

Received: February 2023
Accepted: March 2024
DOI: 10.7862/rz.2024.hss.10

Małgorzata POLINCEUSZ¹

THE VOIVODE'S RECOMMENDATION AS A SPECIFIC TOOL FOR SECURITY PROTECTION IN A DUALISTIC MODEL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN POLAND

This paper aims to analyze the problems resulting from the voivode's use of a recommendation tool issued for local government administration bodies, as well as recommendations issued for local government bodies. It investigates the characteristics of the dualistic system of local administration, along with a discussion of its structure and the importance of the connections resulting from centralization or decentralization. It explores problems related to determining the final nature of orders issued by the voivode for government administrative bodies and local government bodies. The study also encompasses the premises enabling the voivode to issue a recommendation and the positions of representatives of the doctrine on how to understand the concepts of protection of public security and order.

Keywords: voivode, voivode's recommendations, dualism in public administration, decentralization, security protection, protection of public order, local government.

1. INTRODUCTION

The adoption of an appropriate model and specific solutions for the functioning of local authorities and defining the mutual relations between government and local government administration bodies in this context is not just a "technical" choice of one of the potential, equivalent solutions. It is also not a choice dictated solely by organizational considerations, for instance those resulting from the desire to ensure the rationality, efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the activities of the administering bodies. The choice of a specific model of local administration is primarily a political choice, related to, among others, with the adopted concept of the role and degree of independence of local government bodies and determining the degree of centralization of the administrative apparatus. The decision regarding the legal position and the specific arrangement of division of competences between the administrative bodies operating in the area is also important for this choice.

¹ Małgorzata Polinceusz, Rzeszow University of Technology, Poland; e-mail: malgpope@prz.edu.pl.
ORCID: 0000-0002-1179-6628.

2. THE ESSENCE OF DUALISM OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

The concept of dualism of local administration or the dualistic model of local administration may depend on the system and the period when it was formed – understood differently. In Europe, the formation of this dualism is explained by historical reasons. In addition to the centralized administration model established in the absolute state, a second vertical of public administration has emerged in Europe, decentralized administration, i.e. local government administration (Leoński, 2004; Leoński, Janku, Szewczyk, Waligórski, 2005). J. Starościak, distinguishing the types of local administration, distinguished "a) the type of dualistic administration and b) the type of unitary administration. Dualistic administration is characterized by the fact that there is a separate section of centralized (government) administration and, next to them, a section of local government bodies" (Starościak, 1977). J. Lipowicz writes that

the systemic consequence of the distrust towards far-reaching regionalization was the dualism of the voivodeship system, i.e. a situation in which in each voivodeship there is both a directly democratically elected representation of the voivodeship's community [...] and at the same time a voivode representing the interest of the state as a whole (Lipowicz, 2002)

and the concept of dualism of local administration refers to a part of the local structure, i.e. the voivodeship (Polinceusz, 2010).

In Poland, the collapse of the socialist system in 1989 meant the need to take actions to enable the state to move towards a democratic system, and to introduce normative changes enabling the administration structures to find their way in the new reality. One of the manifestations of these reforms was the introduction - initially only at the commune level - of local government administration. This was the first step towards implementation of a dualistic model of administration in Poland. By implementing the principle of decentralization of public administration, over the next ten years the monistic model of the state administrative apparatus was finally abandoned, and the concept of public administration, which includes both central and local government administration, was returned (Chochowski, 2019). The effect of this administration reform was the establishment of a voivodeship government administration, and the integration of as many units as possible in the territory of the voivodeship and subjecting them to the authority of the voivode. However, the consolidation of local government administration did not cover all of its bodies, and the legislator enabled the continued functioning of "united government administration" bodies in the voivodeship, subordinated to the appropriate central or supreme government administration bodies (Rychlik, 2005; Wymyk, 2001; Kulesza, 2002). In addition to local government administration bodies, another distinguishable subsystem of local public administration began to be created by local government units operating on the principle of decentralization within the framework of the legally protected independence granted to them. The basic division of local government bodies was based on the criterion of function (division into decision-making and executive bodies) and on the criterion of body creation (division into bodies elected by general elections and bodies selected by decision-making bodies).

The actions taken at that time aimed at creating a dualistic, government-local local administration apparatus, had an almost revolutionary significance for the Polish administration. The reconstruction of local government was one of the necessary conditions to restore the democratic system in Poland. Moreover, at that time it also became

possible to build a civil society, which would not have been possible without the existence of independent self-government, which meant transferring real competences of public authorities to the local level. Local government functioning in this way can be understood as a “microdemocracy” equipped with legal personality which the state has delegated part of its administrative function to (Jakubek-Lalik, 2019). Decentralization, which was the main assumption of the reform of the 1990s, also meant the need to equip local government units with the right to carry out tasks independently, which also resulted in the need to define responsibility for public affairs at the local level. These reforms also required a new division of competences between the central authorities and those operating in the area, which in turn meant the transfer to local governments of some competences previously reserved exclusively for government administration.

3. STRUCTURE OF DUALISTIC LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to Art. 2 of the Act of January 23, 2009 on the Voivode and Government Administration in the Voivodeship, government administration in the voivodeship is performed by:

- voivode,
- combined government administration bodies in the voivodeship, including heads of combined services, inspections and guards,
- bodies of independent government administration,
- local government units and their associations, if the performance of government administration tasks results from the act or from a concluded agreement,
- governor, if their performance of government administration tasks results from separate acts,
- other entities, if they perform government administration tasks on the basis of separate acts.

Therefore, government administration in the voivodeship is performed by government administration bodies and local government bodies which, in addition to their own tasks, also carry out tasks related to government administration, if this results from acts or agreements concluded by them. The services, inspections and guards in the voivodeship are united under the authority of the voivode and (unless the Act provides otherwise) in one office. The voivode, as the head of the combined government administration, manages it, ensures the conditions for effective operation and is responsible for the results of its operation (Polinceusz, 2010).

Therefore, public administration in the voivodeship is performed by combined and non-integrated administration bodies and local government bodies. It should be added that government administration in the area is also performed by managers of poviat services, inspections and guards, acting under the authority of the starosta; however, they constitute a consolidated poviat administration.

In turn, non-united (special) administration in the voivodeship consists of government administration bodies subordinated to the right minister, as well as heads of state legal entities, and heads of other state organizational units performing tasks in the field of government administration in the voivodeship. The lack of unification means that the voivode has no authority over the above-mentioned bodies, and his influence on the activities of these bodies is limited. However, the duties of non-united administration bodies include, among others: agreeing with the voivode on draft local law acts adopted by

these bodies, ensuring compliance of activities with the voivode's instructions and submitting annual information to the voivode on activities in the voivodeship (Polinceusz, 2010).

In turn, the administration performed by local government bodies is representative in nature, and is part of a two-track, dualistic state administration apparatus. Residents of each local government unit, being the most important entity of local government, make decisions in general elections (through elections and referendums), through their elected bodies of a given local government unit, or express their opinion on matters important for a given local community (social consultations). The authorities of the local government unit (commune, powiat, voivodeship) include:

- self-governing community (created by operation of law by its inhabitants),
- its bodies, i.e. decision-making and control bodies (commune council, county council and voivodeship assembly) and executive bodies (in the commune, a single-person body elected in general elections, the commune/mayor/president of the city and the collegial boards of the powiat and voivodeship with the chairmen of the boards: the starosta and the voivodeship marshal, respectively).

4. FUNCTIONS OF THE VOIVODE

It should be emphasized that among the above-mentioned public administration bodies, the voivode holds a special position. Of fundamental importance to state its legal status are its functions determined by the provisions of Art. 3 of the Act on the Voivode and Government Administration in the Voivodeship, according to which the voivode is:

- representative of the Council of Ministers in the voivodeship,
- the superior and at the same time the body of the combined government administration in the voivodeship,
- supervisory authority over local government units,
- a government administration body in the voivodeship, whose jurisdiction includes all matters related to government administration that are not reserved for other entities,
- a higher-level body within the meaning of the provisions on administrative proceedings, if specific laws provide so,
- a representative of the State Treasury to the extent and under the terms specified,
- in separate acts and the one who is obliged to ensure the management of State Treasury real estate in the voivodeship in a manner consistent with the principles of sound economy.

The functions of the voivode outlined in this way are generally developed and clarified in the subsequent provisions of the Act, which indicate the numerous tasks of this body, especially in the area of protection of generally understood public safety and order. Article 22 on the Voivode and Government Administration in the Voivodeship stipulates that the voivode, as a representative of the Council of Ministers responsible for implementing the government's policy in the voivodeship, in particular adapts the detailed objectives of the government's policy to local conditions and, within the scope and on the terms provided for in the acts, coordinates and controls the implementation of the resulting tasks, ensures the cooperation of all government administration bodies and local government operating in the voivodeship and manages their activities in the field of preventing threats to life, health or property and threats to the environment, state security and maintaining public order, protection of civil rights, as well as preventing natural disasters and other

extraordinary threats and combating and removing their effects, on principles specified in separate acts, assesses the state of flood protection in the voivodeship, develops an operational plan for flood protection and announces and cancels emergency services and flood alarms, performs and coordinates tasks in the field of national defense and security and crisis management, submits to the Council of Ministers, through the competent minister for public administration, draft government documents in matters relating to the voivodeship and performs other tasks specified in separate acts and determined by the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister (Polinceusz, 2015).

5. LEGAL NATURE OF THE VOIVODE'S ORDERS

Another measure of action provided for by the Act, which is the responsibility of the voivode acting as a representative of the Council of Ministers, is the competence to issue orders binding on all government administration bodies (Article 25 of the Act), and in emergency situations also binding on local government bodies. The voivode immediately informs the right minister about the issued orders. However, the legislator emphasizes that these orders cannot concern decisions as to the substance of a case dealt with by way of an administrative decision, and cannot concern operational, reconnaissance, investigation or investigation activities as well as activities related to the prosecution of offenses (Article 25(2) of the Act).

Determining the legal nature of the voivode's orders in question causes many problems now – as before, before the entry into force of the current act, when the voivode was also equipped with this type of power. In the previously applicable Act of June 5, 1998 on government administration in the voivodeship, the provisions of Art. 16 in connection with Art. 9 point 4, the legislator defined the term “voivode's order”. According to this provision, “the voivode's order” should be understood as “a call to perform a specific action, but addressed to the bodies and employees of which he is the superior”. In this case, the legislator referred to the order issued by the voivode as an “official order”. However, the “voivode's order” addressed to other bodies and units performing government administration in the voivodeship in accordance with Art. 9 point 4 of the repealed Act in fine constituted a “supervision measure”.

In the light of the presented regulation, it should have been assumed that the voivode could issue an official order, i.e. a binding order for specific conduct, to those government administration bodies in the voivodeship over which he was the superior, and to non-united administration bodies which operated within the local jurisdiction of a given voivode, with that they had to be treated as a means of supervision. However, it should be noted that – as considered by W. Kisiel and P. Chmielnicki – an order is a measure that does not fit into the classic structure of supervision and that the commented provision in fact introduced an exception to the principle of decentralization, creating the basis for the voivode to use a measure of functional management called a “supervision measure” ((Kisiel, Chmielnicki 2006).

The possibility for the voivode to issue orders has been maintained by the legislator in the currently applicable Act of January 23, 2009 on the voivode and government administration in the voivodeship, although the legislator has not included a definition of the voivode's order in its provisions, which only intensifies the previously existing interpretation doubts.

Orders can be classified as acts similar in nature to official orders, which are individual acts of superiors addressed to subordinates and, as such, are characterized by the highest

degree of imperativeness. By means of a command, the superior can unilaterally specify both the goal, the expected result of the ordered behavior, as well as the start and end date and the detailed procedure for the subordinate's action. This will usually be the nature of orders addressed by voivodes to their subordinate bodies that create the structures of integrated administration in the voivodeship. However, it should be clearly noted that the voivode's orders issued pursuant to Art. 25 of the Act. are addressed not to individual employees, but to administrative bodies. Some of these bodies, the recipients of the voivode's order, are not organizationally subordinate to the voivode, e.g. bodies of non-united government administration. In this case, we will be dealing with orders that can be classified as coordinating activities that are intended to ensure cooperation between all government administration bodies or to adapt the policy of the Council of Ministers to local conditions.

As M. Kasiński notes, orders may also be addressed to administrative bodies of a specific type, e.g. to all powiat police commanders, to all heads of tax offices, to all mayors, and concern their - abstractly defined - legal situation, e.g. an order issued in order to implementation of uniform rules of conduct in specific types of cases. In practice, voivodes issue this type of orders, sometimes using acts with different names: instructions, circulars, circular letters, resolutions, etc. On the other hand, acts named in this way do not always contain content with the hallmarks of normative novelty, sometimes they have only informational purposes and serve to standardize the interpretation of regulations (Kasiński, 2012).

It also happens that the addressees of the voivode's orders specified in Art. 25 of the Act may be bodies that are not even part of the same political structure as the voivode, and such a situation occurs in the case of issuing orders to local government bodies. In such cases, orders may be classified either as acts of supervision, which are the only tools of interference in the independence and freedom of action of the local government permitted by law, or as acts that are not acts of supervision, constituting the implementation of competences related to the implementation by the voivode of the policy of the Council of Ministers in the voivodeship. As M. Karpiuk rightly notes, issuing orders when it comes to government administration does not raise much controversy since this administration was shaped based on the principle of hierarchical subordination, where orders are a commonly used means of influence (Karpiuk, 2018). However, the situation is different in the relationship between the voivode and the local government, which is based on supervision in the event of the possibility of using interference instruments. The only criterion for this supervision is the legality of the activities of the supervised body, and only in this respect can the activities of local government be assessed. Due to the constitutionally guaranteed principle of independence of local government, even in the event of emergency situations, orders are not among the instruments through which the voivode can exercise authority over local government.

It should be noted that although Art. 25 of the Act does not make any distinction between orders issued to government administration bodies and orders issued to local government bodies, the difference in the nature of the voivode's order issued to government and local government administration bodies results from their different position in the legal system. Unlike government administration bodies operating in the voivodeship, local government is a decentralized administration, excluding hierarchical subordination to the voivode. Local governments are, in principle, public administration entities independent of government administration. Authoritative interference in the independent implementation of tasks by a local government unit is possible only as part of supervision. It should,

therefore, be assumed that the voivode's order issued in relation to government administration bodies operating in the voivodeship, even though it is the same activity, defined by the same legal provision, assumes the nature of a managerial activity in relation to a hierarchically subordinated entity. However, if it is directed towards a local government body that is hierarchically independent of the voivode, it constitutes an act of supervision.

Despite this interpretation, the solution adopted by the legislator in Art. 25 section 1 of the Act should be assessed negatively as it raises numerous interpretation doubts and is in contradiction with the legal model of supervision over the activities of local government units and the dictionary of concepts in public administration established in the doctrine and case law.

6. SECURITY THREATS AS A REASON FOR ISSUING A COMMAND

Unless specified in Art. 25 of the Act the voivode's orders addressed to local government administration bodies fall within the scope of measures that can be applied in the sphere of bodies creating centralized structures of the administration apparatus, these orders addressed to local government bodies undoubtedly constitute a kind of interference by the voivode in the normatively protected independence and freedom of action of decentralized units local government. It is true that the possibility of formulating this type of orders was limited by the legislator to emergency situations, but the phrases used by the legislator to enable their identification also do not provide a clear answer to the question of when the voivode will actually be able to issue such an order to local government bodies.

Pursuant to the content of Art. 25 in connection with Art. 22 section 2. the voivode may issue orders binding local government bodies in the field of “preventing threats to life, health or property and threats to the environment, state security and maintaining public order, protecting civil rights, as well as preventing natural disasters and other extraordinary threats and combating and removing their effects”. Moreover, in accordance with the provisions of Art. 25 section 1a the voivode may issue such orders in crisis situations within the meaning of the Act of 26 April 2007 on crisis management.

While the concepts of threat to life, health, property, environmental protection, prevention and removal of the effects of natural disasters and crisis situations used by the legislator have legal definitions or do not pose major problems in determining their meaning, the concepts of “state security” and maintaining “public order”, have long been the subject of numerous considerations in the doctrine due to the diversity and extensiveness of the material constituting the content of the analyzed issue.

S. Bolesta, considering the concepts of “public order and security”, considers “public order” as

a system of public legal devices and social relations arising and developing in public places, whose purpose and task is, in particular, the protection of life, health, property of citizens and property social, ensuring the normal operation of institutions, plants, enterprises and eliminating various types of nuisances, dangerous or inconvenient for society and individuals (Bolesta, 1997).

In turn, the author considers “public security” to be

a system of devices and social relations, regulated by law and moral norms and rules of social coexistence, ensuring the protection of society, individuals and

their property against looming dangers caused by violent actions of people and nature (Bolesta, 1997).

W. Kawka, noting that due to the diversity and extensiveness of the material constituting the content of the analyzed issue, it is not possible to formulate a full definition of “public security”. The author explains that the term “security, peace and public order” should be understood as

certain positive states prevailing in a social organization, whose behavior guarantees the avoidance of specific damage, both by the entire organization and by its individual members. Public security is a state in which the general public and its interests, as well as the state with its goals, are to ensure protection against harm threatening them from any source (Kawka, 1935).

S. Pieprzny claims that

human security and public safety is a state existing in a country in which no danger exists for people or the general public. Safety boundaries are defined by law and everything that disturbs these boundaries constitutes a danger (Pieprzny, 2007).

A quite universal definition was presented by Ed. Ura, according to whom public security is a state in which all citizens living in the state and society, not individually designated, are not threatened by any danger, regardless of its sources. The concept of public order refers to those tasks of entities performing public administration tasks that are directly related to maintaining order enabling the normal development of life in the state (Ura, 1988). In turn, E. Ura understands the protection of public security and order as

the entirety of legal, organizational and technical devices at the disposal of the state, which serve to ensure the security of the state, its durability and development conditions, the protection of constitutional principles with particular emphasis on the principle of respect for the law, including relations regulated by moral and customary norms (Ura, 2003).

In turn, Z. Nowakowski, M. Pomykała and J. Rajchel emphasize that the concept of “public security” is a competence norm and at the same time a general clause authorizing the relevant authorities to counteract and prevent danger. Moreover, a public threat – according to the authors – should not be understood literally, because a public danger will also include a danger that negatively affects the conditions of collective life, even if it only threatens an individual (Nowakowski, Pomykała, Rajchel, 2009).

The analysis of the considerations presented above allows us to assume that the terms “state security”, “public order”, “protection of public security and order” and “maintenance of public security and order” used in many normative acts usually have the nature of general clauses, specific concepts that are not clearly defined, in for which it is almost impossible to determine a uniform way of understanding. The understanding of these concepts is largely influenced by current socio-political conditions, on the basis of which their each interpretation is made. It is also possible to adapt the way of understanding these concepts to changing needs and social conditions. Taking into account all these factors undoubtedly affects the final assessment of the validity of the actions taken in the field of

establishing given legal norms in situations objectively justified by the protection of life, health, safety, order and public peace.

7. CONCLUSIONS

To be effective, the system of public administration bodies responsible for ensuring generally understood security in the state should first of all meet several conditions: it should be simple, it should have precisely defined competences of the entities included in this system and it should be based on legal provisions whose interpretation does not raise any contradictions and interpretation doubts.

However, the protection of public order and security is a highly complex area of activity of public authorities. Due to the multitude of causes and circumstances affecting the scope and level of this protection, the analysis of problems related to the issue does not fit into one conventionally separated field of science or branch of law. Moreover, the very way of understanding the process of security protection will undergo constant evolution in the future, progressing in parallel with the process of globalization, socio-economic changes and successively implemented new solutions based on modern technologies, which will have a direct relationship with the understanding of the concepts of security and public order, as well as how to protect them.

Moreover, the fulfillment of all the above-formulated conditions for the effectiveness of the security protection system is undoubtedly difficult due to the dualistic way of organizing the Polish public administration, which consists of groups of bodies operating on the principle of hierarchical subordination typical of centralization and a group of local government bodies, which creates a decentralized system of entities that are, in principle, independent from the influence of government administration, both central and local. Such a solution must, by its nature, lead to conflict situations, because this type of construction of the administrative apparatus, by its nature, may give rise to a desire for expansion of its individual entities.

Undoubtedly, by creating the normative framework for the system of protecting public safety and order, the legislator assigned the voivode a special function in ensuring security and maintaining public order in the voivodeship. While carrying out tasks in this area, the voivode was, among others, obliged to ensure cooperation and manage the activities of all organizational units of government and local government administration in the voivodeship. The implementation of tasks in this area, combined with the function of the head of the combined government administration in the voivodeship, imposes special responsibility on the voivode for the state of public safety and order in the administered area.

It should be emphasized, however, that the protection of public safety and order and such valuable goods as life, health or the environment cannot be an excuse for disturbing the constitutionally protected principle of decentralization of public authorities. Giving the voivode the right to issue orders to local government bodies, including orders whose nature is difficult to determine definitively because they do not fit into the typical canon of measures used within the framework of legal supervision, undoubtedly means a threat to the independence of local government activities and a weakening of the guarantees of its decentralization. Of course, the legislator restricted the use of this type of orders only in emergency situations and in order to avert threats to particularly valued values, but the voivode should not be able to interfere with the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of local government, even in matters of this importance. It should be remembered that the

legislator's decision was to equip the voivode with supervisory instruments, whose activation is determined solely by the criterion of compliance with the law. The subsequent introduction of regulations that enable the voivode's intervention in other, not fully specified cases constitutes both a threat to the independence of local government activities and additionally introduces interpretation chaos, which certainly does not increase the effectiveness of activities in the area of security and order protection.

REFERENCES

- Bolesta, S. (1997). *Prawnoadministracyjne zagadnienia porządku publicznego*. Warszawa.
- Chochowski, K. (2019). *Samorząd terytorialny w III RP jako element zdecentralizowanej administracji publicznej*. „*International Journal of Legal Studies*”, No. 2(6).
- Jakubek-Lalik, J. (2019). *Decentralizacja czy recentralizacja? Kilka uwag o regulacji konstytucyjnej i praktyce funkcjonowania samorządu terytorialnego w Polsce* [In:] Jaworska-Dębska, B., Olejniczak-Szałowska, E., Budzisz, R., eds., *Decentralizacja i centralizacja administracji publicznej. Współczesny wymiar w teorii i praktyce*. Warszawa–Łódź.
- Karpiuk, M. (2018). *Właściwość wojewody w zakresie zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego oraz zapobiegania zagrożeniu życia i zdrowia*. „*Zeszyty Naukowe KUL*” 60(2018), No. 2 (242).
- Kasiński, M. (2012). *Dylematy działalności prawotwórczej wojewody* [In:] Stahl, M., Duniewska, Z., eds., *Legislacja administracyjna. Teoria, orzecznictwo, praktyka*. Warszawa.
- Kawka, W. (1935). *Policja w ujęciu historycznym i współczesnym*. Wilno.
- Kisiel, W., Chmielnicki, P., ed. (2006). *Komentarz do ustawy o samorządzie gminnym* [In:] Bandarzewski, K., *Komentarz do ustawy o samorządzie gminnym*. Warszawa.
- Kulesza, M. (2002). *Polskie doświadczenia w zarządzaniu reformą decentralizacyjną*. „*Samorząd Terytorialny*”, No. 9.
- Leoński, Z. (2004). *Nauka administracji*. Warszawa.
- Leoński, Z., Janku, Z., Szewczyk, M., Waligórski, M.A. (2005). *O tzw. Dualistycznym modelu administracji terenowej* [In:] *Podmioty administracji publicznej i prawne formy ich działania*. Toruń.
- Lipowicz, I. (2002). *Pojęcie administracji. Administracja publiczna a państwowa* [In:] Cieślak, Z., Lipowicz, I., Niewiadomski, Z., *Prawo administracyjne, część ogólna*. Warszawa.
- Nowakowski, Z., Pomykała, M., Rajchel, J. (2009). *Pojęcie bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego* [In:] Rajchel, K., ed., *Administracja bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem aspektów prawno-organizacyjnych Policji*. Warszawa.
- Pieprzny, S. (2007). *Policja. Organizacja i funkcjonowanie*. Warszawa.
- Polinceusz, M. (2010). *Funkcje wojewody. Studium administracyjnoprawne*. Rzeszów.
- Polinceusz, M. (2015). *Rozporządzenia porządkowe wojewody jako narzędzie ochrony bezpieczeństwa*. „*Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Informatyki, Zarządzania i Administracji w Warszawie*”, Vol. 13, 3(32).
- Rychlik, J. (2005). *Wojewoda jako zwierzchnik zespolonej administracji rządowej* [In:] Chmaj, M., ed., *Status prawny wojewody*. Warszawa.
- Starościak, J. (1977). *Prawo administracyjne*. Warszawa.
- Ura, Ed. (1988). *Prawne zagadnienia bezpieczeństwa państwa*. Rzeszów.
- Ura, E. (2003). *Bezpieczeństwo i porządek publiczny – historia, teoria, praktyka*. Hadle Szklarskie.

Wymyk, P. (2001). *Struktura administracji rządowej w województwie*. „*Samorząd Terytorialny*”, No. 11.

LEGAL ACTS

Act of June 5, 1998 on Government Administration in the Voivodeship, Vol. OJ 2001, No. 80, item 872.

Act of 26 April 2007 on Crisis Management, consolidated volume OJ 2023, item 122.

Act of January 23, 2009 on the Voivode and Government Administration in the Voivodeship, consolidated text OJ 2023 item 190.

