INTELLIGENCE TERMINOLOGY CHALLENGES
ANIMV'S PERSPECTIVE

Author: Advanced intelligence instructor Ana-Maria SURUGIU, PhD candidate - ANIMV

ABSTRACT

The Romanian academic landscape in the field of intelligence has undergone a rapid evolution, keeping the pace with the dynamics of the field itself. Our scientific inquiry will delve into in-depth interviews with renowned and highly specialized professors and intelligence instructors from the "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy, providing unique insights and perspectives regarding the evolution of the field and communication challenges. We will explore both conceptual and lexicographic nuances of the specialized terminology, highlighting the importance of a standard terminology and a common language in specific professional contexts. The testimonials and reflections on the evolution of the terminology of intelligence, from the lexicographic, linguistic, and intercultural perspectives, will shed more light on our field of interest and contribute to its development.

Keywords: challenges, terminology, intelligence, standardization, perspective.

Context

The present article is part of the author's doctoral research - *The terminology of intelligence: lexicographic and translation issues* - conducted under the joint supervision of the Doctoral School for Languages and Cultural Identities, the University of Bucharest, and the Intelligence and Security Doctoral School, within the "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy (ANIMV). It came as a natural progression of the doctoral research, after having discussed English intelligence terminology challenges with professors of intelligence from the European Union (EU) and NATO landscape, such as Prof. Jan Goldman, PhD (USA)[1], professor of intelligence and author of four dictionaries of intelligence terminology; Prof. Rubén Arcos, PhD (Spain), professor of intelligence studies and co-author of a multilingual dictionary of intelligence and security; Assistant Professor Giangiuseppe Pili, PhD (Italy, USA), professor of intelligence analysis; and Prof. Bart Dessein, PhD (Belgium), sinologist, but also an expert on pragmatics, discourse analysis, translator, and interpreter. The interviews with the professors mentioned above shed more light on the challenges of the terminology of intelligence in the Euro-Atlantic space.

Therefore, to have a more comprehensive understanding of the English intelligence terminology in the Romanian landscape, we applied the same methodological approach, investigating Romanian academia's perspective regarding the conceptual differences between, as well as the overlapping of, the terms *intelligence* and *information / informații*, as they are used today, after having been translated into Romanian. We also discussed the way in which the translation of the terms is used by Romanian specialists and researchers alike, conducting several interviews with teaching staff from ANIMV. For the protection of the identity of our respondents, we will anonymize them, refering to our interviewees as *respondents*.

Thus, for a more diverse and better representation of the Romanian intelligence academic landscape, between February and April 2024, we interviewed experienced teaching staff in the intelligence field and renowned specialists who have embraced the academic profession after having acquired essential expertise in the intelligence field. We have chosen both junior and senior members of the university teaching staff, but also

an advanced intelligence instructor[2], so that we can have a more nuanced understanding of the meanings of the terms under discussion and their usage in the intelligence community, once they are translated into Romanian. The selection of the teaching staff was based on the following criteria:

■ relevant expertise in the intelligence field (both highly experienced practitioners, but also teaching staff of ANIMV, specialized in intelligence studies);

■ relevant exposure to the terminology of intelligence (either in professional contexts or in academic contexts) and the specialized literature;

■ active in academic research, in national and international formats;

■ comprehension of the intelligence activity and the theoretical framework.

We emphasize that our research direction is in lexicography and terminology, discussing how the choice of translation equivalents for intelligence terms is reflected in the Romanian specialized literature within the intelligence field. Additionally, the interviews with Romanian academia highlight their academic perspective, without implying that it reflects operational reality, which is by no means the focus of our research and discussion. Furthermore, specialized literature is primarily produced by scholars and members of academia, and too few by practitioners, which could be a possible cause for the lack of clarity in translation choices we investigate in our research.

Methodology

Regarding the methodology we employed for this part of the research, we carried out structured interviews, revolving around eleven questions. For a comparable result, given the interviews with the professors from the international academic landscape, we asked approximately the same questions, adapted to the Romanian academic landscape and the challenges we have identified in the Romanian specialized terminology.

Therefore, during the interviews we delved into and explored the ANIMV's professors' perspectives and comprehension of the following aspects: the Romanian specialists' understanding of the semantic differences between *intelligence* and *information / informații* and the usage of the specialized terms, once translated from

English into Romanian; the need of clarification from a conceptual perspective with regard to the use of the concepts *intelligence* and *information / informații* in the Romanian specialized literature; the (in)existence of (lexicographic) reference books in the Romanian intelligence community that clarify the distinction between *intelligence* and *information / informații* in Romanian; the added value a bilingual glossary of terminology in the intelligence field would bring to Romanian intelligence and national security professionals; the process of extensive borrowing from English and code-switching[3] in the Romanian specialized terminology of intelligence - advantages and drawbacks; the influence of English and Latin on Romanian intelligence terminology; Romanian official documents and legislation on intelligence and security - aspects of terminology; the main conceptual difference between *intelligence* and *information / informații* in Romanian and their usage in specific contexts; translation equivalences or overlapping of the meanings of some of the most common concepts in the field of intelligence.

Interviews analysis

At this research stage, as we will further show, there is no consensus among the professors we interviewed regarding the conceptual difference and understanding of the terms *intelligence* and *information / informații* and their translation by Romanian specialists and academia. For example, *Respondent 1* affirmed that "based on [his/her] experience as an intelligence practitioner, [he/she] would say that <u>Romanian specialists in this area understand the conceptual differences between *intelligence* and *information*</u>", an opinion also shared by *Respondent 5*, who considers that, despite being aware of the differences, specialists nonetheless face difficulties when it comes to translating the concepts into Romanian.

Respondent 3 emphasized the different categories of *intelligence* specialists in Romania, suggesting that the correct usage and understanding of the term intelligence are mostly prevalent among professors and instructors (including specialists who conduct teaching activities) and researchers in the intelligence field. On the other hand, *Respondent 4* highlighted that "<u>terminological differences […] are not clearly defined and unanimously accepted at the level of Romanian specialists in the field</u>", calling for further debates on these topics. This opinion reinforces our findings after reviewing Romanian

specialized literature, which shows both inconsistent use of the terms in Romanian and overlapping definitions (see Rădoi, 2003; Niță, 2009; Ventura & Buștiuc, 2019; Chiru, 2019; Surugiu, 2023).

The same idea was emphasized and further developed by *Respondent 2*, who highlights the role of academia in clarifying concepts and terms:

I do not really think, and this is also based on my previous experience and dialogue with professionals in the field of *intelligence*. <u>I do not really think that they are aware of the differences between *information* and *intelligence*.</u> However, […] <u>I think that they are using *information* in fact as an equivalent for *intelligence*</u> as the conceptual understanding existing in the literature of *intelligence* studies on one hand, but also in the practice of several English-speaking *intelligence* services, such as the UK and the US, is also leading *intelligence* services and voices in shaping *intelligence* as a practice. [This] can be easily understood and explained by the fact that, in Romania, <u>we have not had a consistent and very clear debate in discussing the differences and the benefits of starting to use *intelligence* instead of *information*</u>. So, <u>I think we are not even supposed to expect them to understand and to use this, considering that we lack a serious academic debate about the two concepts and the relationship between them.</u>

The solution that *Respondent 2* put forward was for academia to initiate and develop academic debates on the differences between *intelligence* and *information / informații*, emphasizing the need to involve practitioners in the dialogue to ensure that the terminology meets operational needs. For example, *Respondent 2* considers that specialized literature in the intelligence field in Romania is "an open field to be filled up" and *Respondent 2* also welcomed our research, outlining its topicality:

I think that the specialized literature in *intelligence* in Romania is an open field to be filled up. And there are many opportunities here, and I am very happy that you took this angle in producing your PhD, because this kind of angle and this kind of result is more than needed. […] As an academic community, once more I think <u>this is the role of your PhD thesis to provide a continuous and systematic framework and to provide deliverables which are to</u>

---

be delivered in the right way towards professionals, as to convince them that this is to the benefit of the intelligence practice. This is one of the main things that we, as academics in the field of *intelligence*, should pay attention to, so as not to develop our own perspectives and deliverables in the Ivory Tower, but stay very close to the professionals of the field. The theory of intelligence exists in order to provide a good opportunity to reflect upon the practices of intelligence, to the normative side of intelligence practice, to the ethical perspective, things that are not supposed to be on the professionals' agenda. It is important to stay close to them, to continue, and to have this systematic process, and to make sure that we provide them with a very clear list of benefits. So that once more in time, this will come as a natural process.

Also, *Respondent 1* underlined the lack of unanimously accepted definitions of the two terms under discussion, pinpointing a possible cause of confusion among specialists at the national level:

At the same time, however, I must also specify that the two terms we are discussing do not have a unanimously accepted definition among specialists from all national institutions in this area, a step that I consider extremely necessary. The difficulty in identifying a term in Romanian that allows for highlighting the differences between *information* and *intelligence*, along with a certain reluctance in using English terms directly, have contributed to the current situation regarding the use of these two terms.

Respondent 1 also welcomed further clarifications "especially from the perspective of a unified approach within the national intelligence community, and subsequently, with the aim of promoting this approach starting from the decision-makers to the citizens served by *intelligence* structures". The opinion was also shared by *Respondent 3*, who, much like *Respondent 2*, similarly considers that "the specialized literature in the Romanian landscape makes a transfer of the conceptual approach from the USA or UK, reflected in the differentiations *(raw) data - information - intelligence - knowledge*". *Respondent 4* underscored a broader need for terminological clarification "not only at the level of the specialized literature, but also at the level of the

academic environment *per se*". *Respondent 5* shared this opinion, outlining that "there is certainly a need for conceptual clarification of them, because defining concepts is essential to ensure that content is understood, regardless of the category in which it falls".

The interviews thus confirmed one of our research hypotheses, revealing a broad consensus on the need for a clear differentiation between *intelligence* and *information* / *informații* in Romanian specialized literature. The term *intelligence* was borrowed into the Romanian specialized literature and in the academic studies on intelligence and security as a natural progression and consequence of its use by specialists. The teaching staff we interviewed called for a clear conceptual understanding of the intelligence terminology, highlighting its importance for specialized literature and civil society. They suggested that the ambiguity and overlap in usage exist due to the lack of academic debates and standardized Romanian terminology for these terms. Nonetheless, the collaborative role of academia and practitioners in defining and standardizing Romanian intelligence terminology is unanimously acknowledged and supported, as we can infer from the five interviews.

Another consensus we identified regards the creation of a bilingual glossary of specialized terms, seen as crucial for enhancing communication and ensuring terminological precision. *Respondent 3* discussed the importance of a bilingual dictionary "that would be assumed at an official level [and] would achieve a minimum unitary benchmark for all services or structures that have attributions in the operational intelligence field and/or intelligence collection and analysis", arguing that such a glossary would help to standardize terminology across the Romanian intelligence community. Both *Respondent 5* and *Respondent 2* supported this idea, emphasizing its potential to enhance understanding and communication within the intelligence field. *Respondent 4* viewed such a glossary as a critical step towards aligning Romanian intelligence terminology with NATO and EU standards, and *Respondent 1* considered it to be "an extremely timely initiative, not only for professionals in the field but also for the general public".

The interviews also revealed consensus on the unanimous understanding of the concepts of *intelligence* and *information* / *informații* among the five teaching staff members. As professors of intelligence and former specialists in the field, our interviewees are aware of both the meanings of the two terms and the confusion caused by the lack of a distinct Romanian term for *intelligence*.

The potential implications for professional practice and education are also of interest. All interviewees noted the absence of a standardized[4] approach to using the two terms, underlying the importance of precision and proper use of nuances in the intelligence terminology. For example, *Respondent 1* welcomes the adoption of the English term *intelligence* into the Romanian lexicon, but recommends doing so in certain specific and separate contexts:

Coming back to the complexity of the term *intelligence* and the difficulty of identifying a similar term in Romanian, I would remind the four meanings attributed to it in the specialized literature: (1) the process by which information relevant to national security is collected, analyzed, and disseminated to decision-makers; (2) the entire institutional context necessary for the effective conduct of this process; (3) the product resulting from this process, (4) actions aimed at protecting the process, as well as the information obtained. The closest concept in Romanian, used by institutions with responsibilities in the field, is *informația de securitate națională* (En. national security information). Regarding the use of the terms *intelligence* or *informații*, I would use the term in Romanian [informații] in the official names of state institutions or structures (e.g., Serviciul Român de Informații, Comunitatea Națională de Informații), and I would use the term in English [intelligence] when addressing activities, results, or processes related to intelligence services' activities.

Respondent 4 shared *Respondent 1*'s opinion regarding the translation of *intelligence* into Romanian, mentioning the importance of aligning the Romanian intelligence terminology with that of NATO and the EU and focusing on how language evolution is influenced by international cooperation and standards. *Respondent 4* also emphasized the need to avoid adopting *forms without substance*[5] in the intelligence field:

I want to make a little point at the level of this debate, which, in my opinion, must be constructive, without Manichaean[6] approaches. On the one hand, I can agree with the Maiorescian logic which, if we applied it to intelligence studies, could signal

that we should not adopt forms without substance, but on the other hand, we must be aware that in the world literature issues related to intelligence studies have been addressed *illo tempore* - for example, legendary Chinese military strategist Sun Tzu dedicated over two millennia ago (!) an entire chapter on the use of spies in his flagship book The Art of War. All in all, yes, I agree that language borrowings can help a national language develop.

On the other hand, *Respondent 2* would not translate *intelligence* into Romanian and would rather borrow it as such, following similar patterns of other borrowings in the Romanian language, arguing for maintaining the English term to align with international standards. *Respondent 2* also provided her own understanding and equivalent translation of the concept:

Just to illustrate the fact that *intelligence and informații are two different however related things*, I would say that if I am to translate *intelligence* into Romanian, it is *informație procesată cu scopul de a susține o decizie politico-militară sau privată* (information processed for the purpose of substantiating a political-military or private decision) if we are to take into consideration the application of *intelligence* in the private and business field. So, you see, there are too many words that we need to use to explain what *intelligence* is, it is the process, the criteria, the dissemination part of the cycle. I would not translate it and we have discussed this, I think some time ago, we have the practice of other intelligence services and other intelligence communities that have embraced *intelligence* as such, of course with slight adjustments as to be better and more easily used in Spanish, for example, because I had Spain in my mind. And we could do this because we are not in the privileged situation, such as France, which has *renseignement*, which, by comparison to *information*, it is clear that it means much more or something else.

Respondent 3 discussed the need for a clear differentiation of the nuances of the concept of *intelligence*, arguing in favor of the borrowing process, but drawing attention to the fact that "it is necessary that the

introduction of the term *intelligence* be correlated with a flexible definition, warning that a contextual deciphering of it is appropriate". *Respondent 3* welcomes the English influence on the Romanian intelligence terminology, suggesting that this helps maintain conceptual integrity and facilitates international cooperation. Nevertheless, at the same time, he also calls for further clarification and highlights the fact that contextual understanding is essential for civil society:

> The term *intelligence* is useful, but with the caveat that you have to be careful to decipher its meanings contextually. It will probably not be a problem in expert dialogues, but I do not know how long it will take for the public to differentiate between *intelligence* and *information*. Therefore: a) it will be useful for experts to have as a reference a common online glossary and it would be ideal to be an approach undertaken by an institution in the area of national security to select from internal institutional laws and regulations definitions of various terms, to harmonize and update them, b) it will be necessary for experts to adapt their speech when necessary and attach labels so that the public understands (such as verified / processed vs raw data, information substantiating strategic decisions, etc.).

Respondent 5 also proved to be open to English borrowings in the intelligence field, considering that conceptual integrity is preserved by the assimilation of concepts from the source language. *Respondent 5* highlighted the importance of preserving the original meaning of some concepts, rather than translating them into the host language, thus ensuring and facilitating communication and understanding of common missions:

> The Romanian language is alive and […] some concepts cannot be translated from English into Romanian, borrowing them […] being the only solution to preserve their original meaning. […] The assimilation in the Romanian language of concepts [is] necessary for understanding common missions.

The interviews also enabled us to explore linguistic purity[7] with the teaching staff. Although they are not linguists, the ANIMV specialists acknowledged the challenge of balancing linguistic purity in specific contexts with the need for precision in the intelligence field. The interviews reveal a consensus on the use of *information / informații* in Romanian legal documents and institutional language, which undergoes a slow bureaucratic process when it comes to incorporating English terms. Also, we discussed from a linguistic perspective *Law no. 58/2023 on Romania's cyber security and defense*, mainly the meaning of two concepts that were introduced by the legislator directly in English, bereft of the Romanian translation[8], namely *cyber intelligence*[9] and *cyber counter-intelligence*[10].

As well, we clarified the present designation of ANIMV's Doctoral School Intelligence and Security (Ro. *Şcoala Doctorală Intelligence şi Securitate*), whose name was changed in October 2023 from its former title, Doctoral School Intelligence and National Security (Ro. *Şcoala Doctorală Informaţii şi Securitate Naţională*). In this respect, *Respondent 2* provided the official argumentation for the introduction of *intelligence* in the name of the Doctoral School:

> We changed its name for two main reasons: one was […] the fact that *informaţii* is not, from an academic perspective, the right term to be used and, secondly, because a significant part of our research within the doctoral school, but of course a significant part of our future orientation will go towards Europe and towards attracting PhD students, not just from Romania, but also from beyond Romania. Every time we had to prepare some documents and to open a call or participate in a research competition, we had to translate from *informaţii* to *intelligence*. It was a little bit odd because we are quite convinced that *intelligence* is the right term. And that is why we agreed that it is better to change the name. So, if you want an official statement, which is related to the mission of the Doctoral School, which goes beyond the national framework, it is very closely related to the development of intelligence theory in this field of

study, which hopefully will also spark a light and will open further discussions about why we should have in place *intelligence* instead of *informaţii*.

Once again, the interviews revealed consensus when it comes to the purity of Romanian institutional texts and legislation, where the official names of the institutions comprise the term *information / informaţii* instead of *intelligence*. *Respondent 1* mentioned that "the laws regulating the activity of intelligence services have not been updated since their adoption, and thus there has been no debate addressing the subjects you mentioned". Also, *Respondent 2* considers "we have not seen a very sudden and blunt use of *intelligence* instead of *informaţii* in the official name of the services or in the doctrine framework because this is an *organic process*. The use of *cyber intelligence* is a very good proof illustrating that", opinion shared by the other members of academia that we interviewed. The slow adoption of the term *intelligence* in Romanian official documents and legal texts, compared to the usage of the term by both practitioners and academia alike, reflects a linguistic and bureaucratic inertia that hinders the terminology standardization process. The contrast between the dynamic character of the intelligence field, which is also reflected in the terminology employed by specialists, and the slow-paced evolution of Romanian institutional texts suggests a clear need for precision and clarity in the terminology of the intelligence field. By this, we refer to the lexicographic contribution to the precision of terms and their translation, not to the conceptual clarification *per se*. Specialized terminology in the intelligence field is the prerogative of the specialists in the field. Still, linguists, translators, lexicographers, and academia should be the ones to bring a prescriptive and descriptive contribution (see Bergenholtz, 2003; Curzan, 2014; Fuertes-Olivera & Tarp, 2014; Straaijer, 2016) to terminology and its systematization.

When asked to provide clarifications with regard to the differences in the use of *intelligence* and *information / informaţii* in certain intelligence concepts[11], the interviewees all agreed with *Respondent 4*'s opinion that "the concepts are not mutually exclusive and that they can complement each other very well in Romanian". Specifically, *Respondent 3* felt the need to differentiate *analiză de intelligence / analiză de informaţii* (*intelligence / information analysis*), arguing that "the difference […] comes from the particularities of the intelligence analysis, which does not operate with any kind of information, but only with information relevant to national security".

Respondent 1 also brought up the differences in the use of *intelligence* and *information*, similar to *Respondent 3*'s understanding.

Additionally, *Respondent 2* provided a more detailed explanation of the nuances:

> I would say that there are no differences […] in this particular context, *informaţii* is a concept by which we refer in fact to *intelligence*. What I think complicates the discussion is that, in the literature of intelligence studies, they also acknowledge *informaţii*, but in this kind of diminished and less understanding, so it is just a part of the whole process. I would say that indeed we have at the moment different scholars and a lot of practitioners that are using both of them interchangeably, but once more, I think this is the place where we are at the moment. This is a status. As academics and scholars, we need to take this as an opportunity for further research and reflect upon it, look at why we use these as interchangeable concepts, and where this can take us, because reflecting upon why this may produce additional arguments for why we need to stick to *intelligence* instead of *informaţii*. But, of course, we cannot expect as coming from practitioners, but we need to expect as coming from scholars in the field because that is their job, that is their social mission to produce clarity, to explain, to investigate the different uses, to go to the practitioners and ask them by using different scientific methods as to confer validity to the process. I would say that we are in a little bit of a confusion, it may look like a confusion but considering the evolution and the historical recent development of intelligence studies it is not *per se* a confusion, but it is a phase, which we also need to interrogate, investigate, document as to be able to move forward.

Therefore, once again, the interviews reveal that members of academia also have different understandings of intelligence concepts in some specific contexts, once translated into Romanian, which confirms one of our research hypotheses. Several members of the teaching staff we interviewed are also former practitioners possessing the highest level of expertise in the field of intelligence. However, they do not all concur on the nuances of the concepts, once they are translated into Romanian. The discussions with them revealed that when linguistic phenomena such as borrowing or code-switching occur,

---

[7] Linguistic purity refers to the characteristic of a language as being pure, that is, rejecting borrowings from other foreign languages and using an equivalent in the host language.

[8] In the primary legislation in Romania, the legislator rarely adopts concepts in English (in parliamentary and governmental legal practice, the vast majority of concepts appear only in Romanian) and precisely for this reason the approach proposed by the thesis reconfirms the opportunity of our research, given the fact that there is a possibility that in the future such cases of takeovers without any equivalent translation will appear more often.

[9] Law no. 58/2023, Article 2 letter h) "cyber intelligence - activities of collecting, processing, analytical processing and valorization of data and information on actions that affect national security interests and objectives on the information and communication technology line, as well as the identification, knowledge, prevention and counteraction of any actions in cyberspace that may pose risks, vulnerabilities and/or threats to the national security and defense of Romania".

[10] Law no. 58/2023, Article 2 letter i) "cyber counter-intelligence - all offensive and defensive activities, means and measures to identify, deter, neutralize and protect against intelligence activities on hostile actions that affect national security interests and objectives, carried out in cyberspace and in the field of defense".

[7] Ro. analiză de intelligence / analiză de informaţii - En. intelligence / information analysis; Ro. ciclu de intelligence / ciclu de informaţii - En. intelligence / information cycle; Ro. servicii de intelligence / servicii de informaţii - En. intelligence / information services; Ro. comunitatea de intelligence / comunitatea de informaţii - En. intelligence / information community; Ro. activitatea de intelligence / activitatea de informaţii - En. intelligence / information activity

in certain contexts, there is an interchangeable use of the terms *intelligence* and *informații*, which would call for further academic and linguistic inquiry. Specialized terminology is about clarity and precision, and synonymy is not a characteristic of specialized terms, as we also discussed with Professor Bart Dessein, who calls for accuracy and precision in specialized language. Thus, this strengthens even more the academic engagement in further research and investigations in this field, for enhancing communication and translation clarity.

Conclusion

All in all, we can conclude that the interviews bring to the forefront a significant challenge and concern of the Romanian intelligence academia regarding the translation and subsequent usage and understanding of *intelligence* versus *information / informații*. We notice both varying and shared perspectives at the academic level, similarly to the usage of specialized terminology in the specialized literature in the intelligence field. While the interviews revealed some of academia's unique views on the matter, there is nevertheless a clear consensus with regard to the need for a greater terminological and translation clarity in the Romanian intelligence specialized literature.

Moreover, they are all in favor of language development through English borrowings, being very aware of the Romanian intelligence community's need to stay connected and aligned with the terminology used by the EU and NATO counterparts.

The most challenging aspect revealed by the interviews is, nevertheless, the standard and unitary approach of the terminology[12] in the Romanian intelligence specialized literature, as we could see that there are still some nuances in the translation of the concepts, without distorting the conceptual understanding, though. Nonetheless, there is a shared concern at the level of the Romanian intelligence academia regarding the need for further academic debates, which should include practitioners, to ensure the terminology's alignment with the operational reality of the intelligence field.

We reiterate that we have explored and presented the opinions of some of the members of ANIMV academia regarding the translation of intelligence concepts and their usage in the Romanian specialized intelligence literature and the theory of intelligence studies. Our research explorations focus on linguistics, lexicography, and translation studies, investigating and analyzing the evolution and dynamics of Romanian specialized literature, while the operational reality is under no circumstances under discussion.

REFERENCES:

Bergenholtz, H. (2003). User-oriented Understanding of Descriptive, Proscriptive and Prescriptive Lexicography. *Lexikos* (13), 65-80, doi.org/10.5788/13-0-722, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://lexikos.journals.ac.za/pub/article/view/722.

Chiru, I. (2019). Analiza în intelligence: de la artă la știință, Tritonic Publishing House, Bucharest.

Curzan, A. (2014). Fixing English: Prescriptivism and Language History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fuertes-Olivera, A. P., & Tarp, S. (2014). Theory and Practice of Specialised Online Dictionaries: Lexicography versus Terminography, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278162420_Fuertes-Olivera_Pedro_A_and_Sven_Tarp_2014_Theory_and_Practice_of_Specialised_Online_Dictionaries_Lexicography_versus_Terminography.

Law no. 58/2023 on Romania's cyber security and defense, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.sri.ro/assets/files/legislatie/2024-eng/the_Law_No_58.pdf.

Law no. 199/2023 of higher education, with subsequent amendments and additions, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.aracis.ro/en/higher-education-legislation/.

Niță, C. (2009). O încercare de definire a termenului „*intelligence*". *Revista Română de Studii de Intelligence*, (1-2), 47-62, ANIMV Publishing House, Bucharest, retrieved on March 25, 2025, from https://www.animv.ro/revista-romana-de-studii-de-intelligence-nr-1-2/.

Rădoi, M. (2003). Serviciile de informații și decizia politică. Tritonic Publishing House, Bucharest.

Straaijer, R. (2016). Attitudes to prescriptivism: an introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (37/3), 233-242, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01434632.2015.1068782.

Surugiu, A.-M. (2024). English Intelligence Terminology - Interview Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman. *The Bulletin of Linguistic and Intercultural Studies*, (6), 28-37, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.animv.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Buletin-SLI-nr.6-4.pdf, ANIMV Publishing House, Bucharest.

Surugiu, A.-M. (2024). *Glosar de termeni ANIMV–INV / ANIMV–EDU Glossary of Terms*, first edition, December 2024, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.animv.ro/glosare/, ANIMV Publishing House, Bucharest.

Surugiu, A.-M. (2023). Intelligence – from data to information and intelligence, *Revista Limbă și Cultură*, (3), 298-316, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://lls.unibuc.ro/publicatii/revista-limba-si-cultura/ and https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HClwlS8YGVKkAPr7tRyGlmXMglQxlwN6/view, University of Bucharest Publishing House.

Ventura, R., & Buștiuc, F. (2019). Între *intelligence* și *renseignement*. Evoluții culturale în spațiul francez, *Revista Română de Studii de Intelligence*, (22), 107-119, ANIMV Publishing House, Bucharest, retrieved on March 27, 2025, from https://www.animv.ro/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/5_Ventura.pdf.

---

[12] More broadly, this aspect was taken into account also within ANIMV on the occasion of the compilation of the first bilingual Romanian-English glossary of terms. For more details, see also Glosar de termeni ANIMV–INV / ANIMV–EDU Glossary of Terms available at https://www.animv.ro/glosare/.