

Vakhtang MAISAIA¹

Georgia

Miranda MIKADZE²

Georgia

CBRN THREAT INFLUENCE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – NEW DIMENSION OF SECURITY IN CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL POLITICS

***Abstract:** In this way, during the Cold War, the political notion of security was extended, from referring primarily to matters related to defence and the military, such as the avoidance of military aggression, to dealing with economic, political, and societal matters, domestic as well as international. After the Cold War in post-Bipolarity period of time, the concept of security at global level cardinally changed and shifted and new types of challenges emerged, mainly of hybrid threats. The threats are increasingly transnational, like below – mentioned: Terrorism; Organized crime; Illegal trafficking; Illegal migration; Epidemic disease. Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear threats present significant challenges to global security and pose grave risks to human life, infrastructure, and the environment. Identifying CBRN threats accurately and efficiently is crucial for effective prevention, preparedness, and response measures. This dissertation explores the theoretical concepts and modalities employed in identifying CBRN threats. By examining the theoretical foundations and practical methodologies, we aim to enhance our understanding of CBRN threat identification and contribute to the development of robust strategies for countering these threats. Identifying CBRN threats is a complex and multidimensional task that requires the integration of theoretical concepts and practical modalities. The theoretical concepts of securitization theory and risk assessment provide valuable frameworks for understanding the perception and evaluation of CBRN threats. Securitization theory allows us to examine the discourses and policies that shape the perception of these threats*

¹ Vakhtang Maisaia, PhD, Caucasus International University (Georgia); Józef Gołuchowski University of Applied Science (Poland), ORCID: 0000-0003-3674-3570.

² Miranda Mikadze, PhD, Caucasus International University (Georgia).

as security concerns, while risk assessment enables the prioritization of threats based on their severity and likelihood. The accessibility of CBRN materials by terrorist organizations and individuals has been facilitated by various factors, including advancements in technology, the globalization of information, and illicit black-market networks. The rapid dissemination of knowledge and the ease of communication have enabled the acquisition, production, and dissemination of CBRN materials by non-state actors, expanding the potential reach and impact of their terrorist activities. Furthermore, the transnational nature of CBRN terrorism transcends national borders, making it a global security concern that demands international cooperation, intelligence sharing, and coordinated efforts to identify, track, and neutralize potential threats. The emergence of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) terrorism poses a significant and complex challenge to global and national security, necessitating comprehensive understanding, effective countermeasures, and international cooperation. The increasing accessibility of CBRN materials and the transnational nature of terrorist organizations create a heightened risk of devastating CBRN attacks on a global scale. These attacks have the potential to cause mass human casualties, public health crises, destabilization of nations, and psychological trauma, thereby undermining societal resilience and challenging the ability of governments to protect their citizens. The vulnerability of critical infrastructure and essential services further compounds the complexity of addressing CBRN terrorism.

Keywords: *asymmetric challenges, CBRN threat, CBRN terrorism, “Securitization” theory, Cold War, global security, international cooperation, international security*

Introduction

Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) threats present significant challenges to global security and pose grave risks to human life, infrastructure, and the environment. Identifying CBRN threats accurately and efficiently is crucial for effective prevention, preparedness, and response measures. This dissertation explores the theoretical concepts and modalities employed in identifying CBRN threats. By examining the theoretical foundations and practical methodologies, we aim to enhance our understanding of CBRN threat identification and contribute to the development of robust strategies for countering these threats. Identifying CBRN threats is a complex and multidimensional task that requires the integration of theoretical concepts and practical modalities. The theoretical concepts of securitization theory and risk assessment provide valuable frameworks for understanding the perception

and evaluation of CBRN threats. Securitization theory allows us to examine the discourses and policies that shape the perception of these threats as security concerns, while risk assessment enables the prioritization of threats based on their severity and likelihood.

Practical modalities such as intelligence gathering and analysis, sensor technologies, and data analytics with artificial intelligence play crucial roles in the identification of CBRN threats. Intelligence agencies collect and analyze information from various sources to identify potential threats, collaborating and sharing information to achieve a comprehensive understanding. Sensor technologies, including radiation detectors and chemical and biological sensors, provide real-time monitoring and early detection capabilities, enhancing threat identification. Data analytics and artificial intelligence algorithms analyze vast amounts of data, enabling the detection of patterns and anomalies that may indicate CBRN activities.

Similarly, data analytics and artificial intelligence (AI) have emerged as powerful tools in identifying CBRN threats. AI algorithms analyze vast amounts of data, detecting patterns, anomalies, and potential indicators of CBRN activities. Social media posts, online forums, and other digital sources are scrutinized to identify suspicious behavior or discussions related to CBRN threats. The integration of AI and data analytics augments human analysis, improving threat identification capabilities. However, ethical considerations, privacy concerns, and the need for human oversight must be addressed in deploying these technologies effectively.

National security serves as a critical modality for promoting stability within nations and across the globe. It encompasses a range of strategies, policies, and practices aimed at protecting a country's sovereignty, safeguarding its citizens, and maintaining social order. This dissertation explores the significance of national security as a key modality for promoting stability, highlighting its various dimensions and contributions to maintaining peace, order, and progress within societies.

New Security Dimension and CBRN Proliferation Dilemma

National security refers to the measures and actions taken by a government to protect its interests, values, and assets from internal and external threats. It encompasses dimensions such as military defense, intelligence gathering, economic stability, societal cohesion, and environmental resilience. Stability, on the other hand, refers to the condition of calm, order, and predictability within a nation. It encompasses social harmony, the rule of law, economic prosperity, and the absence of significant conflicts or threats that could disrupt the functioning of a society. National security plays a fundamental role in promoting stability by ensuring the protection of a nation's interests and the

well-being of its citizens. It serves as a shield against various threats that can destabilize a country, including terrorism, transnational crime, cyber-attacks, and internal unrest. By effectively addressing these threats, national security contributes to creating an environment of peace, order, and progress.

One of the primary objectives of national security is to safeguard a nation's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Sovereignty refers to the authority and independence of a state to govern itself without interference from external forces. National security measures aim to protect a country's territorial boundaries, prevent external aggression, and maintain military capabilities that act as a deterrent against potential threats. By ensuring sovereignty and territorial integrity, national security provides stability within a nation. It establishes a sense of security among citizens, as they are assured that their government has the capacity to defend and protect their homeland. This stability fosters trust, unity, and a sense of national identity, which are crucial for the functioning of a harmonious society.

National security is instrumental in maintaining internal order and social cohesion. It involves the protection of citizens from internal threats, such as terrorism, organized crime, civil unrest, and political instability³. Effective law enforcement mechanisms, intelligence networks, and counterterrorism measures contribute to ensuring the safety of citizens and preventing internal threats. Consequently, the Threat Identification Matrix provides a comprehensive analysis of the CBRN threat as a provision for national and global security challenges. By examining the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to the CBRN threat, decision-makers can develop strategies to mitigate risks, enhance preparedness, and respond effectively⁴. Addressing weaknesses through increased public awareness, resource allocation, and regulatory frameworks is crucial for strengthening defenses against CBRN threats. Leveraging opportunities, such as technological advancements, international cooperation, and public-private partnerships, can enhance response capabilities. Proactive measures are necessary to address emerging threats, counter the involvement of non-state actors, and manage the potential dual-use implications of advanced technologies. By considering the multifaceted nature of the CBRN threat, nations can develop comprehensive and integrated strategies to protect national and global security and mitigate the risks posed by CBRN incidents⁵.

³ N. Colletta, *Promoting Interim Stabilization in Fragile Settings: From Theory to Practice*, [in:] *Stabilization Operations, Security and Development*, Routledge, London 2013, p. 84.

⁴ G. Frank, *CONTEST An Evaluation of Revisions to the UK Counter-Terrorism Strategy with a Special Focus on the CBRNE Threat (ARI)*, Real Institute Elcano, Madrid 2009, pp. 23-24.

⁵ M. Kolencik, *Crime Scene Investigation in a CBRN Context*, ISEM Institute, New York 2021, p. 5.

The national security dilemma is a key modality for geopolitical instability, as it creates tensions between states seeking to protect their national interests. When one state makes a solid effort to enhance its security by increasing military capabilities, it simultaneously creates concerns for other nations who perceive this increase in power as a potential threat. This triggers a response from those nations to increase their military capabilities in the same way, finally leading to an escalating arms race dynamic that can ultimately lead to conflict. The book *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*, by Ken Booth and Nicholas J. Wheeler discusses how the national security dilemma creates tensions between states seeking to protect their national interests⁶. There is highlighted how the security dilemma at a national level can cause friction between countries trying to safeguard their interests while also underscoring importance building trust through diplomatic channels aimed at resolving disputes peaceably without resorting military force. Increasingly, it was recognized that international relations were not only about conflictual interactions between states but also about cooperative efforts to build a more stable and secure global community. Yet even as scholars looked for ways of promoting cooperation over competition among nations, they could not ignore the fact that geopolitical instability continued to be driven by an enduring feature of statecraft known as the security dilemma. This concept refers to a situation where one state's efforts to enhance its own security can inadvertently lead other states to feel threatened or insecure. The result is often a spiral of mistrust and tension as each side seeks to counterbalance perceived threats from others⁷. Any kind of conventional wars may also escalate into nuclear wars, through mistakes made in the frenetic atmosphere that often surrounds decision-makers in wartime situations. Danger of Nuclear Imbalances – there is no guarantee that vertical or horizontal nuclear proliferation will preserve the balance of power. Indeed, proliferation inevitably creates temporary imbalances which may then be exploited by aggressive states. After all, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs were dropped to take advantage of precisely such a military imbalance. Usable nuclear weapons – Useable nuclear weapons. Developments in recent years have focused increasingly on the production of nuclear weapons that have a more precise and contained impact, making them useable. These tactical or battlefield nuclear weapons are no longer of symbolic importance alone. This has led to the theory of nuclear utilization target selection (NUTS), which rejects the logic of MAD in suggesting that it is possible for a limited nuclear exchange to occur. Irresponsible Nuclear Powers-Although the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons

⁶ K. Booth, N. J. Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2008, pp. 43-44.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

worked during the bipolar first nuclear age, it is far less reliable in the less stable, multipolar circumstances of the second nuclear age. The possibility of a nuclear first strike relies on the existence of a political or military leadership that is not averse to risk-taking, or a leadership that, because of its values and beliefs, pursues symbolic violence as a method of total war in isolation from strategic considerations. The greatest concern is therefore that nuclear weapons may fall into the hands of military-based dictatorial regimes, or even terrorist organizations, which may have fewer scruples about using them⁸.

CBRN Non-Proliferation and Its Geopolitical Implications: Black Sea Security Case-Study

The CBRN non-proliferation policy still remains as a key geostrategic provision in current international security system. The policy is determined by the implications of the NPT legal framework. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has played a role in decelerating nuclear proliferation, particularly among developed countries that possess the financial and technological capability to develop atomic weapons. Even when the specific provisions of the NPT were not fully implemented, bilateral treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union helped to reduce tension and promote caution, which may have ultimately helped to bring about the end of the Cold War.

The Black Sea region is strategically located between Europe and Asia, with several countries bordering its shores. Black Sea region has seen conflicts in recent years, including the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 which raised serious concerns among other nations regarding territorial integrity/sovereignty issues impacting security across regions⁹. It is possible to identify a few key factors in terms of WMD proliferation threat from this regional perception. This area is interconnected and interchangeable with significant countries such as Russia, Turkey, Iran and NATO members like Romania, Bulgaria, and Ukraine. The Black Sea Region offers convenient access to transportation routes that connect different parts of the world. Unfortunately, this also means that there are significant risks associated with the smuggling and trafficking of advanced weapon technologies in the area. These threats must be taken seriously. Conflicts and escalations are frequent in this region. There is always a chance that incidents that escalate instability could lead to less effective countermeasures against WMD proliferation. In return, destructive outcomes and more tension could emerge within such

⁸ A. Heywood, *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, Washington 2011, p. 72.

⁹ M. Lancaster, *Troubled Waters – How Russia’s War in Ukraine Changes Black Sea Security*, NATO PA Defence and Security Committee Report, Brussels 2023, pp. 3-4.

scenarios. We should mention that multiple states have varying capabilities and resources needed for monitoring and managing sensitive material and technologies linked to WMD developments. Lack of adequately enforced regulatory frameworks, suitable governance mechanisms, and limited collaboration among governments increase risks of unchecked power dynamics that could cause long-term destabilization of security across regions.

The terms, hybrid threats and hybrid warfare/war are sometimes used interchangeably, which is one of the reasons why the concepts can appear confusing. In addition, the concepts have been examined through many different disciplinary lenses: international relations, strategic studies, security studies, military studies, history and political science to name a few. This multidisciplinary analytical mosaic also blurs the picture of what the concept of Hybrid Threats actually entail. In this report the concept of Hybrid Threats is used as an umbrella concept, while hybrid warfare/war is part of the activity occurring under the Hybrid Threats umbrella. Frank Hoffman, often regarded as the father of the hybrid warfare concept, has said that his formulation draws on several schools of strategic thinking, making the concepts (hybrid warfare and Hybrid Threats) intellectual synergies. Indeed, the concepts have evolved over time. In Hoffman's concept, which focused on non-state actors like Hezbollah and Al-Qaida, their tactical and operational military activities are directed and coordinated within the main battle space to achieve synergistic effects, and to include tactics used by transnational networks like transnational organized crime and state actors. At the time Frank Hoffman started to use the "hybrid warfare" label, it was only one of many labels, which also included "New Wars", fourth-generation warfare and asymmetric warfare amongst others¹⁰. These were being used by analysts to conceptualize changes in contemporary warfare in line with the idea that war had become "substantially distinct" from older patterns of conflict. There are plenty other concepts that describe new forms of conflict/warfare: "surrogate warfare", "grey zone activity", "raiding", "unrestricted warfare" (origins Chinese), "reflexive control" (origins Russian), "new generation warfare"(origins Russian), "competition short of conflict", "active measures" (origins Russian), "non-linear warfare", "asymmetric warfare", "compound warfare" "ambiguous warfare", "political warfare", "information warfare", "cyber warfare". All of these are trying to describe very similar actions than the hybrid threats concept – interventions and operations targeted against states and institutions with multiple means. The concept of hybrid threats, however, is the only one that raises the issue of systemic vulnerabilities of democratic systems as particular targets and clearly argues for

¹⁰ F. Hoffman, *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, Arlington Virginia 2007, pp. 19-20.

comprehensive approach with civil – military cooperation from the very beginning.

The concept of hybrid threats has been increasingly debated in the academic circles. A recent Google Scholar search for the terms Hybrid Threats and Hybrid Warfare produced roughly 9,990 results, with most publications - some 6,970 - produced since 2014¹¹. This is an indication that the hybrid threats concept is here to stay. But it does not mean that the concept is fully accepted and understood. In addition to the scientific and military context, the terms Hybrid Threats and hybrid warfare are also used in a political context which started with the annexation of Crimea in 2014. Political use of Hybrid Threats refers to manipulative, unwanted interference through a variety of tools: spread of disinformation/misinformation, creation of strong (but incorrect or only partially correct) historical narratives, election interference, cyber-attacks, economic leverage, to name just a few. Some of the activities may not even be illegal per se. Since Hybrid Threats are characterized as a combination of action, in academic analysis one action alone does not make the activity hybrid and in some cases even the threat aspect can be questioned. These actions and activities alone strictly speaking do not qualify them to be Hybrid Threats. However, they do belong to the landscape of Hybrid Threats. This means that as a political concept, Hybrid Threats can be seen as unacceptable foreign interference in sovereign states' internal affairs and space.

Hybrid Threat Perception and Strategic Stability at Global Level

Having considered how the strategic stability remains still unprecedented indication and only been determined in aegis of Cold War scenario. According to one of the definitions: Strategic Stability – is defined as a characteristic of deterrence based on mutual assured destruction and is measured largely in terms of the potential vulnerability of strategic force components, notably land-based missiles¹². In shifting drifts of contemporary international security system, strategic stability is being affiliated with new threat – hybrid threat modality. The one is shaping and making its contribution of true identity of the system.

The hybrid threats is a broad overarching concept that includes many types of activity: interference, influence, operations, campaigns and warfare/war. All of these activities can be seen as unwelcome interventions of one sort or another to a country's internal space. We need to keep in mind that the term

¹¹ O. Fridman, *Russian Hybrid Warfare: Resurgence and Politicization*, Oxford University Press, London 2018, pp. 23-25.

¹² J. Streinbrunen, *National Security and the Concept of Strategic Stability*, "Journal of Conflict Resolution" 1978, Vol. 22, No. 3, p. 411.

Hybrid Threats is a Western concept used to discuss a security dilemma that states face which either have a democratic state system or are in the democratization phase. This is how the context is framed in most of the Western literature relating to Hybrid Threats. The concept has penetrated to Russian and Chinese writings today, but they did not use the name “Hybrid Threats/Hybrid warfare” before it was widely discussed in the Western security debate. The characterization of Hybrid Warfare can be found in both the Russian and the Chinese literature. They claim that Western countries are using hybrid warfare against them. This claim is often done without giving a context, with strong support for the state’s official line. The references used from Western literature ignore the fact that the used references describe the action by a hostile actor against the Western countries. This fact is not mentioned.

The various academic sources identified three phases with different intensity of action and nature of the threat. This means that an escalation potential exists. These phases are explained later in this document. The activities and phases follow a rather conventional understanding, with slight modifications, of how a threat is constructed and how it might escalate. The activities and phases in themselves do not characterize a threat as hybrid, but they belong to the landscape of Hybrid Threats and are therefore also an integral part of understanding the nature of the threat element of Hybrid Threats. A major ongoing debate concerns old versus new ways of exerting interference and influence¹³. In this debate both, those that argue that there is nothing new relating to Hybrid Threats and those that see Hybrid Threats as a fully new security challenge, have a point. As Mikael Wigell, senior researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, has argued, “many scholars and analysts contest the utility of the hybrid label, criticizing it for conveying little that is new, for being imprecise, or outright misleading. The author called hybrid methods are used alongside more usual deterrence policies” coupled with the term ‘warfare’, critics warn, there is the danger of unnecessarily militarizing the language of international politics with potentially dangerous consequences”¹⁴. What this boils down to is bearing in mind that from the point of view of military-strategic thought, the analytical utility of the “hybrid warfare” concept is contested and, as a tool to analyze military capabilities, its usefulness is very limited.

In recent international politics remains very unstable and after switching again world order structure and percussion occurred in stability of the ongoing international security system. As it is perceived main missions of the

¹³ W. Murray, P. Mansoor, *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, Cambridge University Press, London 2012, pp. 56.

¹⁴ M. Wigell, *Hybrid Interference as a Wedge Strategy: A Theory of External Interference in Liberal Democracy*, “International Affairs” 2019, Vol. 95, Issue 2, p. 256.

international security as structural element of the global politics remain in avoiding wars and military conflicts and perceives of examining power capability. The definition “International Security” is being affiliated with the UN Charter.

Threat assessment criteria is being considered as the most prevalent academic instrument in reaching true realms of logics of international relations. In the 21st century threat identification has determined and transformed into concrete systematic modality. Having considering the “Copenhagen School” securitization concept where there are five ring of security provisions that are enlisted in the following way:

- Political Security;
- Military Security;
- Economic Security;
- Society Security;
- Environment Security.

Therefore with enumerating “five ring” provision in 20-21st century’s two academic sub-fields in international relations have been emerged. Namely, Strategic and Security studies as a whole, represented the most important contribution to the research of security issues in aegis of the political science. Even today, some authors consider them to be the only real research platform in the area of research of security¹⁵. In that manner is important of true classification of threat identification that could be clarified in manner of: threat-challenge-risk. However, the classification is still plausible and general and yet to have confirmed in academic and analytical methodology frame. Nevertheless, there are two types of the threat that is already identified but in general way – symmetric and asymmetric threats¹⁶.

Namely, military security dimension is more applicable for analyzing situation and importance of the region in aegis of international politics. Treating the region from the military perspective is necessary introduce a jargon “Geostrategic Gateway” – space or area vitally important from global security and military perspectives, like “southern limited flank” in aegis of the CFE Treaty of Istanbul OSCE Summit¹⁷. Relatively the Black Sea regional security is referred as “Geostrategic Gateway” mainly due to contemporary “New Cold

¹⁵ R. Ondrejcsak, *Introduction to Security Studies*, Centre for European and North Atlantic Affairs, Bratislava 2014, pp. 12-14.

¹⁶ E. Beraia, *The U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities in the Post-Cold War Period (1990-2016): Georgia’s Case from Transnational Challenges (Including Migration) towards Enhancing Institutional Transformation*, Ph.D. thesis at International Black Sea University (IBSU), American Studies Program, Tbilisi, Georgia 2017, pp. 67-68.

¹⁷ Author personal definition.

War” provision where a coercive competition between NATO and Russia for getting dominance over the Black Sea region.

Due to the strain relations between the West and Russia, from one standpoint an economic war between EU/USA and Russia via sanction policy level and a military confrontation between NATO and Russia via demonstration “military muscles” between competing forces. In that scope, mainly NATO-Russia military confrontation one of the dangerous “combat zone” is sought to be the Black Sea Basin and its littoral territories which is labeled as the “Black Sea Security Dimension”. The flawed geostrategic situation in the area is making possible to deteriorate geostrategic environment in the area further on and the indication derives from those actions taken by the Russian Federation incumbent authority.

Black Sea Regional Security Case-Study: as it is known, on July 27th 2015 a new naval doctrine was declared and later approved by the President of the Russian Federation. This document has identified new version or interpretation of the military doctrine that was approved by the National Security Council in December of 2015. The naval doctrine has identified strategic areas and basins, such as the Arctic and the so-called “Atlantic” direction, which includes the Black Sea basin. The doctrine also undermines the role of the fleet (both military and civilian), the shipbuilding industry, harbors and rigging infrastructure as priorities for the further development of Russia’s naval economy. How is seen based on these documents, Russia is trying position itself as a great power with ability to increase its military capability on the Caspian-Black-Mediterranean Seas axis. The center of this axis is the Black Sea, a basin from which NATO risks being excluded. The Russian policy-makers seek to regain its nation’s great power status-quo with domination in the basin with controlling three key points: Crimea, the mouths of the Danube and the Bosphorus. Having considered the latest events, Russia has partially achieved the strategic goals – first occupied and then annexed the Crimea and reinforced military positions and capabilities in the peninsula, with creation of so-called “Mediterranean Task Force’ within the Black Sea Fleet and detachment of combat ships and boats for the Mediterranean Sea and the Gulf region, Russia pursued getting its control Bosphorus (the Task Force was reinforced by the nuclear carried submarine “Rostov-on-Don”, which sailed from Novorosiisk to join the Force and equipped with newest strategic weaponry system “Kalibr” missiles)¹⁸. With this reinforcement naval forces, Russia is seeking to get under the control the third pillar – the mouth of Danube. However, in order to more reinforce its presence in the Black Sea

¹⁸ V. Maisaia, M. Beselia, *Asymmetrical Warfare Strategy and Its Implications to the Black Sea Regional Security in 21st Century: Non-State Aggressive Actors and Terrorism*, “Ante Portas – Security Studies” 2020, No. 2 (15), p. 73.

basin, the Russian authority announced that 30 new ships are to be supplied to the Black Sea Fleet, including six new frigates, six new submarines and other smaller vessels for naval landing. In addition to that the Black Sea Fleet will be reinforced its anti-access strategy (A2/AD) against NATO forces. Taking together all these factors, and precise attention to the regional security environment, if the Russian government completes its missions in that way how it prescribed in the naval doctrine, the Black Sea Fleet will have full control over the Black Sea by 2020. In that retrospective provision, the military balance at present time between the NATO and Russian forces decreased in proportion of 2:1 in favor to the NATO ones but in that reinforced conditions by 2020 the balance will be absolutely opposite in the same proportion but in Russia's favour. In that configuration, Georgia is in dangerous positions due to its littoral space and its unfrozen sea ports that Russia needs very badly¹⁹. Hence, Georgia is to be perceived new aggressive steps from the Russian authority after the Parliamentary elections, namely toward the ports directions. Hence, the Georgian government and society have to very attentive toward any provocations spurred from the Russian side.

Above-mentioned case are indicated on various approaches from conventional misbalance effect on strategic stability provisions and CBRN threat perception implications on contemporary international security environment. It is vivid scenario why it makes frangibility of security identification causing real risk and threat to strategic stability processes.

Conclusion

At time being, security has traced into global dimension determined by the Globalization phenomenon and acceleration of integration processes. Due to massive effect of threats and risks for Global Politics, a new definition of Global Security emerged in vocabularies of international relations and security studies. According to them, Global Security – is a security model that is implemented by the international and intergovernmental organizations and based on principles of international law principles and norms and backed on this background, the states, as international political actors, are obliged to comply with these ones, by keeping sovereignty untouchable and in case of its of violation take offshoot²⁰. Meanwile, the global threat could be emanated not only from states but also from such subjects yet to be identified as an international actors and even international law is useless in eradication ones and their behaves, like “DAESH” or even COVID-19 virus. Such precedents need more precise and deliberate approaches and analyses. Hence adaptation of

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 74-75.

²⁰ Author personal definition and term identification.

the field of study in Georgia and namely in CIU will promote development of research internationalization tool of the field and Georgia will take part in promotion of the academic field sophistication.

The modern international relations and security environment is characterized by many threats and challenges. This annual is a companion of the 21st century. Along with technological development, the rise of aggressive non-state groups, extremist forces, and individual terrorist groups have created many threats. Consequently, asymmetric threats are becoming more and more common. Important among them are threats from bioterrorism, which can lead to catastrophic consequences. It should be noted here that the risks and dangers arising from biological warfare pose significant threats and challenges to the international community and the entire world. Biological warfare and bioterrorism can destroy a large number of people and the biosphere in the shortest time and with minimal costs. All this is really a serious problem for global security. Based on all of this, it is necessary to actively develop international cooperation mechanisms to ensure a modern biosafety system. In the light of modern threats and challenges, it is very important to develop scientific research in the field of prevention and control of biological threats. Also, the most important issue is the activation of cooperation between states, regional and international organizations regarding the prohibition and control of biological weapons and the fulfillment of obligations.

One of the main events in modern international political developments is the military dimension of global security. Any state has at least two obligations towards its citizens: to ensure their *security* and create conditions for any citizen to increase their well-being (both material and spiritual). Security covers many aspects of public life and implies the neutralization of completely different types of dangers. This may refer to the physical rescue of a citizen and the protection of their life from a bandit attack or, say, protection from the encroachment of their life by the military force of another country. At the same time, the state must be able to protect its own institutions and the inviolability of the borders of the country, which is primarily carried out by using the military forces and capabilities of the country. In this regard, it is important to discuss a phenomenon in this context, which is an essential component of the security of a country, that is - military security. The term "military security" itself means the ability of a state to defend or prevent military aggression from another country (or countries)²¹.

²¹ V. Maisaia, A. Guchua, *NATO and Non-State Violent Religious Actors ("DAESH", "Al-Qaida" and "Taliban") – The Fourth War Generation Strategy and Geopolitical Aspects of Its Regional and National Security (2010-2019)*, Caucasus International University (CIU), Tbilisi 2020, pp. 10-12.

One of the important new dimensions of military security, which determines global and regional security conditions in the military-political context, is the term: “Geostrategic environment”. Under the auspices of the mentioned term, it is meant the combination of political, economic, socio-technological, and military factors that have a negative impact on the military security of the country. The components of the geostrategic environment are represented by three important things:

- Geopolitical transformation - the end of US hegemony and the development of a multipolar world order and the emergence of non-state actors or new centers of influence in it;
- Military-technical confrontation - considerable lag in the military potential of the Georgian Defense Forces in the field of offensive weapons and conventional weapons compared to neighboring countries;
- The new wave of military confrontation between the states, "arms race" - the development of the new "Cold War" and its epicenter in the Black Sea area.

It is also worth noting the fact that the modern geostrategic environment at the global level, which clearly experiences high turbulence, was formed after passing through certain evolutionary phases, within which the modern military strategic culture and art were formed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Books and articles:

1. Beraia E., *The U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities in the Post-Cold War Period (1990-2016): Georgia's Case from Transnational Challenges (Including Migration) towards Enhancing Institutional Transformation*, Ph.D. thesis at International Black Sea University (IBSU), American Studies Program, Tbilisi, Georgia 2017
2. Booth K., Wheeler N. J., *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2008
3. Buzan B., Waever O. De Wilde J., *Security, A New Framework For Analysis*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London 1998
4. Buzan B, Kelstrup M., Lemaitre P., Tromer E., Waever O., *The European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post-Cold War Era*, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, London 1991
5. Colletta N., *Promoting Interim Stabilization in Fragile Settings: From Theory to Practice*, [in:] *Stabilization Operations, Security and Development*, Routledge, London 2013
6. Chifu I., Sauliuc A., Nedea B., *Energy Security Strategies in the Wider Black Sea Region*, Editura Curtea Veche, Bucharest 2010

7. Dannreuther R., *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, second edition, Polity Press, UK 2017
8. Heywood A., *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, Washington 2011
9. Hoffman F., *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, Arlington, Virginia 2007
10. Fridman O., *Russian Hybrid Warfare: Resurgence and Politicization*, Oxford University Press, London 2018
11. Frank G., *CONTEST “An Evaluation of Revisions to the UK Counter-Terrorism Strategy with a Special Focus on the CBRNE Threat (ARI)”*, Real Institute Elcano, Madrid 2009
12. Kolencik M., *Crime Scene Investigation in a CBRN Context* ISEM Institute, New York 2021
13. Lancaster M., *Troubled Waters – How Russia’s War in Ukraine Changes Black Sea Security*, NATO PA Defence and Security Committee Report, Brussels 2023
14. Murray W., Mansoor P., *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, Cambridge University Press, London 2012
15. Maisaia V., Beselia M., *Asymmetrical Warfare Strategy and Its Implications to the Black Sea Regional Security in 21st Century: Non-State Aggressive Actors and Terrorism*, “Ante Portas – Security Studies” 2020, No. 2 (15)
16. Maisaia V., Guchua A., *NATO and Non-State Violent Religious Actors (“DAESH”, “Al-Qaida” and “Taliban”) – The Fourth War Generation Strategy and Geopolitical Aspects of Its Regional and National Security (2010-2019)*, Caucasus International University (CIU), Tbilisi 2020
17. “Munich Security Report 2018” – Munich Security Conference, Munich 2018
18. Ondrejcsak R., *Introduction to Security Studies*, Centre for European and North Atlantic Affairs, Bratislava 2014
19. Streinbrunen J., *National Security and the Conflict of Strategic Stability*, “Journal of Conflict Resolution” 1978, Vol. 22, No. 3
20. Wigell M., *Hybrid Interference as a Wedge Strategy: A Theory of External Interference in Liberal Democracy*, “International Affairs” 2019, Volume 95, Issue 2

Electronic Literature Source:

1. Abrams A., *Here’s What We Know So Far About Russia’s 2016 Meddling* published in “Times” on April 18, 2019, <<https://time.com/5565991/russia-influence-2016-election/>>
2. Barnes J., *Russian Interference in 2020 Included Influencing Trump Associates, Report Says*, published in “The New York Times” on March

- 16, 2021, <<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/16/us/politics/election-interference-russia-2020-assessment.html>>
3. Young K., *Shows How Russia's Election Interference Has Gotten More Brazen*, published in Special Report by Brennan Centre for Justice on March 5, 2022, <<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/new-evidence-shows-how-russias-election-interference-has-gotten-more>>
 4. *The UN Charter, Chapter One: Purposes and Principles*, <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/chapter-i/index.html>
 5. NATO parliamentary Assembly, Defense and Security Committee (DSC), *Troubled Waters-How Russia's War in Ukraine Changes Black Sea Security*, 2 May 2023. P. 4 <<https://tinyurl.com/2fcx62w2>>