



# Geopolitics of Chaos and Geopolitical Vacuum

Current conflicts in the global geopolitical order of power

**Abstract:** The paper elaborates on the current geopolitical issues with potential far-reaching consequences for establishing the future order of power in international relations, as well as on the geopolitical powers themselves. The paper will analyze primarily the existing and potential crisis hotspots, as well as the changes occurring after US President Donald Trump came to power, and anticipations of potential results and consequences of the changes he initiated in his second presidential mandate. Moreover, attention will also be drawn to the analysis of the current position of large geopolitical powers with the already proven status of rivals, competitors and disputers of decades-long domination and hegemony of the Atlanticist West. In addition, we will try to answer the question about the possible end of the globalization era and the potential emergence of the post-globalization order.

**Keywords:** geopolitics, international order, power, crisis hotspots, globalization

The unipolar geopolitical order of power which definitely acknowledged the Atlanticist domination is symbolically marked by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the unification of Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic). The United States of America prepared its unipolar domination and hegemony even earlier by destroying (or, according to some Serbian and Western authors who intentionally use a more neutral term, *dissolving*) the Soviet Union and, thus,

the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact as a military and political alliance. Before that, during the period of the so-called Cold War and bipolar world order, these very political and military formations had for decades maintained a certain balance of power in international relations, and, in geopolitical terms, the balance of military power as well. All processes of economic-political and state degradation and complete structural destruction of the main rival of Atlanticism were prepared long and secretly, under

[1] ljubisadespotovic1962@gmail.com ; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0473-2829>

the codename “Harvard Project” (Petrov, 2020, p. 48), with disastrous consequences to the so-called Soviet bloc. Other international political structures, economic institutions and global organizations founded after the Second World War (the OUN, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Arab League, the Organization of African Unity, OSCE etc.), which had for decades tried and partly managed to rein the overall power of the Atlanticist West, have also become largely dysfunctional.

The planned process of establishing unipolarity also took place in the territory of the contact zone and the always-turbulent Balkans by the dissolution of the SFRY because of the externally induced religious-civil wars in 1991 and the immediate recognition of the independence of Slovenia and Croatia by the Vatican and Germany. With the frozen conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina as formalized by the Dayton Agreement from 1995, many regional hotspots with the mighty destructive potential remained in the post-Yugoslav geopolitical space, mainly in the territories and in the state-like creations in which the Serbian nation continued to live outside the state borders of the Republic of Serbia (as well as in it). Historically it has already been shown that the Balkan region is suitable for political and then armed activations whenever the states from the circle of Atlanticism, the EU or regional powers, e.g., Turkey, assess that it is geopolitically profitable. In that period, ominous for us, of unipolar domination of Atlanticism, in 1999 there was first a brutal and illegitimate aggression against our country and then the malignant and overall occupation of Kosovo and Metohija. It is effective evidence that the Serbian factor was really considered the

greatest geopolitical opponent of the Atlanticist West in the Balkans, which had to be “adequately” punished by robbing it of the most important geostrategic part of the country (the so-called geopolitical macro-fortress) which has not been returned yet under the legal-political, territorial and state sovereignty of the Republic of Serbia. This refers exactly to Kosovo and Metohija with the invaluable historical and identity importance for Serbs as a sacred sanctuary of the Serbian people and the birthplace of its founding “national myth” embodied in Saint Sava’s Orthodoxy and the Kosovo Covenant (Despotović, 2025, p. 69).

After decades-long geopolitical domination and hegemonistic relations contextually situated in the globalization processes by imposing globalism as an ideology and an attempt of building a new world order reflected in one world government, the period of so-called *geopolitics of chaos* began. This stage in international relations began intensively manifesting its destructive power first in the Ukrainian political crisis, and then in the escalation of its military component. Afterwards, in the domino-effect manner, numerous crisis hotspots were opened and radicalized worldwide (the Middle East, Central and South America, the Central East, the Far East, the Pacific power projection zone etc.). Dangerous release began of a huge amount of destructive energy accumulated over decades, which threaten to enter the stage of even larger radicalization and decomposition of the unipolar order of power. Geopolitics of chaos was defined by Ignacio Ramonet back in the 1990s as the beginning of the process of politics defunctionalisation (by displacing decision-making outside the state’s political institutional order), de-democratization of political systems and violation of human

rights and freedoms. The destruction of national states continued, particularly their legal de-sovereignization and territorial fragmentation, followed by the accelerated consolidation and inauguration of the identities of synthetic nations produced by social engineering.

Geopolitics of chaos has had a particularly destructive effect through radical forms of uncontrolled “fission” – splitting of the core, deconstruction and destruction of the axiological corpus of national cultures and total civilizational collapse. “Everywhere, in international relations and within society, power is transformed”, Ramonet states. It happens in such a manner that the degree of its malignity has reached the potential of a global conflict with unforeseeable consequences (Ramonet, 1998). The above-listed destructive changes, exactly because they were not processes of controlled fissional splitting of the existing order, consequently led to the creation of dangerous forms of civilizational confrontation (called “the clash of civilizations” by Huntington). It is the conflict in which, through the agendas of the political, legal and cultural engineering, but even more of bio-. Techno- and geo-engineering, the globalized world even more rapidly fell into the state of geopolitical chaos – international anomy (marked by basic disrespect for international law), radicalization of anti-civilizational ideologies (globalism, anti-humanism, nihilism, individualism, gender ideology etc.) or the return and recovery of old political paradigms through new movements and forms (Nazism, fascism, racism, colonialism), and revision of history, all these accompanied by numerous depopulation agendas (social eugenics, genetic engineering, global pandemics etc.) (Despotović, Glišin, 2024, p. 43).

## Partial geopolitical vacuum

In the continuation of the paper, we allowed ourselves as authors the specific freedom of entering the context of theoretical analogy between physics and geopolitics in an attempt to provide as precisely as possible a sketch of current problems and changes in the geopolitical and international order of power, which is partly suggested by Ignacio Ramonet himself. For this purpose, it was necessary to make an elementary comparison of basic concepts of *physical vacuum* and its analogue, which we are trying to introduce into the theoretical discourse of geopolitics as a synthesis science – the concept of *geopolitical vacuum*. In physics, the general theoretical-conceptual axiom of vacuum has long been “determined in elementary terms as a space without substance”, i.e., since it is the state difficult to achieve as an ideal-type model, there is a substitute concept more frequently used instead of it – *partial vacuum*, which is considered the “space in which the pressure is lower than the atmospheric pressure”. This conceptual determination can be found in every elementary textbook of classical physics, which is also in line with the currently applicable theoretical postulates of quantum physics. It is further stated that “even if all matter might be removed from the given volume, in that space no absolute vacuum would be achieved due to the existence of vacuum fluctuations, gamma radiation, cosmic radiation, the presence of neutrinos and the existence of dark energy” (Chambers, 2004). In a word, within the domain of the quantum theory this may be also defined as the so-called *zero-point field*, as an ocean of microscopic vibrations conceived as an absolutely empty space – therefore, as vacuum,

but in cosmic relations it is not and cannot be, because due to the mentioned micro-vibrations of particles, a certain amount of energy is created which fills it (Taggart, 2009, p. 19). Therefore, in our opinion, the analogy between *partial vacuum* and *geopolitical vacuum* may be seen almost literally, because in geopolitics, space is one of the most important conceptual categories, while power, particularly its hard aspects – economic-financial power, military power, and scientific-technological power – is in compliance with force (political pressure, destructive vibrations etc.) which is projected in some of the forms of this multidimensional space (territory, air, water, underground layers of space, immediate universe environment etc.), which Bertrand Russell a long time ago made equal to energy the fundamental concept in social science is Power, in the same sense in which Energy is the fundamental concept in physics”) (Pavlović, 2012, p. 163).

Therefore, the geopolitical triad of the concepts *power–force–space* has the qualitative characteristics of *partial geopolitical vacuum* – permanent power pressure through projected force on some or all aspects of the space which, as its result, leads to certain changes in it, but they are not finally condensed and structured into its final geopolitical order. Thus, it is not a completely empty space without substance, but the space in which there are always some micro- or macro-vibrations of the force which maintain a certain tension (pressure) in it. This, as we have shown, is an acceptable theoretical comparison and conceptual explication of the cooperation between physics and geopolitics as sciences, especially when it is applied to the processes in the current space of geopolitical relations. It is theoretically and methodologically even more plausible when projected onto the stage or phase of the change of the existing order of power (unipolar order) when it changes, dissolves or disappears, but



Photo: Shutterstock

the new one has not emerged yet, or is still in the stage of embryonic conception and development (multipolar order). Using the language of physics, it means that the projected geopolitical force in the space of new geopolitical actors is still lower than the current “atmospheric pressure” (the force of the existing international order) and thus insufficient to create from the projected and used force the pressure strong enough to have a consequence or a result in the form of, for example, a polycentric world order of power. As a matter of fact, the current processes in international relations, when it comes to their basic geopolitical foundation, are in a complex state of overexertion, which ranges from a relatively controlled geopolitical chaos (destruction of the old unipolar order and forms of globalism to date), particularly when speaking of the last decade, with uncertain elements of partial geopolitical vacuum (the current stage) before the creation of the new order of power (the multipolar order). Namely, this is to a large extent time-related and geopolitical uncertainty as to whether and when the marked processes will become a real alternative in the field, i.e., when they will reach the level of internal cohesive relations and organizational structures which will qualify it as a new and stable geopolitical configuration or formation. And, consistently with the language of physics, when it will pass from the current formative state into a controlled stage of the *fusion* of a new geopolitical order of power.

In the text below we will show in an orientation sketch only part of the current processes of partial geopolitical vacuum (crisis hotspots) in order to, first of all, determine a correct scientific description of its main neuralgic points and problems, and, in

the final part of the paper, to confirm our starting hypothesis, explained through a theoretical-conceptual “dialogue” between physics and geopolitics. In the analysis procedure with an actually limited scope, we will try to emulate something that was done by our unrivalled scientific genius, Nikola Tesla, in his rich research opus (the application of his physical axioms to global issues of war and peace), while being aware of our own incomparably modest cognitive capacities, particularly the degree of quality and reliability of scientific results obtained by such an approach (Abramović, 2015, p. 107).

| 21

## Current and potential geopolitical hotspots

Geopolitical hotspots are geopolitical *topoi* (spaces) where the strength of geopolitical power weighed continuously or occasionally in a direct conflict of large geopolitical powers and political-military alliances or their political exponents at the points of geographical contact, contact zones or regional and international conflict regions. Geopolitical or international hotspots are most often territories (or regions) where tensions are manifested deriving from political confrontations, open military conflicts of today increasingly used combined network-hybrid war, with a higher or lower intensity of using available resources from the “rich fund” of hard, soft and smart power.

The category of these hotspots with their centuries-long history or decades-long inventory of conflicts can include several regional spaces: the Balkans and, in particular, the post-Yugoslav space (Croatia, Serbia – Kosovo and Metohija, Bosnia



and Herzegovina, North Macedonia), Albania etc., the space of the Western parts of the former Soviet Union (Poland, Ukraine and Kaliningrad Oblast – enclave), the Baltic (Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Sweden), as well as the Black Sea region (Transnistria, Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria), the Aegean water area (Greece, Turkey, Cyprus), North Africa, in particular its coastal part (Tunisia, Algeria, Libya, Egypt), the Middle East, always territorially fragmented and conflicting space (Israel, Palestine, Syria, Iran, Yemen), the Central East (India, Pakistan, Vietnam, Burma, Nepal, Myanmar, Laos etc.), the Far East (primarily North and South Korea, Japan...), the Pacific and the Indian Ocean water area (China and the USA with their respective allies) and so forth. Therefore, those are primarily the hotspots situated in the zone of the so-called Rimland, in which centuries-old geopolitical interests of thal-assocratic and tellurocratic powers confront.

Currently active hotspots may include primarily the Ukrainian conflict, whose armed stage has lasted for more than three years, while its intensive preparation form goes back to the 2014 coup, when the neo-Nazi junta and pro-Western opposition came to power after unconstitutionally and illegitimately overthrowing President Viktor Yanukovich. Its profound historical genesis began through confessional infiltration and centuries-long processes of religious conversion conducted by the Vatican, creating a Uniate church organization in the territory of today's Ukraine, i.e., Greco-Catholic identity of a number of the Orthodox population there. An immeasurable "contribution" to these processes was given first by Roman-Catholic Poland and then by the USSR by creating an artificial Ukrainian state, as well as by some Western powers (primarily

Germany, France and Great Britain) by precoding (identity engineering) the value corpus of Little Russians and Ruthenians (so-called Ukrainians) for the purpose of creating anti-Russia as an open and strong geopolitical exponent of Atlanticism exactly in that very important territory for both sides in the conflict (Ukraine, the USA, the NATO, the EU and Great Britain on one side, and the Russian Federation of the other) (Despotović, 2025, p. 60).

The tragedy of both Slavic nations reached huge demographic and economic proportions. Even now it is possible to see an irretrievably large number of casualties and a whole complex of resource and structural losses, especially those of Ukraine. Such an intense war conflict is not close to its end because the initially proclaimed goals of Russia's special military operation have not been fulfilled yet: de-Nazification, demilitarization, liberation of the territories with the majority Russian population, its efficient legal, cultural, political and religious protection, Ukraine's giving up the plan of becoming a member of the NATO, i.e., maintaining political and military neutrality etc., which were essential reasons for the conflict radicalization. To all these, we should also add the constant propaganda incitement to war and direct military armament of Ukraine by the Atlanticists, particularly during Biden's administration and now by its numerous European satellites. This is accompanied by US President Donald Trump's superficial and inefficient "efforts" for the alleged pacification and cessation of hostilities. In such partial geopolitical vacuum, in our opinion, there are only two possible outcomes of the special military operation – the first, considered more realistic and strategically justified, is Russia's overall domination and acceptance of its legitimate goals and state interests, whereas in this option the time

dimension of the conflict length is rather uncertain; the second, quite unlikely in our opinion, is Russia accepting, for tactical reasons, the temporary cessation of the conflict, which would lead to the level of a camouflaged, frozen conflict. Of course, in that case, explosives would be put aside, but there would be even more destructive consequences after the period of reconsolidating the capacity of the hard power of basic actors, when the conflict reactivation would once again be possible. If things go in that direction, the following stage of the conflict will have the form of a total and direct confrontation of Atlanticism and Russia, in which they will go to the end, to the final collapse or victory of one of its actors. "Global rulers of the world have estimated that a shift must be made, they did not renounce either globalism or the main Atlanticist vector towards Russia. They are only trying to freeze the conflict globally, from Ukraine to the Middle East, which should last until Atlanticist rulers decide that they have recovered sufficient power to re-enter the globalization stage. The truth is that the USA will focus its attention primarily towards China, its main rival from the aspect of global power both in economic and military segments. It will not change the strategic goal of subordinating Russia to control, particularly in its European part".<sup>[2]</sup>

Another current armed conflict with its historical length, religious-eschatological origin and state-territorial disputes has been going on in the territory of the Middle East between Israel and Palestine, with frequent stages of reactivation and open hostilities between Israel and Arab-Islam world in its surroundings. The long history of

their confrontations after the Second World War has had forms of destructive military destruction and territorial shifts, but, more frequently, forms of terrorist acts which were the reason for their reactivation. With all the characteristics of extreme destruction and total dehumanization, this conflict is slowly entering its long-term explication with a clearly evident intention of its end when one of the sides in the conflict fulfils its maximalist goals and interests. Whether and when it will happen depends on the resource support to both sides in the conflict, whereas it should be emphasized that Israel's position in these terms is extremely dissymmetric.

In the Middle East as a volatile geopolitical region, there is a "tradition" of millennium-long confrontations of large monotheistic religions, unstable state-like creations and imperialist interests in the background (Lewis, 2004). More than four decades ago, Bernard Lewis, an American historian of Jewish origin, projected the plan of future conflicts under the code name "bloody borders", which was adopted by the foreign policy committee of the US Senate at the beginning of the 1980s. This program contained a whole range of political measures and secret intelligence operations which would serve to destroy the existing authorities, to change state borders, to conduct territorial atomization or total liquidation. That is exactly why, in the near future, it is likely to expect a really destructive conflict in the Middle East between Israel (and the USA, its trans-Atlantic guardian and mentor) and Iran, which has been generated for a long time in the sphere of insurmountable religious and

---

[2] Lj. Despotović, "Agenda for America: a shift towards hard power and white man", *Večernje novosti*, 19 January 2025, p. 8.

civilizational differences between the two countries. However, the primary reason is Iran's nuclear program which its well-known arch-rivals would like to eliminate completely or put it under efficient control. It is quite unlikely that the conflict will be avoided through political negotiations about restricting it to civilian aspects of the use of nuclear power, while the attempt of military destruction of Iran's nuclear technological plants is much more likely, which would prevent Iran from producing real mass destruction nuclear weapons.

The potential conflict may cause even graver consequences having in mind the fact that Iran has signed an agreement on interstate strategic cooperation with the Russian Federation and that its

complex implementation is yet to be expected in the following years. Russia is trying to return actively into this geopolitically quite important region and to realize the projection of its long-term geopolitical and geo-energetic interests. With this policy, it would largely aggravate the realization of Atlanticist plans and substantially undermine their decades-long domination and future positioning in the region. Here, it is also necessary to mention the long-term and not so transparent cooperation of Iran with the People's Republic of China, which is also assuming more and more serious connotations, particularly when this cooperation is perceived through the perspective of the Chinese initiative "Belt and Road" and Pakistan's increasingly impor-





tant role in the strategic projections of power. It goes without saying that in the extremely probable military conflict of the USA and Israel with Iran, neither Russia nor China will enter a direct military confrontation with them, but will definitely support Iran with all other available instruments of political power so as to help Iran exit this conflict with as few strategic consequences as possible.

At the moment when this paper was written, yet another decades-old crisis hotspot has been opened in the Indian subcontinent, between Pakistan and India. In the essence of all their conflicts so far there are insurmountable religious differences, but incomparably more territorially unsolved disputes between the two countries, deliberately kept in that status at the time of the formal end of Great Britain's colonial rule. Occasional terrorist acts, mostly by Islamist extremist organizations (with the tacit organizational, intelligence and financial support of the USA and Great Britain) serve as a trigger for the beginning of the military confrontation between two nuclear powers. Although this confrontation so far has had a limited and controlled character, its huge destructive potential must not be underestimated. The current conflict will probably, as many times before, assume the status of a temporarily frozen conflict, before one of the opposed sides is suggested by its sponsors once again that, due to the current interests, a new form of military-political confrontation should be induced. Numerous experiences confirm that the conflict will primarily serve as a media cover which diverts the attention of the public opinion from major places of geopolitical confrontation, as well as to keep the large Middle East territory in the state of permanent instability, tension and continued large military and economic overexertion.

## The challenge called Trump – the beginning of the end or a temporary crisis of globalism

In this segment of the paper, we will mainly use the normative-axiological theoretical-explicative matrix which will focus first on the normative structure and values of civilization and culture in its foundation. Current confrontations and conflicts in this area will be analysed first as attempts of re-composing their deep structures, organizations and institutions, as well as re-coding of the identity code for the purpose of getting new aspects and forms of international power. Speaking more precisely and at the level of the methodological modelling, we will analyze two models of globalism, the so-called *old globalism*, which expressed the essence of the unipolar structure of the international order of power accompanied by the unquestionable hegemony of the USA and the Atlanticist geopolitical paradigm, and the so-called *new globalism*, which tries to constitute itself after a turbulent stage of internal conflicts both at the level of the “global deep state” and of deep conspiratorial structures of power, thus performing the accelerated structural re-composition, new articulation of basic crypto-political interests and aggregation of available capacities of power in an attempt to find globally adequate responses to strong and better organized challenges of an increasing number of geopolitical actors of multipolarity.

The concept of the “deep state” is often used in the public discourse for denoting the network of secret and influential structures inside and outside the government which act independently of formal democratic institutions of the state. This conceptual construct derives mostly from the disciplinary field of political science,

geopolitics and modern international relations in an intention to determine the structure, content and forms behind its lapidary-constructed crypto-political phenomenology. “Constructed” in this manner, it conceals crypto-political interests and less visible conspiratorial structures placed in the centre of organization because in its narrower terms they are directed only towards the state apparatus and administration; that is the part which most frequently remains in its institutional positions regardless of occasional post-electoral changes in them. However, its broader conceptual determination also implies the part of the corporate and conspiratorial sector in which a huge amount of institutional and extra-institutional power is concentrated. Certain “media analysts” use this construct as a label for the so-called global deep state, thus spreading the zones of its influence and power to the global level of international relations and their main actors.

This conspiratorial structure of power, invisible to the ordinary man’s eyes, is concealed by the opaque screen of official institutions of political power and the backdrop of the state’s constitutional-legal order, building a parallel deep state-social coupling and a complex network of infiltration of crypto-political interests, which definitely includes the “invisible” representatives of large capital, multinational corporations, highest representatives of conspiratorial organizations etc. Although it has been created patiently for several centuries now, the so-called deep state as its most visible part has manifested its full swing and strength in the past few decades, during the unipolar domination of the USA and its “alleged” Western allies (essentially with a single important role – efficient transmission of crypto-political interests into the global space). Moreover, its role, not less impor-

tant, was the control and coordination of the rest of the profane world, which became more significant with the acceleration of globalization processes and creation of the multi-layered network of *global interdependence*. The above-listed has been realized primarily through international organizations and global actors as its official structures and institutions (the OUN, the EU, the IF, the World Bank, the WTO, the NATO, the IGO, NGOs etc.).

Since in this paper there is not enough room for dealing in further detail with conspiratorial structures of power and crypto-political interests lying in the deepest segments of public policies and planning, initiating, controlling and directing globalization flows, we have only labelled them in disciplinary terms as an inevitable fact without which the following analysis would not have its most relevant analytical and theoretical foundation (Despotović, Glišin, 2024, p. 43).

President Donald Trump’s inauguration on 20<sup>th</sup> January this year and his introduction into the second presidential mandate were accompanied by the loud echoes of unhidden thunder of messages from his presidential campaign. This media and political clamour marked the beginning of the practical stage of his clash with the representatives, organizations, institutions and projects of the so-called global deep state not only within the USA, but also in the entire territory of the Atlanticist West. This primarily meant that President Trump as the nominal holder of the monocephalic executive in the US constitutional order and presidential system with his first decisions and so-called executive orders began to undermine and decompose the decades-established and corrupted network of subversive organizations and institutions destructive to the state itself and to the

external world of (USAID, NALED, the EU, the NATO, global NGOs, “humanitarian funds”, “development funds” etc.). These are exactly the organizations and institutions which were the worst parasites on the financial and state tissue of the USA and its taxpayers, turning it into a monstrous para-state leviathan that greedily eats the vital substance of the empire itself and is directed at enticing radical destabilization of everything that might stand in the way of the interests of global scum elites. As soon as such course of the changes began, very quickly, even before the end of the first hundred days of the presidential mandate, after the expected short-term shock and confusion, the response of the globalist deep state started to be organized and prepared both in the territory of the USA and within the European Union and the NATO. Just seemingly defeated forces and slightly shaken globalist structures of power began preparing for a long-lasting conflict with the other cluster of power in the field of conspiratorial structures which is currently personalized in the domain of running the practical and invisible part of political struggle by US President Donald Trump and his administration.

The analyzed conflict came to the surface in its visible form when part of global *power clusters*, composed of numerous cartel organizations (fortunately, those perceived as a whole are not a homogenous and compact organization) properly assessed and realistically considered the cruel truth that it was impossible to continue the old, decades-long practice of irrational wastefulness and accelerated fragmentation of available and particularly important hard aspects of power (economic-financial power, military power, and scientific-technological power). In the conflict with the chief global rivals and challengers (the Russian Federation, PR China, BRICS,

SCO etc.), this decades-long wasteful and arrogant practice of old globalism could rapidly lead to the total collapse of the new order of power, primarily of hard capacities of the empire’s power and its inevitable collapse which was becoming increasingly clearer on the horizon. That it has become even empirically visible will be proved by listing only several important indicators of the looming collapse: US excessive financial debts (external and internal), lagging behind in the scientific-technological development, particularly in the military domain, exhaustion of national ore resources and increasingly harder availability of foreign resources, the threatening fall of the financial power of the dollar, the ever-growing anti-American atmosphere worldwide, the depletion of military assets due to both direct and undisguised support for Ukrainian neo-Nazi formations in the armed conflict with the Russian Federation, as well as Israel’s long-term and continuous conflict with its Islamic surroundings, financing numerous terrorist organizations around the world, subversive activities through financing and organizing networks of global NGOs and their local branches for infiltration and destabilization of national states (e.g., attempts of the so-called colour revolutions in Serbia, Georgia etc.), huge costs of maintaining military bases, but also logistical resources of the EU and the NATO, sponsoring the loyalty of the whole network of local political scum elites, which have, with the unprecedented extent of system corruption, exhausted the pathologically metastasized financial resources, hypertrophy of institutional capacities and organizations in the sphere of the security sector and numerous intelligence agencies, para-state as well as private military companies, relocation of production capacities –

and thus, of modern technologies – to other, often competing countries (e.g., China), the constantly profit-greedy sector of transnational corporations, megalomaniac requirements of the military-industry complex, corruptive pharmaceutical companies, and a number of other bleak indicators.

For decades during the period of the US unipolar power, the entire hypertrophic structure of old globalism used the strength and power of the empire which was so large that the brutal robbery of the rest of the world through the transnational sector, whose profit mainly remained within it, could not void the creation of enormous structural overexertion, material fatigue and pathological costs. The cost side of this policy was possible to hide and cover by FED's uncontrolled dollar emission or by any other palliative measures of economic policy or numerous forms of financial speculations (contaminated financial derivatives, uncovered loan debts, adjusted ratings of investment reliability etc.), which pushed globalized imperial power even further towards the edge of its total institutional, as well as essential disaster. "The most obvious indicator of the declining power of the Atlanticist West led by Washington is the fact that they have waged war against Russia for three years without managing to resolve the Ukrainian issue the way they wanted. That is why part of the deep state has received the task to make a shift, via Trump and his administration, towards classical liberalism and not post-liberalism, as believed by Dugin."<sup>[3]</sup>

Quite soon the radical and accelerated response followed through Trump's newly-established administration in an attempt of urgently stopping negative

trends and structures of recovery, primarily of the USA's hard power. Without it, chances that the empire will continue going along the old road and that globally it encounters challengers and disputers, kept losing the realistic ground for an adequate response. Hence quick and radical responses of Trump's administration. Aware that the recovery of imperial power is impossible without overall interventions and measures, Trump as their main visible exponent not only reached for short-term measures and the US manoeuvre return, the so-called Monroe doctrine, but also showed unhidden appetites directed towards territorial, resource and geo-strategic expansion and revitalization of hard power. He directed his plans in that field towards large stretches of Canada and Greenland, primarily towards regaining full control over the Panama Canal. Simultaneously with the proclaimed measures of power recovery in his "own backyard" he also undertook initiatives for calming or freezing the Ukrainian conflict, the de-escalation of armed actions in the Middle East, the reduction of costs for the NATO through openly pressurizing the alleged European allies (remnants of the old global structure, Great Britain, and the largest part of the EU member-states). He did it by exerting strong pressure and ultimately requesting assuming an increasing burden of financing overall costs intended for defence and strengthening military capacities in the west of the European continent (defence spending allocations accounting for 5% of the annual national GDP). The focus of his work included several other similar measures so that he may achieve visible results in the following years in the process of the comprehensive action of recovering the imperial power of the USA and

[3] Lj. Despotović, "Agenda for America: a shift towards hard power and white man", *Večernje novosti*, 19 January 2025, p. 8.



of Atlanticism, or new globalism. Trump is determined in his intention to prepare this geopolitical formation on a large scale for the inevitable and priority conflict with PR China and its projected aspirations towards global economic and technological leadership. This is an increasingly pronounced intention of both geopolitical rivals to project and maintain their respective power in the water areas of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean, as well as to accelerate the achievement of the long-proclaimed policy of China's territorial unity through the joining of Taiwan that is, at least for the time being, impossible to achieve peacefully.

However, despite President Trump's clearly defined goals to recover the aspects of the US global power defined in this manner soon encountered organized resistance and actions of temporarily undermined and disempowered powers of the *old concept of globalism*, substantial parts of the deep state, and conspiratorial elites that stand and have for decades stood behind them. Both in the territory of the USA and within Western Europe, they carried out political consolidation and interest solidarity in an increasingly organized and rapid manner. European globalists (with active communication and coordination with the same forces in the US deep state) are intensively collection all available economic-financial and military resources, rather exhausted due to supporting the Ukrainian side in the military conflict which is continuing and which they do not want to renounce despite the general opposition of Trump's administration. There are also attempts of forming new organizations and alliances, non-democratic

acting towards all those putting up resistance both in the member-states and in the joint institutions of the European Union (Hungary, Romania, Slovakia).

The entire political system of the EU, from its projection to its foundation, is deliberately politically delegitimized and de-sovereignized (where the member-states, and particularly their citizens, are unable to appoint and control the highest EU structures). The Europeans certainly do not want war, but the Brussels administration is evidently pushing them into the conflict. It is a huge problem that the European Commission is appointed respectively by the prime ministers of the EU member-states. They are the executive power and they choose the body with the legislative power, which is impermissible. Hofbauer, an expert on international law, comments it as follows: "If the EU asked for its reception in the European Union, it would not be accepted because it does not fulfil the basic criteria." [4] All this has been further manifested through the strengthening of the measures of political repression, media censorship, annulment of electoral results, political trials, persecuting and criminalization of sovereignist parties and leaders, favouring old globalist activists in desperate attempts to maintain their own acquired positions, available capital, levers of the state and system power, as well as long-term interests of conspiratorial structures which have made them and support them all the time.

In the USA, such resistance and rebellion against changes began relatively quickly, and were personally shown through Biden's public criticism of Trump:

---

[4] "When trade sanctions fail, weapons speak out", the interview with Haness Hofbauer, published in *Večernje novosti*, was conducted by Boris Subašić on the occasion of Hofbauer's book *In the economic war. The West's sanctions policy and its consequences. The example of Russia*, pp. 10–11, accessed on 18 May 2025.

“He had the worst hundred days that no president has ever had”, Biden said with no hesitation. While Trump is trying to consolidate the new administration and make it efficient for the planned projects of resource power recovery, and the analysts from both sides are drawing lessons from the initial results of the political struggle, “the question remains – Is the American political system still ready for a leader outside the traditional frameworks? Would Biden’s different decision have changed the course of history or did the 2024 election only acknowledged deeper divisions and unwritten restrictions within the society that is proud of democracy? The answers perhaps do not come immediately, but one thing is certain – the political struggle in the USA is entering a new and unpredictable stage.”<sup>[5]</sup> Here are only a few fresh examples of the “answers” provided by the old deep state: the US Federal Court froze many high customs duties introduced by Trump to other countries, claiming that he had overstepped his legal authority; moreover, the court also disputed Trump’s measure about abolishing the Department of Education, and several thousand previously fired employees were returned to work; Elon Mask thanked the president for the offered chance and left his office for state financial audit and prevention of system corruption; USAID’s high representatives complained to the relevant courts and asked for the annulment of all Trump’s decisions and returning to the former state, with huge financial compensations etc., media are full of such and similar news, which serves as a clear indicator that the consolidation process has already been underway on a large scale.

The above-mentioned conflict will not take place only within the USA, but also in other parts of the globalized world and battles will undoubtedly be waged exactly under the auspices of its imperial structure and state institutions. The winning side in that conflict will crucially affect the rest of the same structures in the world, particularly in West Europe. Trump’s resistance and “throwing the glove” into the face of old globalist structures and still powerful parts of the deep state will in the following years (perhaps in more than a decade) answer the question: Is it the beginning of the end of old globalism or the construction of power of new globalism?

We believe that the answers may be discerned even now. Regrouping of power, aggregation of preferences, new articulation of interests, re-definition of goals and change of exit strategies will enable globalist formations (old and new) with their clusters and cartels of power to await more readily the inevitable conflict with the actors of the polycentric world in the formation. This epochal conflict, currently indicated by the facts, will be impossible to avoid, and exactly this awareness will make globalists do everything in order to gain with joined forces the decisive advantage before the open conflict. When such direct conformation begins, all options will be possible – from a total planetary disaster to the change in the geopolitical order of power from the unipolar into the multipolar world of polycentrism.

However, one thing is certain; no matter how this clash of the tectonic plates of opposed geopolitical structures ends, the essence of capitalism as a political, economic-financial and legal order of power will not

[5] “Biden speaks fiercely about Trump: The worst 100 days in history, and I still believe that I would have beaten him”, *WebTribune*, accessed on 11 May 2025.

change. The announcements of some geo-politicians, e.g., Aleksandr Dugin, of the arrival of the new post-liberal epoch and post-capitalism do not seem realistic, plausible and argument-based. It seems that A. Dugin was carried away by doctrinarism enthusiasm of his geopolitical theories and that it was the reason why he rushed with these geopolitical anticipations, overlooking the toughness of the economic-political capitalist order (Dugin, 2009). Capitalism as a socio-economic formation will not have its adequate planetary alternative in the foreseeable future, not because it is not potentially likely and plausible by the projection of new political-value formations, but because of the strength and amount of power which has been maintained by capitalism as an order for centuries and has also entered the structural order of those powers at least principally disputing and publicly criticizing it, unconvincingly searching for its alternative. By occasionally changing the forms of its manifestation, but not the essence of capitalist relations in its foundations, liberalism as its main apologetic and civilizational cover will still remain the essential feature of the political-economic ideology that has changed the models of its existence throughout modern history (proto-liberalism, classical liberalism, modern liberalism, neo-liberalism etc.), but not its original essence and purpose (Despotović, 2022, p. 48).

### Scientific-technological power as a new aspect of hard power

In the final part of the paper, it is important to note that in the classical literature on international relations, the so-called *hard power* is characterized primarily by *economic-financial power* and *military*

*power*, while some authors also add the size of the territory, resource capacities or demographic capacities of a country (Nye, 2012, p. 42). In our opinion, the established model of hard power must also include a new element (resource) – *scientific-technological power* (artificial intelligence, nanotechnology, geoen지니어ing, technoengineering, bioengineering, Teslaian physics, laser technology, hypersonic technology, quantum computers, controlled fusion, synthetic materials technology, “green” steel, new energy sources, systems for time and space control, super-powerful telescopes, universal industrial robots, information quantum medicine, generative drugs with extended shelf life etc.), which needs to be transferred from the model of so-called *soft power* into the model of hard power. The reasons for this proposal are contained in the fact that its accelerated development in the past few decades has made exactly this segment of action an immeasurable source of potential domination over opposed rivals. In the following years and decades, in this domain it will become possible to acquire or lose quickly the position in the hierarchy of the ruling order.

Only one essential qualitative move, step or leap in any of the above-listed, as well as other areas of new techniques and technologies may change literally overnight the established ORDER of power in the world. Hence that amount of secrecy and conspiracy in the sphere of new scientific research among the majority scientifically and technologically developed international subjects, from transnational corporations to large geopolitical powers. They compete feverishly and unscrupulously as to which one and in which segment of the above-mentioned technologies unrivalled advantage over the competitors will be achieved, thus taking the global position of *hyperpower*.

This assessment is particularly important if we take into account the fact that in the systems of secret scientific research, especially of military character as compared to civilian science (whose knowledge and technologies are already becoming obsolete in the cycles of three to five years), military science and technology are estimated to have the time advantage of as many as three decades in the accomplishments of their development (Taggart, 2009, p. 19). Knowing this, we cannot even anticipate how close we are to the end of the world we know and in which, as ordinary citizens, we find it increasingly harder to find our bearings and direction, somewhat naively trying to determine in advance at least some meaning of our own existence.

Due to the “knowledge warriors”, in its final ideological stage and by its brutal essence globalism is actually reduced to a pure concept of antihumanism, which destructs universal value systems of humanism, man’s autonomy and freedom. Not even traditional monotheistic religions have been spared, while Christian religion has been affected particularly destructively. Even more destructive are continued and ever stronger assaults on Eastern Christianity, its ecclesiological structure, dogmatic teachings, value identity and, most of all, its spirituality and Christocentricity (Despotović, 2025, p. 357).

New technologies brought along by transhumanism have already reached the potential of threatening man’s elementary survival because of his alleged improvement and specialization (Schwab, Malleret, 2020). If it were to be realized in the full capacity of its available powers, it would bring hu-

manity into a post-humanism stage in which survival would no longer be possible for a large part of human population (Despotović, Glišin, 2024, p. 207). That is why uncontrolled development of new findings and technologies inevitably accompanying it is not only an area of unimaginable powers, but also a poisoned spring of huge dangers to man as a species. “In his interview for the *Indian Express*, Gates shared his thoughts about artificial intelligence, including three professions that, according to him, will not be replaced by seismic technology. As published by Marca website, Gates predicts that three careers will be safe from artificial intelligence: biology, experts on energy, and computer programmers”<sup>[6]</sup> This is not only the destruction of the current nomenclature of professions and the production of masses, or the so-called working population redundancy, but also of the existing order of geopolitical power, or even a new one that will be built in the future. That is why in this short overview we want to point to unimaginable potentials of power, as well as risks brought along by accelerated scientific-technological development and, apart from transnational corporations, forced by the most powerful geopolitical actors nowadays.

## Conclusion

As we have tried to argue in the paper, the current processes and ongoing changes leave a whole series of new geopolitical questions completely open. Changes are evident in many aspects, but they are still far from their end and are definitely new config-

[6] “Gloomy predictions of Bill Gates: Only this will survive artificial intelligence”, *Večernje novosti*, accessed on 19 May 2025.



urations of international relations. In our opinion, the current processes will remain an enigma for at least one whole decade, with different possible outcomes; namely, they will remain contextually situated in the conceptual zone of partial geopolitical vacuum. How all this will end is certainly unknown at the moment. Judging by the current international indicators and from numerous bilateral meetings in Moscow on 9 May 2025, on the occasion of the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the victory over Nazism and fascism, particularly the agreement reached by the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China, it is becoming increasingly clearer that geopolitical cards have been dealt once again and no one can claim that all the cards have stayed in the hands of the Atlanticist West and its allies. On the contrary, the bloc of the countries opposing the Atlanticist and globalist structure is becoming larger and more comprehensive, while their grouping is becoming more organized, qualitatively stronger, and better networked in economic- financial and military terms. If this development continues in the same direction, the Atlanticist-globalist countries will find it difficult to give an adequate answer in the world of power multipolarity. This is yet another indicator and proof that the global geopolitical board is being slowly but certainly reestablished. President Xi and President Putin have publicly emphasized that their countries will continue their mutual support in building the "new world order." Although the Western powers have tried to isolate Russia, the fact that the Chinese leader appeared in Moscow exactly on 9 May, on the great national holiday, clearly shows that isolation is not functioning – at least when it comes

to the players of this calibre. If we leave the symbolics for a moment and see the broader picture, something much more important can be observed: long-term orientation of the two countries towards deepening their cooperation, despite pressures. When two nuclear powers with global ambitions say that they want to build the new world order – it is not only diplomatic courtesy. It is a strategic message".<sup>[7]</sup>

As the above-listed processes become an increasingly certain global alternative, in our humble opinion, it will also lead to the change in the geopolitical perspective of both Serbia and the Serbian people on the whole. With strengthening multipolarity, our geopolitical orientation will inevitably begin to change in the qualitatively more positive meaning, towards the vector of coming closer to the increasingly organized territory of Euro-Asia. This is, among other facts, also proved by the following example: the first man of the Russian state corporation *Rosatom*, Alexey Likhachev, answered affirmatively the question posed by the RIA Novosti journalist – yes, there were talks about the construction of a nuclear power plant in Serbia – not any sort of plant, but a serious one that could redefine the energy landscape of the West Balkans. "Essentially, President Vučić's visit marks the beginning of a new stage of work with Serbia in terms of the potential placement of a nuclear power plant. This is a very important moment", Likhachev said, pointing out that from now on nuclear power is also formally part of the agenda in the relations between Moscow and Belgrade. Russia is entering Serbia with technology, while Serbia is entering the Russian/Euro-Asian

---

[7] This caused Trump's unprecedented anger. Putin declined the greatest offer ever received from the States", *WebTribune*, accessed on 11 May 2025.

space with an ambition. Will nuclear power become a new pillar of Serbia's energy identity? One thing is certain – the game is now played at a higher level, while Belgrade and Moscow have just raised their stakes”<sup>[8]</sup> Of course, this example is only part of the anticipation about the geopolitical alternative for Serbia and Serbian people being conditioned by real and deeper changes in the geopolitical order of power and increasingly stronger multipolarity.

We hope that the above-listed indicators and arguments give real hope that in the near future it

will be possible to construct a new international geopolitical order which will be fairer, freer and more human than this one, which we have barely survived in the past few decades, painfully and with many sacrifices. As it has already been clearly indicated in the paper, resistance to the multipolar order will continue to be ample, discouraging and marked by a dose of uncertainty. However, on the other hand, there are also real actors and powers which may combat global challenges in the following period and create a polycentric world order relying on new foundations.

## REFERENCES

- Abramović, V. (2015). *Tesla Evolution of Humanity's Consciousness*. Beograd: Draslar [In Serbian]
- Chambers, A. (2004). *Modern Vacuum Physics*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Despotović, Lj, Gajin, V. (2024). *Geopolitics and Cryptopolitics*. Beograd: Catena Mundi. [In Serbian]
- Despotović, Lj. (2022). *Politics at the crossroads of authority and power*. Novi Sad: IP Nacional [In Serbian]
- Despotović, Lj. (2025). *Geopolitics of Saint Sava Orthodoxy*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije. [In Serbian]
- Despotović, Lj. (2025, January 19). Agenda for America: a shift towards hard power and white man. *Večernje novosti*, p. 8. [In Serbian]
- Dugin, A. (2009). *Geopolitics of Postmodernism*. Beograd: “Nikola Pašić”. [In Serbian]
- Lewis, B. (2004). *The Crisis of Islam*. Beograd: Čarobna knjiga. [In Serbian]
- Nye, J. (2012). *The future of Power*. Beograd: Arhipelag. [In Serbian]
- Pavlović, V. (2012). *Political Power*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike. [In Serbian]
- Petrov, K. (2020). *Dead Water*. Zagreb: Teledisk. [In Croatian]
- Ramonet, I. (1998). *Geopolitics of Chaos*. Beograd: Institut za geopolitičke studije. [In Serbian]
- Schwab, K., Malleret, T. (2020). *COVID-19: the Great Reset*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Taggart, L. (2009). *The Field: the Quest for the Force of the Universe*. Beograd: Esoteria. [In Serbian]

## Internet sources

<https://webtribune.rs>

[8] “Serbia and Russia enter a historical project: the first nuclear power plant to be constructed in Serbia”, *WebTribune*, accessed on 10 May 2025