National Security Technologies in the Domestic and Foreign Policy of the State

Vysotskyi Oleksandr
Dr.Sc., Full Prof., https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0712-8499, vysalek@gmail.com
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University (Dnipro, Ukraine)

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to determine the features of national security technologies in the domestic and foreign policy of the state. **The relevance** of the research topic is due to the insufficient attention of researchers to the technological approach as a fruitful heuristic tool and national security technologies of the state as effective means of its domestic and foreign policy. **The results** of the study are the identification and characterization of national security technologies in the domestic and foreign policy of the state. The author summarizes his research in the **conclusion**. National security technologies are effective means for the state to ensure freedom from direct or indirect threats and risks, as well as protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors to its citizens in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural, and technological dimensions. From the standpoint of protecting national interests, national security technologies are tools for effective protection of the state's interests, as well as means of strategic and operational response to potential and actual threats to the realization of these interests. Based on the territorial boundaries of the state, the author distinguishes between technologies of domestic and foreign policy. According to this criterion, domestic policy technologies include social security technologies, economic security technologies, multiculturalism technologies, deliberative democracy technologies, free and fair elections technologies, reputation government management technologies, spiritual security technologies, axiological security technologies, human rights guarantee technologies, environmental security technologies, information security technologies, technologies for preventing income inequality, anti-money laundering technologies, protecting sovereignty technologies, preventing and resolving conflicts technologies, and legitimizing political power technologies. Foreign policy technologies include public diplomacy technologies, geocultural technologies, alliance formation technologies, deterrence technologies, technologies of international propaganda and counter-propaganda, strategic partnerships, cybersecurity technologies, intelligence and counterintelligence technologies, interdependence technologies, arms limitation technologies, coalition building technologies, coercive diplomacy technologies, and collective security technologies.

Keywords: political security, national security, public diplomacy, international communication, international relations, domestic policy, information security, Russia-Ukraine War

Технології національної безпеки у внутрішній та зовнішній політиці держави

Висоцький Олександр
Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара (Дніпро, Україна)

Анотація

Мета роботи полягає у визначенні особливостей технологій національної безпеки у внутрішній та зовнішній політиці держави. **Актуальність** теми дослідження обумовлена недостатньою увагою дослідників до технологічного підходу як плідного евристичного інструментарію та технологій національної безпеки держави як ефективних засобів її внутрішньої та зовнішньої політики. **Результатами** дослідження є виявлені та охарактеризовані технології національної безпеки у внутрішній та зовнішній політиці держави. Автор наводить **у висновках** підсумкові положення свого дослідження. Технології національної безпеки є ефективними засобами забезпечення державою свободи від прямих чи непрямих загроз та ризиків, а також захищеності від деструктивного впливу різноманітних акторів, сил та чинників своїм громадянам у фізичному, соціальному, екологічному, економічному, продовольчому, медичному, психологічному, політичному, культурному та технологічному вимірах. З позиції захисту національних інтересів, технології національної безпеки є інструментами ефективного захисту інтересів держави, а також засобами стратегічного і оперативного реагування на потенційні та актуальні загрози реалізації цих інтересів. На основі територіальних меж держави автор виділяє технології внутрішньої та зовнішньої політики. Відповідно до цього критерію, до технологій внутрішньої політики належать технології соціальної безпеки, технології економічної безпеки, технології мультикультуралізму, технології деліберативної демократії, технології вільних та справедливих виборів, технології керування репутацією державних органів, технології духовної безпеки, технології аксіологічної безпеки, технології гарантування прав людини, технології екологічної безпеки, технології інформаційної безпеки, технології попередження нерівності доходів, технології боротьби з відмиванням грошей, технології захисту суверенітету, технології попередження та розв'язання конфліктів, технології легітимації політичної влади. Технології зовнішньої політики включають технології публічної дипломатії, геокультурні технології, технології союзницького зв'язування, технології стримування, технології міжнародної пропаганди та контрпропаганди, стратегічного партнерства, технології кібербезпеки, технології розвідки та контррозвідки, технології взаємозалежності, технології обмеження використання зброї, технології формування коаліцій, технології примусової дипломатії, технології колективної безпеки.

Ключові слова: політична безпека, національна безпека, публічна дипломатія, міжнародна комунікація, міжнародні відносини, внутрішня політика, інформаційна безпека, російсько-українська війна

Introduction.

National security is a key issue of both domestic and foreign policy. Firstly, the existence of the state depends on ensuring its national security, and secondly, the successful realization of other national interests. Neglecting the national interests of the state in the field of national security leads to political instability and weakening of the country's role in the international arena. Therefore, the issue of ensuring the national security of the state should be considered in the unity of its domestic and foreign policy. To a large extent, the security problem depends on the means that can ensure its solution with high efficiency. Such means are national security technologies, the study of which brings the research, firstly, to a more understandable and structured theoretical level, and secondly, gives it practical significance. In other words, knowledge about national security, comprehended within the framework of the technological approach, can become a factor in optimizing domestic and foreign policy for the successful solution of national security problems.

The foregoing leads to the formulation of the **purpose of the article**, which is to determine the peculiarities of national security technologies in the domestic and foreign policy of the state.

The theoretical basis of the article is the works of modern domestic (Aleksandrova et al., 2021; Stitilis et al., 2020; Tarasenko et al., 2022; Vysotska et al., 2021; Manuylov, & Kalinovsky, 2019) and foreign scientists (Alguliyev et al., 2021; Cruz, 2022; Gilad et al, 2021; Harris, 2021; Miller, 2022; Pauly, & McDermott, 2022; Sheen, 2020; Smith, 2020; Sosa, & Dourado, 2022), devoted to certain aspects of national security and its provision in the domestic and international dimensions.

Methodology. The study of national security technologies in the domestic and foreign policy of the state involves the application of a methodological approach that can be used to identify them. The technological approach is such a methodological tool. Thanks to it, we can identify national security technologies as means of the state's domestic and foreign policy. The technological approach is a broad heuristic lens that also involves the use of general scientific and special methods that help to consider the diversity of knowledge about national security in an instrumental and transformative dimension.

Research results.

Any research involves conceptual clarity, so let's start by expressing its terminological essence.

Security is a state of guaranteed freedom and protection from direct or indirect threats and risks, as well as destructive influence in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural and technological dimensions. This definition emphasizes freedom, firstly, as an opportunity for a decent existence of an individual, nation or state, secondly, as a key value of humanity, and thirdly, as a space for the normal development of any society, cultural community, individual and preservation of their

uniqueness in interaction with the environment. The seeming paradox of maintaining security is the restriction of freedom of expression, freedom of information and movement. There is no paradox here, since the space of freedom of one individual or community is limited by the space of freedom of other participants in social relations. And if social or political actors pose a potential or real threat to other actors, their freedom should be limited in the interests of the security of possible victims of such threats.

National security is the freedom of its citizens to live free from threats and risks, as well as their protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural and technological dimensions, ensured by the state's potential and its domestic and foreign policies. The real paradox in the international arena is that some states, particularly those in the Global South, are ready to justify and actually support aggression against Ukraine in order to solve their security problems related to food and the economy. For example, India has become a major transshipment hub for reselling Russian oil under sanctions. Some South American (Brazil) and African (South Africa) countries offer to make peace on the aggressor's terms. The paradox is that these international actors are not in favor of restricting freedom for a state that is a source of danger to the region and the world (the threat of nuclear weapons), but rather of condoning aggression and limiting the security space for the victim of unjustified aggression and genocide. Such a policy of the Global South can be called a policy of security at the expense of the security of others. This raises the problem of *secondary responsibility* for aggression, which implies sanctions against those international actors who explicitly or implicitly justify aggression and genocide in their own interests, believing that condoning aggression and genocide can indirectly improve their food and economic security.

Based on the above, we define *national security technologies* as effective means for the state to ensure freedom from direct or indirect threats and risks, as well as protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors to its citizens in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural and technological dimensions.

An important concept of the study is *domestic policy*, which we define as the activities of the state's governing bodies to regulate relations and realize important interests of society on its sovereign territory.

Since one of the important interests of society is security, the use of national security technologies is certainly mandatory if it seeks to effectively realize its goals.

Proceeding from the fact that foreign policy is the activity of the state to promote its national interests in the international arena, national security technologies within

this policy are aimed at expanding the state's participation in global security governance and creating regional and global security mechanisms that can provide it with space and a sufficient level of freedom to protect its national interests.

From the point of view of protecting national interests, national security technologies can be defined as tools for effective protection of the state's interests, as well as means of strategic and operational response to potential and actual threats to the realization of these interests.

In addition to freedom, national security is directly related to the protection of sovereignty, both state and personal. It is the inviolability of the sovereignty of the individual and the state that is evidence of political security. In other words, political security is not identical to the stability of a political regime or political institutions, which can change under the influence of ideologies, reforms or public dissatisfaction with their functioning. *Political security* means ensuring the sovereignty of the individual, community, society and state, which means freedom from threats of usurpation and abuse of power by certain groups of society or the state coming under external control by powerful geopolitical players or transnational corporations. Successful external cultural or political influence can also be interpreted as a soft loss of state sovereignty, as active public figures become voluntary supporters of a foreign political system, a different geoculture or way of life.

National security is also linked to the rule of law both within the state and on the global stage. It is the rule of law that is able to protect the space of freedom from threats and risks, as well as the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors. Therefore, the degree of respect for human rights is an indicator of national security. Accordingly, the full realization of human rights depends on ensuring various types of national security - from protecting life, health and environment to preserving cultural identity.

In general, we can distinguish between domestic and foreign policy technologies based on the territorial boundaries of the state. Domestic policy technologies include social security technologies, economic security technologies, multiculturalism technologies, deliberative democracy technologies, free and fair elections technologies, reputation government management technologies, spiritual security technologies, axiological security technologies, human rights guarantee technologies, environmental security technologies, information security technologies, preventing income inequality technologies, anti-money laundering technologies, protecting sovereignty technologies, preventing and resolving conflicts technologies, and legitimizing political power technologies.

Foreign policy technologies include public diplomacy technologies, geocultural technologies, alliance formation technologies, deterrence technologies, technologies of international propaganda and counter-propaganda, strategic partnership technologies, cybersecurity technologies, intelligence and counterintelligence technologies, interdependence technologies, arms limitation technologies (usually representing a set of actions to conclude and comply with international conventions on limiting or prohibiting the use of certain types of weapons), coalition building technologies, coercive diplomacy technologies, and collective security technologies.

This is by no means a complete list of national security technologies in the domestic and foreign policy of the state, but their listing illustrates the large-scale technological diversity, the use of which allows the state to ensure the right of its citizens to live free from threats and risks, as well as their protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors in many dimensions.

We will try to define the features and role of the key national security technologies listed above.

Among the security technologies of domestic policy, *legitimizing political power technologies* are of particular importance. First of all, they provide cognitive and value-based validity and public support for the existing system of political power. If technologies of legitimation are not effective enough, this leads to an increase in various risks and threats to state sovereignty and various aspects of citizens' lives. M. Weber directly linked legitimacy to such an important issue for state sovereignty as the monopoly on the use of violence (Vysotskyi, 2003, 132-133).

Related to legitimizing technologies of national security are *social security technologies* aimed at ensuring proper social conditions for human and social life, their resistance to the impact of factors that increase social risk. Effective implementation of social security technologies is impossible without proper application of economic security technologies. *Economic security technologies* are effective measures of state authorities that ensure resilience to external and internal threats, as well as the ability of the national economy to expand self-reproduction and meet the needs of citizens, society and the state.

Technologies of multiculturalism are also related to technologies of legitimization. Their main goal is to ensure freedom for cultural diversity in society. However, technologies of multiculturalism also achieve security goals such as preventing conflicts and violence on ethnic, religious and linguistic grounds. Technologies of multiculturalism include granting special status to the languages of ethnic groups at the level of regions or the entire state, recognition of dual citizenship, special economic regulation in specific territories, setting quotas for ethnic groups in representative institutions and the education system, inclusion of traditional holidays of ethnic and religious communities in the calendar of official celebrations, and introduction of special programs for the

protection of specific cultures and social integration of their representatives.

Deliberative democracy technologies also work as legitimization tools. At the same time, they are the most effective technologies for ensuring political security, as conflict resolution is transferred to the sphere of reasoned discourse. Deliberative democracy technologies include initiating public hearings, citizen juries, civic workshops, and public discussions on issues important to the community or society as a whole.

Free and fair elections technologies should ensure that the sovereign power and the will of the people are not distorted in the formation of elected authorities. They also work for legitimacy and political security. The free and fair elections technologies include ensuring real rights for citizens to elect and be elected to state authorities, local governments, and other bodies of popular (national) representation, judicial and other protection of electoral rights, and public and international election observation.

Reputation government management technologies are also related to the legitimacy and safe functioning of the political sphere. They include technologies of political mythologization, political ritualization technologies, political nominalization technologies, production and use of functional symbols technologies, positioning technologies, attention, emotions and feelings management technologies.

Information security technologies are aimed at controlling and regulating information flows, protecting the national information space, and ensuring the information sovereignty of the state. Information security technologies include various media politics technologies, reflexive control technologies, agenda-setting technologies, priming technologies, framing technologies, cyberspace protection technologies, detecting and forecasting threats technologies to the vital interests of information security objects, preventing and neutralizing threats technologies to the information security of the state.

Spiritual security technologies are aimed at protecting the spiritual, intellectual and cultural values of society. According to Y.Manuylov and Y.Kalinovsky, spiritual security is the foundation for preserving statehood and the nation's prosperity in the global competition (Manuylov, & Kalinovsky, 2019). The technologies of spiritual security include the technology of creating mental barriers, the technology of constructive fundamentalism, variations of which include the construction of a national idea, the restoration of an authentic civilizational identity, and the remythologization of the past. Within the framework of spiritual security, we can distinguish axiological security (Manuylov, & Kalinovsky, 2017; Kalinovsky, & Zhdanenko, 2022), the effective provision of which is associated with *axiological security technologies*.

Environmental security technologies are aimed at ensuring a clean environment. In particular, they include sustainable development technologies (Vysotska et al.,

2021) and green consumption technologies (Vysotska, & Vysotskyi, 2022).

Technologies of international propaganda and counter-propaganda serve the goals of national security both within the framework of domestic and foreign policy. The essence of propaganda is a constant process of constructing and intensifying convincing and mobilizing meanings for people in order to ensure the victory of some political forces over others in the processes of competition for power, making important decisions and realizing the interests of international players on the world stage (Vysotskyi, & Pavlov, 2020). In the propagandistic foreign policy space, counterpropaganda technologies are of particular importance for ensuring national security. These are preventive, countering (neutralizing) and offensive technologies. Preventive technologies work to anticipate the opponent's reaction by clarifying the situation before it becomes a target for negative messages from the opponent. Counter-propaganda technologies are aimed at reducing or neutralizing the enemy's propaganda. Countering technologies include direct refutation of enemy propaganda, indirect refutation, distraction, silencing, restrictive measures, misleading, prevention and minimization. Technologies of offensive counter-propaganda are aimed at proactively discrediting subjects, sources, means and content of propaganda messages of political opponents. Technologies of offensive counter-propaganda include, firstly, initiating topics that reduce the credibility of subjects, sources and means of dissemination of hostile propaganda, secondly, ridiculing its values and ideological positions, thirdly, bringing to absurdity by hyperbolizing the picture of the world represented by propaganda, and fourthly, irony over those who tend to believe in the plausibility of the opponent's propaganda messages (Vysotskyi, & Pavlov, 2020, p. 120). New types of propaganda include post-truth (Vysotskyi, 2018, p. 132), which has a rich technological arsenal of influence.

Alliance formation technologies play an important role in ensuring national security. They are realized through agreements between states for the purpose of defense or increasing power capabilities. The alliance formation technologies include balancing, bandwagoning, hedging, and binding.

The balancing technology involves the conclusion of an alliance aimed at countering a threat that is identified with a state that is a potential military rival. This technology results in a balance of power in the international arena.

The bandwagoning technology is based on unequal cooperation with the state that is the main threat. In fact, this technology uses the mechanism of asymmetric concessions to the dominant power and requires a weak state to accept a subordinate role in relation to its ally.

The hedging technology is the use by a hedging state of conflicts between states or groups of states for its own benefit. This technology involves such a state entering

into low-level agreements with the opposing parties to the conflict. Turkey is currently using the hedging technology, simultaneously negotiating with the Russian Federation and Ukraine.

The binding technology is aimed at concluding an alliance between states in order to strengthen interstate cooperation, reduce tensions between them, and create relations that can contribute to the growth of trust, the implementation of a common policy in the international arena and, accordingly, the adoption of coordinated decisions in international institutions.

Technology of brinkmanship is an important tool for strengthening national security in the international arena. It involves bringing a situation to the brink of disaster in order to take an advantageous position in relation to the enemy. Before the nuclear era, national security was based on the balance of power, which was based on military and economic power. Nuclear weapons added to aggressive and risky foreign policy instruments the technology of balancing on the brink of war. To a greater or lesser extent, this technology is now being actively used by North Korea, which demonstratively conducts nuclear missile tests, accompanied by aggressive rhetoric.

A tactical foreign policy tool is *the coalition building technologies*, which involves pooling resources to achieve a common security goal of states. Unlike alliances, coalitions are created for a specific purpose. The combination of resources allows coalition members to exercise more power than they could have counted on individually. By implementing the coalition building technologies, less influential members of the coalition gain access to resources that were previously unavailable to them. In order to convince other states to join the coalition, it is necessary to promise them solid incentives. These incentives may include demonstrating that important foreign policy goals of these states are more likely to be achieved by forming a coalition. In addition, it is important to convince potential coalition members that the benefits that can be achieved by joining outweigh the potential costs. The cost of not joining could be catastrophic for their future. It can be argued that the anti-Russian coalition of more than 50 countries was formed largely due to the communication talents of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. Therefore, we partially recognize that an integral element of the coalition building technologies is the ability to convince potential members of its necessity.

Among the foreign policy technologies of the state that have great potential and effectiveness in addressing security issues, *coercive diplomacy technologies* occupy a special place. They are able to change the behavior of another state by stimulating it with costs and benefits. In fact, it is almost a pure application of hard power and its elements such as threats, sanctions, pressure or violence, but with the simultaneous promise of benefits. The hard power of coercive diplomacy is intended to force another state to do something it would not otherwise do, namely, to

cease or reverse an action. The goal of coercive diplomacy is to achieve security through forceful persuasion and without the cost of military action. The factors of effectiveness of coercive diplomacy technologies are: 1) trust in the state that uses coercion, first of all, in the reality of its threats; 2) balance of threats of punishment, promises of rewards for cooperation and confidence in mutual cooperation; 3) the target state's ability to give up its interests; 4) political flexibility of the target state. Interestingly, coercive diplomacy can complement military actions to increase the cost of intransigence of the target state and cause internal political destabilization in it. For example, economic, diplomatic, and legal sanctions against the Russian Federation make it difficult for it to conduct military operations on the territory of Ukraine.

Deterrence technologies definitely belong to the arsenal of coercive diplomacy. They are aimed at coercing a state or person from committing an undesirable action under the threat of harm that will outweigh its possible benefits.

Collective security technologies play an important role in shaping the system of mutual self-defense of states. They are important tools for maintaining peace and ensuring national security. Their essence lies in the conclusion of an agreement, the parties to which undertake to come to the aid of one of its parties in the event of an attack on one of its parties and repel the attack. Collective security technology is based on the reciprocity of obligations to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of allies. Collective security technologies allow to "borrow" the military potential of other states in times of threat or emergency. Thanks to collective security technologies, states receive additional protection and feel more secure. Participation in the implementation of collective security technologies allows: 1) participating states to rely on greater military capabilities; 2) states to acquire international legitimacy by concluding collective security treaties; 3) helps to limit attacks between nations and acts as a factor in guaranteeing compliance with rules against hostility; 4) participating states to spend less resources on national security, which is, in fact, the effectiveness of these technologies; 5) exchange of security information.

The use of information and communication technologies is a factor in weakening or strengthening state power and state sovereignty in the international arena. Therefore, the use of *cybersecurity technologies* aimed at ensuring the stable operation of information, telecommunication and information and telecommunication systems and networks of the country's critical infrastructure is becoming increasingly important. They should effectively combat hacktivism, cyber espionage and cyber sabotage and thereby protect the digital sovereignty of the state. Cybersecurity technologies include restricting foreign software, blocking unwanted resources, establishing control over

Internet access points, indirectly influencing digital content owners, emergency software updates in response to a computer virus, backing up data files, developing firewalls - programs that block unauthorized access to files or users to a computer, controlling access by unreliable or unknown users or computer networks, setting passwords, and encrypting data.

Intelligence and counterintelligence technologies are important tools for ensuring national security and are considered to be exclusively the domain of foreign policy. Counterintelligence technologies include technologies for detecting, understanding and countering intelligence threats from foreign countries. *Intelligence technologies* are effective tools for collecting, analyzing, processing, using and disseminating information related to threats and hostile plans of potential adversaries or any other sources of danger. The main factors of the effectiveness of intelligence technologies are accuracy and reliability.

Interdependence technologies are used in national security as one of the main characteristics of the modern global world. Interdependence technologies are numerous and operate using both soft and hard power tools. Interdependence should be understood not only as the dependence of one state on other states and vice versa. Interdependence has as many dimensions as there are channels for international contacts between members of the global society. Using various channels of international communication, states apply such technologies as public, cultural, digital, music, sports, educational, scientific, visual, fashion, and cinematic diplomacy. According to the principle of operation, all of these types of diplomacy belong to public diplomacy, as they use influence on the foreign public as a tool for implicit, semi-covert adjustment of foreign policy (Vysotskyi, & Vysotska, 2020). These technologies differ in the specifics of different types of cultural interaction in international space. The interdependence technologies that use hard power include, in particular, the coercive diplomacy technologies, which we have already discussed.

Among the national security technologies in the sphere of foreign policy, geocultural technologies should be singled out, one of the goals of which is to preserve the cultural identity of the population of the country and its individual regions.

Conclusions.

Ensuring the interests of national security falls within the scope of both domestic and foreign policy. National security is the freedom of its citizens to live free from threats and risks, as well as their protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural, and technological dimensions, ensured by the potential of the state and its domestic and foreign policies. National security technologies are effective means for the state to ensure freedom from direct or indirect threats and risks, as well as protection from the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors to its citizens in the physical, social, environmental, economic, food, medical, psychological, political, cultural and, technological dimensions. From the point of view of protecting national interests, national security technologies can be defined as tools for effective protection of the state's interests, as well as means of strategic and operational response to potential and actual threats to the realization of these interests. National security is directly related to the protection of sovereignty, both state and personal. It is the inviolability of the sovereignty of the individual and the state that is evidence of political security. Political security means ensuring the sovereignty of the individual, community, society and the state, which means freedom from threats of usurpation and abuse of power by certain groups of society or the state coming under external control by powerful geopolitical players or transnational corporations. National security is linked to the rule of law both within the state and on the global stage. The rule of law is able to protect the space of freedom from threats and risks, as well as the destructive influence of various actors, forces and factors. Therefore, the degree of respect for human rights is an indicator of national security. Accordingly, the full realization of human rights depends on ensuring various types of national security, from protecting life and health to preserving cultural identity. Based on the territorial boundaries of the state, we distinguish between domestic and foreign policy technologies. According to this criterion, domestic policy technologies include social security technologies, economic security technologies, multiculturalism technologies, deliberative democracy technologies, free and fair elections technologies, reputation government management technologies, spiritual security technologies, axiological security technologies, human rights guarantee technologies, environmental security technologies, information security technologies, preventing income inequality technologies, anti-money laundering technologies, protecting sovereignty technologies, preventing and resolving conflicts technologies, and legitimizing political power technologies. Foreign policy technologies include public diplomacy technologies, geocultural technologies, alliance formation technologies, deterrence technologies, technologies of international propaganda and counter-propaganda, strategic partnerships, cybersecurity technologies, intelligence and counterintelligence technologies, interdependence technologies, arms limitation technologies, coalition building technologies, coercive diplomacy technologies, and collective security technologies.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНІ ПОСИЛАННЯ

Висоцький О. Ю. (2018). Постправда: концептуальні та праксеологічні виміри. *Науково-теоретичний альманах Грані*, 21(10), 127-133. DOI: 10.15421/1718138

Высоцкий, А. Ю. (2003). Проблема легитимации политики в концепции. Макса Вебера. *Грані*, 6(32), 132-136. https://grani.org.ua/index.php/journal/issue/view/29/27

Калиновський, Ю., & Жданенко, С. (2022). Безпечне існування соціальних систем у турбулентному світі: аксіологічний контекст. *Вісник НЮУ імені Ярослава Мудрого. Серія: Філософія, філософія права, політологія, соціологія*, 3(54). DOI: 10.21564/2663-5704.54.265591

Мануйлов, Є. М., & Калиновський, Ю. Ю. (2019). Духовна безпека українського суспільства у державотворчих процесах сучасності. *Вісник НЮУ імені Ярослава Мудрого. Серія: Філософія, філософія права, політологія, соціологія*, 1(40), 21-38. DOI: 10.21564/2075-7190.40.155748

Мануйлов, Є. М., & Калиновський, Ю. Ю. (2017). Аксіологічний вимір інформаційної безпеки української держави. *Вісник НЮУ імені Ярослава Мудрого. Серія: Філософія, філософія права, політологія, соціологія*, 3(34), 13-30. DOI: 10.21564/2075-7190.34.109554

Aleksandrova, O, Kosych, M., & Kurman, T. (2021). Public and legal regulation of economic security as a component of national security. *Financial and credit activity - problems of theory and practice*, 4(39), 494-502. DOI: 10.18371/fcaptp.v3i38.237468.9

Alguliyev, R. M., Imamverdiyev, Y. N., Mahmudov, R. S., & Aliguliyev, R. M. (2021). Information security as a national security component. *Information security journal*, 30(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/19393555.2020.1795323

Cruz, J. M. (2022). Police Legitimacy and Hybrid Security Orders in Central America. *Special forces*, 100(4), 1833-1855. DOI: 10.1093/sf/soab087

Gilad, A., Pecht, E., & Tishler, A. (2021). Intelligence, Cyberspace, and National Security. *Defence and peace economics*, 32(1), 18-45. DOI: 10.1080/10242694.2020.1778966

Harris, B. (2021). Coercive Diplomacy and the Iranian Nuclear Crisis. *International negotiation - a journal of theory and practice*, 26(2), 218-244. DOI: 10.1163/15718069-BJA10008

Miller, S. (2022). National security intelligence activity: a philosophical analysis. *Intelligence and national security*, 37(6), 791-808. DOI: 10.1080/02684527.2022.2076329

Pauly, R. B. C., & McDermott, R. (2022). The Psychology of Nuclear Brinkmanship. *International security*. 47(3), 9-51. DOI: 10.1162/isec_a_00451

Sheen, S. H. (2020). US Coercive Diplomacy toward Pyongyang: Obama vs. Trump. *Korean journal of defense analysis*, 32(4), 517-538. DOI: 10.22883/kjda.2020.32.4.002

Smith, F. L. (2020). Quantum technology hype and national security. *Security dialogue*, 51(5), 499-516. DOI: 10.1177/0967010620904922

Sosa, M. C., & Dourado, V. L. (2022). Social Security as an Instrument for Distribution of National Income. *Revista de la facultad de derecho*, 52. DOI: 10.22187/rfde2021n52espa13

Stitilis, D., Rotomskis, I., Laurinaitis, M., Nadvynychnyy, S., & Khorunzhak, N. (2020). National cyber security strategies: management, unification and assessment. *Independent journal of management & production*, 11(9), SI, 2341-2354. DOI: 10.14807/ijmp.v11i9.1431

Tarasenko, O., Mirkovets, D., Shevchyshen, A., Nahorniuk-Danyliuk, O., & Yermakov, Y. (2022). Cyber security as the basis for the national security of Ukraine. *Cuestiones politicas*, 40(73), 583-599. DOI: 10.46398/cuestpol.4073.33

Vysotska, O., Rieznikov, S., Rohova, E., Vysotskyi, O., & Vatkovska, M. (2021). Philosophy and Practice of Education for Sustainable Development in Ukraine: On the Example of Secondary Education in the Dnipropetrovsk Region. *European journal of sustainable development*, 2(10), 256-266. DOI:10.14207/ejsd.2021.v10n2p256

Vysotska, O., & Vysotskyi, O. (2022). Green consumer culture as a factor of sustainable development of society. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 31(1), 171-185. DOI: 10.15421/112217

Vysotskyi, O, & Vysotska, O. (2020). Technologies of Public Diplomacy: Methodological Principles and Practical Potential. *Epistemological studies in philosophy, social and political sciences*, 3(1), 139-147. DOI: 10.15421/342015

Vysotskyi, O., & Pavlov, D. (2020). Spaces of propaganda as structural and functional dimensions of its deployment in domestic politics and in the international arena. *Philosophy and Political Science in the Context of Modern Culture*, 12(1), 114-122. DOI: 10.15421/352013

Vysotskyi, O., & Vysotska, O. (2020). Technologies of public diplomacy: methodological principles and practical potential. *Epistemological Studies in Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences*, 3(1), 139-147. DOI: 10.15421/342015

REFERENCES

Aleksandrova, O, Kosych, M., & Kurman, T. (2021). Public and legal regulation of economic security as a component of national security. *Financial and credit activity-problems of theory and practice*, 4(39), 494-502. DOI:10.18371/fcaptp.v3i38.237468.9

Alguliyev, R. M., Imamverdiyev, Y. N., Mahmudov, R. S., & Aliguliyev, R. M. (2021). Information security as a national security component. *Information security journal*, 30(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/19393555.2020.1795323

Cruz, J. M. (2022). Police Legitimacy and Hybrid Security Orders in Central America. *Special forces*, 100(4), 1833-1855. DOI: 10.1093/sf/soab087

Gilad, A., Pecht, E., & Tishler, A. (2021). Intelligence, Cyberspace, and National Security. *Defence and peace economics*, 32(1), 18-45. DOI: 10.1080/10242694.2020.1778966

GRANI

Harris, B. (2021). Coercive Diplomacy and the Iranian Nuclear Crisis. *International negotiation - a journal of theory and practice*, 26(2), 218-244. DOI: 10.1163/15718069-BJA10008

Kalinovsky, Y., & Zhdanenko, S. (2022). Secure existence of social systems in a turbulent world: axiological context. *The Bulletin of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University. Series:Philosophy, Philosophy of Law, Political Science, Sociology*, 3(54). DOI: 10.21564/2663-5704.54.265591

Manuylov E. M., & Kalinovsky, Y. Y. (2017). Axiological dimension of ukrainian information security. *The Bulletin of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University. Series:Philosophy, Philosophy of Law, Political Science, Sociology*, 3(34), 13-30. https://doi.org/10.21564/2075-7190.34.109554

Manuylov E. M., & Kalinovsky, Y. Y. (2019). Spiritual security of ukrainian society in state-building processes of the present. *The Bulletin of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University. Series:Philosophy, Philosophy of Law, Political Science, Sociology*, 1(40), 21-38. DOI: 10.21564/2075-7190.40.155748

Miller, S. (2022). National security intelligence activity: a philosophical analysis. *Intelligence and national security*, 37(6), 791-808. DOI: 10.1080/02684527.2022.2076329

Pauly, R. B. C., & McDermott, R. (2022). The Psychology of Nuclear Brinkmanship. *International security*, 47(3), 9-51. DOI: 10.1162/isec_a_00451

Sheen, S. H. (2020). US Coercive Diplomacy toward Pyongyang: Obama vs. Trump. *Korean journal of defense analysis*, 32(4), 517-538. DOI: 10.22883/kjda.2020.32.4.002

Smith, F. L. (2020). Quantum technology hype and national security. *Security dialogue*, 51(5), 499-516. DOI: 10.1177/0967010620904922

Sosa, M. C., & Dourado, V. L. (2022). Social Security as an Instrument for Distribution of National Income. *Revista de la facultad de derecho*, 52. DOI: 10.22187/rfde2021n52espa13

Stitilis, D., Rotomskis, I., Laurinaitis, M., Nadvynychnyy, S., & Khorunzhak, N. (2020). National cyber security strategies: management, unification and assessment. *Independent journal of management & production*, 11(9), SI, 2341-2354. DOI: 10.14807/ijmp.v11i9.1431

Tarasenko, O., Mirkovets, D., Shevchyshen, A., Nahorniuk-Danyliuk, O., & Yermakov, Y. (2022). Cyber security as the basis for the national security of Ukraine. *Cuestiones politicas*, 40(73), 583-599. DOI: 10.46398/cuestpol.4073.33

Vysotska, O., Rieznikov, S., Rohova, E., Vysotskyi, O., & Vatkovska, M. (2021). Philosophy and Practice of Education for Sustainable Development in Ukraine: On the Example of Secondary Education in the Dnipropetrovsk Region. *European journal of sustainable development*, 2(10), 256-266. DOI:10.14207/ejsd.2021.v10n2p256

Vysotska, O., Vysotskyi, O. (2022). Green consumer culture as a factor of sustainable development of society. Journal of Geology, *Geography and Geoecology*, 31(1), 171-185. DOI: 10.15421/112217

Vysotskyi, O, Vysotska O. (2020). Technologies of Public Diplomacy: Methodological Principles and Practical Potential. *Epistemological studies in philosophy, social and political sciences*, 3, 1, 139-147. DOI: 10.15421/342015

Vysotskyi, O. Y. (2003). The Problem of the Legitimization of Politics in the Concept of Max Weber. *Grani*, 6, 132-136. https://grani.org.ua/index.php/journal/issue/view/29/27

Vysotskyi, O. Y. (2018). Post-truth: conceptual and praxiological dimensions. *Grani*, 21(10), 127-132. DOI: 10.15421/1718138

Vysotskyi, O., & Pavlov, D. (2020). Spaces of propaganda as structural and functional dimensions of its deployment in domestic politics and in the international arena. *Philosophy and Political Science in the Context of Modern Culture*, 12(1), 114-122. DOI: 10.15421/352013

Vysotskyi, O., & Vysotska, O. (2020). Technologies of public diplomacy: methodological principles and practical potential. *Epistemological Studies in Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences*, 3(1), 139-147. DOI: 10.15421/342015