# SECURITY ENVIRONMENT — CURRENT CONFIGURATION

**ADINA BURCHIU**[*]

**Abstract.** *Given the many national and international debates on security notion, we considered necessary to look up deeper in this field, so that we could understand the situation which characterizes the international society. Being a current issue, approached in a very tense moment on the Earth, the question that should be asked is if Europe (and European Union as an important economic power) is able to ensure a cooperation system between its states, so that it could withstand the threats to its security. Thus, we took the Black Sea Region as a particular case of this issue and during research we tried to find out what role of the most important national and international actors in this region.*

**Keywords:** *security dilemma, balance of power, collective security, security complex, international society.*

## *Introduction*

If until the 20th Century the main threats to one nation security were coming from the political-military sector, with the end of the Cold War, the security concept has extended its definition area. So that, nowadays we speak about energetic security, economic security or social security, sectors which are also very vulnerable.

"*A viable solution against risks and threats to the security appears to be regional integration, in which states adopt a framework of common security and defense policy, using human, material, financial and information resources available to everyone, in a collective manner.*"[1] In this case the first question to be asked is how this subject should be tackle so that results to be efficient and not to endanger the others international actor's interests. In practical terms, measures to strengthen the security of a state or group of states can be seen by others as a threat to their security.

---

[*] Master's student at Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Bucharest, Specialization Security Studies, adina_burchiu@yahoo.com.

[1] Duțu P. & Dinu. M.S, *Politica europeană de securitate și apărare-cadru de manifestare și dezvoltare a intereselor de securitate națională*, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare "Carol I", București, 2007, p. 5.

As noted Petre Dutu and Mihai-Serban Dinu, European Union, as an intergovernmental structure, has its own security and defense policy, which also allows member countries to integrate their own national security and defense policy in it.[2]

## *The security concept*

As noted many International Relations Scholars, the security notion is very controversial, because, until now there is no clear delineation of it. Barry Buzan thinks that "*a simplistic concept of security is also a barrier to progress.*" By the "simplistic" term he means a superficial approach which is limited at the reference area of national security, missing out the fact *that* "*security logic always involves high levels of interdependence between the actors which try to maintain themselves in a security condition.*"[3]

In 1991, Stephen Walt, (a representative of Realistic School) assuming the role of a spokesman of the academic community, says in an article: "*The security can be defined as the study of threats, use and control of the military force. It looks over the conditions that make possible the use of force, the way it affects people, states and societies, and the specific policies which states adopt so that they can prevent or take part in a war*."[4]

A known and widely accepted definition of the security concept is the one given by Arnold Wolfers: *"security, in the objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values and, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."*

On the values to be defended, K. Waltz makes a statement in this regard (from a realistic perspective), considering the survival the fundamental value that must be defended by a nation-state. "*In anarchy, survival is the highest purpose. States may seek to meet other goals such as peace, benefit or power, if only survival is assured.*"

When talking about the security of a state, Realists make an analysis of internal and external environment. Thus, they conclude that if in the internal environment there is an authority which regulate and ensure the maintenance of stability faction in terms of security, in the external environment such authority is lacking. In light of this, they see the international environment as a "*Hobbesian society of competition, in which there is no central authority to impose order*."[5]

The state is the main reference object of security. In an anarchic and competitive international environment (as it is seen form realistic perspective) arises a new security concept: *security dilemma.* In 1950, John Herz describes this dilemma as follow: "*The attempt to ensure the security of a state generates an*

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Buzan, Barry, *Popoarele, statele și teama*, Ed. Cartier, Chișinău, 2000, p. 13.

[4] Stoicescu, Ruxandra, "Conceptul de securitate", in Ghica, Luciana Alexandra & Zulean, Marian, coord., *op. cit.*, p. 79.

[5] Ungureanu, Radu Sebastian, "Conceptul de securitate", in Miroiu, Andrei & Ungureanu, Radu Sebastian, coord., *Manual de relacii internaționale*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2006, pp. 180-181.

*insecurity condition for other actors, which, in turn seek for their own security. Individual looking for security, actually leads to increased insecurity in the system*."[6] As a solution to this problem, Realistic School suggests the attempt of balancing the influence a state can have by attracting allies, this process being called *balance of power.*

Liberal School, on the other hand, rejects the idea of an alliance of smalls against a great power, on the grounds that this approach does not solve the security dilemma, but it moves it to another level. Liberals propose the achievement of a collective security (coalition of all members of the system in case one of them is attacked).

When we speak about international security, we can't ignore another term used, *international society.* Hedley Bull and Adam Watson define it as "*a group of states (or, more generally, a group of independent political communities) which not merely form a system, in the sense that the behavior of each is a necessary factor in the calculations of the others, but also have established by dialogue and consent common rules and institutions for the conduct of their relations, and recognize their common interest in maintaining these arrangements.*"[7]

In the Romanian space, Radu-Sebastian Ungureanu tries to define international security, saying that "*initially, it indicates a non-conflict situation between states, especially between great powers.*"[8] To sustain this statement, he brings some arguments. The first would be that, by their very nature, great powers tend to extend their sphere of influence, so that there is a high possibility that they come into conflict. On the other hand, great powers, unlike players with a much smaller influence have some broader interests that are trying to project onto entire system. For better understanding this last argument, we can take as example international institutions which have as main objective, the international security. In the Security Council of the United Nations case, the decisions that it makes give legitimacy to the external policies of member states. Some studies suggest that Security Council of the United Nations is an influent institution because it promotes a neutral policy. But others believes that it exerts a great influence on international environment because the decisions which are made at this level reflect the content and the intentions of an elitist international society.

As it was mentioned before, the most representative Schools of thought in International Relationship are: Liberal School and Realistic School. Each of them has a different vision about international security.

*Liberal School* assumes an ideal world, where security is ensured by cooperation between states in the economic and political field, but also in energetic, cultural or social sector. Another idea is that it is absolutely necessary to prevent the outbreak of conflict within an international society, by adopting a moral conduct (respect for moral values such as peace, economic prosperity, individual freedom), respecting

---

[6] Herz, H. John, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilema", *World Politics*, 2 (2), 1950, *apud.* Ungureanu, Radu Sebastian, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

[7] Bull, Hedley & Watson, Adam, *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1984, *apud.*, Buzan, Barry, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

[8] Ungureanu, Radu Sebastian, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

international law and the democratization of international relations. So the key concept of this idea is *collective security system*.

*Realistic School*, on the other hand, affirms the exact opposite, that international actions are unpredictable and irrational. Realists argue for national interest pursuit and progressive arming, in achieving a security environment. If the Liberal vision of international security concept revolves around cooperation between the actors so that they can establish a collective security system, the key concept of realistic doctrine is the *balance of power*. Challengers of this view believe that mutual arming and competition between states to establish a high level of security will eventually lead to the cancellation of their power, as each state will develop weapons that cannot be used against each other precisely because the other has similar defense measures.

So, whether we see the international community as a system (divided in turn into subsystems), or we see it as an anarchic environment, attention to safety should be as high. Avoiding the security dilemma is one of the main elements that should be considered when configuring new plans concerning international security.

Besides those currents of thought, International Organizations are also interested in elaboration of some limits to security concept. Among those, United Nations Organization is the most representative. In 2003, trying to define security, UN Secretary-General convened 16 specialists from various countries in developing a clear and complete definition of this term. After intense debates they concluded that the definition of security should take into account two categories of risks:
• *hard* risks — international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, intra and interstate conflicts;
• *soft* risks — extreme poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, contagious diseases, environmental degradation, religious extremism, human rights violations.

The reform of the international security environment comes mainly as a result of terrorist actions multiplication, after September 11 when international society realized that international terrorism, organized crime, trafficking in arms and drugs, can't be viewed separately anymore, but need security measures that take into account the links between those actions, meant to destroy the international environment balance.

## *European perspective on international security*

If the EU started out by establishing an economic reconstruction of Europe after two World Wars, slowly, to its economic functions were added the politico-military ones.

The first attempt to create a European security environment has been launched by the Collective Defense Treaty signed at Dunkirk (1947) and Brussels (17 March 1948), by France, United Kingdom, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg. By this action, are made basis for achieving the Western European Union and it is spoken, for the first time, about an European collective defense. Following the Treaty of Maastricht (1992), the EU starts to look Foreign and Defense

Policy as a necessary economic and political integration. Thus, arises the Common Foreign and Security Policy, with its military component, the ESDP (European Security and Defense Policy). Risk of overlapping functions of EU legislation with NATO powers led to the Berlin Plus Agreements (2003), to allow the Union access to NATO's planning capabilities, logistics, information and other military assets for EU operations where NATO as a whole is not involved. One of the most important progress in the ESDP is the adoption of the first European Security Strategy, Solana Strategy (December 2003), where are mentioned threats that EU security is facing: proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and organized crime, cyber security,energetic security,climate change.

With the adopted Lisbon Treaty (2009) ESDP become Common Security and Defense Policy, while bringing new elements, including: extension of Petersberg missions (humanitarian and rescue missions and peace enforcement), setting up the European Defense Agency, introduction of the solidarity clause.

An important document concerning European security was European Security Strategy, adopted in 2003. It became a landmark for EU foreign and security policy development. The motto "A secure Europe in a better world" is the best to describe the Union expectation in this field. According to the report "Insurance of security in a changing world"[9] drawn by European Council and European Commission, the threats that European Union faces in terms of security are: proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and organized crime, cybernetic attacks, energetic security, climate changes.

*Black Sea — key element*
*in international security equation*

In the last two decades, Black Sea region has changed significantly. Here occurred the transformation of former communist states into free nations, making special efforts to achieve the status of democratic countries. September 11, 2001 was the event which led international society to the conclusion that Black Sea Region faces serious problems which could affect European security, and more. The states' security can't be full without close cooperation between them.

As Ronald D. Asmus and Bruce P. Jackson notice, in the *Black Sea and the Frontiers of Freedom* article "*These events have begun to push the Black Sea for the periphery to the center of Western attention. At the same time, they have underscored the fact that the West today lacks a coherent and meaningful strategy vis-à-vis this region.*"[10] Thus, Black Sea Region, represent an area where Western interests overlap with the Russian (and Turkish, to some extent) interests. In other words, the two main players in the Black Sea Region (Russia and Turkey) have been joined the Western powers, in the U.S. and the EU.

---

[9] *Strategia Europeană de Securitate — O Europă sigură într-o lume mai bună*, 2009, http://bookshop. europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/ro_RO/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start? PublicationKey=QC7809568&CatalogCategoryID=ouUKABst3IoAAAEjxJEY4e5L, consulted at 22.08.2012.

[10] Asmus, D. Ronald & Jackson, P. Bruce, "The Black Sea and the Frontiers of Freedom", Policy Review, No. 125, June 1, 2004, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6451, consulted at: 29.08.2012.

Black Sea Region has great significance in terms of European Union security by diversifying energetic routes to Europe, avoiding illegal migration, organized crime or terrorism. From this perspective, the main reasons that European Union adopted an European Strategy concerning Black Sea Region were: *the risk of failed states,* which means that a national-state "*is unable, or unwilling to exercise control over its teritory, to guarantee the security for its own citezens, is unable to establish effective institutions to guarantee political participation and the rule of law, and to provide public goods such as education, health and structural bases of economic growth*";[11] *a failure of transition towards democracy and towards a free market economy,* which may have repercussions on the economic interests of EU; *economic development in the Black Sea market* is key to reducing differences between EU member states and neighboring quality of life, and business opportunities. As a result of this awareness, in 2007 the European Union has developed a project to combat these threats, called Black Sea Synergy. In this document drawn by European Commission, European Union acknowledges that prosperity, stability and security in the EU's neighborhood, are essential elements in ensuring security throughout the Union.

Today, at 5 years distance form that moment, reports on the effectiveness of this policy are not very encouraging. If in 2008 the first year report on the implementation of VMS, assess progress in achieving objectives, until 2011 any other report to monitor activities in the area wasn't prepared.

The biggest challenge in security in the Black Sea Region is the growing tension between democratization and building of modern nations, and Russia's desire to maintain its sphere of influence in the area. Therefore, we deal with two camps: the Western group (represented by U.S. and EU) and Russia (which is seen in the image of a victim of western expansion). The role of maintaining a secure environment in the Black Sea Region, seem to be assured by U.S. (through NATO) and the EU, although the latter still has much to work until it reaches the stage to impose its will. Perhaps it is too early to speak about such an influence of the EU, since the approaching to the Black Sea Region took place after Romania's and Bulgaria's accession to the European structures, five years ago, and also because the measures adopted until now take time and stabile mechanisms for implementation.

Regarding NATO's attitude in the region, we see that, with the accession of Romania and Bulgaria (2004), the Alliance's borders are closer to Russia. We also shouldn't loose sight of the fact that Ukraine and Georgia expressed at some moment the intention of accessing European Union and NATO, neither the fact that Turkey is an American ally (although lately relationships between those two countries have suffered some changes).

In this context, Russia appears to leave defeated, trying every way to intimidate opponents (the stationing of Russian fleet in Crimea region, the military

---

[11] Pop, Adrian & Manoleli, Dan, coord., "Spre o strategie europeană în bazinul Mării Negre. Cooperarea teritorială", *Proiect SPOS 2007 — Studii de strategie și politici*, Institutul European din România, București, 2007, p. 11, http://www.ier.ro/documente/SPOS2007_ro/Spos2007_studiu_4_ro.pdf, at 22.08.2012.

troops in areas of frozen conflicts). Despite de fact that NATO is opened to the cooperation with Russia, concerning the maintaining of security on European continent, Russia seems to be a partner with whom is hard to negotiate.

There are some reasons why Russia can't be a partner for NATO (at least for the moment) in a common security system: on one hand, the return of Russia to desire to express its imperialist character (when taking office by Vladimir Putin) and, on the other hand, the Western powers focus on the conflict in the Middle East and against anti-terrorism at the expense of finding strategies to attract Russia in a strong partnership. The consequences of these reasons can easily be seen in the emergence of security dilemma that Europe faces. The most important aspects of the security dilemma that Russia spreads are: military security and hostilities against Georgia; provocation and supporting ethnic conflicts and separatist activities of the former Soviet Black Sea Region; monopolization of power supply (mainly gas) in Eastern Europe. Tensions between Russia and NATO regarding the construction of a missile shield in Europe are another clear example of the security dilemma that Europe faces.

Russian interests in the area are limited to the fact that it wants to limit Western influence in the region. Following its involvement in conflicts in South Ossetia, Nagorno-Karabakh and Transnistria and the attempt to control Georgian, Moldavian and Ukrainian governments, help to maintain tension in the area and create an insecurity environment to the EU's and NATO's borders, which have an impact on security of the entire complex.

In this context, Turkey plays an important role. It faced the situation to choose between the status of European country where the principles of law and democracy must make their presence felt, and one regional power (if we look at its past history of important power in the region). The Western is expected from Turkey (a member of NATO and EU candidate) to support their actions, and promote democracy in the region. Although it supported the accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the EU in many respects, the Turkish vision is closer to Moscow than Brussels. Do not forget that political and economic relations with Russia enjoy great popularity in Ankara. Also, Russia is Turkey's main import source, and Russian gas covers 70% of its gas consumption. This orientation towards Russia (old enemy of Turkey, by the way) comes after EU's criticism regarding human rights, equal opportunities between women and men; because of France's and Germany's skepticism which see in Turkey an "associate member second-class". On Turkey's aspiration to become EU member, Oleg Serebrian said: "*Turky, old aspiring European Union, remains on the outside. Overlay this on accepting Cyprus as a member of the Union in 2004, and solidarity of European powers with Greece in Greek-Turkish disputes, creates premises to a passive conflict between Turkey and the EU. Meanwhile, the Europeanism displayed by Ankara, opposes Turkey's population anti-Europeanism.*"[12]

The steady position of Turkey is well seen in the refusal to accept NATO's multinational forces in the Black Sea Region. It isn't willing to renounce its influence in the North Atlantic area.

_____

[12] Serebrian, Oleg, *Geopolitica spaţiului pontic*, Ed. Cartier, Chişinău, Ediţia a II-a, Aprilie 2006, p. 86.

In "*Security and stability in the Black Sea*" Turkish Commander of Naval Forces Staff Kir Sener stated that the Black Sea Harmony operation was launched on 1 March 2004 by the Turkish Navy, and it carried on in accordance with the principles set by the UN Charter and the objectives set by resolutions 1373, 1540 and 1566. The purpose of this mission is to intimidate illegal activities carried out at sea, thereby establishing a level of security in the region. "*We ask to all merchant vessels in controlled areas to give us information on identity, destination, port of landing and type of load,*" he said. Regarding relations with NATO, Kirk argues that "*Black Sea Harmony operation meets all security needs of all partners and NATO allies. In this sense, is very promising recognition, along with other regional initiatives and institutions in NATO forums, of the Black Sea Harmony Operation as an instrument for regional cooperation in support of security and stability in the Black Sea region.*"[13] However, we can see the Turkey's approach to Russia's policy rather than NATO, because, through BLACKSEAFOR, Russia has guaranteed also in the Black Sea naval hegemony.

## Conclusion

Unresolved conflicts in South-Eastern Europe and the Middle East put increasing pressure on Western powers. Other regional players influence, also seem to lead to an instability of the balance of power and to an establishment of security dilemma.

The solution we see to those problems is an increased cultural cooperation especially in areas of frozen conflicts, so that the democratization process of the region and the establishment of safe security environment have conclusive results.

## SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Books**
Buzan, Barry, *Popoarele, statele și teama*, Ed. Cartier, Chişinău, 2000;
Duțu P. & Dinu. M.S, *Politica europeană de securitate și apărare-cadru de manifestare și dezvoltare a intereselor de securitate națională*, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare "Carol I", Bucharest, 2007;
Ghica, Luciana Alexandra & Zulean, Marian, coord., *Politica de securitate națională*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2007;
Miroiu, Andrei & Ungureanu, Radu Sebastian, coord., *Manual de relații internaționale*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2006;
Serebrian, Oleg, *Geopolitica spațiului pontic*, Ed. Cartier, Chişinău, Ediția a II-a, Aprilie 2006.

**Online articles**
Asmus, D. Ronald & Jackson, P. Bruce, "The Black Sea and the Frontiers of Freedon", Policy Review, No. 125, June 1, 2004, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6451;

---

[13] Kir, Şener, "Securitatea Maritimă în Marea Neagră, BLACKSEAFOR şi Operaţia Black Sea Harmony", în Constantin Moştoflei, *Securitate și stabilitate în Bazinul Mării Negre*, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Apărare și Securitate, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare "Carol I", Bucureşti, 2005, pp. 151-152, http://cssas.unap.ro/ro/pdf_carti/securitate_stabilitate_bazinul_marii_negre2005.pdf, consulted at 22.08. 2012.

Kir, Şener, "Securitatea Maritimă în Marea Neagră, BLACKSEAFOR şi Operaţia Black Sea Harmony", în Constantin Moştoflei, Securitate şi stabilitate în Bazinul Mării Negre, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Apărare şi Securiate, Ed. Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare "Carol I", Bucureşti, 2005, http://cssas.unap.ro/ro/pdf_carti/securitate_stabilitate_bazinul_ marii_negre2005.pdf.;

Pop, Adrian & Manoleli, Dan, coord., "Spre o strategie europeană în bazinul Mării Negre. Cooperarea teritorială", Proiect SPOS 2007 — Studii de strategie şi politici, Institutul European din România, Bucureşti, 2007, http://www.ier.ro/documente/ SPOS2007_ro/Spos2007_studiu_4_ro.pdf.;

Strategia Europeană de Securitate — O Europă sigură într-o lume mai bună, 2009, http://bookshop. europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/ro_RO/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=QC7809568&CatalogCategoryID=ouUKABst 3IoAAAEjxJEY4e5L.