

Oksana Chernega, Maria Kolchuk, Yuliia Bocharova,
Oleksandr Ishchenko, Svitlana Ostapenko

ABSTRACT

The place and role of the security phenomenon in the scientific discourse are studied. Approaches to understanding the essence of the concept of «security» are identified. The stages of evolution of the security concept in the 17th–20th centuries are analyzed. Security paradigms (traditional security paradigm, sectoral security paradigm, human security paradigm, integrated security paradigm) are identified. The types of security in the 21st century are identified and it is substantiated that the variability of types of security is primarily associated with its subject-object structure. Analytical security levels are proposed. It is substantiated that, despite the complexity, interdisciplinarity and multidimensionality of the modern concept of security, the defining place in it is still occupied by the concept of national security. It is substantiated that at the present stage of development of theory and practice, national security is considered as a prerequisite and indicator of the socio-economic development of the state, its competitiveness. Approaches to understanding the concept of «national security» are considered and the author's approach to understanding the essence of this term is proposed. The components of national security are identified and it is substantiated that the significance and role of different components of security differ significantly from one group of countries to another, which is dictated by the achieved level of socio-economic development, the geo-economic and geopolitical potential of countries' influence, and their national interests. The essence of the concept of «public administration in the field of security» is revealed. The variability of models for ensuring the security of states and their features are identified. Based on the analysis of the Global Risks Reports, the global threats to national security in the 21st century are systematized and analyzed, the vector of their transformation, the time lag of manifestation and the degree of influence are determined.

KEYWORDS

Security, security paradigm, national security, security governance, threats.

1.1 THE PHENOMENON OF SECURITY IN SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE

Although «the problem of security is relevant in any historical period» [1], «the issue of security has been in the focus of attention of many scientists, historians, lawyers, philosophers, as well as politicians, those in power, the military for hundreds and thousands of years» [2], unprecedented

transformation of the world, an increase in the level of turbulence and uncertainty, which is recorded in the global and national contexts of development, the development of the international division of labor, internationalization, cooperation, and, at the same time, the escalation of competition in the geo-economic and geopolitical plane, logically cause an increase in the attention of both scientists and practitioners to the problem of security in the XXI century. Actual focus on the theory and practice of security in the context of the transformation of the development context, the picture of the world, incl. scientific, quite logical, because the idea of security, which is one of the basic human needs (according to the theory of the hierarchy of needs by A. Maslow), is also undergoing transformation, requires updating and further development.

The etymology of «security» depends on the language in which the term is used. So, according to the Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian language, the concept of «security» comes from the Old Slavonic prefix «without» and the noun «pek», associated with the verb «peka». The prefix «pre» is «in the absence, except», and the noun «peck» is «care, worries» [3], so the concept of «security» means without worries, without hassle, which is possible in the absence of threats. At the same time, as noted by Agnieszka Bien-Kacala, Maciej Serowaniec, «the 'security family' refers to the Latin *insane*, which are a combination of two Latin words – blue and space – and it must remain in full. European English languages, including English and French (*securite*). Sine from Latin is without. Whereas *cura* means 'concern', 'fear', 'anxiety'. This word security is orientally translated as there is no doubt, heaviness or danger» [4]. Lyashenko, E. states that «...Greek contains the first references to security in the broadest sense. The Greek expression «to be safe» means «to control the situation»... In Hebrew, the word «security»... is often... identified with the Hebrew word «shalom», meaning «peace, prosperity» [5].

The first attempts to define the essence of the concept of «security» were made in 1190 [2], however, at the present stage of development of the theory and practice of security, there is no generally accepted approach to understanding the essence of this term, the variability of approaches to its understanding is fixed, because it has evolved over time, formed under the influence of theoretical interpretations of the variability of relations both within the country and outside it (under the influence of the development of international relations), as well as historical events and trends, various sciences and scientific schools, is a very wide, complex phenomenon, has many dimensions, objects and indicators. Ladislav Hofreiter comes to similar conclusions, arguing that «Security itself is complicated, internally structured, multifactor and hierarchized phenomenon. Structuralization and hierarchization of security are given by its internal structuring in subsystems along with their identification in systems of high level» [6].

Today, there are more than 5 different approaches to understanding the essence of the concept of «security»:

- security as a state of protection of vital interests, values, properties of someone and/or something;
- security as the absence of danger to someone and/or something;

- security as a property (attribute) of someone and/or something;
- security as a specific activity;
- security as a state that contributes to the most complete satisfaction of the needs of someone and/or something;
- security as a set of factors that ensure the development of someone and/or something;
- security as a cultural and historical phenomenon [1, 2, 7–13].

Thus, it is quite logical that, in accordance with the most general and widespread approach to understanding the essence, the concept of «security» is a state when, for some reason, nothing threatens someone [14] or «...» for extremely stringent requirements – threats that could so endanger core values that those values would be damaged beyond repair if we did not do something to deal with the situation» [15]. At the same time, the content analysis of works [1–29] allows to assert that the concept of «security» acquires a meaningful meaning, provided it is associated with a specific object (state, region, individual, sphere of human activity, etc.), and is also subjective (associated with the subjective perception of threats).

The first scientific concept of security appeared in the 17th century. Its formation and development were associated with the works of Locke, J., Rousseau, J.-J., Spinoza, B. the works of Machiavelli, N., Montesquieu, C., Kant, I., Hegel, G. and others [2], in these studies, the idea is gradually formed that security is determined by the ability of individuals, states to resist external (exogenous) threats, mainly due to the power component. Thus, as Kim R. Holmes notes, «Modern concepts of national security arose in the 17th century during the Thirty Years War in Europe and the Civil War in England. In 1648, the Song of Westphalia established the idea that the nation-state had legal control not only of domestic affiliation, like religion, but also of external security...» [18]. In the 20th century, with the development of the international division of labor, internationalization, scientific thought, the very nature of security was rethought, its understanding went beyond the limits of only the power component, exogenous threats, and began to be applied to a wider list of objects, incl. regions, industries and sectors of the economy, ecosystems, enterprises, the world as a whole, took into account the threats of endogenous and exogenous origin. Thus, the genesis of security theory in the 20th century can be represented as a staged process consisting of four stages: Stage 1 (40–50s of the 20th century), associated with the theory of classical realism, which focused on issues of national security, led to the emergence of the term «national interests», ensuring security was understood as ensuring the protection and implementation of the national interests of the state; Stage 2 (60s of the 20th century) – the theory of pluralism, which laid the foundation for the development of the theory of regional and international security; Stage 3 (70s of the 20th century) – the use of the ideas of Marxism in the theory of security, which laid the foundation for the formation of the theory of global security; Stage 4 (90s of the 20th century) – the theory of social constructivism, which laid the foundation for universal security, the introduction of the term «human security», a departure from understanding national security only through the ability to ensure security by military means [5].

The consequence of the evolution of the concept of security, the development of scientific schools of security during the 17th–20th centuries was the formation at the beginning of the 21st century of three security paradigms:

– the paradigm of traditional security – the object of security is the state; the object of protection is the integration of state and military security; potential threats – military aggression, nuclear war, etc.;

– the paradigm of sectoral security – individuals, groups, groups of states, humanity, civilizations are the object of security; the object of protection is military, political, economic, environmental, social, societal security, etc.; potential threats – two groups of threats: military (power) and non-military;

– the paradigm of human security – the object of security is humanity, individuals; the object of protection is human and social rights, freedom from fear, freedom from scarcity; potential threats – violence, crime, poverty, repression, hunger, disease, unemployment, etc. [1–13, 15–29].

Content analysis and systematization of information in works [1–13, 15–29] allows us to state that:

1. At the beginning of the 21st century, the formation of the fourth paradigm is observed – an integral one that unites the ideas and results of the development of the above three paradigms, which is due to the dialectical unity of the functioning and development of man, society and the state.

2. Security theory is closely related to risk theory (basic methodological principle: threat – risk – measurement), crisis theory – solution of security or security event; causality – causes of security or security event [9, 12].

3. The concept of «security» acquires a meaningful meaning if it is connected with a specific object (state, region, individual, sphere of human activity, etc.) and subject (it is subjective, associated with the subjective perception of threats).

4. Security, regardless of the object, is characterized by both internal and external dimensions (threats are formed both inside the security object and outside it). At the same time, as noted by Agnieszka Bien-Kacala, Maciej Serowaniec, «... on account globalization... The boundary between external and internal security threats becomes vague or even disappear» [4].

5. In the 21st century, the list of objects and subjects of security is very wide, as a result, there are a large number of varieties of security. At the same time, as noted by Ludek Lukas, Martin Hromada, Lukáš Pavlík. This usually includes sets of measures that serve to minimize harm. All kinds of security spheres or technical security are implemented as periodic activity, as regulated by the authorities, certain measures and tools... protect before this pathologic phenomenon... Society solve the security or security problems by introduction of security or security in the form of institutionalized children of security or security. These types of security or security are included in certain national territory and provided against certain specific threats» [10].

Thus, Ladislav Hofreiter identifies five varieties: global security, regional security, national security, group security, individual security [6].

Ludek Lukas distinguishes three types of security: international security, physic security, fire security [9]. At the same time, he notes that «Currently, security and security research is realized independently, with all sector addressing its own kind of security or security. Its basis of security or security basically creates its own professional conceptual tool» [9]. At the same time, Ludek Lukas, Martin Hromada, Lukáš Pavlík note that «From historic perspective, first kinds of security were physical security and international security» [10].

Lyashenko distinguishes six types of security: individual security, local security, regional security, national security, international security, global security [5].

Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu, Mohammed Shuaibu distinguish the following types of security:

- international security (development of a general medical system; this is related to the amalgamation of measures by states and international organizations);
- human security (this is a particular dimension that focuses on the individual, not in the state. Human protection is about people, centrifugation, multi-disciplinary understanding of security involving a number of search fields including development studies, strategic studies, human rights);
- national security (this traditionally implies the physical protection of the territories of the state from municipal attacks on other states);
- environmental protection (these threats exams consist of trends in nature, communication and peoples. This type of security includes, among other things, water security, energy security, food security);
- transnational security (these practices are taking into account threats such as organized crime, terrorism, trafficking, arms proliferation and other forms of transnational security issues);
- reference information (this refers to processes a methodologies which are designed and implemented to protect print, electronic, or any other form of confidential, private and sensitive information or data from unauthorized access, use, misuse, disclosure, destruction, modification, disruption);
- financial security (a referee at school is one of the worst, if the stench is not stolen, it is inconvenient to provide their expenses);
- economic security (this consists of the principle of security, which is a function of basic needs such as health, education, home, and information, as well as work-related security, which includes job security, income security, et cetera) [12].

Identification, analysis, systematization of author's approaches to the identification of security varieties made it possible to propose analytical levels of security: global level, sub-global, macro-, meso- and micro-levels of security (**Table 1.1**).

There is a complementary relationship between all levels and varieties of security. So, as Ladislav Hofreiter notes, «It is visible that individual security is part of global security level and individual security will not exist if the global security is no guaranteed» [6]. James C. Hsiung comes to similar conclusions, arguing that «The various components of comprehensive security are intertwined. Global warming may have worldwide economic implications, and epidemics may ravage the physical and economic security of the individual (and society at large). While heading

in opposite directions, both globalization shift and the opposite shift to individual are ultimately interrelated because the individual is the ultimate beneficiary of both environmental and economic security» [11]. A similar point of view is shared by Lyashenko, A. [5].

● **Table 1.1** Analytical levels of security in the context of the formation of an integral security paradigm

Analytical Level Security	A kind of security	Security object	Security sectors
Global level	Global Security	Noosphere, world community	Geopolitics, geoeconomics, environmental, military, informational, technological, etc.
Sub-global level	Sub-global security	Macro-regions, continents, integration blocs, groups of countries, international organizations	Military, political, cultural, demographic, social, economic, energy, environmental, scientific and technological, food, healthcare, etc.
Macro level (national level)	National security	States	
Meso level (subnational level)	Regional security, sectoral security, etc.	Regions, industries, social groups	
Microlevel	Personal security	Individuals, enterprises	Social, food, information, cultural, technological, economic, etc.

Source: compiled by the author based on these sources [1–13, 15–29]

Thus, the phenomenon of security is an integral part of scientific discourse, in the 21st century the concept and phenomenon of «security» is complex, dynamic, interdisciplinary, multidimensional, security theory is developing dynamically, which is reflected in the variability of approaches to understanding the types and levels of security of complementary communication.

1.2 NATIONAL SECURITY: ESSENCE AND COMPONENTS

Despite the complexity, interdisciplinarity and multidimensionality of the modern concept of security, the concept of national security still occupies a decisive place in it.

According to Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu, Mohammed Shuaibu, «From the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the concept of security was linked to the state. Hence, the state had exclusive preserve to decide what security meant to it» [12].

As evidenced by a critical analysis of sources [1–13, 15–35], at the present stage of development of the theory and practice of security, it is national security that is considered as an important prerequisite and determinant of the socio-economic development and growth of not only individual states, but also the world community as a whole.

Thus, as PwC experts note, «Security and security lie at the heart of any nation's prosperity» [19]. A similar point of view is shared by OECD experts, arguing that «Security is fundamental to people's

livelihoods, reducing poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals» [33], «The security industry is a large and expanding area of economic activity» [28].

The position of international institutions on the importance of national security for ensuring the socio-economic development of countries and the world community is shared by individual researchers. Thus, Ladislav Hofreiter notes that «Security is one of the most sense human needs, is a precondition of development» [6]. Wolfgang-Peter Zingel states that «Development – Developing Security» [22]. While being an economist, Wolfgang-Peter Zingel submits the paper looks into the field of security (pre-)configuration for development, understanding that the problem is part of what economists refer to a «(non-)economic framework» [22]. Ebeh, J. I. objectively proves that «national development and national health are two essences at the same age ... security is anchored on national development. On the other side, development can be supported in the field of security» [24]. Sebastian Vaduva, Andrew R. Thomas are convinced that Growth, Security and Development are interconnected [34]. Andrea Monti and Raymond Wacks are convinced of the exceptional role of national security at the present stage of development, arguing that «National security is at the heart of contemporary public policy debate. Not only the conventional domains of intelligence and terrorism, but the economy, scientific research, education, and even the COVID-19 pandemic are in the cross-hairs of national security» [25]. The team of authors of the work [1] headed by Professor With, A. P. a beak, they come to the conclusion that «The existence of any sovereign state is impossible without the protection of its national interests, which is the main, fundamental condition for guaranteeing self-preservation and progressive self-development of society. For such reasons, the national security of transitional societies is a paramount condition for a successful socially organized existence» [1]. This point of view is shared by the authors of the work [7], arguing that «The issue of security is a matter of survival, successful existence and interaction between government and society» [7].

Both the concept of security in general and the concept of national security, in particular, are characterized by variability in approaches to understanding the essence of its fundamental concepts.

As Kim R. Holmes notes, a correct understanding of the concept of «national security» (national security) is impossible without a correct understanding of such concepts as:

- power is the nation's possession of control of its sovereignty and destiny, which can be either hard (largely military, power is about control) or soft (it is mainly about influence);
- military strength (This term refers to military capacity and the capabilities of the armed forces);
- force is a way to use a political or legal heart attack capacity to achieve some objective;
- national defense – the ability of the placed force to fight against the limited responsibility of the people and the lives of their people [18].

A similar point of view is shared by the experts of the National Council of Educational Research and Training in India, noting that «Traditional security policy has a ... component called balance of power. If countries look nearby, they say that some countries are big and strong. This is who may be in the future» [15].

A wider list of concepts and categories, on the correct understanding of which the approach to understanding the concept of «national security» depends, reports Lipkan, V. Thus, Lipkan, V. notes that «The conceptual and categorical framework objective formed in the general theory of national security compresses basic and specific notions such as national security (insecurity), national threat, safeguard, ensuring, support, probability, risk, catastrophe, crisis, vital functions, system environment, adverse factor, dangerous impact, system response, algorithm of managing, national idea, national interests, national outlook, national sufficiency, national security system, state administration of national security system, etc.» [17].

Kim R. Holmes defines national security as «...the safekeeping of the nation as a whole». This is a high circle of entrepreneurship – this is the protection of the people and their people from attack and other external citizens to manage the forces and protect state secrets» [18]. At the same time, he notes that national security involves both national defense and the protection of a number of geopolitical, economic and other interests that affect not only defense policy, but also foreign and other policies [18].

In the Law of Ukraine «On the Fundamentals of National Security», the concept of «national security» was identified as «the protection of the vital interests of a person and a citizen, society and the state, which ensures the sustainable development of society, timely detection, prevention and neutralization of real and potential threats to national interests...» [35]. At the same time, the concept of «national interests» is understood as «vital material, intellectual and spiritual values ... of the people as the bearer of sovereignty and a single source of power ... that determine the needs of society and the state, the implementation of which guarantees state sovereignty ... and its progressive development», and «threats» – present and possible phenomena and factors that create a danger to vital national interests...» [36]. In the Law of Ukraine «On the National Security of Ukraine», which replaced the Law of Ukraine «On the Fundamentals of National Security», national security is identified as «the protection of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, democratic constitutional order and other national interests ... from real and potential threats» [37]. At the same time, the concept of «national interests» is understood as «the vital interests of a person, society and the state, the implementation of which ensures the state sovereignty of the country, its progressive democratic development, as well as safe living conditions and the well-being of its citizens», and «threats to national security...» – «phenomena, trends and factors that make it impossible or complicate or may make it impossible or complicate the realization of national interests and the preservation of national values ... of the country» [37].

The authors of the work [8] understand the concept of «national security» as «the protection of the vital interests of society and the state from internal and external threats, which ensures the sustainable and progressive development of the country» [8]. At the same time, they argue that at the present stage of development of security theory, two main approaches to understanding the essence of the concept of «national security» have been formed: «According to the first, national security is considered in the context of national interests..., and according to the other, in the context of the basic values of society» [8].

Lipkan, V. understands the concept of «national security» as «the level of a nation's interests being safeguarded from natural and man-caused dangers using various methods, including investigation of the self-organization of so-called disrupters (destabilizing systems)» [17].

Ladislav Hofreiter, argues that the concept of «national security» should be understood as «...the ability of the state to ensure the protection of its independence, sovereignty, integrity, ensuring its sectorial essential needs, interests and core values against internal and external threats» [6].

Andrea Monti and Raymond Wacks believe that national security is «protection and prevention of internal and/or external actions, activities, or events that harm directly and/or endanger national interests in the economic, scientific, technological, and political field without warning about the functions of the municipal in the fight against the state and what corresponds to 'home-land security'» [25].

Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu, Mohammed, Shuaibu identify «...two main tendencies in defining national security: The first is the State-centred concept, which views national security in terms of defense and survival of the State. This conception equates «defense» with «security» and bestows its protection to the military as the custodians of national security, and equates national security with the security of the State. The second tendency in the definition of national security involves the factoring of the State and the individual into the constituents of the definition. According to this definition, security involves freedom from danger or threat to a nation's ability to protect and develop itself, promote its cherished values and well-being of its people. This takes into account the significance of human well being in the security considerations of a country» [8]. In addition, as noted by Umaru Ibrahim Yakubu, Mohammed Shuaibu, «Theories and perspectives such as idealism, realism, neoliberalism and constructivism have viewed the meaning of security differently» [8]. This point of view is shared by Lucia Retter, Erik Frinking, Stijn Hoorens, Alice Lynch, Fook Nederveen and William Phillips, arguing that the understanding of the concept of «national security» from the standpoint of Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism, Critical Theory, Critical Political Economy [23].

Considering all of the above, the approach to understanding the essence of the concept of «national security», identifying related and important concepts for the correct understanding of this term is determined by which paradigm of security prevails in a particular society, to which the author is more inclined; under national security, it is expedient to understand the ability of the state, due to the existing economic potential and the potential of force, to effectively respond to internal and external challenges, to ensure the implementation of national interests in the short, medium and long term. The decisive role in security is assigned to the state, the government. However, as evidenced by a number of studies, in the context of globalization, the importance and role of the state in ensuring national security, although it remains fundamental, is gradually decreasing.

Thus, as noted by Andrea Monti and Raymond Wacks, «National security is no longer controlled by governments. It is shared with the private sector. This often engenders tension between their respective objectives and hence strategies» [25].

Ripsman, Norrin M., Paul, T. V. come to similar conclusions, arguing that «Since its inception as a social institution, the primary purpose of the nation-state has been to provide security within

a geographically defined territory against both external and internal threats. Throughout many political, economic, and social changes, ranging from the emergence of nationalism, the industrial revolution, two world wars, and the development of nuclear weapons, the state has remained at the forefront of organized protection, and the protection of national security has been its hallmark. However, during the contemporary era, when economic, political, and social interaction expanded beyond national boundaries to reach a global scale, many believe that the state is losing its relevance not only as a welfare provider, but also as a guarantor of security. Consequently, many theorists assert that globalization has begun to dismantle the national security state» [34].

Similar views are held by Lucia Retter, Erik Frinking, Stijn Hoorens, Alice Lynch, Fook Nederveen and William Phillips, arguing that in the 21st century national security is ensured given that security has been extended from nations to the security of individuals; it also accounts for the international system; it has been extended to look beyond military aspects of security to previously neglected dimensions of security, including political, economic, social, environmental or 'human' security aspects; political responsibility for dealing with security matters now includes actors beyond national governments, such as international organisations, local government, the public, the media and the private sector» [23].

Changing views on the importance and role of the state and governments in ensuring national security is associated with:

- changes in the understanding of subjects and objects of national security. A critical analysis of the sources [8, 11, 19, 20, 25, 29–36] shows that at the present stage of development of the theory of security, incl. national security, the objects of national security include not only states, but also people and citizens, society; subjects – not only state institutions, but also society and citizens;

- the evolution of approaches to understanding the components of national security: if in the 17th – early 20th century national security was associated only with military security (actually it was a synonym), then since the middle of the 20th century national security has been understood more broadly, including both power and non-military security, power components. Thus, as James C. Hsiung notes, «A burning issue on the agenda of nations in the twenty-first century is the new meaning of security and its place in world politics. A nation security is no longer the traditional national defense (military security) but has economic, environmental, and human dimensions as well (separately known as economic security, environmental security, and human security). All three dimensions be subsumed under the rubric of «comprehensive security» a new umbrella concept that grew out of the post-Cold War debate over the ramifications of security and over security studies as a field of inquiry» [11].

Experts from the United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) identify seven components of national security: Economic (creation of employment and measures against poverty); Food (measures against hunger and famine); Health (measures against disease, unsafe food, malnutrition and lack of access to basic health care); Environmental (measures against environmental degradation, resource depletion, natural disasters and pollution);

Personal (measures against physical violence, crime, terrorism, domestic violence and child labour); Community (measures against inter-ethnic, religious and other identity tensions); Political security (measures against political repression and human rights abuses) [20].

PwC experts distinguish four components of national security: physical security (this is the ability to protect one's territory, the administrative apparatus); digital security (The protection of data and digital networked assets, regardless of whether they are owned by the state, corporations or private individuals); economic security (The safeguarding of financial stability, nationally and within the wider global financial system. For the individual, this means, at a minimum, having enough to live on and pay the bills); social security (Protection of citizen rights and civil liberties as traditionally defined in each state or territory. This is wider than social security as defined by a typical welfare system, including benefits and pensions; it includes food and water security, environmental sustainability, education and health) [19].

Kim R. Holmes argues that national security includes 2 components: military and non-military, he refers to the latter:

- political security (it refers to protecting the sovereignty of the government and political system and the security of society from unlawful internal threats and external threats or pressures, involves both national and homeland security and law enforcement);

- economic security (It involves not only protecting the capacity of the economy to provide for the people, but also the degree to which the government and the people are free to control their economic and financial decisions. It also entails the ability to protect a nation's wealth and economic freedom from outside threats and coercion. Thus, it comprises economic policy and some law enforcement agencies but also international agreements on commerce, finance, and trade. Recently, it has been defined by some in a human security context to mean eradicating poverty and eliminating income inequality);

- energy and natural resources security (It is most often defined as the degree to which a nation or people have access to such energy resources as oil, gas, water, and minerals. It would be more accurate to describe it as access freely determined by the market without interference from other nations or political or military entities for nonmarket, political purposes);

- homeland security (it is a set of domestic security functions that since 9/11 have been organized in a single agency, the Department of Homeland Security. It includes airport and port security, border security, transportation security, immigration enforcement, and other related matters);

- cybersecurity (it refers to protection of the government's and the peoples' computer and data processing infrastructure and operating systems from harmful interference, whether from outside or inside the country. It thus involves not only national defense and homeland security, but also law enforcement);

- human security (it refers to a concept largely developed at the United Nations after the end of the Cold War. It defines security broadly as encompassing peoples' security from hunger, disease, and repression, including harmful disruptions of daily life. Over time, the concept has expanded to include economic security, environmental security, food security, health security,

personal security, community security, political security, and the protection of women and minorities. Its distinguishing characteristic is to avoid or downplay national security as a military problem between nation-states, focusing instead on social and economic causes and an assumed international «responsibility to protect» peoples from violence);

– environmental security (it is an idea with multiple meanings. One is the more traditional concept of responding to conflicts caused by environmental problems such as water shortages, energy disruptions, or severe climate changes; it is assumed that these problems are «transnational» and thus can cause conflict between nations. The other, more recent concept is that the environment and the «climate» should be protected as ends in and of themselves; the assumption is that the environmental degradation caused by man is a threat that must be addressed by treaties and international governance as if it were the moral equivalent of a national security threat. In the past, natural disasters were not considered threats to national security, but that presumption is changing as the ideology of «climate change» and global warming takes hold in the national security community) [18].

As a result, at the present stage of development, the concept of «national security» includes both power and non-power components, incl. economic, energy, environmental security, health care security, food security, etc.

At the same time, as evidenced by the analysis of sources [6, 23], the determinants of national security are not only characterized by being formed in various areas, but can also be formed both within a certain country and outside it, that is, they can have both exogenous and endogenous origin (in relation to a particular state).

As Ladislav Hofreiter notes, national security is significantly influenced by global security, such factors as global asymmetries, polarization and stratification of the world's population [6]. This conclusion of Ladislav Hofreiter is quite logical, because, as we mentioned above, there is a complementary relationship between security levels.

A similar point of view is shared by RAND Europe experts, arguing that national security is influenced by factors such as:

1. Ownership (through control and influence) by public or private actors of critical infrastructure and sectors, or ownership of assets in physical proximity to critical infrastructure and sectors.
2. Espionage and access to sensitive information enabled, for example, by physical proximity or ownership.
3. Natural resource dependence on third countries and actors for the supply of critical raw materials and energy.
4. Supplier dependence on specific suppliers for the provision and maintenance of critical infrastructure and processes, reinforced by the presence of a skills and technology gap and lack of competition, which may result in reduced efforts to ensure resilience of critical infrastructure, sectors and processes as well as reduced innovation and R&D.
5. Government intervention through expenditure, economic policy and regulation (or lack thereof), which can have a strong influence on the quality, availability and resilience of critical infrastructure, sectors and processes.

6. Corruption and fraud, which may undermine the resilience of critical infrastructure and potentially create opportunities for malicious actors to obtain physical or digital access to sensitive assets and information.

7. Socio-economic inequality resulting from factors such as economic policies and neoliberal market forces, which may reduce the ability of citizens to provide for themselves, as well as risk social unrest and domestic instability that pose a threat to critical infrastructure, sectors and processes [23].

Megatrends, including:

1. Globalisation and interdependence between critical infrastructure, sectors and processes of one country with others, magnifying risks to an individual country's national critical infrastructures, which can be affected through cascading effects from developments elsewhere.

2. International economic trends playing a critical role on countries due to increased interconnectedness via economic, business, political and governance structures, as well as the expanded influence of private actors over political processes.

3. The political and economic paradigm of foreign states which, similar to protectionism, considers the risks related to different national economic models and their impact on the competitiveness in the area of critical sectors and processes.

4. Uncertainty in relation to resource security, particularly in relation to reliance on foreign suppliers of energy and the uptake of alternative energy generation, distribution and storage technologies.

5. Potential concerns with regard to information integrity and trustworthiness, which may act as an avenue for malicious actors including private companies to disrupt critical processes – such as elections and democratic decision-making – and gain influence in critical sectors (such as telecommunications or political institutions) [23].

In this way, national security is determined by a great number of exogenous and endogenous officials in various ethiology and nature. Ladislav Hofreiter comes to a similar conclusion, firmly, that «Security margin of the man, social group, state (hereinafter referred to as objects) will be always the result of interaction of external and internal security risks and threats and protective properties, abilities and capabilities of security object» [6].

Critical analysis of sources [1–3, 5, 6, 15–35] shows that the significance and role of various components in ensuring national security varies significantly from one group of countries to another, determined by its achieved level of socio-economic development and its features. At the same time, as evidenced by the content analysis of sources [1–13, 15–35], at the present stage of development of the theory and practice of security in general, national security in particular, economic and political security remain the most important components of ensuring national security.

Thus, as Lucia Retter, Erik Frinking, Stijn Hoorens, Alice Lynch, Fook Nederveen and William Phillips argue, «In a context of globalisation and further economic integration in recent decades, the relationship between the economy and national security has become increasingly interlinked [23]. In this context, Lucia Retter, Erik Frinking, Stijn Hoorens, Alice Lynch, Fook Nederveen and William Phillips point out the importance for national security Critical sectors (are sectors whose assets,

systems and networks (whether physical or virtual) are considered so vital that their incapacitation or destruction would have a debilitating effect on national security, the functioning of the economy and society), Critical infrastructure (is an asset or system that is essential for the maintenance of vital societal functions or processes), Critical processes (are those processes that could result in severe social disruption in the event of their failure or disruption) [23].

In turn, Krishtanovich, M., Pushak, Ya., Fleychuk, M., Franchuk, V. argue that «security in the political sphere occupies one of the key places in the national security system and acts as one of its main structural elements. This is due to the comprehensive nature and vital importance of the political sphere for the existence of the state and society, as well as the functioning of the main social institutions and organizations» [8]. At the same time, Krishtanovich, M., Pushak, Ya., Fleychuk, M., Franchuk, V. note that «...political security should be understood as a dynamically structured state that ensures the stability, unity and integrity of the political system, its ability to self-regulate, self-develop and respond to adverse internal and external influences. It is a set of measures aimed at preserving the constitutionally legitimized political system of the state, ensuring the creation of the state and constructive politics» [8].

Taking into account all of the above, as well as the fact that political security cannot be ensured without a military component, each state, in order to ensure its security, must understand and correctly evaluate the existing three strategic alternatives for the model of behavior in the face of an existing or potential military threat: «...to surrender; to prevent the other side from attacking by promising to raise the costs of war to an unaccepted level; and to defend itself when war actually breaks out so as to deny the attacking country its objectives and to turn back or defeat the attacking forces altogether... Therefore, security policy is concerned with preventing war, which is called deterrence and with limiting or ending war, which is called defence» [15].

The alternative behavior of the state in the face of an existing or potential military threat, the presence of a large number of areas in relation to which coordinated and balanced decisions must be determined, necessitates their coordination from a single center, the implementation of state administration in the field of national security.

The content analysis of sources [5, 8, 15, 29–37] indicates that public administration in the field of security should be understood as a specific type of public administration that involves the use of the capabilities and resources of the state in order to influence national security objects in order to find and achieve a compromise between human interests, society and the state, and, consequently, the realization of national interests. As noted by Abramov, V., Sytnik, G., Smolyanyuk, V. et al., «The main goal of these managerial influences is forecasting, timely detection, and neutralization of threats... The content and direction of state administration in the field of security depends on the form of government, the political system and the state policy of national security...» [8].

Ludek Lukas, Martin Hromaa, Lukáš Pavlík distinguish six main models of public administration in the field of security:

– regime model (it is based on specification the rules and their following. The regime model is controlled order);

– proactive model (it is based on proactive approach, is oriented on future and prediction of events with goal to avoid negative impact. Model is based on management, active work with information, searching and monitoring undesirable events and their solving. This model has 2 types: predictively-security model, minimize collisions model, stress reduction model);

– barrier model (flexible barrier model, layer barrier model, filter model);

– preparedness model (flexible capabilities model, business continuity model, substitution model, transformational model, redundant model);

– model of participation (it is based on creation collective goal and also on type of its attainment);

– reactive model (it is based on reactive approach, which is also based on reaction of starting event) [10].

Lyashenko, E. identifies five main models of national security, due to the cultural, historical, socio-economic and political features of the development of countries:

– american model (combination of external and internal security);

– the Japanese model (focused on ensuring internal social security, maintaining and developing the economic potential of the state);

– chinese model (based on the principles of social society);

– a model of countries with economies in transition (focusing on current socio-economic efficiency and creating prerequisites for ensuring the implementation of promising innovative projects);

– a model of developing countries (focusing on ensuring the maximum effectiveness of the use of economic potential in the shortest possible time) [5].

Since, as the studies of the National Council of Educational Research and Training of India show, at the present stage of development the thesis continues to dominate that «most threats to a country's security come from outside its borders», Holmes, R. identifies the following three main models through which national security can be ensured:

1) collective defense (collective defense is an official arrangement among nation-states to offer some defense support to other member states if they are attacked);

2) collective security (collective defense involving mutual commitments of member states could be considered a form of collective security, albeit one limited geographically to military defense. Their distinguishing characteristic is their hybrid character between collective action at the international level and the acceptance of nation-states being ultimately responsible for their own security);

3) global security (the world's security is everybody's business, the far greater focus is on attempting to eliminate conflict through international law, aid, confidence-building measures, and global governance) [18].

Thus, national security is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, characterized by the variability of dimensions that make up the object-subject structure, management models and ensuring the containment or leveling of threats of various etiologies. The choice of models of public administration in the field of security depends on the characteristics of the historical, cultural and

political development of states, national interests, threats, etc., and may change over time under the influence of the transformation of the trajectory and context of development.

1.3 THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE XXI CENTURY

At the present stage of development of the preservation paradigm, incl. national security, as Ladislav Hofreiter notes, «Security does not mean only absence of security risks and threats but first of all protection against them» [6]. Given this, the success of public administration in the field of security depends on the timeliness of identifying, assessing risks and developing measures aimed at their leveling and/or reduction. At the same time, not only internal risks are taken into account, but also external ones, because in the context of globalization, the boundary between internal and external threats is blurred.

Among the institutions that systematically identify and differentiate global threats to global and national security, the World Economic Forum (WEF) conducts the most comprehensive and representative study. According to the results of its research, the World Economic Forum – The Global Risks Report, where risks are differentiated by the sphere of occurrence, as they impact and the horizon of their actualization.

Content Analysis of WEF Global Risk Studies 2010–2022 [38–42] allows us to state that in 2010–2022, the risks and threats that affect global and national security have changed significantly – if in 2010 the largest number of the most probable and potentially influential threats were formed in the economic sphere, since 2011 the largest number of security threats with a high level of probability of manifestation (**Table 1.2**) and potential force of influence (**Table 1.3**), arose in the social sphere and ecology.

Among the risks characterized by a high level of probability and potential impact potential, in 2010–2022:

- in the economic area: Fiscal crises; Financial failure; Chronic fiscal imbalances; Unemployment; Asset price collapse; Energy price volatility; Energy price shock;
- in the environmental area: Storms and cyclones; Biodiversity loss; Climate change; Flooding; Rising greenhouse gas emissions; Extreme weather events; Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation; Natural disasters; Extreme weather; Human environmental damage; Climate action failure;
- in the social area: Chronic disease; Severe income disparity; Large-scale involuntary migration; Livelihood crises; Infectious diseases; Social cohesion erosion; Water crises; Social Cohesion Erosion;
- in the technological area: Cyber-attacks; Data fraud or theft; Massive incident of data fraud/theft; Infrastructure breakdown;
- in the geopolitical area: Interstate conflict with regional consequences; Corruption; Global governance gaps; State collapse or crisis; Failure of national governance; Large-scale terrorist attacks; Weapons of mass destruction.

● **Table 1.2** Top five risks by probability of occurrence

Year	Probability of manifestation					Risk area																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
2010	Asset price collapse	Slowing Chinese economy (<6 %)	Chronic disease	Fiscal crises	Global governance gaps																		
2011	Storms and cyclones	Flooding	Corruption	Biodiversity loss	Climate change																		
2012	Severe income disparity	Chronic fiscal imbalances	Rising greenhouse gas emissions	Cyber-attacks	Water supply crises																		
2013	Severe income disparity	Chronic fiscal imbalances	Rising greenhouse gas emissions	Water supply crises	Mismanagement of population																		
2014	Income disparity	Extreme weather events	Unemployment	Climate change	Cyber-attacks																		
2015	Interstate conflict with regional consequences	Extreme weather events	Failure of national governance	State collapse or crisis	Unemployment																		
2016	Large-scale involuntary migration	Extreme weather events	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	Interstate conflict with regional consequences	Major natural catastrophes																		
2017	Extreme weather events	Large-scale involuntary migration	Major natural disasters	Large-scale terrorist attacks	Massive incident of data fraud/theft																		
2018	Extreme weather events	Natural disasters	Cyber-attacks	Data fraud or theft	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation																		
2019	Extreme weather events	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	Natural disasters	Data fraud or theft	Cyber-attacks																		

● Continuation of Table 1.2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
2020	Extreme weather	Climate action failure	Natural disasters	Biodiversity loss	Human-made environmental disasters	0	5	0	0	0	0
2021	Extreme weather	Climate action Infectious diseases failure	Human environmental damage	Infectious diseases	Biodiversity loss	0	4	1	0	0	0
2022	Extreme weather	Livelihood crises	Climate action failure	Social cohesion erosion	Infectious diseases	0	2	3	0	0	0
Total						7	33	11	7	7	7
Absolute deviation						-3	2	2	0	0	-1

Source: compiled by the author based on data from [38–42]

● Table 1.3 Top five risks by impact

Year	Probability of manifestation					Risk area					
	1	2	3	4	5	Economy	Ecology	Society	Technosphere	Geopolitics	
2010	Asset price collapse	Retrenchment from globalization (developed)	Oil price spikes	Chronic disease	Fiscal crises	4	0	1	0	0	
2011	Fiscal crises	Climate change	Geopolitical conflict	Asset price collapse	Extreme energy price volatility	3	1	0	0	1	
2012	Financial failure	Water supply crises	Food crises	Fiscal imbalances	Energy price volatility	3	0	2	0	0	
2013	Financial failure	Water supply crises	Fiscal imbalances	Weapons of mass destruction	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	2	1	1	0	1	
2014	Fiscal crises	Climate change	Water crises	Unemployment	Infrastructure breakdown	2	1	1	1	0	

● Continuation of Table 1.3

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
2015	Water crises	Infectious diseases	Weapons of mass destruction	Weapons of mass destruction	Interstate conflict	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	0	1	2	0	2
2016	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	Weapons of mass destruction	Water crises	Involuntary migration	Energy price shock	1	1	2	0	1	
2017	Weapons of mass destruction	Extreme weather	Water crises	Natural disasters	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	0	3	1	0	1	
2018	Weapons of mass destruction	Extreme weather	Natural disasters	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	Water crises	0	3	1	0	1	
2019	Weapons of mass destruction	Failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation	Extreme weather	Water crises	Natural disasters	0	3	1	0	1	
2020	Climate action failure	Weapons of mass destruction	Biodiversity loss	Extreme weather	Water crises	0	3	1	0	1	
2021	Infectious diseases	Climate action failure	Weapons of mass destruction	Biodiversity loss	Natural re-source crises	0	3	1	0	1	
2022	Climate Action Failure	Extreme Weather	Biodiversity Loss	Livelihood Crises	Social Cohesion Erosion	0	3	2	0	0	
Total						15	23	16	1	10	
Absolute deviation						-4	3	1	0	0	

Source: compiled by the author based on data from [38–42]

According to The Global Risks Report 2022:

– in the next 2 years, the greatest number of threats will arise in the social sphere (4 out of 10 most likely threats). The main threats to national and global security will be: Extreme weather (31.3 % of respondents), Livelihood crises (30.4 % of respondents), Climate action failure (27.5 % of respondents), Social cohesion erosion (27.5 % of respondents), Infectious diseases (26.4 % of respondents), Mental health deterioration (26.1 % of respondents), Cybersecurity failure (19.5 % of respondents), Debt crises (19.3 % of respondents), Digital inequality (18.2 % of respondents), Asset bubble burs (14.2 %);

– in the next 2–5 years, the greatest number of threats will arise in the field of ecology (4 out of 10 possible threats). The main threats to national and global security will be: Climate action failure (35.7 % of respondents), Extreme weather (34.6 % of respondents), Social cohesion erosion (23 % of respondents), Livelihood crisis (20.1 % of respondents), Debt crises (19 % of respondents), Human environmental damage (16.4 % of respondents), Geoeconomic confrontations (14.8 % of respondents), Cybersecurity failure (14.6 % of respondents), Biodiversity loss (13.5 % of respondents), Asset but (12.7 % of respondents);

– in the 5–10-year perspective, the greatest number of threats will arise in the field of ecology (5 out of 10 conditional threats). The main threats to national and global security in the 5–10-year perspective will be: Climate action failure (42.1 % of respondents), Extreme weather (32.4 % of respondents), Biodiversity loss (27 % of respondents), Natural resource crises (23 % of respondents), Human environmental damage (21.7 % of respondents), Social cohesion erosion (19.1 % of respondents), Involuntary migration (15 % of respondents), Adverse tech advances (14.9 % of respondents), Geoeconomic confrontations (14,1 %) of respondents), Geopolitical resource contestation (13.5 % of respondents).

Taking into account the results of a retrospective analysis of the trajectory of the transformation of global risks in 2010–2022, the results of a study of global risks in 2022 in the development of a national security strategy, the formation and improvement of the state security policy will increase their effectiveness and ensure an increase in the level of national security.

REFERENCES

1. Dzoban, O. P. (Ed.) (2021). *Natsionalna bezpeka: svitohliadni ta teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady*. Kharkiv: Pravo, 776.
2. Korzh, I. F. (2019). Safety: medtological approaches to the concept. *National law journal: theory and practice*, 68–72. URL: http://www.jurnaluljuridic.in.ua/archive/2019/4/part_1/14.pdf
3. Melnychuk, O. S., Bilodid, I. K., Kolomiets, V. T., Tkachenko, O. B. (Eds.) (1982). *Etymolohichni slovnyk ukrainskoi movy*. Vol. 1: A–H. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 632.
4. Bien-Kacala, A., Serowaniec, M. (2016). Concept of security and its types. Available at: <https://repozytorium.umk.pl/bitstream/handle/item/3915/Security-MS.pdf?sequence=1>

5. Liashenko, O. M. (2015). Kontseptualizatsiia upravlinnia ekonomichnoi bezpekoiu pidpriemstva. Kyiv: NISD, 348. Available at: https://niss.gov.ua/sites/default/files/2015-10/lyashenko_1_druk-43fc7.pdf
6. Hofreiter, L. (2015). About Security in Contemporary World. *Securitologia*, 21 (1), 7–17. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5604/18984509.1184208>
7. Mykhnenko, A. M., Hrushchynska, N. M., Nesteriak, Yu. V., Zhovnirchuk, Ya. F., Deineha, I. I., Prykhodko, V. P. et. al. (2019). *Publichne upravlinnia ta natsionalna bezpeka*. Kyiv: NAU, 340.
8. Abramov, V. I., Sytnyk, H. P., Smolianiuk, V. F. et. al.; Sytnyk, H. P. (Ed.) (2016). *Hlobalna ta natsionalna bezpeka*. Kyiv: NADU, 784.
9. Lukas, L. (2016). Theoretical Sources for a Theory of Safety and Security. *SECURWARE 2016: The Tenth International Conference on Emerging Security Information, Systems and Technologies*. Available at: https://www.thinkmind.org/articles/securware_2016_8_20_30071.pdf
10. Lukas, L., Hromada, M., Pavlik, L. (2016). The Key Theoretical Models for the Safety and Security Ensuring. 2016 Third International Conference on Mathematics and Computers in Sciences and in Industry (MCSI). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/mcsi.2016.022>
11. Hsiung, J. C. (2004). *Comprehensive Security: Challenge For Pacific Asia*. Univ of Indianapolis Pr., 81.
12. Yakubu, U. I., Shuaibu, M. (2016). The concept of security and the emerging theoretical perspectives. *Corruption, Security and National Development*. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339676247_the_concept_of_security_and_the_emerging_theoretical_perspectives
13. Krickel-Choi, N. C. (2021). Rethinking Ontological Security Theory Conceptual Investigations into 'Self' and 'Anxiety'. Stockholm. Available at: <http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1599680/FULLTEXT03.pdf>
14. *Akademichniy tлумachnyi slovnyk*. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/>
15. National Council of Educational Research and Training of India (2020). *Security in the Contemporary World*.
16. Sussex, M., Clarke, M., Medcalf, R. (2017). National security: between theory and practice. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 71 (5), 474–478. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2017.1347139>
17. Lipkan, V. (2022). Conceptual framework and nature of the general theory of national security. Available at: <https://goal-int.org/conceptual-framework-and-nature-of-the-general-theory-of-national-security/>
18. Holmes, K. R. (2015). What Is National Security? The Heritage Foundation, 17–26. Available at: https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/2015_IndexOfUSMilitary-Strength_What%20Is%20National%20Security.pdf
19. Achieving safety and security in an age of disruption and distrust. Why collaboration between the public and private sectors is a prerequisite for a safe, secure and prosperous society.

- PwC, 26. Available at: <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/government-public-sector-research/pdf/pwc-achieving-safety-security.pdf>
20. National Security versus Global Security. Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/national-security-versus-global-security>
21. Jackson-Preece, J. (2011). Security in international relations Undergraduate study in Economics, Management, Finance and the Social Sciences. London, 40. Available at: <https://www.london.ac.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/ir3140-security-international-relations-study-guide.pdf>
22. Zingel, W.-P., Feichtinger, W., Gauster, M., Tanner, F. (Eds.) (2010). National Security and Economic Development: Securing Development – Developing Security. Economic impacts of crisis response operations. An underestimated factor in external engagement. Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie in Cooperation with the Geneva Centre for Security Policy. Vienna and Geneva, 81–133. Available at: https://www.bundesheer.at/pdf_pool/publikationen/eco_impacts_02_national_security_zingel.pdf
23. Retter, L., Frinking, E., Hoorens, S., Lynch, A., Nederveen, F., Phillips, W. (2020). Relationships between the economy and national security Analysis and considerations for economic security policy in the Netherlands. Available at: https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR4200/RR4287/RAND_RR4287.pdf
24. Ebeh, J. (1970). National Security and National Development: A Critique. *Afrrev Ijah: An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 4 (2), 1–14. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4314/ijah.v4i2.1>
25. Monti, A., Wacks, R. (2021). National security in the new world order. Government and the Technology of Information. Routledge, 181. doi: <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780367809775>
26. Bhangе, C. B., Sahni, A., Bhosale, D. V. (2021). National and Global Security Challenges: Approaches and Strategies. Bharti Publications, 189.
27. Scott, J. M., Carter, R. G., Drury, A. C. (2019). International, Economic, and Human Security in a Changing World. CQ Press, 966.
28. The Security Economy (2004). OECD, 153. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264107748-sum-es>
29. New threats to human security in the Anthropocene Demanding greater solidarity. (2022). UNDP, 188. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents/srhs2022pdf.pdf>
30. Clarke, M., Henschke, A., Sussex, M., Legrand, T. (Eds.) (2022). The Palgrave Handbook of National Security. Springer, 415. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53494-3>
31. Mazarr, M. J. (2016). Rethinking Risk in National Security. Lessons of the Financial Crisis for Risk Management. Springer Nature, 244. doi: <http://doi.org/10.7249/cb549>
32. Stewart, F. (2004). Development and Security. Working Paper 3. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08cd140f0b652dd00159c/wp3.pdf>
33. Security and Development. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/countries/burundi/securityanddevelopment.htm>
-

34. Vaduva, S., Thomas, A. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Geopolitics, Development, and National Security Romania and Moldova at the Crossroads*. Springer, 126. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12685-2>
35. Ripsman, N. M., Paul, T. V. (2010). *Globalization and the National Security State*. Oxford University Press, 294. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195393903.001.0001>
36. Pro osnovy natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy (2003). Zakonu Ukrainy No. 964-IV. 19.06.2003. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/964-15#Text>
37. Pro natsionalnu bezpeku Ukrainy (2018). Zakon Ukrainy No. 2469-VIII. 21.06.2018. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2469-19#Text>
38. *Global Risks Report 2022* (2022). World Economic Forum, 117. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2022.pdf
39. *The Global Risks Report 2021* (2021). World Economic Forum, 97. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2021.pdf
40. *The Global Risks Report 2020* (2020). World Economic Forum, 102. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risk_Report_2020.pdf
41. *The Global Risks Report 2019* (2019). World Economic Forum, 114. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risks_Report_2019.pdf
42. *The Global Risks Report 2010* (2010). World Economic Forum, 52. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risks_Report_2010.pdf