

R zvan Ion N. CHITESCU

Valahia University, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Târgovi te, Romania

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: SECURITY STRUCTURES IN CONFLICTS FROM THE FORMER SOVIET SPACE

Literature
review

Keywords

Information management
Conflict Management

JEL classification

H12

Abstract

The exit from the Soviet sphere of influence begets serious political, diplomatic, social, financial, economic, technical and technological, religious, information, judicial, ecological, military changes in newly-established states. Therefore, the new geopolitical area in which they evolve faces the security requirements of the community with a set of highly complex issues generated by vulnerabilities such as competition for resources, ethnic and religious rivalries, border transparency, the populations' mistrust in the judicial system of their own countries, in the economic system, in armed forces, corruption, organized crime, weapons and drugs trafficking, ecologic problems, migrations. In this world relatively accustomed with the new risks and vulnerabilities, the appearance of conflicts is unavoidable, and the issue of crisis and conflict management is a permanent concern for authorities in charge of security.

Introduction

Security is an essential issue of human society which can be conceptualized as an absence of threats to acquired values and as an absence of fear that such values will be attacked (Wolfers, 1962). The world-scale changes that occurred within the last two decades, linear and predictable or of strategic discontinuity, have brought about changes in the concept of security, by acquiring a more flexible, multidimensional meaning (Buzan, 1991; Walt, 1991; Krause&Williams, 1997). Consequently, we can speak about a military, political, economic, societal and environmental security. These changes require a new approach in the management of local, regional and international crises and conflicts. The change of the paradigm of the security concept was also accompanied by changes in the conflict from the point of view of the generating factors - if the majority of conflicts from the beginning of the '90s had an ethnic cause (Coackley, 1993 ; Wolff, 2006), the new conflicts are the result of a corroboration of several factors among which the most important are insecurity, inequality, private interests and perceptions (Brzezinski, 1994; Buzan et al., 1998) which distinguishes them in nature, scope, duration and impact on the population.

In this context of searches for post-hegemonic security, security organizations/structures have become strong partners for countries and alliances in the coordination of actions and political, economic, social, military and cultural cooperation.

Conflict management- integrated crisis management systems

Conflicts can occur at any time, being unavoidable in a complex, dynamic and conflicting society. Conflicts are multidimensional being triggered by several interdependent factors. In this

context, security has become a primarily global issue, seeing that several local issues have major international consequences. The way they are perceived by the international community has led to transformations in the field of crisis management which implies the identification of risks, current or potential sources of crisis, monitoring the situation, formulating lines of action, implementing them and the return to normality, as well as non-coercive or coercive measures. For this purpose, instruments of analysis and of action are created that rally these three distinct approaches in conflict management: *early warning research achieved by instruments such as mapping*, as a method of analysis and prognosis of conflicts, *the participative research*, as a method of analysis and intervention in conflicts, and *development of the community*, as a method of intervention especially for preventing conflicting situations), the theory of conflicts - the stabilization of conflicts, the regulation or transformation of crisis or conflicting situations in satisfactory or less destructive situations for the parties involved or affected by them (Reimann, 2004) and studies on peace identified by crisis and conflict prevention strategies, peace-keeping, reconciliation and consolidation of the peace process.

The aim of conflict management aimed at national and common, regional or global values and interests is (Tulic , 2009):

1. to know the factors and mechanisms that trigger conflicts;
2. to identify the specific characteristics of potential actors involved in conflicts;
3. to stabilize the conflicts by concluding agreements between the conflicting parties, for ending violence and hostilities of any kind;
4. to draw up strategies that remove the elements of direct violence from conflicts;
5. the fundamental transformation of relationships between conflicting players, to arrive at a positive solution.
6. to formulate strategies that consolidate regional or global peace.

A management system for crisis situations is developed for this purpose which contains the following stages (Tulic , 2009):

- the prevision or forecast, with the role of anticipating the crisis-generating risks and threats and formulating an action plan in this sense;
- the organization – the process of allocation and establishment of objectives and resources for crisis management;
- the order (management) that establishes the decision authority for the management of the respective phenomenon - the decision is closely connected to the ordering and consists of adopting, transmitting, applying and undertaking responsibilities of the action plan;
- the coordination as an activity of harmonization and insurance of the execution of all activities according to the implemented action plan, with coercive and remedying interventions;
- operational and very rarely, post-operational estimative control.

The regional decision-maker has the main role in the management of security crises, in the context of appearance of new types of threats that are mutually inter-conditioned, whose intensity is amplified and whose character is internationalized, triggered in an operational action system based on international cooperation. Therefore, the management of crisis or conflicting situations requires the capacity to act in the same space, together with other participants, even if they are significantly different in terms of capacities.

After the end of the Cold War, when the conflicts became 90% intrastate conflicts, unlike the previous period when these were mainly interstate conflicts (Wallenstein, 2007), new trends appeared that affect the crisis management process, such as:

1. the extension of the globalization process;
2. the creation of regional economic blocks;

3. the transformation of interstate conflicts in intrastate conflicts;
4. civilians become the target of aggressions and violence;
5. the launching of ethnic, religious and cultural purification actions;
6. the appearance of coercive diplomacy to stop or limit the effects caused by humanity crises.

Conflicts are opportunities to find new solutions to certain problems and to stimulate human creativity (Mufloz, 2004 as cited in Ghica & Zulean 2007), so that the traditional conflict management system which involves bipolarity, UN missions of crisis management, regional cooperation creates new directions in crisis and conflict management, such as: *preventive diplomacy* implemented by 1) measures for creating an atmosphere of reliability; 2) creating and developing information and prognosis networks; 3) establishing missions for establishing deeds; 4) preventive display of forces; and 5) creation of demilitarized areas (UN report *An agenda for peace*, 1992); *peace preservation missions* redefined as „multidimensional operations“, “second-generation peace-maintenance operations”, “comprehensive peace-maintenance” or “second-generation multinational forces” (Hansen *et al.*, 2004); *promotion of the peace-building process* with consequences, preventive actions and conflict resolution actions; *sustainable human security* defined as a main instrument for a stable security in all the seven sectors by the United National Development Programme (PNUD, 1994); *the responsibility to protect* with three components - the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to reconstruct (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001); *an increasingly important role of the civil sector*, in particular a higher involvement of the civil sector in the peace-building actions (Hansen *et al.*, 2004).

Security structures/organizations

The structural and essential changes since the end of the Cold War have triggered a series of serious changes in the international political environment in terms of the meaning of the concept of security and of the model of action used for this purpose. The following objectives were proposed for maintaining security (Sarcinschi&Dinu, 2000

- to protect every state against external aggressions;
- to supply means to protect the rights of minorities and ethnic groups within their countries;
- to create a mechanism for resolution of regional conflicts without the unilateral intervention of great powers;
- the commitment of great powers to military support conflicts between other nations or between political groups from the same nation;
- to increase the technical and financial support flow in developing countries, with the purpose of accelerating the process of economic and social transition;
- to preserve the global environment as a base for sustained development.

The fulfilment of these objectives is guaranteed by the activity of international organizations, super-powers, major powers and, only occasionally, by smaller powers (Wilkenfeld&Brecher, 1984). The most important international organizations are:

1. **The United Nations (UN)**-a universal political organization founded in 1945, with 193 member countries whose main objectives are: *to maintain international peace and security* (art.1 a. to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; b. adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace, by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law); *to achieve international cooperation in the economic and social field; to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms*

for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

The UN Charter stipulates that the main method for settlement of any disputes is political dialogue. In inter-state and intra-state relations, this is the most operational and effective means for settlement of any conflicting issues. For this purpose, a series of resolutions were formulated, such as the Manila Declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes" (UN: General Assembly, 1982), "Declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes and conflicting situations (UN: General Assembly, 1988), "Peace-keeping, security and international cooperation" (UN: General Assembly, 1989). International Crisis Behaviour Project underlines the fact that UN acted particularly in the situations in which negotiation or armed intervention were used as instruments for the management of such crisis and that UN actions normally culminated with the conclusion of agreements (treaties, truce, agreements to end hostilities).

The UN Conflict Management System implies the deployment of the following strategies:

1. conflict prevention – to avoid the escalation of the conflict (the peaceful management of conflicts, before a possible violent escalation);
2. peacekeeping – by missions of monitoring, interposition and active maintenance of a third party (military or police forces) in the conflict area (stopping the outburst of new violent conflicts and creating the levers for dialogue between the actors involved in the conflict to know the sources of the conflict);
3. reconciliation – facilitating, mediating a dialogue between the actors involved between which there is an incompatibility of interests and addresses in particular political-diplomatic structures;
4. consolidation of the peacekeeping operations – by deploying programmes of financial, social, political, military support

and creation of new institutions for removing the root causes of conflicts.

2. **The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)** fulfils the role of political-military organization for collective security and defence which contributes to the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic and global space by military actions and other crisis management actions, on its own behalf or on behalf of the UN, or in collaboration with other international security bodies.

3. **The European Union (EU)** is the most important organization at European level, which, due to its geo-economic and geopolitical implications has become a fundamental actor on the international stage in compliance with its objective of *establishing itself on the international stage by implementing external and common security policies, including the definition in time of a defence policy, that might lead, at the appropriate time, to a common defence* (the Maastricht Treaty, completed by the Amsterdam Treaty). One of the main concepts of this organization is the concept of democratic security, an integrating concept that underlines the existing relations between the need to create a European security space and the imperative need to consolidate the entire set of democratic values underlying the European integration process: political pluralism, the rule of law the respect for human rights (C t linoiu, 2011). At the level of the European Union, many structures in charge of the development of security and defence by developing its civil and military capacities for crisis management and conflict prevention at international level were established.

In the '90s, the concept of crisis management was included in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the European Union. The aim of the European Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) is to ensure the necessary instruments and means to intervene for settling an armed conflict and for peace-building in areas affected by the

combination of military with non-military actions, so that they offer Member States political and financial support for all stages and forms of a crisis situation. 9 Strategic Groups of Combat were established as strategic terrestrial structures strategically backed by air and maritime forces. In 2001, the Union of Prevention of Conflicts in the European Union was established (European Commission, 2001).

4. **The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)** with 57 states from Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia and North America is the largest regional security organization in the world. It has a Conflict Prevention Centre, a High Commissioner on National Minorities with missions of monitoring and structural intervention in areas with high potential of political instability. This aims to: consolidate common values and assist Member States in establishing a democratic society based on the rule of state; to prevent local conflicts, to restore peace in areas of conflict, to remove real and observable security deficits; to avoid the creation of new political, economic or social divisions, by promoting a security system based on cooperation, being considered the most advanced organization in terms of preventive diplomacy is OSCE (Ackermann, 2003). These objectives are derived from the Charter for European Security as follows „8. *Every participating state has an equal right to security. We reaffirm the inherent right of each security participant and every participating State to be free to choose or change its security arrangements, including treaties of alliance, as they evolve. Each state also has the right to neutrality. Each participating State will respect the rights of all others in these regards. They will not strengthen their security at the expense of the security of other states. [...]*

9. *We will build our relations in conformity with the concept of common and comprehensive security, guided by equal partnership, solidarity and transparency. The security of each participating State is*

inseparably linked to that of all others. We will address the human, economic, political and military dimensions of security as an integral whole.”

The interconnected and cross-border nature of crisis require the harmonization of national security strategies with those of other Member States by means of strategic alliances and the development of cooperation in crisis management. Therefore, a series of regional organizations were created, the Organization of American States (OAS), the League of Arab States, the European Communities, the Association of Asian Nations, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and research institutions (including participating) such as the Centre for Conflict Resolution from University of Bradford (United Kingdom), African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (South Africa), International Peace Academy in New York, Peace and Conflicts Institute University of Granada (Spain), Peace Research Institute of Oslo and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute with this mission.

Conflicts in the former Soviet space

The new European architecture, highly influenced by the new dynamic of regional and international conflicts, amplifies aspects of insecurity that lead to the proliferation of new threats, crises and conflicts. The classical reasons for conflict (competition for resources, dismemberment of states, ethnic and religious rivalries) were doubled by sources of instability characteristic of transition (corruption, organized crime, weapons and drugs trafficking, border vulnerability, ecologic problems). Since it was impossible to limit their consequences to a single national level, they were experienced, by implications, both at regional level and at global level.

The geopolitical and economic situation of the former Soviet space, in the context of the major trends governing new global evolutions, is oscillating, by promoting the appearance of phenomena specific to an era focussed on the expansion and consolidation of freedom and democracy. No other international power, except for USSR, disintegrated so fast without losing a war (Kissinger, 2007). The fragmentation of the states in parallel with the multiplication of forms and the growth of the intervention of non-state actors in their evolution, the efforts aimed at owning and using economic resources, cultural and environmental issues are characteristic of an instable environment in the sphere of security translated by various social, political and economic concerns. The creation and establishment of a new regional balance underlines the convergence of the efforts of the Euro-Atlantic community in the use of the most effective instruments of action and methods of prevention or ignition of crisis situations and conflicts in the area.

The different history of conflicts, the actors involved and the speculative capacity to exploit the opportunities of the new geopolitical and economic context were responsible for a different approach to the main security issues generated in the former Soviet space. However, this space is not currently threatened by classical conflicts, but faces a series of asymmetrical threats (asymmetry - characteristic of periods of rapid changes, of revolutionary transformations, transformations which implicitly caused the change of the geopolitical and geostrategic map of the world and of continents and that decisively influenced the military phenomenon), hard to predict and difficult to solve. Therefore, the fragility of states and systems is the result of institutional disorganization, border transparency, corruption at a high level, civil conflicts, strengthening the positions of organized crime - the trafficking of drugs, of human beings and of weapons.

Along with the previously mentioned are the tendencies of reviving the influence of states from the region, the growth of anarchic tendencies in certain territories, the possibility of intervention of some foreign security structures in the affairs of a state.

The role of international organization was visible in this space, primarily in the management of the “frozen conflict” in Transnistria as well as the conflict in Ukraine. The conflict in Transnistria is neither inter-ethnic nor domestic. It is a geopolitical conflict by which Russia wants to keep the Republic of Moldova under its control and, therefore, not allow the extension of NATO, the consolidation of GUAM. Several institutions are involved in the resolution of this conflict, especially in the conflict and post-conflict negotiations, namely the European Union, The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (APCE), the United National Organization, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), as well as the High Commissioner on National Minorities. One of the main aspects of this involvement was materialized in significant agreements of cooperation entered into between EU and the Republic of Moldova, such as the Memorandum of Understanding regarding the European Union border assistance mission to Moldova and Ukraine for stopping the illegal trafficking of weapons, drugs, human beings (2005), within the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and of establishment of the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM), and in 2002 the common declaration signed by the President George W. Bush and the president Vladimir Voronin on the Moldovan-American relations which emphasizes *“the determination to bring the Transnistrian separatist conflict to a peaceful resolution”*. Another dimension is the clear definition of the roles of players in the negotiations for the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict held in Odessa in

2005 where EU and USA were accepted as observers, Russia, Ukraine and OSCE were declared mediators, and the Republic of Moldova and “The Moldovan Nistrean Republic“ the conflicting parties. This is a positive practice in the settlement of this “frozen” conflict.

Ukraine’s major geostrategic position in the Euro-Atlantic community due to the fact that it ensures the transit of the Russian gas to European consumers and the access to the Black Sea gives it an important role in Moscow’s strategies and those of the European Union. On the other hand, a stable and democratic Ukraine, a real factor of regional stability to the East of the Euro-Atlantic space, makes it a NATO model of peaceful development for Southwest Asia, an area with severe ethnic and religious turbulence, with silent or visible conflicts. In the context of growth of the competition for energetic resources, a lot of pressure is exerted on the Ukrainian state by NATO and EU. The recent conflict between Moscow and Kiev is an energetic conflict with profound ramifications (Georgia purchased 7 Buk-M1 anti-aircraft missile systems, 200 STRELA and IGLA anti-aircraft missile systems, T-72 tanks and Grad missile launchers from the Ukrainians *“chosen with the help of American experts”* and used on August 8, 2008 in the offensive against the capital of South Ossetia)) and an impact on several European countries. In these conditions, the involvement of international organizations differs more from the conflict in Transnistria. Therefore, in 1997 in Madrid, the agreement regarding a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine was signed, and EU and other forms of regional and international organization are fully open to new ways of cooperation and dialogue with the Ukraine.

Conclusions

The beneficial reconfiguration of regional geostrategic balances enhances the influence of international security organizations. The realities of the political, economic and military-strategic context from European states that have recently emerged from the sphere of interest of Moscow redefine the continental and regional relations, with a direct impact on European as well as international security. Therefore, new cooperation systems emerge which are based on mutual constraints, have stability, cooperation, prosperity and freedom.

Bibliography

- [1] Akermann, A. (2003). The Prevention of Armed Conflicts as an Emerging Norm in International Conflict Management: The OSCE and the UN as Norm Leaders, *Peace and Conflicts Studies*, 10, (1), pp.1-14.
- [2] Buzan, B., Waever, O. & de Wilde, J. (1988). *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*, Rienner, Londra.
- [3] Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-ColdWar era*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- [4] Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Basic Books.
- [5] Coackley, J. (1993). Approaches to the Resolution of Ethnic Conflict: The Strategy of Non-territorial Autonomy *International Political Science Review July 1994 vol. 15*, (3) pp.297-314.
- [6] Ghica, L. A. & Zulean, M. (coord.) (2007). *Politica de securitate na ional . Concepte, institu ii, procese (National security policy. Concepts, institutions and processes)*. Polirom, Ia i.
- [7] Hansen, W., Ramsbotham, O. & Woodhouse, T (2004). Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution. In A. Austin, M. Fischer, N. Ropers (Eds.) *Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict*. (pp 295-319). Berghoff Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- [8] Kissinger, H. (2007) *Diploma ia(Diplomacy)*, Ed. Bic All, Bucure ti.
- [9] Krause, K. & Williams, M. (eds.) (1997), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and cases*, UCL Press, London.
- [10] Reimann, C. (2004). Assessing the State-of-the-Art in Conflict Transformation In A. Austin, M. Fischer, N. Ropers (Eds.) *Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict*. (pp. 41-66) Berghoff Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management
- [11] Sarcinschi, Dinu, M. *Crize i instabilitate în Europa(Crisis and instability in Europe)*, Universitatea Na ional de Ap rare, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Ap rare i Securitate Retrieved from cssas.unap.ro/ro/pdf_studii/crize_si_instabilitate_in_europa.pdf
- [12] Tulic , M. (2009). *Analiza crizelor politico-militare în contextul geopolitic actual (Analysis of political and military crisis in the current geopolitical context)*, CURS 2, Ia i
- [13] Wallensteen, P. (2007). *Understanding Conflict Resolution:War, Peace and the Global System* SAGE.
- [14] Walt, S. M. (1991). The Renaissance of Security Studies, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, (2) pp. 211-239
- [15] Waltz, K. (2006). *Teoria Politicii Interna ionale (Theory of international politics)*, Editura Polirom, Bucure ti.
- [16] Wilkenfield J & Brecher M (1984). International crisis, 1945–1975: the UN Dimension. *International Studies Quarterly*, 28 (1) pp. 45–67.
- [17] Wolff, S. (2006). *Ethnic Conflict :A Global Perspective* Oxford University Press.
- [18] Wolfers, A. (1952). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, (4), pp. 481-502.
- [19] <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>
- [20] <http://www.ziua.ro/news.php?data=2008-10-02&id=13762>
- [21] cssas.unap.ro
- [22] <http://www.e-democracy.md/monitoring/politics/comments/20030212/>
- [23] <http://mpnewyork.mae.ro>
- [24] <http://www.un.org/>
- [25] <http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/index.htm>
- [26] <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2621945>
- [27] The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) <http://www.nato.int/>
- [28] Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe <http://www.osce.org/>
- [29] United Nations – UN <http://www.un.org/>
- [30] Common Security and Defence Policy of the EU: <http://ue.eu.int/pesc/pres.asp?lang=en#TOP?lang=en>
- [31] Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe – OSCE: <http://www.osce.org/publications/handbook/index.php>

- [32] United Nations – UN:
<http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/index.html>
- [33] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty,
2001:<http://www.idrc.ca/EN/Resources/Publications/Pages/IDRCBookDetails.aspx?PublicationID=240>
- [34] An Agenda for Peace UN report,1992:
<http://www.un-documents.net/a47-277.htm>
- [35] PNUD, 1994:
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/>

Chitescu R zvan

*Graduate of the Bucharest University, Faculty of Mathematics,
Post-graduate of Master Studies at the Mihai Viteazul National Academy of Information.
Higher College of National Security - Mihai Viteazul National Academy of Information.
National Defence College - “Carol I” National Defense University
Post-graduate of Master Studies at the Romanian Diplomatic Institute
Parliamentary Counsellor at the Joint Standing Committee of the Chamber of Deputies and of
the Senate for the exercise of parliamentary control over the activity of the Romanian
Intelligence Service*