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Conceptual framework and Historical Background of Geopolitics

Every Social Science tracks its roots in past to analyse its evolution and maturity in the light of sequential developments, disciplines and traditions over the period of time. Looking back in the history, we find the origin of term “Geopolitics” in 1899 by Rudolf Kjellen from the word “Political Geography”. The term “Political Geography” was given by Ratzel (1844-1904). Merriam Webster defined “Political Geography” as branch of Geography that deals with human governments, boundaries and the subdivision of Political units. According to Richard Hart Shorne, in 1954, it is the ‘study of a real difference and similarities in Political Character’. The Adhoc committee on geography enumerated in 1965 that Political Geography ‘is the study of the interaction of Geographical area and Political Process’. The primitive writings in Political Geography are of environmentalist approach laying emphasis on one way cause effect relationship between climatic topography and the Political activities in physical environment. Aristotle (382- 322 BC), a citizen of Athens wrote about the model of “ideal or perfect state”. His writing was the forerunner for many important concepts of Political Geography encompassing the idea of ideal demography paired with Political viability and changing technology. He focused on strategic as well as economic constraints of boundaries and frontier of a nation’s space. Strabo (163BC-24 AD), a Greek scholar in his work “Geography”, said a strong central authority to be the vital ingredient of success of a Political unit and cited Italy as a perfect example of it. Montesquieu’s (1684-1755) ideas were much under than his redressers in term of his consideration for climatic regimes and its effect on human Physiology and behaviour.

By the mid- 19th century, the study of Social Science and Geography became more systematic and intense due to breakthrough of ‘new’ science in the field of biology and environmental effects on society. Karl Ritter, Professor of Geography at Berlin, compared the cycle of state growth with analogy of the physical organism, each of them having a natural cycle of birth, maturity and death. Fredrick Ratzel, considered as ‘father’ of modern Political Geography, adopted the theory of organic state coined by Ritter. He further emphasised on relationship between the state and land (community of man). According to Ratzel, organic state’s success depended on
the development of civilisation on the base of which it flourished just as the case in past empire. The Swedish political scientist, Rudolf Kjellen (1864-1922) evolved the concept of “Science of Geopolitics” and added intellectual and moral dimension to Ratzel’s state as a living organism. He focused on the evolution Cultural-Political region from a natural Geographic area categorized by a continuous interchange among ‘country, people and government’ thus providing solidarity, integrity, loyalty and nationality to the nation. This was called Geopolitical instinct.

“Half a century after Mahan had published his main work, Nicholas Spykman wrote that it is the geographical location of a country and its relations to centers of military power that define its problem[s] of security”.1 “Topography is critical too: landlocked states, island states and states that possess land and sea borders pursue different strategies in national defense”.2 “Beyond that, Spykman attributed national expansion to topography. He pointed out, for instance, that the ancient Greek city states had to become maritime powers after having settled their respective valleys because mountain ranges hampered any further expansion on land”.3 “Fettweis also claims that for adherents of geopolitics the earth is the most basic influence on state behavior”.4 “Geopolitics has, according to Fettweis, ‘always self- consciously been’ a theory of foreign policy”.5

“Geographers who carry out research on international relations have shifted towards constructivism”.6 “Today policy advisers, most prominently Robert Kaplan, are much closer to the classical branch of geopolitics. The objective of Kaplan’s book ‘The Revenge of Geography’ is to show that geographical conditions – understood as the physical reality – matter and why. Thinking geopolitically means recognizing ‘the

most blunt, uncomfortable, and deterministic of truths: those of geography, as he puts it. The idea that we should concentrate on geographical conditions in order to explain the power of states and their expansion is also central to Michael Klare’s abovementioned books ‘Resource Wars’, ‘Blood and Oil and Rising Powers’, ‘Shrinking Planet’. Klare argues that national power in the 21st century is determined by the vastness of a country’s resources and its ability to generate other sources of wealth to purchase resources, especially oil’.

“Since the late 1980s, three scholars have made major conceptual contributions to geopolitics: Colin Gray – a foreign policy adviser of the Reagan administration – argues that the interaction of states with constraints and opportunities that stem from geography accounts for strategic cultures, meaning patterns in foreign policy”8 “the political behavior of a country is the reflection of that country’s history; and that country’s history is in great part (though certainly not entirely) the product of its geographical setting”.9Jakub Grygiel, stresses that the objective reality that every state faces is dynamic; hence, so are geopolitical practices, which he labels geostategies. Grygiel recognizes that non-geographical factors – ideological motivations for instance – interfere with a state’s foreign policy. The capacities of a state’s government to understand what geographical conditions imply also vary. Grygiel explains, however, that only those geopolitical practices that are aligned with the objective reality that a state faces are rational. He explains the impact of rational and irrational geopolitical practices with regard to the rise and decline of medieval Venice. The third important present-day proponent of geopolitics is Saul Cohen. His research shows that geopolitics is not exclusively about international conflicts, disproving Fettweis’s claim that ‘where there is no […] conflict, the tradition has little to say’. Cohen comes from a tradition of academic geography as the study of areal differentiation. He distinguishes between the ecumene, effective territory and empty areas of a region or a state. The ecumene comprises the centres of population and economic activity: California, Florida, the Great Lakes region, the New England states and Texas in the case of the United States. Effective territory has the potential
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to become part of the ecumene – because of its favorable location or resource endowment – but has not yet reached this status. Empty areas do not have the potential for significant development”.10

Definitions of Geopolitics:

Rudolf Kjellen

“Geopolitical thought emerged at the close of the nineteenth century as geographers and other thinkers sought to analyses, explain and understand the transformations and finite spaces of the fin de siècle world”.

Karl Haushofer

“Geopolitics is the new national science of the state, a doctrine on the spatial determinism of all political processes, based on the broad foundations of geography, especially of political geography”.

Peter Taylor (1993)

“Geopolitics has become a popular term for describing global rivalries in world politics”.

“The second form…is an academic one, a new more critical geopolitics. Critical historiographical studies of past geopolitics have been a necessary component of this ‘geographer’s geopolitics’”.

“The third form…is associated with the neo-conservative, pro-military lobby which have added geopolitical arguments to their ‘Cold War rhetoric’. Such studies talk of ‘geopolitical imperatives’ and treat geography as ‘the permanent factor’ that all strategic thinking must revolve around”.


“Geopolitics is the analysis of the interaction between, on the one hand, geographical settings and perspectives and, on the other hand, political processes. Both geographical settings and political processes are dynamic, and each influences

and is influenced by the other. Geopolitics addresses the consequences of this interaction”.

**Colin Flint (2006)**

“Geopolitics, the struggle over the control of spaces and places, focuses upon power. In nineteenth and early twentieth century geopolitical practices, power was seen simply as the relative power of countries in foreign affairs. In the late twentieth century, definitions of power were dominated by a focus on a country’s ability to wage war with other countries. However, recent discussions of power have become more sophisticated”.

**Gerard Toal (Gearóid Ó Tuathail) (2006)**

“Geopolitics is discourse about world politics, with a particular emphasis on state competition and the geographical dimensions of power”.

Amidst of diverse definition of geopolitics, it is regarded as a blend of Geography, History, Political Science and International Relation by the professors. The classical approach of this Science suffered a setback due to Nazis expansionist policies back in history. Now the modern approach integrates the Geography and Power Politics in much more progressive way and thus considered during effective planning by the state.

Geopolitics is a very tricky concept and its overuse and misuse can result in vagueness. Aforesaid definitions will be enough to present an ideal of Geopolitics and its subject matter. Geopolitics is how using of viewing the world, it’s about visioning a global map and places our one foot on the historical and Geographical and other feet on a speculative future. Global space serve as a starting point for Geopolitical thinkers over which they apply a global space serve as a starting point for Geopolitical thinkers over which they apply a “God’s eye view of world” every Geopolitical ideologist analyses his subject on the basis of his/her own priorities. As a hint put it, goal of understand, criticising and review of World Politics powerful way of working with multiple definitions. Thus, throughout the study, Geopolitics will be seen as an intellectual culture of a state, its interest and finally an expression of identity Politics.
2.1 Classical Geo-Politics

“Geopolitical reasoning dates back to ancient Greece. Aristotle derived the respective political systems of the Greek city states and their neighbouring empires and tribes from climatic conditions. Similar ideas were prominent in France during the Renaissance. Immanuel Kant also linked presumed characteristics of peoples to climatic factors. In modern social science this line of thinking received a boost when geopolitics became the predominant approach in research on international relations. German geographer Friedrich Ratzel conceptualised states as growing organisms”. 11 “In an attempt to apply scientific laws from biology to international relations, he argued that states derived their national power – their capacity to survive in the international arena – from the land they controlled. Ratzel’s Swedish colleague, Rudolf Kjellén, coined the term geopolitics. He defined it as the science of states as life forms, based on demographic, economic, political, social and geographical factors”. 12

2.1.1 European Geopolitics

A consideration about intellectual and historical tradition of Geopolitics makes us remember Germany. According to Wickham steed and George kiss, Geopolitics is the yield of German philosophy. The extensive effect of German philosophy and ideologies is visible in several examples from Fichte’s speeches to the German nation to the ‘blood and soil’ theory of Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II, and from Carl Schmitt, Hegel, Schlegal and Chamberlain to Adolf Hitler whose thoughts showcased certain viscidity and consistency. Geopolitics was used a German national pedagogical enterprises’ which aimed at awakening people from the feeling of false safety in favour the interlinked-ness of social and Political attributes on global during the changing history of Germany from I World War and II World War. The treaty of Versailles marked the absoluteness of German philosophy as pre-war aspiration went through a mutation and evolved as authentic thoughts of ideologies by German scholars after the treaty. Ultimately, Geopolitics have a close relationship with German identity, its history, culture, language etc. and its ups and downs have been
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German affair. The three most important German scholars of geopolitics are Friedrich Ratzel, Rudolf Kjellen and Kare Haushofer.

Freidrich Ratzel laid foundation of “Geopolitics” in ‘Political Geography’ (1897) and paper ‘law of spatial growth of states’ (1896). He considered Geography as the cardinal and inseparable base for the study of complex inter-relation of all Social Sciences. In the absence of Geography as the base, social science study would become directionless and ambiguous Geography, the spatial aspect of states, gives the terminal from where the route of Geopolitics in traced. The Geographical significance and state’s fate can be speculated from the human activities which are determined by the physical environment of a state. It can be deduced that Ratzel’s theories provided scientific and theoretical base to German aims and authorized its territorial expansion as well as population growth an attempt of gaining its place in the sun. Ratzel, through his perspective of treating German population as organism which needed living space and human activity being determined by the physical environment, assessed that a state’s policy objective might lead to attainment of its Geographical needs as well as establishment of state’s ultimate destiny. Ratzel focused on German primary and the right for a living state by grounding his theories on scientific bases and thus, paved way for “Geopolitical Science”.

(I) Rudolf Kjellen

“Rudolf Kjellén (1864 –1922), a Swedish professor and politician, published his works in Swedish, which made him less accessible to those who were not familiar with the Swedish language. This denied large parts of academia the acquaintance with and examination of his work. Some of his books were translated into German, but there has been little interest in him in the Anglo-Saxon world. The first Geo-politician was a prolific writer and published a large number of works not only on geopolitics but in his later years on Swedish internal and foreign policy. One of his classical geopolitical works, The Great Powers (Stormakterna), appeared in a first edition 1905 in Sweden. It had over 20 editions in Germany”.13

The Swedish educator was emphatically impacted by the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel and his political topography. In a report concerning Ratzel's work in

Gothenburg Kjellén said geopolitics as the bearing of his addresses. History was in his
view not a tumult of incidental occasions that simply happen. It is affected by
geopolitical standards. Like Ratzel he viewed states as natural and developing. The
state, in bond with the general population, was a living being.

Rudolf Kjellen is esteemed for coin age of the term and further augmentation
of Ratzel’s organic states theory. Kjellen settled that a state needs to apply 5
correlation policies in its attempt of gaining power. These 5 policies were-
“Econopolitik, Demopolitik, Sociopolitik, Kratopolitik and finally Geopolitik”. He
declared that geopolitics was realistic, instead of idealistic or legalistic, with its feet
on earth i.e. it had realistic foundations. “Theoretically Kjellén worked with two
concepts, proper geopolitics and special geopolitics. Proper geopolitics is the
geographical unit limited by borders, outward by “natural borders” and inward by a
“natural territory”. Borders could be political and natural, such as mountain borders,
river borders and natural border zones like deserts, swamps as well as forests and
border zones created by people”. 14

After proper geopolitics he managed uncommon Geopolitics that is space,
shape and position. Space is essentially an issue of vast space. The state has an
impulse of development and this set the immense forces against little states.

Kjellen was influential in Germany where his ‘Staten some piueform’ (the
state as a life form) (1916) was widely read by people and “Geopolitik” got a deeper
ideological meaning. According to him states were dynamic and they naturally ‘grew
‘over the time with the better strengths. The fuel for this growth was “culture”. The
more the culture was advanced, the more the state had the right to expand its
jurisdiction .In his words only advanced culture had the right to expand its authority
over other territories. Thus for him the border extensions were justified as the
boundaries were flexible, not solid. Another concept of Kjellen was Autarky which
mean state’s absolutism i.e. power in wider sense.

Geopolitics, both as Kjellén saw it and in its primary Western stream
(Mackinder, Mahan, and Spykman) is a fringe science between history, topography
and political science yet it can likewise be viewed as a guide to every one of the three.

It is, all things considered, a matter of a strategy or examination. The father of geopolitics accomplished for example not utilized maps in his books. Maps were however utilized widely by for example Mackinder and Spykman.

(II) Karl Haushofer

Though today the Nazi connection of Haushofer controversial, yet he was considered responsible for the bloodshed genocide done by germane policies. The first principle element of his theories was Ratzel’s living state. Haushofer defined ‘lebensraum’ as the nation right and duty to provide its population with necessary space and assets. The second principal element was ‘autarky’ originally developed by Kjellen, which meant absolute sovereign and the right to keep it intact. The third element was ‘pan regionalism’ which referred to states requirement to external its boundaries to include similar culture people. His addition to the theory of Geopolitics was the idea of ‘dynamic frontiers’ which meant that the borders of state should be temporary, instead of fixed, to facilitate the changes in conformity of state’s expedition for lebensraum autarky and pan regionalism. He treated boundaries as living organism and argued for a new dynamic and ever changing border. Haushofer placed Mackinder’s concept in centre of his ideas and believed that this heartland would ensure success for Germany effort of lebensraum autarky and pan regionalism. He put forward the new that the heart of the world was Mackinder’s heartland. For Haushofer, Geopolitics was a living science, related to life and power, which had no extremes so, needed to be taught and learned cautiously. Haushofer considered Geopolitics as the hypothesis of political events unified with their Geographical setting. Geopolitics assisted the foreign policy strategies as Geographic conscience to strengthen/expand the state or at least prevent weakling of the state. His goal was to build up a Geopolitical perception that acknowledge the territorial expansion as well as the colonial expeditions of Germany, which was constrained due to the treaty of Versailles for a long time. The contemporary story perpetuated on American continent where geopolitics had an active and secret existence.

(III) Helford Mackinder

Often Geopolitics is mistaken to be a German science due to the most important names in this field is Germans. When looked deeply into the intellectual and scientific history as well as practice of this field, it is known that it was an
Englishman sir Helford Mackinder who conceptualised Geopolitics as a distant field though the term was never used by him. He gave modern Geopolitical imagination and perception and saw the world in the light of time as well as space thus correlating the History and Geography and argued for Geopolitical of World Politics. “Mackinder interpreted the world historical processes based on the idea that the world was inherently divided into isolated areas each of which had a special function to perform. He asserted that the European civilization was the product of outside pressure”.15 He trusted that Europe's progress and development was invigorated by the need to react to the weight originating from the focal point of Asia. Appropriately, it was the Heartland (where the mainland masses of Eurasia were concentrated) that served as the rotate of all the geopolitical changes of verifiable measurements inside the World Island. He brought up that the Heartland was in the most invaluable geopolitical area. Mindful of the relative way of the origination "focal area," Mackinder called attention to that with regards to the worldwide geopolitical procedures, the Eurasian mainland is found in the focal point of the world, with the Heartland possessing the focal point of the Eurasian landmass. His convention recommended that the geopolitical subject (on-screen character) that ruled the Heartland would have the fundamental geopolitical and financial potential to eventually control the World Island and the planet. “According to Mackinder, a retrospective analysis of military-political and socioeconomic processes in the Heartland revealed its obvious objective geopolitical and geo-economic unity. He pointed to the pivotal nature of the vast Eurasian region: inaccessible to sea-going vessels, but an easy target for the nomads in antiquity. Mackinder was convinced that Eurasia possessed sustainable conditions for the development of military and industrial powers”.16

For recorded and geopolitical reasons, the Pivot turned into the common focal point of compels. Mackinder additionally distinguished the "inner crescent," agreeing with the Eurasian ‘coastal’ front zones. He depicted these as the zone of the most escalated civilizational improvement. It included Europe and Southern, Southwestern, and Eastern Asia. There was additionally the "outer crescent," which included Britain, South and North America, Southern Africa, Australasia and Japan, zones geologically and socially outsider to internal Eurasia. He trusted that the recorded procedures were

focused on the Heartland, region populated by Turkic tribes whose advances constrained Europe to join together, and the country of all the itinerant realms of the past. Inside a brief timeframe he modified his hypothesis twice with an end goal to adjust it to the changing geopolitical substances. He rearranged the Pivot (see Fig. 1) and incorporated the Black and Baltic Sea bowls (Eastern Europe) in the Heartland. This implies his popular equation ought to be reworded as: Whoever principles the Heartland summons the World-Island; whoever runs the World-Island orders the World.

Figure-2.1

Helford Mackinder’s “Pivot” and “Heartland” designation.

Source: www.ca-c.org/journal/2005/-eng/-cac-04/02-megeng.shtml
To summarise, Mackinder considered history as a struggle between land-based and sea-based strength/power. According to him, the world was a big battleground and hold of a vital global position would result in global domination. He divided the world into zones to correlate geography and history of global space to recognize “natural seats of power” (figure 2). Mackinder concluded looking at the world map (in content of history) that whosoever rules east Europe commands the heartland, who rules heartland commands the world-island, who rules world-island commands the world. Mackinder was concerned about the declining supremacy of Britain and the potential growth of Germany more precisely Germany-Russian alliance as dominant powers of the world regarding their geographical position to command the heartland. Development of railway infrastructure and easier access to east Europe further facilitated the way to command heartland and world-island by Germany.
2.2 Modern Geopolitics

“Geopolitics in the late twentieth century and in the early present century became a widely used signifier for the spatiality of World Politics. Agrew and Corbrige (1995) have given the concept of modern Geopolitics some form of clarity and specificity, offering what is perhaps the most comprehensive historical and materialistic theory of modern Geopolitics. Agrew (1998) provided a general theory of Geopolitics that provided a general theory of Geopolitics that treats it both as practise and ideas, as the materialist world order and as a discursive set of understanding and enflaming rules, by blending together to Marxian Political economy, the idiosyncratic writing on space and the anti-textualist critical Geopolitics. A new word Geopolitical economy has been introduced and which became increasingly associated with the modern geopolitics. Spatial practices and the representations of space are the two extremes of the continuum that characterize the modern Geopolitical imagination spatial practices are the everyday material practices across space that help in the consolidation of the global orders of Political economy, while the repetitions if space involves all the concepts, naming practise and Geopolitical codes used to talk about and understand spatial practices”.  

A new concept of ‘Political Economy’ was coined related to modern geopolitical spatial practices and the space representation serve as two extremes of modern geopolitical imagination spatial practices are the materialistic practice of space in to with global orders and representation of space refers to naming , coding and understanding those practice. Geopolitical order and discourse are the base of spatial practice and representation of space. Geopolitical orders arise only in hegemony (dominant state) and geopolitical discourses in the way of specialized the world politics by intellectual of statecraft. The evolution of modern geopolitical discourse can be traced back into the ages of exploration leading to encounters of European and non-European.

Geopolitics priestly practical Geopolitics has been nourished and conceptualised in the shed of great powers, their intellectuals and war plans of expansionist states. The modern Geopolitical imagination is a bequest of European
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expansionist policies across the globe in 16\textsuperscript{th} century that aimed at disciplining their internal and external spaces around sovereign existences with inherent logos.

The approach of mapping the world in spatial blocks and fixed identities by classical Geopolitics has been proved obsolete now due to lagging of spaces as territoriality is replaced by tale materiality such advancements are leading modern Geopolitics towards its climax. The global life slipping cross-map territorial bonds have accelerated the erosion of modern Geopolitics and prompted the flowering of post-modern approach of Geopolitics.

\textbf{2.2.1 US Geopolitics}

The famous Monroe doctrine ruled the American geopolitics until 1\textsuperscript{st} world war according to which US would refrain from any intrusion in the arms fusel of European western hemisphere would be regarded as an malicious act against US. This doctrine was fractured when the first US overseas was of annexation Spanish-American were (1898) took place. This crack in doctrine triggered origination of new Geopolitics ideologies and strategies for developing the doctrine of a neo-ocean naval supremacy of US and challenging the nation that Britain “rules the wave” Alfred Thayes Malan (1890-1914) was first well known Geopolitical theorist of USA who published the book entitled “The influence of sea power upon history” (1660-1783). In this book Mahan emphasised on primary of sea power over land power and vested the base of foreign policy in naval predominance Mahan’s theory was substantiated in the naval build-up of Germany in years ahead of world war I. Mahan safeguarded several imperialist hypothesis and visualised US a supreme power through vigorous naval force.

US mediation also pronounced the induction of idealist pursuits in world politics. The interwar period of idealism were overruled by the introspection of President Woodrow Wilson who considered self-determination a right for each nation. The countries then were exemplified in cultural terms such as common history, traditions, language etc. and not on racial grounds.

Thus nation, with their Geopolitical institution being their nation states became the new Geopolitical subject for the above said Geopolitical view. During the 1919 Paris peace conference efforts we made to define to better boundaries of nation
and state. Bowman played convincing role in American Geopolitics as he believed that America should play the pivotal role in the advancement and maturation of world economy. For Bowman, power if it was to be used efficiently over regions, would have to be acquainted with an assurance of free trade and disseminated through international organisations.

Although Alfred Mahan and Bowman were names in Geopolitics, but it is Nicholas Spykman is credited for bringing traditional Geopolitics mind-set in USA to focus on power, rather than just ideals for an efficacious foreign policy with the values of justice, fairness and tolerance and non-interference in the primary objective of their states power. Spykman debated Geography to be the most vital factor of World Politics and linked it with foreign policy. He cited the effect of size, Geographical and regional location on the state’s foreign policy in determining the suitable paths from many available alternatives. He stated 3 types of states on the basis of location:-land-locked states, island states with sea as well as land frontiers.

“Spykman also paid much attention to the role of the Pivot of the Eurasian continent in world history. He relied on what Mackinder wrote before him to produce his own version of the basic geopolitical model. It differed significantly from that of his predecessor. He was convinced that Mackinder had overestimated the geopolitical significance of the Heartland. He argued that the dynamics of the geopolitical history of the “inner crescent” – the Rim-land, the coastal zones – was the product of its inner development impetus rather than the result of external pressure coming from the “Nomads of the Land,” as Mackinder had asserted. Spykman was convinced that the Heartland was nothing more than a geographic expanse open to cultural and civilizational impulses coming from the Rim-land. He stated that while Mackinder’s Pivot had no independent historical role to play, the Rim-land was the key to world domination. Hence his formula was: whoever rules the Rim-land commands Eurasia, and whoever rules Eurasia commands the world”.

Similar to Mackinder, Spykman also believed that Eurasian balance power was a threat to security of USA. This analysis of Spykman earned him the salutation of ‘God father of containment’. The concept of Geopolitics was imported to America from Europe. The Attitudes of Foreign politics which conceptualised around Geopolitical aspects managed to survive through the dynamic circumstance in USA, despite the term Geopolitics was not much during the post second world war period.

2.2.2 Cold War Geo-Politics

The cold war refers to the period of soviet-American Geopolitical and ideological conflict stretch over span of 40 years from the end of second world war to the fall of Berlin wall in 1989. The ‘Geopolitics’ term was brought back in use by Kissinger in 1970’s and continued to affect the Political conducts until the second half
of the 20th century. Encyclopaedia Britannica states that the word “cold war” was introduced in USA by an American finances and presidential adviser, Bernard, in a speech at state house in 1947.

Cavies F. Kennan played a decisive role in the development of US cold war strategy of ‘containment’ i.e. mastery his two crucial articles, first on containment policy and the second one “The source of soviet conduct” served as milestones cold war.

Kennan’s outlook emerged as the base of US policy towards Soviet Union during the global encounter of national Security Council against socialism. The communist geopolitical perception related to ideas of Marx and Engels, was that all hitherto existing human history was the history of class struggle. American policy containment caught its speed in Europe also. The Truman doctrine gave effect to the European recovery program known as marshal plan. In the view of US it was saviour of the body i.e. the world and soviet served as a disease that weakens and ends the body. In its effort of combating the diseases, US bifurcated the world into two poles of friendly and unfriendly regions. Geopolitics reaches its zenith during the times of modification, metropolis, crisis and wars. The same happened during the disintegration of Soviet Union after the cold war when the study of Geopolitics became prevalent again after nearly half a century of disregard. The rains caused due to moisture laden clouds of changes at the sunrise of post-cold war era, quenched the scholar’s thirst for Geopolitics.

2.3 Post-Modern Geopolitics

As the modern Geopolitical map of the world changed the earlier immanent ideologies relating to working of the world also changed. The descent of American hegemony and maturation of China, Russian and to some extent India, have dragged down the modern geopolitics outlooks.

The progress of new form of representing global space in the era of post-modernity network flows and web have prompted the amalgamation of global and local into globalization thus provoke the ‘implosion of Geopolitics’.

Global webs are the economic calculus resulting from current era of post-modernity. The contemporary information technology, categorized by use highly
technology technical machine satellite etc. Linking the professionals all over the world, have become a basis for the new mathematics of power.

2.3.1 Characteristics of Post-Modern Geopolitics:

The Post-Modern Geopolitics is increasingly featured by the rising importance of telemetrically conclusion of current world politics. The shift from topographical embodiment of global space to post-modern telemetrically a portrayal is the speculation of a broader techno-cultural metamorphism is how the world politics is fancied and visually sketched in today’s scenario.

The post-modern global space is branched into the vital blocks with specific identities and differences. This is epitomized in the existence of post-spatial binaries like Jihad and MacWorld (barbae 1996).

On modern and post-modern Geopolitics, Tuathail (1998) writes, we do not live in the world constituted compulsorily by modern or post-modern Geopolitics, but by combinative coagulation of Geopolitical theories and practices facilitating access to visual techniques, transportation techniques, communication capabilities, political economy, state forms, global compromises, spatial aesthetics and inescapable apprehensions.

Although the department of modern and post-modern Geopolitics have scholastic calibres, we should always be conscious of how the consistency, hybridist and impurities of existent socio-spatial and socio-temporal practice often gateway from the hold of our theories. We are struggling to untwist and describe the disintegrated fractals of post/non/modern geopolitics of the 21st century.

2.4 Post-Cold War Geo Politics

The end of cold-war pronounced end of many things and prevalence of many others. The issue of globalisation culture and identity which lead buried under sheet of cold war regained their zeal and marked their presences in global political agendas in early 1990’s. The post-cold war era was basically characterized by the trend of finding determining the new enemy in the war. Geopolitics swiftly and explicitly gained high positions and became the new vogue. Huntington put forward a new insight into the post-cold war discussion establishing that the politics of new era will
revolve around the civilization side lines. In his view the basic reason for showdown will be culture rather than ideological or economic, Huntington gave a precise account of history of conflicts, consisting 4 major periods of pre-1789 post 1789, the cold war era and post-cold war also, in his article published in 1993 under the title “the clash of civilization the first three combat were between royal authorities, nation –states or ontology’s in the western civilisation”. The fourth conflicts were discrete as it witnessed a switch of International Politics beyond its western arenas. France Fukugama was another well-known scholar who was noted for his article declaring end of history along with end of cold war and upheld the idea that the regions were engaged by economics, not politics due to the termination of history. The shrinking communist culture marked the growth of “common Mercerization” of International Geopolitics avoiding any main stream conflicts that took place in the past.

(I) 21st century Geo Politics

The end of modern Geopolitics seems to have been conditioned by the relative decline of the American hegemony in world politics. The steady rise of China relative to the US and Russia and to an extent India also, create conditions, which appear to problematized and unsettle the modern Geopolitical map of the world, eroding the inherited ontology’s and fixed imagination of ‘how the world works’. The emergence of new forms of imagining of global space in the condition of post-modernity and new modes of representation through flows, networks and webs have conditioned the fusion of global and local into glocalization, which might cause the implosion of Geopolitics. The thread of global webs are the computers facsimile machines, high resolution monitors and modem all of them linking designers, engineers, licensees and dealers worldwide. Thus the contemporary information technologies have become fundamental to the new geometry of power. “Previous global or regional power struggle involved battles on land, at sea and in the air. The twenty-first century’s struggles will likely involve efforts to gain control of outer space or at least to deny to others the use of outer space stations are no longer the stuff of Science fiction. The impact of technology will force statespersons to enlarge their Geopolitical vision. The Geopolitics of the twenty-first century is taking shape. Globalisation, economic interdependence and the information revolution will affect how nations interact.
Instead, those factors and other will operate on nations within a larger Geopolitical framework”.

Tuathail (1998) writes; we do not live in a world constituted essentially by modern or post-modern Geopolitics, but by conjectural congealment of Geopolitical theories and practices that are points of entry into the visual techniques, transportation technologies, communicational capabilities, war logistic, political economy, state forms, global arises and pervasive anxieties etc.

(II) Geopolitics of Asia Pacific

US has been dominating the Asia-Pacific Geopolitics since decades but today the scenario is changing with the emergence of new economically and strategically powerful nations. China is the major contender and player in shaping the Asia-Pacific Geopolitical Order. India is also emerging as an economic and military Centre by intensifying its relations in East Asia. Though, China is not yet a superpower but still invests heavily in its military however far from American military investments and defense expenditure which exceeds the combined total defense budget of next dozen or so countries. Nonetheless, China’s emerging economic and military powers combined with aggressive political leadership have complicated the regional South Asian Geopolitics. China’s efforts to become a power Centre seems to be perfectly justified that the cold-war orders of western countries are looked upon which occurred long before China’s emergence and Asian transformation. US alliance with anti-Chinese countries, especially Japan and Philippines have intensified due to their tensed relations with China. The new Geopolitical dimension had developed new security relationship as well as reinforcement of Japan in terms of maritime surveillance technologies and offshore protection capacities. India is inclined towards maintaining cordial ties with ASEAN nations and adopted the ‘Act East’ policy and identified nations like Japan when there is room for India’s support in maritime capacity enhancement. India is all set to strengthen its threshold in the region through better cooperation and coordination.

The Silk Road economic belt is an initiative to intensify the trade between western China and central Asia connecting ports of south Asia with that of Europe through improved infrastructures. The rise of non-state actors are would be state actors is a major concern for striding geopolitics in the region such as trans-national terrorism and criminal activities challenging the security concerns. There is an immediate need of diplomacy naval forces in Indian Ocean in this 21st century to prevent piracy and passage of trans-national Islamic terrorists. The two other deterrents in Asia-Pacific Geopolitics are Climate change and cyber security issues. Internet advance technological and military have changed the complexities of Asia-Pacific Geopolitical dimension.

(III) Geopolitics of South Asia

One needs to understand the essence and complexities of South Asia beyond the traditional and conceptual definition to speak meant about its Geopolitics. The emerging trends of South Asian Geopolitics have a wide coverage of issues linked with boarder realities of geographical sub regions as well as life of plentitude in South Asia, which accounts for the highest population and share common cultural background and share experience midst its diversities. The South Asian countries comprise multi-ethnic societies with ethnic, linguistic, regional, communal and sectarian domestic diversification. These nations face huge internal atrocities due to poverty, civil war, ethnic combats, terrorism, communalism, political violence, religious intolerance, extremism, power asysmatism in the region, armed violations of human rights etc.

“South Asia is a compact unit, of sub continental proportions, occupying an easily identifiable Geographical space, enjoying a broad cultural unity and a wide range of intra-regional economic complementarities. There were mighty empires in its history that straddled the subcontinent and the experience of colonialism, more recently and reinforced the legacy of interconnectedness and affinity. Later came the trauma of partition, the growth of assertive nationalism, the drift away from democratic freedoms in some countries of the neighbourhood and the impact of global strategic and ideological rivalries, turning the subcontinent into a region of division and conflict, engendering a sense of siege both among states in its periphery and in India it. The subcontinent is now home to several independent and sovereign states
and this is a compelling political reality. South Asia encompasses eight independent sovereign countries Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka which dominate the northern half of the Indian Ocean community and almost a continental whole. The region is, therefore, easily identifiable. South Asia is one of the most populous regions of the Asian continent. This area has acquired a vital position in the world at the end of the twentieth century. The eight countries that constitute South Asia are a zone of fire. China is situated to the north of this zone; n Russia to the north and west; the Middle East, Balkans and Europe are to the west; and the Indian Ocean to the south”.

South Asia has witnessed a transforming Geopolitical environment since last 25 years. “In 1971, the Geopolitics of South Asia presented itself within the context of the bipolar division of the world. Today, Geopolitics presents itself in a very different way, in the context of the uni- polar world of the United States of America and the multipolar world desired by other big powers. But if we begin from the premise that the twenty-first century must belong to the people who will take the centre stage and defeat the big powers. But if we begin from the premise that the twenty-first century must belong to the people who will take the centre stage and defeat the big powers and their dreams to dominate the world, we have to examine geopolitics in a radically different way”.

The dismantle of bipolar geopolitical structure of World after cold war and disintegration soviet union effected the South Asian Geopolitical structure too. US uncertain interventions in South Asia affect the peace and security of this region. The main area of US interest in this region is Indian Ocean which covers as a ‘sea lane of communication’ as more than 60% of oil from Middle East is transported through Indian Ocean. The sea route is cardinal to global economy in particular for USA and Japan. The nuclear tests by India and Pakistan attracted the international attention and interferences. Further, China tries to gain hegemony in the region by extending development and economic support, expanding trade interests, strategic security implications area. The Sri Lankan civil war, Bangladesh’s religious communalism and
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India’s religion influenced politics serve as a catalyst for communal conflicts in South Asia. The water disputes in South Asia have emerged on the same line as the oil disputes in Middle-East and Europe. Many other rising progressions in South Asia decide its Geopolitical contours with time.

As summing up, we can say that there is a vast difference between the geopolitics and its implications in 19\textsuperscript{th} century and present times. The term ‘Geopolitics’ when coined by Kjellen, meant geopolitical significance in politics and power battle. The idea of ‘Heartland’ propounded by Mackinder, gives the importance of Europe and Bowman further argued about more relevance of economics in politics rather than culture. All theories of 19\textsuperscript{th} century, when mingled together gave rise to 21\textsuperscript{st} century ‘Geopolitics’. Mackinder’s Heartland is now Asia Pacific region and called the ‘new Heartland’ or ‘Rim land’. Therefore all major power Centre like USA, China, and EU wish to capture dominance in South Asian region. The cultural, Political, Historical similarity of South Asian nations have the potential to change the world power matrix and secondly, these nations have strategically geographical positions in terms of Sea, land, island, natural harbor etc. one significant point which I inferred is that now the world pendulum has inclined from west to east thus, all the theories of west will now be applicable on the eastern world with altered attitude and outlooks. The still indefinite and dynamic geopolitical structure in South Asia paves way for non-state factors to act. Despite these few deterrents, the interventions from world superpower indicate the expansion of Rim Land as an area of study instead of classical ‘Heartland’. The Indian Ocean region has gained rising importance in recent world politics and Sri Lanka with its geopolitical location and India with its geopolitical position will play a key role in rechristening the maps and studies of ‘Geopolitics’ in future.