



ROMANIAN RESILIENCE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SECURITY SECTORS IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

*Mirela ATANASIU, PhD**

States are constantly in search of security, but the current multiple globalized crises (sanitary, economic, societal, but also political) overlapping in an international context already affected by hybrid threats and military aggressions does not facilitate the pursuit to achieve this goal. UN, NATO and the EU have proven that building resilience is a good solution to increase the security level of organizations. Therefore, also states' security policies have gradually become more focused to provide resilience to its subsequent sectors and dimensions.

In this study, there will be presented a few resilience indicators and practices at the level of national security of Romania, with an emphasis on the security sectors through the lenses of the methodological framework of Copenhagen School.

Keywords: *national resilience; security sectors; globalization; resilience factor; vulnerability.*

Preliminary considerations

The international environment has transformed in terms of dynamics, complexity and interconnectivity in all aspects of security sectors (political, economic, societal, military, and environmental), phenomena reflected in the multiplication of difficult challenges for people, organizations and societies, usually trespassing the borders of the sovereign states.

** Mirela ATANASIU, PhD, is Senior Researcher within the Center for Defence and Security Strategic Studies, within the "Carol I" National Defence University, Associate member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, Bucharest, Romania, and Associate Researcher at the Doctoral School of Safety and Security Sciences, Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary. Email: atanasiu.mirela@yahoo.com*



These changes in the international security environment were majorly triggered by the characteristics of globalization (free movement of people, merchandises and services on the global market; intention to create an overarching set of values, thinking and behaviour models; reconfiguration of the state's role who must cooperate with non-state actors; dominant tendency of security regionalization reflected in the proficiency of regional security organizations and the pre-eminence of some transnational threats – pandemics, natural disasters, crime, terrorism, overflow migration, etc.), each of them reflecting a security dimension (economic, cultural, political and military) (Duțu 2010, 16). But globalization itself increased dynamic with the rapid development and wide spreading of high technologies and trade global expansion, and therefore interdependencies are growing in all security and insecurity aspects. Thus, “while these developments create real possibilities to achieve economic prosperity, spread political freedom, and promote peace, yet they are also producing powerful forces of social fragmentation, creating critical vulnerabilities, and sowing the seeds of violence and conflict” (Davis 2003, 1). Therefore, the need for security incentives has increased.

Resilience has emerged as a strategy of states and organizations to develop and maintain security, which must demonstrate not only the ability to manage the vulnerabilities and to counter the new types of threats, but also the ability to be aware and prepared to face the risks. In this context, state resilience “is the extent to which a country can prepare, manage, and *recover* from a crisis, relative to the severity of that crisis” (Fund for Peace 2024). This is reflected in different categories of indexes as the State Resilience Index (SRI), “new tool used to identify capacities and capabilities in countries under stress” (Fund for Peace 2024), whose methodology is based on certain pillars of analysis (inclusion, social cohesion, state capacity, individual capabilities, environment and ecology, economy, civic space), each of them containing a set of sub-pillars reflecting national security sectors.

In the first part of this paper, the presented concepts and the relations between them are explained by using as research methods the analysis of resilience documents of UN, NATO, EU, Romania and other European states, but also field's literature. In the second part, we identify and present some resilience indicators and practices, empirically connected to the pillars and sub-pillars considered in SRI and other indexes, at the level of national security of Romania, with an emphasis on the security sectors as seen through the lenses of the methodological framework of Copenhagen School¹. This second part of the analysis will bring clarity to the key aspects that need focused practices in different security sectors, for the betterment of the Romanian national resilience.

¹ This framework offers a constructivist reconceptualization of the field of security studies, emphasizing the roles of securitizing actors, but which also broadens the security agenda horizontally (i.e. security sectors) and vertically by accepting society and non-state actors as security referent objects, besides states.



1. Globalization – Security - Resilience Concepts and their Nexus

Globalization is considered to be simultaneously a process and a phenomenon. Sociologists have seen it as “all those *processes* by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society” (Albrow and King 1990, 8), or “a *phenomenon* whereby economic, political, and socio-cultural exchanges take place freely across national boundaries” (Hamadullah 2010, 11). Economists describe it as “the growing interdependence of the world’s economies, cultures, and populations, brought about by cross-border trade in goods and services, technology, and flows of investment, people, and information” (Peterson Institute for International Economics 2022).

Globalization is characterized by multidimensionality and dynamics, being a complex phenomenon that includes realities and trends that insinuate themselves into all areas of social life. The most affected areas are those related to some dimensions of international security, namely political, economic, social, informational, cultural, ecological and military, and which constitute as many dimensions of globalization.

In the current context of globalization, many security aspects (interstate conflicts, hybrid wars, financial crisis, poverty, migration, etc.) combine to increase the dangers of a variety of transnational threats such as economic war, weapons proliferation, cyber-attacks, ethnic violence, environmental degradation, cross-border crimes activities that incorporates drugs, human and arms smuggling, and the spread of infectious diseases. Therefore, globalization also means security challenges transcending national dimension, reflecting the increased porosity of state’s borders and relative decline in the *de facto* sovereign authority of states.

Another characteristic of globalization is internationalization: “Globalization is the process of international integration, whereby more and more issues that were once considered domestic ones are transformed into matters of global concern” (Sankar 2022), and state’s role dissipation on the international scene as “the state’s position as the prime referent object of security is now rivalled by other societal groupings” (Hughes 2001, 410). Therefore, the needs of national security coincide in many ways with international security, even if this operational concept is not universally shared (Pişleag 2016, 69). Concomitantly, national security is also globalizing in its sectors recognized by the Copenhagen School (social, political, military, economic and environmental), but so does insecurity.

Security is among the oldest problems that exist in the world; one can say with certainty that the definition of this concept depended and it still depends not only on the analysed era but also on the involved actors, and more importantly on the one issuing this definition. Moreover, the process of defining this concept is even more difficult nowadays, considering the many dimensions of security and the diversified dangers and threats to security in the contemporary world. Still, one of its shortest interpretations is “the absence of threats ... the absence of fear” (Wolfers 1952, 481).



When it comes to security analysis “the link between threat, aggression, vulnerability, impact and risk is an obvious one, even if sometimes there is confusion regarding their identification or sequence, based on causal criteria” (Petrescu 2022, 276).

States face increasing insecurity, triggered by more frequent and intense “disruptions from a range of acute shocks, such as natural disasters, pandemics, cyberattacks, infrastructure failure, and loss of key industries” (FEMA 2023, 1). Therefore, “a nation’s ability to withstand and recover from shocks, whether they are economic, political, or environmental, is a testament to its national resilience. Robust governance, strong infrastructure, social cohesion, and effective disaster preparedness are crucial components of national resilience” (Rawinji 2023).

Hence, considering the above presented ideas, globalization impact on security consists of “both the vertical extension of security in terms of its referent objects and the horizontal extension in terms of security-threat dimensions” (Hughes 2001, 410), and therefore *globalization – security nexus* is mainly seen in terms of apparition of new security actors and challenges, which obviously need appropriate mitigation strategies, as such provided by resilience.

Resilience is a concept adopted in many research fields: politics, engineering, ecology, economics, psychology, etc. Also, “the theorization of cybernetics and general systems theory are also important developments in the formation of resilience theory and thought” (Oxford Bibliographies 2024). Moreover, when talking about resilience in security domain “the lexicon of resilience has grown in international prominence with a focus on resilience practices seen as simultaneously proactive and reactive, with in-built adaptability to the fluid nature of myriad threats and hazards challenging states and their territories” (Coaffee și Fussey 2015, 90).

Resilience has become an umbrella term to cover many different aspects of overcoming adversity and adapting to environment, but we will refer to it as “the ability to prepare for threats and hazards, adapt to changing conditions, and withstand and recover rapidly from disruptions” (FEMA 2023, 2). Actually, the proactive *ability to recover quickly from shocks* is found in most of resilience definitions of international organizations wherein Romania is part of, and therefore our country also adopted it, namely:

- UN defined resilience to be “the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and *recover* from the effects of a hazard *in a timely and efficient manner*, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions” (United Nations 2009, 24);

- NATO sees resilience as “the individual and collective capacity to prepare for, resist, respond to and *quickly recover* from shocks and disruptions, and to ensure the continuity of the Alliance’s activities” (Article 3, The North Atlantic Treaty 1949);

- EU defines resilience “as the ability not only *to withstand* and cope with challenges but also to undergo transitions, in a sustainable, fair, and democratic



manner” (European Commission 2023a). Moreover, for EU resilience means “decreased *vulnerabilities*, increased capacities, and improved well-being” (European Commission 2023b, 3).

When we speak about state’s resilience, Romanian researchers consider it “must be seen as a national characteristic, as a multidimensional and multifunctional ability, a skill construct with a configuration in a permanent dynamic, shaped by the challenges of the security environment” (Circiumaru 2021, 71). Therefore, building national resilience means to align mind-sets, capabilities and investments (Smith-Bingham, Wittenberg, and Kaniewski 2020). Moreover, national resilience of a state is the result of dealing with each security sector resilience: political, military (defence), societal, economic and environmental. These concepts are explained below.

Political resilience of a state depends on its internal characteristics that allows it and its institutions to navigate a variety of disruptions” (Brown 2022, 2). Therefore, the political sector of resilience is reflected in all the others, as “the governance for resilience is complex and often multidirectional” and “... a few governance super-factors – such as control of corruption, societal trust, and high quality political leadership—are exceptionally powerful in enabling a country to augment its resilience through multiple pathways” (Brown 2022, 2).

In a security and defence (military) context, “resilience is focused on whole-of-society mitigation of, response to, and recovery from national emergencies, especially those sparked by hostile actions from adversaries or competitors” (Institute for Security Governance 2021, 1). The latter NATO Strategic Concept “emphasizes that ensuring our national and collective resilience is critical to all our core tasks and underpins our efforts to safeguard our nations, societies and shared values” (NATO 2022). Also, for the Romanian national security, resilience (together with other factors as continuity, adaptability, flexibility, and predictability) is part of the base for an effective response to face the risks, threats and vulnerabilities (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 5).

Societal resilience refers to “the capacity of communities to flexibly contain major disruptions and to rapidly bounce back and forward following the unavoidable decline of their core functionalities” (Elran 2017, 301).

Economic resilience is typically used in two distinct, but overlapping, understandings: the first, when is seen as a “community’s ability to foresee, adapt to, and leverage changing conditions to their advantage” (Georgia Tech 2017) and the latter, as “the ability of an economy as a whole to cope, recover from and reconstruct after a shock” (Hallegatte 2014, 2). In this paper it is considered the second definition that refers to the national economy ability to maintain its balanced status in the occurrence of a threat.

The ecological resilience is defined as “the capacity of a system to undergo disturbance and reorganize so as to still maintain essentially the same functions,



structures, and controls by not moving in a different region of the state space controlled by a diverse set of mutually reinforcing processes” (Zaccarelli, Petrosillo and Zurlini 2008).

In the National Defence Strategy 2020-2024, the concept of Romania’s resilience is approached in a double key: “the inherent capacity of entities - individuals, communities, regions, state - to resist and adapt to events in an articulated manner violent, causing stress, shock, disasters, pandemics or conflicts, on the one hand, and the capacity of these entities to quickly return to a functional, normal state, on the other hand” (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 11).

In terms of national security aspects, the same strategic document operates with the concept of “extended national security” that involves the protection of more dimensions besides the armed defence (national and collective), namely “foreign policy, public order, intelligence activity, counter-intelligence and security, crisis management, education, culture, health, economic, demography, financial, environment, energy or cyber, critical infrastructures and historical and cultural heritage” (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 7). Thus, resilience presumes implementing mitigation practices in the above-mentioned security dimensions, all these intertwined in the security sectors identified by the Copenhagen School.

2. Resilience Factors for Each National Security Sector of Romania

National resilience is expressed in specialty literature under different perspectives (economic, political, all sectors, etc.) and a series of factors, items or pillars.

FM Global Resilience Index achieved by the FM Global Group’s family of business insurance companies and affiliates examines national resilience from the business’ insurers perspective considering three **factors**: *economic* – it measures political and macroeconomic influences on resilience and is composed of five drivers: productivity, political risk, urbanization rate, energy intensity and health expenditure; *risk quality* – it measures the relative commercial and industrial property risk across countries and comprises as drivers (seismic risk exposure, climate risk exposure, climate risk quality, fire risk quality and cyber risk); *supply chain* –that comprises five drivers: infrastructure quality, control of corruption, corporate governance, supply chain visibility and supply chain timeliness. In this Index, Romania has an average 68.4 score of 100 (expressing the maximum level of resilience), ranking on the 38th place from the analysed countries (FM Global 2024).

The Lloyd’s Register Foundation World Risk Poll expresses national resilience in terms of the Resilience Index composed by four-**item** index of confidence in national institutions (ranging score is between 0 and 1, with a higher score indicating greater resilience), wherein Romania, in 2021, ranked 67th out of 111 countries) (L R Foundation 2021).



The European Resilience Dashboard sets of series of aggregate indicators focused on vulnerabilities and capacities quantified in synthetic indices (*social and economic* – economic and financial stability and sustainability; health, education and work; inequalities and social impact of the transitions; *green* – climate change mitigation and adaptation; ecosystems, biodiversity and sustainable agriculture; sustainable use of resources; *digital* – cybersecurity; digital for industry; digital for public space; *geopolitical* – financial globalization; raw material and energy supply; security and demography (European Commission 2023b, 11). For 2023, Romania registered an overall vulnerabilities index of 0.59 and an overall capacities index of 0.25 (European Commission 2023b, 13), that translate in the third place in the EU in terms of exposure to vulnerabilities (Greece and Bulgaria are more vulnerable) and the last place in EU in terms of capacities for resilience.

For NATO, resilience is strictly linked and envisaged in conformity with Article 3 of the Washington Treaty and considered to be the first line of defence focused on societies and critical infrastructure (energy, health, transport, financial, ICT, water, food, public and legal order and safety, chemical and nuclear industry, space and research), action that “involves supporting continuity of government, and the provision of essential services in member states and civil support to the military” (Roepke and Thankey 2019).

For UN, resilience is strongly related to development, therefore, states are quantified in a global framework with 231 unique indicators (Sustainable Development Goals 2024). *Sustainable Development Goals Indicators* are set in conformity to the goals and their subsequent objectives included in *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Thus, for the *Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere*, there is considered the objective to “build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters” (UNGA 2017, 5) for which with 4 indicators². Inhere, are also included political, economic and societal indicators related to poverty, hunger, food security, health, inclusion, rule of law and equality, access to vital resources, sustainable energy, resilience infrastructure, climate change, sustainable use of water, biodiversity, etc.

In 2022 State Resilience Index achieved by the Fund for Peace (an US NGO) with the most complex set of **pillars** – inclusion, social cohesion, state capacity,

² Indicators: 1. Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population; 2. Direct economic loss attributed to disasters in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP); 3. Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030; 4. Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies (UNGA 2017, 5-6).



individual capabilities, environment and ecology, economy, civic space³, Romania stands the worst in its social cohesion (4.6 score), economic sector with 5.6 score, particularly in dynamism sub-pillar (2.8 score) related to the capacity of innovative economies to generate productivity using new ideas and technologies, but also in the trust placed in national institutions (3.1 score) (Fund for Peace 2024).

In this paper's section analysis, we will consider the overall resilience of state's institutions, infrastructures and population. Therefore, in Table 1, there are presented some resilience indicators identified in the above-mentioned statistics as well as practices identified in UN, NATO, the EU, and Romanian policy documents, but also in field's literature containing resilient states experience. Some indicators and practices are specific to each sector, but some comply with most or even all the mentioned security sectors. Still, this is not an exhaustive iteration, but rather an explanatory one, with the most needs in terms of national resilience for Romania.

As it was already shown in the European Resilience Dashboard, Romania is among EU countries with the weakest resilience performance. This is expressed in "higher vulnerabilities in the areas of inequalities and social impact of the transitions, health, education and work, sustainable use of resources, digitalization and financial globalization" (European Commission 2023b, 43), and the need for capacities particularly in "inequalities and social impact of the transitions, health, education and work, sustainable use of resources, ecosystems, biodiversity and sustainable agriculture, all areas of the digital dimension, as well as security and demography" (European Commission 2023b, 43). Thus, there is room for improving both categories of resilience indexes by limiting vulnerabilities and building capacities. This is mainly achieved through "the development of the security culture of society as a whole to minimize vulnerabilities" and specific practices as "increase of citizens' inclusion on social, political and economic dimensions" (included in Table above).

UN Sustainable Development Goals Indicators show in 2023 Romania encounters major challenges in achieving *gender equality* goal (particularly "Ratio of female-to-male labour force participation rate" indicator) and significant challenges in other 10 out of 17 goals, each with poor performance on at least one indicator (SDG 2023, 2). Thus, inclusive education and equality on the job market are a must to increase gender equality resilience.

³ In the State Resilience Index methodology, for each pillar are assigned sub-pillars: *inclusion* – inclusion of youth, political inclusion, access to finance, group based inclusion, access to economic resources, access to employment, protection against precariousness; *social cohesion* – social capital, social relations, confidence in national institutions; state capacity – finances, government effectiveness, disaster risk reduction, public health, education outcomes, rule of law, freedom from corruption; *individual capabilities* – food/nutrition, education system, health, wealth; *environment and ecology* – pollution, ocean and fisheries health, agricultural productivity, ecosystem health, biodiversity, long-term climate stability, clean energy, water availability; *economy* – diversification, business environment, dynamism/innovation, physical infrastructure, capital flows, economic management; *civil space* – engagement, accountability, democratic structures, human rights and civil liberties, information access. **All scores are between 0 and 10, from the lowest to the maximum level of resilience for a state.**

Table 1: Resilience factors and practices for Romanian national security sectors

National security sector	Resilience indicators ⁴	Resilience practices
Political	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - robust governance; - high political leadership; - political stability; - strong civil society; - confidence in national institutions; - control of corruption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - diminishing threats against state's sovereignty (Circiumaru 2021, 17), through international cooperation and diplomacy; - providing continuity of government and critical government services (Roepke and Thanky, Resilience: the first line of defence 2019); - representation and involvement of civil society in governmental projects; - building public trust in state's institutions; - enhancing government capacity for effective and efficient action (Guvernul Romaniei 2024); - private sector involvement in policing; - tackling corruption and wastefulness and improving transparency (Howell 2013, 7).
Military	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - performance of military capabilities⁵ and personnel; - membership in collective security organizations; - defence spending. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhanced military cooperation within the formats established in the region; - "maintaining and developing individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack" (Article 3, The North Atlantic Treaty 1949); - levelling up more than 2% defence spending in the GDP.
Societal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social cohesion; - proficient educational system; - culture of tolerance and equality; - public health; - access to natural spaces; - rule of law; - cultural heritage; - judiciary system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - multidimensional social support, particularly for disfavoured categories of people (elders, children, women, migrants, disabled, etc.); - settling legislation to improve tools for fighting hybrid threats (terrorism, disinformation, extremism, hate speech, etc.); - "ensuring quality and inclusive education, adapting human resources to the dynamics of the labour market and technology, combating poverty and promoting social inclusion, ensuring quality health services accessible to all" (Ministry of Investments and European Projects 2023, 13); - "the increase in the quality of life of citizens and to the reduction of economic and social division" (Ministry of Investments and European Projects 2023, 13). - better absorption of EU and national funds for innovation and technologies in the market (Ministry of Investments and European Projects 2023, 6); - "investment in innovation and knowledge-based capital" (OECD 2014, 4); - reducing gaps between the development level in different regions (Ministry of Investments and European Projects 2023, 13); - "increasing economic competitiveness and the level of digitalization to support the innovative and intelligent economic transformation of Romania" (Ministry of Investments and European Projects 2023, 13); - "provision of reliable, secure, and affordable electricity" (Stout, et al. 2019, 2).
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GDP/capita; - foreign investments; - strong industry; - sustainable use of resources - balanced currency; - access to resources; - income equality. 	

⁴ Resilience factors are excerpted from the factors, items or pillars used to quantify in FM Global Resilience Index, The Lloyd's Register Foundation World Risk Poll and State Resilience Index.

⁵ For this indicator there are considered: military equipment, readiness, doctrine, interoperability.



Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- stable ecosystems;- water access;- clean energy/ greenhouse gas emissions;- biological diversity;- agricultural output (The World Bank 2024).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- harmonization of forest management practices with those regarding biodiversity conservation and environmental protection (Consiliul Uniunii Europene 12319/21 ADD 1 2021, 31);- optimum management of wastes;- implementation of green budgeting practices (Consiliul Uniunii Europene 12319/21 ADD 1 2021, 171);- need for sustainable use of resources (European Commission 2023b, 43).- “robust civil-military capabilities that sustain governance and build and maintain operational readiness in the face of national emergencies, crises or conflicts” (Institute for Security Governance 2021, 1)- increase of citizens’ inclusion on social, political and economic dimensions;- the development of the security culture of society as a whole to minimize vulnerabilities;- effective crisis management and contingency plans settlement for challenges and threats against national security predicted on medium term horizon (climate change⁶, the destabilization actions of the Russian Federation, etc.) (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 21);- “development of own mechanisms of quick and efficient reaction and, inherently, of a culture of solidly dimensioned security - including among its citizens” (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 6);- providing a stock of education, health, income, and food security for each citizen in order to avoid syncope in “vital areas such as economics, health or education” (Administrația Prezidențială 2020, 6);- “more robust, integrated and coherent approach to building national and Alliance-wide resilience against military and non-military threats and challenges to our security” (NATO 2022, 7);- “share and evaluate successful resilience policies and practices from different country contexts” (United Nations 2020, 74).
All/more sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- strong critical national infrastructure;- protected space and cyber capabilities;- effective disaster preparedness;- inclusion of different categories of population;- security culture.	

Fund for Peace State Resilience Index shows the resilience practices related to improvement of social cohesion and dynamism through *inclusive practices in society, multidimensional social support, particularly for disfavoured categories of people (elders, children, women, migrants, disabled, etc.), better absorption of EU and national funds for innovation and technologies in the market and building public trust in state’s institutions* are a must. Also, all the pillars and sub-pillars must be supported with specific factors and practices in order to improve the level of resilience of a state in all the security sectors.

Romania’s National Recovery and Resilience Plan is based on six pillars (green transition; smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; social and territorial cohesion; health and economic, social and institutional resilience; digital transformation; and policies for the next generation) that cover national needs in the security sectors (NextGeneration EU 2024). These are integrated in national strategies financed

⁶ “The main threat to national security (of Romania, author’s note) lies in the production sudden changes in temperature, particularly dry summers, torrential rain and subsequent flooding” (Circiumaru 2021, 21).



with European investments mainly through the Recovery and Resilience Facility⁷, but also by other adjacent multiannual financial frameworks (i.e. Cohesion Policy related to SME support, investments in a low-carbon economy, research, innovation and territorial development (EuregioDataStories 2024) or Common Agricultural Policy used to secure the future of agriculture and forestry, as well as achieving the objectives of the European Green Deal (European Commission 2024a)). Obviously, each EU resilience pillar is reflected in at least one or more sectors of security, but utmost in national security overall. For example: green transition is part of economic and environmental security sectors; smart, sustainable and inclusive growth is addressed in economic, societal and environmental sectors; social and territorial cohesion – political, economic, societal sectors; digital transformation and policies for the next generation are part of all security sectors).

Conclusions

All three concepts, namely “globalization”, “security” and “resilience” lack generally accepted definitions, although their topics took a plethora of perspectives in different specialties literature. Still, all of them have in common the overarching characteristic their future development majorly preoccupies societies, states and organizations.

As regards the nexus between the three, while globalization and security are phenomena that need to be tackled in the contemporary ages for the well-being of human organized structures, resilience comes as a solution to those. Also, resilience practices need to be multidimensional in order to support all the security sectors affected by the multi-layered globalization.

In literature, there are a series of statistical indexes that present factors, items or pillars identified to reflect security sectors’ national resilience indicators. Some of them are focused on economic resilience (FM Global Resilience Index), societal resilience (State Resilience Index), political resilience (The Lloyd’s Register Foundation World Risk Poll), or multi-sector resilience (The European Resilience Dashboard, UN Sustainable Development Goals Indicators). Moreover, as the overall indicators found in statistics and the increased use of resilience strategy to build security show a new connection, further investigations need to be conducted, other than the one between security and development, the one between resilience and development, as resilience, although in the absence of a crisis, triggers development. Thus, a further study could thoroughly investigate security – resilience – development nexus.

Romanian national resilience key aspect means implementing practices in different security sectors related to some specific indicators that need to be addressed: political – to reinforce key governance competencies and citizens’

⁷ EU’s plan to emerge stronger and more resilient from the current crisis (European Commission 2024b).



confidence on those to support delivery in the context of multiple crises; societal –to improve citizens and stakeholders participation and representation, concomitantly with stimulation of inclusion and innovation; all sectors – critical infrastructure preservation, development with the use of high technology and effective crisis management and contingency plans settlement for challenges and threats against national security predicted on medium term horizon.

Part of the resilience practices to address key indicators affected at the national level are already implemented in some organizations (NATO, EU), or in more resilient states⁸, or are already stipulated in national strategic documents, particularly the National Defence Strategy, but not already properly implemented as it should in order to deliver positive results (for example, the level of absorption of EU and national funds used to develop innovation and technologies to improve the six pillars of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Administrația Prezidențială. 2020. *Strategia Națională de Apărare a Țării 2020-2024*. Bucuresti.

Albrow, Martin, and Elizabeth King. 1990. *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London: Sage.

Article 3, The North Atlantic Treaty. 1949. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm#:~:text=Article%203,capacity%20to%20resist%20armed%20attack

Brown, Frances Z. 2022. “Governance for Resilience: How Can States Prepare for the Next Crisis?” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Brown_Governance_for_Resilience_final.pdf.

Circiumaru, Florian (coord). 2021. *Cresterea rezilientei marilor sisteme publice ale Romaniei. Studiu de caz sistemul militar*. Bucuresti: Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”.

Coaffee, Jon, and Pete Fussey. 2015. “Constructing resilience through security and surveillance: The politics, practices and tensions of security-driven resilience.” *Security Dialogue* 86– 105.

Consiliul Uniunii Europene 12319/21 ADD 1. 2021. *Anexă la Decizia de punere în aplicare a Consiliului de aprobare a evaluării planului de redresare și reziliență al României*. Accessed 02 03, 2024. <https://mfe.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/e6d481b413db9e7384a946c92e833d45.pdf>

Davis, Lynn E. 2003. *Globalization’s Security Implications*. Pittsburgh: RAND.

Duțu, Petre. 2010. *Globalizare versus separatism politic*. Bucuresti: Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”.

⁸ To identify those countries, the cited sources in Table 1 must be explored.



- Elran, Meir. 2017. "Societal Resilience: From Theory to Policy and Practice." *NATO Science for Peace and Security Series C: Environmental Security book series (NAPSC)*. Berlin: Springer.
- EuregioDataStories. 2024. "Cohesion policy support through financial instruments." Accessed 02 13, 2024. <https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/stories/s/Financial-instruments-under-cohesion-policy-2021-2/tkqa-xd2d/#:~:text=Member%20States%20authorities%20use%20the,more%20connected%20and%20social%20Europe>
- European Commission. 2023a. *EU Science Hub Resilience*. Accessed February 2, 2024. https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu/scientific-activities-z/resilience_en#:~:text=Resilience%20is%20defined%20as%20the,wide%2C%20360%2Ddegrees%20approach
- . 2023b. *Monitoring resilience in the EU*. Accessed 02 14, 2024. <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC135043>
- . 2024a. "The common agricultural policy: 2023-27." Accessed 02 12, 2024. https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/common-agricultural-policy/cap-overview/cap-2023-27_en#strongbudget
- . 2024b. "The Recovery and Resilience Facility." Accessed 02 14, 2024. https://commission.europa.eu/business-economy-euro/economic-recovery/recovery-and-resilience-facility_en
- FEMA. 2023. *National Resilience Guidance: Background and Key Concept*. March. https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema_national-resilience-guidance-project-background_2023.pdf
- FM Global. 2024. "Economic." Accessed 02 05, 2024. <https://www.fmglobal.com/research-and-resources/tools-and-resources/resilienceindex/explore-the-data/?&cr=ROU&sn=ex&cd=ROU>
- Fund for Peace. 2024. *State Resilience Index*. Accessed 02 04, 2024. [https://www.fundforpeace.org/SRI/about.html#:~:text=The%20State%20Resilience%20Index%20\(SRI,the%20severity%20of%20that%20crisis](https://www.fundforpeace.org/SRI/about.html#:~:text=The%20State%20Resilience%20Index%20(SRI,the%20severity%20of%20that%20crisis)
- Georgia Tech. 2017. *What is Economic Resilience?* 9 January. Accessed 01 01, 2024. <https://cedr.gatech.edu/what-is-economic-resilience/>
- Guvernul Romaniei. 2024. *Strengthening the Innovative Capacity of the Government of Romania: Interim Assessment Report*. Accessed 02 05, 2024. https://gov.ro/fisiere/pagini_fisiere/OCDE_-_Raportul_de_evaluare_a_capacitatii_de_inovare_a_administratiei_publice_din_Romania.pdf
- Hallegatte, Stephane. 2014. "Economic Resilience : Definition and Measurement." *World Bank*. Accessed 02 03, 2024. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/ea1ef6dc-1ed4-528f-8b76-6b9b02971b1a/content>
- Hamadullah, Hamad Kakepto. 2010. "The phenomenon of globalization." *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*.



- Howell, Lee. 2013. *Resilience: What it is and why it's needed*. https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/governance-risk-compliance-consulting-services/resilience/publications/pdfs/issue3/what_it_is_and_why_its_needed.pdf
- Hughes, Christopher W. 2001. "The Globalization-Security Nexus in the Asia-Pacific." *Security Dialogue* 32 (4). <https://library.fes.de/libalt/journals/swetsfulltext/12558947.pdf>
- Institute for Security Governance. 2021. *Building Resilience for National Defence*. May. Accessed 02 05, 2024. <https://nps.edu/documents/113018911/125185574/ISG+Resilience.pdf/bbbe0227-207d-873a-3864-c4d19d7bdc14?t=1622747034982#:~:text=In%20a%20defense%20and%20security%20context%2C%20resilience%20is%20focused%20on,actions%20from%20adversaries%20or%20competitors>
- Kaypak, Şafak, and Üyesi Vedat Yilmaz. 2019. "Security Understanding of a New Dimension in the Globalization Process and Environmental Effects." *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences* 21 (3): 855.
- L R Foundation. 2021. "World Risk Poll." Accessed 02 05, 2024. https://wrp.lrfoundation.org.uk/country-results-2021-resilience/world_risk_poll_results_2021_resilience_romania.pdf
- Ministry of Investments and European Projects. 2023. "The Cohesion Policy." 04. Accessed 02 05, 2024. <https://mfe.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/a9f8f7c1186a0f44c769d04a80fca8fe.pdf>
- NATO. 2022. *NATO Strategic Concept*. Accessed 02 06, 2024. https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2022/6/pdf/290622-strategic-concept.pdf
- NextGeneration EU. 2024. *Recovery and Resilience Facility*. Accessed 01 20, 2024. https://next-generation-eu.europa.eu/recovery-and-resilience-facility_en
- OECD. 2014. *Overview paper on resilient economies and societies*. Accessed 02 14, 2024. [https://www.oecd.org/mcm/C-MIN\(2014\)7-ENG.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/mcm/C-MIN(2014)7-ENG.pdf)
- Oxford Bibliographies. 2024. *Politics of Resilience*. Accessed 02 04, 2024. <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0297.xml>
- Peterson Institute for International Economics. 2022. *What Is Globalization?* 24 October. Accessed 02 05, 2024. <https://www.piie.com/microsites/globalization/what-is-globalization>
- Petrescu, Dan-Lucian. 2022. "Evaluarea amenințărilor și riscurilor la adresa securității naționale." In *Amenințări și riscuri la adresa securității naționale a României - Orizont 2040*, by Florian Circiumaru and Dan-Lucian (coord.) Petrescu, 276-288. București: Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”.
- Pișleag, Țuțu. 2016. "The Security between National and International." *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Relationes Internationales* 9 (2): 69.
- Rawinji, Fladwel. 2023. *The Unbreakable Spirit: Exploring the Dimensions of*



- Resilience*. 10 August. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/unbreakable-spirit-exploring-dimensions-resilience-fladwel-rawinji/>
- Roepke, Wolf-Diether, and Hasit Thankey. 2019. "Resilience: the first line of defence." *NATO Review*. 27 February. Accessed 02 04, 2024. <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2019/02/27/resilience-the-first-line-of-defence/index.html>
- . 2019. "Resilience: the first line of defence." *NATO Review*. 27 February. Accessed 02 14, 2024. <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2019/02/27/resilience-the-first-line-of-defence/index.html>
- Sankar, Ajaya. 2022. *Globalization & Resilience – Dynamics of Effective Strategies*. 28 May. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/globalization-resilience-dynamics-effective-ajaya-sankar-r/>.
- SDG. 2023. "Sustainable Development Report." Accessed 02 15, 2024. <https://dashboards.sdgindex.org/static/profiles/pdfs/SDR-2023-romania.pdf>.
- Smith-Bingham, Richard, Wittenberg, Alex, and Daniel Kaniewski. 2020. "Building national resilience. Aligning mindsets, capabilities, and investment." *Marsh and Mc Lennan Advantage*.
- Stout, Sherry, Nathan Lee, Sadie Cox, and et all. 2019. "Power sector resilience planning guidebook." *Resilient Energy Platform*. June. Accessed 02 05, 2024. <https://resilient-energy.org/training-and-resources/publications/73489-guidebook-final.pdf/view>.
- Sustainable Development Goals. 2024. "SDG Indicators." Accessed 02 15, 2024. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/indicators-list/>
- The World Bank. 2024. "Environment." Accessed 02 16, 2024. <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/themes/environment.html>
- UNGA. 2017. "A/RES/71/313. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly ." 6 July. Accessed 02 15, 2024. <https://undocs.org/Home/Mobile?FinalSymbol=A%2FRES%2F71%2F313&Language=E&DeviceType=Desktop&LangRequested=False>
- United Nations. 2020. "UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies." *United Nations Sustainable Development Group*. Accessed 02 15, 2024. <https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/UN-Resilience-Guidance-Final-Sept.pdf>.
- . 2009. *UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/2009-unisdr-terminology-disaster-risk-reduction?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiAwvKtBhDrARIsAJj-kThNulWJZuz2jG6k6qD8oXL8wZjDH-HxOXglkrFomBfiv_AFMI5JofcaAIQCEALw_wcB
- Wolfers, Arnold. 1952. "„National Security” as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* 67 (4): 481-502.
- Zaccarelli, N., I. Petrosillo, and G. Zurlini. 2008. "Retrospective Analysis." *Encyclopedia of Ecology* 3020-3029. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/B9780080454054007059>