

Bernard Wiśniewski
Paweł Lubiewski

Threat as a eufunctional factor to the state security system

Zagrożenie jako czynnik eufunkcjonalny systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa

The article is dedicated to the problem of the impact of threats on the state security system in a functional context. The threat-security system relationship is dynamically variable, therefore it seems necessary to study the relationship on various levels, also in terms of the functional significance of risks for the state safety system.

Key words: state security, state security system, security threats, entity security environment, security system dynamics, threat dynamics.

Artykuł poświęcony jest problematyce wpływu zagrożeń na system bezpieczeństwa państwa w kontekście funkcjonalnym. Relacja zagrożenie-system bezpieczeństwa jest zmienna dynamicznie, dlatego wydaje się konieczne badanie tej zależności na różnych poziomach, także pod kątem funkcjonalnego znaczenia ryzyk dla systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa.

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczeństwo państwa, system bezpieczeństwa państwa, zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa, środowisko bezpieczeństwa podmiotu, dynamika systemu bezpieczeństwa, dynamika zagrożeń.

Introduction

There is no longer any doubt that one of the essential features of human safety is its volatility. Although the contemporary scientific output in the cognitive field of security is expanding, the thread of theoretical considerations in terms of its variability is not all too often found in scientific publications. It is therefore worth taking a slightly broader look at that context. Usually, the changeability of security is directly associated with the dynamics of the environment in which man exists. It shall be assumed that such an approach refers to the objective dimension of reality, represented by one of its fundamental characteristics, namely variability seen in a time perspective. However, the broadly understood changeability of safety is also influenced by a subjective factor, created by man. The perception and understanding of security is of considerable importance for the volatility of security. In both the objective and subjective aspects, this variation is fundamentally affected by the threat to the actor of security.

The aim of this article is to provide an answer to the question: how do contemporary threats, as a highly variable factor, affect the state security system? Based on the analysis of the literature on the subject, the hypothesis is that threats as undesirable factors in the subject's security sphere have a destructive effect on safety and thus on the state security system. A number of theoretical methods such as analysis, synthesis, abstraction, generalisation, inference, explanation, as well as empirical methods in the form of literature analysis and criticism, document research or, to a basic extent, system analysis according to Merton, have been used to obtain an appropriate answer to such a question.

Volatility of the security environment and variability of threats

An analysis of the definitional scope of security indicates that the impact of a person's environment is what shapes their security. This is indicated, among others, by Ryszard Zięba, who, in his suggested definition of security, claims that safety is „the certainty of existence and survival, possession and functioning as well as development of an entity”, pointing out at the

same time that this certainty is the effect of the absence of threats (they do not occur or have been neutralised), but also of the creative activity of the subject, which has a social and changeable character¹. Włodzimierz Fehler likewise defines security as „a state of certainty and tranquillity resulting from a low level of threats, the presence of positive development prospects and effective means of protection against negatively valued phenomena and processes”². Bernard Wiśniewski also notes that „the etymology of the word security in many languages (including Polish) highlights the primordially of the sense of danger in relation to the sense of certainty of one’s safety (without care, i.e. without sufficient protection)”³. These are just some instances of definitions of security, as it is impossible to address all of them within the framework of a short academic article. However, these examples already point to threat as a fundamental element of the environment that shapes security. Although not all attempts to define the concept of security directly refer to the subject-environment relationship of safety, the consequence is that such a relationship is taken into account⁴. This stems from the undeniable regularity that every security entity, whether collective or individual, functions in a particular environment, which is to be understood as the totality of conditions affecting it, i.e. those external, but also internal to the entity. The reflections presented so far allow for the identification of the fundamental category of threats to any subject – these are risks to its broadly understood existence (including its development), direct or indirect.

The above-mentioned relationship cannot be studied in isolation from the reality in which that entity subsists. The extraordinary complexity of modern social relations determines the high degree of complexity of the state security environment. Today „the state as the organisation of a large social group still remains the most important organisational unit of the modern world, (although, as it turns out, an increasing number of theorists have doubts regarding it)”⁵. The progressive process of globalisation of

¹ R. Zięba, Introduction. *Pozimnowojenny paradygmat bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego* [in:] R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe po zimnej wojnie*, Warszawa 2008.

² W. Fehler, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne współczesnej Polski. Aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, Warszawa 2012, p. 9.

³ B. Wiśniewski, *Pojęcie oraz typologie bezpieczeństwa i zagrożeń* [in:] B. Wiśniewski (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo w teorii i badaniach naukowych*, Szczytno 2011, p. 12.

⁴ More, B. Wiśniewski, *System bezpieczeństwa państwa. Konteksty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, Szczytno 2013, pp. 37–48.

⁵ Z. Ścibiorek, B. Wiśniewski, R.B. Kuc, A. Dawidczyk, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne. Podręcznik akademicki*, Toruń 2015, p. 365.

many spheres of modern, state activity makes it increasingly difficult for the institution of the state to define the boundaries of its action, to identify the spheres of its exclusivity. It is believed that ,the boundaries of the state are vague, undefined, in many dimensions transparent, ephemeral. In its external environment there is a huge, ever-growing number of organisations of various types: political, economic, cultural, religious, financial, environmental, terrorist, criminal and others. Thus, they range from states to large industrial corporations, religious associations, humanitarian organisations, political parties, international communities – in a nutshell, organisations-institutions separated from their environment (...) But in the environment of the state there will also be whole groups, social communities, local, ethnic and national populations with diverse cultures, and global society. Finally, human beings, socio-psycho-physical entities, the plant and animal worlds and man-made artefacts”⁶. There is no denying that the security environment arena is increasingly being filled by non-state actors as well.

In a more comprehensive analysis of the literature on the security environment of a state, its defence system, it can be assumed that the safety landscape of a contemporary state is conditioned by four fundamental conceptual categories, such as opportunities, challenges, risks and threats. What are they, how to understand them? There is little discussion in the literature on this subject. One suggestion appears in a study entitled ,Challenges, Opportunities, Threats and Risks for the National Security of the Republic of Poland of an Internal Character’, edited by Ryszard Jakubczak and Bernard Wisniewski. According to the authors, a challenge ought to be called „a difficult task posed by a situation, or rather our perception of its evolution or that of other people”⁷. Undoubtedly, that term should refer to the future and, as the authors assert – „A challenge does not indicate an unambiguously positive or negative situation. Rather, it tells of the difficulty of tackling a phenomenon or a group of people, the effects of which cannot be predicted”⁸. The specifics of the concept are aptly described by the idea that „the more sceptical we are about the possibility of winning, the more we are inclined to use the term jeopardy. As the pejorative assessment of the

⁶ Ibidem.

⁷ R. Jakubczak, B. Wiśniewski, *Wyzwania, szanse, zagrożenia i ryzyko dla bezpieczeństwa narodowego RP o charakterze wewnętrznym*, Szczytno 2016, p. 56.

⁸ Ibidem.

situation increases, so does the degree of hardship and effort we have to put in to overcome the challenge”⁹. It can consequently be concluded that challenges can be decomposed into either threats, if taking them entails negative consequences for the operator, or opportunities, if the outcome is desired by the security actor. How to understand then, within the framework of the deliberations conducted here, what opportunities are. This concept is linked to the goal the security actor is pursuing or intends to achieve. An opportunity is the possibility of attaining the envisaged goal. Undoubtedly, that category is viewed positively by the subject, as „a chance is the perception in action of circumstances conducive to the accomplishment of an intended objective or a dare to improve one’s situation in the future”¹⁰. An opportunity is intimately associated with risk, since the possibility of achieving an objective, which is an occasion for the security entity, is subject to the probability of uncertainty of its completion, and hence the failure to take advantage of the chance, or even the emergence of undesirable situations resulting from the action taken, which may in fact be a threat to the entity.

As such, whether the subject of security is a state, a nation or a smaller social group or a human individual, it can be assumed on the basis of the foregoing considerations that, in the objective context, the actor’s security is shaped by the safety environment in which he or she operates, while in the subjective context, it is shaped by his or her consciousness, which is the place where this environment is interpreted.

The preceding thought, rather briefly presented due to editorial constraints, makes it impossible to resist the impression that the all-pervasive category of hazard is decisive for the subject’s assessment of the security environment. It must be taken into account when addressing challenges, must be considered when seeking to exploit an opportunity, and is closely linked to risk.

Variation in risk perceptions

Threat appears as a fundamental, elementary factor determining the security of an entity. Historically, threat has been seen as the most

⁹ Ibidem.

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 58.

important factor affecting human security. For centuries, it was referred to threats of a military nature. This subjective element influencing the entity's security consciousness, which was mentioned at the beginning of the article, appears to be dependent on both quantitative and qualitative hazard dynamics at the relevant time for generation(s). In more recent history, the traditional understanding of security was represented in science and politics by the Cold War paradigm. It was characterised by an understanding of safety as a consequence of the realities of the bipolar order existing at the time and the persistent threat of armed conflict between the rival West-East blocs. In such an environment, due to the natural threat of conflict, the participants (countries) were in a state of constant anxiety and uncertainty about their own survival and the intentions of other countries. Ensuring one's own security was becoming the most important goal of states' activities and thus the main problem of international relations. These objectives were to be achieved through a policy of power, leading to states maximising their might, understood as the ability to pursue their own national interest and impose its will on the other participants in international relations. The essence of the security concept was determined by two factors:

- the concept of 'security' referred exclusively to the political-military sphere;
- threats were understood primarily as the danger of military aggression by other states.

At the time, a state-centric understanding of „security” prevailed¹¹.

In a way, an upheaval in the understanding of the subject's security came with the end of the 'Cold War', when the post-Cold War paradigm took shape in the field under consideration here. Typical of this direction is a departure from a narrow understanding of safety, concerning only the military sphere, perhaps supplemented by an economic aspect. In such an understanding of safety, in addition to the survival of the state as a geopolitical entity and the maintenance of territorial integrity, equally important are the broadly understood quality of life of the population, its welfare, the preservation of its identity and the assurance for the chance of further development. There is a move away from the state-centric Cold War model, which saw the state as essentially the only subject as

¹¹ More, Z. Ciekanowski, *Działania asymetryczne jako źródło zagrożeń bezpieczeństwa*, „Bezpieczeństwo i technika pożarnicza” 2009, nr 3, pp. 47-72.

well as object of security, towards recognising as separate subjects not only the state, but also the international system taken as a whole, and non-governmental actors – specific human collectives, social groups or individuals.

Implications of threats on the state security system

In the light of the above, it is worth noting that it is the dynamics of threats that have had a decisive impact on the security paradigm shift. The significant reduction of the danger of armed conflict has influenced a broader perception of other, non-military threats. It is not only a change in security awareness, a different perception and understanding of the security environment, but also an activity aimed at shaping safety in one's environment by, for example, creating, modifying, improving the state security system.

It is appropriate, then, to ponder what relevance threats have for the shape of the state security system. Given the pejorative nature of dangers, their negative impact on the level of security, and the fact that they are highly socially undesirable, it might be assumed that for the state security system, as an entity designed to protect against factors negatively affecting safety, hazard will have a destructive function. But is it only disruptive?

For the analysis of this problem, the concept of functions by Robert King Merton, the father of modified functional theory (representative of structural functionalism in sociology), and particularly his concept of overt and covert functions, shall be useful. Without going into the essence of his concept, it should only be recalled that Merton considered observable effects that contribute to the adaptation and modification of a particular social system to be functions of that system. Dysfunctions are the observable results that diminish the aforementioned adaptation or modification. Functions are understood here as the result of certain processes and are divided into eufunctions, when we are dealing with phenomena or factors leading to the development of the system and the strengthening of its developmental resources, and dysfunctions, when phenomena, destabilising factors act, jeopardising the integration of the social system. Merton assumed that a phenomenon can generate both functional and dysfunctional effects. Against such a background,

he derived the concepts of overt and covert functions. Overt functions manifest themselves in objective consequences that contribute to the modification or adaptation of a system and these are intended and acknowledged by its participants. Implicit functions, on the contrary, are those that are neither intended nor conscious. It is useful to add at this point, with regard to the latent function, that, according to Merton, there are three types of unintended effects of action on the system. Some of these are functional to the system in question – they contain hidden functions. Others are dysfunctional, and contain latent dysfunctions. Finally, the last ones, which do not act on the system, neither functionally nor dysfunctionally, so towards the system they are non-functional. According to Stefan Nowak „the theorists of functionalism recommend that in the functional analysis of certain systems one should not stop at recording the overt functions performed by particular elements for the system under consideration, but emphasise the necessity of tracing the hidden functions, i.e. the non-obvious effects of the action of a certain element on the system in which or on which it acts”¹².

It seems that threats in the life of society, but also of the individual human being, are not a welcome feature, they are a negative element for the being and its development. Referring to this thought, it is appropriate to carry out a brief analysis of the definition of the term threat. An interesting position on the identification of hazards is presented by Stanisław Śladkowski, who believes that a hazard is a situation in which „there is a possibility of human injury and material damage to the environment or a combination thereof caused by material factors or their complexes: stresses, disturbances, destruction, pollution and contamination. This phenomenon, manifested in the material sphere, leads to a lowering of the level of existence of society, a reduction in economic activity, a depletion of prosperity due to losses that have to be compensated”¹³. An attempt to define the term „threat” was also made by Brunon Hołyst, who, from a psychological point of view, regards threat as „a difficult situation that occurs when there is a fear of losing a value highly cherished by the subject (life, career, income, object of love)”¹⁴. Franz-Xaver Kaufmann, on the other hand, sees threat as, „the probability of the occurrence of

¹² S. Nowak, *Metodologia badań społecznych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2012, p. 420.

¹³ S. Śladkowski, *Bezpieczeństwo ekologiczne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Warszawa 2003, p. 27.

¹⁴ L. Korzeniowski, S. Pużyński (ed.), *Encyklopedyczny słownik psychiatrii*, Warszawa 1986, p. 535.

one of the negatively valued phenomena”¹⁵. In the above context, it seems interesting that the threat can be seen in different dimensions, as Daniel Frei pointed out, for example:

- „state of insecurity (existence of danger) – occurs when there is a high genuine threat and the perception of it is correct,
- obsessive state – occurs when a minor threat is perceived as a major one,
- state of false security – when the threat is serious but is perceived to be mild,
- a state of safety – occurs when the external threat is low and its perception is correct”¹⁶.

Risks are also described as „physical or social phenomena causing a state of uncertainty and fear, i.e. violating the sense of security. Since the sense of security affects all areas of human life and activity creating a multidimensional vector of psychological comfort of people ‚feeling secure’, hence also dangers to this security encompass the whole spectrum of phenomena taking away said comfort in particular areas of life and activity or their diverse configuration”¹⁷.

These are only some of the many definitions of threat, but each of them defines jeopardy as something negatively affecting the security of the subject¹⁸. After this synthetic review of definitions, let us assume for the purposes of this discussion, following Ryszard Zięba, that threat is, „a certain state of psyche or consciousness caused by the perception of phenomena that are assessed as unfavourable or dangerous”¹⁹.

Apart from explaining the nature of the threat, the multidimensionality of the problem says a lot about the specificity of the danger. In the scientific literature relevant to the subject of this discussion, a multiple typology of hazards can be found. The most common sources of hazards include forces of nature related to the natural environment, which can result in natural disasters, epidemics of infectious diseases of humans and animals and technical failures. However, it is also engineering failures

¹⁵ F.X. Kaufmann, *Sicherheit als soziologisches und sozialpolitisches Problem*, Stuttgart 1970, p. 167.

¹⁶ D. Frei, *Sicherheit: Grundfragen der Weltpolitik*, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1977, pp. 17-21.

¹⁷ P. Guła, J. Prońko, B. Wiśniewski, *Zarządzanie informacją w sytuacjach kryzysowych*, Bielsko-Biała 2009, p.13.

¹⁸ More, P. Lubiewski, A. Dróżdż, „Zeszyty Naukowe Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej w Legnicy” 2020, nr 34(1).

¹⁹ R. Zięba, *Kategoria bezpieczeństwa w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych* [in:] D.B. Bobrow, E. Halizak, R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku*, Warszawa 1997, p. 4.

associated with man-made infrastructure that can result in technical and environmental disasters and outbreaks of infectious human and animal illnesses. The main contributors also include social conflicts within a community and with surrounding communities, which can lead to internal and external war, terrorism, crime, unemployment and poverty²⁰. From the above example of the breakdown of hazard sources, it is clear that all hazardous situations for humans and the environment arise through natural forces or human activity²¹.

Another important issue that arises when reflecting on the typology of threats is the division into non-military and military. Undoubtedly, this is one of the most common criteria for dividing the aforementioned theme. Due to its special place in the literature on the subject under consideration, the above division is frequently the starting point for many security studies.

In the literature, it is also possible to find a breakdown of security threats based on subject and object criteria. The former, owing to its complexity, often takes many forms. According to the subject criterion, Włodzimierz Fehler, for example, distinguishes the following division of threats: political, economic, military, ecological, social, cultural, informational²². Ryszard Jakubczak and Józef Flis, on the other hand, propose a separation of hazards into: political, military, economic, ecological, terrorism and social (socio-cultural)²³. According to Włodzimierz Fehler, the previous classification of threats should be supplemented by at least three other divisions such as: military and non-military, real and potential, internal and external²⁴. Jacek Pawłowski, on the contrary, takes the view that today risks can be broken down into: potential and real, external and internal, subjective and objective, military and non-military, crisis and wartime²⁵. Meanwhile, Stanisław Dworecki proposes in this respect a division of threats according to the sources of causal causes, leading

²⁰ More, J. Prońko, B. Wiśniewski, *Klasyfikacja zagrożeń* [in:] K. Liedel, J. Prońko, B. Wiśniewski (ed.), *Administracja publiczna w systemie przeciwdziałania nadzwyczajnym zagrożeniom dla ludzi i środowiska*, Bielsko-Biała – Warszawa, 2007, p. 14.

²¹ Ibidem, p. 11.

²² More, W. Fehler, *Zagrożenie – kluczowa kategoria teorii bezpieczeństwa* [in:] K. Jałoszyński, B. Wiśniewski, T. Wojtuszek (ed.), *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa*, Bielsko-Biała 2007, pp. 38-39.

²³ More, R. Jakubczak, J. Flis, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XXI wieku. Wyzwania i strategie*, Bellona, Warszawa 2006, pp. 110-114.

²⁴ More, W. Fehler, *Zagrożenie – kluczowa kategoria teorii bezpieczeństwa...*, op. cit., p. 42.

²⁵ J. Pawłowski, *Strategiczne dylematy początku XXI wieku* [in:] K. Jałoszyński, B. Wiśniewski, T. Wojtuszek (ed.), *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa...*, op. cit., p. 54.

to the emergence of the hazard. He distinguishes between external and internal threats. The former refer to the violation of principles such as inviolability of borders, non-interference in internal affairs by other states, while the latter refer to all actions causing destabilisation and infringement of fundamental values, i.e. quality and conditions of life, political independence, sovereignty²⁶. A separate group of hazards are those referred to as 'extraordinary threats to people and the environment'. These include those emergencies that „we cannot counter individually. In order to sustain as little damage as possible as a result of their occurrence and, as quickly as possible, to restore the normal functioning of the community, we need to take joint action. Resisting such risks appears to be one of the essential prerequisites for the formation of societies and states”²⁷. Another interesting classification of threats is proposed by Bernard Wiśniewski due to „direct or indirect destructive influences on the subject”²⁸. All the cited typologies of security threats given above clearly indicate a wide spectrum of interpretations of the issue listed previously, pointing unequivocally to a threat as a situation, an event, an undesirable factor, negatively valued in relation to security.

Modern states have developed a significant number of solutions, mechanisms, instruments, procedures, for maintaining the desired level of their security, which are located in the actors and the resources they use. The degree of their intricacy depends, of course, on the wealth of the state, but also on the assessment of the security environment. Such a structure composed of many subsystems is called the state security system. This creation was envisaged for the implementation of tasks in the field of security as an internally coordinated set of organisational, human and material elements, aimed at countering all threats to the state, in particular political, military, economic, ecological, cultural, informational and social ones²⁹. Solutions of an inter-national nature that are an output of the global community cannot be omitted here either.

A number of questions may be formulated here, e.g. would the international system for combating terrorism have developed, both formally and institutionally, to its present form, were it not for the terrorist activity

²⁶ More, S. Dworecki, *Zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa państwa*, Warszawa 1994, pp. 24-28.

²⁷ K. Liedel, J. Prońko, B. Wiśniewski (ed.), *Administracja publiczna w systemie przeciwdziałania nadzwyczajnym zagrożeniom dla ludzi i środowiska*, Bielsko-Biała 2007, p. 5.

²⁸ B. Wiśniewski et al., *Bezpieczeństwo procesów decyzyjnych*, Wrocław 2018, p. 10.

²⁹ *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Warszawa 2008.

of Muslim fundamentalists in recent years? Would the global, but also national, systems for combating organised crime in the broadest sense of the term have the dimension they have today, were it not for the particular dynamics of the threats generated in this sphere? Would cyber-security systems be as they are today were it not for the experience gained from emerging dangers in this domain? Would an integrated external border surveillance system in the European Union have reached the complex shape it has today? Would mechanisms for reducing and countering hybrid threats have been developed internationally at the current level were it not for their scale and scope of impact? Finally, would our knowledge of the threats, which makes it possible to reduce and even counter them to a significant extent, be so rich if we were not subjected to them intensively? The answer is „no”. Many more such questions could be asked. The answers unambiguously indicate that it is the threats that have a considerable, even decisive power to influence the improvement of the state security system through the strong potential of the experiences they more or less painfully bestow on societies, and thus influence the state security systems. The dominant role of risks in the shaping of the state security area results from their functional dualism and the intensity of their occurrence. Following Merton, it may be assumed that a hazard is a phenomenon that can generate both functional and dysfunctional effects for the state security layout. On the one hand, threats fulfil a dysfunctional role vis-à-vis the state security system in the dimension of the latent feature, threatening both the safety of the entities it is supposed to protect and often the very system itself. On the other hand, they show eufunctional features that significantly influence the growth of the state security regime and its refinement.

Conclusions

The state security set-up is not static in its design. Referring to the above considerations, it has to be assumed that the state security system, as a body established to provide the state with the desired level of safety, is continuously subjected to the impact of factors generated by the state's security environment, both external and the internal environment, different in its specificity. To a decisive extent, as indicated by security theory and practice, the state security system is modified, improved as a result

of the impact of threats³⁰. Thereby, threats, in addition to the strength of their negative impact on the security of the subject and its security system, which is not disputed, also have considerable potential for positive impact on the mentioned spheres. By experiencing the safety subject, it forces the actor to expand his practical knowledge of the danger, but also his theoretical awareness. It forces the improvement of the observation of changes in the security environment, as well as the introduction of ongoing modifications to the security mechanism of the entity (here: the state), in order to improve it and increase the resilience of both the asset and the system to the exposure of hazards.

Past experience in the security sphere around the world shows that a significant commitment of human forces and material resources, including considerable financial resources, rarely occurs as a result of anticipation of possible threats that societies have not yet encountered. More often than not, it is the result of the impact of hazards and related lessons learned indicating that it is nevertheless better to modify the security system than to bear the further costs of the destructive impact of emergencies.

In conclusion, it is appropriate to recall the thought of Witold Pokruszyński, according to whom „an important feature of threats is their changeability. The development of certain fields of technology and science makes it necessary to be concerned about things that once did not pose a challenge and today convey a peril. At the same time, nowadays we do not take remedial action against certain phenomena that once provoked a sense of anxiety and fear”³¹. As such it is important to continuously analyse the level of threats, look for their origins and carry out an ongoing classification of newly emerging dangers. The formulation of detailed criteria consequently allows for a more precise division and a more in-depth characterisation of potential hazards.

³⁰ More, P. Lubiewski, *Zagrożenie jako podstawowa determinanta doskonalenia systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa* [in:] B. Wiśniewski, J. Ziobro, T. Zwęgliński (ed.), *Racjonalizacja zarządzania jednolitymi formacjami umundurowanymi odpowiedzialnymi za bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne*, Warszawa 2021, pp. 80-85.

³¹ More, W. Pokruszyński, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe u progu XXI wieku*, „Zeszyty Naukowe AON” 2008, nr 1, p. 27.

Bibliography

- Dworecki S., *Zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa państwa*, Wydawnictwo AON, Warszawa 1994.
- Fehler W., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne współczesnej Polski. Aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, Wydawnictwo ARTE, Warszawa 2012.
- Fehler W., *Percepcja zagrożeń* [in:] Wiśniewski B., *Bezpieczeństwo w teorii i badaniach naukowych*, Wydawnictwo WSPol., Szczytno 2018.
- Fehler W., *Zagrożenie – kluczowa kategoria teorii bezpieczeństwa* [in:] Jałoszyński K., Wiśniewski B., Wojtuszek T. (ed.), *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo WSA, Bielsko-Biała 2007.
- Frei D., *Sicherheit: Grundfragen der Weltpolitik*, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1977.
- Guła P., Prońko J., Wiśniewski B., *Zarządzanie informacją w sytuacjach kryzysowych*, Wydawnictwo WSA, Bielsko-Biała 2009.
- Jakubczak R., Flis J., *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XXI wieku. Wyzwania i strategie*, Bellona, Warszawa 2006.
- Jakubczak R., Wiśniewski B., *Wyzwania, szanse, zagrożenia i ryzyko dla bezpieczeństwa narodowego RP o charakterze wewnętrznym*, Wydawnictwo WSPol., Szczytno 2016.
- Kaufmann F.X., *Sicherheit als soziologisches und sozialpolitisches Problem*, Stuttgart 1970.
- Korzeniowski L., Pużyński S. (ed.), *Encyklopedyczny słownik psychiatrii*, Warszawa 1986.
- Liedel K., Prońko J., Wiśniewski B. (ed.), *Administracja publiczna w systemie przeciwdziałania nadzwyczajnym zagrożeniom dla ludzi i środowiska*, Wyższa Szkoła Administracji – Centrum Badań nad Terroryzmem Collegium Civitas, Bielsko-Biała – Warszawa 2007.
- Lubiewski P., *Zagrożenie jako podstawowa determinanta doskonalenia systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa*, [w:] B. Wiśniewski, J. Ziobro, T. Zwęgliński (ed.), *Racjonalizacja zarządzania jednolitymi formacjami umundurowanymi odpowiedzialnymi za bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne*, Wydawnictwo SGSP, Warszawa 2021.
- Nowak S., *Metodologia badań społecznych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2012.
- Pawłowski J., *Strategiczne dylematy początku XXI wieku* [in:] Jałoszyński K., Wiśniewski B., Wojtuszek T. (ed.), *Współczesne postrzeganie bezpieczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo WSA, Bielsko-Biała 2007.
- Pokruszyński W., *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe u progu XXI wieku*, „Zeszyty Naukowe AON” 2008, nr 1.

- Prońko J., *Bezpieczeństwo państwa. Zarys teorii problemu i zadań administracji publicznej*, Wydawnictwo WSA, Bielsko-Biała 2007.
- Prońko J., Wiśniewski B., *Klasyfikacja zagrożeń* [in:] Liedel K., Prońko J., Wiśniewski B. (ed.), *Administracja publiczna w systemie przeciwdziałania nadzwyczajnym zagrożeniom dla ludzi i środowiska*, Wydawnictwo WSA, Bielsko-Biała, Warszawa 2007.
- Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Wydawnictwo AON, Warszawa 2008.
- Ścibiorek Z., Wiśniewski B., Kuc R.B., Dawidczyk A., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne. Podręcznik akademicki*, Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2015.
- Śladkowski S., *Bezpieczeństwo ekologiczne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Wydawnictwo AON, Warszawa 2003.
- Wiśniewski B., *System bezpieczeństwa państwa. Konteksty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, Wydawnictwo WSPol., Szcztyno 2013.
- Wiśniewski B. et al, *Bezpieczeństwo procesów decyzyjnych*, Wyd. TUM, Wrocław 2018.
- Wiśniewski B., *Pojęcie oraz typologie bezpieczeństwa i zagrożeń* [in:] Wiśniewski B. (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo w teorii i badaniach naukowych*, Wydawnictwo WSPol., Szcztyno 2011.
- Zięba R., *Kategoria bezpieczeństwa w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych* [in:] Bobrow D.B., Haliżak E., Zięba R. (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku*, Warszawa 1997.
- Zięba R., Wprowadzenie. *Pozimnowojenny paradygmat bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego* [in:] Zięba R. (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe po zimnej wojnie*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008.

Articles:

- Ciekanowski Z., *Działania asymetryczne jako źródło zagrożeń bezpieczeństwa*, „Bezpieczeństwo i technika pożarnicza” 2009, nr 3.
- Lubiewski P., Drózd A., „Zeszyty Naukowe Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej w Legnicy” 2020, nr 34(1).

