

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES: SOME CORRELATIONS

PhD Florentin Adrian ILIE

National and international security objectives, as well as the correlations that can be established between them are the tell tale sign of the complexity characteristic of contemporary society. Moreover, as a result of the globalization phenomenon that is changing the physiognomy of humankind and generates an in-depth impact on the current approaches to security in general, these objectives gain new meanings and interpretations. Starting from the axiomatic truth that all national and international endeavors in the field of security need to be focused on the human being and its fundamental rights, it is our firm belief that the analysis of the national and international security objectives can be undertaken only by focusing on the interdependence between them and factors like national interest and human security.

Key words: *security, objectives, globalization, military globalization, human security, national interest*

The international security environment can be characterized as extremely fluid and unpredictable. Such features have a deep impact on the courses of action taken by contemporary world actors and aimed at preserving the normalcy in the future development of the international community by safeguarding values like democracy, peace, freedom and human rights. As a result, the complexity triggered by any approach to the national and international objectives, as well as to the relationship between them has made us focus in a more thorough and comprehensive manner on the main parameters characterizing the international security environment. Thus, the aim of this article is to ponder over the aforementioned universal values and on their real meaning when it comes to associating them with key concepts like international and national security. In this respect,

I would like to emphasize that the opinions expressed in this paper do not reflect any official view on the subject and that they are in line with two famous quotes belonging to Kofi Annan and to Oscar Wilde, respectively: “*Peace means much more than the absence of war.*”[1] and “*When liberty comes with hands dabbled in blood it is hard to shake hands with her.*” [2]

The research in the opinions expressed by reputable Romanian and foreign specialists in the field of security, as well as in the official documents in the same field yielded the conclusion that both national and international security are viewed as the reality perceived in a given moment without any further details on how such reality developed. In our opinion, exactly these details need to be investigated in order to understand the role played by states, by international organizations,

by alliances or various groups in creating the necessary framework for the development and maintenance of national and international security. As a result, I believe that the relationship between national and international objectives should be investigated in order to better establish the boundaries of international law concerning peace safeguarding and human security preservation.

The hypothesis underlying this opinion is that the relationship between national and international interests is tightly connected to a political, legal and military framework that should allow for their manifestation without any conflicting standpoints. Moreover, should there be any differences between the two types of interests, the instruments and mechanisms based on which national interests can be adapted to the international ones and further put into practice need to be identified. In this respect, through an analogy to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's aphorism "Freedom is not about what people can do as they will, but about the fact that they should not do what they are not willing to". [3] and in line with specialists' opinion that the human being's system of reference for understanding liberty is the legal framework, I would like to underline that the system of international norms should be used in order to attain national objectives and not viewed as a constraining one.

The most relevant definition of international security, out of a plethora of such definitions, is the one according to which the aforementioned concept "is the way international relationships are organized so that all states are protected against aggressions, threats to use force, use of force,

attacks on their national sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity. Moreover, it also encompasses the ever increasing interdependence between military, political, economic, social, technological and geographical factors". [4]

The opinion I uphold in this paper and that is based on a thorough research in the field is that the national interest is defined as the will of the people, that is the consensus of the majority that establishes and accomplishes national expectations within the broad framework of international laws and regulations. Moreover, I would also like to emphasize that these international norms and objectives are the result of harmonizing national interests with the international ones. Last but not the least, it is worth underlining the correlation between the national and international security, as well as the fact that the national interest, regardless of its characteristics, is legitimate. However, for the latter to be met it has to be in accordance with the legal framework.

Globalization influences the systemic correlation between national and international security, as well. In this respect, there are a lot of specialized opinions concerning its negative and positive impact [5]. Since the subject is a broad one, I will only focus on the military globalization and on the debate on that. Thus, there are two conflicting views according to which this kind of globalization does not exist at all, or it is accepted unconditionally. I myself support the second perspective and my opinion is supported by the fact that from the dawn of civilization and until nowadays military power has played a major role in the globalization of humankind's issues.

What is for sure is that globalization, the military one included, has shaped the physiognomy of the contemporary world. As a result, deep changes have also occurred in the nature and approaches to international and national security, and these are yet to be investigated and accounted for. One obvious consequence of military globalization is global insecurity generated by those opposing to this contemporary phenomenon.

In order to eliminate any confusion, I must make a distinction between global militarization and military globalization. While the former refers to a generalized process of establishing a “world military base” (evaluated against the increasing level of military expenditures, of armament and of the armed forces), the latter is defined by the processes and patterns of interconnection in the military field that go beyond the local boundaries of national states. In my opinion, the main elements that define military globalization are: the globalization of concepts, of culture, of techniques and technologies, of the means and procedures employed in undertaking battles, of the space, risks and conflicts. As a result, this type of globalization is not about the forces and means involved, but about its consequences that more often than not are of a global nature.

Contemporary world evolution has objectively led to an increased preoccupation on behalf of international

organizations for peace safeguarding and for accomplishing human security objectives, prerequisites that, in case of failure in meeting them, would make it difficult to anticipate the future of humankind.

To sum up, within the broad context of human security, it is a necessity to analyze the correlations between national and international security objectives. Moreover, the interconnectivity between the former and the latter is more than obvious. In this respect, it must be reminded that the preoccupation for human security dates back to the dawn of humanity. Last but not the least, I would like to reiterate once more the necessity to correlate the political, legal and military frameworks in order to uphold the accomplishment of national and international objectives without triggering any conflicts.

In conclusion, even if it is difficult to cover the subject of national and international objectives in a comprehensive manner in only one paper, I would like to underline their fundamental value for the current world. Moreover, regardless of the number of investigations and studies undertaken in this field, one can never say it is enough given their ultimate beneficiary, that is the human being. As a result, the inherent conclusion of this paper is that all human endeavors should be aimed at serving humankind.

REFERENCES

- [1] Koffi Annan - the 7th General Secretary of UN between 1997-2006: <http://www.gdrc.org/sustdev/husec/Definitions.pdf>
- [2] Oscar Wilde: <http://www.worldofquotes.com/topic/Violence/1/index.html>
- [3] J.J.Rousseau (1958) Discurs asupra originii și fundamentelor inegalității dintre oameni, Editura Științifică, București.
- [4] Andrei Miroiu (2006) Manual de relatii internationale, Ed.Polirom București, p. 18.
- [5] Tatar, L., Globalizarea economică și globalizarea militară – generalități și interdependențe în Revista bianuală de cultură managerială CEMEX “Management intercultural”, year IX, no. 19/2009, ISSN 1454-9980, “Al. I. Cuza” Publishing House, Iași pp.74-78.
- [6] United Nations Charter
- [7] North Atlantic Treaty
- [8] European Social Charter, revised
- [9] European Convention on Human Rights
- [10] Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- [11] Millenium Declaration
- [12] National Report on Millenium Declaration
- [13] Pact on Political and Civil Rights
- [14] NATO Summit – Washington, 3-4 April 1999
- [15] NATO Summit - Prague, 21-22 November 2002
- [16] NATO Summit – Istanbul, 28-29 June 2004
- [17] NATO Summit - Riga, 28-29 November 2006
- [18] NATO Summit – Bucharest, 2-4 April 2008
- [19] NATO Summit - Strasbourg, France / Kehl, Germany, 3-4 April 2009
- [20] NATO Summit – Lisbon, 19-20 November 2010
- [21] Romania’s National Security Strategy 2007
- [22] National Defense Strategy, (project), 2010
- [23] USA National Security Strategy, 20 September 2002