

CHAPTER «GEOGRAPHICAL SCIENCES»

THE ROLE OF GEOGRAPHY IN THE EXERCISE OF FOREIGN POLICY AND DIPLOMACY

Lesia Zastavetska¹

Nataliia Taranova²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-077-3-4>

Abstract. One of the most promising areas of modern science is geopolitics, which determines the main trends of today's social life. The research pays detailed attention to the theoretical aspects of the development of geopolitics as an important area of modern social geography. The main geopolitical trends of the twentieth century and the brightest representatives of each of them are described. The purpose of this study is to systematize the existing geopolitical schools and demonstrate the peculiarities of the formation of each of them. Geopolitics has existed since the existence of states. Whether small or large, states are always worried about their borders, while others express a desire to expand to countries with which they border. But beyond the natural and demarcated borders of each country, there are other geographical factors that favor or discourage the development of a country into a Great Power. It seems, therefore, that over the centuries geography has been a common denominator in shaping the foreign policy of states, the implementation of a geostrategic and geo-economic policy in order to maintain or increase their power at regional or international level. Although geopolitics has at times been condemned and rejected by the scientific community, it is clearly demonstrated that it is one of the most important factors in shaping the foreign policy of all states, regardless of whether they are characterized as Great Powers or not. The difference between the less powerful states and the Great Powers is that the latter

¹ Doctor of Geographical Sciences, Professor,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

² PhD (Geographical Sciences), Associate Professor,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

have the ability and the opportunity to formulate their foreign policy and to advance their national interests, while the less powerful states simply endure the effects of these politics. Geopolitics is defined by many manuals and dictionaries of geography as a field of knowledge, which considers the concept of «space» important for understanding the nature of international relations. Understood mainly as «the geography of power» and having from time to time received various slightly different interpretations, geopolitics involves the following stable core of interpretation: it is the study of the interaction of natural geographical division and human purpose with cultural construction ensuring the economic and the military condominium a force on a particular area of the globe.

1. Introduction

The humanity in its effort to understand the world, in recent decades has been increasingly concerned with geopolitics. Geopolitics is an extremely important tool of theoretical analysis that aims to interpret and predict the processes and ways in which a political entity seeks to gain or increase its power in the international environment. In other words, it constitutes the “geography of power”, reducing the science of Geography and the concept of “space” to important parameters in the process of interpreting the entanglement of international relations. In geopolitical narratives, the concepts of space and geography are of particular value as space is perceived as a source of wealth as well as a distance from a starting point to a destination. In this sense, geopolitics is a dynamic approach combined with technological development. Technology creates new sources of wealth and devalues others, while at the same time discovering new ways of transporting and communicating, which is constantly changing the data and the correlations of forces.

Although geopolitics has at times been condemned and rejected by the scientific community, it is clearly demonstrated that it is one of the most important factors in shaping the foreign policy of all states, regardless of whether they are characterized as Great Powers or not. The difference between the less powerful states and the Great Powers is that the latter have the ability and the opportunity to formulate their foreign policy and to advance their national interests, while the less powerful states simply endure the effects of these politics.

Chapter «Geographical sciences»

This section will deal with geography focusing on the concept of geography and its relationship with the other sciences, focusing on the concept of geography and its relationship with other sciences, as well as the term of new geography. It also clarifies the definition of geopolitics and the relationship between geography and international politics.

Man's curiosity and search for the changes he observes in his environment, since the Earth does not consist of uniform areas, but of a complex series of zones that overlap with each other differently, will lead to the need for autonomous development of geography as theoretical science.

In the context of the establishment of Geography as a science, most definitions have been given. In short, Geography has as its object the study and description of the surface of the earth and the phenomena observed in it. The interests of geography are not limited to the Earth's surface, however. This surface is in constant interaction with the atmosphere and the subsoil and all the phenomena – natural and anthropogenic-that occur in this vast area, which requires a parallel examination of these components. According to Mazis I., Geography is the science that approaches the *Natural Space* but also the dialectical compositions of this Space with human societies, which constitute Human Spaces. These dialectal compositions are defined as *Geographical Spaces*. According to Christian Jacob, it is defined as a “geographical approach” that “focuses on exploring the multiple structures of the Space in relation to its given uses and interpreting the entanglement of its various levels of organization” (Vergos, 2004).

From the definition of Geography it is easy to conclude that the study of Geography as a science is complex since its subject is constantly changing both in space and in time. The involvement of other sciences, whether natural or human, is therefore inevitable. In the field of natural sciences he maintains close relations with astronomy (rotational motions and their consequences, inclination of the earth's axis, phenomena of attraction of the Moon and the Sun, etc.), with geodesy (shape and dimensions of the Earth), with topography and cartography (where they, in turn, are linked to mathematics in terms of projections), to geophysics (for geothermal and seismic phenomena), to meteorology (a basis for classifying climates), to geology and to biology. sciences (botany and zoology). Its connection with the social and historical sciences, such as statistics, linguistics (especially

those related to place names), ethnology and anthropology, urban planning, history and economics, is also considered a given.

Although the geography is uniform and indivisible, its study is done, for practical reasons, in separate sections. There are two different approaches. In the first, the Earth's surface is divided into sections or regions and then talk about *geography regions* or *regional geography* (regional geography). In the second, the geographical elements that create standard shapes in the space are grouped according to certain combinations and then we talk about *systematic geography*. In the first half of the 20th century was dominated by the study of geographical regions. Examining all the geographical elements of a certain area and their interaction resulted in the emergence of a uniform character that allowed its separation from other areas. In the second half of the century it was considered by some that with the industrial revolution the spread of cultural values, ideas and technical methods was so rapid that local similarities became more important than local differences. Thus, a preference was observed for the systematic approach to issues, manifested through an intense effort to formulate interpretive hypotheses regarding standard patterns of geographical elements common in many areas (Brzezinski, 1998).

The systematic geography can be divided into several sub-sections or branches. These include natural geography (climatology, hydrography, study of relief forms), biogeography (geography of soils, vegetation, wildlife and human populations), anthropogeography (geography of human economic, political and social activities). in organized societies) and historical geography, which is essentially concerned with the anthropogeography of the past. More specifically [2].

– The *Physical Geography*, which deals with the geography of the analysis of the elements of the Natural Area.

– On *Anthropogeography*, which is connected to the data analysis of primary and composite Human Spaces and comprising:

a) the *National Democratic Anthropogeography*, which is related to the dynamic analysis of the ethnic / national entities and characteristics that are located at the level of the nation state, which is a complex form of Human Spaces;

b) the *Cultural Geography*, which concerns the dynamic analysis of the interaction and interdependence of the cultural archetypes of characteristics,

entities and formations in the context of the currently examined Synthetic Areas;

c) the *Economic Geography*, where it concerns the dynamic analysis of the economic characteristics, entities, formations but also of their entanglements and interdependencies in the context of the Synthetic Areas examined in each case;

d) *Political Geography*, which is connected with the dynamic analysis of the political characteristics, entities, formations, but also of their entanglements and interdependencies in the context of the Synthetic Areas examined in each case;

e) the *Geography of the Centers for Dissemination and Control of Information*, which deals with the dynamic analysis of international sources of knowledge production and its control centers.

Since the second half of the 20th century put the bases of modern science of geography. Modern science deals with the similarities and differences of different regions, with the distribution of the characteristics of the terrestrial environment and with the existing relations between these characteristics. Until then, geography was mainly concerned with differences in space, that is, the distribution or local variations of phenomena on the surface and in the Earth's atmosphere. Geography is now trying to create a unified and structured conception of its subject matter, the differences of which come from the social, economic and political activities of a diverse humanity and from the fundamental natural and biological processes that result in climate change, in relief and vegetation.

The changes that will occur in the methodology of geography, from the early 1960s, will place it at the heart of modern scientific research. These changes, combined with scientific advances, have been the result of the application of quantitative methods, allowed geographers to more accurately deal with a larger number of events.

The 1960s were marked by a profound re-examination of the way in which geography treated space analysis. The impact of these methodological changes has been so significant that the name "new geography" has been coined to refer not to a radical change in the goals of this science, but to the remarkable technical and methodological innovations that have provided geographers with a number of new methods. description and analysis (Hephaestus, 2000).

These innovations were so radical as those introduced in the mid-19th century German scholars Alexander von Humboldt and Carl Ritter, the founders of modern geography. Both emphasized the importance of direct and personal observation and the role of empirical approach in any geographical survey. These methods have been instrumental for the progress of science, typical 19th century. It seems, however, that they later led geographers to overestimate the value of direct, on-site observation, to the detriment of theoretical foundation. On-site observation is still an important practice for geography.

As early as the late 1950s, a number of innovations took place in the field of methodology, resulting in the complete reversal of the rules established until then. The assimilation, by geography, of statistical methods was the most obvious of these innovations. An important innovation has also been the careful placement of space combinations in theoretical control systems, which are capable of applying precision statistical test methods. Finally, the application of advanced statistical methods, the use of computers and data collection by remote-controlled high-sensitivity devices have enabled geographers to combine a larger number of variables in each analysis, faster and more objectively.

Geographers began to establish a number of positions in the field, based on which the main goal was to create rules and theories. Mathematics models and methods that use probability concepts and advanced representational techniques provide new supplies in the areas of technique and description. All these scientific advances have resulted in the shift of the center of gravity of science from its descriptive side to practical applications. This is especially true in the study of human activities. This has led to the study of the factors that shape decision-making for the field and in particular in relation to the economic sector.

On the basis of the new variables, which are introduced by composing the definition of modern Geography, the separation of geographical areas is supported, which are pointed out by Mazis I., capturing their place in the dialectical process. It therefore identifies four types of Spaces [4]:

1. The *Primary* which consists of:

a) the *Natural Space*, which is the dialectically primary infrastructural space understood as a set of physical elements (flora, fauna, relief, subsoil, climate, natural resources and available);

Chapter «Geographical sciences»

b) the *Elementary Anthropocentric*, which is the dialectically primary infrastructural space understood as a set of anthropocentric elements (races, population accumulations and demographic compositions by gender and age, demographic movements, etc.).

2. The *Secondary*, which are ultrastructural spaces and which are divided into two sub-spaces:

a) the *Political Space*, which is a dialectical secondary superstructure space, a derivative of the reproduction maintenance and reproduction reactions of material or intangible production systems with the respective societies;

b) the *Economic Space*, which is a dialectically secondary superstructure space. At this point it should be noted the difference between the Marxist model in terms of the relationship between economic infrastructure and the political-legal-cultural superstructure of the geographical dipole. For Marxist analysis, this space “was not produced in the first place”, but is the result of interactions between Natural and Economic space. In the concept of economic space, the concept of *Geographical Time* is complementary, which embodies the history of economic space (genesis and evolution).

3. The *Tertiary*, which is causal ultrastructural spaces and divided into:

a) the *Cultural Space*, which is the result of the dialectical relationship between Economic and Political Space. The concept of “Culture” is the component of human functions and interventions in the international physical, social and spiritual environment;

b) the National Democratic / National Democratic Space, which is a political-cultural superstructure. The study of this area presupposes clarifications about cultural structures or cultures and the concept of *nationality*.

4. The *Synthetic Spaces*, which are divided into: *Complete* and *Special Synthetic Spaces* or *Spatial Networks*.

a) *Full Synthetic Space* is the space understood as the set of its dialectically primary, secondary and tertiary characteristics, as defined above;

b) *Special Synthetic Spaces*, which result from the overlap, at the level of infrastructure, of the Natural Space and the Human Space and the secondary and tertiary structural characteristics of the variables corresponding to them.

2. Definition of geopolitics. Semantics and use of the term

The geopolitical defined by many manuals and dictionaries of geography as a field of knowledge which considers the concept of «space» important for understanding the nature of international relations. Understood mainly as “the geography of power” and having from time to time received various slightly different interpretations, geopolitics involves the following stable core of interpretation: it is the study of the interaction of natural geographical division and human purpose with cultural construction ensuring the economic and the military condominium a Force on a particular area of the globe [5].

The inventor of the term geopolitics is the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellen, who in 1899 coined the word “geopolitics” to describe the science that the state considers to be a geographical organization or a phenomenon in space. However, the semantics of the term is based on the theory that Friedrich Ratzel will develop and establish before Kjellen.

The geopolitical sets the starting point of the validity study thought the geographical factor, which determines the “strategic importance” of the various positions which the occupation or retention contributes to strengthening of the Force. Thus, geography and politics are a unit of thought, a view that Napoleon had expressed, saying that “the politics of all Powers derive from geography. “Over time, various theories about the importance of geography for the acquisition of power have been added to the notions of the relationship between geography and culture, between the environment and man, thus changing the meaning and use of the term” geopolitics”.

Even before the Renaissance, the world was perceived through the duality of Europe-Asia or in its medieval version, East-West. The expansion of the sea routes to the east will radically change the geographical values and turn the region into a center of a constantly expanding maritime world, which will then unite the oceans and begin a process that will eventually lead to globalization.

During the 19th century confrontation between Britain and the Russian Empire, which had become a global power poles, leading to the formulation of raw geopolitical theories about the naval force. Mahan was the first to focus on the distinction between maritime and land power. However, Mackinder was the first geographer to propose a general geopolitical theory,

which saw the British and Russian empires as heirs to the long-running confrontation between land and naval forces. These forces will clash in World War I through which the confrontation between the Anglo-French and a Central European bloc will be expressed, as Germany will challenge the British naval power. The Russian Empire will collapse (Kennedy, 1990).

The German geopolitical thought in the first half of the 19th century tried to combine the land with the naval force (Second Reich) and then was directed exclusively to the terrestrial model combining directly with the notion of totalitarian rule and totalitarian war (Third Reich). However, the systematic use of geopolitics by its Nazism cost it the cessation of its teaching at many Western academic institutions during the Cold War. The political and economic turmoil that characterized Germany after the defeat in World War I and the humiliation of the Versailles peace created a fertile ground for the cultivation of a German geopolitics known as *Geopolitik*. An integral part of the German *Geopolitik* was the perception of the state as a living organism and the theory of Central Land.

World War II was a bipolar confrontation between the Anglo-French alliance, which defended the status quo, and the Germans, whose expansionist sentiments were seen as challenging the dominant positions of the British and French. The cooperation that will be achieved between the USA and the Soviet Union during the war would signal the cooperation of historical opponents, that is, naval power with that of land.

The Geopolitics science will be negatively affected by the effects of World War II and its use by the Nazis, resulting in 1950s French academic teachers together with German colleagues to make also the “official abolition” of the subject of geopolitics the learning map of the emerging United Europe.

The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II will mark the beginning of an expansion of its power towards the center of Europe and east of the Baltic-Adriatic isthmus. It will be relatively easy and fast to move from the role of the imperial state to the role of the pole of land power. The opposing pole, Britain, was unable to maintain its power and role as a naval hub, leaving room for the “game” to move to the other side of the Atlantic. The confrontation between naval and ground forces will find its expression, in the context of the Cold War, between the United States. and the Soviet Union.

The special atmosphere that prevailed during the Cold War was captured by the pre-eminent contemporary exponent of the Anglo-Saxon Geopolitical School, who also contributed to the creation of the “Mackinder Forum” by Professor Colin Gray. Gray argued in his book *The Geopolitics of the Nuclear Era* (1977) that a distinction must be made between geopolitical science as it stands out as a separate branch of political science and geopolitics as a tool as used by authoritarians, regimes and especially by Nazism [7].

In the midst of the Cold War, political scientist and philosopher Raymond Aron, in his classic work *Paix et guerre entre les nations* (1962), defined geopolitics as a science that combines a geographical formation, diplomatic and strategic relations with a geographical economic analysis of wealth-producing resources and with an interpretation of diplomatic behavior, in relation to lifestyle and the environment”.

Several years before the end of the Cold War, the confrontation between East and West began to be perceived as an ideological confrontation between the communist East and the capitalist West, which was simply the tip of the iceberg of a timeless confrontation. are formulated at the beginning of geopolitics.

The use of the term geopolitics, after the defeat of Germany and the Nazis in the West, changed, making it significantly different from its original definition. More specifically, in the last fifty years, two additional different uses of the term have been formulated, which completely remove it from the original. Anglo-Saxon term, but also from the way it was used in Nazi Germany.

The second use of the term geopolitics came from the way H. Kissinger used it. Kissinger used geopolitics to describe how America and its own efforts sought to ensure the best possible balance of power in the world. The third use of the term connects geopolitics with “geostrategy” and “high strategy”. One of the representatives of this use, Colin Gray, used geography to record what are the key and timeless factors that define international relations between states. This way of using geopolitics has not been used so scientifically. On the contrary, it had a major impact on policy-making, especially in the United States during the Second Cold War, from 1977 to 1989. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the great power of these two powers, the specific use of the term collapsed (Kissinger, 1995).

According to the above, the unbroken link between Geography and Geopolitics is established interdisciplinary and over time, while at the same time it becomes clear that the term “Geopolitics” has gone through many phases of interpretation and approach, with a common denominator of fundamental confusion: of that “Geostrategic Practice”. Regarding the relationship between Geopolitics and Geostrategy as well as the dimensions of Geopolitics, it is worth mentioning that in 1998 the theorists of geopolitics published the “Dictionary of Geopolitics” in which it is stated that: “Geopolitics cannot be identified with geoeconomics, which does not it is, of course, a dimension of geopolitics, as is the case with geostrategy. “According to scientific thought strategists from the 19th the century until today, as the American Alfred Mahan, the British Julian Cobert and the Frenchman Herve Couteau Begarie, apply the following relationship: Geopolitics = Geoeconomics + Geostrategy.

In other words, when a country’s foreign policy-makers study the interdependence of the natural environment and cultural structure in order to consolidate or increase their country’s economic power, then they apply a geo-economic approach to international relations. When the purpose of this study is to strengthen the military might of their country, then they are moving in its geostrategic field. The set of two approaches, in an organic relationship between them, constitutes geopolitics.

Therefore, according to the above, the view of the realists that “Geopolitics and geoeconomics are the face of the same currency” does not correspond to reality. It turns out that geopolitics is the currency as a whole and its two sides are geoeconomics and geostrategy. Furthermore, the dilemma of the idealists “Geopolitics or geoeconomics” does not correspond to reality, since there is geoeconomics there is automatically the whole where it belongs, that is, geopolitics. Consequently, geopolitics, as a geography of power, comes to be united with geography, according to which the cultural edifice of man depends directly on the natural environment, which on the one hand predetermines the economic potential of a society and on the other hand is the place of manifestation and exercise. of power.

Extremely important evidence of all of the above has been substantiated relatively recently, at the first meeting of the Geopolitical Forum Mackinder

at the University of Oxford in June 2000 by General Sir Rupert Smith, Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the NATO Allies in the former NATO, who had extensive experience in handling geopolitics. According to the British general, the coexistence of geostrategy and geoeconomics as two components of geopolitics has been demonstrated in the case of the Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo wars.

The above analysis makes it clear that the question of geopolitical approach is the power that sovereignty ensures. Already in classical antiquity and more specifically in the work of the “father of rationalism”. Thucydides, geopolitics is presented directly connected with the concept of “vital interest” and inextricably linked to the geographical space. In modern times, the interdependence of these concepts has undergone a systematic ideologicalization, which has been best expressed in the field of schematic representation of the geographical area above. In which the power is exercised, that is, on the geographical map. Understandably, the broader and general conception of geopolitics as a “geography of power” has evolved over time so that it can serve the fixed concept of co-examining geographical space and culture with the constant use of new theoretical and positive coordinates that political science, economics, strategy, history, technology as well as other sciences and fields offer an equally steady stream of development (Lucas, 2000).

Through the process of interdisciplinarity, modern geopolitical science aims to draw as safe and objective conclusions as possible about the phenomenon of acquiring, maintaining and increasing the power of powerful states, taking into account a number of inherent and exogenous factors of international reality. In the context of this effort, the theory of Critical Geopolitics will be formulated, which will lay the foundations for a post-modern approach to geopolitical science. The School of Critical Geopolitics appeared in the mid-1980s. Like the French school, critical geopolitics (to which we will refer below) proceeded to discredit traditional geopolitics, believing that its perspective was subjective and that it did not take it into account. the power relations that affect the geographical area. To achieve this, geopolitical critique focuses on the critical study of geopolitical myths and narratives on the planet, which have dominated and influenced the foreign policy of powerful states, mainly because of their persuasiveness rather than correctness.

3. The scientific classification of geopolitics

The geopolitical considered part of political geography and one of those that have been heavily criticized and questioned mainly about the way that was used during the Second World War. We have already reported that geopolitics has been discredited by the Western world because it has been linked to Nazism. But that was not the only reason. The controversy surrounding geopolitics has had other causes, some of which stem from the geopolitical scientific relationship with geography. As it turned out, geopolitics is directly linked, not only to geography, but also to political science. Each of these sciences has tended to consider its geopolitical derivative another. In this way, whenever each of the sciences considered that the conditions required its rejection, they could very easily do so.

The result of all this was that geographers considered geopolitics to be more political than geographical, while political scientists believed that geography and its factors had no major role to play in politics. Thus, neither of the two branches recognized geopolitics as its scientific department. The confusion over the scientific classification of geopolitics is also evidenced by the fact that while, initially, the term was discovered by a political scientist, it was established by its great acceptance and use by geographers.

The initial acceptance of the geographers, of course, had a very strange prospect. Geographers accepted that geopolitics was part of political geography while at the same time trying to prove that it was not credible as a science. This effort can be interpreted in two ways. The first is that they did not agree with some parts of geopolitics and considered them unreliable and the second, the most prevalent, was their fear that a possible rise in geopolitics would have devastating consequences for the traditional way of using geography. After all, as already mentioned, for the western world, geopolitics was not considered reliable and in many cases was not even considered a science. This challenge also existed on the part of political geographers who believed that geopolitics was merely a subordination to the purposes of states and identified several differences but also similarities with political geography, as we shall see below [10].

For Derwent Whittlesey, geopolitics is synonymous with political geography. For him, political geography is the science that studies the relationship between land and states. An integral part of this study is the geography of these states and the way the latter affects their relations. In

fact, Whittlesey argues that geopolitics is a more convenient way to call political geography, which deals with geopolitical schemes, than to be called political-geographical. And he agrees, however, that geopolitics was used primarily to «make political geography serve the purposes of one or the other particular state».

The Richard Hartshorne, publicly set out the views of the same period of time with the Whittlesey, is before the start of World War II, believes that political geography is unrelated to the geopolitical. He believes that while political geography is essentially the geography of states, that is, a science for the purpose of knowledge, geopolitics has different purposes, is used exclusively for the purposes of politics and politics and therefore has no place in political geography. Although there was a general trend at the time that geopolitics was a substitute for political geography, this seems to be the case only for Germany and not for politicians, not for scientists. The rise of geopolitics in the 1970s and 1980s changed the attitude of scientists toward geopolitics. Both geographers and political analysts have approached geopolitics with a new perspective, which leads to a reassessment of its role [11].

4. Geography and international politics

The geography affects primarily international relations to the extent that reflects the characteristics of the soil, in which a similar set of people (nation) becomes close (permanent) connection with its installation in it, thus creating the concept of “homeland” which, in turn, is a necessary condition for the emergence of the state, the basic organizational unit of international (“transnational”) politics [14].

The human activity associated with a given (geographical) area and studied at a certain (historical) time, creates common historical memories, common myths, religions and ideological considerations and forge a common consciousness and an identity collective assumptions and attitudes of people living in same space (“group” formation). The result of the process of emergence and strengthening of the sense of identity among the members of this group, is the parallel creation of a sense of otherness-differentiation between this group and all the others, which leads to the need to ensure it in a very inhomogeneous environment. potentially precarious. This requirement, in turn, highlights the need to create the state, the form

of that internal organization and power of a collective entity (e.g., a nation) that ensures its survival in the international environment. Is created so that the concept of state sovereignty is that, as phenomenon-epigenetic of socio-political reality of the international environment, reflecting the historical tendency of the nation to safeguard the autonomy and independence from other nations, and directly linked to the geographical area occupies [13].

To the extent, therefore, that the exercise of state sovereignty is perfectly determined in relation to the geographical area in which it is exercised, the geographical features, closely related to the historical data, are at the basis of the building block of the creation of states and are therefore linked to the emergence of the phenomenon of international relations. Political geography or *geopolitics* describes and explains the organization of the international system in state entities, observing, relating, combining and comparing fixed factors (geographical space) with variable factors (physical, economic, technical, cultural, religious, historical, ethnological), legal and strategic divisions of space, quantity and quality of productive resources, productivity, political and social structure). All of these factors, and in particular the economic and demographic dimensions, the level of technology, the resources available for defense, the ability of diplomatic maneuvers, etc., relate to power, which is a multidimensional quantity that represents capacity. promotion of the national interest, defined in terms of (in relation to the strength of the opponent, the needs and the “reserve of power”) is examined over time and depends directly on the geographical data.

Therefore, the value of geography, as the most stable and permanent of all the power components, is fundamental. Geopolitics in the above sense includes the concept of *geo-economics*, which concerns the unequal distribution of wealth and natural resources, as well as *geostrategy* which combines geopolitics with military power and political objectives, introducing the element of strategy and tactics in the correlation of geopolitical data, in order to achieve political aspirations. Geography is particularly important for the design and shaping of all levels of military strategy as, as an environmental factor with the limitations or possibilities involved, it significantly influences this design. However, the influence of Geography on the issue of politics and security differs in degree and intensity, depending on level of generality of *geopolitical potential*.

In no case, however, does geography determine exclusively or necessarily the policy pursued. Politics, however, can only take into account the geographical data of the area in which it is developed (Papyrus Larousse Britannica, 2006).

5. Basic Geography Schools

The attempt to describe the basic Schools of Geography is essentially synonymous with the definition of geopolitical science, since the founders of modern geography were the ones who connected it with geopolitics. The theory that will be developed by each of these Schools shows that geopolitics is the historical product of the meeting of politics and geography. These Schools are distinguished in:

1. German School of Geopolitics.
2. Anglo-Saxon School of Geopolitics.
3. French School of Geopolitics.
4. American School of Geopolitics.

5.1. German School of Geopolitics

Friedrich Ratzel (1844–1904). The German School will be represented by the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel. Friedrich Ratzel, who studied natural sciences, was influenced by Charles Darwin's theory of species evolution and used biology terms to analyze international political reality. Ratzel considered geography as a synthesis of natural and human phenomena, which could help in the interpretation of both the nature and the patterns of dispersion of human activity, while he was particularly interested in the political aspects of human behavior. His basic position was that the state is an organism, like the organisms of the natural world, and that it can be better understood if we consider its behavior as the behavior of an organic whole.

Friedrich Ratzel is considered the founder of geopolitical science according to which «Geography [is] placed in the Service of State Policy». He gave this meaning to the term «Political Geography» with the work of *Politische Geographie* (full title: *Political Geography or Geography of States, Trade and War*). In this way he proposed to contemporary politicians an accurate and objective tool for the analysis of political reality, which should not be subject to ideologies and distortions of the

national imaginary feeling. The geographer wanted to create a «spatial analysis technology» and offer it to state power. Speaking of «Political Geography», he considers Geography is transformed by adopting the concept of utility and usability policy. He stressed the importance of applying the findings of the science of Geography in the planning and decision-making of policies while, at the same time, will focus on the importance of the phenomenon of Transport, traffic.

Rudolf Kjellen (1864–1922). Influenced by Ratzel's thinking, the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellen will define geopolitics «as the science of the State understood as a geographical organization as it operates in space». For Kjellen, Geopolitics must be devoted to the analysis of the nature of the State, limiting Political Geography to the study of human societies. He considers, therefore, that it is «the study of the State understood as a geographical organization or even more as a spatial phenomenon, that is, as a part of the earthly space, an area, a spatial framework or even more specifically as a country».

Karl Haushofer (1869–1946). Ratzel was also the brainchild of German geographer and retired Major Karl Haushofer. Haushofer will dedicate himself to the goal of serving German national ideals and will conclude through his analysis that Geopolitics should contribute to the restoration of German greatness. In particular, Haushofer argues that geopolitics should contribute to the emergence on the international stage of a limited number of states of international radiation, including Germany, one of which would dominate a particular sphere of influence. The frictions between them could be observed in the context of the usual power correlation games. The aim of Haushofer's analysis was for Germany to dominate Europe after the neutralization of France and the neutral stance of Italy.

5.2. Anglo-Saxon School of Geopolitics

The Anglo-Saxon School (Classical Geopolitics) perceives things the other way around from German. Particular emphasis is placed on the rigorous and computational scientific character of geopolitical analysis. Conclusions and results have come from a scientific, comprehensive and accurate study of natural geographical space and man-made [1].

Sir Halford Mackinder (1861–1947). Mackinder develops in his geopolitical theory the concept of the region of the «heart» of the world.

This area is identified with the former USSR. Its value in relation to the concept of power is that this area is a natural fortress. It is considered «invulnerable», but at the same time it is extremely difficult to get out of this fort. It accumulates high natural wealth, which makes it even more important in the international geopolitical and geoeconomic environment, giving its holder great comparative advantages. The «heart» is surrounded by the so-called inner ring that corresponds to the geographical subsystem of Western Europe, the Middle East and South and East Asia. This inner ring is in turn limited by two island subsystems, the British Isles and Japan. These are the ends of the outer ring, which includes the Americas, Africa and Oceania. The power balance should be distributed in these three zones and mainly between the area of the «heart» and the areas of the rings. The area of the «heart» is identified with the land power, while the rings with the navy and the one who controls the «heart» controls the «world island».

Nicolas Spykman (1893–1943). Spykman essentially believed that the German School of Geopolitics attributed mysticism to a specific type of border and magical content to the concept of space. He considered such approaches to be metaphysical nonsense. He also tried, together with other geographers and political scientists in the 1940s, to talk about a geopolitics of peace («The Geography of Peace», 1944). For Spykman, real power was not «neither in the navy nor on the mainland but in the territories between them,» that is, in western Europe, southern Asia, and the Far East. Spykman called these areas «Regional Territories» or «Stephen» (Rimland) and suggested his own saying: «Whoever controls Stephen rules Eurasia and whoever rules Eurasia controls the fortunes of the world.» Spykman's ideas were strongly «geopolitical» and influenced Cold War American foreign policy, although the word geopolitical, due to its connection to Nazism, remained almost banned by the American scientific community.

George F. Kennan (1904–2005). Kennan distinguishes on the international stage five centers of power in the USA, Great Britain, Germany / K. Europe, USSR / Russia and Japan. In his view, some force should control four of the five centers of gravity, so that its national security is not threatened. In this way, Kennan proposes the strategy of restraint, which is exercised in the so-called «defensive perimeter», just outside the limits of the center of gravity. If the perimeter and balance of power is ensured there, the aim will be to reduce the future ability of the opposing

center of gravity to exert influence outside its limits. Kennan, therefore, promotes the policy of restraining the geographical ring in order to prevent the leakage of the opponent's power outside his physical limits. After all, destroying the opponent is not an end in itself. The purpose of a state's foreign policy is to maintain national and global security through a balance of power.

5.3. French School of Geopolitics

The French School will be represented by geographers Albert Demangeon and Jaques Ancel. These geographers were contemporaries of Haushofer, whose work they had studied, but they also knew Ratzel's work very well.

Albert Demangeon (1872–1940). Demangeon will be very harsh towards the Haushoferian Geopolitik, stating characteristically that «we must admit that German Geopolitics has nothing to do with science and scientific spirit. No progress has been made in its area since Ratzel. Geopolitik has been derailed in the realm of controversy and nationalist hatred Geopolitik is a rigged game, a war machine. If he wants to be included in the sciences, the best thing to do is to return to the footsteps of [Rachel] Political Geography. «For the French geographer, Geopolitik was nothing more than an education and enlightenment operation of the German people to deliver the final blow to the European order.

Jaques Ancel (1879–1943). Jaques Ancel will be considered the founder of the French School of Geopolitics. His work is undoubtedly influenced by German methodology and recognizes the importance of the Rachel conceptual framework. He adopts the views of both Ratzel and Haushofer on the dynamic nature of borders, however, he strongly opposes the other positions of the German-centered Geopolitik, even giving the French form of the term a *Géopolitique*.

Yves Lacoste. In the late 1970s Yves Lacoste (considered the founder of the modern French School of Geopolitics) introduced a new school of geopolitical thought in France. Completely discrediting the traditional geopolitics that flourished in the interwar period as he did not consider it a real science, Lacoste attempted a new approach, focusing on a global whole and not on a single state. However, this school, apart from the global approach to the state-centric one, also differed in another point. Lacoste

used geopolitics to deal with the planet's environmental problems, that is, to deal with issues that exist in peacetime and not to study war as it used to be.

5.4. American School of Geopolitics

Henry Kissinger. Kissinger is one of the representatives of the American School of Geopolitics [8]. The data of his time will be imposed, in his view, by the shift in US geopolitics. resulting in the international system changing from bipolar (US–USSR) to bipolar (China). The opening to China, however, strengthened the geopolitical views on the axial state and the ring, as the latter increasingly tightened the area of the «heart». Thus, peripheral states would take on a stabilizing role with US assistance and oversight. According to Kissinger's theory, smaller states are called upon to share geopolitically the responsibility of maintaining the power of a larger state in exchange for security.

Zbigniew Brzezinski (1928–). Brzezinski considers Eurasia to be the center of the world. USA. they must not allow any force to dominate this area. This area is represented for Brzezinski by Central Asia [2], which is gaining in importance due to the energy pipelines of the Caspian and Central Asia. In order to secure American supremacy, it is necessary to repel global anarchy by building a geopolitical framework for cooperation in the Central Eurasian region. The goal is to create a transnational security system that includes an enlarged NATO in close relationship with Russia, China and Japan. That would relieve America of some of the burdens of sharing responsibilities. USA. would be responsible for the military part while not seeking the European Union to bear the financial costs.

John Mearsheimer (1947–). Mearsheimer is the founder of the theory of aggressive realism. It analyzes the naval, air and land forces, with the latter having the primacy and at the same time proceeds to a classification based on these criteria. Mearsheimer considers that geography and especially distance and proximity between states catalyze their behavior in conjunction with the structure of the system. When the system is bipolar, the most effective treatment is balancing, while when it is multipolar, weight transfer is the most appropriate strategy. Although aggressive realism is not spatially specialized, the weight of Mearsheimer's theory is thought to lie at the ends of Eurasia. More specifically, Mearsheimer's analysis focuses around the regions of Central Europe and North Asia, which is perfectly normal because there is a significant amount of latent and military power.

References:

1. Vergos K. (2004) Geopolitics of Nations and Globalization – For a History of Geography and a Geography of History, Papazisis Publications, Athens.
2. Brzezinski Z. (1998) The Great Chessboard, Livani Publications, Athens.
3. Hephæstus P. (2000) Diplomacy and Strategy of the great European forces of France, Germany, Great Britain, Quality Publications, Athens.
4. Gere F. (2005) Institute for Defense Analysis, Why the Wars? – A Century of Geopolitics, Papazisis Publications, Athens.
5. Kafidas L. (2009) Political Analysis. Comparative presentation of the different schools of thought in the Military Inspectorate, Nov.-Dec.
6. Kennedy P. (1990) The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers-Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000, A, A1, Axiotellis Publications, Athens.
7. Kennedy P. (1994) Preparation for the 21st Century, Libani Publications, Athens.
8. Kissinger H. (1995) Diplomacy, Lebanon Publications, Athens.
9. Loukas I. (2000) Geopolitics, Athens: Trochalia Publications, Athens.
10. Mazis I. (2002) Geopolitics. Theory and Practice, Papazisis Publications, Athens.
11. Mearsheimer J. (2007) The Tragedy of the Politics of the Great Powers, Quality Publications W.W. Norton & Company, Athens.
12. Papyrus Larousse Britannica, Co-published by Grande Encyclopedie Larousse, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Papyrus Publishing House, Athens 2006.
13. Parker G. (2002) Geopolitics – Past, Present and Future, Roes Publications, Athens.
14. Spykman N. (2004) The Geography of Peace, Papazisis Publications, Athens.
15. Huntington S. (1999) The Conflict of Cultures and the Reconstruction of the World Order, Terzo Books Publications, Athens.
16. Chouliaras A. (2004) Geographical Myths of International Politics, ROES Publications, Athens.