Trends of National Security and European Security Paradigms

Brigadier (ret.) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, PhD

Studies upon the international and national techniques of security strategies inevitably lead to ascertaining their high complexity characterized by dynamism and permanent changes. Throughout history, security strategies have evolved in terms of doctrine and configuration of forces aiming to impose a certain state of security generated by the political aspects at the moment which makes it difficult to systematize and to show the importance of the theoretical phenomenon. In our case we consider that the history of national and international security strategies is based on 3 important patterns: „alone against all", „us against the others" and „guarantee of peaceful co-existence based on generally accepted principles". Unlike the contents of past security strategies, that are history today, the security strategy pattern called "guarantee of peaceful co-existence based on generally accepted principles" builds itself on developing the following pillars: limited intervention of military forces in international relations, focus of the public opinion and international institutions upon conflict prevention and crisis management, geographical expansion of the areas with high security level by political, economic and military commitment of those countries, developing cooperation between those areas and areas beyond, developing the open society principles based on political pluralism and market economy in all areas, developing and introducing non-military strategies to promote interests based on generally accepted principles, maintaining a military structure that can impose and assign the generally accepted security rules.

Key words: *paradigm, strategy paradigm, security strategy, national security, security area, international relations, national interests, global interests, military activities, non-military activities.*

The paradigm, as the basic concept of Thomas Kuhn' s revolutionary scientific theories, designates either basic elements of a knowledge system, that is a scientific achievement universally recognized at a certain moment in time, including laws, theories, applied theories, instrumental preferences, working hypotheses, philosophical and methodological assumptions; this theoretical framework represents a commonly accepted source of research issues and procedures, solutions, and solution-appraisal criteria, or a

model, a prototype or philosophical or scientific system that guides thinking along predetermined directions, often inappropriate[1].

Basically, the term „paradigm" comes from the Greek word *paradigma*: a pattern or a map to understand and explain aspects of reality. A person can make small improvements thus developing new skills by making significant progress, fulfillment of tasks and technologically revolutionary progress requires new maps, new paradigms, new ways of thinking and viewing the world[2]."

The study of the national and global security mechanisms inevitably leads to realizing their overwhelming complexity, characterized by dynamism and continuous change. Historically, security strategies have changed in their doctrines and in their power configuration, designed in such a way as to impose a certain security status, generated by political options at a certain time which makes difficult any attempt to theoretically structure and essentialize the phenomena. From our point of view, the history of the national and global security strategy results from three crucial paradigms of the security strategy: the paradigm of "alone against all", the paradigm of „us against the others" and the paradigm of the „guarantee of peaceful life based on generally accepted principles".

The security strategy paradigm of „alone against all". Its basic view is that insecurity is a universal feature of human beings, social groups and states, generated by the anarchic nature of the human being. Consequently, each socially organized entity feels continuously threatened by other forms of organization; the supreme protection of its identity and social existence will be an appropriate defence strategy.

The theoretical matrix explaining this paradigm originates since the beginning of human development and became meaningful at the end of the 19th century when the security strategy philosophy was structured in terms of concepts like power, force, national interest while international relations were being built, preserved and changed according to manifestations of the military power.

Since intra-organisations and inter-state relations were based on principles of power, war was accepted as a strategic means to guarantee individual and collective security. Since the wars of the Ancient Times until the wars of the late 19th century, military actions were based on and justified by strategies to discourage and defeat enemies in order to control land, locally and regionally, as far as possible, through coercion and submission.

Scientific discoveries applied in the military field allowed significant changes in the army deployment and concentration capabilities, and weaponry efficacy which resulted into questioning the strategy to implement successful military actions against all. In practice, the end of Napoleon Wars mean the beginning of a new security strategy paradigm in which states join according to power concentration in order to better respond potential aggressions.

---

[1] **Thomas KHUN,** *Social Theory and Social Structure, 1962;* **Cătălin ZAMFIR, Lazăr VLĂSCEANU,** *Socioloy Dictionary, Babel Publishing House, Bucharest, 1993, p.420*
[2] **Stephen R. COVEY,** *Ethics of the efficient leader or Management based on principles, Alfa Publishing House, Buchaest, 2000, p.61*

The security strategy paradigm of „us against all". The two World Wars and the global mutual threat status typical of the „Cold War" are the new security strategy paradigm in which groups of states animated by mutual political interests build group security strategies in order to impose their will upon international relations.

Politically, international politics approached through group strategies principles reached its climax during the bipolar world system which divided countries into two camps, more or less, but nevertheless committed to undermine the security strategy of the opposite party. Competition between super-powers, especially ideological and military, marked by the nuclear blockage, reinforced the dependency relations of the small and average countries upon groups of powers. The two big political and military groups of powers were followed by countries that were neutral and non-partisan and politically unstable that could reach any time one of the two competitor groups of countries.

The military risks of the security strategy from the point of view of the competition for power during the bipolar times were connected to the arms race. Between 1966 -1999, military expenditure increased 70%, from 568 billion dollars to 950 billion dollars[3]. Unfortunately, the arms race stays high nowadays and it generates a surplus of military power for some states and lower security level for countries that do not possess resources to modernize their military potential.

The bipolar world paradigm of the security strategy led in practice the European security system to a potential disruption. The uncontrolled and bipolar conflict world security paradigm led to a serious difference between the states across the world, including the Euro-Atlantic area, in terms of their capabilities to ensure security and political decision freedom. At the same time, accumulation of nuclear weaponry having a destructive power impossible to justify deepened the discrepancies between states after the bipolar era. The highly destructive effects of the weapons of mass destruction, achieved as a result of qualitative research in the field, leave no hope to any state that it could stay invulnerable to these weapons, should a major conflict arise.

In the bipolar world, superpowers and other countries possessing nuclear weapons had a certain rationale justifying the existence of the nuclear weaponry that was given by the balance of powers. Given this context, non-nuclear states had to harmonize themselves to the politics of this group of powers and to the logics of confrontation between groups of powers, without having the guarantee that the leaders of the groups of powers would commit themselves at any risk, including the nuclear risk, to defend their partners' interests. Other states, remained outside of the bipolar conflict matrix for various reasons, developed political concepts and military strategies meant to ensure somehow independently but partially any problems arising where aggressions may take place from now on; these countries and all other countries that belong to the groups of powers but have no nuclear weapons have no other option but to be victims of any potential nuclear threat. Hence, the group defence paradigm, even belonging to groups of powers, requires a new definition, that is a new security strategy paradigm.

---

[3] *From SIPRI Yearbook, 1991, p.XXXVII*

Given the inter-state dependencies, any armed conflict arisen will cause huge problems for the entire community as a result of commercial relations of third parties, in areas devastated by the conflict, blocked or seriously affected; transportation, supplies and logistical flows disrupted; population displacement because of the war; consequences of potential economic embargo upon countries in the area, if not beyond a.s.o.; international community, seen as an integrated system, will accept with difficulty the price of conflicts, even if only arisen at the farthest point of peripheral regions.

Currently, in the post Cold War era, the theory and the practice of the national security strategy paradigm and of the group paradigm, postulating that interests of these countries are above any other interests of international relations, while the military force and power were seen as the main arguments in fulfilling foreign policy goals, no longer give the expected results.

The limits of the security strategy paradigm focused on national interest or on group interest appear more obvious during the restructuring of the global and European system characterized by disappearance of the main elements that led to the bipolar world. Although national interest stays primordial, promoting it is increasingly done through methods that are generally accepted, and permissive to cooperation of collaboration. Geopolitics preserves its theoretical principles and imposes their enforcement by increasingly replacing the military instruments with non-military means. In various places worldwide, more and more people „ apparently agree that commerce gradually replaces military means – the available capital instead of fire power, civil innovation instead of technical and military innovation, market penetration instead of conquering garrisons and bases"[4], which causes humankind to move towards a new paradigm of global security strategy.

Paradigm of the „guarantee of peaceful life based on generally accepted principles". Since the military means exhausted their operational capability of tools to promote international relations interests to a large extent, in the traditional way to threaten and use force, the new paradigm of international security strategy that guarantees peaceful life based on generally accepted principles tends to gain progressive importance. At the same time, the irrelevant non-military means of low-potential states and the religious matrixes of some states maintain a residual link to the paradigm of national interest security strategy or group interest security strategy. Actually, the list including risks posed to national and global security reflect the still-existing diversity of military threats and justifies the importance of armed forces, reasonably sized and very efficient, in order to ensure peaceful co-existence and to discourage potential non-conventional risks like domestic subversions, terrorism, drug and illegal substances –trafficking, inter-ethnical conflicts, religious conflicts etc.

Although there is no comprehensive scientific theory available, the new paradigm of global security strategy closely follows the contemporary globalization trends of the

---

[4] **Edward N. LUTTWAK,** *From Geopolitics to Geo – Economics, Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce, in „The National Interest", 1990, p.20*

main social, economic and political activities, causing integration of national interests into regional and global interests.

Unlike older security strategies that are currently history, the paradigm of security strategy through guarantees of peaceful co-existence based on generally accepted principles builds itself on the following pillars: limited chances for direct intervention of military forces in international relations; focus of public opinion and international bodies on conflict prevention and crisis management; geographical expansion of high security areas through political, economic and military integration of the countries thereof; development and diversification of multilateral cooperation of regional entities among themselves and with other areas beyond; generalized profusion across areas of the open society requirements, based on political pluralism and market economy; development and enforcement of non-military strategies to promote interests based on generally accepted principles; maintaining a military component able to preserve and impose generally accepted security principles.

Changing priorities in the use, by states, of means that achieve political goals is a process occurring both with powerful countries and countries with a less comparable military power because of the destructive consequences triggered by armed conflicts. Arms control or arms race control represents the set of political, diplomatic and specific military efforts made to negotiate, enforce and monitor the implementation of multilateral agreements whose goal is, on the one hand, to quantitatively reduce the weaponry possessed by states and to forbid certain types of weapons, and, on the other hand, to stimulate and manage increased trust among states.

Generally, crisis prevention tends to include, in a separate matrix, under formation, a set of attitudes and behaviours of global actors whose overall purpose is to strengthen peace through measures prior to conversions of a crisis into open conflict as a successive deterioration of global context[5]. Crisis prevention requires political, diplomatic, military, economic, humanitarian, etc measures that should be anticipative, identifying and reducing tensions that can degenerate in a certain area; diplomatic techniques should be predominant.

In the past, all geographic areas were characterized by lord-vassal relations and policies that maintained recognition of first- power-and-strength statutes. Thus, „ It is not surprising that states based on these principles wanted to be recognized as such by other states; a process that found its logic in the fact that one nation ended by ensuring its global dominance"[6]. A peaceful behaviour in international relations is ensured by the following factors: enhanced globalised economic, informational and cultural relations; enhanced control of the public opinion over governmental policies; cultural and educational progress leading to increased rational behaviour of the people etc. Nevertheless, interests to develop the market economy, based on pluralist democracy in Europe can only result into enhanced European security and strengthened peaceful co-existence of the countries in the area.

---

[5] **Jenonne WALKER,** *Security and Arms Control In Post – Confrontation Europe, Oxford University Press, 1994, p.127 - 148*
[6] **Francis FUKUYAMA,** *Democratization and International Security, in Adelphi Papers nr 266, 1991, p.18*

The expansion of the security area according to a West European model is currently underway and it is supported both by already existing political, economic and military bodies – EU, NATO etc, that is Western countries, and by CEE countries and North Eastern countries. The history of the latest 50 years in Central Europe has proved a trend to reduce the influenced areas and to increase trust in the joint effort of the European states to build a security strategy based on peaceful co-existence and on enhanced joint cooperation in various fields. The support given to the idea of trust in European integration by giving up all attempts to turn to force is explained by the miracle of the historical reconciliation between the fearful traditional enemies – Germany, France, Austria and Italy; they managed to strengthen some economic and political inter-dependencies that impressively increased the general standards of civilization. Thus, stability and security of the CEE states and security expansion into this geographic area according to a Western model, largely depend on solving crucial economic, political and social problems of transition and on meeting the expectations of the population etc.

Development and enforcement of non-military strategies to promote national and group interests based on generally accepted principles is the key element of the paradigm of security strategy based on peaceful co-existence. In the absence of all military threats, states, companies and individuals compete to prove efficacy of social actions, to increase productivity and efficiency in general, to produce well done things with no constraints. Such social harmony becomes possible by gradually reducing the expression of national interests and progressively increasing the responsibilities of suprastate bodies, taking as example the new European construction.

Conclusions. The paradigm of the security strategy of „alone against all" generated a genuine vicious circle because all versions of social construction started from the assumption that insecurity is a universal and permanent feature of human beings and social structures, of the global system, in general, because of its anarchic and competitive nature. In the absence of a recognized global authority, every state felt potentially threatened by any other state and saw the military force as the only protection form. The perception of all-direction threat allowed every state to misinterpret as threats any actions taken by other states while the defensive preventive measure taken by any state could be interpreted as potential future attacks. Consequently, the competition of military strategies became a feature of the global system and wars, a constituent of international life; peace was merely a stage to prepare new military campaigns[7].

The paradigm of the security strategy „us against all" raised to a higher level the vulnerability and threats status: from independent states to groups of independent states. Thus, threats were perceived as coming not from one state to another state but from groups of states to other groups of states. Such security strategies cause concentration and collection of tremendous, destructive military capabilities, typical in practice of the two World Wars and of the Cold War. This paradigm allowed qualitative improvement of the military war equipment so that the chance of humankind to total self-destruction appeared,

---

[7] *In detail,* **Francis FUKUYAMA,** *The End of History and The Last Man, Avoon Books, New York, 1993, p.247-249*

even by mistake. From a rational perspective, the continuation of such a state of affairs became illogical to support.

The more the security strategies based on national interest and its imposition through force upon international relations are being contested, their place will be taken by the new paradigm of the security strategy of the peaceful co-existence based on generally accepted principles. The structural framework of this paradigm consists of actions like: arms control; trust and security measures; peaceful resolution of territorial disputes; measures to impose and maintain peace; resolution of inter-ethnical and religious unbalances based on decisions of regulatory international institutions; development of security and economic integration areas; rigorous arms control etc. Progress in this respect is slow because of national selfishness of some states, regarding their interests that are still seen better promoted through force.

The new paradigm of security strategy in the EU results from the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) whose role is to provide Europe with a suprastate operational capability, made of both military and civil facilities, in order to be used for international peacekeeping and security missions upon request of the UN Security Council.

Hence, the more the principles of international governance are accepted and the international regulatory bodies are operational, the more a new paradigm of the security strategy will become more solid.

For many researchers, development of communications, transports and IT allowed citizens across the world to know each other better which significantly reduced nationalism as cohesion force. The traditional nationalist arguments find currently their echo in underdeveloped countries that cultivate isolation for nationalistic or fanatical religious reasons. At the same time, „Another basic concept of the nation-state that needs to be removed is national security. Very few countries can protect themselves on their own, without being helped by a nuclear or chemical or bacteriological weapon. National security is so important that countries protect their integrity through supra state or international organisations like the European Conference for Security and Cooperation or NATO. This stays valid in the case of terrorism, drug-trafficking, environmental issues which have a global dimension and cannot be dealt with unless there are international cooperation and suprastate organisations[8].”

Since dependencies among national, regional and international economic, political and security complex issues grow deeper, the national state can gradually give up its independencies in favour of supranational institutions; the contents of the new paradigm of security strategy in which the national state „... is too small to solve the big problems of today's mankind and too small to solve small, daily problems of its citizens will grow from this process[9].”

The new paradigm of security strategy of peaceful co-existence based on generally accepted principles is currently growing, although not without difficulty.

---

[8] **Guillermo de la DEHESA,** *Winners and losers in globalization, Historia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, p.156-157*
[9] **Daniell BELL,** *The World and the United States in 2013, Daedalus, 1987, p.67*

Selected bibliography

1. **BELL, Daniell,** *The World and the United States in 2013*, Daedalus,
2. Collective work, SIPRI Yearbook, 1991.
3. 1987 **COVEY, Stephen R.,** *Ethics of the efficient leader or Management based on principles*, Alfa Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000
4. **DEHESA, Guillermo de la,** *Winners and losers in globalisation*, Historia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007.
5. **FRUNZETI, Teodor, ZODIAN, Vladimir,** *Lumea* 2009, Lira Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009.
6. **FUKUYAMA, Francis,** *The End of History and The Last Man*, Avoon Books, New York, 1993.
7. **FUKUYAMA, Francis,** *Democratization and International Security*, in Adelphi Papers nr. 266, 1991.
8. **KHUN, Thomas,** *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 1962.
9. **LUTWAK, Edward N.,** *From Geopolitics to GEO-Economics, Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce*, in The National Interest, 1990.
10. **VLĂSCEANU, Lazăr,** *Sociology Dictionary*, Babel Publishing House, Bucharest, 1993.
11. **WALKER, Jenonne,** *Security and Arms Control In Post Confrontation Europe*, Oxford University Press, 1994