

GEOPOLITICS AND TERRORISM IN MODERN SOCIETY

Drazan Erkić¹, Miroslav Baljak²

¹Faculty of Business Studies and Law, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia,
drazan.erkic@hotmail.com

²Ministry of Defense of BiH - Armed Forces of BiH, Bosnia and Herzegovina,
baljak.miroslav@gmail.com

Received: 21st June 2022

Accepted: 8th July 2022

Original scientific paper

Abstract: *Today, geopolitics and terrorism are the subject of interest not only in scientific circles, but these two terms are increasingly interesting to the common man and the public in general. Geopolitics is related to space - territory and power in general, which is additionally very interesting in terms of the future geopolitical order and external political positioning of national states on a global level. The external positioning of national states is directly related to the geopolitical value of states, which is primarily reflected in political, economic and military power. Geopolitics is closely related to globalization, which brings with it not only the accelerated development of science, technology and the connection of people, but also certain security challenges and threats, above all terrorist threats that represent a security issue of global proportions. This Paper aims not only to conceptually define and determine geopolitics, terrorism, power and globalization, but also to indicate contemporary security threats in the geopolitical space, above all to indicate terrorism as a contemporary security threat and its impact on security in modern society.*

Key words: *geopolitics, terrorism, security, security threat, modern society*

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, geopolitics as a science plays a special role in international relations and geopolitical actors in modern society. As an agent of future geopolitical changes, globalization is closely related to geopolitics. In such a globalized world, in which the main features are relations between people and states, the development of science and technology is related to geopolitics. Today's geopolitical value of each country is linked to their geopolitical power. That power is a crucial element of geopolitical positioning and the very influence of every nation-state in today's modern society. Today's modern society is characterized by the rapid flow of people, goods and services between people and countries, thus contributing to connecting people. Modern technological innovations are the support for this communication and connecting people. Due to the open borders and the accelerated development of scientific and technological achievements, they are a good ground for connecting people who engage in crime on an international level and who create serious security threats in modern society, among which terrorism stands out. Without any doubt, terrorism is a very serious and extremely worrisome security threat that sows fear among people and creates doubt in citizens'

trust in their own country and its institutions. Terrorism gains a global dimension thanks to the development of written and electronic media. A terrorist act committed in one country thanks to the media will be able to be seen by all of humanity in the fastest possible time. Not so far in the past, the consequences of terrorist acts, such as the attack on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001 in the United States of America, are so brutal and terrifying that they caused great disruptions in society and among people and worried many. In the context of that event, it is worth seeing Azinovic who says "everything that happened that day carried an almost instinctively recognizable fateful character and the realization that nothing can remain the same." Along with this belief grew the need to discover meaning about what happened and what is still happening. Answers and explanations were necessary immediately, while Hegel's owls of wisdom were still hiding in the bright light of day". The fight against terrorism has always been demanding in society, and especially in the security sector, which is trying to find a way to prevent terrorist activities around the world. Everyone has a problem with terrorism, even the most powerful geopolitical actors in the world, who possess geopolitical power in the globalized world. They base their work on the prevention of terrorism, but also on repression when necessary. Terrorism is recognized as a serious global threat to security, which in such a modern society, in order to successfully fight against it, requires the continuous work of all security services at the international level, the rapid flow of security information concerning terrorism, but also the condemnation of everyone from individuals to national governments and international bodies against this scourge. Terrorist acts that are carried out all over the world generally have the same intentions and demands addressed to national governments, and they usually concern some political issues and concessions in a part of a certain territory that arise from secessionist or separatist motives, up to the release of their leaders from prison, the influence on certain processes in society, etc. Without any doubt, today's modern society is faced with a major security challenge related to terrorism itself and the threats of terrorism.

2. GEOPOLITICS - CONCEPTUAL DETERMINATION

In today's society, the word geopolitics can be heard more and more, both in conversation between people and in the media and on social networks. However, it must be said that there is still no single definition or agreement about what geopolitics is in scientific circles and among the professional public. In order to fully understand the very concept of geopolitics, it is necessary to point out its origin. According to Kolev, "the word, term, determinant "geopolitics" is a coin of two words: geo (Greek *ge*) and politics/polis (Greek *politike*). So both words have their roots in the ancient Greek language. Its more literal translation and etymological meaning is usually "geography of politics" or "politics of space". Since it is difficult to translate it into other languages, even into Serbian itself, it has been kept in its original form. The term was first used by the Swedish scientist Rudolf Kjelen in 1889" (Kolev, 2013: 227-228). In order to better understand and know what geopolitics is, we will point out a couple of definitions that deserve attention. According to Dugin, "geopolitics is the science of confrontation between civilizations ... a discipline that examines historical, strategic, geographical and planetary reality from the point of view of confrontation between two types of civilization - the civilization of the land and the civilization of the Sea" (Dugin, 2004: 181). Unlike Dugin, Kolev, D., *Geopolitical power: contribution to the definition of the term. Civitas*, MMXIII (6), Novi Sad, (2013), p. 227-251. Some authors believe that geopolitics is the science of the future, so in this sense it is worth defining geopolitics according to Grcic, who believes that "geopolitics investigates the place of a certain state on the political map of the world and the corresponding regions, with the aim of pointing out the most favorable forms and ways for its development and functioning. It is oriented towards the future. As a science of national strategy, it is the rational basis of the state's political position" (Grcic, 2000: 86). It is impossible to talk about geopolitics without taking into account the view of geopolitics

according to Klaus Dodds. According to his view, geopolitics "implies dealing with dangers, threats, space and force. It helps to explain the world in simple categories. Namely, it often seems that geographical labels such as the 'third world' are well founded. It also enables those who invoke it to make predictions about the future direction of world politics. Journalists and expert commentators often refer to geopolitics when they want to point to some important future events, whether it is the clash of civilizations, the rise of China, the collapse of history (and geography), the new American century, or the realization that Americans and Europeans are doomed to not understand each other because they live in different geopolitical universes" (Dodds, 2009: 49). Defining geopolitics according to the Little Encyclopedia, according to which "geopolitics is the science of the influence of the nature of a country (geographical position, climate, water, etc.) and its economic, social, political and cultural development on the historical development of a nation and its international position" (A small encyclopedia, 1968: 320). Many authors have made a significant contribution to geopolitics since its foundation and throughout its development, each from their own domain. However, as is known, the first term geopolitics was used by Rodolf Kjellen. According to Curak, "Rodolf Kjellen (1864-1922), a Swedish political scientist and professor of political science, is considered the founder of geopolitics, because in the work *State as a Form of Life* (1916), he tried to establish geopolitics as a scientific discipline. He divided politics into five disciplines, one of which is geopolitics, defining it as follows. It is the science of the state, as a geographical organism or phenomenon in space; therefore, about the state as a country, territory, area, or most clearly as land (space)" (Curak, 2002: 100-101). As the same author states, looking back on the beginnings of geopolitics and its further development, he states "due to the abuse of the fundamental but very sensitive principles of political geography by the German geopolitical circle, geopolitics was treated in classical scientific circles for many years as a pseudoscience, as a utilitarian, instrumentalized, totalitarian, state pseudogeography. Geopolitics has been kept silent for many years in the academic community due to this alienation. But globalization processes, accelerated by the collapse of the communist world and the penetration of the Western state and society into the East, have returned geopolitics to the public scene. However, the term (as well as its various representations) that has come before us has moved away from its bad history both in the media and in the health field, and as such, both in the superficial and in-depth sense, enriched with new meanings, in all its interdisciplinarity, has stepped into political science, polemology, geography, economics, ecology, culture and every other related scene, looking for a role for themselves in the many dilemmas of the new age. This deviation of the term and its content from negative historical practice is the best possible investment in geopolitics, and the beginning of a new investment cycle is timed in 1992. We symbolically tie it to William Jefferson Clinton's entry into the executive center of geopolitical power - the White House" (Curak, 2002: 86-87). It is evident that the very definitions of geopolitics clearly indicate that the basic elements of geopolitics and its key terms are space, politics and power. These terms or phenomena are most often associated with geopolitics.

3. GEOPOLITICAL POWER

Geopolitics focuses on space and politics, but also on power. The phenomenon of power is her inevitable field of interest. This is best illustrated by Kolev who says "geopolitics as a science and the phenomenon of power are in a tight and reciprocal relationship. On the one hand, geopolitics builds its cornerstone on the phenomenon of power, while, on the other, power in contemporary international relations is most often manifested as a specific form of power - as the political power of the state (*eng. power politics; Russian: политическая власть*), whereby geopolitical power (*eng. geopolitical power; Russian: геополитической силы*) appears as its basic content. Power is the basic means of achieving defined national and geopolitical interests on a global scale, and power is one of the key geopolitical concepts.

Geopolitics is a valid instrument for understanding the phenomenon of power and its manifestation in the modern world" (Kolev, 2013: 227-228). In order to talk about geopolitical power in general, it is necessary to point out the very definition of the concept of power, as well as its etymology and definition. There are many sciences that deal with the phenomenon of power, thus trying to understand its essence. In addition to geopolitics, power is a central concept of the categorical apparatus in many sciences, such as history, physics, sociology, etc. Power can be said to be a very dynamic phenomenon and changes through the development of society. Just as for many sciences, power was the very focus of interest, so power was also very important for eminent scientists. Power is a very interesting phenomenon in terms of human survival, but it can also be a great danger to civilization and its heritage. As Gacinovic states, "with insufficient control of the power, the survival of the human race becomes very uncertain" (Gacinovic, 2007: 10). The very term "power" in most cases is identified with the terms "strength", "authority" and "force", so the term power can rightly be said to have multiple meanings. Regarding the identification of the concept of power and force, the opinion of Beridan is valuable, stating that "often these two concepts are identified, the concept of power and the concept of force, and in social sciences sometimes one or both are subsumed under the concept of government. For this reason, and for the sake of a better polemological understanding, it is necessary to determine the matrix of their meaning, and to more precisely define the terms of a lower order, those that arise from them. Power, (or as a synonym) strength represents potential, the existence of possibilities, capacities, resources for producing some changes in nature and society. The simplest stratification of social power is its division into individual and collective. The individual is measurable within a collectivity against other individual powers, but also beyond it, while the collective is measurable against the power of other collectivities, i.e. society" (Beridan, 2003: 29). Unlike Beridan, Kolev states that "the American political scientist Robert Dahl (b. 1915), based on Max Weber's understanding, defines power as the ability to force another subject to do something he would not otherwise do" (Kolev, 2013: 235). Power can be manifested through certain forms, so there are several types of power. According to Gacinovic, "we can distinguish several types of power: a) economic power; b) social power; c) military power; and d) political power. These types are most often manifested in connection, that is, they are never realized independently" (Gacinovic, 2007: 10-11). Geopolitical power is linked to politics and political power. Thus, according to Kolev's point of view, "theorists who deal with this science do not dispute that politics is the basic building block of geopolitics and that it possesses power that manifests itself as geopolitical power. States are basic territorialized political communities and as such imply a synthesis of geographic space and politics. That is why it is rightly claimed that the combination of geographic space and politics is the birthplace of geopolitics. International relations theorists believe that geopolitical power in international relations is most often used to create specific relations such as: a) *balance of power*; b) *struggle for power*; c) *distribution of power*; and d) *impact on national will*, etc." (Kolev, 2013: 246). Scientists who deal with geopolitical issues have not yet agreed on the definition of the term geopolitical power. The phenomenon of geopolitical power is itself very complex, so the first steps of scientific workers and researchers were based on the knowledge of the basic content of the term. In the attempt to define geopolitical power, the point of view of the representatives of the realist direction is valuable, as they tried to include the majority of its elements through one more complex definition. Thus, according to the same author, "Hans Joakim Morgento (1904-1980) in his famous book *Politics Among the Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, which for almost three decades was the basic theoretical concept of international of US policy, implicitly provides one of the possible concepts of the structure of geopolitical power". Hans Joakim Morgento defines the concept of power as "man's control over the thinking and actions of other people", and he sees the relationship between states as "the concept of geopolitical interests defined as power". He paid special attention to the elements of state (national) power, which

also includes elements of geopolitical power" (Kolev, 2013: 247). Speaking about geopolitical power, Hans Joakim Morgentau believes that "national power is built from nine basic elements (Morgentau, 1967):

- geographical location - the most stable and permanent element;
- natural resources (agricultural land, raw materials, energy);
- industrial capacities;
- military capabilities (military-technological development, armed forces, mobilization capacities, etc.);
- demographic characteristics of the population;
- the national character of the population;
- national morality;
- the quality of diplomacy ("the brain of national power"); and
- abilities of the government.

For this author, these elements are at the same time a type of instrument and political power itself through which geopolitical interests are realized. As Kolev points out, "in the absence of a more consistent definition of the phenomenon, we will represent the understanding of geopolitical power as the quantum of means, potential and ability of a state or another international entity to realize its geopolitical goals in a certain area." Therefore, the territorial moment of power is the essence of geopolitical power" (Kolev, 2013: 248). It is evident that through geopolitical power, geopolitical actors want to build a certain type of influence on the subjects of international relations, in order to realize their geopolitical interests, and the very goal of geopolitical power concerns the effort to establish control over a certain area, using the necessary and sufficient ways, techniques and methods to achieve that intended goal. These methods and techniques are usually related to economic extortion, coups, psychological manipulation, etc.

4. TERRORISM - A GLOBAL SECURITY THREAT

Security has always been desirable and necessary for human survival, especially today. Security, like geopolitics, does not have its own unique universal definition. For the sake of better understanding, it is necessary to point out several definitions, among which is the definition of Kekovic, according to which "security is a phenomenon on the occasion of which complex relations are established between people, groups, organizations in an effort to ensure such a state, that is, values that are considered essential" (Kekovic, 2009: 16). Unlike Kekovic, according to Tadic, the concept of security is somewhat different, according to which he considers security to be "a state in which country feel that there is no danger of military attack, political coercion or economic compulsions, so that they can develop freely" (Tadic, 1991: 21). In today's modern society, the globalized world, there are many security threats that threaten the safety of people and their property. As stated in the Law encyclopedia, "threat initially has a negative sign because it implies a type of pressure that hints and puts into perspective concrete damage or some evil from the position of force, all with the aim of forcing a certain object of security to make certain concessions or behavior" (Grupa autora, Legal Encyclopedia, 1979: 1101). Special attention from the aspect of security today is attracted by security threats that are a global threat to humanity. Certainly, among the global threats to security, in addition to many others (weapons of mass destruction, transnational organized crime, biological threats, etc.), terrorist threats are at the very top. Terrorist threats, in particular, gain importance for security subjects and the world community in general, after September 11, 2001, with the terrorist attack on New York and Washington. The attitude

towards this type of threat, consequences and possible perpetrators marked a new beginning, not only in prevention, but also in repression. Terrorism is also very difficult to precisely define and determine, primarily because it is a multidimensional social phenomenon that requires a multidisciplinary approach. In the context of the difficulties surrounding the definition of terrorism, and especially in today's contemporary society, Azinovic's point of view is valuable, stating that "after 2001, the confusion surrounding the definition of terrorism was further deepened by reducing the focus of research on its religious motivation. As a result of the trauma produced by the attacks of September 11, 2001, part of the political elite and professional public, especially in the United States of America, created the impression that Islam or Islamism as a resulting (and allegedly legitimizing) ideology are central problems, the understanding of which today, the ability of the West to successfully respond to the challenges of terrorism depends crucially. Apart from being cognitively limiting, this obsession with Islam(ism) as the supposed key generator of contemporary terrorism is at the same time counterproductive as it diverts attention from its real causes. Not even the significant increase in interest in terrorism studies after 2001 brought us any closer to the desired outcome - the emergence of a universal academic definition of that form of political violence" (Azinovic, 2012: 16). However, the complexity of the term itself is also reflected in the fact that terrorism can be viewed from many aspects, primarily from the aspect of criminalistics, politics, criminology, but also criminal law. As with most scientific terms, so with terrorism, in order to best understand it, one must start from its etymological meaning of the word itself. According to Sikman, "when defining the term terrorism, it is necessary to start from the etymological meaning of the word "terrorism", which is derived from the Latin word *terror*, which means intense fear, or the French word *terreure*, which means sowing fear. Because of this, many definitions rely predominantly, or exclusively, on fear as the defining element of terrorism. The term terror, in the political sense, means an action of violence undertaken for political purposes - in order to intimidate and break the resistance of the person against whom it is carried out" (Sikman, 2006: 66-67). There are various definitions that determine the term terrorism, so according to Mijalkovski, "terrorism implies the application of premeditated, organized and systematic violence by a non-sovereign (non-state, non-governmental) subject (groups, gangs, organizations, political parties, etc.) or a sovereign (state) subject, i.e. state, determined to use even the most brutal physical force on a pre-selected (personal) or random victim, for the purpose of killing, maiming, kidnapping or psychological abuse, to preferentially cause a complex of fear or insecurity, anxiety or apathy in the environment from which the immediate victim of the attack is, in order to achieve the projected political goal" (Mijalkovski, 2003: 8). In contrast to this author, Milosevic defines terrorism as "a planned act of violence, undertaken by certain social groups, with the aim of preserving or conquering power, and that only terror that contains a social-psychological, i.e. political component in its being can rightly be called terrorism" (Milosevic, 2005: 9). In contrast to these two authors who give definitions of terrorism, it is necessary to point out the definitions of terrorism which are called institutional, so according to the Criminal Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Art. 201. terrorism means "committing a terrorist act with the aim of seriously intimidating the population or forcing the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the government of another country or an international organization to do or not do something, or with the aim of serious destabilization or destruction of serious political, constitutional, economic or social structures of Bosnia and Herzegovina, other countries or international organizations" (Commentaries on criminal/penal laws in Bosnia and Hercegovina, 2005: 659). Many scientists, in a more serious approach to terrorism, try to point out its causes. Any serious way of researching both terrorism and its causes requires a versatile and comprehensive process. There is no single answer to the causes that lead to terrorism, and here there are different views of researchers and the professional public. Often, different researchers of the phenomenon of terrorism and its causes have diametrically opposite views. However, as

Sikman states, "the causes of terrorism are primarily in deep and irreconcilable global social changes in the political, economic, social, normative and moral sphere of social life, which have occurred in the last two decades." Terrorism is a constant companion of the mentioned social, political, economic and other changes, which manifests itself through various forms of violence, which, depending on the carriers and goals, (political) destabilize the basic values of every society" (Sikman, 2006: 78). When talking about the causes of terrorism itself, there are several divisions, among which the most prevalent is the division that divides the causes of terrorism into objective and subjective. As the same author states, objective causes of terrorism "mean objective problems, injustices, frustrating anomalies in the economic base and political development of society. Some of the objective causes of terrorism can be listed as: non-democratic constitutional organization of the state, non-functioning of state institutions, economic and social differences within states, extreme nationalism and fanaticism, unresolved ethnic problems, colonial and non-colonial dependence, unresolved issues of borders and the state, religious alienation - cleroschauvinism and fundamentalism, the desire for expansion and hegemony (national, territorial, economic, social, religious and cultural domination) etc." (Sikman, 2006: 78-79). Unlike the objective causes of terrorism, as stated by Stajic, the subjective causes of terrorism "mean the assessment of the terrorists that the unsustainable social situation (objective causes of terrorism) can only be changed by violence, i.e. that violence is the fastest, most expedient, most effective and, under the circumstances, the only possible variant of action" (Stajic, 1999: 288). For a more complete understanding of the phenomenon of terrorism, in addition to its definition and the causes that lead to it, it is necessary to point out its characteristics, which relate to its manifestation and these characteristics make it special. Analyzing each terrorist act, it is evident that it is linked both to an individual and to a terrorist organization. For Sikman, the basic characteristics of terrorism are considered to be: (1) an act of violence, (2) causing fear, (3) achieving political (criminal) goals, (4) conveying a specific message, (5) organizedness, (6) brutality, immorality and irrationality terrorist act, (7) choice of victim and object of attack, (8) illegality of terrorist act and (9) condemnation of terrorism" (Sikman, 2006: 82). Terrorism, as a serious security threat to modern society, is classified in several ways and there are numerous criteria for classifying terrorism. Thus, on the scientific scene, we have different authors who state different classifications of terrorism. According to Sikman, "one of the divisions of terrorism is internal and international, based on the location of the given terrorist action, the nationality of the perpetrators and victims. Also, very often terrorism is divided into indirect (discrediting the government by proving its inability to protect the population and its goods) and direct (the goal of terrorism is to terrorize the authorities or their representatives" (Sikman, 2006: 90). A somewhat different view regarding the classification itself of terrorism is given by Mijalkovski who "classifies terrorism based on determining the basic elements of the terrorist process. As the basic elements of the terrorist process, he states: active subject (carrier), passive subject (victim) and observers. Based on the mentioned elements of the terrorist process and the facts that characterize it, terrorism classifies: 1) according to carriers - non-state and state, conditional and international, 2) according to causes - political, religious, ethnic and others, 3) according to object of attack (victim - passive subject) - selective and non-selective and 4) according to means - conventional, nuclear, biological, chemical, internet and others" (Mijalkovski, 2005: 21-56). Regardless of what type of terrorism it was, and what classification of terrorism it belongs to, the act of terrorism itself is very dangerous and causes citizens great fear and a sense of distrust in their own authorities and institutions, which is ultimately one of the goals of terrorists. To achieve their goal, theorists use and apply the terrorist strategy that they believe will be effective in achieving the ultimate goal. Through a careful analysis of the terrorist acts, it can be concluded that the strategy of terrorist activity is characterized by insidiousness, offensiveness, indirectness and long-term exhaustion of the opponent. Unlike in the past when the victims were residents who fought, adult citizens,

today's modern terrorism is different, whose victims are very often minors and even children. As Azinovic states, "if we accept the fact that the most frequent victims of modern terrorism are civilians, i.e. the non-combatant population of all ages, who do not actively participate in a conflict in any way (including the army and the police who are not engaged in the conflict), it is clear that there is no single motive which could justify their suffering, and therefore not using terrorism as a way of fighting. There is no such ideology, political goal or desired model of organizing society that can legitimize the calculated liquidation of innocent people. That is why, regardless of the motive, every act of terrorism is essentially a criminal offense. Or, as Alex P. Schmid stated in his proposal to the United Nations as a legal definition of terrorism in 1992: "An act of terrorism is a peacetime version of a war crime" (Azinovic, 2012: 16). As the ultimate conclusion of terrorist activity, it can be said that any motive or motivation from which it arises is unjustified, because the consequences they bring with them produce enormous negative consequences for individuals and society as a whole. Today, the world is faced with contemporary terrorism, which is very cruel and brutal, and the way to fight against it requires a multidisciplinary approach and a joint response of global society.

5. CONCLUSION

Today's modern society, due to a multitude of social processes, and especially in the midst of globalization, is getting a new form and framework in which it operates. Through the process of globalization, a faster flow of goods and services between countries is realized and a close relationship has been created in connecting people. Certainly, the openness of borders and the availability of goods and services to everyone, in a very quick and simple way, is a great advance for modern man. However, this represents the positive side of the globalized society itself, but there is also that other negative side which, through all these processes, has enabled the connection of criminals, who, by connecting outside the borders of national states, commit the most serious crimes, especially crimes in the field of transnational organized crime. Thus, the association of people from the criminal milieu produces serious modern security threats, such as, among other things, terrorism. Today's modern man is preoccupied with the problem and dangers of terrorism, especially after September 11, 2001. Geopolitics and the main geopolitical actors of today's modern world, through the prism of their geopolitical power, strive to thwart such threats to man, his property, states and society in general. A serious fight against this contemporary security threat and security challenge is not only placed before the main geopolitical actors in society, the security services, but also before the entire world community to help, through various forms of struggle, to stop this global evil. Looking at it from the point of view of geopolitics, it cannot be said that in today's modern society the state is the main geopolitical actor, but there are also some other non-state and supra-state actors. Although geopolitical power focuses on establishing control over space and its resources, control over contemporary security threats is not under control and this represents an additional burden for geopolitical actors with pronounced geopolitical power to sovereignly rule everything. In this fight against terrorism, it is clear that both science and technology must make their contribution, especially science through a type of multidisciplinary approach and building a system for rapid exchange of information that would primarily deal with this type of problem. Current practice shows that the most successful form of terrorism prevention is in the field of obtaining timely information about the planning and organization of a terrorist act. That's why it can rightly be said that we fight terrorism mostly with timely information. Today's and future geopolitical order and global society are fundamentally changing, and therefore a successful fight against terrorism will necessarily require greater flexibility and monitoring of contemporary socio-political trends at the global level.

REFERENCES

- Azinovic, V. (2012) Introduction to Terrorism Studies. Sarajevo: Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Sarajevo.
- Beridan, I. (2003) Conflicts. Sarajevo: Faculty of Political Sciences.
- Curak, N. (2002). Geopolitics as destiny - the case of Bosnia: a postmodernist essay on a peripheral country. Sarajevo: Faculty of Political Sciences.
- Dodds, K. (2009) Geopolitics. Sarajevo/Zagreb: Sahimpasic.
- Dugin, A. (2004) Basics of geopolitics. Zrenjanin: Ekopres.
- Gacinovic, R. (2007) Use of force in international relations. Belgrade: Serbian Political Thought, Institute for Political Studies, Vol. 19, No. 3-4.
- Grcic, M. (2000) Political geography. Beograd: Faculty of Geography.
- Grupa autora (1979) Legal Encyclopedia. Beograd: Contemporary Administration.
- Kekovic, Z. (2009) Theory of security systems. Banja Luka: Faculty of Security and Protection.
- Kolev, D. (2013) Geopolitical power: contribution to the definition of the term. Novi Sad: Civitas, MMXIII (6), p. 227-251.
- Commentaries on criminal/penal laws in Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2005). Sarajevo: Council of Europe and European Commission.
- Krejci, O. (2010) International politics. Praha:Ekopress.
- A small encyclopedia. book I. (1968). Beograd: Prosveta, Beograd.
- Mijalkovski, M. (2003) Terrorism and the fight against terrorism. Beograd: Military Academy.
- Mijalkovski, M. (2005) Terrorism. Belgrade: Faculty of Civil Defense.
- Milosevic, M. (2005) Defense against terrorism. Belgrade: The world of books.
- Morgentau, H. (1967) Politics Among the Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, A. Knopf, New York (Fourth Edition).
- Stajic, Lj. (1999) Basics of security. Belgrade: Police Academy.
- Sikman, M. (2006) Terrorism - current and possible forms. Banja Luka: of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Srpska - College of Internal Affairs.
- Tadic, B. (1991) Security and defense of non-aligned countries. Belgrade: Armed Forces Center for Strategic Research and Studies.