

MULTIMEDIA, CATALYST FOR RESIZING THE SOCIAL SECTOR OF NATIONAL SECURITY DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Cristina BODONI, PhD student
"Carol I" National Defense University, București

The isolation imposed by the pandemic has produced the "rediscovery" of Internet utilities, the only window to the real world. The first areas that took over were the most connected to the sciences of communication. The media has retreated, quickly adapting to traditional functions. (Tele)Communications and the media, the internet and social networks have become reference media in recent years, environments that cause problems at all levels, from the individual to the most relevant to the international and where very few can keep pace with these evolutions. When we say that there are few who keep up, we turn our attention to the effects of change on the national security sectors. However, the laws and systems of protection of events, dangers and risks are far from implementing the general module, and the existing ones are outdated due to the complex vortex of changes and evolution of technologies that people have entered, where there are no borders, national laws or simple rules. of conduct, universally accepted, given that in the virtual space, the state is almost non-existent.

Keywords: mass-media; multimedia; internet; security sectors; international security; national security; journalism;

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

"Can you really distinguish between the media as a tool for information and entertainment and as an agent of manipulation and indoctrination?"
Herbert Marcuse

The world has entered a vortex of change that turns the present into challenging sensitive situations in cross-border free space and virtual space through the tools of the competitive digital environment. All these are visible factors of impact, which directly contribute to the vulnerability of the state by the lack of state control over the spaces that in the past could have managed without problems.

In these conditions, we notice that the huge multimedia has developed at a dizzying pace in the cross-border information environment. In this context, the public system of the state is no longer perceived as a vector of power, it has not had the efficient tools through which it could impose conditions and rules. Here, we are dealing with at least paradoxical situations. We no longer quickly differentiate between published lies and truths. We have not known enough to rapidly recognise which news is built on established rules of conduct of the media and what is actually communicated through the media. Then we notice that the media (does not) manage the information they publish in their interactions with people when all stakeholders should take into account the right to an opinion. Last but not least, we observe that access to news and information and the right to exercise freedom of opinion and expression are being discussed in public in order to identify in the future tools for coercion and the construction of rules of conduct on the Internet. Thus, the world's states and relevant intergovernmental organizations indirectly confirm the inability of all international actors to protect states in their Westphalian sense. The causes for the diminution of the state of national security can be found in two tendencies, which contradict each other. Since March 2020, we have noticed a sharp trend of renationalization, then regionalisation. In 2021 we have some signs of deglobalisation in the real international space, situations in which this protection can no longer be addressed through the established areas of national security sectors, regardless of size, their political, military, economic,

social, environmental or informational. On the other hand, we have an accelerated globalisation in cyberspace through globalization caused by the situations created by the quarantine imposed worldwide after the declaration of the pandemic with Covid-19 by the World Health Organization on 11 March 2020. The national quarantine period in Romania was between 24 March and 14 May 2020. With small differences of days, after quarantine was established in almost all countries of the world, the pandemic became the predominant variable for all subsequent interdependent variables, for everything that happened to the world at the (inter)national level, in all areas of our lives, either in our private life or professionally.

This genuine context was favourable for the elaboration of this scientific research. Its aim is to highlight *the role of multimedia in reconfiguring the social security sector*. In this sense, the approach of this paper followed the criteria related to exploratory, empirical and deductive methodologies. Deductive research has emerged from the empirical exploration of the theoretical scientific basis in the fields of communication sciences and security studies. These produced the explanatory factors for approaching a subject through the transdisciplinary method, which is in full development. As a method of research, transdisciplinarity emerges from the causal analysis of a complex epistemological problem proposed by the connection between different disciplines (Duțu, 2016, p. IX), as multimedia in pandemic times and the effects of multimedia actions on national security in the information age. Thus we build connection points of factors from an imaginary graph to discover ways to move the intersection points of a (sterile) theory into those of effective verification in the real space of a nation's social environment to follow the verification of the research hypothesis: the use of digital tools, the inflation of information popularised through multimedia are both risks and opportunities in our deeply hybridised society. In other words, national security, stability and community development at local and national level are affected by new technologies and applications on the Internet; implicitly the preservation of the entity of the state and the unity of the nation.

The article consists of three sections: (R) the conceptual evolution of security, the globalisation of national security and multimedia, the alarm system for social security. They are developed starting from definitions put into practice, in order to obtain conclusions at the end of the paper.

THE CONCEPTUAL (R)EVOLUTION OF SECURITY

Over the years, security has been approached in the situational context created by the problems that existed in a state at one time. Of all these, one of the remaining definitions of the 2020s is given by the American Walter Lippmann in 1943 (p. 51): *“A nation is safe insofar as it is not in danger of having to sacrifice values. essential, if he wants to avoid war and, perhaps, when provoked, to maintain them, gaining victory in a war”*. It has passed the test of many generations. It remained valid during the war, then, in the period of realism and Marxism in terms of the bipolar (nuclear) power of the Cold War through high (politico-military) policies. In the 1980s, the tradition of equating security with military issues and the use of force was shifted from the military sector to the non-military dimension of dangers in society and the economy (Buzan & al, 1998, p. 21). The changes that began at the end of 1989 did not bypass security studies either. The world has entered an era of transition that does not seem to end in the 2020s. The transition to market economies by replacing the totalitarian regimes of democracy in European states and cheapening access to developing technologies have produced a mobile perpetuum from which we still do not stop in the neo-era of all paradigms of international theory, through neorealism, neoliberalism, neo-conservatism or Gramscian neo-Marxism which is almost the opposite of the neo-Marxism 2.0 of the digital proletariat, then progressivism.

These paradigms introduce us to two more interesting definitions for security. The first belongs to the Indian Praphakaran Kaleri (2006, p. 4), who emphasised national security through the *“measurable capacity of a nation to overcome multidimensional threats to the apparent well-being of its people and its survival as a nation-state at some point, through balancing all government policy instruments through governance that can be indexed by calculation, empirically or otherwise and that can be extended to global securities through its external variables”*. second one refers to the cross-border level of security, international security is the coordination between states to pursue common interests, understood in terms of political, economic and military capabilities (Ocelik, 2015, p. 11).

After the new high technologies became popular, their evolution accelerated, forcing humanity to adapt to multiple and repeated shocks. This situation has also received a generic name used excessively, it is resilience. In turn, this resilience is the watchword of these years, it is being tested in all areas after the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic was declared. Neither states escape, nor democratic ones,

nor those with authoritarian regimes. However, in order to survive, they all try to build the necessary implementation, monitoring and control tools appropriate to new trends, opportunities or challenges. Precisely under the pressure of the dangers arising from the existing context, *“a surveillance capable of corrupting and controlling people, users in the information system, was born, producing true asymmetries of knowledge and power by its hidden nature in the nerves of Internet algorithms and its actions enabled it to impose a substantial control over the division of learning outside our consciousness and without means of struggle”* (Zuboff, 2019, p. 181); as well as through cleverly constructed answers given by algorithms, artificial intelligence to provide essential questions.

The complexity of national security is highlighted mainly by factors related to the political, military, economic, social, environmental, infrastructure (Buzan, 2017, pp. 158-176) and information, integrating in the background, criteria such as health in the social sector or multimedia from that of information. In the midst of a pandemic, the two, health and multimedia, review the pyramid of the importance of security sectors. Almost two years after the first recorded cases of Covid-19, we note that we are dealing with a recombination of the security sectors since the effects produced by multimedia in the information sector; migration, terrorism or health – subsectors of the social sector can dramatically influence the level of impact on national security.

The range of threats includes all possible risks, from dramas of a simple person to a change of political regime or the preference for a certain political leader. Three of the best-known situations are the *Arab Spring* (2011), Brexit (2016) and the US presidential election campaigns of Barack Obama (2008) and Donald Trump (2016). Then, Brexit and the elected presidents were campaigns conducted in democratic states, they did not produce another political regime, they did not replace peace with the chaos of war. Instead, the instigation of violence and the need to change political regimes and authority with democratic regimes were the extremely dangerous factors for the Arab states. In most of these states, clashes between the state and participants have led to changes of government, but in Libya and Syria, violent demonstrations have turned into humanitarian disasters. They all started with revolutions developed during the wave of demonstrations called the Arab Spring. In December 2010, in North Africa and the Middle East, the riots began on various social networks on the Internet (Facebook and Twitter), where the people organised demonstrations that ended in civil wars and the destruction of states.

All of the above are examples of situations that have shaped new approaches to security, both at national and international level, more specifically, at regional one. For us, the Europeans, this aspect of security is reinterpreted especially in the institutional forums of the European Union to build a new *EU Security Union Strategy: Connecting the dots in a new security ecosystem* (2020, p. 1) as follows: *“security is a cross-cutting issue that it enters almost all spheres of life and affects a multitude of policy areas. Building a real security ecosystem can reduce the false dichotomy between online and offline, between digital and physical, and between internal and external security concerns and threats. From protecting our critical infrastructure to fighting cybercrime and fighting hybrid threats”*.

GLOCALISING NATIONAL SECURITY

The Covid-19 pandemic is just the tip of the iceberg of problems facing the world. We have a multiple crisis in which more hidden or visible crises overlap, which reveal already existing problems internationalized before 2019 in all countries of the world. All this brings us back to the phrase of Thucydides, over 2,500 years old, that man fights for three reasons (Roman, 2016, p. 59, according to Thucydides): *“fear, interest and honour”*. Since March 2020, the fight has been no longer with weapons and ammunition, we have rediscovered that, in fact, the biggest threats to national security are in fact global, the universally valid dangers to national security come from the social and environmental areas. Thus, the fear arose in no time because of threats to the survival of humanity through the lens of social security criteria. We have reconsidered our interests. The main focus all over the world was reduced to an almost simplistic fundamental interest of existing.

At the Romanian national level, the pandemic put another hard problem in a period of existing disharmony that indicates a crisis superimposed and multiplied by multimedia means, which are far from everything that should protect the state from internal dangers and protect it.

Globally, we are facing small crises affecting large industries, such as the microchip crisis. The world is facing natural disasters, through which the effects produced in strong states such as Germany, USA or China indicate that the world needs to operate according to other principles than before, because climate change shows us that we are on the verge of destroying our planet. However, in the new spaces of dialogue on the internet, on social media, people waste their time with cheap debates, unnecessary insults. We live in closed groups on social networks (hubs) without taking into account the others. On top of that, neither journalists

nor politicians are willing to listen to each other. Respecting each other's opinions is on the verge of extinction, contradictory debates and discussions are very rare. They show us only a small series of trends that threaten to impede the ability of the media to act as a watchdog of democracy in multimedia, in our case, the rule of law.

The pandemic of the 2020s put humanity in the paradoxical situation of being both an actor and a spectator. On the one hand, because the man quickly realised that he has something to say, his opinion can no longer be controlled, until after the algorithms of social networks detect him, we witness accents placed in cleavages in public communication, especially on the Internet. On the other hand, we have an almost childish *secrecy* of the government that does not allow governments to choose on logical criteria, only to turn the lack of real information into more and more aberrant scenarios supported in turn by means of propaganda and manipulation. All this starts from simple and efficient unreasonable restrictions, to which the society responds with its own means, tries by asymmetric means to warn the officials that they need pertinent information to decide in an informed way what to do. Moreover, we note that the unavailability of governments comes in tandem with the pamphlet or restriction of the right to opinion of some journalists with a significant impact on public opinion. So, *cheap shows* of all kinds have taken over the agenda through entertainment and reality shows.

Decency and seriousness in journalism are on the decay. People who trust the news have been declining in recent years. According to the Statista online website, from the study done in February (Watson, 2021) we notice that: Finland was on the first place with 65%; on the 21st, 22nd places were Romania, with 42%; Turkey, with 41%; on the 43rd place was Bulgaria, with 32%.

Distrust and diminished alternative perspectives make it likely for journalists to position themselves to tip the scales towards authoritarianism, the loss of freedoms. The first to lose was the press. This situation makes the rule of law vulnerable, implicitly the national security intelligence sector, being only one of the trends that threaten to hinder the media's ability to act as a security *watchdog*.

Specifically, Caparini (2004) explains the situation in multimedia: (a) the climate of securitisation through restrictions on publicly available information and the ostracism of critical journalists have had a significant impact on the media; (b) '*shifting*' news to entertainment and a decline in serious public business journalism impose serious constraints on reporting complex security issues; (c) monopolising media ownership through the acquisition of written and audiovisual media by large media trusts, undermining independent and critical journalism; (d) reliance

on official sources makes presentation more difficult alternative perspectives; (e) judicial deference may have an effect, with the courts joining the government on issues that oppose national security claims against freedom of the press.

By tradition, from the Roman protective goddess of the house, Securitas, to the present day, security has been defined by concepts created from antonyms, protection and exposure, attack and defence, vulnerable versus invulnerable, danger and safety, etc. by extrapolation, national security refers to the absence of the threat to the state, its protection and security. These do not mean calibration related to uncertainty, a means of release from danger, but it underlines the means adopted by contrast. According to the Romanian law in force, national security represents "*a state of legality, balance and social, economic and political stability necessary for the existence and development of the Romanian national state as a sovereign, unitary, independent and indivisible state, maintaining the rule of law and the climate of unrestricted exercise of the fundamental rights, freedoms and duties of the citizens, according to the democratic principles and norms established by the Constitution*" (Law no. 51, 1991).

The current approach to national security is constrained by the triptych of internal and external *stakeholders, material and immaterial resources*. In other words, the challenges and opportunities created by the pandemic, climate change and the exacerbation of the use of new technologies in exponential development have put states in a spiral of change a mobile perpetuum to effectively manage the national security system domestically and internationally; in natural spaces and the artificial, virtual. If in the cyber area, globalisation exists at the highest level and states have too little power; in real terms, the limited space in the real life of glocalisation indicates that social groups want to maintain their local values and traditions, accepting tailor-made innovation according to their culture, so that they can find themselves in the new environment.

Glocalisation was back in the forefront of international relations after 2020 in the midst of global quarantine when states were once again raising their physical borders; it was the direct effect of the perceived threat of states to their national security. The wave of globalisation has shown signs of stagnation, retreat or slowbalisation, leaving room for glocalisation. Glocalisation refers to components of globalisation adapted to local preferences, customs and laws, because localization transforms globalization into something applicable to the individual, his needs and context (Racoma, 2018).

This glocalisation is the current mirror of local and national communities, it proportionally reflects the complexity of the world in which we live. This is reiterated by the withdrawal from Afghanistan. One of the reasons is that the West has understood that there are communities that prefer war to accept something that those societies do not identify with, that they decide to remain united not to become just a conglomeration of people; but they are willing to borrow, to adapt their components of globalisation to their local or national culture; knowing that the factor that moderates the conditions of communities (the social sector) is the one that faces the pressures of the global business environment. Glocalisation is a nuance of deglobalisation, the other is slowbalisation. By this, we mean the slowdown in global integration, the new trend in the international system. It considers non-military means. The pandemic has restricted the four freedoms: the cross-border movement of goods, services, capital and people, as commentators have proclaimed the beginning of deglobalisation (Titievskaja et al, 2020, p. 2). In the short term, cross-border trade in goods is likely to remain tense, but trade in global services and the global economy is expected to grow at a modest pace (Kurelian, 2020). This slowdown in globalization is mainly felt in five directions (Titievskaja & al, 2020, pp. 4-19): (a) cross-border trade in goods and services, (b) open and globalized financial system, (c) deep income inequality, (d) international physical interactions (tourism and migration), (e) movement of data and digital exchanges. In these directions we have the triangulation of the economic, social and information security sectors. Interdisciplinarity is not new. Buzan, Weaver and Wilde made the connection between social security and international security, explaining that: the societal level of security shares some qualities with international security, even if social security represents culture, religion, values and traditions, civil guard or police functions, issues law and social justice, and international security is rooted in the traditions of power politics (Buzan & al, 1998, p. 21). This interference is more current than ever because of the amalgam of information and possible dialogue at a click away.

MULTIMEDIA, THE SOCIAL SECURITY ALARM SYSTEM

When we say “*multimedia*”, we tend to think of various activities associated with the press. However, this area is much more complex. From news to commercials, from movies to music, from talk shows to competitions, to podcasts, debates, from encyclopaedias to interactive learning programs, we consider that all these activities are related to the universe of a society and where the importance

of the multimedia sector is becoming exponentially more relevant as a national security sector. The fact that multimedia has become more important in this century is that, in online and offline spaces, happiness has no recorded history. Multimedia practice remains constant after it is transferred to the Internet; it rather signals divergent situations. Even for political actors, consensus is no longer the overriding condition, they prefer the collision in favour of convergence or dialogue with all other stakeholders. In the general meaning of the information area, the environments are closely related to the modalities, at the same time they refer more to the technical means by which the communication is disseminated (Nicotra, 2019, p. 41). For Arianne Mallender, multimedia is a set of informational tools that allow a person to produce graphic and sound content, to consult and interact in cyberspace (2008, pp. 11-12). Multimedia is an accumulation of extended ways of media in the information space, for Jodie Nicotra. The author considers that the means used are the basic sensory ones of communication (Nicotra, 2019, pp. 39-40): verbal (spoken or written words); hearing (speaking, singing, music or ambient noise); visual (photography or video, text, gesture or expression); haptic (sense of touch and where/how the body is positioned).

It is not necessary to make elaborate studies to observe that the way news are covered on different multimedia channels is made subjectively or objectively, but, on the contrary. We already know who it belongs to, what camp it supports and what direction the respective trust has, a fact that is all the more noticeable in the hours of maximum audience of the news foreground. However, if all those presented produce effects in a certain sense or actions taken in the name of the interests of the big international players, states and multinationals, from the political, military and economic sectors, very few assume them. Unfortunately, not many people wonder why such news appears or who uses that news if the interest in the popularisation provoked was premeditated or thoughtless; if it is of public interest and is more of a niche. This news may contain fake news, misinformation or unverified information, tools for manipulating hidden interests, which should not be ignored. On the contrary, because in terms of the legality of transmissions, we have at least two situations. One is regulated, that of the linear written press and that of the audiovisual, the other refers to the nonlinear cyberspace (Mallender, 2008, p. 12).

In cyberspace, the situation becomes even more complicated. Posts are monitored and controlled by bots and algorithms, then interpreted through the private policies of the company that owns the website, portal or search engine

on which the information and dialogues are posted. The most common situations are censored posts, which seem to run counter to democratic goals, such as the right to an opinion, and in the name of which people have made accounts on the Internet. In this environment, users assumed that “the internet should liberate us” (Bartlett, p. 1), that we could communicate uncensored opinions in the unrestricted spaces of societal-level interaction environments in cyberspace. On the Internet “we have no publishers and no one is a contributing editor, everyone meets” (Newsom et al, 2010, p. 473). The first to be affected was the written press, which began to suggest after the level of relevance of the media in the physical space, the real began to diminish exponentially. Thus, many media holding companies have expanded on the Internet, some have built websites to replace the classic domains, others have built socialisation groups (hubs), most of them have created accounts on social networks. Thus, “the media is not dead yet – and journalists have an important duty to gain public trust in their work” (Bartlett, 2019, p. 181). While the physical existence of the world is shrinking for many of the classic companies, the problems of the Internet fully reflect and exacerbate the countries of the users because, after the Internet was artificially built, humanity lost a unique chance, that of tabula rasa. However, without rules applicable from the pioneering stage, anarchy and nihilism have become almost remnant because everything is allowed. Excessive permissiveness amplifies the level of uncertainty, security risks.

These risks may also be caused by the inconsistency produced between the expectations of the public and the producers, or the differences between the simple internet users or receivers of the audiovisual and the creators of the media. These are reluctant to the trends created on the Internet, although most of them catch the opportunity in time. We notice trends as a spearhead of the audio component, often customised. For example, listening to podcasts of content producers on social channels or on Internet portals is increasing from 9% in 2008 to 41% in 2021 in the US (Statista, 2021), and in Romania we have 37% in July 2020 (Mircea, 2020), books can be listened to (audiobook) on the internet or e-kindle and here we also include virtual audio assistants such as Siri from I-Phone or Alexa from Google more and more used.

Thus, after people move away from classic radio and television stations and personally choose in cyberspace what kind of shows they want to see or listen to, sometimes even participate. These unique situations push radio and television

professionals to take action; they began to resize their work tools, technologicalise them by introducing automated systems using algorithms and artificial intelligence to become more efficient. One of the most innovative systems is the Swedish Broadcasting Company, which is already working on a value-oriented algorithm and an artificial intelligence system adapted for social networks on the Internet (Kollruß, 2021).

The growing trend of the number of users, implicitly branching out domains and concerns in the online space, became a constant in the 2020s. For the 4.5 billion internet users, they are just a click away to position themselves in relation to a situation or a person and can show their desire to participate in social life, to be part of various groups at all costs, preferably in the virtual space. Another trend is to increase movements of all kinds, to initiate new types of groups or permanent concerns that were once sequential. Here we have in mind the political environment, national security and the country’s defence, areas that once seemed niche. From here to participatory democracy, there is only one step to take. This listing aims to emphasise that multimedia has the power to shape people’s perceptions, thoughts and values. Independent journalism and the right to public opinion have moved to the Internet, especially during the world quarantine (Kollruß, 2021). Interestingly, many of the private channels of journalists, bloggers, vloggers initiated during quarantine remain watched over a year later. This shows that we have informal leaders who are gradually gaining power and influence over public opinion. Implicitly and explicitly, they can affect social security.

Therefore, multimedia remains in trend, it is simultaneously both danger and opportunity, because the written press, audiovisual are still used as tools of white, gray or black propaganda (fakenews) in times of conflict and war or the creation of general economic culture and politics. For this reason, the idea of creating expectations, thoughts and perceptions of the whole society through multimedia control has become indispensable for the political environment, implicitly, it becomes an important factor for the social sector of national security, especially as laws are built more much more in favor of those in power than of many; although, we attribute to journalists the role of watchdog in forming a more democratic society, encouraging people to be informed about themselves and their society. Multimedia has also become an indispensable tool in the process of democratization of societies, implicitly of social security.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The three sections of this article were intended to gradually highlight the main aspects of social security brought into line with multimedia, given that, since March 2020, social security has been put to the test due to the pandemic. Simultaneously with the health crisis, other problems began to emerge, from those in education, economics or even the environment, and, last but not least, the problems caused by multimedia. Here, we are dealing with a part of the world interconnected online and another fragmented offline. Thereby, in the first section we defined security in terms of the context in which the authors of the definitions were. This finding led to the interpretation of the title in two ways, evolution and revolution: *The conceptual (r)evolution of security*. We currently live in an anarchic system with situations that change during change. On the one hand, we are dealing with change accepted as a natural, even Darwinian evolution; on the other hand, we reject change because it is perceived as an enemy, assuming that the revolution is a process of replacement noted by a process, in our case through accelerated multiple shocks and paradigm shifts in all security sectors. In the second section, *Glocalising national security and multimedia*, we have extracted only a few aspects that have marked our lives in the last two years. These are related to the globalisation of information systems and the fracturing of the globalisation of our real life at the regional, even national, level called glocalisation. In the third section, *Multimedia, the alarm system for social security*, we pointed out that many of the components of social security are situational flags that humanity faces during the pandemic. Social security is at the forefront of security in tandem with the politico-military security sectors. To this end, we have extended the field of press to multimedia by paraphrasing the definition of the role of journalism in the state, which tells us that *“the press is the watchdog of democracy”*.

Thus, the working hypothesis of this research is confirmed by statistical figures, specific criteria to emphasize that national security, stability and community development at local and national level are affected by new types of multimedia activities and socialization on the Internet: maintaining state entity and nation unity. It is increasingly difficult to maintain an acceptable level of protection and safety. The objective of the paper is achieved, social security is resized due to the tendencies towards radicalisation descended in real life from the internet. The catalyst is multimedia. It remains a mass communication complex, an amplifier of the existing reality where we perceive a direct impact of the physical interaction

with the interlocutors as a reaction of the decision taken on social networking sites.

During the research, we developed factors of this complicated world context. They show us that we need an integrative tool in the increasingly polarised international society. Selfish interests, fears that generate actions and prepare for what is to come. At this moment the role of the integrator is almost non-existent because the society is polarised, the cleavage *who is not with me is against me* begins to be felt at all levels; very few take into account that there is a middle ground, that of compromise. The compromise could be made out of fear, out of interest to survive and fight together against unseen enemies, such as viruses, biological wars, instigations of violence, climate change, etc. Compromise can provide reliable solutions for ensuring international, national and individual security by all possible means; decisions belong to us, after we hear or see information designed to influence.

All the arguments developed in the sections of this article lead us to almost opposite ideas regarding the security of states. One includes the universal level of security, the other leads us to the lowest level of security, the individual. The first is that the Relevant Powers (Kings and Queens) on the chessboard of the world are changing, and smaller states like Romania hope not to become pawns again, which can be sacrificed when the interests of kings demand it. States like Romania hope that the geopolitical game will be more of a GO game, where all parts are equal, as is desirable for the international system, where states should be perceived equally, beyond the declarative level of the UN Charter. The second is that we are witnessing the dismantling of the traditional way of political practice through multimedia means and we do not know if the new style of politician whose practice is deeply hybridised still needs a real political party. The 2020-2021 elections in Romania and Germany draw our attention to the fact that traditional political parties are losing their influence, even the elections in Russia (September 2021) prove this, the United Russia party of President Vladimir Putin has about 50%. Temporary political alliances prove fragility and lack of common goals. These can produce a return in time, without political ideologies, to deep individualisation, of medieval aristocratic type. The security of a nation should be taken by leaders as individuals. This situation is neither imaginary nor singular, it only reflects the game of the participants in all possible environments, in this case, we can only have people to vote for. Independents can replace political parties with the help of individualised online campaign tools.

We live in a time when, visibly, the world is set *mutatis mutandis* on new or still unknown criteria, tacitly preparing a new international paradigm. From this perspective, we need all stakeholders to rebuild bridges of dialogue and compromise because there is no more time, they all happen in real time in hybridised spaces.

At the Romanian national level, the current health and environmental problems are reconfiguring our national security system, requiring the restoration of the scale of values for all security sectors.

In conclusion, the environmental, economic, information and social security sectors can no longer be neglected nowadays, they govern our lives more than national and international security policies with strong politico-military accents. People are equal in the face of nature, because regardless of ethnic origin, religious orientation or level of wealth. Nobody can live without breathable air and drinking water, almost simultaneously with the need to live in a real community beyond social networks on the internet, as it turned out again during the global quarantine period from March to May 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Bartlett, J. (2019). *Oamenii vs. Tehnologie. Internetul trebuia să ne elibereze*. Traducere Alexandra Florescu. București: Editura Nemira.
2. Buzan, B. (2017). *Popoarele, statele și teama. O agendă de securitate internațională în epoca de după Războiul Rece*, ed. e 3-a. Traducere Vivia Săndulescu. Moldova: Chișinău, Editura Cartier.
3. Buzan, B., Wæver, O., de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
4. Caparini, M. (Ed.) (2004). *'Media in Security and Governance: The Role of the News Media in Security'*. Nomos/Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)/Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), <https://gsdrc.org/document-library/media-in-security-and-governance-the-role-of-the-news-media-in-security/>, retrieved on 13 September 2021.
5. Dușu, C. (2016). *Introduction*, pp. VIII-X, Akçeşme, B., Bakır, H., Steele, H. (ed.) (2016). *Interdisciplinarity, Multidisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity in Humanities*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
6. Kaleri P. (2008). *Imperatives and Challenges of National Security*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw- Hill Publishing Company.
7. Kupelian. B. (2020). *Predictions for 2020: "Slowbalisation" is the New Globalisation*, <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/research-insights/economy/global-economy-watch/predictions-2020.html>, retrieved on 13 September 2021.
8. Kollruß, A. (2021). *Ausblick 2021: Was wird im Journalismus wichtig (bleiben)?*, <https://white-lab.de/themen/journalismus/ausblick-2021-was-wird-wichtig-im-journalismus-bleiben/>, retrieved on 13 October 2021.
9. Lippmann. W. (1943). *US foreign policy: shield of the Republic*. Boston: Little Brown Publishing.
10. Mallander, A. (2008), *Cum să scrii pentru multimedia. Tehnici de scriere interactivă*. Traducere Oana Drăgănescu. Iași: Editura Polirom.
11. Mircea, S. (2020). *Podcast in România. Ediția I. 8 Iulie 2020. Primul studiu legat de evoluția și consumul de conținut audio în format digital*, <https://www.bancatransilvania.ro/Podcast-In-Romania-by-Brat-&-Banca-Transilvania.pdf>, retrieved on 13 October 2021.
12. Murray, S. (2018), *Bright Signals: A History of Color Television*. SUA: Durham. Duke University Press.
13. Nicotra. J. (2019). *Becoming Rhetorical: Analyzing and Composing in a Multimedia World*. SUA. Boston. Cengage Learning, Inc.
14. Newsom, D. et al. (2010). *Totul despre relații publice*. București: Editura Polirom.
15. Ocelík. P. (2015). *Traditional Approaches to Security in IR*, https://is.muni.cz/el/1423/podzim2015/ESS419/um/59524707/ESS419_02.pdf, retrieved on 13 September 2021.
16. Racoma. B. (2018). *What is Glocalization and How Does it Work?*, <https://www.daytranslations.com/blog/what-is-glocalization/>, retrieved on 10 September 2021.
17. Titievskaia et al. (2020). *Slowing Down or Changing Track? Understanding the Dynamics of 'Slowbalisation'*. Brussels: European Parliamentary Research Service.
18. Watson. A. (2021). *Share of Adults Who Trust News Media most of the Time in Selected Countries Worldwide as of February 2021*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/308468/importance-brand-journalist-creating-trust-news/>, retrieved on 10 September 2021.
19. Zuboff, S. (2019), *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs, Perseus Books.
20. European Commission, *EU Security Union Strategy: connecting the dots in a new security ecosystem Brussels*, 24 July 2020, file:///home/chronos/u-07d8caa271e902557feba663261a8256c696d8df/MyFiles/Downloads/EU_Security_Union_Strategy__connecting_the_dots_in_a_new_security_ecosystem.pdf, retrieved on 13 October 2021.
21. Journalismus, <https://white-lab.de/themen/journalismus/ausblick-2021-was-wird-wichtig-im-journalismus-bleiben/>, retrieved on 14 October 2021.
22. Parlamentul României (2014). *Legea nr. 51/1991 privind securitatea națională a României, republicată*. București: Monitorul Oficial, nr. 190.
23. *Share of U.S. Population that Has Listened to an Audio Podcast in the Last Month from 2008 to 2021*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/270365/audio-podcast-consumption-in-the-us/>, retrieved on 13 October 2021.