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The contemporary society offers us the image of fluid systems, characterised by deep, sometimes surprising changes, which, in order to survive, are restructuring, redefining their interests, reconsidering their laws/relations and principles, creating the image of a global chaos, which in reality operate in an organised manner.

The era of relative stability is now history, and “a new world order is not a fact: it is an aspiration and an opportunity (...) to build a new international system according to the new values and ideals, while old things, considered safe, collapse around us”.

The closer we are to a correct analysis of the international environment, the more we notice that it becomes non-linear and “non-linearity means that the act of playing the game has a way of changing the rules”\(^1\). This “Brownian” motion, inside the global social system, leads to the resettlement of interests and, implicitly, of the forms and means of meeting them, correlated with the changes/mutations
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in the technological, social, economic, political and mental fields, because “...the world is open. The one you thought to be thousand kilometres away is now near you meddling in your business... Globalisation... An euphoric gas”.

The war of the future, being more related to thinking, intelligence and technology, goes beyond its “visible” instrument – the military. Therefore, “in its military, bloody version, classical war has reached its climax”. The future approach presumes taking measures to lower the gap between “soft” and “hard”.

The view on the war of the future entails the development of some daring models in approaching it, the design of new force structures, tailored, trained and equipped to face the new risks and threats. Recent conflicts have shown that the initial military actions are carried out with the forces and assets existing in peacetime.

Because of the mosaic of civilisations and the different perceptions, by international actors, of own interest, in declaration, the world develops in a relative peace – the “democratic peace” – while vectors/means for carrying out the war are developed, the scenarios, conceptions and physiognomy of the armed conflict are changed. However, war still remains the single way of solving contradictions and imposing the will, and the supreme force, considering the level of social integration of some systems.

The war of the future will continue to affect collective existence with all derived risks. Its purpose will be reached gradually, military actions following cease-fire stages. It may be carried out in a single stage, intending to trigger the intervention mechanisms of international bodies and to win victory or to impose the will by negotiation.

A global war involving “the core states of the world’s major civilisations is highly improbable but not impossible”. The attitude towards the adversary is based on the political option/attitude of the state and it is materialised in strategic scenarios and strategic/operational hypotheses developed both in peacetime and while conducting the war/armed conflict.

The new technologies, extremely costly, used by military organisations at every level, from the training to the operational and logistic one, cause deep changes in the approach of the future war and produce mutations in the physiognomy of the battlefield and military actions, regarding the organisation of the armed
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4 Dumitru Sava, Războiul celui de-“al treilea val”, Gândirea militară românească no. 2/1999, p. 69.
5 The psyche, by each individual’s unique genetic code, allows being misinformed. When we address someone, the assessment errors of the interlocutor add to our own errors and so on. If there are intermediaries between the transmitter and receiver, the original message is substantially modified, with each intermediary.
forces, the nature of the missions they have to carry out, and the political objectives that can be reached by the use of the armed force.

The space of future military actions will no longer offer the reality of some well-defined contact lines between the own the adversary forces. Instead we will have the image of a “porous front” where the combatant forces will be “mixed” and the enemy will be blocked by manoeuvre warfare. The physiognomy of the battlefield will influence not only the engagement but also the command, which will establish the objective and general framework of the conception/decision to execute the mission, the commanders choosing the necessary means.

Time and information will increase in importance, due to technological advances. The battle for and with information will gain more and more ground. The one that wins the battle with time, the one that gets the information in advance will be the one able to dominate the enemy and seize the initiative.

Lately, there are more and more frequent mentions of psychological warfare, electronic warfare, geo-physical warfare, ecological warfare, and more recently, of hybrid war and total war, but, at the same time, of classical war, which, generally, “represents the armed combat between two or more states, between political groups or social classes, in order to meet, by the force of weapons, their political, economic or other goals”.

As it is known, war as a socio-human phenomenon is perceived as destructive and requires the presence of at least two adversaries. By analysing the types of wars above mentioned, it can be considered they do not rely on destructive methods only in order to reach their objectives and they do not even require the existence of two adversaries (e.g. psychological warfare presumes an aggressor and an aggressed, but it is not compulsory for the latter to be the adversary of the first, as it may only seek to determine the other to support certain causes).

The war of the future can be defined as the set of actions conducted in the visible or invisible, perceivable or unperceivable spectrum, between the component elements of the international or internal system (states, social, economical/financial, cultural, religious groups), by employing various forms and means, violent or non-violent, to meet own interests.

The war of the future is supposed to be a conglomerate that changes the balance of the military actions of the armed forces vs. armed forces type in the favour of information, psychological, electronic warfare actions and so on.
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7 Leliana Niţă, Războiul viitorului şi unele tendinţe de restructurare a armatelor, in Gândirea militară românească no.1/1999, p.75.
That is why, in order to strictly control the phenomenon, we consider a unitary system has to be created to evaluate and counter the effects and to educate/train the military force, as a specialised body that can intervene more efficiently to face the high number of actions that are possible in the future battlefield.

**The war of the future and Romania’s security**

Romania has to adapt to the future and build an appropriate security system to meet the realities of the beginning of the millennium, in a European security space represented by an environment that favours the promotion and protection of its interests. The high number of risks and threats to the national security and the features of the war of the future, which gets more and more costly, together with the country’s economic situation, make difficult to provide security by own means.

Romania’s security depends primarily on re-launching the economic development, technological advances included. The level of production and the diversification of the economic branches allow the development of equipment and the procurement in the military, being primary factors to consider related to the increase in the military potential. The economic development determines the level of the military combat capacity by providing the necessary resources for the optimal value and by reducing/eliminating the technological gaps.

In order to assure own security, as the “rules of the game” change and a potential war will have a totally different physiognomy and requirements, it is necessary to bring the military to the superior level/state able to discourage through presence or defeat a certain adversary with an equivalent military potential. Also, in peacetime, in order to test our capabilities, certain forces will be required to participate in multinational military exercises, common training, as well as in settling or managing certain crisis situations. These implications suggest two major coordinates: regional accent on the traditional role of our military and a mixed, balanced force, able to accomplish its missions that, at the beginning of the millennium, are bound to be more from the area of crisis situations and low intensity armed conflicts.

For our own security, the future will require more from us and we will have to consider that agility will be very important for our ability to adapt to an extremely dynamic geopolitical and geostrategic environment.

**Aggression against national interests**

**– epistemological approach**

A new paradigm, the essence of the end of the Cold War, came to the fore of nations at the beginning of the last decade of the 20th century, as well as the hope for a relatively harmonious world, having as main goal to develop economically
and re-launch generous international relationships. The people, at least from this part of Europe, hoped that “the future would not be dedicated to numerous battles of ideas, but rather to solving modern economical and technical issues”.

This illusion of harmony caught the states wishing to step on the path of liberalism and open democracy off guard. By practicing for 50 years the responses to military type aggressions, they were surprised and unprepared in the face of the new aggression procedures. The defence against these new procedures did not require an over-sized and heavy armed structure, one trained for a destructive war. The measures for the defence of national interests required a certain type, structure, size and equipment of the force, something that could be attained only in time. The planners and leaders of the new aggression knew it and that is why the offensive was launched in order to seize the initiative and to impose own will, models and standards.

Aggression is based on the will to act, to modify the normal course of events, by remodelling the adversary psychology, especially when the military ways have become excessively costly.

The aggressor considers the aggressed as an enemy and its goal is to destroy the adversary’s will by any means and meet the objectives. It is not a simple threat but a military punishing action. This policy in service of power is more damaging than the one of cannons.

Aggression, as form, is disseminated in the social life, economic, cultural, religious and military domains, acting as a promoter of future and changes, and these sudden changes occurring in people’s lives are overwhelming. In this context, we agree to the idea that “if we extract a man from his cultural environment and suddenly transpose him in an environment completely different from his, with a different set of rules that he has to respond – different conceptions on time, space, work, love, religion, sex and all the others, if then we take away any hope of returning to a more familiar landscape, his uprooting will be twice heavier”.

Military aggression, in the context of the domains of manifestation of general aggression, can be direct or indirect. Romania can be the target of any of them and, considering the prefigured magnitude and consequences, we will be able to plan the level and force of responses.

The types of aggression, direct or indirect, are usually not distinctly manifested, being expected a complex combination of their use both in the tension period and in the initial period of the open armed conflict. Armed aggression consists in “the use of the armed force by a state against the sovereignty, territorial
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integrity or political independence of another state or in any way incompatible with the United Nations Charter”\textsuperscript{11}.

Aggression as a form of manifestation of war is produced, primarily, in the following domains: information, economic-financial – imposing simulated models; cultural – accepting the universal culture and civilisation, in the context of globalisation, to the detriment of national-traditional one; religious – offensive of one denomination over the other; social – promoting the life standard lowering principle, in order to accomplish the transition from a producing society to a consuming society; values – the value fluctuation is rapid, with a focus on universal values over the national ones.

The crisis of the contemporary society is more than a simple economic crisis. Citizens are daily aggressed by presenting negative information, economic-financial tricks that transfer public goods to private persons and by subjecting people to a perpetual “reform” process that has not yet resulted in the increase in life expectancy and life standard.

The aggression phenomenon has a layered development, in line with the structures of manifestation in the society, as follows:

- level I – blocking the rise of the national “personality” in a framework of relative prosperity;
- level II – blocking the development of the nation in harmony, within and amongst its different structures;
- level III – the development mechanisms are conditioned and modelled;
- level IV – within the international division of labour it is attempted the transformation of a country’s economy into an agrarian one;
- level V – blocking the access to the course of ideas ordering the global system, through different manipulation strategies, contempt for national values and limitation of the subsistence capacity;
- level VI – blocking or influencing the manifestation of the social ideal only at the subsistence level, the work for survival.

The aggression phenomenon is possible because “the terms have changed, negotiation and resignation replacing conflict and anger”\textsuperscript{12}.

Aggressors have the monopoly on force, based on the legitimacy given by some achievements and the choice of weapons, but the most efficient weapon against aggression is lucidity, since modern war tends to become a set replacing, according to a pre-established finality, the military actions with non-military ones.

\textsuperscript{11} Additional Protocol to the Geneva Convention on 12 August 1949 relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, see www.crucearosie.ro.

\textsuperscript{12} Philippe Labarde, Bernard Maris, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5.
It is the period of transition, when the disputes in the political-diplomatic, economic-financial, technical-scientific, cultural-spiritual, ecological domains become determinant, bringing to the fore new ways, apparently non-violent, but with deep effects and affecting the whole – blockages, malfunctions, de-structuring, dissolution, even the state failure. The threat of force is no longer the main means; it becomes the reserve, since there are other more alluring means – cultural prestige, life standard, commerce, ideological adhesion etc.

The defence of national interests against any form of aggression can be achieved through measures and actions conducted by political-diplomatic instruments, information and media offensive, promotion of national values, as a sum of individual values, national competition, efficiency of the national economy, citizens’ biological safety, accomplishment of the national prosperity, social harmony and social reproduction circle.

The statistics of the last conflicts proves that the outbreak of a military aggression will happen against a background of a quasi-normal state. It is expected that the pre-aggression period will not suspiciously differ from the state of normality. Defence, in this case, will have the character of a “military response, at a survival level, in the confrontation with a superior adversary and its generalisation only in favourable external political-military circumstances”\(^3\).

The defence of the national interests against aggression will be accomplished through the use of a force structure sized according to the predictable and prospective aggression level, prepared to also provide other than military types of response. Success can be achieved only in the context of prosperity of the nation, able to support its own defence effort, including by the use of armed forces.

The context of the contemporary world and the evolution of the war phenomenon require that Romania should take the necessary measures to restructure and modernise its armed forces and, in correlation with this process, to redefine the missions and reconsider the conception of armed forces employment in different stages and levels of the armed combat.

The current priority is to look into the future and stop living in the past and, maybe, even in the present. History has proved harsh to the weak and undecided. The geostrategic and geopolitical context of the future will be the one of power through dynamism, force and intelligence. Only those prepared meet the challenges, while the hesitating and undecided ones lose. Precaution and anticipation represent two factors of the contemporary world reality.
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