Iulia BULEA (1)
Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania
Andreea DRAGOMIR (2)
Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

THE EXPANSION OF THE SECURITY CONCEPT AND THE NEW CONFIGURATIONS OF GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY

Abstract:	*This article examines how the idea of security has continued to grow in response to the intricate realities of a world that is changing quickly and becoming more interconnected. Security, which has historically been defined in terms of state sovereignty and military defense, has expanded to include more aspects such as social cohesion, environmental balance, human well-being, and access to vital resources. To move from reactive, protectionist approaches to integrated and preventive strategies, the paper looks at how public institutions and global civil society have adjusted to this conceptual shift.* *The analysis, which draws from theoretical frameworks like the securitization theory of the Copenhagen School, emphasizes how threats are evolving and are no longer just interstate conflict but also institutional collapse, economic crises, health emergencies, climate change, and disinformation. Furthermore, the need for multi-sectoral policies and transnational cooperation is highlighted by the blurring of the boundaries between domestic and international security. This study highlights the function of public institutions in promoting social discourse, civic duty, and resilience in addition to upholding order. The paper concludes by advocating for a rethinking of the security paradigm that considers the various demands of modern global societies and harmonizes institutional reforms with democratic ideals.*
Keywords:	**Human Security; global civil society; securitization; institutional adaptation; multidimensional threats**
Contact details of the author:	**E-mail:** iulia.bulea@ulbsibiu.ro (1) andreea.dragomir@ulbsibiu.ro (2)
Institutional affiliation of the author:	**Lucian Blaga University, Faculty of Law** (1) (2)
Institutions address:	Calea Dumbrăvii No. 34, Sibiu, Romania, 550324, 0269233295, https://drept.ulbsibiu.ro/, drept@ulbsibiu.ro

Introduction

It is a well-established fact that the realities of the world are rapidly changing, and interdependencies between societies are increasing. As a result, the key concepts through which we understand the world must also be rethought. A re-evaluation of old paradigms is therefore necessary, with security - once a term almost exclusively associated with armed conflicts - now at the center of extensive and nuanced debates. This paper explores how the perception of security has evolved, highlighting that the perspective reflecting the current world is different. In the past, the dominant vision of security was shaped almost exclusively from the standpoint of state interests, largely ignoring the needs of individuals. The focus was on defending borders and military response capabilities, while aspects related to the everyday life of citizens were treated as secondary or irrelevant to overall security. This perspective changed radically after the end of the ideological confrontation between East and West, which opened the path to the reinterpretation of threats and the redefinition of the involved entities. Nowadays, internal instability, institutional failure, lack of access to essential resources, or ecosystem degradation are the main ways that threats appear rather than international conflicts. These days, a society's capacity to give its members a stable, just, and

sustainable living environment is directly related to its level of security. This entails maintaining a clean environment, a tolerant atmosphere, a good educational system, and operational infrastructure.

While traditional national security emphasizes the protection of state sovereignty and territorial integrity against external threats, human security shifts the focus to safeguarding the vital freedoms and dignity of individuals. As outlined in the UNDP Human Development Report 1994, human security encompasses freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity, addressing risks such as poverty, disease, and environmental degradation that transcend national borders[1].

The concept of human security refers to ensuring an overall state of protection for individuals against major threats affecting their life and well-being. Among the most frequent risks are lack of access to food, health problems, and armed conflicts. This form of security also aims to defend the person against various undesirable situations in daily life, such as medical conditions, workplace accidents, or incidents in public spaces. Human security represents a phenomenon made up of multiple dimensions: economic security, food security, health protection, ecological balance, personal integrity, public order, and political stability[2]. The theoretical model advanced by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, influential theorists in the field of international relations, known primarily for their contributions to the development of security theory from an extended and constructivist perspective, has made a major contribution to broadening the concept of security. In this same vein, according to them, not only armed forces or external conflicts define risk, but any element perceived as a serious threat to an entity, whether it is a state, a community, or a collective identity. When a problem is viewed as threatening to the existence or regular operation of a system in public and political discourse, it acquires security dimensions. In this logic, threats can arise from a variety of sources: economic collapse, political chaos, climate crises, loss of social cohesion, or widespread disinformation[3].

However, the expansion of the security concept has not been without critique. Scholars such as Roland Paris (2001) and Stephen Walt (1991) have argued that a too-broad definition of security risks dilutes the analytical clarity and strategic focus necessary for effective policymaking[4]. The integration of development goals, environmental protection, and human rights under the security umbrella could, paradoxically, weaken state institutions' ability to prioritize imminent threats[5].

Another important trend is the dissolution of the rigid boundaries between what was once labeled as "internal security" and "international security." Contemporary realities - such as global communication networks, cross-border mobility, trade flows, or mass migration - have made it impossible to maintain strict compartmentalization. A political disturbance in an unstable region can trigger chain reactions that affect entire continents, influencing social and economic communities outside the original space. Thus, the security of a nation can no longer be analyzed in isolation but only about global dynamics.

Additionally, at the heart of the new security paradigm is the idea that protecting the individual is closely linked to general integrated adaptability. Environmental issues, unequal access to resources, systemic discrimination, or frequent violations of fundamental freedoms generate tensions that, without adequate management mechanisms, transform into crises with regional or global impact. Human security, in this sense, is a concept that targets both personal well-being and the general conditions of coexistence in society. Furthermore, maintaining peace in the modern world requires not only the absence of armed conflict but also investments in development, equal opportunity, intercultural communication, and open governance. Lack of these elements exacerbates instability and impairs communities' ability to react to crises, from food shortages and pandemics to cyberattacks or the collapse of financial markets.

Therefore, security must be understood as a network of interdependent factors that influence the collective ability to maintain a stable climate. This includes protecting the state from aggression and protecting people from

---

[1] Gerd Oberleitner, *Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?*, "Global Governance", Vol. 11, No. 2, 2005, pp. 185-203

[2] Dan Victor Cavaropol, *Human Security – Modern Concepts and Approaches*, "Journal of the Academy of National Security Sciences", No. 1, 2016, p. 137

[3] Ionel Stoica, *The Temptation of Migration: Necessity and Opportunity in a Globalized World*, Military Publishing House, Bucharest, 2011, pp. 126–127

[4] Stephen M. Walt, *The Renaissance of Security Studies*, "International Studies Quarterly", Vol. 35, No. 2, 1991, pp. 211-239

[5] Roland Paris, *Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?*, "International Security", Vol. 26, No. 2, 2001, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3092123, pp. 87–102

poverty, marginalization, abuse, or resource exploitation. A contemporary vision of security requires an integrated approach, where solutions are built through transnational cooperation, non-discriminatory policies, and a profound understanding of the transformations shaping the current world[1].

Civic Participation and Social Reorganization in Contemporary Democracies

The initial analysis of social movements from the perspective of Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action does not explicitly identify a direct link between them and the affirmative dimension of modern civil society. Habermas focuses more on defensive reactions against the dysfunctions and forms of alienation produced by the institutions of advanced modernity. The omission of the central concept of "voluntary association" in the theoretical structure of civil society leads to a fragmented representation of social movements, treating them merely as responses to normative decline and the cultural fragmentation brought about by modernization processes.

In the absence of a contemporary conceptualization of association as an intermediary form between the individual and institutional systems, the perspective on how emerging solidarities, both intra and intergroup, contribute to the formation of new identity configurations and the revitalization of public life is lost. This absence dilutes the utopian potential of civil society, reducing it to an abstract ideal, lacking concrete applicability in current democratic processes. It is only in his political writings from the 1980s that Habermas reconsiders this vision, assigning social movements a proactive role in shaping an extended public sphere. He recognizes their capacity to challenge forms of institutional domination and to contribute to the democratic reconstruction of the public space at all social levels. In this logic, movements become agents of generating new forms of shared life, where dialogue, participation, and cooperation replace the functional logic of systems based on money and power. The COVID-19 pandemic vividly illustrates the multidimensional nature of contemporary security[2]. Beyond the immediate health crisis, it triggered economic downturns, social polarization, and governance challenges globally, highlighting the necessity for integrated responses that combine healthcare, economic stabilization, and public trust-building. Similarly, the mass displacement caused by the war in Ukraine emphasized the role of civil society networks in providing humanitarian aid and advocating for refugee rights, embodying the practical application of a human security framework[3].

Habermas subsequently proposes a vision of self-reflexive democracy, in which the plurality of civil associations can modulate the decision-making processes of the state and economy, without undermining the autonomy of these subsystems. However, the fundamental challenge lies in identifying the influence of these associations on the functionally differentiated subsystems, without them being absorbed or subordinated to the logic of bureaucracy or market imperatives.

The ability of the state to further its own objectives and affect the balance of power, both locally and globally, is referred to as its power. The traditional conceptualization of the structure of power relations is still typified by Cardinal Richelieu's vision, which is based on the importance of national interest (raison d'État). Like this, political theory has frequently linked the concept of security to conflict as well as social development dynamics, occasionally incorporating it into the framework of contractual relationships between the state and its citizens in the form of an agreement intended to maintain law and order and collective defense[4]. However, this vision opens the way for a theoretical-practical reconstruction of civil society, which involves surpassing the simplistic opposition between the system and the lifeworld. A complete identification between "civil society" and the "lifeworld" is not necessary to understand the dual political role of an analytical democracy: on the one hand, the ability to exert pressure on state institutions and the market, and on the other hand, the institutionalization of collective gains obtained through civic involvement.

In this framework, three major areas of tension emerge: between the radical rejection of the system and the strategies of transformation based on critical autonomy and democratic responsibility; between informal civic networks and organized structures that can influence power only through bureaucratic mechanisms; and, last but not

---

[1] Mihai Marcel Neag, *Ensuring Human Security, Volume I – The Role of Security Institutions and Civil Society*, Sitech, Craiova, 2010, p. 384

[2] WHO, *COVID-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response Plan,* 2021, https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-strategic-preparedness-and-response-plan-operational-planning-guideline (22.04.2025)

[3] UNHCR, *Ukraine Situation Flash Update* (2022–2023), https://data.unhcr.org/en/situations/ukraine (22.04.2025)

[4] Mihaela Istrate, *Security – A Multidimensional Concept*, "Human Rights Journal", No. 2, 2013, p. 31

least, between the social and the political dimensions, i.e., between community organization and the decision-making apparatus of the state. Our political position seeks to formulate a coherent response to these antinomies. We have argued that a civil society with a high degree of self-reflexivity, anchored in the dialogue between theory and collective experience, can generate sustainable strategies for a self-limiting participatory democracy. In relation to Habermas's abstract theory, this approach requires the introduction of bridge concepts that correlate institutional analysis with emerging social realities. The issues become more acute when considering the classic dilemma formulated by Robert Michels: how can social movements avoid oligarchic drift once they enter the institutional logic of the state or economy? Indeed, they risk reproducing exactly those power structures they contest, becoming captured by the imperatives of efficiency and control. However, a reconfiguration of the concept of "victory" for movements - not as the final achievement of goals, but as the sustainable democratization of norms, values, and institutions - offers a more realistic and adaptable perspective. In this framework, rights become the institutional foundation of an active and resilient civil society. It is not the disappearance of social movements that is problematic, but the absence of a legal and cultural configuration that supports the emergence of new forms of civic organization. The rights won in the past - from those of workers to civil and cultural rights - have served as starting points for new claims. However, the current context demands a new set of rights that reflect the complexity of the interaction between citizens, the state, and the economy in globalized societies.

These new privileges should not only contribute to limiting the uncontrolled expansion of system logic in the civil space, but also to articulating "detection mechanisms" capable of indirectly influencing communication structures. The third tension mentioned earlier, between society and politics, thus becomes the most difficult to overcome. Radical self-limitation is sometimes confused with the abandonment of any attempt to democratize the state or economy. In this regard, post-Marxist positions that promote complete separation from the system prove limiting.

Without the extension of democracy into the spheres of governance and production, even the most participatory civil associations remain vulnerable to the dominant logic of the two subsystems. Therefore, projects for radical differentiation must be reevaluated. Habermas himself has been criticized for granting the state and economy too much autonomy without formulating concrete means by which democratic will can influence these closed subsystems. Our proposal aims to overcome this theoretical impasse. The differences between the system and the lifeworld are preserved at the analytical level, but they must be supplemented by an understanding of the interdependence between the different types of social action: instrumental, strategic, communicative, and normative. There is no insurmountable theoretical obstacle that forbids the infiltration of communicative logic into state institutions or the economy. On the contrary, practices already reflect this trend: co-determination, collective bargaining, local participatory democracy, or participatory budgeting initiatives.

Therefore, the democratization of economic and political institutions does not contradict the need for functional performance; on the contrary, they can coexist through the configuration of hybrid spaces, where decision-making mechanisms are responsive to civic initiatives. The market economy is not purely functional, and universities or other educational institutions, for example, can become either instruments of the market or bastions of civil society, depending on how they are organized and governed. The central issue becomes that of inserting the public sphere into the decision-making structures of the state and economy, without eliminating systemic logic but articulating it with networks of communication, deliberation, and civic association. The debate on the desired forms of democratization must remain sensitive to systemic needs but should not abandon the imperatives of freedom and participation. Contemporary crises, including those affecting the welfare state and the prosperity of the global market, increase the urgency of redefining these relationships. Rights are shields against abuse and tools for creating effective forms of participation and justice. In this perspective, the reconstruction of civil society represents both a theoretical task and a historical and political necessity.

Changes in the Perception of Legitimacy in Digitalized Environments

Between the extremes of absolute anarchy and an Orwellian oppressive universe, it is necessary to identify proportions that promote the utilization of human potential within a framework of extended freedom, while also ensuring that this does not lead to the disintegration of social or communal unity. This state must be adjusted in such a way that it supports the fulfillment of the human condition, where the rationality of action is a constitutive element

of its essence.[1] The development of human societies has never followed a linear and predictable trajectory; it has always manifested through alterations of balance and imbalance, progress and regression, stability and crisis. Contemporary social reality is shaped by a succession of sudden transformations and unpredictable phenomena, reflecting the profoundly dynamic and often contradictory nature of human organization. In this context, moments of stability are often interrupted by systemic asymmetries that generate multiple tensions — economic, political, cultural, or security-related - amplifying individual and collective vulnerabilities. Recent history shows that instability is not an isolated accident, but a constant feature of societal functioning, manifested through complex crises and recurrent conflicts. However, these dysfunctions must be perceived as manageable realities through adaptive interventions, integrated public policies, and effective prevention mechanisms. They are not inevitabilities. A deep understanding of the processes that generate social insecurity and institutional fragility is essential[2].

In this context, the capacity of social systems to anticipate, absorb, and adapt effective responses to external shocks becomes a key indicator of their long-term sustainability. At the same time, the intersection of new technologies, global mobility, and climate challenges radically redefines traditional concepts of public order and national security.

In the era of invisible infrastructures, social, economic, and political interactions are filtered and reconfigured through digital networks that transcend physical space and destabilize the traditional boundaries of authority. The emergence of a global digital ecology - a dynamic ensemble of platforms, algorithms, communication protocols, and social networks - generates a new and unpredictable distribution of power. Unlike classic models of authority that operated within geographically and institutionally bounded frameworks, this new form of organization produces decentralized forms of influence, where source code, software architecture, and infrastructural logic become vectors of decision-making and social control. The ability to shape information flows, to hierarchize the visibility of discourses, or to contour affective environments through algorithmic design is not only an extension of the communicative space but a profound transformation of the normative environment.

Manipulation of Public Perception through Digital Platforms

Digital ecology introduces a distributive form of governance, where non-state actors - tech corporations, developer communities, decentralized networks - influence norms of coexistence and mechanisms of public legitimacy. Thus, the logic of power no longer operates solely through coercion or legal authority, but through the infrastructural mediation of behaviors and perceptions. The 2016 U.S. presidential elections and the Brexit referendum exposed the vulnerabilities of democratic systems to algorithmic manipulation and information warfare conducted through social media platforms. According to Freedom House (Freedom on the Net 2023), the proliferation of disinformation campaigns orchestrated by both state and non-state actors has eroded public trust in institutions and contributed to social polarization, illustrating the urgent need for enhanced digital governance and cybersecurity measures within the framework of human security[3].

Beyond the erosion of democratic legitimacy through disinformation, a deeper transformation affects the structural conditions of public participation.

This mutation radically redefines the conditions of possibility for democracy. The digital public space does not function as a neutral extension of the deliberative sphere, but as a field of forces in which political visibility, social validation, and the ability to coagulate solidarities are influenced by opaque technical factors. The logic of platforms - with its focus on engagement, virality, and retention - often favors forms of hyperpolarized and affective discourse, marginalizing the complexity of rational argument. In this framework, representation becomes unstable, and collective will risks being dissociated from the classic mechanisms of democratic decision-making.

At the same time, new forms of digital aggregation - hashtag-based movements, viral campaigns, or decentralized activism networks - introduce a new political temporality: one that is accelerated, discontinuous, and

---

[1] Bogdan Ştefanachi, *Human Action and Its Rational Limits: Some Considerations on Economy, Freedom, and the Individual*, ”Human Rights Journal”, No. 1, 2023, https://revista.irdo.ro/english/index-arhiva.php?anul=2023&nr_revista=1&semestrul=1&limba=engleza, p. 8

[2] Mircea Mureşan, Gheorghe Văduva (Eds.), *Crisis, Conflict, War, Volume I: Defining Crises and Armed Conflicts in the New Configuration of National and International Network Philosophy and Structure*, Carol I National Defence University, Bucureşti, 2007, p. 9

[3] Freedom House, *The Repressive Power of Artificial Intelligence,* ”Freedom on the Net 2023”, https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2023-10/Freedom-on-the-net-2023-DigitalBooklet.pdf p. 5

often fragmented. Instead of stable and institutionalized solidarities, fluid forms of mobilization emerge, capable of exerting symbolic pressure but difficult to transform into structural change. Thus, the tension between the emotional intensity of online participation and the consistency of offline organization becomes a major challenge for the democratic configuration of the present.

Algorithmic Governance and the Challenges of Artificial Intelligence

In addition to these fragmented mobilizations, the advent of artificial intelligence raises further concerns regarding the transparency and accountability of decision-making processes.

Moreover, the proliferation of artificial intelligence and decision-making automation raises the issue of a new form of institutional opacity: the algorithmic one. Predictive models used in justice, credit, hiring, or surveillance redefine the distribution of social risk without being subjected to clear mechanisms of democratic control or public accountability. In this context, rights can no longer be understood solely as tools of defense against human abuse, but also as forms of protection against autonomous technical structures that can produce exclusion and systemic discrimination in the absence of deliberate intent.

The reconfiguration of power in hyperconnected societies involves not only a redistribution of influence but also a resizing of the political imagination. Democratic practices must respond to the challenges of a world where digital infrastructure becomes the primary arena of symbolic conflict, and individual autonomy is filtered through interfaces, default settings, and coding logics. In this sense, digital ecology is not merely an environment for expression, but a battleground for defining norms, visibility, and legitimacy in the contemporary world.

The Role of Public Order and Safety Institutions in the Context of Expanding the Concept of Security

When we discuss human security, we refer to several important aspects. From the perspective of the objectives pursued, it serves both an explanatory role, providing an analytical framework, and an applicative one, through the development of concrete policies and initiatives. Programmatic interventions complement existing tools and strengthen efforts to achieve sustainable development goals. Such initiatives are designed in collaboration with the targeted communities, helping individuals identify their own needs and sensitive points. In this way, the developed strategies become more efficient, leading to real progress toward sustainable development[1].

The opening of a new stage in the evolution of contemporary society brings to the forefront the tension between the legacy of nation-states and the necessity of structures adapted to global interdependence. The genesis of this dualism is found in the cultural transitions of early modernity – the Renaissance, humanism, and anti-authoritarian currents – which strengthened respect for individual autonomy and, by extension, for collective identity. These impulses led on the one hand, to the affirmation of the individual as an active political subject, and on the other hand, to the crystallization of nation-states as expressions of communities' aspirations for self-determination. This is how the cultural dimension of Western civilization was shaped.

At the same time, however, historical dynamics produced a profound transformation in economic and social relations. The traditional fragmentation of productive activities was replaced by global interconnection, favored by the development of transport and communication infrastructures, the diversification of resources, and the expansion of industrial production. This process eroded local self-sufficiency and intensified interdependencies between communities, feeding a material dimension of Western civilization characterized by functional integration.[2]

In this context of cultural and economic convergence, institutions responsible for maintaining public order and safety face the pressure to adapt. A static model, focused on reaction and punctual intervention, is no longer sufficient. Current difficulties – from hybrid threats to emerging social phenomena – require an intervention where order agents must be involved in prevention, collaboration, and risk management in partnership with other social sectors. This shift in vision entails revising institutional roles, developing competencies in new fields, and building strong relationships with communities, in a logic of accountability and co-production of safety. The security model undergoes a reconfiguration that redefines the traditional missions of order structures and calls for an articulation between the normative dimension of law, the operational dimension of intervention, and the relational dimension of public trust. The boundaries between internal and external, civilian and military, real and virtual, are increasingly

---

[1] Adrian Răzvan Serescu, *Securitatea umană în contextul dezvoltării durabile*, Institutul de Dezvoltare a Societatii Informaționale, https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/239-243_8.pdf (22.04.2025)

[2] David Mitrany, *An Operational Peace System*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2023, p. 36

fluid, and collective safety is shaped as a joint effort, sustained by adaptable, collaborative mechanisms aimed at protecting the fundamental values of life in society.

To be fully understood, the profound transformations of the security concept require an analysis of the impact on institutions responsible for maintaining public order and safety. These institutions, such as the police, gendarmerie, intelligence services, and civil protection structures, can no longer be considered purely operational actors, but dynamic components of a coherent system that requires constant alignment with social, technological, and geopolitical circumstances. In the classic model, these institutions primarily acted reactively, intervening after the emergence of a threat or disturbance. Now, risks such as online radicalization, misinformation, transnational organized crime, environmental degradation, or health crises demand a strategic reorientation toward preventing antisocial acts. This involves investments in modern infrastructure, the development of critical thinking capacity, inter-institutional collaboration with sectors such as education, health, or environmental protection, and, most importantly, an active relationship with the community.

Public safety institutions must evolve from a logic of control to one of protection through transparent, efficient, and ethical methods. In this sense, the concept of maintaining order through the consent and contribution of the community (policing by consent) is relevant and even indispensable. Citizen involvement in the safety defense process, through mechanisms such as community councils, civic patrols, volunteering, or local consultations, reflect an advanced level of democratic maturity. Public trust in these institutions is particularly important for preventing conflict escalation and for the effective normative integration of minorities or vulnerable groups. The expansion of the security concept also leads to a redefinition of the police role, which can no longer be perceived solely as a law enforcement force, but as a community actor involved in managing social risks such as domestic violence, addictions, or social exclusion. Acquiring socio-psychological competencies and developing partnerships with NGOs, social services, and educational institutions are essential prerequisites. Therefore, a hybrid profile emerges for the public order agent, capable of combining legal professionalism with the role of facilitating social cohesion.

Technological advancement and intense digitalization create spaces for social interaction, but also significant vulnerabilities. Among the most alarming threats are cyberattacks, which are already at a level where they pose a real danger to national and international prosperity, security, and stability. These attacks are increasingly organized and have a costly impact on government administration, businesses, the economy, transportation, supply networks, and critical infrastructure. The sources of these threats are diverse, including intelligence services, organized crime, and terrorist groups[1]. In this context, public safety institutions must develop expertise in areas such as cybersecurity, online behavioral analysis, or combating disinformation campaigns. Cooperation between the police, computer incident response teams (CERTs), and media analysis units is vital to counteract risks associated with online radicalization or manipulation during electoral or crisis periods.

The concept of human security, focused on protecting the individual from existential risks, expands the responsibility of public order institutions. They must intervene not only in cases of criminality but also in crises generated by natural disasters, pandemics, emergency evacuations, or the protection of vulnerable individuals. Inter-institutional collaboration and ongoing professional training are no longer options but strategic imperatives. Classical order institutions must adopt a network-based operational logic, in which coordination, transparency, and effective information sharing become essential for the success of interventions. The expansion of the security concept is a substantial practical challenge for public safety institutions: they must be more flexible, more collaborative, and more citizen oriented. Moreover, order cannot be maintained solely through force but must be built through proactive participation, mutual trust, and shared responsibility. Transformations in human society directly influence the emergence and manifestation of phenomena such as challenges, dangers, threats, and risks – whether these are assumed, the result of events, or imposed from the outside. These phenomena are present in all areas of activity, directly related to the actions of individuals and social groups. They do not follow a linear trajectory: they intensify or weaken, appear temporarily or disappear, depending on context and interactions within the social system. It is precisely this variability that makes them difficult to fully understand, impossible to eliminate, or permanently

---

[1] Iulian Chifu, *The Reconfiguration of Security and International Relations in the 21st Century,* Volume II, RAO, București, 2023, p. 13

control. There will always be a continuous confrontation between these phenomena and the efforts made to stabilize and protect the affected processes and structures[1].

Nevertheless, operationalizing transnational security cooperation faces significant challenges. Diverging national interests, the persistence of sovereignty-based frameworks, and unequal distribution of resources complicate collective action. As Gerd Oberleitner (2005) points out, human security initiatives often encounter difficulties in aligning universal aspirations with localized political and economic realities[2].

Conclusions

The changes occurring in the international environment and the internal developments of modern states have brought transformations in the field of security. This process is not limited to the expansion of the spectrum of threats but requires a reconfiguration of how institutions and society perceive, prioritize, and manage vulnerabilities. There is a noticeable shift from an approach solely focused on defense and public order to a vision that integrates multiple dimensions of safety, reflecting the diversity of social relations, economic dynamics, and technological impact. This theoretical and practical reassessment of security involves a constant effort of adaptation from public institutions, especially those responsible for maintaining order and safety. Their role is both the application of legal norms, reacting to incidents, and active involvement in preventive processes, creating an environment conducive to social dialogue, and promoting a civic culture of responsibility. In this configuration, punctual intervention is gradually replaced by structured actions that consider the socio-economic dimensions of phenomena and the interdependencies between factors. At the same time, it is observed that security can no longer be guaranteed exclusively by traditional means, as contemporary threats are not geographically limited, do not respect clear institutional boundaries, and often manifest in diffuse forms that are difficult to anticipate or classify. Therefore, there is a need for increased anticipatory analysis capacity, as well as a real willingness to cooperate across areas that were previously treated separately: public order, health, environment, and digital infrastructure. In the absence of an integrative approach, responses remain fragmented and, often, ineffective.

In this sense, the academic approach underpinning this paper sought to highlight the mechanisms through which the state can support, without yielding to momentary pressures, an adaptable and sustainable security model. This pattern requires not only institutional reforms but also a type of professional commitment based on continuous training, a deep understanding of social realities, and the capacity to respond quickly without sacrificing the fundamental principles of the rule of law.

In conclusion, the redefinition of security priorities must be understood as part of a broader process of reconfiguring the functions of the state about global changes and the increasingly diverse expectations of citizens. As Roland Paris (2001) highlights, the human security paradigm represents both a normative aspiration and a strategic redefinition of security priorities[3].

A model for institutional adaptation to the expanded concept of security is the establishment of integrated Early Warning and Crisis Anticipation Units at national and regional levels, inspired by the OECD's Strategic Crisis Management framework. These units would operate across sectors, ensuring rapid information-sharing, citizen engagement, and coordinated responses to multidimensional threats, from cyberattacks to pandemics. Additionally, the creation of Local Civic Security Councils could enhance community resilience and participation in shaping security policies, fostering a bottom-up democratization of risk management[4].

The effectiveness of these transformations depends on how institutions succeed in combining operational rigor with the willingness to collaborate, adapting their methods and procedures without straying from democratic values, and responding through intervention and prevention, education, and constant involvement in community life.

---

[1] Mircea Mureşan, Gheorghe Văduva (Eds.), *Crisis, Conflict, War*, Carol I National Defence University Bucureşti, 2007, p. 18

[2] Gerd Oberleitner, *Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?*, "Global Governance", Vol. 11, No. 2, 2005, pp. 185-203

[3] Roland Paris, *Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air*, "International Security", Vol. 26, No. 2, 2001, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3092123, pp. 87–102

[4] OECD, *Strategic Crisis Management. 4th meeting of the OECD High Level Risk Forum*, 2014, https://one.oecd.org/document/GOV/PGC/HLRF(2014)9/en/pdf (25.04.2025)

Bibliography

Books

1. Chifu, Iulian, *The Reconfiguration of Security and International Relations in the 21st Century*, Vol. II, RAO, Bucharest, 2023
2. Mitrany, David, *An Operational Peace System*, Presa Univesitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2023
3. Mureşan, Mircea; Văduva, Gheorghe (Eds.), *Crisis, Conflict, War*, Carol I National Defence University, București, 2007
4. Neag, Mihai Marcel, *Ensuring Human Security, Volume I – The Role of Security Institutions and Civil Society*, Sitech, Craiova, 2010
5. Stoica, Ionel, *The Temptation of Migration: Necessity and Opportunity in a Globalized World*, Editura Militară, București, 2011

Studies and Articles

1. Cavaropol, Dan Victor, *Human Security – Modern Concepts and Approaches*, "Journal of the Academy of National Security Sciences", No. 1, 2016
2. Istrate, Mihaela, *Security – A Multidimensional Concept*, "Human Rights Journal", No. 2, 2013
3. Oberleitner, Gerd, *Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?*, "Global Governance", Vol. 11, No. 2, 2005
4. Paris, Roland, *Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?*, "International Security", Vol. 26, No. 2, 2001
5. Serescu, Adrian, Răzvan, *Securitatea umană în contextul dezvoltării durabile*, Institutul de Dezvoltare a Societatii Informaționale, Chisinău, 2021
6. Ştefanachi, Bogdan, *Human Action and Its Rational Limits: Some Considerations on Economy, Freedom, and the Individual*, "Human Rights Journal", No. 1, 2023
7. Walt, Stephen, M., *The Renaissance of Security Studies*, "International Studies Quarterly", Vol. 35, No. 2, 1991

Websites

1. https://data.unhcr.org/
2. https://freedomhouse.org/ s
3. https://one.oecd.org/
4. https://ibn.idsi.md/