

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCEPT

Colonel Professor Daniel DUMITRU PhD*

Lieutenant-Colonel Ciprian-Laurențiu FERARU PhD candidate**

Abstract: *The paper is the result of scientific research on the evolution of the concept of security (national security). The paper/article highlights: the stages of the evolution of the national security concept; security definitions and national security; the components of national security.*

Keywords: *national security; security concept; national security concept; constituents of the national security.*

In some areas of interest around the world there are manifestations that run counter to the climate of normality, to the mankind development. In order to settle the conflict situation, it is necessary to involve the institutions with security responsibilities. Thus, the assistance of the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the North Atlantic Alliance, the European Union or other organizations is required.¹

The contemporary world has various notions and concepts about security. The famous sociologist Abraham Maslow, in his famous pyramid of needs, has considered and placed the need for the individual's security immediately after the biological needs, other important needs referring to the freedom of doing anything without disturbing the vital space of the person next to you, the freedom of expression, the freedom of being informed.

The primary definition of *security* is that of “*being sheltered from any danger; the feeling of confidence and tranquillity that one gives to the absence of any danger. Protection, Defense*”².

* “Carol I” National Defense University

** PhD candidate to the “Carol I” National Defense University

¹ Teodor Frunzeti, Vladimir Zodian, *World 2007. Political and Military Encyclopedia*. CTEA Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, p. 29.

² Romanian Academy, *The Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, Bucharest, 2009.

As a current approach, *“the field of security is an intellectual construction that must be understood from the historical perspective of ideas and requires a multidisciplinary attempt”*³.

Other authors consider that *“... the approach to security should be accomplished from a systemic perspective. Security being recognized as a multidimensional and interdisciplinary concept..., while collective security is defined as a state of relations between states created by the adoption of common defense measures against aggression”*.⁴

Worldwide, it is accepted that security is the concept of normality *“... in which all states of the world are sheltered from any aggression, act of force or threat in relations among them, from any attempt to their independence and sovereignty or their territorial integrity”*⁵.

European security is a complex relational phenomenon that takes into account the shaping of complex and efficient mechanisms of the European states' interstate relations meant to preserve the fundamental values of the states and the level of civilization established in Europe⁶.

These phrases include an operational expansion, but also a conceptual delimitation of the notion of security in various fields: global, national, collective etc.

British political scientists use the term *“security and protection system”*, which means: *“all means and apparatus designed to protect individuals and property against a wide range of unpredicted events, including crime, fire, accidents, espionage, sabotage, subversion, unprovoked attack”*.⁷

According to this approach, there is a range of possible and probable events, which have varying degrees of certainty. Thus, security is defined by the opposite of the term (by insecurity), namely through an antinomy,

³ Delacourt Barbara, *Théories de la sécurité*, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 2008, p. 2.

⁴ Benone Andronic, Eugen Siteanu, *National Security, Collective Security, Global Security*, Course, “Carol I” National Defense University Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, pp. 11;12.

⁵ *Collection of terms, concepts and notions of reference in the fields of military policy, national security and armed defense*, Military Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000, p. 245.

⁶ Mircea-Dănuț Chiriac, Emil Ion, Daniel Dumitru, *Political and Security Organizations and Institutions*, “Carol I” National Defense University Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, pp. 50-51.

⁷ Eugen Bădălan, Vasile Bogdan, *Security Organizations and Structures*, CTEA Publishing House, Bucharest, 2016, pp. 26-27.

because it is associated with the state of insecurity.

Therefore, the British concept of security is *“the condition of being protected from danger or not at risk; feelings of safety or freedom in the absence of a threat such as terrorism”*⁸.

Consequently, we consider that *“Security should not only be understood as military, as it cannot be just economical; but it cannot belong to a single nation”*⁹.

Security can be materialized on four levels (content rings) with the following content: *“the first - individual security (asserting and guaranteeing human rights), the second - collective security (the establishment of peace and stability of states), the third - collective defense (the states provide joint defense to outside aggressions) and the fourth - promotion of stability (using international policies)”*¹⁰.

Generally, security as a concept can be identified as both the socio-state transposition of the individual security concept correlated with a certain type of behaviour, as well as an essential and universal condition for the internal and external harmony of the human being. The concept of security covers both a dynamic of conflict and of harmony. *“In security science, what security stands for one side, insecurity stands for the other side and vice versa. So we cannot speak of security science because it would mean not to comply with a principle of law mentioned here, but the science of security and insecurity or the science of security and non-security.”*¹¹ Thus, speaking of war and peace in this world (as in the past), they interpenetrate, even mingle, substitute, undermine each other, betray, but continue to sit at the same table of the world and divide the causes, effects and particularly the benefits. According to our calculations, in 60 years of peace - since the last great world war until 2006 - there have been 727 years of crises, armed conflicts and wars¹².

⁸ Concise Oxford English Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 1301.

⁹ Culda Lucian, *Geopolitica Review*, no. 1/2003, p. 108.

¹⁰ Tohănean Dorin, *Foreign policy – Key Factor of the Security Equation*, “Henri Coandă” Air Force Academy Publishing House, Bucharest, 2014, p. 49.

¹¹ Eugen Siteanu, *Theory of Security and Insecurity, (Part I)*, Article in the Military Sciences Review, no. 4/2017, p. 34.

¹² Gheoghe Văduva, *Security and Defense*, Article in the Military Sciences Review, no. 3/2017, p. 15.

Given that there are significant differences, we present only a few of them, considered among the most significant (Table 1)

No.	AUTHORS	DEFINITIONS
1.	Giacomo Luciani	<i>National security is the ability to resist to any foreign aggression</i>
2.	Franck N. Trager and F.N. Simonie	<i>National security is that part of government policy that has as central objective the creation of national and international conditions favourable to the protection and expansion of national vital values against existing or potential opponents</i>
3.	Barry Buzan	<i>National security is the ability of a nation to successfully pursue its national interests, as it conceives, anywhere in the world</i>
4.	Arnold Wolfers	<i>Objectively, security measures the absence of threats to its own values; subjectively, it denotes the absence of fears that they would be threatened</i>

Table 1. Several definitions of national security.

A closer analysis of the latter definition reveals that it appears to present fewer structural problems and is therefore more easily quantifiable than the others. In fact, this conceptual delimitation requires two clarifications:

The first one would be the destination of security as a reference term (*individual, state, region, etc.*) and the second involves specification of the reference sector (*economic, political, social, etc.*). Indisputably, the concept relates to the threat-vulnerability binomial. The national security strategy of a state largely responds to the evaluation of this binomial, which ultimately makes its effectiveness conditional. The point is that while it is relatively easy to assess vulnerabilities, threats are more difficult to assess, having complex, variable, difficult to quantify valences.

Volatility of perception, evolving over a wide range among subjective and objective perceptions, determines the impossibility of knowing in absolute terms if an entity is truly threatened. On the other hand,

the actors' tendency on the political scene to exaggerate or minimize the true threat pose, depending on their temporary political interest, may create false impressions of the validity or invalidity of a real threat. Moreover, the perception of the threat, when the threat becomes more and more certain, can affect the economic and social actors' judgment capacity, thus leading to inadequate response or even lack of response.

Consequently, for a coherent, real and rational approach to the state-level vulnerability-threat binomial, appropriate instruments of bivalence should be found and used, and it is necessary to dissociate the so-called *normal* challenges of the anarchic international system from those aimed at a particular state, in general.

To refer to national security, we need to refer to the priority sectors of the state, distinct from the abstract perspective, but interdependent in reality: the economic, political, military, social and environmental sectors, which are, in fact, the vectors of increased vulnerability of this.

Political security is related to the ideological, institutional and physical stability of the state.

Social security covers maintaining, within acceptable conditions of progress, of the culture, traditional language, religion and national identity, as well as the traditional customs of a country.

The *military security* binomial represents the general state of confidence and tranquillity of a nation, a state generated by the establishment and maintenance of military protection measures that ensure national inviolability against hostile acts of military aggression¹³. At the same time, it is necessary to bear in mind that "*The phenomenon of security and insecurity is unique, namely there is only one phenomenon in which the sum of security and insecurity is always equal to 1 (100%).*"¹⁴

Economic security is determined by the capacity of a state to accede to the strategic resources necessary for its functioning, as well as the easy access to the markets necessary for maintaining and developing its economic power.

Environmental security refers to the quality of the biosphere as a necessary condition for providing a healthy life to the population.

¹³ JP 1-02, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Washington, DC, 8 November 2010, as amended through 15 January 2016.

¹⁴ Eugen Siteanu, *Quoted op.*, p. 37.

Sector approach was one of the first methods used to develop security analysis. Each sector approached brings a substantial and particular contribution to overall security, and the nature and value of threats affect the security of the state-actor in a particular manner. The sectors are not subsystems, but rather represent a kind of analytical lenses by which the scientific researcher looks at and analyzes the state of the whole system by means of that specific reference. Furthermore, the sectorial approach allows for an in-depth view through that lens. Ultimately, the sectorial approach largely allows controlling as many variables as possible.

However, it should be pointed out that in order to achieve objective results, all relevant sectors need to be analyzed: a national security approach in a reductionist manner, at only one level or only one prism is not enough, the inter-sectorial relationships that are inherently indispensable, leading as an absolute necessity to address all relevant sectors to reach the final set, sectors and levels of analysis being nothing but analytical *synapses*.

In this context, the security function can be given the following definitions: *“The security function (S) is the probability that a state / organization / system etc. operates without insecurity events in a period of time and under certain historical circumstances.*

Another definition: The security function is a parameter that measures the likelihood that the organization / state / system will perform its function / mission within a time frame, without insecurity events (representing actions to destabilize the organization / state / system which is removed from its normal operating state so that it can no longer fulfil (at the required performance level) one or more of its functions. These are quantitative definitions of the security function.¹⁵

To conclude, for an effective security analysis, the analysis should be organized in a *spatial* system, that is, divided into several components: vertical (*the level of analysis*), horizontal (*the analyzed sector*) and temporal (*the analyzed time period, with an effect on evolution dynamics*). As the level does not present problems or pitfalls, we will now detail the sectors mentioned above.

The political sector. The political sector can be broken down into two dimensions: a higher dimension and a lower one. The first dimension refers to the international political system (*unity-interaction-structure*), while the second

¹⁵ Eugen Siteanu, *Quoted op.*, p. 38.

concerns the domestic, state dimension. The limits of national security are determined by reference to the anarchic structure* of the international system. Each state evolves within the international system, being in turn structured in correlation with this system. States interact in the international environment, hence being influenced by the competition. International anarchy is supported by various ideas that govern state views, these ideas aiming at adequately organizing the life and the internal political system on a wide range of alternatives, from democratic to dictatorial, with different degrees of religious influences. Opposites can even perceive each other as a threat to their own existence**.

The organizational stability of the governing system and the ideology on which it is based are the political security key factors.

The social sector. Social security is closely linked to political security. Collectiveness, which generally covers the entire nation of a state, is in fact the true object of national security. The two classic threats to social security are extreme immigration or nationalism, viewed as factors of social disintegration. For example, the current situation on the refugee crisis heading towards Europe, this massive migration which may jeopardize over time the European societies and values unless appropriate measures are found to address the causes of this massive migration, also unless immigrants already arriving on the European territory are not integrated if settling in the European Union. Migration flows, unless stopped, the number of which is becoming more and more significant, are quite important and pose a risk to the labour market and common European identities.

Extreme nationalism can have even more serious consequences than migration and can be used by extreme-right ideologies in connection with immigration and potential security problems for a nation's citizens, even though deliberately omitted that modern states have been formed through massive immigration***. One must not forget the complicated situation in Kosovo, when the issue of social security has degenerated to the level of regional security.

** An example is Iran and the USA, which crystallize the concept of a democratic-liberal state against an authoritarian-theological state. Another example: South Korea versus North Korea, capitalism / communism.

*** See SUA and Canada.

The military sector. Obviously, a high defense capacity implicitly leads to the achievement of the military security objective, but it should be stressed that military security can and must be achieved only in a systemic, interdependent framework, together not only with the secondary elements of national security, as well as those of an economic, social, political, technological and environmental nature.¹⁶ We assess that the key components of a state are the political, informational, economic and military components. Although each of them has a different weight in the total equation, it is essential that their manifestation be integrated, since the achievement of that status can only be achieved by the conjugated and balanced operation of these elements.

The military power of a state, both conventional and especially nuclear, is a basic indicator of the power of that state, and is an extremely important asset against a wide range of possible threats or aggressions, but it should be noted that *“military security is not only providing the inviolability and territorial integrity of a state, but also protecting its citizens against military violence, living and living conditions”*¹⁷.

The main trends affecting the international security environment - globalization, the active competition between world powers already affirmed or emerging, the fragmentation of states in the context of local revolutions or conflicts, the international bodies' lack of capacity to exercise total control or an effective influence on important issues – determine absolute, stringent needs for adjustment to new strategic realities by adopting coherent and consistent national policies able to address the new types of threats. For this purpose, it is necessary to make political-military decisions based on the new leadership patterns of national security. *„ Assessing the security environment at the beginning of the 21st century, as well as the increasingly complicated and multifaceted interactions between the international scene actors in the process of finding a new state of equilibrium indicates that the national security management becomes an increasingly complex process, a structure made up of very different components but which must, however, be perfectly combined. A very important aspect of this vast scheme is represented by the intelligence*

¹⁶ National Defense Strategy of the Country for the period 2015-2019, Bucharest, 2015.

¹⁷ Mihail Ionescu, *“After Hegemony”*, Scripta Publishing House, Bucharest, 1993.

analysis for security information, which has to fit into a new managerial paradigm able to ensure performance of the national security system."¹⁸

The current phenomenon of gradual increase in security risks is mainly generated by the interference of regional security and economic interests, the intensification of extremist, fundamentalist or radical sideslips, as well as the possible changes in the energy architecture or the dependence of some states on these energetic resources necessary for development.

The economic sector. *Economic security* is a situation where risks and threats do not reduce the level and efficiency of the national economy (*access to resources, markets and capital, etc.*). It should also be underlined that the economic status of a state is an essential condition of military and political security.

There is no real consensus on what really represents *economic security*. The market, as it is known, operates according to the risk principle. In no other area, the existence is so brutal, risky, aggressive and uncertain, in other words, in order to function effectively, the actors of the economic scene are subject to the pressure of competition and the fear of losing the pace of economic life. Competition and lack of security are the essence of the capitalist market. If insecurity is part of the normal state, what threats can be considered as *factors of national economic insecurity*? In fact, it is necessary here that the objective understanding of who and who plays on the national economic scene allows to reveal the complexity of establishing the economic security criteria.

It is also difficult to assess the extent to which international companies affect or may affect the national economy and the extent to which the various import / export duties or quotations of the main currencies on the market can affect the domestic economy of a state. Even though the factors presented above may be extremely damaging to the health of a state's economy and may lead to serious imbalances in the balance of payments or the unemployment situation, they are just relatively *normal* risks of games that take place daily, usually aggressive, on the domestic economic market of the states.

Undoubtedly, as the economy is one of the most important components of a state's power, its weakening is, in turn, an equally

¹⁸ Daniela Golea, Andrei Ștefan, *The Need for Managerial Patterns of National Security*, Article in the Military Science Review, no. 2/2016, p. 105.

important threat to the security of that state. Cuts or budget constraints imposed on certain areas such as national defense, health or education may, as a rule, lead over time to a low influence on the international political or economic scene. Economic forecasts are often circumstantial and nothing more. Claims for securing the future of a state according to so-called fair predictions are commendable, but there are and can only remain forecasts, thus possible subject to errors and changes.

The environmental sector. The main threats distinguished on the environment can be divided according to nature, or according to two broad categories: natural threats and artificial threats.

Threats for natural reasons are the inherent risks to our planet's *biology* (such as landslides, earthquakes, floods, etc.). We assess that only those in the category of "natural disasters" and these only in some potentially aggravating circumstantial situations, namely events of a great extent, can highly affect national security. The possibilities to counteract these threats are relatively limited in many situations, but measures can be adopted to mitigate their consequences.

Artificial threats are those threats created by and through the direct and visible influence of intensive human activities (greenhouse effects, ozone degradation, increased sea and ocean levels due to global warming, etc.). This type of threats affects world security, but may in some cases have a direct influence on national security in the following particular cases:

- If a state develops the technological capabilities needed to manipulate effects for its own benefit, those who may be adversely affected may feel threatened;
- In the case of a nuclear war, the planet's ecosystem will be touched by prolonged winter;
- If a state needs to rationalize water resources, it could use military means to protect it.

Although the sectorial analysis of national security is a useful analytical tool for determining the issues related to it, the instrument does not provide the share of the elements analyzed in the general framework. For an objective analysis, the researcher must pay attention to all the elements of each sector under consideration, the establishment of weight centres and their importance in the final equation as key elements for a result closest to reality. For this, we find it useful to use the definition given

by Wolfers^{****}. From an objective point of view, the definition defines the absence of threats to the mentioned values; from a subjective point of view, it considers minimizing the danger that affects these values. In other words, security is in close interdependence with the actors' actions upon the physical world. Then, the ontology of international relations is particularly a subjective construction. Furthermore, without any doubt, the epistemology of this sphere of reflection (on international relations) is constituted by social practices, which leads to the conclusion that there is also a substantial link between epistemology and politics.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *** *Collection of terms, concepts and notions of reference in the fields of military policy, national security and armed defense*, Military Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000.
- *** *National Defense Country Strategy for 2015-2019*, Bucharest, 2015.
- *** *The Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, Bucharest, 2009.
- ANDRONIC B., SITEANU E., *National Security, Collective Security, Global Security*, Course, "Carol I" National Defense University Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, p. 21.
- BĂDĂLAN E., BOGDAN V., *Organizations and Security Structures*, CTEA Publishing House, Bucharest, 2016.
- CHIRIAC M.-D., ION E., DUMITRU D., *Political and Security Organizations and Institutions*, "Carol I" National Defense University Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007.
- Concise Oxford *English Dictionary*, Eleventh Edition, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- CULDA L., Article, *The Geopolitica Review*, no. 1/2003.
- DELACOURT B., *Théories de la sécurité*, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 2008.

**** In an objective sense, security measures the absence of threats addressed to personal values; in a subjective sense, it denotes the absence of fears that they would be threatened.

- FRUNZETI T., ZODIAN V., *The World 2007. Political and Military Encyclopedia*. CTEA Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007.
- GOLEA D., ȘTEFAN A., *The Need for Managerial Patterns of National Security*, Article in the Military Science Review, no. 2/2016.
- IONESCU M., *“After Hegemony”*, Scripta Publishing House, Bucharest, 1993.
- JP 1-02, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Washington, DC, 8 November 2010, as amended through 15 January 2016.
- SITEANU E., *Theory of Security and Insecurity, (Part I)*, Article in the Military Sciences Review, no. 4/2017.
- TOHĂNEAN D., *Foreign policy – Key Factor of the Security Equation*, “Henri Coandă” Air Force Academy Publishing House, Bucharest, 2014.
- VĂDUVA G., *Security and Defense*, Article in the Military Science Review, no. 3/2017.

