

## POSSIBLE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL EVOLUTIONS OF GEOPOLITICS IN THE XXI CENTURY (II)

*Major General (ret) Professor Constantin MINCU, PhD\**

**Abstract:** *In the paper, the author briefly presents possible global and regional evolutions of geopolitics in the XXI century grounded on the analysis of some regards expressed by foreign and Romanian specialists in many papers appeared in the late years on this subject. A special attention is granted to the book published by STRATFOR founder George FRIEDMAN “The Next 100 Years: A Forecast for the 21st Century”, edited in Romania to the Litera Publishing House in 2012. The evolutions forecasted on medium and long term will practically damage all Earth’s population and its regions, with dramatic consequences on economic, financial, social, military and environmental plan.*

*The most of the geopolitics’ specialists appreciate with arguments and grounded there will be following intricate decades with riots and wars with spectacular up side downs of situations and major reconfigurations of areas of influence of major powers with important influences also over Romania.*

**Keywords:** *Geopolitical evolutions, USA, Russia, STRATFOR founder George FRIEDMAN, Europe, Asia, Pacific, geopolitical gaps, sustainable development.*

**I**n the first part of the paper “Possible global and regional evolutions of geopolitics in the XXI century”, presented to the V Congress of Romanian Academy Scientists in May 2013 and published in the “Military Science” magazine no. 2/2013, we brought to your attention George Friedman’s, STRATFOR director, vision on the possible evolution of the world in the next hundred of years<sup>1</sup>; his vision was approved and contested

---

\* Constantin Mincu – Full member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, scientific secretary of the Section of Military Sciences, member of the Honoric Council of the Academy of Romanian Scientists; email: mincu\_constantin@yahoo.com, phone: 0722303015; fax: 031402180.

<sup>1</sup> George FRIEDMAN, *Următorii 100 de ani – previziuni pentru secolul XXI*, Editura Litera, București, România, 2013.

in the same time by many foreign and Romanian geo-politicians and geo-strategists.

In the Military Science Section framework there were also presented critics over George Friedman's paper, the main disagreement elements were as follows:

- **The author represents** much too aggressive the regards of the American power centres (President, Parliament, Govern, Pentagon, Secret Service, etc.) and, therefore, considered to be subjective;
- It is impossible to make so detailed forecasts about the world evolution in the following 100 years;
- The economic, demographic and informational issues are approached without an adequate scientific support;
- It is over-evaluated the American military power, particularly, the Navy power;
- In the approach of the so-called "geopolitical gaps" there are mainly exposed the will of the North-American power;
- The author does not use in the book an scientific apparatus and does not indicate a bibliographical list from which to extract over regards.

Without being an unlimited supporter of STRATFOR director we must show for a balanced opinion to also quote some pro arguments for "The Next 100 years. A forecast for the 21<sup>st</sup> century" book:

- **George FRIEDMAN** is not just a usual person but an American politologist, the founder and general director of STRATFOR, private agency for geopolitical analysis, really taken seriously by the American power structures and also by many foreign governs from important countries (the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, China, Russia, etc.). Even the Romanian governors, in their rational moments, appeal to his expertise and efforts. It is known he visited Romania twice in the last three years and did important appreciations over the place and role of Romania in the Eastern Europe and the structures it is part in (NATO and EU);
- **Behind Friedman**, tens of specialists, of his institute stand, great part of them coming from the American governmental and military apparatus with great deal of knowledge and experience in the complex issue of the contemporary world, in the geopolitical evolutions analysis and, why not to admit, with strong tidings Pentagon, CIA, FBI, NSA and other American power structures;

- **We also must take into account** the analyses effectuated, on demand or not, by the American “think-tanks” are taken and compared in order to ground the medium and long term decisions (differently from some East-European countries way of doing things, which sooner or later became NATO members and “ground” their main decisions on conjectural and emotional considerations without appealing to those who, voluntarily, good lend a hand of help);

- **The scientific apparatus** missing in the book can be considered to be the entire database of information collected for many years at STRATFOR and the daily analysis work done on all the important events of the moment (there must be seen the STRATFOR bulletins and communications over Syria, Egipt, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, etc.).

**Many pro and against argumentations could be done**, but we stop here, leaving to the eventual critics to see from themselves and to identify the elements to sustain or speak against the assertions and predictions done in the analyzed paper.

A lend of help can come from the American historian competitors, as the Russians still consider themselves. Here I quote again the Russian politologist Dughin Alexandr, who, in a paper<sup>2</sup>, published also in Romania, expresses diametrically opposed regards. Some European, Chinese and Middle East countries’ annalists have also contrary opinions but this is not surprising at all.

**Actually, also Romanian military and civilian authors** who published books, studies and articles of geopolitics and geo-strategy often had different perspectives over the future evolutions in the area, regional and global spaces. I believe is correct to recommend some valuable authors and papers from the selected bibliography, as follows:

- **Bădescu Ilie** – „Tratat de Geopolitică” (“Geopolitics Treatise”) (2004);

- **Teodor Frunzeti și Vladimir Zodian** – „Enciclopedie politică și militară” (“Political and Military Encyclopaedia”) (2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013);

- **Marian Vasile** – „Geopolitica și noile provocări ale secolului

---

<sup>2</sup> Dughin G. ALEXANDR, *Bazele geopoliticii – viitorul geopolitic al Rusiei*, Editura Euroasiatică, București, România, 2003.

XXI” (“Geopolitics and the New Challenges of the XXI Century”) (2004);  
- **Mureșan Mircea și Văduva Gheorghe** – „Războiul viitorului, viitorul războiului” (“The Future War, the War Future”) (2006);  
- **Nicolaescu Gheorghe** – „Geopolitica securității” (“Security Geopolitics”) (2010).

The number of prestigious authors is larger and the perspectives are very different therefore we consider a reader interested on these matters could study the papers considered important in order to compare and make his own opinion.

As we already shown in the Part I – already published -, the evolution forecasted for medium and long term will, practically, affect all the Earth population and regions with dramatic consequences on financial, social, military and environmental plans. Consequently, there can not be designed patterns of **sustainable development**, in the absence of calm, international climate, without ongoing wars or permanent threat with the use of force from the stronger international actors but G. Friedman’s predictions do not leave space for silence, starting from the competition for resources, the demographic issues, the development of new technologies and the complexity of the new military systems (particularly of USA, Russia, China, the European countries NATO members, etc.)

But let’s get back to the predictions.

### **1. USA-JIHAD war**

**The author analyses** the motivations and debut of Islamic world confrontation with USA starting from religious, moral, economic, demographic and other nature considerations. He stands for, despite the quasi-general opinion, this “war” would not last for a hundred of years but is about to extinguish because Al-Qaeda organization did not reach its goals and the Islamic countries are strongly dismantled (and this happened more then on hundred years ago).

The events following 1991 (USSR collapse) released the nationalist forces including the Muslim from the Western Balkans and the ones from the whole South of USSR, forces willing to regain their identity and uncomfortable as part of the former Soviet Empire.

**USA-USSR confrontation** overlapped much the Soviet Union borders. **At the end of the Cold War**, the author considers, there were

**three sections** of the same border. There exists the European section, stretching from Norway to the German-Czech border, then, the **Asian** one, from the Aleutians Islands, through Japan, to China, and the **third section, from the Northern Afghanistan to Yugoslavia**. When the Soviet Union collapsed, this late section was the most seriously damaged. Yugoslavia felt down first, but the chaos finally reached the whole length of the sector and swallowed even countries which were not adjacent to the frontline.

The region comprised between Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Pakistan remained untouched along the Cold War. There existed isolated movements as when Iran became pro-American, Anti-American, but also Anti-Soviet, when the Russians invaded Afghanistan or along the Iraq-Iran war.

Once the soviets left, the region seriously destabilized. In great parts Muslim, it represents one of the three Muslim important regions of the world. We also have Northern Africa, the Muslim region from the South-Eastern Asia and the wide, multinational and distressed region stretching from Yugoslavia, to Afghanistan and further more, to South, to the Arabian Peninsula.

It is important to remember the demarcation line of the Cold War passed just by this Muslim region. The destabilization rapidly extended culminating with the problems generated by Afghanistan.

Following 70s the United States used the jihads for their own goals and then they must deal with the monster they created. The Soviet Union dismantling materialized in the destruction of the relations systems which maintained the region in certain order. With or without al-Qaeda, the Muslim entities from the former Soviet Union framework and from its South were about to become unstable and, the same as Yugoslavia, this instability was about, in a manner or another, the single world power, the United States. From the Ostrich border to the Hindu Kush, the region was disturbed, but the United States rushed to resettle the silence, their action resulting in mix results.

There is one more aspect of this situation which worth to be remarked, in the light of demographical trends are figuring as the internal anxieties of the Muslim world. The resistance of Islamic traditionalists to the changes of their habits, peculiarly as regards the status of women and the demographic changes constituted moving forces behind the regional instability. The fight between traditionalists and secularists destroyed the societies of the region

and the United States of America were seen to be responsible for the increased secularization. It seems hard to believe but the changes in the structure of families, resistance to changes and 11 September are very strongly related.

From the largest geopolitical perspective, 11 September ended the period in-between the end of the Cold War and the start of the new era, the one of the war between USA and Jihad. The jihadists could not gain if by “gaining” is understood the Caliphate resettlement, an Islamist empire. The splits from the Islamic world were and are much too deep to be defeated and the United States of America were and are much powerful in order to be easily defeated.

At this moment, the American-Jihad conflict seems very powerful and its so overwhelming importance is still difficult to imagine it extinguishing just as simple. The annalists speak about a century of conflict which will dominate the world but with the twenty years perspective proposed by the author, a world still terrorized by an American-Jihad war even in 2020 is hard to be imagined.

In regard to the characteristics of the wars the USA could bear (including the Jihad), the American power adopted its military strategy taking into account in the most pragmatic manner by the real characteristics and power of the adversaries by developing adequate military capacities and without hesitation to use, no matter what president is at the White House.

**Without thorough in to deep the subject,** it is considered USA has five geopolitical goals which dominate **their military strategy:**

- Total domination of Northern America by the United States Armed Forces;
- The elimination of threats for the United States from the part of any power from the Western hemisphere (in special the Latin America);
- The total control of the maritime access ways toward the United States by the fleet, in order to prevent any possibility of invasion;
- The complete domination of world oceans in order to provide USA’s physical safety and to guarantee the control over the international commercial network;
- The hindering of any maritime confrontation with other state.

The facts presented above help us to understand the Americans feedback to the Islamic attacks and not only. Systematically reaching the

proposed goals, the United States wanted and wants to inhibit the apparition of major power in Eurasia, power which threatens the American interests. The paradox is as follows: the goals of these interventions were never obtained – no matter what sustained the political rhetoric –, but to stop something. The United States of America wanted to hinder the stability in the regions wherein it would have been possible the apparition of a new power. The goal was not to stabilize but to destabilize and this explains the United States feedback to the Islamic earthquake – they wished to hinder the apparition of a great and powerful Islamic state.

As the war between USA and Jihad reaches to an end, the first resistance line against Islamises radicals will be the Muslim states themselves. They are the main targets of Al-Qaeda and indifferently they believe about Islam or about Occident, the Muslim states would not give up the power to Al-Qaeda. They will rather use their national power – their smartness and safety and their military intelligence – in order to crush Al-Qaeda.

**An Islamic world in chaos unable to unite means also the United States reached their aimed strategic goal.**

## **2. Cultural wars, the demographic explosion and computers**

**G. FRIEDMAN, the author**, as well as other specialists<sup>3</sup>, agrees the cultural heritage and the traditions specific for different social groups still represent a playground of tensions and confrontation.

For example, Al-Qaeda fights by all means, inclusively terrorism, in order to assert some traditionalist perceptions about women and families. This regard is not insignificant issue of their program – it is the core of it.

Al-Qaeda perspective it is not specific just for Islam. Unique can be the point to which is ready to pull the strings of this group but the women and families theme is defining for the majority of the religions. The traditional Catholicism, the fundamentalist Protestantism, the Orthodox Judaism and different branches of Buddhism, all have similar attitudes. All these religions are split inside, the same as the societies. In the United States where there is speaking about “cultural wars”, wherein the battlefield is the

---

<sup>3</sup> Huntington Samuel P., *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*, Editura Antet, București, 2000.

family and its definition. All societies are shared between traditionalists and between the ones try to redefine family, women and sexuality.

This conflict will intensify in the XXI century, but the traditionalists lead a defence fight they will loose in the end. The reason is in the late 100 years, the human life structure itself – peculiarly the women’s life – transformed and, consequently to it, the family structure. This already happened in Europe, United States and Japan and propagates in the rest of the world. These things will dismantle many societies, but, in the end, the family transformation can not be stopped.

This does not mean the transformation of the traditional family is a good or bad idea but is an unstoppable trend because the demographical realities of the world transform. The single major demographic change in the world in this moment **is the dramatic decline of birth rate** on global level. Women have each year, fewer children. This does not mean the demographical explosion since the last two centuries will stop but also the women will spend less time giving birth and raising children even their average life expectation is increasing.

#### ❖ **Demographic burst**

In the last decades, it became clearer the world will confront to a serious demographic burst. The uncontrolled growth of population will bring the exhaustion of resources and destruction of the environment making impossible the sustainable development.

The great deal of people will need more resources as food, energy and goods which, at their turn, will lead to the increase of the global heat and many other ecological disasters. The premise of the population growth was accepted by the majority of specialists in the field.

G. Friedman appreciates by offering credible arguments this situation it is not actual anymore. Is already seen a change in the economic developed countries. Humans live more but because of the decrease in birth rate there are fewer young workers to take the place of the retired personnel who are increasing in numbers. Europe and Japan already confront to this situation, and the United States will follow very soon and still the population aging is just the beginning.

People presume while the population growth will diminish in Europe, the total population of the world will continue to grow uncontrolled given the great birth rate in the less developed countries. Actually, the author



appreciates the truth is slightly different. The birth rate decreases rapidly all over the world. The economic developed countries are on the edge of gap, but the rest of the world follows closely. These changes will be defining for the XXI century.

One of the most important and developed countries in the world, as Germany and Russia, will lose great percentage of population. At present, Europe population, taken as a whole, is about 728 millions citizens. The United Nations forecasts in 2050 the numbers will go down to a value comprised between 557 and 653 millions, a remarkable decline. These numbers show women will have average 1.6 children each, at present, the average being about 2.2 children. In today's Europe, the fertility rate per woman is only 1.4 children.

Traditionally, the population decrease brings the diminution of power. For Europe, exactly like this will stay the things. For other countries as the United States of America the maintenance of the population level or the discovery of some means to grow the population in decline will be essential if by this will depend the political, economic and military power in the next hundreds of years.

The historical analyses and the present analyses on areas and countries greatly strengthen the foregoing appreciations.

Grounded on statistical facts and reckoning done by UN specialists, but also by independent specialists, there is considered the critical number is an average of 2.1 children per women in order to maintain stable world population. Any diminution under the line leads to a decrease of population.

The United Nations forecast in the 2050 the fertility rate at global level will decrease to an average of 2.05 births a number under the critical one and some prognoses are going to 1.6 children per woman, thus, until 2050 the population will stabilize, will dramatically decrease, with the involved consequences for the economy, social life, environment and in the end of the power gotten by the world states.

#### ❖ **Computer and the American culture**

In the next period, the United States are interested in destroying the traditional social patterns what creates enough instability and gives the nation the maximum of space for manoeuvres. The American culture is a mix of bible and computer, traditional values and medical innovations but along demography, computer (we largely should understand by it the

informatics and informational systems) will reshape at it turn the American culture becoming the true fundament of American cultural hegemony. This thing is proved to be extremely important in the next 100 years.

The computer represents radical detachment of the former technology and as well as new way to understand the reason. The goal of a computer is the manipulation of quantitative data, meaning numbers. As machine for data manipulation, computer represents single technology. but, while any information – music, film and written words – to numbers, this is, also, an unique method to perceive the reason.

**The American culture** preceded the American digitization. **The philosophic concept of pragmatism was built around some enounces as the one of Charles Pierce, one of the pragmatism founders:** „In order to resettle the interest of an intellectual conception, there must be settled what practical consequences can necessarily result from that conception truth and these consequences total will constitute the whole understanding of conception”. By all means, the significance of an idea consists in its practical consequences. An idea without the practical consequences is without sense. The whole notion of contemplative reason as goal itself is excluded.

**The American pragmatism** represented an attack to the European metaphysic considered to be impracticable. The American culture was and is obsessed by the practical utility and metaphysics defying. Computer and its language are perfect manifestations of pragmatism notions of reason. The only standard is the functionality. The idea a series of codes could be appreciated not for its utility but for its beauty is unimaginable.

Namely, the American culture is not focused on terms as truth or beauty. In exchange, it values the job done until the end without being too much interested by its importance.

Thus, we reach to the central truth of the American culture and to the enormous moving force. The American culture can be accused it raised the practical facts over all the other forms of truth. The accusation is available but does not evaluate the power of this simplification of works. The history itself appeared from the practical value.

If we try to discover the essence of the American culture, it consists not only in pragmatism as philosophy, but also in computer as materialization of pragmatism. Nothing represents the American culture

better than the computer and nothing transformed the world faster and deeper than the computer invention. Computer, more than the automobile or Coca Cola, represents the single manifestation of the American concept of reason and reality.

The United States are imitated by social and technological perspectives and condemned by political perspective. They are placed on the ideological fault of the international system. As the population decreases following the reproductive patterns changes, the United States becomes the centre of the way of social life radically redefined. You cannot have modern economy without computers and corporations you must know English, the language of computers. Those who want to oppose to the liberalization trend must stoically avoid the American pattern of living and thinking. The ones who do not adopt the American pattern cannot have a modern economy. This grants power to America and permanently tilts its critics.

Old institutions decayed and new ones do not yet appeared. In the XXI century, there will be a period wherein there will appear the first attempts to create new institutions, moral systems and practices. the First part of XXI century will be marked by intense religious conflicts. There will be interesting to notice the spontaneous apparition of stable, non-monogamy social patterns.

### **3. New lines of demarcation**

Where there will hit the next earthquake and which will be characterized? This ask himself the author of paper "The next 100 years". In order to answer to this question we must analyze **the geopolitical gaps of XXI century**. As for geology, there are many such gaps. Without pushing the analogy too far, we must identify the active gaps to identify regions where the frictions can provoke conflicts. As the attention granted to the Islamic world decrees in intensity, Which will be the next point of instability at the international level in the next period?

In the world, today exist **five areas perceived as potential candidates** (it is desirable to have ahead a coloured political map of the world when we analyze these gaps). **Firstly**, the Pacific basin is very important. Now and in the future is presumed the United States Fleet dominates the Pacific. The Asian area of Pacific is entirely composed by

commercial countries dependent by the access to ocean, therefore dependent by the United States.

Two of them - China and Japan - are great powers which theoretical could oppose to the USA hegemony. The United States and Japan fought between 1941 and 1945 for the Pacific basin and the issue does not seem to be solved until present.

**Secondly**, we must not forget the Eurasia future after the Soviet Union collapse. Since 1991 the region fragmented and decayed. The Soviet Union successor, Russia, went out from this period with new trust in itself. Still, Russia is situated in a geopolitical position easy to attack. If it will not succeed to create a sphere of influence, the Russian Federation can fragment itself. On the other hand, the creation of such spheres of influence can generate conflicts with the United States and Europe.

**Thirdly**, there exist doubts as regard the European space. For five centuries, Europe was the scene of many wars. In the late 60 years, it was occupied or tried to create an union to stop a new war. And still, Europe can enter in a situation when it should comply with Russia's rebirth, United States boldness or own internal tensions. The Pandora box is not opened yet.

**Fourthly**, let us not forget about the Islamic world. It is not instability worrying here but the possibility of a state apparition which no matter the ideology could form the fundament of a coalition. If we see the problem from historical perspective, Turkey was the greatest successful centre of the Muslim world. Which is its and the rest of the Muslim world future? We will see it, or perhaps our successors.

**Fifthly and in last turn**, we must take into consideration the issue of Mexican-American relations issue. Normally, Mexico statute should not come up to the level of a force to shake the world but its placement in Northern America could do this thing possible no matter is own power. As country with the fifteenth as size in the world, Mexico should not be underestimated either for its own merits. Mexico has old, historical issues to solve with the United State and along this century can appear social forces which can escape from any govern control.

In order to point out the events which are about to take place in the future, we should analyze, as follows, which of these events have chances to produce and in which order. A gap not necessarily bring with itself an earthquake. **The gaps can exist for millenniums provoking just soft,**

**occasional movements. Still, with such deep gaps, a conflict in the XXI century seems almost unavoidable.**

**For the start**, regarding also the possible negative influences over Romania, we will approach Europe's problems leaving the possible continuations to the other geopolitical gaps.

❖ **Europe**

**From the Baltic countries** to the border with **Romania** is laying a region characterized by unsafe borders and frequent conflicts. In North there is a long and narrow field which lays from the Pyrenees to Sankt Petersburg. Here were fought the great battles of Europe. This is the way taken by Napoleon, but also Hitler when he invaded Russia. There exist few natural barriers. After the World War II, on this way the Russians went to the core of Western Germany. Today, withdrawn to East but they must turn back and install as much to the West. This means the Baltic states and Poland represent, as in the past, issues Russia should confront.

Defining the limits of Russia influence will proved to be controversial matter. The United States and the former soviet sphere would not want to go much further. The last thing the Baltic states wish is to enter again under Russian domination. Neither the states situated to the South of North-European Champ in the Carpathians do not wish for this thing. The former Soviet satellites - particularly **Poland, Hungary** and **Romania** know the return of Russian powers to their border would mean a threat against the national security. As these countries are NATO members now, their interests are also Europeans and United States interests. It still remains opened the question: Where will be drawn the demarcation line in West? A question which was always thought along the history and it was key-challenge in Europe along the late 100 years.

**Russia will not become world power** in the next decade, but it can only choose to become major regional power. The Russian-European border remains one of the gaps with enough high potential of confrontation.

Also today, **Europe** is in full process of reorganization following the loss of the empire and two devastating global wars; it is about to be seen if this reorganization will be done in peace. Europe will not regain its empire but we must analyze if we can live with the certitude the intra-European wars are over. The core matter of this issue remains the question if Europe is an extinguished or just latent volcano. The European Union has total GDP

over 14 trillion dollars, one trillion more than the United States. It is possible such rich region - with great diversity of wealth - to remain immune to conflict but nobody can guarantee this.

We cannot speak about Europe as single entity, because it is not, despite the European Union existence. Europe is conditioned by a series of sovereign states dominated by own relations. There exist general entity called Europe but is more reasonable to stop thinking to it as to an Europe, but as to **three Europe** (we exclude from this list Russia and the states of former Soviet Union – although they are European from geographical perspective have different dynamic from Europe):

- **Atlantic Europe:** the states with direct access to Atlantic and the Northern seas, the former great imperial powers along the late 500 years;
- **Central Europe:** essentially, Germany and Italy, which did not exist until the end of the XIX century as modern states. Their will for affirmation of national interests triggered the both world wars from XX century.
- **Eastern Europe:** the existent states between the Baltic region and Black Sea, which were occupied by Soviet troops in the World War II and developed recent national identities, following this experience.

**In the 50s, to NATO creation**, there were settled the grounds for the European Economic Community. The European Union, which born from EEC, is still a schizoid entity. Its main goal is to create a world European economy leaving the sovereignty in the hands of each nation.

Consequently, it is seen as foreword to a federation of European states wherein a central European govern with professional parliament and administration will govern a Federal Europe wherein the national sovereignty will be limited to the local problems, and the foreign defence and policy remain in the hands of the central power.

Europe did not reach this goal. It created a free area and own currency which some members of the free area use and others not. It does not succeeded to ground some political constitution leaving each nation to be its own sovereign - thus, it never created a policy of unique defence. This, as it is coordinated, it is in NATO's hand and not all NATO members are also EU members (as the United States). Following the Soviet Union, just certain independent states from Eastern Europe were admitted in EU and NATO.

Briefly, Europe following the Cold War is characterized by true chaos. The institutional relations extremely complex and ambiguous were created seem impossible to explain. Given the Europe history, such confusions will normally lead to war. But Europe excepting the former Yugoslavia does not have the energy needed for a new conflagration, either appetite for instability and, surely, either will for new conflicts. Although, under EU cover, the old European nationalism continues to affirm but slowly.

Therefore, it would be naive to speak about Europe as about single entity as the United States or China. Europe is a bunch of states still unrecovered after the shock of World War II, Cold War, and lost of the empires. These states are extremely closed organising their geopolitical actions from the individual interests perspective.

**Russia** is the closest military threat for Europe. This is not interested by Europe conquest but the reinstalment of its control over the former Soviet Union. From Russia's perspective, we can speak about reasonable attempt to settle minimum spheres of influence but also an essential measure of defence. Still, such measure is considered defensive immediately damaging the three Baltic states which are at present NATO and EU members.

It is clear **the Eastern Europe** wants to stop a reaffirmation of Russia. The true problem is what the rest of Europe would do - and particularly what Germany would do. It is a problem of complex political analysis hard to solve. There are circulated many scenarios, from which result the Eastern Europe would have to suffer.

Internally, Europe is inert, still numbed by the shock of the suffered losses. But, the extern forces as the Islamic immigration or Russia's trials to rebuild its empire could return to life the old gap, in many ways.

This material's author intention is to continue with other two parts (III and IV) which will be published if is possible in the Military Science magazine approaching selectively and critically also other aspects of the "The next 100 years - A Forecast for XXI century" paper.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amipur Katajun, Beeman William O., Etheshami Anoushirvan, Halliday Fred, Hourcade Bernard, Kapiszewski Andrzej, Posch Walter, Reissner Johannes, *Irannian Challenges*, publicat de Institutul Uniunii Europene pentru Studii de Securitate, 2006.
- Bădescu Ilie, *Tratat de geopolitică*, Editura „Mica Valahie”, 2004.
- Brzezinski Zbigniew, *Marea dilemă – a domina sau a conduce*, Editura Scripto, București, 2005.
- Brzezinski Zbigniew, *Triada geostrategică. Conviețuirea cu China, Europa, Rusia*, Editura „Historia”, București, 2000.
- Buzan Barry, Waver Ole, Wilde Juan de (1998) „*Security A New Framework For Analysis*”, Boulder, Londra, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2-3.
- Chauprade Aymeric; Thual, Francois, *Dicționar de geopolitică*, Grupul Editorial Corint, 2003.
- Claval Paul, *Geopolitică și geostrategie*, Editura Corint, București, 2001.
- Diechlhoff Alain, *Națiune și rațiune de stat. Identitățile naționale în mișcare*, Editura Curtea Veche, București, 2003.
- Dughin Alexandr, *Bazele geopoliticii – viitorul geopolitic al Rusiei*.
- Dungaciu Dan, *Națiunea și provocările (post) modernității*, Editura Tritonic, București, 2004.
- Duțu Petre, *Apărarea colectivă – O necesitate a menținerii integrității statale naționale. Acțiunea armatei României în cadrul apărării NATO*, București. Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare, 2005.
- Eliade Mircea, *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic și Editura Științifică, București, 1999.
- Fedorovsky Vladimir, *De la Rasputin la Putin*, Editura Vivaldi, București, 2003.
- George Friedman, *Următorii 100 de ani – previziuni pentru secolul XXI*, Editura Litera, București, România, 2012.



- Gilpin Robert, *Economia mondială în secolul XXI. Provocarea capitalismului global*, Editura Polirom, 2004.
- Gore John, *Chaos Complexity and the lucidity*, Washington D.C., Universitatea Națională de Apărare, 1996.
- Held David, McGrew Anthony, Goldblatt David, Perraton Jonathan, *Transformări globale. Politică, economie și cultură*, Editura Polirom, 2004.
- Hermet Guy, *Istoria națiunilor și naționalismului în Europa*, Institutul European, 1997.
- Huntington Samuel P., *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*, Editura Antet, București, 2000.
- Teodor Frunzeti, Vladimir Zodian (coordonatori), *Enciclopedie politică și militară, LUMEA 2009*, Editura CTIEA, București, România, 2009.
- Teodor Frunzeti, Vladimir Zodian (coordonatori), *Enciclopedie politică și militară, LUMEA 2011*, Editura CTIEA, București, România, 2011.
- Teodor Frunzeti, Vladimir Zodian (coordonatori), *Enciclopedie politică și militară, LUMEA 2013*, Editura RAO, București, România, 2013.
- Kaldor Mary, *Războaie noi și vechi*, Editura Antet, 1999.
- Kernic Franz, Paul Hirst, *Război și putere în secolul 21*, Editura Antet, 2001.
- King Alexander, Schneider Bertrand, *Prima revoluție globală: o strategie pentru supraviețuirea lumii*, Editura Tehnică, 1993.
- Kissinger Henry, *Diplomația*, Editura Bic All, 2002.
- Lacoste Yves, *Dictionnaire de géopolitique*, Flammarion, Paris, 1983.
- Marin Vasile, *Geopolitica și noile provocări ale secolului XXI*, Editura Universității Transilvania, Brașov, 2004.
- Mateeva Ana, *EU stakes in Central Asia*, publicat de Institutul Uniunii Europene pentru Studii de Securitate, 2006.
- Moștoflei Constantin, Dușu Petru dr., „Apărarea colectivă și apărarea națională în contextul integrării României în NATO și aderării la Uniunea Europeană”, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare, București, 2005.

- Mureșan Mircea și gl.bg.(r) Văduva, Gheorghe, *Războiul viitorului, viitorul războiului*, Editura UNAP, București, 2006.
- Neumann Victor, *Neam, popor sau națiune? - despre identitățile politice europene*, Editura Curtea Veche, București, 2003.
- Nicolaescu Gheorghe, *Globalizare, regionalizare și stat*, în *Impact strategic* nr.4-5/2002, Centrul de Studii Strategice și de Securitate.
- Nicolaescu Gheorghe, Simileanu Vasile, *Globalizarea informaticii*, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, Top Form, București, 2005.
- Nicolaescu Gheorghe, *Gestionarea crizelor politico – militare*, Editura Top Form, București, 2003.
- Nicolaescu Gheorghe, *Geopolitica securității*, Editura U.N.Ap. „Carol I”, București, România, 2010.
- Nivet Bastien, *Security by proxy?: The EU and (sub)-regional Organizations: The Case of ECOWAS*, publicat de Institutul Uniunii Europene pentru Studii de Securitate, 2006.
- Onișor Constantin gl. bg. prof. univ. dr., *Teoria strategiei militare*, Editura Academiei de Înalte Studii Militare, București, 1999.
- Popa Vasile, *Implicațiile Globalizării asupra Securității Naționale*, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Apărare și Securitate, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”, București, 2005.
- Sapperstein Glenn, *Chaos Therapy: The essentials for literary applications* – Naval War College, 1995.
- Siniscalchi Joseph, Colonel, USAF, *Non – Lethal Technologies: Implications For Military Strategy*, Center for Strategy and Technology Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama – USA – 1998.
- Siteanu Eugen, *Războiul bazat pe cunoaștere (războiul cognitiv)*, revista *Impact strategic*, nr. 3 (24)/2007.
- Smith Anthony, *Naționalism și modernism*, Editura Epigraf; Chișinău, 2002;
- Steven Metz și Douglas V. Johnson II, *Asymmetry and U.S. Military Strategy: Definition, Background, and Strategic Concepts*, Institutul de Studii Strategice, U.S. Army War College, ianuarie 2001.
- Toffler Alvin, *Al Treilea Val*, Editura Antet, 2000.
- Toffler Alvin, *Puterea în mișcare*, Editura Antet.

- Volkov Vladimir, *Tratat de dezinformare*, Editura Antet, București, 2000.
- Waltz Kenneth N., *Omul, statul și războiul*, Editura Institutului European, București, 2000.
- Asimetria fenomenului terorist*, Editura Top Form, București, 2003.
- Confruntări asimetrice*, interviu realizat de revista Gândirea militară românească, nr. 4, 2002.
- Doctrina de informații și contrainformații a NATO*, 1996.
- Institutul Român de Studii Internaționale, *NATO: Ce este? Ce va fi? Noua Europă și Securitatea statelor mici*.
- Manualul NATO*, volum colectiv.
- Organizația Tratatului Nord – Atlantic, *Manualul N.A.T.O.*, Editura Ministerului Informațiilor Publice.

