



FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

Journal of Social Sciences

p-ISSN:1300-9702 e-ISSN: 2149-3243



THE PHENOMENON OF SECURITY IN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHIES OF ANCIENT AGES

İlk Çağ Siyaset Felsefesinde Güvenlik Kavramı

Mehmet DEĞİRMENCİ¹

¹ Dr. Gazi University Institute of Social Science, Graduated from Political and Social Science Programme, Ankara, Turkey, mehmetdegirmenci06@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-6949-4155

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article

Makale Bilgisi

Geliş/Received:

24.08.2022

Kabul/Accepted:

22.05.2023

DOI:

10.18069/firatsbed.1166462

Keywords

Politics, Security, Political
Philosophia, Ancient Age

Anahtar Kelimeler

Siyaset, Güvenlik, Siyaset
Felsefesi, İlk Çağ

ABSTRACT

The concept of security has become one of the main elements of the political system discussions today. In this context; It is a question to be wondered how effective the concept of security was in the first age political philosophy period, which is the period when the political system discussions were first put forward. This question cannot find an adequate answer in the literature. Our study will be looking for an answer to this question by examining primary sources such as books and articles on the first age political philosophy by using the literature review method. After briefly mentioning the basic concepts, in the next section, the implications of security in the works of prominent names of Greek and Roman political philosophies, which have an important place in the political philosophy of the first age, will be revealed. Our study is important in terms of considering the First Age political philosophy from a purely security perspective. It is seen that; At that time, security found its place in most of the political thought. It is thought that it will form the basis for the studies to be carried out in the field of security.

ÖZ

Güvenlik kavramı günümüzde siyasal sistem tartışmalarının ana unsurlarından biri haline gelmiştir. Tüm siyasal sistemler güvenlik kavramı etrafında şekillenmektedir. Bu çerçevede; siyasal sistem tartışmalarının ilk ortaya atıldığı dönem olan ilk çağ siyaset felsefesi döneminde güvenlik kavramının ne derecede etkili olduğu merak edilmesi gereken bir sorudur. Çalışmamızın da temel hareket noktasını oluşturan ilk çağ siyaset felsefesi içerisinde güvenlik kavramının nerede olduğu sorusu literatürde yeterince cevabını bulamamaktadır. Çalışmamız bu soruya literatür tarama yöntemini kullanarak ilk çağ siyaset felsefesine ilişkin kitap, makale gibi birincil kaynakları inceleyerek cevap arayacaktır. Temel kavramlardan kısaca bahsedildikten sonra bir sonraki bölümde ilk çağ siyaset felsefesinde önemli yeri olan Yunan ve Roma siyaset felsefelerinin günümüz siyaset felsefesi çalışmalarında öne çıkan isimlerinin eserlerinde güvenlik ile ilgili çıkarımları ortaya konulacaktır. Çalışmamız ilk çağ siyaset felsefesinin salt güvenlik perspektifinden ele alınması açısından önem arz etmektedir. Görülmektedir ki; o dönemde de güvenlik çoğu dsiyaset düşüncesi içerisinde yerini bulmuştur. Güvenlik alanında yapılacak olan çalışmalara temel teşkil edeceği düşünülmektedir.

Atf/Citation: Değirmenci, M. (2023). The phenomenon of security in political philosophies of ancient ages. *Firat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33, 2, 865-874.

Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding author: Mehmet DEĞİRMENCİ, mehmetdegirmenci06@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Security is now a need whose main meaning remains constant, but the way it is perceived and met is constantly changing according to times and places. We say it is a need because after the physical needs in Maslow's famous pyramid of needs, such as breathing, eating, drinking and sleeping, comes the need to feel oneself, family and society in safety and security and away from danger, which we will define in detail in the following sections. is the definition of the concept. So security is one of the basic needs of people.

The concept of security has existed since the existence of humanity, but it has always presented different situations with the way it is perceived, and besides, it is a concept whose main meaning has always remained constant. The difference in the way it is perceived here is related to the element that threatens security rather than the concept itself. So for example; While the idea that security is ensured by suppressing rebellions is dominant in some periods, it is provided by preventing threats from other states in other periods. From this point of view, while security means "to be sure of dangers" in both cases, the phenomenon of danger also differs. In recent years, this concept, which has been constantly taken into account, has taken its final form after the 11th September attacks and studies have been carried out on this shape. This concept of security underlies the latest developments in the world.

Security, which has become the main element in almost all political decision-making stages of states, has become one of the most important phenomena of political science and it has emerged that it should be dealt with separately.

The phenomenon of the state is the cornerstone of political science. Security is the most important concept for the permanence and operability of states. Thus, the concept of security has settled in a very important position for political science.

Due to its importance in terms of political science, in the years when political institutions, which are the basic building blocks of people's coexistence, first emerged, investigating where the concept of security was in these structures emerged as a necessity, astonishing that it had never been studied until today.

Therefore, the main aim of our study is find answers to questions such as; Was security considered as a concept in itself in the political thoughts that were put forward in the early ages? If not, is it completely ignored? Or has this concept, which is one of the main issues of politics, been revealed in the works? How was this mentioned? While realizing this aim, the discourse and thoughts of political philosophy thinkers are taken into consideration rather than the practices in the early ages. The fact that it required serious time to analyze the political practices of that period from a security perspective made it necessary to reduce our subject to the dimension of discourse only.

In our study, which we have prepared on the basis of thought, only the political thoughts in Greece and Rome will be examined due to our limitations. The most prominent political thinkers in these two civilizations will be examined.

While presenting our study, a few basic concepts will be mentioned first in order to prevent conceptual confusion and to be a light-holder. In this section, what the concepts of politics, political science and political philosophy are and where the difference between them comes from will be briefly presented. Then, the concept of security will be discussed.

In the next chapter, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, who are important figures in the history of the early age political thoughts and contribute to today's political thoughts, will be discussed. At first, their political thoughts will be revealed in general terms, and then the points related to the concept of security in the discourses of these three thinkers will be discussed.

In the other part, Roman political thought, which is the second of the foundations of the history of the early age political thought studies, will be discussed. The method applied when dealing with Greek political thought will also be applied here. First of all, the three most important names of the period, Polybius, Cicero and Seneca will be examined. At first, their political thoughts will be explained in general terms, and then the points related to the concept of security in the discourses of these three thinkers will be discussed.

There is no doubt that the works and discourses of the thinkers mentioned in our study are too diverse and numerous to be dealt with in a single study, regardless of its volume. However, due to our limitations, in our study, we will try to reveal the issues that the thinkers deal with directly related to security in their works.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Politics

Politics; It is used in the meanings such as the administration of the people, taking political decisions, the struggle to seize power, and the distribution of resources. The subject of politics is power. Briefly, politics can be defined as power relations.

There are generally four different approaches to politics: domination, cohesion, power and resource sharing, and decision-making in emergencies.

Generally, when politics is mentioned, the first thing that comes to mind is the politics of the country. The concept we call country politics is related to policy issues throughout the country. The main purpose here is to protect the common interests of all people.

2.2. Political Science

The concept of political science is basically concerned with the phenomenon of "power" exercised and used by legitimate institutions and leaders. Political science is mostly related to fields such as "management mechanism" and "public administration". (Yücekök, 1987: 3)

While this concept only dealt with the concepts of state and ruler in the past, various concepts such as political structure, decision processes and participation have now been added to this concept.

The difference from the concept of politics is that while the concept of politics is a concept that examines power relations, the concept of political science examines the structure of power rather than power relations, as well as concepts such as public administration, decision-making mechanisms, and the effect of civil society. For this reason, while the concept of politics is a concept related to seizing power, the concept of political science is a science that examines the process of seizing this power from beginning to end together with its elements.

2.3. Political Philosophy

Political Philosophy, in the most general sense, explores the essence, nature, aims, scope and content of politics as a whole; examines the results, characteristics and grounds of actions encountered in political life; scrutinizes the problems of politics, the subjects he questions, and the answers to them with a philosophical eye; concentrating on various ideal state order proposals and grounding the structure, source, duties and value of the state with methods specific to philosophy; which divides existing or existing state forms, political systems and administrative orders, and clarifies the basic relations between them both in terms of both overlap and divergence; clarifying the effects of various philosophical currents in the formation process of states; investigating the qualifications and responsibilities that should be sought in a statesman; evaluating the structure and realization possibilities of various political utopias; analyzing the relationship between the individual and the state or political authority in terms of the fundamental issues of political life, freedoms and responsibilities; clarifying the meanings of very basic concepts such as "justice", "freedom", "private property", "oppression", "equality", "human rights"; It is a branch of philosophy that systematically deals with the place and importance of politics in human life with all its aspects, especially its implications for philosophy. (Güçlü, Uzun, Uzun, & Yolsal, 2002)

The main subject of political philosophy is the moral evaluation of political power. The most important manifestation of political power emerges in the state, which has the most powerful influence and authority over all the other individuals, institutions and rules of the society and the laws related to them. Political philosophy is concerned with bringing these powerful political powers under moral control and bringing criteria about the source, limits, goals and objectives of power to control them with moral conditions. (Alan, 2011: 349)

Political philosophy; It deals with the examination of fundamental questions about power and the search for the 'best'. It explores the principles on which good management will be based. It is based on Ancient Greek Philosophy. This is the period when city-states experienced different political organisms. There were two basic questions at that time. First question; What is the need that creates the state? The second question is; What is the best shape for states? It is here that political philosophy deals with the concepts of state and power and touches on their interrelationships.

The difference from political science is that while addressing the concepts of state and power, mental activity is aimed at researching the best. The difference of political philosophy from other sciences dealing with politics is that it examines what should be. (Aybek, 2008: 4)

2.4. Security

Literally, security is the state of people to live without fear and the state of being safe against danger and damage to their property, life and other values. In terms of the dictionary meaning, security: It means the legal order in the life of society, the state of being able to live without fear, the safety of people. Security is the absence of threats.

When it comes to security, we come across very different theories in terms of understanding and the changes that these theories have undergone over time. Examining these theories and the constant change in security perception is a separate area of expertise. As of our subject, the definition we need to understand when it comes to security is; It is the situation where people stay away from some risks and dangers of living together while living together. In other words, it is the security of people's property, life and honor.

3. Ancient Greek Political Thought and The Concept of Security

3.1. Socrates

Socrates is one of the most important figures in the history of political philosophy. Since he did not leave any written works in his own period, we learn his views and activities from the philosophers who came after him. The main purpose of Socrates is the creation of a stable political structure and the maintenance of order (Ağaoğulları, 2009: 159). If the individual is alone, it doesn't matter. The individual will be happy when the police have a strong and fair management approach. In this respect, it should be said that Socrates does not focus on individual rights and personal problems, but mainly deals with the question of the power of the state. Socrates also sees the police as an educational institution. Since the primary function of the police is to maximize the happiness of the citizens, its primary duty is to make them good people. (Cevizci, 2006: 211) Citizens who develop spiritually and gain virtue will also act in accordance with their intrinsically good nature. Socrates also opposes the democratic mechanisms that prevailed in Athens at that time. As it is known, the administration in Athens is in the hands of ordinary people who have come to power for a temporary period, not expert administrators who have gone through a certain educational process. Socrates argues that politics, like all business, requires expertise. It is clear that the patient needs a doctor, an athlete needs a coach, and a ship owner needs a captain, and people already get help from experts for their specific needs. However, in Athens they act on their own without such professional support when it comes to running the state. This should not bring tyranny to mind. Because tyranny includes tyranny. Socrates emphasizes that expertise should be at the forefront.

When the thoughts of Socrates were examined in detail, he did not propose any management model. This is related to Socrates' theory of knowledge. According to him, no one can have real knowledge. He didn't have to worry about teaching anyone anything. Because he thought that everyone should write their prescriptions using their mind and logic. He did not think for the society and offer them prescriptions.

If we deduce from his thoughts in the context of security, in Socrates' thought, although the reason for the existence of the police is mainly to ensure the happiness of the citizens, the police also has the purpose of securing the lives of the citizens.. (Cevizci, 2009: 63)

According to Socrates, it is possible to say the following based on his thoughts on security: Politics means regulating the police and working for harmony. However, policy makers act without considering what is good for the police and chaos ensues. According to him, there is a direct proportion between citizens' adherence to the law and order and peace. In addition, a knowledgeable person is a virtuous person and does what is good for the society and works that will bring order. It can be said that the concept of "good" and "order" lies in the perception of security.

3.2. Plato

Plato lived in a time when class conflicts were intense. Plato, who is in favor of the rule of an intelligent wise group, is against democracy and at the same time foresees an aristocratic class society model. According to him, we cannot see what is perfect. We are content to see the shadows of existing ideas.

His most important attempt on political philosophy is his book "The Republic" and he handled this book as a dialogue like all his other works. It is these written works that differ from Socrates.

According to his work The Republic, people formed the society because they were not content with themselves and needed others. Here, the concept of "division of labor" comes to the fore. Plato sees the state as a reduced form of individuals, and the individual as a reduced state, and tries to explain social classes accordingly. Accordingly, he compares the state with the human spirit. Just as there are three layers in the human soul, namely impulse, will and reason, there are also three sets in the state. Those who feed in response to impulses—workers, peasants, artists, those who protect against the will, those who teach against reason, administrators. (Aybek, 2008: 16)

Plato gives importance to protectors. This importance stems from his belief that the corruption of the rulers will necessarily corrupt the state. Protectors are not directly governed by the state; but the ruler-philosophers emerge from them, or rather, every guardian who passes all the necessary examinations becomes a philosopher after the age of fifty. The protectors, who are the assistants of the administrators in the conduct of state affairs, form a kind of "professional army".

Agaogullari explains Plato's thoughts on the ruling class as follows: "The problem is of a political nature; therefore, the solution must be sought at the management level. Since the political field has a decisive role on the social structure, the problem is solved by itself when the political power is given to the real statesmen, namely philosophers, who have devoted themselves to philosophy. Thus, Plato's famous suggestion has emerged: The real state is brought down from the universe of ideas, it is established by philosophy; So either kings will be philosophers or philosophers will be kings." (Ağaoğulları, 2009: 260)

According to him, the ruling class should be chosen from among the protectors. Thus, he will have come from an effective education process and a disciplined lifestyle. The main virtue of rulers will be wisdom.

Finally, slaves (workers) are considered as people who do not own property, consist of workers and can be bought and sold. As can be expected, the most crowded group in the ideal state is the farmers and workers who work with their labor. As said earlier, these are ordinary people who specialize in certain occupations and live with their families.

At this point, let's say that Plato does not look at this class, which is at the bottom of the society, at all optimistically. The only reason Plato included this class, which he saw as evil, in his theory, is probably because these people are needed to meet concrete human needs.

In addition to these, Plato also referred to the forms of government that should be in his "ideal state". According to him, there are five types of government: aristocracy, timocracy, oligarchy, democracy and tyranny. It also states that these forms of management can transform into each other according to the order given.

If we come to Plato's first inferences that can be interpreted regarding the concept of security; According to him, after the settled life, when the lands are insufficient, the desire to join the neighboring lands to their borders will arise. For this reason, a full army is needed as a person cannot do more than one job.

Plato's most important move in the name of security is to predict the class of protectors and explain them at length. According to Plato: The protectors, who are the assistants of the rulers in the conduct of state affairs, form a kind of "professional army". As a justification for this, Plato shows the principle of specialization and argues that only those who deal with war can do this job better. However, behind this regulation lies the idea of not giving weapons to the people. The upper stratum in this society then consists of a small minority of protectors and a few philosophers who emerged from them. It is the logic of Plato's system that great attention should be paid to this elite, which forms the basis of the ideal state. The ideal state can survive by saving the protectors and administrators from individualism, selfishness, self-interest, passions, ensuring that they behave as a harmonious whole and see the state as the highest value, in short, making these people good citizens, real statesmen. Plato foresees two ways for this: To develop the necessary qualities in guardians through education and to prevent them from falling into evil by arranging their lives in a certain way.

Some of the basic qualities that Guardians should have are: Being brave and smart; not be afraid of death; restrain oneself in drinking and eating; ignoring money, material wealth; treat the public well; to look after the

welfare of the state. In addition, Plato also asks guardians to control themselves about love, not to be fond of laughter, not to cry or whine.. (Alatlı, 2015: 135) Thus, he argues that these people should be purified from passions and emotions as much as possible. Thinking that life style other than education is also effective in developing and maintaining these qualities, Plato puts the lives of the protectors in an arrangement, taking care not to overlook even the smallest detail.

Later, while talking about the forms of government, Plato states that each form of government (monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, etc.) emerges with the growth of the reaction to the previous one. In other words, it can be understood as a management system that changes with the moves of some segments that do not feel safe.

Plato places the police in the shape of a circle on a hill for hygiene and security purposes. Instead of being surrounded by city walls, the houses of the protective class at the far end of the circle will be positioned adjacent to each other for the protection of the police so that they function as a kind of wall. Thus, Plato assigns a function for the protection and defense of the city to the residential areas of the guardians, whom he assigns as the guardian and enforcer of the laws. He thinks that the existence of the walls both affects health and creates laziness in the soul of the people. (Akkoyunlu Ertan, 2003: 150)

3.3. Aristotle

Aristotle lived in a time when the city-state model gradually lost its power in the face of the empire and was on the verge of disappearing historically. Both the special situation towards the police and the fact that he had the opportunity to look at the political life in Athens from the outside because he was originally from Macedonia made Aristotle a much more cold-blooded person than Plato.

One of the most well-known words of Aristotle today is his determination that man is a social animal. According to Aristotle, society emerged from continuity and this understanding of naturalness is different from Plato.

In addition, the concept of slavery is the same in Aristotle as in Plato. He considers slavery as a necessary institution, although its necessity was questioned at that time. Because the main duty of man is to pursue virtue. At the same time, it is necessary to work for the continuation of life. These slaves meet this need for work and are the physical strength of society.

His thoughts on forms of government differ slightly from Plato. According to him, management styles may vary according to geography. Aristotle made a classification by looking at how many people hold the power and whether they use the power they have for the sake of the people or their own interests. There are two basic criteria that Aristotle uses to determine the type of power: a) The number of rulers b) The state of the rulers to protect the interests of others against their own interests. In this context, the role that Aristotle assigns to the rulers seems to be outside the homo economicus understanding. The thinker expects the rulers to forget their own interests while in power. Otherwise, there will be corruption in the administration.

When the criteria mentioned above are used, it is seen that Aristotle makes a triple distinction in terms of classifying the governments.

- 1) Monarchy and Tyranny
- 2) Aristocracy and Oligarchy
- 3) Politeia and Democracy

According to this explanation; Monarchy and tyranny are the situation where the government is in the hands of one person, aristocracy and oligarchy are the situation where a group or clan is in the administration, and politeia and democracy are the situation where all the citizens are part of the administration. In all of these forms of government, there is an expression that the second-ranked one is the corrupt state of the first-ranked one.

Aristotle gave place to his thoughts on the political system in his work called Politics. Therefore, we can make inferences about the concept of security from this work. The first to stand out. Aristotle said, "Things that would remain inactive without a partner should be combined in pairs. The unification of the ruler and the ruled is for the protection of common security. The words give clues about the understanding of security.

According to Aristotle, it is the unification of villages that creates the polis, and this is instinctive. The main pillar that sustains it is justice. Justice, on the other hand, is the basic structure in providing security and peace. It prevents the evil inside people from coming out and a peaceful structure emerges. Aristotle says that there are many types of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled. This relationship can be found in every part

of society and life. For example; In man, the mind rules the body, humans rule animals, masters rule slaves, males rule females. This administration is for the safety of the latter.

In the forms of government envisaged by Aristotle, there are three forms of government that aim for the common good (monarchy, aristocracy, politeia), as well as three forms of government that look after the interests of the common (tyranny, oligarchy, democracy). He says that the second ones are the corrupt form of each of the first ones. For this reason, it is impossible to talk about security and peace in the society where there is a corrupt government. In other words, it can be said that the security of those other than those holding the administration is in danger.

The most important problems in Aristotle's ideal state are justice, politics and defense. Citizens also think of them as Greeks with racial characteristics, combining intelligence and courage. Those with citizenship status undertake the duties of defence, justice and administration. Young people will perform their military duties, while the elderly will fulfill their administrative duties. Thus, it plans to try to overcome the security problem against external threats by giving the task of defense to young people.

4. Ancient Roman Political Thought and The Concept of Security

4.1. Polybius

Polybius was the first to use the institutional approach in his study of politics. He established the link between Rome's foreign policy and domestic policy, and attributed Rome's success not to the heroes but to its superior political standards and practices. (Ebenstein, 2001: 57).

The first of the prominent figures in the history of Roman political thought is Polybius. He says that, following Plato and Aristotle, the forms of government change place by following a certain order, as a requirement of a natural law. But unlike them, it focuses not on individuals but on the institutional structure. The first form of government is tyranny based on the brute force of a single person. In time, reason and logic prevailed, tyranny was overthrown and monarchy was established. The monarchy becomes tyranny again when the kings leave the government according to the law. The aristocracy is established when the nobility overthrows the despotic regime. However, the regime turns into an oligarchy when the passion for money leads the nobles to oppress the people. In the face of this, the rising masses establish democracy and equality and freedom are adopted as the highest values. But democracy soon degenerates. Respect for laws decreases, violence increases. Thus, the regime turns into what Plato called rabble rule. (Aybek, 2008: 30-31).

Polybius favored a mixed constitution. Because each form of government hides the seeds of corruption within itself. (Ağaoğulları & Köker, 1998: 31). Polybius believed that such a mixed constitution would not only enable the state to act quickly and effectively, but also set the people free. Dictators, on the other hand, will always lose against such legitimate governments, because it is difficult to grasp the potential source of power possessed by free people seemingly divided and quarreling with each other because they have made themselves a fetish of political unity. (Ebenstein, 2001: 59).

According to Polybius, the political order in the state was shaped according to the security concerns of the citizens. During the periods when the system was corrupt and when they felt that their lives and rights were not safe, citizens caused the management system to change with critical moves.

Polybius envisages a mixed system in which citizens can be even more secure against the state. Because in the mixed system, corruption will be self-destructed and a safer environment will be provided to the citizens.

4.2. Cicero

The period in which Cicero lived coincided with a period of significant political turmoil. According to Cicero, natural laws consist of divine values. Only through these laws can justice be achieved. It is the main indicator of good and evil. As long as the state is in the hands of malicious people, the laws will not be able to ensure the security of the citizens who have basic duties. (Alatlı, 2015: 208-211).

Cicero finds democratic governments that attempt to give equal power to rule to people with unequal power to rule against the natural law. In his view, democratic rule would very quickly turn into tyranny in the wrong hands. In fact, Cicero was the first to ascribe the definition of "the tyranny of the majority" to democracy. He states that a state governed by democratic principles that try to make the inequals equal cannot even be called a state. (Şenel, 1998: 198).

Cicero, in his work called *The Republic*, gives an image that is pro-status quo, protecting the interests of the "aristocratic" segment. In the book, aristocrats are invited to state duty in order to re-establish the republican principles, which declined with the expansion of democratic policies, and to ensure the safety of life and property. (Şenel, 1998, s. 197). Cicero, like Polybius, adopts the doctrine of the circulation of administrations and explains his belief that a mixed constitution will ensure the stability of the state. According to him, the essence of monarchy, which is pure forms of government, is the love of subjects and reason, the essence of aristocracy is wisdom, and the essence of democracy is freedom. (Tannenbaum & Schultz, 2005: 86).

According to Cicero, instability seriously weakens the security of the state. For this reason, a legal order based on laws based on natural law should be established. In addition to this order, it is imperative that there are citizens who are bound by the rules of law.

In Cicero's opinion, just as the child has a caregiver, so the administration of the state should be carried out in accordance with the interests of the people whose duties are carried out, not the people who have been assigned. People who care about a part of the citizens and do not care about a part of them bring very dangerous things into revolts and conflicts in the state, and the following situation arises: some seem to be the beloved of the people, some to be the friend of every aristocrat, and only a few of them all. He says that those in public office should not think about their own interests. He says that he should not think about the interests of any group other than his own, and states that these situations will endanger the security of the state. Cicero, who said that this situation was also seen in Athens before their own state, says that the impartiality of the officials and the awareness of taking responsibility for the citizens should be at the highest level so that the security is not endangered.

Cicero also mentions that the rulers should not act with anger for a safe society. It should be treated with justice, not anger. He says that it is more constructive to be gentle and tolerant than to act with anger. However, he adds that in addition to this softness, there must also be hardness for the benefit of the state.

4.3. Seneca

According to Seneca, in the early days, people were in a natural state of life based on natural law and natural justice found by reason. People were happy at this stage, there was no discord and malice between them. As property tendencies began, the peace and morality structure broke down. (Fendoğlu, 1993: 190).

Seneca, after stating that people lived free, equal and happy in pre-state societies, claims that people deteriorate as they leave this natural life and begin to live in the state. (Yetkin, 2008: 145).

When a person is not satisfied with the blessings that nature has given him and wants more, inequality between people arises and sovereignty relations arise. Unlike the state of nature, there is no talent-based administration in the state. Evil wins and the people are condemned to tyranny. (Yetkin, 2008: 145).

According to Seneca, the best thing to do in this order, where there is no return, is to stay away from social and political life and deal with knowledge and philosophy. (Şenel, 1998: 201).

According to Seneca, who especially emphasizes freedom, there are two types of freedom; inner and outer freedoms. Inner freedom is freedom in one's own actions. As proof of this, he says, "People can end their freedom by committing suicide if necessary," and seriously defends freedom. In external freedom lies harmony with order. However, in this adaptation process, the order must appear rational to people. (Ağaoğulları & Köker, 1998: 69).

According to Seneca's thought, the wise man does not do evil. Saying "Good is knowledge, bad is ignorance", Seneca states that honorable things emerge with wisdom, and shameful things emerge with ignorance¹. Every person can make mistakes. The important thing is to observe the wrong behaviors, not to insist on mistakes, to correct the flaws and to try to make the mind dominant by defeating the passions.

Other ways to end moral evils are to educate consciences and souls. Thanks to conscience, people are instilled with the feeling that others are watching. By training the soul, it is ensured that people get away from greed.

In the transition phase from the natural state to the state structure, evils emerged when people were not content with what they had and the understanding of property emerged. These emerging evils caused a more insecure situation than the current situation in the natural order. With the emergence of sovereignty relations, the evils of people at the point of domination gave birth to tyranny, and thus a different order emerged from the moves of ruling based on the natural state.

The adaptation of people to the existing order and the creation of a safe environment are directly related to the fact that the rules in the order are inclined to the human mind.

Mind brings goodness. By preventing ignorance, evil can be put to an end and a safer structure can be created. Overcoming ambitions and passions and making the mind dominate is the condition of goodness. At the same time, conscience and soul training prevent people from doing evil. In the current order, following each other, that is, following the rules followed by the majority, leads to mistakes. It is good for everyone to make their own path by acting sensibly.

5. Conclusion

Security is everyone's need. Most of life is shaped by this need. States act accordingly, and individuals live according to this need.

Social contract theory, which is one of the most important assumptions about the emergence of states, emerged from the need of people to be sure of themselves both against threats that may come from outside and against the dangers that may come from the state. In other words, the need for security is the basis of political life.

The political ideas put forward in the early ages are important in terms of being the foundations of today's political world. The ideas and theories put forward in those days have survived to the present day. When considered in this context, the need for security, which is one of the most important needs of today, was also important at that time. In this context, to what extent was the concept of security emphasized in the ideas put forward by the first age political philosophers? Finding the answer to this question is an important question.

In our study, we tried to answer this question. Political thought in the early ages can be examined under two main roofs. While the first pillar is Greek political philosophy, the second pillar is Roman political philosophy. It is Plato who made the most important emphasis on the concept of security in Greek political philosophy, and it can be said that he was the first philosopher to propose an institutionalized structure for the field of security. Other philosophers, Socrates and Aristotle, that we discussed apart from Plato, did not put forward a direct explanation or system regarding security. However, he emphasized security in his works and thoughts, and it is seen that some situations in the formation of the state, namely the police, were shaped according to the security phenomenon.

The situation is not different in Rome, which constitutes the second pillar of the political thoughts of the first age. There is no study on safety in Polybius, Cicero and Seneca, which we discussed. However, while concepts such as good society, fair administration and freedom of society were introduced, security was always at the center.

As a result, security was not a concept that was handled and emphasized in the political philosophy of the first age as it is today. It was a subject that was considered important and taken into account, because many structures and orders, shaped according to the concept of security, were put forward in works, works and thoughts. Although "security" is not mentioned very often as a concept, it refers to a situation that is always at the center of political thoughts. This leads us to suggest the following. At that time, this concept was not considered as a separate field of study as it is today.

References

- Ağaoğulları, M. A. (2009). *Kent Devletinden İmparatorluğa*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
- Ağaoğulları, M. A., & Köker, L. (1998). *İmparatorluktan Tanrı Devletine*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Akkoyunlu Ertan, K. (2003). Kentin Tükenişi ve Ütopyalar. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 36 (2), 143-165.
- Alan, G. (2011). Siyaset Felsefesi (Cilt 52). (A. Kesgin, Çev.) Ankara: *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*.
- Alatlı, A. (2015). *Batıya Yön Veren Metinler*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık.
- Aybek, Ş. (2008). *Siyaset Felsefesine Giriş*. Ankara: Maya Akademi Yayınları.
- Aydın, M. (2011). *Strateji ve Güvenlik*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Cevizci, A. (2006). *İlk Çağ Felsefesi Tarihi*. Bursa: Asa Kitabevi.
- Cevizci, A. (2009). *Sokrates*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Ebenstein, W. (2001). *Siyasi Felsefenin Büyük Düşürleri*. (İ. Özel, Çev.) İstanbul: Şule Yayınları.
- Fendoğlu, H. T. (1993). Roma İmparatorluğu'nun Devlet Felsefesi ve Osmanlı Devleti. *Dicle Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* (6), 181-206.
- Güçlü, A., Uzun, E., Uzun, S., & Yolsal, Ü. H. (2002). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat.

- İmamoğlu, T. (2002). Seneca Felsefesinde Kötülük Problemi. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi II* (1), 51-57.
- Sandıklı, A. (2012). *Teoriler Işığında Güvenli, Savaş, Barış ve Çatışma Çözümleri*. İstanbul: Bilgesam Yayınları.
- Şenel, A. (1998). *Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Tannenbaum, D. G., & Schultz, D. (2005). *Siyasi Düşünce Tarihi: Filozoflar ve Fikirleri*. (F. Demirci, Çev.) Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- Tunçay, M. (2006). *Batı'da Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi, Eski ve Orta Çağlar*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Yetkin, Ç. (2008). *Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi Cilt 1*. İstanbul: Salyangoz Yayınları.
- Yücekök, A. N. (1987). *Siyasetin Toplumsal Tabanı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basın Yayın Yüksekokulu Yayınları.

Etik, Beyan ve Açıklamalar

1. Etik Kurul izni ile ilgili;

Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları, Etik Kurul İznine gerek olmadığını beyan etmektedir.

2. Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uydıklarını kabul etmektedir.

3. Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları kullanmış oldukları resim, şekil, fotoğraf ve benzeri belgelerin kullanımında tüm sorumlulukları kabul etmektedir.

4. Bu çalışmanın benzerlik raporu bulunmaktadır.
