

## Conclusions

Security is not merely a means of battling the enemy and addressing fears; rather, it often creates them, Jef Huysmans (2014: 3) noted, emphasising the significance of the processes of securitization and the broadening of the security category. According to Securitization Theory, threats do not exist consistently, in the same dimension and intensity, somewhere in the universe, waiting to be identified and addressed. The formation of security is a political process in which issues are transformed into security threats through a series of events framed within a securitization cycle. At times, all the conditions of the theory are met, while other times, there is merely a speech act that labels an issue as a security problem (which can sometimes be distorted by the populist behavior of the securitizing actor). Additionally, there are areas such as migration or environmental degradation, where inclusion in the category occurs not because they currently pose a real threat, but due to their potential to escalate to that level, affecting multiple sectors of security (economic, cultural, political, people, etc.), and are thereby riskified.

Securitization is a politically convenient procedure. It allows raising the relevance of a problem by presenting it as a security issue, thanks to the speech act so readily practiced in politics. The intensity of the use of this opportunity in the 21st century, also evident in Polish political discourse, coupled with the emergence of riskification processes, raises the question of the values or resources that one seeks to protect by extraordinary means. As mentioned at the beginning of this book, securitization processes have done much good for marginalized but important problems of the modern world (environmental threats, HIV), drawing attention to the fact that human security goes beyond tanks, multi-role aircraft, and diplomatic actions. However, there is also the other side of the coin. The potentially widespread negative consequences of securitization mean that its moral acceptability is already in everyone's interest (Floyd, 2019: 23).

It should not be forgotten that securitization holds significant power: it leads to political decisions that impact the lives of societies. Depending on the circumstances and the subject of securitization, it can result in the banning of certain industries whose production threatens the environment; it can authorize the forcible detention of people considered carriers of infectious diseases; it can initiate the construction of physical borders (walls and fences) and even the potential for shooting at individuals to stop the influx of illegal migrants; and it can be responsible for granting additional powers to the police and

military or expanding a wide range of actions to combat the terrorist threat (Herington, 2012). This is why examining the intentions of securitising actors seeking to expand the security category is so important. When agreeing to such circumstances, it is essential to assess whether the threat is genuinely existential in relation to the reference object that it aims to protect, and whether the same effect can be achieved through “ordinary” policies, using standard solutions and measures. In making this postulation, Floyd cites the example of the wide range of extraordinary measures taken by Western countries, including the US in particular, in the post-2001 fight against terrorism, which she believes were excessive in relation to the reality of the threat. Similar concerns are being raised about measures taken around the world to combat the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic (Shani, 2020; Bilmes, 2020; Butler, 2020; Takao, 2020; Nurhasanah et al., 2020; Hastoro and Sumarni, 2020; Albert et al., 2021; Abbott, 2021; Villarreal, 2021). Researchers are starting to highlight the human security constraints caused by restrictive lockdown policies, social isolation, or pressure to vaccinate against the virus, indicating that health security must not overshadow the other needs and rights of individuals and entire societies.

The question of the morality of securitization processes is an urgent issue. Their intensity in the 21st century may raise suspicions about the motives behind them and the objective existentiality of the threats they address. The effectiveness of securitization processes presents an additional temptation here. However, the aim is not to move away from expanding categories of security, providing a new perspective on phenomena not previously regarded as security issues. While they may be viewed as such, extraordinary measures are not always necessary to mitigate threats, especially if they are not existential in nature. The question of riskification processes also remains open. It is indisputable that the world is increasingly focusing on risks, wisely reasoning that their elimination, or at least control, can prevent risks from materialising. However, excessive reliance on extraordinary measures at the risk stage can exacerbate the dangerous processes highlighted by Floyd (2019). Safety etiquette cannot permit every action under all circumstances. Extraordinary measures should be reserved for emergency situations that cannot be resolved by normal policy. Otherwise, security will lose its effectiveness and undermine the process of achieving a state free from significant threats.