

APPROACHES TO GLOBAL SECURITY. ACTORS, MANIFESTATIONS AND TENDENCIES

Colonel Gheorghe MINCULETE*
Polixenia OLAR**

* PhD in Military Sciences, professor at the Logistics, Finance and Accounting Department, “Carol I” National Defence University, Bucharest, Romania.

** Teaching Assistant, PhD student, English teacher at the the Foreign Languages Department, “Carol I” National Defence University, Bucharest, Romania.

Nowadays, the world seems to be in a transition from the current system founded on the liberal social, economic and political model to a more diverse and heterogeneous model in which the determinant role is played by a number of state and non-state actors. The step from the Western system of cultural, political and predominant economic values to a more diverse and heterogeneous system makes the actors involved defend not only their visions, but also promote their own interests. The differences between visions gain relevance and clarity because the countries supporting them obtain increased power, and that is more than obvious. All this leads to a symmetric allocation of different means, which generates uncertainties and diminishes unilateral actions. This transition process impacts global security especially through the asymmetric, unconventional and hybrid risks and threats manifesting worldwide.

Key words: *globalization, international security environment, global security, the European Security and Defence Policy, global dominance, tendencies of global security, world hierarchy, failed states.*

1. INTRODUCTION

According to opinions expressed by military analysts and experts, until 2020 the international security environment will change in an unpredictable and unexpected manner. Until now people have believed that the process of globalization would intensify leading to a rapid, uneven and transborder increase in the flows of goods, services, people, technologies, ideas, customs, etc. In the context of today's international security the positive effects of

globalization are no longer dominant and they no longer determine the preservation and development of peace and automatically of a safer world, with the exception of certain domains of global interest (such as the internet, information technology, intelligent communication, etc.).

Globalization brought forth a tendency which for some meant an increase in power, while for others it meant marginalization, against a background of volatile tensions between individual and group identity. Although globalization contributed

and can still contribute to a constant economic growth by promoting common economic interests among countries, it no longer represents a safe environment because given its either positive or negative effects on various countries or regions of the world.

From another viewpoint, besides globalization, other phenomena with a negative impact on global security manifest themselves, as well. To this end, we can mention the current financial and economic crisis, the development of transborder terrorist and criminal activities (see the **offensive of Islamic insurgents** in Mali), proliferation of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction, the intensification of regional conflicts, for example the conflict in Syria that has implications on the situation in the Middle East, the proliferation of nuclear weapons (see the threats posed by North Korea and Iran).

The evolution tendencies of global security regarding the potential security risks were analyzed at the Conference of the Military Committee by the chiefs of defence from the 28 NATO countries and by more than 300 officials of this organization, hosted by Romania in Sibiu on 14-16 September 2012 [1].

Having in mind the obvious predictions and tendencies in the new security environment, NATO firmly committed during the Chicago Summit in May to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan until the end of 2014, thus affirming its determination to support Kabul on a long term in order to prevent the return of the Taliban. To this end, the North-Atlantic Alliance characterized as "irreversible" the withdrawal of approximately 130,000 personnel

who are still in Afghanistan, ten years later after the beginning of an increasingly unpopular war. In principle, Romania will begin to withdraw its troops beginning with the second half of 2013 and, beginning with 2014 and in full agreement of the allies, it will ensure a minimum presence in order to guarantee the training and counselling of the Afghan security forces [1].

The Defence Package convened at the Chicago Summit was discussed in detail by the chiefs of defence during the Conference of the Military Committee, with a stress on Smart Defence and on the Initiative of the Connected Forces. Both projects were conceived in order to increase the interoperability between states and to stimulate cooperation in the field of endowment with military equipment.

In another registry of security, on 22 November 2012, on the last day of its plenary session in Strasbourg, the European Parliament (EP) adopted four resolutions regarding the Common Security and Defence Policy. One of the resolutions was based on the report "*The EU clauses of mutual defence and solidarity: political and operational dimensions*", a report elaborated by the Romanian Euro parliamentarian Ioan Mircea Pascu - vice-president of the Commission for Foreign Affairs (AFET) [2]. One of the provisions of the report was brought to the knowledge of the assembly, namely the necessity to increase the contribution of the EU to NATO, because Europe is increasingly required to cope with the more and more complex challenges of global security and defence.

The Romanian official argued in his speech of 21 November that the *European Strategy 2003* mentions that “*Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure and so free*”, a statement that is less obvious today, when mankind is confronted with more and more complex risks and threats, approaching the EU and NATO borders at a swift pace. At the same time he states that, in these circumstances, it is not an opportune decision to reduce defence budgets, since that would cause changes in strategies, be they NATO or EU. Furthermore, according to a statement by the same Euro parliamentarian, “NATO, responsible for the security of 21 of the 27 member states, is confronted with a reorientation of the US toward Asia, which forces Europe to cope with the consequences and to increase its contribution to NATO, as well as to strengthen its security and defence dimension” [2].

2. GLOBAL SECURITY. ACTORS, MANIFESTATIONS AND TENDENCIES

Resuming the analysis in the sphere of the actors of global security, we notice that the United States of America will remain, for the foreseeable future, the leading power of the world. At the same time, they will continue to preserve their hegemonic position which they have occupied since the end of the Cold War. To this end, in order to be able to attain its strategic objectives, even in the unfavourable conditions of the fiscal crisis, the United States will undergo the *largest modernization in history of its nuclear arsenal*. According to the Washington Post,

the estimated costs exceed 350 billion dollars. The operations to be carried out envisage the renovation of the buildings in which bombs are manufactured and the replacement of the old system of delivery [3].

From another perspective, the population of the USA will increase by more than 17%, reaching 364 million in 2030, the largest proportion in this growth being occupied by Hispanic immigrants [4]. Even so, the USA are and will remain a close partner of the EU, based on historic links, converging interests and common values.

Concurrently with the “Obamaera” a window opens toward the European vision of effective multilateralism [4]. The next four years will have a decisive impact on the shaping of the international order until 2020. Due to the world financial crisis, which is likely to deepen, the United States will no longer be able to assume on their own the responsibility for every regional crisis, which will make the role of the European Union increase significantly [4].

The new fiscal reality, completed by the change of elites, as well as the re-balancing of their priorities in the Pacific, forced Washington to profoundly re-think its policies toward Europe. The intervention in Libya was the first signal in this respect, the American participation being a necessary, but not sufficient condition, to ensure the success of the operation

The European Union demonstrated the fact that it is capable of playing a major role in the stabilization of a conflict, as well as in the management of its repercussions. In this context, an increase in the complexity of the situations which the EU might

be asked to get involved in is to be expected. This is possible due to the European Security and Defence Policy which promotes security and stability worldwide, and is in full progress and enjoys full public support.

At the same time, ESDP has to strengthen the transatlantic relations between the USA and the EU, in an open and transparent manner, in order to cope with the new challenges of the security environment.

The traditional image of the USA during the next twenty years will be influenced by four aspects of the culture of the American society, especially the impact of *Hispanic migration, social inequity, the increasing role of the state, the place of religion in the policy of the USA.*

The United States of America is a country of migrants and multiculturalism represents one of its defining characteristics. By 2030 the Hispanic population is expected to reach 20%, from 13-14% in 2004, and up to 25% in 2050. In spite of this multiethnic and multicultural nature, the American values are essentially Anglo-protestant, but there is little doubt that the continuous influx of Hispanic population will erode the reputation of the Anglo-protestant culture and will bring considerable changes to the American society. Unofficially, it is possible for the USA to become a bilingual society [5].

Due to the growing flux of immigrants the USA will become a more diverse society, but also an unequal one, if the current tendencies continue to exist. Inequalities are emphasized even more by the distribution of wealth, thus: one third belongs to the richest, meaning 1% of the country's population, one

third to 9% of the inhabitants and the remaining third belongs to the remaining 90% of the population [5].

In the traditional model of the state - society relations, the state is perceived as a "supervisor" who makes sure that the citizens enjoy their rights, while the citizens pursue welfare and do not kill each other in the process. The state is not to exceed its role and is not to interfere in the life of the inhabitants. This paradigm of the "supervisor" is still of topicality in the American society.

Also, the American society is profoundly religious and there are no signals that it will abandon this belief in the future. The impact of religious beliefs on US foreign policy will continue to remain marginal.

At the middle of November 2012, a group of fifty experts in the field of national security proposed a project called *Strategic Agility*, as an addenda to the strategy presented by the Pentagon during the month of January of the same year. This project could be successfully implemented in the conditions of the current austerity and could give the American president the possibility to operate significant cuts in the Pentagon's budget, by limiting costs, by a better use of human resources, a reduction in the number of military bases outside national borders, by the re-evaluation of the efforts of modernization of the nuclear arsenal, as well as by other measures to increase the efficiency of the structures of the Department of Defence [6].

The strategy adopted at the beginning of 2012 marks a change in the strategic interest toward Asia-Pacific, thus achieving an expeditionary model of the US

military power, different from the current static posture focused on large military bases, characteristic for the realities of the Cold War. This means in fact the redeployment of these large units and of those from Europe, as well as the increase in the number of rotations of the US military structures, both in Europe and Asia, for training activities.

The American specialists who elaborated the proposal to change the strategy estimate that the Pentagon could save up to 500 billion dollars in the next ten years through the better use of human resources, 300 billion through compensating reforms and over 100 billion by improving the practices in acquisitions [6].

The adopted security strategy is elaborated after a decade of American troops involvement in armed conflicts and in the context in which president Obama and the Congress agreed to reduce the defence budget by 487 billion dollars in the next ten years

From a historical point of view, the emerging multipolar systems were a lot more unstable than the bipolar or even unipolar ones, and the growing diversity and power of most countries indicate a decrease in the cohesions and efficiency of the international system.

According to the evaluation obtained following the use of the International Futures computer model [8], the order in the hierarchy of world power may suffer changes until 2025, but the United States will continue to be one of the important actors on the world stage, even if not the most powerful one.

Besides China, only a few countries are prepared to play an important role at world level in the

next 15 - 20 years. If the current tendencies persist, until 2025 China will occupy the position of leader in the world economy and as a military power. At the same time, it will be the largest consumer of natural resources and even the greatest world polluter

Through secret manoeuvres, China has today full control over the Panama Canal and over the Greek ports, 90% of the "rare earths" - minerals needed in military industry and in modern technology. At the same time, China produces 80% of the parts used by the US military! Also, China is the largest exploiter of natural mineral resources, because it owns mines in Australia, USA, the Middle East and Canada [7].

The growth of the power of the very populated states, like China and India, has a major impact on the world hierarchy, while other countries like Iran, Indonesia and Turkey, for example, can play important roles in the international arena and especially in the configuration of the Muslim world.

We can also notice the emergence of other actors on the world stage, like Brazil, which, due to the discovery of oil fields in the Santos Basin estimated at over 10 billion barrels, could become the main oil exporter after 2020 [8].

NATO and *EU* represent the two central pillars of stability and cooperation in the Euro-Atlantic region, a region relatively without problems, in which the possibility of a military or civil conflict is minimum. However, there are conflicts in a latent state in the Caucasus and Balkans that require special attention from the point of view of security. Cooperation between the actors in the area is essential in order to combat

criminal activities like trafficking in weapons, drugs and human beings

Full complementarity between NATO and EU is essential in the case of a global approach to security and in the case of cost efficient stability or support operations. A good cooperation can be useful in the case of non-conventional threats, such as terrorism, cyber attacks or energy vulnerabilities. In this context, it results that the EU has a better expertise than NATO in the non-military field, in the context in which the line between military and non-military threats is growingly insignificant. In this sense, we consider that NATO members and EU non-members and EU members and NATO non-members should have the same degree of transparency and involvement in common activities

NATO's force and visibility could be required to answer challenges that do not directly affect the security of its own citizens, and those interventions will not impact the international image of the Alliance. Among the challenges for which such a scenario could be applied we can mention: humanitarian consequences in the failed states, natural disasters (earthquakes, floods, solar explosions, etc.), dangers caused by genocide or the violation of human rights.

Russia is the largest neighbour of the European Union and its most difficult partner. Due to its geographical size, *Russia* will inevitably play a prominent role in shaping the Euro-Atlantic security environment. Positively speaking, *Russia* manifested good will for the air and land transports supporting ISAF and strongly combated terrorism and piracy.

In its Security Strategy, the European Union considers *Russia* as one of the basic actors at world level and with which it intends to develop a strategic partnership. Thanks to the large profits obtained by exploiting and exporting oil and natural gas, *Russia* continues to modernize its strategic nuclear forces, maintaining significant production capacities [8].

For geostrategic reasons, *Russia* emphasized even more its military doctrine and national security policy and the nuclear option in military planning aiming to regain a dominant position on the world political stage. At the same time, *Russia* has the possibility to be richer, stronger and safer around 2025, but multiple constraints could limit *Russia's* capacity to reach a high economic potential. The population decline predicted for this period will determine tough political decisions. Thus, in 2017 it is estimated that *Russia* will only number 650,000 18 year olds with whom to maintain an army of 750,000, as it has nowadays. In the future, *Russia* will continue to maintain its main role at world level, to be an important partner of the West, Asia and the Middle East. It will also continue to be the main opponent to the global domination by the United States [8].

Controlling the main energy hubs and the routes between the Caucasus and Central Asia, a vital element for its own ambitions of energy superpower, *Russia* will try to re-establish its sphere of influence in the near vicinity. Last year, *Russia* reopened a new project that intended to integrate the energy systems of *Russia*, *China*, *South Korea*, *Mongolia* and *Japan*. The project, elaborated in

1998 is known by the name of “The Asian Superring”. According to it, a hydroelectric plant in Siberia would be the main exporter to the countries in the “superring”, which will allow Russia to control the flux of energy toward them [9].

The existence of liberal economic and political tendencies, corroborated with Russia’s sensitivity to political instability or the emergence of a major political crisis can lead to the exacerbation of the nationalist trend, the emergence of an authoritarian state or even a dictatorship. The version of Russia becoming a country open to progress around 2025 is also plausible.

The challenges faced by the states in Latin America and the Caribbean belong more to the field of crime, and the possibility to conduct stability operation could be most probably in the case of a humanitarian emergency.

In the Middle East the tendencies in the evolution of the security environment can be grouped as follows: a) ongoing extremist violence; b) growing Arab-Israeli tensions; c) Iran’s nuclear policy, that does not comply with UN Security Council resolutions in this matter. Furthermore, Iran also contributes to the aggravation of the security environment through its non-conventional arms programmes: long range ballistic missiles and anti-ship cruise missiles, which raises concerns related to the commercial maritime routes [10].

Thus, Iran’s interest to destabilize the area of the Middle East results from the statements of the leader of the Islamic Jihad, who said on Al-Jazeera television that “the Palestinian groups in the Gaza Strip attack Israel with weapons manufactured in Iran”.

In the same context, the leader of the state of Israel accused the Iranians of delivering Fajr-5 missiles to Hamas, which were launched in the second half of last year against the Jewish state, without hitting major objectives thanks to the efficiency of the “Iron Dome” anti-missile shield [11]. The position regarding the attack against Israel was immediately expressed by the EU foreign minister, who condemned the actions by Hamas to launch missiles on Israel and made an appeal to Israel to use adequate means to solve the conflict.

As failed states, Iran and North Korea continue to threaten the international order. By running nuclear programmes and future proliferation of nuclear weapons and related technology they continue to cause serious concerns among the other countries. Being interested in the nuclear technology and the development of capabilities to enrich uranium, Iran creates a serious threat to the already volatile security of the region. The Iranian regime sponsors terrorism and continues to disrupt the fragile democracies in Iraq and Afghanistan [12]. The North Korean regime creates problems by nuclear proliferation, by threatening countries in the area with ballistic missiles and the illegal trafficking of narcotics and counterfeited currency, but also by the use of tough treatment inflicted on the population. Furthermore, these proliferations were manipulated by terrorist networks, such as Al Qaeda.

In *Asia-Pacific*, the main actors - Japan, the Korean Republic, China, India and Australia - are factors of regional stability and their interests are, in general, in accordance with international norms. Among the long

term sources of instability we can emphasize two: the rivalry between India and Pakistan and the nuclear programme run by the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Due to the regional dynamics, India and Pakistan require increased attention from the international community, as the two countries give significant importance to their nuclear forces.

With regard to *Central Asia* area we believe that several states in this region are favourable to the stability operation carried out in Afghanistan. The activity of the terrorist groups, especially Al Qaeda, determines an increase of transborder dangers which cause serious threats to the states mentioned above. For this reason, political reforms and better governance can be factors that will contribute in a major way to a healthy security environment in Central Asia. If these changes do not occur, this region may experience serious problems that will impact both the inhabitants of this area, and those outside it.

On long term, *China* will continue the broad transformation of its military forces in order to improve their capabilities to project forces and to wage interdiction and repulse operations [12]. On a short term, China is preparing for probable operations in the Taiwan Strait, including as a contingency plan US intervention. In spite of these, China's expanding military capabilities influence the military equilibrium of the Far East. The improvement of China's strategic capabilities has implications on the Asia-Pacific area. From the point of view of its nuclear armaments, China is modernizing its nuclear arsenal both quantitatively

and qualitatively, developing and deploying new classes of missiles, modernizing the old launching systems and elaborating new ballistic defence methods. The improvement of the Chinese nuclear forces adds to its classical land, air, maritime and cyber capabilities.

It is believed that important economic progresses have been made in *Africa* during the last years, but civil conflicts, terrorist actions, diseases and inefficient governance have also evolved. Thus, we can mention a number of countries that will continue to raise concerns: the Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia, Mali and Sudan. Although the leaders in the region tend to solve their problems through the African Union, the North Atlantic Alliance may be asked to carry out stability and support operations.

Having in mind these tendencies and threats, the United States will continue to maintain their nuclear supremacy in the XXI century, as well.

In order to face the new evolutions of the security environment, the European Union developed the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which is expected to answer to the following principles: freedom, democracy, respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of man, fundamental values nowadays and which must remain valid in 2020, as well [14].

To this end, the ESDP established a number of priorities for the following ten years, which will have to become reality, even in the context of the current economic and financial crisis and the cuts in military budgets. These are briefly presented below.

The management of today's crises - common defence until 2020. The military missions by ESDP are vast, among them disarmament, humanitarian missions, military assistance, conflict prevention and peacekeeping. The mission will become even more vast, as follows: conflict management in non-European states, combating piracy, transborder crime, terrorism and cyber-terrorism.

The fulfilment of civil and military objectives for "force generation" is achieved through the development of crisis management civil and military structures, like the EU Peace Corps.

The prioritization of European military and civilian command. The structure of military and civilian command at the level of the EU is extremely bureaucratic and this is why it constitutes an emergency to establish an autonomous civilian-military command for the European Union missions [14].

The position of the European Union and of Romania toward the hottest crisis of the moment, the one in Syria, sets off from the premise that all UNO member states must honour their international commitments with regard to the respect for human rights. In this context, the violence used by the rival sides in Syria against the civilian population can in no way be justified. For this reason, it is imperative to open an as comprehensive as possible social and political dialogue in Syria, oriented toward the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian population.

To this end, several resolutions were adopted by the UN General Assembly and by the Human Rights

Committee which demanded the end of violence in Syria and the identification of a political solution to this crisis. On the same basis, the mission of the special common envoy of the UNO and the League of Arab States was carried out in an attempt to define a political solution to this crisis, as well as the measures decided by the Security Council in Resolution 2043 (2012) by which a monitoring mission was sent to Syria (UMSMIS), a mission in which five Romanian observers participated [15].

3. CONCLUSIONS

The international security environment is in an ample process of transformation and re-shaping, characterized by the manifestation of two antagonist tendencies: on the one hand, the spreading of the democratization process, the assertion of the rights of man and of the principles of a market economy, concurrently with the broadening of cooperation and integration in European and Euro-Atlantic structures; on the other hand, a process of disintegration and fragmentation of multinational state entities. In parallel, we can observe the conservation and diversification of military and non-military risks, mainly terrorism, as well as the increase of the vulnerability of national and international institutions to it.

The most important aspect of our times is the higher probability for events in one part of the world to have repercussions on another part, at a great distance. The anarchy in one country can create opportunities for terrorists to find a safe haven from where they can operate beyond borders. A state that evades

or rejects international norms can become a precedent that other states could follow. As a consequence of the progress of information and communication technologies, the terrorist groups, groups of pirates or other criminal groups use these opportunities to have a worldwide audience when they act.

The growing complexity of the world political situation may lead to a weaker cohesion of the political-military alliances and not only. Thus, the economic problems can distract attention from real security needs, and old rivalries can re-erupt, which may divide the political leaders and weaken cohesion at the level of human communities (states, federations of states, international inter-governmental organizations).

To conclude, a major preoccupation of military experts and planners should be to know and predict the new risks and threats to the international security environment, to take the adequate measures in order to reduce the possibility of their emergence and the management of their effects in case they occur. For this reason, they are required to evaluate the potential impact and to revise the strategic plans accordingly, as well as the need for resources and means for future operations.

REFERENCES

[1] *Reuniunea Comitetului Militar al NATO desfășurată la Sibiu s-a încheiat*, [http://www.mediafax.ro/social/reuniunea-comitetului-militar-al-nato-desfasurata-la-sibiu-s-a-incheiat-](http://www.mediafax.ro/social/reuniunea-comitetului-militar-al-nato-desfasurata-la-sibiu-s-a-incheiat-10080308)

10080308, last retrieved on 12.11.2012.

[2] <http://www.infomondo.ro/pe-a-adoptat-4-rezolutii-privind-politica-de-securitate-si-aparare-comuna-16602.html>, last retrieved on 17.11.2012.

[3] <http://www.publika.md/revista-presei--sua-avertizeaza-despre-possibilitatea-izbucnirii-unui-conflict-armat-in-asia-de-est-1035511.html>, last retrieved 20.11.2012.

[4] *The New Global Puzzle, What World for the EU in 2025?*, Institute for Security Studies.

[5] *The White House, National Security Strategy, May 2010*, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf, last retrieved 27.11.2012.

[6] Silvia Mircea, *Schimbare a strategiei de apărare a SUA*, *Observatorul militar*, Nr. 47 (28 Nov. - 4 Dec. 2012).

[7] Adina Mutar, *Profilul Chinei in strategia Bilderberg*, in *Ziarul Național* of 31.05.2012.

[8] *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*.

[9] *Atenție la finanță „Frăția asiatică a energiei”*, *Cotidianul Național* no.4753 of 21.11.2012.

[10] *Catherine Ashton: “lansarea rachetelor Hamas înseamnă începutul crizei actuale din regiune”*, <http://www.infomondo.ro/catherine-ashton-lansarea-rachetelor-hamas-inseamna-inceputul-crizei-actuale-din-regiune-16573.html>, last retrieved 24.11.2012.

[11] *Israelul este atacat cu arme produse în Iran*, <http://www.infomondo.ro/tag/israel>, last retrieved on 23.11.2012.

[12] *National Defense Strategy 2008*.

[13] *National Security and Nuclear Weapons in the 21st Century*, September 2008.

[14] *Javier Solana, What ambitions for European defence in 2020*, Brussels, June 2009.

[15] <http://www.mae.ro/node/15062>, last retrieved on 04.12.2012.