

Iulia Barbu

University of Lower Silesia
Security Studies, Erasmus Programme
Summer Semester 2014/2015
iulia.barbu27@gmail.com

GRAND STRATEGY FOR INFORMATION AGE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – CASE STUDY: ROMANIA

Summary: The essay is provided a theoretical context and explanations for understanding the concepts of security and strategy and its influence on Romanian's policy.

Keywords: strategy, security, policy

Introduction

To start with, it will be given two definitions for Grand Strategy and Military Strategy, in order to help the reader to comprehend the differences between the two strategies:

- **Grand Strategy** is the art and science of developing and using the political and economic powers of a nation, together with its armed forces, during peace and war, to further national interests, priorities and policies. (Kennedy, Lawlor, Nelson 1997).
- **Military Strategy** is a subset of grand strategy and is the art and science of employing the armed forces of a nation to secure grand strategy objectives by the application of force, or the threat of force. It does not define grand strategy but rather is defined by it. (Kennedy, Lawlor, Nelson 1997).

Theory and practice of security in the light of strategy adaptation

One of the first theorists who wrote about war is Carl von Clausewitz. He had developed specific ideas about how a leader should act in order to widen and increase his country's strategic and military power. He thought that the best strategy is to defeat the enemy's military forces. Also, Clausewitz described a specific typology of thinking for grand strategists. They must understand the process from the general to the specific, which means that they have to design the conflict as a whole and only after to start the operational and tactical discussions. Clausewitz defined war as 'an act of violence to compel our opponent to fulfill our will'. (Kennedy, Lawlor, Nelson 1997).

So as to explain the concept of security, it is important to understand it from different theoretical approaches perspectives. Firstly, the realism defines the security 'as a derivative of power' (Buzan 2007). Also, Hans Morgenthau – well-known realist scholar – states that 'the most important material aspect of power is armed forces', which could explain the relation between power and security because armed forces are so close related to military power. Furthermore, he said: 'power.... tends to be equated with material strength, especially of a military nature'. The realism explanation can be applied for the first half of the 20th century, in the era of World Wars, but in order to explain the Cold War period, we need to broaden our understanding towards more complex approaches, such as constructivism and neorealist. Hence, we can mention Barry Buzan, who created a complex image of security, using concepts as regional security, or the societal and environmental sectors of security. (Stone 2009).

Buzan criticized the realist approach concerning the concept of security, because he saw it as being outdated, stopping the understanding of the notion mentioned. He takes from the neorealist theory the idea that the international system is anarchic. It is important to develop and explain Buzan's ideas about security, because he is one of the most outstanding scholars who studied this concept deeply. His approach is so interesting because he explained security from different angles, from micro to macro, analyzing the social aspects and the impact of the people or societies. Also, he defines three levels: individuals, states and international systems and five sectors: Political, Military, Economic, Societal, and Environmental. He sees the sectors as being interconnected in a web, dependent of each other. The first and the most important are the military threats, because they can affect the society on each of the three levels and can question the authority of the state and its capability of protecting its citizens. The second is the political sector. Political threats are more complicated and harder to explain because they are not so obvious compared to the military threats. Then, it follows the economic threats, which are harder to be shaped, because, as Buzan says, 'the normal condition of actors in a market economy is one of risk, aggressive competition and uncertainty' (Buzan 2007). Also, the military sector is dependent of the economic one, because of the budget constraints. The next type of threat is the societal one, and the most important factors that determine it are identity, culture, and ethnicity. This sector is significant when we try to understand a conflict at a macro level. The last sector is the environmental one and it can be labeled as the most disputable, because the ecological threats such as earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis are impossible to control. (Stone 2009).

Buzan provides an analysis using three key-concepts: insecurities, vulnerabilities and threats and divides the national security policy into two parts: focused outward (cutting off threats to the state at the source), called international security strategy and focused inward (reducing the state's vulnerabilities), called national security strategy. After a deeper understanding on Buzan's work, the reader can comprehend that he thinks that the optimal way for a state is to combine these two strategies, not to choose only one (even though one would also work). He admits that it is not easy for leaders to find the equilibrium between the two, but it would create the security policy that would work on multiple levels. (Buzan 2007).

After analyzing and understanding the concept of security the next step that follows is the comprehension and analyze of strategy. One of the most important strategists is B. H. Liddell Hart. Inspired by the amazing work of Sun Tzu, Liddell Hart created a guidebook for the military men and strategists all over the world. In chapter XX of his book, *Strategy*, the author states eight maxims that can provide theoretical knowledge in case of war. Six of them are positive maxims and two are defensive. Even though many of the readers could consider the maxims unfair, and even not fair-play, we must take into account the fact that war is not a game, and a lot of the losers don't get to go home. (Winter 2015). The first principle says: Adjust your ends to your means. This means that you have to understand clear which is your position, to be aware if the enemy is stronger than you. Don't hold back, but at the same time, don't try to get more than you know you have the power to accomplish, because this will affect the courage of your army. The second maxim tells to keep your object always in mind, while adapting your plan to circumstances. It is important to keep in mind the final objective and try to avoid possible disturbances. The third says: Choose the line (or course) of least expectation. This means that you have to attack the enemy in a way he would never anticipate. It is important to put yourself in the enemy's shoes, and think the way he would, in order to find its weak point, and to attack him in that point. The forth maxim is: Exploit the line of least resistance, so long as it can lead you to any objective which would contribute to your underlying object. Also, don't do more than you need to do, and keep your eyes on the final purpose. The fifth principle is about taking a line of operations which offers alternative objectives. This is essential because if you have more than one objective, the chances to accomplish at least one are bigger, and also because you can mislead the adversary, not letting him know which one is more important. Principle number six says to ensure that both plans and dispositions are flexible and adaptable to circumstances. You must be ready for all possibilities, if you plan is accomplished, or if it's not, or if it's partly a success, but also a loss in certain areas. The seventh maxim: Do not throw your weight into a stroke whilst your opponent is on guard - whilst he is well placed to parry or evade it. The rival's strength can be weakened manipulating him that the odds are against him or by spreading confusion. This can be done through certain means like: cutting his communications, capturing his headquarters, or simply forcing the situation to change more rapidly than the enemy can react. The last principle says to not renew an attack along the same line (or in the same form) after it has once failed, because if it failed the first time, chances are it will fail again even if your attack is reinforced. Also, the opponent can get stronger as fast as you, but his success will help his troops on the psychological level. (Winter 2015)

In the book *Grand Strategy for Information Age National and International Security* are explained two types of threats: the structured one and the unstructured one. In the first category are the nations, terrorists and transnational entities and in the unstructured one are criminals, hackers, crackers, disgruntled employees and vandals. (Kennedy, Lawlor, Nelson 1997).

The grand strategy comprises the "purposeful employment of all instruments of power available to a security community". (Colin 2007) The difference between strategy

and grand strategy is that while the horizons of strategy are bounded by the war, grand strategy looks beyond the war to the subsequent peace. It should not only combine the various instruments, but so regulate their use as to avoid damage to the future state of peace – for its security and prosperity. (Hart 1967).

Romania attitude to strategy formulation

We'll analyze the country's strategy on different areas like: energy strategy, Romania's position within the Ukraine Crisis, The Republic of Moldavia between Russia and Romania, the Black Sea Strategy, The Nabucco Project, counterterrorism strategy.

To start with, I'll analyze Romania's position towards one of the most important issues that concern Europe at this point: The Ukraine Crisis. Its geographical position makes Romania a key player when talking about this issue, but the country also has other concerns.

First, Russia can appear as a danger for Republic of Moldavia because of Transdnistria, the region in Moldavia where mainly Russians live, which supports Russia and it's politically and financially supported by Moscow. Russia could use Transdnistria in order to create social movements in Moldavia to destabilize the country. Strategically, Romania's reaction started with the attempt to keep Moldavia within its sphere of influence. Russia has a remarkable influence in the Republic of Moldavia, with one-third of Moldavia's exports going there and more than half to the European Union. This is the reason why E.U together with Romania started some procedures to keep Moldavia close to them: in April 2014, European Union gave visa free-travel; in May it gave 30 million Euros to seize the benefits of the forthcoming association agreement with the European Union and of course, Romania is strongly supporting Moldavia's membership in the EU.

The second concern that appeared in Romania's political and strategic agenda was the fact that Russia increased its power not only in Eastern part of Ukraine and Crimea, but also in Odessa, which is situated less than 200 km away from the Romanian border. The problem that leads from here is that Russia augmented its power in the Black Sea. To keep the situation under control, Romania strengthened its bonds with the USA, ensuring their military support. Also, Romania helped in 2014 USA when the troops were returning from Afghanistan and in 2015 the U.S. missile defense system will be deployed in Romania. Not only Romania is dependent on the USA, but I could rather affirm that there is a relationship of interdependence. After the Montreux Convention which settles the law that the unlimited transit of a naval force into the Black Sea through the Bosphorus (controlled by Turkey) is prohibited, only Romania remained as an open gate for the USA in the Black Sea. Also, Romania is a potential aircraft base for operations in the region (mainly in Ukraine) and would be win-win game if the USA supports Romania in building a significant naval force in the Black Sea because would not only be a possible strong weapon against Russians, but also might motivate Turkey to cooperate with Romania and thereby work with the United States. One of the most important reasons why Romania is opposing to Russia's increasing power in Black Sea is that Moscow could

became an obstacle in its plan for energy exploration in the Sea. However, Romania is obliged to keep a good relation with Russia because almost all of the gas imported comes from there (Stratfor, May 9, 2014), (Stratfor, September 2, 2014)

From this problem follows the next subject that will be explained in this essay: Romania's energy strategy. In 2014, Romania was producing less than three-quarters of the natural gas it was consuming. One project that would have helped Romania significantly was the Nabucco Project, but unluckily for the country, the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline, which is not crossing through Romania, was chosen over Nabucco. The Nabucco West Pipeline, supported by the European Union, was a smaller version of Nabucco Project. The aim of the pipeline was to provide the East-European countries the energy resources they need to not longer be dependent on Russia. The pipeline was projected to pass from the Turkey border to Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and to go to Austria (as seen in the figure 1.). It can be said that Romania will be even more affected by the decision than Bulgaria and Hungary, because now finds itself without an EU-backed intercontinental pipeline project. The Nabucco West could have not only help Romania economically, but also to strengthen its relations with the core of the European Union. However, this was an impulse for the country to develop its own energy reserves. (Stratfor, July 3rd, 2013).



Fig. 1 The Nabucco West Pipeline

Source: Stratfor (2013). *The Nabucco West Project Comes to an End*, Stratfor, July 3rd, 2013, accessed 22 May 2015

In 2015, Romania has a project to develop a long-term energy strategy. The main achievement will be to strengthen its energy security, and in order to do that, Romania has to diversify import routes and supply sources and to modernize the energy infrastructure. The best procedure to accomplish its plan is through energy efficiency, but this can be difficult even for the well-governed countries, and Romania cannot enter in this category. There are slight chances for Romania to improve her energy efficiency because of low project implementation capacity and subsidized energy prices for residential users (Stratfor, March 13th 2015).

To conclude, the late events made Romania vulnerable in front of Russia, both military and related to energy. The instability in the region will push Romania closer and closer to the USA, bonding them together for further cooperation and projects. Nevertheless, Romania will also keep cold relations with Russia, but at the same time paying attention to not act in an improper way.

An interesting strategic plan had developed in the Central Europe in 2014 and had three main actors: Romania, Poland and USA. The two European countries are the biggest in Central and Eastern Europe, both share borders with Ukraine and both are dependent on Russia with regard to the energy. Furthermore, both are afraid of Russia's possible expansion in Europe due to the past century's history. So they thought that the best option is to strengthen their relationship and to create a coalition to protect themselves from the dangers that came with Russia's actions in Ukraine and Crimea. Romania finds itself in a strange position, having as neighbors an unstable Ukraine and a potentially explosive Moldova to its east and an unreliable Hungary to its west. The other countries in this part of Europe are not essential at this point for the coalition, but USA has an essential role in this plan because the countries need modern military equipment, anti-tank and mobile infantry and air defense. Unfortunately the strongest countries in the European Union kept the distance from the problem and tried to keep good relations with Russia due to their dependence and to the economic reasons related to energy, so for the European countries that feel at risk because of Russia, the only solution remains to rely on USA (Stratfor, June 3rd 2014).

In the following part of the paper, it will be described the relation between Romania and USA and the role Romania is playing in the Eastern part of Europe. Starting with 2005, Romania was taken into account when the United States developed a strategic plan in the East-Europe. In December 2005, Romania signed an agreement with the USA, permitting them to build in the country four military bases. The United States chose Romania for several reasons: it does not have borders with any country from where Russia could launch an attack, the position on the Black Sea constitutes an ideal projection point for efforts in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Middle East. This alliance with the United States guaranteed Romania an important, strategic position at the international level (Stratfor, December 23rd, 2005).

As mentioned above, in the last years Romania has been an important partner for the United States in Central and Eastern Europe, and both countries take advantages from this mutual cooperation. The USA know they can rely on Romania in the region, and Romania feels safer when knows that the United States are guaranteeing protection

in case of danger. Also, Romania and USA had negotiated to sign a key transit agreement as the United States draws down military operations in Afghanistan in 2013 (Stratfor, December 23rd, 2005), (Stratfor, October 18, 2013).

Romania's counterterrorism strategy

At the national level, the document National Strategy on Preventing and Countering Terrorism is providing the necessary information and its objectives are: identifying and permanently monitoring terrorist threats, protecting the national territory and the Romanian citizens, preventing terrorist cells from functioning in the territory of Romania, and participating in relevant international efforts. (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2015). On international level, Romania is cooperating with international organizations like the EU, the UN, NATO, OSCE, and the Council of Europe to facilitate the fight against terrorism, implementing their provisions. On bilateral and regional level, has signed more than 50 bilateral cooperation agreements with European states and states on the American continent in the field of counter-terrorism, fighting organized crime and drug trafficking, to ensure security in the Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Danube and Black Sea region.

The institutions responsible for the National strategy on preventing and combating terrorism are: The National Supreme Defense Council, having a strategic coordinative function, The Romanian Intelligence, fourteen ministries (The Ministry of Public Administration, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forests, The Ministry of National Defense, The Ministry of Waters and Environment Protection, The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, The Ministry of Public Finance, The Ministry of Industry and Resources, The Ministry of Public Information, The Ministry of European Integration, The Ministry of Interior, The Ministry of Justice, The Ministry of Public Works, Transports and Housing, The Ministry of Health and Family), The Foreign Intelligence Service; The Protection and Guard Service, The Special Telecommunications Service; Prosecutor's Office by the Supreme Court of Justice; The National Bank of Romania, the following national authorities: The National Agency for Strategic Exports Control and for the Chemical Weapons Ban (A.N.C.E.S.I.A.C.), The National Bureau for Preventing and Countering Money Laundering (O.N.P.C.S.B.C.), The National Commission for the Control of Nuclear Activities (C.N.C.A.N.) (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2015), (The Supreme Council for Country's Defence (2002).

Conclusion

Base on the research findings, it can be said that during the history, Romania has always been a small power between bigger ones, and its geography didn't help it to protect itself, but rather divided in four parts due to the Carpathian Mountains. However, its position in Europe made it an important actor at the international level, and nowadays,

the strategic partnership with the United States, NATO and the European Union helps Romania to remain significantly important in Eastern Europe.

Bibliography

- Buzan, B. (2007). *People, States and Fear*, ECPR Press.
- Central and Eastern Europe Weigh More Cooperation (2014), Stratfor, June 3rd 2014, accessed June 2nd 2015.
- Colin, G. (2007). *War, Peace and International Relations – An Introduction to Strategic History*, Abingdon and New York: Routledge..
- Hart, L., B. H. (1967). *Strategy* London: Faber & Faber, 1967. second rev. edition.
- Kennedy, Lawlor, Nelson, (1997). *Grand Strategy for Information Age National Security*, Air University Press, Maxwell Airforce Base, Alabama.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (2015). *Asymmetric Risks*, <http://www.mae.ro/en/node/2858>, accessed June 2nd 2015.
- Stone, M. (2009). *Security According to Buzan: A Comprehensive Security Analysis*, Columbia University, School of International and Public Affairs – New York, USA.
- Stratfor (2014). *Romania Reacts to the Ukraine Crisis*, Stratfor, May 9, 2014, accessed 22 May 2015.
- Stratfor (2005). *Romania, Washington's New Best Friend in Europe*, Stratfor, December 23rd, (2005), accessed June 2nd 2015.
- Stratfor (2015). *Romania's Energy Strategy and Petroleum Taxation, Lessons from Norway*, (2015) Stratfor, March 13th 2015, accessed 22 May 2015.
- Stratfor (2013). *The Nabucco West Project Comes to an End*, Stratfor, July 3rd, 2013, accessed 22 May 2015.
- Stratfor (2013). *U.S. Looks to Romania for Afghan Transit*, Stratfor, October 18, 2013, accessed June 2nd 2015.
- Stratfor (2014). *Ukraine, Iraq and a Black Sea Strategy*, Stratfor, September 2, 2014, accessed 22 May 2015.
- The Supreme Council for Country's Defence (2002). *The National Strategy On Preventing And Combating Terrorism*.<http://www.sri.ro/upload/combatingterrorism.pdf>, accessed June 2nd 2015.
- Winter, S. (2015) *From Sun Tzu to Liddell Hart*. <http://www.wizards.com/default.asp?x=ah/article/ah20031003a> accessed 22 May 2015