

NUCLEAR WAR – AS A PLAUSIBLE PERSPECTIVE

Brigadier-general (ret.) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, Ph.D*
(Academy of Romanian Scientists, 3 Ilfov, 050044, Bucharest, Romania,
email: secretariat@aosr.ro)

Colonel (ret.) Professor Eng. Eugen SITEANU, Ph.D**
(Academy of Romanian Scientists, 3 Ilfov, 050044, Bucharest, Romania,
email: secretariat@aosr.ro)

Abstract: *As is known, the phrase "nuclear war" accompanied the division of the world according to ideological criteria, on the one hand the Western world, adept at a liberal economy and democracy, and on the other hand the communist world, adept at a centralized economy and which subordinated the natural freedom of man to an understood necessity. This ideological division of the world lasted for several decades, threatening each other, coexisting in what was called the Cold War, in which the great powers, on the one hand the USA and the NATO military bloc, and on the other hand the USSR and the Warsaw Pact military bloc, threatened each other, but avoided declaring war, because it was considered that a nuclear war would end without a winner, in an apocalyptic ending. The contradictions between the two systems unfolded within the political and diplomatic framework created by the great statesman Theodore Roosevelt, through the existence of the UN and the Security Council, to which all the states of the world related through the cultivation of international law. The Second World War had not yet ended and Theodore Roosevelt was concerned with creating a global organizational framework, designed to ensure world peace, thus laying the foundations of the United Nations. In this process, he convinced two countries to join him at first: the USSR and Great Britain, followed by many others. Immediately after the end of this great world conflagration, the victorious states conceived international institutions designed to regulate important aspects of relations between states, aiming, as appropriate, to consolidate peace and eliminate wars, support the development of world economies to raise the general standard of living, protect the environment, eradicate poverty, respect fundamental human rights, etc., all within the framework of the United Nations. The Security Council, consisting of the USA, USSR, Great Britain, France and China, was meant to jointly provide the forces to deter any attempt to disregard international order. Ideological competition intensified continuously, until the USSR imploded, and the bloc of socialist countries broke away from Soviet tutelage. When everyone believed that humanity would move towards eternal peace, with the revisionist claims of Russia, especially after it invaded Ukraine, the specter of a war involving*

* Entitled member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, email: udrescumircea@yahoo.com.

** Corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, entitled member of the Romanian Committee for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (CRIFST) of the Romanian Academy, email: esiteanu@yahoo.com.

the great powers of the world became a reality. And, what is terrible, this time nuclear war no longer scares anyone, since the threats with nuclear weapons are accepted, they have become an everyday fact, constituting an event not only predictable, but also probably for a not too distant moment and irresponsibly supported by a good part of the media.

Keywords: cold war, conventional, nuclear, peace, ideology, aggression.

DOI 10.56082/annalsarscimit.2025.3.66

Introduction

After several countries, which not many years ago had been part of the communist bloc, asked to join NATO, as NATO moved closer to the Russian Federation, it tried to dictate what the position of some states that belonged to the USSR should be, specifically requesting that Ukraine become a neutral state, as the foundation of its existential security. Noting that Ukraine was manifesting its own security interests, the Russian Federation separated Crimea from Ukraine in 2014 and declared a special military operation in eastern Ukraine, a war that has already exceeded three years. Since Western countries accused the Russian Federation of military aggression against an independent state and switched to multilateral aid to it, threats of nuclear retaliation from the Russian side have multiplied, and the Western media ridicule such threats, suggesting that the war continue until the final victory against the Russian Federation. No one is afraid of the specter of nuclear war anymore.

I. Fundamentals of the Cold War

I.1. Organisms responsible for world order

The United Nations (U.N.) – is another international governmental organization, headquartered in New York, Geneva and Vienna, which was established by the signing, on June 26, 1945, of the San Francisco Charter by 51 states. The U.N. Charter effectively entered into force on October 24, 1945. The U.N. is considered the most representative forum with a universal vocation. According to the U.N. Charter, the organization's purposes are: maintaining international peace and security; developing friendly relations among nations based on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; achieving international collaboration in order to solve international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian nature. To ensure its proper functioning, the UN was conceived as a synergistic organization of six special bodies, as follows:

The General Assembly – as a representative body, made up of all members affiliated with the Organization. It is invested with the right to discuss any issue within the Organization's competence. Its resolutions have the character of recommendations for the member states. It is convened

once a year, but it can also meet in extraordinary sessions, as well as in emergency sessions.

The Security Council is the action body of the United Nations, invested, by the UN Charter, with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It is made up of representatives of 15 UN member states, of which five are permanent members (PRC China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the USA) and ten are non-permanent members, elected for a period of two years by the General Assembly. According to the UN Charter, the Security Council acts to prevent and resolve international conflicts, and, in the event of a serious breach of the peace, of its violation, it is empowered to take prompt and effective action, to apply coercive measures, without or with the use of armed force, to ensure peace. With a view to this end, the Security Council may take, against the aggressor, economic and diplomatic coercive measures that do not involve the use of armed force, such as: partial or total interruption of economic relations and of railway, air, postal communications, as well as the severance of diplomatic relations by members of the United Nations. When these do not lead to the desired results, the Security Council may take any action it deems necessary to maintain or restore peace and security. The UN Charter assigns to the Security Council the responsibility for disarmament, for drawing up plans for the establishment of a system of arms regulation. The Security Council also performs other additional functions, such as: together with the General Assembly of the U.N. elects the members of the International Court of Justice, recommends to the General Assembly the states that request admission to the U.N., decides on the measures to be taken by the member states of the U.N. to maintain international peace and security or to restore it if peace has been disturbed. The Security Council may recommend to the General Assembly, which decides, as the case may be, the suspension from rights or exclusion from the U.N. of a member state that violates the main provisions of the U.N. Charter. In procedural matters, the decisions of the Security Council must meet nine votes, and in substantive matters they must obtain the affirmative votes of nine members, which must include the affirmative vote of all permanent members, that is, the unanimity of the great powers. This is how the unanimity of the Security Council has directed the general behavior of states throughout this period of globalization.

3. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) promotes international cooperation in economic and social matters and is composed of 54 members, elected by the General Assembly for a period of three years, based on the principle of proportional and equitable geographical distribution.

4. The Trusteeship Council supervises the administration of territories under the U.N. trust.

5. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the basic judicial organ of the Organization, headquartered in The Hague, composed of 15 judges elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in their personal capacity, for a period of nine years. The ICJ resolves only disputes between states, based on the prior consent of the parties, and gives advisory opinions on matters of international interest.

6. The U.N. Secretariat is an administrative and executive organ, headed by a Secretary-General elected by the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Security Council, for a period of five years.

To implement international decisions, many other internationally recognized institutions operated with the support and agreement of the UN, including: the World Financial Fund, the World Bank, the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Bank for International Settlements, the International Development Association, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the World Association of Investment Promotion Agencies, the World Trade Center Association, the International Development Association, the World Trade Organization, etc.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) - as a specialized institutional organization of the United Nations, was established in 1945, when the first twenty-nine member nations signed the Articles of Agreement, but began its practical activity in March 1947. The acceptance of a new member state was intended to be based on a "membership resolution", which was to include: the conditions of admission - the size of the allocated quota, the modalities and dates of payments, the term for triggering the initial parity, etc. The management structure of the IMF was and continues to be made up of: the Board of Governors, the supreme governing body, which establishes the subscription quotas for each state, the Board of Directors and the Managing Director. The subscription quotas, i.e. the sources available to the Fund, are reviewed every five years, thus determining the value of the Special Drawing Rights and the number of votes of each member state. The loans requested by member states are approved by the board of governors, but any applicant for funds must harmonize its domestic legislation in order to be able to fulfill the IMF's prudential policies, a process that creates the material premises for the IMF's involvement in the internal affairs of the respective state. Since the United States of America holds 18.25 percent of the vote on the IMF board, that is, three times more than any other member, being the only state with a veto right, there are more and more considerations that support the fact that this organization is under the disguised leadership of the U.S.A.

On the contrary, official IMF documents consider the Fund to be a central institution of the international monetary system, which manages the international payments system and the exchange rate system between national currencies, making business possible between different countries,

and its declared purpose is to prevent crises in the international monetary system, encouraging countries to apply sound economic policies, and to come to the aid of its members who need temporary financing to correct their balance of payments imbalances. The Fund acts for the purpose of general prosperity, promoting: balanced expansion of world trade, stability of exchange rates, avoidance of competitive devaluations, disciplined correction of balance of payments problems. Opponents of international financial regulations integrated into the International Monetary Fund consider the Fund's actions to be synonymous with the expansion of poverty through global measures, to which the United States of America is no stranger, since, in this area, it is the only great power that imposes its will through the veto system. These opponents explain the IMF's actions as follows: The World Bank and the BIS create capital markets and tempt governments to make risky or poorly managed loans through their private banks. In situations where debts begin to be defaulted, interest rates rise, etc., and the IMF intervenes through a rescue operation, with outstanding loans being restructured or replaced with new loans from the IMF. Already distressed states thus obtain additional amounts of money to be able to pay interest and to be able to launch new economic projects. But, under the false slogan of poverty reduction, the citizens of the borrowing states end up in a worse situation than the initial one. The borrowing process is relatively simple. The International Monetary Fund lends money to national governments, the respective countries often being in fiscal or monetary crisis. For this reason, the International Monetary Fund has become known as a lender of last resort. When a country starts to have problems due to a payment deficit, the International Monetary Fund intervenes, upon request, to save it from major macroeconomic imbalances. Since all states refer to the official quotation made by the IMF to the Special Drawing Right unit, there are many voices that consider that the IMF has become a true currency controller over all countries traveling on the globalization express. To reinforce this perception, IMF publications insist that their concern is justified, both for the way financial problems arise and are resolved within many member countries, and for the way the global financial system functions as a whole. Since some of the decisions adopted by the International Monetary Fund's bodies have not been fully implemented by all member states of the organization, the credibility of this body has begun to deteriorate, but the IMF continues to be perceived as a reference financial body in international relations.

The World Bank (WB) is a specialized banking system within the International Monetary Fund, consisting of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the International Development Association (IDA), and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Association (MIGA). The

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development focuses on middle-income countries and those worthy of receiving loans, while the International Development Association focuses only on countries considered to be very poor. The main objective of the WB is to support developing countries in raising their standard of living, by using financial resources from developed countries. According to the statutory provisions, the main functions of the World Bank are: to provide assistance to member countries for the purpose of economic reconstruction and development, increasing productive forces, and valorizing natural resources in developing countries; stimulating private capital investments by granting guarantees; promoting a long-term balanced growth of international trade and supporting the balance of payments by encouraging international capital investments to increase the economic resources of member countries; taking measures to use the credits granted by the bank or the credits guaranteed by it, first of all, for the most efficient and urgent projects. The financing by the World Bank of some objectives in member countries can be done by granting credits, participating in loans granted by any financial institution or by the government, guaranteeing loans granted by other financial institutions, etc. In exercising these functions and financial operations, the World Bank may have contacts only with the central financial institutions of the member countries, such as: treasury, central bank, stabilization fund, other similar institutions.

The World Trade Organization is the world organization through which member countries undertake to respect, in their relations with each other, certain rules and principles, intended to reduce customs duties and remove quantitative restrictions on trade, so that they contribute more substantially to the sustainable recovery of the world economy. The founding act of the World Trade Organization can be considered the Final Act of the Uruguay Round, signed in Marrakech (Morocco) and entered into force on 1 January 1995. The aforementioned final act concretized the debates held for almost twelve years within the Uruguay Round, stipulating that a new framework for conducting trade negotiations is needed, which would lay the foundations for a multilateral, strengthened, stable and transparent trading system. The World Trade Organization, which began its activity on January 1, 1997, is considered the third pillar of the world economy - the others being the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. The fundamental principles underlying the activity of the World Trade Organization are: the principle of non-discrimination in trade relations, with contracting parties having to grant each other the most-favoured-nation clause; the prohibition of quantitative restrictions and other barriers as multiple effects on the import and export of goods; the non-discriminatory application of non-quantitative restrictions, if such restrictions are accepted, by way of derogation from the other principles; the

elimination of export subsidies; the protection of national economies from foreign competition only with the help of customs duties; the use of consultations as a fundamental method for assessing the harm to the trade interests of the parties; the adoption of decisions by general consensus, etc.

Trade negotiations within the World Trade Organization have been and are being carried out in the form of conferences and rounds. These are based on certain principles, such as: each contracting party has the right to decide whether or not to participate in the negotiations; no contracting party can be asked to make unilateral concessions; all contracting parties benefit from the results of customs negotiations, regardless of whether or not they participate in the negotiations; the withdrawal of concessions agreed upon multilaterally cannot be done unilaterally, etc.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is a body of the UN General Assembly, whose main objective is to intensify the efforts of the countries of the world aimed at expanding collaboration and cooperation, achieving equal participation of all states in international economic and social life, in accordance with their interests.

The main functions of UNCTAD are: to promote the expansion of international trade among all countries by accelerating economic development; to formulate principles and policies regarding international trade; to submit proposals and adopt appropriate measures, within the limits of its competence, for their practical application; to facilitate the coordination of the activities of other institutions of the United Nations system with responsibilities in international trade; to take measures, together with other UN bodies, in connection with the negotiation and adoption of multilateral legal instruments in international trade; to ensure the harmonization of the policies of governments and regional economic groupings in the field of foreign trade and economic development.

The organizational structure of UNCTAD includes: the Conference, the Council and the Secretariat.

The Conference on Trade and Development meets every three years, starting with 1964, when the first Conference was held. From the ranks of UNCTAD, the Group of 77 developing countries was formed, which developed the Charter of Economic Rights of the "Third World" (Algiers, 1967), a group later expanded to 96, which, in 1972, developed the Lima Declaration, dedicated to coordinating the actions of developing countries. A wide range of issues was debated at the conferences held, including: the elimination of all tariff and non-tariff barriers to world trade in primary products; the establishment and increase of prices for these products and the conclusion of international product agreements, designed to mitigate the deterioration of their prices; the improvement of invisible trade; financing the development of developing countries; the granting by developed countries of amounts representing 1% of their gross national product for the

establishment of the U.N. fund for the development of developing countries; the intensification of trade and economic cooperation between developing countries; the granting by developed countries of a non-reciprocal preferential customs regime for manufactured products from developing countries; the participation of developing countries in international currency reform, etc. The Trade and Development Board is the permanent organ of UNCTAD, which ensures the development of the activity between sessions. The Trade and Development Board has several permanent committees under its control: the Committee on Commodities, the Committee on Manufactured Products, the Committee on Maritime Transport and the Committee on Trade-Related Intangibles and Finance.

The Secretariat is based in Geneva and has a liaison office at the U.N. (New York).

The other organisms and organizations that have operated and still operate under the aegis of the UN represent ways of the matrix architecture of managing the multiple international problems put into operation to manage world peace.

I.2. Cultivating humanistic responsibilities

The UN became an international body when its initiators overcame basic ideological differences – capitalism versus communism – and imagined a world that could develop in peace, through consultation and understandings between the countries that declared themselves permanent members of the Security Council, understandings that made possible the joint effort to defeat the revanchist current generated years ago by Germany, Italy and Japan, which were joined by a series of other states that entered their sphere of interests.

It can be concluded that the world order after the Second World War was an order of political coexistence of two great ideologies, capitalist and communist, which created international institutions designed to serve general development, to facilitate the requirements of globalization, but also to ensure the victory of general principles of social organization. By major political consensus, the UN Charter, the UN General Assembly Declaration on International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, in accordance with the UN Charter – Resolution 2625 of 26 October 1970, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1975, as well as numerous other decisions of the UN General Assembly created the legal infrastructure on which the forms of globalization required by market laws were expanded and diversified, given that the great powers feared the outbreak of military hostilities supported by hostile military blocs. This is how international law was initiated and became operational, to which any state referred in its relations with other states.

Until there was talk of a certain victory following the Cold War, the following general principles for the defense of peace were promoted within the UN, as follows: equality of rights of states; renunciation of force and the threat of the use of force in international relations; the right of peoples to determine their own destinies; the peaceful settlement of international disputes; the sovereignty and independence of states; non-intervention in matters within the national competence of a state; the cultivation of good neighborliness between states; the observance in good faith of the obligations assumed, etc.

By virtue of their sovereignty, according to international law, states have accepted a range of their rights and obligations, which limited their possibility of abusing power, both domestically and internationally. Through the UN Charter, a series of declarations of the UN General Assembly have enshrined the main rights of states, as follows: the right to existence, the right to peace and security, the right to decide their own destinies, the right to self-defense, the right to the integrity and inviolability of the territory, the right to development, the right to natural resources, the right to be part of international organizations, the right to conclude treaties, the right to participate in solving international problems, the right to cooperation, the right to non-discriminatory treatment, etc. In turn, the fundamental duties of states were closely correlated with their rights.

The general security context of the immediate post-victory period after the Cold War consecrated the end of the bipolar world and the entry of the world order into a period of transition, with a great political charge. The defeated countries, and a good part of the victorious ones, hoped that international life would follow a trajectory of promoting equality, according to principles devoid of radical ideologies. The world, belonging to both blocs, hoped and dreamed of a fairer, safer and more prosperous world under the rule of the UN, but the correct functionality of the international bodies created during the Cold War began to be disregarded precisely by the countries that had patronized their emergence and maintenance and, instead of consolidating the institutional world order, a new world order appeared on the horizon, which was intended to be hegemonic. The hegemonic order, initially promoted by the USA, supported by the former NATO states, desired a unipolar world that, in the name of declared American exceptionalism, aimed to make the USA a supreme international arbiter, ready to dispose of and enforce rules of American origin everywhere in the world. However, the illusion of the sole world power assumed by the USA was questioned, institutionally, on July 1, 2005, by the public declaration of two member countries of the Security Council, the Russian Federation and China, a declaration tacitly accepted even by countries that not many years ago formed the bloc of capitalist countries. This time the "power of force", which stemmed from bloc politics, found itself increasingly challenged by

the "power of law", a kind of mirage of the future world. As such, we believe that globalization has entered a process of theoretical and methodological clarifications, which seems to bring a new stage of globalization, based on a political foundation of participatory international political management, supporting a logic of extended interstate cooperation. After about three decades of enjoying victory in the Cold War, globalization finds itself in a situation where its prospects for consolidation and diversification are jeopardized by the increasing degree of insecurity, as evidence of the inefficiency of the international system, which has remained entrenched in past policies, insensitive to the demands of change. Essentially, the causes of the failure of the international security system stem from the manner in which states, especially those considered powerful, understand how to conduct their foreign policy. At the global level, the UN is inoperable due to the contradictions between the big five within the Security Council, which use their veto right unprincipledly. In turn, each of the five, at the regional level, is withdrawing regional relations, out of a desire to employ as many state entities as possible as vehicles of their own interests.

II. Nuclear war is preparing

II.1. Intensification of geopolitical tensions

The growing geopolitical tensions between the great powers, especially after the emergence of the BRICS geostrategic and political pole, have brought about major changes in the military plan, changes that were frighteningly triggered mainly by the aggression of the Russian Federation on Ukraine in February 2022, followed by the intensification of the differences between the USA and China, regarding the future of Taiwan, as well as by the terrorist attack by Hamas on Israel, in the Middle East. The whole world seems to have moved from a state of cultivating peace to a state of pre-world war, the basic characteristic of which will be its nuclear component. Since the invasion of Crimea, the world's hegemonic powers have been relentlessly demanding a new redrawing of their spheres of influence, ignoring any efforts at compromise, in which no one wants to talk about freely acceptable leadership, but rather about dictate and obedient alignment.

In this context, the European Union is fully committed, alongside the US, to supporting Ukraine, wishing, according to all official statements, not to conclude peace as soon as possible, but to the definitive defeat of the Russian Federation. In turn, the Russian Federation enjoys the visible support of the BRICS countries. China, in its desire to take over political leadership in Taiwan, is supported by the BRICS states, but also by other authoritarian states, which oppose the liberal policies promoted by the US and other Western states. The simple bombings of the Suez Canal,

seemingly out of nowhere but obviously supported by Iran, have caused more than 12% of world trade to bypass Africa, which is unsettling markets everywhere, which are forced to take into account increasingly higher prices, as economies find it increasingly difficult to cope with military-origin restrictions.

II.2. Nuclear War – Operational Variant

After the world realized that the Cold War had ended, the USA considered itself entitled to be considered its victorious country, the other NATO states, along with others that supported the USA in ensuring the balance of forces specific to the Cold War, considered that they had made serious contributions to the victory, and declared their contribution to this victory in one way or another, only the Russian Federation always considered that it did not feel defeated, since there were no military confrontations between the two blocs, and the USSR, in full consensus with the other states that were part of the Warsaw Treaty, expressed its free will to abolish this treaty and to align itself with the UN efforts to maintain peace, based on generally recognized international rules. While one side was savoring the victory, the other side considered the joy of those who considered themselves victors to be unnatural.

It was not long after the euphoria of eliminating the major causes of the outbreak of a world war between the West and the Communist Bloc, that some countries, especially the Russian Federation, China, Iran, etc., formed a bloc of revisionist powers, which no longer agreed with the policies of the USA and its traditional allies. On both sides of these two new trends, states radically accused each other, as the case may be, of: the affirmation of power politics; the crisis of international law; the crisis of democratic life; the struggle for regional supremacy; competition between rival countries; tendencies to overextend power; states with dictatorial leaderships; aggressor states; states that cultivate double standards; states that no longer respect international law, etc.

If during the Cold War, the two great powers, but also the other countries, aligned or non-aligned, considered that general peace must be maintained, because any escalation of the war would entail the use of nuclear weapons, the use of which was capable of resulting in the destruction of human civilization even several times over. As such, the nuclear apocalypse urged ideologically adversarial countries to take responsibility, to find other means of achieving state interests, without resorting to war, because the war between the great powers could degenerate in a short time into a nuclear war.

Now, after the West and the Russian Federation have mutually supported each other to embark on the path of war, it seems that a future nuclear war is being considered, both by the Russian Federation, which sees

itself threatened by the West's involvement in supporting Ukraine, and declares through the voice of its president, Vladimir Putin, that it is considering a nuclear retaliation, but also by Western officials, who encourage, on behalf of their peoples, general efforts dedicated to military confrontation with the Russian Federation, cultivating the illusion that victory over the Russians is possible without nuclear implications.

After about three years of bloody war between the Western world and the Russian Federation, through the sacrifice of the Ukrainian population, in conditions where there is no prospect of a victory for Ukraine and there are no premises for peace, officials of Western countries are competing to support the imperative of Western countries entering a logic of predicting a global war, which is why public opinion must be aware of the need for a military mobilization of industry and the population. For Boris Pistorius, the German Minister of Defense, support for Ukraine is seen as an existential condition for preventing an even wider conflict. As such, by defeating Kiev, the German minister warns that "It would be a mistake to think that Putin will limit himself to Ukraine. His minimalist objective is to restore the borders of the former Soviet Union. If Russia wins in Ukraine, he may feel encouraged to attack other sovereign states. The frontline states, especially the Baltics, become a potential target amid the restoration of Russian military power."

For his part, the Swedish Minister of Civil Defense recently declared "many have said it before me, but I want to reiterate with all the authority of my portfolio: there could be a war in Sweden," because "Russia's objective remains the eradication of a free Ukraine and the creation of a Europe in which force rules the law, with buffer states and spheres of interest." There are many voices that warn that Russia has already switched to the war industry, while Europe is delaying the mobilization of its industrial potential. In this regard, the assessments of the British Defense Minister, Grant Shapps, at the beginning of the year, are suggestive, who considered: "We are at the dawn of a new era. The Berlin Wall is a distant memory. We are back where we started. From a post-war to a pre-war world." Regarding a possible Taiwan crisis, Admiral John Aquillino, commander of US forces deployed in the Pacific, predicted: "Let's expect a show of force from China against Taiwan soon."

Malcolm Davis, an associate expert at the Australian Strategic Policy Institute, an influential military research center in Canberra, fully supported the need to prepare for a long-term war: "Let's be blunt: if we are facing the prospect of a global conflict in the second half of this decade – a third world war – then we need to quickly change the way our defense industrial base operates and explicitly prepare for that," which is why "We need to prepare for the prospect of a major prolonged war in both the Indo-Pacific and Europe. And so far we haven't done that. We assumed it would never

happen and now we are facing that prospect, with the first test coming from Ukraine, the second in the Middle East and the third test probably coming in the Taiwan Strait. And we are not prepared,” because “We need a kind of pre-war/pre-war mentality. It’s the kind of thing we had to do in the second half of the 1930s, when we “We rushed to prepare and fortunately we had enough Spitfires to save the day. But will we have enough Spitfires this time? Shouldn’t we learn the wrong lesson from Ukraine that just because the Russians suffered heavy losses in the first two years of the war doesn’t mean they won’t win in the end. They could reverse this, especially if Western military support for Ukraine starts to taper off in 2024. The Russians have the military-industrial capacity to actually turn this around and win.” In Focus “This would send a huge message to Beijing, which would encourage Xi to make a move against Taiwan.”

Sounding a similar note, military analyst Hal Brands warned in Foreign Affairs: “The United States would have great difficulty mobilizing for a war in multiple theaters, or even mobilizing for a protracted conflict in one region, while keeping its allies supplied in others. It may have difficulty generating the munitions needed for a war between great powers or replacing the ships, planes, and submarines lost in battle. If the war spans multiple theaters in Eurasia, Washington and its allies may not win.”

II.3. Mutual threats multiply

Since the new US leadership began to express its intention to no longer be interested in Europe, France and Great Britain have declared that they assume the nuclear umbrella of Europe and continue to make efforts in the direction of multilateral aid to Ukraine until the final victory. It seems that the Western European world is willing to maintain the war spirit in Ukraine, considering that Russian threats do not represent a threat to Western civilization. The US has threatened Russia with new economic sanctions, which will directly affect it, but all countries that maintain economic relations with it will be affected.

On July 16, spokesman Dmitry Peskov said that all provisions of Russia’s nuclear doctrine “remain in force,” reiterating the idea that nuclear states must “respond” for any provocations from their non-nuclear allies, since the doctrine, revised in the fall of 2024, includes a clear clause: “in the event that a non-nuclear country attacks Russia with the support of a nuclear power, the Russian Federation may consider this act a combined attack.” Western commentators emphasize that this legal-military ambiguity is designed to discourage NATO support for Ukraine by insinuating major risks of escalation. The same commentators warn that all these messages – from nuclear threats to “peace” rhetoric – are elements of a well-calibrated information campaign designed to undermine NATO cohesion and fuel skepticism among the American and European public about continued

military support for Ukraine. Therefore, amid a military offensive that is stagnating in many sectors of the front and an international context more volatile than ever, "Moscow seems to have returned to what it knows best: psychological and propaganda warfare. This time, however, the stakes are higher – and not just for Ukraine. If the signals coming from Moscow manage to divide NATO or cause strategic fatigue among the allies, the consequences could be felt far beyond the battlefield in Donbas." In a recently published message, Medvedev warned that Trump's repeated ultimatums regarding a peace agreement in Ukraine would amount not to a threat to Russia, but to one "against his own country." Trump's response was not long in coming. He ordered the repositioning of the submarines "in appropriate regions" if Medvedev's "reckless statements" were more than mere verbal provocations. US Secretary of State Marco Rubio immediately downplayed the significance of the Russian message, recalling that Medvedev no longer has any role in decision-making in the Kremlin. An opinion shared by Russian analysts, who consider the former president a decorative figure, who has become more of a symbol of excessive rhetoric than political action. Against this background, in an interview with a television station, US President Donald Trump said that he had ordered the repositioning of the two American nuclear submarines near Russia, amid new nuclear threats from former Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Well, a former Russian president, who is now at the head of one of the most important councils, Medvedev, said some very serious things, talking about nuclear weapons. And when you mention the word 'nuclear,' you know, my eyes get big and I say, 'We better watch out,' because that's the ultimate threat," Donald Trump commented. "He shouldn't have said that. He's got a big mouth. He's said other things in the past. So we always want to be prepared. That's why I sent two nuclear submarines to the region. I just want to make sure that his words are just words and nothing more," Donald Trump commented.

As the great powers threaten each other with their nuclear capabilities, countries like Poland or Estonia publicly declare their willingness to accept the deployment of nuclear weapons on their own territory, as a measure of protection and strengthening of their national security against the specific actions of the hybrid war carried out by Russia.

In such a media climate, it seems that no one is interested in peace and the consolidation of appropriate trade relations, but everyone is preparing for war, completely ignoring the consequences of its degeneration into a nuclear war that, this time, would be intended to guarantee the victory of a certain party.

Conclusions

The Cold War did not degenerate into a classic war because the nuclear apocalypse made political decision-makers responsible. In the name of the principles generated by the laws of the market, they urged humanity towards economic globalization, by promoting the freedom of movement of goods, the freedom of movement of capital and the freedom of movement of labor. From the moment when economic laws began to be interpreted by important actors of the international market as risks and threats to national security, the idea of globalization began to decline. That is why more and more states suggest the need for a reglobalization process, in which shared interests would be promoted.

The post-Cold War world dreams of a legitimate world order, able to unleash the processes of globalization, devoid of hegemonies that publicly establish vassal countries, impose their own peace and label everyone else as terrorists, anti-democratic, radicals, aggressors, etc. The world expects the current countries engaged in hegemonic approaches to become promoters of peace, international security and peaceful coexistence, fundamental landmarks in the management of international tensions of any nature.

The key question of the future is related to the moment when the countries with the current hegemonic inclination will return to general responsibilities, to good faith involvement in the management of the world edifice, with a convincing vision of a global community of shared interests, as a fundamental condition of global stability.

Countries with hegemonic appetite, in the name of global responsibility for peace and humanity, are urged to transform their current hegemonic approaches into interstate management that can be constituted on the basis of shared convictions, as was possible with the implementation of the United Nations more than eight decades ago. An international community based on shared interests does not presuppose a world government, does not presuppose a nation of global governance, but common governance generated by behavioral consensus. A broad and institutionalized international cooperation, as a focus of globalization, excludes any unilateral trade barriers, any distortion of political, economic and any other kind of predictability. Political globalization, based on a constitution of globalization, has as its central axis general harmony. This process is now slowed down, but it must be encouraged, developed and encouraged, necessarily institutionalized, in order to promote the common destiny of humanity. Calls for armament and war between the great powers constitute sure steps towards an all-destructive nuclear confrontation. There are not a few who believe that a great nuclear power cannot be defeated militarily except through a devastating nuclear war. It seems that no one

takes into account the fact that such a war has two actors, both possessing devastating nuclear weapons.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BĂDĂLAN E., UDRESCU M., MINCU C., *Condiționări logistice în epoca globalizării*, Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Știință, București, 2010;
- MARGA A., *Școala de la Frankfurt în fața istoriei*, Editura Meteor Press, București, 2023;
- POUMPOURAS E., *Strategii pentru propria securitate*, Editura Meteor Press, București, 2022;
- Cronicile, revistă trimestrială, anii 2023-2025;
- Lumea, revistă lunară, anii 2023-2025.

