I. ARTICLES

Svetlana CEBOTARI[1]
Moldova
Carolina BUDURINA-GOREACII[2]
Moldova

THE 'NATIONAL INTEREST – SECURITY' CORRELATION: CONCEPTUAL-THEORETICAL IDENTIFICATIONS

Abstract: *During the last three decades of the 20th Century more often among political leaders and within the academic community, the essence of the 'national interest – security' correlation is discussed. In specialized literature, the concept of 'national interest' is often approached in connection with the concept of 'security'. Thus, the present article aims to highlight the main conceptual-theoretical approaches to 'national interest' and 'security'. Also, this article highlights the main aspects of the existing correlation between these two phenomena: 'national security – interest'.*

Keywords: *concept, national interest, security, state, international relations, correlation*

Introduction

During the last three decades of the 20th Century, the high degree of complexity of relations regarding the security of geopolitical actors and their interests (in this case the states) gave rise to active theoretical debates. Thus, more and more often in the discussions of political leaders, but also within the

---

[1] Svetlana Cebotari, PhD, Moldova State University in Chisinau. Email: svetlana.cebotari@mail.ru
[2] Carolina Budurina-Goreacii, PhD, Moldova State University in Chisinau. Email: carolina.budurina@gmail.com

academic community, conversations appear vis-à-vis the essence of the 'national interest – security' correlation. In specialized literature, the concept of 'national interest' is often approached in connection with the concept of 'security'. For a better understanding of the existing correlation between the concept of 'national interest' and 'security', there is a need to highlight some approaches concerning these phenomena, the argumentation being focused on the attempt to highlight their main characteristics. Thus, the first concept that must be analyzed refers to that of 'national interest'.

Conceptual-theoretical delimitations of the 'national interest – security' correlation

In the analysis literature, the concept of 'national interest' was included in circulation in 1935, in the Encyclopedia of Political Sciences edited at Oxford[3]. The multitude of definitions, more or less developed, more precise or more confusing, led to the outline of several approaches regarding the definition of the national interest dimension in the context of foreign policy.

The first approach, that of the objective or 'political realism' current is represented by H. Morgenthau, A. Wolfers, W. Hippman, H. Thompson, R. Tucher and current scholars W. Lippman, K. Thompson, H. Kissinger, W. Rostov, D. Bolles et al. According to this doctrine, the national interest is defined as:

1. an ideal and normative complex of goals,
2. a central phenomenon of international relations, perceived in terms of force,
3. a fundamental factor in identifying necessary paths through the labyrinths of international politics[4].

Thus, in Hans Morgenthau's vision, the national interest is a 'hard seed', that is present in any circumstance and a shell made up of variable elements that change depending on the concrete historical circumstances. The 'hard seed' of national interest consists in the preservation of the political and cultural identity of a nation and are related to the assurance of national independence, the preservation of territorial integrity, internal order and balance. The reinterpretation of national interest at each stage of a state's development is inevitable due to the mobility of international relations and the change in the balance of power. Only standing on the positions of political realism is the most

---

[3] V. Juc, T. Spinei, V. Stan, V. Andrieş, *Interesul naţional al Republicii Moldova*, "MOLDOSCOPIE. Probleme de analiză politică", 2019, No. 2 (LXXXV), p. 71.

[4] V. Saca, *Evoluţia conceptului de interes naţional în condiţiile globalizării*, "Interacţiuni în contextul globalizării. Materialele conferinţei ştiinţifice integraţionale din 20-21 noiembrie 2004", Iaşi 2005, p. 120.

effective way to understand the interest of a state[5]. H. Morgenthau states that „the building block that helps political realism find its way in the landscape of international politics". This is the concept of interest that is defined in terms of force. Power or force includes the whole set of phenomena that are the basis of man's control over man and are capable of maintaining it. Power and force are what distinguish politics as an independent sphere of action and knowledge, different from other spheres such as economics, and aesthetics. The force factor, dimensioned by Morgenthau in military, industrial, demographic, and political aspects, determines the interests of states in the international arena and imposes itself as the final arbiter in the struggle between powers. Through the prism of this factor, in Morgenthau's opinion, the term 'national interest' is accompanied by numerous specifications: vital, main and secondary, stable and changing, common and specific, identical and conflicting. At the same time, the author considers it necessary to conform the notion of interest to the resources available to society, to achievable goals. From here he ranks the interests and goals of the American foreign policy as a) the interest that must be achieved at any cost; b) the interest that is realized under favourable conditions; c) desired but achievable interests and goals[6].

Referring to the national interest, the Russian researcher A. Pozdnyakov classifies it depending on the degree of functionality into two levels: the level of main interests and the level of specific interests. For the first level, A. Pozdnyakov includes the interests of the state's foreign policy that are related to ensuring its security and integrity in the social-economic, political, national-historical and cultural community. Also here there are included interests related to the defence of economic and political independence and the place and role of the state in the international relations system. These interests are ensured by all means: military, economic, diplomatic and ideological ones. Such interests determine the function of the state's foreign policy. As long as the state remains a socio-economic and political community, its interests remain unchanged. Depending on the changes in the international system, the concrete content of the external activity, directed towards securing the interests, also changes.

The second level, that of specific interests, includes individual interests, which have a special significance in the external relations sphere. Here the author includes the interests of foreign policy related to concrete processes and events of the national system, and in particular of international relations, conflict situations, and crises. Also here there are included the foreign policy

---

[5] M. Wight, *Politica de putere*, Chișinău 1988, p. 103; S. Tămaş, *Geopolitica o abordare prospectivă*, Bucharest 1995, p. 169.

[6] V. Saca, *Interese politice şi relaţii politice. Dimensiuni tranzitorii*, Chișinău 2001, pp. 69-74; S. Gorceac, T. Dumitraş, I. Rusandu, *Conceptul „interes naţional" în geopolitică*, "Economica. Supliment", Chișinău 1997, p. 24; H. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York 1955, pp. 3-12.

interests caused by the external economic and commercial relations of the states, relations in the field of mutual aid in the sphere of cultural, scientific and other collaboration. The specific interests depend on the main ones and are limited by them; at the same time, they are partially autonomous and determine the content of the political activity functionality of the state in certain directions and in practical actions[7]. The boundary between main and specific interests is conventional and mobile. In concrete situations, specific interests can become the main ones.

Another approach, that of the 'subjectivist' current (R. Snuyder, E. Furnes, N. Forward) considers the national interest a phenomenon of international relations, whose main bearer is the narrow group of political leaders and officials, who are in power, that is, those who make political decisions. These scholars interpret the national interest through the prism of certain criteria, namely: 1) maintaining 'national integrity'; 2) ensuring 'national security'; 3) preserving the 'national role'; 4) of precedent as a model for the future; 5) maintaining 'reputation'; 6) of the 'international standard'. These criteria produced a special influence on political dimensions, in general, and on the 'national interest' concept in particular[8].

Researching the phenomenon of national interest, A. Wolfers has a predisposition towards the concept of 'national goals'. He describes the interdependence of state interests and individual interests through the relation of 'direct' or 'indirect' national goals. By 'direct' national goals he means ensuring national security and independence. These goals can be important for individuals only in the case of their identity with their national state[9]. For J. Rosenau, the national interest cannot serve as an analytical tool. According to him, it is impossible to fully understand the nature of the nation. Therefore, he considers well-defined criteria for determining the national interest, and the causes would be the following: the undefined nature of the nation and the difficulties in determining whose interests it includes; the impossibility of finding criteria to determine the existence of interests and tracking their presence in the independent manifestations of politics; lack of a procedure for accumulating interests as soon as they are identified[10].

G. Modelski has a completely different conception of national interests. According to Modelski, national interests have some requirements regarding the behaviour of other states, and the main role in expressing community interests and transforming them into policy goals belongs to the political leader.

---

[7] S. Pozdnyakov, *Vneshnepoliticheskaya deyatel'nost' i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya*, Moscow 1986, pp. 45-49; S. Mitrokhin, *Natsional'nyy interes kak teoreticheskaya problema*, "POLIS", 1997, No. 1,
[8] V. Saca, *Evoluţia conceptului…,* pp. 120-121.
[9] V. Saca, *Interese politice…*, pp. 73-74.
[10] I. Rosenau, *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy,* New York 1971, pp. 243-244.

Modelski considers the term 'national interest' scientifically unfounded. He emphasizes that the interests expressed by the politician are not the interests of the nation, nor of the state, but of the community. The state is the necessary condition for the existence of a politician, it provides him with the means to capitalize on his goals. The limits of the community are at the same time narrower and wider than the borders of the state: they are narrower because the politician does not express the interests of all social groups and citizens of the country. They are broader because not expressing the interests of all social groups and citizens of his state, the politician embodies the interests of other states, allies or friends, other groups or individuals, including those from non-allied states. According to the American analyst, there are three types of interests that the politician must take into account:

1. the requirements of the community, i.e. interests resulting from the capitalization of goals from the past by politicians;
2. the requirements of the temporary collaborators, i.e. the interests related to the capitalization of current goals;
3. the requirements of enemies or adversaries, i.e. the interests that are ignored in the name of future goals.

Therefore, in the process of defining the interest, the politician takes into account all the requirements related to his policy. He can make decisions or neglect certain interests, but he cannot ignore the consequences of this neglect for his policy and, emerging from the various interests, the politician forms the goals of his foreign policy (he transforms the interests of his community into foreign policy goals)[11].

For M. Wight, the vital interests of a state are what he believes they are and not what another power says they should be. He correlates vital interest with honour in the international relations system. In turn, the idea of honour is closely related to the idea of prestige, which is one of the most important elements of international politics. Honour is the halo around interests, and prestige is the halo around power[12]. Unlike M. Wight, S. Brucan states that „national interest includes the desires that are the fundamental stimuli of a nation's activity in international politics, and its content can be found more easily by studying the social and national relations that generated these desires"[13].

The changes in the territory of the USSR since the end of the 1990s have contributed to changing the views on the national interest of the newly emerging states. In such conditions, the concept of 'national interest' is defined

[11] G. A. Modelsky, *Theory of Foreing Policy*, London 1962, p. 8-20; Saca V. *Evoluţia conceptului…,* p. 121.
[12] M. Wight, *op. cit*, p. 105.
[13] S. Brucan, *Dialectica politicii Mondiale,* Bucharest 1997, p. 133.

not only by the value content but also by the factor of pragmatism, of the state's ability to propose and achieve certain goals. Currently, in the specialized literature, we are looking for new positions in the approach to the national interest, the main of which are those with a national-conservative and national-liberal character. For the followers of the first position (D. Rogozin), the 'national interest' is identical to the 'state interest'. They examine the state as the main factor expressing national interests. The national-liberal position is distinguished by a strict terminological delimitation of the categories 'national interest' and 'state interest'. The followers of this current (E. Sorokin) argue that civil society will become the subject of national interests, to which the right regarding the formation and formulation of these interests must belong[14]. The multitude of definitions, more or less complete, more or less precise or confusing, allow us to make the main differences, among them we emphasize:

1. In some definitions, national interests are considered to be the fundamental objective and the last determinant that guides the political decision-makers of a state, exclusively in the implementation of foreign policy. Others note the mutual or determining influence between national interests and domestic policy.

2. Other definitions approach national interests as distinct elements and others only as component and constitutive parts of a highly generalized concept of those elements that constitute the most vital needs[15].

These interpretations, taken as a whole, although they are different, complement each other, and allow us to conceive interest in a broad sense as a fundamental sociological and political notion.

Currently, the concept of interest, including national interest, takes on new meanings, generated by integrative and disintegrative processes that take place on the European continent. If in the conditions of Western Europe, this concept is considered somewhat of an obstacle to integration, then in Eastern Europe it is imposed on the foreground, reflecting the tendencies of the states here to consolidate their identity of interest, to find themselves even in spite of disintegrations[16]. Therefore, in our view, a real national interest and an effective foreign policy become possible when the state and civil society complement each other.

---

[14] I. Yetinger, *Gosudarstvennyye, natsional'nyye i klasovyye interesy vo vneshney politike i mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh*, "Mezhdunarodnaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya", 1995, No 2; B. Mezhuyev, *Ponyatiye «natsional'nyy interes» v rossiyskoy obshchestvenno. Politicheskoy mysli*, "POLIS" 1997, No. 1.

[15] I. Pîntea, *Identitatea pericolelor, existente şi probabile pentru interesele naţionale de bază ale Moldovei,* Chişinău 2001, p. 33.

[16] S. Cebotari, V. Saca, I. Coropcean, *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova în contextul proceselor integraţioniste*, Chişinău 2008, pp.18-19.

In the specialized literature, a multitude of approaches has been imposed with reference to the given term. The concept of 'security' represents a multidimensional term, which refers not only to political and military aspects, but also to economic, social, cultural, ecological, and even demographic ones. Specialists tried to find a clear, precise and comprehensive formulation of the security concept, most of the internationally accepted definitions highlight different aspects of security, such as national values, duration and intensity of threats, lack of war, acceptable way of life, etc. According to the definition given in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian language, security represents "the state of being safe from any danger". Also, by definition, security is "the feeling of confidence and peace of mind that the absence of any danger gives one". According to J. Balazj international security is "fundamentally determined by the internal and external security of different social systems, by the extent to which, in general, the identity of the system depends on external circumstances". A new definition with reference to the security concept is introduced in the scientific circuit in 1952 by A. Wolfers, according to which "security measures the absence of threats to acquired values, and in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked"[17]. A framing of the concerns of Security Studies in the area of international military relations is carried out in 1988 by J. Nye and S. Lynn-Jones according to which they are general problems (the causes of war and alliances, political orientations, the presence of military or other threats, faced by certain countries). The field includes fundamental theoretical research into the causes of conflict and war in the international system, the dynamics and outcomes of conflict, the nature and perception of threats, and efforts to "ameliorate and resolve conflicts caused by such threats"[18]. In specialized literature, the terms peace and security are often used in a slightly different manner. Thus, in the text of the United Nations Charter, both terms are treated together. However, their meanings differ. Peace refers to the absence of armed conflict, while security refers to the absence of threats[19]. Security is becoming a concern of all states, and tensions are a universal phenomenon of social life that occur both in the sphere of domestic affairs and in the sphere of foreign affairs[20]. Thus, security is a complex and controversial notion. Security appears central to a political dispute when actors threaten or use force to get what they want from each other[21]. Also, security is a phenomenon that continues to be created by human intention or action. It includes all those changes between

---

[17] E. A. Kolodziej, *Securitatea și relațiile internaționale*, Iași 2007, p. 36.

[18] A. Miroiu, R. S. Ungureanu, *Manual de relații internaționale,* Iași 2006, p. 17.

[19] *Ibidem*, p.180.

[20] H. Morghenthau, *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Iași 2007, p. 470.

[21] *Ibidem*, p. 36.

people and agents – states, international organizations, corporations, and associations – in which actors not only pursue certain outcomes but are willing to use coercive violence and intimidation to get what they want[22].

At the theoretical level, the conceptualization of the idea of security experienced a deep transformation in the period after 1989, when the term was expanded according to the changes existing in the international arena. The concept of security cannot be analyzed without taking into account the changes in perspective and the emergence of new ideas in the discipline of international relations and in their practice. Security is the condition or state in which an entity is certain of its survival. Security can be defined as the study of threats, use and control of military force. In the fundamental sense of the term 'security', it denotes a situation in which a state does not face threats (or does not perceive them). Thus, the notion of security was extended to a systemic level, indicating the presence of a non-conflictual situation between states, especially between the great powers[23]. The supporters of expanding the scope of defining security are the representatives of the Copenhagen School: B. Buzan, O. Waever and J. de Wilde. They define security according to the perception of the threat to the existence of a reference object. It can be part of a multitude that includes non-state actors, abstract principles and even nature. The source of the threat can be identified as aggressive states, negative social trends or cultural diversity. In the Copenhagen School's view, threats can manifest in different fields: political, military, economic, demographic, cultural, ecological, etc. Thus, the issue of security becomes an area of research for B. Buzan who observes the ambiguity of the term security. In his opinion, security can be located at the individual, state and systemic levels and identifies both a reason for the behaviour and a possible universal condition. Once expanded into this broader framework, the ambiguity that plagues its use at the national level becomes a quality rather than a disadvantage. The idea of security encompasses both the dynamics of conflict and harmony or rather the breadth of the sphere covered makes it necessary when applied to the international system as a whole. According to B. Buzan, international security is defined according to three main elements. Thus, B. Buzan first posits that states must be considered objects of reference, given the fact that they constitute the framework of order and the highest form of government. Secondly, the systemic conditions in which influencing states evolve, how safe they are/feel relative to each other, and what is the degree of involvement with reference to ensuring international security. The security of each state, in Buzan's opinion, will be a problem that can only be considered in relation to that of other states. Thirdly, security is not only a relational problem but also one that can only

---

[22] E. A. Kolodziej, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
[23] A. Miroiu, R. S. Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

know temporary solutions. The very anarchic nature of the environment in which states evolve defines the competitive nature of the relations between them[24].

The Cold War privileged the realistic approach to security issues. From this perspective, the states, the reference objects taken into consideration must ensure the preservation of cardinal values, the first of which is survival, and the military tool is the one called to fulfil this task. Until now, no methodology has been published to analyze the concept of security, but its definition is an important topic that can also be found in the official documents of some international organizations. Security becomes a concern of all states, and tensions are a universal phenomenon of social life that affects both the sphere of internal affairs and the sphere of foreign affairs[25]. Thus, security is a complex and controversial notion. Security emerges as a central feature of a political dispute when actors threaten or use force to get what they want from each other[26]. Also, security is a phenomenon that continues to be created by human intention or action. It includes all those changes between people and their agents – states, international organizations, corporations, and associations – in which actors not only pursue certain outcomes but are willing to use coercive violence and intimidation to get what they want[27].

Thus, in accordance with the text of the United Nations (UN) Charter[28], especially according to the provisions of Article 2 of Chapter I, all members must resolve their international disputes by peaceful means, in a manner in which international peace, security and justice are not endangered. All members shall refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner contrary to the purposes of the United Nations. Nothing in this Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in issues that essentially belong to the internal jurisdiction of any state, nor should they initiate such claims of agreement based on this Charter; this principle must not prejudice the application of the imposition measures of Chapter VII. Also, according to the provisions of art. 51 of Chapter VII, nothing in the content of the Charter must prejudice the inalienable right to individual or collective self-defence in the conditions where an armed attack takes place against one of the UN members, until the Security Council takes the necessary measures for maintaining international peace and security.

In 2003, the UN General Secretary, K. Annan, organized a meeting with 16 specialists from various countries to analyze future threats to international

---

[24] *Ibidem*, p. 16.

[25] H. Morghenthau, *Politica între națiuni…,* p. 470.

[26] *Ibidem*, p.36.

[27] E. A. Kolodziej, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[28] *United Nations Charter*, <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter> (20.07.2022).

peace and security. The debates also concerned the definition of the security concept. UN experts have proposed a definition of security that includes two categories of risks to it: 'hard' type, such as international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, intra- and interstate conflicts, and 'soft' type, such as extreme poverty, lack of culture, unemployment, contagious diseases, environmental degradation, religious extremism, violation of human rights, etc. The conceptual definition of the security term is also given in the statute of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Thus, in accordance with the provisions of art. 2 of the Statute, "the Parties will contribute to the continuous development of international relations of peace and friendship by consolidating free institutions, by facilitating a better understanding of the principles on which these institutions are founded and by promoting the conditions of ensuring stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflicts from their international economic policies and will encourage bilateral or multilateral economic collaboration"[29].

In this context, the provisions of art. 3 are also included, according to which, in order to more effectively fulfil the objectives of the Treaty, the Parties, separately or together, through self-help and continuous mutual support, will maintain and develop their individual and collective resistance in the face of an armed attack. The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them, in Europe or North America, will be considered an attack against all of them and, accordingly, agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in the exercise of the right to individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, shall support the Party or Parties attacked by immediately carrying out, individually or jointly with the other Parties, any action it deems necessary, including the use the armed forces, for restoring and maintaining the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures adopted as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council. "These measures will cease after the Security Council adopts the necessary measures to restore and maintain international peace and security". Also, according to art. 8, each Party declares that none of the international obligations, in force at a given time between it and any of the other Parties or a third state, is in contradiction with the provisions of this Treaty and undertakes not to assume any international obligation in conflict with this Treaty. Attempts to define the concept of security were also made during the June 2004 NATO summit in Istanbul. Thus, within the Istanbul Summit, the concept of security was analyzed through the prism of the organization's following objectives: the creation of a 'multilateral bridge' across the Atlantic, collective defence, the application of the indivisibility of

---

[29] *The North Atlantic Treaty*, <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm> (20.07.2022).

allied security, countering threats to the allies' territory, whatever their source may be[30].

As an important strategic partner of NATO, the European Union (EU) tried to fulfil the objectives of the Maastricht Treaty through its own security strategy. Thus, according to the provisions of the European Security Strategy, which has been launched at the end of 2003, the EU has as its starting point the premise which claims that the response to risks, dangers and threats to European security must be adapted to each type of them, through multiple strategies and a comprehensive approach. The Solana Strategy, as this document is also called, identifies some threats and vulnerabilities that derive from political, economic, demographic, ecological, scientific and technological developments. The threats identified by the Strategy are: international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, failed states, organized crime, etc. Among the vulnerabilities highlighted by the Strategy are: Europe's energy dependence, and global warming, but also risks and dangers such as poverty. The Joint Declaration for the Integration of European Defense (2004) reinforces the European concept of security and also emphasizes the role of cooperation and consensus in achieving and preserving security (EU Security Strategy)[31].

The conceptualization of the security term is also defined in the statute of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Thus, in the field of security, the OSCE aims to prevent conflicts and manage crises; control arms and disarmament; increase trust and security; cooperate in economic, cultural, humanitarian and ecological fields, to conceptualize a security model in its area of responsibility. The OSCE Security Concept is defined in the Charter for European Security according to which each participating state has an equal right to security. Also, the OSCE Security Concept reaffirms the inalienable right of each participating state and all participating countries to freedom of choice of their own security arrangements, including alliance treaties, as they are issued. According to the provisions of the Concept, each state has the right to neutrality. Each participating state shall respect the rights of all others in these respects. They will not strengthen their security at the expense of the security of other states. The states will build their relations in accordance with the concept of common and comprehensive security, guided by the equal partnership, solidarity and transparency. The security of each participating state is inseparably linked to the security of the other ones. It is important to address the human, economic, political and military dimensions of

---

[30] E. Nistor, *Teorii despre crize şi comunicare şi comunicarea de criză,*
<https://ru.scribd.com/doc/38174766/Comunicare-Si-Negociere-in-Afaceri-Ionel-Nistor>
(20.07.2022).
[31] Council of the European Union, *European security strategy. A secure Europe in a better world*, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/30823/qc7809568enc.pdf > (20.07.2022).

security as a whole. Thus, in order to maintain peace, the military intervention of strong nation-states is no longer sufficient, but a network of regional collective security arrangements such as the UN, NATO, EU and OSCE is needed.

The security problems that the states have proposed to solve have determined the increase in the number and volume of international bodies. As a result of the activity of these international bodies, the dangers and threats have decreased, however, armed conflicts have not been eradicated. The main areas of instability were included in the stabilization processes, but the results were not always those intended. The expansion of NATO's defence and security system was evident, by welcoming new members, as well as the European Union's efforts to develop a model for managing security dynamics in Europe[32].

Conclusions

Returning to the issue of the 'national interest – security' correlation, it should be noted that no interest can be achieved outside and without the involvement of states, which have certain interests, and apart from sovereignty, one of the main interests is that of ensuring national security, whether regional and last but not least, international security. Thus, from the previously stated assertion, we can advance the following conclusion: there is a direct correlation between the concept of 'national interest' and that of 'security'. Each state has certain interests, and one of the main interests of the state is that of ensuring its own security. Based on these reasonings, we can mention that between the phenomenon of 'national interest' and that of 'security' there is a relationship of complementarity, each phenomenon mutually complementing the other. Thus, security becomes a component part of each state's interest and, at the same time, security becomes an environment for realizing the state's interests in the international arena.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Brucan S., *Dialectica politicii Mondiale,* Bucharest 1997
2. Cebotari S., Saca V., Coropcean I., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova în contextul proceselor integraționiste*, Chișinău 2008
3. Council of the European Union, *European security strategy. A secure Europe in a better world*, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/30823/qc7809568enc.pdf >

---

[32] C. Moştoflei, P. Duţu, A. Sarcinschi, *Studii de Securitate şi Apărare*, Bucharest 2005, pp.15-16.

4. Gorceac S., Dumitraş T., Rusandu I., *Conceptul „interes naţional” în geopolitică*, "Economica. Supliment", Chişinău 1997

5. Juc V., Spinei T., Stan V., Andrieş V., *Interesul naţional al Republicii Moldova*, "MOLDOSCOPIE. Probleme de analiză politică", 2019, No. 2 (LXXXV)

6. Kolodziej E. A., *Securitatea şi relaţiile internaţionale*, Iaşi 2007

7. Mezhuyev B., *Ponyatie «natsional'nyy interes» v rossiyskoy obshchestvenno. Politicheskoy mysli*, "POLIS", 1997, No. 1

8. Miroiu A., Ungureanu R. S., *Manual de relaţii internaţionale,* Iaşi 2006

9. Mitrokhin S., *Natsional'nyy interes kak teoreticheskaya problema*, "POLIS", 1997, No. 1,

10. Modelsky G. A., *Theory of Foreing Policy*, London 1962

11. Morghenthau H., *Politica între naţiuni. Lupta pentru putere şi lupta pentru pace*, Iaşi 2007

12. Morgenthau H., *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York 1955

13. Moştoflei C., Duţu P., Sarcinschi A., *Studii de Securitate şi Apărare*, Bucharest 2005

14. Nistor E., *Teorii despre crize şi comunicare şi comunicarea de criză,* <https://ru.scribd.com/doc/38174766/Comunicare-Si-Negociere-in-Afaceri-Ionel-Nistor>

15. Pîntea I., *Identitatea pericolelor, existente şi probabile pentru interesele naţionale de bază ale Moldovei,* Chişinău 2001

16. Pozdnyakov S., *Vneshnepoliticheskaya deyatel'nost' i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya*, Moscow 1986

17. Rosenau I., *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy,* New York 1971

18. Saca V., *Evoluţia conceptului de interes naţional în condiţiile globalizării*, "Interacţiuni în contextul globalizării. Materialele conferinţei ştiinţifice integraţionale din 20-21 noiembrie 2004", Iaşi 2005

19. Saca V., *Interese politice şi relaţii politice. Dimensiuni tranzitorii*, Chişinău 2001

20. Tămaş S., *Geopolitica o abordare prospectivă*, Bucharest 1995

21. *The North Atlantic Treaty*, <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm>

22. *United Nations Charter*, <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

23. Wight M., *Politica de putere*, Chişinău 1988

24. Yetinger I., *Gosudarstvennyye, natsional'nyye i klasovyye interesy vo vneshney politike i mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh*, "Mezhdunarodnaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya", 1995, No. 2.