CONSIDERATIONS REGARDIND THE SCIENTIFIC GROUNDS FOR SETTING UP SECURITY STRATEGIES

Professor, General (ret.) Mihai ILIESCU, PhD.[*]
Professor, Colonel (ret.) Eugen SITEANU, PhD.[**]

Abstract *The main objective of the paper is to present a point of view on scientific approaches towards the security strategy so as to create opportunities to intensify the exchange of scientific ideas between scientists. On this ground the article is addressed to researchers dealing with recent national and international security and security strategy and to strategic research/studies institutes, but also to National Defence Universities / Military Academies in the world. The main goal of the authors of the paper is to provide our readers with a brief presentation of the definitions of conflict, security and strategy, but also of security strategy, security concept and security science.*

Keywords: *scientific grounds, security concept, security science, security strategy, scientific reasoning of security strategies.*

Introduction

The rapid worldwide changes occurring at the beginning of the 21st century under the globalization impact have marked the entire society and its subsequent specific domains (economic, political, military, cultural, technical, technological, scientific, social etc.). Comparing to the past, the current changes of those different domains of human life take place at an accelerated rate, which can hardly be watched, assessed and borne by the majority of the social segments all over the world, since their individual and common/community security are seriously affected by the multiplication and aggravation of so many conflicts, disputes, fights and disagreements.

[*] President of "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" National Association of Reserve and Retired Militaries, Corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, E-mail: ansmrrcentral@yahoo.com.
[**] Corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, E-mail: esiteanu@yahoo.com.

Professor, General (ret.) Mihai ILIESCU, PhD
Professor, Colonel (ret.) Eugen SITEANU, PhD

Due to these unpredictable changes, the relevant specialists and political decision makers of both individual states and international security organizations are confronted with some difficult unprecedented analysis of establishing/determining the tendencies of modifying the security environment in order to develop national or international security strategies.

There have been some „important conceptual evolutions, the most relevant from both theoretical, as well as practical perspective being the adoption of NATO's Strategic Concept, (…) and the new US strategy of military engagement." Concomitent, one knows important „*evolutions, such as: (…) the global economic-financial crisis and its effects; the increase of global complexity and relevance for issues such as the competition for resources, climate change, migration etc."[1]*

The current security environment reveals tremendous transformations and EU's Member States have taken concrete steps to adapt to present evolutions.

All these evolutions related previous, „along with the current global context, fully justify the need for an updated European Security Strategy, which would project a new strategic vision concerning EU's security interests, a vision to which Romania is willing to offer a substantial contribution." If we take all these key-moments into considerations*, „EU can no longer keep away from initiating the revision process of the European Security Strategy, otherwise the new institutional construct would lack an instrument for strategic action in tune with the current international context."[2]*

In the international environment two main tendencies can be noticed:

1. a positive one, based on a diminishing the probability of a war between two antagonistic politico-military alliances (as the former Warsaw Pact and NATO used to be), since on short term there is no prediction of such a threat/danger that could have destroyed the entire world through a devastating nuclear war;

2. a negative one, characterised as follows:

---

[1] Bogdan, Lucian Aurescu, The European security strategy revised. The Romanian perspective, Strategic Impact, Centre for Defence and Security Strategic Studies/National Defence University „Carol I", nr. 2[43]/2012, Bucharest, 2012, p. 17.
[2] Idem.

a)an intensification of multiple conventional and unconventional terrorist attacks, which tend to be generalized all over the globe in the form of terrorist/antiterrorist war;

b)asymmetric threats against national and international security;

c)an increasing number of crises and conflicts.

Also, all over the world two antagonistic tendencies are taking place:

1.the integration tendency (i.e. EU's creation and enlargement);

2.the disintegration tendency (the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics/USSR, the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Ukraine etc.).

The definition of conflict

Initially, the endeavours of defining conflict emphasized the difference between peace and war and the interaction between those two antagonistic states. In the 21st century the research/investigation of this complex domain has moved to an interdisciplinary study which has as objectives of research the interdependence between peace and war and the results of those two essential states of the human being: peace and war analyzed in terms of international relationships, sociology, economic, political, defence, security and international law sciences, which also implies a multidisciplinary research. Obviously, each of these defines conflict from its own perspective, which induces substantial differences between their respective definitions. Thus, some definitions are more focused on the military aspects, others on the political aspects, while others still are concentrated on economical, social, geographical factors etc.

Concurrently, the definition of conflict emphasizes those different parts/facets it comprises and focuses on different factors/elements: „*In their research studies and publications, individual researchers and authors also deal with different facets of conflicts and treat them from different angles, placing emphasis on a variety of conflict-related factors and elements.*" In spite of this, we can assert that „*conflict is conceived as a phenomenon composed of mutually interconnected elements - actors, issues, dynamics and contexts. It follows from the above that the definition and categorization of conflict is a very demanding and complex process. To delineate the empirical field of research, it is necessary to establish criteria for defining conflict, so that we can distinguish which phenomenon should be included*

or excluded. This must also be done to ensure consistency in the use of terms."[3]

By analyzing the above mentioned aspects and noticing how complicated this endeavour of getting a clear definition is, we can state the fact that it is mandatory to have criteria for defining conflict. Without having them in place, there is no chance to solve this problem.

Wasmuth makes a choice; he choosed *"four conditions for an impartial investigation of conflicts, as follows:*

a) conflict should be viewed as a social fact and should not be confused with its form,

b) the definition of conflict should not contain any limiting assessment so as not to pre-determine the conflict's analysis,

c) in defining conflict, it is essential to avoid unnecessarily narrowing down the definition by contextual characteristics, so as not to reduce the complexity of the entire concept,

d) *the definition of conflict should not confuse cause with effect."*[4]

Since the fundamental elements of conflict are the actors (those involved in it), activity/activities and opposition/incompatibility of interests, the conflict itself is *"a social situation in which a minimum of two parties strive to acquire at the same moment in time an available set of scarce resources"*[5], through an entire spectrum of actions, from threats to war itself. When it comes to resources, we do not refer only to the economic ones, but also to any other type: fairness/justice, political power, territorial control etc.

Therefore, we can provide you with other definition: the use of aggressive behaviours of the parts involved in conflict, one against another, for getting/gaining by all means some gains/resources/advantages which are simultaneously incompatible. If the actors/parts involved lived in isolation, they would not collide with each other because their respective locations would be far away, but usually they live together and even if this were not the case, they are still interconnected by thousands of interactions and this

---

[3] Central European Forum on Military Education, Security and Defence Quarterly, nr. 1/2013, Warsaw, 2013, p. 19.
[4] Ibidem, p. 20.
[5] Idem.

generates the conflict, when they have completely opposing interests and do not want to negotiate.

In the human society, conflicts represent a normal state, and their lack is something abnormal. For this reason, conflicts themselves are not considered dangerous. Really dangerous is the absence of any rules meant to solve them or the denial of the decision making factors to solve a specific conflict by peaceful means.

Consequently, conflict is the collision of some social groups which have opposing interests. In the same context, conflict represents the aggressive action of at least one of the parts involved in it (individuals, groups, communities, ethnics, political parties, states etc.) which have divergent interests with other part/parts.

The source/cause of conflict can be the struggle for power or the defence of some values, or a specific status of a part against another, by neutralizing or eliminating the opposing part.

From the international relationship perspective, conflict has political causes (independence, the right of self-determination, territorial/border disputes, struggle for power, access to power etc.) and implies collisions/fights for defending one's interests, involving at least two parts (states, a group of states, organized groups, organizations) which fight each other for victory, one of them being a state. Generally speaking, during conflicts the following actions will take place: negotiations, threatening, putting pressure, active or passive termination of conflict, using physical force or war. However, this definition does not comprise the possibility of collision/fight between two non-state actors and also it does not take into consideration the economic interests.

Armed conflict can escalate and reach its extreme form that is war. There is a difference between armed conflict and war: „*every war is an armed conflict but not every conflict will result in war. (...) War represents organized violence carried out by political units against each other*",[6] which implies premeditated and collective actions. Hence, as a consequence, we can asses that any armed conflict represents a situation in which at least one part systematically uses armed violence in order to achieve its own political objectives or other interests.

---

[6] Ibidem, p. 23.

Professor, General (ret.) Mihai ILIESCU, PhD
Professor, Colonel (ret.) Eugen SITEANU, PhD

The security concept

In the past, the security concept[*] and national security strategy were approached starting from some ideological premises, from a unilateral perspective. From a scientific point of view, the security concept must refer to the nation interests; so it must be called nation security instead of national security. Furthermore, it is not acceptable anymore that security of some individuals, nations or states be accomplished on the basis of the others' insecurity.

In order to establish strategic/ensure security objectives, it is necessary to have a completely scientific interpretation of the causes/sources that produce insecurity and represent solutions to the security issue. By eliminating the false problems of security some viable security could be reached. This way, the theoretical premises of developing security strategies could be determined on scientific basis.

Security represents the essential attribute of organizations, systems, states etc., their capacity of functioning in safe conditions (S) and preserving their characteristics and performances against risks, threats and dangers by avoiding, attenuating or remodelling (Cv) them and their functional re-adaptation (Ra)[7].

Mathematically speaking, security (Sec) can be expressed as follows[8]:

$$Sec = Cv + Ra + S$$

Nowadays, security represents „the result of the dynamic balance" between the diverse components/subsystems of the security environment, that is a state in which the threats, dangers and conditions that create the insecurity of the individual, of the community, of the nation etc. can be controlled for a comprehensive defence of all of them, which determines

---

[*] There are a lot of definitions of the security concept, most of them are determined from the conceptual, actional and systemic point of view, but also trying to determine the concept semantically. In order to clearly define the security concept, this is determined through of security policies, security strategies, security doctrines etc.

[7] Eugen Siteanu, Bedros Năianu, Gheorghe Ilie, *Technical products fiability*, AISTEDA, Bucharest, 2000, p. 123.

[8] Idem.

„*the security of the entire community/society*"[9] At any level, (national, regional, international ones), the security state of individuals must represent the fundament of any security analysis because the human being is the essential element in any social-political organization and the level of assuring „*his/her security is reflected in the security of the community in which he/she lives*"[10].

The security concept initially started from some objective aspects. Nowadays, the concept also contains some subjective aspects in accordance with international relationships theory (including in this concept the interests, culture etc.). The reason for that is the fact that the analysis of the actors' behavior and of a complex phenomenon such as the international terrorism can be made only through the extension of the concept itself.

The security science

As far as security construction and security interests, at the national level, is concerned „The outstanding evolution of knowledge, and especially of technologies, has created new systems of dangers and threats and, accordingly, new vulnerabilities to them, which have raised the necessity of some new approaches of the security concept, from an interdisciplinary perspective. This is the reason for the necessity of a security science." (…) As a result, „*the approach of the security/insecurity science matters requires resorting to the new theories, to the new methods and analysis procedures from this spectrum of the non-predictability status, as, for example, the chaos theory, complexity theory etc.*"[11]

Jules Henri Poincare, the famous French mathematician, said that in any science there is just as much science as one can find in mathematics. That's why, the modern and contemporary security must be based, not only on the natural languages in their descriptive essence, but especially on the logic and mathematical linguistic, on the formal systems analysis. „*Logic*

---

[9] Teodor Frunzeti, *Critical infrastructures security and human security*, Military Sciences Magazine no. 4(41), Year XV, Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Ştiinţă din România, Bucharest, 2015, p. 5.
[10] Ibidem, p. 6.
[11] Eugen Siteanu, Nicolae Zavergiu, *Security under trans-discipline umbrella*, Military Sciences Magazine, no. 4/2016, Bucharest, 2016, p. 47.

may be a real scientific base for the intelligence analysis, for cognitive analysis and security analysis, and even more than that, it may be an instrument that must be used by the intelligence analysts and security C4 systems analysts for developing security studies."[12]

We reiterate the idea that security studies must be based on mathematics, like the security analysis, which has to be set up on scientific reasoning in order to find his/their way through the fog.

For this, within the security science a new mathematical methodology can be used, such as the one discovered by the Romanian academician Grigore Moisil, *„who promoted the mathematical methodology in the humanist/social sciences realm, because his excellence was a great mathematician, an exceptional logician an a great humanist. He crossed the boundary of classic mathematics and got into other domains of mathematics application (economy, biology etc.), respectively in the humanist ones. One of those is the sociology domain, which has concepts and theories close to the security domain, no matter if it is about national, worldwide or international security. Security science is more than a simple social science. It does not target just the security state of the society, but also the security of all systems and processes, including the natural ones, which represent the ground of sources for its interconnection models."*[13]

Security science is still at its beginnings and there is only one thing wanting: it needs a conjugated effort of the worldwide science experts to reach the level of development of military science and to produce a new theory necessary to scientific reasoning of the national and/or global security strategies.

„Nowadays, the security science is in a complex process of formation and development which has as its own domain the laws, rules, principles and norms of security systems and processes (including those specific to organizations, nations and the entire human society) in order to know and model the processes, and to manage those processes."[14]

Nonetheless, the future security paradigm (relating to national, regional or worldwide security) has to make a distinction between

---

[12] Ibidem, p. 48.
[13] Ibidem, p. 49.
[14] Ibidem, p. 50.

organizations/organizing activities and complexities, which are not capable to handle their existence and development, and also between organizations/organizing activities and processualities which have the capacity to handle their becoming/development since they have very well-informed people and posses the social culture which helps to transform them from objects (that can be easily manipulated) into subjects of actions generating security. We might have thought of that truth about the security problems in order to discover the scientific grounds for setting up security strategy and security science.

The scientific reasoning of security strategies

Between reality and the current model of national security analysis, used for developing the National Security Strategy, there is a series of errors in assessing risks, threats and vulnerabilities since some *„situations, processes, phenomena can not be contained in the conceptual framework that represents its foundation"*[15]. Both, professor dr. Ioan Deac, and professor dr. Răzvan Grigoraş, proposed a model that is based on some security opportunities which result from the risks[16], threats and dangers analysis which create insecurity. The analysis of these *„redefines the relationship between risks, threats and vulnerabilities proposed by Barry Buzan and provides it with a new element: the dangers. The main characteristic of model comes from the fact that analysis of those four components becomes the source of defining the security opportunities, and therefore the negative effects of insecurity sources are able to be converted in positive effects."*[17]

Within the need of security analysis, the idea of choosing strategic directions meant to generate enough security is essential for the respective state. At the same time, the correct definition of the aspects that characterize the national security is a fundamental issue for politico-military decision makers. Accordingly, modelling the process of developing the national security strategy represents an absolute priority for the overall activity of all

---

[15] Ioan Deac, Răzvan Grigoraş, *Modelarea autopoietică a strategiei de securitate naţională*, Strategic Impact Magazine, no. 1 [50]/2014, Centre for Defence and Security Strategic Studies/National Defence University „Carol I", Bucharest, 2014, p. 62.
[16] Risks show up at the crossing between threats and vulnerabilities.
[17] Ioan Deac, Răzvan Grigoraş, *op. Cit.*, p. 63.

decision makers who activate in the security realm. Subsequently, it is necessary that these decision makers „*identify the disturbing factors which act over national security and act for removing or diminishing the negative effects. Therefore, it becomes absolutely necessary to build up a model capable of a simultaneous adaptation and generation of national security strategies through more objective, correctly and completely structured instruments for managing the possible future status of the respective state, a model capable to show up both possible evolution directions of the vectors that lead to „less" security, and evolution directions to „more" security, directions which must lead to accomplishing their own levels of aspiration."[18]*

The national security strategy has the role of integrating all the other strategies generated by a state. Therefore, the above mentioned authors offered „*a new approach of the security concept, one that is capable to provide a framework as complete and adequate as possible for building up a national security strategy"[19]*.

According to their opinion, „the national security strategy represents the art of using all the available means in order to assure the security (…) state which, in turn, may assure the achieving of all long term goals and objectives of a state. The national security strategy defines a singular and unique vision of the state over the modality in which it understands to use its political, economic, social, natural and military resources to assure a climate characterized by limiting/diminishing those dangers that threaten its structural elements and population. The national security strategy establishes which are supposed to be the state engagements, through which its available resources are configured in a competitive environment in order to satisfy the basic needs of its citizens."[20] Those two authors appreciate that „*the national security strategy will have three major necessary characteristics for setting the grounds of the proposed courses of action:*

- *the cognitive characteristic – its content is based on scientific reasoned analysis;*

---

[18] Idem.
[19] Idem.
[20] Ibidem, p. 63.

- *the prospective characteristic – its assumptions are capable to characterize the future security environment;*
- *the organizing characteristic – its prescriptions offer action directions for protecting national interests."*[21]

Consequently, the authors consider that „*for achieving the security interests, which should be part of a national security strategy, one needs more than „counterting" risks and threats and that the modelling of national security represents a more appropriate approach for stating and following through the interests of a state."*[22]

The approach of those two professors starts from the „*assumption that security, seen all the characteristic elements belonging to the system, is influenced by the nature of its components and its real resources will be found only in their nature. Furthermore, security, as a mental construction, cannot be just the result of a reactive attitude, but on the contrary, it must be, and in fact it is, a projective and proactive necessity. Security is not just a „state" but rather an „aspiration". As an „aspiration", the desired security must be always related to a reference state, which generates „more", respectively „less" security."*[23]

Nowadays, the international security environment faces dramatic evolutions that Romania as well as other States have to take into consideration when drawing up their security strategies. „*In this respect, a significant role must be assumed by the European Security Strategy which, in its turn, must be re-evaluated according to current realities (...)*

A fair number of the Member States already support the necessity of initiating the review process of this policy document (European Security Strategy), in order to provide the EU with an instrument for evaluation and strategic action in tone with the current international setting." [24]

Romania must take into account the necessity of revising its own Security Strategy.

---

[21] Idem.

[22] Idem.

[23] Ibidem, p. 66.

[24] Bogdan, Lucian Aurescu, The European security strategy revised. The Romanian perspective, Strategic Impact, Centre for Defence and Security Strategic Studies/National Defence University „Carol I", nr. 2[43]/2012, Bucharest, 2012, p. 17.

„The European Security Strategy, in its next enunciation, shall endeavour to go beyond a simple adjustment, predictable by virtue of the (…) years interval since its issuance.

The debate concerning the current state of affairs, the objectives and the future orientation of the European Security Strategy must take into consideration its connection with other policy documents from various related domains - foremost the 2020 Strategy, the internal security strategy and energy security strategy, as well as other similar documents."[25] In the same way, a revised version of the Romanian Security Strategy *„will give structure and prioritize the various domains, by coordinating and integrating various policy initiatives, aiming at overcoming political and operational difficulties and ensuring greater coherence for Romanian foreign and security action. Given the current crisis, it has become even more relevant to combine in a better way the national resources, policies and instruments with the European ones,"*[26] an objective that must be assumed by the current Romanian Security Strategy.

In this regards, we would like to emphasize the necessity to assume the responsibility of strategic ambition to attain trans-Atlantic solidarity and co-operation, both in theory and practice, at all spheres: *"political; aligning US and EU security strategies; consolidating NATO-EU political and operational capabilities for common action; shared areas of concern on the regional and global security agendas - European energy security, neighbourhood policies, relations with Russia, further enlargement, OSCE files, frozen conflicts."*[27] There is no mistaking the words and we, Romanians got to go all by ourself to the best National Security Strategy, every time we got a chance to revise the Strategy; we have to canvass our security system in order to track down every fault, even if there is a mystery into security system that could not well bear the light.

The energetic strategy has glided from the economic level to the political or strategic one, considering the interruptions in the flow of energy

---

[25] Ibidem, p. 18.
[26] Idem.
[27] Ibidem, p.19.

resources, *"may be the result of either political decisions or security incidents"*[28].

The same author emphasizes the fact that, *"In order to manage successfully the current security environment, the EU needs an increased level of cooperation with its partners, both at State level, as well as at the organization's level. Multilateral action and cooperation with international partners, especially NATO, but also the UN or OSCE brings efficiency and enhance European efforts."*[29]

Finally, he emphasises *the fact that any strategy is a prescription for action. As such, in the revision process of the European Security Strategy* (or of the National Security Strategy, *author's note*) *we must find the optimum balance between the level of ambition in formulating the objectives and the mechanisms and instruments through which these objectives could be achieved. The institutional framework set in place by the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty offers the EU a set of innovative instruments. From this perspective, the European External Action Service is not just one of the key actors of the revision process of the Strategy, but also one of its beneficiaries."*[30] From this point of view in the revision process of the Romanian Security Strategy the rulers/leaders of state have to find the best balance between the objectives and the mechanisms through which respective objectives can be achieved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AURESCU Bogdan Lucian, *The European security strategy revised. The Romanian perspective,* Strategic Impact, Centre for Defence and Security Strategic Studies/National Defence University „Carol I", nr. 2[43]/2012, Bucharest, 2012.

---

[28] Idem.
[29] Ibidem, p. 19.
[30] Idem.

Central European Forum on Military Education, Security and Defence
Quarterly, nr. 1/2013, Warsaw, 2013.

DEAC Ioan, GRIGORAŞ Răzvan, *Modelarea autopoietică a strategiei de
securitate naţională*, Strategic Impact Magazine, no. 1 [50]/2014,
Centre for Defence and Security Strategic Studies/National
Defence University „Carol I", Bucharest, 2014.

FRUNZETI Teodor, *Critical infrastructures security and human security*,
Military Sciences Magazine no. 4(41), Year XV, Editura
Academiei Oamenilor de Ştiinţă din România, Bucharest, 2015.

SITEANU Eugen, NĂIANU Bedros, ILIE Gheorghe, *Fiabilitatea
produselor tehnice, Technical products fiability*, AISTEDA,
Bucharest, 2000.

SITEANU Eugen, ZAVERGIU Nicolae, *Securitatea sub umbrela
transdisciplinarităţii, Security under trans-discipline umbrella*,
Revista de Ştiinţe Militare - Military Sciences Magazine, no.
4/2016, Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Ştiinţă din România,
Bucharest, 2016.