



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS RESEARCH: G
INTERDISCIPLINARY

Volume 20 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2020

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals

Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

Specification a Model for Study of Insecurity Systems

By Cruz Garcia Lirios

Abstract- The objective of this essay is to establish the relationship between insecurity and sociopolitical dynamics. For this purpose, the presidential and parliamentary democratic systems from which the system of election, concentration of power and exercise of responsibilities as the foundations of contemporary society are reviewed are reviewed. The risk society is described as the socio-political context that determines citizen participation and the exercise of political power. The analysis will allow to open the discussion on the importance of the democratic regime in reference to decision-making for the governance of uncertainty, risk and insecurity.

Keywords: Insecurity, uncertainty, risk, presidentialism, parliamentarism and semi– presidentialism.

GJMBR-G Classification: JEL Code: M19



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



Specification a Model for Study of Insecurity Systems

Cruz Garcia Lirios

Abstract- The objective of this essay is to establish the relationship between insecurity and sociopolitical dynamics. For this purpose, the presidential and parliamentary democratic systems from which the system of election, concentration of power and exercise of responsibilities as the foundations of contemporary society are reviewed are reviewed. The risk society is described as the socio-political context that determines citizen participation and the exercise of political power. The analysis will allow to open the discussion on the importance of the democratic regime in reference to decision-making for the governance of uncertainty, risk and insecurity.

Keywords: *Insecurity, uncertainty, risk, presidentialism, parliamentarism and semi-presidentialism.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Risk Society can be analyzed from two dimensions to clarify the axes of thinking around social insecurity. It is the immeasurable and unpredictable dimensions around the magnitude and impact of risk events.

The Risk Society involves a triad in which the State, the media and civil society are involved. The risk corresponds to a phase of persuasion antecedent to coercion that characterized authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. In this sense, the media are a persuasive instrument of democratic states. Mainly, presidentialism combined with parliamentarism, seem to be the democratic regimes most in need of persuasion of civil society.

The Risk Society, when moving from a safe situation to another insecure, has been influenced by political systems, forms of state and government regimes that try to minimize financial uncertainty, reducing the ambiguity of political decisions.

The history of societies in economic crisis refers us to the actions of the State, its governance style and organizational structure of government. Faced with a contingency, the most economically developed countries overcome economic, political and social crises by implementing adjustments in the governance structure.

Such are the cases of Spain and Italy who, despite experiencing major economic crises, have historically overcome them by modifying their regimes and forms of government.

Until the 1990s, the proportional representation election system determined, in the Italian government, a multi-party system that combined the customs of corruption to create an election system, particularly corrupted by the exchange of votes for the representation of the mafias in minority parties. This process of social decomposition changed at the same time that the simple majority and citizen participation replaced proportional representation and collusion between mafias and the ruling party.

The new election system allowed the emergence of parties and adherents who came to enrich the Italian political system. In spite of the constant destitution of its ministers, Italian democracy is strengthened by recharging in the public figures, the responsibility of leading the country based on decisions rather than the market or popular mobilizations.

However, presidentialism and parliamentarism by requiring the concentration of power in the figure of the executive are perfect systems in their elections and the assignment of responsibility. National security is determined by the will of the popular vote. Paradoxically, risk society is a system of public decisions made by an executive figure in power.

Perhaps, this is the main risk if it is an economic crisis. If a political system organizes the election of a presidential or parliamentary system, then the elected minister or president will imply a representative citizen bias. Since presidential and parliamentary democratic systems tend to centralize their decisions regarding national security and international cooperation against the enemies of democracy, the semi-presidential system seeks to balance the concentration of power and its decentralization by maximizing executive responsibility and minimizing the power of parliament.

National security, in the semi-presidential system, is protected by the executive's mistakes in turn whenever it is sought, as in the other systems, to concentrate power and responsibility rather than overcome the glimpses of crises, mainly financial ones.

The semi-presidentialism, is a form of democracy that seeks to replace the president by the Prime Minister. Sociopolitical studies on insecurity can be analyzed from their schools of thought. Such academic paradigms are influenced by geopolitics. Since insecurity is considered a cycle of underlying violence when decapitalization, unemployment and ungovernability are its main indicators.

Author: e-mail: garcialirios@hotmail.com

This is how the geopolitical division directly affects economic growth strategies that require a security system in which the investment is guaranteed for reproduction. The gendarme state, under the geopolitical perspective, is the preamble of ungovernability. Precisely, when governance does not guarantee investment and its reproduction, insecurity emerges as a barrier. In this sense, the traditions that study the problem are divided into two geopolitical areas: the informational north and the maquiladora south.

Developed countries in Information Technology or Communication (ICT) have shown a very peculiar relationship or problem in which insecurity is the result of these technological advances

II. RISK SOCIETY

Insecurity is an adverse consequence of the informational development of central development countries (Beck, 1992). Knowledge has led to competition for resources, a cascade of investments among the economies inserted in the world systems (Beck, 1995). With respect to peripheral development countries, the most adverse consequences underlie. If the advances involve greater risks; unexpected and unpredictable, then its consequences will be immeasurable and uncontrollable (Bulkeley, 2001). In developed areas, technological risks are more frequent than natural risks than in peripheral areas are more common (Fonseca, 2008). In the central areas, the risk trend is of a technological nature (Giddens, Bauman, Luhmann and Beck, 1996). On the contrary, natural disasters prevail in emerging areas even in spite of technological dependence on informational northern economies (Giddens, 1990).

In this way, natural phenomena such as hurricanes and floods, are more likely to impact more strongly in peripheral economies where technology is not a priority (Beck, 1998).

In this context, uncertainty is shown as the most significant social effect of information technology modernity. The Risk Society, being a consequence of economic growth, frames all the consequences, mainly those of a technological nature (Alfie and Méndez, 2000). The impact of technological risks implies the socialization of uncertainty.

If in the past individuals wielded expectations, speeches and achievements around security and identity, today their actions precede their uncertainty (Luhmann, 1994). As a *modus vivendi*, risks are new forms of coexistence (Beck, 2003). Three are the consequences of modernity; speculative capital flows, informational flows and migratory flows. Technology, far from providing security, moves its

users to an alternate reality in which the internet increases global uncertainty.

Social networks show images and phrases to upset the symbols, meanings and values of Modernity and exalt the nascent Post modernity. However, the same networks warn of informational insecurity in which identities are replaced and personalities distorted (Beck, 2002). Insecurity is the cause and effect of Post modernity while security, perhaps an invention of modernity, sought to build strengths to centralize the political powers that would make decisions of collective interest.

Modernity freed the individual into a consumer entity (Beck, 2006). Expression, transit and choice were consolidated as the factors of the Risk Consumption Society. Since merchandise was a means to achieve Safety, now Postmodernism is an end. It is an aversion to the future in which the consequences are informational. That is, technology made possible the yearning for authoritarian regimes of omnipresence. Technology when capturing images makes the present of the modern individual more hedonistic.

If the information age consists of an era of images, then modernity is a phase prior to uncertainty, virtuality and risk. Authoritarian regimes could not prevent the proliferation of images (Giraldo, 2004). Insecurity, as an effect of an authoritarian regime, was panoptic violence. Authoritarian regimes spied on their dissenters and adherents. The Modern State was erected as a symbol of national security and identity.

The advent of religious globalization exported the unification of images from colonialist countries to colonized countries (Valencia, 2004). This had an impact on migratory flows whenever they sought security lost in their place of origin. Willing to work flexibility, they would correct their lack of roots due to the production and consumption of goods. They went from an insecure society to a consumer (Beck, 2007).

Migrants from the central economies had austerity in their places of origin as the main resource to deal with them. Now, in the central economies, they had to adopt consumerist lifestyles to cope with the global economic crisis at the government level and staff resuelv in with re - borrowing (Grant, 2007). Indeed, consumerism and austerity are responses to political and social economic crises. Both in a context of uncertainty, are aversions to the future. If austerity is the preservation of resources, consumerism is improvising expectations and needs (Beck, 2000). Maquilador south and north informational seem to be governed by and I cycle of uncertainty that goes from crisis to austerity and re-borrowing consumerism.

The socialization of insecurity is the apprehension of the present. In developed countries it is considered an area of opportunity and in peripheral

countries it is the legitimization of its underdevelopment. In both hemispheres, the communication that served as a link between the cycles that go from insecurity to certainty, is now little less than information. The recognition of the other as an interlocutor vanishes.

III. WITH FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This essay has established the relationship between insecurity and post modernity. The economic, political and social context is a network of uncertainty in which every time decisions are taken at a constant risk. To the extent that they seek to minimize costs and maximize profits, presidents and prime ministers adopt a rational path based on growth objectives.

As a context of images and phrases that socialize uncertainty, post modernity is a network of emotions that reaches the political and economic sphere. It is enough to observe the process: decapitalization → deceleration → crisis → re-indebtedness to confirm that security no longer belongs even to the economic plane. In addition to the non-governance, economic crises show uncertainty from stock markets to informal employment.

On the other hand, ungovernability not only refers to social movements, but also the absence of legal frameworks that guide initiatives, limit executive power and encourage legislation in favor of freedoms and equality. In this context, economic security is not the opposite of insecurity, it is only a phase of crisis, uncertainty and risk.

Learning to live under uncertainty, socializing risk and adapting to insecurity seem to be the elements to build a building of insecurity with modern foundations and postmodern finishes.

The society of uncertainty not only transits from modernity to postmodernity. Given the insecurity of the present, the risk society will be established as an alternative of life. It should be noted that the insecurity society, unlike the risk society, has its foundations in economic globalization. If capital flows and investment define global geopolitics, risks and uncertainty link localities into a single global challenge: insecurity.

Consequently, the loss of identity conflict will be a factor that will trigger symbols and meanings par to social change. In this sense, the new regimes of government and forms of State will evolve until they find the justice, equity and dignity required for governance.

From the local to the global, freedom of choice and consumption seem to coexist with austerity as responses to market oppression and the volatility of their investments in stock markets.

Unlike the economic world system, politics seems to be insufficient enough to be so insensitive to the processes that legitimize its functions. Such are the cases of the citizen mobilizations and the new laws of

representation around which, the society hopes to recover the ethics, rationality and participation that were forbidden by its rulers, but the establishment of an agenda requires more than the political will: the citizen initiative.

Currently, citizens are reaching the limit of indignation with expectations of mobilization through informational networks to express their disagreement and anxiety. Both are consequences of insecurity, are indicators of uncertainty. The new generations will build tomorrow a knowledge that allows them to inhibit the media arsenal with which they are controlled today.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Alfie, M. and Méndez, L. (2000). The risk society: threat and promise. *Sociological*. 15, 173-201
2. Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage
3. Beck, U. (1995). *Ecological politics in an age of risk*. Cambridge: Politic Press
4. Beck, U. (1998). *World risk society* Cambridge: Polity Press
5. Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. *British Journal of Sociology*. 51, 79-105
6. Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 19, 17-44
7. Beck, U. (2003). Toward a new critical theory with a cosmopolitan intent. *Constellations* 10, 453-468
8. Beck, U. (2006). Living in the world risk society. *Economy and Society* 35, 329-345
9. Beck, U. (2007). Beyond class and nation: reframing social inequalities in a globalizing world? *British Journal of Sociology*. 58, 679-705
10. Bulkeley, H. (2001). Governing climate change: the politics of risk society? *Royal Geographical Society* . 26, 430447
11. Fonseca, F. (2008). Processes of rupture and continuity between nature and society in the modern city. *Papers* 88, 141-151
12. Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press
13. Giddens, A., Bauman, Z., Luhmann, N. and Beck, U. (1996). *The perverse consequences of modernity. Modernity, contingency and risk*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
14. Giraldo, G. (2004). The risk society and its transits. *Journal of Human Sciences*. 33, 23-35
15. Grant, C. (2007). *Uncertainty and communication. New Theoretical investigations*. New York: Palgrave McMillan
16. Luhmann, N. (1994). The modernity of science. *New German Critique*. 61, 9-23
17. Renn, O. (2008). *Risk governance Coping with uncertainty in a complex world*. London: Earth scan

Samaniego, G. (2006). Political globality and the de-stateization of the State. *Province* 15, 65-91

18. Valencia, A. (2004). The left center in Europe: lights and shadows of the new social democracy. *Uruguayan Journal of Political Science*. 14, 155-171.

