

Original article

Civil defense and crisis management in Poland in the systemic approach

Romuald Kalinowski 

State Security Research Team, Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Natural Sciences and Humanities in Siedlce, Poland,
e-mail: romuald.kalinowski@uph.edu.pl

INFORMATION

Article history:

Submitted: 12 February 2020

Accepted: 5 May 2020

Published: 15 September 2020

ABSTRACT

The two subsystems in the state defense system that make up the civil defense system and the crisis management system have specific tasks to fulfill. The two organizational structures, guided by their systemic approach, remain independent of each other, even though they share the same decision-making bodies, executive or executive bodies, subsidiary bodies, and executive entities.

Inappropriate perception of them – even by decision-makers – leads to organizational irregularities, a lack of understanding of the responsibilities of the bodies and actors of these systems. It is also a source of misregulation in this area. A systemic perspective may require an appropriate approach and the development of new solutions to improve the process of activity in this area.

KEYWORDS

civil defense, crisis management, system of civil defense,
organization of crisis management and civil protection in Poland,
public administration



© 2020 by Author(s). This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY). <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

All the activities of organizational entities in the state bear the hallmarks of a systemic approach to the problem. It is not always visible but results from the logical and practical perception of each organization's needs.

In the subject literature, one can notice various approaches to the term system [1, p. 139]. The difference in terminology stems from the basis of reference. Nevertheless, it is always seen as a set of certain elements created for some purpose, connected by a shared guiding idea. According to Professor Piotr Sienkiewicz, "a system is every object distinguished from the reality being studied, constituting a whole created by a set of elementary objects (elements) and connections (relations) between them" [2, p. 27]. One does not find a full (closed) reference to the term system in the form, as mentioned above. It is also necessary to indicate the principles of operation, scientific basis, the complexity of elements, or organizational assumptions.

The two terms “crisis management” and “civil defense” shown in the title seem to discipline the system area, indicating the state security system, the defense system, and the state defense system.

The state security system is “an internally coordinated set of organizational, human and material elements aimed at counteracting all threats to the state, in particular, political, economic, psycho-social, environmental, and military ones” [1, p. 139]. In turn, the system of state defense “is an internally coordinated set of organizational, human, and material elements mutually linked and working to defend the state” [1, p. 140].

Similarly, the state defense system “is a set of internally organized and interconnected elements – people, organizations, devices – working to maintain the military security of the state” [1, p. 141].

The essence of the systemic approach is noted, among other things, in a distinctive way in the development of the term Armed Forces’ mobilization system. One of the definitions of this system reads that it is “an internally ordered system of elements and a set of rules and norms regulating its functioning in time of peace, mobilization, and war. The Armed Forces’ mobilization system consists of the theory of mobilization, governing bodies, planning documentation, mobilization and mobilized units, and elements of the mobilization base. What is more, it includes reserves in the national economy, armaments, equipment, and material reserves maintained in military units, the subsystem of appointing (drawing) reserves from the national economy, the subsystem of mobilization training, the subsystem of training of personnel reserves, and the subsystem of controlling the mobilization readiness of troops” [1, p. 140; 3].

Another definition states that the Armed Forces’ mobilization system is “an internally structured set of elements and a set of principles and norms that regulate its functioning in time of peace, mobilization, and war. The Armed Forces’ mobilization system consists of the theory of mobilization, governing bodies, planning documentation, military units, elements of the mobilization base, state reserves, armaments and equipment, and Armed Forces’ material reserves” [1, p. 140; 3].

The basic approach is noted in the definition that the Armed Forces’ mobilization system is “an internally structured set of elements that function under certain principles and norms and a set of principles and norms in the time of peace, crisis, and war. They coordinate planning and organizational undertakings carried out by military and administrative bodies and economic operators to use dedicated forces and measures to develop the mobilization forces following the assumed political and operational objectives” [1, p. 140].

The definitions of the mobilization system presented above bring the reader closer to the essence of the problem. They also provide an opportunity to approach civil protection and crisis management in systemic terms. It should be stressed that the commonality of both structures gives their components a characteristic dimension.

Civil defense and crisis management – basic terminology

In the literature on the subject, the reader will not find the expression civil defense system developed. By analogy, it can be said that a civil defense system is an internally ordered system/having a specific structure/arrangement of elements and a set of rules and norms that

regulate their functioning in times of peace, crisis, and war. The purposefulness of their creation and improvement, legal norms, and scope of tasks should be emphasized. Therefore, it also includes management bodies, subsidiary bodies, executive bodies, entities for which it was created, training centers, and planning documentation.

While remaining in the Convention, the crisis management system can be described as “an internally organized and integrated system that develops a dynamic system of three essential subsystems: the management bodies’ subsystem – the management apparatus, the subsystem of information links within the organization, and the subsystem of methods and actions. The latter refers to the rules of operation of organizations that jointly pursue one essential objective: the reduction and, if they occur minimization, of the impact of crisis factors on the operation of the organization” [4, p. 47]. It should be stressed that the set consisting of some elements and relations between them does not constitute a system since rules ordering this set are still necessary.

Another approach identifies the crisis management system “as a set of public administration bodies and institutions connected with each other by relationships, whose primary purpose is to implement the crisis management process [5, p. 82]. A. Szymonik defines a system of crisis management as actions of many institutions and inn-keepers for the benefit of ensuring existence and development in situations of danger. He lists the following sub-systems as components:

- crisis response, which is a set of organizational units, legal and natural persons, and mutual dependencies and rules of conduct in the course of actions,
- management, covering the organizational and functional structure of information and decision-making activities carried out to achieve the goal [6, p. 57].

None of the definitions of crisis management provided in the studies refers explicitly to the scientific theory and practice of the above issues. It is to be assumed that the existence of many schools (views) on this matter does not support such a perspective. This approach, perhaps reluctantly characterizes the young field of scientific theory and practice. The logic of the viewpoint to understanding the problem above allows other system definitions to be used to describe the systems under consideration.

The expressions in the title: civil defense and crisis management are not synonymous. However, they are two different concepts having many shared features while maintaining legal separation of their functioning in the Republic of Poland. Thus, one should strongly oppose the views expressed in certain circles, including those of decision-makers, that crisis management and civil defense are the same. Such a vision harms the case, introduce and confirms the ignorance of those responsible for the implementation of issues arising from the terminological, task, and legal provisions. The above statement is not contradicted by the organizational, legal, and naming community of structures of decision-making bodies, auxiliary bodies, and executive sub-entities at every level of public administration.

So how it looks in terms of terminology. Crisis management is the activity of public administration bodies, which is an element of managing the national security and consists in preventing crises, preparing to take control over them through planned actions, reacting in the event of a crisis, removing effects, and restoring critical resources and infrastructure [7]. At this point, it should be highlighted that this is the authorized public administration bodies’ activity that clearly indicates the decision-making (management) administration at each level of the

country's territorial division. Thus, this management is based on decision making structures of public administration (governmental and local governmental) of the Republic of Poland.

The subject literature also contains other definitions of crisis management. One of them treats it as "a component of projects implemented in the framework of ensuring the security and defense of the state, more precisely – the internal security of the state" [8, p. 315], which covers planning, organizational, leadership, and control activities [8, p. 315]. The next one, presented by J. Gołębiewski, indicates that crisis management is not a special kind of management but organizing security processes. The problem is that in the absence of an unambiguous definition of the term "organization of security processes", new concepts should not be created. Specific rules of correctness guide onomastics, and experts ought to practice it. In turn, civil defense "means the fulfillment of all or some of the tasks listed below¹ (...) aimed at protecting civilians from the non-security resulting from military action or natural disasters and overcoming their immediate consequences and providing the conditions necessary for survival" [9].

Another definition treats civil defense as one of the links of the non-military system in the state defense system. It should be emphasized that it is intended to prepare and coordinate planning, prevention, protection, and rescue measures to protect civilians from the dangers arising from armed operations and natural disasters and to overcome their immediate consequences, as well as to provide the conditions necessary for survival [1, p. 80].

We note the systemic reference to civil protection in the statement that it is "an organizational system of action, planning, training, prevention and preparedness for emergencies at the local and national level aimed at defending (correctly protecting – the RK) civilians during natural disasters, human-made or armed actions [1, p. 79].

The adoption of appropriate benchmarks makes it possible to mention other definitions. Therefore, it seems justified to see civil protection also as a set of pre-planning, preventive and protective undertakings: civil protection and rescue operations carried out by appropriate authorities and separated (specific) forces, with the active participation of society within the framework of the national (general) defense [10, p. 223].

The definitions presented here do not cover the essence of the problem. They do, however, bring the considerations to the most fundamental subject, which is human. Nevertheless, the purpose of civil defense – as it is indicated in the Act on the universal obligation to defend the Republic of Poland of 21 November 1967 – apart from civil protection, is to protect "workplaces and public utility facilities, cultural assets, rescue and help the victims of war, and cooperate in combating natural disasters and environmental threats and removing their effects" [11].

Although the juxtaposition of the presented definitions in the field of crisis management and civil protection allows for the statement that there is no sign of equality between them, one

¹ These tasks included warning service, evacuation, preparation and organization of shelters, operation of blackout facilities, rescue, medical services, i.e., first aid and religious service, firefighting, detection and marking of danger zones, decontamination and other similar protective activities, provision of emergency rooms and supplies, emergency assistance to restore and maintain order in affected areas, emergency restoration of essential public services, emergency burial of the deceased, rescue assistance for goods necessary for survival, additional activities necessary for the fulfilment of any of the above tasks, among others, planning and organizational work.

can notice references to planning, organizational, and practical activities, which are, after all, a determinant of the rationality of each system (subsystem) or organization.

The assumed goal of establishing appropriate organizational structures has its justification. Furthermore, even though the legal provisions of crisis management point to a different/greater need for a systemic approach to the issue to manage national security, by referring to crucial critical infrastructure systems, for food and water supply, rescue, health protection, and other services also relevant for the security of citizens (monitoring, warning and alerting; organization of evacuation from areas at risk, organization of social and medical care, organization of protection against radiological, biological and chemical risks, information to the public on risks and ways of dealing with them) [12], elements common to these systems are highlighted.

There are also others that will be referred to later in the considerations. It does not preclude the separate functioning of both systems, even if their legal bases are separate. It is also since civil protection is increasingly perceived as part of crisis management and civil defense [13], or for indicating that it will be crisis management in peacetime and civil defense in war. Nothing more ridiculous.

Formal and legal regulations governing civil defense and crisis management systems

As noted earlier, the legal basis for the functioning of the organizational systems mentioned above is adequately described. In the case of crisis management, it is the Act of 26 April 2007 on crisis management (as amended). In turn, in the case of civil defense, it is the Act of 21 November 1967 on the universal obligation to defend the Republic of Poland (as amended) and Additional Protocol I of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, which our country ratified.

It should be emphasized that the Constitution of the Republic of Poland is the fundamental basis for the Acts, as mentioned earlier. Nevertheless, the provisions contained therein treat a substantially different problem with an identity of the organizational structures re-implementing them and with the naming coherence of decision-making bodies, auxiliary or executive bodies, and executive entities. As mentioned earlier, the Acts supplement or complement to a given time the relevant executive regulations, guidelines, and orders of relevant bodies and local administration. They are vital to the overall assumptions made regarding structures, tasks, and areas of activity. It should be stressed that crisis management in our country is a “young” field of theory and practice², in contrast to the civil protection established in May 1973, which had its reference to institutionalized forms of civil protection from 1934, when a relevant act established the anti-aircraft and anti-gas defense [14].

The Acts referred to above indicate the governing body, which is the competent public administration body. In the case of crisis management, it is the authority competent for crisis management, and in the case of civil protection – the head of civil protection. In the first and second cases, it is the same person as the local administration body competent in the given area. Hence, on the commune level, it is the mayor, at the poviát level, it is a starost, and at the voivodeship level, it is a voivode, who is a representative of the government administration in the area. It should be stressed that there is no transfer of the name of this

² Since the adoption of the Crisis Management Act of 26 April 2007 [Ustawa z dnia 26 kwietnia 2007 r. o zarządzaniu kryzysowym (Dz. U. 2007 Nr 89. poz. 590 z późn. zm.)].

body to another area of activity, nor is there any substitute use of this name within a specific systemic approach. Naming, organizational, and managerial differences occur at the central administration level. Here, the Head of Civil Defense is the Commander-in-Chief of the State Fire Service, and the Council of Ministers³ exercises crisis management on the territory of the Republic of Poland. Those persons are assigned appropriate tasks remaining within crisis management and separate ones in the function of civil defense.

Thus, we obtain confirmation of the legal, organizational, and task-related solutions adopted separately for the needs of crisis management and separately for civil protection. Even though these are separate solutions, but they prove to be compatible ones for both problem areas.

The tasks of the body competent in matters of crisis management in a specific territorial area are outlined in the Act of 26 April 2007 (as amended) on crisis management, and ones of the head of civil defense at the appropriate level – in the Ordinance of the Council of Ministers of 25 June 2002 on the detailed scope of activities of the head of national civil defense, heads of civil defense of voivodeships, poviats, and communes [15].

The executive and auxiliary bodies at the field administration level in both systems are Security and Crisis Management Departments, crisis management centers, and crisis management teams. Relevant organizational regulations cover Their tasks, organizational scope, and structures. It should be noted that they have the same name in both systems. Appropriate naming and organization exist only at the level of the central administration. That applies to, among others, the Government Security Center and the National Fire Service Headquarters.

Nevertheless, the discussion about the task and sub-task separation of each of these systems will be continued.

At this point, it should be emphasized that civil defense is prepared for the period of external threat to state security and war, with the possibility of implementing rescue projects during peacetime. Crisis management, in turn, is the activity of public administration bodies during peacetime as part of the management of national security.

The identity of both systems – despite their shared features within the organizational structures in the case in question – is contradicted by the development of two separate plans: a crisis management plan implemented at the national, voivodeship, poviats, and commune level and a civil protection plan implemented at the voivodeship, poviats, and commune level. Their parts are different, although some of them are called the same or similar. Thus, the crisis management plans contain three parts entitled: the master plan, the crisis management series of actions, and the functional annexes of the master plan. Civil protection plans, on the other hand, consist of five parts entitled: the master plan, the procedures for progress, and the charter for carrying out civil protection tasks, the functional annexes, and other documents developed following the decision of the authority drawing up the plan.

All parts of the crisis management plan and the civil protection plan shall be filled in with relevant content, reflecting the theoretical and theoretical assumptions made for these plans.

The crisis management plan includes: 1) the master plan, including: a) characteristics of threats and risk assessment of their occurrence, including critical infrastructure and a risk

³ In urgent cases, crisis management is exercised by the minister in charge of internal affairs, immediately notifying the Prime Minister of his/her actions. Act of 26 April 2007 on crisis management [Ustawa z dnia 26 kwietnia 2007 r. o zarządzaniu kryzysowym..., op. cit.].

and threat map; b) tasks and responsibilities of participants in crisis management in the form of a safety net; c) a list of forces and means planned to be used in crisis situations; 2) a set of undertakings in case of crisis situations, including a) threat monitoring tasks; b) the mode of activation of necessary forces and means participating in the implementation of planned undertakings; c) procedures of crisis response, specifying the way of dealing with the situation; d) cooperation between the forces referred to in point (a), (b) and (c), (d) the interaction between the forces referred to in point (b); (3) functional annexes to the master plan specifying: a) procedures for the implementation of tasks in the field of crisis management, including those related to the protection of critical infrastructure; b) organization of communications; c) organization of a monitoring, warning, and alerting system; d) principles of informing the population about threats and ways of dealing with them; e) organization of evacuation from endangered areas; f) organizing rescue, medical care, social and psychological assistance; g) organization of protection against threats specific to a given area; h) list of concluded contracts and agreements related to the implementation of tasks contained in a crisis management plan; i) principles and mode of damage assessment and documentation; j) procedures for mobilizing state reserves; k) a list of critical infrastructure located in a voivodeship, poviát, or commune, respectively, covered by a crisis management plan; l) priorities for protection and restoration of critical infrastructure [7].

The civil protection plan shall include: (a) the master plan, and in it: an order introducing the civil protection plan for application, a memorandum of understanding, a register of changes, conclusions from the peacetime threat assessment and the characteristics of threats in the event of an external threat to national security and the period of war, the tasks and responsibilities of persons and entities entrusted with the implementation of the civil protection tasks realized by organizational units on the administered area, the characteristics of organizational structures and resources and an analysis of the possibilities of their use; (b) procedures for action as documents related to defense preparedness, which should mainly relate to the time of the external threat to national security and war, and other documents drawn up in accordance with the decision of the authority drawing up the plan; (c) functional annexes defining threat monitoring, warning and alerting, including information to the public on threats and modus operandi, directing and communication, evacuation of people, animals and property in the event of a threat to national security and war, medical care, social assistance and psycho-logical and religious assistance, decontamination and other similar protective activities, preparation and organization of protective structures, operation of blackout facilities, rescue, firefighting, detection and marking of danger zones, provision of emergency rooms and supplies, emergency restoration of essential public services, emergency burial of the deceased, rescue aid for goods necessary for survival, emergency aid for restoring and maintaining order in disaster zone; additional activities necessary for the fulfilment of any of the tasks listed above, including planning and organizational work; (d) supplementary information supplementing the state's collection of the necessary data needed for planning and decision-making and directing activities [16].

It should be noted that they are subject to sub-writing and approval by the competent authority. The civil protection plans shall be approved by the heads of civil protection competent for the territory concerned, while the crisis management plans by the authority competent for higher-level crisis management.

When developing a crisis management plan and a civil protection plan, it shall be assumed that the plan is appropriate if it is:

- a) purposeful, that is to say one which identifies the forces and measures actually needed to achieve the intended objective,
- b) feasible, i.e., taking account of the actual implementation capacity of the different planning levels,
- c) internally consistent, without contradictory assumptions or recommendations, one of which makes it difficult or impossible to implement the other,
- d) operational, with a structure that is as simple and transparent as possible,
- e) flexible, allowing for or anticipating certain changes,
- f) reasonably detailed, covering the entire project,
- g) reasonable, based on a sound knowledge of the projects planned,
- h) reasonably long-term, with the possibility of making appropriate adjustments,
- i) a “good work” plan, ensuring the selection and layout of the projects, which will ensure the accurate and reliable performance of the tasks⁴ [17].

In the presented assumptions, the reader will notice the collective content, even in the title of the relevant documents. It is the substantive correctness resulting from the similarity of the assumptions, objectives of the action, and the same data adopted for planning and the correlation of some parts of the plans. It does not change the fact that we are still talking about two different plans and two separate systems that share common elements, bodies, and executive entities.

The implementation of the crisis management tasks and the civil protection plan shall be ensured by appropriate forces. In the crisis management system, they are said to be executive entities and in the civil defense system they are said to be civil defense formations. In the first as well as in the second system, their role boils down mainly to the fulfillment of protection and rescue tasks in the event of a threat, mainly of human lives. Nevertheless, there is a subtle difference between these forces. Some of them operate based on everyday professional duties⁵, others on organizational assignments given by the territorially competent military administration at the request of the relevant head of civil defense.

Therefore, it is hard to accept the views expressed that during peacetime, it will be a rescue force, and during the war, a civil defense formation. Such an approach – with the law of the Republic of Poland being in force – is an inappropriate one, since it points to a specific area of ignorance even if it is confirmed that these are rescue forces, in the literal sense of the word, executing the whole range of rescue tasks (in conformity with the competences) or forces performing specific activities (also in accordance with respective competences) in the whole of rescue operations.

The new overview at rescue forces through the prism of “firefighter’s look” indicates minimalism of perception of the above problem by legislators and decision-makers. The novelties are reflected in the document entitled “Standards in the field of supplying civil defense bodies

⁴ Professor Tadeusz Kotarbiński states that the plan should be purposeful, feasible, transparent, complete, operational, internally consistent, coherent, accurate, alternative, and long-distance.

⁵ As the Police, State Fire Service, Medical Rescue, Polish Red Cross, Municipal Guard, services, guards and inspections, GOPR, TOPR, etc.

and formations with equipment, technical measures, and uniforms necessary to perform civil defense tasks and their framework organizational structures and basic tasks” of March 2014 and the respective Guidelines of the Head of the National Civil Defense of 3 March 2014 [18].

The fact that the organizational and mobilization allocations to the formation have been abandoned, as well as the equipment of these subunits in terms of percent completion in specific states of defense readiness (20% in permanent readiness⁶, 50% in defense readiness in times of crisis⁷, 100% in defense readiness in times war) is worrying. There are more shortcomings in that document.

The functioning of civil protection and crisis management in the Republic of Poland rests upon relevant principles. In the literature on the subject, the principle is “the foundation on which something is based, the rule, standard, especially norm of conduct” [19, p. 981]. It is also the norm of social coexistence. In turn, a norm – “in ethics, a rule of conduct, an order (prohibition) of specific behavior in a given situation, determining duties and obligations, formulated according to the binding assessments and moral values; 2) a rule, regulation, template, most often a technical-legal document which clearly defines the qualitative and/or quantitative requirements for the object” [20, p. 522].

There are also some differences in this area, which are the reflection of the “science schools” of individual research and decision-making centers. It is understandable that due to their conceptual and task area they are differentiated in terms of terminology, with some degree of their consistency (identity). It is worrying that they have not been fully defined in the general version. Why? Well, let this remain a rhetorical question.

The rules of civil protection include:

- a) universality, which is to provide the whole of society with protection adequate to the expected threat,
- b) responsibility, resulting from a legal framework, broad participation of all citizens, and accountability,
- c) invariability (identity) of organizational structures,
- d) adequacy of preparation to the degree of threat and its economic capacity,
- e) comprehensiveness, seen as a continuous and close correlation of civil protection undertakings with those of the Armed Forces and the national economy,
- f) decentralization, management of civil defense preparations, especially in the territorial arrangement with maintenance of decisive provisions within the competence of central administration,
- g) readiness, immediate emergency response,
- h) planning,
- i) support, counter-measures at two adjacent levels of authority shall be activated simultaneously,
- j) inter-territorial solidarity, as reflected in the plans of autonomous administrative units and the state.

⁶ More correctly: defensive readiness for peace time, defensive readiness for crisis time, defensive readiness for war time.

⁷ Having, for example, only 20% of personal protective equipment in peacetime defensive readiness does not guarantee the performance of specialist tasks.

The principles of crisis management are:

- a) one-person management and one-person responsibility (with a small exception at the central administration level due to the fact that crisis management on the territory of the Republic of Poland is carried out by the Council of Ministers, and in urgent cases by the minister in charge of internal affairs),
- b) primacy of the territorial arrangement over the ministry,
- c) universality (differently perceived by selected research centers; once as an obligation for all state law entities to participate in anti-crisis activities; otherwise perceived in the sense that each citizen may be obliged to provide personal or material services),
- d) adequacy,
- e) partnership,
- f) citizen participation,
- g) common sense,
- h) association,
- i) functional approach (definition of relatively permanent, usually repetitive, typical, and procedurally formalized actions, distinguished by the type of national security objectives),
- j) the continuity of the functioning of the state, which determines that notwithstanding the state's state and circumstances the forms of state authority remain unchanged and individual public administration bodies perform their functions, regardless of whether it is a time of peace, crisis, or war⁸ [21, p. 31].

Other principles of crisis management are also given. J. Gołębiewski mentions universality and comprehensiveness of action in all phases of crisis management. He mainly emphasizes the elimination of risk factors, risk reduction, and the reduction of potential effects, e.g., by changing the spatial development, changing the design of buildings or the building material used, development, including anticipation and readiness for every evolution of the situation, ensuring flexibility of action in every situation with the participation of many actors and the whole society, risk modeling, cooperation, but not consisting of a formal "governance", integration in all phases of crisis management with an emphasis on the planning stage, coordination, flexibility, professionalism (resulting from knowledge, skills, effectiveness as well as practice and competence).

With the multitude of provisions in the case in question, the lack of their unambiguous definition, as well as references to the statutory definition of what crisis management is, it is considered reasonable to include in their classification the principles of crisis management mentioned by R. Wróblewski. These are as follows: hierarchy of the organization of authorities, one-human management, and responsibility for maintaining the readiness of the system to operate, adequacy of the response of the public administration level to the nature and size of the threat, universality of crisis management by including citizens, NGOs, services, inspections, and guards in the management process [8, p. 316-7].

⁸ J. Fałęcki points, among others, to the principle of the adequacy of actions to the size of the threat, categorization of threats, versatility, flexibility.

Their diversity and multiplicity do not seem to be essential for a systemic approach. However, it is crucial to organize crisis management theory and practice⁹ [22, p. 32-3]. Besides, the unification of terminology concerning the above principles is supposed to lead to the development of science and their clear understanding. Therefore, it is reasonable to adopt them and present the terminology remaining in the problem area.

Conclusion

To sum up, the above contents include crisis management issues and civil protection in a specific systemic perspective. It should be pointed out that in the case of a significant difference in organizational and task solutions, they contain appropriate common elements. Their organizational, task-oriented, and legal approach clearly indicates separate systems. The systems are interconnected, while being one of many subsystems of the state security system, and thus also the security of citizens. However, their interconnectedness, which is theoretically possible in practice, will require a relevant reworking of the state law and mental approach to the above issue. It should be stressed here that the existence of the same decision-making bodies (otherwise called, and yet the same), executive, and auxiliary bodies (with the same names), and similar tasks fulfilled in a specific situation, does not give rise to an intended or unambiguous perception of both terms. The statement is not contradicted by the crisis management mission, which is considered to be the protection of the population or the vision to prepare a society that is less vulnerable to threats [23, p. 145] and capable of facing the challenges of any misfortune and any disaster.

Pointing to the extended purpose of civil protection – contained in the Act of 21 November 1967 on the universal obligation to defend the Republic of Poland – one can notice a similarity to the mission and vision of crisis management, where civil protection and rescue also remain a priority.

Acknowledgement

No acknowledgement and potential founding was reported by the author.

Conflict of interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

Author contributions

The author contributed to the interpretation of results and writing of the paper. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical statement

The research complies with all national and international ethical requirements.

ORCID

Romuald Kalinowski  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5725-6304>

⁹ W. Lidawa, W. Krzeszowski, W. Więcek indicate the principle of the primacy of the territorial arrangement, the principle of one-human management, the principle of public authorities' detachment, the principle of association, the principle of hazard categorization, and the principle of universality.

References

1. *Słownik terminów w zakresie bezpieczeństwa narodowego*. Warszawa: AON; 2002.
2. Sienkiewicz P. *Inżynieria systemów. Wybrane zastosowania wojskowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej; 1983.
3. *Instrukcja o mobilizacyjnym rozwinięciu SZ RP*. Warszawa: Szt. Gen. WP; 1994.
4. Kitler W. *Zarządzanie kryzysowe jako element bezpieczeństwa*. In: Piątek Z (ed.). *Funkcje organów samorządu terytorialnego w obszarze zarządzania kryzysowego*. Zielonka: Urząd Miasta Zielonka; 2006.
5. Krasnodębski G. *Modelowanie systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem infrastruktury krytycznej państwa*. Gdynia: Akademia Marynarki Wojennej im. Bohaterów Westerplatte; 2103.
6. Szymonik A. *Organizacja i funkcjonowanie systemów bezpieczeństwa*. Warszawa: Difin; 2011.
7. Ustawa z dnia 17 lipca 2009 r. o zmianie ustawy o zarządzaniu kryzysowym (Dz. U. 2009 Nr 131, poz. 1076).
8. Wróblewski R. *Zarządzanie kryzysowe jako element zarządzania bezpieczeństwem narodowym*. Siedlce: UPH; 2013.
9. Protokół dodatkowy do konwencji genewskich z 12 sierpnia 1949 r., dotyczący ochrony ofiar międzynarodowych konfliktów zbrojnych (Protokół I), sporządzony w Genewie dnia 8 czerwca 1977 r. (Dz. U. z 1992 r. Nr 41, poz. 175, załącznik).
10. Kalinowski R. *Obrona cywilna w Polsce*. Siedlce: UPH; 2017.
11. Ustawa z dnia 21 listopada 1967 r. o powszechnym obowiązku obrony Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej (Dz. U. 1967 Nr 44, poz. 220 z późn. zm.).
12. Ustawa z dnia 26 kwietnia 2007 r. o zarządzaniu kryzysowym (Dz. U. 2007 Nr 89, poz. 590 z późn. zm.).
13. *Ochrona ludności w ramach zarządzania kryzysowego i obrony cywilnej. Raport o wynikach kontroli*. Warszawa: NIK; 2017.
14. Ustawa z dnia 15 marca 1934 roku o obronie przeciwlotniczej i przeciwgazowej (Dz. U. Nr 80, poz. 742).
15. Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 25 czerwca 2002 r. w sprawie szczegółowego zakresu działania Szefa Obrony Cywilnej Kraju, szefów obrony cywilnej województw, powiatów i gmin (Dz. U. Nr 96, poz. 850).
16. Wytyczne Szefa Obrony Cywilnej Kraju z dnia 27 grudnia 2011 r. w sprawie zasad opracowania planu obrony cywilnej województw, powiatów i gmin.
17. Kotarbiński T. *Traktat o dobrej robocie*. 2nd Ed. Wrocław–Warszawa: Zakład Naukowy im. Ossolińskich; 1958.
18. Wytyczne Szefa Obrony Cywilnej Kraju z dnia 3 marca 2014 roku w sprawie normatywów w zakresie zaopatrywania organów i formacji obrony cywilnej w sprzęt, środki techniczne i umundurowanie niezbędne do wykonywania zadań obrony cywilnej z uwzględnieniem ramowych struktur organizacyjnych i podstawowych zadań formacji obrony cywilnej.
19. *Słownik poprawnej polszczyzny*. Warszawa: PWN; 1980.
20. *Encyklopedia Popularna PWN*. 6th Ed. Warszawa: PWN; 1982.
21. Fałęcki J. *Zarządzanie kryzysowe w teorii i praktyce*. WSH, Kielce 2012.
22. Lidawa W, Krzeszowski W, Więcek W. *Zarządzanie w sytuacjach kryzysowych*. Warszawa: AON; 2010.
23. Gołębiowski J. *Propedeutyka zarządzania kryzysowego*. Warszawa: Difin; 2015.

Biographical note

Romuald Kalinowski – Prof. Dr. hab., is a full professor at the Institute of Safety Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Natural Sciences and Humanities in Siedlce. His scientific

and research interests mainly include the issues of crisis management, civil protection and civil defense. His achievements include about 100 scientific and popular science books, including 4 books.

Obrona cywilna i zarządzanie kryzysowe w Polsce w ujęciu systemowym

STRESZCZENIE

Występujące w systemie obronności państwa dwa podsystemy, jaki tworzą system obrony cywilnej i system zarządzania kryzysowego mają do wypełnienia stosowne zadania. Dwie struktury organizacyjne kierując się swoim podejściem systemowym pozostają wobec siebie niezależne, nawet przy wspólności stosownych organów decyzyjnych, organów wykonawczych, organów pomocniczych i podmiotów wykonawczych. Niewłaściwe ich postrzegane – nawet przez decydentów – prowadzi do nieprawidłowości organizacyjnych, braku zrozumienia odpowiedzialności organów i podmiotów tych systemów. Jest przy tym źródłem błędnego stanowienia prawa w zakresie tej problematyki. Ujęcie systemowe wymaga być może stosownego podejścia i wypracowania nowych rozwiązań usprawniających proces działalności w tej dziedzinie.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE

obrona cywilna, zarządzanie kryzysowe, system obrony cywilnej, organizacja zarządzania kryzysowego i obrony cywilnej w Polsce, administracja

How to cite this paper

Kalinowski R. *Civil defense and crisis management in Poland in the systemic approach*. Scientific Journal of the Military University of Land Forces. 2020;52;3(197):513-525.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.3923>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>