

SOME ASPECTS OF THE STATE  
AS AN ORGANISATION PROVIDING  
NATIONAL SECURITY

WOJCIECH HRYNICKI

Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego  
I Indywidualnego “Apeiron” w Krakowie

BOGDAN BAJORSKI

Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego  
I Indywidualnego “Apeiron” w Krakowie

**ABSTRACT**

The categories of the interior and international safety are nowadays extensively studied and described in numerous studies. Due to editing requirements of the publication, the authors have not attempted to compare the most important modern research trends regarding the subject of this work, with the mere purpose of drawing the attention to the long-lasting actuality of the term *state*, its essence from the point of view of the security in the interior and exterior approach. Thus, these reflections are of a rather “fragmentary” character in the domain of study of security in a broad sense, and shall serve to initiate further actions in this area.

National security has its long history, however, this term was not always in use (...). The new understanding of the term “national security” occurred in the 2nd half of 19th century when new nation states begun emerging on the world map, mainly in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> L. Wyszczelski, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XX–XXI wieku na tle wyzwań bezpieczeństwa globalnego*, [in:] M. Kubiak, A. Turek, *Współczesne bezpieczeństwo militarne*, Wyd. UP-H w Siedlcach, Siedlce 2012, p. 163.

This category is important for humans mostly because they have a constant need of a safe existence. It is the state *that* makes them feel safer, since, because of the intensity and significance of the contemporary opportunities, challenges and threats, it is mainly the state authorities that can fulfil the needs of the citizens in terms of safety. The need for safety is closely linked both to the basic needs, as well as to the higher ones, intangible, both individual, as well as popular such as personal or national freedom, without which is difficult to achieve social or personal stability, or even the further survival.

Ensuring a safe existence *of the society forming the nation*, as well as providing conditions of its social development are one of the most important functions of *the state*.

Depending on the research perspective, which is subject to the historical and political conditions, the understanding of the *state* as an organisation responsible for the security of the citizens represents different solutions and forms.

Therefore, it seems appropriate to determine the meaning of such terms as *a state* or *a nation*, understand justice in its broadest possible meaning and the influence *of the state* as an organisation of the social life. Particularly today, when the devaluation of role models and values can be observed. It is worth quoting a fragment of the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”<sup>2</sup> and the legal regulations specified therein: “Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the [human] individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice (...).”<sup>3</sup>

The document states as well that “ (...) This Charter reaffirms, with due regard for the powers and tasks of the Community and the Union and the principle of subsidiarity, the rights as they result, in particular, from the constitutional traditions and international obligations common to the Member States, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Social Charters adopt-

---

<sup>2</sup> *Karta Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej*, Dziennik Urzędowy UE, (2010/C 83/02), C 83/389.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 83.

ed by the Community and by the Council of Europe and the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities and of the European Court of Human Rights.

The perspective of the political science indicates that the *state* constitutes the optimum form of organisation of *a society-nation*, identified not by the criterion of ethnicity, but the political one, in other words, the civil<sup>4</sup> criterion. As noted by one author, “nowadays, *the studies of safety* apply the political concept of a nation *as perceived by Gellner*. It seems that the concept of the social phenomenon in question understood this way assumes that before a *nation* has formed in a given area, a *state* aroused first. People living in a given territory have with time formed a coherent *society* constituting a *nation* governing this land, which has, in time, become a state.”<sup>5</sup> Other authors as well often express the opinion that, to this day, it is the *state* that creates the basic institutional infrastructure for action.”<sup>6</sup>

Democratic *state* represented by power should guarantee development to the citizens in order for them to obtain the adequate level of existence and security<sup>7</sup>. Internal security of a state is a situation achieved through the realisation by *the state* of internal function in the strategy of national security, through protection of the public security in a narrow perspective, and the common security and constitutional order in a broader perspective, the protection of life and health of the citizens and the national treasure against lawless actions, technical disasters and the forces of nature<sup>8</sup>. In his reflection on the national security, Andrzej Urbaniak states that at the end of the cold war, *the state* was the main entity acting in favour of the *national security*. This was caused by the situation in the international security environment. In a bipolar world, dominated by two superpowers, the US and the USSR, and the rhetoric of power and the arms race,

---

<sup>4</sup> T. Homa, *Obywatelskość: wybrane europejskie ujęcia filozoficzne i kulturowe*, WAM, Kraków 2013.

<sup>5</sup> J. Piwowarski, *Transdyscyplinarna istota kultury bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku, Słupsk 2016, p.147.

<sup>6</sup> Por. M. Budyta-Budzyńska, *Socjologia narodu i konfliktów etnicznych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2010, p. 284.

<sup>7</sup> *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne RP w ujęciu systemowym i zadań administracji publicznej*, Ed. B. Wiśniewski, S. Zalewski, Bielsko-Biała 2006, p. 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 26.

the state was the only power able to face the threats to the security, defined in the political and military categories<sup>9</sup>.

The aim of these reflections is also to present the essence of the state as an organisation. It is difficult, however, to describe the essence of the state without specifying its limitations resulting from the international treaties, agreements and economic and political commitments. It is impossible not to appreciate as well the influence and the results of the impact of the *globalization factors* on the state.

Until the 16th century, there was no unambiguous definition of the state. In the Ancient Greece, the city-state was described by the name of *polis*. In the Ancient Rome, the terminology was more diverse and related to the evolution of the organisation of the state<sup>10</sup>, starting with the citizens' state, *Civitas*<sup>11</sup>, the Roman Republic – *Republic* and the Roman Empire, that is *Empire*.

In the countries with a monarchist form of government, the terms with Latin roots became common *regnum* – *régne*, *Reich*, *reign*, *regno*. Apart from these terms, the word *terra* (Terre, Land) was used as well, which underlines the importance of land possession as the deciding factor concerning the state authority<sup>12</sup>. With time, more terms describing the state have emerged. The nomenclature depended on the system of the state. In the times of state Poland, the category of the state was formed in accordance with the Latin terminology and the character of the noble democracy. The term “*Rzeczpospolita*” was used as well as “*regnum, crown, police and kingdom*”<sup>13</sup>. Wojciech Lamentowicz points out that the term *state* in the present understanding begun being used somewhat later than the type of organisation it described<sup>14</sup>. The person who in the 16th century begun using one term, regardless of the system differences was Niccolò Machiavelli<sup>15</sup>, social and political writer of the Renaissance. He was a historian

---

<sup>9</sup> A. Urbanek, *Państwo jako podmiot bezpieczeństwa narodowego – ujęcie dziedzinowe*, [w] A. Urbanek, *Wybrane problemy bezpieczeństwa dziedziny bezpieczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo Społeczno-Prawne, Słupsk 2013, p. 11.

<sup>10</sup> J. Kuciński, *Nauka o państwie i prawie*, Warsaw 2008, p. 11.

<sup>11</sup> B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki, *Wprowadzenie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Lublin 2001, p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> J. Kuciński, op.cit., Warsaw 2008, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>14</sup> K. Gilarek, *Państwo narodowe a globalizacja*, Toruń 2006, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> J. Kuciński, op.cit., p. 11.

and a diplomat from Florence<sup>16</sup>, a representative of the Italian political thought of Renaissance and the author of the work *The Prince*. The author proposed to apply the term *Stato*, which comes from the Latin *Status*, used to describe a system. Between the 16th and 18th century, the notion of *Stato* was adopted in France as *État*, in Germany *Staat*, and in England – *State*.<sup>17</sup>

According to Piotr Winczorek, a uniform notion of *the state* appeared when the distinction was made between the ruler and the organisational formation of public law, which was no longer in possession of the ruler, the highest state officer<sup>18</sup>.

Historically, in Poland, the term *państwo [state]* was used sometimes to define the estates of the magnates, it came very often from the word “pan” – used to describe the person who reigns, resolves disputes, rules. (...) The Italian term “stato” was not adopted by Poles, as it happened in the western countries. They used their own term, just as Bulgarians, Russians, Serbs and the rest of Slavs, with the exception of Slovaks and Czechs. In Poland, the word *państwo* was given the same meaning as the word “stato” in the West<sup>19</sup>.

The Greek philosopher from Stagira Aristotle (384–322 BC), considered to be one of the most eminent personalities in the history of philosophy<sup>20</sup>, was the first to make a serious and worth mentioning attempt to explain the term *state*. He included reflections on this subject in his work entitled *Politics*, in which he stated that “the end of the state is the good life, and *the state* is the union of equal persons in a self-sufficing life”<sup>21</sup>.

According to Aristotle, *the state* exists to guarantee to the citizens the best possible living conditions. Even though the definition of Aristotle describing the *state* was shaped in the times when the society was based on slavery, the philosophers of the following periods were referring, and still refer, to it. Theoreticians of the *state*, including the representatives of the catholic social teaching who believed that the purpose of the *state* is the general good of its citizens<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> D. Scott-Kakures, et al., *Wstęp do historii filozofii*, Poznań 1999, p. 36.

<sup>17</sup> J. Kuciński, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>18</sup> P. Winczorek, *Nauka o państwie*, Warsaw 2005, p. 7.

<sup>19</sup> J. Kuciński, op. cit, Warsaw 2008, p. 12.

<sup>20</sup> D. Scott-Kakures, et al., op. cit., Poznań 1999, p. 49.

<sup>21</sup> J. Kuciński, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>22</sup> J. Krukowski, op. cit., Lublin 2004, p. 15.

In the modern times, huge popularity was gained by the definition of the *state* by Georg Jellinek (1851–1911), a German lawyer, well-proven specialist on the *state*<sup>23</sup>. He thought that the “*state* is a united association of sedentary men, equipped with an original power of domination<sup>24</sup>”.

It is constantly important to underline that *the state* is a sovereign and territorial organisation. The Jellinekian definition of the *state* enabled the differentiation between the state organisation and the other political and economic creations which do not have the state nature.

Article 1 of the Montevideo Convention of 1993 declares that the “*state* which is subject to the international law, shall possess the following elements: sovereign power, permanent population, and a specified territory, separated from others with a border, the capacity of entering into international relations”<sup>25</sup>.

*The state* was born at the moment of division into segments of the noble society, and at the moment of creation of private production means<sup>26</sup>, and nowadays the term *state* is used at least in three main aspects: (...) as an organisation of citizens, global organisation of a society and a citizen community. As the participant of international relations, and international laws, as well as to describe a system of public authorities and state institutions, and the hierarchy of authorities and bodies<sup>27</sup>.

In conclusion, different definitions related to the notion of the *state* and appearing in many scientific studies can be reduced to – in a simplified way – the conclusion that the *state* is primarily an organisation ensuring social cohesion of the population who lives on the given territory.

A crucial trait of *the state* is as well its sovereign character, which is often described as “ (...) independence from another state, autonomy”<sup>28</sup>, also in relations with other states and international institutions<sup>29</sup>.

In the external relations, the notion of sovereignty means independence from international organisations and any other *state* and, in general,

---

<sup>23</sup> B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki, *Wprowadzenie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Lublin 2001, p. 15.

<sup>24</sup> J. Kuciński, op. cit., Warsaw 2008, p. 13.

<sup>25</sup> [http://www.wiedza24h.pl/pojecie/19/panstwo\\_definicje.html](http://www.wiedza24h.pl/pojecie/19/panstwo_definicje.html), access: 12 May 2013.

<sup>26</sup> *Encyklopedia popularna PWN*, Warsaw 1982, p. 565.

<sup>27</sup> J. Kuciński, *Nauka...*, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>28</sup> Por. *Mały słownik języka polskiego*, op. cit., p. 789.

<sup>29</sup> More: B. Szmulik, M. Żmigrodzki, *Wprowadzenie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Lublin 2001, p. 20.

it comes down to the fact that the *state* is the only competent body deciding of its own affairs. It can also cause the acceptance of specific rights and privileges, for instance, subject to an international agreement, agree to respect specific conditions in its activities. *The state* “has to, however, agree to it voluntarily”, and authorised constitutional bodies, such as the government or the head of the state, may act on its behalf.

In the interior relations, the sovereign *state* is defined by a sovereign authority over all, separate centres of social authority and only the acts of *state* bodies may impose obligations on the citizens and draw consequences with the application of coercive means. These bodies sanction and define the way of operation of the social organisations within the state borders<sup>30</sup>.

Thus, one of the crucial tasks of *the state* is the protection of the independence and inviolability of its territory. The execution of the above objective allows the possibility of realisation of derivative aims, such as development, enforcement of the position of the *state* compared to the others, or the cultural, political or economic expansion.

Based on these reflections, it can be also stated that the internal security is one of two, next to the external security, types of security distinguished based on the attitude to the territory of the *state*. However, ensuring *national security* is the main missions of the external policy of the *state*, and the aim of the internal security policy is to protect the national *state* and its society against the internal and external threat. It is impossible, according to the authors, to question the fact that the internal security depends on the international security and the geopolitical context.

Nowadays, both in Western Europe, as well as in the other highly-developed states, in particular in North America, there exist mono-ethnic and multi-ethnic states. It is difficult to set a precise border between them. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe have a more uniform character. Judging the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society of the United States of America, which still identifies itself with its *state*, it can be said that the meaning of the *national state* in an ethnical approach is of secondary significance.

It can be stated that the *state* is the highest form of social and political organisations known to us today. Is the institution which was created in order to serve the purposes of the citizens and the purposes of the group

---

<sup>30</sup> E. Zieliński, *Nauka o państwie i polityce*, Warsaw 1999, p. 18–20.

and the whole community which is created by its members. Its mission is to guarantee safety and future of *the nation*, and, therefore, ensure its cultural and social and economic development. *The state* is an institution which arises as a result of long historical processes, thanks to which people related to one another cultivate the same traditions and customs. Each nation, providing the backbone of *the state*, has its language, tradition and culture, which set them apart from the other politically organised groups.

Ensuring security constitutes one of the basic needs of a human being, and *the state* shall remain, despite some trends of globalisation, a solid guarantor of security for the citizens. Leaders and politicians, building a safe political and economic surrounding for the states, still have to take into consideration the global conditions, respect the rules of international law and act together to implement and protect these principles.

#### REFERENCES

1. *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne RP w ujęciu systemowym i zadań administracji publicznej*, Ed. Wiśniewski B., Zalewski S., Bielsko-Biała 2006.
2. Ehrlich S., *Wstęp do nauki o państwie i prawie*, Warsaw 1979.
3. Gilarek K., *Państwo narodowe a globalizacja*, Toruń 2006.
4. Gulczyński M., *Nauka o polityce*, Warsaw 2007.
5. Kowalski J., Lamentowicz W., Winczorek P., *Teoria państwa i prawa*, Warsaw 1981.
6. Krukowski J., *Nauka o państwie i prawie*, Lublin 2004.
7. Kuciński J., *Nauka o państwie i prawie*, Warsaw 2008.
8. Kuciński J., *Podstawy wiedzy o państwie*, Warsaw 2003.
9. Lang W., Wróblewski J., Zawadzki S., *Teoria państwa i prawa*, Warsaw 1979.
10. Piwowarski J., *Police Officer's Ethics*, EEDA, Podhajska/Kraków 2013.
11. Scott-Kakures D., Castagnetto S., Benson H., Taschek W., Hurley P., *Wstęp do historii filozofii*, Poznań 1999.
12. Sobolewski M., *Podstawy teorii państwa*, Kraków 1986.
13. Szmulik B., Żmigrodzki M., *Wprowadzenie do nauki o państwie i polityce*, Lublin 2001.
14. Winczorek P., *Nauka o państwie*, Warsaw 2005.
15. Zieliński E., *Nauka o państwie i polityce*, Warsaw 1999.
16. Nepos K., *Żywoty wybitnych mężów*, PWN Warsaw 1974.

17. Karta Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej, Dziennik Urzędowy UE, (2010/C 83/02), C 83/389.
18. Zalewski S., *Ochrona porządku konstytucyjnego państwa we współczesnych warunkach bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] Jaczyński S., Kubiak M, Minkina M., *Współczesne bezpieczeństwo polityczne*, Wyd. UP-H w Siedlcach, Siedlce 2012.
19. Biernat T., *Legitymizacja władzy politycznej. Elementy teorii*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 1999.
20. Wyszczelski L., *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XX– XXI wieku na tle wyzwań bezpieczeństwa globalnego*, [in:] M. Kubiak, A. Turek, *Współczesne bezpieczeństwo militarne*, Wyd. UP-H w Siedlcach, Siedlce 2012.
21. Urbanek A., *Państwo jako podmiot bezpieczeństwa narodowego – ujęcie dziedzinowe*, [in:] A. Urbanek, *Wybrane problemy bezpieczeństwa dziedziny bezpieczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo Społeczno-Prawne, Słupsk 2013.
22. Łopatka A., *Prawoznawstwo Wprowadzenie*, Oficyna Wydawnicza, Warsaw 2000.

#### Dictionaries and encyclopaedias

23. Encyklopedia popularna PWN, Warsaw 1982.
24. Mały słownik języka polskiego, Ed. S. Skorupka, H. Auderska, Z. Łempicka, Warsaw 1969