

Goran ZENDELOVSKI

UDK: 355.01/.02:32(100)“20“;
355.48:316.485.6(100)“20“; 355.015(100)“20“
Review article

WAR, POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Abstract:

War is one of the most studied phenomena at the beginning of the 21st century. Due to its constant transformation and the different ways of its manifestation, the need for its observation is also growing. There is a wide range of interpretations of war because it affects all areas of social life, politics, economics, diplomacy and religion. The prevailing uncertainty and fear of future wars and conflicts were seen as a reason for strengthening military capacities and increasing defense spending of states and international organizations, which contributed to a new arms race and strengthening the militaristic mentality and influence of military force as a driver in foreign policy.

We pay particular attention to the causes of wars and the policies that encourage war to the extreme, both in terms of the engagement of forces and resources, and in terms of the manifestation of violence. Historical experience shows that governments and their leaders are guided by national interests and ideologies, and are not at all hesitant about starting a war, viewing military force as a means to achieve political goals, while not paying attention to the repercussions on international law and the preservation of peace in the world.

Keywords: *war, politics, interests, ideology, global militarization*

Introduction

The Internationalization of War

War is a complex social phenomenon in which violence, reason, political will, ideology and interests are intertwined, and it changes its nature several times in each specific case. The phenomenon of war in past eras has been the subject of study and interest of a large number of authors from different professions and occupations, some of them are Confucius, Sun Tzu, Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Hegel, Marx, Engels, Clausewitz and others. The holy books of the Bible, the Quran and the Talmud also give adequate treatment to war as a destructive apocalyptic phenomenon that is generally associated with the “end of the world” or “judgment day”. The presence of the fear of war is justified because it changes the fate of peoples and states, and wars have always been considered the boundaries of great historical changes in which prominent civilizations disappeared (Nacev and Nachevski, 2000).

If we look deeper into the past, we will come to the realization that in the 3,000 years of human history, only 300 years (or 10% of that time) have passed in peace, without wars and armed conflicts (Pavlovic, 2009: 199). According to the International Peace Research Institute, approximately 14,570 wars have been recorded throughout human history, resulting in the deaths of 3.7 billion people. Since the end of World War II, not a single day has passed without war, and in the same period, more than 50 million people have died in wars and violent clashes in that period, so this tendency that leads to an increase in the number of wars and violence does not stop (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2000). This is also confirmed by the striking data that the areas affected by conflicts and clashes in the world have grown by 65%, and casualties has increased by 29% since the beginning of 2021 (Brennan and Durmaz, 2024). In 2022 alone, 92 countries were involved in at least one armed conflict out of a total of 193 countries in the world (Global Peace Index 2024). Based on the above data, it follows that the number, scale and destructiveness of wars and conflicts are increasing in parallel with the development of civilization.

In general, from the Peloponnesian Wars to the two world wars of the 20th century, most of them were fought to gain security for their nation and its survival. However, achieving security through war is paradoxical, because often wars ended up undermining the security of the nations that were supposedly supposed to be protected (Kalin, 2015). During the Cold War, the international system was static with an appropriate structure and rules, set around nation-states and balanced between the two superpowers. The ideological clash between capitalism and communism created tension and the possibility of nuclear annihilation. However, the conflict between East and West was contained by nuclear deterrence and within the framework of the traditional security dilemma. After the Cold War, a systemic transition occurred, in this period

characterized by US hegemony, war became a matter of creating coalitions to intervene in Third World countries that were inciting civil or ethnic violence, genocide, war crimes and interstate conflicts. Peace imposed by military force (or as George Orwell said “war is peace”), did not bring the desired stability, on the contrary, it led to the rise of global militarism and the expansion of military interventionism under the auspices of the UN, NATO and the developed Western countries.

After the September 11, 2001 attacks, the world entered a new era of “perpetual war” (a counterpart to Kant’s thesis of perpetual peace), where attention shifted to terrorist organizations, insurgents and other non-state actors. During this period, war, the method of warfare and the conduct of military operations were the main features of international relations. The military-repressive dimension expressed through various humanitarian interventions, counterterrorist engagements, preventive wars, or terms such as “responsibility to protect” (R2P), “regime change” and “special military operation” -transformed perceptions of war and exposed its underlying contradictions. First, the “Global War on Terrorism”¹ (also referred to as Third World War), heralded the absolute dominance of military force and power in global affairs, without setting limits or restrictions on space, while marginalizing the issue of traditional conflict between states. Through the prism of this war, several contradictions appear, relating to: the inability to define the enemy (the focus is on changing a specific regime or leader, rather than a hostile state or people); the beginning and end of the war are unknown; there is no specifically defined territory – “the war is where the enemies are” (it can also affect an entire region); and threats vary from one extreme to the other (from war, terrorism, to the proliferation of WMD) (Vankovska, 2011: 93).

Since then, various terms have been used to conceptualize modern wars, such as “wars of the third kind”, “hybrid wars”, “proxy wars”, “postmodern wars”, “democratic wars” and “new wars”. In general, new wars are the result of the dynamics of modern globalization, which breaks down the differences between state and non-state, public and private, external and internal, economic and political, war and peace. Although, some authors argue that there is nothing new in new wars, when it comes to crimes against civilians or methods of warfare. However, Mary Kaldor identifies key distinctions between classical and new wars in terms of actors, goals, methods and forms of financing. In the new wars, the actors are regular armed forces, private military and security companies, mercenaries and paramilitaries, and the wars are all fought in the name of identity (ethnic or religious), unlike the “old wars” that were fought for geopolitical interests or ideology. In terms of methods, these wars

¹According to the “Costs of War” project, the costs of wars since September 11, 2001, have amounted to over \$14 trillion, and the number of human casualties has been around 500,000 (excluding about half a million deaths in Syria), while 38 million people have been forcibly displaced across Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, the Philippines, Libya, and Syria or forced to flee abroad (Parmar and Hooper, 2022).

are fought through guerrilla techniques and ethnic cleansing, with violence directed against the civilian population as a way to control territory, rather than against enemy forces. The new wars are financed through a globalized decentralized economy in which the warring parties are self-financed through the black market or with support from diaspora. Therefore, such wars are difficult to end because warfare itself is more profitable than conquering territory or achieving a final victory (Kaldor, 2013).

Causes of War

The increased interest of the academic community in the problems of war is due to the fact that war is increasingly used as a way to resolve international disputes, is waged in the name of international peace and security, as a means of achieving certain goals and interests of states, as a “racket”² and exploitation of resources³, or it is waged to fulfill atavistic and biological instincts. The causes for wars today are almost more numerous and more pronounced, they vary from secular interests such as territorial conquest, power, security and profit to abstract ideals such as law, justice and God (Creveld, 1991).

In this context, we will mention some of the already known causes, which have been highlighted by world-famous authors. According to Francis Fukuyama, the primary causes of wars are oil, emigration and the new world order. Among these, the third reason for the emergence of wars and conflicts is very current and more significant, and it provokes a series of dilemmas because it covers a broad spectrum of activities for starting military campaigns (Fukuyama, 1992). The author Samuel Huntington discusses the “clash of civilizations,” arguing that the fear of losing one’s identity and language to global cultural values may drive some countries and peoples to resort to violence, ethnic cleansing, genocide, and war as a means of asserting their own cultural values over others (Huntington, 1996). He emphasizes the cultural dimension as a trigger for war and conflict, which took on new significance and classi-

²For former US General Smedley Butler, “war is a racket” and has always been the oldest and most profitable phenomenon that is international in scope and the only one in which profits are calculated in dollars and losses are measured in human lives. His arguments are that war serves only the material benefit of a small group of people (the elite), to the detriment of everyone else. He points out that during World War I alone, over 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were created in the United States, and almost none of them participated in the war or in any combat (Butler, 1935).

³Author Michael Klare emphasizes that competition for natural resources is the primary cause of global conflicts. According to him, resource scarcity will become the dominant cause of war in the 21st century. These “resource wars” (over water, gas and oil) will increasingly be present in the regions of North Africa and the Middle East, and tensions and rivalries are also expected to increase in areas rich in rare minerals such as the South China Sea (Klare, 2002).

fications (based on religion, nation, identity and civilization) especially after the terrorist attacks in the United States. Sociologist Zygmunt Bauman links the causes of wars to the processes of globalization. He identifies two types of wars: "globalizing wars" and the "globalization-induced wars". The purpose of globalizing wars is to remove obstacles hindering the realization of the neoliberal model - wars are initiated to open closed territories to the global flow of capital and goods. The absence of an international political authority is the reason for conducting military operations followed by the rule of action known as the "law of the strongest", and some countries show their own "muscles" and freedom of action in the name and defense of the international order. The second type of wars, known as "globalization-induced wars". It is said that globalization processes destroy the existing borders of other nations and eliminate their power, while economic benefits are directed to the countries leading these wars. Therefore, globalization causes dissatisfaction and insecurity followed by wars and conflicts in most countries that resist globalization trends. Bauman identifies interethnic wars, genocide and terrorism as outcomes of globalization-induced wars (Bauman, 2001).

Some authors also refer to globalization as the "Fourth World War" or as a new type of war, also known as the "non-military conquest of the world". For Catherine Odora, "globalization represents a new phase of war that never ends", i.e. she points to globalization as a form of "Low Intensity Warfare" (LIW). The "victims" of globalization or the terrain for low intensity warfare are those countries that are part of the globalization gap, i.e. countries that are excluded from the rest of the world or that do not accept the obligations imposed by international authorities and the leading countries of modern globalization (Odora, 1999). Almost all wars in the past three decades (including those in the Balkans, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf) are precisely in countries that are excluded from globalization trends, that is, countries that have not accepted democratic principles and Western neoliberal values.

Undoubtedly, (de)globalization generates numerous contradictions and various forms of crises, increasing the possibilities of wars and conflicts of regional or global scale. It is expected that in the modern era the form and nature of wars and conflicts will be determined on a broader basis, most often by geopolitical, economic, technological, cultural and external (global pandemics, climate change, demographic changes and resource scarcity) trends. Each of these different dimensions contributes to a special aspect of the destructive impact of war. Therefore, in academic circles, the new type of wars is classified as geopolitical wars, economic or trade wars, information-technological wars, cultural or religious wars, which are related to the effects of contemporary (de) globalization processes.

Man, the State and the International System as Causes of War - "Old Theory in a New Era"

The mentioned views can also be complemented by some of the most representative traditional interpretations of the causes of wars, which remain relevant to the current state of international relations. The representative of classical realistic theory, Kenneth Waltz, categorizes the causes of wars into three levels - the man, the state and the international system. The first level is related to the behavior of man and his rooted warrior nature. War, above all, is a product of man, not a natural or divine condition. Human imperfection, selfishness as well as aggressive instincts (which vary by gender, age and individual) are causes of violence and war. The urge for power is the cause of confrontation and violence because people want certain things such as objects, amenities and etc. (Waltz, 2018). Many scholars support the thesis that the problem of war and peace is in the hands of leaders and ruling elites most responsible for their country's politics and for international politics. The politics of statesmen, as well as interests and actions, are the product of temperaments, experiences, reason, and circumstances facing. As in the past and today, leaders have different ambitions to gain greater power, wealth, influence, status or aspire to change or to rule the world. Some statesmen are driven by atavistic impulses and associations with important historical figures (e.g., emperors, kings, tsars, sultans) initiate wars to preserve their militaristic tradition and their position, risking the future of their country and people. With the coming of power of psychologically unstable individuals, with political manipulations or as historical coincidence, it increases the possibilities for confrontation and the outbreak of wars. Not coincidentally, due to the concentration of power in the hands of one person or government, certain wars have become personalized – such as Napoleonic wars, Hitler's wars, Saddam's wars, Clinton's, Bush's and Putin's wars.

The second level refers to the internal organization of the state and its structure as a cause of war. Given that wars are fought between states it is necessary to reform states in order to reduce or eliminate wars forever. In this sense, various contents are indicated that should be the subject of reform. Karl Marx believed that this is the ownership of the means of production, and Marxists are convinced that capitalist states are the cause of war and that through revolutions and the destruction of capitalism, and the construction of socialism, peace will be established. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant hoped that a world with republican governments would be free from war, that is, that liberal republics would be more hesitant on issues related to warfare than countries led by dictators who go to war with everyone (Nacev and Nachevski, 2000). One of the dominant contemporary theses is that "a world composed of liberal democracies should have fewer motives for war" (the idea that democracies do not wage war on each other) (Fukuyama, 1992). However, statistically, in recent decades, democratic countries have been much more involved in wars with other countries than autocratic countries. They have very easily started "democrat-

ic wars" (with political manipulation⁴ and public disapproval, and with illegitimacy from international organizations) in those countries (such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, etc.) that did not accept Western liberal democracy and mostly ended only with a change of the regime (removal of a leader), rather than systemic transformation or the establishment of democratic peace and order. The contemporary democratic wars in which Western countries have participated are not wars for survival and greater security, but wars of their own choice to create a new political order. On the other hand, the "third wave of autocratization" is increasingly deepening and spreading, and faith in the democratic model of governance is continuously declining. Currently, there are 88 democracies and 91 autocracies worldwide, with nearly three quarters of the world's population, or 72% (5.8 billion people) living in autocratic countries (Nord, et al., 2025). We argue that multiple factors influence the decision whether a state will participate in wars, and they relate to the type of government, the size of the state, the ruling ideology, economic capacities, military power and public awareness of citizens. For example, the two most powerful military and economic powers in the world, the United States and China, have different political systems and a different systemic approach, one superpower is inclined towards the policy of war, and the other towards the policy of peace. The United States is considered the most warlike nation in the history of the world, which has spent only 16 years of its existence in peace, in contrast to authoritarian communist China, which has not been at war with anyone since 1979 (Wilkins, 2019).

The last level of Waltz's analysis is related to the nature of the international system as a cause of war, where states are the main subjects. The problem lies in the fact that states are guided by their national interests, ambitions, priorities and decide how they will act on the international stage. The absence of an effective international organization or supranational authority (which would have the characteristics of a world government that would be able to regulate the behavior of states), allows state actors to use force. The author believes that wars do not occur due to the open intention of states to wage war, but due to the lack of organized force that would successfully prevent the outbreak and conduct of war. He focuses on the balance of power and the creation of alliances as realistic responses to the security dilemma of states in the international system (Waltz, 2018).

At the same time, there are evident efforts to limit international anarchy and the incentives for war through the prism of the engagements of international organizations and groups such as the UN, EU, NATO and G7. Although some of these organizations were ineffective in preventing wars, there were still efforts to organize the world on the foundations of justice and law. Today, there is

⁴The manipulation of information by the United States related to the war in Iraq left doubts that have long affected their foreign and security policy. The Bush administration's misperception of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is considered the main reason for the war, as well as imposing its personal position on the military invasion on international organizations (UN, NATO, EU) and manipulating their decisions.

an increased need to create new effective international organizations or reform existing organizations to promote supranational mechanisms and capacities for the prevention of wars and armed conflicts. Because the international system is in a state of imbalance where states are dissatisfied with the territorial, political and economic status quo, they are increasingly inclined towards expansion and starting wars. The expressed distrust and uncertainty forced states to engage in an arms race, increase defense spending, conquer territory and strengthen military-defense alliances.

The Russo-Ukrainian war served as a trigger for the restructuring and reshaping of the existing international system, which relies on outdated organizations and institutions that have existed for about eighty years. Currently, in this transitional phase that resembles more of a “non-polar world” than a multipolar world, there is no single force capable of mobilizing other states around its agenda. This means that no state can be a security guarantor or a global leader that will control the behavior of state actors, leaving every actor free to challenge any other in international relations (Cronin and Oakley, 2009).

War as a Political-Ideological Instrument

War is studied from many perspectives, with the most relevant and dominant being the political approach to war, which is based on the position of the Prussian military theorist Carl von Clausewitz. According to him, “war is the continuation of politics by other means”, and is a political instrument mainly in the hands of the state, and more recently, it has also been considered as a means in the hands of the government and leaders to achieve political goals (Clausewitz, 1976). This means that war and politics are in a mutual “marriage” relationship, regardless of whether war is observed as a means or as the ultimate goal of politics. Also, for the former Chinese leader Mao Tse-tung, “war is politics and war itself is a political action, which has its own special characteristics, but cannot be identified with politics”. For him, “politics is war without bloodshed, while war is politics with bloodshed” (Tse-tung, 1938). The idea that war is a servant of politics (of “general politics” or of “specific politics”), or more precisely of “Realpolitik”, is also analyzed by Martin van Creveld, according to whom there are political and non-political (for justice, religion and survival) wars. Following Clausewitz’s theory, he points out that waging war must be a subject, if not of politicians, then of political considerations. Second, war must be waged solely for political reasons, and third, politics must constitute the most important criterion by which the outcome of one war is assessed and the next war is prepared. These ideas are widely accepted in contemporary strategic thought in developed countries, and some are almost taken “for granted” (Creveld, 1991).

Namely, war always begins under political conditions and is driven by political motives, and the political goal is the initial motive for war and represents a standard that will determine the engagement of military force. However,

the political goal changes depending on the newly emerging circumstances, and it can be occupation of territory, destruction of enemy forces, or total victory. Accordingly, Clausewitz emphasizes that “every age had its own kind of war, its own limiting conditions, and its own peculiar preconceptions”, alluding to the changing character of war in different time periods and circumstances (Clausewitz, 1976). With the change in politics, ideology and the interests of states that change from time to time, it is difficult to predict the character of war and the way of warfare in the future (Karlin, 2024).

The trinity of war, politics and interests has been closely linked since the time of Machiavelli to the present day. Politicians often use the term “national interest” when seeking support for starting a war. It is known that every state is ready to defend its interests by using military force, because only interests are “eternal and perpetual”, and allies and enemies change depending on circumstances and needs. Therefore, when it comes to national interests, states act more according to Clausewitz’s rules than according to Kant’s rules (Cooper, 2004). Survival, security and welfare represent the most important interests of states, for which there are no compromises and generally in their “name” military spending increases and the militaristic mentality is justified as a driver in domestic and foreign policy. In international relations, states strive to promote their values and achieve national interests and goals, which will inevitably lead to wars and conflicts in those zones or spheres where their interests clash or overlap.

Alexander Nikitin emphasizes that war is a clash of interests that in most cases are of a political nature and relate to various forms of power and dominance of certain political actors over others. Hence, the political causes of war are associated with both internal state politics (redistribution of power among groups, classes, elites and leaders, forms of governance), and to international (interstate) politics (borders and territories, access to resources, alliances, international agreements and obligations). Most often, political interests are related to the economy, such as the distribution and allocation of resources, finances, territory, etc. Hence, there are not only political wars or only economic wars (expressed through economic sanctions, embargoes or trade blockades), but a combination of both (Nikitin, 2001). In the contemporary political community, the term “political war or warfare” refers to “the synchronized use of any aspect of national power short of overt conventional warfare—such as intelligence assets, alliance building, financial tools, diplomatic relations, technological and information dominance to achieve state objectives” (Theohary and Weiss, 2023). For example, Russia uses energy as a political weapon; the United States and China use economics and trade as political weapons and for political influence in international relations; Iran uses proxy strategies and means of influence throughout the Middle East; North Korea relies on its nuclear power as leverage in world politics.

In the current international security environment, political war is also associated with the terms strategic competition, rivalry and ideology, empha-

sizing the importance of the non-military dimension. Political antagonisms and conflicts of interest do not lead to war until the ideological competition between states intensifies. Ideology is one of the most controversial terms that is mainly used as a political weapon to condemn and criticize opposing beliefs. The clash between opposing ideologies such as capitalism and communism, democracy and authoritarianism, nationalism and internationalism led to tensions that catapulted the world into a period of constant conflict, that is, led to a new era of endless war. Compared to territorial or other types of wars, the goal of political-ideological wars is the neutralization and transformation of the enemy country, as well as the imposition of one's own will on the opponent. For many, the Cold War represented more a war of ideologies than a war between military forces (Chomsky, 1992). The main motive was the elimination of the political threat (from communism), while at the beginning of the 21st century attention was focused on the global war against terrorist and extremist ideology. At the start of this decade, the world entered a period of intense ideological turmoil between democrats and autocrats. Such ideological division stimulated debates about political restructuring and the creation of a new post-liberal international order. The war in Ukraine had a huge impact on this situation, which not only forced policymakers to reconsider their visions of the world's future but also to draw strategic and ideological lines of separation. The new geopolitical reality resembles the old bipolar confrontation (or a Second Cold War), as the world is once again fragmented into political-ideological and security-military blocs. On one side are the Western democratic countries (led by the USA and EU), whose ideology is based on the principles of democracy, human rights and freedoms and the liberal market; on the other side are Eastern autocratic countries such as Russia, Belarus, China and North Korea, whose alliance is based on socialist ideology, anti-hegemony, and the promotion of anti-Western values.

As previously stated, the waging wars is a subject for analysis by politicians, because wars are ultimately a political decision. Political leaders decide when and how wars will end, not military leaders (Creveld, 1991). Therefore, war as an instrument of politicians is considered in a broader context, through the prism of political ambitions, private (business) interests, vanity and egoism of those who rule. The practice of politics is strongly influenced by the visions and ideals held by political leaders. In the modern era, military-political-ideological governance of the world has regained significance primarily due to the Machiavellian and antagonistic attitudes of current world leaders. Some, driven by politics of power, steering their countries in a diametrically opposed direction to national interests and the policies of allies and international organizations. Such an example is the new U.S. ideology (known as "Trumpism")⁵,

⁵"Trumpism" is a political movement in the United States that encompasses political ideologies associated with US President Donald Trump. Its ideology is based on right-wing populism, anti-globalism and economic nationalism and is characterized by significant illiberal, authoritarian, and even neo-fascist beliefs. The current US administration uses ideological constructs in political discourse such as "Make America Great Again"

which represents a policy of American nationalism, strengthening of sovereignty, protectionist trade policy, non-interventionism and implementation of anti-immigration policy, which is contrary to the ideals and principles of democracy, economic liberalism and the rule of law (Gnesotto, 2025). This destructive ideology is aimed at destroying alliances, balances and rules, as well as the liberal international order based on economic openness, multilateral institutions, security and military cooperation, democratic solidarity and internationalist ideals – which the United States historically protected and promoted (Ikenberry, 2017).

In fact, the new revisionist ideology that is reshaping the international system and order does not respect national borders and the sovereignty of other states and creates a different world without “rules of the game” where the main driver is the politics of power and dominance. Proponents of this ideology believe that their nation and culture are superior and the most important in the world, and therefore their national interests should come before the interests of other countries in the world. Examples of this are the territorial ambitions of US President Donald Trump to take over the Panama Canal and Greenland, unite with Canada, as well as to start a global trade war; Russian President Vladimir Putin’s⁶ efforts to revise the European geopolitical order established after the Cold War (through a “special military operation” to demilitarize and denazify Ukraine, creating ideological constructs of Russia as an anti-fascist, anti-colonial power and defender of traditional values); and the Chinese political leadership’s attempts to reshape the Asian and world order by promoting “socialism with Chinese characteristics”.

Such revisionist ideologies have caused global upheavals, conflicts, and mistrust, pushing war to its extreme limits. They are so powerful that they create distorted images and visions of the new post-liberal world order and relations between states, forcing us to believe that war is rational despite its destructive consequences. Hence, the prospects for peaceful transformation of the international system are increasingly unlikely, as every state strives to maximize its power and influence. It is almost, practically, impossible to avoid or eliminate war in a multipolar world where one or more political ideologies seek domina-

(MAGA) and “America First” (which is similar to the Nazi ideological slogan “Germany above all, above all else in the world”), with which it has caused global upheavals and conflicts with traditional allies, and has emboldened its opponents. Among other things, Trumpism emphasizes and promotes the U.S. withdrawal from international organizations and treaties.

⁶“Putinism” is the state ideology of Russia under the leadership of President Vladimir Putin. It represents a personalized autocracy (rule by one individual), where the idea of neo-imperialist and nationalist etatism alongside a messianic image of Russia as a great power and civilizational state are exalted. Beyond etatism, a key pillar of this ideology is the historical struggle against the West, the preservation of traditional values, as well as the return of the tsarist empire and the sphere of influence that Russia once held in Europe.

tion and world governance, and achieving lasting peace through coercion or the politics of war is even more improbable and difficult.

Conclusion

Our understanding of the nature of war must be adapted to the context of the changed international security environment and the various trends that contribute to its manifestation. Numerous factors have encouraged the internationalization of war in the 21st century, primarily as a result of the dynamics of modern globalization which blur the distinctions between internal and external, political and economic, war and peace. Therefore, the causes of wars today are more pronounced and diverse, which should be viewed through the prism of the role of humans as political beings, of state actors as the main political subjects in international relations, and the role of international organizations and institutions whose efficiency has gradually weakened over the past decades. The experiences from past wars and those of recent times such as the wars between Russia and Ukraine, Israel and Hamas, and the numerous armed conflicts in Africa, lead more to the danger of permanent global militarization and chaos in international relations, rather than to the establishment of lasting peace.

Given that “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun”, or that “politics and ideology are only as strong as the military,” it can be concluded that states and political leaderships will continue to pursue the strengthening of a militaristic mentality and military power as essential instruments for achieving national interests and political goals. In this context, it is imperative that states, governments, and leaders to make fundamental changes in their approach to war, re-evaluating their policies, ideas and views on war and its consequences. We believe that the approach to wars must be considered within a broader context between opposing geopolitics, different ambitions and visions, clashes of ideologies, and diverse national interests which will determine the character of wars and the way of warfare in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Bauman, Z. (2001). "Voinite v erata na globalizaciata ". Sociologeski problemi 1-2.
- Brennan, H. and Durmaz, M. (2024). "Global conflict zones grow by two thirds since 2021, topping 6 million km²". Political Risk Outlook. Verisk Maplecroft. Available at: <https://www.maplecroft.com/products-and-solutions/geopolitical-and-country-risk/insights/conflict-zones-grow-by-two-thirds-globally-since-2021-covering-6-million-km2/> [Accessed 8 April 2025]
- Butler, D.S. (1935). War is a Racket. New York: Round Table Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1992). What Uncle Sam Really Wants. Odonian Press, Berkeley CA, USA.
- Clausewitz, C. (1976). On War. Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, R. (2004). The Breaking of the Nations: Order and chaos in the twenty-first century. Atlantic Monthly Press, First Edition.
- Creveld, M. (1991). The Transformation of War. The Free Press, New York.
- Cronin, P. and Oakley, R. (2009). "A Nonpolar World?" in: Global Strategic Assessment 2009: America's security role in a changing world. Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). The End of History and the Last Man, Penguin Books.
- Ganser, D. (2016). Illegale Kriege, Wie die NATO-Länder die UNO sabotieren. Eine Chronik von Cuba bis Syrien. Orell Füssli Verlag AG Zurich.
- Gnesotto, N. (2025). "Trumpism, the new revisionist ideology of the century". Notre Europe-Institut Jacques Delors. Available at: https://institutdelors.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/BP_250213_Trumpisme_Gnesotto_EN.pdf [Accessed 19 March 2025]
- Huntington, S. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster.
- Ikenberry, J. (2017). "The Plot Against American Foreign Policy: Can the Liberal Order Survive? ". Foreign Affairs, May/June. Available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-04-17/plot-against-american-foreign-policy> [Accessed 23 March 2025]
- Institute for Economics & Peace. Global Peace Index 2024: Measuring Peace in a Complex World, Sydney, June 2024. Available at: <http://visionofhumanity.org/resources> [Accessed 14 March 2025].

- Kaldor, M. (2013). "In Defence of New Wars ". *Stability*, 2(1): 4, pp. 1-16. Available at:DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/sta.at>. [Accessed3April 2025]
- Kalin, I. (2015). "War, peace and national interest ". Available at:[Accessed29January 2025]
- Karlin, M. (2024). "The Return of Total War: Understanding and Preraring for a New Era of Comprehensive Conflict ". *Foreign Affairs. Nov/Dec Vol.103 Issue 6*, pp: 8-19. Available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ukraine/return-total-war-karlin#> [Accessed7February 2025]
- Kegley, W.C. and Wittkopf, R.E. (2000). *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. Wadsworth Publishing, 8th edition.
- Klare, M. (2002). *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*. Holt Paperbacks, First Edition.
- Nacev, Z. and Nachevski, R. (2000). *Vojna, mir i bezbednost. Kumanovo: Makedonska riznica*.
- Nikitin, A. (2001). "Political and Economic Causes of War ", in: *Eliminating the Causes of War*, Pugwash Occasional Papers Vol.2 No.3.
- Nord, Marina, David Altman, Fabio Angiolillo, Tiago Fernandes, Ana Good God, and Staffan I. Lindberg(2025). *Democracy Report 2025: 25 Years of Autocratization – Democracy Trumped?* University of Gothenburg: V-Dem Institute.Available at: https://www.v-dem.net/documents/54/v-em_dr_2025_lowres_v1.pdf[Accessed4April 2025]
- Odora, C. (1999). "In the Seas with the Sharks:Experiencing Globalization - An African Perspective" in: Utne B.and Garbo G., *Globalization on Whose Terms?* University of Oslo, Report No.5: 234-260.
- Parmar, I. and Hooper, S. (2022). "American power elite and War-Making in the Post-Cold War Era ". Available at: <https://cscr.pk/explore/themes/defense-security/american-power-elite-and-war-making-in-the-post-cold-war-era/> [Accessed 15 March 2025]
- Pavlovic, V. (2009). *Društveni pokreti i promene*. JP Službeni glasnik i JP Zavod za udžbenike.Beograd.
- Theohary, C. and Weiss, M. (2023). "What Is "Political Warfare"?" Congressional Research Service. Available at:<https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF11127>[Accessed28March 2025]
- Tse-tung, M. (1938). *On Protracted War. Selected Works, Vol. II*. Available at:https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_09.htm[Accessed17 April 2025]
- Vankovska, B. (2011). *Megjunarodna bezbednost: kriticki pristap*. Skopje: Filozofski fakultet.

-
- Waltz, K. (2018). *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. Columbia University Press.
 - Wilkins, B. (2019). "Jimmy Carter: US 'Most Warlike Nation in History of the World'". *Common Dreams*. Available at: <https://www.commondreams.org/views/2019/04/18/jimmy-carter-us-most-warlike-nation-history-world> [Accessed 14 January 2025]
 - Wolin, S. (2004). *Politics and vision*. Princeton University Press.