Chapter One

Introduction: A Century of Geopolitics
fin de siecle Geopolitics
The course of politics is the product of two sets of forces, 'impelling' and 'guiding'. The impetus is from the past, in the history imbedded in a people's character and tradition. The present guides the movement by economic wants and geographical opportunities. Statesmen and diplomatists succeed and fail pretty much as they recognise the irresistible power of their forces.¹

(QUOTATION: Mackinder, 1890: 84)

States do not find themselves within a geographical straitjacket; instead geography or geographical configurations present opportunities for policy-makers and politicians. This was recognised by the geographical theorist, Sir Halford Mackinder, in 1890. It is from choices made by policy makers that political importance or relevance is attached to geographical configurations or particular geographical locations.

There can be little doubt that the disintegration of the dominant post 1945 political arrangements and the unprecedented surrender of aspects of national sovereignty by members of the European community, political turbulence in the USSR (C.I.S.) current shift of relative powers, unification of two Germany etc., have set the continents on a path towards a new and potentially exciting future.

Early scholars interpreted geographical factors within an environmental deterministic framework, as witnessed by Greek models of the ideal state, which sought to relate the facts of political life with the underlying physical conditions. Similarly, the development of political arithmetic in seventeenth century Europe, which entailed the cataloguing of the physical and human resources of a state, was founded on the belief that government policy should be based on a proper understanding of geography. This applied, empirical and essentially nationalistic approach was boosted by the military and strategic requirements of major wars, and remained the focus for political geography well into the present century. The period was characterized by studies of international boundaries and of ethnic and national groups, and by the emergence of theories such as 'Mackinders', 'Heartland concept'.

Of all the topics of study in political geography, probably none has attracted as much controversy as 'Geopolitics'. In large part, the manipulation of the concept by German geographers and Nazi military strategists during world war II to promote overt expansionist policies not only, besmirched the term but tarnished political geography itself as a legitimate area of scholarly investigation for the following decades. Nevertheless the application of geographic

---

2 Term carried in 1919, though one could trace its antecedents atleast as far back as Mahan’s writing on the Erasian core.
information, whether relating to resources, power, diplomacy, military strategy, continued to be recognised, even though the term geopolitics was avoided.

Within the past decade, the term has crept back into the literature and vocabulary of the scholarly and governmental community, even though it never had lost its appeal to military and defence analysts. It is the purpose of this study to explore this now popular notion in the contemporary world situation. Geopoliticians are concerned with the geographical consequences of political decisions and actions, the geographical factors which were considered during the marking of any decision, and the role of any geographical factors which influenced the outcome of political actions.

**Literature Survey: Fin de Siècle Geopolitics**

Investigations in geopolitical studies, as in other scientific fields of enquiry, should ideally be embedded in a theoretical structure in order to achieve a full understanding of the processes operating. At the level of the state, the theoretical analysis revolves around the question of the nature and purpose of the state and its activities. At the international scale attention is directed towards the political economic ramifications of global interdependence and upon international conflicts.
In determining a methodology of research appropriate to geopolitical studies, it is essential at first to make a general survey of the evolution of geopolitical thought. Though geopolitics as a branch of learning is a newcomer, geopolitical thought is as old as civilization. In the initial stage of the growth of civilization, it developed in an unsystematic and isolated way in different political areas of the globe. Indeed, it was indistinguishable from geographical ideas, foreign policies and general political notions of different States and political areas. This stage lasted till the middle of the nineteenth century. Even now, although, geopolitical thought has begun to receive systematic treatment, it is by no means possible to get a conspectus of the geopolitical notions obtaining in different areas of the globe. In tracing the evolution of geopolitical thought, therefore, we should not only analyse the writings of different geopoliticians but also discuss the possible geopolitical significance of certain related geographic, foreign policy, and general political notions which contain geopolitical values and substance in them.

Let us first see how geopolitical thought has gradually developed out of land, sea, and, at a much later stage (i.e. since the Second World War), air geographies. Only a proper understanding of the evolution of geopolitical thought would enable us to determine a methodology of research appropriate to the task of assessing the geopolitical situation of a country or an area in
particular, and of the globe in general, in any given period of history, especially in the contemporary era.

Geopolitical Ideas in Ancient Times

In ancient times, there were wide cultural disparities among people. Technology and man's way of living were primitive. The growth of geopolitical thought was then limited - both by the extent and character of the geopolitical setting of the areas actually inhabited by men. There was no effort, conscious or otherwise, to combine heterogeneous natural elements, such as river valleys, mountains, deserts, etc., into one unit in geopolitical ideas, so that they become mutually complementary in view of the restricted movement of man, ideas, and resources. Man was then concerned with naturally homogeneous units.

Geopolitical Concepts of Ancient Greece and Rome

With the Greeks, geopolitics entered a new phase of development. They adopted broad climatic patterns as the basis for the geopolitical division of the world. On the basis of climate, the geopolitical thinker, Hecateus, of the sixth century B.C., divided into two parts all the areas of the world known in his time: Europe, including Siberia, and Asia-Africa the warm areas of the South. Asia-Africa, more favourable for settlement; was considered the major power locale. There were certain other reasons as well for attaching much importance
to Asia-Africa. Civilization had first flourished there. The Persians had built up
the mightiest empire of the ancient world. North India had developed a most
remarkable civilization. In Europe, only Greece witnessed an advanced
civilization and even this civilization, had been a late development. Greece was
yet to reach its zenith.

On the basis of his theory of temperature zones, Aristotle built up his
theory of power. Aristotle (382-322 B.C.), as an Athenian, wrote within the
political environment of the city-state world of ancient Greece. In his ‘Politics’
he presented a model of the ideal or perfect State.

The earliest writings in political geography are in the ecological tradition
and usually have a particularly deterministic or environmentalistic bent. The
relationship is seen mainly in terms of one-way cause and effect. It is assumed
that the political activity of man is, in large measure, strongly influenced by the
physical environment and especially by climate and topography. This particular
viewpoint is known as environmental determinism, which dominated
geographical thought until the close of the nineteenth century.

All these geographical writings of the Greeks set the stage for the
development of a wider geopolitical view. But with Strabo, the Roman
geographer, the continental concept of Asia as a region, separate from Europe began to gain ground. The European continent was described as the 'most favourable to the mental and social ennoblement of man.'³ (Hamilton & Fabenower, 1954:191).

The growth of geopolitical ideas in any age depends upon the existing politico-geographic perspective, whether local, regional, or global. During the Middle Ages the Moslem world did not make any breakthrough in the field of science and technology, or the system of transport and communications. In fact there was a sharp decline in the field of national ideas and scientific and geographic discoveries. As a natural corollary, the progress of geopolitical ideas also halted, and for centuries the same old continental concept of the globe reigned supreme.

Ibn-Khaldun was an Arab philosopher and historian. His autobiography or ‘Muqaddimah’ (‘Introduction to History’) is a versatile work which, among many other things, reflects the political-geographical thinking of the late fourteenth century Arab world.

Evolution of Geopolitics from Fifteenth to Mid-nineteenth Century

It is well known that the Portuguese were superseded by the Dutch after a contest for commercial benefits in the regions of Asia and Africa. And the Spaniards ruled a vast colonial empire in the Western Hemisphere. But neither the Spaniards nor the Dutch were able to develop a systematic geopolitical concept.

Growth of Systematic Geopolitical Thought

Geopolitical concepts derive from the traditions, geographic and historical backgrounds, political objectives, and other distinctive characteristics obtaining at different times in different countries. But till the latter half of the nineteenth century, no systematic attempt was made to evolve geopolitics as a separate branch of learning. Thereafter because of the advances made in the study of Geography in different countries, the stray geopolitical concepts and ideas and speculations have increasingly acquired the character of a distinct discipline. Let us briefly consider the basic concepts of leading geopolitical thinkers, so that we may learn something of the nature of the evolution of this discipline.

Immanuel Kant

It is in Germany that systematic geopolitical thought was born. The eighteenth-century philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) propounded his
theory of a ‘Universal International State’ on the basis of the argument that nature had so endowed man as to enable him to live in any part of the globe. This theory, however, was Europe-centered, and he believed that owing to the mutual rivalries of the European States there could be no permanent peace in Europe. On the other hand, he believed that a peaceful federation of free States in Europe could impose permanent world peace. Kant, however, failed to mature his geopolitical speculations, except perhaps his idea of a ‘Universal International State’.

**Humboldt, Ritter and Gayot**

Alexander von Humboldt and Karl Ritter founded modern geography in Germany in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. They conceived the idea of the unity of the nature and postulated reciprocal relations between man, State, and natural environment. Ritter formulated a hierarchical system of regional divisions within the unified globe. He divided the earth into two broad hemispheres, one of land and the other of water. He further divided the land area into two subdivisions, Old World and New World, the former with greater climatic similarity and the latter with more marked diversity. He also conceived of each continent as a natural whole. In some cases, he further recognised the divisions of continents as individual units.
The American geographer Arnold Gayot, who lived in the mid-nineteenth century, further contributed to modern geographic analysis. He made two types of globe divisions: (i) the land hemisphere’s Old World, New World landmass division, and (ii) the water hemisphere’s Atlantic-Pacific basin division. He was the first modern geographer to stress the central position of Europe on the grand ocean highway of the world. He also emphasized the oceanic unity of the globe. But his two major geopolitical conclusions originated from Ritter’s theory of continents as ‘natural wholes’. The first of these was that world leadership was passing from Europe to North America. The second was that Asia was the cradle of civilization, Europe the maturing ground, and North America the culminating locale of this process.

_Friederich Ratzel_

The German geographer Friederich Ratzel, a junior contemporary of Gayot, developed political geography to a point where geopolitics could easily emerge. He made a comparative study of the political divisions of the earth as the culmination of the difference in the physical and cultural environment. He was the first to treat space and location systematically and is, therefore, regarded as the founder of modern geography. He considered political geography as a branch of natural science. Space and location were the two systematic essentials of his theory. He viewed space both as contributing to, and dependent upon, the
political character of the group occupying it. He regarded location as a factor which made the space occupied by a State unique.

Ratzel strove to define the effect of space and location on the State. He projected an organic view of the State. He considered the State as an organism rooted in the soil. Ratzel’s most significant contribution lay in his effort to correlate continental areas with political power. He felt that the driving force in international politics in the twentieth century would be the desire on the part of the various States to create and utilise State power effectively by enlarging the area of space at their disposal.

Rudolf Kjellen and Alfred Thayer Mahan

Rudolf Kjellen, a Pro-German Swedish of the First World War, developed Ratzel’s ideas. He held that a State was a living organism, the territory, its body; the capital and administration, the heart and lungs; the rivers and the roads and the railways, the arteries and veins; and the areas rich in raw materials and in the food necessary for growth, the limbs. He further held that the most important attribute of a State was power and that the life of a State depended upon its soil, government, people, economy, and culture. He was the first geographer to use the world ‘Geopolitik’.
Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan

Let us now turn to the writings of Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan of the United States. He propounded a geopolitical view on the basis of sea power. He held that control of the sea was a prerequisite of world power. He listed the following as the six fundamental factors affecting the development of sea power: geographical position, physical conformation, extent of territory, size of population, national character, and governmental character. Control of the sea could be achieved only by controlling those land bases which had the advantage of strategic location, coastal shape, and a hinterland endowed with a depth suitable for defence.

Halford J. Mackinder

It was the English political geographer, Halford J. Mackinder, who gave a mature expression to geopolitical concepts. He combined space and location to a geographical setting that gave pre-eminence to one continental portion of the world. In doing so, he brought to light the significance of the geographic distribution of landmasses and bodies of water. He interpreted history as essentially a struggle between land and sea power.4 (Pearey, 1959:21) He was the first thinker to assess global geopolitics from the points of view of a sea man and a land man.

Mackinder propounded his theory at first in a lecture on ‘The Geographical Pivot of History’, delivered before the Royal Geographical Society in 1904. In this theory he stressed on the fact that the inner areas of Eurasian land was the pivot of world politics. Politically, the pivot area was entirely Russian in East Europe and Asia. In 1919 the revised version of his theory was published in his work, ‘Democratic Ideals and Reality’, giving a more detailed account of his geopolitical ideas. The classical geopolitical dictum, formulated by Mackinder was first published in his 1919 work:

Who rules East Europe commands the heartland,
Who rules the heartland commands the world island, who rules the world island commands the world.6 (Mackinder, 1919:194).

Mackinder’s chief virtue was his flexibility of thought. During the Second World War, he modified his geopolitical theory considerably. In 1943, he wrote an article entitled "The Round World and the Winning of the Peace"7 to pinpoint the modifications made by him. He detached lenaland (the Central Siberian Tableland) from the Heartland. He redefined the Heartland as the area consisting largely of the cleared forest and steppe portions of Eurasia.

6 ibid., p.194.
Karl Haushofer

After the First World War, the Munich School of geopolitical studies in Germany was deeply influenced by Mackinder. With the assistance of the geopolitical institutions of Munich, Haushofer undertook a wide geopolitical survey. Haushofer adopted Ratzel’s concept of living space and a large State. He argued that space ultimately governed history and that a state would either expand its space or perish. He forecast the end of smaller States and the rise of bigger and mightier States. From this followed his concept of regionalism in global geopolitics. He divided the world into three main regions, each dominated by a super State: the United States in the Western Hemisphere; Japan in East Asia; and Germany in Europe, Africa, and the Heartland. Hitler borrowed many aspects of his geopolitical concept from Haushofer, especially his idea of Eurasian mastery by Germany.

Nicholas J. Spykman

Nicholas Spykman’s geopolitical ideas were identical with Mahan’s, but his basic inspiration came from Mackinder, whose conclusions he tried to refute. The main purpose of his writings was to arouse the United States to the danger of world domination by Germany. He felt that only a powerful alignment of Anglo-American sea power and Soviet land power could prevent Germany from seizing control of all the Eurasian shorelines and establishing its domination over the World Island.
Spykman defined geopolitics as the ‘planning of the security policy of a country in terms of its geographic factors.’\(^8\) (Spykman, 1994:56). One of Spykman’s significant geopolitical conclusions was that the destiny of a region was determined by the factors of geography and by the dynamic changes occurring in the power centers. He was convinced that geopolitics was, by its very nature, dynamic.

He considered the rimland or innercrescent of Eurasia more important than the Heartland.

From this he drew a conclusion which was just the opposite of Mackinder’s:

‘Who controls the Rimland rules Eurasia;
Who rules Eurasia controls the destinies of the world.’\(^9\)
(Spykman, 1994:43).

With the enunciation of the theory of the inner portion of Eurasia as the Heartland, inaccessible to seapower, there appeared a tendency to characterise the inner portions of certain other regions as the Heartland. The most notable example of this is to be found in the writings of J.B. cressy and Renner.


\(^9\) ibid., p.43.
Alexander de Seversky

Air power based geopolitical concepts were developed by Alexander de Seversky and John Selsor. The crux of their theories is the absolute superiority of air as a mean of movement. They subordinate land and naval to airforce. Even with a limited manpower, supremacy in a region, can be achieved by advanced air technology.

Significance of the Study

The events of 1989-91, what could be called a geopolitical transition provided a severe test to all existing political analyses and geopolitical models are no exception. It is believed that geopolitical analysis stand upto the changes as well as upto any other theory. The demise and rise of geopolitics since the second world war has been quite remarkable. For most of the time geopolitics has been virtually abandoned as an academic discourse. The term ‘geopolitics’ became an embrassment to be distinguished from ‘respectable’ political geography. Saul Cohen has been the major exception among political geographers in keeping global thinking alive in political geography. He understood that geopolitical issues were two important a subject for geographers to abandon. In this century he has been joined by many other geographers in an overdue, but no less welcome revival of geopolitics.
The revival of geopolitics has taken a new form, the term reentered popular language, so that today it is not unusual to encounter reference to geopolitics in any serious press article on world political issues. The second form the revival has taken 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’. Such revisionist histories have included both re-assessment of key figures of the past, such as Mahan, Mackinder, Spykman, Isaiah Bowman (N. Smith 1984) and, of course, fresh perspectives on German geopolitics (Heske 1986, Bassin 1987, Sandner 1989). More generally political geographers have become particularly involved in researching the geography of war and peace (Pepper and Jenkins 1985, O’loughlin and van der wusten 1986; O’sullivan 1986). This study aims to provide a framework for studying global rivalry in political geography.

Before we embark on this task, however we need to mention briefly the third form that the revival of geopolitics has taken. This 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.
Analysis of geopolitical theories attempts to relate international political power to its geographical setting. With the present transitional world order, this kind of analysis to predict the contemporary and future relevance of a geopolitical concept is important. Influential geopolitical theory of 'Heartland concept' is an attempt to draw attention to the importance of certain geographical patterns in political history. It is a theory of spatial relationships and historical causation. From it explanation will be deduced, which suggest the contemporary and future political relevance of various geographical conceptualization.

Aim and Objective

The starting point for almost all discussions of geopolitics is sir Halford Mackinder's Heartland theory. Despite its neglect in geography it remains probably the most well-known geographical model throughout the world. Although first propounded in 1904 it continues to inform debate on foreign policy. Walter\(^{10}\) (1974:27) goes so far as to say that 'the Heartland theory stands as the first premise of western military thought.' This remarkable achievement of longevity is the subject matter of this section. The strategic arguments of Macknider were simple but heady and formed the foundation for

the strategy of the deterrent. The study aims to analyse the powers which would emerge as a great colossus in world politics in the present political system and also the key to world supremacy. There is also an effort to assess the influence of Mackinder's ideas on global strategic thinking in the modern world. While one may safely wager that if some day one nation should rule all of Europe, Asia and Africa, it would be well along the way to world rule, the question could still be raised: Is that power due to geography? Have extremists like Mackinder gone too far?

In spite of these criticisms and odium attached to the subject, the theory did not die with Mackinder as most people feel. The reason for the lack of acknowledgement of this study in international relations is given by W.T.R. Fox - The annihilation of distance for some purposes but not for others, which are the consequences of the new military technology as it pertains to a possible world war III means that every exercise in strategic theory is at least in part an exercise in geopolitical thinking'. However, our habit of thinking in geopolitical terms is completely assimilated into the thought patterns, of typical contemporary student of international relations, that the word, 'geopolitics' itself seems almost to have dropped out of sight and people speaking in geopolitical language, while thinking quite in correctly, that geopolitics died with Mackinder.
At the first thought, Peare has noted, far from being outmoded (Mackinders), 'Democratic ideals and reality' appears to be more relevant than ever." (Peare, 1962) In human affairs it is not, "reality" but the "images of reality" that really count war lives in the minds of people and so does all politics.

To conclude, whatever its shortcomings - and there are many still 'Heartland model', is relevant to contemporary world politics; because the parties to the game of power continues to have faith in it. Therefore, the objective is to make best use of one's own insight and access the relevance of the 'Heartland model', in the contemporary world order and at the same time remaining critical; offer new insight by means of alternative interpretation. Which serves to further understanding and, constitute to meaningful discussions.

We begin by describing the power-political heritage of geopolitics. Quite simply we cannot expect any advance in this field until we have come to terms with its past. The subject matter will be models both geographical and geopolitical, with especial focus on 'Heartland Concept'.

Geopolitics is concerned with the recent past, the present and the near or distant future. On the basis of analysis of the recent past and present geopolitical
models, an attempt would be made to evaluate future geopolitical trends and indicate what strategies or policies a particular nation or region, or the world, should pursue. There is, therefore, scope for writing the history of the geopolitical growth and models through this methodology.

As geopolitics deals with basic aspects of the growth of civilization, its analysis in the form of a complete methodology has a fourfold objective:

1. to evolve a sound theoretical/basis on which geopolitics could be developed as a systematic discipline.
2. to examine the nature of the development of contemporary regional and global geopolitics, including Land, Water and air models.
3. to reconstruct the history of geopolitics of any particular country or region or of the globe.
4. to analyse the national power of important countries.
5. Study the emerging trends of geographical conceptualizations.

Thus geopolitics has two aspects theoretical and operative. The present undertaking is an attempt to evolve a theoretical basis of a methodology on the basis of which operative geopolitics may be developed into a systematic discipline of learning. It deals with certain basic theoretical principles and laws of geopolitics which at the same time, are intimately related to historical studies.
There is a notion, among some intellectuals that geopolitics is an instrument of war, imperialism and territorial expansion. The present work attempts to prove that this notion is wrong. No doubt, at a certain stage in its development as a subject of study, geopolitics was utilised by the Axis powers to further their aggressive designs. But that does not mean that it has no positive and constructive role. Political theories of divine right of kingship and supremacy have been utilised for political tyranny by kings the theory of papal supremacy for religious exploitation and domination by the church, and fascism and Nazism for world conquest by the Axis powers. Thus, the constructive or destructive utilisation of a subject depends upon the motivation of particular persons, groups, power or powers. Mackinder and other geopoliticians utilised the subject with a view to preserving world peace, while the Axis powers utilised the same for world conquest. So, its not the subject but the motivation of a nation or nations that should be blamed for the utilisation of a particular subject for destructive ends.

Man will continue to occupy the earths surface much in the manner he does today, and surface strategy will, therefore, continue to be relevant. It is also necessary to explore the often overlooked relation of geographical setting and physical power to international politics.
Methodology

While the true significance of geopolitical research lies in a new worldwide perspective the methodology of this study would be philosophical speculation. That is, consequences of various geographical configurations, with systematic reference to historical patterns be made. The thrust of this work is to speculate on future power configurations between states often based on adherence to political and historical phenomenons, taking into account strategic economic human and cultural milieux.

Geopolitical analysis across historical time periods have recently become prominent in the world system literature. This includes comparativist methodology which is used in this study where comparisons run across historical time periods and across different countries. The emphasis is on the comparative basis of powers defined in political and economic terms, the analysis will suggest the reasons for the rise and fall of hegemonic powers in the dominant world systems since the 19th century.

The geopolitical interpretation of the present is based on the history of the past, while the geopolitical events of the future arise from the conditions of the present. When once the facts of the past from the ‘Heartland concept’ have been collected and the locale has been intimately studied, the significant geopolitical pattern is likely to appear.
As the changes under way are vast and complex my approach will necessarily be general and selective and my coverage will include the Soviet Union (CIS) vis-a-vis and other Eurasian nations. The methodology of this geopolitical research will not follow the traditional research pattern of specialisation and division of labour. The law of relativity will be allowed free play in geopolitical analysis so that the basic elements of geopolitical studies (Man, Matter and idea in movement on space), might stand in a proper relationship. Then alone can geopolitics establish itself as a systematic and scientific discipline in the realm of learning.

Regionalism and unevenness are two of the basic characteristics of geopolitics related to the uneven nature of physical geography and civilization. The phenomenon will be studied here along with emergence of super powers in two different hemispheres and the global geopolitical situation of the contemporary period. A brief study of the evolution of geopolitical ideas and concept of geopolitical world order which have contributed, to make geopolitics a unique discipline.

Geopolitical theory has been related as an attempt to draw attention to the importance of certain geographical patterns of political history. It is a theory of spatial relationships and historical causations. The fundamental approach would
consist of historical evidence showing a direct connection between a particular policy and a theory to deduce the contemporary and future political relevance of various geographical conceptualizations.

Sources

Research material is drawn from partly primary sources, that is, various books, articles, journals, and newspaper clippings.

Going through the letters and communication of the authors of the models, specially that of Mackinder, with their contemporary scholars and critics. This lead to deeper understanding of motivations and background in presenting a particular geopolitical concept. Public papers of various Presidents of USA, helped a lot in understanding the relationship between Policy and Geopolitical theory.

Hypothesis

1. To assess the importance and relevance of geographical dictates on the geopolitical configuration in the light of unprecedented changes in technology, science and resource management.

2. To understand the role of geography in developing and analysing the east-west confrontational syndrome. Can geography help in building up forces of collaboration and co-existence for development and peace.
3. To see the emerging geopolitical scenario of the present - growth of an unipolar world, end of the cold war, the trends towards regions and regionalism, and the changing military strategic environment - manifesting itself sometime in support or against the basic format of Mackinder's formulation. Further to assess the future shape of the Power structure things and the possible impact on Geopolitical theory of 'Heartland Concept'.

4. 'Heartland concept', a theory of spatial relations and historical causation has moulded the perception and actions of policymakers throughout the wars and in the post world war period. This phenomenon strongly supports its relevance in this time period.

5. The extent to which there is continuity in the geopolitical theory, will be studied in this particular doctoral work.

Inspite of the impact of technology on geopolitics and the resulting changes that must necessarily be made, one question arises. Is it at all probable that nuclear weapons (which contemporary geopoliticians feel have outmoded classical geopolitical thought) will be used? Considering that unleashing of nuclear energy will result in total annihilation for civilization, it must need an unbalanced hand to use these weapons, and till such time when a contingency
arises, would not ‘classical geopolitical’ thought, based on configuration of land and sea, and the processes and forces of changes still be relevant? Technological change in the sphere of communications, transport, industries etc. have made changes in the world situation but that also adds to the rapid changes in the political relevance of geographical locations. As the political meaning of geography is in a constant process of change. Political development of a state is perceived to be determined entirely by geographical factors.