

Family Policy of the State as a Response to Social Security Threats

Denys Svyrydenko

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: denis_sviridenko@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-6126-1747

Dariusz Tulowiecki

Doctor of Social Sciences in the field of Sociology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw (Poland)

E-mail: d.tulowiecki@uksw.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1875-7776

Today, national security is widely understood, and its definition goes beyond the absence of military action. The broad sense of security includes not only a lack of risk or a direct threat to war, but also a sense of security in other segments of life: social, economic, ecological and cultural. Social security encompasses vital welfare, not limited to the economic dimension, but to the possibility of development and participation in social relations. In a risk society, there is no state of total freedom from security threats, but the state, as the crucial actor of life, is responsible for maximizing security and minimizing its risks. In the social security sector, the state, through appropriate social policies, can and should solve social problems, minimize their effects, and prevent their occurrence. The family is a special actor in social life. Its modern transformations lead to the difficulties and distortions of individuals and societies. Particular threats bring: low fertility — which can lead to biological disappearance of nations, violence and divorce — disrupting the stability of married and family life. The task of the state is to build and maintain an adequate family support policy for families with problems. Lack of such activities generates serious social, economic and security deficits.

Keywords: national security, social security, social problems, family, social policy, family policy

Received: July 29, 2018; accepted: August 25, 2018

Future Human Image, Volume 10, 2018: 92-102.

DOI: 10.29202/fhi/10/10

© Svyrydenko, Denys, 2018

© Tulowiecki, Dariusz, 2018

Introduction

National security is treated as the superior value, the primary purpose of the state's activity and the priority need. It is a process, which, in consequence, determines the state's sovereignty, independence and inviolability. It also allows to eliminate restrictions on taking advantage of rights, freedoms and civil liberties. Essentially, the state of safety creates conditions for free development. Achieving a satisfactory state of security requires integrated actions involving all parties and covering all areas of the state functioning [Urbanek, 2013: 19]. Family policy is also a part of activity aimed to rising of social security.

Modern Understanding of Security

Until the 20th century, security was identified with peace or the absence of military action. Today, however, this category goes beyond the mere absence of war, and the notion of security includes not only the inviolability of the territory, but also the protection of civil liberties and human rights, the well-being of citizens, the protection of cultural heritage, the preservation of natural and historical resources. Theorists and security strategists extend the way they define it and treat it as the central problem of modern civilization [Kubiak, 2012: 26].

Significant changes in the term "security" took place after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the bipolar world division. Contemporary European Security Strategy also tries to predict the post-Cold War challenges at ones hybrid forms as well as [Bazaluk & Svyrydenko, 2017]. After the "great change" and the collapse of the bloc of the communist system, new foundations of international and national security emerged. In the area of international relations, the role of strategic studies has significantly reduced, while security studies came out on the first plan. These studies, related so far to the military aspects of security, such as disarmament and arms race, have taken up the contemporary problems of international security in a comprehensive way. The holistic nature of the approach means incorporating analysis and security policy into other sectors of life, apparently excluded from the art of war: social, demographic, humanitarian, economic, ecological, political issues while at the same time appropriately reducing the emphasis on the military aspect [Kuzniar, 2005: 246]. The concept of "security" has different sectors: military, political, social, economic, ecological ones. Other researchers have introduced even more detailed categorization of safety by distinguishing economic, international, national, domestic, environmental, social, financial, data, computer networks, raw materials and energy safety [Razniak, 2012: 41].

The extension of subjective scope of security has centrally placed human as an autonomous entity in the complex structure of modern society. Proponents of a broader view of security assume that security and its lack are described by the condition of threat or peace, sense of security and freedom from threats, freedom from fear or attack, and the prospect of life's stability, freedom of action, which is not accompanied by sense of danger and permanent fear. Security carries a particular condition for sustainable development, building solidarity between people and nations as a basis of trust. Therefore, like other spaces of social life: economy, politics, culture and others, it appears as a necessary surface for international cooperation, sometimes with other fields in conflict.

Individual state organs are generally responsible for ensuring security condition. Therefore, state agencies through their subsystems, including the public security system, are obliged to maintain social order as the most important value of the system. The term "public safety" includes all actions in the law field, the fight against crime, the prevention of social pathology,

the efficient operation of criminal prosecution and justice, assuring the sense of security, the improvement of social life quality and the prevention of crime. Recently defined public security is a state that protects the legal order, life and health of citizens and national property from illegal activities. On the other hand, the sense and social experience of security depends on both the internal state of the society and its phenomena, as well as the circumstances of the external world, which are relevant to the overall functioning of man. Marek Stefanski to define a sense of security uses a psychological approach, according to which it is “to realize something that exists as an objective fact, or a subjective, internal state”, which is a kind of “peace of mind that is caused by the belief that you should not be afraid of anything. It is one of the basic needs of man, the essential condition of his mental health” [Stefanski, 2013: 66].

Defining safety as a state of satisfying needs can be seen as: satisfaction from life, satisfaction with good health, realization of personal development. It is also a positive human relationship with the surrounding reality that contributes to satisfying the needs of identity development.

Societal Security as Contemporary Social Sciences Concept

Societal security is a component of broader national security. The material scope of the goods that constitute to social security, as well as the degree of formalism on the ground of doctrine and law, are quite complex. This sector has its definitions, ranging from broad to narrow, and is in the field of interest in sociology, as well as in psychology, economics, political science, history, security sciences, and even family sciences.

Expanding the interests of national security with a societal security area is due to the role of the modern democratic state, whose duty is to care for citizens regardless of their material status; to let them really and actively participate in public life. The condition for such participation seems to be social security, understood as the protection of the existential foundations of people’s lives, the ability to meet their individual needs — material, cultural and spiritual — and the fulfillment of life aspirations by creating conditions for work and study, health and retirement guarantees [Leszczyński, 2011: 57].

However, social security is not the same as societal security. The latter is a much broader term. Its essence, in the objective sense, is not only protecting the basis of life — existence, but also creating the opportunity for development as a necessary condition for progress — in the social sense and satisfaction of life — in an individual sense. Unemployment, homelessness, poverty, civilization diseases these are modern dangers that cause dysfunctions of entire social groups that push them to the margins of social life. Similar threats to society today are caused by other phenomena such as climate change, environmental degradation, weakening of family and social ties, the spread of diseases and addictions. Demographic problems are included in the field of societal security threats, which goes beyond the social space. When some countries have a policy of limiting their population growth, others are struggling with the lack of replacement of generations. In Europe, there is not only the problem of (in)efficiency of pension systems, but also the provision of care for seniors, the breakdown of social exclusion as a result of their age and the maintenance of their longest social activity, and the support for families functioning according to the “sandwich generation” model.

The complexity of the modern world and its processes, the numerous risks and dangers to the existence of individuals and social groups and the necessity of creating and preserving conditions for development make societal security not only related to the duty of society itself,

but also to the functions of the state. The very concept and state defined as societal security intertwines the efforts of two basic actors: the state and society. They are required not only to ensure the protection of human existence but also to enable them to develop [Majer & Ubranek, 2016: 62].

Societal security, according to some researchers, is identified with the ability to meet individual needs and to realize life aspirations by creating conditions for development: work and learning. Ensuring the security of this kind requires a set of legal, organizational and educational activities carried out by self-government, government (national and transnational) communities, the third sector and the citizens themselves to ensure a kind of standard of living for people, families and social groups. These actions are also intended to prevent the exclusion and marginalization of vulnerable groups: temporarily or permanently incapable of work, in a difficult life situation due to their own indecision, experiencing sudden deterioration of living conditions as a result of external circumstances (fire, flood, storm). There is, however, important consideration in ensuring societal security: help and social support offered cannot lead to the perpetuation of helplessness, social passivity and demanding altitudes.

Marek Leszczynski grouped components of societal security in three categories: social security, community security, development security. According to him, social security is a derivative of the minimum wage, income and transfers guaranteed by the legal system, and stemming from the essence of the democratic state. System security has been linked to social capital, i.e. the ability to work together, help, create an organization and participate in social activity. Development security, on the other hand, is geared towards human capital, which depends on institutional conditions, the degree of decentralization of the state, and the empowerment of the citizen in the legal system [Leszczynski, 2011: 56].

Social Dangers and Lack of Security Policy Responses

Security, in a lexical approach, contains a kind of freedom from danger. On the other hand, the pursuit of societal security is a set of actions aimed at eliminating these threats. However, in a world stamped with risk society, the absolute state of security seems difficult: “This is a natural consequence of the fact that the world is and always has been a source of danger to man” [Majer & Ubranek, 2016: 133]. Therefore, different parties identify hazards and seek ways to prevent and eliminate them, while science provides ways to analyze them and suggests strategies for solving or minimizing them.

In defining problems, sociology of social problems is a special place whereas in solving them — social politics is. Sociology sees societal patterns of behavior or social conditions as threats to society and as such are perceived by a significant group, by strong groups, or by charismatic individuals. These problems can be remedied or can be alleviated or resolved. This latter aspect is dealt with by the social politics of each country. It is based on “the need to come to the aid of people who, from different backgrounds and through different circumstances, need support from other people” [Mazur, 2013: 24].

State action, through governance, is the process that is going to be presented in a very simplistic way to solve public problems or the process of managing public affairs. In social politics, there are not only public services for those marginalized or living without social security, but there are also social needs. Satisfying social needs is done through caring and pro-planning activities. The first kind consists in equalizing the socially defined standard of living of different categories of persons and groups. In this respect, it is necessary to be

vigilant that this equalization does not take place from the “top” to the “bottom” — that is, the reducing the quality of life, but the opposite trend: to develop in the direction of prosperity. In turn, prognostic and planning activities are to be directed towards comprehensive and prospective development of social development problems [Mazur, 2016: 13-14]. In this ruling it is possible to distinguish the stages: the first — directing the attention of the authorities to certain phenomena or processes considered to be problematic; the second — a better understanding of the problem and recognition of it as necessary to be solved; the third — choosing one of the alternatives and preparing for its implementation; fourth — the implementation of laws and programs, i.e. implementation. The final stage is the assessment of the impact of implementation on the problem and on other aspects of collective life. From this point, another new cycle may begin [Szarfenberg, 2011: 22].

In diagnosing and counteracting social threats an important role-play: cognition, understanding and proper interpretation of all circumstances and conditions of security and its threats. In commonly used terms, a threat is treated as an opposite of security and represents the possibility of an event that is negatively valued by the party (individuals, groups, parts of society) as a potential or actual phenomenon, a situation, an activity that is in conflict with basic interests and values.

Understanding the essence of threat requires a distinction between the two essential elements: objective and subjective. An objective element refers to those phenomena that cause uncertainty, anxiety, or fear. The subjective element refers primarily to the perception and perception of phenomena deemed to be unfavorable or dangerous to the subject. Because of its nature, the objective element includes real threat and is subject to objective evaluation, the other — focusing on their psychological reception [Pronko, 2007: 78].

These models indicate another attribute: relativity, which should be considered and accepted when assessing the state of safety and the threat force. In general, evaluation, objective states are as important as subjective. Relative, uniform safety assessment can only be obtained when objective assessments — expert, actual, objectivized — are adequate to subjective — social, perceptible, measured by surveys [Majer & Urbanek, 2016: 135]. Therefore, it is the responsibility of those responsible for national security to reconcile expert analyzes with public opinion. This implies a refinement of the security research methodology, which takes into account the linkages between subjective and objective factors: social beliefs, perceptions by politicians, researchers’ views, social resonance, real state of affairs, level of hidden threats, false conviction of danger [Zeiba, 2008: 26].

The complexity of social threats derives from their internal connections and globalization processes taking place in the modern world. Contemporary threats are often global in nature, therefore one of their qualities is omnipresence evanescent with sensual cognition. They are universal, they concern each subject, and the sense of danger or consciousness of danger accompanies every human being and human community. This gives a new perspective on security perception, no longer as a threat but a low, acceptable level of social risk. It can therefore be assumed that threats are complex, ubiquitous, universal, relative, multidimensional and relative phenomena, and only the simultaneous consideration of their subjective and objective dimension allows to define and present a real picture of the state of security [Majer & Urbanek, 2016: 135].

Sociology — as previously mentioned — uses the terms “social problems”, which encompass a peculiar composition of subjective and objective factors. In general, it can be stated that they cover living conditions, which a large group of people find cumbersome,

difficult and painful. These problems preclude the attainment of the postulated level of quality of life, but they can be remedied, limited, counteracted [Mis, 2007: 37-38]. Sociology sometimes uses terms such as “social disorganization”, “deviation” or “social pathology”, depending on the accepted theoretical key. However, the last of these terms is not often used in sociology — because of the pejorative tone and the possibility of negative social attitudes. However, social pedagogy uses it, defining it as a negative social phenomenon, which takes into account the following conditions: 1) breach of norms and values; 2) the destructiveness of behavior as measured by the scale of social condemnation; 3) occurrence in a larger community or mass scale; 4) the need to use collective strength to counter such problems [Pospieszyl, 2009: 12].

The principles of societal policy developed within the state correspond to the problems that create a sense of threat and violate societal security. Due to the narrowing of the range of family hazards in this paper, the societal policy guidelines will be limited to actions for the benefit of families, i.e. family policy.

Changes in the Contemporary Family

The family, seen in sociology, as the primary group and social institution that forms the foundation of social life, is subject to many important transformations today. They are so deep and clear that today there are difficulties in defining a family or families, and not all terminological clarifications are always universally accepted and unequivocal: “Family, in spite of changes, is still seen as a primitive and fundamental group for all forms of social life as well as a component of individual biographies. It is a unique place of socialization that no other institution or community can replace. Its impact on socialization is extremely wide because it spreads to all spheres of life: politics, economy, culture, religion and morality” [Tulowiecki, 2012: 262].

The traditionally defined family is, however, irreplaceable in society. Researchers, despite observing changes in the way they define and extend the meaning of the term “family”, do not envision a society without a family: “Mankind has not worked out yet another institution that could successfully replace the family and it is not known whether it will succeed in the future” [Tyszka, 2003: 50]. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct analyzes of the directions of its modern transformations, its dysfunctionality and all that directly reduce the level of security of all its members.

Anthony Giddens pointed to six distinct trends in family transitions that can be observed in a global context: 1) clans and other groups of kinship lose importance; 2) young people are increasingly free to choose a partner; 3) the recognition of the rights of women in marriage and family is increasingly recognized; 4) more and more sexual freedom is allowed; 5) children’s rights are expanded; 6) acceptance of same-sex marriage is gaining widespread acceptance [Giddens, 2012: 334]. In another place, the same British researcher has explicitly introduced the term “pure relationship” as a new foundation of relationships in modern times. According to him, the basis of social life and good quality of life of individuals is the situation of “liberation” of marriage from the external — primarily economic, but also social, demographic and legal factors. In the modern “romantic relationship”, which is a “pure relationship”, individuals enter it for themselves, that is to say, for the expected gratification that each individual can take from it. In a “pure relationship” one can continue as long as both sides derive enough satisfaction from it to maintain it [Giddens, 2008].

Nowadays the pursuit of an individualist model of the family is particularly dangerous, because it leads to alienation, viewed in its extreme form, as a system of independent relations. In such family, the processes of socialization are difficult and even disappear. They can cause two dangers: 1) the egocentralization of family members, especially adults, which leads to the disappearance of generation and care for the young generation; 2) infantilization of adults and, consequently, greater acceptance of roles in the family, with a clear shift towards mature behavior from young generations [Harwas-Napierala, 2008: 24].

Among family threats, a number of processes that influence its weakening can be distinguished. One should mention here: ridicule of family values and conjugal ties, its clear structure, its social significance. Experts from social security point out and define as a dangerous decrease of the level of parenting, parental authority, role of parents in the upbringing and development of children, confusion of concepts of “parental authority” and “authoritarianism”, equality of marriage with the concubine, suppression of differences between men and women, elimination of concepts “husband”, “wife”, “father”, “mother”, transfer of actual control over children from parents to state institutions [Majer & Urbanek, 2016: 140-141].

Threats of the Modern Family: the Case of Poland

One of the major social problems in Poland is the low birth rate in families. The demographic problem in Poland has risen to the level of “anxiety”, which is manifested in: decrease of fertility, increased participation of informal partners replacing married couples, increase in indicators of children born outside stable and formalized unions, marriage disintegration.

Comparing to European Union, Poland is one of the countries with the lowest birth rates. In 2013, less fertility than in Poland was recorded only in Portugal (1.21) and Spain (1.27). The highest fertility rate is currently observed in Western and Northern Europe — the highest in France (1.99), followed by Ireland (1.96), Iceland (1.93), Sweden (1.89), Great Britain 1.83), Norway (1.78) and Finland and Belgium (1.75). It should be noted that all these coefficients remain below the value defined as the simple generational substitution of 2.13-2.15 [Stanczak et al., 2013]. Maintaining the current level of procreation is not only a social but also a biological threat — the disappearance of the substance of the nation through depopulation.

Low fertility coexists with other processes that lower levels of procreation. While the value of a child in Polish society remains high, maternity is perceived as an obstacle to education and ballast on the path to professional development. This leads to delaying the decision to have the first child and consequently to late maternity. Late maternity is also influenced by women’s strong emphasis on building a high professional and material position, pursuing self-fulfillment and personal development, housing, lack of suitable partner, and immaturity. Late maturity and low fertility are associated with infertility. It is a clear limiting factor for fertility, and also is associated with the opposite process — improving the health of society and promoting healthy lifestyles.

It seems, however, that the connection between security and childbirth may also be different: because of the lack of security in relationships, people reduce or limit the desire to have children. The first threat to family security may be the threat to the relationship between partners in marriage. Uncertainty and instability of the relationship, fragility of the relationship — may be the reasons for the lack / limitation of having descendants. People do not want to have children with people they do not love and whose love does not assume durability. Another danger is the feeling of economic instability — work and income. This is linked to the housing threat: lack

of credit security or lack of income stability guaranteeing housing and spending on children. Security in this matter is not guaranteed in Polish conditions only by having permanent work. Work, even hard, steady, intense and committed, does not protect against poverty and does not guarantee economic security of the household.

Another major social problem related to family functioning is domestic violence. Violence, as a pathological phenomenon, is a consequence of deviant-emotional behavior. The consequences of experiencing violence are related to the disorder of the normal functioning of the individual in society, the state of his or her health, and its developmental disorders. Domestic violence is defined by its consequences: 1) it is always intentional; 2) violates personal rights and personal property; 3) violates individuals' rights and personal interests in a manner that prevents self-defense; 4) always causes injury; 5) is not a one-off, is reproducible [Majer & Urbanek, 2016: 140-141]. The circumstance, which is almost always present in families at risk of violence, is an alcohol problem. For family safety, alcohol abuse or alcohol addiction is particularly dangerous for women. This generates a special form of female violence against the family. However, this category is not often empirically investigated, and the main field of analysis is violence against women, children, the elderly and people with disabilities.

Family violence occurs in four categories: 1) physical violence — the intentional action of a person towards another person, most often a member of his or her family, resulting in an injury. Physical violence can be divided into active and passive: a) active — this is the actual use of force to inflict harm (beating, kicking, forcing to serve), more brutal (burns, wound cuts, jerks, etc.) b) passive — these is any kind of negligence such as restrictions on caring of (children, people with disabilities), all kinds of bans (eg speaking at a certain time, ban on leaving home); 2) psychological violence — actions that seek to humiliate victims, intimidate, abuse, manipulate, and deprive their own abilities; 3) sexual violence — forcing a victim against their will to commit sexual acts; 4) economic violence — controlling expenses, taking away earned money and not satisfying basic material needs [Ritter et al., 2014].

Another phenomenon, the last one chosen for this analysis, is the problem of divorce. Although the breakdown of marriages by some researchers is not defined as a social problem, but as a manifestation of a desire for full satisfaction in relationships and the search for an ideal relationship giving the best conditions for quality of life, however social security experts consider it as social pathology, public opinion in Poland accepts it as “necessary evil” and “tolerated standard” in some cases: brutality and violence in families (94% of Poles accept a divorce in such a situation), abandonment by the spouse (85%), addiction (77%), adultery (63%), sexual dissatisfaction (56%), mental illness (43%), venereal disease (40%), infertility (22%) [Tulowiecki, 2012: 207-209]. Divorces sometimes are accompanied with other social phenomena, such as migration or low religiosity.

Divorce, despite partial social acceptance, carries a number of negative consequences. They touch not only spouses, but also especially children. The result of divorce is the deterioration in the material and housing conditions of individual lives, and above all, the violation of the emotional, intellectual and social development of the child.

Other changes to the marriage and family models are related to divorce: re-union, multi-family (patchwork families), cohabitation partners and partnerships. The most difficult problems are caused by patchwork families, which are established by people having children from previous partnerships or children of ex-spouses. Thus, reconstructed family has many positive societal characteristics, but it also carries many difficulties: 1) biological parents

have the right to influence their children, which destabilizes the newly-established family-relationship; 2) divorce and re-marry divide current spouses, positions them negatively and sometimes even hostile, which can lead to “playing” with children against new partners; 3) in one patchwork family there may be parents and children whose approach to life, future and parenting is extremely different [Majer & Urbanek, 2016: 145].

Conclusions

In the context of changes in the way families are defined, it is difficult to give a strict family policy definition. Nevertheless, it can be said that family policy is the government’s actions for children and their families, and especially the state policy aimed at influencing the situation of families with children or influencing individuals in their family roles [Firlit-Fesnak, 2011: 188]. Social policy is not limited to social programs securing the beneficiaries’ income and their social activation [Rymsza, 2013: 63]. The main goal of the family’s state policy is to create conditions conducive to family formation, development and fulfillment of important social tasks. These conditions cover broadly understood development conditions that will ensure family members to have basic living and cultural needs covered, optimal conditions for young people’s education and parenting.

Family policy is an important part of social policy. The family is in the field of its interests indirectly and directly. Indirect interest — points to the need for social interference in the problems of individuals, which are in fact family problems. By investigating the source of these problems, they come across their family circumstances. Very often, problems are rooted in a malfunctioning family. In order to remedy the individual situation, one must influence the family and the individual through the family. Noticing the sources of problems in a family, and the most important factor in combating these problems, develops in various social policy activities [Tulowiecki, 2016: 100]. On the other hand, direct actions take place when the policy tries to consciously and deliberately shape social relations. These actions result from the awareness that the family remains an institution of extremely important social functions and is a basic social environment.

Fertility, violence, and permanence of marriages and families are and should be the subject of state programs. The level of fertility, the durability of marriages that are the basis of family life and the minimization of violence in families — influence the level of social security in society. Therefore, the aim of many social benefits, tax relief and indirect family policy instruments is to increase birth rate, help families with the maintenance and upbringing of children, facilitate reconciliation of work and family responsibilities, and search for appropriate housing policy. Family violence is also a subject of state policy. It is monitored by various research centers, and on the basis of empirical evidence and social resonance — multi-faceted institutional support programs are being built. Similarly — divorces — are both the subject of scientific analysis, monitoring by the state, and building policies to prevent them and promote the durability of relationships.

The state also conducts an evaluation procedure — quality control of the actions and effectiveness of the implemented programs. The aim of supervision is to improve these programs and to seek new tools for policing social security threats in the family sector. The exchange of international experiences in family policy, especially by countries facing family-threatening problems and the simple substitutability of generations — the effectiveness and efficiency of solutions, is the search for optimizing activities for the family.

Individual state institutions, including government entities responsible for building strategies for solving social problems, not only work to build strategies for solving social problems, including family ones, but also estimate the costs of neglecting their own activities. Disregarding societal actions in the context of social policy has even more serious social and financial implications for the state. Making calculations related to undertaken or unresolved activities within the ongoing or abandoned social policy is intended to support the process of building social strategies and their implementation. It is possible to calculate the costs of omissions for social security, to calculate the costs of the consequences of unresolved social problems in different dimensions, including those affecting families and relationships. On the basis of analogy, it can be inferred that costs of neglecting are not just economic. Lack of ongoing and implemented social policies to address family problems, will result in additional social harm and a growing social security deficit.

Building social security is not an easy task. However, as long as the condition of social life depends on the condition of the family, the sense of security depends on the creation and implementation of the state's family policy. Abandonment in this segment will generate additional economic and social costs and deepen social security deficits. Since in the family two deficits of security cross: the threat of existing and the threat of "self". Existence is its life and health, its quality of life. "Self" — it is the need for subjectivity, satisfied in different social contexts and different circumstances. Therefore, the task of the state seems to be to carry out remedial action in the field of social policy, to strengthen the family — through pro-family policy — both protect the economic and social as well as psychological units [Mazur, 2012: 14-15]. In this way, the state, as the supreme form of social organization, becomes co-responsible for building the well-being of people it acts on behalf of. Welfare, however, assumes a guarantee of order and minimizes risks [Leszczynski, 2011: 111].

References

- Bazaluk, Oleg and Denys Svyrydenko. Philosophy of War and Peace: In Search of New European Security Strategy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, No.12, 2017: 89-99.
- Firlit-Fesnak, Grazyna. Polish Families and Family Policy. State and direction of change. *Social Policy. Academic Textbook*. Warsaw, 2011: 187-199.
- Giddens, Antony. *Sociology*, Warsaw, 2012.
- Giddens, Antony. *The Transformation of Intimacy, Sexuality, Love and Erotism in Modern Societies*, Cambridge, 2008.
- Harwas-Napierala, Barbara. The Importance of the Transition of the Modern Family to Human Development. *Developmental Psychology*, 3 (13), 2008: 21-27.
- Kubiak, Mariusz. *Cultural determinants of state defense*, Siedlce, 2012.
- Kuzniar, Roman. *Politics and power. Strategic Studies — Outline of Issues*, Warsaw 2005.
- Leszczynski, Marek. *Social security of Poles against the challenges of the 21st century*, Warsaw 2011.
- Majer, Piotr and Andrzej Urbanek. *Social Security. Evolution, institutions, threats*, Warsaw 2016.
- Mazur, Jan. Inspiration "Centesimus annus" for social policy in postmodern world. *Social policy towards "new things". 25th anniversary of the encyclical "Centesimus annus" of St. John Paul II*, Krakow, 2016: 9-30.

- Mazur, Jan. *Pro familia et societate. Selected issues of social policy*, Cracow, 2013.
- Mazur, Jan. *Prophylaxis and prevention. Between danger and safety. Selected issues*, Katowice, 2012.
- Mis, Lucjan. *Social Problems. Theories, methodology, research*, Cracow, 2007.
- Pospieszszyl, Irena. *Social Pathologies*, Warsaw, 2009.
- Pronko, Jaroslaw. *State Security. Outline of theory, problem and tasks of public administration*, Bielsko-Biala, 2007.
- Razniak, Piotr. The impact of the level of social security on population migration in Poland, *Safety. Theory and Practice*, No. 4 (9), 2012: 41-52.
- Ritter, Dominika, Rudnicka, Paulina and Wanda Pruszewicz W. *Domestic violence in the Torun area as a threat to social security*, <http://docplayer.pl/49324371-Dominika-ritter-paulina-rudnicka-wanda-pruszewicz-przemoc-domowa-na-obszarze-miasta-torunia-jako-zagrozenie-bezpieczenstwa-spolecznego.html>
- Rymsza, Marek. *Activation in social policy. Towards reconstruction of European “welfare states”?*, Warsaw, 2013.
- Simon, Luis. Neorealism, Security Cooperation, and Europe’s Relative Gains Dilemma, *Security Studies*, No. 2 (26), 2017: 185-212.
- Stanczak, Joanna, Stelmach, Karina and Magdalena Urbanowicz. *Marriage and fertility in Poland 2016*. https://stat.gov.pl/files/gfx/portalinformacyjny/pl/defaultaktualnosci/5468/23/1/1/malzenstwa_i_dzietnosc_w_polsce.pdf
- Stefanski, Marek. Shaping public security as a priority of state functioning. *Selected security problems. Security domains*, ed. A. Urbanek, Slupsk, 2013: 61-76.
- Svyrydenko, Denys. Divided universities: the postcolonial experience of contemporary Ukrainian higher education. *Future Human Image*, Vol. 7, 2017: 128-134.
- Szarfenberg, Ryszard. Definitions, scope and contexts of social policy, *Social policy. Academic Textbook*, edited by G. Firlit-Fesnak, M. Szytko-Skoczny, Warsaw, 2011: 21-36.
- Tulowiecki, Dariusz. Cultural security and the presence and / or elimination of religion in the Polish cultural canon. *Scientific Bulletin of the Catholic University of Lublin*, No. 4, 2016: 89-115.
- Tulowiecki, Dariusz. Family as a Value in Contemporary Polish Society. *Principles of the Christian Family in the Modern World. The 30th anniversary of the “Familiaris Consortio”*, edited by Z. Struzik, Warsaw, 2012: 177-213.
- Tulowiecki, Dariusz. Social Policy and Family Pedagogy. *Pedagogy of the Family. System approach. Volume 1: Familiology*, Gdansk, 2016: 90-104.
- Tulowiecki, Dariusz. *Without God, Church and principles? Sociological study on youth religiosity*, Krakow, 2012.
- Tyszka, Zbigniew. *Family in the contemporary world*, Poznan, 2003.
- Urbanek, Andrzej. State as a National Security Entity — Sectoral Approach. *Selected Security Issues. Security domains*, ed. A. Urbanek, Slupsk, 2013: 11-39.
- Zieba, Ryszard. Post-Cold War Paradigm. *International Security after the Cold War*, edited by R. Zieba, Warsaw, 2008: 15-39.