

POSSIBILITIES OF ENSURING PERSONAL FREEDOM AND PUBLIC SECURITY IN CONTEMPORARY MIGRATION CONTEXT: THEORETICAL ASPECT

Nijolė Aukštuolytė¹, Aušra Stepanovienė²

¹Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, e-mail: nijola@mruni.eu

²Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, e-mail: ausrastep@mruni.eu

Abstract. *The article deals with compatibility of personal freedom and public security. The aim of the research is to analyse theoretical aspects of the correlation between personal freedom and public security and evaluate their assurance possibilities in the context of contemporary global migration. The article emphasizes value of freedom and security, their interconnection as well as demand and possibilities of their compatibility. Aspects of freedom as personal decision-making and freedom as realizing that decision are analyzed by revealing that extension of freedom boundaries common to contemporary society can turn into self-will with regard to other individuals or society. Such concept of freedom subsequently raises the issue of public security. The following research methods were employed: text interpretation, rational reconstructions, historical explications. On the basis of the methods, the essential ideas of the issue under discussion, its arguments and meanings within historical context were revealed. The conducted analysis allows one to make a conclusion that an individual is free in the society as much as he acknowledges others' right for freedom whereas the society is secure if certain individual's self-will is limited for the sake of all society members' right to freedom. Assurance of personal freedom and public security is the goal of contemporary democratic society and different state institutions including the State Border Guard Service, and has become extremely relevant in the context of modern global migration.*

Keywords: *personal freedom, migration, public security.*

Introduction

In a context of modern globalization, when the borders between states disappear, society is becoming more open. Human rights and possibilities to choose their place of residence determine processes of migration and, thus, the problem of compatibility of individual freedom and public security is becoming more and more urgent. Today's world is turning into one unit. On one hand, it promotes standardization of people's lifestyles, their social behaviour and relations whereas on the other hand, it provides conditions for the emergence of cultural, value differences and contradictions. In recent years, the European Union, its declared values, institutions and citizens have encountered the phenomenon of the unexperienced scale, where processes within one region affect a wider segment of the society outside. Due to the military conflicts in Syria and in some African countries, the massive wave of war refugees and those who

are struggling to find better lives are a major challenge for the Western Europe's key cultural values, i.e. freedom and security.

Migration is the natural and inevitable outcome of the contemporary globalisation. However, the occurring processes encourage one to rethink the ratio between personal freedom and public security. What are the boundaries for open individual's expression without violating freedom of other people and how secure is the society by ensuring the right of freedom for its members? These issues call for new solutions.

Therefore, the object of the research is interdependence between freedom of an individual as a person and public security.

The aim of the research is to evaluate the relationship between freedom of an individual and public security as well as the possibilities to ensure it in the context of contemporary global migration.

The following methods of literary source analysis are used: text interpretation, rational reconstruction and historic explications. On this basis, the article seeks to reveal the main ideas of the issue under discussion, the arguments and meanings as well as their change within the historical context.

Theoretical Aspects of Freedom and Security Concepts

A human being lives in the society. He/she coexists with others. Thus, it is important for him/her to adjust not only to natural environment, but also to the public system. Public life and its structure – customs, forms and ways of activities as well as regulating institutions – relate people by tight connections and determine biological survival even more than natural phenomena. Public life and the ability to manage it efficiently should ensure security of an individual in the world. However, is it really the case? What are the ways and measures used? On the other hand, don't public security needs violate individual person's freedom? These issues have become especially relevant within global migration context of the recent years.

While searching for the answers, one should analyse theoretical aspects of freedom and security concepts. In general, freedom is perceived as the possibility of a human to make a decision or a choice which is one of the crucial conditions for individual's existence. It is no doubt true that a person always has the potential to manage his/her activity by his/her will. Freedom is unquestioned value and right with regard to a person and the society. When making a decision, a person feels (or at least is supposed to feel) the importance of his/her decision and moral responsibility for its consequences because when realizing his freedom, he/she can limit that of the other person(s). John Stuart Mill has described this aspect very accurately by stating that „if the mankind except one person had a

unanimous opinion and only that person had a different opinion, by overwhelming him/her the mankind would not be right either; likewise that person, if, having such power he would force the mankind to agree“ (Mill 1990, 114).

In the world of his mind and will, a human being cannot be *not* free. However, this freedom cannot be transformed into the sphere of action following the principle “I do what I want and in the way I want“. Therefore, it is worth considering what the boundaries for individual’s expression of freedom without violating that of other people and without being violated himself/herself are. In order to be free, a human being has to understand that his/her freedom depends on others’ freedom whereas that of others depends on freedom of that individual. In other words, expression of freedom is always related not only to an individual but also to the society and is a crucial condition for their interaction. Realizing his/her freedom, a human being is affected by factors which he/she cannot use at his/her discretion, every single moment in every single step, because he exists in the field of natural, social and cultural powers that limit him/her. However, he/she still seeks freedom.

Being a member of the society, a human being is as free as he/she respects other individual’s right to personal decision-making and how much he/she appreciates other individual’s right to freedom by limiting his/her own. Only respect to the other person, responsibility for one’s decisions and subsequent behaviour turns a human being into a free personality which does not overwhelm freedom of the other person. Such a conception of freedom which is implemented in the common space by combining it with others’ right to be free (i.e. to be able to make decisions themselves) is crucial for free and secure society.

A need for security for a human being is no less important. Since Renaissance philosophy has treated an individual with his/her private interests, initiatives and especially mind which is acknowledged by the condition of using his/her different capacities, as the basis on which stable and secure society is built. By co-living and seeking security people established institutions and ways of activity enabling to relate individuals, facts and items on the common basis of consumption or interests. Thus, the state and law were born which represent public side of individual’s life while personal decisions form a private space of a human being.

In people’s consciousness a huge step from Antiquity’s attitude towards the individual as a member of an organized community to the idea developed by Kant’s ethics which states that a man is the aim, not the measure, was taken. It in turn established individual’s priority with regard to the state. If Plato, by designing the model of the ideal state employed the person to conduct certain functions which had to serve common welfare

(namely, the state), in recent times it is declared that the state is created for a man, but not vice versa.

Seeking to define the pattern of human behaviour and to establish conditions under which stable and secure society is possible, Thom Hobbes based human behaviour on self-preservation principle. The desire for security is fundamental to human nature. However, ways to establish it can lead to “war against everyone“. How to avoid it? While trying to answer the question, more than one social political theory was developed which is not going to be analysed here for obvious reasons. They all have in common the fact that peace and cooperation are considered as more assuring personal and public security than overall competition and fight for one’s welfare. It needs interpersonal confidence, certain agreements and their observation to establish common welfare, i.e. enabling all members of the community to feel safe and ensuring self-realization possibilities.

One can reasonably expect that agreements will be observed if there is efficient power that can punish for one’s failure to fulfil them. According to Hobbes, agreements without swords are just words and they have no power to protect a person while verbal connections are too weak to manage human ambitions, greediness, anger and other passions without any fear (Hobbes, 1999). Security of a human being and society depends on the fact if there is power which can maintain peace and apply sanctions against antisocial behaviour and tendencies. All insights of philosophers have not lost their significance until today and have even become more relevant.

Problematics of Freedom and Security Compatibility

Certain dilemma has been formed: so that peace in the society as well as personal and public security could flourish, certain power and compulsion mechanism is needed. However, one cannot forget that a human being as a person is primarily perceived as a free entity, i.e. making decisions on his/her own: he/she can choose occupation, friends, way of life, observe (or not) standards, public opinion, customs, etc. accepted in the society. Only being free, a person can dispose of his/her abilities, talents, work outcomes, i.e. he/she creates and realizes himself/herself. In the opposite case, if a human being has no possibility to control his/her body and activity, he/she cannot seek his/her aims and realize values. He/she experiences the threat of becoming the property of another individual or society, scarifying his/her aims for other people, etc. (Gray 1992).

In the society the problem of compatibility of different types of freedom frequently arises, the decisions of which are supposed to ensure public security, without allowing other individuals to overstep fragile boundaries separating freedom from self-will. Are these aspects revealed within the context of contemporary migration? Current flows of illegal

migrants and war refugees flooding the European Union pose significant challenges in western culture for the accepted world pattern. By arriving, migrants bring their own culture, moral values, political and religious beliefs which they tend to impose on the society, where they are, in fact, supposed to integrate. On the other hand, occurring processes clearly demonstrate that the model of the western world is not the only one. The world is varied and one has to accept cultural, religious and value-related differences as well as a distinct way of life.

Citizens of numerous countries are afraid of huge flows of immigrants because they envisage the threat to their personal interests. Rivalry concerning workplaces, the increasing number of individuals receiving social benefits and allowances as well as impact of unfamiliar traditions and customs are listed as a source of anxiety. Meanwhile a huge wave of migrants has formed not only due to the real threat to their life or personal safety but rather to consumer incentives which implies a desire to have better economic possibilities, to use social benefits of other countries, etc. Keeping in mind that these individuals are often separated by religious beliefs, traditions and customs, the opposition between residents as *hosts* of the country and newcomers as *intruders* starts which does not help solve the issues of personal freedom and public security.

In contemporary society rapid technological advance, development of the consumer tendency, and intrusion of different media into the area of personal decision-making create an illusion of unlimited human possibilities. According to Arvydas Šliogeris, the world for a human being emerges as the space of infinite, countless opportunities and he/she starts playing with them, though they in fact are not real but only projected (Šliogeris 1996, 492). In such a way, real individual's freedom "here and now" is replaced by abstract, virtual world of unlimited opportunities. Being the owner of his/her feelings and thoughts a human being starts identifying freedom with total infinity and unbinding by any norms, rules and requirements. Such conception of freedom starts dangerous balancing on the edge of self-will. It is clearly demonstrated by the situation in the contemporary school, where teachers have no rights and students have no duties. It emerges in the work of police officers or state border guard officials and finally everyone of us can experience it in our life, when, starting from trivialities and finishing with serious issues, someone starts to suppress us.

Perceiving freedom as an opportunity to behave in the way one wants, it approaches self-will. The demand to extend the boundaries of one's own freedom on behalf of others is especially seen in today's consumer society when a human being tends to emphasize his/her rights in a relationship with others to a certain extent. Most probably he/she even

without realizing is trying to express his/her aim to extend personal boundaries by intruding into other individual's private decision-making space. (Fromm, 1990). Such concept depersonalizes human relationship and makes it possessive. However, freedom cannot become compulsion to others.

Declaration of personal freedom and absolutism of independence increases the separation between a person and the society which in turn prevents from understanding that society is the most important condition of personal freedom. It protects freedom of its members by limiting self-will of certain individuals. Each human being has principal possibility of freedom but implements it in different ways. "Human being is not *absolutum* like a crystal ball floating in empty space. In every moment and every step, it is limited by factors which it cannot dispose at its discretion..." (Šliogeris 1996, 517). According to Sartre, a well-known representative of existential philosophy, despite different circumstances, we want freedom for freedom itself. Then we perceive that it entirely depends on freedom of others whereas their freedom depends on our freedom (Sartres 2016).

Human being of the western world seeks to preserve crucial value priorities – democracy, freedom, human rights, public security – as unquestioned good. However, it is becoming more difficult to preserve typical world model. Flow of migrants in recent years forces politicians, public institutions and specialists of different areas to seek new solutions in order to preserve basic values of the western culture. Among some migrants, there are those who are reluctant to observe standards and rules accepted in the society in which they are seeking asylum, raises new objectives for officials of different state institutions, including State border guard, that are supposed to be ready to ensure public security without violating freedom of every individual.

Conclusions

The conducted analysis allows one to make a conclusion that a human being in the society can be free as much as he/she can accept the right of freedom of other individuals whereas the society is secure if self-will of separate individuals for the sake of all society members is limited. Thus, personal freedom treated as a possibility to behave "as I wish" is not acceptable and cases of such behaviour clearly demonstrate how fragile the boundary between freedom and self-will is; overstepping can be dangerous with regard to public security.

Assurance of personal freedom and public security is the goal of contemporary democratic society, various state institutions including State

Border Guard Service, and is especially relevant in conditions of contemporary global migration.

References

1. DAHRENDORF, R. (1996). Modernus socialinis konfliktas: esė apie laisvės politiką. Vilnius: Pradai. 332 p.
2. FROMAS, Ė. (1990). Turėti ar būti Vilnius: Mintis. 283 p.
3. GRAY, J. (1992) Liberalizmas. Vilnius: Pradai. 107 p.
4. HELD, D., MCGREW, A., GOLDBLATT, D., PERRATON, J. (2002). *Globaliniai pokyčiai: politika, ekonomika ir kultūra*. Vilnius: Margi raštai. 540 p.
5. HOBBS, T. (1999). Leviatanas. Vilnius: Pradai. 695 p.
6. LEWIS, R., D. (2002). *Kultūrų sandūra*. Vilnius: Alma litera. 432 p.
7. MILL, J., S. (1995). Apie laisvę. Vilnius: Pradai. 200 p.
8. SARTRE, J.- P. (2016). Egzistencializmas - tai humanizmas. Vilnius: Vaga. 85 p.
9. ŠLIOGERIS, A. (1996). Transcendencijos tyla. Vilnius: Pradai. 853 p.