

The Geopolitical Conceptual Shifting: Forward a
Critical Geopolitical Approach in IR.

التحول في المفاهيم الجيوبولتيكية:
نحو مقارنة جيوسياسية نقدية في العلاقات الدولية

Alaerrahmane Ben Messahel*,
The new political science laboratory,
University of M'sila, Algeria.
Alaerrahmane.benmessahel@univ-msila.dz

Received: 13/08/2023

Accepted: 01/01/2024

Abstract:

This topic falls within the interest of theoretical studies in international relations, which link epistemic shifts in geopolitical thought and their relationship to shifts in global politics. This article aims to monitor the development of geopolitical thought through three main parts. The first part presents classical geopolitics, introducing geopolitical thought in the pre-Cold War phase. The second section deals with Cold War geopolitics and the revival of geopolitics, while the last section represents post-Cold War geopolitics and the theoretical foundations of critical geopolitics.

The study concluded that the conceptual and intellectual shift in geopolitics coincides with the developments in international relations in theory and reality.

Keywords: Geopolitics; Critical Geopolitics; Geopolitics Revival, World Politics.

* author correspondent

ملخص:

يندرج هذا الموضوع ضمن اهتمام الدراسات النظرية في العلاقات الدولية، التي تربط بين التحولات الإستراتيجية في الفكر الجيوسياسي وعلاقتها بالتحولات في السياسية العالمية. يهدف هذا المقال إلى رصد تطور الفكر الجيوسياسي من خلال ثلاثة أجزاء رئيسية، يقدم الجزء الأول الجيوسياسية الكلاسيكية مع التطرق إلى مدخل إلى الفكر الجيوسياسي كمرحلة ما قبل الحرب الباردة. أما القسم الثاني فيتناول جيوسياسية الحرب الباردة وإحياء الجيوبولتيك، بينما القسم الأخير، فيمثل جيوسياسية ما بعد الحرب الباردة، والأسس النظرية للجيوسياسية النقدية. وقد توصلت الدراسة إلى أن التحول المفاهيمي والفكري في الجيوسياسية يتزامن مع التطورات الحاصلة في العلاقات الدولية تنظيراً وواقعاً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجيوسياسية- الجيوسياسية النقدية- إحياء الجيوسياسية-

السياسية العالمية.

Introduction

The accumulation of knowledge and research in geopolitical studies has reached new boundaries in which it transcends those traditional frameworks that governed its methodology. The expansion of intellectual propositions helped transfer the concept from studying the relationship between international political affairs and the geospatial considerations on which this policy is based to paying attention to the allegations behind the policies pursued. Which made there a necessary need to re-deal with geopolitics.

There is no doubt that the overlap and exchange between disciplines and theoretical discussions in the field of international relations and the involvement of a wide range of sociologists, philosophers, development theorists and anthropologists in the debate on geopolitics helped to systematically re-frame it within the field of international relations and expand the field of knowledge and study all the frameworks surrounding it.

Geopolitics explains the location of the state and the main regions, where the land or sea location and land area were determinants of the nature of power in the state. In the process of establishing a conceptual base, geopoliticians faced a major dilemma arising from the failure to achieve a scientific position in the academic agendas, especially after the end of World War II on the one hand, and the new transformations in the global arena.

Soon, geopolitical concepts took into account the changes that occurred in the international environment and kept pace with current developments. While the world has become front of a great need to think about rearranging priorities again, political, economic, cultural and civilizational conditions have become a controlling factor in global politics in addition to geographical conditions. Critical geopolitics, which reflected an effort supported by a new generation of scholars to uncover the mysteries and overcome the bad reputation directed

geopolitics to provide an analytical view that keeps pace with global developments.

In this context, critical geopolitics comes to overcome the theoretical and empirical obstacles that confronted classical geopolitics in the pre-Cold War period. It promises to present an alternative approach that avoids introducing epistemic additions in the field of geopolitics and imbuing a new analysis in the field of international relations.

Based on the foregoing, the scientific importance of the study is evident in monitoring the intellectual and cognitive transformation in the geopolitical direction, and in examining what critical geopolitics can offer to geopolitics on the one hand and the field of international relations on the other.

Through the foregoing, we present the problem that this study addresses:

How did the alternative critical approach to geopolitics contribute to the intellectual and conceptual development witnessed by geopolitics and the field of international relations in the post-Cold War period?

This problem includes a set of sub-questions, mainly represented in:

- What is the etymological basis of geopolitics?
- What are the epistemic and intellectual shifts in geopolitics in the context of the Cold War?
- What are the new theoretical frameworks proposed by critical geopolitics in the field of international relations?

To answer the presented problem, we put forward the following hypothesis:

- Geopolitics has a long and varied history that exceeds its original importance, which was generally concerned with geography and politics - geopolitics -. Giving a particular definition to the concept of geopolitics is proving difficult indeed. Accordingly, this type of concept tends to change according to the transformation witnessed by the historical stages and formations of the world system.

- The evolution of geopolitical thought through criticism of its foundational approaches, and a process of refining and reformulating the concept and its implications to keep pace with the changes brought about by the post-Cold War world.

To answer the research questions raised, this article uses foundational studies of critical geopolitical theory, which seeks to highlight the defects in classical geopolitical thought and adds scientific approaches and epistemological studies capable of restoring the status of geopolitics in academic studies. Thus, this article uses reading. In works that seek to highlight the development of geopolitical thought, works that have begun to gain increasing attention in recent years. Leslie W. Hepple's 1986 article "The Revival of Geopolitics." This paper chronicles the revival of geopolitical writing and analysis in North America and Europe since 1970, after a 20-year decline. The revival is examined in terms of language and substance, and the reasons for the revival are explored. In addition to its role in analyzing the global and regional strategy. Other studies in this context can be referred to, such as the article "Geopolitics in the Nineties: One Science, Many Meanings", by Mamdouh V.D. Mamadouh, published in 1998. This article focused mainly on the contributions of geographers, by the strong historical links between

geopolitics and geopolitics, as well as the innovation they introduced in this field in the nineties of the last century.

In addition, the book *Rethinking Geopolitics* by Simon Dalby and Gerard Total, issued in 2002, dealt with fourteen chapters that discuss how geopolitics can be viewed from iron.

This study is divided into three central parts, including its Bedouins, into two main parts. The first part deals with a general introduction to geopolitics that presents the conceptual and historical context of geopolitics, touching on the most important principles of the classical geopolitical school. The second section deals with the geopolitical approach in the Cold War, which was presented through two phases, the phase of geopolitical isolation from academic studies, and the phase of revival. The last section deals with the critical geopolitical approach by presenting the most important concepts and topics that I added to address global policy issues.

Classical Geopolitics: A Study in the Historical Context and Conceptual Dimension Emergence of Geopolitics

The world has witnessed changes in the map of politics since ancient times, and this continues to this day, either because of the expansion and emergence of empires or due to the occurrence of divisions for various reasons (ethnic, cultural, religious...). These changes are considered geopolitical practices that appeared before the advent of the word "geopolitics". Since ancient times, the conquerors and founders of empires have used the material and human resources of the region that they venture to seize and monopolize, as well as benefit from the region's data to achieve goals that have not yet been reached (Dufay, 2007). p. 11). Geopolitical ideas are as old as human thought in its ancient civilizations, similar to the ideas of Aristotle, who emphasized that Greece's geographical location in the moderate climatic region led the Greeks to global sovereignty over the peoples of the cold north and the hot south (Riyadh, 2012, p. 16), in his book *Politics* "In which he touched on the theory of the relationship between climate and freedom, and had a great positive impact on many thinkers in the modern era.

Cognitively, geopolitics appeared at the end of the nineteenth century (19), when geographers and other thinkers tried to analyze, interpret, and understand the transformations and specific spaces of the world at the end of the Fin de siecle century (Dodds and Antixton, 2010, p. 3), in the year 1899 Rudolf Kjellen put the term geopolitics for the first time (Dodds and Antixton, 2010, p. 16) in his book *"The State as an Organic Organism"*, where he considered geopolitics as one of the five sections of politics on the basis that it

is: and O'Callaghan, 2008, p. 162). While most of the academic and analytical studies are based on the state and how to achieve its goals and objectives; Kulin harnessed geography at its service to become a geopolitik, and harnessed demography to become a demopolitik, and economic geography to become an oekopolitika, and the necessity of harnessing sociology to become a sociopolitical, as well as government administration to become a kratopolitik (Mohamed Rabih al-Khairi, 2014, p. 55).

The latter referred, under the concept of "geopolitics", to three geographical features (Mamdouh, 1998) for the state:

- topopolitik (state website about other countries).
- morphopolitik (form of the territory of the state).
- physiopolitik (surface and physical characteristics of this area).

In the year 1897, the book "Political Geography" was published by F. Ratzel (Pascal, p. 7) as the first book in modern geography to deal with political issues from a geographical point of view. Where he considered political geography an integral part of the field of geographical research, which appeared in the article "The Seven Laws of Territorial Growth of the State" (Muhammad Rabie Al-Khairi, 2014, p. 69) by showing his influence on the theory of evolution, considering political geography as a branch of the natural sciences, and He presented a fundamentalist study that authorized him to be the founder of political geography.

The term geopolitics was a new scientific innovation, and the original formulation that Kulin presented to him determined the regional basis of the modern state and the geographical elements of governance (Muhammad Rabi` al-Khairi, 2014, p. 50). At the beginning of the twentieth century, specifically in 1903, the "American Political Science Association" was established, which is credited with establishing political science as an academic discipline and contributed to giving it an identity (Zaqag, 2009, p. 35). This event coincided with the publication of the article "The Geographical Pivot of History" in the Geographical Journal of its author, Halford Mackinder, who is considered an indispensable reference for the study of the history of geopolitics, although he did not use this term in his studies, it is considered a foundational work for this scientific field.

In addition to what was adopted by the Anglo-Saxon geostrategy, and the work of the American Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, who developed theories about the importance of controlling the seas and continents to achieve the global balance of power.

Hence the new term "geopolitics" spread among German geographers, under the leadership of Karl Ernst Haushofer and his colleagues from the *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* (1924-1944). The contributions of Haushofer, who developed the ideas of Ratzel and Kellin, differed from them in some of the existing relationships between several concepts, such as the state, population, self-sufficiency, and the vital field.

Nicholas Spykman presented in his book "Foreign Political Geography 1938" an analysis of the implications of space and location globally and regionally on the foreign policies of countries, and he believes that the main element of the great power of the state is manifested in effective and central control, and in establishing an effective communication system between the centres and the periphery. He invented The concept of Rimland (Boniface, 2020, p. 30) (Lands and Edge Regions).

Through this brief preface about the emergence of the concept of geopolitics, we will touch on what follows from the article to provide a specific definition of the concept and try to clarify its most important cognitive aspects, to reveal its nature and significance.

Conceptual Context of Geopolitics

Geopolitics is considered one of the branches of general geography that occupies great importance in international relations. Geopolitics seeks to understand and analyze current global and international issues and problems through an approach that combines the distribution of the various problems and issues on the geographical map and the analysis of the results of various policies and The behaviours of the actors associated with it according to historical thinking depends on the study of history and the development of events before their beginnings to the current situation and even after it in the future. Geopolitics expresses the complexity and ramifications of its topics and issues, which are associated with the intellectual development of the concept.

Thus, the intellectual significance of the concept of geopolitics can be determined, as most studies and references indicate the impact of geography on politics, taking into account the development of its use over the past century to include broader connotations. which often remain implicit and sometimes contradictory and disparate. In academia, the study of geopolitics involves the analysis of geography, history, and social sciences concerning spatial policies and patterns at different scales (ranging from the state level to the

international level). On the empirical level, it is seen as a rearrangement of the balance of power in the world arena.

Several definitions of geopolitics were presented because of the ambiguity and ambiguity of this concept, the multiplicity of visions about it, the diversity of schools and intellectual trends, and the angle from which each thinker looks. Below we will present a specific set of definitions, for example, but not limited to, to provide a comprehensive definition Of the geopolitical:

Some consider it to be political geography, as stated in the Political Encyclopedia (Al-Kayyali, 1985, p. 70), and here we find differences from the latter, not to mention considering it the bad side of geography, such as the description given by the geographer Carl Saur in 1927 when he called it "the disobedient son in the family." Geography (Dodds and Antixton, 2010, p. 9) "Way-word child of geographic Fauniln. In addition to the geographer Richard Harshhorn, who considered it "an intellectual poison and a mere pseudo-science that, with its political corruption, has brought disgrace to academic geography (Ruzeeq, 2014, p. 8)". As for General: Jahn Dau Kastrou: "This word so suspicious, so detestable, must be equated with consideration by giving it its true meaning" (Seleh, 1988, p. 13).

The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English defines it as: "a study of the influence of the country's location, its population, and its components on its policy (Gokmen, Geopolitics and the study of IR, 2010, p. 14)." The British Encyclopedia Britannica defines it as: "Analysis of the geographical influence on power relations in international relations" (Gokmen, Geopolitics and the study of IR, 2010, p. 14).

Some define it as: "the theory that examines the power of the state about the land, or as the theory of political developments in terms of its relationship to the land" (Muhammad Rabie Al-Khairy, 2014, p. 34)

Perhaps what is wrong with these definitions is the lack of agreement on whether geopolitics is a theory, perspective, model, or just a study that combines two disciplines, not to mention also the lack of agreement on a unified definition of the theory and the distinct differences between the different thinkers about it (Aref, 2002).

The German Journal of Geopolitics 1928 defines it as: "the science of the earth's relationship to political processes, and that its subject is based on a long-standing geographical base, especially political geography – the science of political beings in their place and environment – and considering geopolitics as the geographical

conscience of the state (Mohamed Rabi' al-Khairiy, 2014). , p. 35), and this is what tends to a large extent to what Napoleon Bonaparte said: "The policy of the state depends on its geography (Al-Kayyali, 1985, p. 70)." It also revolves around "the interaction between the state and empires within a specific geographical framework (Sempa, 2002, p. 5)".

As defined by the theoretical founders as:

Rudolf Kjelen: "The scientific application of geopolitics in the analysis of national power (Al-Zaher, 2007, p. 14)." As for Karl Haushofer: "A Study of Land Relations with Political Significance (Al-Zaher, 2007)."

Otto Mall Otto Mall 1936: "Geopolitics means the state as a living organism; not a place. Geopolitics searches behind the state's relationship with the environment - its area - and then tries to address those problems resulting from spatial relations. Geopolitics is concerned with the spatial requirements of the state, while the state is concerned with studying the spatial conditions of the state." And when you put geography at the service of the current spatial policy (Al-Hiti, 2013, p. 21). Geopolitics adopts the answer to questions related to the future. Have the state's spatial requirements been met? And if they have not been met, how can these requirements be obtained by their geographical conditions? In what direction should change occur?

Colin Gray: "The relationship between power, international politics, and the geographical framework" (Qadri, 2007, p. 50).

Aymeric Chouprad: "Geopolitics is the study of will to power applied to physical and human geographic situations."

(Taje, 2008, p. 10). As for Yves Lacoste, he defines it as: "an approach concerned with conflicts between powers or influence over land and the individuals who live on it, whether it is competition between different political forces or between armed groups." illegitimate, i.e. all conflicts that aim to control, conquer or defend large and smaller territories" (Taje, 2008), he presents geopolitics as epistemological thinking about the conflicts that occur in the earthly space.

The Russian Alexander Daugin defines it: "Geopolitics means the struggle of the powerful on the globe, and we add that geopolitics in this represents the point of view of the authority involved in this conflict, which is the authority of a superpower that seeks victory over the competing superpower (Mohamed Rabi' al-Khairiy, 2014). It is noted from the multiplicity of definitions of geopolitics and the discrepancy between the traditional and modern concept and between the narrow and broad concept that providing a specific

definition for it is difficult, as concepts such as the latter "change with the change of historical periods and the structural structures of the global system" (Gereard, Dalby, and Routledge, 1998, p. 3).

According to this, a procedural definition can be provided for this complex and complex concept: Geopolitics is an analysis of the interactions between the region and the factors (economic, demographic, climatic, geographical, historical and political processes) it contains. The result of this interaction is considered one of the outputs of geopolitics that may affect the conditions of the state (internal or external) and even the distribution of global powers and change the structure of the global system.

Cold War Geopolitics: The Revival of Geopolitics Ideological geopolitics and imperialism

The end of World War II led to the emergence of a new state of international interactions that international relations did not witness in the previous stages, on the academic and realistic levels.

academically; The defeat of Germany and the fall of Nazism was accompanied by the disappearance of the term geopolitics from the field of academic studies, and it became seen as an example of imperialism, and this problem reached a large amount when it was seen as a false flag and a carrier of a hostile ideology that perpetuates national ambitions (Hamid, 2018, p. 76). The international system rejected this period of geographical determinism, and everything related to geopolitical thought was erased, banned, and humiliated. While it was used in practice by building two blocs and two spheres of influence (Stephanie, 2014, p. 101); The formation of the world in 1945 made the United States of America - an island, continent, maritime empire - and the Soviet Union - exciting with its continental mass in the heart of Eurasia - the two largest geopolitical powers of that period. The leitmotif describes the fact that the Cold War is a geopolitical world order between two superpowers, the United States of America as the dominant power and the Soviet Union as the challenger. Geopolitics "has become an ideological tool used by US officials in the field of foreign policy." (Naji & Jayum, 2011, p. 151)

Based on a basic idea put forward by American diplomat George Kennan called the policy of "containment" published in an article in Foreign Affairs in July 1947 (Smolen, 2012). The latter questioned the nature of Soviet policy and suggested that the United States should be prepared for the expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union to contain communism (Hamid, 2018, p. 77). He also

classified the world into regions; Where he identified the world of maritime trade and called it the West, and the East is tyrannical.

Frank Debeh (Debeh, p. 18) says in the focus of his article "A Glimpse of Political Geography by Peter Taylor" that: "The ideology of the Cold War operates based on ideas that are easy to understand to the public: Stalin is soon Hitler, and Communism is almost Nazism." This confirms the dominance of ideology. Over that period, whether in the academic or field aspect.

Classical geopolitics disappeared and left its position after the Second World War, but it soon regained it in the seventies of the twentieth century thanks to a group of geographers Paul Claval, Claude Ravestin, Paul Gichonet, Michel Foucher, Boulding, and many other specialists in the field. The historical and political field "Harold and Margaret Sprout", made it possible to renew the concepts of political geography, restore the concepts of geopolitics, and resume some classic geopolitical concepts (Girard, 2014, p. 115).

Geopolitical revival and the end of academic isolation

A few years later, Leslie Hebel (1986) indicated a revival of the term geopolitics among prominent policymakers such as Henri Kissinger. New and radical interpretations of the term by geographers and others from Saul Cohen and Yves Lacoste to Pitter Taylor (Debit).

The new geopolitical approach emerged in the seventies in the works of both Samir Amin on the theory of dependency, and Yves Lacoste and his various works in Herodotus' magazine. In American circles, Henry Kissinger, the US National Security Adviser during the reign of Ronald Reagan in 1979, used geopolitics on a large scale (Dods, Kuss, & Sharp, 2016, p. 5). on the geopolitical necessities in Europe and Latin America, and the Gulf crisis can explain the sudden boom of analyses and specialists in geopolitics.

The ideological trend of the logic of the Cold War was the source of the strength of geopolitics as it enabled it to expand its reach which lasted for more than forty years.

The replacement of geo-economic analysis and the emergence of globalization and speed and environmental policy in many studies has been considered an official declaration of the end of geopolitics altogether. However, after several years of neglect, the term "geopolitics" has been explored in recent years by academics and the media. This could appear, in general, as a good development, as it relates public opinion to foreign policy and regional domestic administration. As in the past, when geopolitics was misused and reinterpreted as a German geopolitical concept, leading to the key term being banished from academics, the same problem returned

through the overuse of the term in vulgar cases and situations not related to geopolitics, and even more dramatically, In situations that don't even relate to any idea of geography or spatial visualization. Indeed, this can lead to dangerous situations that could make geopolitics a false domain to justify a supposedly strategic vision of a malicious author who wants to do something and endorse it.

Geopolitical concern in the end. For this reason, it is important not to create another definition of geopolitics but rather to make a precise delineation of its boundaries to determine when this issue, event or article is a geopolitical subject of analysis and when the movement of such a country is linked to its geopolitical ambitions. This research aims to evaluate different samples in which the term geopolitics was used to analyze when the term was applied or not applied correctly. Moreover, through these samples, the topic of geopolitics can be separated and identified to determine when this report or study is related or not related to the key term and suggest a systematic outline to determine when the term geopolitics can be used correctly (De Leon & Gomes, 2018, p 42).

However, geopolitics had hardly regained its centrality in academic debates when a new "crisis" arrived in geography that accompanied the end of the Cold War. In the 1990s, the liberal approach emerged and brought with it changes such as the disappearance of borders, the inevitable spread of democracy, and the loss of the importance of geography in a globalized world (De Leon and Gomes, 2018, p. 45).

Francis Fukuyama argued that the victory of Western liberal democracy and the free market had the form of a global state in a new world, where geography would matter less, borders would be useless, and national issues would be more homogeneous (Al-Hadithi, 2004). In matters of national security, even the generation of New threats, such as organized crime, terrorism and other non-state agents, will be more important than the old security model based on states as a threat. This "new world" would have deprived the country of its sovereignty with many new globalized threats that do not respect borders.

Moreover, new technologies will make geography less important than ever. Therefore, the mobility of people and products will increase and greatly reduce transaction costs. Indeed, geography will not be relevant in this new era because non-state actors will use the information age and cyberspace in a global level of communication, with the resulting absolute loss of the nation-state the ability to control mass media and cyberspace due to the wide reach by population to digital information.

The critical approach and rethinking geopolitics

Critical Geopolitics: In Context of Concept.

Critical geopolitics emerged in the same context as the so-called Dissident International Relations (IR). The major dissidents introduced post-structuralism into IR in the 1980s and challenged the founding ideas of neo-realism in particular. In doing so, they developed a critique of the novelty of IR theory (Ashley and Walker, 1990). And it was reinforced by a postmodern vision, as it opened the doors between the disciplines of interdisciplinary (Raqadi, 2017, p. 4).

The first writings in this field aimed at trying to radically re-vision geopolitics to adapt to the changes and emerging influences in global politics that prompted political geographers to search and test identity politics and the geographical consequences of the conflict, not to mention the creation of a distinct intellectual space and the recognition of the intellectual history of the term.

This approach highlights the socially constructed nature of international affairs and the importance of statecraft practices in this process. Critical geopolitics builds on this idea of statecraft. ^ O Tuathail & Dalby, Rethinking geopolitics: Towards critical geopolitics, 1998 suggest that "a country's cultural myths" should be taken into account in critical geopolitical study and that geopolitics is not a distinct school of statecraft, but rather should be understood as they are spatial (physical, representational) practices of statecraft itself.

The 'dissident effect' raised awareness and what followed was a collection of seminal critical geopolitical investigations into how maps of world politics are sculpted (Dalby, Critical Geopolitics: Discourse, Difference, and Dissent, 1991) published simultaneously by types Various intellectuals in the art of government such as political leaders, critics, advocates and advisors (1992). (O Tuathail, The Bush administration and the "end" of the Cold War: A critical geopolitics of US foreign policy in 1989, 1992).

Critical geopolitics examines "geographical representations and practices" (Gerard and Dalby, 1998) and sheds light on the evolution and relationships between geopolitical lines of argument and worldviews, to contribute to a better understanding of how political power is built over territory, and also in terms of language, where it aims to understand How private understanding of place is constructed by political actors (practical geopolitics), strategic institutions (formal geopolitics) and media (popular geopolitics) to emerge in specific perceptions of the world order (Gerard, Dalby, & Routledge, 1998).

- Popular Geopolitics: Popular Geopolitics: represented in mass media, cinema, novels or cartoons.
- Practical Geopolitics: represented in foreign policy, bureaucracy and political institutions).
- Formal Geopolitics: represented in strategic institutes, think tanks and academic circles.

The three types of geopolitics contribute to determining spatial borders and dangers (the geopolitical map of the world), geopolitical representations of the self and the other, and the geopolitical imagination.

Contributions to critical geopolitics are very diverse, but they all examine the problematic relationship between geographic knowledge and power (Gerard & Dalby, 1998). Geopolitics primarily works on discourses that justify the foreign policy of the United States, and also the foreign policy of other countries, such as the United Kingdom, South America, South Africa, and Australia (Dalby, Reading Rio, writing the world: The New York Times and the 'Earth Summit', 1996) (Dalby, 1996c). Attention is also paid to international actors such as the International Monetary Fund and environmental issues, international trade and geopolitics of the union, geo-economics and world trade, cyberspace and global flow concepts. Besides the works of politics and the speeches of politicians and diplomats, much attention is paid to the media (Toal, 1992).

It can be seen that critical geopolitics has been expanding for a long time by assuming that world politics can be read through textual evidence. That is, understanding texts is an important way of representing geography and politics. In other words, representations and performances opened an important path for geopolitics as political space is a flexible creativity. It has a political purpose and multiple possible meanings (Martin, 2012). Critical geopolitics locates the understanding of discourses in the realm of discursive practices and linguistic semantics, keeping in mind that everything especially geography and world politics can be represented through systems of symbols (Ning, 2017, p. 15).

New propositions arose in this context stating that not everything can be understood and represented through linear practices and texts, such as experience, emotions, perception, etc., which play a major role in defining space and global politics.

Geopolitics of Emotions

In the book of the French geographer "Dominique Moisi" entitled *Geopolitics of Emotions*, he sees that emotions also play a prominent role in moving human political behaviour. An important influence on geopolitics, because emotions reflect the degree of confidence that society possesses about itself; that is, it is the degree of confidence that determines the ability of society to rise after any crisis, and among them emerges challenge behaviour, response behaviour, or coping behaviour (Scheff, 2018, p. 151).)

He also believes that there are three basic emotions (Pain, 2009) influencing the geopolitics of the political path:

1. Fear the lack of confidence in international relations, or the critical confidence of those who have lost hope in the future, due to their expectation that the future will be more dangerous. By that he means Europe.
2. Hope is an expression of confidence and conviction that today is better than yesterday and that tomorrow will be better than today, and conviction is against surrender. The same applies to Asia.
3. Humiliation: The feeling of humiliation sometimes turns into a diplomatic weapon, and plays with the feelings of the oppressed nations (Khurshid, 2013, p. 44), where is the reason for this choice because these three emotions, without the other emotions, are directly related to the trust gap that is considered tantamount to The determining factor for how nations and populations face the risks they face on the one hand, and how to build their relationships with each other. This includes the Islamic world.

CONCLUSION

The main endeavor of this research is to examine the problem of whether the emergence of critical geopolitics in the field of international relations contributes to the development and rebuilding of a new geopolitical approach, or is merely a critical approach to an existing intellectual trend. A review of the geopolitical development led to the conclusion that its development is linked to the changes taking place in the global and academic arena alike, as the intellectual background of classical geopolitics is closely related to the Nazi tendency that ruled the stage of the World War. In addition to the geopolitics of the Cold War, which embodied the ideological nature of the conflict, down to the critical geopolitical approach that was closely linked to the variables at the end of the Cold War and the developments that took place in that period, from technological, scientific, and even strategic developments.

Thus, the main conclusions that can be recorded in the conclusion of the study focus on:

- The post-Cold War situation presents new dimensions in geopolitical analysis, such as globalization and technological and informational development, which led to the adoption of an alternative approach to classical geopolitics represented in critical geopolitics.
- Critical geopolitics is a cognitive shift in geopolitical thought that adopts a post-modern and post-structuralist perspective within the framework of interdisciplinary studies.
- Critical geopolitics is concerned with the multi-faceted approaches to geopolitics as developed in the 1980s and embodied in the literature of authors such as Dalby and Tuatail.
- The research addition lies in critical geopolitics, as a critical stance on classical geopolitical thought, and its contribution to removing the bad reputation that this trend gained in the post-World War II period.
- Critical geopolitics added new approaches, an alternative to the traditional ones, based on written and rhetorical practices, and the role of influence and emotions on the other hand.

In the end, it can be said that the alternative critical approach to geopolitics contributed to the intellectual and conceptual development of geopolitics and the field of international relations, as those epistemic-conceptual shifts accompanied the developments that took place in the post-Cold War period. Critical geopolitics is not an addition to classical geopolitics (although it is certainly a much-needed addition to the discussion of geopolitical thought) but an alternative to it.

Bibliography List :

Arabic References:

- Agnetichka, L. (2018). *New Geopolitics: What is new in this field?* Translated paper, K. Jalal, Istanbul: Idraak Center for Studies and Consultations.
- Al-Zaher, N. (2007). *Contemporary geopolitics under a new international order*. Jordan: Al-Bazouri Scientific for publication and distribution.
- Kayali, A. a. (1985). *Political Encyclopedia*. Beirut: The Arab Institute for Studies and Publishing.
- Al-Hiti, p. F. (2013). *Studies in geopolitics and geopolitics*. Jordan: Al-Riwaq for publishing and distribution.
- Boniface, b. (2020). *Geopolitics: an approach to understanding the world in 48 articles*. (E. Issa, Trad.) Damascus: Publications of the Syrian General Authority for Books.
- Jarad, p. a. (2018). *Geopolitics: concepts, milestones and bets*. Algeria: El Shehab Publications.
- Gerard, d. (2014). *A study in international relations: geopolitical theories* (ed. 1). Syria: Nineveh House for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
- Hamid, F. P. (2018). *Strategists - an introduction to the study of global strategic thought*. Beirut: Dar Al-Rafidain.
- Khurshid, F. H. (2013). *Contemporary geopolitics - behavioural analysis*. Kurdistan: Sulaymaniyah House for Publishing and Distribution.
- Dodds, K., & Antixton, D. (2010). *Political Geography in a Hundred Years*(Global Geopolitical Evolution. (p. Certified, Trad.) Al-Foumy Center for Translation.

- Dufay, A. (2007). *Geopolitics - Geopolitics* (ed. 1). (H. Haidar, Trad.) Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Oweidat for publication and distribution.
- Debeh, F. (s.d.). *Is geopolitics a science?* Centre for Strategic Studies, Research and Documentation.
- Raqdi, p. a. (2017, June). *Geopolitics and globalization: in talking about the end of geography*. *Notebooks of Politics and Law*, 9 (17), pp. 209-220.
- Razik, M. (2014). *Geopolitics*. Algeria: Dar Cordoba for publication and distribution.
- Riyad, M. (2012). *General origins in political geography and geopolitics*. Cairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture.
- Zaqag, p. (2009). *The fourth debate is between theoretical approaches to international relations. A dissertation submitted for obtaining a doctorate of science in international relations*. Department of Political Science, University of Batna, Algeria.
- Zibingo, b. (2015). *The Great Chessboard - American Supremacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. (S. Abraham, Trad.) Syria: Dar Alamuddin for publication and distribution.
- Stephanie, L. (2014). *International Relations*. (A. A. Al-Khuzami, Trad.) Cairo, Al-Fahira: Dar Al-Fajr for publication and distribution.
- Seele, b. (1988). *geopolitical and geostrategic*. (A. Abdul Karim, Trad.) Damascus: Al-Ahali for printing, publishing and distribution.
- Sufouh, A. (2000). *Geographical: subject matter, methods and objectives*. Beirut: Dar Al-Fikr.
- Aref, M. n. (2002). *Comparative Politics Epistemology: Cognitive Model, Theory, Approach*. Lebanon: Majd: The University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
- Griffiths, M., & O'Callaghan, T. (2008). *Basic concepts in international relations*. UAE: Gulf Research Center.
- Qadri, H. (2007). *International Conflicts "Study and Analysis"*. Algeria: Khair Jlees Publications.
- Nawar Muhammad Rabih Al-Khairy. (2014). *Principles of Geopolitics*. Iraq: Dar Adnan for publication and distribution.

English references:

Ashley, R. K., & Walker, R. J. (1990). Speaking the language of exile: Dissident thought in international studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 34 (3), pp. 259-268.

cattaruzza, A., & Sintès, P. (2016). *Geopolitique des conflits*. France: Bréal.

Dalby, S. (1991, september 1). Critical Geopolitics: Discourse, Difference, and Dissent. *Sage Journals*, 9 (3), pp. 171-188.

Dalby, S. (1996, july). Reading Rio, writing the world: The New York Times and the 'Earth Summit'. *Political Geography*, pp. 593- 613.

Dods, K., Kuss, M., & Sharp, J. (2016). Introduction: Geopolitics and its critics. chapter in a book: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics*. (K. Dods, M. Kuss, & J. Sharp, Éds.)

Gerard, T., & Dalby, S. (1998). *Rethinking Geopolitics*. London: Routledge.

ge.

Gerrard, T., Dalby, S., & Routledge, P. (1998). *The Geopolitics Reader*. London: Routledge.

Gokmen, S. R. (2010). *Geopolitics and the study of IR*. A thesis submitted of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the department of IR. technical university of the Middle East.

Gokmen, S. R. (2010). *Geopolitics and the study of IR*. a thesis submitted, in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of doctor of philosophy. the graduate school of social science of M.E, Department of IR, Technical University.

Mamdouh, V. (1998). Geopolitics in the nineties: one flag, many meanings. *Geojournal* (46), pp. 5-19.

Martin, M. (2012). Opening the black box of the organization: Socio-material practices of. *Political Geography*, 311 (6), pp. 379-388.

Naji, S., & Jayum, J. A. (2011, April). US hegemonic leadership and its geopolitical codes. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (7), pp. 149-157.

Ning, A. (2017, April). *Confucian geopolitics: Chinese geopolitical imaginations*. PhD thesis. School of Geographical and Earth Sciences University of Glasgow.

O Tuathail, G. (1992). The Bush administration and the “end” of the Cold War: A critical geopolitics of US foreign policy in 1989. *Geoforum*, 23 (4), pp. 437-452.

O Tuathail, G., & Dalby, S. (1998). *Rethinking geopolitics: Towards a critical geopolitics*. London: Routledge.

Pain, R. (2009). Globalized fear? Towards an emotional geopolitics. *progress in Human Geography*, 33 (4), pp. 466-486.

Pascal, B. *la geopolitique 42 fiches themetiques et de downentee Pour comrendere l’actualite*. Eyrolles .

Scheff, T. (2018, december). The world politics of Dominique Moïsi: a review of MOÏSI, Dominique. *The Geopolitics of Emotion: How Cultures of Fear, Humiliation, and Hope are Reshaping the World*. *RBSE Revista Brasileira de Sociologia da Emoção* , 17 (51), pp. 155-157.

Sempa, S. P. (2002). *Geopolitics: From the Cold War to the 21st century*. U.S.A: Transaction Publishers.

smolen, k. (2012). Evolution of geopolitical schools of thought. *Miedzmer* (7), pp. 5-19.

Taje, M. (2008). , "Introduction à la géopolitiques . Tunisie : université virtuelle de la Tunisie .

Toal, G. (1992, March). Geopolitics and Discourse Practical Geopolitical Reasoning in American Foreign Policy. *Political Geography*. *Political Geography*, 11 (2), pp. 190-204.

Ukraine: Near Abroad Of The European Union? - Overcoming A Curse Of Dual-Periphery. (2004, February 20-21). *Ukraine in Europe and the World” ConferencePaper*. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Vojvodina, A. (2017). Book Review in: *Near Abroad: Putin, the West, and the Contest over Ukraine and the Caucasus*, by Gerard Toal, oxford: Oxford Press.