

Times of Transition

Editorial Team

<https://doi.org/10.5209/geop.110058>

You don't need to be an expert in Geopolitics or International Relations to perceive that we are facing a period of global disorder. The international press reminds us of this every day. Traditional alliances are in crisis: «La conferencia de Múnich, símbolo de la Europa más atlantista, acusa a Trump de 'demoler' el orden internacional» (*El País*, 9 February 2026). Stephen E. Hanson and Jeffrey S. Kopstein denounce the questioning of the inviolability of state territories: «We Tried Fuzzy Borders in the 19th Century. It Didn't Go Well Then, Either» (*The New York Times*, 27 May 2026). Either the end of the old liberal global order is announced: «Donald Trump ordonne le retrait des Etats-Unis de 66 organisations internationales» (*Le Monde*, 8 January 2026). Or the spheres of influence seem to be returning: «Trump e o regresso da geopolítica rígida às Américas» (*O Globo*, 26 December 2025). These are just a few examples.

The fact is that we at the magazine felt we had to contribute to shedding light on this situation, and for this reason, we devised a Debate Forum that appears in this issue: «Trump: Anomaly or Herald of a New Geopolitical Order?» (in English and Spanish). How did we conceive of the debate forum? In the «About the Magazine» section of our website, we explain it in detail. It consists of:

Brief reflections on current topics proposed by the editorial team. Generally, it begins with an initial proposal document, followed by different individual responses. Individual articles should be between 1,500 and 2,000 words in length, including references (endnotes and subheadings are discouraged). Discussion forums are not peer-reviewed, but they are reviewed by the editor and possibly other members of the editorial team. They can be published in Spanish, English, or Portuguese.

We believe this is an agile format for providing relatively quick answers to questions like these, which concern everyone, without ruling out its use in other contexts and with a different dynamic than the one described. It is faster than a monograph and subject to less editorial bureaucracy than a special issue.

To launch the Forum, we sent a text by John Agnew, «The New 'Geometries' of Global Power,» to 11 specialists in Geopolitics who had responded positively to the invitation to participate. There were more guests invited, but the list was ultimately reduced to the aforementioned number, drawn from diverse geographical and geopolitical contexts and with a relative gender balance.

Also noteworthy in this issue is the article and commentary in the Geopolitical Classics section. The article, by Serbian scholar Jovan Cvijić, is titled «The Geographical and Cultural Position of Serbia,» and sheds light on Balkan geopolitical thought from the first third of the 20th century. Cvijić played a decisive role during the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, in another period of geopolitical transition. His exhaustive ethnographic maps of the Balkans served as the basis for the Allied powers to draw borders and justify the creation of the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (the future Yugoslavia). The commentaries are by two young Serbian geopoliticians, Mihajlo Kopanja and Nebojša Vuković. Given the lack of an English translation of Jovan Cvijić's article, we have opted to publish both a Spanish and an English version, as we did in a similar case

with the translation of Kitarō Nishida's «The Principle of the New World Order,» translated by Takashi Yamazaki (into English) and Marina Díaz (into Spanish) in issue 10(2) of 2019.

In short, we hope this issue proves useful. As Xiaobo Su, one of the participants in the Discussion Forum, argues, following Marx and in relation to Iranian resilience to the Israeli-American attack—though this can be applied to many other cases—: the weapon of criticism does not replace the criticism of weapons, but it can become a factor of equal or even greater importance. May it be so!

Madrid, May 2026