

## **European Security Environment in the Context of Globalization**

**Senior Lecturer Florinel Iftode, PhD**  
*Danubius University of Galati, Romania*  
*floriniftode@univ-danubius.ro*

**Abstract:** The most important consequence of the Cold War was that “it leaped the pressure cooker lid of the planet.” There were released, thus the determining energies in the globalization acceleration and its assertion as the current main feature of the international system. Cold War demonstrated, firstly, the rule of the West in its ideological confrontation with communism. Although the massive military expenditures of NATO countries had their importance in deterring a possible Soviet aggression, which brought to its knees “The Evil Empire”; it was the antithesis between communist demagogy and the political, social and economic performance from the West. Constantly under the threat of a nuclear Armageddon, the Cold War “was a global, systemic, long-term conflict, between two power blocks sustained by incompatible ideologies. It was a global war, accompanied by wars around by the inference of the entire world. It was a “one-dimensional” confrontation, well organized, guided by the written and unwritten principles, accepted by the main opponents and by their allies. The fact that the international system in the years after 1989 was dominated by the U.S. military was a good thing, its effect being the reduction of chances that, in a period of profound changes, a war between great powers would take place. Post-Cold War period, although it was registered a number of wars, especially civil ones, cannot be said in any case that it was characterized by major risk of a war between the great powers.

**Keywords:** Cold War; NATO; globalization

### **1. The End of the Cold War - A Beginning for the New European Security Environment**

Constantly under the threat of nuclear Armageddon, the Cold War “*has represented a global systemic conflict, on long-term, between two blocks of power sustained by incompatible ideologies. It was a global war, accompanied by wars taken by the inferences across the world.*” It was a “unidimensional”, well organized confrontation, guided by written and unwritten principles (Malița, 2007, p. 3) accepted by the main opponents and their allies.

Nuclear deterrence and the doctrine of “mutually assured destruction”<sup>1</sup> shaped and moderated the behavior of U.S.A. and USSR. The strategic plan was solid and the concepts such as “massive retaliation”, “flexible response” or “peaceful coexistence” have defined the rules of behavior between the two blocks (Pila, June 1996, pp. 13-29) NATO and Warsaw Treaty guaranteed the stability and predictability between the superpowers and their followers. Even if the essence and the specificity of the two organizations were diametrically opposed,<sup>2</sup> finally, strategically speaking, the result was the institutionalization of confrontation or competition (when we are in times of relaxation). Politicians responsible for the national security, strategies responsible with the way of using the military force were confronted with clear problems, managing unidimensional threats from the two parties and their potential allies. The main goal was to reduce the risk of a direct war, conventional or nuclear, and the possibly of the establishment of “peaceful coexistence”. The events were predictable and, even in the case of unpleasant surprises, the main format of the negotiations was already a classic, bipolar one. The communication channels, formal and informal, were well established and, even in the hottest moments of the Cold War, the relations between Washington and Moscow or Washington and Beijing have never stopped. Moreover, to some extent they were able to cross communicate, Romania being a good example in that sense, during the Cuban missile crisis, managed to send to Washington an important message of neutrality. (Malița, 2007) The international system was largely predictable. Open conflicts, wars, there were by the inference and the periphery in the confrontation area. Vietnam and Afghanistan, beyond the tragedy of civilian population in those countries, represented a way to control the danger of direct confrontation between Americans and Soviets. The chances that such a conflict would spiral out of control and evolve into a direct confrontation were relatively low, being the necessary time to initiate negotiations and avoid such a scenario, as was the case during the time of Cuban missile crisis.

---

<sup>1</sup> MAD (*Mutual Assured Destruction*). In practice it meant that each of the two largest players, USA and USSR have a significant nuclear potential enough to ensure the adversary of total destruction in case of nuclear attack.

<sup>2</sup> As the founding document clearly show, that is the Washington Treaty (1949), NATO was created to defend common values and a certain type of civilization, the West. Warsaw Pact (TV) was not only a tool of ideological uniformity and fidelity guarantee of its members towards the "sole owner" - the USSR. The best evidence is the intervention of TV in the two Member States, Hungary and Czechoslovakia respectively, despite their people desire. TV was a clear element of "international political police".

With the events of 1989 and the disappearance of the Soviet camp there were reasonable expectations that the international developments will be linear, under the control and guidance of those who won the Cold War, that is the U.S.A. and their allies, both in Europe and in Israel, Canada, Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand. The liberal democracy and free market economy generated a standard of living so high compared with communist eastern states that every year thousands of people risked their lives, leaving, most often illegally, the East, hoping for a decent life in the West. The collapse of communism was the total economically and previously politically, the Eastern European regimes, since 1989, collapsed one after another. In 1991, despite the efforts to restore communism<sup>1</sup>, the Soviet Union disappears as state.

In the West, the euphoria of victory was high (although it later turned out to be early), a university, such as Francis Fukuyama, hastening to announce “The End of History”. (Fukuyama, 1992)

The fact that the international system in the years after 1989 was military dominated by the U.S.A was a good thing, its effect being to reduce the chances that, in a period of profound changes, a war between the great powers would take place. Post-Cold War period, although it registered a number of wars, especially civil, in any case cannot be said that it was characterized by the risk of a major war between the great powers. This situation had a positive impact on the democratization of regions of the planet, ending a cycle of 30 years, during which we witnessed how the “fall of about sixty dictators freed countless millions of people under the repressive leadership.” (Human Security Report 2005-War and Peace in the 21st Century, The University of British Columbia, 2005)

The fall of communism in the East, weakening of Soviet authority and even its subsequent collapse<sup>2</sup> led firstly to the freedom from communism, completely or partially, of the Central European states, which did not hesitate to ask the return of the group of Western states and accession to NATO and EU (European Community at that time), thus opting for liberal democracy and free market economy. On the ruins of communism it appeared a large number of new states in Central Europe

---

<sup>1</sup> In August 1991, a group of conservative politicians tried the preservation of Soviet communism, arresting Mihail Gorbaciov and building the martial law. In Moscow the population, led by Boris Elțan, opposed the coup, saving Gorbaciov, but speeding up the USSR’s collapse, which is produced in late 1991.

<sup>2</sup> In late 1991, Gorbaciov resigned, accepted the USSR collapse. On its ruins would appear Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Moldova and the other heir states of the former Soviet empire.

(Czech Republic and Slovakia), in South East Europe (disintegration of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) and Eastern Europe and Central Asia (CIS).

In the former Yugoslavia, the West, using the main military tool at its disposal, NATO, finally managed to take the control of collapsed consequences of the federative state, stopping the ethnic fighting in Bosnia and in Kosovo. Then we proceeded to its political reconstruction and its recovery area, parts of former Yugoslavia being now integrated into NATO and the EU, Slovenia, or at different stages of approximation and integration.

After the democratization of Central Europe and stabilization of and Southeast Europe, the Western community, full of confidence, seemed to be able to engage into the next big strategic step, namely the spread and consolidation of democracy beyond the West, especially in the Eastern Europe, Black Sea and Middle East. Unfortunately, the main logic of the international system in the XXI<sup>st</sup> century was to be given not by democracy but by globalization, item found up to 9/11 in the background of international developments, but bursting with full force on September 11, 2001. When the Western academic community has understood that, with the democratic revolutions, in the world there had been another revolution, “The First Global Revolution”, and that it would lead to the acceleration of globalization.

1989, the peak year of the third wave of democratization, will remain not only a symbolic year of the Revolutions in Central Europe, but at the same time the temporal landmark of accelerating globalization. Removing the ideological obstacle represented by the communist camp and his obsession for authoritarian leadership and centralized economy have led to a very rapid spread of new liberal political organization of communities norms and it imposed the rule of free market economy. Finally, the political liberalization, given the revolution in communications, especially the appearance of the Internet has brought more open access to information.

Unfortunately, the dialectics of this process resulted also in the appearance of the first negative consequences, the first witness being offered us by the succession of “the new wars” of the states of former Yugoslavia. All of the early 90s we have the first signs of the hatred with which the fundamentalist groups Islamic looked the West and especially the U.S.A., namely the 1993 terrorist attack on World Trade Center, or the Somali Islamic guerrilla attacks on U.S.A. troops in Somalia, from the same year.

In history books, 1989 will have a similar significance as the one in the 1789, 1918 or 1945, years start or end historical cycles. The events of 1989 have accelerated the course of history. The end of East-West ideological conflict and its geopolitical and geostrategic consequences have lifted the lid on the pressure planet. According to the Japanese teacher appreciation Rei Shiratori, between 1989-1991, limited to the three significant events (revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe, the Gulf War and the disappearance of the USSR) is established in a true gateway towards globalization. 1989 was a revolutionary year not only by the scale transformations in Central and Eastern Europe, but also by the fact that these changes, in turn, have generated as the Club from Rome, being considered as the “first global revolution.” (Alexander & Schneider, 1993) The year 1989 represents a new beginning, Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider, in “First Global Revolution”, published in 1989, said that mankind is at a “great transition”, by that name they meant an early stage of formation of a new type of global society, be it a post-industrial society, an information society or services society.

## **2 Fluid and Dynamic Security Environment**

At the beginning of the millennium, the world has entered in a new phase of its evolution, marked by the coexistence and confrontation of other major positive trends which entails risks, threats and danger. The world order based on bipolar logic characterized by rivalry and capacity of mutual annihilation blocks states, disappeared, and the transition post-bipolar ended. “*Globally, the world continues to be strongly conflicting. The motors of disagreements operate both in the access of the resources domain, their distribution mechanisms and markets, and the identity differences: ethnic, religious, cultural or ideological.*” (Petrescu, 2008, p. 20) There are rare the states which historically have not been faced crisis or certain forms of violence, and in the current context, when bombings, hostage taking and cross-border crime multiply exponentially, the terrorism and the organized crime outline a specific problem, which in order to solve it requires a quick solution, able to dissolve existing networks, and at the same time, to prevent the creation of new subversive groups. Without a doubt all these primary threats aimed primarily at the instability of the state and its institutions. (Petrescu, 2008, p. 19)

The possibility of a large military confrontation is reduced while the regional and internal conflicts can be more frequent, and their effects, directly or in combination, harder to control. Today's security environment is experiencing a

situation with profound geopolitical and geostrategic transformations, with essential consequences on the ability to promote and protect the national interests of all States or the coalitions they belong to. The complexity of the security environment arising as a result of globalization and other processes, overlapping trends, apparently contradictory, fragmentation and regionalization, with the emergence of new or non-state security actors led and continues to generate new risks and threats more and more predictable. (Petrescu, 2008, p. 20) “Primary threats such as terrorism, organized crime, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, the existence of weak state structures, the search for resources, illegal migration, environmental degradation, pandemics / epidemics, global warming and water crisis, population growth and poverty were the subject of numerous studies that have attempted, from different perspectives, to analyze complexity of the phenomena, to determine their origins and especially, to find an adequate and efficient response.” (Petrescu, 2008, p. 19)

Terrorism is the gravest threat to international life (Maftai, 2009, pp. 791-794), forcing the world to face an unprecedented situation: its splitting and the weakening of the world stability. These phenomena and processes have led to the increase of the relationship between internal and external problems, which complicates further the way to identify the causes and methods of “treatment” of negative developments in the security environment. “By limiting the scope of the military component of security concern, we find a significant reduction of the danger of a major regional or world wars, although it still maintains many sources of instability, outbreaks of crisis or conflict, particularly at regional and sub-regional levels, which can generate low-intensity armed conflicts at local level. The mere threat to use force is always less effective and credible, given what happened in the Balkans or in Chechnya. That is way it is increasingly necessary to conduct on the field of surveillance ground forces and crisis control.” (Petrescu, 2008, p. 21)

The effects of globalization are becoming more visible in the sense that the world economy, after a considerable period of decline, gives signs of globalization recovery. Overlapping the globalization process which the regionalization and fragmentation trends generate new tensions and risk factors. The new international security environment shapes also a different geopolitical map of the world, in its design plays an essential role in the transatlantic relation. Europe, after several efforts, it succeeded in erasing the artificial boundaries between East and West. (Petrescu, 2008, p. 22)

In a global environment, “the states’ defense against the dangers and threats must be done traditionally through policies and individual strategies and though collective forms of action, always adapted to the “challenges” to which the security environment is submitted.” (Petrescu, 2008, p. 23)

On the global scene, mainly within the European and Balkan security environment there are acting more and more state and non-state actors, which make the process of decision making in foreign policy and security of states to become increasingly complex. The accurate analysis of the international environment is more difficult to be achieved, as it becomes nonlinear, and thus the act of carrying out the “game” has a way of changing the rules.” Inside the global social system it occurs by this movement a resettling of interests and, thus it is a resettling of forms and means of achieving them, correlated with the changes / mutations in the technology, social, economics, politics and mind domain. (Petrescu, 2008, p. 31)

### **3. Current Developments in International Security Environment**

The current security environment is characterized by a high degree of instability and unpredictability, by the manifestation of new risks and threats, especially those with asymmetric character, by redefining the relations between great powers and by the increase of action freedom action of the regional actors (state and non-state). The threats that arise in this context are linked as mutual support. The new risks and threats are augmented by the access to modern information systems, that allow the implementation of violence to great distances, from one continent to another. In addition to these effects, they carry on the instability state in the “unsafe” region, “*where chaos is produced already by the existing conditions, including expanding economic poverty, authoritarian governments, states and weak societies, criminal behavior and a decline of institutions responsible with the security and collective defense.*” (Naghi, 2010, p. 55)

At global level the security environment remains quite complex and visibly dynamic, with apparently contradictory developments, but also with big surprises. Thus, the emergence of new global security actors such as China, India, Iran, Pakistan, along with the non-state actors, with globalist ambitions, the international bodies of environmental protection and human rights or some terrorist organizations, yet unsuspected of being developed and efficient, make lesser predictable the security environment for decades. (Petrescu, 2008) It is likely to increase the role of global superpower states, around which revolve coalition of

states or countries interested in achieving the same goals at the expense of international security organizations with solutions to global problems which became less effective, and the mechanisms for implementation more difficult. *“At the beginning of XXI<sup>st</sup> century, the general feature of European security environment is to reduce the risks of conventional and, therefore, to eliminate an armed conflict premises at continental or regional scale, along with the increased unconventional risks and threats that led, among other things, to the alarming revival of ethnic and religious nationalism and deepening the economic and social disparities, with negative effects on security.”* (Petrescu, 2008)

Following the development of trade flows and international investment, the developments in technology and the spread of democracy, a growing number of states, nations and peoples enjoyed, after 1990, the results of political freedom and market economy. These positive developments had as path even a greater involvement of non-state groups and parties in international affairs. (Naghi, 2010, p. 57) However, many previous issues remained unsolved, while others worsened. Thus, the regional conflicts have continued to remain a significant source of instability and to negatively affect the economic activities, including security interests of the EU. Conflict zones such as the Balkans, Kashmir, Korean Peninsula and the Middle East have affected both directly and indirectly, the interests of the European Union.

These international circumstances demand new rules in the international security domain. Redefining the ruled on international security after the collapse of the bipolar order, however, rise many problems, not only practical but even conceptual ones, including for the U.S.A, yet under the position of one super-Power.

These difficulties are caused by factors such as:

- international environment that has become much more dynamic and complex;
- the lack of consensus on the approach of international security, a reality which allowed the expression of various interest groups at all levels;
- proliferation of access to information in real time, “a pressure” that causes political leaders to make decisions on spot, without relying on deep evaluations;
- multiplication of specialized institutions at national and international level which deals with security issues from specific angles and it determines analysis and fragmented decisions;

- lack of a “security model” reasonable and acceptable for most countries which favored the ad hoc responses and timely approaches. (Naghi, 2010, p. 57)

At the level of the closest area to Romania, the security environment has witnessed profound changes in the history of the past fifty years, and the current transition period, as it was called in the specialized analysis, has the most important consequences and implications at regional and global level. *“The geopolitical and geostrategic interest area of our country, that is the Central and Southeastern Europe, was and remains so affected by developments in Europe and Asia, as well as the Atlantic ones, which determines that the changes that occur in this part of the world, especially security-related events, to have multiple and diverse scoops, often original in the interests of some global security actors.”* (Petrescu, 2008, p. 29)

#### **4. Determinations of Globalization on European Union**

Above all benefit or drawback of globalization, the reference to this concept must be linked with the notion of interdependence. The globalization is a subcategory of interdependence, as a means of expression for it. Metaphorically speaking, globalization is contempt of territoriality and boundaries. The classical forms in which globalization manifests are: economic, military, social, political, cultural and environmental globalization. Each of these sectors is variable and dependent on others in a sharp dynamics. (Naghi, 2010, p. 59) The evolution tendencies of globalization process are bi-dimensional, according to the paradigm where the analysts built their approach. Teodor Frunzeti (the Rector of National University of Defense Carol I) calls these two tendencies in terms of optimistic and negative case scenario. Optimistic scenario, according to analyst, is that where the states will lose their sovereignty in a natural way, in order to become parts of a macro mechanism, while the negative scenario postulates the exacerbation of the competition between states in the fight over control. “According to the optimistic scenario, supported by the neoliberal theory, the national sovereignty is becoming narrower, as the globalization of markets and civilizations will exceed the today’s geopolitical borders and it will erode strongly the national identity, thus creating global citizens, which will absorb the general interests of all humanity”.

On the other hand, “the other scenario, based on the realistic theory predicts that the states will exacerbate the competition in which they are to each other, because

of globalization phenomenon, trying to take over the new competitive tendencies. This competition will foreshadow the global distribution of power, resulting in the increase of wealth and stability of some countries and, conversely, the more pronounced depletion and increase of instability in already poor countries, so that because of globalization, the gap between rich and poor will increase.” (Naghi, 2010, p. 60)

The main effect of globalization is that of minimizing the role of their borders to reduce the legal status of geographical delimitation. The globalization has effects on all spheres, so that the states are obliged to operate in a global strategic environment: as the capital, the trade or any means of communication operating in a global world, as well as security or insecurity are subject to globalization, in the sense that they can only be defined by reference to clearly defined territories. (Naghi, 2010, p. 61)

Currently, the globalization is a beneficial phenomenon by the economic dynamics and flows, information, capitals. But, simultaneously, it is created a network of links that predispose to the vulnerability of the international system. exactly this, which makes these interdependent networks, stresses that these are capable and likely developments towards global insecurity.

It is important however, a clear separation between the notion of globalization and interconnectivity. The interdependence means increasing the links between different sovereign entities, while globalization affects sovereign entities in the relations between themselves, which does limit to the level of foreign policy, but at the level of internal policy, in areas such as public or private one.

So globalization is more than dependent, it is actually a change at the level of internal structures. (Naghi, 2010, p. 61) Globalization will benefit those countries that will participate in the development technologies and communications. Although the U.S.A., EU and Japan will feel the pressure of the emerging markets, they will maintain the key economic sectors: industry, capital markets and research.

Globalization creates in the same time the mixing (converging social habits), and fragmentation (the rediscovery of the local culture). As a result of globalization, it is expected to increase hybrid cultures, less “westernized”; rejection reactions can lead to many collisions which will represent a challenge to the traditional channels of democracy. (Naghi, 2010, p. 63)

The challenges of globalization require a coordinated response, which the current institutions are not able to provide, as the market, in order to develop it needs well established rules and laws; the globalization requires governance. The extension will change also the nature of security.

The European security risks in a globalized world will have a multiple nature, so that the impact will be greater than the cumulative effects (terrorist threats on the globalization nodes - transport infrastructure and energy production, increasing the likelihood of producing and spreading of epidemics or natural disasters), propagating in waves, affecting the safety of people or infrastructure, economy and society as a whole. (Naghi, 2010, p. 64)

At the beginning of the century and millennium, the united Europe commits to continue the process of completing the economic dimension with that of foreign policy and defense. On the security background it was chosen a cooperative security paradigm. Cooperative security is a strategic system formed around the liberal democratic states, connected together by a network of alliances and formal and informal institutions, characterized by shared values and through practical cooperation and transparency in the economic, political and defense domain. This model takes the form of four circles that are mutually-sustained, called “security rings”:

- individual safety (is synonymous with human security and human rights)
- collective security (legal and political obligations of Member States for protecting the integrity of states signatories from the signing group of the Treaty)
- collective defense (engaging all states in the each defense of the outside aggressions)
- promoting stability (the preparation for joint diplomatic, economic and military engagement in areas outside their own, to promote prosperity and stability). (Naghi, 2010, p. 65)

The EU does not seem to be threatened by classic conflicts, constant in armed attacks on a large scale, however, a different set of threats looming, each of which is hardly predictable and relevant diffuse, which makes them, in a way more difficult to combat.

## **5. Conclusions**

From the European point of view, there are three notable threats, in particular:

*A. Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a major contemporary threat to peace and security of countries and peoples.* By the early 90s the Strategy and international treaties and export controls have resulted in limiting the spread of these weapons, but now there is a danger to their dissemination, especially in the Middle East. The spread of missile technology carrier will increase the instability and Europe will generate some additional risks. The special risks arising from this type of threat is by the use of weapons of mass destruction by a small terrorist group which can cause losses that previously could only be caused by the armies of national states.

*B. International terrorism is a strategic threat.* This new type of terrorism is linked to fundamentalist religious movements, which have very complex causes. Beyond the immediate risks, the terrorism threatens the openness and specific tolerance of democratic companies. The new type of terrorism is different from that of previous decades because it seems to be interested in using violence and produce unlimited massive losses. For this type of terrorism, it exemplified by the Al-Qaeda, Europe is both a target and a launch base of attacks.

*C. The existence of weak state structures (failed states) and the increase of the organized crime.* The existence of weak state structures, the civil conflicts and access to guns have caused empowering the position of the organized crime. These situations are threats to security, by supporting drug trafficking and trafficking in human beings.

Many of these threats to Europe's security are located in the Western Balkans or Eastern Europe, or have as access routes the Balkans, Eastern Europe and Central Asia. (Naghi, 2010, p. 67)

## 6. Bibliography

Human Security Report 2005-War and Peace in the 21st Century, The University of British Columbia. (2005). *Oxford University Press*.

Alexander, K., & Schneider, B. (1993). *Prima Revoluție Globală - o strategie pentru supraviețuirea lumii/The First Global Revolution - a strategy for the survival of the world*. Bucharest: Tehnică.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. *New York Free Press*.

Maftai, J. (2009). EU's Role in Fighting Terrorism. *EIRP Proceedings*, Vol. 4, issue 1, pp. 791-798.

Malița, M. (2007). *Tablouri din Războiul Rece: memorii ale unui diplomat român/Pictures of the Cold War: Memoirs of a Romanian Diplomat*. Bucharest: CH Beck.

Naghi, G. (2010). *Securitatea Europeană – Fundamentări Normative și Instituționale/European security - regulatory and institutional substantiation*. Bucharest: C.H. Beck.

Petrescu, S. (2008). *Amenințări primare/Primary threats*. Bucharest: Militară.

Pila, J. (June 1996). Tendencias estrategicas en el umbral del siglo XXI/Strategic trends in the XXIst century. *Ejercito/The army*, Year 57, no. 673, 13-29.