

Politics and War in Historical and Theoretical Perspective. With EU Case Study

*La política y la guerra en perspectiva histórica y teórica.
Con un estudio de caso de la UE*

Selma DELALIĆ

Associate Professor for International Relations and European Studies

International Burch University (Sarajevo)

selma.delalic@ibu.edu.ba

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2341-3425>

Adem OLOVČIĆ

PhD candidate for International Relations and European Studies

International Burch University (Sarajevo)

adem.olvacic@ibu.edu.ba

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5761-3831>

RECIBIDO: 2 DE SEPTIEMBRE DE 2021 / ACEPTADO: 20 DE OCTUBRE DE 2021

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to shed light on the dominant theoretical paradigms and show their sustainability in the last 150 years, following the historical context of the interrelationship between politics and war. Starting from Clausewitz's thesis on war as a continuation of politics by other, violent means, the paper thematizes the dominant wars in the twentieth century, World War I and II, their causes and connection with politics, which proves to be an essential element of every war. Namely, war has always been the consequence of political decisions and as such a significant political tool for achieving a certain goal. In this context, the Cold War period unequivocally confirms Clausewitz's realist thesis, showing that war is not necessarily an armed conflict, but that it is nonetheless a political matter. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, realism and liberalism regained prominence and emerged as significant theories on war and security. Both theories have their roots in the twentieth century, and therefore their paradigm becomes insufficient to answer the new questions posed by the nature of interdependent world. Nevertheless, these theories, especially liberalism, show their practical application and stand at the core of the ideological basis for the formation of the European Union. In this sense, Europe, after centuries of wars fought on its soil, displays the possibility of successful cooperation. As a result, war appears not only as a continuation of politics by violent means, but as a constituent element of systems and states in the modern world.

Keywords: politics-war-realism-liberalism-European Union.

Resumen: El objetivo de este trabajo es arrojar luz sobre los paradigmas teóricos dominantes y mostrar su sostenibilidad en los últimos 150 años, siguiendo el contexto histórico de la interrelación entre política y guerra. Partiendo de la tesis de Clausewitz sobre la guerra como continuación de la política por otros medios violentos, este artículo analiza las guerras dominantes en el siglo XX, la Primera y la Segunda Guerra Mundial, sus causas y su conexión con la política, que resulta ser un elemento esencial de toda guerra. En concreto, la guerra siempre ha sido la consecuencia de decisiones políticas y, como tal, una importante herramienta política para conseguir un determinado objetivo. En este contexto, el periodo de la Guerra Fría confirma inequívocamente la tesis realista de Clausewitz, demostrando que la guerra no es necesariamente un conflicto armado, pero que no deja de ser una cuestión política. Tras el colapso de la Unión Soviética y el fin de la Guerra Fría, el realismo y el liberalismo recuperaron protagonismo y surgieron como teorías significativas sobre la guerra y la seguridad. Ambas teorías hunden sus raíces en el siglo XX, por lo que su paradigma resulta insuficiente para responder a las nuevas cuestiones que plantea la naturaleza del mundo interdependiente. Sin embargo, estas teorías, especialmente el liberalismo, muestran su aplicación práctica y se sitúan en el núcleo de la base ideológica para la formación de la Unión Europea. En este sentido, Europa, tras siglos de guerras libradas en su territorio, muestra la posibilidad de una cooperación exitosa. En consecuencia, la guerra aparece no sólo como una continuación de la política por medios violentos, sino como un elemento constitutivo de los sistemas y estados del mundo moderno.

Palabras clave: Política, Guerra, Realismo, Liberalismo, Unión Europea.

Summary: I. INTRODUCTION – THEORETICAL BACKGROUND. II. 20th CENTURY – HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CLAUSEWITZ'S THESIS. II.1. Failure of diplomacy and the outbreak of the wwI. II.2. Politics as the trigger for the next world conflict – WWII. II.3. Cold War and the altered global geopolitical security context. III. GLOBALIZATION AND WAR – THE CONTINUOUS INSECURITY. III.1. Globalization – a challenging concept. III.2. Globalization and the changing nature of security. IV. ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE AND THE DECLINE OF THE MILITARY FORCE – NEOLIBERAL THESIS. IV.1. Neoliberal pursuit for peace. IV.2. Tocqueville and the democratic peace theory. V. GLOBALIZED WORLD AND COLLECTIVE (IN)SECURITY. V.1. Globalization and the new world peace pessimism – a neorealist assumptions. V.2. Neoliberals vs. neorealists – a path to collective (in)security. VI. WAR IN CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS: ARE THE DISPLAYED THEORETICAL APPROACHES SUSTAINABLE. VII. EU CASE STUDY. VIII. CONCLUSION. IX. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.

I. INTRODUCTION – A THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In a myriad of the phenomena connected with politics, war occupies a central position. From the earliest beginnings of human societies to the present day, war has posed a constant challenge to human societies and a predominant security threat. Security in the international system emerges as a fundamental value to which all subjects of the international relations aspire. According to Raymond Aron, one of the most prominent scholars of the last century: «Every political unit strives to survive first and foremost.»¹ This value consists, first and foremost, in not ceasing to exist. Survival implies, as the Serbian scholar Vojin Dimitrijević points out, «national and physical survival, not just maintaining the status of a separate state.»² In the first case, the goal is for a nation to survive as such, not to get lost by denationalization or assimilation, and the second case purports the physical survival of the existing generation of the population, the danger of destruction by weapons. Both threats can be eventually realized through war, as a political agent.

In terms of anthropology, war is a paradoxical phenomenon to explain.³ On the one hand, it stands in opposition to civilization, and on the other, it is a

¹ ARON, R., *Paix et guerre entre les nations*, Calmann-Lévy, 2005, p. 82.

² DIMITRIJEVIĆ, V.; STOJANOVIĆ, R., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Službeni list CRJ, 1996, p. 223

³ The phenomenon of war has occupied man's thought since his very beginnings. Thus, for example, most ancient thinkers considered war to be man's natural state, which generates the development of society itself. The ancient philosopher Heraclitus considered wars a normal state of social life and approved them for the acquisition of slaves, which, in his opinion, enabled free citizens to engage in culture. For him, 'war is a confirmation of regularity that works universally – the father of all and the king of all. War makes one god, others men, some slaves, and some free.' For more information on the origins of the war see: MARKOVIĆ, M., *Filozofija Heraklita Mračnog*, Beograd, Nolit, 1983; PLATO, *The Republic*, Penguin Classic, 2012; SEKULIĆ, N., *Skriveni rat*, Institut za sociološka istraživanja, Beograd, 2013; MALEŠEVIĆ, S., *The Sociology of War and Violence*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

tool and a means of its formation. War cannot be spoken of as something that does not belong to men. However, war, at the same time calls into question humanity in the most barbarous way. War is not an unplanned, instinctive, and affective state – an *ex-nihilo* manifestation of human aggression, but an intelligently used instrument and aspect of sometimes ingeniously designed human activity. It is planned and organized as a violent and armed way of determining the distribution of goods, power and roles in society, the state or among states. How the war originated, what are its causes, what role did it play in the history of the development of human societies, and whether and when it will disappear, these are all the questions that have occupied political thought for centuries. History is so burdened by wars that the question of eradicating or at least reducing the causes of conflict and war inevitably arises. Yet, never before has been paid so much attention to the study of this phenomenon as it is in the last hundred years. There are many reasons for this, and they all arise from the fact that war in the modern world is not just a threat to an ethnic group, nation, class, race, or political coalition, but to the biophysical existence of humanity.

The famous Swiss historian Jean-Jacques Babel found that during the 5,600 years of documented history, humanity fought 14,500 wars with three and a half billion casualties.⁴ However, the history of warfare showed that all the wars that humanity has fought so far have not had nearly tragic consequences, as the modern wars had. According to some estimates, around 25 million people died in all the wars fought in the 17th, 18th, and the 19th century, while in just ten years of the 20th century warfare (World War I and II), 65 million people lost their lives.⁵ In an effort to understand and ultimately eliminate the causes of conflict and war, scholars have sought for centuries to establish links between wars and other aspects of human life, such as health, social and economic security, and of course politics. Distinguished German military thinker Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) in his famous essay *On War*, 1832, expressed the thesis that «War is merely the continuation of policy by other means.»⁶ By «other means», the author meant primarily weapons and war equipment.⁷

⁴ MRKIĆ, S.; PRELEVIĆ, M.; BEGOVIĆ, A., *Teorija o ratu. Vojnoizdavački zavod*, 1981, p. 17.

⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁶ CLAUSEWITZ, C. von, *On War*, rev. ed., ed. and trans. M. Howard and P. Paret, Princeton, University Press, 1984, p. 87.

⁷ The given thesis will be a theoretical basis for further consideration in this paper.

The material side of the war has been continual subject to different studies from the time of the first wars until the Napoleonic era. Nevertheless, Clausewitz was one of the first to include political aspect in his definition of war, emphasizing that the politicization of the masses is an indispensable part of every war. Similar attempts could be found in the teachings of Thucydides and his account of the Peloponnesian War, where the war occurs „as a result of a fear of a politically stronger neighbor»⁸. That fear shapes the essence of war, politicizing and turning it into a mere calculus of power.⁹ Likewise, Clausewitz perceives war not only as an armed conflict of armies on the battlefield, but as a war of entire nations, which is never *causa sui*, a purpose to itself. For Clausewitz, war has always been a mere tool of politics, and, as such, it cannot be grasped separately. In other words, war is always an effect or a consequence of certain politics and/or political ideology¹⁰ that underlies it.

History has shown many times that politics disposes of different means to achieve its goals. War is just one of them. Since the meaning of war, according to most authors, comes down to the ability of using force to meet political goals, the connection between these two phenomena is unquestionable. However, despite this obviousness, this relationship is not that simple. Namely, it is not that easy to place war in a subordinate position towards politics. If we go back to the definition of war, the reciprocity in the action of war strategy and policy must be observed: war strategy is subordinated and serves the goals set by politics. At the same time, politics cannot set goals that are not in line with strategy if these goals are achievable by using force. Nevertheless, war begins and ends with

⁸ VOLKMANN-SCHLUCK, K., *Politička filozofija*. Naprijed, 1977, p. 17.

⁹ The ancient historian Thucydides (c. 460-c. 400 BC), was the first to consider the problem of power in politics. Politics is first and foremost turned to power, and power is all to the core turned to itself and its being tends to increase. This approach set the realist paradigm in politics. From a theoretical point of view, Thucydides is thought to have given the broadest and most detailed assessment of the social role of war. By analyzing the Peloponnesian Wars (431-404 BC), Thucydides pointed to irreconcilable contradictions between the two slave-owning states – democratic Athens and aristocratic Sparta – that were being resolved by the wars. Thucydides sees the main cause of the Peloponnesian War in «severe earthquakes» that affected most of the country, and in «great droughts» that caused «terrible famine and severe disease» In his theorizing, Thucydides tried to find a logical connection between the consequences and causes of warfare. That is why, as the main cause of war, sometimes there is a fear of a stronger neighbor, sometimes honor, sometimes even «some marital things», but, most often, it is a material benefit – fertile land, favorable geographical location, favorable coastline, and the like. Following this, Thucydides calls the war «violence of the stronger over the weaker» in order to gain a certain benefit. (THUCYDIDES, *Peloponneski rat/Peloponnesian War*, Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska, 1957, pp. 14, 25, 33, 50, 51).

¹⁰ VLAISAVLJEVIĆ, U., *Etnopolitika i građanstvo*, Dijalog, 2013, p. 67

political decisions, and the development of war strategies, due to advancement of modern technology, contributes to the deepening of this relationship. In this context, Clausewitz emphasizes war «as a conflict and high-risk situation, as an area of unpredictable social dynamics and unpredictability manipulation, as a sudden stagnation and uncertainty, and as a phenomenon whose laws are difficult to predict, because they correspond to the laws of gambling with enormous stakes, during which great rebukes can be expected.»¹¹

A new period in understanding the essence of war began with Clausewitz's paradigm, opening the possibility for some authors such as Vlaisavljević, to define war as not mere political, but the «greatest cultural act.»¹² The influence of politics on war is so strong that it determines its very character. The more magnificent the politics that drives the war, the more magnificent the war will be. If we look back historically, we will see that this has been the case from the Clausewitz's era to the present days.

II. 20TH CENTURY – HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CLAUSEWITZ'S THESIS

War, as defined by Clausewitz, has always been a matter of political decisions, albeit sometimes caused by seemingly different events. This is particularly evident in the context of the twentieth century, which, historically,

¹¹ CLAUSEWITZ, C. von, *On War*, rev. ed., ed. and trans. M. Howard and P. Paret, Princeton, NJ, University Press, 1984, p. 104.

¹² In his work, the author tries to explain the causes of wars in the Balkans in the 1990s and offers his view of post-war policies that, he believes, inevitably lead to new wars. At least in the case of the Balkans, such policies are related to certain ethnonational, i.e., cultural paradigms. Following the post-structural approach, which in the field of international relations became especially current after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union and whose main proponents are the prominent US authors such as Alexander Wendt (1992) and David Campbell (1992), a Bosnian philosopher Ugo Vlaisavljević, articulates the phenomenon of war in the context of the cultural relationship through the dichotomy «We» and «Other». The central thesis of this work is that the war cannot end as long as the «living» enemies, that is, those we perceive as enemies. This is so because the basis of the cultural constitution of peoples is a distinction from a particular culture that is not their own and which belongs to another people. In this sense, war as a cultural event, emerges, not only as a tendency to destroy the culture of the Other but also as the rise of the constitution or final confirmation of one nation and its culture. These theses about the unbreakable relationship between culture and war caused a lot of controversy in the Bosnian public, and the author presented his observations on his work in an interview given to the renowned Croatian daily newspaper «Novi list», in 2005. Retrieved from Lupiga, 2012: <https://lupiga.com/vijesti/ugo-vlaisavljevic-rat-kao-najveci-kulturni-dogadjaj> VLAISAVLJEVIĆ, U., *Rat kao najveci kulturni dogadjaj*, Maunagić, 2007.

has created multiple triggers for the two world wars to take place. Based on different historical sources, we can say that the causes of the two world wars were multiple but intertwined. Yet, they all rest upon the desire to gain certain political and economic power within the international system. The twentieth century, in addition to achievements that can undoubtedly be described as progressive, had witnessed several negative developments. On the one hand, that century represents the period of scientific, technical, and technological progress, the rapid development of industrialization, informatization, and abrupt changes in political ideologies and paradigms. On the other hand, these changes impacted the most brutal bloodsheds, caused by wars that grew out of technological progress. Such events achieved their greatest effect both at the ideological level and at the level of cultural and technological progress, effects that Herbert Marcuse warn about in 1960s:

«As a technological universe, a developed industrial society is a political universe, the last level in the realization of a specific historical project of experience, transformation and organization nature as a mere material of subordination. In its course, the project shapes everything: reasoning and action, intellectual and material culture. Culture, politics, and economics are in the medium of technology merged into a ubiquitous system that swallows, or suppresses, all alternatives. The productivity and growth potential of this system stabilizes society and contains the technical progress within the structure of domination. Technological rationality has become political rationality.»¹³

The twentieth century witnessed the two greatest wars in human history, based on the achievements of the industrial revolution, which, guided by the classical realistic paradigm, is best reflected in the production of weapons. These wars, however, have largely determined the fate of world politics.

II.1. *Failure of diplomacy and the outbreak of the WWI*

The late unification of Italy (1870) and Germany (1871) is the reason why these two states held very few colonies in the late 19th and early 20th century. Their demands for colonial possessions could not have been realized

¹³ MARCUSE, H., *Čovjek jedne dimenzije*, Sarajevo, Veselin Masleša, 1989, p. 16. (*One-Dimensional Man*, 1964).

without jeopardizing the interests of the other colonial powers in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world. The goal of German conquests was to dominate the Middle East through Southeast Europe, what was expressed by the slogan «DrangnachOsten».¹⁴ German international policy was supported by Austro-Hungary, hoping that this would make it easier to achieve its expansionist goals. German and Austro-Hungarian intentions were opposed by the interests of Russia, which sought to secure access to the so-called «warm seas» (Aegean, Adriatic, and Marmara seas).¹⁵

Pursuing a certain degree of security in case of war with Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary entered a military alliance as early as 1879. Italy joined the alliance three years later. Thus, in 1882, a military-political bloc of states was formed, called the Triple Alliance, directed against the interests of France and Russia. In the face of the threat, Russia and France concluded an

¹⁴ Translated in English as a «Drive to the East», the German nationalist motto referred to the idea of German territorial expansion toward Eastern Europe into the Slavic lands and further to the Middle East. After unification in 1871, Germany became a strong industrial, economic, and military power. The state directed most of its wealth to creating a strong army and navy. The strength was followed by the ambition to take over international influence, primarily from Great Britain. Germany sought the redistribution of the former colonies, spreading its ambitions beyond European borders, to the east. Aforementioned motto is best expressed by the German Emperor Wilhelm II in 1898, emphasizing that «Germany has great tasks outside the narrow borders of old Europe.» For more, see DURAKOVIĆ, N., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Sarajevo, 2009, p. 35.

¹⁵ The desire for unrestricted access to the warm seas is a centuries-old strategic Russian interest. These efforts, which involved control over the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, resulted in a conflict between Russia and Western powers in the 19th century – the Crimean War. At the end of the century, Russia emerged as a bastion of support for the Western Balkan countries in their struggle for independence and liberation from the Ottoman and Habsburg empires, the main strategic Russian opponents in the competition to control these passages. The conflict between Russia and Western powers continued into the early 20th century, albeit in a changed geopolitical context in the aftermath of the October Revolution, which now took the shape of a geostrategic competition between the USSR and the West for domination over Eastern Europe and its relentless endeavors to get unhampered access to the Mediterranean. In the late 1950s and during the 1960s, the Soviet Union strived to intensify its influence in the Balkan countries, especially in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, whose ports on the Adriatic were a significant step toward entrée to the Mediterranean. Following the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia's strategic geopolitical interests in this context remained unchanged. Thus, the Russian annexation of Crimea at the beginning of 2014 partly reflects these strategic national interests: the largest Russian fleet is located in the port of Sevastopol, from which it has access to warm seas. For more information see: MANKOFF, J., *Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics (A Council on Foreign Relations Book)*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2nd edition, 2011; DONALDSON, R.H. & NADKARNI V., *Foreign Policy of Russia: Changing Systems, Enduring Interests*, Routledge, 6th edition, 2018; GALEOTTI, M., *A Short History of Russia: How the World's Largest Country Invented Itself, from the Pagans to Putin*, Hanover Square Press, 2020.

agreement on mutual cooperation in 1893 in case one of them was attacked by a member of the Triple Alliance. In fear of excessive strengthening of Germany, Great Britain, which opposed redistribution of the colonies, concluded in 1904 an alliance initially with France, and in 1907 with Russia. With that act, a new military-political bloc of states called the «Entente Cordiale»¹⁶ was formed.

The formation of blocs of great powers, which were soon after joined by some smaller European countries, led to a further strain in their mutual relations. While the Triple Alliance strived at a new colonial division of the world, the members of the Entente sought to preserve the acquired colonial possessions and dominance in the world. These contradictions became more and more pronounced over time and made it clear that any change in the existing relations would have to cause major crises or even a war conflict between two blocs. These events resulted in an arms race and accelerated preparations for war. By mid-1914, the members of the opposing alliances were ready for war. The only thing awaiting was the event to be used as a cause, which historically took place in Sarajevo, with the assassination of the Austro-Hungarian heir to the throne Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sofia, on 28th June 1914.

Virtually unprecedented in the slaughter, carnage, and the destruction it caused, WWI or the Great War is cited in the history of diplomacy as one of the most significant, at the same time, the most tragic examples of diplomacy failure. Along with the disappearance of the old empires, the WWI marked the end of the old or orthodox diplomacy, characterized by pronounced closedness and elitism. In other words, the First World War represents a milestone in the transition from old to new, modern diplomacy. Openness, transparency, faster, easier and more open communication, the growing power of public opinion and the media were slowly becoming a determinant of diplomacy. However, before we address the reasons for the failure of diplomacy, we will

¹⁶ English, «Cordial Agreement» that was actually composed of two agreements on the division of spheres of interest, first in North Africa, signed on April 8th, 1904, between England and France, and second in Asia, especially Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet, signed on 31st August 1907, between England and Russia. The agreements on the division of Africa and Asia represented the same time agreements on joint activities of the mentioned forces against Germany and its allies and their demands for colonies and a new partition of the world. For more information see: HOBBSAWM, E., *Age of Extremes: The Short 20th Century 1914-1991*, Tantor, 2020. KEYLOR, W.R., *The Twentieth-Century World and Beyond: An International History Since 1990*, Sixth Edition, Oxford University Press, 2012. MAZOWER, M., *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, London Penguin, 1999.

look at the climate that prevailed in the international environment on the eve of WWI. The Ottoman Empire started falling apart in 1878, the Berlin Congress was convened to solve the issues of the Near East, the Treaty of Berlin was signed. The Ottoman Regime surrendered part of Caucasus to Russia, recognized the independence of Montenegro, Romania and Serbia; Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, which motivated the nationalist sentiment among the Southern Slavs, Britain acquired Cyprus. In the period from 1890s to 1900s European countries (Britain, Italy, France) started building overseas colonial empires. Gavrilo Princip, a member of *Young Bosnia*, assassinated Franz Ferdinand, Crown Prince of Austria and his wife Sofia in Sarajevo, BiH. Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia the same year, and the WWI started.¹⁷

How has diplomacy managed to fail? Namely, on the eve of WWI, there was anarchy and a general feeling of insecurity in the international system. In such an environment morality was considered individual, national interests superseded all the other and a need arose to establish as many colonies as possible. Numerous wars materialized in a short period of time, and the presence of so many conflicts resulted in a realist behavior of the countries. In order to protect themselves, states sought power in colonial possessions and armament. The leaders turned their backs on diplomacy and asked advice from military officials. Nationalism was on the rise, leaving little space for civilized negotiations, without taking into consideration anything other than the *self* perceived through the lenses of nationality. Rise of nationalism led to rise of new ideologies, which were also a setback for diplomacy. Diplomatic staff still failed in switching from private diplomacy to public one as media outlets were still developing. All of the factors combined resulted in the failure of diplomacy, which provoked failure of its main principle – peace, resulting in a devastating war and changing the course of history.

The war that broke out in 1914 and lasted for the next four years turned 70 million people into arms. Around 36 countries out of 54 that existed in the world at that time got involved in this war. According to the size of the territory and the number of armed forces, the war fought from 1914 to 1918 was the most immense armed conflict in the history of mankind until then, repre-

¹⁷ For more information about diplomatic history, the collapse of the state's system comprised of the European great powers, see: ROSS, G., *The Great Powers and the Decline of the European States System*, London, Longman, 1983; MARTEL, G., *Origins of the First World War*, Routledge Francis & Taylor, 2017; HENIG, R., *Versailles and After, 1919-33*, Routledge Francis & Taylor, 1995; CLARK, C., *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe went to war in 1914*, Harper Perennial, 2014.

senting a true world conflict. World War I was, for a long time, characterized as the «Great War»¹⁸ due to its scope and the damage it caused. In the book *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, written in 1916, soviet revolutionary and statesman Vladimir Ilyich Lenin wrote: «the war of 1914-18 was imperialistic (annexationist, predatory, plunderous war) on the part of both sides; it was a war for the division of the world, for the partition and repartition of colonies, ‘spheres of influence’ of finance capital, etc.»¹⁹. In short, World War I broke out at the time when each capitalist state sought to increase its access to foreign markets, to annex, prey on and loot other countries, although its result turned out to be quite different.

II.2. *Politics as the trigger for the next world conflict – WWII*

In the aftermath of World War I, the warring states faced a very difficult domestic situation. There has been a sharp deterioration in industrial production, rise in unemployment rate, lower wages, and the decline of small businesses. As civic parties had not been able to find appropriate solutions, movements which advocated dictatorship emerged on the stage of political life – Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany. Influenced by the thrive of these movements, dictatorships were established in some other European countries. Various forms of dictatorial regimes had been introduced in Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Spain. Of the non-European countries, fascism became entrenched in Japan. Small states like Czechoslovakia and Austria found themselves under direct threat from German expansion. France and Great Britain observed this without interference until 1939. At the same time, threats to world peace were coming from fascist Italy and militaristic Japan.²⁰

As is usually the case, politics once again instigated the beginning of a new world conflict. After a series of successful aggressions in Europe, Adolf Hitler, a German politician and a leader of the Nazi Party, prepared for the next conquest of Poland. As before, he sought the pretext to attack by de-

¹⁸ ALINK, B.; PAPE, A.; ANIĆ, N.; NOVAKOVIĆ, J.; BOGDANIĆ-ĐURIĆ, S.; STANKOVIĆ, V. *Drugi svjetski rat*, Mladost, 1981.

¹⁹ LENIN, V.; CHRISTMAN, H. *Essential works of Lenin*. Bantam Books, 1966, pp. 7-8.

²⁰ ROBERTSON, E.M. (ed.), *The Origins of the Second World War: Historical Interpretations*, London, Macmillan, 1971.

manding from Poland the city of Gdańsk, the coastal belt and the privileged position of German minority in that country. When Poland refused such demands, Hitler sent a military detachment dressed in Polish uniforms to attack the German border radio station. That staged incident served him to declare Poland an attacker that should be punished. At the dawn on September 1st, 1939, the German units carried out a general attack on Poland without declaring war. This marked the beginning of the World War II, the greatest armed conflict in the history of humans, which lasted for a full six years. On September 3rd, Great Britain and France declared war on Germany as allies of Poland, even though they were not militarily prepared enough to undertake any military operations. Poland was the first German testing ground for a new war tactic called lightning war «Blitz Krieg»²¹. This war tactic involved first air strikes, followed by a rapid penetration of tanks and infantry into the depths of enemy territory, which made it impossible to establish defense.

Hitler managed to conquer most of the European continent. Yet, as history always repeats itself in a certain way, Russia had to be conquered as well. After capturing Northwestern and Western Europe, Hitler decided to attack

²¹ Blitzkrieg or the ‘lightning war’ is a term used to describe a type of offensive guerilla warfare that is characterized and most known by the Nazis in early World War II. It is designed to create a psychological shock to the opposing side using a brisk and devastating force concentration consisting of armored vehicles supported by war planes intended to break through the enemy’s line of defense by a brief, brisk, and forceful attacks. Breaking the defense and encircling the enemy with a surprise air attack tactics usually leads to a quick victory, limiting the loss of soldiers and artillery. It is the opposite of the war of attrition, which uses a great number of resources in order to wipe off the opponents’ soldiers and other war materials. The reason why Blitzkrieg warfare tactics was used by Nazi Germany in the World War II is because after the World War I, Germany (Weimar Republic at that time) was heavily rearmed by the Versailles Treaty. The latter is also the reason why the Allies left Germany, especially Hitler, in such rage because it stripped them off of everything. Due to their high reparations and the overall destruction of the system and the state, they fell into a serious economic recession, followed by hyperinflation, which triggered the nationalistic radicals who wanted Germany to be great again, led by the infamous Adolf Hitler that had limited means of attack and was in no way prepared for the war of attrition. That is why, with all the limited resources, the forces could only count on their speed and overwhelming element of surprise, sweeping through Poland, Norway, Belgium, Holland and France. Blitzkrieg’s origins, however, can be traced back to the 19th century when Prussia faced the same problem as Nazi Germany in the beginning of the World War 2 – the limitation of their economic and warfare resources so they focused and accumulated all their forces into one key moment that led the opponents confused and unconcentrated. ALINK, B.; PAPE, A.; ANIĆ, N.; NOVAKOVIĆ, J.; BOGDANIĆ-ĐURIĆ, S.; STANKOVIĆ, V. *Drugi svjetski rat*, Mladost. 1981.

the USSR.²² To this end, in September 1940, Germany, Italy, and Japan concluded the Triple Alliance-Military Alliance of Three States in Berlin. For the same reason, in an attempt to secure himself from Southeastern Europe, Hitler won over Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria through diplomacy, which after a while joined the Triple Alliance. By mid-1941, Germany and Italy put almost all of Europe under their rule, except Great Britain and the USSR, and the military-neutral states: Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland, Turkey, Spain, and Portugal, although the last two had dictatorial regimes in power. Japan, at the same time, conquered significant parts of the territories in Asia and some islands in the Pacific Ocean. The United States demanded withdrawal of Japanese troops from China and Indochina. On December 7th, 1941, Japan responded with a surprise attack on the U.S. naval base at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii.²³ The very next day, the United States declared war on Japan and the

²² It should be noted that energy, specifically oil, was an important factor that shaped the entire course, but also the end of the Second World War. During the WWI, oil was recognized for the first time as a strategic product, the control of which was of key importance for the realization of imperialist plans. Hitler himself was obsessed with oil, as the WWI taught him that oil was vital to both economic power and the execution of military plans. Access to oil was also the main motive for the German invasion of the Soviet Union. Ultimately, oil decided the outcome of WWII itself. Destruction of German synthetic oil production plants played a decisive role in the defeating the Third Reich. For more information see: GILBERT, M. *et al.*, *The First World War: A Complete History*, Audiobook, 2020; DOWSWELL, P. *et al.*, *The World Wars*, Usborne Pub Ltd, 2007.

²³ On December 7, 1941, the Japanese military carried out a devastating surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, an United States' naval base near Honolulu, Hawaii. Hundreds of Japanese airplanes launched surprised bomb attack killing 2,403 Americans, wounding more than a 1,000 people, and seriously damaging U.S. naval and air power in the Pacific. At that time, the United States was a neutral country. One of the main reasons for the attack was increased tensions between the United States and the Empire of Japan. The Empire of Japan wanted to «unify» Asia under one flag, the flag of Japan. Militaristic emperor Hirohito wanted to conquer as much of Asian territory as possible. On September 27, 1940, Japan joined Italy and Germany within the Triple Alliance. The United States response was in imposing embargo against Japan, by cutting them supplies of steel, and oil which resulted in crippling Japanese military and economy. The situation escalated into the attack. The only way the emperor could subjugate the southeastern islands was to destroy the United States Navy which was stationed at Pearl Harbor. A famous speech by Roosevelt was delivered the day after the attack to a Joint Session of Congress, calling for a formal declaration of war to the Empire of Japan. The Congress approved his request an hour later and the United States went to war on December 8. Despite the Tripartite Treaty not requiring the war on United States, Germany and Italy declared one on December 11. Later that day, the United States Congress declared war on Germany and Italy. Practically overnight, Americans had united against Japan as a response to calls to «remember Pearl Harbor!» A poll conducted in December 1941, showed that 97% of respondents supported the declaration of war against Japan. This attack not only changed the United States, but also the entire world. Before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States adhered to a policy of non-interference,

countries of the Triple Alliance. Even before the official entry into the war, the United States gave loans and delivered large quantities of war material to the opponents of the fascist forces, primarily Great Britain. From December 1941 to March 1942, the Japanese conquered Hong Kong, the Philippines, Singapore, the islands of Indonesia and Burma, drawing the whole world in the war.

Concerns about these events lead a large number of countries to form anti-fascist coalition, led by the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States. The coalition succeeded in its political intentions, which resulted in capitulation of Italy on 8 September 1943, Germany on 9 May 1945, and Japan on 2 September 1945²⁴. The capitulation of Japan ended the six years'

maintained isolation for the benefit of the country, and did not participate actively in a warfare. This event brought American isolationism to an end. A continued presence of the US on a global scale, due to four years of fighting in World War II resulted in the US's significant impact on the United Nations as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) formation. (BERINSKY, A., YOHAI, I., POWELL, E., SCHICKLER, E., July 2011, Revisiting Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s).

²⁴ Even before the war began, the U.S. scientists, most of them coming from the European fascist regimes, were concerned about the research done on nuclear weaponry in Nazi Germany. In 1940, US government funded its own atomic weapons development program, codenamed «The Manhattan Project». During the next several years, a team led by J. Robert Oppenheimer worked on this project and on July 16, 1945, successfully detonated a plutonium bomb on a test site in New Mexico. At the moment of the test detonation, Nazi Germany was already defeated in Europe, but Japan, facing certain defeat, became even more deadly on the other end of the world and rejected demands for surrender that was proposed in the Potsdam Declaration. In the Potsdam Declaration it said that if Japan refused surrender, they will be met with prompt and utter destruction. American military commanders wanted to continue bombing Japan with smaller bombs and to follow it up with a land invasion. They asserted that if US invaded Japan, it would cause around 1 million US casualties, and President Truman decided that it was better if they used the atomic bomb in order to end the war, than to invade Japan. By using the atomic bomb, they would also showcase the might of the US military and put themselves as the absolute leader of the postwar world. The first atomic bomb, «Little Boy», was dropped on August 6, 1945, on the city of Hiroshima. In Hiroshima at the time of bombing were 290,000 civilians and 43,000 soldiers. Estimates put the death toll between 90,000 and 166,000 in the four months following the bombing. The number rose to 200,000 in the next five years from the consequences of the bombing. Out of 76,000 buildings in Hiroshima, 70,000 were damaged, 48,000 of those completely destroyed. On August 9, three days after the first bombing, an atomic bomb known as «Fat Man» was dropped on Nagasaki. In Nagasaki between 40,000 and 75,000 people died immediately, and by the end of the year the number rose to 80,000. Originally, US government selected the city of Kokura for bombing, but because of bad weather conditions and Japanese antiaircraft fire, the airplanes left Kokura and dropped the bomb on the secondary target, Nagasaki. The US government decided to use the second bomb on August 7 after Japan showed that they had an endless supply of weaponry, and Kokura was their biggest ammunition plant. Emperor Hirohito surrendered on August 15 via a radio communication, and documents were signed officially on September 2. Today, there are many debates if the usage of the bomb was needed and necessary, do the bombings count as war crimes etc.

War, the bloodiest and largest military conflict in world history, which came as a result of political decisions and ended in the same way. Around 110 million soldiers were mobilized, of which about 55 million were killed and 35 million were wounded. USSR suffered the biggest human losses, 20 million people, followed by China about 10 million, and Poland 6 million. The human losses of the fascist states amounted to more than 9 million victims.²⁵ New forms of warfare were applied in World War II: landing incursions of motorized units and combined attacks by air, land, and naval forces. Moreover, World War I was a frontline war, with no targeted mass extermination of civilians, which was the main characteristics of World War II.²⁶ During the war, new weapons and machines were used and old ones perfected. Material losses were enormous; numerous infrastructures were destroyed, and significant cultural heritage was lost. World War II was fought on three continents, marked by major conflicts in the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean, showing its global dimension. While World War I, as a predominantly European war, according to Zbigniew Brzeziński, marked the end of European political, economic, and cultural domination over the rest of the world, the end of World War II has marked the onset of the «bipolar US-Soviet conflict for global supremacy.»²⁷

II.3. *Cold War and the altered global geopolitical security context*

«From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia; all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject, in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and in some cases increasing measure of control from Moscow»²⁸, said Winston Churchill on March 5, 1946, accompanied and welcomed by President Truman in Missouri, US. This post WW2 speech will later be recognized

²⁵ Research Starters: Worldwide Deaths in World War II. Retrieved from: <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/students-teachers/student-resources/research-starters/research-starters-worldwide-deaths-world-war>

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ BRZEZIŃSKI, Z., *Velikás šabovska tabla*, CID, 2001.

²⁸ Quote taken from the Westminster College, <http://wcmo.edu>, 2021.

as the greatest speech Churchill delivered as a Leader of the Opposition. It started with praises to the US, immediately mentioning one of two key phrases from the speech: «special relationship». Generally, many would and have argued that the main purpose behind the speech was improving the relationships between the two forces, the US and the UK. On the other hand, Russian historians take this speech as the beginning of the Cold War. He announced the situation which so many, at the time, were unwilling to hear. In situations like these, Churchill's greatness arose. The man predicted, saw and announced the greatest happenings in the world. In the speech, he laid the goals of the Soviets: «What they desire are the fruits of war, and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines.» He knew very well that simply calling the actions of the Soviets an „ideology» would not cut it. They wanted power and they wanted to grow. Now, having mentioned the special relationship and the improvement of it, it is clear why this was Churchill's aim. He urged the West to stay strong and united, aiming towards a system of collective security. In his words: «There is nothing [the Russians] admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than weakness, especially military weakness». This drew a lot of attention and criticism. It was a bold move to make such a public accusation or announcement, however, the world wants to call it. What most failed to notice is that this speech was actually a call for peace. Churchill reminded everyone of their duty, guarding the common people against another war. The improvement of the relationship was not a selfish move, it was a power move. It was a public invite to the Western countries to come together and safeguard peace and stability against the Soviets, who lowered the iron curtain across Europe. As the man himself said, what was happening in Europe at the time, was not the Liberated Europe they fought for, nor were there any signs of permanent peace. 'Sinews of Peace' was a public service announcement, providing direction to the British-American alliance as their relations with the Soviets slowly collapsed and Europe was crying for help.

European domination in world politics ended with World War II, after the final defeat of Germany in 1945 by the two non-European winners, the United States and the Soviet Union. These states would become the heir of the demand for world supremacy, the same demand which had directed European endeavors in prior centuries. After World War II, it was necessary to establish new relations between the world's states. These relations entailed, *inter alia*, the preservation of peace and security in the world. In order to achieve this goal, the United Nations were counter terrorism activities established

with the task of preserving world peace and developing friendly relations between states on the principles of mutual respect and appreciation. Through the work of its agencies, the United Nations has done much to improve health and education in underdeveloped countries as well as to protect human rights and cultural heritage. In the post-war period, the United Nations played an important role in preserving peace. Through their mediation, they managed to reconcile various conflicts worldwide.²⁹

International relations after World War II developed ever more in the sign of the conflict between the two great powers – the USSR and the USA. Communist regimes were systematically established in Eastern Europe under the influence of the USSR, pursuing the Soviet model (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia and, since 1949, East Germany). In order to halt further spread of communism, the capitalist countries gathered around the United States, formed the so-called Western bloc. The largest number of socialist states gathered around the countries of the USSR, which formed the so-called Eastern Bloc.³⁰ Thus, soon after the war,

²⁹ The United Nations was established in 1945, following the WWII, the most devastated war in human history, with a core mission of preserving global peace and security. These goals have been achieved through various diplomatic, administrative, and military activities such as peacekeeping, peacemaking, and conflict prevention. Since its existence, the UN has been involved in the plethora of operations in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Americas, Europe and Central Asia, and the Middle East. As the global security environment has undergone serious changes in the past couple of decades, so the UN mission has been modified in order to meet new security challenges the world has been facing. Thus, the UN has been seriously involved in counterterrorism and WMD proliferation prevention activities. For more information on the UN operations, visit: <http://un.org>.

³⁰ The military alliance agreement was signed in Warsaw on May 14, 1955, by the Soviet Union and the states of the Eastern Bloc under the influence of the USSR, including Bulgaria, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Albania, which resigned in 1968. Also known as the Eastern European Pact of Mutual Assistance, the Warsaw Pact emerged as a counterweight to the NATO pact, which included West Germany, providing a unified military command through Soviet units in each member state as well as mutual assistance. Even though, the principle of interference was the main element in the internal affairs of its members along with the collective defense and mutual decision making, the Soviet Union eventually dictated most of the Pact's decisions. The Warsaw Pact troops numbered over half a million and were made of Soviet Russians, Bulgarians, Polish, and Hungarians, while Romania, Albania, and East Germany were not actively involved in troops. In the 1980s, the Warsaw Pact was plagued with problems connected with the economic decline in all Eastern European countries, and political changes in most member states in the late 1980s made the treaty almost worthless. The Warsaw Pact ceased to exist on July 1, 1991, when it was officially abolished at a session in Prague, after the collapse of the Soviet Union. By then, the USSR had withdrawn its troops and equipment from Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Withdrawals from Poland and Germany were completed in 1994. CRUMP, L., *The Warsaw Pact Reconsidered: International Relations in Eastern Europe, 1955-1969*, Routledge, 2015.

the world was divided into two social systems: capitalist and socialist. In order to prevent further spread of communism in Europe, in 1947, the US President Harry Truman offered European countries financial assistance through a program called the Marshall Plan.³¹ Thanks to this plan, the impoverished states of Western Europe reorganized their own economies and stabilized society.

The second half of the twentieth century showed the indisputability of Clausewitz's thesis. Moreover, it completely reversed the old, materialistic conception of war, showing practically that war can be fought without traditional weapons, which was evidenced by the «Cold War». Historically, the period was marked by accumulation of nuclear weapons and serious crises that threatened a new world war. Back then, political imperatives, particularly historical ones, required constant vigilance due to constant danger of using such weapons or outbreak of war among the exceptionally selfish, power-seeking states.³²

The Cold War produced a state of tension and strained relations between two hostile superpowers, the US and the USSR and their allies. Some of the

³¹ The Marshall Plan, formally known as the European Recovery Program, was an American program of economic aid intended to European countries and implemented from April 1948 to December 1951. The program was initiated by the US Secretary of the State, George Marshall as a four-year plan. It aimed to rebuild cities, industries, and infrastructure that was severely damaged or completely destroyed during World War II, which will help remove trade barriers between neighboring European countries and encourage trade between these countries and the United States. The assistance was provided on a per capita basis, with even greater amounts granted to major industrial powers such as West Germany, France, and the United Kingdom. It was based on the belief of Marshall and his advisers that the recovery of European countries was vital to the recovery of Europe as a whole. When it comes to Germany, it should be noted that although the whole of Germany suffered major damage at the end of World War II, revitalization of West Germany was considered vital to the economic stability of the region. Interestingly, the United Kingdom received about a quarter of the total assistance provided by the Marshall Plan, while France received less than a fifth of the funding. The Marshall Plan aid represented about 3% of the recipients' gross national income, which meant that GDP grew by almost half a percentage point. The phrase «equivalent to the Marshall Plan» is often used to describe extensive economic emergency aid and became an institutionalized concept of U.S. foreign aid programs as an indispensable part of the U.S. foreign policy. Marshall Plan European-United States history, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Marshall-Plan>, revised and updated by Jeff Wallenfeldt, Manager, Geography and History, accessed: 24 March 2021; OATLEY, T., *International Political Economy*, 5th ed., 2011. BALAAM, D. N.; DILLMAN, B., *Introduction to international political economy*, Routledge, 2018.

³² It is important to emphasize here that there was a restriction on the use of nuclear weapons. Regardless of the number of warheads at its disposal, the Soviet Union was limited by the cognition that the United States had the same number, if not more, and that it could retaliate. This relationship was called mutually assured destruction (MAD) and meant that no superpower would dare to attack another. GADDIS, J.L., *The Cold War: A New History*, Penguin Books, 2006.

basic features of the Cold War were the arms race, space exploration and the development of a nuclear program, the cessation of all forms of cooperation (political, economic, cultural and sports) and the establishment of military-political alliances. In 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded, which brought together mostly Western bloc countries.³³ Establishment of the Warsaw Pact followed six years later, in 1955, bringing together Eastern Bloc countries with the HQ in Moscow. Tensions and intolerance between the two military-political alliances manifested in a series of local conflicts, proxy wars, and political crises that threatened a new large-scale war. The state of hostility and strained relations between the great powers was particularly pronounced during the partition of Germany, the Israeli-Arab wars, the Vietnam War, the Korean War, and the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Still, those forty-five years were marked by the longest interstate peace in Europe in its post-medieval history³⁴. Zbigniew Brzeziński in the already cited work states that, historically, the half century of the Cold War was the period of global projections of the political ideologies of the US and

³³ The Military Alliance for the Defense of Western Powers, or North Atlantic Treaty Organization, was founded in 1949, during the first years of the Cold War, primarily to defend against threats coming from the Soviet Union and its allies. Namely, in the aftermath of World War II the war-torn European regions needed a massive influx of help to boost and recover industry and economy. They also needed security, that is, required assurances against the resurgence of Germany or the Soviet intrusion. On the other hand, the United States viewed Europe as vital to the prevention of communist expansion. From 1947 to 1948, a series of events caused Western European countries to pay great attention to their security, while the United States became more closely involved in European affairs. Western European countries were ready to consider collective security solutions. In response to frictions and security issues, representatives of several Western European countries gathered to form a military alliance with the purpose of providing collective defense within which if any one of these countries is attacked, other countries are obliged to help defense. On that basis, North Atlantic Treaty is signed, as a founding document for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the most powerful and historically longest-running security organization in the world. The fall of communism after 1989 and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact after 1991 led to a re-emphasis on the role of NATO, as a mediator in providing economic assistance to the newly created Eastern European democracies. In 1994, the former communist republics were invited to join the «Partnership for Peace» in preparation for NATO accession. As of the first 12 member states to the present, the organization now has 30 participants, committed to keeping the alliance strong in a changing world order. (<https://www.nato.int>). For more information about NATO see: BOŽINOVIĆ, D.; ČEHULIĆ VUKADINOVIĆ, L.; VUKADINOVIĆ, R., *NATO – Euroatlantska integracija*, Zagreb, Topical, 2007. TATALOVIĆ, S., *Nacionalna i međunarodna sigurnost*, Zagreb, Politička kultura, 2006. SIMMA, B., «NATO, the UN and the Use of Force: Legal Aspects», *European Journal of international law*, 10(1), 1999, pp. 1-22.

³⁴ KAYSER C. *et al.*, *Collective Responses to Regional Problems*, Committee on international security studies American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1994, p. 81.

the Soviet Union aimed at domination over the whole world. Furthermore, projected ideologies were amplified by the historical narratives and optimism for the achievement of the stated goal.³⁵ Still, both rivals used the old, endorsed tactics, strengthening their power over the states that were subordinate to them. One could claim that the main characteristic of the Cold War was the arms race, driven by the aforementioned political and historical narratives and ideologies, with significant advances in culture, sports, science and technology, resulting, for the first time in history, in the departure of the man to space, as one of the positive aspects of the Cold War. As prominent French sociologist Pierre Naville from that period stated, «war is no longer only destructive, but also, it creates significant technical and economic progress»³⁶.

The main causes of this paradox Naville found within the following:

- war needs instigate the sacrifice of ever greater investments in production which, directly or indirectly, serves the armies.
- the forced production in the belligerent countries of goods which they cannot acquire in the international market.
- inventions multiply and are getting applied faster in order to secure a strategic edge in combat.
- the labor force is motivated or forced to produce at its maximum capacity.
- the rising number of the killed, wounded and missing as a consequence of the war along the fall in birth rates did not manage to put a stop to the demographic boom.³⁷

³⁵ BRZEZINSKI, Z. *Velika šabovska tabla*. CID, 2001.

³⁶ FRIEDMANN, G.; NAVILLE, P., *Traité de sociologie du travail*, Colin, 1972, pp. 656-668.

³⁷ In addition to the advancement of new technologies, the Cold War had a considerable impact on development of the Civil Rights Movement. Namely, even though slavery was long abolished, the black people were still facing social discrimination and still suffering from racial discrimination. Consequentially, the Cold War was used as the perfect means of promoting civil rights in order to present the U.S as a beacon of democracy in the eyes of the rest of the world. In this regard, the President Truman said, «If the United States were to offer the ‘people of the world’ a ‘choice of freedom or enslavement’ it must ‘correct remaining imperfections in our practice of democracy».

Richard Nixon also promoted Civil Rights in his campaign at the time when he was still a Republican candidate. The military spending also helped reduce high unemployment rates, as well as boosting their economies which had entered the post war-depression. The competition between the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War compelled the two sides to advance in all possible areas with an aim to establish themselves as the only and ultimate power. Without such a fierce competition, today we would not enjoy the benefits of nuclear energy, compact electronics, and many other commodities.

The positive aspects of the Cold War were reflected in the fact that this period has been marked by great scientific and technical progress. This has led to a drastic change in people's lifestyles. Devices such as televisions, computers, lasers, and many others have entered everyday use. The Cold War waged between two superpowers, the U.S., and the USSR, pushed extensive space exploration. The era of space travel thus began in 1957 with the launch of the first artificial satellite in orbit around the Earth. It was the Soviet spaceship «Sputnik 1», and in the same year the Soviets sent the first living creature – the dog Laika – into space. Shortly afterwards, in 1961, Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space to successfully fly around the Earth and return. To prove their superiority over the Soviets, the Americans decided to go a step further. On July 21st, 1969, they sent a three-member crew to the moon in the spaceship Apollo 11. The first man to come out of a spaceship and step on the lunar soil was Neil Armstrong. Today, a large number of satellites for various purposes orbit the earth. While some transmit sound, others send satellite images from various parts of the world. Space exploration is still current, and the American agency NASA is the world's leading agency in that field.

Apart from astronautics, the development of computer technology was of great importance for further development and progress of human society. At the end of the 20th century, computers arrived in households. A true revolution in the electronics industry was brought about by silicone chips invented in the 1970s in the United States. They have found their application in information technology allowing huge amounts of data to be stored and processed. Great strides have also been made in the field of medicine. A transplant of the heart, kidneys and other organs was performed, numerous medicines were invented for treatment diseases, infant mortality was reduced, life expectancy was extended, and a vaccine against polio was developed. The accelerated development of science has enabled its results to be applied more and more quickly in direct production and human practice in many spheres of life. Advances in genetics have enabled intervention in the development process and the creation of living organisms. Significant progress has been made in the development of transport, especially in the automotive industry, but also in rail transport. All of this significantly improved the comfort and speed of transporting passengers and goods, and ultimately created a «global village»³⁸.

³⁸ MCLUHAN, M. *et al.*, *The Global Village*, Junfermann, 1995.

To sum up, one could claim that «The Cold War was characterized by intensive political and economic rivalry between the two superpowers»³⁹, with a tendency to broaden this competition to the military sector as well, thus leading the superpowers to occupy one selves in an arms race and the resultant need for producing huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. With that, the modern world experienced certain scientific, technological, and cultural breakthroughs. As history has shown, not only the Cold War, but war in general, contributed to the emergence of many positive advances. This is further evidence by the scholar Bruce Pilbeam «War is a complicated, contradictory phenomenon.»⁴⁰ That is why this confidante of human societies also found refuge in theories of international relations, especially after the end of the Cold War.

III. GLOBALIZATION AND WAR – THE CONTINUOUS INSECURITY

The dramatic events of 1989 brought the Cold War era to a close. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the cessation of its influence in East and Central Europe ended the division of Europe and restored democracy to countries that had been ruled by socialist parties for over forty years. In addition to Soviet Union, the socialism collapsed in the Former Yugoslavia, which resulted in 15 (Soviet Union) and 7 (Yugoslavia) newly independent states emerging on the international scene.

These momentous changes were accompanied by perceptions of a shift in the structure of world power. The bipolar world order dominated by the two superpowers was replaced by a new unipolar system in 1990's in which the United States emerged as the only remaining true world superpower. Still, in the last decade i.e., from the mid-2000's, the international system has begun to move towards global multipolarity. In this system, united Europe, economically vital Japan, and populous China joined the top ranks of the leading powers. Meanwhile, the Russian Federation experienced a revival in the late 1990s and became the driving force behind establishing some very influential organizations on a global scale, both economic (BRICs) and security (CSTO). Although the post-Cold War period marked a new stage in the development

³⁹ HOUGH, P.; SHAHIN, M. *et al.*, *International Security Studies*, Routledge, 2015, p. 5.

⁴⁰ PILBEAM, B. «New wars, globalization, and failed states», *International Security Studies*, Hough, P.; Shahin, M. (ed.), Routledge, 2015, p. 87.

of international relations and the classical, materialist conception of war has been abandoned, it seems that states went on to compete and that the force has prevailed as the ultimate arbiter of international disputes.

Nevertheless, political changes in the aftermath of the Cold War showed that the phenomenon of politics and war cannot be understood from a single perspective, as it was the case in many historical attempts, the more so because globalization shows its multiplicity day by day.⁴¹ World is becoming more and more interconnected and increasingly integrated into a global community. People, money, goods, information, ideas, and technology are easily crossing national borders at an incredible rate. Still, globalization poses new challenges in an attempt to answer the question about the interrelation between politics and war, the one that haunted political theoreticians throughout the history, and which now, in the context of globalization can be transformed into the question: Is international security possible to be achieved in the world we live in?

III.1. *Globalization – a challenging concept*

As a concept, globalization can be highly contentious one, depending on the perspective one may look at it. Mainly, globalization is understood as the «intensification of global interconnectedness (...) and the changing character of political authority.»⁴² This interconnectedness can be seen from political, economic, and sociological perspectives, each entailing their own and specific forms of interconnectedness, used for grasping various phenomena found in each. For example, the economic perspective emphasizes trade, free movement of goods and services, as well as the cross-boundary movement of labor. The sole economic interconnectedness can be explained by one company that spreads from a specific country throughout the globe, establishing its offices and production facilities in a number of nation-states, thus fostering increased trade and movement of people.⁴³

⁴¹ Notwithstanding the process of globalization as a process that began in the 18th century, it reached its full momentum after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the lowering of the Iron Curtain. In the early 21st century, the process transformed the global community that entered the area of interdependence.

⁴² KALDOR, M., *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, 3rd ed., Cambridge, Polity Press, 2012, p. 4.

⁴³ GRAY, A., *What is globalization anyway?*, Retrieved from World Economic, 2017. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/what-is-globalization-explainer/>

Another aspect of economic dimension argues that globalization goes «hand in hand» with capitalism and free trade. It is supposed to bring about lower trade barriers and tariffs on trade, working towards the elimination of such altogether. According to these proponents, usually economic liberals, free trade – which is underwritten with globalization – also promotes global economic growth, whilst creating employment opportunities and lifting many above the poverty line.⁴⁴ However, this has not gone without the critical approach of structuralists and constructivists who assert that globalization has made unequal gains across the globe both between states and within states, contributing to an increase in wealth inequality.⁴⁵ This passage is supported by Mary Kaldor who is known for her classification of wars into old and new ones, as well as her contribution to a modern-day understanding of globalization.

The political dimension, on the other hand, looks at the regime and governmental changes globalization is responsible for, such as the spreading of democracy and the widening of international institutions responsible for a bulk of activities previously regarded to fall within the scope of nation-states. Therefore, Kaldor herself holds that globalization «erodes the power and authority of the state», which is heightened to another level by the so-called hyper globalists who propose that sooner or later, we will be living in «an entirely borderless world.»⁴⁶ Additionally, it is crucial to incorporate the cultural and social aspects of globalization into the definition in order to make it more comprehensive and encompassing. Here, we divert our attention to everyday experiences and how, fueled by technological and innovations in communications, cultures seem to be merging into one homogenous unit⁴⁷.

Globalization has more than ever contributed to members of different cultures meeting in their differences in the ‘global village.’⁴⁸ The cultural aspect of globalization, therefore, is very often considered with regard to the

⁴⁴ COLLINS, M., *The Pros and Cons of Globalization*, 2015, Retrieved from Forbes: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikecollins/2015/05/06/the-pros-and-cons-of-globalization/?sh=1b5b794dcce>

⁴⁵ PILBEAM, B., «New wars, globalization, and failed states», *International Security Studies*, Hough, P.; Shahin, M. (ed.), Routledge, 2015.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p. 109.

⁴⁷ L. WATSON, J. *Cultural globalization*, 2020, Retrieved from Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/science/cultural-globalization>

⁴⁸ MCLUHAN, M.; POWERS, B.R., *The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21st Century*, New York, Oxford University Press Inc, 1992.

very context of relations in the international system, challenged by interrelationship of cultural diversity, accelerated by the globalization. The question whether cultures permeate each other or clash in the globalized world has been open ever since the Huntington's thesis on the clash of civilizations.⁴⁹ In this regard, the author Lechner (2001) proposes that cultural exchanges among societies can have different outcomes: firstly, they can produce cultural hybrids based on the «mixing of cultures in particular places and practices;» secondly, they may also produce contestations, whereby the «spread of ideas and images provoke reactions and resistance» within and among different cultural groups. In the very context of our topic, this is important in terms of whether culture in the global village fosters diversity, cooperation and mutual survival, or whether it generates conflict and the need for supremacy of the more powerful societies and their cultures.⁵⁰

III.2. *Globalization and the changing nature of security*

When it comes to the aspect of security, globalization added to the proliferation of a number of transnational threats.⁵¹ With the increased spread of ideas, knowledge, and technology, globalization has also contributed to the development of WMD that, now, could get into the hands of dangerous groups of individuals, superseding the state.⁵² Furthermore, Kaldor posits that

⁴⁹ HUNTINGTON, S. P., «The clash of civilizations?», *Culture and politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2000, pp. 99-118.

⁵⁰ LECHNER, F.; BOLI, J., *The Globalization Reader*, 6th edition, 2020.

⁵¹ There are numerous questions on the effects of globalization on international security. Globalization has caused strong interdependence among states, one cannot escape other and every action taken causes a reaction from other states. While there are some positive effects of globalization, it seems to have unfavorable consequences on global security. Globalization is often seen as the main cause for economic imbalance, terrorism, cyber safety, religious identity threats, increase of conflicts and more. Globalization is also viewed as a main cause of the increase of the development of mass destruction weapons. Globalization seems to have made the situation within the international system more uncertain and has made certain countries only care for themselves, while some turned to other countries for cooperation and collaboration. The ongoing pandemic, which is also the cause of globalization could, also, serve as an example of globalization's negative effects on global security, but also as an example why it is crucial to work together and fight such issues and fight for international security. Perhaps events like this serve as a reminder why it is important to be thoughtful of others than just ourselves. See: MITTELMAN, J., *Hyperconflict: Globalization and Insecurity*, Stanford Security Studies, 2010. KALDOR, M., *Human Security*, Polity, 2007.

⁵² DAVIS, *Globalization's Security Implications*, RAND, 2003.

globalization has also proliferated a number of actors in conflicts, including warlords and criminal gangs, on top of mercenaries and private military and security companies. Lastly, it is useful to mention that, although globalization can make it easier for people with different backgrounds to learn about each other towards acceptance, globalization has fostered tensions, may it be of ethnic, nationalistic, and religious nature. Kaldor explains this as:

«One of the most common arguments made in relation to globalization and war is that it has served to exacerbate ethnic, nationalist and religious tensions, and has therefore helped foster conflicts centered upon them. This includes those that have occurred in places such as Rwanda, Sudan and Georgia, where different ethnic, nationalist and religious groups have either fought to control power within their respective states or demanded the right to secede to form new states.»⁵³

Some authors, like Steger emphasize the importance of social interdependence, claiming that «globalization can best be described as the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world-time and world-space.»⁵⁴ while others like Paul and Ripsman are concerned with certain structural, ideological, and political problems, created by this phenomenon. Therefore, they argue that: «while globalization may transform the pursuits of security in the future, there is no evidence that it has done so profoundly to – date.»⁵⁵ On one hand, globalization connects and unites the world and creates an unprecedented level of wealth. On the other, this process leads to different integration and disintegration of the states, with the growth of some states and the decline of the authority of many others, with only a small number of those who know how to respond globally to constant changes. Based on this, one could claim that globalization has failed when it comes to global prosperity, because only a small number of countries have experienced this prosperity.⁵⁶

⁵³ PILBEAM, B. «New wars, globalization, and failed states», *International Security Studies*, Hough, P.; Shahin, M. (ed.), Routledge, 2015.

⁵⁴ STEGER, M.; JAMES, P. *Globalization*, Routledge, 2017.

⁵⁵ PAUL, T. V.; RIPSMAN, N. M., «Under pressure? Globalisation and the National Security State», *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2004, p. 355.

⁵⁶ Globalization has indeed led to increase in prosperity across the planet. Millions of people on the planet live a much better quality of life than their ancestors did. Yet a large number of people are still struggling with poverty and in that struggle they often dare to leave their homes

Based on the aforementioned and prompted with Clausewitz's thesis set out at the beginning of this paper, the next task will be to examine has the current era of growing interdependence i.e., globalization transformed world politics so that global political actors now establish relations of cooperation for mutual gain rather than conflict? Or is the zero-sum competition for relative power and conflict still the primary structuring force of global politics? In doing so, we will use dominant theoretical approaches in the field of international relations, aware that in political science nothing can be fully predictable. As the prominent economist W. Arthur Lewis put it, «The process of social change is much the same today as it was 2,000 years ago (...) We can tell how change will occur if it occurs; what we cannot foresee is what change is going to occur»⁵⁷

Through the history of international relations, we could see that the debate on international security has ranged between realists and idealists, who have been reciprocally optimistic and pessimistic in their response to this question. In the period following the World War I, liberalism (also called idealism) based on the hope that application of intellect and universal morality to international relations can lead to an ordered, just, and cooperative world, voiced far-reaching support as the League of Nations seemed to offer some hope for better international order.⁵⁸ In order to ensure collective security, as

and embark on the path of prosperous, mostly Western societies to experience the benefits of globalization despite many risks. Two-thirds of the world's population, about 4 billion people, have not felt the benefits of globalization. They are simply left out of the system. STIGLITZ, J.E., *Globalization and Its Discontents Revisited: Anti-Globalization in the Era of Trump*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1st edition, 2017; RODRIK, D., *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*, W.W. Norton & Company, 2012.

⁵⁷ LEWIS, W. A., *Some aspects of economic development*, Allen & U, 1970, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁸ The League of Nations was primarily intergovernmental alliance whose essential objective was to maintain global peace. Established on the January 10, 1920, after the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War. The association's essential objectives, as expressed in its Covenant, incorporated thwarting combat activities, demilitarization, improving security, and resolving worldwide conflicts through negotiation and mediation. Other issues in this and related arrangements comprised treatment of local residents and global wellbeing, medication issues, the arms trade, treatment of the POWs, and insuring minority rights in Europe. The Covenant of the League of Nations was endorsed on 28 June 1919 as Part I of the Treaty of Versailles, and it entered into force along with the rest of the Treaty on 10 January 1920. The main conference of the Council of the League occurred convened on 16 January 1920, and the Assembly of the League met on 15 November 1920. In 1919, the U.S. president Woodrow Wilson won the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts in architecting the League. The League did not have its own executive powers and relied upon WWI Allies (France, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan which constituted the Executive Council) to authorize its goals and overall activities, including

a global (or regional) regime, based on agreement between the great powers, the basic idea was not to accept war as a legitimate instrument of national and foreign policy and to persist on collective security that would ultimately manage to prevent war by means of collective action. On the other hand, realism has become the predominant school of thought during the Cold War. According to this theory, war and conflict are perennial features of inter – state relations that stretched throughout history of human society. Most authors see realism as a theory based on the assumption that world politics is essentially an unchanging struggle between states, each looking primarily at its own interest for supremacy and position under conditions of international anarchy, and each pursuing its own national interests. With the end of the Cold War, however, the debate has been renewed and intensified and at the same time, offered in a somewhat different form, what will be discussed below.

IV. ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE AND THE DECLINE OF THE MILITARY FORCE – NEOLIBERAL THESIS

Developments in the global arena and state behavior in the years following the Cold War, have influenced the emergence of certain theoretical approaches in the field of international security. Nevertheless, it has been shown many times that history is an essential factor in international relations, therefore, liberal and realistic approaches remained dominant perspectives on this issue, albeit in a somewhat modified form.⁵⁹ Relying on the paradigm that anarchy does not necessarily lead to conflict, but cooperation, neoliberal theoreticians emphasize the importance of economic interdependence of states in the world system as the element of conflict prevention among them. Neo-

monetary and military once. However, the great powers were hesitant to fully use their powers. According to Benito Mussolini: «the League is very well when sparrows yell, yet no decent at all when hawks fall out.» LIEBER, A. K., «The New history of World War I and What it means for International Relations Theory», *International Security*, vol. 32, no. 2, p. 163.

⁵⁹ Although both classical realism and classical liberalism started from human nature and on that basis built the nature of states and their behavior in the world system, at the end of 1980s new, somewhat changed variants of these theories emerged. Namely, the reason for the behavior of states according to these, ‘new’ theories, lies no longer in human nature, but in the nature (structure) of the world system, which is anarchic for both types of theories. This is how theories that we call structural realism, or neorealism, and structural liberalism, i.e., neoliberalism, essentially, are created. BAYLIS, J.; SMITH, S.; OWENS, P., *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, 2016.

liberals claim that states are increasingly developing transnational economic connections at all levels, thus reducing the likelihood of inter-state conflict given the adverse economic consequences for all parties in such a scenario

The first approach accentuates that the end of the profound ideological confrontation between East and West was a critical moment in the history of international relations, heralding a new pattern in which inter-state vehemence and conflicts would gradually become a matter of the past and new communitarian values would bring more significant co-operation between individuals and various human collectivities (including states). This is reflection of more optimistic views on the advancement of peaceful global society. In the past few decades, there has been a significant rise of interest in the relationship between political conflict and economic interdependence. This is noticeable given the scientific agreement that growing economic exchange cherishes cooperative political relations. The opinion had its practical implications aimed at justifying several world policies and agreements such as the establishment of the European Economic Community, Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik, etc. Moreover, the idea that stronger economic exchange promotes political cooperation is still present, through the question marked in the title of the paper. The viability of such an approach can be seen in the debate between liberals and realists, i.e., their newer approaches: institutional liberalism and neorealism.

With modern economic interdependence, war does not necessarily include military conflict among nations. As could be seen in the historical summarization given above, interdependence, as a complex and multilayered phenomenon gives an opportunity for conflict among nations to occur at many levels and in several different forms, for world politics is a complex system composed of different interests, ideas, values, and agreements shared between some states in order to achieve some specific common goals. The absence of world government increases insecurity and contributes to different theories taking different perspectives. The main scholarly task in this context is to answer the question which authors Mansfield and Pollins emphasized in the article «The Study of Interdependence and Conflict:» «...in what form and in what sense interdependence is expected to influence conflict of which type and at what level of intensity...»⁶⁰ Due to that fact, the whole diversity of liberal and realist arguments present a remarkably «rich source of ideas to

⁶⁰ MANSFIELD D. E.; POLLINS M. B., «The Study of Interdependence and Conflict», *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2001, pp. 834-859.

engage this debate on the relationship between interdependence and conflict. Central to the idea of interdependence and conflict is the long-standing claim that open international markets and intensified economic exchange inhibit aggressive interstate activities.»⁶¹ Through developing this thesis neoliberals have underlined many different arguments.

IV.1. *Neoliberal pursuit for peace*

The first neoliberal argument that can be used for advocating the given thesis is that economic transposition and military invasion are backup means of acquiring the resources needed to foster political security and economic prosperity. Along with the expanding trade and foreign direct investment – motivation for foreign territorial expansion and imperialism is decreasing. Second neoliberal argument is based on the thesis that economic relations increase contacts and promotes communication between private and non-state actors in different countries as well as between governments – these contacts and communication are in charge of improving cooperative political relations. This could be achieved only if we consider the three main presumptions of liberal theory, discussed by Andrew Moravcsik in his article: *Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics*.

In order to demonstrate empirical accuracy of the liberalism, author claims that liberal theory of international relations is «non-ideological and non-utopian form appropriate to empirical social science»⁶² and that the relationship between states and the domestic and transnational society, they are embedded in, seriously frame state behavior. This can be modified in the aforementioned presumptions of liberal theory, which, according to the author, offer the appropriate foundations of any social theory of international relations. Those presumptions «specify the nature of societal actors, the state and the international system.»⁶³ The key actors in international politics are individuals and private groups. These actors organize exchange and collective action in order to, as author claims, «promote differentiated interests under

⁶¹ BARBIERI, K., «Economic Interdependence: A path to peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?», *Journal of Peace Research*, 1996, p. 45.

⁶² MORAVCSIK, A., «Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics», *International Organization*, vol. 51, no. 4, 1997, p. 515.

⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 516.

constraints imposed by material scarcity, conflicting values, and variations in societal influence.»⁶⁴ According to Moravcsik, this basically means that actors in international politics promote and support stability of a system exposed to various influences. The system is strengthened by strengthening individualism, from individuals to state, because liberals see additional parallel between individuals and states; liberalism views the individual as a set of moral values and virtues and therefore rational beings with the strong claim that human beings should be viewed as ultimate purpose, not as a means.

Liberalism emphasizes rational choice, rather than the aspiration for rule in the international system. Therefore, international politics is not defined in terms of the ‘struggle for power’ (as in realism), but rather, the ‘struggle for agreement’ – in order to benefit, actors should seek arrangements. Such agreements can be made through international regimes, which consequently give authority to international organizations and call for promotion of common values. That would, from another side, improve cooperation in the global community. Based on these claims, the answer to our question would be positive – the current era of growing interdependence transformed world politics so that global political actors now establish relations of cooperation for mutual gain rather than conflict. There is an increasing number of international organizations tasked with facilitation of cooperation in the age of globalization.

IV.2. *Tocqueville and the democratic peace theory*

The early beginnings of this doctrine are attributed to Alexis Tocqueville, who, in his famous work *Democracy in America*, points out that «democratic nations are naturally prone to peace, from their interest and their propensities»⁶⁵ and Immanuel Kant, the German idealistic philosopher, with an idea of perpetual peace elaborated in his work *Toward Perpetual Peace*, which can be achieved through union of world states, based on liberty, equality and fraternity, as well as moral law that would create the state of perpetual peace.⁶⁶ In the

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁵ TOCQUEVILLE, A. DE, *Democracy in America*, Wordsworth Editions Ltd, 1998, p. 335.

⁶⁶ Kant's basic idea was a world community of states that would thus create, as he calls it ‘a perpetual peace.’ However, Kant himself believed that the basis of such a community can only be the state established on an individual freedom, as the basis of the rule of law. Starting from the natural state, which he considers to be a state of war in which there is a constant threat of an out-

1980s, these ideas influenced the occurrence of liberalism and the idea of democratic peace theory. This idea is considered to be another 'liberal' approach to international security, which has gained momentum in the post – Cold War world. Based on Tocqueville's thesis, the main argument of this theory was that spreading of democracy would lead to enhanced international security. Democracy, due to this theory, is seen as a major source of peace.⁶⁷

Numerous scholars have dealt with this theory based on the foundations of Kantian logic, which emphasizes three elements: «republican democratic representation», «ideological commitment to human rights», and «transnational interdependence». In the article «Kant or Cant: The Myth of the

break of hostility among people, Kant considers it necessary to establish a state of peace. This situation should be founded on the principles of law and in order to be valid, must necessarily be subordinated to the principles of morality. Kant considers the existence of the principles of force and enmity among nations not only unjustified, but they are also unsustainable at a future stage of human cultural development. Kant notes that the idea of world civil law is not a fantastic and exaggerated legal idea, but it is a necessary supplement to the unwritten code of state and international law for public human rights in general, and thus for eternal peace. Kant defines the fulfillment of the demand for eternal peace as a historical task, which has yet to be created and accomplished in a republican social order when the peoples themselves, and not individual rulers, take responsibility for all state affairs, and thus for waging war. Until the realization of eternal peace, humanity is constantly in war conflicts or in a stage of war truce – which is nothing but preparation for new bloody campaigns. Kant thus anticipated the social reality of generations after him, contemplating the idea of eternal peace two centuries before the founding of the League of Nations (founded after the First World War), or the United Nations (founded after the Second World War). GRETIĆ, G., «Pax Kantiana and Hegel's Critique», *Politička misao*, vol. XXXIII, 1996, no. 4, pp. 56-73. *Kants Werke*, Akademie Textausgabe, vol. 8, Berlin, 1968.

⁶⁷ Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859). French politician and historian, best known for his analysis of democracy in the United States from the early 19th century. Tocqueville spent nine months traveling in the United States, between 1831 and 1832, where he reportedly studied criminal law reforms for the French government. He was, in fact, interested in American democratic institutions and how their work could be applied in Europe. Therefore, upon his return to France, he began writing his major work, *Democracy in America*, which was soon published. This work is recognized as a classic work of political theory. Tocqueville was particularly impressed by the political freedom that existed in the United States and the degree of equality that existed among the people there. He compared it to Europe, especially France, which was still ruled by an aristocratic elite. According to him, France failed to keep the promises given during the French Revolution: liberty, equality and fraternity – a central features of a democratic political system. Within his theory, Tocqueville gave the deepest and most comprehensive analysis of the essence of modern democracy. In his work, Tocqueville presents the idea that equality as a fundamental feature of modern democracy, gives a certain direction to public opinion, a new character to laws, new principles to government, new habits to subjects and ultimately changes the course of history of international relations in general. For more on Tocqueville's work see: VOLKMANN-SCHLUCK, K. H., *Politička filozofija: Tukidid Kant Tocqueville*, 1977, Zagreb, Naprijed. MILL, J. S., *M. de Tocqueville on Democracy in America*, vol. 2. John W. Parker and son, 1859. PIERSON, G. W., *Tocqueville in America*, JHU Press, 1996.

Democratic Peace», scholar Christopher Layne, focuses on a critique of credibility of this theory, asking a question «whether democratic peace theory or realism is a better predictor of international outcomes.»⁶⁸ The author deals with democratic peace theoreticians, finding two strands to the causal logic of the theory. While first attributes, as he suggests «the absence of war between democratic regimes to institutional restraints, the restraining effects of public opinion, or the checks and balances embedded in a democratic state's domestic political structure»⁶⁹ second suggests that «it is democratic norms and culture – a shared commitment to the peaceful adjudication of political disputes – that accounts for the absence of war between democratic states». As it is known that democracies rarely go to war against each other—showcased by the democratic peace theory—democracies, however, can act belligerently vis-à-vis non-democratic states. This was asserted by Layne who also demonstrated the shortcomings of the institutional-constraints argument; namely, the latter being unable to explain the absence of war between democracies.

Using four modern historical cases, in which democratic great powers almost collided: the Trent affair in 1861 (United States and Great Britain); the Venezuela crisis in 1895-96 (same actors); the Fashoda crisis in 1898 (France and Great Britain); and the Ruhr crisis in 1923 (France and Germany), the author focuses on head – to – head test in order to apply the democratic peace theory and realism on great powers and their international relation, to see their capabilities. These cases are in favor of a democratic peace thesis strengthened with the facts of economic interdependence and special ties between conflicting parties. However, the author concludes that democratic peace theory has «extremely little explanatory power» in the studied cases and that this theory «does not contend that democratic states are less war – prone than non – democracies, they are not.»⁷⁰ Still, this theory consists of one important fact that it is the true nature of democratic political systems that they are reluctant indeed to threaten or fight other democracies. The author concludes that realism is superior with regards to the democratic peace theory, because it can better predict international outcomes. According to the explanation of democratic peace thesis, growth of the number of democracies in the world should, therefore, lead to an increase in peace and stability.

⁶⁸ LAYNE, C., «Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace», *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1994, p. 6

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p. 10.

Applying his theory on US foreign policy, the author outlined that US politics has been consistent in its foreign policy aims for more than half a century. Although the end of the Cold War completely and enduringly transformed the international landscape, we have witnessed no corresponding change in the aims and construct of the U.S. foreign policy.

In order to summarize all these arguments on neoliberals, we can use the thesis given by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in their work *Power and Interdependence*, that hard military power is declining as a foreign policy instrument due to the fact that states pursue the greater economic interaction and cooperation indispensable for prosperity in a globalized world.⁷¹ On one hand, expanding the classical liberal thesis, the neoliberal approach in economic interdependence sees the stability of the international system. On the other side, however, with the increase in the number of democracies in the world, stability in the global system is strengthening. Globalization, therefore in the eyes of neoliberal scholars has brought a historically long-desired peace and stability based on «peaceful competition, persuasion and compromise»⁷² Still, this is only one side of the story. Below we will shed light on the other, neorealist side.

V. GLOBALIZED WORLD AND THE COLLECTIVE (IN)SECURITY?

In order to examine the neorealist approach to the issue of politics and war, it is necessary to point to the main assumptions of classical realism itself, because this theory ultimately, shaped the neorealist approach. Historically, the oldest and the most enduring theory in the field of international relations, classical realism, encompasses many reflections and different ideas, which all have several common points based on the approach of the two leading international relations scholars, Edward Carr and Hans Morgentau and their classic works, *The Twenty Years' Crisis (1939)*⁷³ and *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (1948)*.⁷⁴

⁷¹ KEOHANE R.; NYE J., *Power and Interdependence*, Longman, 2012.

⁷² LAYNE, C., «Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace», *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1994, p. 7

⁷³ CARR, E.H., *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

⁷⁴ MORGENTHAU, H., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, McGraw-Hill Education; 7th ed., 2005.

However, the causes of the emergence of a realistic paradigm in the field of international relations can be traced back to two facts. First, it is an undoubted reaction to the pacifist and legalist idealism that flourished between the two wars in the science of international law with the creation of the League of Nations, which saw the realization of a kind of «social contract», as an aspiration to overcome the «natural state» that prevailed in international relations. The disappointment that must have come after such an idealization of reality, led to the other extreme, to the almost complete negation of international law and international institutions in their mutual relations. Second, the velocity of the rise of the United States in the international hierarchy of powers after World War II imposed the need to explain the place and role of this power in international relations in the new constellation of forces in the global arena. The historical conditionality of realistic theories can best be seen in the attitude of George Kennan, one of the most prominent representatives of this school. He points out that American policy often did not pay enough attention to the role of force and national interests in international relations, which, in his opinion, was a mistake, because foreign policy must not be based on legalistic idealism that places too much trust in legal and moral principles.⁷⁵

Realism as a theoretical position in the science of international relations has its special place as a theory that puts the struggle for power and force at the center of the political process. Namely, to explain the states' behavior within the international system, classical realism starts from human selfish nature, driven to compete with others, with the primary goal to dominate and gain certain benefits. This principle is the driving principle of overall action in world politics, as a struggle for power, or a place where «a war of all against all» (Hobbes) happens. As scholar Rathbun emphasizes, «The focus on gain

⁷⁵ KENNAN, G. F., an American diplomat and historian, known for his policy of containment of Soviet expansion during the Cold War. In the late 1940s, his work inspired Truman's Doctrine and the foreign policy of the United States to «contain» the Soviet Union. In his «Long Telegram» sent from Moscow in 1946 and his subsequent article «The Sources of Soviet Conduct» in 1947, he expressed belief that the Soviet regime was essentially expansionist and that its influence must be «contained», at the same time, bringing strategic benefits to the United States. These texts provided both the foundation and the pretext for the Truman administration's new anti-Soviet policy. Historically, Kennan's role was important in the development of Cold War institutions and plans, in particular, the Marshall Plan. For more, see: DIMITRIJEVIĆ, V.; STOJANOVIĆ, R., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Službeni list CRJ, 1996, p. 31

and greed is one reason why morality cannot be expected to play a role in relations among states or people.»⁷⁶

The main actor of world politics is the state, with the main purpose to achieve power as the «most important currency in international politics»⁷⁷, in the international system, and to promote the national interest. The role of state is not to fulfill a certain ethical tenet, but rather, to serve its self-interest, aware in every moment that in an anarchic world system rule by the strong or those who seize power through force, i.e., *kratocracy*, is the basic principle and where the «might makes/is right». To achieve power, states must acquire sufficient military capacity to discourage potential enemies, and, at the same time, to exploit influence over others, for what economic growth is crucial, as an instrument of acquiring and expanding state power and reputation.

In short, this theory focuses primarily on «the sources and uses of national power (...) and the problems that leaders encounter in conducting foreign policy»⁷⁸. For this theory, the main driving force within the international system is *animus dominandi*, a will for domination, based on human egoistic and selfish nature. With its concepts, classical realism was one of the most influential theories of world politics, especially after the Second World War, at the beginning of the rivalry between the US and the USSR, escalation of the Cold War and global struggle between East and West.

V.1. *Globalization and the new world peace pessimism – a neorealist assumptions*

In contrast to the classical realists, who attempted to determine state behavior by investigating the motives of an individual, the neorealists' theory put focus on a more holistic analysis. Neo-realism (or structural realism) sees identity, motivation, and behavior as products of social environment in which individuals reside. In other words, neo-realism is «based on a belief in

⁷⁶ RATHBUN, B., «Politics and Paradigm Preferences: The Implicit Ideology of International Relations Scholars», *International Studies Quarterly*, No. 56, 2012, p. 611.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 622.

⁷⁸ TALIAFERRO, J. S. E.; LOBELL; RIPSAN, N. M., *Neo-classical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 16.

the shaping power of conditions over agency.»⁷⁹ The leading proponents of this approach are Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer. Beginning with the thesis of the international system as anarchic, the neorealist scholars express skepticism due to the change in the nature of world politics in the post-Cold War era. Kenneth Waltz's approach was based on international anarchy (as a main structural element of the international system), which is the cause of competitive relationships between states within the international system, different from classical realist opinion on allegedly evil and selfish human nature, as the main cause of the state behavior within the system. According to Waltz, the absence of global government, as a central arbiter, is the determining structural feature and/or main driving force of international politics. From that point of view, states are emerging as vulnerable and insecure and acting defensively by making agreements against rising threats. With that, the balance of power emerges from an anarchic structure of the global system, and it is a continuous state of that system.

On the other hand, American scholar John Mearsheimer, went a step further advocating thesis that anarchy in the international system determines, not only how states will behave in the global system, but it also forces them to become the hegemons, as a greater chance to survive within the system. Such a behavior, however, is based on rational choice, and it is not a matter of selfish, egoist and evil man's nature. Basically, the most rational choice of every state is to strengthen its position in the international, anarchical system, in order to survive. That means that not only self-help is a determining point for the states in the international system, but also their continuous quest for opportunities to increase power at the expense of other states. While for Waltz, the main goal of every state is to survive in the international system, for Mearsheimer, on the other hand, that goal can be achieved only through its strengthening and hegemony. Still, Mearsheimer is aware that international hegemony is impossible to be achieved, so the author concludes that the international system is a place of «perpetual great powers competition».⁸⁰

When it comes to interdependence, Mearsheimer acknowledges certain difficulties of co-operation between states; although, collaboration between

⁷⁹ HARKNETT, R. J.; YALCIN, H. B., «The Struggle for Autonomy: A Realist Structural Theory of International Relations», *International Studies Review* 14(4), 2012, p. 500.

⁸⁰ MEARSHEIMER, J., «False promise of liberal institutions», *International Security*, vol. 19; No.3., Winter 1994-1995.

states exists, it is difficult to achieve and even more difficult to preserve. In his article «False promise of liberal institutions», Mearsheimer argues that there are clear limits to the cooperation between states. There are two main reasons for the difficulties of this cooperation: first: the problem of cheating, and second—the problem of relative gains. Criticizing the thesis that institutions drive states away from waging war and, at the same time, promote peace, Mearsheimer insists on fear as a guiding factor of states in relation to other states. States have deep-seated primordial fear that other states will defraud on the reached agreements and strive to gain advantages over them. «Although the level of fear varies across time and space, it can never be reduced to a trivial level»⁸¹, he emphasizes. This risk is exceptionally important considering the existence of modern military technology that can easily contribute to the shift in the global balance of power. Such a development, argues Mearsheimer, «could create a window of opportunity for the cheating side to inflict a decisive defeat on the victim state.»⁸² States acknowledge the cruel truth and even though they make alliances and enter into arms control agreements, they still remain watchful of the need to maintain their own national security.

Furthermore, for Mearsheimer, states in contemplations on collaboration «must consider how the profits or gains will be distributed among them,» and they (states) can assume that the distribution may go in two different ways: in terms of total gains and/or they can be motivated mainly by partial gains. The first type of distribution hypothesizes that each participant focuses on boosting its own yield and has no concern over the other participant's loss or gain in the arrangement and the second type of distribution reflects on the ways of ensuring that it performs better, or at least not worse, than the other participant in any arrangement. Although collaboration is harder to accomplish in relative – gains sense, Mearsheimer states that for the power equilibrium, «states should be motivated primarily by relative gains concerns.» In his sense, liberal institutionalists do not intend on dealing with frauds and impaired parties by modifying basic principles of state conduct, nor they propose the change of the anarchical nature of the international system. Nevertheless, he states that liberal theoreticians recognize the postulate that states function in the anarchic nature of the international system. Based on this, the approach

⁸¹ *Ibid*, p. 11.

⁸² *Ibid*, p. 13.

of international institutionalists is, as he points out: «less ambitious than collective security and critical theory,» but rather, they focus on representing how regulations can work to solve the cheating problem, as states look for boosting their own welfare.

V.2. *Neoliberals vs. Neorealists – A path for Collective (In)security*

Although we have discussed in detail the significance of different theories of world politics, such as critical theory, the institutionalist response on Mearsheimer's claims deserves special mention. The authors Charles and Clifford Kupchan in their study *The Promise of Collective Security*, reject the idea of state behavior simply being the product of the international system's structure. Ideas, they claim, are also important for humans are rational actors in society. They emphasize that for three main reasons, Mearsheimer's critique of collective security falls short.⁸³ They claim that Mearsheimer uses a narrow definition of collective security, and that he also misinterprets how collective security promotes stability. According to them, Mearsheimer depicts security on moralistic principles that challenge power-balancing logic, and overlooks the degree to which residential legislative issues, convictions, and standards shape behavior.

In defense of collective security, institutionalists argue that under this concept, «states agree to abide by certain norms and rules to maintain stability, and when necessary, band together to stop aggression.»⁸⁴ The authors point out that Mearsheimer only focuses on ideal collective security and explicitly exclude from reflection other institutional constructs, in other words accords that rely on looser and more informal power balance, arguing that they do not institute collective security. They accept, however, that their ideas are not a panacea for preventing war. At the same point, they argue that by setting up collective security institutions some of the worst excesses of the perennial competition between states can be avoided. Upon this view, «regulated, institutionalized balancing is preferable to unregulated balancing under anarchy.»⁸⁵ According to the authors, collective security includes acknowl-

⁸³ KUPCHAN C., *The Promise of Collective Security*, 1995, p. 52

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 52-53

⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p. 53

edgment by states that in order to upgrade their security they must agree to three fundamental standards in inter-state relations. To begin with, they must revoke the utilization of military force to change the status quo and agree to gently settle all the disagreements. He further states, «Changes will be possible in international relations but ought to be achieved by negotiation rather than force. Second, they must broaden their conception of national interest to include interests of the international community as a whole; third, and most importantly – states must overcome the fear, which dominates world politics and learn to trust each other. Such a system of security depends on states entrusting their destinies to collective security.»⁸⁶

Collective security, they concluded, «directly addresses a key concern of realists with the dynamic nature of the international setting and its inclination to produce triggers of antagonism.»⁸⁷ Specifically, collective security aims to develop a more effective tool for balancing against aggressors when they surface, as well as to reduce the likelihood of aggression by improving the competitive aspect of international relations. It allows for more effective equilibrium against invading forces with stronger, rather than equivalent force. Underneath collective security, governments are more likely to join the opposing coalition because they have made direct or indirect pledge to do so, and they have an interest in maintaining the international system that benefits their own security. Despite the past mistakes, the post-Cold War era offers a chance for greater collective security achievement.

VI. WAR IN CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS: ARE THE DISPLAYED THEORETICAL APPROACHES SUSTAINABLE?

With the above in mind and despite the fact that both neoliberalism and neorealism have offered sound arguments with stronghold in socio-political relations within the system of world politics, we should make a brief empirical scrutiny in order to probe our main question and the possibility of the given theories to provide proper answer. As we have emphasized many times, globalization is first and foremost labeled as a process of interdependence accompanied by the complexity of the relations among states. Still, the phenomenon

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem.*

transforms society and multiplies disputes causing different shared efforts of states, because globalization, as Ioan Bari emphasized:

«is the particularly dynamic process of increasing interdependencies between national states as a result of the expansion and deepening of transnational ties in the broader and varied spheres of economic, political, social and cultural life, and implying that problems become more global than national, demanding, in turn, a more global rather than national solution»⁸⁸

As a result of globalization, many dilemmas and paradoxes have arisen in the field of security and other areas. Security in the contemporary environment becomes not just of concern to states, as the case was before, but a matter of regions, groups, individuals, with both state and non-state actors, multinational corporations, and different multilateral organizations as main actors. All this is based on the nature of the new threats such as extremist and terrorist groups, bandits, criminals, immigrations, and disasters. New threats and the manifestations thereof suppressed the classical paradigm with military threats taking the lead and the war as the primary focus in the analysis of security. Furthermore, most of the new threats are not anymore threats to the survival of the state, but to the society and the individuals. According to I. A. Cîrdei: «What is new in globalized society refers to violence that emits from non-state entities, which generate sources of insecurity that cannot be correlated with a particular territory, do not have an exact location, the threat being diffuse, permanent and multidirectional.»⁸⁹

Based on the aforementioned, one could claim that asymmetric threats have emerged along with globalization and that wars are not any more a dominant security threat. Consequently, if we take into consideration the statistics of the number of conflicts between the states from 1946 to 2016, we will see that this thesis is proven to be true. Namely, according to Max Roser, author of the article «War and Peace», published in the journal *Our World in Data* in 2016, the number of deaths decreased since the end of World War II. The author further emphasizes: «In some years in the early post-war era, around half a million people died through direct violence in wars; in contrast, in 2016

⁸⁸ BARI, I., *Probleme globale contemporane*, București, Editura Economică, 2003, p. 37.

⁸⁹ CÎRDEI IA., «The Impact of Globalization on the Security Environment», International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION, 2019 Jun 1, vol. 25, No. 1, p. 42

the number of all battle-related deaths in conflicts involving at least one state was 87,432.»⁹⁰

The decrease in absolute number of war casualties comes as a result of declining global inter-state conflicts. Through the Cold war, humanity faced several wars with serious death tolls: the Korean War (early 1950s), the Vietnam War (1955-1975), the Iran-Iraq and Afghanistan wars (1980s). In the aftermath of the Cold War, there has been a significant increase in war victims driven by conflicts in the Middle East, particularly Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan. Based on this, one can conclude that the number of active conflicts grew each year. However, the increase relates only to civil intra-state conflicts. Expansionist conflicts or the ones related to the defense of colonial empires ended with decolonization, while conflicts between states, as global actors, have almost ceased to exist. That basically means that the conflict is not anymore the primary structural moment of world politics, which makes the realist approach falling.

Still, that does not mean that the liberals' thesis is viable, because although the number of inter-state conflicts declined in the post – Cold War era, many empirical examples are challenging this theory. In this context, the question that rightly arises is why, after the collapse of the USSR, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the abandonment of Cold War logic and behavior, NATO still insists on its strengthening and expanding?⁹¹ Why Western democracies still insist on the expensive arms race and the fight against world terrorism (wars in Iraq and Afghanistan) under the guise of defending democracy and its values? Why is aggression, which some people call neo-im-

⁹⁰ ROSER, M., «War and Peace», *OurWorldInData.org*, 2016. Retrieved from: <https://ourworldindata.org/war-and-peace>

⁹¹ After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, NATO was left without a precisely defined purpose. It was necessary to reassess the role of NATO as a defense mechanism. However, several non-traditional and quite unexpected challenges would soon give NATO new tasks and a new mission. One of the most serious challenges of post-Cold War Eastern and Southeastern Europe were unresolved issues of self-determination in which NATO had played a central role. NATO air campaign in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo was a drastic departure from its earlier policies: for the first time, NATO acted in an offensive rather than a defensive style in a mission outside NATO territory. The new NATO mission includes the promotion of democracy and the protection of human rights in Europe. After 9/11, NATO adopted a broader concept of self-defense, taking into account risks such as terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, contributing to overall peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. Finally, a key strategic NATO interest is enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, placing Russian influence under American security structures. Delalić, S. (2010) *New Post-Cold War Strategy of the NATO Alliance*, *Pregled, Periodical for Social Issues*, No. 3.

perialism, being used under the pretext of globalization and the establishment of a 'global democracy' in the first and second decades of the 21st century? Why is the most sophisticated weapon in the world today being used mostly against the powerless and destitute people? Finally, why is the possession of nuclear arsenals and the WMD by some world powers tolerated, while other states are forbidden to have them? These questions are undermining the liberal approach, with regards to its starting points and claims discussed in the previous part of the paper.

When it comes to collective security in the conditions of globalization, there are international organizations involved in solving these problems. Still, it is significant to underline that in many cases international community seems to be powerless to give appropriate response to the post-Cold War challenges, albeit such challenges, as the author David Hannay emphasizes, on many occasions are «state failure, followed by the collapse of state institutions and rule of law»⁹², often with regional chaos that strikes weak neighboring countries. During the Cold War, this phenomenon had occasionally arisen, but it had been followed by the tendency to be handled, although frequently crudely and brutally, by one of the two world powers or by the country's neighbors. In the era of growing interdependence, however, failed states have created the conditions for concealed terrorism (Afghanistan), genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Rwanda), massive starvation (Somalia) and overwhelming flow of refugees (Haiti) that occurred in a relatively short time, and where the peace operations by international community were repeatedly too short term and inadequate to give proper response.

Based on all of the above, one could claim that the globalized, post-Cold War world has created a paradox in which insecurity is growing, for weakened states rely on global governance, which failed to provide sufficient security of the world system or adequate response to certain problems. This in turn only strengthened the uncertainty. In this regard, the given theories, even though they have had their historical background and strongholds in the system of world politics, are not capable of getting to the heart of the problem, and therefore, to give adequate response to the security flows in the globalized world. However, the era of growing interdependence with decreasing number of interstate conflicts is not a peaceful one, but burdensome and insecure.

⁹² HANNAY, D., *New World Disorder-the UN After the Cold War-An Insider's View*, London, I. B. Tauris, 2009, p. 292

VI. EU CASE STUDY

Created by the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, the European Union can be interpreted and defined in many aspects; hence, some call it a monetary and trade union or a body, an international organization with nation-states as members, or a supranational organization which draws its power from member states but supersedes their national borders. Still, no matter how it is defined, the European Union is a substantially a liberal project, based on the pursuit of cooperation, rather than conflict. In this regard, John Pinder emphasizes that lasting peace was the basic political motive for forming a new community on the European soil in the 20th century, which would not have been successful without adequate cooperation in the field of economy.⁹³

Let us analyze each of these definitions. First, as a monetary and trade union, the emphasis is on the free flow of people, goods, and services, as well as the capital. Reduction or complete annulment of trade tariffs and/or barriers amongst member states took place, allowing for better and increased competition on the market.⁹⁴ Common currency, the euro that gradually replaced national currencies, serves to improve global monetary and financial stature of member states. Those looking at it as an international organization focus on various policies that cover not only economic sphere. Thus, EU member countries bring about and challenge various economic, social, and security policies under this formalized institution. Issues such as immigration, employment opportunities, and judiciary are addressed within the auspices of the EU and its ‘contracting parties’⁹⁵. The signatories are geographically located on the European continent, giving the meaning to the name of the organization, and their common aim is, at least the proclaimed one, the advancement and furthering of democracy and peace in Europe.⁹⁶ There seems to be little distinction between an international organization and a supranational organization with one caveat being that in the latter the organization receives certain

⁹³ PINDER, J., *Evropska unija*, Sarajevo, 2003.

⁹⁴ AMADEO, K., *The European Union, How It Works, and Its History*, 2020. Retrieved from: The Balance <https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-the-european-union-how-it-works-and-history-3306356>

⁹⁵ GABEL, M. J., *European Union*, 2020. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/European-Union>

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*.

powers that affect all member-states, sometimes regardless of whether such a state holds favorable views of those effects.

To be able to better understand the EU and how it functions, it is necessary to go back to history and look into some important historic moments in its development towards what it is today. Throughout history, as Serbian scholar Saša Hrnjez points out, «Europe», as a term, has mostly been associated with a danger coming from outside politics (Greco-Persian wars, Ottoman invasions, etc.). Constant concern about being endangered by the intrusion of different forces, influenced the process of self-identification which ultimately led to the creation of the united states of Europe.⁹⁷ In this sense, the fear of a new war, as a continuation of politics by other means, served as a motive for establishing a liberal paradigm in practice.

The context in which the EU was created was a post-WWII one in which the economies of the Western European states were in shambles. The situation was not much better regarding human freedoms and the quality of life. With the aim of preventing any such similar event from occurring in the future, the European Coal and Steel Community was set up between previous rivals and enemies.⁹⁸ The ideals of its originators were peace, prosperity, and unity: Konrad Adenauer pushed for the German reconciliation with France and signing a treaty of friendship with the French President de Gaulle; Joseph Bech, a Luxembourgish politician who was the leading architect of the EU integrations; Winston Churchill, British Prime Minister who envisioned the so-called United States of Europe, modeled after the United States of America; Jean Monnet – Frenchman and the «(...) inspiration behind the Schuman Plan (...)» that focused on the integration of the European heavy industry.

From the original 6 members and leaders of the reconciliation process in Europe – Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and West Germany – to today's 27 countries, the steps towards today's project that still needs to be perfected, included the European Economic Community created by the Treaty of Rome, which also gave birth to the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) simultaneously in 1958⁹⁹. This allowed for the crea-

⁹⁷ HRNJEZ, S., «Evropske kontroverze i srpski put u Evropu.», *Nova Srpska politička misao*, 2005.

⁹⁸ European Union. (n.d.). The history of the European Union. Retrieved from Europa: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history_en, European Union, EU Pioneers, n.d. Retrieved from Europa: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/eu-pioneers_en#konrad_adenauer

⁹⁹ GABEL, M. J., *European Union*, 2020. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/European-Union>

tion of a single, unified market and was a major step towards a freer, capitalist way of trade. The Single European Act of 1987, gave way to coordination in the sphere of foreign policies of members, as well as increased funding of various programs for member-states who were still struggling. The 1992 Maastricht Treaty, which turned the European Economic Community into the EU we know today, was met with serious objections from countries such as Denmark and France, due to fears of interference with their self-determination and sovereignty.

The 2009 Treaty of Lisbon is also one of the key treaties governing this body, but it also increased the powers of one of the main institutions of the EU – the European Parliament, which along with the European Council and the European Commission operates on the basis of the rule of law and other democratic principles. The Commission proposes new laws whilst the Parliament and the Council of the European Union (not the same as the European Council) adopt these laws. It is also important to mention that the EP is directly elected by the EU citizens in elections that take place every 5 years and where parties align themselves based on the political issues they want to tackle; not where they are coming from¹⁰⁰. On the other hand, The Council (the Council of the European Union) is made up of ministers from each state and is in charge of adopting laws and coordinating policies.

Another body to mention is the European Council and is comprised of all the highest-ranking and top political figures of the member-states such as heads of government, the President of the Commission, as well as the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. This body serves for the representation of states and resolving pending issues, and it functions in the form of quarterly summits chaired by the President of the European Council. Voting takes place unanimously or by a qualified majority on issues such as foreign and security policy, complex issues that require longer negotiations as well as the overall direction of the EU. Last but not the least, the European Commission is the institution relegated for the proposing of legislation, which is composed of 28 Commissioners, one per member-state, besides the President and Vice-Presidents.

When it comes to the common security aspect of the EU, it would be erroneous to say that it does not exist, and that not enough attention is given

¹⁰⁰ Publications Office of the European Union, *The European Union – What it is and what it does*, Luxembourg, Luxembourg Publications Office of the European Union, 2018.

to it. On the contrary, the EU members work together in many fields, including this one, with the Common Foreign and Security Policy being the most important one, besides other institutional and international provisions each member state could have individually in this field (membership in some military alliance). The decisions are unanimously made and implemented in this area and expanded upon by qualified majority voting. The person in charge is the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, currently, Josep Borrell¹⁰¹. The afore mentioned policy rests upon 4 pillars that cover the physical protection of EU citizens from various evolving threats such as terrorism and organized crime.¹⁰²

With regards to the position of the EU in relations to other great powers, it is important to say that the EU has relatively good relations with all its neighbors, although history has shown special alignment with the western superpower, the US. This is due to its overall commitment to economic, social, and political development for which a sound neighborhood policy is a necessity. Aside from the enlargement itself that worked on attracting the former communist and eastern European states towards the EU, the EU has established partnerships with non-members such as Georgia, Belarus, and Armenia.¹⁰³ However, the EU has found itself under a lot of criticism especially from the side of realists for not having a unified military and command structure. This is mostly because Germany still holds quite a low position regarding military power, making France the sole military strength provider in the EU, backed by Spain and Italy. Moreover, it is important not to overlook the role of NATO as a collective military alliance that already serves as a strong military organization¹⁰⁴.

The fact is that the EU is not a military power such as the US and Russia, and it probably will never be. However, the development of the huge economic and scientific-technological potentials of the EU will certainly in the future determine the overall course of international relations and strength-

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰² European Union, European Security Union, n.d. Retrieved from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/promoting-our-european-way-life/european-security-union_en

¹⁰³ Government Offices of Sweden, EU relations with the rest of the world, 2016, December 29th. Retrieved from Government Offices of Sweden: <https://www.government.se/sweden-in-the-eu/eu-policy-areas/eu-relations-with-the-rest-of-the-world/>

¹⁰⁴ Ogden, T. *Why the Armed Forces of Europe is not possible?*, 2020, July 30th. Retrieved from New Europe: <https://www.neweurope.eu/article/why-the-armed-forces-of-europe-isnt-possible/>

en the EU's influence on world events. In that sense, the European security strategy, regardless of the fact that most of the EU member states are at the same time NATO members, is different from the geopolitical and military strategy of the world's leading powers, primarily the United States. The main reason for this is the fact that the EU's military strategy is not based on a realist paradigm.

The EU in the last decades has become a strong supporter of integration and institutional approaches to peacekeeping. The EU's security strategy increasingly invokes the principles of neoliberal institutionalism, in the sense that the EU sees its future, above all, in the expansion of international organizations, European unification, respect for international law, disarmament and the promotion of democracy. This is accompanied by a general commitment to the free market and free trade, and to the establishment of world peace. There is a growing belief, within the EU, that dialogue, cooperation, and free trade are the path to be taken. Of course, the EU is still torn between the opposing interests of the US, Russia, China, etc. However, the idea of Europe is day by day implemented and strengthened resting upon neoliberal paradigm of expanding and strengthening the European community of states and peoples.¹⁰⁵

After a century of wars, Europe has prospered, as we have seen, in establishing a community determined by security and economic stability. European history, although marked by conflicts, is nevertheless a history of success and progress in pursuit of eternal democratic peace, which prominent Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant emphasized in his reflections as a decisive question of the modern era. Having this in mind, one could claim that Clausewitz's thesis, given at the beginning of this paper, serves as an important testimony and part of the story of how the modern era embedded war as a legitimate means of conducting politics in the foundations of modern democracy. In this sense, the war appears not only as a continuation of politics, but as the architect of certain policies, systems, or, in Hobbesian terms, even states. This contradiction is found in the very essence of humans.

¹⁰⁵ As the author M. Eliot points out, Europe today considers itself «the second federal democratic power and in the long run, Euroland is likely to spill over its immediate borders.» Namely, if we look critically all aspects of the European Union, from economic strength, through security policy, scientific and technological influence, to traditional and cultural significance, one can claim that the Union has one of the key roles in the modern world. For more, see DURAKOVIĆ, N., *Međunarodniodnosi*, Sarajevo, 2009.

VIII. CONCLUSION

War has been a faithful companion of mankind since its very beginnings, but for the last hundred years special attention has been paid to this phenomenon. This is especially pronounced due to the fact that with the development of modern techniques and, in particular, the methodology of warfare, war has become a threat to the biophysical survival of mankind. The twentieth century was marked by the bloodiest wars in the history of mankind, with over 65 million victims. The war is a distinctly political phenomenon, and as such belongs to man and his life in society. Perhaps the most quoted definition of war was given by the prominent German thinker Carl von Clausewitz, who pointed out that war is nothing but the continuation of politics only by other, violent means.

Every war, in fact, begins and ends with political decisions and as such, in its nature carries a political determinant. This determinant, on the other hand, is most often of an economic nature, that is, the need to control resources and thus strengthen the state economically. Such were the wars fought in the twentieth century, started by the newly formed world powers, which did not have their own colonies, but aspired to them. On the other hand, the old colonial powers tended to retain their colonial possessions, which ultimately led to World War I, by far the greatest conflict in human history. The war, which by its nature appeared as a consequence of the desire to redistribute colonies and resources, and which was largely fought on European soil, would lead twenty years later to another, even bigger and bloodier World War II. The motif of the world powers fighting in this war was the aspiration not only to capture resources, but also to exterminate entire nations.

World War II, which lasted a full six years, was a much bloodier but also much more advanced military conflict. For the first time, it was a war with a true hallmark of a world war, with soldiers, miles away from their homes, fighting from completely distant states. This war would unite the seemingly incompatible world powers, but only temporarily.

It is said that history repeats itself, first as a tragedy, second as a farce. This is indeed the case if we look at the history of warfare in the twentieth century. Once again, Clausewitz's definition is proven to be correct. Namely, after the Second World War, the world witnessed another, but somewhat different war. There was a struggle between the two greatest powers of the time – the United States and the Soviet Union, which, in addition to military-political blocs, fought for almost forty years with technological advances, space races

and demonstrations of force wherever possible. However, although it resulted in a series of proxy wars and conflicts, the Cold War, in itself, did not lead to a large-scale military conflict, but it did attract the attention of thinkers in the field of international relations who this time split into a realistic, dominant paradigm, and liberal, which since the First World War has insisted on cooperation as a guarantee of world peace.

On the other hand, the world hoped that the evil of war would not ever repeat after WWII, and in this regard the Organization of United Nations was created, with the aim to promote cooperation and maintain peace. At the same time, in Europe, impoverished and ravaged by wars, the idea of economic and security cooperation emerged, which would prevent the emergence of a future conflict similar to the First and Second World War. This cooperation will ultimately be the basis for the creation of the European Union in the 1990s.

After almost forty years, the collapse of socialism in the Soviet Union and other European countries opened the possibility and opportunity for globalization, although a long-lasting world event, to gain its full momentum. With the collapse of the USSR and the spread of democracy and liberal capitalism, the US became the main hegemon in the post-Cold War era. At the same time, new nontraditional security threats and challenges emerged. The recovery of the Russian state, economic advancement of China, and influence of multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations led to a new debate in the field of theories of international relations. This debate intensified in the form of neorealism and liberalism offered the possibility of answering the fundamental question whether it is possible to achieve security in the contemporary globalized world system.

While, on the one hand, for neorealism, war and insecurity remain the primary, structural element of world politics, for neoliberalism, the basic lever that keeps the world at peace is nothing but the existence of international institutions and international law, which guide states to act for mutual gain, rather than zero sum game.

Although globalization has created interdependence between states, for neorealist theorists, the anarchy of the world system is still present, and the states base their actions on the use of force to protect themselves, or aspire to become hegemons, to justify the classical realistic paradigm by which «might make / is right». On the other hand, for neoliberal authors, states prefer to establish agreements, and to act in accordance with them within international organizations. They also act according to the principles of international law,

all with the aim of surviving in an uncertain, globalized world, thus achieving world peace.

Even though there are still a lot of non-interstate conflicts in the world, the war is no longer the primary structural moment of the world system. Modern challenges that globalization brings about include myriad threats to the countries of the world. The rapid flow of services, goods and people have improved economic cooperation, but also created new threats such as migration, arms and drug trafficking, as well as intensified activities of terrorist and other organized crime groups. Globalization has led to the erosion of the nation-state and thus the state is no longer the only actor in the world system in the field of security. With the erosion of the nation state, a paradox has been created in which global institutions are unable to respond to the challenges that arise. Based on this, the dominant theories of international relations, realism, and liberalism have faced questions to which, as we have seen, they cannot provide adequate answers. For realism and liberalism, the main actor in international relations is the state, resting upon the thesis of the world system as anarchic with the constant fear of an external enemy being present, Contemporary threats, however, undermine this view in the context of security.

Finally, after a century of wars, Europe has managed to achieve the long-awaited peace and prosperous economic and foreign policy cooperation within the European Union. However, it is said that the above would not have been possible without wars, which seem to be the basis of modern democracy and economic cooperation. After all, Clausewitz's thesis on the nature of war has not been overcome, but has taken on new meanings of the political, which in modern society nevertheless prefers economic cooperation rather than armed conflict. In this context, the European Union is essentially a (neo) liberal project, based on shared institutions, economic interdependence, and common foreign and security policy.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- ALINK, B.; PAPE, A.; ANIĆ, N.; NOVAKOVIĆ, J.; BOGDANIĆ-ĐURIĆ, S.; STANKOVIĆ, V. *Drugi svjetski rat*, Mladost, 1981.
- AMADEO, K., *The European Union, How It Works, and Its History*, 2020. Retrieved from: The Balance <https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-the-european-union-how-it-works-and-history-3306356>
- ARON, R., *Paix et guerre entre les nations*, Calmann-Lévy, 2005.

- BARBIERI, K., «Economic Interdependence: A path to peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?», *Journal of Peace Research*, 1996, pp. 29-49.
- BARI, I., *Probleme globale contemporane*, Editura Economică, București, 2003.
- BAYLIS, J., SMITH, S. and OWENS P., *The Globalization of World Politics*, 2016, Oxford University Press.
- BERINSKY, A., YOHAI, I., POWELL, E., SCHICKLER, E., July 2011, Revisiting Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s
- BOŽINOVIĆ D., ČEHULIĆ VUKADINOVIĆ L. and VUKADINOVIĆ, R. *NATO – Euroatlantska integracija*, Zagreb, Topical, 2007.
- BRZEZINSKI, Z. *Velika šabovska tabla*. CID., 2001.
- CARR, E.H., *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- CLARK, C., *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe went of war in 1914*, Harper Perennial 2014.
- CLAUSEWITZ, C. von. *On War*, rev. ed., ed. and trans. M. Howard and P. Paret, Princeton, University Press, 1984.
- COLLINS, M., *The Pros and Cons of Globalization*, 2015, Retrieved from Forbes: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikecollins/2015/05/06/the-pros-and-cons-of-globalization/?sh=1b5b794dcce>
- Crump, L., *The Warsaw Pact Reconsidered: International Relations in Eastern Europe, 1955-1969*, Routledge, 2015.
- DAVIS, *Globalization's Security Implications*, RAND, 2003.
- DELALIĆ, S., «New Post-Cold War Strategy of the NATO Alliance», *Pregled, Periodical for Social Issues*, No.3. 2010
- DIMITRIJEVIĆ, V.; STOJANOVIĆ, R., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Službeni list CRJ, 1996.
- DIMITRIJEVIĆ, V.; STOJANOVIĆ, R., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Službeni list CRJ, 1996
- DONALDSON, R.H. and NADKARNI V., *Foreign Policy of Russia: Changing Systems, Enduring Interests*, Routledge, 6th edition, 2018.
- DURAKOVIĆ, N., *Međunarodni odnosi*, Sarajevo, 2009.
- European Union, European Security Union, n.d. Retrieved from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/promoting-our-european-way-life/european-security-union_en
- FRIEDMANN, G. and NAVILLE, P., *Traité de sociologie du travail*. Colin., 1972.
- GABEL, M. J., European Union, 2020. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/European-Union>
- GADDIS, J.L., *The Cold War: A New History*, Penguin Books, 2006.
- GALEOTTI, M., *A Short History of Russia: How the World's Largest Country Invented Itself, from the Pagans to Putin*, Hanover Square Press 2020.

- Government Offices of Sweden, EU relations with the rest of the world, 2016, December 29th. Retrieved from Government Offices of Sweden: <https://www.government.se/sweden-in-the-eu/eu-policy-areas/eu-relations-with-the-rest-of-the-world/>
- GRAY, A., *What is globalization anyway?* Retrieved from World Economic, 2017. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/what-is-globalization-explainer/>
- GRETIĆ, G., «Pax Kantiana and Hegel's Critique», *Politička misao*, vol. XXXIII, 1996, no. 4, pp. 56-73
- HANNAY, D., *New World Disorder-the UN After the Cold War-An Insider's View*. London, I. B. Tauris, 2009.
- HARKNETT, R.J. and YALCIN, H. B., «The Struggle for Autonomy: A Realist Structural Theory of International Relations», *International Studies Review* 14(4), 2012, pp. 499-521.
- HENIG, R., *Versailles and After, 1919-33*, Routledge Francis & Taylor, 1995.
- HOBBSAWM, E., *Age of Extremes: The Short 20th Century 1914-1991*, Tantor, 2020.
- HOUGH, P.; SHAHIN, M. *et al.*, *International Security Studies*, Routledge, 2015.
- HRNJEZ, S., «Evropske kontroverze i srpski put u Evropu.», *Nova Srpska politička misao*, 2005.
- HUNTINGTON, S. P., «The clash of civilizations?», in *Culture and politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2020, pp. 99-118
- KALDOR, M., *Human Security*, Polity 2007.
- KALDOR, M., *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, 3rd ed., Cambridge, Polity Press, 2012.
- KAYSEN C. *et al.*, *Collective Responses to Regional Problems*, Committee on international security studies American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1994.
- KEOHANE, R. and NYE J., *Power and Interdependence*, Longman, 2012.
- KEYLOR, W.R., *The Twentieth-Century World and Beyond: An International History Since 1990*, Sixth Edition, Oxford University Press 2012.
- KUPCHAN, C. and KUPCHAN C., *The Promise of Collective Security*, 1995.
- LAYNE, C., «Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace», *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1994.
- LECHNER, F. and BOLI, J., *The Globalization Reader*, 6th Edition 2020.
- LENIN, V. and CHRISTMAN, H., *Essential works of Lenin*. Bantam Books, 1966
- LEWIS, W. A., *Some aspects of economic development*, Allen & U, 1970.
- LIEBER A., K., «The New history of World War I and What it means for International Relations Theory», *International Security*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2007, pp. 155-191.
- MALEŠEVIĆ, S., *The Sociology of War and Violence*, Cambridge University Press 2012.
- MANKOFF, J., *Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics (A Council on Foreign Relations Book)*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2nd edition, 2011.

- MANSFIELD D.E. and POLLINS M.B., «The Study of Interdependence and Conflict», *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2001, pp. 834 – 859
- MARCUSE, H., *Čovjek jedne dimenzije*, Sarajevo, Veselin Masleša, 1989.
- MARKOVIĆ, M., *Filozofija Heraklita Mračnog*, Beograd, Nolit, 1983
- MARTEL, G., *Origins of the First World War*, Routledge Francis & Taylor, 2017.
- MAZOWER, M., *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, London Penguin 1999.
- MCLUHAN M. et al., *The Global Village*, Junfermann, 1995.
- MCLUHAN, M. and POWERS, B.R., *The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21st Century*, New York, Oxford University Press Inc, 1992.
- MEARSHEIMER, J., «False promise of liberal institutions», *International Security*, vol. 19 No.3., Winter 1994-1995, pp. 9-14.
- MITTELMAN, J., *Hyperconflict: Globalization and Insecurity*, Stanford Security Studies 2010.
- MORAVCSIK, A., «Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics», *International Organization*, vol. 51, no. 4, 1997, pp. 513-553.
- MORGENTHAU, H., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, McGraw-Hill Education; 7th ed., 2005.
- MRKIĆ, S.; PRELEVIĆ, M.; BEGOVIĆ, A., *Teorija o ratu. Vojnoizdavački zavod*, 1981.
- OATLEY, T. (2011), *International Political Economy*. 5th ed. BALAAM, D. N. and B. DILLMAN, *Introduction to international political economy*, Routledge, 2018.
- OGDEN, T., *Why the Armed Forces of Europe is not possible?*, 2020, July 30th. Retrieved from New Europe: <https://www.neweurope.eu/article/why-the-armed-forces-of-europe-isnt-possible/>
- PAUL, T. V.; RIPSAN, N. M., «Under pressure? Globalisation and the National Security State», *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2004, pp. 355-380.
- PILBEAM, B., «New wars, globalization, and failed states», *International Security Studies*, Hough, P.; Shahin, M., (ed.), Routledge, 2015.
- PINDER, J., *Evropska unija*, Sarajevo, 2003.
- PLATO, *The Republic*, Penguin Classic, 2012.
- Publications Office of the European Union, *The European Union - What it is and what it does*, Luxembourg, Luxembourg Publications Office of the European Union, 2018.
- RATHBUN, B., «Politics and Paradigm Preferences: The Implicit Ideology of International Relations Scholars», in *International Studies Quarterly*, 2012, No. 56, pp. 607-622.
- ROBERTSON, E.M., (ed.), *The Origins of the Second World War: Historical Interpretations*, Macmillan, London 1971.
- RODRIK, D., *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*, W.W. Norton & Company, 2012.

- ROSER, M., «War and Peace», *OurWorldInData.org*, 2016. Retrieved from: <https://ourworldindata.org/war-and-peace>
- ROSS, G., *The Great Powers and the Decline of the European States System*, London, Longman 1983.
- SEKULIĆ, N., *Skriveni rat*, Institut za sociološka istraživanja, Beograd, 2013
- SIMMA, B., «NATO, the UN and the Use of Force: Legal Aspects», *European Journal of international law*, 10(1), 1999, pp. 1-2
- STEGER, M. and JAMES, P., *Globalization*, Routledge, 2017.
- STIGLITZ, J.E., *Globalization and Its Discontents Revisited: Anti-Globalization in the Era of Trump*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1st edition 2017.
- TALIAFERRO, J.; LOBELL, S. E. and RIPSAN, N. M., *Neo-classical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- TATALOVIĆ, S., *Nacionalna i međunarodna sigurnost*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2006.
- TOCQUEVILLE, A. de, *Democracy in America*. Wordsworth Editions Ltd, 1998, p. 335.
- VLASAVLJEVIĆ, U., *Rat kao najveći kulturni događaj*. Maunagić, 2007.
- VLASAVLJEVIĆ, U., *Etnopolitika i građanstvo*. Dijalog, 2013.
- VOLKMANN-SCHLUCK, K. H., *Politička filozofija: Tukidid Kant Tocqueville*, 1977, Zagreb, Naprijed
- MILL, J. S., *M. de Tocqueville on Democracy in America*. Vol. 2. John W. Parker and son, 1859.
- PIERSON, G. W., *Tocqueville in America*. JHU Press, 1996.
- VOLKMANN-SCHLUCK, K., *Politička filozofija*. Naprijed, 1977.
- WATSON, L. J., *Cultural globalization*, 2020, Retrieved from Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/science/cultural-globalization>