

Managerial Characteristics in Critical Situations

Romania's Participation within NATO at Managing Crises

Cristian - Sorin Prună
National Intelligence Academy "Mihai Viteazul", Romania
prunacristian@yahoo.com

Abstract: The defining marks of the thesis regard the creation of new scientific premises, that should structure the approached issue – crises management by relating it to the present international context coordinates. The suggested approach has the purpose of establishing the elements which define crisis and of highlighting specific issues in the crisis management process (including in what the states' participation at maintaining peace operations and multinational operations deployed in different theatres of war). In the effort of organising such a scientific background, we have tried to realize clear, concise delimitations, by the research method – the study and analysis of the determinant factors and conflicts. Thus, we have disclosed the characteristics of the situation and crisis state, the requirements and the stages in the crises situation management process, its characteristics, customizing the circumstances which contribute to planning the answers and establishing the moments favourable to the abolishment of the crisis or preserving it in a balance that should allow subsequent diffuses.

Keywords: crisis; security state; management; leadership

1. Introduction

The current security system is influenced by the continuous changes and transformations generating new threats. The next security agenda should be based on new approach methods of the asymmetrical and non-conventional risks, including new types of international solidarity. In this context, it becomes more and more obvious the fact that the states' security objectives can be realised only through international cooperation, which comprises conjugated action forms of the statal entities sharing common values and interests.

The Euro-Atlantic community, respectively the relational and organisational system existing between USA, Canada and the European countries, based on structures which fundamentally regulate it, NATO and the European Union, is

established on common solid values which allowed and determined the reach of an unprecedented links of any nature.

Political transformation and NATO expansion, after 1989, reflects its adaptation to the new European geopolitical directions, the alliance modifying its main function from a defence organisation to a security one, and in the context of preserving initial missions has added new ones – the most important being represented by ensuring stability and security, both within the responsibility field and outside it.

Along the edification of a security architecture through political dialogue, consultations and international collaborations, the representative actors of the Euro-Atlantic community. Having the attributes of power centres, are not only the beneficiaries of the security climate to be founded, but also responsible for its quality and duration.

An indispensable condition to economic development, preserving and asserting national and collective interests is the existence and the quality of entity relations, dialogue efficiency and level of implications of the great powers and international organisms in resolving controversies and crises, aspects which significantly contribute to the insurance of the security environment. The Euro-Atlantic integration process, characterised by NATO expansion towards the East and the establishment of new relations with Russia and Ukraine, developing the Mediterranean Dialogue, as well as including in the E.U. the central and eastern European countries, proves to be a real factor generating security and prosperity¹. All these, in the context in which instability crises and phenomena at a sub-regional level and fragmentation tendencies, marginalisation or state isolation persist. A challenge for the international system is represented by the growing number of fragile societies and, implicitly, of their inability to control inner evolutions of their own territories.

2. Managerial Characteristic in Critical Situations

2.1. Conceptual Delimitations Regarding Crisis

The essential etymology of the word crisis resides in the notion of decision (Latin – crisis, French - crise), and thus the crisis phenomenon implies the obligation to decide. The emergence of this phenomenon constitutes a threat on the priority objectives of the entity where it manifests, being an unexpected situation for its decision makers.

Crisis represents a conflicting state in which there are tensed confrontations between different force categories, especially the mobilised armed ones (conjuncture, not on a large scale).

In the national context, this state implies an imminent civil war or a general crush of the rule of law, order and law, as well as increasing the probability of war outbreak.

The situation of state participation at maintaining peace operations is also representative, in different theatres of war, when the elements specific to the crisis can occur within them, other states or at the level of international organisms.

The subjects of a crisis are the individuals, groups, institutions, states, etc, which are grouped in at least two camps, on account of common interests, in which there are conflicting relationships (real or potential).

During conflict deployment there are at least two sides (individual, groups, states), which:

have different and irreconcilable goals or the same goal that can be achieved only on the benefit of one side;

intent to use contested means to achieve goals.

As a result of the perception on the necessity of their winning, conflicts often develop an internal dynamics which impedes, if not excludes, a peaceful, constructive and non-violent settlement. This presents a permanent escalate danger, on account of the excessive value of acquiring power and using violence strategies.

Regarding the characteristics of the crisis concept, one can point out the following facts:

- a situation which:
- threatens high-priority objectives for the decisional unit
- limits the available time for an answer, before the situation is modified;
- when it happens, it surprises the decisional factors.
- an event characterised by:
- laying a development point in the flux of the events;
- imposing the necessity to adopt a decision;
- implementing the fundamental values of at least one actor;
- decision making in a very short time.

A situation defined by four necessary and sufficient conditions (it is thus they are perceived by the decisional factors from the maximum leading level of the entities involved):

- a mutation in the external or internal environment;
- a threat of the background values;
- a high probability of involving in predominantly military hostilities;
- an answer to the threat of values.
- international crisis state implies from the decision makers' perception that:
 - the actions, current or threat-invoked, of an international actor affect the concrete national interests, the peace negotiator reputation or own ability to stay in power;
 - irrespective of the action meant to face this threat (excluding capitulation), the probability of armed conflict outburst is amplified;
 - it acts under time pressure.

The following perspectives in defining the crisis concept are also pointed out:

- systemic – mutation in state functioning in the context of international political action flow
- decisional – a certain situation, with distinctive, different properties, regarding occasional decisions;
- politologic – sudden change, following a major disorder in the social life, characterised by accentuating the existing contradictions through the collision of antagonist forces;
- sociologic – a period in the dynamics of a system in which the accentuated accumulation of difficulties and conflicting expressions of the tension slow down its normal functioning, triggering strong pressures towards change.

In this context, two other concepts can be significant: crisis state and crisis situation. The concept of state can be defined as a specific position, identifiable in a continuum or a series of a process, and the crisis situation represents the result of combining circumstances / factors in a given moment.

The contextual environment of a crisis is characterised by polarizing social and political differences within a statal entity, by repression, insurgency and systematic violation of human rights that can have as effect national mobilisation, through deploying challenging actions (sporadic, unorganised, with a low violent level) in a generally untrustworthy climate in which there is inter-group hostility and the

interests of the other sides are perceived as being incompatible. Generally, the outburst is caused by the emergence and evolution of some critical situations whose solution is not possible (inability of the decision makers in identifying adequate solutions, interests on the line of maintaining / accentuating triggering factors).

Management inability manifests itself on the following coordinates:

- informative – lack of available intelligence
- functional- morphological – the institutions responsible with managing crisis lack promptitude, level of knowledge and availability to efficiently deal with it;
- technical – the elites are either not able to adequately react in order to identify and maintain the subsidiary effects of the crisis under control, or don't want to acknowledge, partially or totally, the authority of the decisional factors.
- political – displacing some factual elements, strictly technical, to the area of political interest.

From a general perspective, it can be considered that any crisis has two distinctive stages – in their turn characterized by intermediate states¹- namely: the escalate stage, generating tensions and the regressive stage (releasing the stress of the situation and reverting to normality or stability).

The crisis precedes the strong conflict, according to the following sequential transformations: competition, inchoate rivalry, declared rivalry, intense dispute, inchoate conflict, crisis, strong declared conflict. The evolution / covering of the stages can be determined by: the number of controversies and the intensity of hostile behaviours (we include here the degree of threat or use of armed instrumentality), the sides' perceptions and attitudes (towards each other), the mobilization and organisation degree, the cohesion between the leaders and the members of the groups.

Regarding their generation, crisis can be accidental, intentional, and from a temporal perspective, they can be sudden or with a pre-crisis period (it presupposes elements whose succession leads to crisis escalate.)

In what their intensity is concerned, crises can be more or less intense, violent, implicit and severe. This can be measured, for example, in the case of political, military, economic and social crises, in terms of a series of elements, such as: the

attitude of the system components in crisis, the changes registered in the assignment of powers, changing the number of the power centres, the influence areas and their ranking, the emergence of new alliances, relations, changes, on account of loosening the existing connection in the respective system, and the modification of the number of components in conflict or system change or reorientation. Identifying and monitoring the evolution of these circumstances / factors make the projection of answers possible, establish the favourable moments to the abolishment of the crisis, maintaining crisis state in a balance that should allow future defusing.

2.2. Crisis Management and Leadership

The multiplication, diversification and escalation of the political, economic, ethnic-religious controversies etc, both locally and regionally, makes the peace state to consist in a series of vast events such as: natural, technological disasters (caused by human actions excess), disfunctionalities in political, economic and social systems (born patiently or inducing revolts in the social environment), interventions of the power holders to the detriment of the others (that can lead to war) or terrorist attacks (causing abominable acts). Within this context, the decisional factors / the international affairs responsible actors are constrained to manifest an increasing preoccupation towards the crisis issues and their superior and efficient management, and particularly, towards preventing, managing and post-event state.

The previous experience demonstrates that completely resolving a crisis implies two complementary aspects, respectively management and leadership (decisional means). In other words, it is imposed that the attributes of leadership be permanently intensified through the leader's activity, which requires substantial involvement in resolving issues.

NATO acknowledges the exceptional importance that should be granted to crisis management and places this issue among the important ones in world's security. Thus, successfully managing crises continues to be one of the intercessions of the Alliance in order to preserve peace and to strengthen security. In tight connection with the complexity of international relationships, NATO has a complete, dynamic and active, constant system of structures, practices, procedures, techniques and standards that represent the reaction to critical situations or disasters. In case of necessity, everything is politically authorised, so the role of political leadership is obvious and it is sustained by other specialised structures, and thus, complete

involvement in crisis management. At the same time, the complementarity and also the info-decisional process synergy is easy to notice within the crisis management. It is only this way that management can be achieved, either by preventive diplomacy measures, or by more powerful actions, with a military component.

For a more efficient situation management, the problem of applying a set of measures and politico- military actions and not only, as follows:

- crisis retort actions, with a much more specialised leadership for sustaining the peace process
- collective anti-crisis defence, which also means collective leadership;
- operations regarding natural, technological and human disasters, which need a partner leadership.

In all the situations, leadership is defining since it timely approves intercessions, leads some of them directly, and at the beginning and ending, carrying out, supplementary and exclusively, actions which only certain people and structures can manage (collaboration, support, negotiation, implementation etc.), direct management being carried out by specialised strategic structures.

Within the strategic partnerships with NATO, EU acts, more and more lately, in the involvement and own support of the crisis management operations. To this purpose it has made aware more successful factors in managing crises, among which a well defined part is played by collective abilities and specific aspects in leadership (intelligence, prudence, mobility and flexibility of decision, info-decisional flux continuity etc.). However, the challenges for EU, resulted from engaging in managing crises across Europe, would be: prompt answer, flexibility, armed conflict prevention, continuity, abolishing backwardness etc, which are also determined / generated in leadership. The diversity and complexity of the issues has made crises management to placed in External Politics and Common Security¹, where a few priorities are stipulated:

- identifying timely instruments of crisis retort (among which the leadership ones confer increasing efficiency);
- expanding crisis management in civil sphere (another aspect of leadership);
- identifying and developing necessary and existing military abilities within the Quick Reaction Force.

The crises events that can occur in the near future, within European area or others, will definitely impose the depreciation of management to leadership in order to resolve them.

2.3. Leadership in Crisis Management Process

The term crisis has lately acquired more and more varied meanings, mainly related with the study of complex, societal, community, stata, local, regional, events. The multitude of situations to which this term refers makes the specialised studies that aim at its defining, recent or older, to engender some vagueness.

The classic defining criteria of the crisis consider a well-defined cause, a destructive / dysfunctional, easy-identifiable agent, sequential events (from the beginning to the end, up to a climax), with damages and victims and which subsequently require a recurrence plan. Essentially, it all reduces to threatened / affected values systems.

In a different, subjective perspective, the leader and leadership intervene, becoming fundamental elements in understanding and of course, resolving crisis. In other words, crisis is regarded as an opportunity to formulate major decisions, since increasing disfunctionalities in a system imposes taking decisions in critical conditions. It all depends on the perception and expertise of the leader, which, within management, triggers an appropriate leadership. It is a one-sided assumption of responsibilities, potentially damaging to the system, since the institutions nominated to manage crisis cannot assume responsibility and opportunely intervene.

The perception on events, respectively discontinuity / rupture in the normal functionality of a system/ reality, leads to another conceptual delimitation of the crisis. It thus operates with a duality – normality and crisis, in the second case the decision, action and control in order to bring reality to its initial state are imposed.

A means to define crisis consists in approaching it as the eradication of the institutional structures of a social system. The defining element is legitimacy, and in the critical situation a decay in legitimacy is produced, expressed by the deterioration of the management functions (also leadership), which leads to weakening of trust in political and social structures, in this case the system isn't so operational.

Crisis display is made through the discrepancies between external expectations (electorate, population, international institutions) and internal performances of the system itself. In other words there is a rupture between the internal functionality and the external factors / beneficiaries, an aspect which can lead to disabling the leader / leadership and impossibility to trigger adequate management in order to stop the degrading process. In most cases, a collapse of the system cannot be avoided.

From the perspective of the politico- military contribution in defining crisis, two points of view are highlighted. The first one brings forth the crisis as a threat to values, interests and objectives, and the second one presents it as a major disfunctionality that occurs in a system. Specific to each opinion, we can easily distinguish two types: evolution crisis and intervention crisis. Both terms are pertained to a common parameter – normality. Thus, in the evolution crisis, normality means good functionality and self-regulation of the system, whereas in intervention crisis the system does not self regulate and cannot stand interior controller intervention. It is necessary to evaluate the establishment and expertise of abnormality, respectively who defines the crisis and who triggers the intervention / management. All these are superior and efficient management interventions, i.e. strategic art, in which the leader through leadership, on the basis of internal and external contacts, trigger and assume responsibility for system adjustment, sometimes with external intervention.

One issue needs to be further analysed and it's the distinction between pre and post crisis normality. The pre-crisis normality may be vicious (it had the germs that triggered the crisis) and consequently it purified through crisis. The post-crisis normality will certainly be a different one, which presupposes an adequate leadership from the leader. Usually, the prolonged span of a crisis determines a new post-crisis normality, strongly revised and which should bear the strategies necessary to the rejection of a subsequent crisis. The leadership will be able to assess / monitor safely, more prepared, precautious and prudent to normality.

Modern society makes us face more and more often a dilution of legitimacy and authority of state institutions and leaders, thus an insufficient credibility and efficiency of leadership up to a national level. In the international environment, the phenomenon seems endemic, reported to the institutional potentiality index (from the perspective of authority functions in society).

Leadership crisis is basically an authority and trust crisis, determined by the weak functional performances of the institutions (national and international) and their leaders. In this crisis pattern, leadership seems to be a vicious circle, connected with the way in which society favours / promotes a leader and their personal style, but their excesses, lack of performance proven in practice, political incoherence and lack of moral substance lead to tensions and internal conflicts which trigger crisis. It is the decisional crisis, with the basic criterion – option ability, which automatically leads to eroding authority, lost of legitimacy and distortion of system functionality itself. In this case, crisis settlement doesn't need to and can't be done by the institutions and leaders who triggered it, the distinction between order / disorder, continuity / discontinuity, stability / instability being difficult to perceive, the democracy is polluted by populism and demagoguery, falsity and imitation. A deficient understanding of the democratic functionality of the societal / statal system has led in time to the change of governing / leadership patterns of a paternal type (stronger and authoritarian) with so called materialist (more tolerant). In fact, a substitution of rigour with perfidy in expressing authority was created, which led to the increase of power, through the support of some concerned circles (of an economic-financial, media, non-government influential structures type etc.).

In the EU vision, solving this crisis implies two aspects. The professionalization of a department that should know the exertion and expertise of the managerial act (superior leadership) and should consciously assume responsibility in any situation is born in mind. To all these, the reorganisation of the institutions involved in the managerial act (leadership) and the storage of trustworthy funds are subsumed, so that it can dispose of the ability to correctly use power. At the same time, the beneficiary of governing are also taken into consideration, since they should, among other things, acquire a culture in the field, be more informed and more resistant to manipulation.

Many specialised studies do not operate a difference between crisis management and crisis leadership, the two collocations being considered similar. However, there are a few studies where a differentiation is tried out, sort of evasive and partial. The rigour and pragmatism specific to the American management school discovers, as a result of analysing the issue referring to leadership under crisis, that both collocations exist. Thus, crisis management clearly highlights the main role that the team, the organisational / institutional structure have in managing the situation based on consecrated and normed algorithms, techniques and technologies for each type of action / operation. Consequently, crisis leadership emphasises more

the role and personal activity of the leader in managing events, under the aspect of opportunities, actional procedures, engaged abilities etc. in any moment of their deployment. Thus, in managing a crisis, leadership in relation to management, found in a permanent complementarity are preeminent.

The idea that resolving a crisis depends a lot on the strict junction between leadership and management is more and more imposed. The practice of managing wide scope crises reveals that the leader's activity (leadership) should be based on psycho-professional features which place trust in the managed people, on authority in an optional context and on a lot of cooperation. This last feature shows the leader's ability to establish options and formulate decisions congruently with superior reasons, but also with the intercessions of the other institutions / compartments enabled to interfere in resolving a crisis. In what the major crises are concerned, they require an authoritative, visionary, charismatic and courageous leader and leadership. In order to manage the subsequent crises, the strategic requirement that is imposed is accomplishing leadership superiority within the management ensemble, expressed through permanent (pre)vision, rational option and firm decision, assuming actional responsibility, tenacity in order to achieve normality.

The intervention term is often mentioned in specialty studies regarding crises. The dictionaries in the field clearly define intervention in two aspects: interference in a situation / issue with the purpose of changing its course / destination; an entity's involvement in another entity's business. The issue that is carried out is the legitimacy of the intervention under a benefic aspect and its delimitation from the negative and dangerous meaning – as an attack to sovereignty. Any intervention inevitably triggers a crisis, which implies a leadership pattern used under a political and secure aspect. Considering the fact that the intervention action is predominantly from outside the country and it aims at producing an imbalance in the system in order to abolish what is negative by rebuilding a different balance, managing and solving the crisis are very difficult to control. The superiority of the intervention from the point of view of the leadership (ability to analyse and decide) makes, to a great extent, the power difference, such disparities generating asymmetric reports, shaped into adversities. Therefore, it all depends on the leadership pattern adopted, since in this situation it becomes a differentiation criterion. The results can be rational, leadership being able to assume/ accept intervention and its results (replacing internal imbalance factors), or fatal, having as finality the abolishment by force of tensions / imbalances and leaders /

institutions that generated them. At the same time, maximum shortage of the intervention is necessary, since the international affairs are strongly affected. Rapid recurrence to normality is the main condition of an intervention success, and the main role should be credited to the new leaders and created institutions, to which occasion leadership will be preoccupied to maintain and develop the new normality.

In a maximum generalisation form, crisis resumes to only two elements: a superior one – danger and the other, inferior – opportunity, in other words foreseeing danger and taking measures on time. A well oriented leader can speculate with success, intelligence and ability, these two elements so that they become extremely profitable for him. When a leader acquires a power potential that he uses discretionary or when he does not have the ability and capability to improve it, it affects the system that he manages, and this can generate the opportunity of his elimination (which represents avoiding the production of a totalitarian / intervention crisis).

In the current internal frame and those of international affairs, leadership crisis represents the most obvious parameter of the need for change and reform in order to achieve globalisation through security, integrity and development.

Considering the crises issue, which becomes more complex and actual, managing any crisis should benefit from a well defined, strict and dynamic management, the main role being the task of the leader, who through personal qualities and deeds (leadership) should precisely and relevantly hallmark the favourable settlement of events and normality establishment.

2.4. Stages and demands in crisis management

Crisis management implies a specialized action of great complexity, conducted and supported on multiple plans (political, diplomatic, military, economic, social, religious etc.), in order to diminish and maintain under control negative effects. Its essence is constituted by the prompt and adequate reaction of the executive to the events which threaten or directly affect national security, or in case of disaster, normality state. Thus, the objectives of crisis management are:

- reducing tensions, in the purpose of preventing transformation into crisis;
- managing crises and preventing their transformation into conflicts;
- organizing civil and military preparation appropriately for different types of crises, including ensuring the ability / potential of discouraging elementary implied / promoter elements;
- controlling induced reactions, and in case conflicts break out, preventing their escalating.

Effectively, managing any crisis depends on the efficiency of the connections established both within the respective system, and among exterior, interested groups. The essential components of the managing process are determined by the efficiency of the means and procedures subject to accomplishing info-decisional flux. They initially circumscribe to the analysis of the situation (through crisis manifestation), identification and evaluation of the opponent factors, the aims and means used by them, and result in defining the appropriate answers (in a first stage, according to the political, military, economic and social purposes), respectively implementing the best solution.

In the field of national security, crisis can be associated to peace time, exceptional states and to war (armed conflict), the manager role belonging to the strategic decision factors (with decisional attributions and responsibilities regarding conceiving, planning, organizing and controlling the adopted measures). Their intercessions will mainly aim at situating the opponent in a crisis situation, avoiding it or, if it is impossible, abolishing the effects through corrective actions. In order to solve crisis, they adopt a series of political, diplomatic, economic, informational, military, or other measures (applied individually or combined, according to the means of solving the critical situation), with respecting principles regarding operative elaboration of decisions based on a probable and timely informational flux, coordinating and controlling the achievement of the activities, informing public opinion and assuming responsibility. Generally, military action is

the last to which the strategic decision factors resort to, the decision regarding engaging armed forces are compliant to constitutional norms, and the achievement of the missions be realized under direct control of the authorities involved in managing the crisis.

The crisis management process will comprise the following stages:

- initially, scientific activity in order to highlight all the implications characteristic to the reference field (by studying the existing or potential conflict, internal and international conditions that might facilitate the establishment or accentuation of controversies, establishing institutional structures with attributions in solving critical situations – through identifying, preventing, opposing and abolishing consequences, promoting in view of adopting a good legislative frame);
- adopting at institutional level, the measures that should ensure the identification of the conflict display premises and monitoring the dynamics of controversies (by making the info-decisional flux adequate) – in order to timely establish the means and modality appropriate to be used in diminishing the conflict degree, to block its accentuation or abolish the consequences.
- subsequent to crisis break out, measures will be adopted on different plans (social, political, economic, military) to prevent escalating the conflict or, if it is produced, to combat violent manifestations, respectively to initiate treaties between actors and reconciliation;
- monitoring the achievement means of the measures in order to revert to normality state and their effects, in the purpose of establishing and adopting necessary corrections.

A first demand in crisis management is constituted by the operative elaboration of decisions, motivated by its complexity (it has as determinants – knowing generator causes, current laws, the level of training of the nominated forces and the adaptation of concrete action means specific to each case, in order to maximize the effects).

During crisis development, the decisional factors follow strategies composed of a coherent series of action forms, which circumscribe to initial analysis, permanent evaluation and establishment of timely intercessions. Thus, crisis management uses the methodologies which facilitate the approach of crisis systematically (without omissions, adopting correct and efficient tactics), and detailed acknowledgement of

the context. A determinant role is exerted at the level of the teams nominated to elaborate different management strategies for critical situations and the expertise of the members (gained by direct experience in the respective domains), necessary to the anticipation of the planned and enterprised measure effects (so that they don't result in crisis magnification).

Extremely important for managing critical situation is the use of relevant information for the given context, that can decisively influence the decisions. Consequently, there is a possibility to update existing plans (used in the training process of the managerial team and the participant forces), to be viable in critical situations (adapted according to new information).

From this perspective, the coordination component within the crisis management process implies distributing relevant information to all responsible factors in dealing with the critical situation (given by law), so that they can achieve their attributions in timely conditions. Also as managerial demands the informing of public opinion is imposed – with significant influence on critical evolution evolvment and responsibility assuming – with positive effects in what crisis settlement is regarded, based on respecting national interests and constitutional norms or other law norms.

3. Romania's Participation within NATO at Managing Politico-Military Crises

The existence of strongly developed countries, economically and military, characterised by stability, democracy, respect for human values, as opposed to vast unstable regions, has lead to the emergence and propagation of an unsafe and uncertain environment. The emergence of new vulnerabilities, threats, challenges, respectively the activation or break out of crises have determined the increase of the security area, simultaneously with the increase in the risk of resorting to military means use. Thus, the instability extended to Europe, Asia and Africa, and the conflicts worsened, generating a whole series of internal crises, with a social, economic, ethnic, religious character and even inter-statal rivalries. The former Yugoslavia, Caucasus, Near and Middle East represent areas where war has been and still is a reality.

The current elements foreshadow the end of classic war based on a strict, strongly terrorised system, and the emergence of a new type of conflict, characterised by

insecurity and influenced by asymmetric threats, led through any possible means, from the diplomatic and economic to military, including through security organisms and structures. The military actions these days, including the ones in Afghanistan and Iraq, prove both the abilities and the limits of opposing the new types of threats. They have reiterated the importance of the contribution and involvement of each organisational entity, and thus, the individual and collective intercessions destined to identifying and applying the most adequate and efficient means of adjusting and resolving crises are the guarantee for the local, regional and global security.

Crisis management is a permanent and evolving process, within a controversy and a conflict (that can go through all the stages), having as purpose the defence of interests and contested values.

Besides, the existence of the conflict can affect the interests of tierces which are not directly involved, hence they will develop their own strategies to preserve their own interests (they will activate a crisis management process, but from different positions). Another situation that needs to be taken into account is the one determined by statal participation to maintaining peace operations, multinational operations deployed in different theatres of war. The elements specific to crisis can emerge during their participation to such missions, the crises manifesting within the country (between representative organs of the state or towards public opinion), as well as between the reference state and other international states or organisms.

Thus, we can exemplify Romania's army participation to NATO missions in Europe (IFOR/ NATO mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, SFOR/ NATO mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, KFOR/ NATO mission in Kosovo, SFOR/KFOR strategic reserve), in Middle East (ISAF/ Afghanistan mission, NTM-I - NATO Training Mission - Iraq).

3.1. Romanian Army in the NATO Operation Theatres in Europe

IFOR/ NATO mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (**March - December 1996**)

Legal aspects:

- UN Security Council Resolution 1031 from 1995 (mandatating NATO to ensure Dayton peace Agreement implementation, being launched a vast

operation, „joint Endeavour”, thorough Allied Rapid Reaction Corps ARRC);

- Romanian Parliament Decisions 23 and 43/1995 and Government Decision 63 on 07.02.1996 (through which, starting with 08.03.1996, Romania participated in the mission with „Dr. Joseph Kruzel” 96 Sapper Battalion – 200 soldiers).

Participation:

IFOR International force (Implementation Force, with a year mandate), constituted on 20.10.1995 (with an effective of 60.000 soldiers, of which 45.000 from NATO member countries and 15.000 from outside NATO) for: maintaining peace, armed forces and munitions retreat, infrastructure repair and deployment in good conditions of general elections (September 1996);

“Dr. Joseph Kruzel” Sapper Battalion, whose mission constituted in ensuring liberty of movement of the international military force in the operation theatre – Bosnia – Herzegovina’s territory (through spotting, mining and demining research, repair, maintenance and infrastructure building – roads, bridges, roadbeds, buildings, including interventions on IFOR routes in case of heavy snow or natural disasters).

SFOR/ NATO mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (December 1996 - November 2004)

Legal aspects:

- Authorising by the UN Security Council, on 12.10.1996, the decision of NATO council referring to the extension of NATO forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina (after ending the IFOR mission mandate in December 1996) – „Joint Guardian” operation (IFOR tasks being transferred to a new mission – SFOR, Stabilisation Force);
- Romanian Parliament Decision no. 25 in 1996 and Government Decision no. 73 in 14.03.1996 (according to which „Dr. Joseph Kruzel” 96 Sapper Battalion has remained as part of SFOR over a period of 18 months, subsequently prolonged with a year – until June 1999).

Participation:

International SFOR Force (with an initial number of 32.000 soldiers, respectively 12.000 in 2003, constituted under NATO aegis, transferred from November 2004 –

under EU aegis – EUFOR, under the name of ALTHEA), having as objectives the prevention of conflict break out and continuing peace process, supporting non-governmental civil organisations and return of the refugees, but also competences regarding cooperation with United Nations International Police Task Force and International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia;

“Dr. Joseph Kruzel” 96 Sapper Battalion and new subunits (a military police squad, a national intelligence cell, as well as new functions for the Romanian officers in the Sarajevo main quarter) which subordinated to LANDCENT (NATO Land Force in Europe at that time) – the replacement of the superior echelon during the IFOR mission (ARRC).

KFOR/NATO mission in Kosovo (March 2000 – to present)

Legal aspects:

- Romanian Parliament Decision no.1 in 12.03.2001 (a military police squad was sent to the field on 23.04.2001);
- Romanian Parliament Decision no. 22 in 19.09.2001 (according to which an infantry company was sent to Kosovo from 22.11.2001, and the National Force Troops – ROFND – from 01.03.2002).

Participants:

A military police squad (25 soldiers, sent to Djeneral Jancovic, retreated in 2003, subordinated to the Greek contingent from the East Multinational Brigade, found under American command), whose missions consisted in ensuring traffic control and displacement in the operation area, maintaining first aid support and recovery, continuous information of KFOR /JTCC (Joint Transportation Coordination Centre) regarding the HAWC communication means and its traffic conditions, respectively ensuring security and defence of the Djeneral Jankovic field;

An infantry company (89 soldiers, sent to the North of the province, retreated in July 2003, included within the Belgian contingent from the North-East Multinational Brigade, found under French command), having as objectives the permanent control of the responsibility area, ensuring compliance to the Peace Agreement, spotting and seizure of illegal munitions, ensuring a fast reaction group, executing the convoy and participating in operations of spotting smuggling (on the administrative border of the province);

National Force Squad (sent to Camp „Basco” Gorazdevac, acts under Italian command in Task Force Aquila – Italian battalion-like unit – within the South-west Multinational Brigade), having as missions: ensuring compliance to the Peace Agreement, ensuring liberty of movement on communication means within the responsibility area, security and defence of the camp, of religious institutions and people within them, convoy and security of Serbian citizens in different situations, spotting and collecting of munitions and prohibited materials, respectively patrolling on main and secondary routes and organising check points (fixed and mobile).

SFOR/KFOR Strategic Reserve

Legal aspects:

- Romanian Parliament Decision no. 9/09/1997 and no.5/24.03.1998 according to which Romania’s participation to SFOR was approved, with forces and means from the National Defence Ministry (an infantry battalion and a staff group – a total of 400 soldiers);
- Romanian Parliament Decision no.3/ 08.03.200 – which approved the extension of the mandate only for „Neagoe Basarab” 26 Infantry Battalion from SFOR reserve to execute missions in the support of KOSOVO Peace Maintenance Force (KFOR).

Participants:

An infantry battalion and a staff group (SFOR strategic reserve), respectively „Neagoe Basarab” 26 Infantry Battalion (from SFOR strategic reserve with KFOR competences) – representing a mobile force reserve, which can be rapidly deployed and can act on Bosnia-Herzegovina territory or Kososvo province, with the purpose of answering a crisis situation or significantly increasing the tension in the area, to ensure protection of the forces from SFOR and KFOR (on request) and to achieving the missions that require supplementary forces (additional to the ones found on the field and after using tactical operative reserves) or to discourage (through force demonstrations).

3.2. Romanian Army in the NATO Operational Theatres in Middle East

ISAF mission/Afghanistan

Legal aspects:

- UN Security Council Resolution 1386 from 2001 has instituted the ISAF mission - International Security Assistance Force¹, (constituted of soldiers from 19 states, „FINGAL” operation), whose six months mandate was prolonged through resolutions no.1413 and 1444 from 2002 (ISAF, led by NATO, has as objective the insurance of security in the Afghanistan capital, Kabul and its surroundings).
- Romanian Parliament Decision no. 38/21.12.2001 – which approved Romania’s participation with personnel and technique from National Defence Ministry to ISAF, reiterated during the negotiations according to which the Romanian side has engaged forces even from the beginning of the mission (February 2002).

Participants:

A military police squad, staff personnel, a military information squad, an aerial traffic control team (including a C-130 B Hercules transport airship) and soldiers in two province reconstruction teams (P.R.T./Provincial Reconstruction Team), a total of approximately 900 soldiers, the Romanian contingent being found during the entire mission under national authority and ISAF squad operational control (sent to Kabul).

Among the Military Police Squad missions, one can notice security and ISAF objectives insurance, checking security rules, patrolling and collecting information from the civil environment, respectively participating at trainings in the Afghan Police Academy from Kabul for the teachers and the personnel ensuring ministries security. Thus, we remind the dislocation of the manoeuvre Battalion from Kandahar to Qalat, starting with September 2006, in order to achieve tasks, such as: consolidating security and reconstruction in the areas near Qalat, leading military actions in order to secure and control communication lines in the vicinity of the key routes, supporting the expansion of the afghan government authority.

NTM-I mission (NATO Training Mission - Iraq)

Legal aspects:

- Decision adopted with the occasion of the Istanbul NATO Summit (2004), at the interim Iraqi government, with the purpose of supporting (training, equipment and technical assistance) starting with August, 14, 2004, the Iraqi security forces (by the authorities).

Participants:

Romanian contingent of 412 soldiers (among which three officers – within the NATO Iraqi security forces instruction, and 409 soldiers act on the basis of a Commitment Memorandum between the Romanian and Iraqi government – subsumed to the IRAQI SUNSET operation).

4. Bibliography

Chelaru, M. (1995). *Paradigma crizelor/The crisis paradigm*. Bucharest: AISM.

Liteanu, T.; Onișor, C. și Mihalache, V. (2006). *N.A.T.O. – securitate integrată/ N.A.T.O. - Integrated security*. Bucharest: A.N.I.

Mândru, M. (1999). *Managementul crizelor politico-militare/ Politico-military crisis management*. Bucharest: A.I.S.M..

Petrescu, S. (2005). *Mediul de securitate global și euroatlantic/ Global and Euro-Atlantic security environment*. Bucharest: Editura Militară.

www.bruxelles.mae.ro

www.cultura.mai.gov.ro

www.dadalos-europe.org

www.mae.ro

www.romaniailibera.ro

www.ramp.ase.ro

www.revista22.ro

www.scoalarosu.ro

www.ziua.ro