

## THE FRAMEWORK STRATEGY RELATED TO SECURITY IN SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

*Valentin-Bogdan DĂNILĂ, PhD\**

*When discussing the current strategic environment, there is the "when" of the Cold War and the first half of the '90s , and the "now" of today . The changing demography and migration patterns, ethnic and religious tensions, environmental degradation, instability coming from states that are likely to decline or have already fallen, and growing proliferation of weapons are just some of the problems that have exacerbated the differences between security "then" and "now", such as the transnational terrorist attacks after September 11, 2001. The concept of security was much disputed, as seen from a study of the United Nations in 1986, developed by a group of experts on the concept of security, resulting in the existence of a limited conceptual similarity between them [1]. Mankind has always been concerned with building or rebuilding peace and security [2]. During the Cold War, Central and Eastern European countries were not talking about a national security concept in the Western sense of the word, but about a military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact and, in some cases, as was that of Romania, about a national military doctrine. After the fall of the Iron Curtain, those countries have gradually chosen to use the concept of national security, a term that takes into account all types of threats to national interests, and also the whole range of ways to counter them, the military not having the leading role any longer.*

**Keywords:** *Homeland Security; Balkans; vulnerabilities; defense strategies; cooperation; terrorism.*

**A** national security concept adopted by a particular state contains the detailed concerns of the country in its own security, provided alone or with external partners. The national security concept adopted by the

---

\* National Intelligence Academy „Mihai Viteazul”, Bucharest, Romania

state shall guide the security policy, as part of the general policy of the state, which will indicate how the country will react to these issues.

It is noted that the concept of security policy currently suffers major changes [3]. A security policy involves a network of interrelated decisions on the choice of objectives, means and resources allocated for their achievement in specific situations.

In recent years, the non-military dimension of security has gained ground in front of the military one. The main reason is simple and all too often invoked in security studies: the realization that, with the end of the Cold War, a major military threat has diminished[4], being replaced by new risks, dangers and threats [5] of political, economic, social, ecological, etc. nature.

Thus, changes affecting the international security environment have resulted in clarifying a vision of the international community aimed at strengthening global peace and security and hence the conflicting tensions of all kinds and causes of major international disputes.

This means, essentially, as stated earlier, identifying the existing vulnerabilities at an international scale, the risks and threats hanging over larger spaces than the national state space [6] and even regional, resulting in instability or sources contributing to the worsening of the existing ones.

The problem of transforming the national armed forces is a topic on the agenda of almost every European country, whether belonging to the European Union or NATO or not yet a member of any of the two. Over the past 15 years, major geopolitical changes in Europe and new perceptions, such as the collapse of certain states and terrorism in the military area, have caused a shift from the traditional tasks of defending the country to peacekeeping operations, crisis management and networking security.

This development requires - among other things - new security and defense strategies and, to date, effective management of the human, financial and infrastructure resources, as well as new decision-making structures for implementing security arrangements, not only nationally but also at EU and NATO level.

Although the transformation of armed forces is not a problem, which identifies only the transformation of the states in South-Eastern Europe, the region must also cope with some additional challenges in terms of military issues. In particular, the social aspects of transforming the armed forces in South-Eastern Europe appear to play a more important role than in Western Europe. Unlike the established democracies and market economies in Central and Western Europe, where security

institutions are easily accepted by people, in some countries in the South-East people have little confidence in their security forces. The reasons are obvious: the security force abused for political goals during the authoritarian communist regime and especially during the Balkan wars of the 90's.

Building confidence among the peoples in the Balkans over their security forces is only possible if each country west of the Balkans and the state is making headway in the transformation: this means that democratic institutions and the rule of law grow as a social and economic market. If the transformation of the armed forces in South-Eastern Europe is closely linked to other sectors, it could adversely affect military commitments, even the Balkan countries in international peacekeeping operations. Transparency, relationships and democratic control are some keywords that should characterize successful peacekeeping operations. Clearly, the armed forces, who see themselves as a "corpus separatum" (separate entity) in their own society, will not be able to meet this criterion.

Only if the process of transforming the armed forces will be brought into line with political institutions and economic transformation, negative social consequences due to staff reorganization measures will be minimized.

The reorientation of the armed forces in the South-East, which is usually connected with a large and painful staff reduction becomes an important issue for the regional stabilization process and not a problem for only one state.

Thus, the social and political transformation of the armed forces in the South East should be put on the agenda of international aid programs.

The countries of South-East Europe could therefore learn many more lessons in reforming the security sector.

For example, Western Balkan countries could benefit from the experience of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary which have undergone since NATO integration processes all major consequences upon their armed forces, described for example in Bulgaria's contributions. But there may be joint efforts to assimilate these lessons from Western Balkan countries. For example, Serbia and Montenegro are now facing a large reduction of troops, which will lead to social problems. Bosnia and Herzegovina have already gone through this painful process, so that Belgrade could benefit from the experience of Bosnia in the development of social and economic programs for retired military personnel.

Among the good reform proposals built in the South-East, which are presented in this article, one will have to remain realistic about what can be

achieved in the short or medium security in the region: the South-East is still far from having a common system of cooperative security. In terms of security we can differentiate between three types of countries: a group of Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria as full NATO members, the second group consisting of Croatia, Macedonia, and Albania waiting to be integrated in a few years, and the third group consisting of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina that are not supported even in the NATO Partnership for Peace. With this distinction present, an important aim of NATO and the EU in South-Eastern Europe should harmonize the armed forces in the Balkan countries by setting the same values to build a cooperative security system.

But the process of harmonizing and unifying solutions can generate forces required for transformation in the South-East, which do not take into account in particular the various economic opportunities and social conditions of each Balkan country.

The September, 11 attacks on the United States warned the decision-makers worldwide. For Europe, these attacks have signaled the emergence of new threats and stressed the importance of cross-border cooperation, for which the EU has adopted several measures.

This reality is beginning to gain its concept of terrorism Homeland Security, whose reason lies precisely in mastering these undesirable phenomena. The Homeland Security tried to harmonize the actions of various sectors, both national and international, to enable a common approach to worldwide challenges [7].

"Homeland security" is a global mission. From ensurance to protecting border supply chains worldwide, virtually every aspect of preventing terrorist attacks has an international dimension involving the United States to cooperate effectively with its allies.

For many, the term "Homeland" resonates most strongly at the country level. In fact, European policy decision-makers prefer to use terms such as internal security, civil protection, security and cooperation when referring to security issues within the European Union.

The literal translation of the notion of "Homeland Security" [8] is "security of the country", but it does not contain the entire concept. According to the Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language, homeland is "the territory historically belonging to a people and where the latter lives, the country of his birth, and whose citizen someone is" [9]; Homeland Security refers not only to the protection of a

country's citizens and their property, but also to the protection of a certain way of life that transcends borders.

In theory, it appears that such a definition is too narrow to reflect the complexity of the concept. This is about the security of what we call, in globalization terms, "home", whether this space is the national territory or that of the European Union or across the Atlantic. A translation of it, which could include all these features, can be "security area of interest", i.e., the security interests of the state, regional organization, regional or even global in their circumscribed space, and also outside it.

From here one can go on to analyze the density of interest that a player has in a certain area. It is obvious that at the state level, the highest density of interest is within the boundaries of that State. Globalization, however, resulted in increasing the permeability of borders, so as to secure the state and the nation, governments projecting their interests abroad, launching various external instruments designed to protect national interests.

Due to the transnational nature of contemporary terrorist threats, the interdependence of modern societies resulting from globalization, and the concept of defense by using aid to counter threats in stages, all multinational partnerships are subject to the security interest of space.

The events of the last decade illustrate the extent to which terrorism has become an international challenge.

The attacks in Madrid (March 11, 2004) and in London (July 7, 2005) caused the amplification of debates among Community experts. Gijs de Vries, EU counter-terrorism policy coordinator, estimated that "the EU anti-terrorist policy must articulate new threats, so that: the entire panoply of security and intelligence services, police forces and judicial authorities can work together (Coherence); agreements arising from Brussels to be applied by all Member States (Implementation), to provide increased capacity for analysis and dissemination of information (intelligence)" [10].

Such systematic effort was initiated, which engages both government bodies and the private sector to reduce vulnerabilities and to develop special protection capabilities.

As these vulnerabilities [11] both belong to different levels - national, regional and global – it is essential to achieve objective analysis tools that serve to create this vision that can be implemented practically. Already today we can say that this

process has become far-reaching, both in terms of spatial dimension and the temporary nature harmonizing major sources of instability, which may originate at the economic-financial, political, military, social, and cultural environment.

Above the levels themselves, there is the classic battle for resources (especially energy), in which there are the rivalries or ethnic and religious conflicts. In addition, recent decades have shown vehemently other sources of insecurity, such as terrorism, proliferation of weapons and technology for weapons of mass destruction, arms and drug trafficking, illegal immigration [12].

One possible approach, proposed by Peter Faber [13] (a researcher at the War College of the National Defense University, USA), "Homeland Security" may be affected by three categories of risks, dangers and threats: non-state enemies international and domestic enemy enemy state. In the first category, between terrorism and organized crime, in the second - terrorism, organized crime and military attacks, and the third - terrorism, civil movements turbulence and natural disasters. All such risks, dangers and threats they can be countered by an efficient algorithm: prevention, protection and response.

Although at first glance it seems a simplistic model, behind each element there is a complex action. Thus, prevention can be achieved by: border control, collection, analysis and dissemination of information, cooperation agencies and international law enforcement, arms control and nonproliferation; use of diplomatic means and instruments, etc. Protection covers both the critical infrastructure and the population on that space, and response and crisis management considers the consequences, and also ensures continuity of government activities.

But, unlike the U.S., the Black Sea area, the vision of the concept of "Homeland Security" riparian countries divided into three categories :

1. NATO and / or the EU countries, Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, which structures the security strategies depending on the status and international role of membership in these organizations involved;
2. the Russian Federation, which has a distinct vision of security that comes from its position in international relations;
3. countries aspiring to NATO and / or EU membership, e.g. Georgia and Ukraine, which began a process of adaptation to the requirements of accession / integration in these organizations.

So, the first group of countries has a tributary status on the international stage. NATO has not a clearly defined strategy in terms of Homeland Security, but the concept is not new for the Alliance. Since the Cold War years, they have had

clear plans to combat the Soviet special forces, which had managed to infiltrate the Western block [14].

Also, allied military forces have always been prepared to assist civil authorities, whether it was natural disasters, closure of borders and critical infrastructure protection.

However, NATO is not the only organization that coordinates counterterrorist efforts of the West, as understood by "Homeland Security". If you want to play a distinctive role in achieving effective and Homeland Security, you must make changes in the strategic concept and the organizational culture, by developing new concepts and preparing special operations units [15].

While developing the concept for the U.S. "Homeland Security" means engaging in a comprehensive reorganization of the national security system for European countries, implementing and developing the same concept is implemented within the existing institutional and countering terrorism and other types of threats and counter threats to security. Overall, the core of the European approach on SSI / HS is societal security, namely the protection of citizens.

Since the '80s and '90s, the EU has provided a framework for cooperation, in order to ensure protection of its citizens through the Schengen agreement and initiate cooperation in Law and Home Affairs.

Internationally speaking, there are opinions that the Europeans have urged the application of the law enforcement tools to strengthen SSI / HS. Meanwhile, other analysts said the strategy of European governments in the SSI / HS is the integration of counter-terrorist strategies into the existing efforts in crisis management and emergencies, so that they can give greater flexibility in responding to challenges to security.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Grigore Alexandrescu, *Amenințări în mediul de securitate*, în Constantin Moștofleu, Nicolae Dolghin (Coord.), *Studii de Securitate și Apărare*, Vol. I, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare, București, 2005

Rafael Bardaji, Daniel Keohane, *Debate, Should homeland security be a fundamental NATO mission?*, în *NATO Review*, nr. 2/2006

- Nicolae Dolghin, Alexandra Sarcinschi, Mihai-Ștefan Dinu, *Riscuri și amenințări la adresa securității României. Actualitate și perspectivă*, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, București, 2004
- Nicolae Dolghin, *Stabilitatea lumii navigând printre strategii*, în Revista *Impact strategic*, Nr. 1 [26] 2008, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, București
- Peter Faber, *Homeland Security: General Templates and Options for the Future*, în *Information & Security. An International Journal*, vol. 17/2005
- Constantin Moștofleii, *Strategia, arta operativă și tactică în contextul politicii de securitate viitoare*, în Revista *Impact strategic*, Nr. 4 [25] 2007, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, București
- Gijs de Vries, *European Union, A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy*, Bruxelles, 12 December 2003
- Alexandra Sarcinschi, *Regiunea extinsă a Mării Negre între constrângerile tradiției și provocările noului mediu politic internațional de securitate*, în *Securitate și stabilitate în bazinul Mării Negre*, a V-a sesiune internațională de comunicări științifice, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, București, 2005
- Alexandra Sarcinschi, *Securitatea spațiului de interes. Reprezentarea psihosocială a securității și Homeland Security în zona Mării Negre*, în *Impact Strategic*, nr.3[28]/2008, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”
- Gheorghe Văduva, *Strategia acțiunilor rapide*, Editura Academiei de Înalte Studii Militare, București
- [http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_hls.pdf): *The National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Office of the Homeland Security, July 2002
- <http://www.esnips.com/doc>: *Terorismul: Dimesiune geopolitică și geostrategică, războiul terorist, războiul împotriva terorismului*, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Securitate, București, 2002
- [http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new\\_pubs/jp1\\_02.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf): *Department of Defence Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, 12 aprilie 2001 (actualizat la 17 octombrie 2008)
- <http://www.russiaeurope.mid.ru/russiastrat2000.html>

