JOURNAL OF SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES
ISSN 2029-7017 print/ISSN 2029-7025 online
2021 Volume 11
https://doi.org/10.47459/jssi.2021.11.25

DETERMINANTS OF THE PROCESS OF CREATING NATIONAL SECURITY

Tomasz Kośmider

Academy of Justice, 50 Wiśniowa Street, 02-520 Warsaw, Poland

E-mail: tomasz.kosmider@swws.edu.pl

Received 13 November 2020; accepted 25 March 2021; published 30 June 2021

Abstract. Security, synonymous with stability and development, in its most desirable form ensures certainty of existence, preservation of identity, freedom of affiliation, activity and functioning of individuals and communities, integrity and independence, satisfaction of basic needs, defence against their loss, prosperity and satisfaction. The interpretation adopted for the purposes of the paper refers to several elements that affect national security. It is primarily creating its security by organising society on the basis of power, giving its actions a purposeful character serving to maintain order and stability, and social order. Another element is the creation of certain states of social reality through the policy of the institution of power, which relates to the present, but inevitably leads to the future. The third element is the creation of future, desired social, political and economic phenomena and processes forming the order and the basis for further related activities, based on the policy instrument, which is the national security strategy. The last element is combining all of the previously listed in national security management. Together, these elements create an interpretation of the way of transforming and creating the state's ability to ensure its security, a necessary condition for its existence and development. The presented study, not exhausting the subject, allows for the formulation of directions for further research, which appear to be important in creating national security.

Keywords: national security system; security strategy; national security determinants

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Kośmider, T. 2021. Determinants of the process of creating national security. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 11, 287-299. https://doi.org/10.47459/jssi.2021.11.25

JEL Classifications: O1

Additional disciplines: Security Sciences

1. Introduction

Designing actions in the field of national security, the role and position of which, due to participation in international relations, is subject to evolution, must take into account the most probable scenarios for the development of security conditions and actions to stabilize security, crisis response, and actions carried out below the threshold of war (hybrid or asymmetric actions). The essence of these actions is determined by their nature, which boils down to eliminating and neutralizing phenomena that are perceived as negative for the state. This aspect of security policy shows two complementary elements. The first one is reactive in relation to the events taking place and the second one, characterised by its creative nature, is related to the preparation for the absorption of negative influences for the state, as well as the creation of appropriate potential for this (Kośmider, Gąsiorek, 2017). The processes of development and functioning of the state in the context of its security should certainly be considered in a multi-sector manner.

A necessary condition for the survival and development of the state is to take actions aimed at arranging both external and internal relations that allow to create the desired security space by strengthening the state's potential. This requires an appropriate potential and a vision of decision-making factors in the definition and implementation of state interests.

It should be noted that the history of many states is not free from deadlocks. The methods employed to solve problems remain interesting from the point of view of security issues. It seems that the basis of success, is the skilful use of methods and tools of political influence characterised by realism and projects ensuring the diversification of security.

In this context, it is extremely important to have a strategy based on proper recognition of international determinants, otherwise it becomes impossible to effectively and smoothly react to the changes taking place. There is no doubt that securing the interests of the state in the international environment requires taking steps to create appropriate bilateral and multilateral relations. Maintaining a balance between the potential of internal forces and the economic situation and the balance of forces outside the state, including the application of appropriate ratios between diplomatic and military means, remains an important issue. It is related to the skilful promotion of the state in the international environment and its importance for the functioning of regional or pan-European political and strategic projects.

In the existing world order, many issues undergo significant changes, including the very concept of security, which has ceased to be limited to the military dimension only, expanding to other categories, e.g. energy, health, food, ecological, information, social or cultural security (Tvaronavičienė et al., 2020; Kulish et al., 2021; Kolomoiets et al., 2021; Shumilo et al., 2021).

As a result, more and more emphasis is placed on the implementation of strategic goals not through the use of military force or economic pressure, but the social dimension, attractiveness of culture (axiology), or the style of practiced politics, which is often referred as soft power, but their effective impact requires the support of hard power in the form of military or economic strength. This influence may have an active dimension, in which the instruments of political response predominate (which to a large extent determine the classification of power) or a passive one with the domination of resources (values, culture, foreign policy, public diplomacy – covering aspects of international relations that go beyond traditional diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and national branding, related to the building of image of the state and the media) (Brown, 1983; Collins, 2010; Dory, 2003; Floyd, 2007; Jurgilewicz, Sulowski, 2018; Kośmider, 2018; Krause, 1998; Sabak, 2013; Rechlewicz, 2012). The use of soft tools of influence does not exclude hard power from among the tools of politics in the 21st century (Wrzosek, 2018), the more so as there is no certainty about the future forms of cooperation and areas of confrontation (Łoś, 2017). The relationship between hard and soft power was quite accurately presented by Niall Ferguson, according to whom soft power can be treated as "the velvet gloves concealing an iron hand" (Ferguson, 2004).

Still, the fundamental issue is the selection of appropriate means of political and socio-economic influence and the definition of priorities implemented both in the external and internal dimensions.

2. National security determinants

Sovereignty, independence, survival, as well as the guarantee and the prospect of development are current categories regardless of time and latitude. Only the determination of the essence, function or level of security evolves depending on the changing political, economic, social or cultural factors. Capturing the essence of the described phenomena, the regularities of which have a universal dimension, is the key of research (Zygmuntowicz, 2007). Their identification and definition are extremely valuable from the point of view of the national security strategy, which, taking into account general principles, should propose specific solutions. In the sciences of security, as pointed out by Waldemar Kitler, "the problem remains unsolved, boiling down to the question about the nature of national security, about the essence of related phenomena and regularities governing the functional and organisational spheres of the state, as well as difficulties with explaining and understanding this particular element of the real world" (Kitler, 2011).

The creating of activities relating to the security of the state must take into account the most likely scenarios for developing security conditions and operations to stabilize security, respond to crises (prevention, preparation,

response, reconstruction) and defence operations (deterrence, prevention) as well as those which are carried out below the threshold of war. Building an appropriate level of national security requires a joint effort both on the part of the state and society - which plays an important role in this process. The basis for activating the society in the field of state defence is the cooperation of state institutions with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other social partners, including schools, or local government authorities. Let's remember that NGOs have special capabilities for social monitoring of threats, especially in the field of detection, warning and alerting, which translates into the increased readiness to predict, prevent, mitigate and deal with the effects of such threats or disasters. This determines the effectiveness of the armed forces, police, guards and inspection services to a large extent. The activity of non-governmental organizations for security is manifested not only in activities that directly strengthen internal security, as is the case with Volunteer Fire Brigades (such solutions exist e.g. in Republic of Poland), performing both protective, intervention, educational and even cultural functions, but also indirect, as can be observed in relation to organizations counteracting pathological phenomena or institutions supporting education conducted for security (such solutions exist e.g. in Scandinavian Countries). This is confirmed by the research conducted by the author-member of Ministry of National Defence Republic of Poland the research team for developing assumptions of organizational-functional new solutions of the cooperation with non-governmental organizations and study of organizational and functional solutions for the National Reserve Forces, member of the Strategic Defence Review Team – Research Team – Non-military defence preparations).

The state is not only a formalized participant in international relations, but also an institution filled with material, cultural and institutional content that determines the success of its development and position in the international arena. State's security is a derivative of different, individual and group values in the field of safety of the society inhabiting it, as well as a resultant of the safety of many other entities of international relations.

Security must be seen as a value worth striving for. This was well known in the ancient times, at least from the moment when the focus of the current philosophy was shifted from nature to humans and culture, and from the time when rational thinking occurred, so characteristic of Western culture.

The dominant, institutional approach to security causes that the expectations of citizens – primary recipients of services in this area – often differ from the preferences of the institutions that ensure this security. In a modern society, the concept of security is constantly evolving, based on the primacy of the state and narrow military categories, according to which the most important thing is the security of the state, not the security of an individual. In the countries of a consolidated democracy, there is a concept of alternative public security that is more adequate to the social perceptions. The society often feels more threatened by economic and social considerations than by military ones. Protection of natural rights in the political structure involves the establishment of limits to their validity.

The two basic dimensions of the functioning of the state are security and development. On the one hand, without an adequate level of security, it is impossible to ensure a stable and long-term development of its structures, on the other, without development, it would not be possible to improve the potential of national security. The adopted research problem makes it necessary to look at the issue of security through the prism of the ability of the institutions of political authority to protect and defend the society. This alliance contributed to the creation of three basic elements of thinking in the perspective of political power. The first is related to the method of selection, exercise and responsibility in the context of maintaining the social order and its stability. The second concerns the evolution of security in relation to political power, while the third concerns the characteristic properties of power and the order it creates, presented with the use of specific attributes attributed to people, in the past also to gods and nature. This specific formula of understanding of reality "has defined the basics of recognizing security through the prism of the selected form of order. At the same time, it contained a lasting form of projection of the actions of the political authority towards other states, communities and entities. It defined a comprehensive expression of thinking and acting in the name of the state, combining all its elements – the centre of power, institutions of power and a policy aimed at taking specific actions for (…) security" (Gryz, 2013). When analysing the problem of political factors influencing national security, we encounter a number of dif-

ficulties related to showing the relationships between the activities of centres exercising power, decentralized forms of political organisation and national security, which creates a sense of stability for individuals and social groups and offers development opportunities. The problem of the quality of the exercised political power and the level of its concentration as well as the nature of the functioning of local-governmental and non-governmental organisations remain essential. Consequently, it is about diagnosing the phenomenon of public participation in exercising of power. The nature of supervision, control and oppressiveness of government institutions determines the form of personal and public security. The nature of society, tradition or political culture can be treated as a starting point for defining the activities of the institutions of political power in the field of ensuring security in extenso (Andersen, 1992).

An important issue in the state's security policy remains to ensure stability, which is the basis of order, both nationally and abroad. The essence of this policy determines its nature, which comes down to the elimination and neutralization of social, political, economic or cultural phenomena perceived as negative for the state. This aspect of state's security policy shows two complementary elements. The first one is reactive in relation to the events taking place and the second one, characterised by a creative nature, is related to the preparation for the absorption of negative influences for the state, but also the creation of appropriate potential for this – individual and collective – with the participation of other entities under international relations (Kozub, 2013). These activities determine the scope of the state's ability to conduct pro-development activities in the social, political, cultural and economic areas, and consequently shape the foundations for individual and collective involvement of the state in activities aimed at developing its potential. This is determined by the ability to acquire knowledge, create cooperation platforms, and compete.

Directing the state's activities towards its security requires that the institutions of political power identify the current and the desired state of affairs with regard to the mission and vision of development. The security of a given entity is the area of its activity, the content of which is to ensure the possibility of survival (existence) and the freedom to pursue one's own interests in a dangerous environment, in particular by taking advantage of opportunities (favourable circumstances), facing challenges, reducing risk and counteracting (preventing and opposing) all kinds of threats to the subject and its interests (Koziej, 2001). The main problem here is power and exercising it by ruling entities. However, this is defined and implemented differently on the domestic and international level. The internal function of the state is related to ensuring public safety and order, protection of property and health of the society, as well as securing the durability of the ownership system in the internal structure of internal relations and creating conditions conducive to the economic development of the state.

The basic task is to obtain compliance of all political forces with regard to the priority treatment of national security matters in state policy. The state's strength in international relations depends on it. This strength is necessary both to attract allies and partners, and to deter potential enemies. In domestic politics, this consensus is necessary for the proper definition and implementation of an algorithm of action in the event of responding to current domestic threats that harm the interests of the state and the security of its citizens. This applies to both the routine actions of state bodies and the response to crisis situations.

The level of state development management depends on the determination of the public authority, its greater openness to solutions coming from citizens, and on the other hand, on the involvement of civil society as a partner. Unfortunately, the inefficiency of public institutions, resulting mainly from ineffective administration of personal and financial resources, remains a problem of social life. These institutions are characterised by low activity and poor orientation towards social needs and changes. This image is strengthened by: lack of operational transparency, "lack of openness to citizens" and limited access to information.

The foundation of effectiveness in modern management in the public sphere is, on the one hand, an efficient state, focusing not on administration but managing its development, and on the other hand, public confidence, i.e. a helpful state, based on the redefined principle of subsidiarity and conditions for the growth of social capital. The coupling of the state's efficiency and civic ability to cooperate resulting from social capital is visible especially in times of threats and crises. However, social development is not only about the quality of social

benefits and services. It is a much broader phenomenon that concerns many processes stimulating communication and self-organising of individuals, communities and institutions around common goals, enabling citizens to actively engage in the formulation and implementation of the state's development policy.

In political science and sociology literature dealing with the issue of the effectiveness of social institutions, great importance is attached to the role of the network of social bonds, norms of reciprocity and public confidence. James Coleman and Robert Putnam defined this feature of social structures as social capital. Its basic components include: social bonds, social values and norms (solidarity, cooperation) and public confidence. Communities with high social capital potential achieve greater economic and political benefits, and they cope better with social issues. Despite the beneficial influence of social capital on the functioning of the community, there are also some problems. They are the result of significant disproportions between individuals and social groups in access to capital and the tendency of social capital to concentrate in family structures or small social groups. In this way, natural conditions are created that favour the emergence of social pathologies, such as corruption, nepotism, or *power-holding groups*. Relying on informal social capital, especially in the public sphere, undermines the confidence in public institutions (Czapiński, 2006).

Designing structural and personal security ensuring optimal conditions for the development of the state and society, especially in democratic systems, largely depends on the level of civic culture, which is manifested in the methods of solving public matters and important social issues. The strength of a democratic state is expressed in the moral qualities of citizens and their tendency to pro-social activities, as well as recognising the primacy of the common good over individual aspirations. Without the axiology and accepted norms of behaviour, the promotion of pro-social and pro-state attitudes influencing the creation of community, which is a necessary condition for the efficient functioning of the state, especially in crisis situations, such as during the Covid-19 pandemic, cannot be promoted. Without it, it is difficult to consider the involvement of citizens in solving public affairs and important social issues, which is a prerequisite for the efficient functioning of the national security system. The following are involved in these activities: school, NGOs, with particular emphasis on pro-defence organisations, or an institution that plays an important role in the building of the national spirit, i.e. the army.

One of the main challenges of the security policy is to promote the desired axio-normative and prepare citizens to act for the defence and development of the state. Language, tradition, culture, value system strengthening the national identity, constitute an important factor that binds the society of a given country together and guarantee the nation's survival even in the period of non-existence of the state, as was the case with the Jewish or Polish nation.

Civil society is a great opportunity for the proper functioning of a democratic state, especially in the face of a growing tendency to obreption of the elites. This phenomenon consists in the departure of some of the elites of the Western world from the ideals of democracy towards subordinating political decisions mainly to the goals of large supranational corporations and financial institutions. It is related to the marginalization of the representative power of society and the ostensibility of the functioning of the state. Proponents of this option do not refer to specific political agendas. They use their social position, historical experience, and current socio-political trends to manipulate social awareness and influence people's behaviour. In view of the weakening condition of the state and the aggressive expansion of globalizing commerce, the premises for the rational development of democratic societies are disappearing, and there is a threat of an increase in fundamentalism and the activation of criminal groups (Utrat-Milecki, 2006).

The image of the citizen, like everything in the contemporary world, is undergoing a revaluation. Interesting insights on this subject are provided by the analyses of postmodernists who claim that traditional civic identity is blurring and the present times are setting new contexts of citizenship. While in the past the sense of national or state belonging set the general background for shaping identity, nowadays more and more often a person is a *citizen* of many communities. Civic identity in a democratic society is shaped in the conditions of dynamic socio-cultural transformations. It seems that the most important factors giving a specific character to the human condition in contemporary democracies include: cultural pluralism, social differentiation, de-institutionalization and structural individualism.

The activity of the civil society, perceived not only through the prism of third sector organisations, remains invaluable. Activating civic attitudes and building communities is an extremely important problem of contemporary democratic systems. One of the most important threats to democracy is the breakdown of social bonds and the passivity of citizens. It is to be hoped that as the civil society solidifies, both the number and the offer of NGOs, which are part of the global trend of public diplomacy, will increase. NGOs, however, may constitute a potential source of risk or threat. It cannot be ruled out that they will be used by criminal groups to hide illegal property, launder money or avoid taxes. There may also be a threat from terrorist organisations (Śpiewak, 1997).

In the light of the analysed phenomena, it is impossible to ignore the impact of globalization on state sovereignty. Anyway, it is worth noting that there is no normative definition of sovereignty, both at the level of international public law and at national law. However, the lack of a normative definition did not prevent the system of international law from being based on the paradigm of sovereignty of international law, which was clearly defined in art. 2 para. 1 of the United Nations Charter. The traditional model of sovereignty is eroding. In contemporary scientific considerations, the thesis pointing to the weakening or even collapse of the nation state appears more and more often. One can come across the concept of post-sovereignty (Aleksandrowicz, 2013). We are dealing not so much with the decline of states as with the disappearance of a particular metaphysics of the state, accompanied by processes leading to the deontologization of power. "This is particularly noticeable in post-communist countries entering the international division of labour (...) the optimization of the relationship between the limitation of Westphalian sovereignty and the potentially greater, thanks to integration, power of the system over itself depends mainly on institutional choices and cooperation with actors outside politics" (Staniszkis, 2004). David Held has a similar opinion. He believes that it cannot be assumed that the centre of effective political power is the national government, because in the modern world nations are more dependent on complex problems of an international nature (Held, 2002). Power is no longer concentrated in state institutions, but rather *scattered over networks* (Castells, 2008). Migration leads to the emergence of groups of people in foreign territories with limited access to civil rights and social security. Moreover, as a result of the development of international corporations and political institutions, the institutional and normative basis of civic privileges and obligations is transferred to them. As a result, the borders of citizenship are becoming more and more open, both in the territorial, social and political spheres (Budakowska, 2006).

Institutional approach to security causes that the expectations of citizens – primary recipient of services in this area - often differ from the preferences of the institutions that ensure this security. The existing concept of security is evolving, based on the primacy of the state and narrow military categories, according to which the most important thing is the security of the state, not the security of an individual. In the countries of a consolidated democracy, there is a concept of alternative public security that is more adequate to the social perceptions. The society feels more threatened by economic, health (e.g. Covid-19) and social considerations that military ones. These threats not only affect the quality of life of the inhabitants, but also mean the possibility of a crisis having a destructive effect on the state's security system (Gierszewski, 2013). The sources of their threats are mainly related to the so-called social risks.

When assessing the social potential, attention should be paid to the weaknesses in dissemination of knowledge about security. The consequence of this state of affairs is the insufficient awareness of citizens and social structures as to the needs, conditions and tasks in the field of security. Without doubt this tendency has a limiting effect on the definition of strategic goals in the field of security. Meanwhile, the state, as the highest form of society's organisation, has many obligations related to ensuring its survival and development. Therefore, it should organise the social, economic and political space in such a way as to generate conditions of safe existence for the entities that established it. In this sense, every activity of the state evokes a sense of security and certainty or danger and frustration in individuals or social groups. The reaction of the community to projects implemented by the state depends on these subjective assessments. Ensuring favourable conditions for the functioning of individuals and social groups is supported by a defined and conducted specific social policy, the purpose of which is to create public *good* (Kooiman, 1993).

3. Designing activities in the field of creating security in the state

In a world subject to the processes of globalization, the fundamental issue is the ability of the state, operating effectively in the modern world thanks to its transformation into a non-political administrative system, to shape an increasingly complex social, political, economic and cultural reality (Mazurek, 2014). This is done as a result of the process of formulation of the personal and structural security, using the powers and means of the state, as well as methods and forms of action (Foucault, 2010). The national security paradigm, which should not be forgotten, is the resultant of many variables, achievement of which is a prerequisite for its construction. In connection with this situation, there are many consequences that determine the form of order and security and their derivatives. The main one is the political change that finds its reflection in the ways of thinking about the social, political and economic order and their shaping. Another one is related to ensuring the living conditions for a society organised into a state. This makes it necessary to consider this problem through the prism of the functioning of security institutions and society. In considering this issue, it is impossible to ignore the relationships in the international environment, which are the aftermath of interactions between the subjects of the international environment. These issues create the state of national security and affect the actions taken in the area of politics and strategy. Anyway, we have been dealing with the relations between politics and security, understood as the ability of the institution of political authority as a basic, sovereign political institution to defend and protect the society from the very beginning of the state's existence. The final success in the process of managing security in the state is determined by the compilation of such factors as: population and territory, economic and military potential, as well as the strategy and will to implement it (Cline, 1975).

Figure 1. The nature of relations between the terms defining national security

Events	Phenomena	Processes	Trends
	Strength	Power	Influence
	Authority	Politics	Strategy
Idea	Ideology	Doctrine	Agendas
Values	Needs	Interests	Goals
	Social structures	Social norms	Social institutions
	Individual	Social group	Society
	Feelings	Beliefs	Experience

Source: (Gryz, 2013)

Identification of the way of achieving strategic goals in the field of national security should be accompanied by an introjection of the degree of achievement of both the main goals and their derivatives, as well as determination of the way in which the entities of the security environment influence the state's strategies. Due to the degree of achievement of the adopted goals, this process can become significantly more complex. It is primarily about the scope of the appropriate selection of the subject of the analysis, allowing for a proper assessment of what should be followed and what to take into account, the main issue being the identification of one's own interests, goals and options for action (Brown, 1983).

When considering the problem of national security, three fundamental issues should be taken into account, namely: ensuring social order, meeting the challenges of the changing turbulent social, economic, political, sometimes cultural reality and its other dimensions, as well as guaranteeing continuous development through the synergy of political activities with other activities determining the existence of community (Foucault, 2009).

Counteracting potential threats to security requires an integrated national security system, which should be understood as all means and resources allocated by the state to perform tasks in the field of security – organised, maintained and prepared properly to perform these tasks, in which the control subsystem and executive subsystems can be distinguished.

National security depends to a large extent on the ability of authorities to manage it in an adaptive, and not reactive, manner. It is necessary to build an optimal security management system, including its control in all states and circumstances of the functioning of the state, along with making dynamic organisational changes and recognising all challenges and threats. Security management is one of the most important activities of the state aimed at ensuring its existence and development in the changing conditions of the security environment, ranging from local and limited effects to those covering the entire state. Its ability to take up challenges and to counteract threats, both of a political and military and economic and social nature, is closely related to the socio-economic development of the state, and this development determines the improvement of the organisational efficiency of the state and the provision of resources and instruments to eliminate emerging threats. Contemporary challenges and threats oblige us to take long-term preventive actions in the field of security. It is necessary to establish appropriate institutional mechanisms of action that will function efficiently in the event of an immediate threat, as well as to take measures that will minimize the likelihood of occurrence of undesirable phenomena. An important role in the process of managing national security is played by the defense dimension (national defense), safety dimension (civil and non-military security, protection of the population, resources, infrastructure and state structures) as well as economic and cultural security.

The tasks of the state in the field of security should be considered through the prism of its objective and systemic functions. They result from its external and internal functions. The external function covers the state's foreign and defence policy. The essence of actions for security in this case is the protection of the state's interests in the international arena, leading to the preservation of territorial integrity and sovereignty. In turn, the internal function of the state is to achieve and maintain the social order. It manifests itself in actions taken to ensure internal security through strong state structures, stable law, environmental protection, social security and a stable economy (Szczurek, 2012).

The condition for the effective functioning of the state is the universality of activities of various public administration bodies and institutions. In this context, a question arises about institutions that will be able to recognise the symptoms of threats in a professional manner and at various levels by their actions, and in the event of their occurrence, counter them or minimize their effects. Moreover, in special situations, they will be prepared to take actions resulting from threats to the state. Thus, we come to the concept of an *institution of security*.

It seems that public authorities play a key role in ensuring security, due to having a formal mandate to manage the state, control the compliance with legal rules and enforce a specific coercion in relation to all entities of the political system. These authorities have very extensive functions, and thus they have numerous powers to manage many areas of social life by applying state law. The traditional role of public administration, includ-

ing local administration, boils down to, among others, managing national security, i.e. creating conditions for the survival and development of an organisation, i.e. the state, and its elementary components, occurring in all states of its functioning. While perceiving security as a common good of the whole society, the functioning social and economic structures should also be taken into account in this process.

The contemporary security environment is characterised by the blurring of the boundaries between its internal and external, military and non-military dimensions. It is a qualitatively new situation that requires a change in the state's approach to security issues. Designing activities in the field of management of a state, the role and position of which as an entity in international relations is subject to evolution, must take into account the most likely scenarios for the development of security conditions and activities aimed at stabilizing security (promoting and developing cooperation, taking advantage of opportunities, preventing risks and threats), crisis response (monitoring, recognition, information, containment, elimination of the effects of the crisis) and defence activities (deterrence, prevention, countering aggression, counterattack). This is not an easy task, because in many cases the state's actions in this area may interfere with various spheres of public and private life. For example, they may violate other values of the subject covered by this activity or even constitute a threat (lower the level of security) of a third party (Kośmider, 2018). Therefore, the management functions are performed by various entities specialised in the performance of various tasks (in action).

In managing the security of the state, the principle of precise definition of the powers of the authorities in the scope of its introduction or reduction is particularly important, and due to the demographic, economic, historical, religious, etc. determinants, the state is not a single-purpose organisation, operating in the complex and unpredictable environment. From this arise the duties and powers as well as the specific place and role of individual authorities in the entire security management system in the state (Koziej, 2008).

National security can be understood as an area of knowledge that not only explains the operation of mechanisms governing the provision of order, order and stability of human communities, the accompanying concepts, methods and forms of conduct, but also as the art and science of effective survival in time and space. The perception of the issues of national security has a multifaceted interpretation. It creates an understanding of the past, creates an image of the present and constitutes a premise for thinking about the future.

The interpretation adopted for the purposes of this paper refers to the following elements that have a decisive influence on the national security. The first one is creating the national security by organising society on the basis of power, giving its actions a purposeful character serving to maintain order and stability, social order. The second is the creation of certain states of social reality through the policy of the institution of power, which relates to the present, but inevitably leads to the future, to abstracted visions of security. The third element is the creation of future, desired social, political and economic phenomena and processes forming the order and the basis for further related activities, based on the policy instrument, which is the national security strategy (Haydn, Court, 2002).

The current state of knowledge in the field of research on the foundations of designing national security is extremely dispersed. The interpretation contained therein is essentially descriptive, forming the theory of designing national security to a lesser extent. This justifies undertaking scientific research on the issues of creating and ensuring national security in the context of projecting its activities undertaken and carried out by government institutions.

The assessment of the security environment and its directions in the global, regional and national dimensions allows for the generation of a probable scenario of the development of strategic security conditions in the time to come. There is no doubt that despite seeking and preferring various forms of cooperation, it is not possible to build relations free from confrontation. The idea of perpetual peace proposed by Immanuel Kant, assuming that the rule of force will yield to justice, is far from being the case. This seems to be a sufficient argument for the need to conduct appropriate activities in the area of designing. Efficient organisation of national security management requires a broad and interdisciplinary approach, also with regard to executive issues, including decisions issued at the central-ministerial level. It should be remembered that the implementation of executive

functions is to ensure that the expected result of the action is achieved under certain conditions and circumstances of the state's functioning (normal state, crisis, state of emergency), using appropriate measures and tools. It is the executive subsystems that are responsible for transforming the political decisions of the supreme (superior) national security management system into specific actions. This problem should be viewed through the prism of stability, efficiency, mobility and predictability (Zalewski, 2010; Nye, 2011).

The relevant changes should take into account the model of the integrated national security system consisting of the following executive subsystems:
- defence subsystem;
- protection subsystems;
- economic subsystems;
- social subsystems.

In the national security management system, the principle of one-man management at all levels of national security management should be adopted. This means that in each executive subsystem there is a need to select one body that will coordinate the activities undertaken within it. Among the principles that should be taken into account in the designed model of security management in the state at the central-local level, the following principles should also be indicated:
- prioritizing of activities;
- continuity of responsibility of public authorities in all states and circumstances of the functioning of the state;
- adequacy of the level of competence (counteraction and responsibility) with regard to the nature and extent of the threat;
- the inclusion of a uniform scope of competences by the same authorities and administration of all categories of threats, crises and wars;
- uniformity of the organisation of the body and the management apparatus at all levels of responsibility (Gryz, 2013).

Such an approach imposes the following algorithm of operation, in fact quite complex, including: decision-making process; political decision and implementation.

The multifaceted and multi-sectoral nature of the activities determines the need for planning that takes into account all state bodies, cooperation of state bodies with NGOs, and cooperation assuming a military and non-military dimension. This requires a precise definition of the competences of individual components of the system, including the managing bodies.

In activities carried out for national security, two levels can be distinguished, at which the conceptualization and concretization of security initiatives takes place, namely the conceptual stage and planning stage. At the first level, the national security strategy is formulated. At the second level, planning takes place, including strategic and operational planning as well as programming and budgeting of tasks (Davis, 2005).

The first area should include the Political and Strategic Defence Directive and its derivatives, namely the plan for the use and operation of the armed forces and the plans for the functioning of individual authorities at all levels of the state in every condition (peace, crisis and war). At the second level, multi-annual programs of defence preparations, the development of the armed forces, and defence preparations of the authorities at all levels of the state are built in each of the constitutionally defined conditions of its operation.

In the conceptual and decision-making phase, this activity covers the ideological, doctrinal, program and operational layer. In the implementation phase, these will be specific security measures taken. The process of managing security in the state must be flexible and take into account all changes taking place in the external environment, as well as all transformations taking place inside the security system, thus creating an effective and long-term security policy.

Conclusions

National security can be understood as an area of knowledge that not only explains the operation of mechanisms governing the provision of order, order and stability of human communities, the accompanying concepts, methods and forms of conduct, but also as the art and science of effective survival in time and space. The perception of the issues of national security has a multifaceted interpretation. It creates an understanding of the past, creates an image of the present and constitutes a premise for thinking about the future.

The interpretation adopted for the purposes of this paper refers to the following elements that have a decisive influence on the national security. The first one is creating the state' security by organising society on the basis of power, giving its actions a purposeful character serving to maintain order and stability, social order. The second is the creation of certain states of social reality through the policy of the institution of power, which relates to the present, but inevitably leads to the future, to abstracted visions of security. The third element is the creation of future, desired social, political and economic phenomena and processes forming the order and the basis for further related activities, based on the policy instrument, which is the national security strategy.

The research intention in the paper was to present national security as a consequence of the ideas contained in theories that determine its deliberately undertaken actions. Thus, showing the relationship between the conceptual action and the action in a specific area, which is ensuring safety, as well as designing it, i.e. striving to achieve future expected states of affairs or the potential need to face those considered undesirable. This includes all the specifics of the state's actions.

The above idea expresses the belief that the security of the entity, which is the state, is a consequence of actions taken in the changing conditions of social reality. Praxeological interpretation of the understanding of security concerns the way of constructing and using the theory of security as a source of knowledge for designing future, desired states of affairs. There is no doubt that despite seeking and preferring various forms of cooperation, it is not possible to build international relations free from confrontation. This seems to be a sufficient argument for the necessity to conduct appropriate activities in the area of designing of security management in the state.

No matter how we look at the issue of security, it should be noted that it must be seen as a value worth striving for. It should not be forgotten that the contemporary security environment is characterised by the blurring of the boundaries between its internal and external, military and non-military dimensions. Globalization and growing interdependence often result in the unpredictability of phenomena, the scope of which is no longer limited by geographic barriers, political and economic systems. In contemporary inclinations to the multi-sectoral perception of security, it takes on a special meaning. It creates a complex and dynamic indicator of the country's organizational efficiency, enabling its citizens to be united around the important goal of countering threats and building social support for decisions taken by management factors in the creation of safe spaces.

References

Aleksandrowicz, T.R. (2013). Sieciowy paradygmat bezpieczeństwa państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych. (The network paradigm of state security in international relations).. Akademia Obrony Narodowej.

Andersen, U., Woyke W. (1992). Handwörterbuch des politischen Systems der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Opladen.

Brown, H. (1983). Thinking About National Security: Defense And Foreign Policy In A Dangerous World. Avalon Publishing.

Budakowska, E. (2006). Międzynarodowe migracje a współczesne zagrożenia. Europejskie dylematy (International migrations and contemporary threats. European dilemmas). In: J. Królikowska (Ed.), Problemy społeczne w grze politycznej. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Buhaichuk, K., Varenia, N., Khodanovych, V., Kriepakova, M., Seredynskyi, V. 2021. Mechanism of formation of innovation security and activation of innovation activity of corporations, 8(3), 402-419. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2021.8.3(26)

Castells, M. (2008). Wiek informacji: ekonomia, społeczeństwo, kultura (Information age: economy, society, culture). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Cline, R.S. (1975). World Power Assessment. A Calculus of Strategic Drift. Westview Press.

Collins, A. (2010). Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford University Press.

Czapiński, J. (2006). Kapitał społeczny. In: J. Czapiński, T. Panek (Eds.), Diagnoza społeczna 2005. Warunki i jakość życia Polaków (Social diagnosis 2005. Conditions and quality of life of Poles). Wyższa Szkoła Finansów i Zarządzania.

Davis, J (2005). Terms of inquiry: on the theory and practice of Political science. John Hopkins University Press.

Dory, A. (2003). Civil Security. Americans and the Challenge of Homeland Security. Washington.

Ferguson, N. (2004). Colossus. The Price of America's Empire. New York.

Floyd, R. (2007). Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: bringing together the Copenhagen and Welsh Schools of security studies. Review of International Studies, 33, 327-350.

Foucault, M. (2009). Security, Territory, Population. Picador.

Gierszewski, J. (2013). Bezpieczeństwo społeczne. Studium z zakresu teorii bezpieczeństwa narodowego (Social security. A study in the field of national security theory), Difin.

Gryz, J (2007). Policy and strategy of the state. Strategic Impact. National Defence University „Carol I" Printing House.

Gryz, J. (2013). Bezpieczeństwo państwa (State security). Władza – Polityka – Strategia. Akademia Obrony Narodowej.

Haydn, G., Court J. (2002). Governance and Development, World Governance Survey Discussion. Paper 1. United Nations University. Held, D. (2002). Czy można regulować globalizację? Krytyka Polityczna.

Ilchenko, O., Brusakova, O., Burchenko, Y., Yaroshenko, A., Bagan, Y. (2021). The role of a defence industry in the system of national security: a case study. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, 8(3), 438-454. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2021.8.3(28)

Jurgilewicz, M., Sulowski S. (2018). W kręgu nauki o bezpieczeństwie (In the field of security science). Difin.

Kitler, W. (2011). Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie, uwarunkowania, system (National security of the Republic of Poland. Basic categories, conditions, system). Akademia Obrony Narodowej.

Kolomoiets, T., Tsybulnyk, N., Moroz, O., Prymachenko, V., Khashev, V. (2021). Influence of shadow economy legalization on national security of Ukraine. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, 8(3), 420-437. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2021.8.3(27)

Kooiman, J. (1993). Modern Governance: New Government Society Interactions. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kośmider, T. (2018). Bezpieczeństwo państwa polskiego. Rozważania w kontekście historycznych doświadczeń (Security of the Polish state. Considerations in the context of historical experiences). Difin.

Kośmider, T., Gąsiorek K. (2017). Powszechna Obrona Terytorialna podstawą bezpieczeństwa narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. Bezpieczeństwo (General Territorial Defense as the basis of the national security of the Republic of Poland. Security). Teoria i Praktyka, 3, 37-49.

Koziej, S. (2001). Bezpieczeństwo: istota, podstawowe kategorie i historyczna ewolucja (Security: essence, basic categories and historical evolution). Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe, 18, 19-39.

Koziej, S. (2008). Kierowanie bezpieczeństwem narodowym (National security management). https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=%22Koziej%22+AND+%22Kierowanie+bezpiecze%C5%84stwem+narodowym%22#

Kozub, M. (2013). Myśleć strategicznie o bezpieczeństwie przyszłości (Think strategically about the security of the future). Akademia Obrony Narodowej.

Krause, K. (1998). Critical Theory and Security Studies. The Research Programme of Critical Security Studies. Cooperation and Conflict, 33(3), 298-333.

Kriviņš, A., Teivāns-Treinovskis, J., Tumalavičius, V. (2021). Issues of state and national security: Religiously inspired terrorism in the Baltic States: internal and external factors. Insights Into Regional Development, 3(1), 65-79. http://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2021.3.1(4)

Kulish, A., Yunin, O., Us, O., Shapovalova, I., Yaromii, I. (2021). Smuggling as a threat to economic security of the state. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, 8(3), 384-399. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2021.8.3(25)

Łoś, R. (2017). Soft Power we współczesnych stosunkach międzynarodowych (Soft Power in contemporary international relations). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Mazurek, M. (2014). Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem jako dysfunkcja systemu władzy (Security management as a dysfunction of the power system). Difin.

Nye, J.S., Jr. (2011). The Future of Power. Public Affairs.

Rechlewicz, W. (2012). Elementy filozofii bezpieczeństwa. Bezpieczeństwo z perspektywy historii filozofii i filozofii polityki. Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem (Elements of the security philosophy. Security from the perspective of the history of philosophy and philosophy of politics. Safety management). Difin.

Sabak, Z. (2013). Strategia. Podstawy myślenia w XXI wieku (Strategy. Basics of thinking in the twenty-first century). Akademia Obrony Narodowej.

Shumilo, O., Lytvyn, I., Shablystyi, V., Kornyakova, T., Popovich, I. (2021). Legal mechanism to ensure national security in the field of use of natural resources. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, 8(3), 455-470. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2021.8.3(29)

Staniszkis, J. (2004). Początek i kres metafizyki państwa (The beginning and the end of the metaphysics of the state). Praktyka Polityczna, 1, 3-7.

Szczurek, T. (2012). Od deskrypcji do antycypacji wykorzystania potencjału militarnego w kształtowaniu bezpieczeństwa nowoczesnych wspólnot państwowych wobec rozwoju zagrożeń niemilitarnych (From description to anticipating the use of military potential in shaping the security of modern state communities in the face of the development of non-military threats). Wojskowa Akademia Techniczna.

Śpiewak, P. (1997). Demokracja partycypacyjna (Participatory democracy). Wiedza i Życie, 3.

Tvaronavičienė, M., Plėta, T., Della Casa, S., Latvys, J. **(**2020). Cyber security management of critical energy infrastructure in national cybersecurity strategies: cases of USA, UK, France, Estonia and Lithuania. Insights into Regional Development, 2(4), 802-813. http://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2020.2.4(6)

Utrat-Milecki, J. (2006). Obrepcja elit. In: J. Królikowska (Ed.), Problemy społeczne w grze politycznej (Social problems in the political game). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Wrzosek, M. (2018). Wojny przyszłości. Doktryna, technika, operacje militarne (The wars of the future. Doctrine, technology, military operations). Fronda.

Zalewski, S. (2010). Bezpieczeństwo polityczne państwa. Studium funkcjonalności (Political security of the state. Functional study). Akademia Podlaska.

Zygmuntowicz, J. (2007). Bezpieczeństwo w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych (Security in the science of international relations). Problemy Bezpieczeństwa, 1.

Tomasz KOŚMIDER is a full professor, director of the Institute of Safety Sciences of the Academy of Justice. In the years 2012–2018 he was the director of the Institute of State Security of the National Defense Academy / Academy of War Art. Author and co-author of nearly 200 scientific studies: books, articles, reviews and expert opinions, incl. 17 research projects. Manager of 4 research projects financed through national and international competitions. He has prepared several dozen expert opinions and other studies commissioned by public institutions or entrepreneurs. He has taken part in expert and competition teams many times. He cooperates with many academic centers and think-tanks in Poland and abroad. Reviewer of many scientific journals, monographs and international projects. Member of editorial committees and scientific councils of journals.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2129-3642