

NATO SUMMIT AND REACTIVATION OF TRADITIONAL SECURITY PARADIGM AS A RESULT OF THE INTENSIFICATION OF GLOBALIZATION PROCESSES

*Brigadier General (ret.) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, PhD**

Abstract: *Accomplishing the studies upon the international and national techniques of security strategies inevitable guides to an ascertained fact of a high complexity described by dynamism and continuous change. Over the history the security strategies have developed in the doctrinaire level and also in the configuration of forces aiming to impose a certain security state generated by the political aspects of the moment. This fact is making difficult the need to systematize and to show the importance of the theoretic 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 „guaranteeing the peaceful companionship on the base of general accepted principles”.*

Keywords: *paradigm; strategy of security; national security; security zone; international relations; national interest; world interest; military activities.*

1. Overall aspects. The Cold War ended with the declared victory of the Occident. USSR dismantled and also the Warsaw Treaty that comprised the former socialist countries armed forces was put it down in a general atmosphere of content.

NATO as collective defence system formed by countries considered to protect the international democracy did not followed the processes similar to the Warsaw Treaty but on the contrary it widely opened its gates to initiate and strengthen new partnerships. Thus, on January 1st, 2009, NATO was

* Member of Romanian Scientists Academy, Military Sciences Section, Artifex University, Bucharest, phone: 0722.626.244.

composed by 28 states which agreed to go on with the principle stating “*an armed attack against one or many of the allied European countries or Northern America will be considered as an attack against all and consequently, if such attack will occur, each of them, by exercising their individual or collective right to defence, recognized by Article 51 of the UN Charter, will provide support to the attacked Party or Parties and will be taken concerted measures considered necessary including the armed force use in order to reinstall and maintain the security in the North-Atlantic area*”. In first, this phrase referred to the situation when USSR would have launched an attack against its European allies and USA had to address the Soviet Union as they themselves were attacked. But the feared soviet invasion in Europe was not a fact. In exchange, the phrase was used for the first time in the Treaty’s history on September 12th, 2001 as response to the September 11th, 2001 attacks. This time, the common enemy was generically called terrorism.

NATO Bucharest Summit took place back grounded on the consecration of Western victory over the East and NATO Eastern borders occupying an alignment formed by the Baltic countries, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria, and Ukraine and Georgia as very near countries to become members of this treaty. By all means, it was more than obvious the winner extended its exclusive influence area much inside in the territory controlled few years ago by Russia. In relation to the adhesion process of Ukraine and Georgia, this time, Russia strongly opposed. There were done promises and Russia warned and threatened. The former NATO enemies and neutral analysts seen NATO enlargement as a process to involve in US and their traditional allies sphere of influence of new territories, new countries “repelling from Satan” and looking for security guarantees from the winning Party of the Cold War. A process specific to democracy, freedom and independence of states, but with obvious occidental blessing.

Under these circumstances, the Pro-European processes in the both countries in the near vicinity of Russia were deepened but the Russian countermeasures radicalized too. Georgia supported an humiliating Russian military intervention to which Occident remain without replica and Ukraine supports a territorial fragmentation war with direct Russian contribution and Occident is again surprised and without replica. On this tensioned background, in-between September 4-6, 2014 it took place the Wales

NATO Summit by which final declaration we can easily see the actual and future enemy: *“We condemn in the most serious terms the illegal and increasing military intervention of Russia in Ukraine and we request Russia to stop and withdraw its forces from inside and along the Ukrainian borders. This infringement of Ukraine sovereignty and territorial integrity is a serious crime against the international law and major challenge against Euro-Atlantic security. We do not recognize and will not recognize the illegal and illegitimate «annexation» of Crimea by Russia. We ask Russia to conform with the international law, its international obligations and responsibilities, to end the illegitimate occupation of Crimea; to keep away from aggressive actions against Ukraine; to withdraw its troops; to stop the flow of armament, equipment, peoples and money over the border by the separatists and to stop the fuelling of tensions along and over the Ukrainian border. Russia must use its influence on the separatists in order to de-escalate the situation to make concrete steps to allow a political and diplomatic solution, to respect the Ukraine sovereignty, territorial integrity and internationally recognized borders. We are extremely worried the violence and insecurity in the region caused by Russia and separatists supported by Russia lead to deterioration of humanitarian situation and material damages in the Eastern Ukraine.*

We are worried about the discrimination suffer the Tatars originating in Crimea and other members of local communities in the Crimean Peninsula. We request Russia to take the needed measures to provide safety, rights and liberties for all the persons living in the peninsula. This violence and insecurity lead to the tragic knockdown of the Malaysia Airlines MH17 passengers’ airplane, on July 17, 2014. Remembering Resolution 2166 of UN Security Council, the allies request to all the states and actors in the region to provide immediate, safe and unrestricted access to the place of MH17 collapse to allow the reopening of the investigation and repatriation of victims’ remains and goods from the crash place. The direct or indirect guilty people for taking down the MH17 airplane should be brought in front of justice and convicted as soon as possible.

We are also worried by the repetitive way of Russia to disrespect the international law, including the UN Charter; its behaviour to Georgia and Republic of Moldova; the infringement of European security arrangements and basic engagements including Helsinki Final Act; long standing non-

implementation of the Treaty on the Conventional Forces in Europe and the use of military and other nature instruments in order to coerce its neighbours. This threatens the international order based on rules and it is a challenge against Euro-Atlantic security. Moreover, these developments can effect on long term on the stability in the Black Sea which stands as main component of Euro-Atlantic security. The recent actions of Russia are contrary to the principles on the bases of mechanisms to grow the trust in the Black Sea region. We will continue to support when the efforts in the regional plan asserted by the Black Sea riparian states regarding the provisioning of security and stability.

As long as Russia continues to intervene military, to arm the separatists and to fuel the instability in Ukraine, we will support the sanctions imposed by the EU, G7 and others representing an essential component of overall international efforts meant to answer to the destabilizing behaviour of Russia, to determinate it to de-escalate the situation and to reach a political solution for the situation created by its actions. Among those are counted the measures taken by the Allies, including Canada, Norway and USA, as well as by EU decisions to limit the access to the capital markets for state financial institutions in the Russian Federation, to restrict the armament commerce, to settle some export restrictions for double use products with final military destinations, to limit Russia's access to sensitive technologies in the defence and energetic sectors, and also other means.”¹

From the Declaration, along the Russia's condemnation, NATO also manifests its worry for the instability grow in the Middle East, the conflict situations in the Republic of Moldova and Southern Caucasus, security decay in the Northern Africa, aggressiveness of so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Levant, escalation of crisis in Syria, deterioration of situation in Lebanon, management of post-war situations in Afghanistan and Iraq, the decay of human rights statute in Central Africa, etc.

When the threats were identified, in the NATO Summit framework was decided it is needed an increase of logistical efforts to support the

¹ Wales Summit Declaration adopted by the chiefs of states and governs participants to the North-Atlantic Council in Wales, September, 4-5, 2014, items 16-19.

operations and this was found in the following formulation: “We convened to inverse the decrease trend of defence budgets, to use with maximum efficiency our funds and to promote more balanced distribution of costs and responsibilities. Our security and defence in their whole depend on the expenditures volume as well in the manner we spend the money. The enhanced investments should be directed to analyse our priorities in the field of capabilities and the Allies should also prove their political will to provide the necessary capabilities and to deploy forces when they are needed. A strong defence industry to the level of whole Alliance, including stronger defence industry in Europe and enhanced cooperation in the field of defence industry in Europe and over the Atlantic and it is continuously essential to deliver the necessary capabilities. NATO and EU efforts to strengthen defence capabilities are complementary. Keeping in mind the recent engagements, we are guided by the following considerations:

- The allies who respect nowadays the reference value of NATO of minimum 2% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for defence expenditures and will fix as goal to continue to respect this value. Also, the allies expending more than 20% in their defence budgets for equipment of major importance, inclusive for respective research and development, will continue to do this thing.

- The allies with actual share of GDP assigned for defence expenses is under this level:

- We will stop each decline in the defence expenditure sphere;
- They will fix as goal to enhance the defence expenditures in real terms when the GDP grows;

- They will fix as goal to advance in order to provide the reference value of 2% in an interval of a decade in order to fulfil NATO Target Capabilities and to eliminate the shortcomings of NATO in the capabilities field.

- The allies spending today less than 20% of the yearly budgets assigned for defence in order to buy major importance equipment, including for research and development activity associated to those, and will set as goal to enhance its yearly investments in a decade to 20% or more of the total of defence expenditures.

- All the allies:

•Will assure their land, air and maritime forces correspond to the guidelines convened to the NATO level as concerns the capacity to deploy and sustain other quantifiable agreed results:

•Will assure their armed forces can really operate together including by implementing standards and doctrines agreed to the NATO level.

The allies will yearly analyse the progresses achieved on the national level. This will be discussed on the occasion of future reunions of defence ministers and will be analysed by the chiefs of state and government in the future Summits.”²

2. The political-military evolution generating this conflict situation. As is well known, on December 25th, 1991 was pulled down from the Kremlin tower the USSR state flag and this act essentially signifies the capitulation of former communist world in front of West, a triumph of occidental democracy over the communist democracy. Under these circumstances, in the Central Europe and peripheral space of European and Asian Russia was created a “power void”. In the winner’s vision, it is considered it has the historical mission to guarantee or correct the existent borders and to manage the interethnic disputes even if the use of military force is not excluded. EU and NATO became vectors to assimilate spaces of “power void”, in certain situation even with great overreactions as regards the respect of international law principles.

A sampling of it is the Yugoslavia-nation process. As it is well known, in 1989, the world countries included Yugoslavia, a federal country playing major political role in the Cold War period, by the fact it was in the top of the non-aligned countries. In 1993, SFR Yugoslavia was already history. On the territory of a sovereign states without the acceptance of central institutions there appeared other sovereign and independent states as: Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia – formed by Serbia and Montenegro, all with certain international recognition. But, by this fragmentation process it was opened the door for overreacted nationalism from which the world acknowledged “the bloody dismantling”.

Also, the international public opinion was convinced “the bloody dismantling” of a sovereign state took place with the very interested support of at least three recognized state entities: US, Germany and Russia.

² Idem, items 14-15.

On 25.06.1991, Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence immediately recognized by Germany. On 27.04.1992, was proclaimed the Popular Republic of Yugoslavia, formed by Serbia and Montenegro which recognized de facto the independence of the other former Yugoslavian republics. Only the independence processes should be stopped to the limit of some borders set ad-hoc without taking into considerations the requests of the area's minorities. Thus, on 13.08.1991, was publicly announced the referendum for Bosnia-Herzegovina independence. On 12.09.1991, mostly Serbian population from eight districts of the Trebinje area proclaimed their territory as "Serbian Autonomous Region". On 18.09.1991, the Serbians from the East of Bosnia-Herzegovina proclaimed their territory as "Romania Serbian Autonomous Region", and on 20.09.1991, the Serbian from the Bejina-Loport district proclaimed as „Serbian Autonomous Region in the North-East Bosnia". On 15.10.1991, in Sarajevo, the Parliament formed only by Muslims and part of Croats proclaimed Bosnia-Herzegovina Republic as sovereign and independent state recognized by preponderant Muslim states. On 21.10.1991, the so-called Parliament of "Herzegovina Serbian Autonomous Region" announced the referendum on 10.11.1991 for separating from Bosnia-Herzegovina and union with Kraina Republic. On this moment, the process of Serbian republics formation was the same legal as the process of greater republics formation, for example the process for the constitution of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The missionary interventions of the international community generated discontents because the minority communities particularly the Serbian ones were considered to be wronged by their new statute. Immediately the weapons started to speak and from a flourishing region it transformed overnight in a fearful field of war wherein took place real crimes against humanity.

On this moment, the former foreign minister of Italy recognized that "Germany did pressures on the recognition of Slovenia and Croatia. In December 1991, Germans they will do it also alone, without EC. We were then before the Maastricht Treaty and we could not afford community's disintegration. We reached to an agreement but it was very clear such decision will stir the fire which will also stretch to Bosnia, and perhaps, tomorrow in Macedonia and Kosovo"³.

³ C.I.Cristian, Sângeroasa destrămăre Iugoslavia, Editura Sylvi, București, 1994, p. 309.

In Macedonia was not the situation, but in Kosovo, the parties' will was imposed by the NATO military intervention. The press of the times related that "For the first time in NATO history, General Secretary of the organization, Javier Solana, authorized the commandant of Alliance's troops for Europe, Wesley Clark, with the first mission outside the NATO member states borders. This "humanitarian intervention" of the Alliance was a novelty also for the international law. The critics of military offensive in Kosovo drawn the attention, at one hand, NATO acted without straight mandate from the United Nations and this contravenes to the international law, on the other hand, the Alliance acted outside the member states borders and infringed the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia. Still, the military intervention adepts consider the United Nations mandate was granted by the adoption of a series of resolutions as well as by Security Council incapacity to impose the requests addressed to Belgrade. Before the Alliance's troops to enter Yugoslavia, UN repeatedly asked for the Serbian armed force withdrawal from Kosovo, request ignored by the Belgrade government and Serbian president, Slobodan Milosevic. Therefore, NATO intervention in Kosovo were strictly necessary to grant a humanitarian aid to the population of the region but also to reserve global peace. In a strive to be the echo of the international public opinion, Joseph Marko, expert in the international law, considers NATO intervention in Kosovo showed which are the weak points of the international law and concomitantly offering new impulses for developing legislation in this sense. Therefore, „*Kosovo was a crossroads for the international law. Because of the members with right of veto, UN Security Council is clearly incapable to act in crisis situations. NATO humanitarian intervention in Kosovo offers us the chance to discuss over the state sovereignty principle from other perspectives*”⁴.

Kosovo became an independent and sovereign state with NATO blessing. To this blessing took part for the first time also German Tornado air fighters hitting target on Serbian territory.

In is obvious, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq etc. are samples questioning UN role and the international law as they existed in the Cold War. As the international political life became more complex when the

⁴ Fabian Schmidt, Maria Popescu, Intervenția NATO în Kosovo și dreptul internațional, <http://dw.de/pHlfJ>

security and sovereignty of the states are not anymore guaranteed by a recognized overall international framework we appreciate NATO Summit took place on the grounds of re-discussing the traditional paradigms of security.

3. The return into actuality of traditional security paradigms. The achievement of studies on the mechanism of national and international security strategies leads unavoidable to the fact of an overwhelming complexity characterized by dynamism and permanent change. Along history, the security strategies evolved on the doctrinaire level, as well as to the level of forces configuration meant to impose certain security state generated by the moment's political options and this makes difficult the will to systematize and theoretical essentiality of phenomena. As concerns us, we consider the history of national and international security is grounded on three important paradigms of security strategy thus: "alone against all" paradigm, "we against the others" paradigm and "guaranteeing the peaceful co-habitation grounded on the accepted overall principles" paradigm.

"Alone against all" security strategy paradigm. Its basic content stars from the reasons in regard to which insecurity is universal available feature of human, social groups and state entities generated by the anarchical nature of human being. Thus, each socially organized entity felt permanently threatened by the other similar forms of organization, the supreme force of social identity and existence remains the adoption of an adequate defence strategy.

The theoretical matrix meant to explain this paradigm content is keen of the beginnings of human development but it gained consistency to the end of the XIX century when thinking trend in matters related to security strategy was structured on power, force, national interest concepts and the international relations were built, maintained and modified in conformity with forms of manifestations of military power.

Centring the intra-organizational and interstate relations on force principles allowed the acceptance of war practice as strategic means to guarantee the individual and collective security. From the Antiquity wars to the wars of the end of XIX century, the military actions were settled and were justified by deterrence and defeat of adversaries' strategies, for the larger territorial and area control, by coercion and obedience.

General discoveries of science with applications in the military field made possible important mutations in increasing capacity to deploy and

concentrate forces, as well in the field of armaments' efficacy and this lead to the questioning of the strategy to lead successful military actions against all. In practise, the end of the Napoleon-type wars signs the starting point of a new paradigm of security strategy wherein the states unite grounded on power pols in order to confront in better circumstances the potential aggressions. The conditions of recent security environment are dominated by a major security organization, NATO, by others in creation, but also invites all the other states to strengthen the defence means thus to be able to confront any aggression. Basically, an invitation to review defence and endowment strategies with military technique.

“We against all” security strategy paradigm. The both world wars, to which is added the mutual threat situation on the global level specific for the “cold war” represents the content of a new security strategy paradigm wherein groups of states animated by common political interests built their group security strategies in order to assert their will on the tier of international relations.

In political plan, the international political life in conformity with the principles of group strategy seem to reach its climax in the period of the bipolar global system. This followed into the division of all countries in both camps engaged more or less in undermining security strategy of the adverse party. The competition between the superpowers, particularly in the ideological and military plan, under the impact of nuclear impact determined the enlargement of dependence relations of small and medium size countries in relation to the power centres. The both political and military blocks were completed by a group of states formed by neutral and non-aligned countries characterized by political instability which can anytime lead in one or other of the parties involved in the existential competition.

The military risks of security strategic approach from the perspective of competition for power in the bipolar period were mainly related to the arms race. Only in-between 1966 -1999, the global military expenditure grew with 70%, from 568 billion dollars to 950 billion dollars.⁵ Unfortunately, the ratio of arms race remain also today very raised, generating excess of military power for certain states and the decrease of

⁵ SIPRI Yearbook, 1991, p. XXXVII.

security level for countries without resources needed to modernize their military potential.

The security strategy paradigm of the bipolar world lead in practice the European security system toward a possible deadlock. The uncontrolled competitive and conflicting character of bipolar security paradigm lead to the severe separation of the world's states, inclusive of the states from the Euro-Atlantic space regarding their capacity to preserve security and freedom of political decision. Also, the accumulation of nuclear arsenals with unjustified destructive force accentuated the gaps between the states after the exit from the bipolar world.

The effects of weapons of mass destruction owed to their qualitative development to very high destructive levels vanished the illusions of the states to remain invulnerable in situation of major conflict.

In the framework of bipolar world, the superpowers and others countries possessors of nuclear weapons disposed of certain reason justifying the existence of the nuclear arsenals given by the force balance. Under these circumstances, the non-nuclear states have had to integrate to the block policy and to the logics of confrontation between the blocks without having the guarantee the block leaders would have engaged at any risk, including the risk specific for the nuclear component for the defence of partners' interests. The other states remained from different reasons outside the bipolar conflict matrix developed political conceptions and military strategies meant to provide the relative independent but only partial resolution of defence topic in the context of an aggression. From now, these countries, as the countries of the former blocks without nuclear weapons do not have other option but to be a sure victim in front of any nuclear threat. Therefore, group defence paradigm even in the framework of many power centres, starts to ask for new forms of group manifestation requesting a new paradigm of security strategy.

In the context of diversification of interstate dependencies the launch of any armed conflict raises huge problems for the whole community coming from the blockage or serious damage of commercial relations of the third parties in the areas devastated by the conflict, the transportations, supply and other logistical flows disturbances, the horrible spectre of migration trained by war, collateral traces of eventual economic embargo measures over the area's states and not only etc. and they become factors

hard to accept for the international community seen as more integrated system, the prize of conflicts appeared even to the outside limit of the peripheral regions.

The theory and practices of national and group security strategy paradigm postulated the countries' interests are coming first to any other interests in the international relations and the force and military power were considered to be main arguments in achieving the foreign political goals ceased in leading to the expected outcomes in the post-Cold War period.

The limits of security strategy paradigm centred on national interest or group interest become more obvious in the process of restructuring of international and European system marked by the collapse of essential aspects which lead to the humanity bipolarity. Although the national interest continue to remain the most important, the promotion of this appeals more and more to general accepted methods, permissive for cooperation and collaboration. Although geopolitics keeps its theoretical principles it tends to impose their application in practices the place of military instruments being replaced on very large scale by non-military means. In different corners of the planet and wider circles.

“It seems anybody agrees now the commercial methods replace the military ones – the available capital in replace of firepower, the civilian innovation replacing the technical-military process and intertwining on markets replacing the garrisons and military bases”⁶, and this does the humankind as a whole to go toward a new paradigm of international security strategy. New strategic partnerships Russia-China, Russia – India, Russia, Brazil, India, China, South Africa, etc. are trials of economic and security counterweights to the great military adversary NATO.

“Guaranteeing the peaceful living grounded on general accepted principles” paradigm. Owed to the fact the military means exhausted in a great measure their operational instrumental capacity to promote their interests in the international relations in the traditional manner of threatening with and use of force, the new paradigm of international security strategy to guarantee the peaceful living grounded on the general accepted principles tend to gain more importance. Although, the irrelevance of

⁶ Cf. Edward N. Luttwak, *From Geopolitics to Geo – Economics, Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce*, in „The National Interest”, 1990, p. 20.

certain states non-military means with diminished potentials with the religious matrix of others maintain over remnant rapport to the security strategy paradigm of national or state group interest. Thus, the list of risks against national and international security illustrates the maintenance and diversification of military nature dangers but also justifies the importance of an armed force well-dimensioned and very efficient to guarantee the peaceful coexistence and to deter certain unconventional risks, intern subversions, terrorism, drugs and forbidden substances traffic, inter-ethnic conflicts, religious conflicts etc.

Although there is not built a comprehensive scientific theory the new paradigm of international security strategy closely follows the contemporary trends of globalization of main social, economic and political activities which lead to the integration of national interests in the framework of regional and global interests.

Differently from the content of former security strategies the security strategy by guaranteeing peaceful living grounded on the general accepted principles is built on the development of following resistance elements: limitation of possibilities of direct manifestation of military force in the international relations; focusing of the public opinion and international bodies on the conflict prevention and crises management; geographical enlargement of areas with increased level of security by political, economic and military integration of the countries compounding them; development and diversification of multilateral cooperation relations of regional entities and with other spaces remained outside the integration; generalization in all the areas of the open society requirements based on political pluralism and market economy; development and application of some non-military strategy to promote interests based on general accepted principles; maintaining a military component capable to keep and imposed general accepted security principles.

The change of priorities between the means used by the states to achieve their political goals represents a process to which are engaged strong countries as well as countries without large military force because of the uncontrolled consequences coming from the armed conflicts. The arms control or ammunition control comprises the ensemble of political-diplomatic and specific military efforts undergone for the negotiation, application and verification of some multilateral agreements applications

which has as object, at one hand, the limitation or quantitative diminution of armaments' level of the states as well as the forbiddance of some armament categories and, on the other hand, the stimulation and management of processes to increase the mutual trust among the states.

Generally, crises prevention tends to embody in a distinctive matrix under construction a series of attitudes and behaviours of international actors who have as generic goal the strengthening of peace by measure settled before the crisis burst toward an open conflict because of the successive deterioration of the international context⁷. Crisis prevention needs the development of political, diplomatic, military, economic, cultural, humanitarian, etc. with a trend of anticipation, detection and diminution of tensions able to degenerate in a certain area. In their framework are detached diplomatic procedures which become preponderant.

All the geographical areas of the past years were characterized by vassal relation and policies of maintaining the state recognition as the first seize and power. Thus "it is not surprising the states organized around such principles were looking to be recognized by other states, a process without a logic final until a nation did not provide the global dominance"⁸. Among the factors that calls for peaceful conduct of international relations can include: increasing globalization of economic, informational and cultural relations; intensification of public control over government policy; cultural and educational progress which emphasizes the degree of rationality of human behaviour etc. However, interest in the development of market economy, amid a pluralist democracy in Europe may not have the purpose than strengthening European security and strengthening peaceful coexistence of states in the area. Anyway, the interest for market economy development grounded on the pluralist democracy in Europe cannot end but with the strengthening of the European security and consolidation of peaceful coexistence of area's states.

The enlargement of the security areas by West-European model is fully developing and it is sustained by the both directions, the political, economic and military bodies already existent – EU, NATO, etc. from the West-European states as well as from the states from the Central, Eastern

⁷ Jenonne Walker, *Security and Arms Control In Post – Confrontation Europe*, Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 127-148.

⁸ Francis Fukuyama, *Democratization and International Security*, in *Adelphi Papers* nr 266, 1991, p. 18.

and North-Eastern part of Europe. The historical experience of the late 50 years in the central-European countries proves the trend to diminish the policies of influence spheres and to raise the level of trust in the common effort of the European states to build a security strategy centred on peaceful living and common collaboration enlargement in many fields.

The explanation of trust support in the European integration by eliminating trends to use the right to force it is based on the miracle of historical reconciliation between redoubtable historical adversaries – Germany, France, Austria and Italia which succeeded the consolidation of some complexes of economic and political interdependencies that lead to the spectacular increase of general level of civilization. On this background, the stability and security of central and East-European countries as well as the enlargement of security in this geographical space copying an Occidental model largely depend by the resolution of basic economic, political and social problems of transition, by the satisfaction of population expectations etc.

The development and application of some non-military strategies to promote national and group interests grounded on some general recognized principles represents the essential element of peaceful coexistence security strategy paradigm. Sheltered by any military threats, the states, companies and also the individuals are competing as regards the efficacy of social action, productivity and general efficiency growth, unlimited affirmation of well done things. Such social harmony becomes more possible by the progressive diminution of national interests expression and continuous growth of super state bodies responsibilities taking as model exactly the new European construction.

Conclusions. The “alone against all” security strategy paradigm generated a veritable vicious circle because the variables of social construction started from the presumption the insecurity represented an universal and permanent feature of peoples and social structures, the international system as a whole because of the anarchical and competitive feature of it.

In the absence of internationally recognized authorities, each state was considered potentially threatened by any other state, the only form of defence consisting in the use of military force. The perception of threat from all sides makes it possible to misinterpret each state as threatening another

state actions and defensive measures envisaged by a state, in turn, could be interpreted as preparatory actions for review. As a result, competition in military strategies has become a feature of the international system and wars a constant of international life, peace is reduced to a simple training period for new military campaigns⁹. The not too distant past is about to return to the present, since the regulatory bodies of international law are increasingly ignored by countries which should ensure this.

In return, “us against all” security strategy paradigm raised to a higher level of vulnerability and threat conditions from the independent states to the interdependent groups of countries. The threats were perceived to come not from one state to another state, but from groups to other groups. Such security strategy led to the concentration and centralization of terrible destructive military capabilities specific to the practice of the two world wars and the Cold War. This paradigm has made it possible to improve the quality of military instruments of battle, that there is the possibility of self-destruction of humanity even in an accidental context. Rationally, the perpetuation of such a state of affairs should not have reason. But when a group of states in the name of principles acceptable, but biased aggressor become law, it is clear that this paradigm will return ominous date.

This paradigm made possible the qualitative improvement of military fight instruments thus there exist the possibility of humankind self-destruction even in an accidental context. Reasonable, the perpetuation of certain state of things should not have reason. But when a group of states in the name of some acceptable but biased principles become aggressor by law and it is obvious this paradigm will threaten the actuality.

As the security strategies grounded on national interest and its imposition by force in the international relations framework are increasingly contested their place is about to be taken by the new paradigm of security strategy of peaceful living grounded on overall accepted principles. The structural framework of this paradigm is built on actions as: arms control; trust and security measures; peaceful resolution of territorial disputes; measures of peace enforcement and peace keeping; resolution of inter-ethnic and religious misbalances grounded on decisions of regulating

⁹ Largely, Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and The Last Man*, Avon Books, New York, 1993, pp. 247-249.

international institutions; development of security areas and economic integration; rigorous control of armaments, etc. The progress in this direction is somehow slowed down by national egoisms in matters of interests more promoted following force principles.

The imposition of new security strategy paradigm to the level of European Union countries results from the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) which already has the role to put on its disposal in the supranational plan of an operational capacity formed by military and civilian means in order to be used in peacekeeping missions and international security missions to the request of UN Security Council.

Thus, it is expected as the new paradigm of security strategy to become more consistent as the measures of international governance are more accepted and the international bodies of regulation are more operational.

For many researchers, the development of communications, transportations and information technologies allowed the citizens from different countries to know better one each other and this led to the considerable diminution of nationalism use as cohesion force.

The traditional nationalist arguments have now a certain echo in the underdeveloped countries which cultivate isolation by nationalist or religious fanatical reasons. Also, there are appreciations “other fundament of the nation-state that should be replaced is the concept of national security. There are few countries in the world able to defend by their selves with the support of a nuclear attack or a chemical or bacteriological weapon. National security is so important that countries defend by their integration in supranational or international organizations as the European Conference for Security and Cooperation or NATO. The same thing is available for terrorism, drugs traffic and environmental problems, each of them having global dimension that can be confronted only by international cooperation or by supranational organizations.”¹⁰

Under the conditions of the greater accentuation of the dependence between national, zonal and international of the complex economic, political and security problems, the nation-state is seen put in the situation to

¹⁰ Guillermo de la Dehesa, *Învingători și învinși în globalizare*, Editura Historia, București, 2007, pp.156-157.

continuously cease from its attributes of independency to the supranational institutions, process which will be built the new content of security strategy paradigm wherein the national state ... is much too small to solve large issues of nowadays world and too big to solve small problems, daily for its citizens”¹¹.

Without being a smoothly process the new security strategy paradigm of peaceful coexistence grounded on general accepted principles it is wanted but it is not on its affirmation course. It is threatened by realities as Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Ukraine, Syria, etc. As a whole, the security topic got dramatic since the globalization vectors under NATO management, comprised regions near Russia. Here from the destabilizing actions specific for Ukraine situation are justified by Russia following the “similar resolution” principle.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C. I. Cristian, Sângeroasa destrămăre: Iugoslavia, Editura Sylvi, București, 1994.
- Edward N. Lutwak, From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics, Logic of Conflict, Grammar of commerce, in *The International Interest*, 1998.
- Fabian Schmidt, Maria Popescu, Intervenția NATO în Iugoslavia și dreptul internațional, <http://dwde/pHefJ>.
- Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and The Last Man*, Avon Books, New York, 1993.
- Fukuyama, Francis, Democratization and International Security, in *Adelphi Papers* no. 266, 1991.
- Walker, Jenone, *Security and Arms Control In Post Confrontation Europe*, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Guillermo de la Dehesa, *Învingători și învinși în globalizare*, Editura Historia, București, 2007.

¹¹ Daniell Bell, *The World and the United States in 2013*, Daedalus, 1987, p.67

Brigadier General (ret.) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, PhD

SIPRI Yearbook, 1991.

Wales Declaration adopted by the Chief of State and Government participants to the Reunion of the Wales North-Atlantic Council, September 4-5, 2014.

