



## **Narrative Report concerning the Third Seminar of the Ovidiu Sincai European School 2011 Edition Danube Delta, 2-5 June 2011**

The third national seminar of the “Ovidiu Sincai” European School – 2011 edition took place at the *Mila 35 Complex* from the Danube Delta in the period 2-5 June 2011. Its main theme was ***Challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. A Changing World.*** Lectures were presented by:

- **Constantin Hlihor**, Professor, “Dimitrie Cantemir” Christian University, Bucharest – **“Challenges of globalization for the nation-states”**;
- **Iulian Fota**, Advisor for National Security of the President of Romania – **“The European Union and the remodelling of international relations”**;
- **Ioan Mircea Pascu**, MEP, Vice-chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET), former Minister of Defence (2001-2004) – **“The role of the European Parliament in the EU foreign relations after the Lisbon Treaty”**;
- **Anne Juganaru**, Member of the Board, Romanian Public Television – **“Mass media: a substitute for justice systems?”**;
- **Teodor Melescanu**, Senator, former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1992-1996) and of Defence (2007-2008) – **“Techniques of negotiation in diplomacy”**.

Below are the main ideas which emerged during the presentations and the debates:

### **1. Constantin Hlihor – “Challenges of globalization for the nation-states”**

Globalization involves pressures in three main fields: (1) identity; (2) security; (3) economy. Generally, people operate with two types of realities: (a) physical – which is touchable and material; (b) social-constructed – which cannot be perceived by the senses. Humankind is the only living being moving between these two types of realities. That is why any change is taking place, first at the social-constructed level, then at physical level (if it is possible). Most often, the socially-constructed feeling of fear (insecurity) is used in order to restructure traditional societies. This feeling was globalized not so much by a multiplication of real threats, but by a modification of the mass media generated perceptions.

Globalization and the nation-state are socially-constructed terms, which are concrete only by their component elements. Both realities are perceived according to cultural, religious and other values. Generally, globalization can be perceived in three ways: (1) commonly, approximated and little defined; (2) academically – the interest

does not consist in changing attitudes and behaviours; (3) interest-constructed – for example, ideological (by means of parties), religious. These are only different images of the same reality.

Globalization is a reality specific to post-modern societies, which currently does not yet affect all human societies, which implies changes of an abstract nature in political, social and economic organization. At the same time, globalization is also reflected by groups of people living within this reality, which constitutes a product of human reflection (by means of studies, books, products, mass media), people who live and define the phenomenon by means of the information they have.

According to the attitude towards globalization, people can be divided into three categories: (a) optimists, who believe that globalization is essential to human development and progress in all fields; (b) sceptics, who consider that standards can be global, but resources are unequal (11% of the world population 67% of resources); (c) balanced people, who combine the first two tendencies.

Globalization can also be promotion, advertising or propaganda (an implicit phenomenon). Over 80% of media materials are, in fact, vehicles of promoting change and not of information, as most viewers believe.

Globalization has an impact over communities at the following levels: (1) political, over the state of organization pattern of a community, including the territorial organization; (2) economic, by detaching the value from the material object, for example by substituting the metal coin through the value given by negotiation; (3) resources, which are physical elements, but which can become stakes by establishing property over them, which makes the others' access more difficult and gives value to resources.

The nation-state has a tradition of two centuries in Europe and the western world, in general. This concept is based on the loyalty of people towards a central authority and on their solidarity against dangers, but most of all on a territory, a population and a set of rules of a psycho-social kind, rationally justified, on institutions (parliament, administration, justice system). At the same time, the nation-state is based on identity, as a result of the ideology lying at the foundation of

establishing the state and which gives birth to citizenship, meaning the legitimacy of the state as the single depository of the monopoly on violence. Globalization is manifested, in this last case, through the phenomenon of army, protection



and security firms and public order privatisation.

The individual's identity matrix is established according to solidarity and cohesion, of an existing common feeling and of loyalty towards the state, which creates physical comfort and confers rights. This matrix is based on "hard" elements (social and cultural specificity, communities) and on "soft" elements (education, institutional space, political, moral, ethic and ethnic values). Globalization determines a restructuring of the matrix to the lowest levels, by atomizing the society. At the same time, loyalty towards the state is decreasing, as founding national myth do not ensure ethnic solidarity anymore, being replaced by other myths of the globalized contemporary society.

The main problem of the European Union is not the integration of national matrixes, but the integration of other (extra-European) populations. European national societies are generally open to integrate European populations from the same cultural space. However, globalization flattens the image of foreigners, generalizing the image of anti-social behaviours. Nevertheless, the European nation-states' identity matrix is not the same, as they are forced to adapt to the new global conditions.

## **2. Iulian Fota – "The European Union and the remodelling of international relations"**

In the period 1990-2008, it can be said that international relations were on holiday. After the end of the Cold War and the fall of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe, we have witnessed the expansion of the free market, of the western democratic regime and of the United States' military predominance. In this context, we saw NATO and EU enlarging towards the east of the European continent and the insertion of the globalization phenomenon, as an opportunity for prosperity in the region.

Romania grounded its state policy after 1989 on the premise of belonging to the West, by virtue of its Latin ethnic origin and of the interwar parliamentary tradition. During the period 2002-2008, almost 60 billion euro was pumped into Romania as foreign direct investment.

Currently, humankind has reached a level of development which can even modify the natural environment; we would be in the so-called era of "Antropocene". Globalization contributes to the development of countries in its core, which make up the western world. At the same time, peripheral countries are also affected, but in a more complex manner. Some resources begin to become scarcer (water, oil, ice etc.), which generates a harsh competition.

The year 2008 is very important because it marks the occurrence of the economic crisis and because the Russo-Georgian conflict takes place, which is changing the global logic. The economic crisis leads to the emergence of a zero or negative sum game. The Russo-Georgian conflict indicates a reactivation of Russia's imperial tendencies. This is a situation of effervescence at the level of international relations, especially due to the economic ascent of BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China), beside other extra-European actors, such as Turkey and Israel. Also, revolts from the Arab world, corroborated with disagreements among western countries, constitute new challenges to international stability.

China has become the second world power, from an economic and political point of view. It is estimated that, in 2018-2020, China will economically match the United States. Having achieved such a status, China will have a different share in international institutions (IMF, UN, World Bank etc.), fostering a bipolar structure, such as a G2. The US and China can rule the world together but they can also confront each other.

In Europe, the geopolitical space is tri-polar, under the influence of the spațiul Berlin – Moscow – Ankara triangle. There is also an external significant actor, the US, which has military bases and troops stationed on the European continent. Tensions existing within the European Union begin to transfer from the traditional East-West division to the North-South division. This is demonstrated by the worsening of the economic crisis in countries such as Greece, Portugal and Spain.

In matters of foreign policy, the European engine is no longer Franco-German but Franco-British, with the significant support of the United States. European countries have become more self-centrist and it is very difficult to build a unitary policy in this field. In the Arab world, the “Jasmine revolutions” have warmed relations between anti-western actors, so that the former secret relations with western governments will be replaced by a more reserved attitude. Israel is also not in a very comfortable position.

At an institutional level, rules are increasingly questioned. The new world order will be a competition based on rivalries, spheres of influence, mercantile networks (the pessimistic model) or will continue the old order, based on openness, rules and multilateralism (the optimistic model). Any rearrangements of the world were historically achieved through war. But in democratic regimes financial resources mostly come from trade.

The development of world trade can help contain poverty and conflicts.

In what concerns Romania, there are a few internal handicaps that must be overcome: (1)



(2) the status of a predominantly rural country; (3) the current ideological confusion; (4) the increasing social cleavages; (5) deprofesionalization; (6) grey economics. The lack of internal solidarity is a strategic weakness to this end. The value system and the meritocracy that were destroyed during the communist regime (1945-1989), must be rebuilt from scratch.

### 3. Ioan Mircea Pascu – “The role of the European Parliament in the EU foreign relations after the Lisbon Treaty”

Foreign policy is a field which involves the essence of the nation-state’s sovereignty. As a consequence, EU member states were for many years reticent towards integration in this area, as opposed to cooperation, which went very well.

In 1970, the initiation of the European Political Cooperation process was a mild form of cooperation in foreign affairs (inter-governmentalism). In 1992, by the Treaty of Maastricht, EU foreign policy was included in the second pillar of treaties, concerning inter-governmental cooperation. In 1999, on the occasion of the Cologne summit, the office of EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy was established.

The Lisbon Treaty brought important changes to the EU institutional framework. Also, the office of President of the European Council (which became an institution) was created. The EU was endowed with legal personality, so that the High Representative can now address to the UN General assembly on behalf of the Union. Also, the European External Action Service (EEAS) was established, which is a sort of diplomatic service of the Union.

The European parliament (EP) receives, in this context, extended powers, including in the field of foreign affairs, which nonetheless remains a field mainly



regulated at inter-governmental level. The European Council identifies the Union’s strategic interests and objectives in the field of foreign affairs and the other fields of external action, and decisions

are taken by unanimity. EP proposals in this field are addressed to the Council and to the High Representative. The High Representative is also a member of the Council and a Vice-President of the European Commission, so that he can delegate a part of his multiple attributes to other Commissioners or members of the Council.

Currently, there is a nationalization of the Union’s policies, which creates serious hurdles against the foreign policy integration process. Even in the case of EEAS, there were difficult negotiations between the EP, Commission, Council and the member states. The lack of institutional coherence is due to the fact that European policies are evaluated at national level. Also, the personality of those who are first

appointed into offices affects the institutional profile. Another negative element is the European institutional inertia, which gave birth to a self-generating bureaucracy.

#### **4. Anne Juganaru – “Mass media: a substitute for justice systems?”**

The right to the freedom of expression, as well as the freedom of the press, as a corollary of this right, represents fundamental values of the modern pluralist democracy. Without them, many of the progresses achieved in the contemporary world couldn't be imagined. That is why all these rights must be defended.

However, these rights that were hard to acquire in the difficult process of democracy's birth, are nowadays abusively exercised in subtle forms by one of their major beneficiary which should have been one of their main defenders: the mass-media.

The experience of the last decade in Central Europe, for example, shows that mass media served decisively in the construction of the civil society and in censuring the authoritarian trends of some politicians or parties. Also, it corrected and continues to correct, the excesses, misconducts and management errors in the countries with a consolidated democracy. Without the freedom of expression, and thus without the freedom of mass media, a democracy cannot be conceived. A free press sometimes makes difficult a democratic government's life or the life of public personalities; but it always makes a dictatorship impossible.

In the context of these statements it must though be noticed that democracy is passing, at present, through a crisis of growth and of adaptation to the new contemporary world realities. The causes of this crisis are: (a) the inadequacy of the mechanisms of the democracy developed in the national environment to the conditions of globalizations; (b) the occurrence, in the context of emergent globalization, of social communities who, fearing they will not be able to adapt to the new conditions, are sensitive to the populist and national-populist message; (c) the weakening of the credibility and even of the efficiency of democracy's classic mechanisms because of the lack of transparency, electoralization and commercialization of the political action. As for the third cause, it must be underlined that the invasion of the democratic exercise by the methods of the commercial marketing and the development of "show state" led to the wider separation of society from the political field and of the power from the truth. This fact is expressed by the low turn out at the elections, the civic non-involvement and the cynical views of the social actors. In respect of all these three causes, mass media has an immense responsibility and an essential role to play.

Mass media has some responsibilities as far as the crisis of the democracy is concerned. This is related at least to the following aspects:

- Mass media makes it possible the appearance and the development of the "political show". Electoralism means the exaltation of the elections' importance, not as a method for the consultation of the electorate in order to identify its aspirations and expectations, but only as a method of seizing the power. The power without a mandate regarding the application of a clear program is, though, a power that cannot be exercised. On medium and long term, such a power alienates the electorate; as it creates the feeling the voters have no control over politicians (decision making and decision makers).

- Mass media might create as well, false personalities and destroy real personalities. It might impose questionable political groups and hide compromising truths, inventing, at the same time, artificial crises.
- Mass media sometimes could determine the spending of important amounts of money in campaign that might confuse the ordinary people and, thus, might actually encourage corruption.
- Mass media, in a number of cases, distorts reality and induces pessimism, scepticism, distrust and an inclination towards isolation and violence in society through its mainly conflicting approaches and its search for the sensation.

It is always very disturbing when mass media tries to determine the issues on the public agenda. Often artificially and without any relation with the citizens' real agenda and the priorities recommended by the social reality mass media attempts to establish political priorities. This fact can be explained, among others, by the secret links between mass media and the great national or international corporations. In such cases, although introducing itself as representing a public interest, mass media actually represents the private interests. This situation can lead to manipulations of the public opinion in the direction desired by the private financial sponsors, who are looking for some market advantages or economic gains.

On the other hand, the emergence of media monopolies creates the premises of reducing the number of options available to the citizen and the possibility of his subtle manipulation. The quality of information decreases and the danger of disorienting the citizen increases, as the very laws of competition on the free market are not protecting the press consumer any longer. This means, at the same time, the decrease in the quality of democracy.

All these negative phenomena - ever more serious as globalization advances and the press conveys events happening at long distance, events that the receiver cannot check directly – should lead to the recognition, besides the right to free information, to the freedom of expression and the freedom of the press, of a citizen's right to accurate information.

## **5. Teodor Melescanu – “Techniques of negotiation in diplomacy”**

Negotiation is a current social activity in the life of each of us. The term comes from *negotium*, which originally meant the denial of any other alternative. Negotiation is different from conversation, which does not have the same purposes and effects. Negotiation offers an alternative to conflict in solving disputes they may emerge in inter-human relations. Economically, negotiation is also a means of stimulating sales, especially under the American influence of the last decades.

Diplomacy is the field which uses most often negotiation, but it also has the function to represent a state in international relations. International differences of opinion can be solved in two ways: through conflict or through diplomatic negotiation.

Any negotiation has the following essential features: (1) it is a social phenomenon by which people communicate, especially in the case of a complex politico-diplomatic negotiation; (2) contributes to the division or redistribution of resources; (3) it may be meant to define a common final objective (which is called integrative negotiation), case in which all parties must consider that they have won; (4) is a competitive process contributing to the achievement of common interests

following mutual concessions, after reaching a balance, without compromising in essential problems, though; (5) the argument line procedure is based on rational elements.

There are several negotiation typologies, such as: (a) internal political negotiations, usually taking place between parties or institution (they can be pre-electoral, post-electoral, parliamentary, tripartite etc.); (b) diplomatic negotiations; (c) military negotiations; (d) cultural negotiations; (e) economic and commercial. If we analyze the parties involved, negotiations can be bilateral or multilateral.

In a negotiation, we usually have several stages which have to be covered. The first of them is pre-negotiation, which implies the preparation and organization of negotiations. In this context, one should take into account a preparation of alternatives and files, drawing up and approval of the mandate (including the final version of the objective to be fulfilled) and the formation of the negotiation team (appointing a negotiator-in-chief, who I helped by experts in various fields). A second stage is the negotiation itself, based on offers, arguments, concessions, periods of reflection and reaching an agreement. The third stage is post-negotiation. After signing the final document, its provisions must be applied. Sometimes unknown, unpredictable elements can arise, case in which the negotiation resumes or, if there are other problems, it can reach to arbitration. Apart from these, there can also be a proto-negotiation phase, made up of things happening beside the negotiation itself, certain

articles in the media, the positions of non-state actors etc.

In any negotiation, communication is predominantly oral and takes place in real time, clarifications being made on the spot, by using



persuasion, reassurance, manipulation, correction. The main instrument used, in this context, is verbal communication. Among the problems that can arise are ambiguity (when double-meaning phrases are used), polarization (presenting realities in black and white, friend or enemy), generalization (ignoring the lack of information, limited perception), logorrhoea (unidirectional blocking of communication, indiscretions, monologue), egocentrism and secrecy (lack of reaction).

A good communication during a negotiation is made up of the formal message, real content, perception, understanding, memory and acceptance. Repetition of the same discourse is recommended for the interlocutor to memorize the ideas. Also, one

must respect the rule of the five “W” (Who? What? When? Where? Why?) and the rule of the four „f” (friendly, frank, fair, factual).

There is also a series of communication techniques that can become an advantage in a communication. Silence can also be an important communication means. In Ancient Greece, rhetoric was the science to convincingly speak in public, especially in the context of Athenian democracy. Romans were also experts in rhetoric, especially in its practice, which they called oratory (from among the great Roman orators we can recall Cicero, Seneca etc.). The five major phases of oratory are: (1) *de inventione*, consisting in gathering information and material about the field in question; (2) *de dispositione*, which consists in making up the structure and the general presentation; (3) *de elocutione*, deciding the presentation manner by using personal qualities or eloquence exercises; (4) *de memoriae*, representing the phase of memorizing the text, for a convincing presentation according to the original (a text which is read has the advantage of a very correct and precise presentation and great chances to persuade, but the impact over the audience is smaller; memorization and free presentation can incur the risk of omissions and mistakes, but has a greater impact in public, also according to personal qualities); (5) *de actio*, consisting in the clothes use, looks, stature, visual contact, non-verbal communication.

Among the main negotiation techniques, the following can be mentioned: (a) clipping, by accomplishing agreements around small point (“small successes”); (b) package, by mutual concessions in order to accomplish a general agreement; (c) expanding the field, by adding elements in order to dilute the opponents’ objectives; (d) transformation, in order to achieve minimal elements; (e) appeal to third parties (arbitrage); (f) time manipulation, by procrastination, pauses, asking for thinking time, setting deadlines, false concessions; (g) veiling, as a factor to surprise the opponent; (h) blaming the other, as an emotional factor; (i) duality, meaning negotiation (secretly or not) with other interlocutors from the opposing delegation; (j) ace in the sleeve; (k) the great patron, miming generosity; (m) equivocate (“yes, but...”); (n) ultimatum, if it is based on a strong position; (o) *fait accompli*, in order to force the other’s hand; (p) limited mandate to hide disagreement; (q) short-circuiting, avoidance or distracting attention, in order to raise confusion; (r) sterile negotiation, by asking for impossible concessions, which can generate a conflict spiral; (s) immorality, by annoying the partner, exhaustion, competition, offering alternatives, taking “hostages”, alternating the negotiator, using emotions; (t) postponing, by asking repeated questions; (u) checking reactions, by asking for additional information.

The constructive ambiguity formulas contribute to difficulties in applying agreements. However, negation is not common to diplomacy. A bad decision is, nevertheless, better than the lack of negotiation. It is often said that a twisted negotiation is still better than a just war.

## **6. Evaluation of questionnaires**

Questions regarded the evaluation of each speaker, according to informational content, novelty, interactivity and efficiency (on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest level), appreciations regard the organisation of the third seminar, compared to the first two, interaction with other participants and speakers and recommendations for future editions.

Accordingly, the organization of the second seminar was considered superior and above average (most of the participants choosing the answer “Very Good” and “Good”). As far as the communication with other participants and the speakers, it was considered satisfactory at both levels.

Participants have recommended the following: more interactivity (working groups, time limit for each question), organizing a socialization programme after courses and preserving the same qualitative standards for organizing future seminar.

