

UDC 341.31

Review paper

Received: -

Acceptee: March 27, 2021.

Corresponding author: drazan.erkic@hotmail.com

WAR AS A SOURCE OF NON-SECURITY

Dražan Erkić

*Faculty of Business Studies and Law, Union - Nikola Tesla University in Belgrade
drazan.erkic@hotmail.com*

Abstract: *Security as a phenomenon and a concept is a topic that is very current and important for today's modern society. A full understanding of the process in society and the world of politics in general is inconceivable without an understanding of security and its forms and sources of threat. In the multitude of sources of security threats, war is considered very important. The peculiarity of war in the context of endangering security is reflected not only in its brutality, violence, number of victims and a wide range of negative consequences, but that war in the global context is a real cataclysm that basically affects all mankind. Due to its complexity and complexity, war, as a total social conflict and a source of insecurity, affects all spheres of socio-political life and thus leaves disastrous consequences on people, the social system and society as a whole. This paper aims to point out not only the conceptual definition of war and security, as well as historical context, but also to clearly point out the threat of war and its consequences, with special reference to these two phenomena and their relationship in today's globalizing modern society.*

Keywords: *security, war, sources of threat, armed conflict, modern society.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The tendency of people to live and work in a safe environment is a normal occurrence and an existential need. Security is justifiably perceived as necessary and its level of development is largely reflected in all spheres of socio-political life in a society. The entire world public encounters various forms and sources of security threats on a daily basis. The sources of endangerment have changed throughout history, some partially, some completely, so they have disappeared over time, and some have only changed and adapted to the development of society, technique and technology. By

comparison, the threat of biological weapons was not so developed in the past, while today it has experienced so much progress and represents a serious security threat on a global scale. As a serious security threat, both before and today there is war. War is without any doubt a serious security threat, which has always aroused the interest of many, especially experts in the field of military and security sciences. Understanding the war, its causes and consequences is very specific and individual. In order to fully understand the war, a wider range of indicators and detailed analyzes must be taken into account, which are based not only on military and security sciences, but also on some others, such as psychology, sociology, etc. The consequences of war, as a source of security threats, are very brutal, worrying and unpredictable in terms of strength and intensity. War usually covers a wider geographical area and affects a larger number of people, and therefore the consequences are greater. The very technique of warfare, but also the character of war are changeable, which has been shown throughout history. Regarding the change in the structure of the war, it is worth seeing Fiameng according to which "war has changed somewhat in its structure throughout history. Until the French Revolution, it was a problem of the rulers and their mercenary armies. Since then, however, it has also become a problem for the people. Since then, in other words, the total population capable of war has been involved in the war. On the other hand, until the French Revolution, wars were relatively limited in both their goals and their engagement. Those, who were led after that, became more and more ambitious and demanding. The destructive power of war campaigns, which until then did not mean a real threat to the human race, is becoming increasingly destructive. Suffice it to recall only the two world wars and their devastating effects. After all, war can often be defined as an extension of politics by other means. But the thing that could characterize each subsequent war is the possibility of total destruction, not only of the war opponent but also of those who gravitate to him, who are his neighbors, and in the most radical form of the human race in general. In other words, if war was once a means of conducting politics, a possible new world war could, accordingly, be the end of all politics. (Kukić u Fiamengo, 1985:495). With the change in the character of the war, the methods and ways of warfare changed, which resulted in more extensive destruction and threats. There is a lot of violence in the war, which later reflects on the human factor, as well as on property and socio-political life. The view of war and its consequences are very different. Optimists are of the view that people can build a better and more peaceful world and that the key to success is in human nature. By changing themselves, that is, by repairing themselves, people would influence the wars to stop and disappear. However, on the other hand, it is

clear that war is associated with politics and socio-political institutions, while others (pessimists) believe that human nature cannot be changed, but that it is easier to change socio-political institutions that need to be at the very center of interest when considering war as a social phenomenon. Nonetheless, war has been and will remain very interesting to study and view from the perspective of various sciences and scientific disciplines, and this interest in war is justified by the fact that war remains a very serious security threat to people and material goods, which can endanger all humanity and its values.

2. WAR - DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION

There are many theories about war as a phenomenon. This diversity of theories allows for a better understanding of the war itself and its characteristics. War as a complex and intense conflict is primarily determined by its elements viewed from several aspects. Some authors have tried to challenge the war, and some to justify it, believing that war is an inevitability and a real phenomenon that is related to people and society. There are countless definitions in theory that define war, but there is still no single and unified definition. However, in the context of better understanding and understanding of war as a social phenomenon, it is worth seeing the war according to several authors. According to Beridan, "war is a complex and intense conflict between states, military alliances, or various social forces within a state, in which violence is massively organized and armed struggle is waged, in order to achieve certain political, economic and military goals" (Beridan, 2018:127). Unlike Beridan, Lazović and Stišović give a slightly different definition of war. These authors view war as "a form of drastic conflict between political societies in which, in order to achieve political goals, all forms of violence are used on both sides, especially organized, mass and in a relatively long period - armed violence." (Lazović i Stišović, 1998:27). Unlike these authors, Milašinović et al. Give a slightly different definition of war. according to which "war is often defined as the engagement of military means to achieve political goals ... Another, more subtle way - political war - uses images, ideas, speeches, slogans, propaganda, political pressure, and even advertising techniques to influence the political will of the opponent" (Baldwin in Milašinović, et.al., 2012: 131). In order to define and define war as completely as possible, it is necessary to point out the philosophy of war. According to Williams, the three philosophies of war are "marked as political, eschatological and cataclysmic." Clausewitz was the most important proponent of the political philosophy of war, in which war was generally defined as "an act

of violence with the intention of forcing our opponent to fulfill our will.” (Clausewitz 1976:75). In that theory, war was understood as rational, national and instrumental. During his life (1780-1831) war was understood as a legitimate instrument of state policy, although an instrument that should have been used only with a clear goal in mind. Contrary to this view, eschatological philosophy revolves around “the idea that history, or at least a part of it, will culminate in a final war that will lead to the realization of a great plan - divine, natural or human” (Rapoport 1968: 15). The report suggests that this philosophy appears in two variants: messianic and global. In the messianic variant, it is assumed that the factor that is destined to realize the “big plan” already exists. His “mission” is to “impose just peace on the world,” and thus “remove war from future history.” Finally, in cataclysmic philosophy, war is seen “as a catastrophe that affects a part of humanity or the entire human race” (Rapoport 1968: 16). According to this view, war can be understood as God’s penance or as an unfortunate by-product of the anarchic “international system”. And that philosophy appears in two variants: ethnocentric and global. In the ethnocentric version, war is understood as something that is likely to befall us; war is something that others threaten us with. He cannot be of any use to us; all that can be done is to prevent an accident or mitigate its consequences. In the global variant, war is a cataclysm that affects humanity as a whole, and not just a group of people. No one is held accountable and no one will benefit from it.” (Vilijams, 2012:216-217).

In order to better and easier study of war, it is necessary to know well the types of war and the way of their classification. The very division of wars, as well as the doctrine regarding the war, bases its views on the experiences from the war through history, the forces and means used in it, the goals and the like. When it comes to the division of wars, Beridan’s position is valuable, according to which “according to the social and political essence, wars can be divided into just and unjust. This usually means that one warring party leads a just, ie defensive, and the other an unjust, ie offensive. From a political point of view, wars are divided into external and internal, ie wars between states and wars waged by different social forces within one state. For the latter, the term civil war has been most commonly used, since ancient times. According to the size of the affected area and the number of countries participating in them, wars are usually divided into: local, regional and global. A local war is a war in which an armed struggle is waged in a relatively small area, most often between two states or in the process of dissolving a complex state not its member. A regional war is usually considered to be one in which more countries participate in a larger geographical area than the local one. World war means an armed conflict that has

affected more than half of the globe and in which military superpowers are directly involved” (Beridan, 2018: 128-129). In addition to the above classifications of war, according to the same author, wars can also be divided according to the following criteria. Thus, “according to the goal, wars are most often divided into those with a limited and radical goal. A war with a limited goal is one in which the attacker is limited to only some of the goals that the war normally seeks to achieve. A war with a radical goal is a war in which the conflicting parties set political, military and economic goals, the achievement of which would significantly change the existing relations and situation. According to the means that can be used in war, wars are conditionally divided into conventional and nuclear. Conventional warfare involves the use of classic (usual) combat means. Nuclear war would mean the use of nuclear weapons to a greater or lesser extent, or the use of all types of weapons that can be used in war, including chemical and biological. In the time after the Second World War, and in the context of international relations, the terms “cold, psychological or special war” are used. “ (Ibidem, str. 129-130). The war, in general, was largely preceded by psychological propaganda, ie psychological war. As Milošević states, “psychological-propaganda actions (psychological war) are a much broader concept than psychological operations and represent a planned, coordinated and deliberate use of information, propaganda and other activities to put pressure on the consciousness, psyche and morale of the population, in order to accept the system values and gains for the policy of the state that undertakes such actions” (Milošević, 2001: 190). Speaking of war, its classification, consequences, etc. it is also necessary, in order to better understand it, to point out the meaning and characteristics of the armed conflict. According to Beridan, “armed conflict is a term that refers to the mutual use of weapons between two or more states, or different political structures within one state or social groups. Armed conflict may or may not be a war, war is an armed conflict, but more precisely: a comprehensive, massive and intense conflict, with the organized use of military, armed force. The conclusion of the higher order is that armed conflict is a broader concept than war because it does not imply mass (in terms of number of people, material resources) and intensity, complexity as well. Armed conflict can occur at the borders between two states (and last for a shorter time), aircraft of two states can fight armed, if the air forces of one state fly into the airspace of another state, and weapons are used to prevent them. Armed forces of a state can clash with armed terrorist groups and criminal groups that for various reasons (smuggling drugs, other goods, etc.) can try to cross the border of a state, or weapons can be used against special military - police forces that a state tries inserted across the border of

another state. Armed conflict also occurs within states as a civil conflict and represents the struggle of armed groups with the military or police forces of that state, armed groups with each other, military formations of one state against paramilitary formations within it, etc. In the end, it should be concluded that every armed conflict is not a war at the same time. Armed conflict escalates into war when it lasts longer and during that time covers a wider territory of a state, when it becomes massive and intense, complex (comprehensive) as well.” (Beridan, 2003: 110-111).

3. CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF WAR

While studying war, many sciences and scientific disciplines, as well as various scientists and thinkers, tried to focus their interest on the causes of war. In the causes of the war they sought to find a multitude of essential answers. In his book *Čovjek država i rat*“, Waltz believes that there are two important causes of war. According to this author, “wars are related to nature and human behavior. The root of evil is man, and therefore he himself is the root of a specific evil, war. This notion is characterized by a pessimistic attitude: wars stem from selfishness, from misdirected aggressive urges, from stupidity. Pessimists — including classical realists, such as Morgenthau — hold that human nature is incorrigibly immutable, meaning that war is inevitable; in contrast, optimists believe that the elimination of war can be achieved by improving and enlightening people, or by enabling their psycho-social adjustment, which is the light-motive of modern behaviorists. Contrary to pessimists who view international politics and man from the point of view of his aspiration for power - force, optimists try to base their views on the abundance of anthropological, sociological and psychological material, and direct their remedies to policy makers and decision makers. The second position starts from the fact that the causes of war lie in the states, that is, in the state understood individually. It is the structure of the state that represents the dominant factor in the cause-and-effect sequence that leads to conflict, ie war. After all, wars take place between states. In order, therefore, to find possible explanations for the event or non-occurrence of war, international politics must be observed, and the view must be focused on the states themselves.” (Waltz, 1998:38-40). Unlike Waltz, speaking about the causes and motives of the war, the position of Milašinović et al. is of value; they claim that “the opposition of economic and political goals and interests of certain classes, states, institutions (church wars) and peoples leads to war whenever the accumulated social contradictions sharpen to such an extent that all other means except intense armed political violence become insufficient

to resolve them.” So, regardless of the ideological, religious and other slogans under which the war is waged, its motives are always economic and political in nature, while the armed force as a means of waging war is always and in all cases a means and weapon of politics. There is no apolitical war, just as there is no classless politics, as war theorists emphasize ”(Milašinović, et.al., 2012: 208). In any case, the state and politics are closely connected with the war, that is, politics has a great influence on the war. In the context of the influence of politics on war, the point of view of Pandurević is valuable, who clearly indicates that “when it comes to the influence of politics on war, then it is quite clear that politics determines the goal, and that war is a means. In the relationship between politics and war, politics always has an advantage. War also affects politics, but it is of secondary importance.” (Pandurević, 1999:40). Perceiving war as a social phenomenon over a long period of time, it is evident that its characteristics have changed and been conditioned by many different factors. The success of the war and its outcome in part depends on its preparations. Preparations for war are demanding and in peacetime conditions imply more extensive preparations, both in the military sphere and in the sphere of economy and politics. Today, in modern society, modern wars are being fought, which are recognized by their characteristics. Thus, when talking about the characteristics of modern wars, Beridan’s view is that “modern wars are characterized by a high degree of use of war techniques, dynamism of combat operations with the use of all types of armed forces, in order to achieve war goals in a timely manner. All modern wars at the local level threaten to grow into regional or global ones. This characteristic comes from the fact that every war in modern international relations concerns in a certain way most countries of the world, regardless of where it was fought, with their direct or indirect participation in it in terms of political, economic or military influence. Every war is an event of significance for the whole world. There is a great fear of the danger of using nuclear warheads to a greater or lesser extent in any war, due to their worldwide distribution. No matter what level the war is being waged (local, regional or eventually global), it is total for the territory where it is being waged. War encompasses all segments of society: military force, civilian population, economy, etc., with extreme strain, based on the fact that war is the most difficult social situation. In modern wars, the line between front and rear is largely lost. This leads to a constant increase in the percentage of loss of civilian population in relation to members of the armed forces of the country on which the aggression was carried out, with an increasing mass destruction of material goods.” (Beridan, 2018: 131). The introduction to every war, and especially to the modern war, is preceded by certain crises and destabilization of society, which is

reflected through civil riots or other forms of disobedience. In this context, the same author states that “every modern war is preceded by a period of political crisis and an intense” special war “, which is its accompanying appearance until the very end. The reason for this is the attempts to achieve certain goals without the mass use of armed force, on the one hand, and on the other hand, to start and prepare the warring parties from the inside and prepare for war, psychologically, politically and in every other respect. on concessions without armed struggle. The attacked country usually builds its defense by stopping the aggression as soon as possible or by using long-term resistance to aggression. This is one of the reasons why the duration of modern wars is uncertain. In most cases, neither of the conflicting parties can determine it, until one of them corrects its previous goals, independently or under pressure from foreign and international forces.” (Ibidem, str.131-132).

4. WAR - ENDANGERING SECURITY

War has been and remains a very important security threat, especially in countries that are still in the process of development. That is the reason more, that those who deal with security issues cannot and should not ignore the war. Historical facts, but also analyzes of the war, indicate that the war causes enormous suffering, but the war also encourages innovations in the field of technology and science, and can be an instigator, ie the basis for social and political reforms. Williams says that war is sometimes considered a necessary part of maintaining what the United Nations Charter refers to as “international peace and security.” Some people explore wars to help their side win them; others make an analogy with the medical approach to disease and argue that war must be explored to eradicate it. Whatever the motives, the interest in war forms the traditional core of security studies; some analysts think it should stay that way.” (Vilijams, 2012:215-216). Security, since the beginning and development of human society, has been a frequent topic that many have been interested in and written about. Out of that great interest, a single and unified definition has not yet been defined in many security definitions. Many authors find the answer in the very complexity of the phenomenon, and some in the nature of the threat and the object itself that is being protected. Dimitrijević best points to this complexity and difficulty in defining the concept of security, according to which “the definition of security is multidefinite and non-universal”. Everyone understands or glimpses its meaning, and few are able to summarize and explain it. It is indisputable that, in the most general sense, “security exists when it exists and is unhindered (reached, developed and

improved, can be enjoyed) what is (for us) valuable and significant, and when such a state is obviously certain, predictable and controlled, which implies (our) ability to protect it from unwanted influences ”(Dimitrijević, 1973: 38). Unlike Dimitrijevic, according to Kekovic, “security is a phenomenon that establishes complex relationships between people, groups, organizations in an effort to ensure such a situation, or values that are considered important.” (Keković, 2009:16).

With the emergence and emergence of society and its values comes at the same time the emergence of threats. These phenomena of endangerment are related to security itself, which basically deals with the security of people and their property. It is very important for the security in the society to point out its endangerment. According to Ivančević, “endangerment is a common name for a number of related manifestations, phenomena, processes, forms and their sources (causes, roots). Endangerment has an impact on all social processes, so it is practically impossible to determine theoretical and methodological views on all possible aspects of endangerment within one scientific discipline ”(Ivančević in Keković, 2009: 11). In addition to defining the concept of threat, security sciences seek to define and define security threat. According to Savić and Stajić, “since the origin and development of the Basics of Security as an independent teaching-scientific discipline, in order to explain all sources, forms and carriers of socially dangerous and harmful phenomena for society and nature, the term security endangerment has been used.” However, most authors believe that there is no single definition for the term threat itself, because it is often used differently.” (Savić, Stajić, 2006:67). However, when it comes to endangering security, the position of Danicic is of value, according to whom endangerment is “a process that arises due to conflicting interests that cannot be achieved at the same time, nor can a compromise be reached in attitudes on eliminating the causes of conflict.” within the state itself or some other state. Security threats occur when the degree of opposition reaches such a level that it cannot be resolved by peaceful and permissible means in a conventional and reasonable manner ”(Daničić, 2010: 93). The same author gives his opinion on endangering security and defines it so that according to him “endangering security is any unforeseen event, case, behavior, violent action of man, nature or technical systems in a long period of significant scale, which realistically puts or can endanger people and property of the company, and may result in loss of human life or health, loss of equipment and / or loss of business.” (Ibid, str. 94). The security threats associated with the war have been of different shapes and intensities in the past and today. Today’s society, which is considered a form of modern society, is based on constant changes and today’s man is known as modern society. Modern society in the

era of accelerated development of science and technology is facing various security challenges and threats. Weapons and military equipment have also undergone a great transformation and modernization, so that analogous security threats have appeared, which are used in armed conflict, ie war. These threats are much more serious and lead to greater and more dangerous consequences for security, and in the context of maintaining security, comprehensive action must be taken at all levels of people's organization, from local to global. Serious security threats, including war, today in modern society require rapid exchange of necessary security information with the greatest possible international cooperation of various security entities and other entities that directly and indirectly contribute to the realization of the security function.

CONCLUSION

Man, as a conscious human being, has as his primary interest to be safe and to develop unhindered. The man was not able to provide his necessary security alone, individually, but he sought protection in a community with another, that is, in the state. In the past, the beginnings of the human community, and especially today the state, are a guarantee to man to exercise his rights and freedoms and meet his basic life needs. Any kind of endangerment of these rights is related to human security. The variety of sources of security threats is great and worrying, and war as one of the sources of insecurity is of particular concern to people and humanity as a whole. Today's global modern society is facing a great challenge, how to respond, and especially how to prevent the causes that lead to the endangerment of people and material goods by war. That war is a serious source of security threats is shown by the fact that it is at the very center of the study and practice of it by the security sciences. This danger and the threat that comes with war have been recognized by the security sciences, that is, security studies. In order to better understand future processes in the era of globalization, war, armed conflict, is a constant and inexhaustible topic for scientists engaged in peace studies. Taking into account relevant historical facts, expert analyzes and usual statistical indicators regarding the dangers and harms of war, but also future projections of security threats, war will be an inexhaustible and constant topic of the public at the global level, especially the professional public. The consequences of war are not only a problem of security sciences, but also of others such as sociology, economics, law, etc. A special area of interest is human rights, which are denied and disputed during the war, which is inadmissible under all international

and domestic regulations. It is certain that the war will continue, in today's modern society, to be a serious challenge and a threat to security.

REFERENCES

- [1] Beridan, I. (2003). *Konflikti*, Fakultet političkih nauka, Sarajevo.
- [2] Beridan, I. (2018). *Porodica i rat*, Fakultet političkih nauka, Sarajevo.
- [3] Daničić, M. (2010). *Bezbjednosni menadžment*. Fakultet za bezbjednost i zaštitu, Banja Luka.
- [4] Dimitrijević, V. (1973). Bezbednost i politička zajednica, pojam bezbednosti u međunarodnim odnosima, *Savez udruženja pravnika Jugoslavije, Beograd*, 7-38.
- [5] Fiamengo, A. (1985). *Osnove opće sociologije (o društvenim sukobima i ratu, XVI izdanje)*. Narodne novine, Zagreb.
- [6] Keković, Z. (2009). *Teorija sistema bezbjednosti*. Fakultet za bezbjednost i zaštitu, Banja Luka.
- [7] Lazović M, Stišović M. (1998). *Teorija ratne veštine*, Policijska akademija, Beograd.
- [8] Milašinović, R., Milašinović S., Putnik R. (2012). *Teorije konflikata - drugo izmenjeno i dopunjeno izdanje*, Univerzitet u Beogradu - Fakultet bezbednosti, Beograd.
- [9] Milašinović, S., Jevtović, Z., Despotović, Lj. (2012). *Politika, mediji, bezbednost*. Kriminalističko-policijska akademija, Beograd.
- [10] Milošević, M. (2001). *Sistem državne bezbednosti*. Policijska akademija, Beograd.
- [11] Pandurević, V. (1999). *Osnovi doktrine odbrane Republike Srpske*. Institut za geopolitičke studije, Beograd.
- [12] Savić, A., Stajić, Lj. (2006). *Osnovi civilne bezbednosti*. Fakultet za pravne i poslovne studije, Novi Sad.
- [13] Vilijams, D. P. (2012). *Uvod u studije bezbednosti*, Fakultet bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu, Beograd.
- [14] Waltz K.N. (1998). *Čovjek, država i rat*, Institut za međunarodne odnose, Zagreb.