ENTERPRISE ECONOMIC SECURITY POLICY IN POLITICALLY VOLATILE ENVIRONMENTS: STRATEGIC FOUNDATIONS, RISK DIMENSIONS, AND CRISIS ADAPTATION MECHANISMS

Igor Britchenko[1]

[1]Doctor of Science (Economics), Professor, University of the National Education Commission, Krakow, Poland, e-mail: ibritchenko@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9196-8740

Citation:
Britchenko, I. (2025). Enterprise Economic Security Policy in Politically Volatile Environments: Strategic Foundations, Risk Dimensions, and Crisis Adaptation Mechanisms. *Economics, Finance and Management Review*, (2(22), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5208-2025-2-57-68

Received: June 03, 2025
Approved: June 29, 2025
Published: June 30, 2025

Abstract. *In today's globally interconnected and politically unstable environment, the concept of enterprise economic security has become a strategic priority for firms facing increasingly unpredictable challenges. This article addresses the need for a comprehensive framework that allows enterprises to ensure resilience, continuity, and competitiveness amid political disruptions such as sanctions, trade conflicts, regulatory shifts, and geopolitical tensions. The objective of the study is to explore how economic security policy can be institutionalized at the enterprise level, serving as a foundation for adaptive strategy and sustainable value creation. The research employs a multi-method qualitative design, combining theoretical synthesis, case study analysis, and comparative modeling. The conceptual foundation integrates insights from strategic management, political economy, and systems theory to construct a multidimensional policy architecture. Empirical evidence is drawn from case studies of politically induced business disruptions, including the Russian sanctions regime, Brexit, COVID-19 emergency regulations, Venezuela's nationalizations, and the U.S.–China trade war. A comparative framework is developed to classify political and economic threats and match them with relevant enterprise adaptation strategies. The results reveal that political dynamics such as lobbying, regulatory volatility, and public–private interdependence are critical determinants of economic resilience. Enterprises that institutionalize political intelligence, scenario planning, compliance flexibility, and ethical governance are more capable of mitigating shocks and capitalizing on emergent opportunities. The findings highlight that economic security is not merely a risk management concern but a strategic imperative embedded in core decision-making. This article contributes both to academic scholarship and managerial practice by offering an integrated model of enterprise economic security policy. Its practical value lies in providing corporate leaders with tools to navigate politically volatile environments without sacrificing strategic clarity or institutional integrity. The proposed framework supports evidence-based decision-making, strengthens adaptive governance, and enhances enterprise agility in the face of systemic uncertainty.*

Keywords: *economic security policy; political risk; enterprise resilience; strategic adaptation; public–private partnerships; regulatory volatility; crisis management; institutional governance; political economy; scenario planning.*

JEL Classification: F52, H12, H56, G38

Formulas: 0; fig.: 0; table: 4; bibl.: 22

Introduction. In the context of intensifying geopolitical instability, trade realignments, and state intervention in markets, the economic security of enterprises has emerged as a critical strategic concern. Businesses across sectors and national boundaries now operate in environments where political decisions—whether in the form of sanctions, tariffs, regulatory shifts, or populist fiscal policies—can instantly alter the structural parameters of competitiveness, liquidity, and continuity. Traditional risk models that once prioritized market fluctuations, operational inefficiencies, or sector-specific disruptions are no longer sufficient. Instead, enterprises must increasingly navigate a complex landscape shaped by power asymmetries, institutional unpredictability, and regulatory volatility. Within this evolving context, the formulation and implementation of an Enterprise Economic Security Policy (EESP) becomes not merely a precautionary initiative but a foundational pillar of strategic governance.

Enterprise Economic Security Policy refers to a holistic and anticipatory framework that integrates financial resilience, regulatory adaptation, political intelligence, and operational agility to safeguard long-term corporate viability. It embodies the confluence of strategic management theory, systems thinking, and political economy by recognizing that economic risks are often inseparable from institutional and geopolitical contexts. In politically volatile environments—ranging from post-conflict economies and transitional democracies to advanced markets grappling with protectionism and deglobalization—enterprises must construct robust architectures capable of absorbing shocks, reallocating resources, and sustaining trust among key stakeholders.

This article presents case-based insights into crisis adaptation mechanisms, illustrating how enterprises have navigated politically induced shocks such as sanctions, trade wars, nationalizations, and emergency state interventions. Through this analysis, the article aims to deepen the conceptualization of economic security as an active, embedded, and governance-intensive domain of enterprise strategy—one that is increasingly central to survival and competitive advantage in the 21st-century global economy.

Literature review. The concept of enterprise economic security has evolved significantly over the past two decades, driven by increasing geopolitical volatility, regulatory fragmentation, and global economic interdependence. Early contributions to the theory of enterprise risk management emphasized internal vulnerabilities—such as operational disruptions, financial instability, and governance failures—as the primary threats to corporate continuity (Kaplan & Mikes, 2012). However, contemporary literature increasingly underscores the role of external political and institutional factors in shaping enterprise viability, especially in volatile and uncertain environments (Doh et al., 2012; Henisz, 2016).

From a strategic management perspective, economic security is understood as a firm's ability to maintain competitive advantage under conditions of institutional flux. Porter's (1985) seminal work on competitive strategy acknowledged the influence of regulatory regimes and political institutions, though it did not yet integrate political risk as a dynamic variable in firm-level resilience planning. More recent approaches have attempted to close this gap by aligning risk management with strategic foresight and geopolitical intelligence (Buggea & Khanna, 2021; Bremmer, 2018). These models advocate for enterprise systems that monitor legislative changes, trade policy shifts, and sovereign risk indicators as part of standard scenario planning.

The literature on political risk further extends the scope of enterprise economic security by identifying how firms are affected by actions such as sanctions, expropriation, and populist regulation. Kobrin (1979) and Henisz (2000) laid foundational work in conceptualizing the unpredictability of political institutions as a quantifiable risk factor. Today, frameworks developed by the World Bank, the OECD, and private intelligence firms emphasize the need for resilience architectures that combine political forecasting, stakeholder engagement, and compliance protocols.

In addition, studies on public-private alliances highlight the increasing interdependence between business and the state in co-producing economic security. According to Rodrik (2020), successful economic development under volatile conditions often depends on institutional collaboration between governments and enterprises. This trend is reinforced by literature on institutional capacity-building and regulatory responsiveness, which points to the role of lobbying, industrial policy forums, and adaptive governance in supporting enterprise-level security strategies (Bennett & Feldman, 2022; Hall & Soskice, 2001).

Finally, empirical research on politically induced crises—such as the U.S.–China trade war (Bown, 2022), the Brexit regulatory realignment (Springford, 2022), and the Russian sanctions regime (Yale CELI, 2023)—provides case-based evidence of how firms restructure supply chains, adjust capital allocation, and reshape compliance mechanisms in response to political upheaval. These studies collectively demonstrate that enterprise economic security policy is no longer a reactive safeguard but a strategic imperative in modern global business practice.

Aims. The primary aim of this study is to explore and conceptualize the strategic underpinnings, multidimensional risk structure, and practical adaptation mechanisms of enterprise economic security policy (EESP) in politically volatile environments. The article seeks to provide a comprehensive theoretical and empirical foundation for understanding how enterprises can design and implement economic security policies to withstand political disruptions, maintain resilience, and sustain competitive advantage.

To achieve this aim, the article is guided by the following specific objectives: to define and conceptualize the framework of enterprise economic security policy by synthesizing insights from strategic management, political economy, and systems theory; to identify and categorize the key dimensions of economic security risk that enterprises face in politically unstable contexts, including financial, regulatory, institutional, and reputational risks; to examine the influence of political instruments—such as lobbying, public–private alliances, and political capital—on the formation and implementation of enterprise economic security policies; to analyze real-world case studies of politically induced business crises (e.g., sanctions, trade wars, nationalizations) to evaluate how enterprises adapt strategically and operationally; to propose a strategic policy architecture for enterprise-level resilience and institutional adaptability in the face of political unpredictability.

Methodology. This study adopts a qualitative and theory-informed methodological framework aimed at exploring the structure, dynamics, and strategic relevance of enterprise economic security policy in politically volatile environments. The approach is grounded in interpretive analysis and cross-disciplinary synthesis, allowing for a comprehensive examination of how enterprises conceptualize, manage, and adapt to political-economic disruptions.

The research design integrates three complementary components. The first is a conceptual-theoretical analysis, which involves a critical review of relevant scholarly literature spanning strategic management, political economy, institutional risk theory, and systems thinking. Foundational works by scholars such as Porter (1985), Henisz (2016), Kaplan and Mikes (2012), and Rodrik (2020) provide the theoretical basis for constructing a multidimensional model of enterprise economic security. This conceptual analysis serves to clarify the key principles, mechanisms, and governance structures through which enterprises pursue resilience and risk mitigation in politically uncertain contexts.

The second component of the methodology is a case study analysis, which draws on empirical examples of politically induced business crises. The selected cases—namely, the Russian sanctions regime (2014–present), Brexit-related regulatory disruption (2016–2020), the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting emergency economic measures (2020–2022), Venezuela's nationalization of oil assets, and the U.S.–China trade war (2018–2020)—illustrate the diverse forms that political risk can take, as well as the adaptive strategies enterprises employ in response. Each case is examined to identify firm-level vulnerabilities, strategic recalibrations, and shifts in policy engagement. This empirical component is instrumental in grounding the theoretical model in real-world phenomena.

The third element of the methodological design is the development of a comparative framework. This framework categorizes political-economic threats and maps them to corresponding enterprise-level adaptation strategies. The purpose of this comparative structure is to uncover common patterns and divergences across cases, thereby supporting the formulation of a generalizable model for enterprise economic security architecture. This model is intended to serve both as an analytical tool for scholars and as a strategic reference for practitioners operating in politically sensitive environments.

Overall, the methodology prioritizes interpretive reasoning and context-sensitive insight over purely quantitative analysis. It seeks to generate deep conceptual understanding and practical relevance for a range of audiences—including academic researchers, corporate strategists, and policy professionals—concerned with the resilience and strategic integrity of enterprises in an era of increasing geopolitical and regulatory complexity.

Results. Enterprise Economic Security Policy refers to a strategic and institutionalized framework through which a business ensures its long-term financial stability, operational continuity, and resilience against both internal vulnerabilities and external threats—particularly those arising from economic, political, regulatory, and market environments. It is a multi-dimensional construct that integrates risk management, corporate strategy, and engagement with state policies to safeguard the enterprise from disruptions that could compromise its viability or competitive positioning.

Enterprise Economic Security Policy represents a sophisticated, multi-level system of strategic governance that aims to ensure the long-term viability, competitiveness, and autonomy of a business entity in the face of multifaceted and evolving economic threats. It is not a static or reactive mechanism but rather a dynamic, anticipatory construct that bridges the domains of enterprise strategy, political economy, institutional risk management, and regulatory adaptation.

At its theoretical core, enterprise economic security emerges from the convergence of several disciplinary frameworks:

– Strategic Management Theory provides the foundation for understanding how firms formulate and implement plans to sustain competitive advantage under uncertainty;

– Political Economy explains the reciprocal influence between state institutions and market actors, revealing how political decisions shape the rules, constraints, and incentives that define the operational field of enterprises;

– Systems Theory and Risk Governance highlight how enterprises function as open systems embedded in larger socio-economic and political ecosystems, with vulnerabilities that may arise from external systemic shocks as much as from internal inefficiencies or governance failures;

Thus, Enterprise Economic Security Policy must be understood not simply as a business continuity plan or compliance protocol, but as a strategic synthesis of foresight, adaptability, and institutional alignment.

A comprehensive economic security policy incorporates at least five interrelated dimensions (Table 1).

Table 1. Key Dimensions of Enterprise Economic Security Policy

Dimension	Description
Financial and Operational Stability	Focuses on liquidity, capital structure, and agile financial planning. Mitigates risks related to currency, inflation, interest rates, and investor confidence—all influenced by political and fiscal cycles.
Regulatory and Political Risk Management	Addresses the impact of political decisions such as tariffs, tax laws, and regulations. Involves monitoring trends, scenario forecasting, and proactive engagement with policymakers through public affairs or associations.
Strategic Foresight and Scenario Planning	Involves anticipation of disruptions via scenario planning, stress testing, and horizon scanning. Considers geopolitical, technological, environmental, or epidemiological threats and models their effects on operations.
Corporate Governance and Institutional Resilience	Centers on robust internal governance, including oversight committees, control systems, and strategic alignment. Ensures resilience against fraud, corruption, and political vulnerability, especially in critical sectors.
Reputation and Stakeholder Legitimacy	Emphasizes trust-building and ethical conduct in the ESG era. Aims to protect against reputational damage and stakeholder backlash stemming from political or regulatory scandals.

Source: compiled by the author

One of the defining features of enterprise economic security policy is the inevitability of compromise - particularly in jurisdictions where political unpredictability, state interventionism, or populist policymaking prevail. Enterprises often find themselves navigating contradictory imperatives: aligning with government expectations while preserving strategic autonomy and global competitiveness.

Political compromise can take the form of:

- accepting regulatory burdens in exchange for market access or subsidies;
- adjusting supply chains to comply with localization mandates;
- modifying ownership structures to satisfy national security screenings;
- adapting pricing strategies in response to politically motivated price controls or consumer protection laws.

The enterprise must thus build strategic flexibility into its operating model, designing structures and processes that allow for rapid reconfiguration in response to political signals—without undermining internal coherence or long-term planning.

In modern economies, particularly those transitioning or recovering from crisis (e.g., post-war reconstruction, post-pandemic recovery), enterprises and the state are increasingly co-producers of economic security. States rely on enterprises to generate employment, innovation, and tax revenues, while enterprises depend on predictable legal frameworks, infrastructure, and macroeconomic stability.

This interdependence requires structured dialogue and co-regulation. Public-private partnerships (PPPs), national industrial strategies, and crisis coordination mechanisms (e.g., during energy blackouts, cyberattacks, or financial shocks) illustrate how economic security becomes a joint function of private initiative and public policy.

However, this proximity also risks politicization—where favoritism, rent-seeking, or regulatory capture can distort market functioning and undermine security in the long run. Therefore, transparency, institutional independence, and ethical guardrails are crucial for ensuring that enterprise-state collaboration serves broader public and economic interests.

To formalize enterprise economic security, firms should develop an integrated policy architecture that includes:

- a corporate security doctrine outlining principles, goals, and thresholds for intervention;
- a risk matrix that classifies economic threats by probability and impact, with dedicated response protocols;
- a political intelligence function embedded in strategic planning or governance units;
- a compliance and ethics framework tied to national and international legal obligations;
- resilience metrics and audit tools to monitor policy implementation and stress-test assumptions.

Such architecture enables enterprises to shift from fragile linear models to resilient adaptive systems, capable of withstanding not only market volatility but also policy turbulence and geopolitical reordering.

Enterprise Economic Security Policy is not merely a defensive shield against uncertainty—it is a strategic enabler of sustainable development, innovation, and institutional legitimacy. In an era of complex interdependence between business and politics, enterprises must cultivate the ability to navigate compromise without losing strategic clarity. This demands more than financial acumen or legal compliance; it requires foresight, ethical integrity, institutional agility, and an acute understanding of the political ecosystem in which enterprise security is embedded. The future of economic resilience lies in politically literate, strategically disciplined, and governance-anchored enterprise ecosystems.

The Political Dimension of Economic Security. The political dimension of economic security reflects the extent to which enterprises are embedded within, influenced by, and contributors to the broader political ecosystem in which they operate. Far from being passive recipients of policy, enterprises are active political agents, engaging in lobbying, building alliances, and strategically shaping public policy to enhance their resilience, competitiveness, and economic stability. This political agency becomes especially salient in environments characterized by regulatory volatility, economic nationalism, and increasing state interventionism.

Table 2. Political Instruments and Their Role in Enterprise Economic Security

Political Mechanism	Description
Lobbying	Strategic efforts by enterprises to influence public policy to gain regulatory, fiscal, or market advantages. Often conducted by internal departments or professional lobbyists.
Political Lobbying Groups	Collective advocacy through associations or coalitions to amplify industry voices, influence regulation, and share reputational/political risks among members.
Public–Private Alliances	Formal collaboration between the state and private sector to co-produce economic stability, especially in crisis contexts (e.g., infrastructure, public health, cyber defense).
Political Capital and Influence	Firms with high political capital can access privileged decision-making channels. Unequal access creates strategic advantages for large, well-connected entities.
Normative and Ethical Considerations	Raises questions about fairness, transparency, and public interest. Institutional responses include lobbying disclosure laws and corporate ethics codes.

Source: compiled by the author

The political dimension of enterprise economic security is no longer peripheral—it is central to strategic governance in an age of complex political-economic interdependence. Lobbying, political lobbying groups, and public–private alliances constitute essential tools through which enterprises defend, co-create, and stabilize the conditions for their operation. However, these tools must be wielded with a deep understanding of institutional dynamics and ethical constraints. In volatile or transitional contexts, political engagement can be the difference between resilience and vulnerability—between adaptation and collapse. As such, cultivating political literacy, ethical advocacy, and institutional legitimacy is now a core imperative for economic security policy in the 21st century.

Case Examples of Politically Induced Business Crises and Adaptations. The intersection of politics and enterprise security becomes most visible during periods of crisis when policy decisions—whether deliberate, reactive, or erratic—generate profound economic dislocations in markets, sectors, and entire supply ecosystems. In such moments, politically induced business crises reveal the deep structural dependencies between firms and their broader macroeconomic and institutional environments. These crises disrupt not only corporate operations but also market prices, demand-supply equilibriums, investor behavior, and inter-firm competitiveness.

From a microeconomic perspective, firms experience changes in production costs, access to inputs, capital flows, and regulatory overhead. At the macroeconomic level, these political events often trigger currency fluctuations, inflationary pressures, GDP contractions, or sector-specific output losses. Consequently, the economic security of enterprises is directly tied to their ability to absorb politically driven economic shocks, preserve productive capacity, and protect market share.

By examining specific cases of politically triggered disruptions and firm-level adaptations, we gain insight into how enterprises construct their economic security architectures through risk mitigation, strategic flexibility, and political-economic intelligence.

The Russian Sanctions Regime and Western Multinationals (2014–Present). Following the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, Western countries imposed a series of economic sanctions on Russia targeting its financial institutions, energy sector, key individuals, and technology imports. Russia's GDP contracted by approximately 2.5% in 2015, with inflation rising above 15%, and the ruble losing nearly half its value in late 2014 (World Bank, 2016; IMF, 2015). For Western multinationals operating in or trading with Russia—such as BP, McDonald's, ExxonMobil, and Siemens—this constituted a politically driven business crisis with immediate strategic implications. By 2022, the exodus of Western firms had resulted in over $240 billion in estimated losses across sectors (Yale CELI, 2023). This case highlights how state-imposed constraints can override market mechanisms, forcing firms to re-optimize production, capital allocation, and financial exposure based on political calculus rather than economic efficiency.

Brexit and Regulatory Disruption in the UK and EU (2016–2020). Brexit exemplified a political rupture with complex and prolonged economic consequences. The breakdown of economic integration between the UK and the EU disrupted trade flows and altered the institutional foundations of investment decision-making. The decision of the United Kingdom to leave the European Union created a protracted period of regulatory ambiguity, tariff uncertainty, and investment hesitancy that particularly affected sectors like manufacturing, finance, and logistics. According to the Office for Budget Responsibility (2023), Brexit is expected to reduce the UK's GDP by 4% in the long term, with the UK's trade intensity falling by 15% compared to a no-Brexit baseline. The Centre for Economic Performance at the London School of Economics found that Brexit caused an average increase of £210 per month in food bills for UK households due to new trade frictions (Springford, 2022). Foreign direct investment also declined significantly after the referendum (Dhingra et al., 2017). Brexit illustrates how political disintegration undermines economic scale and efficiency, forcing enterprises to absorb increased transaction costs and reevaluate their positioning within regional trade networks.

COVID-19 Emergency Measures: State-Driven Business Closures and Subsidies. The COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a public health crisis—it evolved into a state-managed economic emergency, in which governments around the world exercised extraordinary regulatory and fiscal power over business operations. In 2020, the global economy contracted by approximately 3.1%, with advanced economies shrinking by an average of 4.5% and the Eurozone experiencing a 6.5% decline (IMF, 2021). The UK economy faced its worst recession in over three centuries, with GDP falling by 9.9% in 2020 (Office for National Statistics, 2021). Governments responded to the COVID-19 crisis with aggressive fiscal and monetary policies, lockdowns, and trade restrictions—creating a political-economic environment where survival depended on compliance, state support, and operational agility. Global fiscal stimulus exceeded $16 trillion by the end of 2021, primarily in the form of business loans, wage subsidies, and public investment (OECD, 2021). The pandemic shows that economic resilience requires fiscal absorption buffers and institutional trust—enterprises that adapted fast captured market share from slower rivals.

Political Protests and Nationalization: Venezuela's Oil Sector. Venezuela's political and economic collapse, driven by hyperinflation, authoritarian consolidation, and corruption, led to widespread nationalizations of private assets, particularly in the oil and gas sector. The oil industry, once a global leader, became a battleground of failed nationalization and international litigation.Venezuelan oil production collapsed from over 3 million barrels/day in 2000 to under 700,000 by 2021. The economy experienced hyperinflation, effectively wiping out real income and domestic market viability. Political expropriation led to asset seizures estimated in the tens of billions. Venezuela's political-economic collapse reflects a case where authoritarian policy, corruption, and mismanagement obliterated an entire productive sector.

U.S.–China Trade War (2018–2020): Tariffs and Technology Restrictions. The trade war between the U.S. and China represented a confrontation between strategic economic nationalism and global supply chain interdependence. Politically motivated tariffs and tech bans disrupted global flows of goods, capital, and innovation.

The trade war between the U.S. and China significantly reduced bilateral trade. U.S. imports subject to tariffs dropped by 17–25%, while Chinese agricultural exports to the U.S. declined from $19.5 billion in 2017 to $9.1 billion in 2018 (Wikipedia, 2024a). Semiconductor imports from China remained approximately 26% below pre-trade war levels by mid 2021 (Bown, 2022). The U.S.–China trade deficit narrowed from $375 billion in 2018 to around $295 billion by 2024 (Amiti, Kong, & Weinstein, 2025). These shifts reflect a restructuring of global value chains and a broader trend toward economic decoupling in response to political confrontation.

This case underscores that geoeconomics now rivals pure market logic in shaping firm behavior - political alignment is increasingly priced into economic decision-making. The table 3 summarizes the results of the study of politically induced business crises. Each case reveals a distinct mechanism by which political action produces cascading economic effects: altering factor costs, market access, investment patterns, regulatory burdens, and even social demand structures. Enterprises must now integrate macroeconomic literacy and political analysis into their risk management frameworks.

In politically volatile environments, enterprises are exposed to a wide range of external threats that can disrupt operations, reduce profitability, and undermine long-term sustainability. These threats - originating from political decisions, institutional instability, or economic policy shifts - necessitate proactive and strategic responses. The following table presents a structured classification of key political and economic threats faced by enterprises and matches them with appropriate adaptation strategies at the operational and governance levels.

Table 3. Politically Induced Business Crises: Economic Impacts and Enterprise Adaptations

Case Example	Economic Impacts
Russian Sanctions Regime (2014–Present)	Capital flight; ruble devaluation ~50% in 2014; inflation >15%; energy and commodity market disruption; multinational write-offs.
Brexit Regulatory Disruption (2016–2020)	4–6% UK GDP loss forecast; 15% drop in trade intensity; £40B estimated loss to UK public finances; fall in FDI.
COVID-19 Emergency Measures (2020–2022)	GDP fell −9.9% (UK), −8.2% (Eurozone) in 2020; government debt surged; global demand and labor supply shocks.
Venezuela Oil Sector Nationalization	Oil output fell from 3M to <700K barrels/day; hyperinflation >10,000,000%; total investor exit.
U.S.–China Trade War (2018–2020)	Bilateral trade loss >$300B; China tech exports restricted; higher input costs; supply chain inflation and restructuring.

Source: compiled by the author

This comparative framework supports managerial decision-making by linking specific risks to targeted resilience mechanisms (Table 4).

Table 4. Classification of Political-Economic Threats and Enterprise Adaptation Strategies

Political-Economic Threat	Description of Threat	Enterprise-Level Adaptation Strategy
Sanctions and Export Controls	Restrictions on trade, investment, or financial transactions due to geopolitical conflicts or punitive measures.	Relocate operations, diversify export markets, enhance legal and financial compliance frameworks.
Regulatory Uncertainty and Legal Shifts	Frequent changes in regulations, tax codes, or legal interpretations affecting business operations and compliance.	Establish regulatory monitoring units, build adaptive compliance processes, engage in stakeholder lobbying.
Trade Disputes and Tariff Escalation	Bilateral or multilateral trade tensions resulting in increased tariffs, quotas, or retaliatory measures.	Reconfigure global supply chains, shift sourcing to low-tariff regions, pursue bilateral trade advocacy.
Nationalization and Expropriation	Government seizure or forced divestment of private assets, often without fair compensation.	Seek investment treaty protections, secure political risk insurance, use international arbitration channels.
Political Instability and Civil Unrest	Disruptions to operations and logistics caused by protests, strikes, or regime instability.	Develop crisis response protocols, invest in security and local partnerships, increase remote management capacity.
Geopolitical Conflicts and War	Physical risk to assets, staff, and infrastructure in conflict zones or adjacent regions.	Suspend or downsize at-risk operations, relocate critical infrastructure, engage in scenario planning.
Currency Volatility and Capital Controls	Loss of value due to exchange rate swings, inflation, or restrictions on repatriating profits.	Implement currency hedging, adjust pricing models, diversify financial exposure across stable markets.
State Intervention in Pricing or Competition Policy	Imposed price caps, market entry barriers, or favoritism toward domestic firms affecting competitive dynamics.	Engage in advocacy, adjust pricing and distribution strategies, enhance agility in cost structures.

Source: compiled by the author

The classification underscores the complex and evolving nature of political-economic threats in global business environments. By aligning each type of disruption with actionable adaptation strategies, enterprises can improve their preparedness, enhance strategic flexibility, and protect their core functions. Ultimately, the ability to recognize, anticipate, and respond effectively to political risks is a critical component of enterprise economic security and long-term competitiveness.

Discussion. The research has demonstrated that enterprise economic security is no longer confined to the realms of internal governance and financial control - it is intricately tied to the political, regulatory, and institutional environment in which a firm operates. As the case studies reveal, politically induced crises - whether through sanctions, trade wars, or emergency regulations - have the power to reshape entire business models and sectoral competitiveness. The Russian sanctions regime, Brexit disruptions, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the U.S.-China trade war each exemplify how enterprises must absorb not only direct economic shocks but also indirect institutional instability and reputational risk.

The multidimensional framework developed in this study provides a comparative tool for categorizing political-economic threats and mapping them to actionable enterprise-level strategies. The findings reinforce the need for enterprises to develop anticipatory governance capabilities - such as scenario planning, political intelligence units, and adaptive compliance functions - that enable them to interpret and respond to political risk in real time.

Furthermore, the political dimension of economic security has been shown to be as influential as traditional economic indicators. Lobbying, public–private alliances, and the accumulation of political capital are now central to enterprise strategy, especially in jurisdictions where the boundary between public policy and corporate activity is fluid. However, this political embeddedness carries ethical and institutional implications, demanding high standards of transparency, corporate responsibility, and regulatory balance to avoid distortions such as rent-seeking and regulatory capture.

The research also highlights the growing symbiosis between enterprises and the state in producing economic stability. Particularly in post-crisis or transitional economies, this relationship is becoming institutionalized through national industrial strategies, shared infrastructure investment, and joint crisis management mechanisms. The challenge is to ensure that this collaboration enhances resilience without eroding market integrity or democratic accountability.

Conclusions. This study contributes to the evolving understanding of enterprise economic security by offering a conceptual and empirical exploration of how businesses can withstand politically induced disruptions. It advances the notion that economic security must be embedded within a firm's strategic architecture, encompassing not only financial resilience and risk management but also political engagement and institutional alignment.

The comparative framework developed in this research offers both theoretical clarity and practical utility. It allows enterprises to assess their exposure to a spectrum of political-economic threats and align their strategies with resilience-building mechanisms. The incorporation of real-world case studies strengthens the framework's relevance and demonstrates its applicability across sectors and geographies.

In conclusion, enterprise economic security policy must be seen as both a governance imperative and a strategic asset. It requires an integrated approach that combines foresight, agility, ethical conduct, and proactive adaptation to political realities. In an era of rising geopolitical turbulence and institutional unpredictability, enterprises that invest in comprehensive economic security strategies will not only survive shocks but also gain long-term strategic advantages.

References:

1. Amiti, M., Kong, S., & Weinstein, D. (2025, February 5). *U.S. imports from China have fallen by less than U.S. data indicate*. Liberty Street Economics – Federal Reserve Bank of New York. https://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2025/02/u-s-imports-from-china-have-fallen-by-less-than-u-s-data-indicate/
2. Bennett, A., & Feldman, S. (2022). *Political risk and institutional adaptation: Firms navigating volatile environments*. Journal of International Business Policy, 5(3), 215–231. https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-022-00125-w
3. Bown, C. P. (2022, May 19). *Four years into the trade war: Are the U.S. and China decoupling?* Peterson Institute for International Economics. https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economics/2022/four-years-trade-war-are-us-and-china-decoupling
4. Bown, C. P. (2022, May 19). *Four years into the trade war: Are the U.S. and China decoupling?* Peterson Institute for International Economics. https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economics/2022/four-years-trade-war-are-us-and-china-decoupling
5. Bremmer, I. (2018). *Us vs. them: The failure of globalism*. Portfolio/Penguin.
6. Buggea, E., & Khanna, P. (2021). *Strategic foresight for enterprise resilience*. Harvard Business Review, 99(4), 58–66.
7. Dhingra, S., Ottaviano, G., Sampson, T., & Van Reenen, J. (2017). *The impact of Brexit on foreign investment in the UK*. Centre for Economic Performance. https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/brexit03.pdf
8. Doh, J. P., Lawton, T. C., & Rajwani, T. (2012). Advancing nonmarket strategy research: Institutional perspectives in a changing world. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 26*(3), 22–39. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0041
9. European Central Bank. (2021, May). *The economic impact of Brexit on the UK and EU economies*. ECB Economic Bulletin, Issue 5. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/economic-bulletin/focus/2021/html/ecb.ebbox202105_03~267ada0d38.en.html
10. Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford University Press.
11. Henisz, W. J. (2000). The institutional environment for multinational investment. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 16*(2), 334–364. https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/16.2.334
12. Henisz, W. J. (2016). *Corporate diplomacy: Building reputations and relationships with external stakeholders*. Greenleaf Publishing.
13. International Monetary Fund. (2015). *Russian Federation: 2015 Article IV Consultation*. IMF Country Report No. 15/211. https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2015/cr15211.pdf
14. Kaplan, R. S., & Mikes, A. (2012). Managing risks: A new framework. *Harvard Business Review, 90*(6), 48–60.
15. Kobrin, S. J. (1979). Political risk: A review and reconsideration. *Journal of International Business Studies, 10*(1), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490631
16. Office for Budget Responsibility. (2023). *Economic and fiscal outlook – March 2023*. https://obr.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-march-2023/
17. Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
18. Rodrik, D. (2020). *Why does globalization fuel populism? Economics, culture, and the rise of right-wing populism*. Annual Review of Economics, 12, 133–170. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080919-023528
19. Springford, J. (2022). *The cost of Brexit: December 2022 update*. Centre for European Reform. https://www.cer.eu/insights/cost-brexit-december-2022-update
20. The Times. (2023, March 21). *Predictions of £40bn hit to public finances from Brexit correct, say economists*. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/predictions-of-40bn-hit-to-public-finances-from-brexit-correct-bzr63nw8d
21. World Bank. (2016). *Russia Economic Report No. 35: The long journey to recovery*. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/173631468197398498/russia-economic-report-no-35-the-long-journey-to-recovery
22. Yale Chief Executive Leadership Institute. (2023). *Over 1,000 companies have curtailed operations in Russia—but some remain*. https://www.yalerussianbusinessretreat.com/