

SECURITY CULTURE AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SECURITY STUDIES PROGRAMS' CONTRIBUTION TO ESTABLISHING THE SECURITY CULTURE OF POST-1989 ROMANIA

Oana-Luiza BARBU*

Abstract

The end of the Cold War prompted the recalibration of the concept of security, the theoretical debate ending by the assertion of the multidimensional perspective on security at the international level. Embracing this new viewpoint on security was imperative for the Romanian process of democratization. This change entailed also the need to create a new security culture, a difficult task undertaken too late by the Romanian authorities, situation caused by the delaying of the transition process itself, until 1996. Therefore, this paper aims, firstly, to clarify the concept of security culture, focusing on how it is defined by academics at the national level and, secondly, to identify the contribution that the academic programs of security studies had in spreading the knowledge and information related to security, essential elements of the formal dimension of security culture. The lack of research material has imposed an explanatory and exploratory approach, rather than a critical one, the analysis being carried out in a multidisciplinary perspective, using both sociological and educational sciences frameworks. The analysis results showed a certain consensus on the level of definition, the security culture being understood both as a product and as a process. However, during the first post-communist decade, the security culture was perceived primarily as a process (of creating a legal and institutional framework), without taking into consideration the importance of the security culture as a product embedding democratic values (information, knowledge, behavior), vital for the functioning of the institutions involved. It's only starting from 2010 when we can assert that the theory of interdependence can be confirmed, because the security culture as a product and as a process begins to generate itself mutually from its two aspects, leading to a more open attitude of the society towards security, a more visible desire for information and a strengthening of the legal and institutional framework. The introduction of security studies in the university's curriculum has contributed and will contribute more significantly in creating the security culture at national level primarily through the dissemination of information and knowledge regarding this field. Also, the security studies programs will lead to the familiarization of the civil society with the subject and will help in removing the negative connotations that security has acquired during the communist regime. Lastly,

*PhD Candidate, Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, Philology field of study, European and Cultural Studies specialization, oanaluzabarbu@yahoo.com

they will support new emerging professions in the labor market, by offering the necessary expertise.

Keywords: *security culture, security studies, Romania, higher education, security*

Introduction

The end of the Cold War brought many changes in the international security system's configuration. The fall of the Iron Curtain affected also the theoretical field leading to a new understanding of the concept of security. Until that moment the concept was seen only in military terms. Attempts to expand this concept were also made in the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which, in the Helsinki Final Act from 1975, has structured its interests in the so-called baskets. This baskets included issues related to political, economic, military, environmental, and societal security.

Considering the configuration of the CSCE, and the lack of conceptualization of the multidimensionality of security, we can affirm that its objectives have been achieved only after 1989. With the fall of the communist regimes, CSCE's activities were unlocked and, thanks to the Copenhagen School (Buzan, Waever, Wild, 1998, p. 2), security has been recalibrated from a theoretical standpoint. The academia has adopted this constructivist vision of the concept. Today both academicians and practitioners are operating with this latest understanding of security. More than for other European countries, for former communist countries the incorporation of a new perspective on security within the society (perception, norms, and institutions) was more difficult. The difficulty resulted from the significantly different manner of perceiving it, but also because of a solid security culture, based, however, on values and principles contrary to liberal democracies.

It is also the case of Romania, for which establishing a new security was a difficult task, undertaken later, situation caused by the delay in launching the transition process until 1996. The higher education institutions, through academic programs in this field, were among the actors who have actively participated in the process of establishing a new security culture for the post-communist Romanian society. Therefore, this scientific approach aims, firstly, to clarify form a theoretical point of view the *concept of security culture*, focusing on how it is assumed by the national academia. Secondly, we intended to identify the contribution of university security studies programs in spreading knowledge and information, essential elements of the formal dimension of the security culture.

This research project is legitim and relevant from a scientific point of view, given the superficial approach of the concept by the specialized literature, observation issued from the prior research undertaken, the present approach is

legitimate and pertinent. Furthermore, if we take into consideration the fact that the only references about this subject were identified at governmental and / or non-governmental organizations level, we consider that applying this concept to the Romanian society is even more scientifically deficient. In addition, we believe it is important to analyze also the contribution that the university security studies programs have in the process of establishing a solid security culture in the today's Romanian society.

Taking into consideration all the above, we will approach the concept of security culture through the concept of culture aiming to apply its characteristics on our study object. Once the conceptual clarification is achieved, we will go further to the identification of the manner through which the security culture how it is materialized in Romania. The approach of this topic can be defined as being multidisciplinary, since it combines two theoretical frameworks, one belonging to sociology and the other to education sciences.

Thus, at the level of theories about culture, we can identify many viewpoints which are, to some extent, divergent. Karl Marx in classical sociology and Pierre Bourdieu in recent sociology believe that culture is a product of society, ie, in relation to society, culture is seen as a dependent variable. Emile Durkheim asserts an opposite vision considering culture, in the same relation, as an independent variable, arguing his opinion by stressing the fact that culture determines changes in the social structure, influencing its fulfillment.

Currently, the neo-liberal paradigm stresses that sociological model of the division between culture and society is replaced by a model in which the relationship between the two is one of interdependence (Williams, 1992, p. 12). Presently sociology operates with this perspective, arguing that organizations and institutions generate frameworks for cultural convergence. Furthermore, the same view stresses the idea that they shape the beliefs and mental models that receive, reproduce and transmit cultural configurations. However, their meanings are contingent because institutions can fix and reproduce only certain meanings, to the exclusion of others. Therefore, the international academia talks about cultures (associated with a dynamic circulation of objects, ideas and practices on a global scale), and not about a unique culture (Appadurai, 2011, p. 282).

As a result, despite the integration process and the generalization of the perception on security culture on international level, under the impact of a more accelerated globalization process, we cannot talk anymore about a unique culture, but about shared values and harmonized interests, which presents particularities from one culture to another. Considering that a global security culture does not exist, we can rather talk about a national security culture which, although influenced by the integration process, presents its own characteristics.

Peter Katzenstein's vision falls under the same paradigm. He argues that the security environment in which the states are involved is largely cultural and institutional. He believes that the international system can be perceived as a society in which states, in order to participate, must adhere to the rules and regulations imposed in a variety of fields. However, in the end, the states' policy reproduces and rebuilds the cultural and institutional structure. Accordingly, the interests in the field of security are defined by actors who respond to cultural factors. (Katzenstein, 1996, p. 8).

From the methodological point of view, this article is based on the qualitative method, more precisely on the analysis of primary sources (laws, rules, reports, strategies, regulations at national and / or international) and on content analysis, in an attempt to exploit the very few available secondary sources. We should mention that, while working to this research project, the main difficulty and limitation was the lack of relevant secondary sources (specialized literature in the field), which would have imposed a critical approach. As a consequence, our approach will be rather exploratory and explanatory.

The first part of this project will be dedicated to the conceptual clarification of the term security culture, using for this purpose the concepts of culture and security. The second part will consider the security studies, their evolution as academic study programs and their contribution in establishing the security culture within the post-communist Romanian society.

Security culture: assuming a working definition

As previously stated, the conceptual clarification of the term *security culture* will be made by using two other concepts, *security* and *culture*, which requires also attention. The validity of the analysis result depends on their correct understanding.

Security

Like other concepts pertaining to security studies, the term *security* is among the concepts on which hovers ambiguity because the lack of a univocally accepted definition. Moreover, in theory, security is differently perceived by theorists, according to the paradigm which they claim. The option for a theory or another will have influence also on the pragmatic level. This option is reflected in the manner in which the state chooses to pursue their security objectives in relation to the general trend and the dynamic of the security environment.

Etymologically speaking, the notion of security has its origins in the Roman Empire during the reign of Emperor Hostilian, for whose empire goddess *Securitas* ensure the protection and welfare. *Securitas* meant freedom against threats. One of the earliest definitions of security which presents a character closer to general understanding belongs to Arnold Wolfers, who

believes that "in an objective sense security measures the absence of threats to acquired values, and in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked (Wolfer, 1952, p. 485)". We note that, traditionally, the concept of security has been understood only from the military standpoint, referring mainly to the balance of power in terms of military power (Smith, 2002).

This view has been dominant until the end of the Cold War when realism theory in international relations seemed to become obsolete. The fall of communist regimes made room for the institutional liberalism paradigm of liberalism which has been competing with the realism it since the '70s. The identification of the multiple dimensions of security was made even before its conceptualization, during the drafting of the Final Act of Helsinki and the inauguration of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Within this framework, the multidimensionality of security was revealed for the first time. Thus, the CSCE's activities were organized taking into consideration the social, economic, political and environmental security issues.

The conceptualization was subsequently performed in 1983 by Barry Buzan, but has gained popularity only after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Copenhagen School members (Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde) proposed a constructivist approach which defined security by the presence of the awareness of threat to the existence of a valued reference object strongly (Buzan, 1983, p. 78).

Emma Rothschild explains how the concept of security has expanded. The author identifies four development directions:

- Down, from the security of nations to group and individual security;
- Up, from the security of nations to the international system's security;
- Horizontally, because different entities design differently the security and/or insecurity status. As a consequence, the development of the concept from a strictly military meaning to the political, economic, societal and environmental ones resulted;
- In order to ensure security, the forth direction political takes into account the political responsibility. We observe a multidirectional diffusion, from the nation state to international institutions (up), or to local and regional governments (down), but also side-scattering, to NGOs, public opinion, media and abstract forces acting on the market (Rothschild, 1995, p. 55).

Emma Rothschild explanation is conclusive for understanding the complexity of security concept, as well for developing security strategies.

As such, the definition of national security in *the Romania's National Security Strategy* uses the universal perception on security, being connected to the Euro-Atlantic approach. The document presents national security as "a condition for the existence of the nation and of the Romanian state which has

as baseline the national values, interests and necessities. National security is an indefeasible right that stems from people's full sovereignty, being based on the constitutional order and being achieved in the context of regional, Euro-Atlantic and global security".

However, in current use another definition of national security was spread, namely that "national security represents a set of politico-diplomatic, economic, military, ecological measures aimed at ensuring state independence and national sovereignty, territorial integrity, internal constitutional order and productive vitality of its system of values" (Bidu, Troncota, 2005, p. 15).

These two definitions revealed two main features of the current perceptions on the security concept - universality and multidimensionality. Taking into account Romania's membership in the Euro-Atlantic structures, creating a national security framework will be made considering the aspect mentioned above. We believe, however, that its reification to institutional, legislative / regulatory and affective level will depend to some extent on the cultural factor, affecting both security and culture.

Culture

The security culture represents the main subject of this article. However, for a better understanding of the concept and for a better identification of its constitutive elements materialization, we have considered as being necessary to firstly clarify both determinants. Therefore, we will go further by addressing the second element, namely the culture.

Etymologically speaking, the word culture comes from the Latin *culture* that for the Romans meant farming. Cicero's passion for philosophy led him to classify this science as a culture of the soul. The meaning that he attributed was later adopted and semantically expanded, reaching the general sense that culture represents the cultivation of human values, the development and the emancipation of the soul. A new sense of culture is attached with the spread of the phrase attributed to Voltaire, *cultivons notre jardin*. The main idea was that of cultivation of the mind, of the reason and of the human values. This new sense acquired by culture was the one imposed and dominant in the 19th century.

Culture can be defined as the sum of behaviors, beliefs, values, attitudes and ideals learned and shared by all members of a group or society, guiding its social or personal life.

We have to specify that when we talk about culture, we talk about both human material products (physical products) and immaterial ones (values, symbols, norms, customs, and institutions). However, the inclusion of products in culture is preceded by going through a process of objectification, transforming it into an object that can be put into circulation.

We stated above that we cannot talk about a single culture, but about cultures, and this is because to every human society pertains a distinct type

of culture. Material and immaterial cultural objects acquire different meanings from one society to another, managing to influence both the behavior and the way of thinking. Moreover, they pass through another filter, an individual one. Personal subjectivity plays an important role in the selection of information and in its interpretation based on various schemes. Pierre Bourdieu identifies another factor that influences the way in which the individual relates to the cultural space, namely the membership to a certain social class, causing different attitudes, such as compliance, innovation or adaptation (Bourdieu, 1997).

Taking into consideration the neo-liberal paradigm and the ongoing process of integration generated by the acceleration of globalization, we see that contemporary society is one of the organizations, one in which the main trend is to coordinate the individual efforts to achieve a common goal. If we remember Peter Katzenstein's argument, namely that the environment in which states interact is particularly cultural and institutional, we have to recognize that during this interaction, which is multidirectional, the cultural changes that are happening are firstly adapted to the society who takes them over, and then internalized.

Security culture

Having the determinants well calibrated, we will address now the *concept security culture*, very often used both in the security strategies (on national or organizational level) and in mass media. It should be noted that in the specialized literature, the concept has been much less examined and its operationalization has been superficial.

According to some authors, the concept has been launched during the Cold War, following the development of the nuclear industry. By that time, the concept referred to risk reduction and standardization of rules and practices in order to eliminate hazards. Other authors attribute this concept to George Robertson, former NATO General Secretary (1999-2004) who made it core value of the North Atlantic Alliance (Neculai, 2006, p. 528).

In Romania, the concept began to gain notoriety after 2000, following the inauguration of the Security Culture Promotion Center in September 2003, being subordinated to the Romanian Intelligence Service (SRI) and to the European Institute for Risk, Security and Communication Management (EURISC) and the inclusion of this concept in legal documents such as the *National Information Security Doctrine*, in the *SRI Strategic vision 2007-2010* and in the *National Defense Strategy* (2008).

However, its definition is vague. If we refer to the international specialized literature, we can be guided by the work of Peter Katzenstein, *The Culture of National Security*. In his work the author seeks to analyze the implications of culture and identity on national security in the context globalizing processes. The subject of this paper is centered on security culture

and on how it is articulated in the Romanian post-revolutionary society, the likeness with the work cited above consisting in the approach of the subject in the same globalized context.

Regarding the concept's definition, within the national level we have identified several definitions mostly coming from the organizational side, and less from the academia, where the specialized literature is not yet very well developed. Thus, one definition can be found on the online platform of the Center for Promotion of Security Culture, which, in *Small Dictionary of Security Culture*, defines the concept as being "a modern institutional approach that promotes security issues; knowledge of public political, military, economic, societal and environmental emergencies; all concepts, ideas and information regarding the values, interests and national security needs from which the citizens dispose; ways of developing necessary attitudes, motivations and behaviors for the defense and protection of the individual, group and state against vulnerabilities, risk factors, threats, state of danger or potential aggression, and their promotion in the domestic and international security".

Another definition of security culture is found in the *SRI Strategic Vision 2007-2010*. According to it, security culture represents "the promotion and the consolidation of democratic values through the development of a common understanding of the challenges and opportunities in national security field related to the Romanian state and society".

The third definition of security culture is found in the *National Defense Strategy* from 2010. According to it, the security culture represents the totality of "norms, values, attitudes and actions that determine the understanding and assimilation of the concept of security and of other derived concepts from national, international, collective security, insecurity, cooperative security, security policy etc."

These three definitions, although not explicitly, refer to the impact that changes in the security environment can have on national security, either theoretical ("political, military, economic, societal and ecological public emergency" - referring to the multidimensional concept of security," the understanding and assimilation of the concept of security" - as formulated by the Copenhagen School and as imposed on international level) or pragmatically ("vulnerabilities, risk factors, threats, state of danger or potential aggression ") as a result of the integration process in the context of accelerating globalization.

There is however a definition that distinguishes itself from the others, coming from the academic field. It is a definition in which the implications of globalization are expressed explicitly. The addition to the attribute *Romanian* make us think about the existence of a proper pattern of security culture: "Romanian security culture represents the totality of knowledge, society and state structures and the political factor related to integration, stability and development embodied in the material and spiritual values achieved in the

national and international practice and applied in concrete dynamic conditions that exist and develop within the supranational and/or interstate relations".

The inventory of the security culture definitions formulated at national level revealed a consensus on both its perception as a product and as a process. These definitions highlighted three common elements that define the security culture: knowledge (meaning information) about security capturing the clear, objective image of reality; policies and security strategies as a result of creating a subjective image of reality; material and spiritual objects as a result of knowledge and the creative process at individual and state level.

From all the above we can determine a certain degree of awareness regarding the impact of the international security environment on the actors involved in different types of relationships within it. We have also observed the focus on the national interest and national security, which are however achieved as the result of the implication at international level. As such, we will be interested to look at the extent to which the post-communist Romania assimilated the democratic principles and practices and how they were reflected in building a Romanian security culture.

Security culture likewise political and civic culture is a mass culture, belonging to society thoroughly. It is not only the appanage of those people working in the field, but we admit that they are the first who has to possess it, since they are the main responsible for perpetuating it, playing the role of catalysts. Moreover, institutions can be tailored only from the inside in order to answer to the security environment's exigencies. This can be achieved by the ability of individuals to rethink both the frame and the substance of the problems hence the need for a solid education in the field. We shall note that to the political elite level both reproduction and circulation phenomenon are manifested. Given that any of its members can become a participant or a decision-maker within these institutions, we conclude the necessity that the entire society to benefit from this type of education.

Knowledge and information in the field of national security. The contribution of security studies

An important element of security culture consists of the assimilated information and knowledge by civil society. During the communist regime, the education system had a controlled and centralized character. The political control was manifested both in the access to higher education, in the elaboration of syllabuses, in recruiting the teachers, in obtaining the financial means, in the institutional management, faithfully following the model imposed by the Soviet Union (Udrescu, 2011, p. 37). At that time, education was a tool of the state to create the New Man, by promoting proletarian and communist ideology. This task was successfully completed, given the fact that

even today the Romanian education system it's not completely detached from the communist legacy.

In January 1990, authorities began the depoliticization of the education system, but the legal vacuum that characterized the early years of Romanian democracy had as a consequence the regulation of the education system only by government decrees and ministerial orders. Five years after the fall of the communist regime the first law of education was adopted. The law has been the subject of numerous amendments leading in 2011 to the adoption of a new education law. The first decisions taken by the authorities aimed at creating new universities, higher education funding, new regulations for the recruitment of students, teachers and faculty staff (Udrescu, 2011, p. 37).

Subsequently changes aimed to the access to education, to the increase of the number of universities, the establishment of private universities, the diversification of the fields of study, the use of new media, the implementation of international mobility programs (Udrescu, 2011, p. 37) were achieved. However, the security field was ignored for a long time. Likewise political and civic culture, security culture must be assimilated by society as a whole, not just by some interest groups or closed bureaucratic institutions, as was the case during the communist regime.

We consider education as the main pillar because it allows national security and defense to properly respond to the new challenges of the security environment. Therefore, it's necessary that through education and scientific research, the Romanian education joins the EU model of education.

In the Romanian academic curriculum, security studies as an independent study program was introduced very late, what we believe induced the hindering of the process of establishing a security culture in the post – 1989 Romanian society, the formal dimension concerning the spread of information and knowledge security being neglected.

In what follows we will address the evolution of security studies as a field of study, the uncertainty surrounding them and also the inauguration and the inventory of the undergraduate and post-graduate study programs in Security Studies nationally.

Security Studies, a controversial field of study

Security Studies is a relatively new research area, appeared within the American academia after the Second World War. Since then, the autonomy and research object of the security studies have been widely debated, without reaching a consensus in this regard.

Perspectives on security studies varied depending on how the security was essentially perceived. This has triggered also debates on the autonomy of

security studies in the field of scientific research. Thus, realists have attributed as study object the military aspects, the Marxists considered them superfluous since for them the economic reasons were the ones that had the power to configure the international system, while the social constructivists approached them rather from a sociological point of view. The change occurs after the fall of the Iron Curtain, when the Copenhagen School's perspective on the multidimensionality of security was imposed (Buzan, 1991, p. 19). However, the relation and even interdependence with other field of studies left the debate open.

As a result, even today, within the international academia, security studies are considered to be essentially a subfield of international relations (Collins, 2010, p. 2), an autonomous field (Williams 2008, p. 5) or a field which was autonomous at its beginnings, but which gradually has been absorbed as a subfield of international relations (Buzan, Hansen 2009, p. 3). The consequences of this lack of consensus regarding the autonomy of security studies are experienced on the undergraduate and post-graduate study programs, as well on the manner on which the curriculum is configured. This is a valid observation at least for the Romanian society, as we will show in the following. Of course, we can add to this situation the lack of academic experience due to their late introduction as an academic study program.

Security Studies in Romania

In Romania there are 56 state universities and 36 accredited private universities. However, in the country there are only four undergraduate programs in security studies and eleven post-graduate study programs.

Regarding the undergraduate programs in security studies, the first university which launched such a program was the University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, in 2009, within the Faculty of Social Sciences, as a specialization in the field of political science. Since 2012, the Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest, provides students with an undergraduate program in security studies, also as a specialization within the field of political science.

The third program of security studies at undergraduate level is offered, from 2013, by the University Babes Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca, the Faculty of History and Philosophy, as a specialization within the Faculty of History, the program being taught both in Romanian and English language.

The fourth undergraduate program in security field of study is provided by the Faculty of Security and Defense of the National University of Defense Charles I. Although a mainly military higher education institution, the university has opened its doors to civilians interested in the subject, offering an undergraduate program in security and defense, included in fundamental field of study of military and intelligence sciences.

Following the inventory of these programs, we find, first, their insufficiency and their late inclusion in the academic curriculum, which limits

the access to those interested in training in the field, thus affecting the building of security throughout society, the insufficient staff with relevant expertise being the main cause.

Moreover, the analysis has highlighted the ambiguity regarding the perception of security studies as a field of study. In none of the Universities, security studies are not considered autonomous field, but are perceived as subdomains or specializations. What is even more interesting is how they are subordinate to different domains as political science or history, which entails the formulation of heterogeneous study programs, with specific approaches issued from the domains to whom are subordinated.

The differences are even more pronounced in the curriculum at the Faculty of Security and Defense, where the perspective is predominantly military, the disciplines belonging especially to military sciences.

Master's programs, although numerous, are facing the same problem, but the fact that master's programs are post-graduate, specialization programs, the multidisciplinary aspect is justified and even encouraged. In the field of security studies we can find master programs like *Security Management in Contemporary Society*, *Security and Diplomacy*, *European Integration and Security Studies*, *Defense Diplomacy*, *International Relations*, *Security Systems*, *Security and International Relations*, *Security Studies*, *Security and Defense*, *Management of National Security Intelligence and Intelligence Management in Counterterrorism*.

The research in the security field of study is also encouraged, but currently is also insufficient. Besides the educational institutions were created numerous specialized centers on issues related to security. We mention here the Center for Promotion of Security Culture, established in 2003, the Centre for Defense and Security Strategies Studies, established in 2000, Centre for Research and Public Security Studies, Center for Applied Strategies, Center for Advanced Strategies, the latter being established after 2010. Under the aegis of these centers workshops, conferences, courses are organized, introducing to the civil society security related issues.

Also, in addition to these centers, we have to mention the existence of academic publications as *Romanian Journal for Intelligence Studies*, *Strategic Impact*, *Military Magazine for Management and Education*, *Studia Securitatis*, or non-academic journals and periodicals such as *Intelligence* or *Military Observer*.

Why do we need to include security studies in higher education curriculum?

The necessity for introducing security studies in higher education curriculum derives firstly from the reconceptualization of security and from its understanding from a multidimensional perspective. Thus, no longer the exclusive appanage of military science specialists, encompassing now

economic, cultural, social, political and environmental aspects, security requires a deep understanding regardless the field of activity of the individual. At the Romanian society, the introduction of security studies program is of utmost importance, given the recent past, undemocratic, and lack of expertise in security based on democratic values. The building of security culture in the post-communist Romanian society largely depends on that. It is necessary that generations are educated from the beginning in the of a security culture adjusted to the new realities.

Moreover, the inclusion of such study programs is justified by the emergence of new professions, thus coming to meet the market demands for specialists in security field, by giving them the necessary expertise. We are talking about profession such as security manager and negotiator and other occupations proposed to be included in Romanian Occupations Classification (COR), without forgetting those such security political analyst, internal affairs attaché, magistrate for public order and safety, security adviser for organizations. The professionalization of the security studies is sought as a consequence of the exigencies expressed on the labor market level. At the research's level, security studies are necessary due to the emergence of new research directions, such as European governance, security governance, unconventional risk factors, Romania's security policy, ecological, economic, geopolitical and geostrategic security, security and insecurity in ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary societies, international organizations management or European political integration.

Conclusions

For this study we have considered as being necessary to undergo a conceptual clarification of security culture and of the manner in which it is understood at national level, using in this purpose the concepts *culture* and *security*. In terms of security, at least conceptually, theoretically, Romanian society has acquired ownership of the term, as it was imposed internationally after the Cold War, being recognized both its universality and multidimensionality.

Regarding the security culture, we found that there is a certain consensus on the definition, security culture being perceived both as a product and as a process. The definitions have revealed three common elements - knowledge, policies/strategies and objects of material and spiritual recovery as a result of the first two. Also we could determine the impact that the international security environment had on the involved actors. We have also noted the focus on the national interest and on national security.

If the legislative and institutional reform started visibly late, the providing of information and knowledge in security field to civil society was even more delayed. Incidentally, even today is still deficient, although we note the emergence of numerous initiatives in this respect, with the ultimate goal of

creating a true security culture based on the democratic principles and values. It requires efforts from both the institutions and the civil society to reach this goal. Institutions must open their doors, and civil society must abandon the prejudices and the skepticism still existent, because only by doing so we will reach a security culture in the true sense of word.

During the first post-communist decade, security culture was perceived primarily as a process (creating a legal and institutional framework), without taking into account the importance of security culture as a product (information, knowledge, behavior) of utmost importance for the proper functioning of the concerned institutions. Only from 2010 we believe that the theory of interdependence can be confirmed because security culture both as a process and as a product begins to generate mutually. We thus observe a more open society towards security, a greater desire for information and an strengthening of the legal and institutional framework.

The introduction of security studies within the higher education curriculum has contributed and will contribute significantly in building the security culture at national level primarily through the dissemination of information and knowledge regarding this field. This will lead the civil society to become familiarized with the subject and to remove the negative connotation that security has gained during the communist regime.

Moreover, security studies will provide the necessary expertise, both theoretically and practically, supporting the labor market demands for new professions.

The difficulties in achieving this scientific project consisted in the lack theoretical information, which imposed an approach exploratory and explanatory rather than a critical one. This project can be seen as a starting point for further research in the field of security because security culture became an increasingly used concept and, maybe in the future, will become an analysis tool for the various phenomena involved in security. The study also provides insight on the security studies as a (sub) field and as a national post-graduate and undergraduate study program, direction that can be developed in the future.

References

Treaties

*** Helsinki Final Act, 1975.

Doctrines, Strategies

1. *** National Doctrine of Security Intelligence, approved in Country's Defense Supreme Council on 23.06.2004.
2. *** Romania's National Security Strategy, 2007.
3. *** Country's Defense National Strategy, 2008.
4. *** Country's Defense National Strategy, 2010.

5. *** Romanian Intelligence Service's Strategic Vision, 2007-2010.

Articles, publications, scientific conferences

1. *** (2010). *Momente Semnificative din Istoria Serviciului Român de Informații*, in Intelligence, no. 17.
2. Appadurai, A. (1990). *Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy* in Imre Szeman, Thimoty Kaposy (2011). *Cultural Theory. An Anthology*, Wiley Blackwell.
3. Buzan, B (1983). *Peoples, States and Fear. The National Security Problem*. International Relations, Wheatsheaf Book LDT, Brighton.
4. Neculai, S. (2006). *Securitatea umană și Cultura de Securitate*. Securitatea și apărarea spațiului sud-est european în contextul transformărilor de la începutul mileniului III, Sesiunea de comunicări științifice cu participare internațională Strategii XXI, 13-14 aprilie 2006, București, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare Carol I, București, 582-595.
5. Rothschild, E. (1995). *What is Security? The Quest for World Order*, 124(3), 53-98.
6. Smith, S. (2002) *The Concept of Security in a Globalized World*, paper presented at the Otago University Conference, June, Otago.
7. Williams, S. (1992). *A theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation*. American Journal of Sociology, 98 (1), 1-29.
8. Wolfers, A (1952). *National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol*. Political Science Quarterly, 67(4), 481-502.

b. Books

1. *** *Curs Cultura de Securitate*, Chapter VII, p. 157, <http://ro.scribd.com/doc/94954792/Curs-Cultura-de-Securitate#scribd>, Accessed 25.09.2015.
2. Bidu, I., Troncotă, C. (2005). *Coordonate de securitate*, Editura ANI, București.
3. Bourdieu, P (1997). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
4. Buzan, B, Waever, O., de Wilde (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
5. Buzan, B (1991). *Peoples, States and Fear*, London:Harvester Wheatsheaf.
6. Buzan, B., Hansen, L (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge University Press, 1 edition.
7. Collins, A (2010). *Contemporary Security Studies*, New York: Oxford University Press.
8. Katzenstein, P. (1996). *The Culture of National Security*. Columbia University Press, New York.
9. Udrescu, C.M. (2011). *Universitatea din București. Modele și traiectorii postcomuniste*, Editura Universității din București, București.
10. Williams, P (2008). *Security Stides. An Introduction*. Routledge.

Online sources

1. ccpic.mai.gov.ro
2. www.cpcs.ro
3. www.edu.ro

4. www.mapn.ro
5. www.osce.org
6. www.presidency.ro
7. www.sri.ro
8. www.snsa.ro
9. www.ubbcluj.ro
10. www.ulbsibiu.ro
11. www.unibuc.ro
12. www.unap.ro