

THE DILEMMA OF PUBLIC SECURITY AND BUSINESS COMPETITIVENESS: WHAT SCHOLARS HAVE TO SAY TO POLICYMAKERS ABOUT IT?

O DILEMA DA SEGURANÇA PÚBLICA E DA COMPETITIVIDADE EMPRESARIAL: O QUE OS ESTUDIOSOS TÊM A DIZER AOS POLÍTICOS SOBRE ISSO?

NIDI BUENO¹

ABSTRACT

The binomial public security and business competitiveness is not a prevailing trend neither in studies on strategic management nor in academic works on public safety. However, some significant works on the subject have already been published. This article surveys and classifies some of the main studies regarding how public safety and business competitiveness interact. Its main argument is that the studies about the security-competitiveness dilemma reveals two big academic debates: one focused on the impacts of public security on business competitiveness, and the other concentrated on the reversal side of the puzzle, i.e., on the impacts of business strategies on public security. The study is divided into three parts. The two first analyze the two big scholarly debates, while the third lists the two debates' main findings and, based on them, enumerates a brief list of policy prescriptions regarding the security-competitiveness dilemma.

Keywords: public security; business competitiveness; citizen security; business improvement district (bids).

RESUMO

O binômio segurança pública e competitividade empresarial, não é uma tendência predominante nos estudos sobre gestão estratégica ou, tampouco, nos trabalhos acadêmicos sobre políticas de segurança. No entanto, alguns trabalhos significativos sobre o assunto já foram publicados. Este artigo analisa e classifica alguns dos principais estudos acerca de como a segurança pública e a competitividade empresarial interagem. Seu principal argumento é o de que os estudos sobre o dilema segurança-competitividade revelam dois grandes debates acadêmicos: um focado nos impactos da segurança pública na competitividade empresarial, e outro concentrado na equação reversa, ou seja, nos impactos de certas estratégias empresariais sobre a segurança pública. O estudo está dividido em três partes. As duas primeiras analisam os dois grandes debates acadêmicos, enquanto a terceira consta as principais conclusões desses debates e, com base nelas, enumera uma breve lista de recomendações de políticas públicas relacionadas ao dilema segurança-competitividade.

Palavras-chave: segurança pública; competitividade empresarial; segurança feita pelo cidadão; distrito de melhorias empresariais (dmes).

1 Doutor em Relações Internacionais pela Universidade de Brasília (UnB), Brasília-DF, Brasil. Professor visitante da *School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University*, Washington, Estados Unidos. *Lattes:* <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2367587840316707>; *E-mail:* nidibueno@gmail.com, *ORCID:* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9538-469X>

INTRODUCTION

Foundational competitiveness, the cascading nature of public security risks, A multifaced, interconnected business strategy, the FPS-IPS surveillance model, Hong's RCA-PCA-MET-RCA framework, and BIDs adapted for/by developing countries: what all these mean to policymakers and government officials concerned about providing public goods such as higher standard of safety and lower rate of unemployment? All these terms and concepts are related to the two aforementioned public goods and have been developed and debated by scholars from both North Hemisphere and South Hemisphere. However, the dialogue between scholars and policymakers is still in a need for improvement.

The idea that there is a deep connection between competitiveness and security become for the very first time consolidated at earlier post-Cold War period. Borrus and Zysman (1991) left it clear in their today's classic *Industrial competitiveness and American national security*. The authors just start their article by stating straightforward that the "debate on US competitiveness must become a debate about national security" (p. 11). They were sure that "relative decline in economic position and failing technological leadership will soon undermine the exercise of American power" (p. 11). Nevertheless, although Borus and Zysman (1991) had indeed consolidated among scholars the existing linkage between security and competitiveness, they did so in terms of national security, a concept larger and different of the stricter concept of public security.

As long ago defined by Wolfers (1952), while national security refers mainly to crossborder safety issues and is overall under the jurisdiction of national government (p. 481), public security refers mainly to in-borders safety concerns and is overall under the jurisdiction of sub-national and local governments (p. 491). This distinction between the types of security demand also a two types the literature review. The present article focuses on the second kind: the interconnection between business competitiveness and public security.

Regarding this, although so much has been said in the academic field on public security as well as on business competitiveness, not so much has been said on the interconnectedness of these two important societal variables. Indeed, the study of the connections between public security and business competitiveness are not a prevailing trend neither in the works on strategic management nor in academic papers on public safety. Nevertheless, some significant works on the subject have already been published. This article surveys and classifies some of the main studies regarding how public safety and business competitiveness interact. Its main argument is that the studies about the security-competitiveness dilemma reveals two big academic debates: one focused on the impacts of public security on business competitiveness, and the other concentrated on the reversal side of the puzzle., i.e., on the impacts of business strategies on public security.

There are at least two clear reasons way this article is relevant to the epistemological community concerned about public security. First of all, because, as it will demonstrated by the literature review ahead, enhance in business competitiveness might positively reflect on public security. Additionally, all the way back, enhance in public security might positively impact on business competitiveness.

To a deeper understanding of the subject, this study is divided into three parts. The two first analyze the two big scholarly debates, while the third lists the two debates' main findings and, based on them, enumerates a brief list of policy prescriptions regarding the security-competitiveness dilemma.

I – THE FIRST SCHOLARY DEBATE: PUBLIC SECURITY'S IMPACTS ON COMPETITIVENESS

A relevant concept developed in this first scholarly debate is the notion of foundation competitiveness. It is one of most useful analytical concepts in the specialized literature on the impacts of public security on business competitiveness. Delgado, Ketels, Porter and Stern (2012). *The determinants of national competitiveness* (No. w18249). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Developed by Delgado, Porter, and Stern (2012) – in a work concerned about *The determinants of national competitiveness*, which was published by the National Bureau of Economic Research –, the concept of foundational competitiveness refers to the projected level of production per working-age individual that is maintained by the complete quality of a nation as a place to do business. What makes the concept relevant is its focus on output per potential operative. This index has two advantages: first, it is a wider measure of national productivity than production per current worker; second, it reflects the double role of personnel participation and output per operative in defining a nation's standard of living.

In the process of designing an analytical framework to approach foundational competitiveness, the aforementioned Delgado, Porter, and Stern's work uses a scheme that establishes three comprehensive and interconnected drivers of foundational competitiveness: social infrastructure and political institutions, monetary and fiscal policy, and the microeconomic environment (2012, p. 16-34). It is in the first driver where the study goes through public security as a variable to impact on country's business competitiveness and it does so by using estimation of a theoretically grounded and empirically validated measure of national competitiveness. Such empirical strength is shown by a multiple data sets employed, encompassing more than 130 countries over a seven years period (2001-2008). The study comes to the conclusion that, as the other two drivers, social infrastructure in general, and public safety in particular, has a deep relation with the level of business competitiveness of all the 130 covered countries.

Risk increasing level, risk cascading nature, and organization ability to manage public security risks are the three main points observed by van Opstal (2009) *The resilient economy: integrating competitiveness and security*. Published by the Council of Competitiveness, the relevance of van Opstal work resides mainly in describing how crucial it is for business companies to take public security into account in their strategical plans. Technological complexity, globalization, climate and energy volatility, interdependence, terrorism, and pandemic potential are presented as being part of a scenario (that COVID-19 crisis has clearly shown to be realistic) in which prevails an increasing level of public security issues that societies and organizations are contemporarily facing.

Van Opstal (2009) study also demonstrates the cascading nature of the subject and that risks in the public safety arena are more and more interconnected. It means that disturbances in one area can cascade in multiple directions. It is noteworthy the fact that this intriguing nature of public safety risks demands from business strategy that is also multifaceted and interconnected. This is so important that it is one of the aspects addressed in the prescriptive section of the present article.

Although van Opstal (2009) works in a broader perspective, one can correctly infer from its seminal study that firm capacity to manage emerging public safety risks, forestall the interactions between diverse forms of public security risk, and bounce back from public safety disturbance is a competitive differentiator for both companies and countries in the contemporary global scene. This overall set of firm skills and abilities is what is termed in the study's title as economic resilience.

Far beyond general findings and premises, van Opstal (2009) also presents some practical strategic prescriptions to policymakers. Based in his work findings, he presents four main recommendations that appeared summarized below:

1. Businesses must root the case for investment in resilience strategies to manage a variety of risks in their strategies, including those derived from public safety minor risks that can potentially impacts on business continuity and shareholder value (p. 17);

2. Businesses must do not manage specific risk scenarios, rather they should create the agility and flexibility to cope with tempestuous circumstances (p. 19);

3. Policies to fortify risk management capabilities must attend security and competitiveness goals alike (p. 25);

4. CEOs and Boards must take into account that handling operational risks progressively affects real-time financial performance (p. 67).

Under the title *Balancing national security and competitiveness in the age of information*, Stanojević and Pavlović (2020) published one of the most recent study on the binomial public security and business competitiveness. This new work observes that "a secure environment plays a crucial role in the overall stability of the economy, having an impact and contributing to its competitiveness" (p. 1201).

When compared to other similar studies -- such as the one conducted by Delgado, Porter, and Stern (2012); Stanojević and Pavlović's work covers a reduced set of countries. However, even though, it still has a significant coverage, since it encompasses all the 27 European Union (EU) countries plus Serbia, a candidate to be an EU state-member. The study's temporal marks range from 2011 to 2017. What makes it representative is the analytical framework by its authors to approach the theme. It is composed by three drivers, each of them accompanied by a respective empirical indicator: first, business costs of terrorism; second, business costs of crime and violence, and organized crime; third, the reliability of policy services (p. 1203).

By providing a comparative investigation on each of the aforementioned indicators, the study evaluates their trend, keeping the focus of the analysis on the connection between national security and national competitiveness and pursuing

the objective of determining how the former affects the latter. Stanojević and Pavlović must important assumption is that, albeit the absence of security risks cannot positively drive the country's economic development and competitiveness, its existence would undeniably have far-reaching costs for the economy.

Spich and Grosse (2005) work is another applicable piece of the puzzle on what scholars have to say to policymakers about the interactions between public security and business competitiveness. Their study frames the matter regarding homeland security and its relationship to the international competitiveness of U.S. companies. Although their work is far from overcoming other studies in terms of empirical data – since it is a mostly conceptual statement, as the authors themselves assume (p. 457) – it guarantees its presence in this survey due to the fact it identifies the main areas of U.S. national security that are vital to companies as well as explores the management concerns of business regarding the risks and opportunities that have brought up by homeland security issues. The study's framework has four drivers related to the kinds of costs and risks that homeland security risks generate for U.S. international business: exports costs, imports costs, incoming costs, and investments costs (p. 485). Last but not least, despite its expressed conceptual nature, it enumerates a couple of some policy prescriptions for both companies and the U.S. Government toward mitigating the negative impacts of the homeland security challenges (p. 488).

Kajalo and Lindblom (2010) work reveals a subtle but interesting nuance of the binomial security and competitiveness: formal security mechanisms have a negative impact on firms competitiveness, at least for certain kinds of businesses. The study accomplished to provide a wide understanding of the ways in which retail entrepreneurs perceive the association between surveillance and customers' and employees' sense of security at the store level. Its findings revealed that formal surveillance has a negative impact on customers' feelings of security from the retailers' point of view (p. 300). On the other hand, it comes to the conclusion that, in contrast to formal surveillance, informal surveillance had positive impacts on customers' and employees' feelings of security (p. 305).

What could we learn and what kind of questions we could ask about the relations between Kajalo and Lindblom (2010) study's findings on retailer businesses surveillance and this present work on the broader notion of public security? The first question could be about the potential similarities and differences between private surveillance system and public security system. This would be and useful for the purpose of our present investigation. Its specific objectives could include to:

- check customers' and employees' sense of security not at the story level but at the story's surrounding level (SSSL);
- track SSSL under formal police surveillance (FPS) vis-à-vis SSSL under informal police surveillance (IPS);
- compare the findings on FPS and IPS;
- present a set of policy prescription based on the study main findings.

As for developing countries, an important group of studies refers to the tourism industry. That occurs mainly due to the fact that tourism is projected to become a foremost vehicle of economic development in industrializing nations in the twenty-first century. However, as defended to achieve this projection, countries with tourism-based economies must develop methods for transforming their comparative advantages into competitive advantages. This is the main assumption presented by W.C. Hong (2009, p. 105) in his *Competitiveness measurements for the tourism sector*.

Hong work's higher contribution is its proposed analytical framework. It has four components: Ricardo's comparative advantages (RCA), Porter's competitive advantages (PCA), tourism management's education and training ((MET), and environmental conditions (EC). The topics below summarizes the way Hong develops his framework in his article's 27 pages:

- Hong's RCA factor measures both exogenous comparative advantages (represented by the country's conditions of natural endowments) and endogenous comparative advantages (represented by the country's degree of technological change);
- Hong's PCA factor is used to describe the growth in trade among countries with similar factorial portfolios;
- Hong's MET factor highlights the role of tourism management in the provision of providing high-quality education and training as a way of enhancing both RCA and PCA;
- Hong's EC factor embraces domestic and the global environmental conditions alike and uses an analytic hierarchical process to weight these two evaluation dimensions.

II – THE SECOND SCHOLARLY DEBATE: BUSINESS STRATEGY'S IMPACTS ON PUBLIC SECURITY

A second big scholarly debate about the security-competitiveness dilemma goes through the reversal side of the puzzle, emphasizing not the impacts of public safety on business competitiveness, but how business strategies and arrangement can impact on the provision of public security's goods. This debate is guided by the discussion of two main kinds of arrangements: Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and those related to citizen security.

Although this kind of arrangement are better known and more frequent implemented in developed countries, they have been also registered in some developing countries. The most common among them is the so-called business improvement districts (BID). BID is a widespread economic development and urban revitalization model in industrialized nations in which local property and business holders pay an assessment tax that funds extra services, including private security. It is a non-profit organization formed by property owners to deliver local public goods, usually including public safety. When a BID is approved by a majority of property owners in a district, state law makes contributions to the BID budget compulsory (BROOKS, 2008, p. 388).

When it comes to forms of urban revitalization, BID arrangement is as much widespread as it is controversial. The key point of the dispute is the argument that it privatizes economic development and public safety initiatives in public

space. BID and its controversy has been approached by many scholarly analyses, including those conducted by Logsdon and Wood (2002), Brooks (2008), Cook and MacDonald (2011), Hallahan and Pehan (2011), MacDonald, Stokes, Grunwald, and Bluthenthal (2013), Muggah at alle (2016), and Muggah (2017).

Logsdon and Wood (2002) presented one of the first 21st century scholarly work on what has been known as citizen security. In their article they first make the case that development of the concept of global business citizenship, seeking to show “how the libertarian political philosophy of free-market capitalism must give way to a communitarian view in order for the voluntaristic, local notion of “corporate citizenship” to take root” (p. 155). They also distinguish the notion of global business citizenship from corporate citizenship, displaying the way by which the former notion requires a change from communitarian thinking to a position of universal human rights (p. 159).

Brooks (2008) pioneer empirical study on BIDs come to the conclusion that BIDs resolution of the district’s collective action problem reduces crime and that, crime decreases unrelatedly of estimation technique, from fixed effects and comparing BIDs to neighborhoods that considered, but did not adopt, BIDs to using propensity score matching and comparing BIDs to their neighbors. The study also points out that crime reduction brought by BIDs arrangement would also have a reducing relative cost (p. 395). Cook and MacDonald (2010) calls the attention to the requirement for a legal framework that helps neighborhoods solve the collective action problem (p. 211).

Hallahan and Pehan (2011) works on the alleged advantages of deploying a sole nationwide broadband wireless network to serve all public safety users over the current split public safety systems. They make the point that a national system could be formed to attend both public security and commercial contributors, by assuming that it would allow a provider to exploit significant economies but force it to meet the more costly requirements of public security (p. 250).

The two authors scrutinize the viability of a public–private partnership that serves public security and commercial propriety owners from a for-profit provider’s standpoint. To do so, they have developed a model that estimates the net present value (NPV) of a wireless network by calculating costs based on the number of cell sites required and revenue based on the projected number of subscribers acquired. The model is used to both a network that serves only propriety owners (on 10 MHz of 700 MHz) range and a public–private partnership that serves property owners and public security personnel (on 20 MHz of 700 MHz) range (p. 267).

Hallahan and Pehan (2011) comes to the main finding that NPV is superior for the public–private partnership than for the commercial-only network According to the authors, this finding was confirmed for any resident’s density, which shows that the value of 10 MHz of range exceeds the cost of meeting public security demands. They also argue that NPV/cell increases with residents’ density, in a way that “urban areas are profitable and rural areas are unprofitable” (p. 268).

Finally, Hallahan and Pehan (2011) conclude that a public-private partnership covering 94% of the US population disruptions even since the most urban 56% of

population supports coverage for the next 38%. They believe to have demonstrated that if initial deployment is funded, a financially sustainable public-private partnership can serve much more than 94% (p. 261).

MacDonald, Stokes, Grunwald, and Bluthenthal (2013) dedicate their study to answer a simple question (stamped in their work's subtitle): *do business improvement districts reduce violent crime among adolescents?* For the sake of finding an empirically based solution to their posed question, the authors examine whether BIDs provide concrete benefits beyond their immediate boundaries to local people in the form of reduced violence among teenagers. By comparing violent victimization among youths living in BID neighborhoods with those in correspondingly situated non-BID districts, they find no effect of BIDs on violence. Yet, they do find that BIDs might be an agent of crime reduction, but this benefit is likely concentrated only in their immediate borders and does not extend to adolescences living in adjacent neighborhoods.

Cook and MacDonald (2011) recognize that "private actions to avoid and prevent criminal victimization and assist public law enforcement are vital inputs into the crime-control process" (p. 445) and defends that, as one of the forms of private action, BID arrangement "appears particularly promising" (p. 445). In their research on 30 Los Angeles BIDs they demonstrate that the social benefits of BID expenses on security are a large multiple (about 20) of the private expenses. It also shows that crime displacement appears minimal, and that this reduction has been accompanied by a decrease in arrests, what indicates additional savings.

Muggah at alle (2016) 's work moves forward on Logsdon and Wood (2002)'s study on citizen security. First, it amplifies the focus from BIDs to cities. Second, it strays the focus from developed countries to developing nations. As the authors point out, the reason for them to considering cities instead of larger territories is the fact that they "are natural laboratories of policy innovation to prevent and reduce violence" (p. 221), what seems to be an interesting argument to be empirically checked. And they do so. By changing the focus of studies on citizen security from rich, industrialized countries to medium and large cities in Latin America and Caribbean, their study faces a bigger challenge, since figures on crimes and violence in this region are worldly known as being the highest in the planet.

As of 2016, yet Latin America was the home to 8% of the world's population, it was the site of 33% of the world's homicides; Latin American's regional homicide rate was crudely 21.5 per 100,000, more than three times the world average; .at least seventeen of the top twenty most murderous nations in the world were located in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean; nothing less than 43 of the 50 most homicidal cities in the world were located in Latin America (MUGGAH, 2017, p. 291). If it was not enough to show the challenges the region faces, data on economic and financial cost of crime and violence make the prospect even more complex. Between 2010-2014 that cost was about 3.5% of GDP, double that of more developed regions around the planet; and the total estimated financial burden of criminal violence was between \$114.5 and \$170.4 billion a year (MUGGAH, 2017, p. 299).

Although figures on crime and violence do show a huge challenge, Latin America is also a region that shows some innovative experiences in reducing these figures at the city level. Most of these experiences have been coined in bases of the so-called citizen security model. Cali, Bogota and Medellin – all of them in Colombia -- were the first cities in Latin America to implement citizen security arrangements, in 1998 (MUGGAH, 2017, p. 306).

III – CONCLUSION AND PRESCRIPTIONS

That all being said, we come back to the initial question. Foundational competitiveness, the cascading nature of public security risks, A multifaced, interconnected business strategy, the FPS-IPS surveillance model, Hong's RCA-PCA-MET-RCA framework, and BIDs: what all these mean to policymakers and government officials concerned about providing public goods such as higher standard of safety and lower rate of unemployment? All these are the main findings scholars dedicated on sorting out the competitiveness-security dilemma have achieved through two different academic debates. There are at least five main points to be highlighted:

First, from the first scholarly debate we have learned on the projected level of production per working-age individual that is maintained by the complete quality of a nation as a place to do business. Scholars working in the field of the binomial public security and business competitiveness know it as foundational competitiveness, and in this field the use of this concept is in good measure the usage of terms has to do with Delgado, Porter, and Stern (2012)'s contribution to understanding of the subject. This analytical tool is particularly relevant, since, first, its focus is on output per potential worker rather than measuring production per current worker; second, because it highlights the double role of workers participation and output per worker in defining a nation's standard of living (p. 30).

Second, scholars have also learned the cascading nature of public security risks, meaning that in the public safety arena risks are more and more interconnected and that perturbations in one area can cascade in multiple directions, as show the findings of van Opstal (2009)'s study. In the same way, there is a significant scholarly consensus that this intriguing nature of public safety risks demands from business strategy that is also multifaceted and interconnected (p. 151). Albeit van Opstal handles in a wider perspective, scholars can infer from his study that business ability to manage emerging public safety risks, anticipate the interactions between diverse forms of public security risk, and bounce back from public safety disturbance become a competitive differentiator for companies as well as for countries.

Third, in addition to what have already found, scholars in the field are still proposing new interrogations such as what would be the potential similarities and differences between private surveillance system and public security system, and how findings about it could be useful for the purpose of equalizing the dilemma on business competitiveness and public safety's mutual impacts.

Last but not least, scholars have very much to say about BIDs and on what this kind of public private partnership has achieved in industrialized, rich countries – like in many cities in the U.S. – and in developing countries’ medium and large cities – like the Colombian *municipalidades* of Cali, Bogota and Medellin.

Based on these four elements, it is possible to present at least three policy prescriptions:

First, public security’s policymakers must promote a wider analysis of the scope of the impacts of public safety on the jurisdictional area and society groups they are in charge of, systematically considering also those impacts it has directly on business competitiveness and, indirectly, on unemployment rates. By doing so, policymakers would be making the most of Delgado, Porter, and Stern’s scholarly notion of foundational competitiveness.

Second, public security’s policymakers must fund or co-fund academic research focused on checking business customers’ and employees’ sense of security not at the story level (private space) but in public spaces -- at the story’ surrounding level (SSSL), tracking SSSL under formal police surveillance (FPS) vis-à-vis SSSL under informal police surveillance (IPS), and comparing the findings on FPS and IPS.

Third, particularly developing countries’ policymakers working in enhancing both public security and tourism competitiveness must work together to promote a better understanding of Hong (2009) framework. It can be especially useful, thanks to include a complex and comprehensive model that embraces well known analytical tools, including Ricardo’s comparative advantages (RCA) and Porter’s competitive advantages (PCA) as well as the innovative notions of tourism management’s education and training (MET), and environmental conditions (EC).

Fourth, policymakers from both public security area and business competitiveness promotion must foster the dialog between government official and scholars producing on the competitiveness-security dilemma. After all, the dialogue between scholars and policymakers is still in a need for improvement.

REFERENCES

BORRUS, M.; ZYSMAN, J. **Industrial competitiveness and American national security**. 1991.

BROOKS, L. Volunteering to be taxed: Business improvement districts and the extra-governmental provision of public safety. **Journal of Public Economics**, v. 92, p. 388-406, 2008.

COOK, P.J.; MACDONALD, J. **Public safety through private action**: an economic assessment of bids, locks, and citizen cooperation (No. w15877). National Bureau of Economic Research. 2010.

COOK, P.J.; MACDONALD, J. Public safety through private action: an economic assessment of BIDS. **The Economic Journal**, v. 121(552), p. 445-462, 2011.

- DELGADO, M.; KETELS, C.; PORTER, M. E.; STERN, S. **The determinants of national competitiveness** (No. w18249). National Bureau of Economic Research. 2012.
- HALLAHAN, R.; PEHA, J. M. The business case of a network that serves both public safety and commercial subscribers. **Telecommunications Policy**, v. 35, p. 250-268, 2011.
- HONG, W. C. Global competitiveness measurement for the tourism sector. **Current issues in tourism**, v. 12, p. 105-132, 2009.
- LOGSDON, J. M.; WOOD, D. J. Business citizenship: From domestic to global level of analysis. **Business ethics quarterly**, p. 155-187, 2002.
- MUGGAH, R. The rise of citizen security in Latin America and the Caribbean. In: **Alternative pathways to sustainable development: lessons from Latin America**. Brill Nijhoff, p. 291-322, 2017.
- SPICH, R., & GROSSE, R. How does homeland security affect US firms' international competitiveness?. **Journal of International Management**, v. 11(4), p. 457-478, 2005.
- STANOJEVIĆ, J.; PAVLOVIĆ, M. Balancing National Security and Competitiveness in the Age of Information. **TEME**, p. 1201-1215, 2020.
- VAN OPSTAL, D. **The resilient economy: integrating competitiveness and security**. Council on Competitiveness. Brill Nijhoff, p. 132-154, 2009.
- WOLFERS, A. "National security" as an ambiguous symbol. **Political science quarterly**, v. 67(4), p. 481-502, 1952.