**Paweł Lubiewski, PhD, prof. at WSPol**
*Police Academy in Szczytno*

# Systemic Approach to Cooperation in the Sphere of Public Security – Outline of Problem

## Abstract

The paper attempts to outline issues of systemic interplay in the field of public security. Given the importance of public security for the society both in the collective and individual dimensions, the issue of interplay as an element required to streamline the security system appears to be of incomparable importance. The state security system as a construct created to assure the optimum security level (i.e. one that is socially desirable) may not be perceived as a static value, because neither the security environment nor the public security entity are made that way. Systemic interaction is one of the elements that make the public security system gain flexibility features, and makes it adapt to variable conditions of its functioning, which is a direct result of the need of effective implementation of its functions. In this respect it is vital that it is created within the systemic dimension so that it has a direct impact on fulfilment of the function assigned to the public security system, and not merely on the apparently effective involvement of the potential ascribed to it.

# Systemowe ujęcie współdziałania w sferze bezpieczeństwa publicznego – szkic problemu

## Abstrakt

Celem artykułu jest nakreślenie problematyki systemowego współdziałania w obszarze bezpieczeństwa publicznego. Z racji wagi, jaką stanowi bezpieczeństwo publiczne dla społeczeństwa zarówno w wymiarze zbiorowym, jak i indywidualnym, problematyka współdziałania, jako elementu mającego w konsekwencji usprawnić system bezpieczeństwa, wydaje się

być niezwykle ważną. System bezpieczeństwa publicznego jako twór skonstruowany z myślą o zapewnieniu optymalnego (pożądanego społecznie) poziomu bezpieczeństwa nie może być wartością statyczną, gdyż takie nie jest ani środowisko bezpieczeństwa, ani też podmiot bezpieczeństwa publicznego. Systemowe współdziałanie jest jednym z tych elementów, które powodują, że system bezpieczeństwa publicznego wykazuje cechy elastyczności, dostosowując się do zmiennych warunków jego funkcjonowania, co wynika bezpośrednio z potrzeby efektywnej realizacji jego funkcji. Istotnym przy tym jest, by wykreowane ono było w wymiarze systemowym, by miało bezpośredni wpływ na wypełnianie funkcji nadanej systemowi bezpieczeństwa publicznego, nie zaś jedynie na pozornie efektywne angażowanie przypisanego mu potencjału.

# Системний підхід до співпраці у сфері громадської безпеки – огляд проблеми

### Анотація

Метою статті є окреслення питань системної співпраці у сфері громадської безпеки. З погляду на важливість громадської безпеки для суспільства як у колективному, так і в індивідуальному вимірі, питання співпраці як елементу, спрямованого на вдосконалення системи безпеки, видається надзвичайно важливим. Система громадської безпеки, котра скерована на забезпечення оптимального (соціально бажаного) рівня безпеки, не може бути статичною цінністю, оскільки таким не є ані середовище безпеки, ані суб›єкт громадської безпеки. Системна взаємодія є одним із елементів, що впливають на те, щоб система громадської безпеки була гнучкою, пристосовуючись до мінливих умов її функціонування, що безпосередньо виникає з необхідності ефективного здійснення її функцій. Важливо також, щоб вона була створена у системному вимірі, щоб безпосередньо впливала на виконання функцій, покладених на систему громадської безпеки, а не лише на очевидно ефективне використання покладеного на неї потенціалу.

## 1. Introduction

Given its exceptional complexity, scientific exploration of the field of state security requires that a systemic approach be adopted. The necessity of adopting such an approach for the analysed issues is mentioned by many researchers in the field of security. For example in the opinion of Bernard Wiśniewski this arises among others from the necessity of having all activities in this sphere subordinated to care for achieving and maintaining security [1, p. 115]. The author suggests that "the following features speak for adoption of a systemic approach to deliberations in the scope of state security:

- holism, i.e. exploring phenomena, objects, processes, events etc. as a whole;
- complexity, i.e. disclosing diverse internal ties and relations;
- essentialism, i.e. studying phenomena (objects) from the viewpoint of important characteristic features;
- structuralism, i.e. identifying properties of the object (area) of interest based on features of its structure considered as invariable and with an integrating nature;
- contextuality, i.e. analysing systems with view to their position in the larger entirety;
- teleologism, i.e. analysing phenomena from the viewpoint of their purposefulness in the given field, especially in the entire reality;
- functionality, i.e. analysing systems with view to achieved goals and fulfilled functions;
- effectiveness, i.e. analysing systems from the viewpoint of the magnitude of results of achieved goals and fulfilled functions;
- synergism, i.e. analysing properties that arise from cooperation and interaction under a system of subsystems and elements of those subsystems, the essence of which is cooperation that turns out to be a much more effective measure than the sum of their individual measures;
- development, i.e. analysing systems in the aspect of the process of transformations and changes connected with transition to more complex states or forms, which in certain aspects may be even more perfect" [1, pp. 115–116].

Another equally important premise that determines a systemic approach to problems of state security are features of the already mentioned activities oriented at achieving and maintaining security, such as "anticipation, adaptation, purposefulness of activity, orientation at development, which are traits of a systemic approach that still remains a contemporary method of operation. Its characteristic features are as follows:

- treating the given object as a system;
- treating the given system as a unit that comprises mutually interrelated subsystems;

- treating the given system as one being a part of a larger system;
- conscious utilisation of a system mode with a strictly defined resolution level that expresses the given aspect of operation" [1, p. 115].

In the author's opinion only such an approach opens the possibility of establishing a mechanism meant to structure the state of knowledge pertaining to security.

## 2. Systemic nature of state security protection

Consequently it seems that a systemic approach to studies on the sphere of state security require adopting the same viewpoint also in relation to the institutional aspect, i.e. entities that execute all activities oriented at achieving and maintaining state security [19, pp. 113–120]. This also results from the necessity of planning institutional and procedural structures with systemic features on the basis of cognitive resources of science.

In this respect Piotr Sienkiewicz appears to be right in his presumption that referred to studying the effectiveness of systems suggesting that "the cognitive aspect studying the effectiveness of systems is related with adopting the following presumption: effectiveness is a systemic feature, i.e. one that characterises the operation system as a whole, and that reflects all factors of system functioning and development" [15, p. 301].

If one were to refer to the terminological scope in this aspect it could turn out that definitions that define the system tend to point to a construct, an established order, set of elements or relations that exist between them as well as principles that regulate them. The concept of the system is contemporarily widely applied in many fields of life, but is concurrently quite frequently used in excess. At this point it should be emphasised that not every set of elements, which are even to some extent mutually coupled, would form a system. Marian Mazur makes a justified presumption as he points to premises that need to be fulfilled that would define some construct as a system. When the author refers to those conditions as rigours of systemic play, he points to the necessity of occurrence in such a construct of specific features, such as accuracy, invariability, completeness, separability and functionality. Marek Zbigniew Kulisz agrees with Marian Mazur and slightly broadens the comprehension of those features and defines then as follows:

- accuracy – the system (the subsystem) needs to be defined in a precise way to make it clear what belongs to it and what does not. Both the definition of the system and the identification of its subsystems need to be accurate – it may be relatively general, but it may not be vague, otherwise important elements, information or relations existing within the system may be omitted;

- invariability – determination of the system (its features and properties) and the specification of elements in the system (subsystems) should be constant, i.e. invariable in the entire analytical process executed in the given period. Rigour does not mean the invariability of the system (in practical terms changes take place and in many cases are absolutely unavoidable), but much more the invariability of its definition in the given period of studies of the system. Consequently the point is that a subsystem (element) considered as belonging to a system (subsystem) was also treated in the subsequent stage of the analysis as an inherent element of the given system (subsystem);
- completeness – the division of the system into components (subsystems) should be comprehensive, i.e. that it has to reflect the actual image of the system in a reliable way at the exact moment when the analysis is being made. In other words, the analysed system may not comprise any elements that do not belong to any of its subsystems;
- decouplability – the division of the system into subsystems (elements) should be decouplable, i.e. that the individual subsystem may not comprise components also belonging to another subsystem. This implies that belonging of a given element to some subsystem clearly implies that it certainly does not belong to any other subsystem;
- functionality – the system (subsystem) should be distinguished and identified with view to its function, and not owing to spatial separability. Consequently for example a working team of people may not be divided into subsystems connected with diverse activities executed by particular team members, but merely into the managerial subsystem (team head) and the executive subsystem (employees carrying out the manager's instructions) [2, pp. 97–113].

This shows that apart from organisational conditions to be fulfilled by the system, its exceptionally important feature is its functionality, i.e. its designation, the sense of its creation. The same convictions are expressed by Zbigniew Ścibiorek, Bernard Wiśniewski, Rafał Bolesław Kuc and Andrzej Dawidczyk who indicate that the system "means a physical or abstract object in which a set or sets of elements may be distinguished that are mutually bound into schemes, which as a whole implement a superior function or a collection of such functions" [3, p. 87].

Consequently in the most generalised formulation the main function of the state security system would be to assure security to the state. Authors of the *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego (Glossary of terms in the scope of national security* suggest that the national (state) security system be understood as "an internally

coordinated set of organisational, human and material elements, oriented at counteracting any hazards to the state, in the first place political, economic, psychosocial, ecological and military hazards" [4, p. 139]. It has been described in a similar way in the White Book of Public Security of the Republic of Poland as a system that comprises forces, means and resource designated by the state for needs of implementation of tasks in the field of national security, appropriately organised, maintained and prepared" [5, p. 36].

It should be borne in mind that the state security system is a highly complex structure, one that is based on numerous subsystems. It consists among others of the management subsystem, executory subsystems, and operating subsystems under them (of protective and defence nature) and support subsystems (social and economic ones). This shows that system elements are constituted in the first place by people with tasks assigned to them, material and organisational resources, including also legal regulations and procedures.

This structure of the system allows the presumption that it is made of elements with varying complexity, but also of differing quality. This causes problems of organisational nature, and one connected with such structuring of system elements that would allow the most effective implementation of its function. Given the considerable complexity level of the analysed system the issue of appropriate, i.e. the most effective interplay, appears on many of its levels and for this reason it appears to be an issue that requires constant enhancing.

As correctly presumed by Piotr Sienkiewicz in a cycle of his lectures concerning systemic research, "complex studies of the effectiveness of operating systems (organisations and institutions, economic systems, logistic systems etc.) attempt to obtain sensible answers to the following questions:
- to what extent the presently functioning organisations satisfy social needs and meet specific structural, functional and development requirements;
- which criteria and methods should be used to assess and compare operating systems, and which assessment procedures should be adopted in control models (management, heading, command);
- which system features should be chosen and how should they be utilised to assure that requirements of high (desired) effectiveness be met etc." [14, p. 301].

## 3. Determinants of systemic interplay in the scope of public security

Clearly one of the most serious challenges in the analysed scope is coordination of individual elements in the security system that would enable the appearance of the synergy effect. Given such an approach to the problem, particular importance is gained by interplay

between particular system components. This concept may be referred both to material resources (e.g. cooperating communication and information systems, logistic systems etc.), as well as human resources. While as regards the first ones it is mainly based on algorithms worked out (designed) earlier and over a short-term period its variability is of a rather static nature, and on the other hand in the latter case apart from already defined principles or procedures it is created in a dynamic way, depending on the force of impact of factors for the system having an external nature (security environment). Consequently it seems that such a scope of cooperation is of particular importance for the effectiveness of the system. It is of importance both in the aspect of synchronisation of its elements, but also as regards the process of enhancing its effectiveness, i.e. in the final dimension of its quality.

At this point, given the thematic scope of the present paper, the further direction of our deliberation will be limited to a part of the area of national security mentioned at the beginning, and namely public security. Without references to definitional heterogeneity of the term of public security [6, pp. 19–23], in most general terms this pertains to this fragment of the sphere of state security, which is described by Janusz Gierszewski who describes it as a "physical process and actual status inside the state that allows normal functioning of constitutional structures of the state and protection of life, health and property of the inhabitants in guaranteeing their civil liberties" [7, p. 88]. As suggested by Marek Lisiecki "public security concerns primarily the people and their property, (…) is a component of internal security – but at the age of general globalisation of measures, and opening of borders it also depends – on external security" [8, p. 38]. This is the sphere of state security that allows undisturbed operation of public facilities in a state and assures the security of the life of citizens by protecting their life, health and property [15, p. 101], or as confirmed by Waldemar Kitler this is an area of state security that is connected with normal functioning of the state and of its citizens in the process of assuring protection from illegal actions that violate social order in the state defined by legal regulations, in such a way impairing the life, health or public order [16, p. 54]. In this context, when referring to the praxeological aspect, Robert Gwardynski suggests that although not each type of security is a creation, yet public security may certainly be considered as one, as this effect of consciously directed impulse of any generator counteract illegal acts not accidentally or by nature, but thanks to human will transformed into actual act [17, p. 55].

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Poland [20, art. 146] caring for this particular social value has been assigned for implementation by state authorities.

However, as regards activity of the national security system, measures meant to assure public security are implemented not only by government institutions but also non-government institutions and certain entities of the private sector. Those measures are of a protective nature. Their basis is "assuring conditions necessary to keep up constitutional order, internal stability of the state, societal security and public order, both of common and individual tangible and intangible material resources, as well as functioning of critical infrastructure" [5, p. 169]. The division of tasks and responsibilities was based on acts of generally binding law. This comprised among others such public institutions as services, guards and other institutions responsible for civil protection, public order and crisis management, as well as in scope of responsibility comprising the freedom of utilisation of civil rights and freedoms and self-government institutions.

One has to agree with Grzegorz Rydlewski who insists that a "multi-element composition of the institutional system of internal security is strictly correlated with the diversified nature of potential events that disturb security. This results from the fact that the mechanism of their creation may differ, which may be proven by targeted measures and chance events [9, p. 135]. Marek Lisiecki perceives the problem similarly, and states that "numerous entities handle security of the citizens. A part of them fulfils functions of a creative and supervisory nature, and the remaining part – executory functions. In the author's opinion "entities handling civil security protection may be qualified to the following fields:

- legislative sphere;
- presidential sphere;
- government sphere;
- self-government sphere;
- commercial sphere;
- judicial sphere;
- civil sphere" [8, p. 87].

Classifying them as to the implemented functions, the author considers them to be responsible for:

a) creative and supervisory functions:
- Sejm;
- Senate;
- President of the Republic of Poland;
- Council of Ministers;

- Prime Minister;
- ministers responsible for security;
- local bodies of general administration;
- territorial self-government bodies.

b) executory functions:

- Police;
- State Fire Service;
- Medical Rescuing;
- prosecutor's offices;
- correctional institutions;
- commune (municipal) guards;
- personal and goods security entities, investigation agencies;
- economic inquiry entities;
- insurance companies;
- universal courts [8, p. 87].

Among institutions that carry out executory functions in the state security system, apart from assigned responsibility for societal security or political security, their considerable part implements tasks related to assuring public security and order. It should be pointed out that a lot of them are executing various tasks in the scope of internal security of the state and it would not be easy to classify them in the context of responsibility or specific segments of internal security. Yet it may be seen that those are specialised entities "for which the issues of internal security constitute the main or a significant scope of tasks and competencies" [9, p. 135].

One of those entities is the Police, whose specific and main scope of operation lies in public security and order. Given this specific nature, although the Police are one of numerous public institutions that implement tasks in the scope of assuring public security, it remains a leading entity in the field of maintaining public security and order. This arises from statutory regulations that contain unequivocal stipulations that the above mentioned service has been assigned for "protecting the safety of people and for maintaining public security and order" [21]. According to Stanisław Pieprzny competencies of the Police make it virtually impossible to define a situation in which the Police would have no authority to take up measures related to protecting and maintaining public security and order [10, p. 26].

The visible abundance of entities involved in implementation of tasks related with protecting the safety of people and keeping public security and order points to the fact

that the earlier mentioned aspect of effective interplay of particular elements of the security system becomes a real challenge in this respect. It seems that in the case of such a structure of the public security system, making a concurrent assumption of the necessity of interplay, one of its elements must assume responsibility for its initiation and development. Those deliberations indicate that the Police as a leading entity should be the creator of interplay in this sphere of public security.

It seems obvious that in an attempt at implementing the assigned tasks on an optimum qualitative level (i.e. one desired by the society), the Police need to come into interaction with other entities operating in the sphere of public security. Taking into account the complexity of tasks implemented by the Police and the public sphere of their activity one may assume that failure to take up such activities would render impossible its appropriate functioning under the system. Consequently it should be assumed that creating possibilities for taking up interplay with other entities and its on-going enhancing is one of basic issues in the field of implementation of statutory tasks of the Police that requires a systemic reference.

In this regard it seems to be indispensable to create and enhance diverse types of dynamic and multidimensional relations oriented at interplay under the state security system. As stated by Dariusz Nowak, "relations that exist between individual (unit) entities and institutional entities (groups) may be of different nature and type. Their essence lies in striving at concurrent implementation of a common goal or mutual achievement of divergent objectives" [11, p. 691]. It is important that the interplay created between particular entities is directed at "taking up mutually consistent and supplementing measures and those that have a positive importance from the view-point of their impact on the achievement of goals" [12, p. 13]. The above indicates that basically no limitations exist as to the framework and form of interaction between institutions under the state security system. This results from the effectiveness of goal achievement and implementation of assumed functions by the entities. Nevertheless in the case of the public sector, it is imperative to take into consideration limitations caused by legal regulations and financial issues (rational expenditures of public funds).

The dimension of interaction on which focus the present deliberation may acquire different forms, based on diverse resources available to interacting institutions, comprise among others:

- intellectual resources (experience);
- information resources (knowledge);
- human resources (personnel support);

- logistic resources (equipment support);
- financial resources (financial support).

As regards the public sphere of state functioning it should be borne in mind that interaction understood in such a way may acquire different forms, i.e. from one enforced by legal regulations that define both its objective and subjective scope, as well as procedures, and it is of an obligatory dimension in the system. Nevertheless in many cases interaction within the system is of a voluntary nature that arises from needs of implementing functions of the system, for example in a region with a specific nature in relation to hazards and methods of their elimination, in the case of which interacting entities define on their own the scope and way of interacting based on hitherto experience [18, pp. 74–75].

As it comes to the scope of interaction in the sphere of public security, with reference to system determinants, it should be pointed out that it should fulfil requirements that could make it a "structured action of a permanent nature that comprises long-term transactions of resources flow between organisations and that enable the achievement of goals, the individual implementation of which would require involving much bigger means and forces, and in certain cases it would be impossible" [13, p. 211].

## 4. Recapitulation

Although owing to editorial limitations the above analysis dedicated to problems of the systemic approach to cooperation in the scope of public security needs to remain rather brief, yet all the same it allows making a presumption suggesting that as regards the system as such not only the interaction initially ascribed to its components is necessary for the implementation of system functions. The dynamically changing environment, in which its functions are implemented by the state security system requires its flexibility also with respect to functional assumptions. It would not be appropriate for the system to remain invariable particularly in the field of public security, because not only hazards are variable, but also the object of security (society). One of the symptoms indicating that the system is becoming adapted to a variable environment is developing the interplay dimension, especially one in the optional form, not imposed by legal regulations. Nevertheless to make it possible for it to constitute a value added for the hitherto functioning system, in which diverse interacting entities function, it must arise first of all from needs of functions ascribed to it.

Taking up interaction with each entity that implements tasks ascribed to it in the field of public security is not rational. Interaction cannot be effective with each of

them, and in certain cases it may be even quite the opposite – instead of serving as support, it becomes a redundant encumbrance for the entity. The basic determinant that precedes the commencement of this type of interaction must be the calculation of risks for the security system (increasing of effectiveness), which may result from it as well as costs which would have to be borne in connection with it.

It should be emphasised that interplay in the sphere of public security is being created on all levels of system functioning. This pertains to institutions that execute creative and supervisory functions (interaction is regulated by legal acts), as well as executory functions (the interaction scope is generally broadened as a result of gained experience). It seems that in system-based conditions a specific regularity may be observed arising from spatial conditions of interaction. On a national level it is in the broadest sense planned under creative and supervisory functions of specific entities and it is less susceptible to modifications. On the other hand, on a local level it is being created under executory functions of entities that operate in the public security system, and in this regards in the broadest sense, as a result of impact of the security environment on the system, it becomes supplemented. This results among others from a much lesser inertness of the system on a local level as compared to its national dimension, and lack of necessity subjective and objective standardisation of the scope of interplay onto the national level.

## References:

[1] Wiśniewski B., *System bezpieczeństwa państwa. Konteksty teoretyczne i praktyczne*, Wydawnictwo WSPol, Szczytno 2013.
[2] Kulisz M.Z., *Zarządzanie systemem bezpieczeństwa państwa*, "Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego" 2011, vol. 5.
[3] Ścibiorek Z., Wiśniewski B., Kuc R.B., Dawidczyk A., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne. Podręcznik akademicki*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2015.
[4] *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, National Defence University of Warsaw, Warsaw 2002.
[5] *Biała Księga Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, National Security Bureau, Warsaw 2013.
[6] Szerzej Kowalkowski S., *Bezpieczeństwo publiczne – pojęcie, charakter i uwarunkowania,* [in:] Kowalkowski S. (ed.), *Niemilitarne zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa publicznego*, National Defence University of Warsaw, Warsaw 2011.

[7] Gierszewski J., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne. Zarys systemu*, Difin, Warsaw 2013.

[8] Lisiecki M., *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem publicznym*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe ŁośGraf, Warsaw 2011.

[9] Rydlewski G., *Kształt systemu instytucjonalnego bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego w Polsce*, [in:] Sulowski S., Brzeziński M., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państwa. Wybrane zagadnienia,* ELIPSA Dom Wydawniczy, Warsaw 2009.

[10] Pieprzny S., *Policja. Organizacja i funkcjonowanie*, Wolters Kluwer, Warsaw 2007.

[11] Nowak D., *Wpływ współpracy i współdziałania na wybrane obszary funkcjonowania przedsiębiorstwa – wyniki badań*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego" 2012, No. 736.

[12] Lichtarski L., W*spółdziałanie gospodarcze przedsiębiorstw*, PWE, Warsaw 1992.

[13] Kożuch B., *Nauka o organizacji*, CeDeWu, Warsaw 2008.

[14] Sienkiewicz P., *25 wykładów*, National Defence University of Warsaw, Warsaw 2013.

[15] Pikulski S., *Podstawowe zagadnienia bezpieczeństwa publicznego*, [in:] Bednarek W., Pikulski S. (ed.), *Prawne i administracyjne aspekty bezpieczeństwa osób i porządku publicznego w okresie transformacji ustrojowo-gospodarczej*, UWM Publishing House, Olsztyn 2000.

[16] Kitler W., Skrabacz A., *Bezpieczeństwo ludności cywilnej. Pojęcie, organizacja i zadania w czasie pokoju, kryzysu i wojny*, Towarzystwo Wiedzy Obronnej [Defence Knowledge Association], Warsaw 2010.

[17] Gwardyński R., *System bezpieczeństwa państwa w ujęciu prakseologicznym*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej im. Witelona w Legnicy" 2019, No. 33 (4).

[18] Lubiewski P., *The Cooperation of the Police Academy in Szczytno with Polish Security and Public Order Formations*, "Internal Security" 2020, special issue.

[19] Lubiewski P., *Bezpieczeństwo państwa w ujęciu systemowym*, "Zeszyty Naukowe SGSP" 2020, No. 74(2).

[20] Constitution of the Republicof Poland of 2 April 1997 (Polish Journal of Laws Dz.U. from 1997 No. 78, item 483 as later amended).

[21] Act on the Police of 6 April 1990 (Polish Journal of Laws/Dz.U. from 1990 No. 30, item 179 as later amended).

**Paweł Lubiewski** – PhD in social sciences in the field of the science of security. Longterm practitioner in internal state security (Border Guards, Internal Security Bureau), with orientation at problems of managing state border protection, combatting organised

transborder crime, counteracting immigration threats, counteracting extremist and terrorist threats as well as counter-intelligence protection of the state. Long-term participant in works of the Interministerial Team for Terrorist Threats and the Permanent Group of Experts at the Team. As regards research, author of numerous publications and participant in research related to internal security of the state. The strategic area of interest is associated with problems of rationalisation of the functioning of the institutional internal security system of the Republic of Poland, coordination as part of the internal security system of the Republic of Poland, impact of immigration processes on public security and the impact of terrorist threats on public security. Presently an academic teacher, university professor at the Police Academy in Szczytno in the Department of Security and Legal Sciences.

ORCID 0000-0001-5149-7908

---

**Paweł Lubiewski** – doktor habilitowany w dziedzinie nauk społecznych w dyscyplinie nauki o bezpieczeństwie. Wieloletni praktyk w obszarze bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego państwa (Straż Graniczna, Agencja Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego), gdzie zajmował się problematyką zarządzania ochroną granicy państwowej, zwalczania zorganizowanej przestępczości transgranicznej, przeciwdziałania zagrożeniom imigracyjnym, a także przeciwdziałaniem zagrożeniom ekstremistycznym, terrorystycznym oraz kontrwywiadowczą ochroną państwa. Przez długi czas brał udział w pracach Międzyresortowego Zespołu do Spraw Zagrożeń Terrorystycznych oraz Stałej Grupy Eksperckiej przy Zespole.

Na płaszczyźnie naukowej autor wielu publikacji oraz uczestnik badań z zakresu problematyki bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego w państwie. Obszar zainteresowań oscyluje wokół problematyki racjonalizacji funkcjonowania instytucjonalnego systemu bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego RP, koordynacji w ramach systemu bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego RP, oddziaływania procesów imigracyjnych na bezpieczeństwo publiczne oraz wpływu zagrożeń terrorystycznych na bezpieczeństwo publiczne.

Aktualnie nauczyciel akademicki, profesor uczelniany w Wyższej Szkole Policji w Szczytnie na Wydziale Bezpieczeństwa i Nauk Prawnych.