

## **INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE**

**Juliusz Piwowarski, Lyubomyr I. Sopilnyk**

**POLISH SCHOOL OF SECURITY CULTURE  
AND DEFENSE. AN OUTLINE OF THE CONCEPTION  
OF MARIAN CIEŚLARCZYK**

### **Abstract**

Security is based on fixed values that are preserved in three dimensions, individual and social, and external and internal to a particular entity. Those dimensions are: mental (spiritual and psychosocial) organizational and legal, and material. A phenomenon of the most pluralistic structure, thus adequate to attributes (transdisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity) of security studies discipline is security culture. The phenomenon itself, which is called security is being identified in dependence of the context as one of following concept: a state without threats, a value, a development process, a function of development, and finally – as certain social construct. In the article presented was the problem that is a prolegomena to recently created in Poland research discipline, i.e. security studies. The authors of the article are publishing their scientific transmission in the context of serving the peace, and also the security, constructive scientific and research cooperation. It refers to two schools of higher education, which actively cooperate. One of them operates in Poland (Cracow, European Union), the latter in Ukraine (Lvov – CIS\*)

### **Keywords**

Security, science, three pillars of security, defense

## Introduction

Nowadays, when it comes to widely defined security and the future of the world, which is related to it, we are facing a dilemma of probable clash of various cultural circles. The conception of Samuel Huntington<sup>1</sup> refers to that. This conception however does not exclude another possibility – the cooperative security which is a result of a consensus between differing civilizations. An indirect possibility are alliances between particular cultures or even only countries, which belong to culturally different civilizational circles as in the example of America and Japan. Possible is also an alliance between representatives of Euro-American west civilization and orthodox cultural circle.

An example for such cooperation was joint action of Poland and Ukraine due to efficient organization of EURO 2012, and finally – analogic, though in a smaller scope, cooperation, that fruited with this article related to problem of the security studies area. The article is a result of common researches of authors from the School of Higher Education in Public and Individual Security „APEIRON” in Cracow (Poland) and University of Business and Law in Lviv (Ukraine).

The concept of security is an epiphenomenon of threats phenomena, therefore to reveal a complete definition of security, has to be done a recapitulation of this relevant for the security culture scope of undertaken issues and aspects.

It is known that the security<sup>2</sup>, which is a subject of a new scientific discipline of securitology<sup>3</sup>, may be comprehended as the

---

\* (j. ang.) Commonwealth of Independent States - CIS, (j. pol.) *Wspólnota Niepodległych Państw*,

(j. ros.) *Sodruzhestwo Nezavisimych Gosudarstw – SNG*,

<sup>1</sup> S.P. Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster Paperback, New York 1996.

<sup>2</sup> J. Arnoldi, *Risk*, Public. Policy Press, Cambridge 2009; Cf.: J. W. Vincoli, *Basic Guide to System Safety. Second Edition*, Published by John Willey & Sons, New Jersey 2006; *Implementing Safety Management Systems in Aviation*, A. J. Stolzer, C. D. Halford, J. J. Goglia, Published by Ashgate Publishing Company, Burlington USA 2011; *System Safety. Engineering and Management*, H. E. Roland, B. Moriarty, Published by John Willey & Sons, New York 1990; *Safety and Reliability in System Design*, M. Larson, S. Hann, Publishing Ginn Press, Needham Heights 1989.

*state without threats*, we treat it also as specific and highly important for a man *value* (and a *need* at the same time) that meets all the other needs, such as *need of lack* (basic needs) and *need of development* (meta-needs with self-realization on the top of the needs). It also is being defined as a *development process* or a *function of development*, thanks to which we realize our social and personal development (which is also a *meta-need* of a man) and finally – we interpret the *security* as *social construct*, resulting from social interdependence and interaction.

Authors of the article propose a brief definition of the *security culture* phenomenon [*Definition of the security culture by Piwowski – Sopilnyk*]

**Security culture is the whole of material and non-material output of the mankind that serves its widely understood – military but also non-military – defense. It consisted of three following dimensions: spiritual and intellectual, organizational and legal, and material. Security culture serves the mankind by realizing following purposes:**

- 1. Maintenance (cultivating) of the non-threats state for an entity;**
- 2. Restoring the security, when lost in result of appearance of particular threat of an entity;**
- 3. Rising up to the highest levels the multiaspectual comprehended security of certain entity (*comprehensive security*).**

---

<sup>3</sup> L. F. Korzeniowski, *Securitologia. Nauka o bezpieczeństwie człowieka i organizacji społecznych*, EAS, Kraków 2008, p. 23 and 33; J. Piwowski, A. Zachuta, *Pojęcie bezpieczeństwa w naukach społeczno-prawnych*, Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron”, Kraków 2010; F. Škvrda, *Vybrané sociologické otázky charakteristiky bezpečnosti v súčasnom svete*, [in:] K. Čukan, a. kol. *Mládež a armáda*, MO SR, Bratislava 2005, p. 41; L. Hofreiter, *Securitológia*, Akadémia ozbojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, Liptowski Mikuláš 2006, p. 19; L. F. Korzeniowski, *Securitologia na początku XXI wieku*, „Securitologia”, 2007, no. 5, p. 186; J. Matis, *Sociálno-pedagogické aspekty prípravy bezpečnostného manažéra*, „Securitologia” 2008, no. 7; В.И. Ярочкин, *Секуритология – наука о безопасности жизнедеятельности*, Ось – 89, Moskwa 2000; J. Janosec, *Securitologie – nauka o bezpečnosti a nebezpečnosti*, „Vojenské rozhledy”, 2007, no. 3.

*Security culture* accompanies human development since the dawn of time regardless of whether we are aware of that or intuitively create this phenomenon.

### **Culture versus culture of security and defense**

Discussing the security culture, one needs to begin with the basis of functioning of human groups, communities and entire societies. The basis is the culture<sup>4</sup>, which was being built by the mankind for long, diligent and not always safe centuries. **Culture is the whole of elements that are fixed over the time material and non-material output.**

Robert Scruton claims that „culture counts”<sup>5</sup>. This statement in the opinion of authors of the article does not sound in the globalization era strong enough, to not be reiterated more often. When it comes to the west cultural circle, and fraternal to it the circle of the orthodox culture, it seems that this duty should be particularly undertaken by residents of Europe, which is the home for the civilization of the West. However to be able to proclaim that „culture counts”, one needs to start with himself.

In this scope western trends are often a false interpretation of freedom, which causes lowering of the level of many branches of European culture. „False freedom” frees a man from illusionary „fetters” that result from human duties of obeying the rules indicated by the culture (not imposed). Thus many Europeans frees themselves from social duties or burdens resulting from an aware responsibility. In situation when this kind of toxic freedom is being widely popularized, there is a threat that western culture may be squandered, and morality, to the detriment of security of people will be lend on the scrap heap of „anachronisms” and replaced with customs of barbarians, who daily use advanced

---

<sup>4</sup> *Culture* – the whole of material and non-material products: spiritual, symbolic etc. It is being comprehended mostly as the whole of material and non-material output of society. Cf. J. Kmita, G. Banaszak, *Spoleczno-regulacyjna koncepcja kultury*, Instytut Kultury, Warszawa 1994, M. A. Krapiec, *Człowiek i kultura*, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2008.

<sup>5</sup> R. Scruton, *Culture Counts. Faith and Feeling in a World Besieged*, Encounter Books, New York 2006.

technology but mostly are defective in respect of morality, emotionally and intellectually. It is very actual for the West and at the same time wide subject, which requires separate elaboration, that is a modernized alternative for considerations started by Oswald Spengler<sup>6</sup> hundred year ago.

An expanded definition of security culture was proposed by Marian Cieślarczyk, according to whom the **security culture is: “a pattern of basic assumptions, values, standards, rules, symbols and beliefs that impacts the way of perceiving advantages, chances and (or) threats, the way of feeling of safety and thinking of it, as well as related to it way of behaving and acting (cooperating) of entities, which is learned and articulated in processes of widely interpreted education, including natural processes of internal integration and external adaptation, and other organizational processes, as well as process of strengthening widely understood (not only military) defense that serve relatively harmonious development of these entities and obtaining by them interpreted in the widest way security, with benefit for them and the environment”**<sup>7</sup>

### Three pillars of security culture

*The security culture* as it was mentioned may be analyzed in three dimensions:

1. First dimension – consists of certain ideas, value system and spirituality of a human being<sup>8</sup>;
2. Second dimension – refers to social impacts, organizations and legal systems, inventiveness, innovation etc.
3. Third dimension – ranges from all material aspects of human existence, which are a man’s creation<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> O. Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim 2007.

<sup>7</sup> M. Cieślarczyk, *Kultura bezpieczeństwa i obronności*, Wyd. AP, Siedlce 2010, p. 210.

<sup>8</sup> Duchowość – pojęcie obecnie dostrzegane i opisywane przez naukę, jest ono szersze aniżeli pojęcie religii. Opisuje je między innymi; Por. P. Socha (ed.), *Duchowy rozwój człowieka*, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2000.

Those components of security culture Cieślarczyk called „pillars of security culture”<sup>10</sup>.

The scholar consecutively called them: mental and spiritual pillar<sup>11</sup>, organizational and legal, and third – material pillar. Components of these pillars interpenetrate and so e.g. knowledge, which is part of the first pillar, apart from included in it values and rules respected by a man, is generally also an element of the second pillar that is of organizational and legal character, but also associated to technical thought. Assuming that the phenomenon of *the culture of security and defense* is not autonomic but is a result of impact of specific threats, analogically to three pillars of security culture which determines the ways of dealing with dangers, distinguished may be also those threats:

1. **First pillar of security culture** relates to such elements as:

- Ideas<sup>12</sup> – threats, related to ideas, results above all from a contemptuous attitude toward them. An obvious example are totalitarian systems, which are based on depreciation of ideas associated above all to spirituality and religion.
- Personality development<sup>13</sup> – need of development and self-improvement is one of the biggest needs and values for a man
- Sense of life<sup>14</sup> – related to self-realization and various choices made in the scope of needs selection and values adequate to them. Reaching for higher values

---

<sup>9</sup> A. Kłoskowska, *Socjologia kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2007, s. 103 i nast.; A. Kroeber, *Istota kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2002, p. 195 and foll.

<sup>10</sup> M. Cieślarczyk, *Fenomen bezpieczeństwa i zjawisko kryzysów postrzegane w perspektywie kulturowej*, [in:] *Jedność i różnorodność*, E. Reklajtis, B. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (ed.), ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2010, p. 96 and foll.

<sup>11</sup> P. M. Socha, *Duchowość – zarys koncepcji dla psychologii religii*, „Przegląd religioznawczy”, 1995, no. 1.

<sup>12</sup> Weaver R. M., *Idee mają konsekwencje*, Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu, Kraków 1996.

<sup>13</sup> J. Piwowski, *Rozwój osobowości jako przyczynek do konstrukcji autonomicznego systemu bezpieczeństwa*, „Kultura Bezpieczeństwa. Nauka – Praktyka – Refleksje” 2011, no. 2.

<sup>14</sup> J.M. Bocheński, *Sens życia i inne eseje*, Philed, Kraków 1993.

supports the process of self-realization, while the needs, we may call “superficial” generally make impossible the meaningful existence and reaching within it the state of self-realization.

- On the borderline of both first and second pillar is also another element: upbringing and education<sup>15</sup>. It is characteristic for the first pillar, as it is associated to teachings of tradition and moral attitude but also for the second as it is based on social relations.
2. **Second pillar of security culture** consists inter alia of following elements:
- Social competences<sup>16</sup> – highly important for western and eastern systems, philosophical systems of Far East, which in globalization era adopted were also in the West.
  - Organization and management<sup>17</sup> – within this element in modern era appears a new kind of threats, violating the so called cybernetic security (cybersecurity), related to protection of the information against distortion or deformation.
  - Legal systems and functions of law<sup>18</sup> – threat may be posed by such variants of law, which are

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf.: Янковська Л.А. Розвиток освітньо-фахового потенціалу регіону: теорія. Методологія, практика: Монографія. – Львів: Інститут регіональних досліджень НАН України, 2007; *Bezpieczeństwo i edukacja dla bezpieczeństwa zmieniającej się przestrzeni społecznej i kulturowej*, (ed.) R. Rosa, Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach, Siedlce 2012.

<sup>16</sup> E. Aronson, *Psychologia społeczna. Umysł i serce*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1997; cf.: M. Radochoński, *Osobowość antyspołeczna*, Rzeszów 2009.

<sup>17</sup> Cf.: J. Piwowarski, B. Piłonka, *Etyka w administracji i zarządzaniu publicznym. Motywacje, realizacja, bezpieczeństwo*

<sup>18</sup> Functions of law: **Stabilizing and regulative function**; the law, due to establishing an order in various disciplines, such as: social order, economy and policy on the territory of the state, in which this system is in force, provides specific, stabilized level of order and security; **protective function** involves protecting values considered important by all people, who consists in society, protecting at the same time protecting the good of citizens of certain state; **educational function** of the law is based on shaping certain behavior of citizens, in accordance to the established rules, that within preventive actions help increasing of the socially perceived quality of life, and within sanctions, which are a result of infringement of the regulations – deters from committing or reiterating illegal acts; **dynamizing (catalytic) function**– in socio-legal sense is based on using legal tool to carry

incompatible with the conception of *natural law* and the role of ten functions of law, which is a primal ethical basis of sense of law regulations in favor of protecting and developing rightfulness of a man in relations with others.

3. **Third pillar of security culture** is related to following elements:
  - Economy – economic threats may generate existential threats such as poverty and derivative phenomena. On the other hand threats resulting from existing of economic factor in human's life may have a negative influence on the level of security in the area of the first pillar, since exposing the role of economic factor as dominant (such as *profit*) may cause a decline or decrease of values system, and hence lead to social threats.
  - Ecology – it is related to nature, which does not belong to the culture, but also in some way depends

---

out, in accordance to other functions of law (i.e. stabilizing and regulative function of law), changes in certain areas of life necessary in specific moment; for instance imposing of local administration after the change of the regime, that is after arrangements of the Round Table (1989), **distributive function** is about separation of both certain goods, and burdens, which are elements necessary for proper, harmonious functioning of the state; **repressive function** of the law regards to those tasks of state that focus on determination of penalty in cases of committing illegal actions, which are considered crimes or offences. Simultaneously this function pursues preventive actions – it is to scare, that is to demobilize, potential criminals. Helpful for that is also very important aspect of inevitability of penalty for committed crimes; **control function** of the legal system results in transparent determination of what is in accordance with the law and what is not. In other words, the system of law is a social control tool leading to righteousness of people's behavior; **organizational function** is based on creating with the system of law of organizational frames for public authorities, organization of society and for public and non-public administration; **culture-creating function** of law is defined as role of integrating the population of the specific state within the care, which is related to use of the system of law, for maintenance of historical durability, traditions of the nation and development of the culture and the art. This function, cooperating with the protective function, favors cultivation of relevant for specific society value system and its sense of identity; **guarantee and regulative function** is to define the borderline between the competences of the state administration, which works for the common good, and the rights of an individual, that defines the liberties. Regulation within the law system regards also possibilities of achieving compromise as desired and successful form of ending the social conflicts.

on the economic factor. Culture and civilization, which operate based on human greed, have a destructive impact on the environment by generating threats mostly to health security of a man and to the natural environment.

- Technogenic sphere – in great scope impacts the ecology. This sphere has also enormous significance for the culture of security and defense, as it consists of tools that are useful when threats of military or non-military threats appear. Devices of this sphere may be used to counteract the threats of the forces of nature, in case of cataclysms and disasters, which reasons are other inefficient or improperly used products of the technogenic sphere, hence they may pose a threats themselves.

The authors in order to stimulate mindfulness of a reader indicated only few, exemplary threats derived from three pillars of *culture of security and defense*. Obviously within the same areas we may find measures of counteracting all kinds of threats in larger account than above-mentioned examples.

### **Threats awareness of an experiencing entity**

Security culture functions in four possible situations of awareness and potentiality of an experiencing entity, which are referred to perception of threats<sup>19</sup>:

1. The threat exists objectively – an entity is aware of a danger situation and is able to react.
2. The threat exists objectively – an entity is unaware of existing danger.
3. The threat exists objectively – an entity knows the situation, but has no possibility within one, two or three

---

<sup>19</sup> For comparison (authors of this article have used slightly different typology of cases than proposed here as comparative material scientific work by L.F.K.) L.F. Korzeniowski, *Podstawy nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, Difin, Warszawa 2012, s. 99.

pillars of security culture to react on currently occurring kind of threat.

4. The threat does not exist – in this case possible are two variants:
  - 4.1 certain entity may be aware of lack of danger; paradoxical, this situation may also pose danger – for instance threat of stagnation, caused with excessive comfort resulting from the lack of threats;
  - 4.2 or mistakenly: be sure of its existence, which unnecessarily lowers his level of security and at the same time limits possibilities of action.

Aforementioned four cases illustrates in a basic way the possibilities of occurring of four levels of awareness of the security state of certain entity.

### **Conclusion**

1. Reflection of four dimensions of *security culture* are three pillars (mental, organizational and material) of widely understood and not simplified to only military approach of the feature of an entity, which is his defense.
2. Linking the phenomenon of security with the defense potential of certain entity creates a complimentary *dipol of security culture and defense*. It is close to description consisted in one of definition of security, which was formulated by a securitologist Leszek Korzeniowski: **“Security is an ability of creative activity of an entity and means an objective state based on lack of threats”**<sup>20</sup> [or its efficient neutralization – auth.].
3. Author of this article propose following definition of security [*definition of security by Piwowarski – Sopilnyk*]:

***Security of a certain entity may be comprehended as desired state of lack or efficient control of various internal***

---

<sup>20</sup> L.F. Korzeniowski, *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, PŚB, Kraków 2000, p. 437.

**and external threats to this object, one as the value, which enables realization of all other needs, values<sup>21</sup> correlating to them, from the basic to most important, i.e. self-realization, or as *process* or *function*, which impacts on the freedom of development of the object of study, and finally – as such *social construct*, that meets all aforementioned conditions for existence of individual or collective entity.**

4. Third and fourth way of understanding the concept of security (value, development process) allows to compare this phenomenon to one defined by Marian Cieślarczyk as *culture of security and defense* or even to risk a statement that they are identical in case of meeting assumptions of Kotarbiński and Rudnański, related to necessity of simultaneous occurring of praxeological and ethical factors as well as balance between them in *dipol of culture of security and defense* (which may be briefly defined with the term *security culture*).
5. *Security culture* is based on fixed values and processes of development reflected in its three dimensions: mental (spiritual), organizational (rational) and material in

---

<sup>21</sup> Krzyżanowski (L. Krzyżanowski, L. Krzyżanowski, *O podstawach kierowania organizacjami inaczej: paradygmaty, modele, metafory*, PWN, Warszawa 1999, p. 206) summarizes considerations on the concept of *value* as follows a) value is related with evaluation, assessing judgments; b) assessment aims to differencing between what is good and what is negative; this judgment may be expressed or not, may only be conceived; c) assessing entity is both an individual and collective, such as a team of professionals or society of family, local and bigger communities; d) subjects of the assessment are conceptions and real components of the reality, from ideas, through relations, certain states or events to features of persons and objects; e) value is a product of evaluation of specific object done by an entity, who evaluates it; f) it should be noticed, that in case of the concept of value, it is only about positive evaluation, not as in case of issuing a rate, when it can be negative, neutral or positive g) hence the concept of value is associated to defining a hierarchy of needs, preferring something in relation to other alternatives; h) underlined should be the fact that an evaluation aiming the assessment of value which may have individual as well as collective character and the fact that creating values is related to rational intelligence and emotional intelligence. Cf. J. Piwowarski, *Bezpieczeństwo jako stan oraz jako wartość*, [in:] *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość*, Conference Proceedings of the Conference *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość* dated 18 April 2010, Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron” w Krakowie, Kraków 2010.

individual and collective dimensions and in internal and external aspects referred to existence of certain entity (object of the study). Properly functioning first pillar containing ethical culture determines (*a necessary condition*) proper functioning of two other pillars.

6. As Leszek Korzeniowski notices on American and English universities essential content corresponding with the *security studies* discipline has a subject named “security culture”<sup>22</sup>.

### References:

1. Arnoldi J., *Risk*, Public. Policy Press, Cambridge 2009.
2. *Bezpieczeństwo i edukacja dla bezpieczeństwa zmieniającej się przestrzeni społecznej i kulturowej*, (ed.) R. Rosa, Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach, Siedlce 2012.
3. Cieślarczyk M., *Fenomen bezpieczeństwa i zjawisko kryzysów postrzegane w perspektywie kulturowej*, [w:] *Jedność i różnorodność*, E. Reklajtis, B. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (red.), ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2010.
4. Cieślarczyk M., *Kultura bezpieczeństwa i obronności*, Wyd. AP, Siedlce 2010.
5. Hofreiter L. , *Securitológia*, Akadémia ozbojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, Liptowski Mikulasz 2006.
6. *Implementing Safety Management Systems in Aviation*, A. J. Stolzer, C. D. Halford, J. J. Goglia, Published by Ashgate Publishing Company, Burlington USA 2011.
7. Янковська Л.А. Розвиток освітньо-фахового потенціалу регіону: теорія. Методологія, практика: Монографія. – Львів: Інститут регіональних досліджень НАН України, 2007.
8. Janošec J., *Sekuritologie – nauka o bezpečnosti a nebezpečnosti*, „Vojenské rozhledy”, 2007, no. 3.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. N. Pidgeon, *Safety Culture and Risk Management in Organization*, Cardiff 1991.

9. Jarmoszko S., *Nowe wzory kultury bezpieczeństwa a procesy deterioracji więzi społecznej*, [w:] *Jedność i różnorodność. Kultura vs. kultury*, E. Reklajtis, R. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (red.), Aspra-JR, Warszawa 2010.
10. Ярочкин В.И., *Секьюритология – наука о безопасности жизнедеятельности*, Moskwa 2000.
11. Kłoskowska A., *Socjologia kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2007.
12. Kmita J., G. Banaszak, *Spółeczno-regulacyjna koncepcja kultury*, Instytut Kultury, Warszawa 1994.
13. Korzeniowski L. F., *Securitologia na początku XXI wieku*, „Securitologia”, 2007.
14. Korzeniowski L. F., *Securitologia. Nauka o bezpieczeństwie człowieka i organizacji społecznych*, EAS, Kraków 2008.
15. Korzeniowski L.F., *Podstawy nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, Difin, Warszawa 2012.
16. Korzeniowski L.F., *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, PŚB, Kraków 2000.
17. Kroeber A., *Istota kultury*, PWN, Warszawa 2002.
18. Malinowski B., *Naukowa teoria kultury*, [w:] *Szkice z teorii kultury*, Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 1958.
19. Matis J., *Sociálně-pedagogické aspekty přípravy bezpečnostného manažéra*, „Securitologia” 2008, no. 7.
20. Pidgeon N., *Safety Culture and Risk Management in Organization*, Cardiff 1991.
21. Piwowarski J., A. Zachuta, *Pojęcie bezpieczeństwa w naukach społeczno-prawnych*, Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron”, Kraków 2010.
22. Piwowarski J., *Bezpieczeństwo jako stan oraz jako wartość*, [w:] *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość*, Materiały z II Konferencji Naukowej *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość* z 18 kwietnia 2010, Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego „Apeiron” w Krakowie, Kraków 2010.

23. *Safety and Reliability in System Design*, M. Larson, S. Hann, Publishing Ginn Press, Needham Heights 1989.
24. Scruton R., *Kultura jest ważna. Wiara i uczucie w osaczonym świecie*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 2010.
25. Škvrda F., *Vybrané sociologicke otázky charakteristiky bezpečnosti v súčasnom svete*, [in:] K. Čukan, a. kol. *Mládež a armada*, MO SR, Bratislava 2005.
26. Socha P. (red.), *Duchowy rozwój człowieka*, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2000.
27. Socha P.M., *Duchowość – zarys koncepcji dla psychologii religii*, „Przegląd religioznawczy”, 1995, nr 1.
28. *System Safety. Engineering and Management*, H. E. Roland, B. Moriarty, Published by John Willey & Sons, New York 1990.
29. Vincoli J. W., *Basic Guide to System Safety. Second Edition*, Published by John Willey & Sons, New Jersey 2006.