it is inevitable that the existing theoretical fund is intensively arranged in the security science, to strive for an adequate methodological framework and categorical apparatus of these sciences, as well as for an adequate differentiation of scientific disciplines.

2) **The theory** is another important constituent of any science, and thus, the security science as well. There are no unique views on this constituent among the theorists. Starting from the attitude that science is universal for the mankind, that its truths are independent from individuals or even entire societies, it brings into question the merits of scientific knowledge of the security agencies and their activities. It is claimed that this knowledge is of national (doctrinal, normative) importance, and that it must be such, because it represents an extension of politics by other means; that is why the theory, limited by narrow national frameworks, is always pragmatic. It does not contain (or contains very little) universal theoretical facts, for example, scientific laws and postulates. Therefore, it is believed that knowledge of security is not a science, but only a positive doctrine coloured by local social conditions.

⁶ Lj. Stajić, *The Fundamentals of Security*, Police Academy, Belgrade, 1999, p. 56.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid, p. 14.

Although the theory of any science of security actually contains many proper (national) attitudes, we cannot deny its scientific character. This is because of the fact that, with the peculiar views, given mainly in normative definitions and doctrines of individual countries, the theory of any security science has long been a series of proven scientific fact. The special theory of security science is built on these facts (concepts, principles). At the same time, the contradictions of specific positions with generally accepted theoretical facts are being avoided.

The theory of the security science is usually defined as a thought and guideline on the structure and functioning of security systems.⁹ It includes the basic idea of the security system as a wholesome social phenomenon and a number of facts about different levels of cognitive aspects of the system. The facts are coherent and compatible with the basic idea; they are in function of the basic idea. From the point of the research, it is important to be thoroughly familiar with the basic idea, but also with the content of the security science theory. The facts contained in the security science theory have different cognitive achievement. There is a conceptual-category tool in the base of the theory. Furthermore, there are maxims, principles, postulates, and laws.

The conceptual system of security science categories comprises concepts and categories with different levels of generality. Regulated by systemic, analogous phenomena and processes, they comprise the activities of the security agencies. Some of them are defined (e.g. civil unrest), and some are not (e.g. protection of national security). Their construction is conditioned by general development of theory and research practice. However, scientific research is essentially determined by the state of categorizing apparatus for security science.

The largest part of the content of the security science theory is attitudes. Certain normative attitudes (doctrine), which constitute the applied part and the core of security science theory, are scientifically derived from general theory and specific security agencies' practices, for example, maxims and principles. Some, however, have derived approximately, without scientific verification, and have the meaning of hypothetical attitudes. The maxims of security science are scientifically established premises, which the organization and functioning of security systems are directed by. They depend on knowledge of the laws of the security system and on the adopted doctrine. However, since the doctrine (normative attitudes) is different for security systems of individual countries, therefore different maxims of

⁹ „Any valid scientific theory is a system of knowledge that certain values are derived from certain theoretical abstract principles and which describes or explains an area – an object or a phenomenon.“, Gligoriye Zaječaranović, *Basic methodology of science*, Naučna knjiga, Belgrade, 1977., p. 196

security system have been adopted. However, in the operative practices, maxims have a function of the general premises that should be respected in order to achieve the objectives of the security agencies. In the research practice, maxims enable understanding of the agency as a research subject, but even more – they represent the theoretical support for the creation (design) of scientific research. In the latter case, the maxims are given the attributes of scientific laws.

The maxims are, by the cognitive values and function in the security agencies practice, similar to principles. These two concepts most often do not differ, significant difference may not be determined between them. It is only the notion that principles are scientifically based and obligatory for application, while the maxims are mostly experiential and oriented to practical use. The famous military philosopher Karl von Clausewitz even defines the maxims as laws for action, not in form but in spirit. The maxim is “...the spiritual meaning of the law, in order to leave judgment more freedom in the application where the diversity of the real world cannot be encompassed by the definite form of the law. Since judgment must motivate cases by itself, where the maxim cannot be applied, it becomes a real support or a guiding star for the subject in the action”¹⁰.

In the security science theory, as well as in security doctrine, many premises are given as maxims. There are more of them in the doctrines that give priority to human factors and their qualitative values: initiative, morale, diversity, and the like. The maxims provide a choice, without being limited to “the only possible” variant such as regulations and orders. They are not suitable for the orthodox doctrine, the attitudes of which are conditioned by a technique, while the technique is still limited by opportunities, and therefore strictly defined usage variants. In the research practice, maxims are used, on one hand, to understand the actions of the security agencies, and on the other hand, as a source of research problems. In this second case, study aims to verify the principles, to narrow its vagueness, and, if necessary, to transform it into scientific law.

The hypothetical attitudes represent unchecked and experiential knowledge, which act as guidelines for action of the security agencies in practice.¹¹ They touch “...a multitude of circumstances which indicate the course, and which would be too numerous and insignificant for general laws”¹². The theory of security science has many hypothetical attitudes. This testifies that it is not built, but it is vital and represents a significant source of

¹⁰ Karl von Clausewitz, *About the War*, Vojno delo, Belgrade, 1951., p. 111

¹¹ We should distinguish attitudes as guidelines for the treatment of so-called directives that in the didactic and synthesized manner determine the phenomenon in connection with the actions of the police.

¹² Clausewitz, *ibid.*, p. 111

problems for research. Verification of hypothetical positions can reach scientific facts. Regardless of scientific merits, attitudes are merely relatively permanent facts. They necessarily vary with alteration of the basis they derive from, and are confirmed, corrected or rejected by theoretical and (or) practical verification. Every science, and thus the security science also, is more scientific if it contains fewer hypothetical attitudes, and more proven facts – especially scientific laws. About the existence of scientific laws in science at the beginning of its development, opinions have long been divided.

In an attempt to, at least reduce dilemma, we must consider whether there are general, vital, and constant regularities as assumptions of competent actions in the matter of security science, or these regularities are not studied as laws and formulated in the theory of that science. It is known that the security agencies in the same kind of phenomena, for example, the suppression of civil disorder, act – in similar or the same conditions – in the same or similar manner. Each individual or group action must be consistent with the general intentions (actions); each normative rule contains a number of general attitudes about certain forms of action of the security agencies, there are only a small number of attitudes on individual action. It is well known, for example, that, for suppression of civil unrest, the security forces are assigned according to the appropriate volume and aggression of the mass, and that for the successful keeping of civil order, the security agencies require close cooperation between citizens and the like. This means that there are universal, essential, and permanent regularities in the subject of security science.

It is understood that there are variations of these regularities and that they are not repeated in mathematically correct order. Variations violate regularities in the security science, but not to the extent to question these regularities. On the contrary, they usually confirm that there are regularities in many cases and we can reasonably talk about validity in the subject area of security science. Hence, it is probable that security science has the so called laws of tendency (probability) and the laws – empirical generalizations. The former are based on the regularities that occur in many cases, and the latter on experiences that are generalized. Very close to these laws are the principles. However, in order to incorporate them as a law into the theory of security science, they should be studied and verified. Then the theory of security science can become a reliable support for new research of security agencies and the phenomenon in relation to their action.

3) **The method** of security science represents a path – a way of acquiring knowledge of the subject area of these sciences. Although scientific knowledge is more conditioned by the epistemological basis of the

subject of study and theoretical fund, the method is cognitively the most dynamic constituent of security science. The creative power of research depends on it, and therefore the scientific scope of the study results. A line of theoretical (logical epistemological) and practical procedures, techniques and tools undertaken by scientific subjects in acquiring knowledge about the study subject case of security science, depend on the method. In the history of science, method was more questionable than any constituent was. This is because the method is complex, dynamic, heterogeneous, caused by a number of factors and it is thus its cognitive power is different. Discussions on the method of security science are also relevant, as the entire current methodology of the science.

The crucial question for security science is not whether it has a genuine method of research, but whether the security agencies and phenomena arising in connection with them may be studied with any methods. The most valuable methods, with the highest cognitive power, are usually the most universally applicable to very different research subjects. They are indeed adapted to the subject thus becoming part of the method of science that explores it. Thus, all so-called general, special, and the empirical methods are applicable in the study of various important subjects of the social and natural sciences. They are also applicable in the study of the security agencies and their activities, so we can say that security science has its own research methods. The methods of scientific organization and methods of operating work often do not differ from the scientific method in methodological debates. The consequence is to insist on direct intervention (implementation) of certain methods and procedures in the work of security agencies. Tendencies are to use effective, practical means of action of the security agencies, particularly in management and command of units in emergencies. There is no doubt that these efforts are justified and that, in fact, all research in security science are ultimately subordinate to them. However, not all methods can be used directly in the operational practices to its rational allocation. Some of them are not intended for that purpose, nor do the logical and technical bases provide them so. Some are, however, intended for direct rationally oriented practices, such as methods of scientific organization and operating methods close to them. These methods (and ways) are used primarily for the efficient preparation of the security sector (staff method, group work, etc.). They represent the methods of scientific knowledge, because on the one hand, they direct the practice towards tested methods, while on the other hand, they re-verify the procedures using practice and come up with new knowledge. All methods of operation research and methods of scientific organizations have such a role. To that extent, they can be used as a scientific method of the security agencies and their activities.

However, these methods differ from the so-called scientific methods, which are primarily used for research. The practice is the subject (object) and the criterion of the truth of scientific knowledge, the methods are used to learn it first, and later change according to survey results. Based on the results, first theories and norms (doctrine) change, and then the practice of the security agencies (organization and functioning), and the security system.

In the research of the subject of security science, there is a need for philosophical, primarily dialectical method as a way of thinking and cognitive orientation for other methods. This method is firstly specifies by general, then specific empirical and (possibly) cybernetic methods. Out of the general methods the most commonly used are the statistical and comparative method; of the special – a unique analytic-synthetic and inductive-deductive method and of the empirical – the content analysis and testing. Each of these methods has a specific function in the realization of the research (collecting or arranging and processing, data analysis or verification of hypothesis).

4) **Language** is the least controversial constituent of security science. It was developed initially in operational practice, but it was constituted with the emergence of the theory of this science. Language cannot be separated from the conceptual and categorical apparatus. As distinctive the conceptual system of categories is, so is the language of security science. It contains a series of terms, signs, and symbols that are common in scientific and operational practice. On the surface, it seems that the language of security science is communicative enough, concise, and clear for effective communication. However, it has many features significant for the security phenomena research:

- a large number of terms, including those which are designated as category terms, have derived in a conventional way. Regardless of whether they were taken from another terminology or they have been made in our practice, they often lack semantically¹³ logical support in the literary language. In fact, the terms do not correspond to concepts (correlates) to which they relate. It definitely has some impact on the research that relies on the precise meaning of concepts and terms.
- Because of the conventional origin of terms, the same concepts are differently named in the security science of certain countries. It creates certain difficulties in translating theoretical works, because the connection between conventional and literary meaning of the term is lost. Therefore, it is often said that the language of security

¹³ Semantics is a scientific discipline which studies the relationship between words (terms) and their subjective sense on one hand, and the meaning of words and language expressions, as subjective sense, on the other hand.

science is not communicative, while the theory is strongly limited by national and regional frameworks. This, among other things, conditions a relatively slow development of security science.

- In the operative communication of the security agencies a concise language is used. It is believed that concise and clear expressions are prerequisites of effective command and control. It is likely that it contributed to the language of security science to remain short of words related to terms and their explanations. Therefore, they are not suitable for scientific communication, so it is necessary to be studied (metalinguistic research) and developed.
- There are many so-called marginal terms in security science, the content of which partially (or as a whole) belongs to other terms. Such marginal terms do not have semantically adequate linguistic expressions (terms) and are often arbitrarily determined. This brought confusion in the language fund of security sciences.

The language of the security science is apparently stipulated by a number of facts, mostly by the subject and the scientific theory. Regardless of the extent to which it is developed as an operational language of communication, is not sufficiently developed as a language of science. It is therefore necessary to develop it in parallel with the theory of security science, through the study of security phenomena, especially through the so-called metalinguistic research. A step in this direction would be an encyclopedia of security and a security lexicon. These works have a capital importance in the security science language development.

From the above, it can be seen that knowledge of security has all the constituents of a science. However, the subject is not clearly and precisely defined yet, while the theory, method, and language are in the process of development. This means that security science is at the beginning of constitution and development. They may develop faster or slower, depending on the systematic study of their subject area and the meta-research. It is, after all, the destiny of all sciences, especially the young ones. Without the research of security practices, all intellectual (solely theoretical) efforts will be in vain.

The possibility of scientific research of the security phenomena

As in the other sciences, the ability of the scientific research of security phenomena is primarily determined by the characteristics of objects, theoretical fund (particularly its cognitive range), and the language of security science. It is true that the possibility of research is determined by the integral security science methodology, then, human resources, a common

attitude toward research, funds for research and the like. However, the research, particularly in its methods, is primarily dependent on the other constituents of the security science. The methodological theory insists on the unity of the subject and research methods. Epistemological characteristics of the subject determine the method. This means that the method of security science is as distinctive in relation to the methods of other sciences (as special security phenomena), as the subject of investigation in relation to the areas of reality that other disciplines explore. It is undisputable that the appearance of security features has certain implications for the method and, hence, the possibility of scientific research in security science.

- The fact that the security phenomena (especially the security system) are directed to social phenomena has resulted in an important role of the human (i.e. subjective) factors. Behaviour of people (members of the security agencies) in their relationships with the others is not and cannot be strictly programmed; it is always dependent on the personality; emotions, abilities, knowledge, and values, all of which are of a great importance. Due to the subjective nature of the security sector, scientific knowledge is limited to the description, systematization, specific scientific explanations, and conditional scientific predictions. It is certain that we cannot expect exact research results as in natural sciences or the like or as it is expected by positivist science. However, the subjective nature of the activity of the security agencies conditions that for such (inexact, probable) results of research a complex methodological framework must be applied, or more methods to explore the psychological and social phenomena.
- This results into a conclusion that the security phenomena are an interdisciplinary research subject. Precisely because they are complex, dynamic, and hierarchical, and because they contain a variety of factors studied by different sciences, they cannot be reduced to elementary phenomena; the security phenomena are the subject of numerous scientific disciplines. A research in security sciences is interdisciplinary because they have to rely on the knowledge of these disciplines and to use methods that are used in them.
- Because some of the security phenomena are occasional, the research loses stable (permanent) empirical ground. Instead of real phenomena (e.g. civil unrest, terrorist activities, criminal acts, and the like) imitation and models, it becomes an empirical field. Therefore, some researches in the security science are model-like. This has significant implications for the possibility of knowledge. Namely, models cannot be identical, or even similar to their own originals. If they can be

similar in space, time, physical strength, and activity, they cannot be such for the qualitative values of the people, or by the results (e.g. losses); these values cannot be properly modeled, not even studied. Therefore, the results can only be conditionally reliable.

- Precisely because the security phenomena are occasional and occur in actual forms and contents, the research is difficult to verify. If the factual positions of the security science are performed inductively from the previous experience (as verification criteria), they may be as true and operating as this experience; the experience becomes outdated, losing power of facts and hypothetical attitudes begin to appear. They must be re-checked to ensure that they actually act as facts. At the same time, we should bear in mind that the views on a number of qualitative factors of people – members of the security agencies, can hardly be empirically verified and measured out of the actual activities of the security system. If the attitudes are theoretically verified, by determining compliance with the most general attitudes of the security science or even the normative attitudes (in the deductive way), there is a danger of positivism and vulgarization, for all the attitudes that are verified have to be consistent with the theory they are verified by. The exceptions in this type of verification confirm that the validity of the attitude that contradicts this theory, are quite rare. The theory is commonly accepted as a priori true in a positivist way. The research has the task to coordinate with the new attitudes with already established theory, by which the researches are made superfluous.

Apparently, the inductive and deductive verification methods alone are not enough reliable for the research of security phenomena. Each has certain advantages and disadvantages, and it is therefore considered that the verification can be correct only if it is dialectically derived using inductively deductive method. Only with a unique mutual theoretical and empirical verification it is possible to get to the factual attitude of security sciences.

The possibility of scientific research of the security phenomena is caused by the theoretical fund and language of security science. Here it should be noted that the new scientific knowledge about the security phenomena is significantly dependent on the quantity and quality of the existing theoretical fund of security science. The fact is that security science does not have constructed, or a single, unique theory; it is a set of often remote parts of the theory of narrow parts of the security science subject. Some are primarily theoretical and some applied. Each of them has the character of the doctrine and (or) legislation; they are composed of a series of views, guidelines and principles. There are not enough correct definitions

and scientific laws, which have a capital role in the research phenomenon. Therefore, the research is very complex and unreliable, and the results are conditional and hypothetical.

However, despite the aforementioned problems, security science like all the other “young” sciences is vital from the research aspect, and provides a huge number of problems for scientific research, fundamental, applied, and developmental. It is the underdevelopment of the theoretical fund and language of security science that guarantees that its vitality will be preserved for a long time. On the other hand, the emergence of new forms of threat to security which is inevitably conditioned by the development of society and technological advances represents a completely new area of research, which becomes a research field of the security science.

Conclusion

In an attempt to perceive the term of the security science, it can be concluded that:

- security sciences represent a group of sciences that comprehensively examine security in the broadest sense – as a condition, as function and organization;
- security science studies security as its core subject entirely and comprehensively. This means that security sciences are interdisciplinary and that it often seems they affect the subject areas of other sciences and disciplines; it is inevitable for a science which is at the beginning of its development. In order to properly constitute the security science as independent, it is necessary to run a series of fundamental researches of its subject area
- although there is a strong resistance for constituting a new science, or rather a group of sciences, for the subject area of security in the broadest sense, a number of undisputed facts indicate that the security as a subject is an extremely complex area of knowledge, and goes beyond the common ways of finding new and confirmation of the already existing knowledge.

A science cannot exist without clearly differentiated constituents that define it as independent. Security sciences have clearly defined constituents, which makes them an independent group of sciences:

- the subject of security science is security of society in the broadest sense;
- the security science theory is a thought and guidance on the structure and functioning of security systems which includes

conceptual and categorical apparatus, attitudes, and probably the laws of tendencies (probability) and the laws of empirical generalizations. The theory of security science, as any other science in the development process, is still not fully developed and defined yet, but further research of security as the subject area of security science shall eliminate the deficiencies noted, and properly shape and fill the theory;

- security science, as well as many other sciences and scientific disciplines, has its own methods, because security and the phenomena in relation to it can be comprehended using any scientific methods. The most valuable methods, with the highest cognitive power, are often the most universally applicable to a variety of subjects of research;
- language is the least controversial constituent of the security science. It was developed initially in the operational practice, but it was constituted with the emergence of the theory of this science. It contains a series of terms, signs, and symbols that are common in scientific and operational practice. It is necessary to develop it in parallel with the theory of security science, through the study of the security phenomena, especially through the so-called meta-linguistic research.

Research opportunities within the security science are large. True, there is a problem of underdevelopment of the security science theory because new scientific knowledge about the security phenomena is fundamentally dependent on the quantity and quality of existing theoretical fund. However, on the other hand, underdevelopment of the security science theory makes them, in fact, from the research point of view, very vital, and opens series of unresolved problems for future research that will model the theoretical fund of the security science and fill them with scientifically proven knowledge.

REFERENCES:

1. Aristotel, *Politika*, Kultura, Beograd, 1960
2. Dekart R., *Rasprave o metodi*, Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb, 1951.
3. Gadamer G. H., *Istina i metoda*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1978.
4. Grupa autora, *Metodologija ratne veštine skripta*, CVVŠ VJ–GŠŠ VJ, Beograd, 1996.
5. Klauzevic K.F., *O ratu*, Vojno delo, Beograd, 1951.
6. Koen M., Nejgel E., *Uvod u logiku i naučni metod*, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika SR Srbije, 1965.

7. Kovačević S., *Osnovi sistema DSZ*, VŠUP, Beograd, 1980.
8. Mariček J., Kovač M., Naučna utemeljenost sistema vojnih nauka, *Vojno delo*, broj 1/1997.– VIZ, Beograd, 1997.
9. Marković M., *Filozofski osnovi nauke*, SANU, Beograd, 1981.
10. Milosavljević B., *Nauka o policiji*, Policijska akademija, Beograd, 1997.
11. Milosavljević S., *Istraživanje političkih pojava*.
12. Milošević N., *Metod i metodologija ratne veštine*, CVVŠ OS, Beograd, 1990.
13. Milošević N., Milojević S., Osnovi metodologije bezbednosnih nauka, Policijska akademija, Beograd, 2001.
14. Pečujlić M., *Metodologija društvenih nauka*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1989.
15. Radinović R., *Metoda ratne veštine*, VIZ, Beograd, 1983.
16. Stajić Lj., *Osnovi bezbednosti*, Policijska akademija, Beograd, 1999.
17. Suzić N., *Primenjena pedagoška metodologija*, XBS, Banja Luka, 2007.
18. Šešić B., *Opšta metodologija*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1974.
19. Šešić B., *Osnovi metodologije društvenih nauka*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1974.
20. *Vojni leksikon*, VIZ, Beograd, 1981, str 56.
21. Zaječaranović G., *Osnovi metodologije nauke*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1977.