

Socioenergy, co-existence and co-evolution: key factors of a Romanian national development strategy

Dumitru IACOB¹
Ștefan STĂNCIUGELU²

Abstract. *The Romanian society, as any other society, needs a dynamic, and balanced correlation of the individual with the community energies. Normally, the idea expressed above should be at the basis of any social construction program and of any national development strategy. As a part of EU and NATO, Romania has acted during the last decades in the same paradigm of the co-existence that was specific to the Cold War period. The Russia-Ukraine war is the result of the co-existence paradigm. The future of the international relations needs a paradigm shift - the replace of co-existence paradigm with the co-evolution paradigm, which Romania should be part of. A co-evolution paradigm based national and international politics for Romania might start from the Ministry of External Affairs and the National Bank of Romania as “islands” of stability within a too dynamic political environment between 1990-2014.*

Keywords: *social energy; anti-social energy; co-existence; co-evolution; mutual support.*

We will say, as the chronicler, that the unfortunate man is “under the control of time”, his life and his belongings being directly influenced by the cycle of “times”. Of course, to a large extent the events in history have happened as the chronicler would tell us. However, man is not completely under the influence of time. By the power of his mind and arms, lasting life structures have often been built. And this happened when man knew how to work together with his fellows. When achievements reached “together” were possible, man’s enemies proved helpless. The following

1. Professor, Ph.D., College of Communication and Public Administration, National University of Political Science and Public Administration, Bucharest, Romania, dumitru.iacob@comunicare.ro.

2. Associate Professor, Ph.D., College of Political Sciences, National University of Political Science and Public Administration, Bucharest, Romania.

demonstration centers on this idea. We aim to prove that the safest security source in the life of human communities lies in man and in the strength of human connections.

Our study is considering a simple hypothesis: a distinct form of energy, namely social energy, is generated and manifests itself in society's life, as a result of the specific relationships between the significant social players, individuals, groups and human communities (Iacob and Iacob, 2010, pp. 54-59). As we have already shown (Iacob and Iacob, 2006, pp. 39-44), the security of nations is strongly influenced by the force of social energy existing in a society, the relationship between the nations' security and social energy being directly proportional.

About correlations between community and individuals

For the beginning, we shall notice that in the social theory, in sociology, the concepts having paradigmatic value become possible only in terms of likely and desirable correlations between human community and individuals. A few examples may be useful:

- The social system includes a lot of "objects" that interact so strongly that their states are interdependent, the change of one of them leading to changes of all the others. Social systems tend towards balance. Social systems are dynamic systems, characterized by the fact that their internal changes are continuous, without reaching highly stable balance states. Essentially, balance represents a continuous process of balancing and rebalancing.
- Social balance finally means the capacity of a social system of compensating for the changes of certain constituents by the change of other constituents. Social systems are evolutionary due to their homeostasis. By means of feedback systems continually rebalance in relation with the environment, ensuring both their stability and evolution.
- Social action takes into account both social stability and historical creation. To Max Weber, an action is social if and to the extent to which it modifies depending on another's individual's activity, on the basis of values or symbols shared by the members of a community. To Talcott Parsons, the social character of an action is given by an individual's interpretation of the other individuals' behavior. The interpretation system of the "others"

behavior includes the following alternatives – type – orientation towards the self or the collectivity; particularism/universalism; quality/performance; affectivity/affective neutrality; and diffusion/specificity. According to Parsons, a human action is social if, in a situation involving the interaction of at least two players, each of them aims to obtain the highest satisfaction, by selecting from the five pairs of alternative-constitutive pairs of variables of the social structure.

Considering what has been said above, we highlight two ideas. Firstly, the understanding of the social system is considered within a communicational paradigm. Both to Talcott Parsons, and to the representatives of the Palo Alto School, communication is a fundamental unit of the social, a social system that has the capacity of guaranteeing the production and reproduction of optimum communication. Actually, as understood by the Palo Alto School, the optimum social aggregation is the result of the normality of the social communication. At the same time, it is useful to remember one of Aristotle's ideas (Encyclopedia of Philosophy and Human Sciences, 2004, p. 279); the Stagirite uses the concept of energy (“energeia”) related to the action by means of which potentiality is turned into action. Actually, according to our hypothesis, the social energy expresses the society's capacity of turning the potential social relationships into deeds of social performance and national security.

The premises of a possible definition of socioenergy are the following:

- human societies develop within certain civilization contexts, by means of which certain relationships among individuals, groups and human communities are expressed; thus, there are socio-historical contexts, such as the western type ones, in which the individual's role is predominant (civilizations and cultures centered on the individual), as there are contexts, such as the eastern ones, in which the community predominates (civilizations and cultures centered on community values); in both cases the social matrix (the type of social equation) is the result that highly depends on the historical context, the particular conditions under which one civilization or another has been created and developed;
- the analysis of history and social life emphasizes a requirement of social performance, which is the essence of the performance capacity of the social structures - namely the dynamic balancing and the mutual intensification

of individuals, groups and communities, in their interdependency relationship; expressed in other words, it is not societies that are constituted by strong individuals, namely strong societies that are powerful and performing, but it is particularly those societies that succeed in multiplying the individual's strength by means of an optimum connection with the power of the group, of the community and the other way round.

Basically, *socioenergy is the distinct type of energy resulting from a permanent mutual intensification of the energy of the individuals and the energy of the community*. Against history and various civilization experiences, socioenergy has minimum values when the social cohesion is destroyed, when the connections between individuals and communities are broken, but also when, within the social equation, one of the terms dominates the complementary one. On the contrary, socioenergy will have high values within the civilization experiences where there exists the wisdom of generating social action forces by means of the cumulative action of all the social actors.

Socioenergy and anti-social energy

Socioenergy refers to *positive processes* in the dynamics of a community that take place under the sign of cooperation, openness, social construction, participation and engagement in joint activities whose purpose is in line with the common interest of a community. In a sense, social energy could for instance mean public decision of the elected representatives of local, regional, national and international community. The social energy is the source of development projects and strategies of a community of different size or of a social group.

Anti-social energy is the correlative concept of social energy. Social energy becomes destructive, inhibitory, and can become a hindrance for the community development to the extent that it takes the form of a conflict on the basis of private or group interests, which may replace the common interest of the community members. The anti-social energy is the source of conflict that at some point of the accumulation can embrace physical violence, with its extreme form of armed war. The anti-social energy can be found in physical and symbolical social violence whereby a part of the

group or of the community tries to assume a private or a group interest for the resources or for the redistribution of resources of a community. The anti-social energy may have as vectors political parties and pressure groups that define common interest as private / group interest when they have access to public decision. An actor who uses anti-social energy can also be the state or an alliance of states that, in the absence of development, cooperation or negotiation projects in order to solve problems, chooses war violence or invents a reason to justify and use war violence.

Socioenergy or *anti-social energy* of a community uses as means of manifestation the accidental and the unplanned event, but also the project and the planned strategy of acquisition or maintenance or re/distribution of public resources of a wider national or international community. Finally, the two concepts aimed actions – planned or not – claim or set against the common interest. The two forms of social energy are found in projects and cooperation actions: social, economic, political, cultural development projects, within a monopole or group actions over the resources of the community and their unethical distribution. The construction and development project and the different forms of social conflict whose parts could no longer negotiate over a certain problem represent principal ways of manifestation of *social* and *anti-social energy*.

The world of peaceful *co-existence* and the world of *co-evolution*

The two concepts acquire a significant endorsement in the special context of communist and post-communist history after World War II. The end of the war as a form of manifestation and concentration of anti-social energy at a peak level launches suddenly a second War - The Cold War -, the concrete form of manifestation of negative social energy of the same type, in which the anti-social energy is ideologically based: The Communist and The Capitalist Alliance define and build each other in a project for over a half century in terms of Good and Evil.

From the perspective of the previously used conceptual pair social/anti-social energy, we deal with a world where the anti-social energy dominates, which rejects any common project, dividing the world into Good and Bad. We call this world the *world of co-existence*. Apparently, we have to deal with a peaceful world. The physical war is avoided -

which is fine, but the history after WWII until the '90s is marked as a symbolic conflict era: capitalism and communism co-exist peacefully. More specifically, the Cold War occurs, fueled by the logic of division and potential conflict between East and West. It imagines the ideology of peaceful co-existence, which makes it less likely the hot conflicts, but does not generate a combustion development. *Peaceful co-existence* means delimitation of spheres of influence and a symbolic constant conflict under an assumed ideology and permanent reactive strategies. *Peaceful co-existence* means separation and mutual denial, strategic defense and attack management, demonstrations and counter-demonstrations of power of different kinds, testing and response tests or traps - *a permanent symbolic war which eliminates the joint projects or the authentic dialogue.*

In 1986-87 it seems that the Soviet leader Gorbachev realized that freedom of speech could become a development resource, because in freedom people can create and can participate to the creation of a more effectively future than under communist oppression. Moscow lost economic and military war because the single centralized party proved to be inefficient in the battle with the free market, the multi-party competition and the economic development from the western world. The development resource that Gorbachev wanted to use as a resource for conservation of the communist world in the same peaceful co-existence turned against the USSR and succumbed. The Cold War ended with the defeat of the USSR at least at a formal level. In fact, the logic of this peaceful co-existence dominated federal political thinking of Russia after 1991 until today. Holder of energy that Europe needs Russia behaves in the same field of peaceful and anti-social coexistence. And the West reacts in the same way as in the Cold War, although the Cold War - formally - is over.

The statement that we want to stress in this paper is that today, in the context of Russian-Ukrainian war, both Russia and the EU or the US think in the same logic of the Cold War - the two sides co-exist and seem incapable to think in terms of social energy constructive cooperation, evolution of one joint venture and joint development. The Russia-Ukraine war is the violent answer, by anti-social energy at global level, which appears in the absence of any economic development projects and of increase of the living standards. Russia is using violence war because it played continuously in the logic of the Cold War after 2000 and its

government today has resorted the violent means in order to compensate the lack of development projects.

From the conceptual perspective that we propose, this war, and also its continuation by apparently peaceful means of negotiation is the result of co-existence and of the inability to overcome this separatist logic, incapable to generate social energy of joint social development projects.

Such new logic entails co-evolution and the transition from a logic of conflict to one of cooperation. Social energy is the means by which the model of co-evolution manifests - a response to the congestion created by the behavior based on the logic peaceful co-existence.

Co-evolution and the use of its elements at socio-political and economic level are equivalent to a shift of paradigm in the understanding and the projection of development at national and global community. The logic of the Cold War should be replaced with a logic of participation and cooperation, of joint development projects, where conflict and - his most destructive form - violent war block the resources of understanding and cooperation.

Socioenergy and the security values

The security values, as well as the insecurity ones of the socioenergy are easily visible. First of all, in the historical situations when socioenergy has minimum values, societies' capacity of surviving throughout time is significantly diminished, these societies running high risks of dissolution and chaos. To this end, it is useful to notice that, as a rule, under circumstances of anarchy and social violence, the main explanation consists in the serious imbalance of the relationship between individuals and community.

Out of what has been said before it results that, finally, the most profound and severe form of aggression against a society is the triggering of the processes which destroy the balance between individuals and society, the social energy being dissipated in peripheral, disintegrating experiences. At

the same time, it is obvious that it is essential that a national security strategy should rely on a social human-community construction program, in which individuals can find their optimum environment of existence within the community life.

The American and the Japanese civilizations cases - a brief discussion

In the following paragraphs we consider two historical cases, extremely complex, therefore difficult to summarize. It is first of all, the *American case*, frequently mentioned in various contexts. From the standpoint of the current discussion, the experience of American history has in its forefront the individual's dominant profile. It is the individual whose force actually builds a new community. In the American civilization the norm, as an essential expression of community life, is the major influence of the individual's practical life. Basically, the force of the American society, its social efficiency, is the result of this very relationship, constantly contradictory but permanently balanced, between individuals and community.

To conclude this brief remark on America's power, we present a quotation from an analysis of American literature (Secolul 20, 1999, p. 250): *"During our extensive discussions on American literature he showed me this paradoxical duality of the hero on the new continent: the need for community and the escape from the world, to reach solitude..."* Actually the above quoted words are a concise formulation of the equation of the American social performance – the dynamic connection between "solitude" (individuality) and community.

The other historical case we are considering, *the case of Japanese civilization*, expresses, in an exemplary way, a performing socioenergetic construction formula, based on the mutual intensification of the individual and community energies. By comparison to the American experience, the Japanese case is more interesting as its historical beginnings are completely different, the Japanese civilization relying on an intense community life. Japan's entrance into modernity meant the very intense triggering of individual energies, without diminishing the community's social significance. This sociohistorical construction process fuels Japan's current

prosperity and power. From what we notice, another significant power of the 21st century is undergoing a similar sociohistorical construction process: it is China.

The Romanian case

For the Romanian case, we use as a reference Constantin Noica's famous comment related to the word "longing for" ("dor" in Romanian) (Noica, 1987, p. 205): "When one wants to show that we mean something else by our words and that as a result of this, the Romanian language is entitled to exist in the world, the first word that comes to your mind is <longing>... The word <longing> has in its structure a prototypical feature..., it represents a blending..." In line with Noica's thinking, we can easily imagine the idea by means of which <longing> means the very need of blending between man and world, between individual and community. Obviously, starting from this idea, a likely rich social Romanian anthropology can be undertaken.

The task of putting together the Romanians' socioenergetic construction is a self-contained one. However, even considering things very broadly, it can be stated that *the Romanian people's socioenergetic core* is healthy and resilient. The tradition of community life, the village population and the strength that connects man, as an individual, to the land and the customs of life shared with others support this idea.

The overall context of the Romanian people's history has indicated *socioenergetic disturbances over the last decades*. From this perspective, two major risks of manifestation of a socioenergetic deficit in Romanian social life could be identified: a) firstly, the Romanian society has been affected by the experience of the pseudo-community life after years following the second World War; b) secondly, but not less negatively, there have been the processes of false development of human individuality, under the precarious normative circumstances of the social transition.

Lucian Boia (2012, pp.80-81) correctly noticed: "The Romanian culture lacks the capacity of every-day democratic adjustment capacity, which would maintain things in balance, removing the risk of dangerous drifts. Romanians do not commit themselves, they look for insignificant

individual solutions instead of searching for collective solutions, and then nothing fundamental will be solved while the tensions will continuously build. The lack of a minimal dialogue, of a minimal protest, of a minimal compromise has generated the unexpected and huge explosion in December 1989”.

This very situation of cultural deficit, this precariousness of the community-democratic practice has generated, in our opinion, an extremely painful paradox. In December 1989, the Romanians had an issue, expressed essentially by the totalitarian pressure over people and communities. In December 1989, in the following months and years, Romanians dealt with the issue with which they were confronted, the totalitarian political structure being destroyed. However, the issue has been dealt with in a way that has generated many other issues, extremely serious. First and foremost, it is the issue of the political climate, the community behavior and the people’s frame of mind. It is difficult to find a more telling example of the lack of public intelligence...

Along the ideas expressed above, the same Lucian Boia (2012, pp. 93-94) comments: “What does not work in Romanian society, or works with obstacles is the selection of values. The dominance of personal or group relationships over institutional requirements: older faults, increased during communism, and left uncontrolled after 1989. Simultaneously with the overcoming of the totalitarian system, a sort of individualistic wilderness without rules has manifested itself, for securing a better position...”

Obviously, in order to survive in time, the Romanian society, as any other society, needs a dynamic, and balanced correlation of the individual energies with the community energies. Normally, the idea expressed above should be at the basis of any social construction program and of any national security strategy. We think that Romanian needs a paradigmatic shift in the strategic thinking for domestic and international politics. The co-existence paradigm should be soon replaced by a co-evolution paradigm.

Romania - the future has to be defined within the *co-evolution* paradigm

Romania has been governed in the domestic and foreign policy by decisions and strategies belonging to the peaceful co-existence paradigm. This Romanian approach is part of a global game that unifies and divides Europe after the fall of communism. Although it changed the political sides, Romania participates today at the game of co-existence as part of the West. The camps during the Cold War were redefined after the fall of the USSR, but the logic of Russia's relations with the West remained the same – the peacefully co-existence generated by negative social energy.

What is sure today is the destructiveness of Russia-Ukraine war in Europe. Nothing suggests that there is some form of social energy this war may produce, even for Russia. Our hypothesis is that this extreme form of negative social energy at European level - the Russo-Ukrainian war - is the result of the absence of joint development plans of the EU, the US and Russia. It seems that the paradigm of peaceful co-existence came to a deadlock. The result of lack of the economic development projects for Russia was the war violence - a social manifestation of the negative energies more manageable for Russia than projects and strategies of economic development.

What could Romania do in this context, as a part of the EU and NATO?

Romania's internal difficulties

Internally, it is hard to immediately identify a project for transforming the generalized symbolic political violence, based on the coexistence paradigm into projects of co-evolution and national cooperation. Cooperation projects, political alliances, coalitions of government are short and insignificant in relation to conflict and political aggression - forms of manifestation of social negative energy. Social energy does not preclude conflict, but getting over its limit to get cooperation and development in confronting different views and projects. The conflict between two ruling parties concerning the number of vice-premiers is a conflict that does not eliminate the co-evolution in the alliance of government. Nevertheless, the rupture and getting out of the government because the parties failed to agree over the attributions of a proposed vice-premier is a clear case of

peaceful co-existence and anti-social energy. Romania cannot build inside a national policy shared in its principles and frameworks by a majority of the governing elite (political parties). *Romanian national politics unfolds a quarter of a century still in the frameworks of anti-social energy that is specific to the paradigm of peaceful co-existence.*

Domestic opportunities in Romania

We believe, however, that we can identify in the Romanian public space *islands of co-evolution* and of allowing the creation and the manifestation of *social energy*. An optimistic outlook would suggest that, based on those islands, around them can coagulate important social and political actors that are able to generate a wave of change to a national co-evolutionary logic: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Bank of Romania.

Try to consider these two areas are *islands of co-evolution*, which could generate cooperative and coagulation movements of development cooperation projects at the national level, by stimulating cooperation and co-evolution potentials of social energy at the political and civil society levels. We further operationalize the co-evolution potential that the Romanian Foreign Ministry owns (The co-evolution potential of the National Bank of Romania represents the subject of another research project we are working on).

Somehow away from the accelerated dynamics of change in depth, the Foreign Ministry has a stable body of expertise that may be used for projects in a co-evolutionary paradigm at international level, in which Romania may be an active part or even the initiator.

Such a development project could be represented by the proposal and by the organizing of Romania of a framework for discussion and cooperation on economic and social development projects in response to the war between Russia and Ukraine. *Organizing an international Summit in Bucharest focused on economic development projects and solutions could be the offer of social energy and a paradigm shift in the relations between the EU, the US and Russia, which is held today in the specific logic of the maximum manifestation of negative social energy - the violent war.*

A foreign policy of co-evolution could mean overcoming the conflict and mutual potentiation of resources development. Romania could initiate with full coverage in the logic of history, co-evolutionary processes of the European Union and Russia. An international summit held in Bucharest, of the EU and Russia, with special guests to debate the common strategy of co-evolution (the US, China, Japan, and all countries with investment potential in the area), may represent the beginning of a paradigm shift at global level.

Co-evolution does not share Kant's categorical imperative - it will be an utopia to invoke ethical values outside politics in the policy of states. Co-evolution means in this case *win-win strategies*. If we don't see them, it doesn't mean they don't exist. The international EU-Russia Summit in Bucharest, inviting NATO, the US, China and other international actors that could participate in socio-economic development projects would be a good opportunity to test the potential of the co-evolution. A logic similar to the Pascalian bet would suggest to calculate the odds of risk of this International Summit in the following terms:

- (i) If Romania is betting on the success of the proposed international summit in Bucharest and loses the bet, it does not lose anything - you cannot lose what you never had.
- (ii) If Romania is betting on the success of the proposed international summit in Bucharest and the summit will be successful, we will win everything is at stake (cooperation, joint EU-US-Russia economic and social projects, win-win social and economic projects of a global type, the elimination of the war violence).
- (iii) If Romania is betting on the failure of the proposed international summit in Bucharest and the Summit is a failure, we won the bet, but, in fact, we don't win anything because we remain with the existing war situation.
- (iiii) If Romania is betting on the failure of the proposed international summit in Bucharest and loses the bet, meaning that it would be a successful summit, we will, in fact, never organize it, and therefore we will never know anything about its success.

Using the same Pascalian logic, one of the four hypotheses is preferred and has the biggest gains.

A *co-existence logic* is compatible with the cases (i), (iii), (iiii).

The paradigm of *co-evolution* is compatible with the rest.

References

- Boia, L. (2012). *De ce este România altfel?*. Bucharest: Humanitas Publishing House.
- Enciclopedie de filosofie și științe umane (2004). Bucharest: ALL DeAGOSTINI Publishing House.
- Iacob, M., and Iacob, D. (2010). *Fondul și forma. O poveste culturală*. Bucharest: Tritonic.
- Iacob, M., and Iacob, D. (2006). *Socioenergy and the security of nations*. In *Actualitate și perspective în societatea înalt tehnologizată*. Bucharest: UNAp Publishing House.
- Noica, C. (1987). *Cuvânt împreună despre rostirea românească*. Bucharest: Eminescu Publishing House.
- Secolul XX (1999). A review of world literature, sciences and the dialogue of cultures, 7-8-9/1999