



Clío

Revista de Historia, Ciencias Humanas
y Pensamiento Crítico



ISSN 2660-9037



Adscrita a:

Fundación Ediciones Clío

Academia de la Historia
del Estado Zulia

Centro Zuliano de
Investigaciones
Genealógicas

Sección: Artículo científico | 2025, julio-diciembre, año 5, No. 10, 70-91

Meanings of the concept of national security. A historical review from the main ideologies of political modernity with emphasis on the role of public-private collaboration

Shtangret, Andriy¹

Correo: andrii.m.shtanhret@lpnu.ua

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5179-4996>

Skrynkovskyy, Ruslan²

Correo: uan_iviv@ukr.net

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2180-8055>

Stetsiv, Lesia³

Correo: lesia.p.stetsiv@lpnu.ua

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2564-1854>

Malyarchuk, Iryna⁴

Correo: iryna.l.maliarchuk@lpnu.ua

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0009-7389>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14966105>

Abstract

The concept of national security has evolved dialectically throughout history, under the influence of different political ideologies. In general, its meaning has centered on territorial defense and protection of the state, but its scope is now broadening to include aspects such as economic, food and cyber security. In essence, all contemporary notions of national security agree that this phenomenon is the result of public-private collaboration that also promotes a culture of civil society participation, recognizing that security is a shared responsibility between the State and citizens. From the perspective of the history of political ideas, for

¹ Department of Management and Marketing in Publishing and Printing. Institute of Printing and Media Technologies. Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine.

² Department of Business Economy and Information Technology. Lviv University of Business and Law, Ukraine.

³ Department of Management and Marketing in Publishing and Printing. Institute of Printing and Media Technologies. Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine.

⁴ Department of Management and Marketing in Publishing and Printing. Institute of Printing and Media Technologies. Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine.



BY: se debe dar crédito al creador.

NC: Solo se permiten usos no comerciales de la obra.

SA: Las adaptaciones deben compartirse bajo los mismos términos.

<https://ojs.revistaclio.es/index.php/edicionesclio/>

Recibido: 2024-10-12 **Aceptado:** 2024-11-24

which concepts are not metaphysical entities, but a particular reflection of the time and space where they are produced, to explain certain phenomena and justify the interest of power actors, the objective of this research is to describe the meanings acquired by the concept of national security in different political and ideological discourses of Western modernity. It is concluded that, from liberal narratives that promote international cooperation to nationalist positions that prioritize the sovereignty of the nation-state, each discourse offers a different view of what it means to protect a nation.

Keywords: public-private partnership; food security; national security; state governance; public management.

Significados del concepto de seguridad nacional. Una revisión histórica desde las principales ideologías de la modernidad política con énfasis en el papel de la colaboración público-privada

Resumen

El concepto de seguridad nacional ha evolucionado dialécticamente a lo largo de la historia, al calor de la influencia de diferentes ideologías políticas. En general, su significado se ha centrado en la defensa territorial y la protección del Estado, pero, en la actualidad, su alcance se amplía para incluir aspectos como la seguridad económica, alimentaria y cibernética. En su esencia, todas las nociones contemporáneas de seguridad nacional coinciden en que este fenómeno es el resultado de la colaboración público-privada que, además, promueve una cultura de participación de la sociedad civil, reconociendo que la seguridad es una responsabilidad compartida entre el Estado y los ciudadanos. Desde la mirada propia de la historia de las ideas políticas, para la cual los conceptos no son entidades metafísicas, sino un reflejo particular del tiempo y espacio donde se producen, para explicar determinados fenómenos y justificar intereses de los actores de poder, el objetivo de esta investigación es describir los significados que adquiere el concepto de seguridad nacional en diferentes discursos políticos e ideológicos propios de la modernidad occidental. Se concluye que, desde las narrativas liberales que promueven la cooperación internacional hasta posturas

nacionalistas que priorizan la soberanía del Estado-nación, cada discurso ofrece una mirada distinta de lo que significa proteger a una nación.

Palabras clave: colaboración público-privada; seguridad alimentaria; seguridad nacional; gobernanza del estado; gestión pública

Exordium

As Huntington (2001) suggests, in his classic work *The Clash of Civilizations*, the current concept of national security has become more complex and multidimensional in the contemporary geopolitical scenario, especially, we add, considering the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In today's geopolitical scenario, national security is no longer limited only to the protection of the physical borders of a given state, but encompasses more complex aspects such as cybersecurity, economic security, social stability, and collective resilience to hybrid threats.

In this context, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has highlighted the importance of military deterrence, international cooperation, and the ability to respond quickly to external aggression that puts the security of entire regions on edge. At the same time, he stressed the need to strengthen strategic alliances between geopolitical blocs and to diversify energy sources to reduce Europe's geopolitical vulnerability to Russia. Therefore, national security has become a comprehensive concept that requires close coordination between different sectors of government, private enterprise, and organized civil society (Espinosa & Perera, 2022).

On the other hand, the historical evolution of the concept of national security has been closely linked to the dominant political and ideological discourses of each era. During the Cold War, for example, national security was mainly focused

on containing communism and the arms race between the superpowers, as Mazower (2017) explains. With the end of the Cold War, the concept was expanded to include non-traditional threats such as international terrorism and ethnic conflicts (Huntington, 2001).

In more recent times, leaders such as Angela Merkel have promoted a vision of national security based on multilateral cooperation and European integration. In the words of Barrientos (2017), Merkel's leadership advocated a security policy that combined, on equal terms, the strengthening of defensive capabilities with diplomacy and economic cooperation, emphasizing the importance of the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, henceforth just NATO, as pillars of German and European security in general.

In the dimension of the history of political ideas⁵ that situates texts in their context or place of enunciation, the national security discourse typical of liberal ideology is characterized by emphasizing the importance of international institutions, free trade, and multilateral cooperation as guarantors of security (Vallès, 2000). Until recently, liberals tended to prioritize *soft power* diplomacy and the peaceful resolution of conflicts over the use of military force, but did this situation change with Joe Biden's administration? They also tend to defend the promotion of democracy and human rights as key elements for global stability.

⁵ For the general purposes of this research, the history of political ideas is understood as a discipline that studies the evolution of political thought over time, analyzing concepts, theories, and doctrines in their historical context. Specifically, Jean Touchard defines it as a field that goes beyond the mere analysis of political systems, seeking to reconstruct these systems within a given historical context, to try to see how they were born and what they represented for the men who lived in this era (Touchard, 2006). This conception emphasizes the importance of understanding political ideas in relation to the institutions and the social environment of their time.

Thus, national security, from this perspective, is understood as a collective effort that requires collaboration among democratic nations and the strengthening of international law. For authors such as Sala (2022), liberals in the *global north* also tend to advocate a balance between security needs and the protection of civil liberties, as a guarantee of human rights.

On the other hand, in the words of Espinosa and Perera (2022), the national security discourse typical of socialist-Marxist ideology tends to focus on the fight against economic inequality and imperialism as the main sources of insecurity. From this perspective, national security is intrinsically linked to social justice and the right of peoples to self-determination. For Sartori (1988), socialists often criticize security policies based on militarization and foreign intervention, arguing that these practices perpetuate cycles of violence and social exploitation. Instead, they propose a security approach focused on international solidarity, the redistribution of wealth and what is now defined as sustainable development. Finally, national security, for socialists, also implies protection against economic exploitation and the defense of natural resources against transnational corporate interests, which act under the protection of the imperial powers of the hegemonic West.

In any attempt at synthesis typical of the history of political ideas, as understood by Mazower (2017), the discourse of national security characteristic of nationalist ideology focuses, on the other hand, on the preservation of national sovereignty, cultural identity, and national interests over international considerations. Nationalists (right-wing and left-wing) tend to favor security policies based on military and economic self-sufficiency, as well as strict border control. This chauvinistic approach to national security often prioritizes

strengthening the armed forces and the national defense industry. Therefore, Barrientos (2017) asserts when he states that, in general, nationalists often see threats to national security in terms of foreign influences, whether cultural, economic, or political. Consequently, they may promote protectionist and restrictive immigration policies, arguing that these measures are necessary to protect national integrity from the imprint of the *external enemy*.

As Sala (2022) argues, the history of ideas, as a mature academic discipline, plays a crucial role in deciphering the ideological and political meanings that underlie national security discourses. Therefore, this discipline examines how security concepts have evolved dialectically over time and how they reflect the power interests of different geopolitical actors and factors. In the context of the era of the military-industrial complex, the history of ideas can reveal how national security narratives have been shaped by the interaction between the state and private companies in the defense sector. This critical analysis of historical science allows us to understand how certain security discourses can be used to justify the increase in military spending or the expansion of state surveillance. More importantly, the history of ideas also helps to unravel the philosophical and cultural roots of different approaches to national security, offering a deeper perspective on contemporary politics.

In accordance with the historiographical project of Fontana (1999), from the perspective of the history of political ideas, for which concepts are not metaphysical entities, but a particular reflection of the time and geographical space where they occur, in order to explain certain phenomena and justify the interest of the actors of power, the objective of this research was to describe the meanings that the concept of national security acquires in different ways. political and

ideological discourses typical of Western modernity. The work was divided into 5 particular, but logically connected sections: in the first section, the main theoretical influences that determined the authors' vision on national security are described; in the second, the methodology of the research is described; In the third section, the main contributions and results obtained through the hermeneutics of the sources are analyzed and discussed. Finally, the main conclusions of the research are presented in the light of the findings collected.

1. Most relevant historiographical materials on national security discourses with an emphasis on the role of public-private collaboration

It should be clarified that, to select the most relevant authors on national security and public-private collaboration in the field of this form of security, criteria such as the number of citations in high-impact academic databases, the quality and prestige of the publication sources and the international valuation of their works were considered, both in academic circles and in the formulation of public policies. Consequently, following the line of Carr (2016), authors whose research has significantly influenced theoretical and practical debates on national security in recent decades were prioritized, encompassing perspectives of analysis from history, political philosophy, and social sciences in general. This small selection of documents sought to include works that have shaped the thinking of intellectual elites and decision-makers, offering *innovative conceptual frameworks* to understand the evolution of national security and public-private partnerships in this field of action.

A fundamental work in this field of national security is *Public-private partnerships in national cyber-security strategies* by Madeline Carr, published in

International Affairs (Carr, 2016). This article critically analyzes public-private partnerships in U.S. and U.K. cybersecurity strategies, revealing significant tensions between government and private sector expectations. Carr (2016) argues that there is a fundamental disconnect: while governments consider private critical infrastructure as a key element of national security, in contrast, they are reluctant to assume direct oversight of their security. For its part, the private sector is not willing to accept political responsibility or legal responsibility for national cybersecurity. However, the main limitation of the study is its focus on only two countries, which could restrict the generalization of its findings to other national contexts other than the Anglo-Saxon world.

Édgar de Jesús Velásquez Rivera (2002), in his article *History of the Doctrine of National Security*, offers a valuable historical perspective on the contradictory advance of this doctrinal concept in Latin America. Velásquez Rivera argues that the National Security Doctrine was an ideology used by the United States to consolidate its dominance in the region during the Cold War, assigning specific tasks to the national armed forces and, at the same time, promoting conservative political thinking in the region. The author highlights how this doctrine was based on a bipolar view of the world, justifying armed interventions and authoritarian policies. However, the article is mainly limited to the Latin American context and could benefit from a broader comparison with other regions of the world. For this New Granada author, the doctrine of national security (DSN), hegemonic in the second half of the twentieth century:

...it was the systematization of theories and experiences related to geopolitics and was adopted after the end of the Second World War. It was part of the Cold War developed since 1945 by the great centers of military power. This last war was an instrument or occasional modality

of a post-war tactic, a period of perplexity, uncertainty, alarmism, and indecision that had, among others, the following objectives: 1. To conquer at the lowest possible price, preferably without bloodshed, the areas and territories envisaged as suitable for political integration. 2. To lead the enemy to discredit and uncertainty in those territories and areas suitable for conquest. (Velásquez Rivera, 2002, p. 11)

For its part, Aviram's (2004) research, *Network Responses to Network Threats: The Evolution into Private Cyber-Security Associations* on public-private partnerships in cybersecurity, represents another significant contribution. This author focuses on proposing improvements for these partnerships, analyzing their challenges and potential solutions. Their work is valuable for offering practical recommendations to strengthen collaboration between sectors in the field of cybersecurity. One limitation, however, is that it focuses more on how to improve these partnerships than on critically questioning their broader political implications or the theoretical underpinnings that epistemologically underpin the question of national security as such. Consequently:

The enforcement of certain norms on network participants – such as norms supporting information exchange and governing access to the network – is critical in ensuring the security of the network. While a public norm enforcer may be feasible in many situations, private norm enforcement may, and frequently does, complement, or substitute public enforcement. Private enforcement of cyber-security is often subsidized, primarily in non-pecuniary manners (e.g., by exemption from antitrust laws). (Aviram, 2004, p. 2)

In short, these works offer complementary perspectives on national security and public-private collaboration. Carr provides a critical analysis of tensions in cybersecurity partnerships, Velásquez Rivera offers a historical view of the National Security Doctrine in Latin America, and, finally, Aviram focuses on

improving public-private partnerships in cybersecurity. Together, these investigations reveal the complexity of national security in the modern era, highlighting the need for a multidisciplinary approach that considers historical, political, and practical aspects to address contemporary challenges in this field of research, reflection, and action.

2. Methodological procedure

The methodology for interpreting the meanings of the concept of national security, from a perspective of the history of political ideas and documentary hermeneutics, was structured in several phases. Initially, a thorough review of primary and secondary sources addressing the major ideological currents of Western modernity, including liberalism, socialism, and nationalism, was conducted. This review focuses on identifying how each ideology conceptualizes national security and the relationship between the State and private actors in this area.

In a second phase, a hermeneutical analysis was applied to the selected documents, paying special attention to political discourses, national security strategies and relevant legislation. This analysis of the discourse of documentary observation reveals, in the words of Molero de Cabeza y Cabeza (2009), the underlying meanings and divergent representations of the concept of national security in each ideological context, considering factors such as the language used, the metaphors used, and the implicit values. Special attention was paid to how public-private collaboration is articulated in these discourses.

The third methodological phase involved a comparative analysis of the different meanings identified, looking for patterns, divergences, and evolutions in

the conceptualization of national security over time and between different ideological currents. This analysis focuses on how different ideologies address aspects such as sovereignty, international cooperation, and the role of the private sector in national security, with a direct impact on social representations and collective imaginaries of a particular time and space (Vasilachis de Gialdino, 1999). Then, in the fourth phase, the findings were contextualized within the broader framework of the history of political ideas, considering how changes in political thought and historical, material, and ideological conditions have influenced the evolution of the concept of national security. Here, they also examined how significant historical events such as the war in Eastern Europe and the technological transformations of the digital age have shaped perceptions of national security and public-private collaboration.

Finally, for expository purposes, the qualitative results obtained were synthesized to build a coherent narrative that explains how the different political and ideological discourses of Western modernity have conceptualized national security, in a semantic process of constant resignification. In a reading between the lines, this synthesis addressed the symbolic continuities and ruptures in thinking about national security, highlighting how public-private collaboration has been understood and valued in different ideological and historical contexts.

3. Analysis and discussion of results

The historical evolution of modern political ideologies has significantly shaped discourses on national security and public-private collaboration in this area, as Foucault (2002) said in his work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. From liberalism to nationalism, passing through socialism, each current

has provided lights, in its own way, that reflect a particular vision of how to protect national interests, both in everyday life and in moments of crisis. As already stated, liberalism, for example, has emphasized the importance of international institutions such as the United Nations and multilateral cooperation as guarantors of security, while nationalism has prioritized national sovereignty and military self-sufficiency. These perspectives are reflected in the policies and statements of contemporary leaders, as evidenced in America First's "Trump Doctrine". In the words of Tovar:

Trump endorsed some of his electoral pronouncements, clearly referring to sectors of the U.S. population that considered themselves to be the losers of globalization, emphasizing its more classical Jacksonian dimension, and reaffirmed the criticism of the investment of previous administrations in the defense of third countries while renouncing to defend their own interests (Trump, 2017b). (Tovar Ruiz, 2016, p. 266)

Typically, Donald Trump, during his first presidency, articulated a vision of national security centered on U.S. economic and military interest. In his speech on the *New National Security Strategy*, Trump declared, "With every decision and every action, we are now putting America first" (May, S/F, p. 9). This chauvinist narrative reflects a nationalist and neoconservative tendency that prioritizes internal strengthening over international cooperation, contrasting with more globalist liberal or socialist ideologies. Specifically, Trump's political communications strategy emphasized military modernization and border protection as fundamental pillars of U.S. national security.

Image 1. Attempted assassination of Donald Trump in Pennsylvania on July 13, 2024.



Source: (Wallace-Wells, 2024).

In stark contrast, according to Muñoz Rivera (2024), Angela Merkel, who was Chancellor of Germany, has promoted a vision of national security based on multilateral cooperation and European integration. In general terms, its social-democratic approach is known for combining the strengthening of defensive capabilities with diplomacy and economic cooperation, emphasizing the importance of the European Union and NATO. This perspective aligns more with the liberal traditions of international politics, seeking security through alliances and supranational structures that benefit entire geopolitical regions, rather than individual countries.

Image 2. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany from 2005 to 2021.



Source: Webber, 2024.

In this scenario of the breakdown of the international order in force since the end of the Second World War in 1945, the war situation in Ukraine has shown how different conceptions of national security can collide dramatically. In this context, Volodymyr Zelensky has had to deal with an unprecedented national security crisis due to the full-scale Russian invasion that began in February 2022. According to the Council on Foreign Relations' Global Conflict Tracker:

Two years since Russia's full-scale invasion, Ukraine has recaptured 54 percent of occupied territory, while Russia still occupies 18 percent of the country. Ukraine's counteroffensive efforts have stalled, and Russia has opened a new front in Ukraine's northeast Kharkiv region. Meanwhile, Russia continues to bombard Ukrainian cities and blockade its ports, and Ukraine has stepped up drone attacks on Russian ships and infrastructure. Since January 2022, Ukraine has received about \$278 billion in aid, including \$75 billion from the United States, though it warns of donor fatigue. Fighting and air strikes have inflicted over

30,000 civilian casualties, while 3.7 million people are internally displaced, and 6.5 million have fled Ukraine. 14.6 million people need humanitarian assistance. (Global Conflict Tracker, 2024, par. 1)

Vladimir Putin, for his part, has justified his military actions in Ukraine under the pretext of the geostrategic national security defense of the Russian Federation. In this discursive fabric, it is widely known that Putin has argued, without further evidence or foundations, the alleged need to "demilitarize and denazify" Ukraine, presenting the invasion as a defensive measure against the alleged Western threat represented by NATO. This neoconservative discourse reflects a vision of national security deeply rooted in concepts of spheres of *influence* and external threats, characteristic of certain interpretations of nationalist ideology that identified, at the time, the Cold War, as Mazower (2017) refers to.

Announcing that he would begin a "special military operation" against Ukraine in the early hours of Thursday, February 24, Russian leader Vladimir Putin justified his action on the need to "denazify and demilitarize Ukraine." "I have made the decision to carry out a special military operation. Its objective will be to defend the people who for eight years have suffered persecution and genocide by the Kiev regime. To this end, we will aim for the demilitarization and denazification of Ukraine," Putin said in a televised address, with no evidence to back it up. (Sanches, 2022, par. 2 and 3)

In the face of the Russian onslaught that has been escalating since the events of *Euromaidan*, national security policies in Ukraine have focused on resisting Russian aggression and strengthening, always, the country's defensive capabilities. According to the Security Council Report, Ukraine has received significant international support, with "about \$278 billion in aid, including \$75

billion from the United States" (Security Council Report, 2024, p. 03). In Ukraine, these national security policies include military modernization, seeking integration with Western security structures such as NATO, and diplomatic efforts to maintain international support.

Image 3. Putin and Zelensky.



Source: Higuera, 2022.

Faced with this complex scenario of the war in Ukraine and its various discursive representations, the history of political ideas shows us how the concepts of national security have evolved dialectically and adapted to different ideological and geopolitical contexts. From Trump's *America First* vision to Ukraine's resistance against Russian aggression, to Merkel's multilateralism and Putin's *defensive nationalism*, we see how modern political ideologies continue to shape national security strategies in the 21st century. The different narratives of national security, always determined by their context of origin and illocutionary force, reflect the persistent tensions between international cooperation and national

sovereignty, between globalism and nationalism, between the liberal thinking of postmodernity and the neoconservative tradition that, ontologically, characterize the contemporary security landscape.

4. By way of an epilogue: conclusions, recommendations, ethical aspects, and epistemological limitations of research

The overall findings of this research reveal to historical understanding that national security manifests itself in a multifaceted concept that varies, significantly, according to the ideologies and contexts of contemporary political leaders. From liberal narratives that promote international cooperation, to nationalist positions that prioritize the sovereignty of the nation-state, each discourse offers a different view of what it means to protect a nation.

Likewise, it has been shown that collaboration between the public and private sectors is a common element in all these modern doctrines, without distinction of their ideological differences, reflecting the growing interdependence between the State and private companies in the management of the integral security of a given nation. This theoretical and practical dynamic, general and specific, abstract, and concrete, not only highlights the importance of strategic alliances, but also the need for a coherent regulatory framework that guarantees accountability and transparency in these collaborations that occur between private enterprise and the public sector.

In this order of ideas, the tensions, and contradictions in the relationship between the State and private companies in matters of national security are palpable in different investigations and realities (Espinosa & Perera, 2022; Sala, 2022; Velásquez Rivera, 2002). On the one hand, governments depend on the

private sector to provide them with technology and services essential for defense and cybersecurity; On the other hand, there is a risk that commercial interests will prevail over the public welfare and have no democratic control. In this typical context of the current era, the military-industrial complex plays a crucial role in 21st century warmongering, since its influence can lead to political decisions that prioritize profit over the real security of nations. Consequently, the lack of adequate regulation can result in conflicts of interest where companies seek to maximize their profits at the expense of a coherent and effective national security policy, even going so far as to influence the escalation of the war.

In the face of the complex contemporary geopolitical landscape, the role of the critical historian is fundamental to unravel the various discourses on national security. This professional, custodian of collective memory, must analyze not only the historical facts, but also the narratives built around them (historiography), always questioning the "assumed truths" and, more importantly, unraveling the political interests behind each discourse of knowledge and power, as Foucault (1980) assumed. A critical historian must be attentive to how ideologies shape perceptions of security and how these perceptions that translate into cognitive packages, individual and collective, can be used to justify specific policies. At the same time, the historian of political ideas must foster an interdisciplinary dialogue that includes perspectives from different fields of knowledge, thus enriching the analysis of national security in a particular time and space (Fontana, 1999).

In this order of ideas, for future researchers interested in the subject of national security, several recommendations can be made with some epistemological or practical utility. First, it is crucial to adopt an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates theories and ideas from various areas such as history,

political science, and social sciences when seeking to understand, in a holistic way, the phenomenon of national security. Second, attention should be paid to local and regional contexts to better understand how security policies manifest themselves in different socio-cultural settings. Third, it is important to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to obtain a more complete view of the phenomenon studied. Finally, researchers must be critical of their own ideological positions and recognize how these subjectivity biases can influence their analysis and results.

In ethical terms, which should not be omitted, the main problems that arise from the historical study of national security include issues related to the manipulation of information and the improper use of knowledge to justify *coercive actions* or *military interventions*, for the benefit of hegemonic powers. The dilemma of how to adequately represent the voices of those who have been affected by national security policies is also presented, especially in contexts where there are human rights violations. Similarly, researchers should consider the ethical implications of their own methodological approaches and how these can contribute to perpetuating *hegemonic narratives* or silencing *marginalized perspectives of vulnerable groups*.

Finally, the epistemological limitations of a documentary and qualitative study on national security such as this one, within the framework of the history of ideas include the risk of interpretive bias in selecting limited historical and theoretical sources. Thus, researchers may be influenced by their own beliefs or by the dominant currents in their field, which may limit their hermeneutical and heuristic capacity to offer unbiased and honest analyses. Likewise, the qualitative-inductive approach may not adequately capture the complexity of the phenomenon studied if it is not complemented with broader quantitative data. Finally, it is

important to recognize that discourses on national security are constantly evolving, which can make it difficult to create definitive conclusions on the subject, based solely on a review of the most widely disseminated international historiography on national security.

References

- Aviram, A. (2004). *Network Responses to Network Threats: The Evolution Into Private Cyber-Security Associations*. Florida: Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection.
- Barrientos Valverde, J. (2017). Personajes y discursos político-ideológicos en la construcción de una historia identitaria: Rusia y Costa Rica. *Revista Estudios*, (35), 1-56.
- Carr, M. (2016). Public-private partnerships in national cyber-security strategies. *International Affairs*, 92 (01), 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12504>.
- Espinosa, S. & Perera, E. (22 de abril de 2022). *Seguridad, Geopolítica, y Teoría de la Guerra desde la visión rusa. Papel de EE. UU. y la OTAN en el conflicto ruso-ucraniano*. Obtenido de CIPI: <https://www.cipi.cu/seguridad-geopolitica-y-teoria-de-la-guerra-desde-la-vision-rusa-papel-de-ee-uu-y-la-otan-en-el-conflicto-ruso-ucraniano/>
- Fontana, J. (1999). *Historia: análisis del pasado y proyecto social*. Barcelona: Biblioteca de Bolsillo.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Microfísica del poder*. Madrid: Ediciones de La Piqueta.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Vigilar y castigar: Nacimiento de la prisión*. Buenos Aires: Siglo veintiuno editores Argentina S. A. .
- Global Conflict Tracker. (16 de octubre de 2024). *War in Ukraine*. Obtenido de Center for Preventive Action: <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/conflict-ukraine>

Higuera, M. (19 de abril de 2022). *Putin y Zelenski: la instrumentalización de la extrema derecha en la guerra de Ucrania*. Obtenido de Al Descubierto: <https://aldescubierto.org/2022/04/19/putin-y-zelenski-la-instrumentalizacion-de-la-extrema-derecha-en-la-guerra-de-ucrania/>

Huntington, S. P. (2001). *El choque de civilizaciones y la reconfiguración del orden mundial*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Mayo, L. (S/F). *“Desde Hoy, América Primero”: Un Balance de la Política Interna del Primer Año del presidente Trump*. Santa Fe: Universidad Católica de Santa fe.

Mazower, M. (2017). *La Europa negra Desde la Gran Guerra hasta la caída del comunismo*. Valencia: Barlin Libros.

Molero de Cabeza, L., & Cabeza, J. (2009). *El poder, el querer y el protestar Análisis semiolinguístico del discurso*. Maracaibo: Universidad del Zulia.

Muñoz Rivera, A. (2024). *El Liderazgo Alemán en La Unión Europea: Un Análisis de Política Exterior de Angela Merkel (2005-2021)*. Puebla: Universidad Iberoamericana Puebla.

Sala, L. (2022). La Doctrina de Seguridad Nacional en América Latina. Un repaso por los estudios clásicos y sus críticos. *Revista electrónica de estudios latinoamericanos*, 20 (80), 1-25. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/4964/496470836001/496470836001.pdf>.

Sanches, M. (26 de febrero de 2022). *Rusia y Ucrania: "¿Desnazificar Ucrania?": la historia detrás de la justificación de Putin para invadir Ucrania*. Obtenido de BBC News: <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-60524958>

Sartori, G. (1988). *Teoría de la democracia. Tomo II. Los problemas clásicos*. Madrid: Alianza Universidad.

Security Council Report. (16 de november de 2024). *Monthly Forecast*. Obtenido de https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/2024_11_forecast.pdf

- Tovar Ruiz, J. (2016). La doctrina Trump en política exterior: fundamentos, rupturas y continuidades. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, (120), 259-283. <https://doi.org/10.24241/rcai.2018.120.3.259>.
- Vallès, J. M. (2000). *Ciencia Política Una introducción*. Barcelona: Ariel Ciencia Política.
- Vasilachis de Gialdino, I. (1999). *La construcción de las representaciones sociales Discurso político y prensa escrita*. Buenos Aires: Gedisa editorial.
- Velásquez Rivera. (2002). Historia de la Doctrina de la Seguridad Nacional. *Convergencia*, (27), 11-39.
- Wallace-Wells, B. (13 de July de 2024). *The Attempt on Donald Trump's Life and an Image That Will Last*. Obtenido de The New Yorker: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/the-attempt-on-donald-trumps-life-and-an-image-that-will-last>
- Webber, M. R. (04 de September de 2024). *Who Is Angela Merkel?* Obtenido de Investopedia: <https://www.investopedia.com/angela-merkel-7559368>

Conflict of interest and originality declaration

As stipulated in the *Code of Ethics and Best Practices* published in *Clío Journal*, the authors, Shtangret, Andriy; Skrynkovskyy, Ruslan; Stetsiv, Lesia y Malyarchuk, Iryna, declare that they have no real, potential or evident conflicts of interest, of an academic, financial, intellectual or intellectual property nature, related to the content of the article: *Meanings of the concept of national security. A historical review from the main ideologies of political modernity with emphasis on the role of public-private collaboration*, in relation to the publication. Likewise, they declare that the work is original, has not been published partially or totally in another medium of dissemination, no ideas, formulations, citations or illustrations were used, extracted from different sources, without clearly and strictly mentioning their origin and without being duly referenced in the corresponding bibliography. They consent to the Editorial Board applying any plagiarism detection system to verify their originality.