


The Normative Dimension of Securitization as a Strategic Crisis Communication Theory. Lessons from the COVID-19 Pandemic in Central & Eastern Europe



<p>Marta Natalia Lukacovic, <i>PhD, Assistant Professor of Communication and Mass Media,</i> <i>E-mail: marta.lukacovic@angelo.edu</i> <i>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8244-892X</i> <i>Angelo State University –</i> <i>Texas Tech University System</i> <i>San Angelo,</i> <i>2601 W. Avenue N</i> <i>San Angelo, TX 76909</i> <i>Texas, USA.</i></p>	<p><i>Citation:</i> Lukacovic, M.N. (2022). The Normative Dimension of Securitization as a Strategic Crisis Communication Theory; Lessons from the COVID-19 Pandemic in Central & Eastern Europe. <i>Social Communications: Theory and Practice</i>, Vol. 14(1), 197–209. DOI: 10.51423/2524-0471-2022-14-1-8 © Lukacovic, M.N. (2022).  Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)</p>
---	---

Annotation

The aim of the study. This article aims to advance the development of the normative dimension of securitization as strategic crisis communication theory. Securitization is a powerful persuasive tool because it builds an argument that an existential threat is looming and extraordinary measures should be employed to counter it (Buzan et al., 1998; Vultee in Balzacq, 2010; Watson, 2012). **Research methods and techniques.** The theorization in this article is based on an analysis exploring a set of cases of Slovakia’s counter-pandemic measures during the first two years of the COVID-19 outbreak in the country. **Results and discussion.** The case study of Slovakia is informative because the instances there reflect a broader array of problems that are experienced across various global societies; for example, a failure to introduce measures that are inclusive of the marginalized people in terms of ethno-racial discrimination or digital disparities. The analysis helps to extract a set of practical recommendations that aim to craft ethically-sound securitized discourses for persuasive purposes during crises. The framework proposed by Floyd (2011; 2019) is used as the main scaffold for normative securitization and is further enhanced by the relevant ethics standards of the strategic communication field, leading to the introduced lineup of recommendations. **Conclusions.** The author provides recommendations for the use of securitization methods: 1) establishing the causes of securitization (determining the cause of the threat to a particular type of security; establishing a clear and transparent set of guidelines to consistently determine which frame is reasonably superior to another frame (s)); 2) taking into account the reference object of securitization (inclusion of all victims and groups; establishing a clear and transparent set of guidelines for determining the consequences of non-human entities and concepts from a regulatory point of view).

Keywords: securitization, strategic crisis communication theory, normative communication theory, COVID-19 communication, pandemic communication, Slovakia.

Introduction

While the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the world in tremendous and tragic ways, there still are lessons to be learned with one being precisely how our understandings of the concept

of security can enhance strategic crisis communication. As of March 2022, the global death toll has exceeded 6 million (World Health Organization, 2022). While the world appears to be adjusting to life with the coronavirus, several other crises are unfolding or looming, including armed conflicts and environmental degradation. These grim prospects make it rather paramount that communication scholarship swiftly extracts important takeaways based on recent events toward useful theories for those crises that societies are likely to face in the near or more distant future.

Scholars and analysts have identified numerous pronounced uses of securitization in the way COVID-19 has been talked about by medical professionals, political leaders, and media commentators, among other relevant speakers with a public platform (e.g., Al-Sharafat, 2020; Dimari & Papadakis, 2022; Kirk & McDonald, 2021; Krasna, 2020; Rogers, 2020; Vivek, 2020). Many of these analytical accounts highlight the problematic aspects of securitized framing (e.g., Grančayová, 2021; Rogers, 2020). The criticism of the securitized pandemic-related narratives is not surprising granted that a large portion of Copenhagen-school (Buzan et al., 1998) inspired works on securitization tends to point out how the securitized framing weakens democratic discourses and exchanges of ideas, so ‘desecuritization’ has been understood as ‘normatively positive’ (Austin & Beaulieu-Brossard, 2017). However, recent calls within the field of crisis communication have encouraged a different direction – one that would attempt to harness securitization for strategic persuasive purposes (Schraedley et al., 2020). While the adaptation of securitization within the strategic communication field is arguably a worthwhile endeavor, as this article further explains, it still must be done while paying attention to several ethics-related considerations. Hence, this article is focused on advancing the scholarly discussion of securitization as a strategic crisis communication theory while addressing specifically the normative dimension.

The theoretical roots of securitization and its adaptation within the field of communication are traced in the following paragraphs of this section. Then, the current article outlines the direction for further theory development of securitization as an ethical strategic communication tool. In order to verify the validity of the theoretical claims, the case of Slovakia’s management of COVID-19, and specifically the securitized discourses that surrounded it, are utilized. The analysis of this case allows reflections on particularities of the Central-and-Eastern European (CEE) experience. Furthermore, the discussion explores the generalizability of the findings towards a more globally universal communication theory-building and practical implications. While the analysis focuses on the pandemic, the discussion and conclusion sections offer implications that apply beyond the context of infectious diseases to other possible uses of ethical securitization as strategic crisis communication theory.

The Copenhagen School's theory of securitization (Buzan et al., 1998) has its origins in the academic field of international relations. From the ontological and epistemological perspectives, the original conception of the theory was specifically rooted within the constructivist paradigm (Adler in Carlsnaes et al., 2013; Watson, 2012). The theory proposes that securitization is a form of speech act through which an issue is removed from the typical ‘politicized’ discourse toward ‘securitized’ discourse. This means that an issue is portrayed and consequently perceived as an existential threat. Precisely, a ‘referent object’ is subjected to a threat that puts some integral part of the referent object’s existence or identity in jeopardy. The referent object is frequently a nation (as people) or a nation-state (as a political entity including institutions, ideologies, etc.). However, the referent object can also be a collective unit such as an alliance or another international organized entity, for example, the European Union (Sperling & Webber, 2019). Even a whole civilization in the Huntingtonian or other type of interpretation can be proposed as a referent object (Buzan & Waever, 2009). Importantly, the main output product of securitized discourse is an assertion that

‘extraordinary means’ may (and perhaps even must) be employed to eliminate the threat and thus preserve the referent object.

One of the significant contributions of the securitization theory was introducing the multitude of potential existential concerns into the understanding of a nation’s or nation-state’s security. Traditionally, security was discussed only from the military perspective. However, securitization theory-inspired literature has been advancing the concepts of political security, cultural security, economic security, environmental security, health security, etc. (e.g., Bengtsson & Rhinard, 2019; Buzan et al., 1998; Maertens, 2019).

When the COVID-19 pandemic unfolded and authorities worldwide began implementing and defending extraordinary measures to mitigate the pandemic's threats, the usefulness of the theory of securitization in describing what has been happening was pointed out by the analysts rather quickly (e.g., Al-Sharafat, 2020; Krasna, 2020; Lukacovic, 2020; Rogers, 2020; Vivek, 2020). Indeed, across the globe, leaders were describing paramount threats to numerous forms of securities such as to the health of the population, the vitality of the economic system, the cultural and religious practices of societies, etc.

While the securitized discourse has been abundant, its specific characteristics significantly differed in identifying the referent object, the nature of the threat, and the types of extraordinary measures that ought to be implemented. Sometimes, wide-ranging differences occurred even within the same country. For example, Lukacovic (2020) describes how in the United States (US), some political influencers (frequently those on the conservative side of the political spectrum) focused on the concept of the nation's liberties as the main integral feature of the referent object’s identity under the threat. The extraordinary measures from this perspective would mean sacrificing the health of COVID-19’s victims to protect the liberties and freedoms of other Americans. The referenced liberties would include actions such as congregating and not wearing protective face masks when in public despite a massive disease outbreak happening at the time. While other political influencers (frequently those on the liberal end of the political spectrum) painted the disease itself as the key threat to the health security of the people of the US. Hence, the failure to protect the people's health and lives would be perceived as incongruent with core shaping values and the identity of the US. Consequently, this perspective subscribed to the type of extraordinary measures which would include strict adherence to COVID-management protocols such as social distancing, protective face mask wearing, etc. These described competing perspectives in the US represent two different forms of securitization, where for each the cause – the nature of the threat to the referent object diverges rather drastically and requires completely different response measures.

'Securitizing actor' is the one making the assertion about a security threat, according to the original conception of the securitization theory (Buzan et al., 1998). Besides the political leaders, medical professionals, and public health experts as the securitizing actors, the media organizations as well as the members of the wider public were readily discussing the pandemic and its repercussions. Certainly, media scholars (e.g., Dolinec, 2010; Vultee in Balzacq, 2010) have been emphasizing that securitization should be studied in tandem with mass communication theories. Specifically, the model of framing (Entman, 1993; 2003) has been proposed as being a closely overlapping construct with securitization (Watson, 2012). In particular, Entman’s (2003) framing model demonstrates how a frame exists and functions across various levels of discourse: as persuasive political communication, as an inclination in the media coverage, and as a tendency in conversations and understandings among the public. Securitization is a specific type of frame (Dolinec, 2010; Vultee in Balzacq, 2010; Watson, 2012). So, communication scholars have already established several bridges between the established communication theories and the abundant political science and international relations literature on securitization.

The key question that remains to be addressed in the current literature that attempts to expand the presence of securitization theory in the field of communication is related to the normative dimensions. Specifically, how should an ethical version of securitization be delineated within strategic crisis communication?

Research Methods and Techniques

This article is primarily a theory-building piece. Hence, the main methods and techniques that are used are focused on reviewing and synthesizing the various pertinent theoretical works on securitization in particular and strategic crisis communication in general. The constructed theoretical framework will be analytically applied to the case of Slovakia during the coronavirus pandemic to verify its pertinency and draw further conclusions.

From the original conceptualizations of the theory, the audience's acceptance of the discursive proclamation of a specific security threat and the necessary extraordinary means to counter the threat is the fundamental purpose of securitization (Buzan et al., 1998). Therefore, the audience's identification with the definition and proposed response to the alleged threat is the central factor in whether a successful securitization has occurred. It is about persuasion through an argument. Hence, it is clear that within the internal logic of the theory itself, the securitization concept actually captures the instances of particular strategic communication. Importantly, as the scholars and practitioners of the field of strategic crisis communication move to harness the theory of securitization (Schraedley et al., 2020), it should be reexamined and revised to fulfill the currently upheld normative commitments of the field.

Many theories of strategic communication emphasize the various roles of ethical and normative standards across the field's specific subareas such as public relations (e.g., Botan, 2018; Bowen 2004; Grunig, 2013), health communication (e.g., Dutta, 2007), and crisis communication (e.g., Littlefield et al., 2021). The ethical and normative commitments of the field stress notions such as truth, honesty, inclusiveness, equal or equitable representation of groups and individuals, the wellbeing of all stakeholders, and broader social responsibility. Hence, strategic communication literature offers a variety of works that can further inform this analysis.

Among the scholars of securitization theory, Floyd (2007; 2011; 2019) fashions a normative version of this framework. Specifically, she proposes that while in some cases securitization is indeed morally problematic, there are cases when securitization is not incorrect or merely neutral, but a morally correct approach to the situation. In short, as some security threats are real, securitization in those instances is the right thing to do. Furthermore, Floyd states that *just securitization theory* can be crafted along with the guidelines of *just cause*, *just referent object*, and *just means*. Importantly, Floyd's framework has been demonstrated as suitable for evaluating the ethical qualities of securitization surrounding the COVID-19 crisis (Dimari & Papadakis, 2022).

The basic structure of the analysis follows Floyd's framework. When relevant, the additional points from strategic communication literature are plugged in. The combination of Floyd's normative securitization and germane strategic communication works is creating a theoretical lens. A set of specific cases from Slovakia's counter-pandemic measures and communication are analyzed using this theoretical lens. Based on the analysis, relevant implications are drawn for both further theory building and practical application.

Analytical Results and Discussions

Just Cause

The guideline of *just cause* of securitization refers to the real nature of the existential threat (Floyd, 2011). As securitization can be and frequently is used as a political persuasive tool, it is

subject to possible exaggerations and distortions. Within strategic communication, practices such as exaggerations and distortions in information campaigns are considered unethical and thus are discouraged by the wider community of academics and practitioners (Hayes et al., 2013). Therefore, when constructing a strategic securitized frame, it is paramount that the depicted existential threat reasonably represents a peril to the referent object.

In the case of Slovakia, the two dominant competing frames surrounding the pandemic defined the cause of the existential threat to the country differently. One position focused on the health security threat to people's well-being while the other position focused on security as embodied in liberties (civil liberties, economic liberties, etc.). With the health security focus, the cause of the threat was defined as the COVID-19 disease, while with the liberties focus, the cause of the threat was defined as the actual anti-pandemic measures (Beblavy, 2020; Lukacovic 2020). This is a very important discrepancy as the two different securitizations would compete in the marketplace of ideas. Essentially, when speaking of existence and survival, it is likely to fall into the either-or type of thinking. So, it may encourage believing that just one is correct and just one refers to a true threat to security.

Based on the evidence of how the pandemic has been talked about in other countries, we can detect similar trends of two different competing securitizations with alternative positions on the cause [such as in the US as recapped based on Lukacovic (2020) in the introductory section of this article]. Hence, the findings from the Slovak case are not solely particular. These findings can serve as a useful case to provide more internationally generalizable theoretical recommendations in terms of the cause of the threat when building an ethically sound – securitized – strategic communication;

(1.) It is paramount to establish clear guidelines for identification of the cause of threat to a specific type of security.

(2.) When there are discrepancies in how the threat is identified within two or more frames, a clear and transparent set of guidelines should be established to consistently determine which frame reasonably outweighs other frame(s).

Communication and media practitioners, academics, and ethicists, along with other relevant experts, should jointly work on establishing the above-proposed guidelines for various crisis situations. This would mean that in health crises, medical professionals and public health officials ought to play a significant role in working on establishing and revising guidelines. But for example, in the case of environmental issues, among the included consulting experts there should be conservationists, natural scientists, etc.

Just Referent Object

The guideline of just referent object refers to the entity that is allegedly threatened according to the securitized narrative (Floyd, 2011). The guideline is based on the realization that not all political or social entities are equally worthy of protection through extraordinary measures. For instance, an extremist organization that advocates and uses abject violence such as the German Nazi Party or the terrorist organization ISIS would not be among the just referent objects that deserve to be safeguarded and preserved. From the perspective of strategic communication, there are also strong arguments for the importance of the represented entity's broader ethical commitments and practices. Therefore, the public relations practitioners are not meant to be a mere «clean-up crew», but significant decision-makers who contribute to creating respectable organizations, institutions, and states (Hayes et al., 2013).

In Slovakia, certain problematic tendencies occurred in how the referent object for securitization has been delineated. The first main problem was the narrative which excluded some groups from the perceived equal members of the nation who are threatened by the virus. This tendency stems from ethno-nationalist conceptions of the 'pure' Slovak nation. Such a view

excludes some or all ethnic minorities. Slovakia, a country of 5 million inhabitants, is home to several ethnic minorities, among which the Roma have a population of 450,000 and are disproportionately intensely impacted by poverty, health disparities, and racist attacks (Belak et al., 2017; Lajčáková, 2012). In the views of many Slovak far-right public figures, the Roma are not considered ‘white’ nor Slovak. Such exclusive conceptualizations of a nation are types of cultural violence (Galtung, 1990). Major problems occur when cultural violence is further weaponized to justify institutionalized unequal treatment (structural violence) or even outright physical attacks (direct violence).

Another main issue in Slovakia was connected to prejudicial discourse that privileged and marginalized certain groups in creating a type of hierarchy of worthy victims. COVID-19 has disproportionately affected the elderly or people with pre-existing conditions. Lukacovic et al. in Minielli et al. (2021) document that the Slovak people report substantial cases of ageism (age-based discrimination) within the society and in particular by the health care system and health professionals. This type of position reflects a form of cultural violence because it fails to acknowledge the elderly as the equally worthy part of the population. Some COVID-19 narratives dismissed the severity of the threat by alleging that «only» the elderly and sick are impacted. Furthermore, the Slovak extreme far-right influencers such as the group around the politician Milan Mazurek repeatedly mocked obese people and dismissed the disease as not a general problem, by which they have created a stigmatized and victim-blaming notion around those who might be gravely impacted. As the literature suggests, obese people are recurrently stigmatized in other contexts as well (Puhl et al., 2013).

In the US, criticisms have been also raised that the disease might not have been taken as seriously because it has disproportionately compromised people of color (Harrington, 2020). Therefore, the frames around security that do not perceive all citizens as equally worthy of protection are apparently not only occurring in Slovakia or for that matter in the CEE region but extend to a much wider level across the international community

The recommendations that stem from the analysis of the just referent object point to the importance of recognizing the equal value of all humans. Hence, the broader initiatives that fight for the establishment of consistent inclusivity are likely to create such systems, cultures, and consequent narratives that are inclusive and thus contribute to articulations of the more just referent objects of securitizations. However, the move toward fully inclusive societies is still ongoing and far from completion. Thus, it will be crucial to pay close attention to the inclusivity or lack thereof in the securitized frames.

With some other types of strategic securitizations that are not related solely to humans, additional considerations should be invested in the guidelines of delineating just referent objects. For example, when it comes to environmental degradation – how should the referent objects be portrayed? Should they include inanimate objects such as rock formations or plants? Again, pertinent experts in relevant fields should be joining ethicists along with practitioners and scholars of communication and media in broader discussions and determinations on the referent object guidelines for the ethical securitized crisis communication.

In sum, the following recommendations can be drawn based on the current findings:

(1.) It is paramount to be inclusive of all affected individuals and groups when discursively constructing a referent object of securitization.

(2.) When non-human entities and concepts are considered as a part of the proposed referent object, a clear and transparent set of guidelines should be established to determine the repercussions of these entities and concepts from the normative perspective.

Just Means

The guideline of just means is related to the extraordinary measures that are asserted via securitized framing. From the original conceptualizations of the theory, the acceptance of the policy that carries out the crucial extraordinary means by the audiences is the fundamental purpose of securitization. Hence Floyd (2011) stresses the importance of ethical commitments in outlining such extraordinary means that are appropriate for the threat and that minimize any residual negative impacts.

Floyd (2007) describes how some core foundations of the Copenhagen School securitization reflect consequentialist locus. In the ethics scholarship within the field of strategic communication, Bowen (2004) makes an argument for a more deontological/Kantian-oriented locus. Furthermore, the practical field of strategic communication frequently applies situational ethics, which does involve some plusses as media ethicist Ess (2014) advocates for the usefulness of virtue ethics in the era of global intercultural interdependencies and global media platforms. For Ess the flexibility paired with a thread of commitments within virtue ethics is the most fitting way to build inclusive normative platforms on transnational levels. In short, consequentialist approaches would likely allow a broader range of the extraordinary means as long as considerable positive outcomes are brought about by these means. Deontological approaches are stricter and allow only a specific set of means as acceptable across all cases. Situational and virtue ethics approaches propose judging and making decisions on a case-by-case basis.

In addition to the philosophical plethora of positions on how the desirable just means should be envisioned, when discussing securitized crisis communication, there is one more important distinction. It is quite vital for analysis as well as application implications to distinguish between the means as general policy measures when addressing the alleged threat and the actual means of communication around the securitization.

As far as the general counter-pandemic measures go in Slovakia, one gravely problematic aspect was connected to the treatment of the Roma individuals and policy towards Roma settlements in general (Holt, 2020). The members of this ethnic group were subjected to different policies, restrictions, and frequently were abused. So in this instance what is talked about are means used by authorities ranging from police to public health officials or medical professionals. However, even with such instances, there is a communication dimension involved as such policies are ideologically rooted in cultural violence, which is embodied in stereotypes against Roma. Galtung (1990) characterizes cultural violence as all cultural aspects of dehumanization, demeaning, or other forms of communication that serve to portray an entire group as less than the other groups. Cultural violence can become translated to structural measures, hence evolving into structural violence, like different and abusive treatment of the Roma. From the consequentialist angle, such measures did not maximize positive outcomes but only deepened the conflicts between members of the population. From the deontological angle, discriminatory measures of such type should never be acceptable. Yet, the prejudices and discrimination against the Roma are common across CEE and beyond (Matache & Bahbha, 2020). Thus, this issue is also analytically noteworthy for more generalizable recommendations.

Ethical securitization in strategic crisis communication should advocate only for measures that represent morally justifiable procedures. Discriminatory and outright structurally violent measures in the case of a pandemic or another serious crisis are not morally justifiable from any perspective. Even when considering very flexible consequentialist or situational approaches, the curbs on the spread of COVID-19 were unlikely significantly enhanced by discriminatory treatments. Contrary, the negative outcomes of such treatment of individuals are likely to breed more distrust and discord in societies, producing grave long-term negative effects on multiple levels. So the first recommendation suggests:

(1.) General means to counter the security threat should be inclusive and non-discriminatory. For communication to be considered 'just', it should be used to advance and advocate for only such inclusive and nondiscriminatory means. Similarly, communication means must be inclusive and non-discriminatory.

Furthermore, Slovakia also witnessed communication-specific problematic means when dealing with the pandemic. In 2020, the governmental coalition of then serving Prime Minister Igor Matovic passed the Act on Electronic Communication, which has been perceived by some critics as violating the rights and liberties related to the privacy of citizens (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2020). According to the accounts from across the world (Roumate, 2021), Slovakia's experience with privacy-violating policies was not unique either, but rather symptomatic of a larger transnational problem.

The crucial implication from the specific case of privacy violations represents a complex challenge. On one hand, the protection of privacy has repercussions that are vital for democracy (Ess, 2014). On the other hand, the liberty versus security debate is not resolved and clear lines where one should trump the other have not been consensually drawn yet. Thus, at this point following two recommendations can be outlined:

(2.) Communication measures should reflect the established normative consensus.

(3.) In cases that are complicated and unresolved, and hence a general consensus does not exist, the applied communication measures should be based on a temporary consensus or compromise that is achieved through a transparent inclusive discussion between relevant stakeholders and experts.

With the previous set of recommendations in this article, it would be acceptable to leave the decisions to technocrats. However, means to address massive crises like the pandemic that impact many people, it is very important to create more wide-ranging platforms for discussion where different perspectives can be truly heard.

Another example of problematic communication means in Slovakia was the instance of exclusively digitalized procedures for some crucial counter-pandemic measures. During the early roll-out stages of the vaccination, other than a digital option for registration did not exist. Hence, a portion of the population was effectively excluded from access to the resources. Importantly, those who are likely to experience technology use and access disparities are disproportionately more likely to be elderly, people who live in poverty, and Roma people. Furthermore, those are exactly the groups that were already very vulnerable to grave health impacts of COVID-19. Lukacovic et al. in Minielli et al. (2021) found that many Slovaks perceive there is a high degree of disparities based on elderly age and low socioeconomic status in the health care system. It can be summarized, that the marginalized in Slovakia were subjected to an intersectional combination of preexisting disparities and newer disparities, including the use of digital media. Also, in this aspect, Slovakia is not an exception but an example of problems that are somewhat universal across societies. The issues of access to and ability to use digital technologies and means of communication contribute to the rise of digital disparities that often further exacerbate other already existing disparities (Robinson et al., 2015).

The implication in this specific case reflects the already established first recommendation in this subsection (the means-specific subsection) in the sense that it echoes the importance of inclusivity. The just communication means that are used to disseminate the information and that are expected to be utilized by the public in access to help need to be equitably available. To achieve this, the responsible authorities must be keenly aware of the existing barriers and issues. Furthermore, the authorities must be working towards countering all disparities, not perpetuating, let alone exacerbating them. Furthermore, upholding the third recommendation from this

subsection, so creating widely-representative discussions around means, would be tremendously helpful in addressing disparities that may emerge due to the issues with the securitization measures.

This section of analytical results and subsequent discussions is outlining a few specific sets of recommendations. However, it is imperative to recognize that this is just a first step toward addressing the normative dimension of securitization as strategic crisis communication theory. The scope of the recommendations is limited by the nature of the analyzed cases in Slovakia. Although, as demonstrated through the discussions, the Slovak experience is not merely idiosyncratic but reflects problems that occur in various other contexts within the region of CEE and beyond. Still, other countries and societies can provide different cases that can further serve to theorize and refine the proposed recommendations. Also, future researchers should explore other types of crises to outline further recommendations that are more specific for different situations or can help to draw additional general implications.

Conclusions

This article aims to advance the development of the normative dimension of securitization as strategic crisis communication theory. Securitization is a powerful persuasive tool because it builds an argument that an existential threat is looming and extraordinary measures should be employed to counter it (Buzan et al., 1998; Vultee in Balzacq, 2010; Watson, 2012). The theorization in this article is based on an analysis exploring a set of cases of Slovakia's counter-pandemic measures during the first two years of the COVID-19 outbreak in the country. The case study of Slovakia is very informative because the instances there reflect a broader collection of problems that are experienced across various global societies; for example a failure to introduce measures that are inclusive of the marginalized people in terms of ethno-racial discrimination or digital disparities. The analysis helps to extract an array of practical recommendations that aim to craft ethically-sound securitized discourses for persuasive purposes during crises. The framework proposed by Floyd (2011; 2019) is used as the main scaffold for normative securitization and is further enhanced by the relevant ethics standards of the strategic communication field, leading to the following lineup of recommendations;

I. Just cause of securitization:

(1.) It is paramount to establish clear guidelines for the identification of the cause of threat to a specific type of security.

(2.) When there are discrepancies in how the threat is identified within two or more frames, a clear and transparent set of guidelines should be established to consistently determine which frame reasonably outweighs other frame(s).

II. Just referent object of securitization:

(1.) It is paramount to be inclusive of all affected individuals and groups when discursively constructing a referent object of securitization.

(2.) When non-human entities and concepts are considered as a part of the proposed referent object, a clear and transparent set of guidelines should be established to determine the repercussions of these entities and concepts from the normative perspective.

III. Just means of securitization:

(1.) General means to counter the security threat should be inclusive and non-discriminatory. For communication to be considered 'just', it should be used to advance and advocate for only such

inclusive and nondiscriminatory means. Similarly, communication means must be inclusive and non-discriminatory.

(2.) Communication measures should reflect the established normative consensus.

(3.) In cases that are complicated and unresolved, and hence a general consensus does not exist, the applied communication measures should be based on a temporary consensus or compromise that is achieved through a transparent inclusive discussion between relevant stakeholders and experts.

References

- Adler, E. (2013) Constructivism in international relations: Sources, contributions, and debates. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, & B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *The handbook of international relations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 112–144). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Al-Sharafat, S. (2020, May 11). Securitization of the coronavirus crisis in Jordan: Successes and limitations. *Washington Institute for Near East Policy*. Retrieved at <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/fikraforum/view/COVID-19-Jordan-Middle-East-Securitization>
- Austin, J. L., & Beaulieu-Brossard, P. (2017). (De)securitization dilemmas: Theorizing the simultaneous enactment of securitization and desecuritization. *Review of International Studies*, 44(2), 301–323. doi:10.1017/S0260210517000511
- Belak, A., Madarasova Geckova, A., van Dijk, J.P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2017). Health-endangering everyday settings and practices in rural segregated Roma settlement in Slovakia: A descriptive summary from an exploratory longitudinal case study. *BMC Public Health*, 17. DOI 10.1186/s12889-017-4029-x
- Beblavy, M. (2020). How Slovakia flattened the curve. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/06/slovakia-coronavirus-pandemic-public-trust-media/>
- Bengtsson, L., & Rhinard, M. (2019). Securitization across borders: The case of ‘health security’ cooperation in the European Union. *West European Politics*, 42(2), 346–368.
- Botan, C. (2018). *Strategic communication theory and practice: The cocreational model*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bowen, S. A. (2004). Expansion of ethics as the tenth generic principle of public relations excellence: A Kantian theory and model for managing ethical issues. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 16(1), 65–92.
- Buzan, B., & Waever, O. (2009). Macrosecuritization and security constellations: reconsidering scale in securitization theory. *Review of International Studies*, 35, 253–276. doi: 10.1017/S0260210509008511
- Buzan, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Pub.
- Dimari, G. & Papadakis, N. (2022). The securitization of the COVID-19 pandemic in Greece: A just or unjust securitization? *Quality & Quantity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01341-9>
- Dolinec, V. (2010). The role of mass media in the securitization process of international terrorism. *Politické Vedy/The Journal of Political Sciences*, 1(2), 8–32.
- Dutta, M. J. (2007). Communicating about culture and health: Theorizing culture-centered and cultural sensitivity approaches. *Communication Theory*, 17(3), 304–328.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51–58.

- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: contesting the white house's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20, 415–432. doi: 10.1080/10584600390244176
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2020). *Coronavirus COVID-19 Outbreak in the EU Fundamental Rights Implications*. Slovakia. Retrieved at https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/slovakia-report-covid-19-april-2020_en.pdf
- Ess, C. (2014). *Digital media ethics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA; Polity Press.
- Floyd, R. (2007). Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: Bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 33, 327–350.
- Floyd, R. (2011). Can securitization theory be used in normative analysis? Towards a just securitization theory. *Security Dialogue*, 42(4–5), 427–439.
- Floyd, R. (2019). Collective securitization in the EU: Normative dimensions. *Western European Politics*, 42(2), 391–412.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291–305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005>
- Grančayová, M. (2021). Plagues of Egypt – the COVID-19 crisis and the role of securitization dilemmas in the authoritarian regime survival strategies in Egypt and Turkey. *Czech Journal of International Relations*, 56(1), 69–97.
- Grunig, J. E. (2013). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harrington, C. N. (2020). Opinion: Poor, Older Black Americans are an Afterthought in the COVID-19 Crisis. *PBS*. Retrieved from: <https://www.pbs.org/wnet/chasing-the-dream/stories/opinion-poor-older-black-americans-afterthought-covid-19/>
- Hayes, D. C., Hendrix, J. A. & Kumar, P.D. (2013). *Public relations cases* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Holt, E. (2020). COVID-19 lockdown of Roma settlements in Slovakia. *The Lancet*, 20(6). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30381-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30381-9)
- Kirk, J., & McDonald, M. (2021). The politics of exceptionalism: Securitization and COVID-19. *Global Studies Quarterly*, 1(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksab024>
- Krasna, J. (2020, April 13). Securitization and politics in the Israeli COVID-19 response. *Foreign Policy Research Institute*. Retrieved at <https://www.fpri.org/article/2020/04/securitization-and-politics-in-the-israeli-covid-19-response/>
- Lajčáková, J. (2012, November 22). Changing the story about minorities in Slovakia. *Open Society Foundation*. Retrieved at <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/changing-story-about-minorities-slovakia>
- Littlefield, R. S., Sellnow, D. D., & Sellnow, T. L. (2021). *Integrated marketing communications in risk and crisis contexts: A culture-centered approach*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books – Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lukacovic, M. N. (2020). «Wars» on COVID-19 in Slovakia, Russia, and the United States; Securitized framing and reframing of political and media communication around the pandemic. *Frontiers in Communication*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.583406>
- Lukacovic, M. N., Sellnow-Richmond, D. D., & Durechova, M. (2021). The role of Internet-user-generated content in exposing corruption and ageism in Slovak health care. In M. Minielli, M. N. Lukacovic, S. A. Samoilenko, M. Finch, & D. Uecker (Eds.), *Media and public relations research in post-socialist societies* (pp. 201–224). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books – Rowman & Littlefield.

- Maertens, L. (2019). From blue to green? Environmentalization and securitization in UN peacekeeping practices. *International Peacekeeping*, 26, 302–326. doi: 10.1080/13533312.2019.1579648
- Matache, M., & Bahbha, J. (2020, April 7). Anti-Roma racism is spiraling during COVID-19 pandemic. *Health and Human Rights Journal*. Retrieved at <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2020/04/anti-roma-racism-is-spiraling-during-covid-19-pandemic/>
- Puhl, R., Luedicke, J., & Heuer, C. (2013). The stigmatizing effect of visual media portrayals of obese persons on public attitudes: Does race or gender matter? *Journal of Health Communication*, 18(7), 805–826. Doi.org.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/10.1080/10810730.2012.757393
- Robinson, L., Cotton, S. R., Ono, H., Quan-Haase, A., Mesch, G., Chen, W., Schulz, J., Hale, T. M & Stern, M. J. (2015) Digital inequalities and why they matter. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 569-582, doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1012532
- Rogers, P (2020, September 29). COVID-19: The dangers of securitization. *Oxford Research Group*. Retrieved at <https://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/covid-19-the-dangers-of-securitisation>
- Roumate, F. (2021). Artificial intelligence, ethics and international human rights law. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 29(3). doi.org/10.29173/irrie422
- Schraedley, M.K., Bean, H., Dempsey, S.E., Dutta, M.J., Hunt, K.P., Ivancic, S.R., LeGreco, M., Okamoto, K., Sellnow, T. (2020). Food (in)security communication: A Journal of Applied Communication Research forum addressing current challenges and future possibilities. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 48(2), 166–185. doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2020.1735648
- Sperling, J., & Webber, M. (2019). The European Union: Security governance and collective securitization. *West European Politics*, 42, 228–260. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2018.1510193
- Vivek, N. D. (2020, August 9). India’s health securitization under the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Health Policies Network*. Retrieved at <https://www.internationalhealthpolicies.org/featured-article/indias-health-securitisation-under-the-covid-19-pandemic/>
- Vultee, F. (2010). Securitization as a media frame. In T. Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* (pp. 77–93). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Watson, S. D. (2012). ‘Framing’ the Copenhagen School: Integrating the literature on threat construction. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(2), 279–301.
- World Health Organization. (2022, March 29). Overview. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. Retrieved at <https://covid19.who.int>

Нормативний вимір сек'юритизації як теорія стратегічної кризової комунікації. Уроки пандемії COVID-19 у Центральній та Східній Європі

Марта Наталія Лукакович,

доктор філософії, доцент кафедри комунікації та масової інформації,

Університет штату Анджело –

Система Техаського технічного університету

(м. Сан-Анджело, Техас, США)

Анотація

Мета дослідження. Стаття спрямована на розвиток нормативного виміру сек'юритизації як теорії стратегічної кризової комунікації. Сек'юритизація є потужним переконливим інструментом, оскільки вона створює аргументи про те, що екзистенційна загроза назріває, і для протидії їй слід застосувати надзвичайні заходи (Buzan et al., 1998; Vultee in Balzacq, 2010; Watson, 2012).

Методи й методики дослідження. Теоретизація в цій статті ґрунтується на аналізі, який досліджує низку випадків контрпандемічних заходів Словаччини протягом перших двох років спалаху COVID-19 у країні.

Результати й обговорення. Дослідження Словаччини є інформативним, оскільки приклади відображають ширший спектр проблем, із якими стикаються різні глобальні суспільства; наприклад, нездатність запровадити заходи, які б охоплювали маргіналізованих людей із точки зору етнорасової дискримінації або цифрової диспропорції. Аналіз допомагає отримати набір практичних рекомендацій, які спрямовані на створення етично обґрунтованих сек'юритизованих дискурсів для переконливих цілей під час криз. Структура, запропонована Флойдом (2011; 2019), використовується як основний каркас для нормативної сек'юритизації й додатково доповнена відповідними етичними стандартами сфери стратегічних комунікацій, що призвело до введеної низки рекомендацій.

Висновки. Автором подані рекомендації щодо застосування способів сек'юритизації: 1) установлення причин сек'юритизації (визначення причини загрози конкретному типові безпеки; установлення чіткого й прозорого набору керівних принципів, щоб послідовно визначити, який кадр обґрунтовано переважає інший(і) фрейм(и)); 2) урахування референтного об'єкта сек'юритизації (включення всіх постраждалих осіб і групи; установлення чіткого й прозорого набору керівних принципів для визначення наслідків нелюдських сутностей та концепцій із нормативної точки зору).

Ключові слова: сек'юритизація, теорія стратегічної кризи, теорія нормативної комунікації, комунікація щодо COVID-19, комунікація щодо пандемії, Словаччина.

Submitted to the editor – 01.04.2022

Review 1 – 18.04.2022

Review 2 – 30.04.2022

Accepted for printing – 24.06.2022

Подано до редакції – 01.04.2022

Рецензія 1 – 18.04.2022

Рецензія 2 – 30.04.2022

Прийнято до друку – 24.06.2022

