



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2013  
Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

## **RISKS AND THREATS RECOGNIZED IN THE SECURITY ENVIRONMENT**

**DĂNILĂ Valentin-Bogdan**

PhD Candidate, National Intelligence Academy "Mihai Viteazul", Bucharest, Romania

### **Abstract:**

*Since the terrorist attacks have not ceased being a problem on the agenda of South - Eastern Europe countries, and also for large organizations / international actors, the security strategies / policies in the region continue to sustain further changes so as to ensure public safety, first of all.*

*Thus, starting from the situations where the lack of information led to significant losses as a result of not taking optimal decisions, through this paper are returned to the forefront the intelligence services and information needs.*

*Significant in this respect are intelligence key-elements on economic, political and military situation issues that are reflected in security initiatives or doctrines.*

*Prior to obtaining informations, there has been a long process of cooperation between states, ie - a configuration of information communities, together with setting information leaders.*

*Specifically, at the base of the relations between the countries in South - Eastern Europe there are common objectives, such the capabilities and intentions of potential enemies / competitors.*

**Keywords:** *security environment, global stability, risks and threats, Homeland Security, geopolitical changes*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Unsettling and unpredictable, the new security environment requires a specific and determined approach regarding the new asymmetric border threats and risks. During the Cold War and beyond the collapse of the Soviet Union, the issue of threats was dealt from a national perspective, focusing on the dangers of known enemies, definitively identified, even on transnational issues - terrorism, organized crime, proliferation, drug trafficking - were approached from the national perspective. This vision guided the great powers national security policy towards actions designed to influence the behaviour and attitude of other states through intimidation, measures, economic

sanctions, military assistance, etc., with emphasis on the military power, as a guarantee for national security. Currently, this approach in terms of homeland threats remains necessary, but not sufficient, as they can't cover the full spectrum of threats.

The fact that the present security environment is characterized by high instability, unpredictability, - as a manifestation of risks and threats, particularly asymmetric ones, of redefining the relations between the great powers and of the growing freedom of action of the regional actors, set and unset - has already become a common topic in the specialized studies. The recent extension of asymmetric threats can generate insecurity spirals unpredictable for the contemporary international relations. It

manifests strongly the temptation and tendency of some actors (state or non-state) to overcome their inferior hierarchical rank in the system with military, economic, political, ideological or religious weapons. The concepts, capacity and volitional characteristic of their actions may cause some internal and external developments with profound reflections on the near or distant security environment.

## **2. EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGIES**

Several key factors were identified as those influencing this process: Eastern European policies aimed at integration into Western organizations, a set of conditions imposed by these institutions and the communist legacy, in addition to traditional models of civilian-military relations in those societies.

On the other hand, Western countries, who want to meet this challenge, but also to realize "the design of stability" in neighboring regions and - sometimes - guided by a sense of duty to reunify Europe, have defined specific criteria for the institutions membership at an European and Euro-Atlantic level.

Revising the existing national defense concepts - or in force - in South-Eastern Europe, where large nations, medium and small states, try to coexist and cooperate is difficult.

Countries that make up South Eastern Europe, most of them sources of culture and civilization, cover differently certain portions of this area, each one with some specific features that we commonly call:

- i. The Wider Black Sea Region with the Asian area;
- ii. The Balkan region composed of the Western Balkans, Eastern Balkans and the complementary area, Bulgaria and Romania;
- iii. The South-East European maritime region.

The distribution is heterogeneous, some states ( parts of states) in south - eastern Europe are part of one, two or more regions.

Wide security risks increased in parallel with the broadening definition of security.

A feature of the international system in the restructuring process is the simultaneous presence of traditional security risks and new threats that often take a form and aim at a global scope. New types of challenges and threats are more numerous, less transparent and forward-looking.

A typical trend is represented by the vague line between external and internal risk factors. Risk factors are manifested both at a global, regional, and national level, in general not separately, but simultaneously, mutually reinforcing.

New challenges can be met effectively through cooperation with international organizations and institutions and other forms of cooperation.

The chain of events and changes in south-eastern Europe during the 90's led to political responses, political approaches and long-term strategies sophisticated enough for the region as part of Europe.

The experience of the four wars that took place in recent years in the South-Eastern Europe led to rethinking and improving the strategic principles and instruments of the European Union for South Eastern Europe.

The largest and most dangerous instabilities in international relations are typical for transition periods between old and new structures of the international system at different levels. In these circumstances, even the smallest changes can cause strong reactions of transforming the initial conditions.

The approach between security policies applied not only in South-Eastern and Central Europe to the U.S. ones, integrated in the Homeland Security concept continues to be realized gradually, given the common goals of removing threats from non-state actors, leading to the proliferation of such phenomena as the ones mentioned above.

The challenges of the contemporary world, although different in nature, have in common the fact that they challenge the



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2013

Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

capacity of security institutions to meeting them.

The new security and stability architecture was and is shaped by the values and standards of democracy, freedoms and human rights, the rule of law and market economy, in order to ensure the global, regional and zonal stability.

Within the global social system occurs, through this movement, a resetting of interests and thus, of forms and means of achieving them, correlated with changes / mutations in the fields of technology, social, economics, politics and mind.

Being one of the main threats to human society and the world states, after more than a decade of the sinister event in the United States, international terrorism continues to be a very serious threat both to the structure and social cohesion, and also to the security of European states, which were not immune to this kind of danger.[1]

Thus, changes affecting the international security environment have resulted in clarifying a vision of the international community aimed at strengthening global peace and security and hence on reducing the conflicting tensions of all kinds and causes generating major international disputes.

### 3. HOMELAND SECURITY – AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVES

While for the U.S. developing the concept of Homeland Security means engaging in a comprehensive reorganization process of the national security system, for the European countries, implementing and developing the same concept is realized within the existing institutional framework and

regards countering terrorism and other types of hazards and security threats. Overall, the core of the European approach on societal security is homeland security, ie protection of citizens.

The european definition of terrorism, in Article 1 of the *Framework Decision on combating terrorism (2002)*, provides that terrorist offenses are those actions, criminal in nature, included in a list of serious crimes against persons and property, which "produce a country or an international organization, some damage, in order: to intimidate the population, to force unjustified government or international organization to do or not in some way, to destabilize or destroy their fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures".[2]

The list includes nine crimes: attacks on a person's life which may cause death, physical attacks on a person, kidnapping or hostage taking, producing severe damage to government or public facility, a transport system, an infrastructure facility, including an information system, a fixed platform located on the continental shelf, a public place or private property, damages that may endanger human life or cause major economic losses, seizure of aircraft, ship or other persons or property transports; production, possession, acquisition, transport, supply or use of weapons, explosives or NBC weapons, also the biological weapons research and development, chemical and nuclear, spills of dangerous substances or fire, floods or explosions with effects that endanger human lives, interfering with / destroying water supplies, electricity networks and vital natural resources, with effects that endanger human lives, threat with producing any of the actions listed above.

EU, which now assumes the position of "global partner", began since 2003 conducting

civilian, police and military forces in areas of crisis and conflict.[3] Thus, in this period, Member States have conducted over 9,500 people in 19 operations, of which 10 are continued to the present (EUFOR-Althea, EUPM, EU Planning Team Kosovo, EUPOL COPPS, EUBAM Rafah, EUJUST Lex, EUPOL Afghanistan, EUPOL RD Congo, EUSEC DR Congo, Darfur).

According to the European Security Strategy, these operations are tools to achieving strategic objectives of the organization, in order to develop a strategic culture that promotes an early, rapid intervention, and when necessary, intensive.[4]

Thus, similar to the American vision, staff development beyond the organization's members is one of the most important ways to achieve security in the Union, protect its interests.

Unlike the U.S. case, the European budget instrument for achieving "the security in the space of interest" is more difficult to identify. Up to and including 2006, the European budget was divided into eight chapters, as follows: agriculture, structural operations, internal policies, external action, administration, reserves, pre-adhering strategy, compensations.

At an international level, there are opinions that Europeans have not urged the application of the law enforcement tools to strengthen the "security in the area of interest." [5] Meanwhile, other analysts say that European governments strategy in terms of homeland security lies in the integration of counter-terrorism strategies in existing efforts to manage crises and emergencies, so as to give greater flexibility in responding to the challenges to security.

On the other hand, the U.S. continues to play a role in both the security of the European continent, despite the crisis related to the intervention in Iraq and the fight against terrorism. U.S. strategy for Europe has its traditional content of military defense, but also a strong intelligence component. The U.S. has the *Linked Operational Intelligence Centers Europe (LOCE)* system, which provides strategic and tactical informations for

the NATO troops. The original system, exclusively American, called *Operational Capability Europe Limited*, which didn't reveal its specific intelligence as its current name which, has kept the acronym LOCE. Balkan wars turned LOCE from a military safe and effective communication network in an intelligence model, essential for Joint Deployable Intelligence Support Systems (JDISS), a common base of informations in NATO.

A common European intelligence policy is not only necessary but also indispensable, Alessandro Politi assessed in a study for the Institute for Security Studies in Paris. This enthusiastic assessment should be seen more as signaling a normal course for the principles of European construction, but which often contradicts with the reality. While we hope for a common European policy on intelligence, we must acknowledge the persistence of autarchic traditions, especially in services with a long history.

A common security policy, in the countries of South - Eastern Europe involves a common perception of risks, implicitly a common approach on threats. Modern activity will thus be necessary for the precise application of these common European policies, this time in the security field.

Intelligence cooperation is indeed a matter of high confidentiality in a scene where shadows matter as much as light. People involved in that business will certainly not expose the nature, the purpose, the scope, the channels and the depth of their cooperation. To such opacity, one has to add the very nature of what is at stake. It is about using the means offered by international cooperation for exchanging very sensitive information in order to identify, deter, prevent and act against terrorism. In that sense international intelligence cooperation for protecting the nation, the homeland, is about linking the local to the global.[6]

To some degree, the fusion process involves every level and sector (discipline) of government, the private-sector, and the public. The level of involvement from these participants will vary based on specific circumstances. Some disciplines, such as law



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2013  
Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

enforcement, represent a core component of the fusion process because of the relationship between crime and because, in many cases, law enforcement authorities are best-suited to coordinate statewide and local fusion efforts. Minimally, the fusion process should be organized and coordinated on a statewide level and each State should establish and maintain an analytic center to facilitate the fusion process.

The public should be engaged through public education programs that describe what they should look for and what to do if they observe suspicious activities or circumstances.

Efforts should be organized and managed on a geographic basis and scalable so adjustments can be made based on changes in the operating and/or threat environment. While national standards and guidelines should guide the institutionalization of the process, the actual technological infrastructure and operational protocols used by individual jurisdictions should be based on the management structure, specific needs, and capabilities of each individual jurisdiction.[7]

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Systemic nature of the principal risks and instabilities caused by structural causes, legacies of the past, ethnic and religious diversity of the area, heterogeneous social content and low political culture, also the policies of particular states requiring a complex system of interrelated strategies in the European Union with a sophisticated implementation management.

The problem of transforming the national armed forces is a subject on the agenda of almost every European country, whether belonging to the European Union or

NATO or not yet a member of any one of the two.

In the past 20 years, major geopolitical changes in Europe and new perceptions as failed states and terrorism within the military field have caused a shift from traditional homeland defense tasks to peacekeeping operations, crisis management and networking security.

According to the presentations on the complexity of European, it concludes that the countries of South Eastern Europe are a favorable environment for active cooperation in intelligence between several states. Also, to achieve its ambitious goals, the EU needs a modern and efficient intelligence activity.

Also, the countries in South Eastern Europe could learn many more lessons in reforming the security sector.

But this harmonizing process can not generate unifying solutions required for transforming armed forces in South - Eastern Europe, which are not taken into account in particular as various economic opportunities and social conditions in each Balkan country.

Conceptual and also functional, national defense and security, the North Atlantic and European area security and defense, in general, but also in terms of the specific case of Romania, in particular, are influenced by the geopolitical and geostrategic changes produced in the international environment, in fact, in the global environment.

The European security system is facing recently times the same major problems that characterize the evolution of European integration: extending and deepening of the European project. Meanwhile, the impact of external factors, mostly related to globalization, is more intense and complex.

European security is an indivisible phenomenon, and thus also the European security system is more uniform, and ceased to be a purely military problem and witnesses a lot of implications or economic, social, environmental, informational, cultural, religious aspects.

#### REFERENCES

1. Sarchinschi, A., *Security area of interest: actors, tools and trends*, Bucharest, University of National Defense "Carol I" (2007).
2. Andreescu, A., Radu, N., *Terrorist organizations*, Bucharest, Artprint Publishing House, 2007.
3. Alexandrescu, G., *Security threats in the environment*, in Mosoflei, C., Dolghin, N., (eds), *Defence and Security Studies*, vol I, Bucharest, National Defense University Press, 2005,
4. Gijs de Vries, speech delivered in the Europe Subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations House of Representatives, Washington DC, September 14, 2004 – *European Union, A Secure Europe in A Better World*.
5. Archick, K., (eds), *European Approaches to Homeland Security and Counterterrorism*, CRS report for Congress, 2006.
6. Boyer, Y., *Intelligence Cooperation and Homeland Security*, Esther Brimmer Publishing House, 2006.
7. US Department for Homeland Security, 2005.