

Laura Cristina PA-CU
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași
Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences
PhD Researcher, POSDRU/159/1.5/S/132400 - "Young successful researchers –
professional development in an international and interdisciplinary environment"

GEOPOLITICS - A NEW FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS: GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES

Empirical
study

Keywords

Geopolitics;
Globalization;
International relations;
Security;
Development cooperation;
Geo-economics

JEL Classification

F35, F63, P33

Abstract

Geopolitics born at the end of the 19th century and reborn at the end of the 20th century, from the need to explain certain issues arising out of the general evolution of human society and the growing influence of permanent politico-economic changes on the human consciousness and the entire system of socio-political life and culture. Also, geopolitics gives us the opportunity to reflect on the manifestation and evolution of power relations within a particular historical period, to assess and track changes and trends in the current system of international relations, giving us indicators and analytical methods about the reality of international relations.

The relations of competition versus cooperation between international actors have changed gradually in the 21st century; however, development cooperation can provide solutions or opportunities for defining global problems. Globalization creates a new framework in security and international relations also introduced the geo-economics perspectives to assumed new found geopolitical importance at the outset of the twenty-first century.

Introduction

In the globalized world of interdependence, as the one where we live in the present, we cannot limit the trace just deterministic coordinates of geographical areas. We must look beyond these maps, these figures and to analyze the influence that, the layout on a given geographical space, one has on the evolution of a State. In a widely accepted form, geopolitics is this analysis of the importance and influence of geographical elements of internal and external policy of the country.

Geopolitics, born at the end of the 19th century and reborn at the end of the 20th century, from the need to explain certain issues arising out of the general evolution of human society and the growing influence of permanent politico-economic changes on the human consciousness and the entire system of socio-political life and culture.

Both foreign policy and domestic politics and geopolitics are linked together, and the beginning of the evolution of the modern state of the international system represented the beginning of geopolitical perspective, because the interpretation is geopolitics is a national, regional or global, governed by a state or by a system of states, under strong power-dependent relationships.

In terms of maximum generality, geopolitics gives us the opportunity to reflect on the manifestation and evolution of power relations within a particular historical period, to assess and track changes and trends in the current system of international relations, giving us indicators and analytical methods that allow us to penetrate into the essence of the reality of international relations.

Interdependence of geopolitics - global development - international relations - economic diplomacy - security was highlighted in this paper work, where I presented comparative analytical challenges and perspectives on the new dimensions in international relations and cooperation.

The main objective of this paper work is to present and analyze comparative perspective both theoretical and descriptive, but especially from a historical and systemic functional perspective, the existence to a structural dynamic interdependency between the international relations and geopolitical changing in the context of globalization.

An explanation of the relations is geopolitics, geography, politics, so by defaults with the geography, as well as with geo-history, geo-economics and geostrategic, is a mandatory approach, in setting up a clear position of the studied discipline in system of sciences. In the definition of the profile, it can be confused with synthesis; a recombination-recombination is a fragmentary disciplinary blend, while the synthesis brings a new interpretation.

From my point of view, without deep knowledge of political, geographical realities reported in global economic and social attractions, geopolitical analysis of the international political phenomena, with the support of the state policy, even viewed through the prism of a smooth application of spatial and temporal,

not only can not only make a "geopolitical without substance".

Geopolitics – Traditions Overview

The first world war, with the whole dramatic changes and, in particular, the establishment of peace after this, was one of the conditions of the development of this discipline, but not only as an academic specialty, but especially for solving the pressing of that era. Abandoning traditional concerns to address issues of peace and war, which led to the emergence of an industry considered; applied to avoid the trap.

Continuously, international relations system has established new structural landmarks space time, thus, the map of Europe and the world had revised. Geopolitics has assumed the appearance of studies related to political and military models, national and linguistic, cultural or religious regions, important concepts, theories, related to the issue of borders and their relationship to the physical and human environment or political-economic structure of states.

A decisive role in shaping the first geopolitical concepts and in the consecration of the new disciplines is traditional German geopolitical school, Friedrich Ratzel, Rudolf Kjellen, Karl Haushofen. This perception is determined by numerous concerns regarding the political geography, military, and political theories in this field, moves which must be reported to the historic stage of the society and the state travelled German since the second half of the nineteenth century, in conjunction with the expansionary policy in the period of the Second World War (Claval, 2001, pp. 27-31).

The traditional Anglo-American school, Alfred Mahan, Halford Mackinder and Nicholas Spykman, maybe did not use the term geopolitical but there is something that the unit's identifying such representatives, mainly strategic orientation of thinking theoretical elaborations and conceptual basis of the geopolitical order, a fact which justifies us and let's talk about an Anglo-American School of geopolitics, the characterized interpretations and solutions, the following peculiarities specific to the American approach, a practical vision and strategic orientation of the analysis (Claval, 2001, pp. 46-48).

Established in the context of the end of the 19th century, the geopolitical school French identify themselves as part of this first period, covering issues such as domestic studies of French, claiming it in human geography. As in the case of the German school, where Friedrich Ratzel, one of the founders of the human geography of Germany, is considered the precursor to avoid, and in the case of the French School, the new discipline will be fostered through the contribution of the founder of the French school "human geography" Paul Vidal de la Blache, who in addition to heading the forerunner, a trainer of the future role of geopolitical concepts, by Albert Demangeon and Jacques Ancel (Encel, 2010, pp. 35-36).

We notice that Russian space represents a important spatial and temporal frame from the point of

view of the development of power, so that year, a geopolitical analysis of the structure of the internal functional country and "foreign policy seen as geopolitics", its relations with former Soviet States, with the United States, the European Union, as well as reporting to the emerging powers, make that, indeed, the study of pragmatic actions of the Russian Federation the light of the Aleksandr Dugin's profile as the main exponent, to be particularly relevant for the understanding of perspective to avoid the imperial vision of Eurasian this nation (Dughin, 2011, p. 22).

Romanian traditional geopolitical thinking has been reported through its most famous exponent, Ion Conea, Anton Golopenția and Simion Mehedinți, along with the other schools of thought peculiar to the first period of geopolitical evolution. Romanian school wars would bring the contribution to development to avoid the whole theoretical and applicative of works drawn from various fields, geography, history, anthropology, political sciences and sociology (Emandi, Buzatu, Cucu, 1994, p. 17).

As we have seen, both the German geopolitical school and incoming French and Anglo-American, who added that Romanian and Russian, through many studies and analyses, through diverse approaches, have gradually created at the beginning of the 20th century, a strong current of applied and theoretical thinking in geopolitics. In a relatively short period, but strongly marked by dramatic political changes, social-economic and identity through the humanity in the twentieth century, geopolitics becomes a concern of the elite, an academic discipline with relevance to the study of power in international relations.

Geopolitics – A New Framework of Analyses

Today, geopolitics is perceived as an academic discipline and a field of politico-strategic action at the State level. In general, is not considered a science in the classic sense because no specific method and its object of study is not very well defined in relation to other areas such as geography, history, demography, economy or political sciences, however, geopolitics has, par excellence, a "character integrator and visionary" (Parker, 1998, p. 11).

As the field of academic research, geopolitics present us a *multidisciplinary* and *interdisciplinary*, political geography, international relations, international law, economics, sociology or statistics are just a few areas in which geopolitics borrows data and analytical methods for making conclusions, studies and perspectives of their own (Huzum, 2011, p. 113).

On a general level, the term "geopolitics" is structured into interdependent relationship between politics and geography, sociology, demography and economy, referring in particular to the incidences of these areas of international relations of the state. Thus, geopolitics becomes a field of study of combinations of geographic and political factor by determining the location of a State towards its neighbors and regional or international context in relation to other actors in the system.

As the objective reality in the field of international relations, geopolitics, said Constantin Hlihor, manifested in the evolution of humanity at least since "a country had the strength and the ability to enforce sovereignty or control of the other namespaces than the one on which it was constituted as an independent political entity" (Hlihor, 2005, p. 6).

When an actor has "used" international geopolitics, along with other disciplines, in order to justify political action and interest in a particular space, it becomes "a propaganda tool that has nothing common with the theory and scientific analysis" (Hlihor, 2005, p. 6)

Geopolitics has had some difficulty in shaping and its development as a discipline, as effervescent period at the beginning of the 20th century, especially in the decades after World War II, through frequent association with fascist theories or as part of the German war machine. However, since the 1970s, geopolitics will know, however, a revival not only in space, but the Anglo-American and French space. Thus, one can say that *Geopolitik* became, behold, in the most natural way, *Geopolitics* and *Géopolitique* (Tuathail, Dalby, Routledge, 2003, p. 7).

Also, the fact that this discipline provides an overall view of the world and proposes a spatial vision of events, "present better than anything that this discipline is not, as they claimed, an artificial creation and that it has its place in the social and political phenomena" (Dobrescu, 2008, p. 11).

Gearóid Ó Tuathail considers that geopolitics is a polisemic term that exceeds any attempt to delineate it as singular aspect is better addressed through a critical investigation into how the concept is endowed with certain meanings within the political discourse. Also he is considering three ways in which geopolitics gives global policy understood: as the study, as the art of governance and as a major strategy (Tuathail, Dalby, Routledge, 2003, p. 11).

Addressed issues of geopolitics can have varying degrees of assessment related to the analysis of the policy of states and other international actors, in order to decipher the geopolitical interest taken on a particular area or by global events. Geopolitics must observe and study the changes in power relations in space-delimited assumed interest or in the system of global forces of current international relations (Bu e, 2012, p. 12).

The balance or imbalances of power are those showing the state of the system of international relations, basically, geopolitical environment at any given time. Thus, balance of power has been associated with international security, and the intensity and the degree of imbalance occurred at some point in the equation of power have led inevitably to state of crisis, conflict and even war, which changed the geopolitical positions of structural protagonists (Velea, 2009, p. 19).

Globalization and Post-Cold War Geopolitical Challenges

Globalization is often described as a process: steadily progressing over time, pervasively spreading over space, and clearly inevitable in its development. But globalization is also a revolution, one of the most profound revolutions the world has ever known. Indeed, globalization is the first truly world revolution. All revolutions disrupt the traditions and customs of a people; indeed, they threaten a people's very security, safety, and even identity. The world revolution that is globalization in some measure threatens the security of every people on the globe (Bari, 2010, p.72).

Globalization is therefore by no means a process which moulds all the cultures which meet within its dynamic into a single homogeneous whole. Indeed it is equally plausible to claim the contrary, globalization may bring about the unpacking of local cultural complexes, but in the process it creates multifarious local identities and cross-crossing frontiers, so that diversity comes to rule more than ever before in local spaces, even while similarities and links across social and spatial distances also become ever more evident (Held, 2004, p.20).

Globalization was described as the process in which the world is increasingly defined by a common activity. It refers to the extent to which wars, trade, culture, and many other aspects of life, are becoming globally inter-related. It is also a matter of a change in consciousness. People in business, politics, culture, and many other activities are thinking and acting in a global world. Within that process, territoriality is having less significance (Stiglitz, 2008, pp. 24-25).

The core of globalization is that there is increasing inter-dependence. What happens in one part of the world affects what happens elsewhere. Some people have seen the term "globalization" as a cover for a Westernizing process. Many people, who see globalization as undesirable, see it as a process in which Western capitalism is dominating the world (Martin, Schumann, 1999, p. 21).

Many voices believe that as globalization extends, so extends the power of the Western corporate giants and the nations which harbor them. Together, they keep the Western world rich at the expense of the poverty of many other parts of the world. They dictate the trading terms, the interest rates, and the dominance of highly-mechanized production. (Zakaria, 2009, p.11).

The Cold War structured world's geopolitics for four decades. The Berlin Wall became the symbol of the Cold War. It made visible the divide between the Atlantic Alliance and the Soviet Gulag. It was a physical distinction between „friend" and „foe", between the „Free World" and the „Evil Empire" (Tunander, 1997, p. 5).

It was a line drawn in the sand of Central Europe, a symbolic axe forced into the body of Europe. The Berlin Wall reflected the geopolitical conflict of the second half of the 20th century, just as the city wall reflected the geopolitical distinction of medieval Europe. The Wall, the physical distinction between one side and the other, is a sign of power, but it is also a physical expression of the conflict itself, recognizing

the limits of dialogue and the limits of reason (Tunander, 1997, pp. 5-6).

With the fall of Berlin Wall, the ending of the old ideological and geopolitical division has facilitated peaceful solution and made dialogue a major instrument in solving conflicts. Reason seems to have become the apex of the new world order. Conversely, the geopolitical weight of strategic nuclear weapons and the weight of conflicting experiences and cultures seem to have transferred aspects of the old bipolarity and division into this new world (Kolodziej, 2007, p. 24).

In the post-Cold War Era, the continental geopolitical discussion seems to have reappeared, not only with the reintroduction of cultural divides- a "clash of civilizations", but also with the recognition of centralized structures of not fully sovereign states. The European Union (EU) is not primarily looked upon as a union of sovereign states that could possibly develop into a federal state, but as something in between. These in-between structures are based on cultural identity and political-economic competition rather than on political-military conflict, Edward Luttwak has characterized this new phenomenon as "geo-economics" (V t man, 2009, p. 10).

The EU, the United States and the emerging power are not in competition military, but economically, or possibly, global transnational companies are using the states and these centralized economic-political structures to their own ends. Global media and economic transnational forces have made borders more transparent and territory less sacred – the power of the economic and political networks has in some cases replaced the power of the states.

The post-Cold War emphasis on economic rather than military power has been translated into a focus on centrality, on access to the decision-making centers, not on the rural less developed periphery, are not primarily on territorial control. The appearance of new "battle zones", however, has once again raised the question of territorial control, the need for a military divide, the need to raise and move a "metaphorical wall" up to border of the „other", seemingly confirming the hypothesis "clash of civilizations" advanced by Samuel Huntington (Huntington, 1998, pp.159-160).

A Global Role for Development – Geopolitical Traditions and Perspectives

Since the late 1950s at least, a particular classification of countries, a dichotomous distinction between *developed* and *developing*, has been dominant within the development business and prominent in other domains: the mass media; diplomacy; school curricula. In addition to *developed* and *developing*, we have *developed* and *underdeveloped*, *donor* and *recipient*, *North* and *South*, *First World* and *Second* or *Third World*.

That dichotomous distinction, modified to acknowledge the existence at the time of a Second World of Communist countries with centrally-planned economies, dates back to the 1950s, as defined by both

internal characteristics and patterns of external relations, and second, these basic divisions were acceptable or actively embraced by governments of countries within each category (Khanna, 2008, pp. 25-26).

They were convenient, usable for political and diplomatic purposes and, among other things, consistent with the development, the geopolitical and security concerns and policies of the main Western/First World aid donors. We all agree that there is no longer a distinctive Second World of Communist-ruled, centrally-planned economies (Khanna, 2008, p. 27).

Thus, in this new world where the political map is more diverse and pluralistic, there are fewer chances that any one way of classifying countries will be useful to a wide range of governments and other policy actors (Harris, Moore, Schmitz, 2009, p. 9).

In order to understand the currently prevailing language it helps to go back to the tripartite classification of countries that began to emerge at the end of the 1940s as a result of the Cold War. The countries within each cluster had a great deal in common not only in terms of the attributes of their individual political and economic systems, but also in respect of how they related politically and economically to the rest of the world (Nicholson, 1998, pp. 54-55).

The original justifications for the emergence of large foreign aid programmes from developed to developing were shaped by perceptions of the successful Marshall Plan transfer of American capital to Western Europe after World War Two. However, the aid relationship expanded, both practically and in terms of the ways in which it was represented, to other areas in addition to the channeling of capital and technical assistance, to include general guidance and injunctions about economic policy, public policy generally, and modes of governance (Goldstein, Pevenhouse, 2008, p. 117).

The disappearance of the category of Second World and centrally-planned economies is not a major concern in its own right. It matters to the extent that it contributes to our major story: the blurring of the differences between developed and developing countries such that the old labels are now rarely a useful way of summarizing either the structural characteristics of national economies or the patterns of interaction between countries (Gilpin, 2004, p. 223).

The delivery of aid can at best assist countries in mobilizing their efforts to address challenges. Development cooperation should thus not be regarded as the one and only silver bullet to global problems. It is somewhat like providing risk capital, aid will work in some cases and not in others and Official Development Assistance (ODA) is only a tiny fraction of global financial flows, additional to private capital flows.

Developing countries are increasingly differentiating; some countries are new stars, others are starting from a completely different basis due to conflicts or failed government policies. Accordingly,

donors will have to think how to differentiate goals and instruments in international co-operation. These vary across different types of countries for instance:

- **the poorest countries** - Least Developed Countries, with substantial capacity constraints;
- **the fragile or failed states** - with de facto non-existent internal or external sovereignty;
- **The emerging powers** - the "BRICS"- Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (Grimm, 2008, p. 3).

Today, the importance of development assistance is nowadays one of key methods for building a country's international position. It combines the carrying out of foreign policy objectives, soft power activities, and the promotion of defined political rules, good governance, and the fulfillment of the commitments made by richer countries towards poorer countries (Dobrescu, 2010, pp. 19-20).

Development assistance has both practical, measured by increased political and economic influences, and prestige aspects. The provision of development assistance also serves the purposes of actions undertaken in the donor's country such as the strengthening the non-governmental sector, which is responsible for delivering a large part of aid, the promotion of business, and awareness raising of global issues in society.

After the end of the cold war development assistance was monopolized by Western countries. These countries, grouped together in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), until the mid-2000s accounted for 95% of the funding allocated for development purposes. The DAC has also become one of the sources of concepts and rules regulating Official Development Assistance (ODA). The DAC countries opted for conditionality of provided assistance, making aid dependent on the implementation of political and economic transformations (Smith, Zimmermann, 2010).

With the appearance of new centers of economic growth, other countries, from emerging powers such as China, India, Russia, Brazil and South Africa, through EU new member. With the arrival of new sources of funding development assistance, its objectives and principles have started changing; also development assistance provided by new donors has several characteristics:

- it is focused on the region in the immediate vicinity (Russia – CIS states, China – Asia, India – its neighboring countries; Brazil – Latin American countries; it is also similar for Turkey and for South Korea);
- new donors shift away from the principle of conditionality and underline non-interference with the recipient country's internal affairs;
- new donors development assistance often provides a way of winning political influence

and access to strategic resources (China's policy towards Africa);

- Promotes co-operation on an equal footing (South-South co-operation) (Lundsgaarde, 2011).

New donor countries are presenting a challenge to the already established development assistance system dominated by Western countries, despite the fact that their contribution is under fifteen per cent of global development assistance.

The aid granted by them often runs contrary to the principles developed by Western countries, such as the realization above all of the interests of the beneficiaries and not of the donor, the separation from direct benefits. The ideological platforms of national ODA also vary, not all countries have special development agencies, and also, specialized development agencies in different countries are subordinated to different ministries, depending on ideology. World experience of involving business in national International Development Assistance (IDA) programs has a history and the "new geopolitical trend" has recently been developed by the "new donors".

Conclusions

Multidimensional transformations at the global level have induced structural changes in default and geopolitically, we may interpret as being, by redefining the basis of members to generate power and influence policies, with the aim of maintaining advantageous geographical location of brackets and badly needed construction and recognition of power in the international system.

The original rationale for development policy in general and IDA or ODA organizations in particular was that there was a developing world which needed help from the developed world. Some developing countries have experienced the fastest sustained economic growth in history; others have declined or fallen apart. In many cases, the relationships between countries and cooperation perspectives have changed so much from geopolitical and geo-economical point of view.

Thus, geopolitics can offer a multidimensional panorama of contemporary international relations, as a show of muscle space-temporal, *the stage of the whole world*, in which international actors are represented and individualized genetic geographical manes, but combined, with the dynamism of the determinants, borders, identity and nationalism.

The current state of perception of the level of the overall societal development allow us a clearer understanding of the relationship established between geographical environment and society and of the limits of deterministic concept. The influence of geographical environment to be regarded differently from one stage to another historic, being closely connected with the development of the society in the context of a predetermined geographical environment, but who can support the development of an artificial environment through visions, strategies and projects to achieve geopolitical new geopolitical identity.

The era of globalization is characterized, inter alia, and by concentrating the effects more precisely through action based on the effect of interdependences. In this case, there is a tendency that the geopolitics to emerge from her traditional definitions and to resize as a support of the action, a concentration of power bills in the states policies and connections of international bodies. From my point of view, Geopolitics tends to become increasingly inclusive and multidimensional in scope of analysis, in addition to classical studies and policies of economic, financial, social or environmental identity.

Acknowledgments

This paper is a result of a research made possible by the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, inside of the project POSDRU/159/1.5/S/132400 - "Young successful researchers – professional development in an international and interdisciplinary environment".

References

- [1] BARI, I., (2010). *Tratat de economie politic global* [Global Political Economy Analysis]. Bucure ti: Economica.
- [2] BU E, D., (2012). *Geopolitic i Geostrategie* [Geopolitics and Geostrategic]. Bucure ti: Universitatea de Ap rare "Carol I".
- [3] CLAVAL, P., (2001). *Geopolitic i Geostrategie. Gândirea politic spațiul și teritoriul în secolul al XX- lea* [Geopolitics and Geostrategic]. Bucure ti: Corint.
- [4] DOBRESCU, P., (2010). *Viclenia globaliz rii* [Globalization Craftiness]. Ia i: Institutul European.
- [5] DOBRESCU, P., (2008). *Geopolitica* [Geopolitics]. Bucure ti: Comunicare.ro.
- [6] DUGHIN, Al., (2011). *Bazele Geopoliticii* [Foundations of Geopolitics]. Bucure ti: Eurasiatica.
- [7] EMANDI, E. I., BUZATU Gh. , CUCU V. S., (1994). *Geopolitica* [Geopolitics]. Ia i: Glasul Bucovinei.
- [8] ENCEL, Fr., (2010). *Orizonturi Geopolitice*, [Geopolitical Views] Chi in u: Cartier.
- [9] GILPIN, R., (2004). *Economia mondial în secolul XXI* [Global Political Economy]. Ia i: Polirom.
- [10] GOLDSTEIN, J. S., PEVENHOUSE, J. C., (2008), *Relații Internaționale* [International Relations]. Ia i: Polirom.
- [11] GRIMM, S., (2008). *European Development Co-operation to 2020*, retrieved from <http://www.edc2020.eu>.
- [12] HARRIS, D., MOORE, M., SCHMITZ, H., (2009). *Country Classifications for a Changing World*, IDS Working Paper No. 326, retrieved from <http://www.ids.ac.uk/gdr/cfs/pdfs/wp326.pdf>.

- [13] HELD, D., (2004). *Transformări globale* [Global Transformations]. Iași: Polirom.
- [14] HLIHOR, C., (2005). *Geopolitică și Geostrategie în analiza relațiilor internaționale contemporane* [Geopolitics and Geostrategic in International Relations Analyses]. București: Universitatea Carol I.
- [15] HUNTINGTON, S., (1998). *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale* [Clash of civilizations]. București: Antet.
- [16] HUZUM, E., (2011). *Concepte și teorii social-politice* [Concepts and social-political theories]. Iași: Institutul European.
- [17] KHANNA, P., (2008). *Lumea a doua* [The Second World]. Iași: Polirom.
- [18] KOŁODZIEJ, E. A., (2007). *Securitatea și relațiile internaționale* [Security and International Relations]. Iași: Polirom.
- [19] LUNDGAARDE, E., (2011). *New Actors and Global Development Cooperation*, retrieved from <http://www.edc2020.eu>.
- [20] MARTIN, H.-M., SCHUMANN, H., (1999). *Capcana globalizării* [The Global Trap]. București: Economica.
- [21] NICHOLSON, M., (1998). *International Relations*, London: Macmillan Press.
- [22] PARKER, G., (1998). *Geopolitics. Past, Present and Future*, London: Pinter.
- [23] SMITH, K., ZIMMERMANN, F., (2010). *Beyond the DAC. The welcome role of the other providers of development co-operation*, retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/opendoors>.
- [24] STIGLITZ, J., (2008). *Mecanismele globalizării* [Making Globalization Work]. Iași: Polirom.
- [25] TUATHAIL, G. Ó., DALBY S., ROUTLEDGE, P., (2003). *Geopolitics Reader*, Londra New York: Routledge.
- [26] TUNANDER, O., (1997). *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe*, London: Sage Publication.
- [27] V T MAN, D., (2009). *Geoconomie* [Geeconomics]. București: Pro Universitaria.
- [28] VELEA, M., (2009). *Paradigma geopolitică a puterii* [The emerging paradigm of power]. București: Universitatea de Apărare "Carol I".
- [29] ZAKARIA, F., (2009). *Lumea Postamericană* [PostAmerican World]. Iași: Polirom.

