



Journal of Intercultural Management and Ethics

JIME

ISSN 2601 - 5749, ISSN-L 2601 - 5749

published by

Center for Socio-Economic Studies and Multiculturalism
Iasi, Romania
www.csesm.warter.ro

TABLE OF CONTENT

Editorial	3
Julian Warter	
Culture Differences and Trust	5
Paulo Finuras	
The Pre-M&A Stage: Understanding the Phases and Success Factors	13
Rachel Calipha, David Brock	
Life's a Box of... Conversations: The Company as a Language Network	35
Thomas D. Zweifel	
How Could We Turn a Good Idea Into an Effective Action? From Human Security to Interpersonal Securitization	43
Anton Carpinski	
Laughing Matters: When Humor is Meaningful	55
Hershey H. Friedman, Linda Weiser Friedman	
Inequities in the Romanian Society of Today	73
Melentina Toma	
Dental Healthcare Accessibility in Underprivileged Populations.....	81
Oana Isailă, Hostiuc Sorin	
Book Review	87
George Simons	
Book Review	89
George Simons	

HOW COULD WE TURN A GOOD IDEA INTO AN EFFECTIVE ACTION? FROM HUMAN SECURITY TO INTERPERSONAL SECURITIZATION

Anton Carpinschi, PhD

Professor Emeritus, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iași, Romania

E-mail: anton.carpinschi@gmail.com

Abstract

The concept of "human security" enjoys academic recognition, being used in the vocabulary of political science, international relations theories, strategic security studies etc. In these circumstances, why would we need a new concept? The point of this essay is that, although the term "interpersonal securitization" cannot replace that of "human security", it can specify it explicitly. As a predicate of human security, the "interpersonal securitization" offers a semantic clarification, a conceptual foundation, a deepening of reflection and, through all these, an discursive-pragmatic finality. By rethinking human security as interpersonal securitization, we can obtain a non-formal, personalized and operational understanding of human security.

Keywords: human security, interpersonal securitization, therapeutic self-reflexivity, communicative action, communicative-securitizing interaction

Introduction

Human security is a relatively recent topic in the area of political theory, security studies and international relations. In the dramatic political-military circumstances of the twentieth century, the phrase "human security" has late acquired an official status through its adoption in the documents of the United Nations and other international organizations. Published in 1994 as part of the "United Nations Development Program", *Human Development Report* is the document that marks the introduction of the theme of human security on the United Nations agenda, together with the political-military approach to security. Eclipsed during the Cold War by strategic approaches focused on the role of the states and political-military alliances, human security now seemed to open to "a new approach, both for security and for development" (Kaldor 2010, p.214). Security thus appeared as a working agenda aimed at protecting and developing the human being in a variety of plans - economic, food, health, environment, personal, community, political, informational - brought together in an analytical model focused on security of the human factor. And yet - argues one of the most authorized researchers in the field - despite the vital importance of the security agenda and the numerous works dedicated to its forms and levels, the conceptual analysis of security is "incompletely developed" (Buzan 2000, p.15). Nor is the conceptual analysis of human security in a better situation. "Is human security more than a good idea?" asked Keith Krause at a conference dedicated to promoting security in the early 2000s (Krause 2004, p. 43-46). Resuming this question, we might ask ourselves: is the agenda of human security - conceived in terms of international law and United Nations documents - more than a good idea?

"Is human security more than a good idea?"

A first answer to the previous question could be that, a normative-institutional declaration regarding human security proves as necessary, as insufficient. As much as it is necessary to establish the values, principles and norms of human security, so insufficient is by its limitation to formal citations. Beyond the abstract-humanitarian value of international documents and legal texts, it seems to me a sad and bitter irony only to repeatedly invoke them against the background of political disinterest and powerlessness. For example, Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1948), according to which: "Every human being has the right to life, liberty and security of his person". Or of article 22 of the same Declaration, according to which: "Every person, in his capacity as a member of the society, has the right to social security; it is entitled that through the national effort and international cooperation, taking into account the organization and resources of each country, to obtain the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for its dignity and the free development of its personality". Considering the universality and value of the humanistic principles that underpin these articles, such an invocation appears only as a declaration of good intentions.

Beyond the good intentions, however, in terms of multiple and immediate realities, many human communities are facing social polarization and increasing economic-financial disparities; accentuating the gaps between the minority of developed and most underdeveloped or developing countries; the multiplication of regional insecurity complexes; multiculturalism's danger unconverted in intercultural education programs; the ravages of interreligious wars; the drama of refugees; the influx of immigrants with ambiguous status and potential for terrorist risk. More recently, we notice the symptoms of a crisis of liberal democracy, accompanied by the recrudescence of autocratic regimes supported by demagogic and populist propaganda. The gravity of the problems listed draws attention to the fact that a return to the question posed by Keith Krause in the early 2000s would be required. In this sense, we can ask ourselves: how could we transform a "good idea" -- the idea of human security - - in an effective action? What solutions could be found and by what ways could they be applied in a particular region or community?

In the context of international politics, human security would be "more than a good idea" when the security agenda would effectively contribute, according to the United Nations Development Program, to "the release from poverty" and, at the same time, to the "liberation from fear" (Human Development Report 1994. UNDP). Human security would be "more than a good idea" when the principle of responsibility to protect could be transposed into practice through honest and effective humanitarian interventions (Bădescu, 2011). Until then, despite identifying the components of the concept of "human security" - economic, food, health, environment, personal, community, political - and of the theoretical correlation of security policies with the problem of development, human security remains only an excellent mobilizing motto in the UN agendas for development and security (Ogata & Sen, 2003). At the same time, however, in terms of scientific documentation and research, it can be appreciated that the topic of human security is represented by a useful bibliography, rich in important books, documents, reports, empirical analyzes, statistical data, tables, schemes and graphs. It is, of course, a delightful thing that highlights an institutional-political and academic concern sustained on a global scale, reflected, moreover, in the "multiple understanding" of human security.

Human security and the advance of security studies in recent decades

The concept of "human security" enjoys academic recognition, being used in the vocabulary of political science, international relations theories, strategic security studies, etc. Appearing within the theory of international relations and strategic security studies, the theme of human security bears the imprint of the disciplines and cognitive strategies focused on the

problem of international anarchy, the political-military relations between states or on the analysis of sovereignty and the security complexes. Against the background of political-military realities and the "turbulences" of the international environment, security studies have benefited of important acquisitions from the field of international relations theory. Of course, first, I consider the two classical perspectives and their founders: political realism (Morgenthau, 2007) and neorealism (Waltz, 2001, 2006), on the one hand, liberal idealism and neoliberal institutionalism (Keohane & Nye, 2009), on the other hand. If political realism supports a realist-pessimistic conception on human nature and anarchic behavior of states in a conflictual international system burdened by the insufficiency and formalism of international law, on the contrary, the (neo) liberal institutionalism advances a conception essentially, rationalist, functionalist and optimistic about international institutions and inter-state cooperation.

Against the backdrop of realistic-political and institutionalist-liberal theories, it is particularly interesting the emergence of social constructivism initiated in theory of international relations by Alexander Wendt, Nicholas Onuf, John Ruggie, etc. This current could be perceived as an innovative synthesis. able to deepen the research of the concept of human security. Constructivism appears as an application of subjective neo-Kantian idealism, phenomenology and pragmatics in the study of international relations. In support of this assertion, a number of arguments raised by Alexander Wendt could be invoked: the character of human construction and social product of the international system; building political actors through socio-human perception and communication; correlating the material factors present in international relations - territories, military capabilities, natural resources, etc. - with social processes and human action; evaluation of the international system, as part, in a global social system characterized by significant interactions of socio-political actors; development of discourse theory through socio-discursive articulation and capitalization of the "illocutionary force" of words. It can be seen from the enumeration of these arguments that the "ontology of international life" in Alexander Wendt's view is "social" in the sense that states refer to each other through ideas and "constructionist" in the sense that these ideas contribute to defining who and what the states are "(Wendt, 2011, p.360). The ontological-constructivist position stems from a phenomenological tradition concerned with "the way ideas build power and interest" (Wendt, 2011, p.359). Thus, within the horizon of a constructivist strategy, beyond the materialistic and individualistic ontology of realism, we notice the appearance of a constitutive theory of social forms (the international system) constructed through ideas whose authors are, of course, people. "By reconceptualizing the structure of the system in holistic terms and especially in idealistic terms it is possible - concludes the American researcher - to ask constitutive questions that could generate progress in the evolution of the system. We need not only be our reflection around the state, but we can also do it in and through the state" (Wendt, 2011, p.363). But, the constitutive reflections "around the state" or those "in and through the state" can extend outside the state. This means that we no longer think of security only as statocentric security. Thinking in holistic terms, we can also consider sociocentric security, also anthropocentric security, therefore, human security.

In this sense, it can be seen that the theme of human security evolved in recent decades on a path of epistemic maturation and diversification. From the researches and the strategic-military reports on the political, national, regional, global security - prevalent in the second half of the twentieth century - it has gradually passed, in the first decades of the 21st century towards multidisciplinary research with openings. various topics, concerning the links of human security with gender issues, human rights, human development, humanitarian intervention, sovereignty as a responsibility. At the same time, there are significant efforts to theorize human security within the horizon of constructivist neorealism, of discourse analysis by investigating the connections of language and action. Noteworthy, in this context, some

interesting contributions: conceptualization of human security as a dimension of human rights, a condition of political legitimacy and a test for crisis management (Kaldor, 2010, p.216); multilateral approach to human security in the context of global governance (MacLean, Black & Shaw, 2006); focusing on the individual as the "reference object" of human security (Mack, 2004, p.48-49); sketching an integrative and comprehensive concept of human security (Debiel, 2004, p.52-54); the dilemma of evaluating priorities in the human security agenda in relation to national and international state-political security (Rotfeld, 2004, p.122-126); case studies on human security in national, societal, regional, for example, the Balkan region (Møller, 2000). Also remarkable are the efforts of the Copenhagen School, both in overcoming the "classical" theory of the security complexes by broadening the analytical framework, specifying the levels of analysis, describing the sectors and cross-sectoral connections of activity, locating regional, geopolitical groups, as objects of analysis, as well as in the direction of refining the conceptual apparatus including, for the research of human security (Buzan, Waever & de Wilde, 1998). Unfortunately, the situation of philosophical reflection on human security is not the same.

About the discrete presence of philosophical reflections and the need to rethinking human security. The therapeutic self-reflexivity

Phenomenon of the geo-political reality, objective of the international organizations of profile, human security is the subject of predominantly empirical-analytical studies materialized in field research, statistical analysis, official reports, political, sociological, geopolitical and international relations studies. This situation explains, to a certain extent, the discrete presence in the human security issues of philosophical approaches, the precariousness of conceptual-reflexive concerns and the insufficiency of the problematic approaches with therapeutic purpose at personal and interpersonal level. Attractive and generous, the concept of human security has, unfortunately, remained insufficiently explored in the horizon of philosophical reflection and, especially, in that of therapeutic self-reflexivity. Developed from the perspective of international relations, strategic-military analysis and political science, some of the security studies - including those on human security - are predominantly empirical-descriptive with ideological purpose. Treated in terms of the "political interests of the participants", security it turns out, as Barry Buzan points out, a "poorly conceptualized but strongly politicized concept" (Buzan, 2000, p.15, 17). The explanations of the incomplete philosophical conceptualization of the theme of security, in particular, of human security, are of a different order. In this sense, the complexity of the problem of human security can be invoked; also, the vastness and variety of the area of security phenomena; the inheritance of a research institutionalist tradition focused on the of power; pre-eminence of empirical-analytical research, official reports and strategic-military studies; the inefficiency of normative idealism in counteracting political realism; the difficulty and timidity of self-reflexive, transdisciplinary approaches, etc.

Beyond recognizing the usefulness and importance of the theme of human security, we must admit, however, that being, really, a good idea", human security risks to remain just a good idea. Trying to encompass the universe of human security, the concept of "human security" is in the paradoxical situation of wanting to say everything and, at the same time, being able to say too little. The attachment of the terms "security" and "human" suggests certain ontological-anthropological depths, but, in my point of view, they cannot be problematized by a reflection with existential-therapeutic valences. Used most often in the empirical-analytical analysis, the concept of "human security" is the result of observing and analyzing the phenomenon of human security from the outside, as an "object" of social reality. Evaluated from a reflexive and, especially, self-reflexive perspective, the concept of human security appears as a generic and global term, insufficiently consistent in terms of its

reflexive -problematic content and reference levels, insufficiently exploited in terms of operationalization possibilities, and therapeutic application. Generic, global and static, the concept of "human security" is insufficiently developed in terms of capturing the dynamic and paradoxical nature of the process of (in) human security and its therapeutic applicability. The discrete presence of the *self-reflexive-therapeutic approach* in the field of human security research offers an explanation, even partial, of the incomplete conceptualization of the phenomenon of human security.

But what is therapeutic self-reflexivity? Strictly semantic, the term "therapeutic self-reflexivity" refers to *reflexivity focused for therapeutic reasons on its own reflexive activity*. Thinking which thinks about himself, self-reflexivity participates in exploring self-awareness in different life situations, as well as in examining thought acts and cultivating reflexive processes in order to design their own reflexive-therapeutic strategies. Personalized reflexive process characterized by cognitive, emotional, volitional self-control, therapeutic self-reflexivity marks the shift from the impersonal discourse about reflexivity to the therapeutic assuming of reflexivity. Unlike the impersonal, referential discourse on reflexivity, self-reflexivity marks an important change of perspective: *assuming reflexivity in personal name*. Self-reflexivity is self-referential, expressing itself through reflexive discourse in the first person. As a term of reference, the personal pronoun "I" imprints to the reflexivity the mark of self-referentiality. In the case of therapeutic self-reflexivity, I am the one who experiences my own reflexive experiences in different cultural contexts and life situations. These are the inspiring experiences of conceptual structures, theses, hypotheses and reflexive-therapeutic strategies. The therapeutic self-reflexivity is the central "piece" of this approach around which the other conceptual structures, theses and hypotheses will appear.

Against the background of therapeutic self-reflexivity, I propose the elaboration from a triple perspective of the conceptual structure, the "interpersonal securitization". Thus, from a *terminological-semantic* perspective, the phrase "interpersonal securitization" appears as a verbal expression, a flexible lexical formulation, operational in the plane of interpersonal relations. From a *conceptual-reflexive* perspective, interpersonal securitization is a predicate of human security. From a *discursive-pragmatic* perspective, the predicate "interpersonal securitization" can be transposed through language and communication into what I call the *communicative-securitizing interaction*. The rethinking of human security as interpersonal securitization / communicative-securitizing interaction involves the significant reconfiguration of this self-reflexive-therapeutic approach: from a formal-institutional level to an informal-interpersonal level; from empirical-analytical methods to self-reflexive-therapeutic methods; from an impersonal and descriptive discourse to a personalized and problematize narration; from the informative-expository purpose to the pragmatic-therapeutic purpose.

Interpersonal securitization: a terminological-semantic perspective

From a terminological point of view, the verbal expression "human security" is a consecrated one, commonly used in the institutional and academic language. However, I felt the need to propose the verbal expression "interpersonal securitization". Without unnecessarily doubling the term "human security", the term "interpersonal securitization" appears as a situational, flexible, operational linguistic expression in the plane of interpersonal relations. Unlike the term "human security", too general and sometimes too vague, the phrase "interpersonal securitization" appears as a linguistic expression more appropriate to the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. But, let's take a closer look at the lexical-semantic mechanism of elaborating the substantive phrase "interpersonal securitization", considering both terms: "securitization" and "interpersonal".

The substantive locus "interpersonal securitization" was formed by transforming the verb "to secure" into a noun: "security". Unlike the word "security", which has a static connotation expressing a relatively certain and stable security state, the word "securitization" from the verb "to secure" expresses much better the dynamic dimension, the permanent change of relative security-insecurity conditions. The concrete life of multiple and opposite realities brings with it numerous evidences of the relativity and fragility of human security conditions. As for the word "interpersonal", it refers to the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. In the phrase "human security", the dynamics of interpersonal relationships is hidden behind the global, generic and abstract term: "human". The dynamics of interpersonal relationships shape any human community and any system of social, political, economic, religious, cultural, educational activity etc., conferring, at the same time, the situational character, specific to the phrase "interpersonal securitization". Complementary, the verbal phrase "interpersonal securitization" does not replace the one already established, "human security". However, being more appropriate to the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, the phrase "interpersonal securitization" better responds to a reflexive approach with a pragmatic-therapeutic purpose at the level of interpersonal relationships.

By concluding, in the process of social communication, interpersonal security brings together two plans: 1) that of the *intersubjective evaluations* generated by the personalized perception of the real threats and vulnerabilities; 2) that of the *securitizing interactions*. The coupling of the two plans is achieved through a socio-discursive act, the act of producing and using verbal expressions of thought as a binder of securising interactions. Here we could formulate the following definition: *interpersonal securitization is a socio-discursive act of intersubjective evaluation and counteracting external threats and internal vulnerabilities by encouraging securitization interactions and prosocial behavior*. The term "interpersonal securitization" can be perceived, concomitantly, as a syntagm in the terminological-semantic plane and as a conceptual-experiential structure in the conceptual-reflexive plane. Through the information contained in its constituent words, the phrase "interpersonal securitization" prepares to conceptualize the phenomenon of interpersonal securitization as a determinative predicate of human security.

Interpersonal securitization: a conceptual-reflexive perspective. About interpersonal securitization as a predicate of human security

The conceptualization of the phrase "interpersonal securitization" as a predicate of human security presupposes the use of phenomenology as a "working philosophy". Phenomenology is an operational philosophy with a double orientation: towards the phenomena of the directly observable reality and, simultaneously, to their reflection as mental phenomena at the level of the acts of thought and states of consciousness. The valorization of phenomenology as an operational philosophy with dual orientation implies the use of the term "phenomenon" in a special sense: the *phenomenological sense*. Moreover, *Dictionnaire de langue philosophique* operates the following distinctions between the philosophic meanings of the term "phenomenon": "1. Either as an external fact in itself. The phenomena thus conceived are the subject of the sciences of nature, from astronomy to biology, (but also of the social sciences - n.n.). 2. Either as an inner fact or a fact of consciousness, existing only in consciousness; this is the way in which classical psychology considers psychic facts (thoughts, feelings, acts of will ...) and absolute idealism conceives the nature that the common sense calls the outside world. 3. Either as a fact conditioned, to the same extent, by an external reality (...) or by an inner activity of consciousness; this is the phenomenon of phenomenology inspired by Husserl" (Foulquié, 1992, p.535). This third meaning of the term "phenomenon" as a double conditioned - both by the external reality of things and by the inner activity of the states of consciousness - is the phenomenological meaning of the term

"phenomenon". While the empirical-analytical concept of human security used in a descriptive-positivist manner in political science is based on the first sense, that of external observable in a phenomenal field, the elaboration of the predicate "interpersonal securitization" takes into account the third meaning of the term "phenomenon", that of phenomenological perception oriented both to the external reality of things and to the inner activity of states of consciousness.

The conceptualization of the phrase "interpersonal securitization" as a predicate of human security presupposes the use of phenomenology as a "working philosophy". Phenomenology is an operational philosophy with a double orientation: towards the phenomena of the directly observable reality and towards the mental phenomena at the level of the acts and states of consciousness. The valorization of phenomenology as an operational philosophy with dual orientation implies the use of the term "phenomenon" in a special sense: the *phenomenological sense*. Moreover, *Dictionnaire de langue philosophique* operates the following distinctions between the philosophic meanings of the term "phenomenon": "1. Either as an external fact in itself. The phenomena thus conceived are the subject of the sciences of nature, from astronomy to biology, (but also of the social sciences - n.n.). 2. Either as an inner fact or a fact of consciousness, existing only in consciousness; this is the way in which classical psychology considers psychic facts (thoughts, feelings, acts of will ...) and absolute idealism conceives the nature that the common sense calls the outside world. 3. Either as a fact conditioned, to the same extent, by an external reality (...) or by an inner activity of consciousness; this is the phenomenon of phenomenology inspired by Husserl" (Foulquié, 1992, p. 535). This third meaning of the term "phenomenon" as a double conditioned - both by the external reality of things and by the inner activity of the states of consciousness - is the phenomenological meaning of the term "phenomenon". While the empirical-analytical concept of human security used in a descriptive-positivist manner in political science is based on the first sense, that of external observable in a phenomenal field, the elaboration of the predicate "interpersonal securitization" takes into account the third meaning of the term "phenomenon", that of phenomenological perception oriented both to the external reality of things and to the inner activity of states of consciousness.

In this context, I propose the following hypothesis: *the use of the term "phenomenon" in a phenomenological sense facilitates through orienting the perception, both to the reality of the facts and to the states of consciousness, the perceiving of interpersonal securitization as a predicate of human security*. The double orientation of the phenomenological perception - towards the reality of the facts and the states of consciousness - favors *penetration in the personalized experiential interiority of human security and its experiencing as interpersonal securitization*. The personalized experience of human security as interpersonal securitization reveals us the interpersonal securitization as a *way-of-being* of human security. In this way, we can conceptualize interpersonal securitization as an *ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security*, a predicate that *by phenomenological perception of human security ontologically determines its constitutive being*. Rethinking human security as interpersonal securitization through its phenomenological perception and ontological grounding provides a reflexive and appropriate framework for deepening human security research. Interpersonal securitization thus becomes a determinative and operational predicate of human security.

It can be observed that this hypothesis calls for a *self-reflexive synthesis approach*, inspired by transcendental Husserlian phenomenology, but also by Heideggerian ontological phenomenology. Husserlian phenomenology is, par excellence, a phenomenology of transcendental consciousness able to capitalize a series of capabilities of the act of conscience (Husserl, 2011). First, the *intentionality*, the focus of the consciousness on a certain thing or phenomenon; the fact that the act of conscience is awareness-of-something. Secondly, the

conceptualizing capacity of the intentional consciousness, its capacity to constitute by mentalization an "object", the ideational essence of that thing or phenomenon. Third, intentional and constitutive, the conscience is a *donor of meaning* in different plans: common knowledge, scientific research, political, economic, cultural, religious actions, etc. Thus, the intentional consciousness becomes an instrument of transcendental phenomenology. In this context, the stake of transcendental phenomenology is the identification, with the help of intentional consciousness, of the ideational essences capable of the phenomenological foundation of empirically observable things and phenomena. But the proximity to the ideational essences through intentional consciousness implies the inner dialogue of the self with the deep self, a dialogue that brings in the field of phenomenological research the awareness of the self and the therapeutic autoflexivity. All these "tools" and mental capacities present in the self-reflexive-therapeutic approach are situational experiences of the intentional consciousness that brings us closer to understanding the interpersonal securitization as a special *topos* placed between the consciousness of the self and the encounter of the other.

The "pure phenomenology" - the phenomenology of the essentialization of the phenomena in the intentional consciousness through the phenomenological reduction of the reality - felt, however, the need for the *ontological opening by exploring the constitutive being of things*. The need to seek and find out the constitutive being of things and phenomena led Martin Heidegger to elaborate *ontological phenomenology*. The ontological-phenomenological exploration is a way of experimentation and explanation based on affirming the exploratory role of the intentional-constitutive consciousness that is in search of ontological basis (the constitutive being) of the things and phenomena of reality. The use of these two classical methods of phenomenological reflection offers a remarkable advantage in conceptualizing interpersonal securitization as an *ontological-phenomenological predicate* of human security. When I undertake an ontological-phenomenological exploration, I consider the double dependence of such an exploration: the *phenomenological dependence* and, at the same time, the *ontological dependence*. The phenomenological dependence is formulated by Martin Heidegger in the following way: "ontology is only possible as phenomenology", because - observes the German philosopher - "phenomenology is the way of accessing what should become the subject of ontology" (Heidegger, 2003, p.47). On the other hand, the phenomenological exploration of the ontological basis brings to our attention our ontological dependence, understood as "a relationship, or (...) a family of relations between entities or beings (beings)" (Tahko, & Lowe, 2016): The ontological dependence expresses the need to find the ontological basis, a need felt, also, in scientific knowledge, philosophical reflection, aesthetic sensibility or spiritual-religious revelation.

Interpersonal securitization is an ontological-phenomenological predicate because it is the result of an *ontological-phenomenological synthesis*. The ontological-phenomenological synthesis is an ideational process in which the ontological basis (the constitution of being) of a phenomenon becomes intelligible by its phenomenological configuration within the horizon of intentional-constitutive consciousness. In other words, the ontological-phenomenological synthesis is the "intelligible place" (*topos noetos*) in which the *ontological basis is perceived phenomenologically*. This is because exclusively phenomenological assimilation would risk blocking the transcendental ego in a situation of solipsism. But, as a *comprehensive-being-present-in-the-world*, I transcend the blockade of the transcendental self. In this way, I can perceive from an ontological-phenomenological perspective the constitution of that "own" of human security, its being constitution: interpersonal securitization. Interpersonal securitization becomes an ontological-phenomenological predicate, a predicate that highlights a certain way of being: *interpersonal securitization as the way of being of human security*. Thus, through the ontologico-phenomenological synthesis the transcendental self thinks about human security beyond the concrete phenomena, empirically observable based on which the

empirical-analytical concept of human security has been elaborated.

But how can one explain the fact that therapeutic self-reflexivity can initiate actions and develop strategies with a direct impact on the socio-human reality? Personalized reflexive process, therapeutic self-reflexivity can initiate actions under the guidance of practical and communicative rationality, thus acting as a true *vector of mental causation* in the immediate reality. This means that therapeutic self-reflexivity manifests itself as a *causal self-referentiality*, a self-reflexive process capable of mentally causing the behaviors, therefore, a mental process with an impact on professional, family, cultural, religious, civic-political activities etc. From what has been sustained so far, it turns out that self-reflexivity is all the more useful when it has a practical, therapeutic purpose. Interpersonal securitization, in turn, as an ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security has a discursive-pragmatic (applicative-therapeutic) role in the form of *communicative-securitizing interaction*.

From interpersonal securitization to communicative-securitising interaction. A discursive-pragmatic perspective

Rethinking human security as interpersonal securitisation is a real challenge for therapeutic self-reflexivity. In this context, we can say that the stake of the self-reflexive-therapeutic approach is the argumentation of the following hypothesis: *as an ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security, interpersonal securitization becomes communicative-securitizing interaction through the practice of interactive discourse (discursive pragmatics)*. In other words, *the fact that interpersonal securitization is an ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security allows its transposition into immediate reality as communicative-securitising interaction*. We use here the *transcendental-pragmatic argument* that *transcendental-phenomenological reflexivity and its discursive-pragmatic transposition are two complementary experiential plans of human existence*. In these existential circumstances, interpersonal securitization as an ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security can be operationalized in the immediate reality through its discursive-pragmatic transposition. Discursive pragmatics is the one that transposes the ontological-phenomenological predicate "interpersonal securitization" through language acts into communicative-securitizing interaction. At the meeting of knowledge-communication-action, discursive pragmatics tests the acts of thought in the practice of interactive discourse through language and communication. In these existential circumstances, the predicate "interpersonal securitization" can be transposed and operationalized in the immediate reality as a communicative-securitizing interaction and thus used in field research and case studies.

The communicative-securitizing interaction is the communication and action instrument with the help to which interpersonal securitization actually occurs. But the communicative-securitizing interaction cannot be understood in the absence of the concept of "communicative action", due to Jürgen Habermas (Habermas, 1984). In order to support his conception of communicative action, Jürgen Habermas sought the mechanism by which an agreement can be rationally motivated in the communication act. Instead of focusing on the meaning of words by the *semantics of representation*, the German philosopher preferred a *pragmatic approach*, analyzing the conditions of illocutionary success of a speech act. In this way, the rationality and efficiency of the discourse are related to the rationality and efficiency of the communicative action. By connecting the meanings of words with the efficiency of speech acts, Jürgen Habermas has moved *from the semantics of representation to the pragmatics of communicative action*. But what do I mean by the communicative-securitizing interaction? How much is the communicative-securitizing interaction due to the communicative action and by what differentiates it?

Starting from the concept of the communicative action, I consider that the communicative-security interaction appears through the combining of two types of action: the *communicative action* and the *securitizing action*. Communicative action through speech acts represents the technical-discursive, linguistic-semantic part of the practical reason. The securitization action, in turn, it materializes through the methods and techniques of interpersonal securitization: aggression control, securitizing affiliations, the "well-tempered" ideology, the culture of mutual recognition, etc. The communicative action of coordination and negotiation of the consensus and the securitizing action by methods and techniques of interpersonal securitization together form what I call, the "communicative-securitizing interaction". The importance of the communicative-securitizing interaction lies in the correlation of the thinking, speech and the acts of interpersonal securitization through the self-consciousness states. Cerebral controlled, the acts of thought and the acts of speech merge into an organic whole, an ordered complexity of the individual and collective life. Conscious mental activity thus becomes the coordinating information center of speech acts and practical actions. Depending on the mental activity, the therapeutic self-reflexivity tests its pragmatic efficiency through the communicative-securitizing interaction. In order to secure the persons and the interpersonal relations in a community, the human being endowed with cognitive rationality appeals, in order to be understood, to the verbal and nonverbal means of communicative rationality. The communicative-securitizing interaction also implies, in the axiological plane, the assumption of a set of values and objectives oriented towards a coherent and constructive purpose.

Summarizing, the complementarity of the *theoretical, self-reflexive discourse* and *pragmatics of communicative-securitizing interaction* is a constant of the research strategy adopted in this paper. Following the thread of Habermasian reflexive pragmatism, the guiding ideas of our self-reflexive-therapeutic approach stipulated, from the beginning, the *interweaving of cognitive-instrumental rationality with the communicative rationality*. This means that the interpersonal securitization as an ontological-phenomenological predicate of human security can be pragmatically tested through interpersonal communicative-securitising interaction.

Instead of conclusions

The term "interpersonal securitization" cannot replace that of "human security". Although it cannot replace it, it can specify it and explicit. The ontological-phenomenological predicate "interpersonal securitization" offers a *semantic clarification*, a *conceptual foundation*, a *deepening of reflection* and, through all these, a *discursive-pragmatic finality*. By rethinking human security as interpersonal securitization, we obtain a more precise definition and a non-formal, personalized understanding of human security. The ontological-phenomenological exploration facilitates the discovery of the self of human security in the interpersonal securitization, thus favoring the researcher's penetration into the mental interiority of the human security phenomenon from the social reality. As an ontological-phenomenological predicate, "interpersonal securitization" appears as an essential determination capable of conferring a more precise content to human security, transforming it from a generic term - often used in an abstract, formal, propagandistic way - in a dynamic and operational term. In this context, we can define interpersonal securitization as: *the way-to-be-together by evaluating and counteracting external threats and internal vulnerabilities, encouraging interpersonal relationships and prosocial behavior*. Conceived as a determinative predicate of human security, interpersonal securitization refers to intersubjective evaluation and counteracting objective threats and vulnerabilities by developing interpersonal relationships in the community. Operationalized through

communicative-securitizing interaction, the predicate "interpersonal securitization" can thus be applied in field researches and case studies.

References

1. Bădescu, C. G. (2011). *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: Security and Human Rights*. New York: Routledge.
2. Buzan, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
3. Buzan, B. (2000). *Popoarele, statele și teama. O agendă pentru studii de securitate internațională în epoca de după războiul rece* (Peoples, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era). Translated from English by Vivia Săndulescu. Chișinău: Editura Cartier.
4. Debiel, T. (2004). „The Need for an Integrated Concept of Security”. In M. Brzoska & P. J.Croll (Eds), *Promoting Security: But How and For Whom? Contributions to BICC's Ten-year Anniversary Conference*. Bonn International Center For Conversion (B.I.C.C.). Brief 30. Retrieved from http://www.humansecuritycentre.org/publications/bicc_brief30.pdf.
5. Foulquié, P. (1992). *Dictionnaire de la langue philosophique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
6. Habermas, J.(1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Volume 1. *Reason and The Rationalization of Society*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
7. Heidegger, M. (2003). *Ființă și timp*. (Being and Time). Translated from German by Gabriel Liiceanu and Cătălin Cioabă. București: Humanitas.
8. *Human Development Report 1994*. Published for the United Nations Development Programme. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://hdr.undp.org/site>.
9. Husserl, E. (2011). *Idei privitoare la o fenomenologie pură și la o filosofie fenomenologică. Cartea întâi: Introducere generală în fenomenologia pură* . (Ideas Regarding Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy. Book One: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology). Translated from German by Christian Ferencz-Flatz. București: Humanitas.
10. Kaldor, M. (2010). *Securitatea umană* (Human Security). Translated from English by Monica Andriescu, Ana-Maria Butiurcă, Andrei Aroneț. Cluj-Napoca: C.A.Publishing.
11. Keohane O. R., & Nye, S. J. (2009). *Putere și interdependență*. (Power and Interdependence). Translated from English by Adriana Straub. Iași: Polirom.
12. Krause, K. (2004). „Is human security more than just a good idea”? .In M. Brzoska & P. J.Croll (Eds), *Promoting Security: But How and For Whom?, Contributions to BICC's Ten-year Anniversary Conference* (pp.43-46), Bonn International Center For Conversion (B.I.C.C.), Brief 30. Retrieved from http://www.humansecuritycentre.org/publications/bicc_brief30.pdf.
13. Lalande, A. (1991). *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
14. Mack, A. (2004). „The Concept of Human Security”.In M. Brzoska & P. J.Croll (Eds), *Promoting Security: But How and For Whom?, Contributions to BICC's Ten-year Anniversary Conference*. Bonn International Center For Conversion (B.I.C.C.), Brief 30. Retrieved from http://www.humansecuritycentre.org/publications/bicc_brief30.pdf.
15. MacLean, S. J., Black, D. R., & Shaw, T. M. (2006). *A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms*. Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
16. Møller, B. (2000). *National, Societal and Human Security. A General Discussion with a Case Study from the Balkans*. First International Meeting of Directors of Peace Research and Training Institutions on, *What Agenda for Human Security in the Twenty-first*

- Century?*. UNESCO, Paris, 27-28 November 2000.
17. Morgenthau, H. J. (2007). *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*. (Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace). Translated from English by Oana Andreea Bosoi, Alina Andreea Dragolea, Mihai Vladimir Zodian. Iași, București: Polirom.
 18. Ogata, S., & Sen, A. (2003). *Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People*. New York: Commission on Human Security.
 19. Rotfeld, A.D. (2004). „Promoting Security but How and For Whom”, in *Keynote Speeches*. In M. Brzoska & P. J.Croll (Eds). *Promoting Security: But How and For Whom?, Contributions to BICC's Ten-year Anniversary Conference*. Bonn International Center For Conversion (B.I.C.C.), Brief 30. Retrieved from http://www.humansecuritycentre.org/publications/bicc_brief30.pdf.
 20. Tahko, T. E., & Lowe, J.E. (2016). „Ontological Dependence”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/dependence-ontological/>.
 21. United Nations (UN).(1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.
 22. Waltz, K.N. (2001). *Omul, statul și războiul. O analiză teoretică*. (Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis). Translated from English by Mihaela Sadovschi. Iași: Institutul European.
 23. Waltz, K. N. (2006). *Teoria politicii internaționale*. (Theory of International Politics). Translated from English by Nicoleta Mihăilescu. Iași, București: Polirom.
 24. Wendt, A.. (2011). *Teoria socială a politicii internaționale*. (Social Theory of International Politics). Translated from English by Mihai Cristian Brașoveanu. Iași, București: Polirom.