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To resize the current security environment, especially after the collapse of the bipolar international system and after the terrorist attacks in September 11, 2001 in the U.S.A. - that generated the crisis of international relations - the reorganization of international security organizations and redefining concepts on the fight against international terrorism, as power factors tend to enhance the structures, that hold the main role to ensure the most advantageous position in the new security architecture determines the subjects of the article.

Also the article is about the threat to international security system - terrorism, which has diversified and become of global level and its associated risks are of political, economic, social, demographic, environmental way, which are border of insecurity and cause of the most serious consequences on our lives.

The international security system includes national security of states, continental security, regional security and the security of international organizations. Among actors and factors presumed to guide international policy we mention: people who share the same cultural, moral and ethnic or national political ideology, national identity, the systemic structure as well as global markets and multinational corporations or interstate system. The range size of security include non-state actors such as multinational corporations and human rights support groups or other systems and human institutions such as global markets and dissemination of scientific knowledge and technological know-how. These actors and factors which affecting international security are very important for the stability of international security system.

A basic attribute of international security system is the international security environment, which has two fundamental characteristics: the "information age" and the development of security architecture. Security environment of the XXI century is characterized by substantial changes that require adaptation of
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the classic criteria for the analysis of international security. New security challenges, generated by the overlapping phenomena such as globalization and fragmentation, add some classic forms of regional risks and vulnerabilities. Outbreaks of tension remain traditional, but their development is inherently influenced by the emergence of unconventional risks and cross-border as terrorism, organized crime and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There is a functional interdependence between different types of security environments. National security environment can be viewed as a component of regional security environment, and the latter is an essential element of the global security environment. So if major disruptions are present, out of control, at national level, they adversely affect the stability of the international security environment. For example, the armed conflict between Israel and Hezbollah militia in southern Lebanon acted significantly on the international security environment, amplifying the sources of insecurity. Basically, the "Arab Spring" revolution called Arab or Arab awakening is a set of popular events scale variable which swept many countries in the Arab world since December 2010. [1, p.166] The new security environment can be approached from two points of view: it begun to consolidate after the Cold War, when international relations become more complex and interdependent or after 2001 with the start of the war on terror, which showed that non-state actors began to play an important role. Whatever the conceptual orientation, the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 indicated the need to redefine the international security environment, the transition from the unipolar world of accounts after the end of the Cold War, where the U.S.A. had a dominant position, as a real advance towards all members of the world to multipolar one, where were present new power poles Russia, China, India, Japan, Germany, Brazil. [2, p.322] After that attack in the international security system began the changing of relationships between the major power centers of the world, the fragmentation of collective security mechanism, limiting its appeal to international law in relation to terrorist activities, as well as the emergence of the security model of unlimited self-defense, based on solidarity countries that share democratic values. Therefore international stability cannot be conceived today than under cooperation at various levels in the international community, through institutionalized dialogue, through increased involvement of major international organizations in defining the security state of the world. [3, p.309]

Thus, the present actors with global impact on security are the U.S.A., Europe, China, Japan, India, Brazil and Russia. The essence of the new security structure of the world is in the relationship between U.S.A. and Eurasia, according to Zbigniew Brzezinski. [4] He argues that the power poles Europe and Japan clearly relies on the idea of stability and international security, while China and Russia
remain open and interested in any geopolitical change. In this context, S. Huntington argues that the world created so-called "axis of instability" or "axis of crisis", which includes the Balkans, the Caucasus, North Africa, Middle East, Central and South Asia, separating the poor world by the rich. [5, p.33-48]

The main actors in the international security environment are states and international organizations, including NGOs. In this context the current security environment instability are determined largely by emphasizing the phenomenon of proliferation of actors, resulting from the disintegration of the federal state, which is determined implicitly by increasing the number of countries and the increasing number of international organizations. Also, recently diversified economic ties and new markets have emerged a growing number of multinational companies and their intention to assert that international actors value. It is about the track in the foreground of political supranational organizations and then follows the technical, scientific and non-governmental organizations involved in solving global or regional problems. [6, p.9]

According to Henry Kissinger, the duration of international security has decreased with each century. Thus, for example, the post-Westphalia order lasted 150 years, the international system created by the Congress of Vienna lasted 100 years, the order that characterized the Cold War remained for 40 years. [7, p.160] H. Kissinger emphasizes the balance of power as a tool of international relationships, adding that it is the statesman, especially if he is of great power like the U.S., to manipulate the balance of power to maintain international order where no state does dominate the other. [8, p.163]

We believe that the end of the Cold War led to the creation of a new international security system with a new international order, based on reconsideration of general human values that bind together states and nations. The most important effect of the end of the Cold War was tearing down the barriers that have stalled globalization. [9, p.23] The application of military force as the main influence argument is not a priority; the focus is moved to the actions of force expressed by means and economic, technical, scientific and political methods. The military aspect between states remains in force as part of the national security system. [10, p.25] Some analysts, for example Adei Bozeman, believe that the new international security system is more unstable than that of the Cold War, characterized by a seemingly predictable stability and security, and the balance of nuclear terror between the superpowers. Thus neorealism claims that bipolar systems are more stable than multipolar. [12, p.881-909] In their view security system is characterized by the presence of the risk of increasing abundance of state and non-state centers of power, which occurs without anyone being in charge of order in world affairs. In this case the terrorists may attack a superpower and cause a global war against terrorism, without a clear and predictable end. Formerly close
partners in NATO now disagree on global security policies, split already evident in the difference of the opposite side from Europe and America to war on Iraq in 2003 (France and Germany opposed the war). Disagreements between the Western democracies are considered even deeper and more explosive than those of European and American components of the Western coalition. This system is threatened by clashes between the cultures of the world that seem to underpin interstate conflicts, ethnic, racial, national. [13]

The main feature of the system of post-Cold War international security was dominant U.S.A. role as "world policeman" - a characterization that not only summarizes the status of global hegemon, but also the permanent power challenged in one way or another, for one reason or another, the other actors in the international system. Since the early 90s the question arose whether unipolarity can be a sustainable formula in international politics. [14, p.23-33] As a result, in Western academic environment stood two schools of thought: the so-called declinists, who argue that U.S.A.’s single superpower status is a historic passing of international system and counterbalance of other major players will not delay to appear. [15, p.667] On the other hand, theorists who approved «U.S.A. rule" state that a unipolar system can be sustainable, because the U.S.A. has the resources and tools of economic, political, military and technology needed to make the rocking against him to be unlikely. At the same time a unipolar system dominated by the U.S.A., in their opinion, would be a peaceful and stable. [7, p.10-11]

The professor of Kornwell University W. La Feber, expert in leadership, makes the connection between international terrorism and escalating U.S.A. triumphantly as one of the key actors of contemporary world politics. Interests focus on international cultural policy strategies and external errors that do not account for the realities of democratic pluralism and their shadow related to the increasing influence of non-governmental organizations are noted as features of increasing power of U.S.A., causing activation of international terrorism. [16, p.8-9, 16-17]

We believe that the U.S.A. is the state whose soft power (sanctions, rewards, payments, trade-offs resulting from mediation, great arrangements) was the most effective in the twentieth century. Political, economic, financial, cultural opportunities had great appeal were unstoppable especially during the Cold War. But when the promotion of them in other areas have used excessive U.S.A. support hard tools (recourse to armed violence), things started to get complicated. The anti-American power intensified no in the Muslim world only, but also in South America, for over two centuries considered the backyard of the United States, although the United States compared with other countries, are most heavily involved military and financial in managing security issues in the world [10, p.68-69].
There is the term “New World Order”, introduced by U.S. President George Bush to characterize the system of international relations that followed the collapse of the USSR [11, p.195]. A fair assessment of this new world order does Henry Kissinger, who argues that what is new in new international order is that the United States can neither retreat from the world, but not to dominate. [17, p.707] It is obvious that the future belongs to a multipolar world.

Setting antiterrorist coalition has led some political scientists talk about "the fourth world war" that opposes two camps superterrorism and antiterrorist coalition countries. The events of 11 September 2001 triggered unprecedented backlash terrorism on all fronts (diplomatic, legal, intelligence, financial, military, etc.). At first only France, Russia and China have expressed doubts that the next constituted antiterrorism coalition against Afghanistan was challenged by all participating countries. In the case of Iraq, except Great Britain and the countries of Eastern Europe, other countries did not participate. Operation Enduring Freedom, launched on October 7, 2001 and consisted of more than 90 countries, will remain in history as the largest coalition ever formed. Up to that date terrorist attacks were treated on their hazard extent and were not analyzed as fragments of a systematic and general war. Operations were considered some isolated individual initiatives of some fanatics. In this context, these events are beginning allies’ review, global relations, even the formation of new alliances based on mutual interests in terms of security. Thus states with divergent positions until recently considered even irreconcilable, are now on the same front in the fight against terrorism. War on terror does not imply classic military action, but is a new and very important remark about the legitimacy of terrorist attacks in general. [18, p.167] Or as said George Clemenceau "War is a too serious thing to be left to militaries". [19, p.18] Unfortunately the war against terrorism has turned into war through terrorism, after which whole peoples suffering [20, p.11]. Already there are military analysts who believe that intelligence structures form a fourth category of armed forces, along with the land, air and naval. [21, p.261] In the author's opinion, the war on terror more easily can be resolved through special services and cooperation between law enforcement authorities of different states than militarily.

The different kinds of international relationships are difficult putted under control and rely mainly on their own possibilities and interests, created a vacuum of power which tends to be filled with all sorts of extreme and destructive forces. These were manifested by a large wave of terrorist acts that endangered the security of many states, terroristic means and methods affect destabilize the existing social structure [22, p.4], built by actors of security system, who agree follow certain rules or conventions. [23, p.6-7] At the same time, the destroying of global and regional international security’s old structures is accompanied
by the state disequilibrium formations, as a result in the world appeared more and more gaps and loopholes, especially in the sphere of power. Areas where they occur become objects of attention and policy enforcement of international terrorism.

To this system is characteristic the increasing and diverse types of security actors in the emergence of new state actors with globalist trends, transnational security actors like terrorist groups, religious or ethnic movements, international NGOs; the trend of reform, dynamic and expanding of organizations responsible for contemporary security - the UN, NATO, EU, OSCE, etc - accompanied by transformation and negotiation of key security arrangements.

Currently, we are witnessing the emergence on the world stage of new transnational and nonstate factors, which have sufficient capacities to lead to global action. Thus the main features of the international security system is the end of bipolarity and the reorganization of power centers, increasing the number of countries and of international organizations, including non-governmental one; the terrorism by its mode of manifestation, which the last period has turned into a global player; more countries have embraced democratic political ethics; the differentiated access states to resources affects relationships between them. The collapse of some states, poor economic conditions, social disorder create conditions that some countries are not able to survive as a political entity, especially in states whose behavior is guided by ideological and political reasons, cultural or religious (Afghanistan). In the created vacuum may interfere other countries and organizations, not necessarily of security or humanitarian - as with many terrorist organizations take full advantage of the "hospitality" of such states. Another feature of the international security system is the spread of ethno-religious conflicts. The last decades have shown that the tendency toward conflicts of territorial claims fell, instead it ethnic and religious conflicts had amplified. However, the increasing performance of military technology and its proliferation is one of the most pronounced features of the international security environment. Progress in science and technology, and the spread of more sophisticated IT offered many actors (state or nonstate) the purchase and possession of guns, sometimes disproportionate to the needs of defense, power and their resources. [24, p.7-8] However, in the present state of international security environment, the use of terrorism as a method of retaliation is potentially genocidal.

Currently the international security environment is one of the rare moments in which great actors of the world state say that there is no adversarial relationship between them. They accept that there is competition, differences in positions on issues and areas of the world, but no adversarial relationship or enmity.
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The current international security system has a number of domestic and international terrorism issues, which generates insecurity and deeply disturbing normal life of society, in defiance of law and international order. The more so due to the assimilation of new technologies and methods, contemporary terrorism is now more dynamic, amorphous and difficult to combat. Therefore we believe that any counter-strategy must combine military security, internal border control and development of special services, balancing and coordination with other levels of change influence - economic, social, political, and educational.

We emphasize that increased terrorist attacks in recent years has prompted a reassessment of the need for international actors to intensify their efforts to strengthen international security system. However, our days there are various forms of maintaining global, international, regional, security being driven by different size of geopolitical areas, by the level of participating states’ development, the economic policy orientation, the influence of political systems on international issues.

Some experts consider that the process of reforming the architecture of global security and creating a new world order where terrorism is an important one, can be determined including the impact of the global economic crisis, but also features an order of transition. Also, the current international security environment record terrorism as the main threat that’s why the national security strategies and policies are directly connected to identify the most viable solutions to prevent and combat terrorist acts.

Specialists in the field have identified the predominant areas of conducting terrorist actions: the highly industrialized states, where terrorism is caused by serious social and economic contradictions of a strong sense of frustration and alienation, manifested especially among youth. The second area is the countries where national historical past and religious contradictions generated strong leading, for example, the Basque, the Irish and Muslims which move from resistance to terrorist violence, organized for recognition of their rights. The last area is the third world countries where dictator’s terror corresponds with violence of extremist groups.

The identification of terrorism with worldwide counter-globalist movements (U.S.A.) or classification of national liberation movements as terrorist structures (Russian Federation) are just two recent examples of the use of double standards in assessing impacts and threats posed by international terrorism. Identify the group of states that make up the "axis of evil" in 1998 by the U.S.A. Government (Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Syria), together with measures as preventive wars to punish them or by imposing economic embargoes and other restrictions under UN resolutions were not able to prevent the escalation of terrorism in the new millennium. [25, p.138, 140, 141]
The policy of double standards takes and identifies some intentions of the coalition of state terrorism. For example, the U.S. response triggered by the realm of "war on terror" against the Afghan Taliban, state which sheltered Osama bin Laden. Many analysts have noted, however, that the overthrow of the Taliban was useful Americans from other considerations: the giant petro-gas pipeline that would bill the huge reserves of oil and gas resources of the Caspian area, through Turkmenistan and Afghanistan to Pakistan and India (gas), China and Japan (oil). There are other examples of countries where there is a link between terrorism, oil and gas reserves of vital importance to the United States and the Western countries, including Saudi Arabia, Libya, Bahrain, the Gulf Emirates, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Sudan and Algeria, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Chechnya, Georgia and eastern Turkey. These regions have more than 65 percent of the world's oil and natural gas production. From these considerations are present views as the war against terrorism is seen by many as a war on behalf of U.S. companies: Chevron, ExxonMobil and Arco, British Petroleum, Royal Dutch Shell and other multinational giants, which have hundreds of billions of dollars invested in these regions ".[26].

Today Middle East region continues to be uncertain in terms of security, includes countries that have nuclear weapons, countries that support or are base for terrorist networks and is surrounded by countries that are nuclear powers (Russia, India, China, Israel, and Pakistan). In addition, Iran has ballistic missiles that could hit European countries [27, p.209-211]. In recent years the favorite target of terrorism in the Middle East constituted citizens, property and interests of the USA and the State of Israel, in the latter case even the national territory. [28, p.154] The crises of identity in the region, but also in North Africa and the Middle East have the potential to be transformed in the crisis of security. Thus the "Arab Spring" as called the popular uprisings in countries of North Africa and the Middle East, has benefited from the competition of large international and regional powers, that why the situation does not escalate and affect the already hopelessly conflict in the region. If U.S. and NATO participation was not a surprise element, in the war in Libya for example, the national contribution of France, which has doubled its political declarations with military efforts, was one of the most consistent, being exceeded only by the U.S. France demonstrated a pragmatic, even opportunistic attitude toward Libya. [7, p.84] International media reported on the Arab revolutions events called them either Arab uprisings or Arab Spring. The Islamic world across a relative increase in power, but face difficulty in identifying a unitary political line within the guidelines of Islam due to their two legal-political lines: the Sunni (traditionalist) and Shia (revolutionary). The first moderate and conciliatory tendency has its center in Saudi Arabia, second, prone to violence, in the Iranian.
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As was told before, the contemporary terrorism knows big changes after the events of September 11, 2001, which caused a real shock in the world [29, p.89] and marked the beginning of a "new era" in international relations [30, p.1]. There are organizing no more terrorist acts, but terrorist operations like "Planes operation" on September 11, 2001, "Trains operation" on March 11, 2004, marking, according to American researcher Harvey Sicherman, the beginning of a new historical era, "war against terrorism". Some authors call this new scourge "Islamofascism" because of the similarities between the Islamist-Jihadist current movement and Nazism - the desire to dominate the world, believes in the superiority of religion / their culture, which would legitimize their global domination, the hatred toward other religions and cultures, especially those of Western origin, incitement to genocide against Jews etc. [31, p.542-543]

According to Romanian researcher V. Diaconu among the immediate causes and conditions that generate the development of contemporary international terrorism are included: Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the conflict between rich and poor, conflicts between civilizations, the conflict between religions [32, p.59], which lead to the conclusion that people on the planet living at the same physical time, but not at the same historical time. [33, p.35] However, although the number and extent of the conflicts on territorial disputes decreased, the ways of solving ethnic and religious differences through power has grown and diversified [34, p.7], which in turn weakens the international political system, generating multiple forms of violent conflict, including terrorism.

As a conclusion, we mention that the international security system is currently undergoing a number of changes, depending on the existing military-political alliances strategies, currently economic and financial interests of the various states that make up alliances to promote national security interests, the functioning of these organizations is adapting to the new global geopolitical and geostrategic context. International relations policy should be based on the new realities of the world and based on accepted multipolarism principle, where, although the U.S. was for a time the only pole of world power, there is emerged the enhancing role of security organizations (UN, CE OS, EU) in preventing and managing crises and terrorism. Also in the international environment is observed two poles of power involved in defined geographical areas - the European Union, including the Russian Federation and the states of South-East Asia. This is about China, because the high growth rate could give another dimension to its military power. However, the presence in this geographic area of regional actors that have nuclear power (Pakistan, India, North Korea) and their possible grouping around China, are issues that contribute to the formation of a new power pole at the planet level. Besides China and other countries could come, smaller but with a remarkable economy or even less developed countries (Taiwan, Singapore, South Korea,
Vietnam, etc.) who want to enjoy protection and access to resources. Such features international security system is characterized by the ability of the United States to prove their capabilities to engage effectively in the management of the major problems of mankind, considered by some authors as the only political, economic, financial and military credible and viable superpower.

The current international security system is marked by a number of factors that increase terrorism and destabilize the system, such as the support given by some fundamentalist states and NGOs to terrorist structures, transition from the security architecture based on the principle of bipolarity to unipolar structure with current trends towards multipolarism - where the nation states, groups states, NGOs and international organizations are trying to fill an advantageous position, the access of global terrorist structures to information, human, material, financial and demographic resources, trend of migration from poor countries to rich ones, exacerbating extremism and separatism, intolerance and their degeneration into violent manifestation of globalization, leading to the presence of certain vulnerabilities in the international security environment, by taking advantage of international terrorist networks. Some states are unable to exercise effective control over its territory, allowing its exploitation by terrorists, criminals and insurgents, which create instability in international security system, often due to the stagnant economy, corrupted political institutions, poor public health system or those that have natural resources and are thus trapped in multinational competition for them. These are often sources of conflicts, which in turn are generating transnational insurgency and terrorism.
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