

THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL AND HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS' STRATEGIES OVER THE MILITARY DOCTRINES

Maj. Vasile DOBRESCU**, Ph.D. Candidate
„Codrii Vlăsiei” Emergency Situations Inspectorate, Ilfov

Often, there is stated “the strategy was and is the military coat of politics”¹. It benefited and still benefits as much possible direct mean of economy’s result by the technology, of culture’s results by the morals, and of finances by the military budget. The national strategies express the need of a certain manner, a certain plan to materialize, often by force, by confrontation, the nation’s interests obviously expressed by nation, law state’s policy.

Keywords: political strategy; military doctrine; risk; violence.

The national and international strategy’s grounds pass, as almost all, by the political space. The nations armed themselves and still arms with weapons, suspect each other and take all the measures to be able to master a confrontation they don’t wish or admit to be unfavourable to them. In this époque of post-Cold War, the nations are extremely sensitive and disoriented. In Europe wasn’t yet created a strong European army because there exist NATO but an European strategy resulted from a common European policy is wanted. The specialty studies unanimously emphasize the essence of the military phenomenon is the violence; not any type of violence, but the collective violence which represents the awakening and exacerbation of asleep aggressiveness in the unconsciousness of the human being and assigned in masses consciousness². An analysis of politics influence over the strategy would be edifying. The Gulf policy, for example, born the modern strategy, of American roots, of rapid intervention in the last finalized in the 1991 war against Iraq, the area being put under control.

The military strategy as any other strategy involves three compulsory components: a strategy of forces (land strategy, air strategy, navy strategy), a

** e-mail: dobrescu_laur@yahoo.com

¹ M. Neag, *Tehnici de război și strategie*, 1993.

² C. Păunescu, *Agresivitatea și conduita umană*, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 1994.

strategy of means (of systems of weapons and other means to conduct the war or of other military actions) and an operational strategy, a strategy of actions (preventive actions strategy, classical operations strategy, deterrence strategy, rapid actions strategy, crises management strategy, etc.). Until now, the millenniums of military confrontations didn't change the essence of war and, in our regard, neither in the future will change. The doctrines and concepts, the means of conducting the war and in correspondence with those, the change of forces were always changed – but in the space of confrontation dialectics, not outside it – were. Thus, when we speak about the future of war, we doesn't necessary refer to the presence or absence of this conflagration in the human life society, but to the forces and means which will put into practise the concept of war, to the system of engagement, to the space-time wideness of actions and operations, to their characteristics, and, of course, to its consequences³.

The future war seem will exit from the millenary slogans of some confrontations submitted to the theory of strategic games with null sum and will become more and more dependent of special forces, "intelligent" technologies and, generally, by means and procedures regarding the mastering of the gravity centres and vital areas in regard to some adoptive dynamic systems' theory, in conformity to which the result of a confrontation is hardly predictable and controllable. The possibility for the both partners to win or to loose it isn't excluded. Obviously, under such perspective, it increases the role of the grand strategy, of political strategy and becomes undependable the thorough strategic thinking in the military field. This must promptly answer – firstly, as theory, practise and expertise, but also as strategic art – to the political command being unequivocally traced on the coordinates asserted by the grand strategy which increasingly becomes an integral type strategy, in the democratic societies.

Still, since the beginning of the XXI century, we assist to a factor to impulse the changes in the field of political strategies and of military and humanitarian intervention strategies following the existence and evolution of the United Nations Organisation (UN), created as an international political context marked by the end of the World War II. UN by its structures owns the objectives and goals needed to be considered the guardian of international law respect no indifferently the changes of the international political environment⁴. Still, as a cooperation forum, UN stood on the basis of conception over the international order, more precise, the states grounding on

³ M. Mureşan, *Pentru ce fel de război ne pregătim?*, Impact strategic nr. 1/2004.

⁴ Gheorghe Văduva, *Strategie militară pentru viitor*, Bucharest, Paideia Publishing House, 2003.

their legitimate sovereignty decided to end a historical period of international relations characterized by the pre-eminence of force over the law, by the regulations of conflict by war and to start the era of international cooperation, grounded on principles of law and peace.

We also precise UN had a meaningful contribution in the materialization and consolidation in a juridical and unanimously accepted form of the international legal order. In this concern, the UN Charter can be seen as condensed expression of the contemporary international law and UN represents the condensed expression of the state multilateralism based on sovereignty respect. The history of international humanitarian operations starts once with the apparition of International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the oldest and well structured humanitarian organization in the world. Until today, ICRC stood as the most prestigious humanitarian organization; it received three times the Nobel Prize for Peace – in 1917, 1944 and 1963 -, single situation in the prize's history. The humanitarian action became one of the pillars of the new international architecture created to narrow the states sovereignty concept under the circumstances of globalization and decentralization processes advance. The model of humanitarian aid of this beginning of century is based on ethical principles and is closed to the human rights system. It can't rest neutral in front of genocide and it must evaluate the long term impact of each operation in order to stop the granted aid – if it considered this will prolong the crisis or will endanger the respect of human rights. From the international experience of the humanitarian actions undergone in many conflict areas, the humanitarian operations are an important instrument of fight at global level against the genocide, war crimes, ethnical purification or crimes against humanity. By all means, it appears the trend (which we appreciate is a mistake) to acquire the ideals of movement for human rights and to become a mechanism of their implementation⁵. What is today proposed as objective (the promotion of human rights, the cease of armed conflicts and the fulfilment of social justice) conceptually and logistically overlaps them. The contemporary crises are far from having just a humanitarian dimension and the true humanitarian practise, situating at the border and not in the centre of the international order, and don't have the capacity to offer those a comprehensive answer. Under the circumstances of the actual modifications of political and intervention strategies at the global level, they appear as significant influences in the adoption of doctrines by the other states.

By definition, the military doctrine represents the unitary conception adopted by a certain state in the fundamental issues of war, army and

⁵ C. Barbu, *Intervenția umanitară internațională, între obligație morală și proiect tehnologic*, București, 2004.

country's defence, the forms and procedures the respective state it applies in the preparation of armed forces, population and war conducting, related to its needs, conditions, interests and specific⁶. Furthermore, we will present few aspects over the orientation and trends in adopting the contemporary military doctrines. Starting from the fact the doctrinaire principles are found in the content and physiognomy of the war as: the armed forces organization for the fight, the armed forces preparation, their means there are trained in order to lead the armed fight, the endowment with armament and fight technique adequate to the defensive or offensive character of war and, respectively, the military action leading to the strategic, operative and tactical level, we see three orientations and basic trends as: armed forces leading in war< the military actions in the peace support; the provision of some optimal and efficient means to conduct the war in the framework of some political-military alliances or in the framework of a multinational coalition.

By its content, the military doctrine stands on the basis of construction and adoption of the military strategy and, as levels of operation of this term, we distinguish the national military doctrine, the strategic doctrine (proper for the strategic level), the fight doctrine and the national defence (war) doctrine. The factors influencing the foundation and evolution of military doctrines can be internal, external or/and combined factors depending by the mutations from the political power sphere, the system of external relations, the science and techniques evolution, the transformation in the conception of national and global security, the mutations from the sphere of the contemporary military phenomenon, the maintenance of war in the political sphere of each state, the mutations related to the ratio of forces on global plan and, not in the end, the presence of multiple risks and threats.

Under these circumstances, the short and medium term Romanian political-military doctrine starts from the following essential aspects: Romania isn't threatened by a direct armed aggression against its territory; it doesn't consider either state as a possible enemy; the risks will be non-military and unconventional; and, the use of military means represents a last instance political option. Therefore, the essence of Army's transformation taking place in the last time consisted in the transformation from a defence army to a "stability army", emphasizing on the maximization of forces efficiency and on getting the capacities to forecast the evolution of the strategic environment and to find in, in real time, means to adapt to those⁷.

⁶ Gh. Deaconu, *Studii de doctrine militare* (sub egida ISOP București), noiembrie, 2010.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barbu C., *Intervenția umanitară internațională, între obligație morală și proiect tehnologic*, Bucharest, 2004.
- Deaconu Gh., *Studii de doctrine militare* (under ISOP Bucharest), november, 2010.
- Mureșan M., *Pentru ce fel de război ne pregătim?*, Impact strategic no. 1/2004.
- Neag M., *Tehnici de război și strategie*, 1993.
- Păunescu C., *Agresivitatea și conduita umană*, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 1994.
- Văduva Gheorghe, *Strategie militară pentru viitor*, Paideia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003.