

THE GEOPOLITICAL CRISES MANAGEMENT AT THE END OF THE XXST CENTURY

Ioana Mihaela DINESCU*, Gabriel VALENTIN*

*The Mountain Training Base, Predeal, Romania

***Abstract:** The XXst century does not resemble to any other century that lapsed on our planet. It is unique. Its uniqueness consists of the coming into being and flashing disappearance of the greatest empires, the cycle development of the two world wars, the incredible and breathtaking technological progress, the highly improbable and always perfectible capacity of man to cross out life in all its forms of manifestation. It is the most revolutionary century both in good and bad aspects. The word 'crisis' is used on a regular basis. The dilemma to which the XXst century people will have to answer still persists: can crises be analyzed, administrated and managed with an efficiency permitting to the decision centre the taking of some coherent measures for the survival of the social system? Starting from this state of fact, the paper aims at presenting the dynamics and manifestation of the crises.*

***Key words:** management, crises, geopolitical.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The XXth century does not resemble at all with any other that went along our planet. It is unique.

This uniqueness can be noticed in the "sudden" apparition and flashing disappearance of the greatest empires, in the cyclic development of the two World Wars, in the incredible and stupefying technological leaps, in the incredible and almost unbelievable perfect human capacity to conquer life under all its form of manifestation.

It is the most revolutionary century and also the most prolific both in good and evil.

The Cold War was the moment "to breath", when there was believed that "the balance of terror" is enough to make wars disappear. If we are to analyze the critical situations that also this "calm" period faced, as well as the fragility of the balance that was created by the powers of the world, we can easily notice that how wrong we are and also for how many times the mankind depended upon simple happenings.

2. INTERPRETATIONS GIVEN TO THE GEOPOLITICAL CRISES

The international crisis represents a decisional stimuli, with definite properties that can produce reactions in an adequate measure, pre-determined reactions at the nation's, the organization's, the decision making factor's and the individual's level. For Holsti [5] an international crisis is "a non-anticipated threatening situation that has important values and a reduced time for decisions".

For Herman [4] the crisis is „a situation that threatens the objectives that have a high priority for the decision making unit, restraining the available time for an answer, before the situation is being modified and when it is produced and when it surprises the members of the decision making unit".

For Brecher [1] „a crisis is a situation characterized by four necessary and sufficient conditions, like the ones perceived by the decisional members at the maximum level of the other persons involved:

- a mutation in the internal or external environment;

- a threat of the basic values;
- a high involving probability in hostilities that mostly have a military character;
- for an answer to the value threatening”.

Lebow [6] states three properties belonging to an international crisis:

- the decidents’ perception regarding the fact that the actions of another international actor may affect the concrete national interests, the peace negotiator’s reputation or its own capacity of keeping the power;
- the decidents’ perception that, regardless the action meant to confront this threat (excluding surrendering) amplifies the probability of starting an armed conflict;
- the perception of acting upon the pressure of time.

When we talk about solutions we must take into consideration a complex of decisions, papers, tryouts, correlations, which act together for a difficulty, a problem, and in our case of a crisis.

In this case the solutions can be individualized only upon the capacity of the politic factor to process the relevant information, to conceive real objectives in order to take the necessary measures for the prevention of the unorganized processes.

3. NATIONAL SECURITY AND LACK OF SECURITY

Both conceptually and practically, the security problem will represent the subject of permanent reconsidering as long as the theoretical analysis is getting better. In the idealistic circuit we are operating with several meanings of the „national security” concept. [3]

This diversity can be explained through the major differences that still exist between the nations and their identical preoccupations (own defence, freedom, economical welfare and favourable worldwide order), and also through the result of the interaction of several factors like:

- the dynamics of the international system and the evolution of the aggression means of the nations;
- the characteristics of the internal situation particular for each nation;

- the geopolitical specialty of each nation;
- the possibility of conceiving a political security in aggressive or defensive ways;
- the theoretical perspective difference in the analysis, the conceiving and the practical presentation of the national security strategy;

Today we assist to a drastic diminishing of the preoccupation of the specialists towards the „national phenomenon” by introducing the fake idea of its absence from the contemporary history. The nations are not only absent from the history, but they also orientate the main regional and global evolutions.

From a systemic point of view, the security can be defined as a sum of actions and as a result of those actions in order to „maintain the on going of a national entity in certain limits that do not endanger its state or position as compared to other structures” [2].

The security refers to the equilibrium state of an „inter” and „intra” socio-organizational structure at the same level and with different gathering spheres, in a way in which there won’t be affected their fundamental objectives (the values), generally accepted, and their existence as entities and their reproductive possibilities [7].

From a political and military perspective, the security is being interpreted as an expression of the quality of the relations between the states, based upon the principles of the international right, the ethical principles of peace and peaceful coexistence, having as an essence the rejection of the force and of the force threat among the international relations, the insurance of the national integrity, of independence and of national sovereignty.

This systemic perspective is being insufficient because it ignores the aspects brought into our attention by the procedural analysis. That is the reason why “the security state” tends to become a multidimensional and plurivalent concept. There are taken into consideration several unlimited risks out of which we can enumerate: the economical and political lack of stability, the internal instability, the erosion of the cultural identity and the state’s answer towards these, answer that for most of the situations is not sufficient.

So, as a consequence, the content of the national security must include all the

fundamental dimensions of the human activities, optimally correlated at an internal and international level, so that to insure the prosperity and the satisfying of the existential needs in a socio-political and military environment that is not contradictory or helpful for the progress [3].

As for the problem of insecurity the already done studies have noticed a series of important aspects that have relevance for the solving of this problem, aspects that are being involved in the starting point of the crisis:

- the insecurity is a state of fact (national and international, an unidentifiable reality throughout the evaluation indicators of the already considered fact);
- the functioning way of the system of political relations and the manifestation of the political will of the persons governing us can also be destructive if it is not taking place for the peaceful solving of the differences and conflicts of any nature;
- the already existing alliance system (treaties and military blocks), of the military doctrines promoted by the large states of the world put pressure upon the international order and relations, becoming possible factors for the national lack of security.

The nations cannot find themselves in a state of security as long as the transnational processes are troubled.

4. THE CRISES MANIFESTATION

The new sources can manifest under different forms that become more and more complex, diversified and typical, coming from different fields of activity and diverse directions, making the process of prevention and solving even more difficult. Even more often now within these situations can we notice certain ethnical and territorial rivalry, the spreading of certain conflicts or most likely to become conflicts, both in the European space and on the other continents.

During the last few years, within the area of critical situations, we have witnessed several risk factors that tend to spread and that tend to become uncontrollable due to a lack of an intense cooperation at an international level, situation in which we could determine a

new era for the humankind, an era “without any frontiers”.

Among these risks we can enumerate the terrorism acts, drugs’ traffic, nuclear materials and components, the spreading of mass destruction weapons, the seizing of the vital resources’ delivery, misinformation, and informal aggressions and all its components, human being traffic, money washing, illegal immigration etc. All these risks can also transform themselves into crises.

We must take into consideration the fact that a multitude of risks and implicitly the diversity of the crises can show up and lead to questions that deserve all the attention. What kind of strategy should be adopted in the near future for the crises management? An offensive or a defensive one?

Against all the utopist thoughts, the military force remains a factor that can establish the order along the troubled times of the worldwide geopolitical context. It is important to understand that a war is a “chameleon” that changes into a particular situation from a certain period of the history of the state. It is also known that no war resembles another and that it is necessary to keep in mind the things the nation learnt from the previous one.

The European civilization, the Russian and the American one, separately from the Japanese one that do not share the same essential strategic interests in a totally different cultural context, must decide how to protect themselves against the military or non military threats coming from The IIIrd World, and especially from its own demographic pressure combined with the decolonizing and development’s collapse, with the Balcanic politics, with the intensification of the religious radical movement and with the short term possibility of spreading the mass destruction weapons.

5. CONCLUSIONS

For the solving of the problems we can see the possibility of two types of strategies.

The first strategy is that of “open gates”, through which the Occident allows the access for the Eastern immigrants, though selectively,

trying to homogenize the values of the ones who came from the European culture and civilization.

The measures taken and the initiatives towards the extension of the European Union and N.A.T.O. are conclusive as well [3].

Through this attempt we must notice a series of extremely important aspects of the European demographical configuration:

- the occidental countries are facing a strong demographical crisis and there are no clues for an improvement of the birth rate without a series of measures that do not come in contradiction with the field of individual liberty;

- both the East, an immigrants' supplier, and Russia, find themselves in a deep demographical crisis. Moreover, Russia is facing the most rapid growth of the population having a Mongolo-Turkish origin as compared to the Slavic one;

- the Islamic population, untouchable from the point of view of their politico-religious identity, is not being assimilated by the European culture not even if, *ab absurdo*, it would give up its own values and it would transform itself in a "multicultural civilization";

- the existence of a mechanism that can ensure the immigration control and the selection of the most valuable subjects towards their integration in the European values' circuit. Towards such a situation, such a mechanism seems impossible to exist in the Occident.

The second strategy might be the adoption of the "the Byzantine strategy", meaning the closure of the gates towards the Occident. Through the acceptance of such a strategy we can notice a series of risks and lacks from which we mention the most important ones:

- the closure strategy would not bring the cancellation of the decline and the crises, but only their delay;

- the decline, the crisis and the decay may become insensitive if there are not taken the measures to improve the demographical situation from the Occidental countries;

- the maintenance of the technological superiority with the price of aggravating the economical conditions from the countries of the IIIrd World will not eliminate the spreading sources of the terrorism or of the regional conflicts;

- this considerably enlarges the importance of the diplomatic approaches that are orientated towards the scission of the possible opponents with the purpose of avoiding their alliances of the Occident;

As to sum up the procedural character of the social existence determines the types of critical situations to be modified. If the existential pressures keep changing the decisional centers can enter in a critical situation if they do not seize the new threats in due time.

The new situations can become useful but only in new types of solutions; the decision making factors can start critical situations if they remain to the old ways of interfering. [3]

In the globalizing conditions, as a natural process, trying a new part of the world in order to keep the other one under control is an old fashioned situation, a colonial scheme.

REFERENCES

1. Brecher, M., *Studies in Crisis Behavior* Special Issue the Jerusalem of International Relations, 1978;
2. Culda, L., *Devenirea oamenilor în procesualitatea socială*, Editura Licorna, București, 1997;
3. Dinescu, I.M., s.a., *Geopolitical crises management—dynamics and manifestation*, International Scientific Conference „Management - Theory, Education and Practise 2008”, Liptovsky Mikulas, Slovakia, 2008;
4. Herman, C.F., *Crisis In Foreign Policy. A Simulation Analysis*, Indianapolis, 1969;
5. Holsti, O.R., *Crisis, Escalation, War*, Montreal.
6. Lebow, R., *Between Peace and War the Nature*, Baltimore, 1981;
7. Nicolaescu, Gh., *Gestionarea crizelor politico – militare*, Editura Top Form, București, 2003.