

**Robert BIAŁOSKÓRSKI**

Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach

## **REGIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM AFTER THE COLD WAR – A GAME OF POWER AND INTEREST**

### **Abstract:**

*The paper analyses the regional security system (RSS) concept consisting of regional security organizations (RSOs) related to five regional security blocks (RSBs): Western RSB, CIS/CSTO RSB, CIS-Asia RSB, African RSB, and East-West RSB, after a Cold War. Relying on the empirical data received from powermetric formal model approach, the balance of power, as well as the security interests of the RSBs have been determined. The East-West RSB represented by the OSCE is the leader in all categories of powermetric ranking according to economic power, military power, and geopolitical power, composed by the NATO's, EU's, as well as the CIS/CSTO RSB countries. The economic, military, and geopolitical power of the NATO (more broadly the Western RSB) is the strongest pillar of the OSCE power. The non-NATO states, like the Russian Federation only slightly impact the power of the OSCE. The security interests of the Western RSB countries are quite different in comparison to the CIS/CSTO RSB states in OSCE.*

**Keywords:** NATO, OSCE, CIS, CSTO, SCO, EU, ANZUS, African Union, international security, powermetrics, economic power, military power, geopolitical power.

### **Introduction**

In a realistic approach to international relations and security studies, the states and other international actors are rivalling to get the best possible position in the hierarchy (ranking) of the international system. The states, as well as intergovernmental organizations are still the core actors of international relations. The rivalry in the international system, in particular between states, is a so-called 'zero-sum game', where the 'winning' of one side is a 'loss' of the other side(s) with the same size. During the rivaling, the ratio of power of states in the model is constantly changing, but a global power does not change and is always equal to one hundred percent. To get the best possible position in the

international hierarchy, states have to maximize their sociological power (Mazur, 1996, p. 183)<sup>1</sup>. This last mainly depends on a general (tangible and intellectual), potential, political and social support (will), and appropriate implementation of the national interests of the state, through an optimal policy and strategy (Sulek, 2010, p. 98; Moczulski, 1999, pp. 402–403). During rivalling, the states interact. Due to the global limited resources, the states have to calculate the possibility of pursuing their national interests. For this purpose, they always adapt two forms of rivalling: (1) *cooperation* (trade resources) or (2) *struggle* (other resources). The cooperation is a so-called ‘positive-sum game’, where all players profit, but in different degree. Struggle (in different spheres: political, economic, military, etc.) is a so-called ‘negative-sum game’, in which all players lose also in a different quantity. Finally, the states are permanently use alternate (more or less) both of this rivalling instruments depending on the specific conditions (Sulek, 2013, pp. 23–27).

The article presents the new concept of the regional security system (RSS) constituted after the Cold War according to actually available data. This research concept tests the game of power and interest between the regional security organizations (RSOs) and leads to a realistic approach in estimating of the possibilities of maximizing the power of RSOs in the RSS. The research has been based on the one of the powermetric method of measuring the power of states to evaluate the game of power and analysis and critique of the research sources and strategic documents to assess the game of strategic interests in the framework of RSS.

### **The Regional Security System**

As a research subject, the regional security system concept is composed by eight top regional security organizations grouped in five regional security blocks: Western RSB (NATO, EU, ANZUS), CIS/CSTO (co called ‘Russian’) RSB (CIS, CSTO), CIS-Asia (co called ‘Russian-Asian’) RSB (SCO), African RSB (AU) and East-West RSB (OSCE) (Table 1).

The regional security organizations are different in quantitative (number of member states, ranking position) and qualitative (power index) dimensions. The existing similarities in terms of national security interests determine the communal belonging of states to RSOs and RSBs. EU’s member states were considered according to the evaluated data (2019), but taking into account the decreasing of its power after Brexit in January 2020 (EU-27). Moreover the accession of Northern Macedonia to NATO on March 2020 is not included, but

---

<sup>1</sup> It refers to cybernetic theory of known Polish scientist Marian Mazur and considers a power in the category of sociological power. There are two principle forms of sociological power of state: (1) Internal power – within political system of state and (2) External power – in the international system.

this did not significantly affect the general balance of the alliance's power (Table 2).

**Table 1. The regional security system concept**

<b>Regional Security Organization (RSO)</b>	<b>Western RSB</b>	<b>CIS/CSTO ('Russian')RSB</b>	<b>CIS-Asia ('Russian-Asian')RSB</b>	<b>African RSB</b>	<b>East-West RSB</b>
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	+				
European Union (EU)	+				
Australian, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty ('Pacific Security Treaty', ANZUS)	+				
Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)		+			
Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO)		+			
Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)			+		
African Union (AU)				+	
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)					+

Source: own elaboration.

## **Methodology**

Among the methods of measurement of power (Höhn, 2011), a powermetric approach is very useful in geostrategic studies (Białoskórski, 2018). Powermetrics is a new term, introduced by the Polish scientist Mirosław Sulek<sup>2</sup> (Sulek, 2013), combining two concepts – “power” and “metric”. It has been adopted on the grounds of Polish science. Powermetrics is an applied science dealing with measurement, assessments, and evaluation of the public life participant’s (actor) power, particularly of states, and the modelling, simulation, and forecast of the relationship between them in a global, regional and local dimensions. The powermetric research focused on two main areas: 1) economic – resulting from the desire to rationalize the costs (expenditures) of the

<sup>2</sup> Mirosław Sulek is a professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations at the Warsaw University. He is an economist, praxeologist and analyst of the strategic studies. He is an active member of the Polish Society of International Studies and Polish Geopolitical Society and Vice-President of the Polish Scientific Society of Praxeology. He is considered as the founder and popularizer of the Polish powermetric school.

**Table 2. Regional security organizations (permanent member states in alphabetical order) in 2019**

No.	OSCE	AU	NATO	EU	CIS	SCO	CSTO	ANZUS
1	Albania	Algeria	Albania	Austria	Armenia	China	Armenia	Australia
2	Andorra	Angola	Belgium	Belgium	Azerbaijan	India	Belarus	New Zealand
3	Armenia	Benin	Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Belarus	Kazakhstan	Kazakhstan	United States
4	Austria	Botswana	Canada	Croatia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyz Rep.	Kyrgyz Rep.	
5	Azerbaijan	Burkina Faso	Croatia	Cyprus	Kyrgyz Rep.	Pakistan	Russian Fed.	
6	Belarus	Burundi	Czech Rep.	Czech Rep.	Moldova	Russian Fed.	Tajikistan	
7	Belgium	Cabo Verde	Denmark	Denmark	Russian Fed.	Tajikistan		
8	Bosnia and Herz.	Cameroon	Estonia	Estonia	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan		
9	Bulgaria	Central African Rep.	France	Finland	Uzbekistan			
10	Canada	Chad	Germany	France				
11	Croatia	Comoros	Greece	Germany				
12	Cyprus	Congo, Dem. Rep.	Hungary	Greece				
13	Czech Rep.	Congo, Rep.	Iceland	Hungary				
14	Denmark	Cote d' Ivoire	Italy	Ireland				
15	Estonia	Djibouti	Latvia	Italy				
16	Finland	Egypt, Arab Rep.	Lithuania	Latvia				
17	France	Equatorial Guinea	Luxembourg	Lithuania				
18	Georgia	Eritrea	Montenegro	Luxembourg				
19	Germany	Eswatini	Netherlands	Malta				
20	Greece	Ethiopia	Norway	Netherlands				
21	Hungary	Gabon	Poland	Poland				
22	Iceland	Gambia, The	Portugal	Portugal				
23	Ireland	Ghana	Romania	Romania				
24	Italy	Guinea	Slovak Rep.	Slovak Rep.				
25	Kazakhstan	Guinea-Bissau	Slovenia	Slovenia				
26	Kyrgyz Rep.	Kenya	Spain	Spain				
27	Latvia	Lesotho	Turkey	Sweden				
28	Liechtenstein	Liberia	United Kingdom	United Kingdom				
29	Lithuania	Libya	United States					
30	Luxembourg	Madagascar						
31	Malta	Malawi						
32	Moldova	Mali						
33	Monaco	Mauritania						
34	Mongolia	Mauritius						
35	Montenegro	Morocco						
36	Netherlands	Mozambique						
37	North Macedonia	Namibia						
38	Norway	Niger						
39	Poland	Nigeria						
40	Portugal	Rwanda						
41	Romania	Sao Tome and Principe						
42	Russian Fed.	Sahrawi Rep.						
43	San Marino	Senegal						
44	Serbia	Seychelles						
45	Slovak Rep.	Sierra Leone						
46	Slovenia	Somalia						
47	Spain	South Africa						
48	Sweden	South Sudan						
49	Switzerland	Sudan						
50	Tajikistan	Tanzania						
51	Turkey	Togo						
52	Turkmenistan	Tunisia						
53	Ukraine	Uganda						
54	United Kingdom	Zambia						
55	United States	Zimbabwe						
56	Uzbekistan							
57	Vatican (Holy See)							

Source: own work.

development and defence in certain circumstances and conscious of their formation; 2) political-military – resulting from the desire to occupy the best position and to play the best role in the international system.

The synthetic formal model according to M. Sulek powermetric approach assumes three categories of power: (1) Economic Power (EP), (2) Military Power (MP), and (3) Geopolitical Power (GP) (Table 3).

Table 3. Synthetic formal powermetric model

(1) Economic Power	(3) Geopolitical Power
$EP = (GDP)^{0.652} \times L^{0.217} \times a^{0.109}$ <p>Where:  <i>EP</i> – Economic Power (Sulek, 2001, p. 87–97)<sup>3</sup>,  <i>GDP</i> – Gross Domestic Product,  <i>L</i> – Population,  <i>a</i> – Area (Territory).</p>	$GP = \frac{EP + (2 \times MP)}{3}$ <p>Where:  <i>GP</i> – Geopolitical Power,  <i>EP</i> – Economic Power,  <i>MP</i> – Military Power.</p>
<p>(2) Military Power</p>	
$MP = (MEX)^{0.652} \times S^{0.217} \times a^{0.109}$ <p>Where:  <i>MP</i> – Military Power (Sulek, 2001, p. 87–97)<sup>4</sup>,  <i>MEX</i> – Military Expenditures,  <i>S</i> – Soldiers (active),  <i>a</i> – Area (Territory).</p>	

Source: (Sulek, 2020), (Białoskórski, Kiczma, Sulek, 2019).

In a narrow sense, the economic power expresses only the organizational and production ability or the collective action ability as the stream (flow) of the gross domestic product (GDP) in time. Broad sense of EP formula takes also under consideration demographic and spatial (territory) factors. In this sense, EP includes MP and may alternatively be called a general power. Thus, the military power formula is based on an economic power approach (EP) stressing the total (general) character of power, including MP. The flow of military expenditures (MEX) expressed in time reflects the organizational and production skills (ability to collective activity) of state. It has to be noted, that the MP expresses a conventional military power without nuclear factor, which has to be researched separately, as a new scientific task, not included in this article. The geopolitical power formula stresses the total character of power, including EP and twice strengthened MP of state. It is necessary to note that the GP formula is a working concept still being developed.

The exponent values of the factors of power formulas are different, expressing their different weights, from the largest 0.625 (GDP, MEX), to 0.217 (L, S) and 0.109 (a). This concept was determined by M. Sulek using the deductive method (Sulek, 2020).

The value of the world power is always a hundred percent (100%), so the power of every state is a fraction (share) of a global value. The formal powermetric model adopted in this research can be implemented to measure the

<sup>3</sup>The exponent values were determined by the deductive method.

<sup>4</sup> The exponent values were determined by the deductive method.

power of individual states as well as the organizations (i.e., a sum of power values of all permanent member states).

### **The Game of Power**

**The East-West RSB** is composed of only one RSO - the OSCE - with the largest 57 permanent member states. The OSCE is the leader in all categories of the powermetric ranking (Table 3). It consists of top economic, military, and geopolitical power states, such as: the United States, the Russian Federation, Germany, and France (Table 4). These all states take also a high position in a world ranking of power (Table 5). All NATO permanent member states belong to the OSCE. It should be noted that the power of the NATO (2. rank) is 85% of EP, 86% of MP, and 85% of GP of the OSCE.

It means, that the power of the NATO (more broadly **the Western RSB**) is a pillar of the OSCE power and the non-NATO states, like the Russian Federation only slightly impact the power of the OSCE. The other participants of the Western RSB, the non-EUNATO states, especially the United States, Canada, and Turkey, are a pillar of the NATO power with 58% of EP, 70% of MP and 66% of GP (table 6). The EU power leaders are the strongest European states, i.e., Germany, France, and the United Kingdom (table 4). According to the power simulation in 2019, after Brexit, EU losses on average 15% of power (table 7). It is also the significant reduction power of the Western RSB. The ANZUS is still strong the hegemonic power of the United States – 90% of EP, 94% of MP, and 93% of GP. The power of NATO is also very strong with the United States power – 49% of EP, 64% of MP, and 59% of GP (table 6).

**The CIS/CSTO ('Russian') RSB** consists of the two RSOs - CIS and its military alliance CSTO. This RSO ranks low in the ranking of power (table 3). It is important to note that the CIS and CSTO power is only about 11% of the NATO power (!). The Russian Federation is the absolutely hegemonic power state in this RSB (table 4).

**The CIS-Asia ('Russian-Asia') RSB** is composed by the only one RSO – SCO. It is the principle political-military cooperation platform between the Russian Federation and China. Both states are cooperating to reduce the political-military global advantage of the United States and the Western RSB. The SCO takes the high third position in the economic power and fourth rank in both military and geopolitical power rankings (table 3). The SCO economic power is high, 79% of the NATO capacity, 55% of MP, and in total 62% of GP. China is dominant state in the SCO with 65% of EP (India – 20% and Russia – 10%), 53% of MP (India – 21% and Russia – 20%) and 58% of GP (India – 21% and Russia – 16%) (table 4). India and Pakistan permanent membership significantly increased the total power of SCO (both states are also nuclear power) and reduced the power and political position of the Russian Federation.

It is interesting to note that the China power (one state) is comparable to the total EU power (28 states) (table 8).

The African RSB is composed of only one RSO – the African Union (AU). Despite the large number of permanent member states (55), only two less than the OSCE (57), the AU takes further items in power ranking among all considered RSO – 7. in EP, 9. in MP and 7. in GP. The AU, as well as the CIS/CSTO notes the low values of all indicators of power (Table 3). Nigeria (leader in EP ranking) and Algeria (leader in MP and GP) are the strongest states in African RSB (table 4).

**Table 3. The balance of power of the regional security organizations (RSO) in 2019 (world=100%)**

Rank	RSO	GDP	RSO	L	RSO	a	RSO	MEX	RSO	S	RSO	EP	RSO	MP	RSO	GP
1	OSCE	52.25	SCO	41.61	OSCE	36.76	OSCE	60.73	SCO	25.90	OSCE	36.55	OSCE	42.05	OSCE	40.22
2	NATO	46.85	AU	16.98	SCO	23.89	NATO	56.16	OSCE	24.41	NATO	31.01	NATO	36.03	NATO	34.33
3	ANZUS	26.24	OSCE	16.79	AU	23.07	ANZUS	41.15	NATO	16.40	SCO	24.59	ANZUS	24.43	ANZUS	21.87
4	SCO	22.17	NATO	12.27	NATO	17.97	SCO	17.43	AU	12.14	ANZUS	16.74	SCO	19.89	SCO	21.45
6	EU	17.77	EU	6.70	CIS	15.85	EU	15.57	EU	7.59	EU	14.05	EU	11.64	EU	12.44
7	AU	2.76	ANZUS	4.67	CSTO	15.42	CIS	3.07	ANZUS	7.28	AU	5.34	CIS	4.45	AU	4.25
8	CIS	2.38	CIS	3.09	ANZUS	13.43	CSTO	2.96	CIS	5.83	CIS	3.31	CSTO	4.30	CIS	4.07
9	CSTO	2.25	CSTO	2.49	EU	3.14	AU	2.06	CSTO	5.23	CSTO	3.07	AU	3.70	CSTO	3.89

Source: Own elaboration on the basis of Sulek formal model and data from: The World Bank (2020) and The Military Balance (2020).

Table 4. The power of the top three countries of regional security organizations in 2019 (world=100%)

Regional Security Block (RSB)	East-West RSB		NATO		EU		ANZUS		CIS/CSSTO ('Russian') RSB		CIS-Asia ('Russian-Asian') Block		African Block		
	OSCE	United States	United States	Germany	Germany	United Kingdom	United States	Australia	Russian Federation	Russian Federation	Russian Federation	China	China	Nigeria	AU
EP	15.11	15.11	15.11	2.56	2.56	2.05	2.05	1.43	1.43	0.31	0.31	2.58	2.58	0.57	0.57
	2.58	2.58	2.56	2.05	2.05	1.92	1.92	1.43	1.43	0.31	0.31	4.92	4.92	0.57	0.57
	2.56	2.56	2.05	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	0.20	0.20	0.14	0.14	2.58	2.58	0.57	0.57
MP	22.97	22.97	22.97	2.09	2.09	2.09	2.09	22.97	22.97	3.96	3.96	10.53	10.53	0.78	0.78
	3.96	3.96	2.09	2.09	2.09	1.85	1.85	1.32	1.32	0.18	0.18	4.23	4.23	0.44	0.44
	2.09	2.09	1.85	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	3.96	3.96	0.36	0.36
GP	20.35	20.35	20.35	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08	20.35	20.35	3.50	3.50	12.34	12.34	0.48	0.48
	3.50	3.50	2.08	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	1.36	1.36	0.22	0.22	4.46	4.46	0.48	0.48
	2.08	2.08	2.07	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.87	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.13	3.50	3.50	0.44	0.44

Source: Own elaboration on the basis of Sulek formal model and data from: The World Bank (2020) and The Military Balance (2020).



Table 5. The global balance of power of the top ten countries in 2019 (world=100%)

Rank (EP)	Country Name	GDP	Country Name	L	Country Name	a	Country Name	MEX	Country Name	S	Country Name	EP	Country Name	MP	Country Name	GP
1	United States	24 419	China	18 215	Russian Federation	12 860	United States	39 521	China	10 251	China	15 966	United States	22 972	United States	20 350
2	China	16 345	India	17 807	China	7 372	China	10 457	India	7 334	United States	15 104	China	10 533	China	12 344
3	Japan	5 791	United States	4 278	United States	7 183	India	3 495	United States	6 951	India	4 915	India	4 229	India	4 458
4	Germany	4 382	Brazil	2 750	Canada	7 141	United Kingdom	3 163	Russian Federation	4 534	Japan	3 381	Russian Federation	3 955	Russian Federation	3 497
5	India	3 276	Russian Federation	1 881	Brazil	6 563	France	3 017	Brazil	1 849	Brazil	2 742	Brazil	2 097	Japan	2 449
6	United Kingdom	3 222	Japan	1 645	India	2 335	Japan	2 805	Japan	1 244	Russian Federation	2 580	France	2 086	Brazil	2 312
7	France	3 095	Germany	1 083	France	0 430	Germany	2 803	France	1 028	Germany	2 563	Japan	1 984	Germany	2 084
8	Brazil	2 097	France	0 874	Japan	0 286	Russian Federation	2 783	Germany	0 912	France	2 047	Germany	1 845	France	2 073
9	Canada	1 979	United Kingdom	0 871	Germany	0 274	Brazil	1 586	United Kingdom	0 746	United Kingdom	1 921	United Kingdom	1 836	United Kingdom	1 864
10	Russian Federation	1 937	Canada	0 490	United Kingdom	0 190	Canada	1 081	Canada	0 337	Canada	1 833	Canada	1 140	Canada	1 371

Source: Own elaboration on the basis of Sulek formal model and data from: The World Bank (2020) and The Military Balance (2020).

**Table 6. The structure of balance of power in NATO in 2019 (world=100%)**

	EP	MP	GP
<b>EU Members (23)</b>	12.98	10.91	11.60
<b>Non-EU Members (6)*</b>	18.03	25.12	22.75
<b>United States</b>	15.11	22.97	20.35
<b>Excl. United States</b>	15.90	13.06	14.01
<b>Total</b>	31.01	36.03	34.35

Legend: \*United States, Canada, Turkey, Norway, Iceland, Montenegro.

Source: own study.

**Table 7. The power simulation of EU after Brexit according to data from 2019 (EU to UK=100%)**

	GDP	L	a	MEX	S	EP	MP	GP
<b>EU</b>	85	87	94	80	90	86	84	85
<b>United Kingdom</b>	15	13	6	20	10	14	16	15

Source: own study.

**Table 8. The structure of balance of power between the United States, China and the European Union in 2019 (world=100%)**

Rank	State/RSO	EP	MP	GP
<b>1</b>	<b>United States</b>	15.11	22.97	20.35
<b>2</b>	<b>China</b>	15.97	10.53	12.34
<b>3</b>	<b>European Union</b>	14.05	11.64	12.44

Source: own study.

### **The game of security interests**

The security interests of RSOs united in the Western RSB are focused on the implementation of common geostrategic goals of the NATO, EU, and ANZUS, i.e., collective defence and protection of peace and security of all member states. It is the strongest RSB with the top rank of economy, military, and geopolitical power supporting their implementation. However, it is strong depending on a political will and strong cooperation of all NATO Alliances.

After the Cold War the Western RSB faces an increasing number of external and internal challenges, diverging national interests, growing polarisation in internal policies of member states, finding increasing difficult common positions. In the external dimension, the Western RSB meets a strong political military struggling with the CIS/CSTO Block states led by the Russian Federation, strengthened by the CIS-Asia Block states with the Russo-Chinese cooperation impact. In the internal dimension, there are a number of challenges such as (1) differing narratives on the future of trans-Atlantic relations and the Western RSB; France and Germany focus on the U.S. rivalry with China and claim that Washington is gradually withdrawing politically and militarily from Europe, while the eastern flank countries (with Poland in the forefront) emphasise the return of the U.S. to Europe and the unprecedented political and

military engagement in the region, (2) the varying threat perceptions; since 2014, NATO has started to strengthen the collective defence on the eastern flank countries by increasing allied military presence in Poland, the Baltic states and Romania; Washington wants to direct the NATO attention to China's increasingly assertive and growing economic and military power, also (or above all) relates to Chinese activity in Europe affecting broader security (5G civilian telecommunication network discussion); France and Germany present the different political-military attitude to the Russian threat than Middle and Eastern Europe countries, (3) insufficient consultations on strategic issues, like operations in northern Syria (e.g. the U.S. decision to withdrawal of troops; Turkish uncoordinated military offensive targeted against Kurdish groups allied with the U.S.; a German proposal to set up a security zone and French concerning reopening a strategic dialogue with Russia without consulting the Allies), (4) disagreements over defence spending; the 2% of GDP defence investment pledge to be fulfilled by 2024 is inalterably on NATO's agenda, however, twelve Allies (including Germany and Italy) still allocate less than 1.4% of their military expenditures and (5) the imbalance of power as the question of leadership inside the Alliance, especially between U.S. and the European countries (Gotkowska, 2019).

The NATO is still in the transformation process and faces the challenge how to better manage Europe's collective defence on the eastern flank and crisis response in the southern neighbourhood. The European pillar of the NATO has to be strengthened and an intra-European unity and consensus in European security and defence policy, taking into account various perspectives i.a. between France, Germany, and Poland, has to be found. The political-military agreement on the European military capabilities and policy coordination should be developed to strengthen the Alliance and relations with the United States without adversely affecting the NATO and trans-Atlantic ties. It is still the best political-military option for all NATO Allies of the Western RSB (Gotkowska, 2019).

The CSTO Alliance plays the role of the CIS Block Collective Forces created with the political-military ambition as the NATO equivalent (so called 'East NATO'). There are the following geostrategic goals of the CSTO: strengthening peace, international and regional security, and stability, ensuring the collective defense of independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty of the member states, in attainment of which the member states shall give priority to political measures. The Allies shall also coordinate and harmonize their efforts in combating international terrorism and extremism, illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and arms, organized transnational crime, illegal migration and other threats. The CSTO has been created by the Russian Federation to keep its geopolitical interests in the CIS zone. After 17 years of development, the CSTO is still far away from full operational readiness

with many problems and disappointments. The CSTO Collective Forces consist of the CSTO Peacekeeping Forces (CSTO PF) created in October 2007 to conduct peacekeeping operations (ca. 4-5 thous.), the CSTO Collective Rapid Reaction Forces (CSTO CRRF) created in February 2009 (ca. 5-6 thous.) to repel military aggression, conduct anti-terrorist operations, fight transnational crime and drug trafficking and neutralize the effects of natural disasters (reaction to interstate conflicts is not within the range of their responsibility; they are located in Russia, under one command) and the CSTO Collective Operational Reaction Forces (CSTO CORF) created in June 2009 composed of the special forces and airborne troops to conduct the rapid military operations in any area. The structures of the CSTO Collective Air Force (CSTO CAF) and the CSTO Crisis Response Center (CSTO CRC) are under development. The future and international role of the CSTO depends on the geostrategic goals of the Russian Federation. This leads also to internal conflicts in the Alliance because not all members agree with the Russia's hegemonic policy (Nikitina, 2013), (de Hass, 2016), (Mrvaljevic, 2015), (Dąbrowski, 2019). The geostrategic ambition of the CIS/CSTO Block to get a political-military balance relative to the Western RSB based on the NATO military power is unreal from powermetric research, because the economic, geopolitical and conventional military power of the CIS/CSTO RSB is much lower (only ca. 11%) than the power of the NATO and the Western RSB Alliance (Table 3). Of course, the Russian Nuclear Forces provide the CSTO nuclear power, but this problem is beyond this study. The CSTO political efforts expended towards securing international recognition as a regional security organization and getting acknowledged by the NATO as an equal and legitimate partner are ineffective. Even interaction with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization is limited due to Chinese reservations and fears that a closer relationship between the CSTO and the SCO might give the impression to the outside world that the SCO endeavoured to become a 'NATO of the East' preferring political and economic cooperation (de Hass, 2016, p. 37) and the NATO has consistently refused to enter into any contact with the quasi-alliance. On the other side, Russia is building ties with China in the SCO and keeping it away by strengthening the CSTO (Baev, 2014, p. 42; 46).

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is a Eurasian political, economic, and military organization based on a group of states 'Shanghai Five' with the participation of China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan. After the accession of Uzbekistan, this formula has been changed to the SCO in 2001. It is open for enlargement now, although the initial positions of the parties were quite different. The largest members (China and Russia) claimed that it was premature and undesirable (Douhan, 2013, p. 6). Finally, India and Pakistan have joined the SCO in 2017. The SCO aims to strengthen mutual security, fight terrorism, extremism, and separatism ('three evil forces'), promote

trade, and, in practice, to resist Western-type democratic changes and NATO enlargement and serves as a counterpoise to Western RSO (Oldberg, 2010, p. 9) (Oldberg, 2016, p. 5). To achieve these goals, the SCO has adopted the Shanghai Convention on Combating Terrorism, Separatism, and Extremism and created the Regional Anti-Terrorist Structure (RATS) of the SCO with headquarters in Tashkent in 2001 (operating since 2003). To build antidrug zones around Afghanistan, the Agreement on cooperation in combating illicit trafficking of drugs, psychotropic substances, and their precursors was accepted in 2004 (Rozanov, 2013, pp. 43–45). The SCO is an organization with two security leading actors – China and Russia, in contrast to the CSTO with only one leader – Russia (De Hass, 2016). Thanks to China's high power rate supplemented by India and the Russian Federation, the SCO takes the high 3. position in all categories of power ranking just behind the OSCE and NATO. Since the mid-2000s, economic cooperation (finance, trade, transportation, infrastructure, telecommunications, agriculture, and energy cooperation projects) has emerged as a twin priority for the SCO alongside security. Thus far, there is little prospect of the SCO establishing a common military unit or force. Instead, the main role of the peace missions is a confidence-building measure between the SCO member states (Aris, 2013, p. 6). The future role of the SCO depends mainly on two factors: (1) relations between Russia and China; the degree of compatibility of their interests and priorities in the Eurasian region, (2) American foreign and security policy in the Central Asia (Rozanov, 2013, pp. 48–49). The SCO development may have negative consequences for the broader American interests in the Eurasian region (Boland, 2011, p. 50). On the other side, the SCO can play an important role in the axis of power – the US, Europe, and Japan – not be seen as a threat but a vehicle for increasing economic and social prosperity in the region (Prajakti & Siddharth, 2007).

The African Union's concept (2002) expresses the Pan-African long-standing desire and determination of the peoples of Africa and African states' to promote unity, solidarity, cohesion, and cooperation in the political, socio-economic and military dimensions. The main political-military goal of the AU is to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of its member states, and promoting peace, collective security, and stability on the continent. The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) with The Peace and Security Council (PSC) were established for the early warning and prevention, management, and resolution of many African conflicts. Five strategic priorities were adopted: (1) conflict prevention (including early warning), (2) crisis/conflict management, (3) post-conflict reconstruction and peace building, (4) strategic security issues, (5) coordination and partnerships and their efficiency monitoring and verification program (African Peace and Security Architecture. APSA Roadmap 2016-2020, 2015). The ambitious project

'Silencing Guns' (2013), reviving an aspiration set out by African leaders to end war and prevent genocide on the continent by 2020 failed. Due to the massacre of peaceful protesters by military putschists, the PSC suspended Sudan's membership in early June 2020 and helped mediate between civilian and military leaders. It has not significantly reduced violence, but it renewed outside attention to the crisis and united diplomats behind a single mediation effort. Although, in other countries, such as Ethiopia, Ivory Coast and Guinea, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Somali, the AU has not been so successful. The African leaders' commitment to multilateral efforts to fulfill this security task seems to have faded. There are at least three reasons for this, such as: (1) the priority of the AU housekeeping (authorities elections in 2021), (2) a merger of the political affairs and peace and security departments (politics often lies at the core of most of the continent's conflicts and efforts to resolve them, to axe jobs, to safe money etc.), (3) dispute with the United Nations over co-funding of peace operations (Eight Priorities for the African Union in 2020, 2020, pp. 1-3). On the other side, the AU must be supported by the international society in its conflict prevention and resolution efforts, because of the low rates of power, despite the significant number of participants comparable to the number of OECD states.

## **Conclusions**

The eight regional security organizations grouped in five regional security blocks have been examined under their economic, military (conventional), and geopolitical power. The results of a powermetric research have allowed to estimate their ability to achieve the adopted political-military goals (interests).

The East-West Block represented by the OSCE is the leader in all categories of powermetric ranking - economic, military, and geopolitical power. It is composed by the NATO's, European Union's, as well as the CIS/CSTO Block countries. The power of the NATO (more broadly the Western RSB) is a pillar of the OSCE power. The non-NATO states, like the Russian Federation only slightly impact the power of the OSCE. The political-military interests of the West Block members are quite different as the CIS/CSTO RSB states in the OSCE. This considerably limits the implementation of the organization's high capabilities and potential to obtain common European security goals.

The military security ambitions of CIS/CSTO RSB under the Russian hegemony to play the NATO equivalent role (so called 'East NATO') must be assessed as unreal. The powermetric research results prove a strong advantage of economic, military (conventional), and geopolitical power of the Western RSB over the CIS/CSTORSB (only ca. 11% of Western RSB power). The future and international role of the CIS/CSTO RSB depends on the geostrategic

goals of the Russian Federation, which is clear so far, to maintain political and military control over the part of the former post-Soviet area.

Due to the international isolation, mainly because of the aggressive foreign policy, Russia sees China as an ally. As the economic world power and the military great power, China rivalling the United States in the domination in the international system is a potentially a very attractive partner for the Russian Federation. However, the Chinese-Russian relations are complicated for historical and geopolitical reasons. The accession of India (the third state in the global power ranking) and Pakistan (both states are nuclear power) significantly strengthened the power of the SCO (the high third power rate, just behind the OSCE and NATO). China and India are the top two power states of the organization now. Russia has lost its second position in the power ranking of SCO. Russia, China, and India are also principal members of the BRICS platform targeted to the construction of a new world economic order. It will significantly influence the further development of the SCO. It has a partnership and relevant economic forum than military alliance nature now. The security cooperation framework of the SCO is focused on combating terrorism, organized crime, as well as extremism and separatism threats. The potential extension of the SCO to such countries like Mongolia, Afghanistan (observer states), and Sri Lanka and Cambodia (dialogue states) and cooperation with the ASEAN states lead to a question about the future Pan-Asian nature of this organization.

The Pan-African ambitions of the AU to clean the continent of many conflicts, to ensure peace, stability, and security to the peoples of Africa is currently failing. It is mainly due to the internal policy barriers (the priority of housekeeping instead of peacekeeping) and the low values of all indicators of power (international support required), despite a large number of member states.

## **References**

- African Peace and Security Architecture. APSA Roadmap 2016-2020*, 2015. African Union Commission, Peace and Security Department. Addis Ababa.
- Aris, S., 2013. *Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Mapping Multilateralism in Transition No. 2*. International Peace Institute. Retrieved from [https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/ipi\\_e\\_pub\\_shanghai\\_cooperation.pdf](https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/ipi_e_pub_shanghai_cooperation.pdf).
- Baev, P., 2014. *The CSTO: Military Dimensions of the Russian Reintegration Effort*. In: S.F. Starr & S.E. Cornell (ed.), *Putin's Grand Strategy: The Eurasian Union and Its Discontents*. Central Asia-Caucasus Institute & Silk Road Studies Program.

- Białoskórski, R., 2018. *The Geostrategic Position of the Russian Federation. A Powermetric Study*, Scientific Publishing House of the Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Siedlce.
- Białoskórski, R., Kiczma, Ł., Sulek, M., 2019. *National Power Rankings of Countries 2019*, ASPRA-JR, Warszawa.
- Boland, J., 2011. *Ten Years of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization: A Lost Decade? A Partner for the U.S.?* Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/ten-years-of-the-shanghai-cooperation-organization-a-lost-decade-a-partner-for-the-united-states/>.
- Dąbrowski, M., 2019. Kryzys „rosyjskiego NATO”. *Dokąd zmierza OUBZ? (eng. The Crisis of Russian NATO. Where is the CSTO going to?)*. Defence 24. Retrieved from <https://www.defence24.pl/kryzys-rosyjskiego-nato-dokad-zmierza-oubz-analiza>
- De Hass, M., 2016. *War games of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Collective Security Treaty Organization: Drills on the move!*, Journal of Slavic Military Studies, 29, 3, pp. 378-406.
- Douhan, A. F., 2013. *Evolution, Status, and Main Fields of Activity of SCO*. In: A.A. Rozanov (ed.), *The Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Central Asia's Security Challenges*. The Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Almaty-Minsk-Geneva.
- Eight Priorities for the African Union in 2020*, 2020. International Crisis Group. Crisis Group Africa Briefing No. 151. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/african-union-regional-bodies/b151-eight-priorities-african-union-2020>.
- Gotkowska, J., 2019. *NATO in Transition*. Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW). Retrieved from [https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/commentary\\_314.pdf](https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/commentary_314.pdf).
- Höhn, K., 2011. *Geopolitics and the Measurement of National Power* (PhD dissertation, Universität Hamburg).
- Mazur, M., 1996. *Cybernetyka i charakter (eng. Cybernetics and Character)*, AULA, Podkowa Leśna.
- Moczulski, L., 1999. *Geopolityka. Potęga w czasie i przestrzeni (eng. The Geopolitics. Power in Time and Space)*, Bellona, Warszawa.
- Mrvaljevic, S., 2015. *Collective Security Treaty Organization: Russia's answer to NATO?* Retrieved from <http://www.iapss.org/wp/2015/02/04/collective-security-treaty-organization-russias-answer-to-nato/>.
- Nikitina, Y., 2013. *Security cooperation in the Post-Soviet area within the Collective Security Treaty Organization*. ISPI Analysis, (152). Retrieved from [http://www.ispionline.it/it/documents/Analysis\\_152\\_2013.pdf](http://www.ispionline.it/it/documents/Analysis_152_2013.pdf).
- Oldberg, I., 2010. *Russia's Great Power Strategy under Putin and Medvedev (No. 1)*. Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Retrieved from <https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui->



- [publications/russias-great-power-strategy-under-putin-and-medvedev-min.pdf](#).
- Oldberg, I., 2016. *Is Russia a status quo power?* Ulpaper. Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299513226\\_Is\\_Russia\\_a\\_status\\_quo\\_power](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299513226_Is_Russia_a_status_quo_power).
- Prajakti, K., Siddharth, S.S., 2007. *Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Prospects of Development in the Eurasia Region*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281593748\\_Shanghai\\_Cooperation\\_Organization\\_and\\_Prospect\\_of\\_Development\\_in\\_the\\_Eurasia\\_Region](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281593748_Shanghai_Cooperation_Organization_and_Prospect_of_Development_in_the_Eurasia_Region).
- Rogozińska, A., 2020. *Rola NATO w kształtowaniu systemu bezpieczeństwa Europy Wschodniej*, Przegląd Geopolityczny, 31, s. 113-126.
- Rozanov, A.A., 2013. *The Issue of Security in the SCO*. In: A. A. Rozanov (ed.), *The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation and Central Asia's Security Challenges*. Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). Almaty-Minsk-Geneva. Retrieved from [www.dcaf.ch/content/download/139624/2168660/file/DCAF\\_RP16\\_SCO.pdf](http://www.dcaf.ch/content/download/139624/2168660/file/DCAF_RP16_SCO.pdf).
- Skrzyp, J., 2018. *Chiny i Stany Zjednoczone Ameryki w ujęciu geopolitycznym*, Przegląd Geopolityczny, 23, s. 9-23.
- Sulek, M., 2020. *Measurement of National Power - A Powermetric Model*. Przegląd Geopolityczny, 32, s. 35-57.
- Sulek, M., 2001. *Podstawy potegonomii i potegometrii (The Principles of Powernomics and Powermetrics)*, WSEiA, Kielce.
- Sulek, M., 2013. *Potęga państw. Modele i zastosowania (The power of States. Models and Applications)*, Rambler, Warszawa.
- Sulek, M., 2018. *Praxiology: A New Approach*, in: *Praxiology: The International Annual of Practical Philosophy and Methodology*, edited by W. Gasparski, Routledge, New York and London.
- Sulek, M., 2010. *Prognozowanie i symulacje międzynarodowe (The International Forecasting and Simulations)*, Scholar, Warszawa.
- The Military Balance*, 2019. International Institute for Strategic Studies, London.
- Wilczyński, P. L., Adamczyk, N., 2018. *Sily zbrojne Unii Europejskiej*, Przegląd Geopolityczny, 23, s. 100-122.
- Wilczyński, P. L., 2020. *Rozwój sił zbrojnych ChRL w ujęciu geostrategicznym*, Przegląd Geopolityczny, 34, s. 52-79.

## Regionalny system bezpieczeństwa po zimnej wojnie - gra sił i interesów

*W artykule przeanalizowano koncepcję regionalnego systemu bezpieczeństwa (RSS) po zimnej wojnie, składającą się z regionalnych organizacji bezpieczeństwa (RSO) powiązanych z pięcioma regionalnymi blokami bezpieczeństwa (RSB): Zachodnim, Rosyjskim (WNP/OUBZ), CIS-Azjatyckim, Afrykańskim i Północnym. Opierając się na danych empirycznych otrzymanych z metodycznego modelu potęgometrycznego, określono równowagę sił, a także interesy związane z bezpieczeństwem poszczególnych bloków. Blok Północny, reprezentowany przez OBWE, jest liderem we wszystkich kategoriach rankingu potęgometrycznego zarówno jeśli chodzi o potęgę gospodarczą, militarną jak i geopolityczną. W jego skład wchodzi państwa NATO, UE, a także państwa WNP/OUBZ. Potęga gospodarcza, militarna i geopolityczna NATO (szerzej bloku zachodniego) jest najsilniejszym filarem potęgi OBWE. Państwa nie należące do NATO, jak Federacja Rosyjska, tylko w niewielkim stopniu wpływają na siłę OBWE. Interesy bezpieczeństwa bloku zachodniego są zupełnie inne niż w krajach WNP.*

**Słowa kluczowe:** NATO, OBWE, WNP, OUBZ, SCO, UE, ANZUS, Unia Afrykańska, bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe, potęgometria, potęga gospodarcza, potęga militarna, potęga geopolityczna.