



POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STRATEGY – THE PLACE OF MARITIME STRATEGY –

Lucian Valeriu SCIPANOV, PhD

“Carol I” National Defense University, Bucharest

The attempt to identify a possible solution for the realisation of a national defense strategy derives from the extrinsic motivation to quantify those national security objectives that find their representation in strategies and doctrines. The national defense strategy contains those directions, corresponding to the national objectives, regarding the manifestation of interests at the national and international levels. The identification of a model that achieves a connection between the ends, the ways of accomplishment and the means necessary to reach the national security objectives, represents a necessary step to the theoretical level of the strategic thinking from which the practical thinking extracts its foundations. The novelty of this approach derives from the intrinsic motivation to promote the opportunity of a maritime strategy and to identify the level of its representativeness within the National Defense Strategy and the Military Strategy. Through this approach, I address the specialists, those who contribute to the development of strategic and doctrinal documents, the master’s degree and doctoral students, the student officers, those interested in the mechanism of developing a strategy, to have at hand a possible solution for the realisation of the national defenses strategy, and also to identify the correlation between the component elements (ends-ways-means) and their implications at the level of secondary strategies and doctrines.

Keywords: security strategy, defense strategy, maritime strategy, maritime power, the Ends, Ways & Means model.



INTRODUCTION

The term *strategy*, according to the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, represents “a component part of the military art, which deals with the problems of preparation, planning and conducting of war and military operations”¹.

The term has its origin in Greek, being made up of the terms *stratos* (army) and *agein* (leadership)².

In the Greek understanding of the term, *strategos* was called the general, the commander of the army; *stratego*³ represented the ability to command, to be commander, to be general, along with the derivatives of the term which covered, as a general meaning, the functions of the general or his qualities.

Even though I identified many military connotations of the term, I also came across meanings of the term, which refer to policies, plans and directions of action in different fields of application: game strategies; development strategies; economic strategies, and so on. Thus, in the first instance, I can conclude that strategy represents a systematic, well-grounded plan, through which certain planned objectives are implemented, using the specific means at hand, and that contributes to the fulfillment of the purpose for which it was achieved.

In the national approach, the scientific aspect of the term is mentioned, i.e. strategy represents the “fighting leadership science”⁴ and – in another approach – I found out that strategy represents “the art of using all the available means with a view to ensuring success in combat”⁵.

In the Greek understanding of the term, strategos was called the general, the commander of the army; stratego represented the ability to command, to be commander, to be general, along with the derivatives of the term which covered, as a general meaning, the functions of the general or his qualities.

¹ According to dexonline.ro retrieved on 10.02.2020.

² According to <https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/articles/ideas-work/von-clausewitz-war-six-lessons-modern-strategist>, retrieved on 22.02.2020.

³ Verb – *strategos*, adjective – *strategikos*, noun – *strategika* (pl.) [A/N].

⁴ *Dicționar de neologisme*, Editura Steaua Nordului, 2002.

⁵ *Ibid.*



At the political-military level, strategy covers much more than the military side. In different situations, strategy covers the fields of security (security strategy), the field of defense (defense strategy), the military field (military strategy), the maritime field (maritime strategy), and so on.

Strategy was brought into attention by philosophers, leaders, historians, and writers, who gave it different meanings, which in principle covered the need for understanding and using the term. Frederik the Great⁶ was one of those who understood the importance of a unified vision of the state leadership and the defense approach from a scientific perspective: *“He who defends everything defends nothing”*⁷, representing the acceptance that a defense strategy is a solution on an optimal response regarding the security of the kingdom (Prussia).

“The strategy is the science of war; it outlines the plans, has the general vision and determines the course of the military actions, it is, exactly speaking, the science of the commanding generals”.

Clausewitz was the one who best emphasised this aspect, stating that *“strategy is to use war for the purpose of war”*⁸, thereby providing a first modern military perspective on the term.

Previous opinions outline the idea that strategy is not only a science, but also an art.

STRATEGY IS SCIENCE AND ART

*“The strategy is the science of war; it outlines the plans, has the general vision and determines the course of the military actions, it is, exactly speaking, the science of the commanding generals”*⁹. Being a science, the theoretical character of the meaning is emphasised: *“Strategy must study combat in relation to its possible results, as well as with the most important intellectual and moral forces in its use”*¹⁰.

⁶ Frederick II or Frederick the Great (1712-1786), King of Prussia, Hohenzollern dynasty [A/N].
⁷ Frederick the Great, <https://devcentral.f5.com/s/articles/he-who-defends-everything-defends-nothinghellip-right>, retrieved on 22.02.2020.
⁸ Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831), translated by Corneliu Soare, *Despre război*, Editura ANETET XX PRESS, p. 72.
⁹ Archduke Charles, Duke of Teschen, A. S. I. l'archiduc Charles; translation from German by Antoine Henri Jomini, *Principes de la strategie*, Paris, 1818, *Chapitre premier, Section premiere*, p. 1.
¹⁰ Carl von Clausewitz, *op. cit.*, p. 72.



On the other hand, strategy is an art. *“Strategy is the art of combining preparations for war and the grouping of operations to achieve the aim put forth by war for the armed forces”*¹¹. Strategy is an art based on the knowledge of the commander and his intuition, that spark of genius, hard to reach without an experience in weapons.

In this way, practitioners differ from theorists: *“The researcher who, starting from this success of assembly, does not see that harmony, often looks for genius where the latter is absent and cannot exist”*¹².

From the point of view of international relations and national security, Lecturer Edward Mead Earle stated: *“strategy is the art of controlling and utilising the resources of a nation, or of a coalition of nations”*¹³, an aspect that represents a new scientific approach to the term from a military perspective, with effects on economic security.

On the other hand, Professor Colin Gray mentioned that strategy is the product of the dialogue between politics and the instruments of power; it is a bridge between political goals and military means. *“Often politics decide on policy, then decide on an action, but neglect to tie the two realms together. The purpose of the strategist is to bridge this gap by being well-armed with the General Theory of Strategy”*¹⁴.

The strategist must have an integrated vision, comprehensive of the battlefield, where he will exert his leadership qualities according to a number of factors, internal and external, political and economic, which will influence his approach. *“The strategist must take into account the state’s entire rear area, his own and that of the enemy with all its political and economic potentials”*¹⁵.

*“Strategy provides the bridge between military means and political goals”*¹⁶, an aspect that finds its foundation in some general laws

The strategist must have an integrated vision, comprehensive of the battlefield, where he will exert his leadership qualities according to a number of factors, internal and external, political and economic, which will influence his approach.

“Strategy provides the bridge between military means and political goals”, an aspect that finds its foundation in some general laws of the war.

¹¹ David M. Glantz, Harold S. Orenstein, *The Evolution of Soviet Operational Art, 1927-1991: The Documentary Basis*, Vol. I, Franc Cass London, 1995, p. 6.

¹² Carl von Clausewitz, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

¹³ Edward Mead Earle (1894-1954), Professor of security studies, Princeton, *Strategy: Create and Implement the Best Strategy for Your Business*, Harvard Business Review, p. XII.

¹⁴ Colin Gray (1943) – Professor of Oxford and Manchester – strategic studies, Colin Gray, John Baylis, James Wirtz, *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press, 2019, p. 391.

¹⁵ David M. Glantz, Harold S. Orenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹⁶ Colin Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 5.



of the war: “The law of the dependence of the course, the denomination, the consequences of the war on the quality of public decision acts; The law of the dependence of the armed confrontation on the economic, technical, scientific potential of the states involved; The law of the role of the nation in sustaining the war effort”¹⁷; “The law of the concordance between the political purpose, forces, means, resources and objectives”¹⁸.

As a partial conclusion, I can point out that *strategy* is the art of leadership (the art of command in general), but one should not minimise the theoretical side, in which strategy is a science. Therefore, strategy represents, beyond the controversy over its nature, a science and an art in equal measure.

Having presented these characteristic elements of the term, I think that strategy is the art and science of employing the political, economic, psychological, military and security instruments of a nation in order to meet the political objectives in competition with other actors pursuing their interests. In my opinion, strategy is the subject of a unanimous agreement; it is both art and science, so it is a bridge between theory and practice; strategy is a process, with a much more complex content than the meaning it bears.

Strategy represents the way things should be done; it presents the general path through which the set objectives are achieved. I want to emphasise that strategy is a process in itself and not a goal. If we refer to the strategy of an organisation, this is the way in which the organisation prepares itself for an uncertain future, through which to face the challenges of any kind, through a response identified as a solution.

In my opinion, strategy is manifested by two components, *hard* and *soft*; the hard components are represented by the elements of military

If we refer to the strategy of an organisation, this is the way in which the organisation prepares itself for an uncertain future, through which to face the challenges of any kind, through a response identified as a solution.

¹⁷ Mircea Mureșan, Costică Țenu, Lucian Stăncilă, *Corelația artei militare cu fenomenul militar contemporan, Curs de artă militară*, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare “Carol I”, București, 2005, pp. 95-100.

¹⁸ Gheorghe Văduva, *Principii ale războiului și luptei armate – realități și tendințe*, Universitatea Națională de Apărare “Carol I”, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Apărare și Securitate, București, 2003, p. 4.

power; the soft components are represented by politics, economy, technology, culture, state tradition etc.

Next, I will approach the term from the perspective of security and defense and their influence on the *hard* component (i. e., military power).

To identify at what level of leadership we can develop a strategy, I will call on the levels of the military (i. e., strategic, operational and tactical art).

THE LEVELS OF STRATEGY

From this perspective, the levels of strategy are identified primarily at the political and military levels. The political strategy (called the Grand Strategy¹⁹), contains all the power tools of the state. Military strategy describes how to employ the military instrument in times of peace, crisis, or war. *“Policy is the ways (methods or patterns) by which strategy reaches its objectives”*²⁰.

In the military field, strategy has operational and tactical influences. At the operational level, the strategy on the theater of operations describes how to employ the military instrument at regional level, and, at the tactical level, the strategy of the different services describes a specific strategic concept (strategy).

Let us further see in which areas we can identify the opportunity to develop strategies. I identified four levels of strategy manifestation: *The Grand strategy*²¹; *the strategic level*; *the operational level* and *the tactical level*.

The grand strategy represents the level at which the political-military decisions are made; it is determined by whether a country enters the war or not, who the enemies will be, who the allies will be



The levels of strategy are identified primarily at the political and military levels. The political strategy (called the Grand Strategy), contains all the power tools of the state. Military strategy describes how to employ the military instrument in times of peace, crisis, or war.

¹⁹ “Grand strategy” (Clausewitz, Liddell Hart, Corbett) refers to the diplomatic and political-military level of the strategy [A/N].

²⁰ *Strategy: Ends and Means*, p. 39, at https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/usmc/mcdp/1-1/mcdp1-1_chap2.pdf, retrieved on 22.02.2020, “grand strategy”, “grand national strategy” or, currently in the United States, “national security strategy”.

²¹ Colin Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-321.



The grand strategy represents the state's war policy. Its purpose is to coordinate and direct all resources of the nation or of a coalition, alliance, union, partnership, in order to achieve the political objective of the war.

and what they want as a result of peace. At this level, it is essential to be able to lead the war, to build alliances, coalitions, partnerships, in order to know from the very beginning which position they want to hold in negotiations (which kind of peace they want).

Therefore, the grand strategy represents the state's war policy. Its purpose is to coordinate and direct all resources of the nation or of a coalition, alliance, union, partnership, in order to achieve the political objective of the war.

The USA does not use the term *Grand strategy*, but rather uses the term *national strategy*; the UK uses it, with this meaning: "*an application of national resources to achieve national policy objectives and which involves economic, industrial, political and military components*"²².

The strategic level aims at the general war management and estimates the forces that will be available; it also distributes the war effort among the different war theaters. The operational level represents the level that aims at reaching the end of the war with the assigned forces. This is the level at which the plans for the employment of land, air and maritime forces are drawn up and the level of employment of these forces stipulated during the campaign.

The tactical level is the place where the opposing forces are physically confronted and where the objectives set by the upper echelon are clear. "*Tout plan stratégique doit pouvoir être mis à l'exécution par les mayeurs de la tactique*" / "*Any strategic plan must be made by the tactical mayors*"²³.

This is the level of execution, of implementation of tasks specific to the objectives specified in the mission. The fulfillment of orders at the tactical level does not require a special mental effort, but it requires knowledge, intuition, experience, will, determination, which are the attributes of a good tactician.

²² G. Sheffield, G. Till, *The Challenges of High Command: The British Experience*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2003, p. 191.

²³ A. S. I. l'archiduc Charles; translated of Antoine Henri Jomini, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

STRATEGIC THINKING AND OPERATIVE THINKING

According to the ones presented, I identified two levels of thinking, i. e., strategic thinking and operative thinking, identifying a substantial delimitation between the upper level of application (strategic level) and the lower level (operational and tactical level). Practically, I differentiated the theoretical level related to the political-military level from the practical level related to the operative-tactical level.

Strategic thinking is achieved in the long term. It is conceptual, reflective-cognitive thinking because it is based on theoretical foundations, laws, principles, the decision being scientifically argued. *“The strategist’s weapons are strategic thinking, consistency and coherence”²⁴.*

Strategic thinking is short-term; it identifies the opportunities, the most appropriate response variants for the hypothetical situation. The dynamics of the action environment involve an adaptation of the strategy to the existing news through unique solutions. Strategic thinking aims at achieving an optimal efficiency ratio. Thus, at this level, strategy has the role of identifying those response variants that are the most appropriate (the ones that are needed), the image of the planners being a general one.

Operational thinking is realised in a shorter term, immediately applicable, in a concrete mode of action. Operational thinking is characterised by routine, actionable experience, heuristics of the operational level commander. It is a dynamic action, an adaptive one because as problems arise, they are solved. Strategic thinking aims to achieve goals through effective solutions that solve problems by all means. Thus, at the operational level, strategy has the role of identifying appropriate solutions (as it should), the image of the planners being a local, limited one.



Strategic thinking is achieved in the long term. It is conceptual, reflective-cognitive thinking because it is based on theoretical foundations, laws, principles, the decision being scientifically argued. “The strategist’s weapons are strategic thinking, consistency and coherence”.

²⁴ Kenichi Ohmae (1943-dean UCLA), *The Mind of the Strategist: The Art of Japanese Business*, Paperback, Editura McGraw-Hill Education, 1991, p. 57.



Having in mind the ideas presented up to this point, I can conclude that strategy is a concept in itself because it encompasses a series of descriptive meanings and terms, which coagulate around science and art. So strategy is not a sum of the constituent elements of a system, but rather a concept. I also state that strategy is a process.

STRATEGY AS A PROCESS COMPARED TO STRATEGY AS A CONCEPT

Next, let us look into the dominant features of strategy as a process compared to strategy as a concept.

Strategy as a concept delimits politico-military dependencies; it links politics with military operations, defines political and military analysis criteria, so that an effective strategy must integrate political and military criteria rather than separate them, avoiding thereby the tendency to separate the opinions of civilian and military leaders.

Strategy as a process encompasses a series of interdependent actions, which are carried out on all the levels of manifestation of security: determining the national security objectives; formulating the political strategy; developing of the military strategy; designing the operative strategy (doctrines); formulating the battlefield strategy (tactics).

Strategy as a concept delimits politico-military dependencies; it links politics with military operations, defines political and military analysis criteria, so that an effective strategy must integrate political and military criteria rather than separate them, avoiding thereby the tendency to separate the opinions of civilian and military leaders.

Given the new context of regional security, I consider it is opportune to develop strategies to respond to the globalisation under the conditions of new competitors, challenges and dangers, risks and threats, etc. The competition for resources generates new regional actors, so the old principles need to be adapted to the new security climate. New times, new principles I would say, however, I believe that adaptation is the key to success, so the old principles remain in the spotlight. Why would we need a new strategy? If we look at the security environment, it is defined as multipolar, so the arguments presented above, support the idea of a new strategy.

A possible solution for the realisation of a strategy

„Strategia națională de apărare a țării pentru perioada 2015 – 2019 – O Românie puternică în Europa și în lume” (“The National Defence

Strategy 2015-2019 – A Strong Romania within Europe and the World”) was applied between 2015-2019. “The document facilitates the understanding of how the state – while respecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizen – exerts through its institutions the responsibilities regarding the security of the country and the safety of its citizens”²⁵.

Even though the security environment is in a continuous dynamic, the content elements of the strategy remain largely up-to-date. I am certain that the new security threats will be analysed and taken into account in order to define the next strategic directions.

Next, I want to identify a possible solution for the realisation of a strategy, to see in fact what the process itself is, from the institutional approach to its content.

The institutional process of elaborating a national defense strategy begins with a debate at the national level regarding the realisation of a strategy project, following the refinement and optimisation of the content. In this form, it is submitted to the Parliament by the Romanian President, within a maximum of three months from the investiture²⁶.

The defense strategy includes measures and activities that must be adopted and carried out by the Romanian in order to guarantee the national sovereignty, independence and unity of the state, the territorial integrity of the country and the values of constitutional democracy, with a five-year evaluation horizon. The defense strategy is a product of the national public authorities established by the Romanian Constitution.

A strategy builds on the political and strategic options and decisions of the Romanian Parliament, of the public institutions that have attributions in the field of national security and defense, which must estimate the resources allocated and the necessary means



A strategy builds on the political and strategic options and decisions of the Romanian Parliament, of the public institutions that have attributions in the field of national security and defense, which must estimate the resources allocated and the necessary means in the long term, in order to offer the possibility of achieving the security and national defense.

²⁵ <https://www.presidency.ro/ro/presa/securitate-nationala-si-aparare/ghidul-strategiei-nationale-de-aparare-a-tarii-pentru-perioada-2015-2019>, retrieved on 25.02.2020.

²⁶ *Ordonanța nr. 52, (art. 4) din 12 august 1998 privind planificarea apărării naționale a României/ Ordinance no. 52, (art. 4) of 12 August 1998 regarding the planning of the national defense of Romania*, republished in the *Romania Official Gazette*, Part I, no. 185 of 28 April 2000.



in the long term, in order to offer the possibility of achieving the security and national defense.

THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

Next, let us see specifically what is the process of developing a strategy.

Following the analysis of several strategies at the international level, I identified that in the first stage the national purpose is defined, which is based on values, beliefs and ethics, national interests, to which vision, strategic education, and policies are added.

In the next stage, a strategic level analysis (strategic analysis) is carried out, at the security environment level, which is carried out in four steps, which I will identify and present below.

The analysis model is based on a process of identifying some directions of action. It starts with defining the strategic environment (step I), at the level of the global and internal security environment. In the next step (step II), a careful analysis of the effects of the defined strategic environment on the national security from all points of view is necessary, in relation to the existing strategies of the neighbors.

An evaluation of the strategies of the emerging countries (step III) is needed to identify common interests that are contrary to national interests. After these first three steps, in step IV variants of the national security action directions are determined.

Phase III is the stage of identifying possible directions of action, risks, and threats.

The analysis of the global environment consists of identifying the regional actors, their armed power, the regional interests, trends of the global and regional security environment. This is an analysis process based on a model similar to the one presented above. The competitors, the economic conditions, the effects of globalisation at the region level, the technological development of the neighbors, the international laws that influence regional security are identified.

The international organisations operating in the area are also identified. This goes equally for regional actors, state or non-state,

The analysis of the global environment consists of identifying the regional actors, their armed power, the regional interests, trends of the global and regional security environment. This is an analysis process based on a model similar to the one presented above. The competitors, the economic conditions, the effects of globalisation at the region level, the technological development of the neighbors, the international laws that influence regional security are identified.

exerting a certain influence. Finally, having all the elements presented, in relation to all the variables that influence security, one can identify the risks and threats that can impact on national security.

Generally, the internal security environment is in direct relation with the governing system, which offers the possibility of all the functions of the state regarding the provision of security to manifest in optimal conditions. The analysis of the internal environment consists of identifying the national authorities that have responsibilities for strengthening national security. It identifies the economic conditions, the needs of the society, the dominant social characteristic (the level of social development), the morale of the society, the independence of the media, etc.

The best-known process model for implementing a strategy is the Anglo-Saxon model defined in clear terms by the American school itself: Ends, Ways & Means²⁷:

- *ENDs (objectives)*: political level and political-military level (grand strategy, national strategy);
- *WAYS (ways)*: which can be identified at the level of strategic thinking and operational thinking from a comprehensive perspective (*comprehensive approach*);
- *MEANs (means)*: development of capabilities and means; implementation of strategic directions with the help of developed and available means (at the level of operative-tactical thinking).

I believe that the process of elaborating a national strategy can be based on the Objectives-Ways-Means model, in which we identify:

- national objectives (*Ends*); identified the purposes;
- strategic concept (*Ways*); identified the path;
- instruments of national power (*Means*): identified those means that must be developed in order to achieve the goals; identified



ROMANIAN
MILITARY
THINKING

The analysis of the internal environment consists of identifying the national authorities that have responsibilities for strengthening national security. It identifies the economic conditions, the needs of the society, the dominant social characteristic (the level of social development), the morale of the society, the independence of the media, etc.

²⁷ Gregory D. Miller, Chris Rogers, Francis J. H. Park, William F. Owen, and Jeffrey W. Meiser, *On Strategy as Ends, Ways, and Means*, journal of the US Army War College 47(1):125-126, January 2017.



those resources with can be developed the capabilities which we can provide an optimal response, adequate to the security needs of the following years.

This model of strategy development is based on the result of the global and internal analysis. It has enabled me to identify possible directions of strategic action and conduct a strategic analysis from a comprehensive approach.

This approach consists of identifying national interests based on their prioritisation, defining national values and principles, evaluating the identified problems, trends and challenges, risks, and threats, opportunities to manifest national interests on security.

Following is the application of the previously proposed model, which consists of: determining the objectives (ends), elaborating the alternatives (ways), depending on the resources available or necessary (means) to reach the objectives.

Having performed this analysis, one can proceed to the next step, i. e., risk assessment, in the sense of identifying the most vulnerable pillar of the objectives-ways-means model. The result is a well-founded strategic policy recommendation.

This model can be verified by an analysis that takes into account the following criteria: adequacy, acceptability, feasibility, risk assessment. If the strategic directions obtained respond positively to the analysis of the aforementioned criteria, then we have a strategy.

A BRIEF CASE STUDY

Let us check the applicability of the model by analysing the content of the national defense strategy: *The National Defence Strategy 2015-2019 – A Strong Romania within Europe and the World*.

Stage I

Defined purpose: *“A strong Romania within Europe and the World, a state that ensures the security of its citizens wherever they are”²⁸.*

²⁸ *The National Defence Strategy 2015-2019 – A Strong Romania within Europe and the World (Strategia Națională de Apărare a Țării pentru Perioada 2015-2019. O Românie puternică în Europa și în lume)*, The Presidential Administration, București, 2015.

We identify the national values: *“dignity; civic cohesion and affirmation of national identity; constitutional democracy and the rule of law; the state and territorial integrity of Romania”*²⁹.

We identify the national principles: *“continuity; predictability; legality; proportionality”*³⁰. Also, national security interests are defined. We can identify them in the chapter 1.2. *Interese naționale de securitate*³¹ :

Stage II

Step I: defining and evaluating the global and internal strategic environment.

In *Chapter II* of strategy, we can identify the *“international security environment assessment”*³², in which we find a presentation of the global security environment, the security dimension at the Euro-Atlantic level and the regional security environment. This chapter presents the state of the security environment, its evolution, and trends.

Step II: a careful analysis of the effects of the strategic environment on national security is performed.

Step III: evaluation of the strategies of the regional actors, to identify the common interests and those that contradict the national interests.

As a result of this analysis, we can identify the threats, risks, and vulnerabilities to national security presented in *Chapter III: “amenințări, riscuri și vulnerabilități”*³³ (*threats, risks and vulnerabilities*).

After this step, the *Ends* are obtained, which represent the first pillar in the *Ends, Ways & Means* triptych. We identify the national security objectives (*Ends*):

- *“strengthening Romania’s profile in NATO and the EU through both conceptual and operational contributions;*



In Chapter II of strategy, we can identify the “international security environment assessment”, in which we find a presentation of the global security environment, the security dimension at the Euro-Atlantic level and the regional security environment.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 7.

³¹ *Ibid*, p. 8.

³² *Ibid*, p. 11.

³³ *Ibid*, pp. 14-16.



The directions of action and the main ways of ensuring national security (Ways) are: “the defense dimension; the public order dimension; the informational dimension, counter-information, and security dimension; the economic and energy dimension; the diplomatic dimension; the crisis management dimension; the educational, health, social and demographic dimension”.

- respecting the fundamental principles and values of the EU;
- strengthening the strategic partnership with the USA, including in the economic and commercial field;
- ensuring security in the Black Sea;
- deepening cooperation with neighboring states and those on the eastern flank;
- intensifying regional cooperation including in the field of defense;
- supporting the European path of the Rep. Moldova;
- promoting political, economic and security interests in regions of strategic relevance for our country”³⁴.

Step IV. Defining the directions of action, following the identification of threats, risks, and vulnerabilities, which in fact represent the *Ways*, the second pillar of the triptych *Ends, Ways & Means*. Let us see what are the *Ways* presented in strategy, through which these objectives can be applied. These are presented in *Chapter IV: Direcții de acțiune și principalele modalități pentru asigurarea securității naționale a României*³⁵ (*Directions of action and the main ways to ensure the national security of Romania*). If we analyse the content, we can conclude that here are the means, too, which in my opinion are not sufficiently detailed.

The directions of action and the main ways of ensuring national security (Ways) are: “the defense dimension; the public order dimension; the informational dimension, counter-information, and security dimension; the economic and energy dimension; the diplomatic dimension; the crisis management dimension; the educational, health, social and demographic dimension”³⁶.

These are the main benchmarks for defining possible directions of action and identifying risks and threats to national security.

³⁴ *Ibid*, p. 10.

³⁵ *Ibid*, pp. 18-22.

³⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 18-22.

In conclusion, the *Ends, Ways & Means* model applies well to the National Defense Strategy, with the mention that *Means* can be detailed, that is, the concrete way of developing those presented directions should be identified, thus offering the premises of their materialization. Following the analysis, I identified the national goals (*Ends*), I identified *Ways*, but I did not identify *Means* well represented. If means are not defined, this aspect is also transmitted to strategic documents that extract their directions from this national reference document.

Having validated the method of realising a strategy, I consider that these aspects are a result of the theory and art of the Romanian school that uses the theory and applies the art of modern strategic thinking.

THE PLACE OF A MARITIME STRATEGY

Next, I would like to identify the place of a maritime strategy, which extracts its purpose and objectives from the directions specified in the national strategy. Also from here, it extracts his foundation and a military strategy. Having developed a national defense strategy, there is the premise of developing a military strategy that meets the country's security guidelines.

The maritime component of security is another national objective that should not be neglected, specified in the framework of the national strategy in *Chapter I*³⁷. Thus, a maritime strategy of the Black Sea must also represent a national priority institutional approach. The advantages of a maritime strategy are reflected by the existence of security, of the favorable environment for the development of the economy, which leads to the multiplication of the country's welfare. From this point of view, maritime security is very important.

A maritime strategy must occupy a wider space, well defined, in the national strategy, in the military strategy as well as in the military-strategic plans. In my opinion, there are all the premises



A maritime strategy of the Black Sea must also represent a national priority institutional approach. The advantages of a maritime strategy are reflected by the existence of security, of the favorable environment for the development of the economy, which leads to the multiplication of the country's welfare. From this point of view, maritime security is very important.

³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 10.



The manifestation of national interests in the maritime environment has a direct connection with the maritime power of the state. The components of maritime power must be subjects of analysis of a maritime strategy. The most visible component of maritime power is the naval power, represented by the Romanian Navy.

for developing a maritime strategy that clearly defines national interests in the maritime environment. I recall that the strategy represents a means of achieving the goals defined by the policy, thus, the maritime strategy represents the means by which the national interests in the maritime environment are fulfilled.

It is precisely this aspect of my approach that I consider being the novelty of this article, which consists in identifying the place of the maritime strategy within the National Defense Strategy and the Military Strategy.

The manifestation of national interests in the maritime environment has a direct connection with the maritime power of the state. The components of maritime power must be subjects of analysis of a maritime strategy. The most visible component of maritime power is the naval power, represented by the Romanian Navy. The capabilities of this component (means) are the most important vector for achieving the objectives of the maritime strategy. I believe that together with the naval forces, human resources and education are the most accessible means of achieving these objectives, components that must be fully exploited and exploited.

In my opinion, after analysing the content of the previous strategies, I consider that they did not represent the maritime strategies well. I also bring in your attention to the fluvial component. Let us not forget the Danube River! In this direction, I consider that a maritime strategy must also include Romanian fluvial interests. I do not think we can yet speak of the opportunity to develop a strategy for the Danube River, because the Danube River is not fully exploited, but we can approach the field within the Romanian maritime strategy.

Therefore, I consider two variants of presenting Romania's maritime interests. In the first version, I consider its own maritime strategy. In the second variant, I believe that this can be found in the national defense strategy. The provocative question is how to represent a maritime strategy in the national defense strategy and in the military one. But I will resume this topic in another dedicated work.

In the hypothesis that we are not yet prepared to have a separate maritime strategy, in this variant, I propose a separate chapter in the national defense strategy, which defines maritime and fluvial security.

A brief comparative analysis

In order to make a comparative picture, I will analyse how the issue of national and maritime security is approached in the neighboring countries and I have chosen two partners and allies, Bulgaria and Poland, identifying the strategic model and directions of the main strategic documents.

I chose Bulgaria, because we have a lot of commonalities regarding the manifestation of regional interests, to see what their vision is about security and how they develop their capabilities to ensure it. I also chose Poland because I observed a considerable involvement in the strengthening of regional security, an increase in the capabilities of action and a political consensus that supports the measures provided for in the national security strategy.

Following the analysis of the Bulgarian national strategy, I found that it is also built on the Anglo-Saxon model, adopted after joining NATO, and defines in great detail the objectives, ways, and means necessary to strengthen national security, the army is the main vector to guarantee the fulfillment of political intentions, the necessary means being of human, material, informational and financial nature³⁸. It should be noted that our neighbors have their own maritime strategy, through which they promote their own maritime interests but also those of the community, promoting measures to cooperate with their neighbours³⁹.

Analyzing the Poland Security Strategy⁴⁰, I found that it is very dynamic and adaptive to the international Security environment.



Following the analysis of the Bulgarian national strategy, I found that it is also built on the Anglo-Saxon model, adopted after joining NATO, and defines in great detail the objectives, ways, and means necessary to strengthen national security, the army is the main vector to guarantee the fulfillment of political intentions, the necessary means being of human, material, informational and financial nature.

³⁸ *National Defense Strategy, Sofia, 2011*, conform www.strategy.bg, retrieved on 27.02.2020.

³⁹ <https://www.moew.government.bg/en/water/marine-environment/marine-strategy-of-republic-of-bulgaria/> retrieved on 27.02.2020.

⁴⁰ *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw, 2014*



The Poland defense strategy starts from the objectives set at the political level, sets the ends, to increase the deterrent capacity, establishes the ways, i.e. modeling the desired form of the Polish army, thus being called the means by which these objectives are achieved.

I noticed that in 2016, Poland launched a new strategic concept, very realistic, that would respond to security needs under the conditions of A2AD threats⁴¹, defining very clearly the objectives, the ways and means by which to achieve them. The document, however, emphasises and details the ways in which the strategic objectives can be achieved with a deadline established in 2032, the focus being the defense capabilities, the command, and control system, the responsiveness. The political environment plays an important role⁴². Interestingly, the effects of applying this strategy are already being observed, with the Polish Armed Forces being highly visible at regional, alliance and EU levels, which gives it a credible security generator position.

In 2016, Poland launched a new strategic concept, very realistic, that would respond to security needs under the conditions of A2AD threats, defining very clearly the objectives, the ways and means by which to achieve them.

Concerning the Poland maritime strategy⁴³, I identified that the strategic document contains the assessment of the maritime security environment, the threats, risks, opportunities and challenges, the assessment of the country's maritime forces, defines the national interests and the strategic objectives. The elements of tradition, historical and social-cultural context are presented. It basically represents a coherent dialogue forum that requires a synergistic and integrated approach⁴⁴. In my opinion, it is a very well-balanced strategic document, the *Ends, Ways & Means* model being well applied⁴⁵.

Following the analysis, I noticed two different security approaches, one declarative and one actionable. The Polish example is

⁴¹ <https://www.defence24.com/polish-national-defence-concept-new-division-and-5th-generation-fighter-aircraft>, retrieved on 29.02.2020.

⁴² <https://www.gov.pl/web/national-defence/polish-defence-in-the-perspective-of-2032>, retrieved on 29.02.2020.

⁴³ <https://en.bbn.gov.pl/ftp/dok/SKBMRPENG.pdf> retrieved on 27.02.2020.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p. 6.

⁴⁵ Tomasz Szatkowski, Undersecretary of State at the Polish Ministry of Defence, <https://www.defence24.com/polish-national-defence-concept-new-division-and-5th-generation-fighter-aircraft>, retrieved on 29.02.2020.

a benchmark for the member countries on the eastern flank of the Euro-Atlantic bloc, which must be followed. They identified the potential and opportunities that generated the awareness of the proactive adaptation to the security environment threats and identified the ways of expressing the national intentions. It is worth noting that Poland has indeed found the key to success, which I identified at the level of political will.

CONCLUSIONS

Following the presentation of a possible solution for the realization of a strategy and the analysis of the content of the national defense strategy, I consider that a strategy must be defined by the following characteristics: be proactive and anticipatory; to be hierarchical, that is to define clearly the objectives, to define and identify the ways of accomplishment, to identify and to offer the possibility of developing the means for the accomplishment of the objectives. Basically, it has to strike an appropriate balance between ends, ways, and means. Political objectives must prevail in one strategy.

I believe that the national defense strategy is well structured, but even though I have clearly identified the ends and the ways, I have not found well represented the concrete means of achieving the political objectives.

As a specialist in the field of maritime operative art, I felt the need to promote such an approach, because an articulated strategy of the Black Sea does not exist and its realization is an effort that requires time and resources.

Successfully promoting the maritime strategy depends on the awareness of the political class of the importance of the manifestation of the maritime power, of the valorisation of the resources of the maritime and fluvial environment. I believe that the fulfillment of national maritime interests is achieved by creating and developing a maritime power supported by the existence of a naval strategy that emphasizes the defense of the interests of the state at sea and river.



Successfully promoting the maritime strategy depends on the awareness of the political class of the importance of the manifestation of the maritime power, of the valorisation of the resources of the maritime and fluvial environment.



I believe that the novelty of this article consists in the attempt to identify the place of the maritime strategy in the framework of the National Defense Strategy and the Military Strategy, which is the level of representativeness and which is the opportunity of such an approach, in relation to Romania's maritime power.

The missing link in the national defense strategy is defined by the national maritime and fluvial policy. I think that for the moment, Romania is not prepared to have a maritime strategy on its own, but in the long term, this objective must be achieved. That is why, in my opinion, I think it is appropriate to start such a process, for which I personally started the promotion. Such an approach, the promotion of Romania's maritime strategy is the result of an integrated vision regarding the motivation of protecting the maritime and fluvial interests of our country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ***, *National Defense Strategy, Sofia, 2011*, www.strategy.bg.
2. ***, *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw, 2014*.
3. ***, *Ordonanța nr. 52, (art. 4) din 12 august 1998 privind planificarea apărării naționale a României*, republished.
4. ***, *Strategia Națională de Apărare a Țării pentru perioada 2015-2019. O Românie puternică în Europa și în lume/The National Defence Strategy 2015-2019 – A Strong Romania within Europe and the World*, The Presidential Administration, București, 2015.
5. Antoine Henri Jomini, *Principes de la stratégie*, Paris, 1818; translated from German to French.
6. David M. Glantz, Harold S. Orenstein, *The Evolution of Soviet Operational Art, 1927-1991: The Documentary Basis*, vol I., Franc Cass London, 1995.
7. Colin Gray, John Baylis, James Wirtz, *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press, 2019.
8. Gregory D. Miller, Chris Rogers, Francis J.H. Park, William F. Owen, Jeffrey W.Meiser, *On Strategy as Ends, Ways, and Means*, Journal of the US Army War College 47(1):125-126, January 2017.
9. Mircea Mureșan, Costică Țenu, Lucian Stăncilă, *Corelația artei militare cu fenomenul militar contemporan, Curs de artă militară*, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare, București, 2005.

10. Gheorghe Văduva, *Principii ale războiului și luptei armate-realițăți și tendințe*, Universitatea Națională de Apărare, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Apărare și Securitate, București, 2003.
11. Wilhelm Rustow, *The War for the Rhine Frontier 1870, its Political and Military History*, Vol. 2, p. 281.



WEBOGRAPHY:

1. dexonline.ro
2. <https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/articles/ideas-work/von-clausewitz-war-six-lessons-modern-strategist>
3. <https://devcentral.f5.com/s/articles/he-who-defends-everything-defends-nothinghellip-right>
4. https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/usmc/mcdp/1-1/mcdp1-1_chap2.pdf
5. <https://www.presidency.ro/ro/presa/securitate-nationala-si-aparare/ghidul-strategiei-nationale-de-aparare-a-tarii-pentru-perioada-2015-2019>
6. <https://www.moew.government.bg/en/water/marine-environment/marine-strategy-of-republic-of-bulgaria/>
7. <https://www.defence24.com/polish-national-defence-concept-new-division-and-5th-generation-fighter-aircraft>
8. <https://www.gov.pl/web/national-defence/polish-defence-in-the-perspective-of-2032>
9. <https://en.bbn.gov.pl/ftp/dok/SKBMRPENG.pdf>