

ЗНАЧЕННЯ ТА КЛАСИФІКАЦІЯ НЕБЕЗПЕК В УПРАВЛІННІ ВНУТРІШНЬОЮ БЕЗПЕКОЮ

© Ліманський А., 2015

Виокремлено характерні загрози внутрішньої безпеки у контексті динамічно змінного середовища. Наголошено на ролі та актуальності визначення небезпеки та її запобіганні в процесі управління внутрішньою безпекою. Оговорено класифікацію небезпек щодо однорідних груп відповідно до багатьох диверсифікованих критеріїв класифікації. Зроблено наголос на зростаючому значенні міжнародних, невійськових небезпек, запобігання яких вимагає багатосторонніх підходів, що ґрунтуються на залученні агентів та агентств з національних держав.

Ключові слова: бізнес-середовище, зміна, небезпека, безпека, управління безпекою.

A. Limański

Silesian School of Economics and Languages in Katowice

THE SIGNIFICANCE AND TAXONOMY OF HAZARDS IN HOMELAND SECURITY MANAGEMENT

© Limański A., 2015

The article aims to outline characteristics of threats to homeland security in the context of dynamically changing environment. In this way, the role and significance of hazard identification and danger prevention in the process of homeland security management are emphasized. The text, furthermore, postulates a taxonomy of dangers grouped into relatively homogenous sets according to a plethora of diversified classification criteria. In this context, the article lays a specific stress on increase in the significance of transnational, non-military dangers whose prevention requires a multilateral approach based upon engagement of agents and agencies from a number of nation states.

Key words: business environment, change, hazard, security, security management.

Definition of Research Problem/ Having assumed a necessity to characterize specified types of undertaken security measures, all analyses concerning security management, as a consequence, must also entail the determination of the subject and object of applied security measures. It is beyond doubt that security-related considerations are primarily focused upon the human being whose tranquil existence as well as freedom from diversified threats are indicative of diversified possibilities of safeguarding one's needs in the said aspects. When studied in a more detailed manner, the notion of security implies the following [6, p. 18]:

- human beings conceived as individuals endowed with specific systems of values that require relevant protection, defense and safeguarding against threats (an individual's personal security);
- groups of individuals (i. e. social groups) – both formalized (the family) and non-formalized (ethnic groups, nationalities, religious communities) – which are endowed with diversified attributes, such as folkways, social norms, systems of belief, that call for relevant security measures (collective security);

– a plethora of organizations that have been established in order to function within the spheres of free market (corporations), politics, and other forms of social activities (i. e. political parties, grassroots associations) – organizational security;

– formalized and territorially recognizable structures, such as counties, provinces, states, or groups of states, that follow a number of legal norms; in this case, one may address the notions of local security, homeland security, or international security.

Ontologically speaking, the subject-centered criterion of security refers to phenomena, processes, all manifestations of being, as well as formative relationships among the previously defined entities. The object-centered approach is auxiliary with reference to the former one, as the determination of the subject of security measures logically precedes attempts to define its manifestations, such as forms and scopes of relevant processes or phenomena. Needless to say, the latter conceptualization boils down to a necessity to define selected forms of security; that is, political, military, economic, social, cultural and environmental.

Nowadays, civilizational processes are responsible for the formation of new social and economic frameworks which exert a considerable influence upon the issue of security management. The advent of the twenty-first century is a period of changes that affect not only the conditions of human existence, but also ways according to which the notion of security is understood and conceptualized. Likewise, a number of emerging hazards paved the way for a tendency suggesting that the notion of security has acquired a transnational, or even global, profile. On the other hand, however, one must remember that security is not deprived of its personal character gesturing to a sense of safety experienced by a single individual. The virtue of security has emerged as an existential foundation of societies comprising free people who are successful and unconcerned with their future fate [10, pp. 69–81; 13].

Analysis of Recent Publications and Studies. Although roles and functions of nation states undergo processes of continuous evolution, there is a widespread consensus postulating that these organizations constitute principal agents of international relations [8, pp. 7-19]. Georg Jellinek postulates a classical, tripartite definition of the state which is commonly accepted both in the context of international law as well as international affairs. Jellinek assumes that the state is comprised of three inseparable components: a specified territory, people inhabiting a given area, and a form of authority exercising control over the aforementioned territory and its residents. As soon as these conditions are met, a given state becomes an agent of international law and a participant in trans-national relations [7, p. 67]. At this point, it must be emphasized that actions taking place within international relations could be also performed by trans-national agents (i. e. non-state actors), such as international non-governmental organizations, global corporations, trans-national organized crime organizations, and international terrorist organizations or groups. These structures may exert diversified and increasingly intensified influences upon decisions and actions undertaken by nation states and, at the same time, may become recipients of non-state actors' purposeful actions. Nowadays, the formation and functioning of non-state actors are manifested by more general tendencies in the development of international relations that refer both to the proliferation of such agents and the increase in their heterogeneity [2, pp. 94–104; 3, pp. 20–37; 9, pp. 311–321].

Having assumed a viewpoint postulating the dominant role of nation states in international relations, the external aspect of homeland security fulfils an instrumental role as far as theoretical analyses or practical undertakings in the field of security management are concerned. Yet, a holistic perspective on the issue of homeland security must entail both internal and external aspects. A conclusion of this kind is rendered reliable by the following facts [6, p. 19]:

– nation states are not only a formalized institutions of international relations, but they are also an assemblies of human, cultural, material and institutional components that pave the way for its developmental successes and the resultant position in the international arena;

– when it comes to the sphere of international relations, democratic states, as a rule, represent these security-related values that are concerned as shared and common by members of society regardless of differences of opinions dividing them;

- homeland security is a product of individual and collective values that characterize society, but it also results from security measures undertaken by other actors of international relations;
- society existing within a given nation state (also known as the nation) is willing to perceive security issues as related to challenges and dangers resulting from the conflictual nature of diversified social relations, consequences of civilizational development and technological progress, and devastating forces of nature.

When current socio-economic factors and determinants are taken into consideration, there exists a plethora of approaches towards homeland security [11, pp. 309–323]. In this sense, homeland security could be defined as “freedom from dangers posing risk to the survival of a given nation state, it concerns actions aiming at safeguarding its territorial integrity, sovereignty, political autonomy, and conditions conducive for development and affluence” [1, p. 13]. Homeland security, to put it otherwise, is defined as “an ability of nation and its authorities to protect the scope of the nation’s intrinsic values whose most significant elements comprise: the survival of state as an institution, survival of nation as an ethnic group, people’s biological endurance, territorial integrity, political autonomy and freedom to take action on the international scene, peace, protection of private ownership, protection of citizens’ quality of life” [14, p. 18].

Aims of the Article. The article aims to present relationships taking place between reality perception and actions taken in the sphere of security management in the context of changeable dangers of internal and external kind. Hence, it is postulated that trans-national, non-military dangers are currently increasing, and taking effective countermeasures against them requires a multilateral approach; namely, a method assuming participation of agents and agencies coming from diversified nation states. Contemporary dangers are not only caused by actions undertaken by authorities of separate nation states, but they spring from pathological phenomena of international scope, which trespass boundaries of separate countries, avoiding traditional systems of defense based upon armed forces.

Basic Research Material. When perceived from perspectives of both organizations and individuals, contemporary civilizational changes may be seen as sources of developmental chances and challenges or threats. These factors come to constitute dilemmas of the contemporary world which faces the era of ubiquitous globalization and digitalization of society (a paradigm of globalized informational society), which – in turn – could be translated into issues concerning security as related to individual nation states and the whole international arena of policymaking.

In addition to the already existing dangers, a plethora of new hazards have emerged. This process is accompanied by questions concerning the nature of those hazards as well as changes affecting both individual and organizational approaches towards an effective elimination of their consequences and/or preventing them from coming into being. Hence, it is beyond doubt that danger analysis and hazard prediction are nowadays both included to the most important spheres of study. Their significance seems even more substantial when one realizes that taking up systematic studies in the field of disaster incubation is sufficient enough to prepare society and relevant agencies responsible for crisis management to undertake a course of action rendering possible crisis prevention and/or crisis mitigation.

The meaningfulness of strategic decision-making that is typical of institutions of political authorities could be represented as the construction of social reality in conditions of the turbulent environment. This applies both to the state institutions and thusly influenced international organizations. Seeking for a common denominator for actions undertaken by the said types of institutions is necessitated by the ability to appoint criteria determining the scope of homeland security policies and strategies. The relevant criteria may comprise: challenges, dangers, opportunities and risks. When seen in combination, the aforementioned notions create a grid of terms referring to a given form of security strategy, its formulation, and the resultant evaluation of its realization. In this case, the relevant criteria comprise: challenges, dangers, opportunities, and risks determining a nation state’s existence and development.

Challenges are perceived as group of factors whose selection determines an agent's existence and development in either negative or positive terms. Challenges could be treated as problem situations in the sphere of security that pave the way for dilemmas to be faced by a given agent (i. e. nation state, international community) in the process of dealing with security issues. These dilemmas are often caused by political partners and allies who represent certain expectations or, as it is often the case, formulate standards obligatory in alliances or coalitions. Challenges could be undertaken or ignored. Facing existing challenges entails efforts and costs, but it is beneficial as far as one's future existence is concerned. Likewise, ignored challenges hinder getting profits from commonly undertaken activities and may provoke dangers when unfavorable conditions are faced.

Challenges could be also seen in terms of a possible problems of the future. Yet, in this context, one must have in mind the fact that gravity the problem in question seems insignificant at the introductory stage of assessment or observation. One can therefore assume that a challenge may be defined as a situation awaiting relevant solutions in which there is a slight probability that a given agent's operation will be disturbed. In a very similar vein, a challenge is conceived as a new, difficult situation that enforces a certain attitude, relevant actions, articulation of warnings, and presenting possible countermeasures. Consequently, it is a warning signal indicating an obligation to react early enough with respect to incoming signs that refer to a possibly dangerous developments within a given organization or in its environment [15, pp. 61, 62].

The notion of danger is ambiguous and it could be studied from a number of research perspectives. Furthermore, it is analyzed with reference to individual and collective situations, systems subsuming micro and macro social processes, determinants and circumstances taking subjective and objective aspects of a given phenomenon (or phenomena) into consideration. Dangers, when seen in the most general context, are possibilities that negatively valued phenomena may occur. They refer to situations that generate a probable appearance of threats and, thus, evoke fear and anxiety [5, p. 30].

When seen in the context of a nation state, or society, and its functioning, dangers are characterized by a situation in which society (or the nation state) faces a likelihood that diversified conditions necessary for its unhampered functioning or development will be exhausted. Dangers to societies or states refer to events and process – both present and future – endowed with a negative impact on a homeland security level. A danger is very frequently tantamount to a unsolved challenge which has not been accompanied with relevant countermeasures in a due time. Provided that changes are discerned in a due time and relevant action are undertaken, they will not convert into dangers. Otherwise, a given hazard may give rise to a process dynamic in time and space which, in turn, may lead to a disruption of balance, crisis situation, inability to exert control over a given sequence of events and, finally, a full-blown crisis. That is why, detected dangers call for actions whose aim is preventing crises and crisis situations from actualization and further development. At the same time, challenges are incentives to inform agents and agencies dealing with crisis management about a necessity to take up a comfortable position which renders effective counteractions in the future.

Opportunities could be regarded as a group of factors exerting a positive influence upon the agent's existence and development. Concurrently, they constitute a product of those challenges and dangers that may be averted or diminished in the course of actions undertaken by the very agent in question. Opportunities may be considered as occurrences existing independently of an agent's will (i. e. events and processes taking place in the sphere of safety) that facilitate goal achievement and interest realization. In the contemporary, increasingly globalizing world, where agents' mutual interdependencies are increasing, opportunities are more ubiquitous. The art of seizing opportunities is nowadays an increasingly important area of broadly understood security management.

In the context of the aforementioned considerations, risk is a yardstick or evaluation criterion that refers to dangers resulting from undertaken challenges or seized opportunities. Risk is evident in events, phenomena or processes that are independent of an organization (independent variables). Contrariwise, it could be seen as a correlate of consciously undertaken activities aiming to provide certain gains (dependent

variables). Risks can be seen in terms of uncertainty experienced in relation to one's own activities and its consequences. Hence, the notion denotes a possibility of facing negative consequences in the sphere of safety and security. Risk is also an element invariably related to policies and strategies associated with the area of homeland security. Every decision, undertaken or disdained, entails risk. Hence, it a matter of assessment and calculation to learn which decisions, considering their timespan and possible consequences, may entail an element of contingency or uncertainty.

Postulating a taxonomy with reference to a broad spectrum of contemporarily existing hazards is a very difficult task to accomplish. The only attainable strategy in this context is to provide an aggregation of existing dangers into relatively homogenous sets according to a previously indicated criteria for classification. When a degree of preparedness for incoming danger situations is taken into consideration as a criterion of classification, one is in a position to differentiate between unpredictable dangers (i. e. unconscious dangers) and predictable dangers (i. e. conscious dangers). What is more, dangers could both unexpected – as side effects of actions undertaken to attain certain profits – or expected as in the case of an agent's purposeful actions aiming to exert influence upon other subjects in order to burden them with certain negative consequences. Hazards may be endowed with a continuous character, which is typical of natural phenomena or elements of a given social group's agenda that are forwarded from one generation to another. In this specific context, society is often willing to accept those dangers as undesirable occurrences which are real but, at the same time, impossible to eradicate [5, pp. 33–40].

When the problem of homeland security is taken into account, the differentiation of dangers according to their sources of origin is an important area of consideration. In this respect, dangers could be divided into external and internal. One has to remember, however, that internal and external dangers' consequences may be similar or even the same in various respects. Both types are conducive to the disruption of the agent's internal stability, weakening of its development, which result in the attenuation of its position in the relevant environment of action. Consequently, general definitions aiming to explain the nature of internal and external dangers are very often similar. They are differentiated solely by the indication of relevant sources of hazardous activities (i. e. places). The internal danger is a specified state, a correlation of internal occurrences typical of a given subject which result or may result in the disruption of its internal stability and harmonious development in all areas of functioning, including the weakening of its position or the loss chances of survival in its own environment of action. In the case of external dangers, the relevant source of origin points to a group of occurrences taking place in a given subject's environment [6, p. 54].

A similar conceptualization refers to internal dangers to homeland security in terms of factors caused by structural dysfunctions which lead to destabilization or infringement of such core values as: the state's or nation's will to survive, territorial integrity, political autonomy, sovereignty in terms of choices made with reference to socio-political system or domestic or foreign policies, and the quality of existence understood as the preservation of appropriate living standards and developmental chances. At the same time, external dangers to homeland security may be seen as violations by another state of the following rules and values: sovereign equality, respect of laws inherent to sovereignty, refraining from deploying military force, inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, peaceful conflict resolution, refraining from intervening into the state's domestic affairs, respect of human rights and basic forms of liberty (including freedom of thought, religion, and beliefs), respect of rights to self-determine the rules of partnership cooperation among states, and observing obligations arising from international law [15, p. 64].

When their character is taken into consideration, hazards can be divided into military and non-military ones. Military dangers are combinations of politico-military occurrences which may result in diminishment or loss in conditions necessary for favorable existence or development of the state (nation), or infringement or loss of its territorial integrity and sovereignty as a consequence of military aggression. Non-military dangers, in turn, are combinations of occurrences which may result in diminishment or loss in conditions necessary for favorable existence or development of the state (nation), or infringement or loss of its territorial integrity and sovereignty due to political pressures or economic sanctions implemented without deploying physical (military) force [15, p. 64].

Nowadays, one witnesses a progressive evolution of threats taking place with regard to the criterion of their character, which paves the way for changes in object-centered understanding of homeland security [12, pp. 317-329]. It is worth to remember that the age of the Cold War was characterized by a tendency to study homeland security predominately in terms of national structures whose security was attributed to elaborate military resources. Hence, it was postulated that the state of danger had to be counterbalanced by the deployment of relevant military resources that were necessary to deflect the dangers in question. Nowadays, dominant conceptualizations in the field of homeland security postulate that the aforementioned approach was far too ethnocentric, which resulted in the restriction of security-related considerations to military aspects. Instead, an alternative, elaborate conceptualization was delineated. It comprises – apart from military elements – political, economic, social cultural and environmental components which are all situated in the international context of trans-national affairs [16, pp. 21, 22]. Although it seemed that the significance of military component will be gradually decreasing, the contemporary, globalizing world is still characterized by phenomena that can be effectively averted by deployment of military forces. For instance, the war against international terrorism brings about a renewed appreciation of military instruments in the policies of homeland security (i. e. the remilitarization of nation states).

Existing classifications of dangers can be based upon a delineation of primary sources or causes responsible for their generation. This criterion has led to four major types of dangers [4, pp. 76, 77]:

- natural dangers caused by those psychical and chemical occurrences in the natural environment or outer space that until recently were beyond human control;
- technical hazards associated with human rational activities (mostly economic ones), civilizational development, and progress in science and technology;
- social dangers caused by more or less purposeful human activities, cultural and civilizational development, diversified theories and viewpoints expressed by individuals, social groups or social organizations;
- other causes comprising compilations of the abovementioned sources and new, previously unknown categories.

The complexity of issues related to homeland security is manifested by a possibility to deploy further criteria of classification [4, pp. 78–81; 15, pp. 65–67]:

- criterion of character and scale of negative consequences: 1) small scale dangers characterized by low volume of impact and low degree of harmfulness (events, incidents, coincidences); 2) medium scale dangers characterized by moderate volume of impact and harmfulness (failures, accidents, phenomena); 3) large scale dangers characterized by high volume of impact and high degree of harmfulness (calamities, catastrophes, crunches, plagues); 4) extreme dangers characterized by extremely high volume of impact and disastrous degree of harmfulness (cataclysms, epidemics, wars).

– criterion referring to a predicted timespan of danger neutralization and coping with its consequences: 1) dangers whose consequences last for a short period of time and are characterized by low destructiveness and relatively high predictability; 2) dangers whose consequences last for a moderate period of time and are characterized by definable consequences which can be dealt with in a predictable timespan; 3) dangers generating long-term effects whose neutralization time is relatively long and difficult to determine because their consequences are hard to predict; 4) dangers whose effects cannot be mitigated in a realistic timespan and, hence, one cannot assume a relevant neutralization time without running a risk of making significant mistakes.

– criterion of crisis area: 1) dangers affecting selected areas of economic life; 2) dangers affecting selected socio-cultural forms (i. e. social, religious, ethnic, cultural threats); 3) dangers affecting homeland public order and international public order (i. e. national, political and civilizational hazards); 4) natural and environmental dangers that may be endowed with grave social, economic and environmental consequences; 5) total hazards that affect all spheres of social, economic, political, civilizations, climatic, and environmental activities.

– criterion of scope and character of negative consequences: 1) hazards evoking immediate effects which are less disastrous and relatively unproblematic to mitigate; 2) serious threats whose negative consequences are characterized by higher propensity for destructiveness, so that their elimination is necessitated by the deployment of considerable resources and measures; 3) dreadful hazards causing harmful and dangerous effects which are difficult to eliminate quickly; 4) total hazards generating catastrophic consequences, enormous losses and the most intense forms of multifaceted danger.

– criterion of character of causes triggering hazards: 1) hazards caused by purposeful human activities and their technical, social and civilizational products; 2) hazards caused by random factors which elude attempts at rational control at the current level of civilizational development; 3) hazards caused by purposeful and random causes whose sources are more or less known and could be subjected to surveillance and control procedures to a bigger or lesser degree; 4) natural, environmental and cosmic hazards which are practically beyond human control.

– criterion of a scope and area of impact: 1) local hazards (environmental); 2) regional hazards (borderline hazards); 3) countrywide hazards (national, ethnic); 4) trans-national hazards (trans-frontier); 5) global hazards.

– criterion referring to a possibility to anticipate hazardous effects in terms of their scope, intensity and harmfulness: 1) hazards that are generated gradually and, consequently, may be predicted and reduced to a minimal level providing relative safety; 2) hazards whose scope, effects and impact area can be anticipated relatively credibly, but the present technological development render it impossible to exert control over them; 3) unpredictable hazards understood as random and unavoidable ones; 4) hazards caused by the so-called “force majeure” that cannot be predicted, leaving humans utterly helpless.

Conclusions and Perspectives for Further Research. Nowadays, it is claimed that the issue of security is a state of consciousness characterizing given subjects, like citizens or societies in general. It could be also conceived as a certain continuous process that leads to a perception that a given form of danger is no longer active. In spite of civilizational progress, the dynamic increase in human productivity and potentialities for coping with difficulties and dangers, there is an observable increase in the number, scope and severity of events and phenomena disorganizing social, economic and political life of nation states as well as the international arena in general.

When considered as a type of phenomena, dangers – depending on their nature – can be diagnosed and described and plausibly characterized in terms of the scale of possible losses. This process depends upon continuous monitoring of one’s environment, analysis of challenges and symptoms typical of a given negative event, their subsequent assessment, willingness to take relevant decisions and deploy appropriate resources and measures. Hazards are, hence, important elements of decision processes typical of all organized agents (including nation states), which is necessitated by choices made with respect to danger attenuation or prevention.

When current social and economic circumstances are taken into consideration, one faces a necessity to provide solution for the following problems: evaluation of challenges and dangers so that it could be stated whether they exert realistic influence upon homeland security; determination of premises referring to analyses of real dangers; determination of a moment in time by which undesirable events and phenomena will have reached the level of realistic and significant danger. A model whose application renders possible the evaluation of an actual level of danger could be helpful in analyses of the aforementioned problems. Firstly, a condition of insecurity is observable when there is a clear and present danger of a significant scale and its perception is relevant; namely, adequate. Secondly, obsession is observed when insignificant danger is perceived as a considerable one. Thirdly, a condition of false safety is observed when an external hazard is significant, but it is assessed in terms of an insignificant one. Fourthly, a condition of security is observed when an external hazard is minor and its interpretation is adequate. One may, therefore, conclude that the condition of security is a conglomerate of two aspects: first and foremost, it is the observed, objective lack of existing dangers and, later on, the absence of subjective anxieties suggesting that hazards are existent or could take place in a foreseeable future. To put it otherwise, researching into security-

related problems is necessitated by studies concerning both reality in which dangers come into existence and the sphere of human consciousness in which danger perception take place. As a result, elements of subjective judgment and objective assessments must be taken into account [14, p. 17].

1. Czaputowicz J. *Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa – aspekty teoretyczne*. [W:] Dębski S.; Górka-Winter B. (red.) *Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa*. Warszawa: Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, 2003. 2. Drabik I. *Bezpieczeństwo ekonomiczne państwa w warunkach procesów globalizacyjnych*. [W:] *Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2013*. 4. *Medzinárodná vedecká konferencia. Zborník vedeckých a odborných prác. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl generála Milana Rastislava Štefánika, 2013*. 3. Drabik I. *Rola i znaczenie podmiotów niepaństwowych w kształtowaniu współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*. [W:] A. Limański, I. Drabik (red.) *Współczesne problemy zarządzania bezpieczeństwem w aspekcie zagrożeń w Polsce, na Słowacji i Ukrainie*. Katowice: Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania Marketingowego i Języków Obcych, 2012. 4. Ficoń K. *Inżynieria zarządzania kryzysowego. Podejście systemowe*. Warszawa: BEL Studio, 2007. 5. Górski P. *Zarządzanie logistyczne w sytuacjach kryzysowych w Polsce*. Warszawa: Akademia Obrony Narodowej, 2009. 6. Kitler W. *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe. Podstawowe kategorie, dylematy pojęciowe i próba systematyzacji. Zeszyt Problemy nr 1 (61), 2010*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Wiedzy Obronnej. 7. Kondrakiewicz D. *Państwo*. [W:] Pietraś M. (red.) *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2006. 8. Limański A. *Suwerenność państwa jako uczestnika stosunków międzynarodowych w warunkach globalizacji*. [W:] A. Limański; I. Drabik (red.) *Współczesne problemy zarządzania bezpieczeństwem w aspekcie zagrożeń w Polsce, na Słowacji i Ukrainie*. Katowice: Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania Marketingowego i Języków Obcych, 2012. 9. Limański A. *Globalizacja korporacyjna i jej wpływ na bezpieczeństwo ekonomiczne*. [W:] / A. Limański; I. Drabik // *Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2014*. 5. *Medzinárodná vedecká konferencia. Zborník vedeckých a odborných prác. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl generála Milana Rastislava Štefánika, 2014*. 10. Limański A. *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem pod presją czasu*. [W:] / A. Limański; Z. Grzywna, I. Drabik // *ryń, W.; Dębowska, N. (red.) Bezpieczeństwo – wielorakie perspektywy. Człowiek – Społeczeństwo – Państwo w sytuacjach kryzysu*. Poznań: Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa, 2014. 11. Limański A. *Tradycyjne i współczesne paradygmaty bezpieczeństwa państwa*. [W:] / A. Limański, A. Olak // *Stawnicka J. (red.) Komunikacja w sytuacjach kryzysowych III*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 2012. 12. Limański A. *Redefinicja zakresu przedmiotowego bezpieczeństwa państwa we współczesnych stosunkach międzynarodowych – wielowymiarowość bezpieczeństwa*. [W:] / A. Limański, A. Olak, I. Drabik // *Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2012*. 3. *Medzinárodná vedecká konferencia. Zborník vedeckých a odborných prác. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl generála Milana Rastislava Štefánika, 2012*. 13. Tyrala P. *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem w warunkach procesów globalizacyjnych*. / P. Tyrala, A. Limański, I. Drabik. - Katowice: Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania Marketingowego i Języków Obcych w Katowicach, 2013. 14. Zajac J. *Bezpieczeństwo państwa*. [W:] / J. Zajac // K. A. Wojtaszczyk, A. Materska-Sosnowska (red.) *Bezpieczeństwo państwa. Wybrane problemy*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, 2009. 15. Żebrowski A. *Zarządzanie kryzysowe elementem bezpieczeństwa Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*. / A. Żebrowski. – Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego w Krakowie, 2012. 16. Żukrowska K. *Pojęcie bezpieczeństwa i jego ewolucja*. [W:] K. Żukrowska, M. Gracik (red.) *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe. Teoria i praktyka*. Warszawa: Szkoła Główna Handlowa, 2006.