

MARIAN ZULEAN

**ARMATA ȘI SOCIETATEA ÎN
TRANZIȚIE¹**

Tritonic 2003,

161 pages

Mihaela Oglice*

Marian Zulean's most recent book, *Armata și Societatea în Tranziție*, provides an up to date, scientific analysis of the current political and security situation in Romania. According to the author, Romania has managed to build an institutional framework in which civil-military relations are based on democratic principles. He analyzes the two main areas – civil-military relations and security – within the broader policy and institutional framework of the Romanian military. After several years of sustained effort, Romania has managed to attain one of its major goals, that of NATO membership. The 'open door' policy promoted by Alliance leaders and the international community constitutes, in the author's view, one of the main stimuli for the reform process of the Romanian army. When Romania becomes a full member of NATO, Romanian security policy – affecting not only military institutions, but also relations with the society – will have to be devised according to security objectives determined in cooperation with allies. The author works out an explanatory model, taking both the domestic and international context into consideration. In this regard, Marian Zulean's work provides not only a complex diagnosis of Romanian army reform, but also an analysis of this reform process within the broader context of international realities. Such an intervention is important as the basis for a much more comprehensive approach to Romanian security policy.

Drawing on an interdisciplinary scientific method, utilizing concepts from military sociology, political science and public policy, the author describes the



¹ The Army and Society in Transition

* Mihaela Oglice holds a degree from the Romanian National School of Government and Administration and is currently studying European Law .

military and social reform process in terms of a democratic transformation. Jeffrey Simon has presented a similar picture, claiming that 'since the army's democratic surveillance became a mandatory condition for NATO affiliation, by the agency of *The Study on NATO Enlargement* in 1995, the interest in this issue has considerably increased and multiplied in Central and Eastern Europe'.

Simultaneously, with this elucidative and descriptive method, the author considers the theoretical paradigms of civil-military relations. He analyzes the level of social democratization, appealing for civil control over the armed forces and lauding the effects of mechanisms of democratic accountability. Divided into two main sections, Zulean's book deals with the process of transforming civil-military relations in Romania, on the one hand, and with the factors contributing to this transformation, on the other. Civil-military relations are analyzed both from a theoretical framework and in the context of social science. The patterns of civil-military relations identified by Huntington and Janowitz are taken up as benchmarks, against which to evaluate the structure of the relations between the armed forces and society adopted in Romania.

As far as the dynamic of these relations is concerned, two ground vectors are taken into account: a societal vector – the implementation of democratic standards and mechanisms that enable the democratically chosen civil authorities to control the armed forces; and a military vector – the professionalization of the army so as to prepare it for accepting this control. Issues like tradition, transition stages, institutions of civil democratic control, the democratic professionalization of the armed forces, and the relationship of theory to practice are important for explaining the transformation of civil-military relations in Romania. The identification and description of the factors contributing to this transformation process, like security policy in the age of globalization, complete the author's comprehensive analysis.

The issues of democratization and the institutionalization of democratic control of the army are at the center of one of the most ardent debates in this field. They establish a theoretical framework that gives coherence and substance to this debate. The book offers a matrix for what present security policy is presumed to be: i.e., dedicated to army and secret services. However, the paradigm proposed by the author represents a much more complex vision, in which a state's security policy is understood to include, in addition to the military, also foreign policy, national security, economic policy, as well as social, political and administrative factors.

The other side of the paradigm identified by the author is the institutional one, which defines the relation between the army and democratic society. This pattern is built on two main pillars: the first addresses civil democratic control through the legal system, as it is implemented by public institutions and civil society; the second addresses the professionalization of the army, its structural transformation, human resources management and the educational system.

Still, there are several shortcomings that must be identified. The first is related to the methodology employed by the author. His starting point is Nelson's methodological diagram, based on a matrix with two inputs: a limited dimension of the armed forces, and an unrestricted dimension of society. This

theoretical paradigm fails in its attempt to offer a complete causal and explanatory complex. Another deficiency can be identified in the author's attempt to analyze security without taking into consideration other areas that make an important contribution to security, like intelligence and internal affairs. Furthermore, a comparative analysis with other countries in post-communist transition would lead to a more comprehensive approach to the subject.

The book is undoubtedly a major contribution to the field of civil-military relations. Its originality rests in promoting a theoretical and operational model for these democratic relations, which is historically, analytically and empirically grounded. The elaborateness and complexity of this intervention, in addition to the importance and timeliness of the themes addressed, are only a few of the reasons this book is deserving of special attention.

THOMAS CAROTHERS,
**'PROMOTING DEMOCRACY AND FIGHTING
TERROR',**

Foreign Affairs, vol 82, no 1, January/February 2003

PAULA J. DOBRIANSKY & THOMAS CAROTHERS,
'DEMOCRACY PROMOTION',

Foreign Affairs, vol 82, no 3, May/June 2003

**An American Debate: or, What Can Be Done In a True
Democracy?**

by Emanuel Raută

In the January/February 2003 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, the theorist of democracy Thomas Carothers published an article suggestively entitled 'Promoting Democracy and Fighting Terror'. The article presents a strenuous critique of the current US administration's tolerance of, and even support for, autocratic regimes around the world. The administration's response came in the form of an article by Undersecretary of State Paula J. Dobriansky – entitled 'Explaining the Bush Administration's Position' – which was published in a subsequent issue of the same magazine. The exchange represents a model of the kind of challenges that can be mounted by members of civil society to the policies of elected officials, and of the robust public debate that can ensue. It should be a lesson to the new democracies of South-Eastern Europe – and especially Romania – as to the importance of open public debate and the need for greater awareness of democratic and individual rights. However, for the United States, the events of September 11 inaugurated a policy dilemma: what is the proper balance between security and the guarantee of these very democratic rights?

The US asserts its presence in virtually every 'hot spot' in the world, often at the expense of one of its stated missions: the promotion of democracy and the preservation of human rights. The close US relationship with Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, both of which are ruled by authoritarian dictators with longstanding records of human rights abuses, testifies to the value the US places on the kind of logistical support these countries can provide in this sensitive region. Meanwhile,

these autocratic leaders effectively exploit the situation in order to secure US economic and military assistance, which in turn helps them sustain and consolidate their brutal regimes. These are just a couple of the examples that Carothers adduces to demonstrate the contradictions in US foreign policy. Carothers suggests that the lack of interest in the project of nation building and the absolute priority placed on narrow security goals, by what he calls the 'realist' strain of US foreign policy, ultimately serve to undermine the fight for democracy. He cites as an example the conflicting results of US operations in Afghanistan: when the US decided to employ Afghan fighters as proxies against the Taliban regime, they in effect reinforced the country's tribal structure, creating conditions unfavorable to the consolidation of a new central authority in Kabul. Thus, in this case, military/security considerations, narrowly construed, served to undermine the ultimate objective of creating a stable democratic Afghanistan.

In addition, as Carothers points out, the fact that the US imposed restrictions on civil liberties at home has caused significant harm to democracy promotion around the world, sending the wrong signal to governments that are only too eager to seize the opportunity. Carothers notes several domestic policies that did unnecessary harm to the rights of citizens: the detention of immigrants, closed deportation hearings, and the categorization of some US citizens as 'enemy combatants'. Some countries – such as Cuba, Belarus and India – took advantage of this state of affairs to deploy repressive tactics in their own countries, in the name of the 'war on terrorism'.

However, Carothers also notes the rise of a second policy orientation of the Bush administration, which he calls 'neo-Reaganite', that entails a serious and principled commitment to protecting human rights and promoting democracy. Carothers credits the Bush administration with committing to a policy of democracy promotion in the Middle East, the obvious examples of which are the war in Iraq, as well as the continuous pressure on Iran and Libya. This agenda, which is promoted by trusted 'neo-conservative' advisors to the president, is being undertaken 'with fervor and force', in order to 'cut Islamic extremism at its roots'. This aggressive new policy entails enormous risks – for example, a rise in anti-Americanism in the Islam world – and obstacles – such as, the absence of any democratic tradition in the Middle East. The policy is especially vulnerable to the demonstrated 'lack of neoconservative will in the matter of nation building that undermines the democracy process'.

In outlining this 'split' policy personality, Carothers does not confine himself to negative criticism but offers constructive advice as well. He

understands the difficulties inherent to US foreign policy in today's complex world, but calls for a longer-term outlook that sees democracy promotion as in fact a crucial component in the battle against terrorism. In addition, Carothers points out that the US administration needs serious allies in the fight against terrorism and that it is extremely dangerous for the Bush administration to have alienated these allies through its unilateral realist foreign policy.

Undersecretary of State Paula J Dobriansky rejects the accusation of instrumentalization in America's foreign policy, insisting that Carothers' position is reductionist. According to Dobriansky, America cannot answer to only one imperative in its foreign policy but rather must engage on different levels: the US has indeed allied itself in the war against terrorism with countries with dubious records regarding respect for human and democratic rights, but the US is also constantly applying pressure, in a multitude of ways, to encourage these countries to adopt democratic ideas and practices. Dobriansky insists that only by communicating and engaging with them can the US influence authoritarians to step up their liberalization and democratization efforts. Current US policy tries to locate complementarities between security policies and human rights protection policies. The Undersecretary of State suggests that American foreign policy already, in fact, represents an effective synthesis of these two policy commitments.

The debate between Mr. Carothers and the Bush Administration cannot be concluded quickly and easily; it deals with one of the most important and vexing subjects currently facing the US and the world – i.e., the legitimate geopolitical role of the US after September 11. People around the world are confused and conflicted when asked whether America has the right to intervene by force to pacify entire regions. They are not privy to the internal mechanisms by which decisions on the American foreign policy are made, and hence cannot be sure if these are driven by an interest in democracy promotion or narrow national interest. In short, it is not clear which of the two ‘personalities’ Carothers outlines is the dominant one.

The exchange in *Foreign Affairs* makes clear that this question is still open, and is being debated within America as well, at the highest levels of government and civil society. Even if the answers are not clear, the fact that such debates are thriving in the United States reflects well on the vitality of American democracy and offers important lessons for politicians in country's like Romania, who refuse *a priori* to engage in debate or to accept any input from the civil society.