

## **Geopolitics and Geostrategy - a “historical roadmap” to a New World Order**

*Assoc. prof. Katerina Veljanovska Blazhevska, PhD*

*veljanovska\_katerina@yahoo.com*

*MIT University – Skopje, Faculty of Security Science (North Macedonia )*

### **ABSTRACT**

Within the analysis presented in the book “The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives”, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the author, diplomat and political scientist, is determining the coordinates of future world developments, and he pays special attention to the analysis of China’s positions [1]. Namely, he analyses that despite all the efforts for an accelerated development, this inhabited country continues to grow its national income by three times by 2020, but it will still be a poor country.

Following, it alludes to the fact that the world is entering new global dimensions that are difficult to be realistically predict, as they depend on several existing factors, and above all the level of technological development, economic impact and aspirations for the future alliances.

In this regard, the future geo-political scene is influenced by numerous opportunities for the creation of new alliances, attempts to build multilateralism, in order to see the real relations of power, which in turn lead to the reorganization of the international relations.

**KEYWORDS:** Geopolitics, Geostrategy, World order, Change

Received: 20/03/2022

Revised : 07/04/2022

Accepted: 18/04/2022

**Introduction** .New global problems are beyond the reach of nation-states, on the basis of which traditional geopolitical issues are unlikely to be able to address the emerging challenges of the disappearance of a fundamental geopolitical system based on the existence of a global power. Each country needs to rethink its internal vision and values in order to set out an external strategy for alliances and global representation, taking into account that there is a real possibility of changing the course of the global order [2].

However, questions arise as to whether the horizons of the world political scene are clearly presented; is there a sufficiently precise vision of global political actors; as well as the extent to which national countries have a degree of geostrategic understanding of the real situation, on the basis of which it is necessary to take future steps.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the presentation and projection of contemporary processes and possible challenges facing the global political scene, especially given the existing geopolitical and geostrategic position and the possible need to redefine it.

The existing dynamics of international relations point to a series of moves, initiated by globally important actors, yet unpredictable or unplanned by existing alliances. These are strategic trends that have the potential to change the course, not only of the global politics but also of the way of understanding international law and the dimension of its perception and application [3].

For a long time in history after the Second World War and geopolitical and geostrategic reshaping, the primacy of the leadership was given to the American society, which dynamically responded to all the challenges within the international relations, and was the main generator for resolving all of the crisis situations and tensions [4]. However, the impact of a change in the strategic approach of US foreign policy, especially with changes in the presidency, has over time created objective difficulties for this type of leadership on a long-term basis. Euro-Atlantic relations have greatly contributed to the visibility of US policy in Europe, and the NATO alliance has a special role to play. Still, is that enough for the world? New pretensions, technical-technological development, economic challenges have created a different need for, above all, an understanding of globalization, and further its verification in reality.

Within the framework of this paper, an qualitative analysis of existing facts and future projections is presented in connection with setting the geopolitical and geostrategic challenges, as well as the need for new roles in the world political scene.

## **Geopolitics and geostrategy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – the new frame of the “balance of power”**

The term “geopolitics” has a far more elastic meaning than the “balance of power”. However, as in the case of a balance of power, there is an essence that everyone agrees on in principle: the influence of the geography is decisive in directing foreign policy. Beyond this there is no agreement [5].

According with the above, two special schools of thought develop from beliefs in the importance of geography. One factor of geography is observed within the state reason, in essentially as an extension of the balance of power, and recognizes the limitations on the exercise of power determined by spatial factors; the other school considers geography to determine the nature of the state, thus determining the direction of foreign policy independently of the state reasons. While the first focuses on the constraints imposed by geographical area, the second rationalizes the process of state expansion as a fact of life [6,p.118].

The balance of power, as a concept, was supposed to limit the threat that one would or several countries could represent the European system of states. That will say it is the concept that recognize a certain interest above the state, though only for the sake of a clearly defined one goal [7]. Geopolitics as a worldview has not only expanded the range of calculations in terms of distance, but actually increased the needs of the state and decreased, if not completely removed, parallel needs. According to Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher, the state becomes a legal entity. Furthermore, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, also a German philosopher, elevated into logical abstraction. Moreover, leading creators of anthropomorphic geopolitics, have turned the state into an organism supplied with life and needs.

Following, there is a realistic conclusion to a spectrum of thought about international relations that is with great benefit tried to put the behaviour of states in context of geographical constraints and dynamics.

According to Spykman and Rollins, boundary changes, which are a physical manifestation of the dynamics of expansion, are not the only indicator of a change within the power balance [8]. Given the above, the area of international relations is like a field of forces corresponding to the magnetic field. Moreover, at any given moment, certain great forces act in it as poles. Changes in the relative strength of these poles or the emergence of new poles will change field and the reverse direction of the force. Reorientation or redistribution of small forces in such a field may be the first result of a change in the balance of power between the great forces.

Geopolitics, in its theoretical explanation, is aimed at solving problems and the practice of governing a certain area. However, the complexities of the international scene and global political life are changing the course of perception of the future experience of geopolitics, especially the strategic approach it promotes [9].

However, geopolitics is a much broader and more complex issue than it is understood in classical geopolitics. All countries in the world are organized on a certain territory and their foreign policy strategy

and practice are to some extent adopted by geographical factors, primarily by their position. On the other hand, foreign policy strategy is based on the geographical interpretation of the world, which relies on geopolitical analysis [10].

In parallel, it is important to analyse the geostrategic position of a country in a regional (world) context. Moreover, geostrategic interests exist between: the great powers, their political and security strategies for a certain area and the possibility of endangering the security of the countries located in that area, as victims between the geostrategic (political games) of the USA, Russia and other world players [11]. It's important to notice that all of this requires a continuous analysis of the complexity of the security conflicts in a given period of time. As an example, it can be complex answers to the genesis of old and new Balkan conflicts, their goals and actors.

### **The challenge of globalization – existing facts and the need for remodeling**

Globalization – economically and on a cultural level, reduces the importance of the national borders. In that direction, it is difficult to make future projections and forecasts, primarily due to the dynamism. Even within economy, scientists are in opportunity to make either a short-term or a medium-term forecast. There are some opinions that the UN is starting to lose its authority within the global politics [12]. It seems possible that the visions for the future world order more often depends on the need of change than on the stability of the geopolitical landscape. So-called “common sense” cannot help understanding the future.

Accordingly, a large number of so-called “Geopolitical forecasts” fail to be realized, despite the declared goals and intentions of their creators, who aspire to identify political, social, economic, cultural and military tendencies and geopolitical barriers that limit possible developments, as well as predict the main events that may occur in the observed future [13].

Analyzing George Friedman’s geopolitical vision, U.S. geopolitical forecaster and strategist on international affairs, it can be uncovered the hidden ideas and assumptions about American national interests, potential perceptions of threats and possible reactions, based on a combination of fears, systems of believing and interpreting trends. Emphasis should be placed on the very fact that one of the most inclusive futurists with a shocking view of what lies ahead for the United States and the world, in fact, pays no attention to international peace as it tries to mobilize the nation to face possible dangers in the future to come [14].

Following, the general challenge is to be aware of national stereotypes and other relevant issues. There is no one that can provide the future forecast of future developments, free from prejudice, bias or fixed political beliefs and attitudes deeply rooted within national history and myths, because the futurist himself shares basic understandings of the world, international relations, and is influenced by national histories and geographies [15]. Furthermore, long-term forecasts attract wide public attention, not only because of their elegance, but also because testing their accuracy and achievement is impossible for those who read them.

In addition, alliances have had a major impact on international relations. As a result, states would not form or maintain alliances if they did not serve state interests that might not otherwise be achievable. Numerous studies have concluded that alliances have been key to the outbreak, spread, and outcome of military conflicts. Moreover, according to Stephen Waltz, American political scientist, the creation and cohesion of international alliances can have profound effects on the security of individual states and help determine the likelihood and possible outcome of war [16].

There are at least two potential problems with precisely defining alliances. Initially, it was an expanse of scope for a security agreement between the states. Particular emphasis is placed on the need to see the difference between alliances on the one hand and collective security agreements on the other, which implies substantially different orientations. Alliances are primarily, if not exclusively, externally oriented in order to improve the security of members vis-a-vis external parties. Collective security agreements and related phenomena are diametrically different, such as arms control agreements that are supposed to improve security between members [17].

On the other hand, the inability to distinguish different forms of security cooperation is emphasized. The main point is that the security concept is constantly being reformulated. In this regard, alliances may be limited to supportive diplomacy or economic assistance in addition to security objectives. However, what separates alliances from security treaties is the importance they attach to the military form of aid, especially the use of force.

### **Changes and the new course of geopolitical movement**

What can be expected from the world change? There are strongly believes that the world is never going to be the same in several points. On a geopolitical and geostrategic basis, the world is experiencing changes in continuity, which are additionally accompanied by socio-economic and cultural aspects of the masses of the population. At any time, it changes, not only in the evolutionary terms, but does it every day, in all the areas, in the political, economic, biological, ecological and scientific terms. With its unlimitedly different forms and occurrences, the world still moves towards its wholeness [18].

In geopolitical and geostrategic terms, the world is entering in a new era of challenges. Globalization, in its intellection, is not the same reading that was known to and processed by a series of theoreticians, analysts, and global actors, who skillfully used its achievements to justify their activities.

The Covid-19 pandemics has largely contributed to thinking “out of the box” while striving towards new horizons of analysis and interpretation of the humane dimension of the living. To this direction, new ways of protection of the personal, social, global interests occur in continuity, above all based on the influence

of various external actions, all this towards overcoming some limits that obstruct the achievement of the goals set.

### **New strategic compass – the global actors of changes**

If one speaks of global actors, the same context undoubtedly also mentions the European Union, which should still make some change under these newly created conditions, not only initiate mutual cooperation with Member States but work on setting a new strategic compass in its long-term functioning. The European Union should develop its personal mission as a global actor. That also means that that the democratic capacities should be strengthened [19]. Furthermore, that means that a more effective cooperation with the United States should be initiated, in relation to coping with the existing and future global challenges. Furthermore, in institutions such as NATO and EU, one cannot call a lawyer for certain issues that have not been implemented. Simply, one should work according to the set principles, ensure positive lobbying in relation to proclaiming one's national interests and policies until positive practices and changes have been achieved. This is not easy, though it is manageable with a lot of effort, dedication and positive affirmation. What is required to be considered and understood additionally is that in the new globalization frame and arrangement, each region promotes different aspects of cooperation. Despite this, an even higher level of correlation with the set goals is required, based on the need for a series of essential changes within the global political scene [20].

Strategic goals should especially express the focus on climatic changes, migration, and multilateralism. Currently, two parallel scenarios are occurring in the world: growth of populism in terms of encouraging the national identity, and growth of migrants and the need of additional policy on the national, regional and global levels [21].

### **Developing and creating and new world roles**

The world is facing with order of roles. More precisely, it is about developing and creating new roles with greater participation and imagination, without ignoring global changes, especially in terms of power and progress [22]. Issues that should be dedicated time and research are as follows: what is happening with the current formations and alliances, what is the future like? Following, it is necessary to analyze the capacity of the EU to cope with the newly emerging conditions observed, in the democratic, security and socio-economic terms. Moreover, all of that has its own impact and importance within the geopolitical frame and terms. As an explanation, there is still no clear, precise answer for future formations within the global tectonic movements on the political world scene, and yet, all this must initiate two aspects of analysis, i.e. whether the right activities are taken and whether this takes place in the right manner. One should look more deeply to the missions undertaken so far for preservation of the world peace and order, care for the population,

ecology, as well as the economic challenges, all with a purpose of being able to say that the lesson is learned [23].

A question to governments would be to what extent they are directed to and involved in coping with the policy of the regions, above all from the aspect of loyalty to the set ideals for co-habitation and cooperation. Also, the position of China as a great global player is unavoidable and it should be taken into account when creating the global political scene. Following, if there can be said that everybody plays according to the established rules, still, it is not only for the system, this requires initiatives, reforms etc., so that political commitment and dedication is shown. This means that the specific focus concerning global actors should be expanded, not only to countries and regions but companies and corporations and their contribution, as well as to individuals with the established integrity [24]. In that case, one can already speak of added value, and thus give contribution to the economies of small countries as well, more precisely, to see how “added value” is realistic against what could be achieved with joint commitment and specific measures [5].

The main point of all the above might be that it is already very difficult to make distinction of areas of action in the international dimension. Concerning some obligations, the global actors can only access multilaterally, is positive outcome is to be expected [26]. Simply, all this is only a process of learning within the frameworks of which the challenge is sometimes on the national level and quite often requires a wider, external action [27]. At the end of the day, there is the public that should be convinced in procedures of its leaders, as well as in the achieved goals.

**Conclusion** .Alliances are formed in order to realize the internal interests of the states, which are not able to realize them independently, ie without the help of other states. The states form alliances in order to unite their military capabilities and thus improve their military security position. Therefore, the more vulnerable countries are exposed to the alliance according to their needs, especially when many auxiliary countries are confronted. Basically, countries are free to join alliances, but the new challenges on the global political scene (such as the current events in Ukraine) point to certain facts that allies are often influenced by neighbors’ aspirations, which may hinder certain developments and the prosperity of the countries in the region.

After the end of the Student War, many analysts thought that the NATO alliance would soon disintegrate, because there were no longer any reasons for its existence. But after the terrorist attacks in 2001, the US alliance is facing new challenges by deploying troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, which is improving the so-called “identity crisis”. However, the events that follow in 2021 and the beginning of 2022, with the withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan, as well as the beginning of the military escalation in Ukraine by Russia, point to the urgent need to reorganize the world political order. Therefore, it is especially related to the fact that the respect for the international law is not fully expressed. Following, it is necessary to redefine the terminology, globalization, geostrategy and geopolitics in order to contribute

to the need for the emergence of a world of roles, which will emphasize not only the national entity of the country but also the role of the individual.

## References

- [1] Z. Brzezinski ,*The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*.New York: Basic Books. 2016
- [2] Oxford Analytica. Pivotal powers: Politics and prosperity in a volatile world. Oxford: Oxford Analytica. <https://www.oxan.com/analysis/dailybrief/pivotalpowers/default.aspx> 2013. [Accessed Feb. 22, 2022].
- [3] S. Reich,and R. Ned Lebow ,*Good-Bye Hegemony! Power and Influence in the Global System*. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [4] Z. Brezezinski and B. Scowcroft, *America and the World: Conversations on the Future of American Foreign Policy*. New York: Basic Books, 2008.
- [5] J. Mattis, *Summary of the National Defense Strategy of The United States of America*. Washington: Department of Defense, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://nssarchive.us/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2018-National-Defense-StrategySummary.pdf> [Accessed Feb. 22, 2022].
- [6] R. Niebuhr,*The children of light and the children of darkness* . New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.1944.
- [7] S.G. Brooks, and W. C. Wohlforth. *World out of balance: International relationsand the challenge of American primacy*,Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2008
- [8] N. Spykmani , and A. Rollins, “Geographical Objectives in Foreign Policy”, I, *ibid.*, tom 33, br. 3, *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 33, no. 3 (Jun., 1939), pp. 391-410,1939.
- [9] J. Agnew, K. Mitchell, G. Toal, and eds., *A Companion to Political Geography*.Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- [10] T. Gravelle, B. J. Reifler, and T. J. Scotto. “The Structure of Foreign Policy in Transatlantic Perspective: Comparing the United States, United Kingdom, France, and Germany,” *European Journal of Political Research* 56:4, 2017.
- [11] J. Crampton, and S. Elden,(eds.), *Space, Knowledge and Power*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- [12] J. Agnew, *Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005.

- [13] L. Grinin, and A.V. Korotayev, *Great Divergence and Great Convergence. A Global Perspective*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [14] R. Kagan, *The World America Made*. New York: Vintage, 2013.
- [15] L. Grinin, and A. Korotayev, "Does 'Arab Spring' Mean the Beginning of World System Reconfiguration? World Futures," *The Journal of Global Education* vol.68, no 7, pp. 471-505, 2012.
- [16] S. M. Walt, "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power," *International Security* Vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 3-43, Spring, 1985.
- [17] R.L. Schweller, "Unanswered threats. A neoclassical realist theory of underbalancing," *International Security*, Vol.29, no.2, pp.159-201, 2014.
- [18] J. Mattis, "Nuclear Posture" Review February, [Online]. Available: <https://media.defense.gov/2018/Feb/02/2001872886/-1/-1/1/2018-NUCLEAR-POSTUREREVIEW-FINAL-REPORT.PDF>). [Accessed Feb. 23, 2022].
- [19] J. Mueller, *The Stupidity of War: American Foreign Policy and the Case for Complacency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [20] W. Jannace, and T. Paul, "A New World Order: The Rule of Law, or the Law of Rulers?," *Fordham International Law Journal*. Vol. 42, no. 5, 2019.
- [21] R.Chase, Hill, S. E. B., and P. Kennedy, "Pivotal states and U.S. strategy." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.75, no.1, pp. 33-51, 1996.
- [22] T.L. Friedman, "Order vs. disorder", part 3. INYT. 2014. [Online]. Available: [https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/24/opinion/sunday/thomas-l-friedman-order-vs-disorder-part-3.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/24/opinion/sunday/thomas-l-friedman-order-vs-disorder-part-3.html?_r=0) [Accessed Feb. 21, 2022].
- [23] H. Kissinger, *World order*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004
- [24] L., Wieseltier, *Obama was wrong. The era of humanitarian intervention is not Over*. New Republic. 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/119238/obama-was-wrong-erahumanitarian-intervention-not-over> [Accessed Feb. 21, 2022].
- [25] J-A. Davies, "Clashing Civilizations or Conflicting Interests?," *Geopolitics*, Vol. 13, 2008.
- [26] D. Acemoglu, and J. Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. New York: Crown, 2012
- [27] B. Brake, B. Katzenstein, "Lost in translation? Nonstate actors and the transnational movement of procedural law," *International Organization* ,67pp.725-57, 2013.