S T U D I A N A D B E Z P I E C Z E Ń S T W E M

Nr 10 **s. 95–117** **2025**

ISSN 2543–7321
© Instytut Bezpieczeństwa i Socjologii,
Uniwersytet Pomorski w Słupsku
Przyjęto: 30.05.2025
Zaakceptowano: 30.05.2025

Oryginalna praca badawcza

DOI: 10.34858/SNB.10.2025.005

Michał Wnuk
WSB University in Dąbrowa Górnicza
e-mail: mwnuk00@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0006-5420-6997

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM – A THEORETICAL APPROACH

ROLA ORGANIZACJI SPOŁECZNYCH W SYSTEMIE BEZPIECZEŃSTWA NARODOWEGO – UJĘCIE TEORETYCZNE

Abstract: The aim of the article is to identify the role of social organizations in the national security system and to propose their functional typology from a theoretical perspective. The study adopts a theoretical approach based on a critical literature review and synthesis of concepts related to national security, crisis management and civil society. The analysis indicates that contemporary security systems require the integration of public and social actors in line with the "whole-of-society" approach. The key outcome of the study is an original typology of the roles of social organizations, including operational, supportive, educational, integrative and innovative functions. The findings demonstrate that social organizations constitute a significant component of the security system, enhancing its capacity for response, adaptation and recovery.

Zarys treści: Celem artykułu jest określenie roli organizacji społecznych w systemie bezpieczeństwa narodowego oraz zaproponowanie ich typologii funkcjonalnej w ujęciu teoretycznym. W opracowaniu przyjęto podejście właściwe dla badań teoretycznych, oparte na analizie krytycznej literatury przedmiotu oraz syntezie koncepcji dotyczących bezpieczeństwa narodowego, zarządzania kryzysowego i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego. W artykule wskazano, że współczesne systemy bezpieczeństwa wymagają integracji podmiotów publicznych

i społecznych, zgodnie z koncepcją „whole-of-society". Kluczowym rezultatem badania jest autorska typologia ról organizacji społecznych, obejmująca funkcje operacyjne, wspierające, edukacyjne, integracyjne oraz innowacyjne. Wnioski wskazują, że organizacje społeczne stanowią istotny komponent systemu bezpieczeństwa, wpływający na jego zdolność do reagowania, adaptacji oraz odbudowy po sytuacjach kryzysowych.

Keywords: national security, social organizations, crisis management, social resilience, security system.

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczeństwo narodowe, organizacje społeczne, zarządzanie kryzysowe, odporność społeczna, system bezpieczeństwa.

1. Introduction

Contemporary security environments are characterized by the growing complexity and dynamism of natural, technological and social threats, necessitating a redefinition of approaches to the organization of national security systems. Traditional institutional models of security provision, based primarily on the activities of public administration and state services, are proving insufficient in the face of the scale and multidimensional nature of contemporary challenges. As Kitler points out, the national security system encompasses the entirety of the forces, means and resources of the state aimed at ensuring the security of citizens and protecting national interests, which implies the need to involve a variety of actors operating in both the public and social sectors. In this context, the systemic approach and the concept of a "whole-of-society" approach, which assumes the active participation of civil society in security-building processes, are gaining increasing importance. Social organizations, as an important component of civil society, possess significant organizational, social and volunteer capacities that can be effectively utilized in civil protection and crisis response activities. As Salamon emphasizes, non-governmental organizations constitute one of the foundations of contemporary civil society, playing an important role in social mobilization and the provision of public services.

The importance of social organizations within the national security system is particularly evident in the areas of crisis management and civil protection, where their involvement encompasses preventive activities, emergency response and support for post-crisis recovery processes. Research indicates that effective crisis response

systems require cooperation among multiple actors, including social organizations, which enhance the flexibility and adaptive capacity of the security system.[1] In particular, research conducted by David Alexander indicates that in the case of large-scale disasters, such as earthquakes or floods, social organizations may undertake as much as 30–40% of relief activities during the initial response phase, particularly in the distribution of aid and the provision of logistical support. At the same time, Kathleen Tierney emphasizes that their effectiveness is strongly dependent on the degree of their prior integration into the institutional system.[2]

In contrast, research by Arjen Boin and co-authors indicates that an excessive number of informal actors may lead to decision-making chaos and coordination problems, particularly under conditions of time pressure.[3]

This means that the presence of social organizations does not automatically increase the effectiveness of the response system; rather, appropriate integration mechanisms and clearly defined roles are required. In the author's view, the key factor is not merely the participation of social organizations, but the degree to which they are institutionally embedded within the security system. At the same time, societal resilience to threats depends to a significant extent on the level of social engagement and the capacity of local communities for self-organization.[4] Despite the growing importance of social organizations in state security systems, the literature reveals a shortage of comprehensive studies addressing their role from a systemic and functional perspective. Existing analyses most often focus on selected aspects of the activities of social organizations, such as participation in rescue operations or humanitarian assistance, while less frequently attempting to comprehensively position them within the structure of the national security system.

In response to the identified research gap, it is therefore justified to analyse the role of social organizations in the national security system from a theoretical perspective, with particular emphasis on their functions and the possibilities for their integration with the institutional structures of the state. Of particular importance is determining the scope of tasks that social organizations may perform in preparedness, response and post-crisis recovery processes, as well as identifying mechanisms for their cooperation with public administration.

---

1 D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency Planning for Preparedness, Response, and Recovery*, "Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science" 2015.

2 K. Tierney, *The Social Roots of Risk*, Stanford University Press, Stanford 2014.

3 A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis: The Politics of Investigation, Accountability and Learning*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008.

4 K. Tierney, *The Social Roots*…, op. cit.

Accordingly, the aim of this article is to determine the role of social organizations in the national security system and to propose a functional typology of these organizations from a theoretical perspective. The following research question was formulated: What is the role of social organizations in the national security system, and what functions can they perform within its structure? It should be noted, however, that the approaches prevailing in the literature focus primarily on describing the role of social organizations and less frequently attempt to position them systematically within the structure of state security. In the author's view, this results in a fragmented perception of their functions and an underestimation of their importance in crisis response processes.

This article adopts the assumption that social organizations are not merely a supporting component but constitute an integral element of the security system, whose functioning should be analysed from both systemic and functional perspectives.

The scientific contribution of this article lies in proposing an original typology of the roles of social organizations within the national security system, which represents an attempt to systematically organize these roles and conceptualize them functionally in the context of contemporary approaches to security.

2. Methodology

This article adopts an approach appropriate to theoretical research in security studies, based on a systematic analysis of the relevant literature and a synthesis of existing concepts concerning the functioning of national security systems and the role of social organizations.[5] The primary research method is a critical literature review, which enables the identification of the main research strands, an assessment of the current state of knowledge and the identification of research gaps concerning the integration of social actors into security systems.[6]

The literature review makes it possible to organize conceptual categories and reconstruct the key theoretical concepts applied in research on security, crisis management and civil society. In particular, the study draws on research concerning the functioning of crisis response systems, which emphasizes the need for cooperation among multiple actors of diverse institutional and social character.[7] This analy-

[5] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge, New York 2013.

[6] A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis*…, op. cit.

[7] W. Waugh, K. Tierney, *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*,

sis was supplemented by a review of the literature concerning non-governmental organizations as a component of the state's social infrastructure.[8] It should be emphasized, however, that although a literature review enables the identification of dominant research trends, its capacity to capture the actual mechanisms of cooperation under operational conditions is limited. In the author's view, a particularly significant gap exists between declarative models of cooperation and their implementation in practice, which justifies the need for further empirical research.

The second key methodological element is the application of a systems approach, which makes it possible to analyse national security as a complex arrangement of interconnected elements encompassing both public institutions and social actors. The systems approach enables the identification of relationships between individual components of the security system and the determination of their functions within the overall mechanism of security provision.[9] The literature emphasizes that the effectiveness of a security system depends on the degree of integration of its components and its capacity to coordinate the activities of different actors.[10]

In addition, a comparative analysis of theoretical concepts relating to resilience and the role of civil society in security systems was employed. This analysis enables the identification of common elements across different theoretical models and the determination of the importance of social organizations in preparedness, response and post-crisis recovery processes.[11] Research on crisis management indicates that social organizations play an important role in enhancing the adaptive capacity of security systems and strengthening societal resilience.[12]

The research process also employed classical methods of scientific reasoning, particularly deduction and synthesis. Deduction enabled conclusions to be formulated on the basis of existing theories and concepts concerning the functioning of security systems, while synthesis made it possible to combine the findings of the literature analysis into a coherent interpretative model.[13] This approach is widely used in theoretical research in the social sciences, where combining different research perspectives is essential for developing new conceptual frameworks.[14]

ICMA Press, Washington 2007.

8 L. Salamon, *The State of Nonprofit America*, Brookings Institution, Washington 2012.

9 P. Sienkiewicz (ed.), *Inżynieria systemów bezpieczeństwa*, PWE, Warszawa 2015; W. Kitler, *System bezpieczeństwa narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Difin, Warszawa 2016.

10 A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight: Conceptualizing the Creeping Crisis*, "Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy" 2020, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 116–138.

11 K. Tierney, *The Social Roots*…, op. cit.

12 R. Dynes, *Organized Behavior in Disaster*, Heath Lexington Books, Lexington 1970.

13 P. Sienkiewicz (ed.), *Inżynieria*…, op. cit.

14 B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold*

In the context of the issues analysed, particular importance is also attached to the concept of systemic resilience, which constitutes one of the key categories in contemporary security research. Systemic resilience is understood as the capacity of a system to absorb disruptions, adapt and recover following crisis situations.[15] From this perspective, social organizations are regarded as an important component enhancing the flexibility and adaptive capacity of the security system, which is supported by research on the social determinants of risk and crisis response.[16]

The research approach adopted in this article is original insofar as it combines a literature review with an attempt to systematically organize the roles of social organizations, an issue that has not been extensively developed in previous studies. The author assumes that understanding the functioning of a security system requires not only the identification of its constituent elements, but above all the determination of the relationships between them and the functions they perform within the system as a whole. The adopted methodology therefore enables a comprehensive analysis of the role of social organizations in the national security system and provides a basis for developing their functional typology from a theoretical perspective.

It should also be emphasized that the use of literature analysis as the primary research method is justified by the nature of the research problem, which concerns the conceptualization of the role of social organizations in the national security system. This approach enables the identification of theoretical relationships and the development of interpretative models, while at the same time limiting the possibility of empirically verifying the assumptions adopted. Consequently, the findings should be regarded as a basis for further empirical research.

3. National security as a system

National security constitutes one of the fundamental research categories in security studies, encompassing the entirety of state activities aimed at ensuring its survival, territorial integrity, and the security of its citizens.[17] In its classical understanding, this concept focused primarily on military threats; however,

War Era, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder 1991.

[15] A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight*…, op. cit.

[16] K. Tierney, *The Social Roots*…, op. cit.; N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit.

[17] R. Jakubczak (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XXI wieku*, Bellona, Warszawa 2011; B. Wiśniewski, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państwa*, Difin, Warszawa 2013.

contemporary approaches emphasize the need to extend it to include social, economic and environmental dimensions.[18] The contemporary security environment is characterized by a high degree of complexity and unpredictability of threats, which necessitates a redefinition of traditional security models.[19] As Kitler points out, the national security system encompasses the entirety of the forces, means, and resources of the state intended to perform tasks related to ensuring security and protecting national interests.[20] This means that national security should be perceived as a system rather than as a collection of separate institutions.

The systems approach assumes that national security constitutes a complex arrangement of interconnected elements, encompassing both institutional and social subsystems. Empirical studies indicate that the national security system consists of multiple interacting components, such as the defence system, crisis management system, civil protection system and other elements responsible for responding to threats.[21] An important aspect of the functioning of this system is its capacity to coordinate activities and make effective use of available resources. It should be noted, however, that the systems approach is sometimes criticized for oversimplifying relationships between actors and for insufficiently accounting for socio-cultural factors that may, in practice, determine the effectiveness of actions undertaken in crisis situations.

For example, an analysis of the response system in the United States (FEMA) demonstrates that the formal inclusion of social organizations within the National Response Framework significantly improves the capacity to mobilize societal resources. By contrast, in many European countries where such cooperation is more ad hoc in nature, the effectiveness of these activities is lower, indicating the importance of institutionalizing cross-sectoral relations.

At the same time, the systems approach is sometimes criticized for oversimplifying relationships between actors and for insufficiently accounting for socio-cultural factors. An important feature of the contemporary approach to national security is the shift away from an exclusively state-centric model towards an approach that recognizes the role of society and non-public actors. In this context, the importance of civil society as an integral component of the security system is emphasized.[22] Social organizations, local communities and various forms of civic

[18] B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder 1991.
[19] *Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Warszawa 2020.
[20] W. Kitler, *System bezpieczeństwa*…, op. cit.
[21] B. Wiśniewski, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne*…, op. cit.
[22] L. Salamon, *The State*…, op. cit.

engagement constitute an important complement to the activities of state institutions, particularly in crisis situations.

The concept of resilience is receiving increasing attention in the literature and has become one of the key concepts in contemporary security research.[23] The resilience of a security system is understood as its capacity to absorb disruptions, adapt to changing conditions and rapidly return to a state of equilibrium following a crisis.[24] From this perspective, security is not a static condition but a dynamic process requiring continuous adaptation to emerging threats. Research indicates that the resilience of security systems depends not only on the institutional capacity of the state but also on society's capacity for self-organization and cooperation in crisis situations.[25] The societal dimension of security therefore becomes one of the key factors determining the effectiveness of crisis response systems.

In this context, the concept of crisis management is also of particular importance. It encompasses activities undertaken throughout all stages of the crisis management cycle, namely preparedness, response and recovery.[26] The literature emphasizes that effective crisis management requires cooperation among multiple actors, including social organizations, which enhance the flexibility and adaptive capacity of the security system.[27]

The national security system can therefore be understood as a multi-level arrangement in which the integration of the activities of public institutions and social actors plays a key role. Research on the functioning of crisis response systems indicates that a lack of coordination and insufficient integration of different system components may reduce its effectiveness.[28] Consequently, one of the key challenges facing contemporary security systems is the development of mechanisms that enable effective cooperation among different actors. From a systems perspective, national security should therefore be regarded as a dynamic process whose effectiveness depends on the capacity to integrate institutional and societal resources and to develop coherent mechanisms of cooperation. Such an approach provides the basis for further analysis of the role of social organizations in the national security system and their importance in strengthening the state's resilience to contemporary threats.

---

[23] P. Gromek, *General Concept of Re-Framing Urban Resilience*, "Zeszyty Naukowe SGSP" 2021, no. 77, pp. 95–116.

[24] A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight…*, op. cit.

[25] K. Tierney, *Disasters: A Sociological Approach*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2019.

[26] D. Majchrzak, *Zarządzanie kryzysowe w administracji publicznej*, Difin, Warszawa 2018.

[27] W. Waugh, K. Tierney, *Emergency Management*…, op. cit.

[28] A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis*…, op. cit.

In the author's view, the systems approach to national security should be extended to explicitly recognize the societal subsystem as a component of equal importance to institutional structures. Existing approaches often treat this element as secondary, which does not reflect its actual significance in crisis situations.

4. Social organizations within the structure of the national security system

Social organizations constitute an important element of contemporary national security systems, forming an integral part of civil society and providing significant support for the activities of public institutions. The literature emphasizes that non-governmental organizations act as intermediaries between the state and society, enabling the mobilization of societal resources and the delivery of public services in a more flexible manner adapted to local needs.[29] From a systems perspective, social organizations can be regarded as part of the societal subsystem of national security, which interacts with institutional subsystems in carrying out tasks related to civil protection, crisis response and post-emergency recovery.[30] Their importance derives primarily from their organizational capacity, ability to mobilize rapidly and proximity to local communities.

The foundations for the functioning of social organizations within Poland's national security system are established by a number of legal acts regulating public benefit activities, volunteering and crisis management.[31] Of particular importance is the Act on Crisis Management, which emphasizes the need for cooperation between public administration and other actors in performing security-related tasks. The most recent regulations concerning civil protection and civil defence also emphasize the role of social actors as a supporting component of the state security system.[32] The literature indicates that social organizations perform a range of functions within the national security system, which can generally be classified as auxiliary, complementary and partnership functions in relation to state institutions.[33] The auxiliary function involves supporting public administration activities in crisis situations, while the

[29] L. Salamon, *The State*…, op. cit.

[30] W. Kitler, *System bezpieczeństwa*…, op. cit.; P. Sienkiewicz (ed.), *Inżynieria*…, op. cit.

[31] Act of 26 April 2007 on Crisis Management, Dz.U. (Journal of Laws) 2007, No. 89, item 590, as amended.

[32] Act of 5 December 2024 on Civil Protection and Civil Defence, Dz.U. (Journal of Laws) 2024, item 1907.

[33] R. Jakubczak (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe*…, op. cit.

complementary function consists of performing tasks that are not fully covered by state institutions. The partnership function, in turn, assumes cooperation between social organizations and public administration based on shared responsibility for the implementation of security-related tasks. The importance of social organizations is particularly evident in the field of crisis management, where their involvement encompasses activities undertaken throughout all stages of the crisis management cycle, namely preparedness, response and recovery.[34] These organizations participate in educational, training and information activities, thereby contributing to greater public awareness of threats and appropriate ways of responding to crisis situations.[35]

The COVID-19 pandemic provides an empirical example illustrating the importance of social organizations within security systems. In many countries, social organizations played an important role in complementing the activities of public institutions, particularly by supporting older people, distributing personal protective equipment and organizing neighbourhood assistance. In Poland, there was a dynamic development of grassroots assistance initiatives, including volunteer networks supporting people in isolation and campaigns to produce protective face masks. Similar developments were observed in other European countries, where non-governmental organizations assumed logistical and information-related functions when public administration became overburdened. At the same time, the pandemic revealed significant limitations in cross-sectoral cooperation, including the absence of clearly defined mechanisms for coordinating the activities of social organizations with public administration. In many cases, these activities were spontaneous and were not fully integrated into formal crisis management structures.

During the response phase, social organizations play a particularly important role by participating in rescue, relief and logistical activities. Their capacity for rapid action and organizational flexibility enable them to provide effective support to public institutions in emergency situations. The literature emphasizes that organized societal action constitutes one of the key elements of society's response to disasters and crisis situations.[36]

During the recovery phase, social organizations participate in activities related to humanitarian assistance, psychological support and the restoration of social ties, which are of considerable importance for restoring the functioning of communities affected by crises.[37] Their activities contribute to strengthening social capital and

[34] D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency*…, op. cit.
[35] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit.
[36] R. Dynes, *Organized Behavior*…, op. cit.
[37] K. Tierney, *The Social Roots*…, op. cit.

building societal resilience to future threats. At the same time, it should be noted that the role of social organizations within the national security system has not been fully regulated or institutionalized. Comparative analyses indicate that the absence of coherent mechanisms for integrating social organizations into the security system may lead to fragmented activities and the underutilization of their potential.[38] This problem concerns, in particular, the coordination of activities and the flow of information between public institutions and social actors.

In this context, there is an increasing need to develop systemic solutions enabling the effective integration of social organizations into the structures of the national security system. As Gromek points out, the effectiveness of the security system largely depends on its capacity to integrate different actors within coherent functional structures, thereby enabling better use of available resources and strengthening the system's resilience to threats.[39] Social organizations should therefore be regarded as an important component of the national security system, whose significance derives not only from the operational tasks they perform but also from their contribution to building societal resilience and strengthening the adaptive capacity of the security system. From this perspective, their role extends beyond traditional auxiliary functions, making them one of the key elements of contemporary security systems based on cooperation among multiple actors.

Based on the analysis conducted, the author proposes an interpretation according to which social organizations perform the function of a "systemic link" between the institutional and societal levels. Their role is not limited to performing operational tasks but also encompasses the integration of resources, information flows and the development of the adaptive capacity of the security system. Such an approach makes it possible to move beyond the traditional perception of social organizations as merely auxiliary actors and instead recognize them as active participants in the security system.

5. Typology of the roles of social organizations in the national security system

In light of the systemic and functional conditions presented above, it is appropriate to attempt a more precise organization of the roles of social organizations

[38] A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis*…, op. cit.

[39] P. Gromek, *Armed Forces and Disaster Risk Reduction: A Theoretical Approach*, "Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne" 2023, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 47–69.

through their typologization. An analysis of the literature and the functioning of contemporary security systems indicates that social organizations perform diverse and multidimensional functions whose significance extends beyond the traditional auxiliary role. Given the increasing complexity of threats and the need to build systemic resilience, it is appropriate to organize these functions into a typology that enables their systematic conceptualization and the identification of the position of social organizations within the national security structure.

The typology proposed in this article is original and represents an attempt to systematically organize the roles of social organizations in a manner that goes beyond existing approaches in the literature. Unlike approaches focusing on individual functions, the proposed classification takes into account the multidimensional nature of the activities of social organizations and their significance across different phases of crisis management. The literature emphasizes that the effectiveness of crisis response systems depends on the capacity for cooperation among multiple actors with diverse competencies and resources.[40] Due to their flexibility and capacity to mobilize societal resources, social organizations constitute an important component of this system.[41] On this basis, five fundamental roles of social organizations within the national security system can be distinguished.

For the purpose of systematically presenting the proposed typology of the roles of social organizations within the national security system, it is presented in tabular form (Table 1).

Table 1. Typology of the roles of social organizations in the national security system

Role	Scope of Activities	Crisis Management Phase	Importance for the Security System	Theoretical Basis (Sources)
Operational	Participation in rescue, evacuation, and relief activities	Response	Enhancing response capacity and reducing response time	Dynes (1970); McEntire (2015); Alexander (2015)
Supporting	Logistical, organizational, and humanitarian support for public institutions	Response, recovery	Supplementing state resources and increasing the effectiveness of operations	Waugh and Tierney (2007); Kapucu, Hawkins and Rivera (2013)

[40] D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency*…, op. cit.
[41] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit.

Role	Scope of Activities	Crisis Management Phase	Importance for the Security System	Theoretical Basis (Sources)
Educational and preventive	Training, information campaigns, and educational activities	Preparedness	Raising public awareness and mitigating the consequences of threats	Kapucu, Hawkins and Rivera (2013); Tierney (2014)
Integrative (social)	Building social capital, cooperation networks, and community integration	All phases	Strengthening societal resilience and self-organization capacity	Salamon (2012); Tierney (2019)
Innovative	Implementing new organizational and social solutions	All phases	Enhancing the adaptability and flexibility of the security system	Boin, Ekengren and Rhinard (2020); Gromek (2023)

Source: author's own elaboration based on: R. Dynes, *Organized Behavior in Disaster*, Heath Lexington Books, Lexington 1970; W. Waugh, K. Tierney, *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*, ICMA Press, Washington 2007; N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge, New York 2013; D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency Planning for Preparedness, Response, and Recovery*, "Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science" 2015. ; K. Tierney, *The Social Roots of Risk*, Stanford University Press, Stanford 2014; K. Tierney, *Disasters: A Sociological Approach*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2019; L. Salamon, *The State of Nonprofit America*, Brookings Institution, Washington 2012; Boin A., Ekengren M., Rhinard M., *Hiding in Plain Sight: Conceptualizing the Creeping Crisis*, "Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy" 2020, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 116–138; P. Gromek, *Armed Forces and Disaster Risk Reduction: A Theoretical Approach*, "Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne" 2023, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 47–69.

5.1. Operational role

The operational role refers to the direct participation of social organizations in activities undertaken in response to threats and crises. It primarily includes participation in rescue, evacuation and relief activities. The literature indicates that organized societal action constitutes one of the key elements of disaster response, particularly during the initial phase of a crisis, when response time is of fundamental importance.[42] Due to their organizational structures and proximity to local communities, social organizations are often able to respond more rapidly than public institutions,

[42] R. Dynes, *Organized Behavior*…, op. cit.

thereby increasing the effectiveness of rescue activities. Their involvement in operational activities contributes to enhancing the security system's capacity to respond to emergencies.[43]

5.2. Supporting role within the security system

The supporting role consists in complementing the activities of public institutions through the performance of logistical, organizational and relief-related tasks. Social organizations can support the security system by providing resources, organizing humanitarian assistance and supporting operational activities carried out by state services. The literature emphasizes that cooperation between social organizations and public administration enables more effective use of available resources and enhances the flexibility of the security system.[44] This function is particularly important in large-scale crises, where the resources of state institutions may prove insufficient.

5.3. Educational and preventive role

Social organizations play an important role in public education and preventive activities aimed at preparing society to respond to threats. These activities include the organization of training courses, information campaigns and educational programmes designed to increase public awareness of security threats and appropriate responses to crisis situations. Existing findings indicate that the level of societal preparedness for crisis situations has a significant impact on response effectiveness and the mitigation of the consequences of threats.[45] Through their educational activities, social organizations contribute to the development of a security culture and the strengthening of societal resilience.

5.4. Integrative (social) role

The integrative role refers to the capacity of social organizations to build social ties and strengthen social capital. The literature emphasizes that social capital is one

[43] D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency*…, op. cit.
[44] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit.
[45] K. Tierney, *The Social Roots*…, op. cit.

of the key factors determining society's capacity to respond to crisis situations.[46] Social organizations contribute to the integration of local communities by strengthening social trust and developing networks of cooperation among different actors. These activities are of considerable importance for building societal resilience, which constitutes a foundation of an effective security system.[47]

5.5. Innovative role

The innovative role of social organizations involves introducing new organizational, technological and social solutions in the field of security. Due to their flexibility and fewer formal constraints, these organizations can adopt new methods of operation more rapidly and test innovative solutions.[48] Previous research indicates that the capacity for innovation constitutes one of the key elements in building the resilience of security systems. Social organizations may therefore serve as an "innovation laboratory" in which new approaches to crisis management and cooperation among different actors are tested.

5.6. Significance of the typology from a systems perspective

The proposed typology of the roles of social organizations demonstrates their multidimensional character and significance for the functioning of the national security system. Social organizations do not merely perform auxiliary functions but constitute an active component of the system, influencing its capacity to respond and adapt to changing conditions.[49] From a systems perspective, this typology enables a better understanding of the mechanisms of cooperation between public institutions and social organizations and provides a basis for further analyses concerning their integration into the national security system. In particular, it facilitates the identification of areas in which the potential of social organizations can be effectively utilized to strengthen the state's resilience to contemporary threats. It should be noted, however, that the proposed typology is model-based and that, in practice, the roles of social organizations often overlap, making their unambiguous classification

[46] K. Tierney, *Disasters*…, op. cit.
[47] L. Salamon, *The State*…, op. cit.
[48] A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight*…, op. cit.
[49] P. Gromek, *Armed Forces*…, op. cit.

difficult. The literature also includes approaches that limit the role of social organizations exclusively to auxiliary functions, which contrasts with concepts based on the "whole-of-society" approach.

The author takes the position that reducing the role of social organizations to auxiliary functions does not reflect the contemporary realities of security systems. At the same time, however, the boundaries between individual roles are fluid and depend on the specific characteristics of a given crisis. The proposed typology may provide a basis for further empirical research and for the development of models for integrating social organizations into the national security system. Its application enables a better understanding of the actual role of these actors and facilitates the identification of areas requiring strengthening at the institutional level.

6. Challenges and directions for the development of the integration of social organizations into the national security system

Despite the growing importance of social organizations within the national security system, their potential is not fully utilized due to a range of systemic, organizational and legal barriers. The literature emphasizes that one of the main challenges is the absence of coherent mechanisms for integrating social actors with institutional security structures, which leads to fragmented activities and limited effectiveness of cooperation.[50]

One of the major problems is insufficient coordination between public administration and social organizations. In practice, such cooperation is often ad hoc and dependent on specific crisis situations rather than resulting from permanent systemic arrangements. Research on crisis management indicates that the absence of clearly defined cooperation procedures and insufficient information exchange can significantly reduce the effectiveness of actions undertaken in response to threats.[51] This problem became particularly evident in the context of the crisis caused by the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine, which resulted in a mass influx of refugees into European countries, including Poland. Social organizations played an important role in this process by participating in the organization of transport, provision of accommodation, distribution of humanitarian aid and integration support. In many cases, social actors constituted the first line of response, acting ahead of public institutions. At the same time, the scale of their involvement revealed shortcomings

[50] A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis*…, op. cit.
[51] W. Waugh, K. Tierney, *Emergency Management*…, op. cit.

in systemic arrangements for their integration with public administration. The lack of uniform cooperation procedures and limited coordination resulted in the duplication of initiatives or the underutilization of available resources. Experiences related to the Ukrainian crisis demonstrate that social organizations can constitute a key component of the crisis response system; however, their effectiveness depends on the extent to which they are institutionally integrated into crisis management structures.

Another significant challenge is the lack of uniform standards of cooperation and formal mechanisms for including social organizations in the planning and implementation of security-related activities. Despite the existence of legal regulations emphasizing the need for cooperation among different actors, their practical implementation remains limited.[52] As a result, social organizations often operate at the margins of the security system despite possessing significant operational and societal capacities. Another important issue is the varying degree of professionalization among social organizations, which affects their ability to participate effectively in security-related activities. The literature indicates that the effective functioning of security systems requires adequate preparedness of all participating actors, including social organizations, which should possess appropriate competencies and resources. A lack of appropriate training and operational standards may limit their effectiveness and hinder cooperation with public institutions. In the context of these challenges, the development of a model for integrating social organizations into the national security system based on a systems approach and the "whole-of-society" concept is of key importance. This approach assumes the active inclusion of all societal actors in security-building processes and the development of mechanisms for cooperation between the public and social sectors.[53]

One of the fundamental directions for development is the establishment of formal cooperation structures between public administration and social organizations. Such structures should operate at both central and local levels, enabling the coordination of activities and the effective flow of information between different actors within the security system.[54] In particular, it is important to include social organizations in crisis planning and preparedness processes.

Another direction for development is the standardization of cooperation and the development of uniform procedures defining the principles governing the participation of social organizations in security-related activities. Such standardization

[52] Act of 26 April 2007 on Crisis Management, op. cit.
[53] A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight*…, op. cit.
[54] W. Kitler, *System bezpieczeństwa*…, op. cit.

should encompass both organizational and operational aspects, thereby increasing the effectiveness of cooperation and reducing the risk of uncoordinated activities.[55]

An important element in the development of the security system is also investment in the competencies of social organizations through training, exercises and educational programmes. As Paweł Gromek points out, the preparedness of actors participating in the security system is of key importance to its effectiveness and its capacity to respond to threats.[56] Including social organizations in training and exercise systems can increase their level of professionalization and improve their cooperation with public institutions.

Another important direction for development is the use of the potential of social organizations in building societal resilience. Through their educational, integrative and relief activities, these organizations contribute to strengthening society's capacity to cope with threats.[57] The literature emphasizes that societal resilience constitutes one of the key components of modern security systems based on cooperation among multiple actors.

Effective integration of social organizations into the national security system requires a systemic approach encompassing both institutional-level changes and the development of competencies and cooperation mechanisms. Social organizations should be regarded not as a supplementary element but as a fully-fledged component of the security system whose potential can significantly contribute to strengthening the state's resilience to contemporary threats. The key problem facing contemporary security systems is not the absence of resources, but an insufficient capacity to integrate them. Social organizations represent significant potential that, in many cases, remains underutilized due to the absence of systemic mechanisms for cooperation.

7. Research limitations and challenges in integrating social organizations into the national security system

The analysis conducted, despite its synthetic and systemic character, is subject to certain limitations arising primarily from the methodology adopted for theoretical research. Although literature analysis enables the identification of key concepts and the systematization of existing knowledge, it does not allow for the empirical

[55] P. Sienkiewicz (ed.), *Inżynieria*…, op. cit.
[56] P. Gromek, *Armed Forces*…, op. cit.
[57] K. Tierney, *Disasters*…, op. cit.

verification of the assumptions and functional models presented. The literature emphasizes that theoretical research should be complemented by empirical analyses that make it possible to assess the effectiveness of proposed solutions in practice.[58]

Another significant limitation is the diversity of theoretical approaches to the role of social organizations in security systems. Depending on the research perspective adopted, these organizations may be perceived as auxiliary, partnership-based or autonomous actors, which makes it difficult to determine their position within the structure of the national security system unequivocally.[59] The absence of a unified theoretical approach translates into difficulties in developing coherent models of integration.

A further limitation concerns the context-dependent nature of the issues analysed. The functioning of social organizations within security systems is strongly influenced by the legal, institutional and cultural conditions specific to individual states. Consequently, the conclusions formulated on the basis of the literature are general in nature and require adaptation to the specific characteristics of national security systems.[60]

In terms of practical challenges, one of the most important problems remains the absence of coherent and sustainable mechanisms for integrating social organizations into the national security system. Cooperation between public administration and social actors is often incidental and dependent on crisis situations rather than based on systemic institutional arrangements.[61] This situation limits the possibility of fully utilizing the potential of social organizations.

Another significant challenge concerns the coordination of activities and the flow of information among different actors within the security system. The absence of clearly defined cooperation procedures and insufficient communication may lead to the duplication of activities or operational inefficiencies, particularly in large-scale crisis situations. The literature emphasizes that the effectiveness of security systems depends to a considerable extent on the quality of cooperation among their constituent elements.

Another challenge is the varying level of professionalization among social organizations, which affects their capacity to participate effectively in security-related activities. Not all organizations possess adequate resources, competencies and experience, which may limit their effectiveness and hinder cooperation with public

[58] A. Boin, A. McConnell, P. Hart, *Governing after Crisis*…, op. cit.
[59] L. Salamon, *The State*…, op. cit.
[60] K. Tierney, *Disasters*…, op. cit.
[61] D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency*…, op. cit..

institutions.[62] In this context, the development of training systems and certification mechanisms is of key importance.

The insufficient formal and legal regulation of the role of social organizations within the security system also remains an important issue. Despite the existence of legal provisions emphasizing the need for cooperation among different actors, their practical implementation is often limited.[63] The absence of precise regulations concerning the scope of tasks and responsibilities of social organizations may lead to ambiguity regarding competencies and accountability.

In light of the above limitations and challenges, there is a particular need for further research on the role of social organizations within the national security system. In particular, empirical studies focusing on actual cooperation mechanisms and the identification of good practices in integrating social actors into the security system are warranted. As Gromek points out, the effectiveness of a security system depends to a considerable extent on its capacity to integrate different actors and develop coherent structures of cooperation.[64] The limitations of the present study and the challenges identified indicate the need for further development of both theoretical research and practical solutions concerning the integration of social organizations into the national security system. Despite existing barriers, these organizations represent significant potential whose effective utilization may contribute to strengthening the state's resilience to contemporary threats.

8. Conclusions

The analysis conducted allows for the formulation of a number of conclusions concerning the role of social organizations in the national security system and their significance for the functioning of contemporary security structures. These conclusions are both theoretical and practical in nature, indicating directions for further research as well as opportunities for the practical utilization of the potential of social organizations.

First, social organizations should be regarded as an integral component of the national security system rather than merely as auxiliary actors. Contemporary approaches to security, incorporating the concept of resilience and the "whole-of-society" approach, emphasize the need to involve civil society in security-building

[62] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit..
[63] Act of 26 April 2007 on Crisis Management, op. cit.
[64] P. Gromek, *Armed Forces*…, op. cit.

processes.[65] From this perspective, social organizations constitute an important component that enhances the system's capacity to respond and adapt to changing conditions.

Second, social organizations perform multidimensional functions within the national security system, encompassing operational, educational, integrative and innovative activities. The typology of roles proposed in this article demonstrates that their significance is not limited to supporting the activities of public institutions but also includes actively shaping the capabilities of the security system.[66]

Third, the effectiveness of the national security system depends to a significant extent on the degree of integration among its constituent elements, including social organizations. The absence of coherent cooperation mechanisms and insufficient coordination constitute significant limitations that may negatively affect the effectiveness of the system.[67] It is therefore necessary to develop institutional arrangements that enable the effective integration of social organizations into the structures of the security system.

Fourth, a key factor determining the role of social organizations within the security system is their level of professionalization and preparedness to participate in security-related activities. Competence development, participation in training and inclusion in exercise systems constitute important factors enhancing their effectiveness and capacity to cooperate with public institutions.[68]

Fifth, social organizations play an important role in building societal resilience, which constitutes one of the key components of contemporary security systems. Through their educational, integrative and relief activities, they contribute to strengthening society's capacity to cope with threats and adapt to crisis situations.[69]

Sixth, further research on the role of social organizations in the national security system should focus primarily on empirical analyses enabling the verification of the theoretical assumptions presented in this article. Of particular importance is the examination of actual mechanisms of cooperation between public administration and social organizations and the identification of good practices in this field.

In conclusion, social organizations represent significant potential within the national security system, the effective utilization of which requires a systemic approach and the development of coherent mechanisms of cooperation. Their role is likely

[65] A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *Hiding in Plain Sight*…, op. cit.
[66] N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, F. Rivera, *Disaster Resiliency*…, op. cit.
[67] W. Kitler, *System bezpieczeństwa*…, op. cit.
[68] D. Alexander, *Disaster and Emergency*…, op. cit.
[69] K. Tierney, *Disasters*…, op. cit.

to increase in the future as a result of both changes in the security environment and the growing importance of civil society in security governance processes. An analysis of experiences related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the refugee crisis caused by the war in Ukraine confirms that social organizations perform key operational and societal roles in crisis situations. However, their potential is not fully utilized due to the limited degree of their integration into the institutional system.

In light of the analysis conducted, it should be recognized that the future of security systems will increasingly be determined by their capacity to integrate social actors. In the author's view, social organizations are no longer merely a "supplement" to the system but are becoming one of its key operational and societal pillars.

From the author's perspective, social organizations should be regarded as one of the most important components of contemporary security systems, whose significance will systematically increase as threats become more complex. Their role extends beyond traditional auxiliary functions and encompasses co-creating the system's capacity to respond, adapt and recover from crisis situations.

This implies the need to redefine existing security models towards approaches based on the integration of public and social actors, which constitutes one of the most significant challenges facing contemporary states.

Bibliography

Alexander D., *Disaster and Emergency Planning for Preparedness, Response, and Recovery*, "Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science" 2015.

Boin A., Ekengren M., Rhinard M., *Hiding in Plain Sight: Conceptualizing the Creeping Crisis*, "Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy" 2020, vol. 11, no. 2.

Boin A., McConnell A., Hart P., *Governing after Crisis: The Politics of Investigation, Accountability and Learning*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008.

Buzan B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder 1991.

Dynes R., *Organized Behavior in Disaster*, Heath Lexington Books, Lexington 1970.

Gromek P., *General Concept of Re-Framing Urban Resilience*, "Zeszyty Naukowe SGSP" 2021, no. 77.

Gromek P., *Armed Forces and Disaster Risk Reduction: A Theoretical Approach*, "Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne" 2023, vol. 79, no. 3.

Jakubczak R. (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe Polski w XXI wieku*, Bellona, Warszawa 2011.

Kapucu N., Hawkins C., Rivera F., *Disaster Resiliency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge, New York 2013.

Kitler W., *System bezpieczeństwa narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Difin, Warszawa 2016.
Majchrzak D., *Zarządzanie kryzysowe w administracji publicznej*, Difin, Warszawa 2018.
Salamon L., *The State of Nonprofit America*, Brookings Institution, Washington 2012.
Sienkiewicz P. (ed.), *Inżynieria systemów bezpieczeństwa*, PWE, Warszawa 2015.
Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, Warszawa 2020.
Tierney K., *The Social Roots of Risk*, Stanford University Press, Stanford 2014.
Tierney K., *Disasters: A Sociological Approach*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2019.
Waugh W., Tierney K., *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*, ICMA Press, Washington 2007.
Wiśniewski B., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państwa*, Difin, Warszawa 2013.

Act of 26 April 2007 on Crisis Management, Dz.U. (Journal of Laws) 2007, No. 89, item 590, as amended.
Act of 5 December 2024 on Civil Protection and Civil Defence, Dz.U. (Journal of Laws) 2024, item 1907.

Summary

The article examines the role of social organizations in the national security system from a theoretical and systemic perspective. Its aim is to identify and organize the key functions performed by civil society actors in contemporary security systems. Based on a critical review of the literature and synthesis of concepts related to national security, crisis management, resilience and civil society, the study proposes a functional typology of social organizations. It distinguishes operational, support, educational, integrative and innovative roles. The analysis demonstrates that social organizations should not be perceived merely as supplementary actors activated during crises, but as an integral component of security systems operating across prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Their importance is particularly evident in strengthening local capacities, social resilience, information flows and cooperation between public institutions and communities. The article concludes that effective integration of social organizations requires stable institutional arrangements, clear coordination mechanisms and their systematic inclusion in security planning and preparedness processes.