



CLASSICAL AND CRITICAL GEOPOLITICS: SYNERGY OF INTERACTION OR DIVISION

Qudratjon Abduraimov¹

Dilmurod Dilmurodov²

University of World Economy and Diplomacy

KEYWORDS

classical geopolitics,
critical geopolitics,
convergence of modern
geopolitical trends,
humanitarian function of
geopolitics

ABSTRACT

At the present stage, the level of socio-economic development of territorial entities and the effectiveness of enterprises and firms are largely dependent on the actions of global factors, as well as the ability of the subject and the chosen model management of socio-economic processes to adapt to the rapid changes taking place in the external environment, building its policy in such a way that it is most effective use limited resources and opportunities for development, minimize possible risks.

2181-2675/© 2022 in XALQARO TADQIQOT LLC.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6507801

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International(CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

¹ PhD student, University of World Economy and Diplomacy, Tashkent, UZB

² Student, University of World Economy and Diplomacy, Tashkent, UZB (dilmurodov3033@gmail.com)

The collapse of the bipolar world during the Cold War and the advent of the postmodern era to some extent devalued classical approaches in geopolitics. At the forefront of geopolitical research came such factors such as the geopolitical potentials of the state, the quality of human capital, the ethno-national and confessional psychology of the population and their influence on the formation of the socio-political situation in the country, and also the impact of information-psychological operations on the mental environment of a person in order to transform his socio-political orientation and control his behavior.

The consequence of this was the transfer of the struggle for global and regional leadership of the subjects of international politics into a multidimensional geopolitical space, which led to the emergence of a new form of geopolitical confrontation – “hybrid wars”.

If we turn to the origins of the emergence of the concept of critical geopolitics, it should be noted that in the English-language literature in the 1970s–1980s, a discussion unfolded, consonant with the ideas of the French ideologists of postmodernism, about a new, “impartial” geopolitics, which should be based on the vision of a multidimensional geopolitical space by social individuals and social elites as an object that changes in depending on the specific goals pursued by political groups and various sectors of society.

As a tool for solving socio-political problems, political the discourse by which the generally accepted vision and interpretation of the surrounding world was determined, as well as the actions of people and the institutional forms of organization of society arising from such a vision. Political discourse was aimed at changing or forming new socio-political ideas. In a number of works Western sociologists have proved that discourse plays an important role in the formation of the political map and the "territorial-state" belonging of a person.

As a result, at the turn of the century, these processes led to the emergence of a new concept, which received the name is “critical geopolitics”, in which the status of such objective factors of the material world as geophysics, economics, demography, ecology, technology and military power was recognized as secondary. The objective factors of geopolitics faded into the background, giving way to subjective interpretations of reality generated in the human mind under the influence of the conscientious influence of the media and technology called the Overton Window.

The focus of geopolitical discourse was a new interpretation of power and centers of power, and the aforementioned material geopolitical factors were presented as one of the forms of socially conditioned knowledge. Instead, the leading place was taken by the geopolitical imagination and myths about geopolitical spaces, formed in the virtual space of the global information society.

Critical geopolitics has taken up the study of international relations through political discourse, developed in the works of its founders - G. Tuatayla and S. Dalby in which they formulated the concepts “high” and “low” geopolitics. “High” geopolitics should be dealt

with by the elites represented by the political science community, but the “low” geopolitics was intended for the people.

The scope of the latter content contained in media reports, advertisements, cartoons, films and caricatures of political figures, purposefully formed images and ideas about the place of the country in the world, its foreign policy orientation, potential and real allies and main rivals in the international arena.

In fairness, it should be noted that in the modern world the existence of “high” and “low” geopolitics, as components of critical geopolitics, is interdependent and is justified due to the need for constant mutual information feeding and interaction of the two floors of this structure, regulated by the political elites of the country, depending on the specific socio-political and international environment.

At present, the areas of scientific knowledge in which critical geopolitics operates are: geopolitical culture, geopolitical vision of the world, national stereotypes, the national image of the country, space and traditions, which are devoted to a number of works by domestic and foreign authors³

The geopolitical vision of the world is formed under the influence of folk traditions, education, personal experience of a person, the size of the territory occupied by the population of a given country, literature and art, as well as the media that create and spread myths and stereotypes about national history. These ideas are spread and fixed in the minds of people in the course of geopolitical discourse initiated and supported by certain groups of elites in order to form the basic foundations of the geostrategy of the state in the minds of the population in terms of understanding the national interests of the country and ways to ensure their protection.

In this regard, critical geopolitics has moved away from the traditional understanding of the concepts of “political” and “geographical”. It went beyond research tasks that take into account only the physical boundaries, institutions of state power and the objective characteristics of the state. The focus of critical geopolitics is postmodern philosophy, which considers a wide range of socio-philosophical problems related to lifestyle, ecology, politics, morality, and, of course, pays special attention to culture, art and aesthetic values. Ideology and practice of domination, violence, wars are rejected in favor of the values of pluralism, equal dialogue and discourse for finding together decisions, peace and harmony.

As the analysis of the concept of critical geopolitics shows, it is a tool for maintaining a unipolar world, in which the primacy is a priori awarded to the civilization of the Sea.

At the same time, supporters of critical geopolitics allow themselves the luxury of criticizing “Anglo-Saxon imperialism” because it has already won, which makes it possible to move the situation from the stage of proclamation hegemony to the stage of implying it. By rejecting the dualism of land and sea that underlies classical geopolitics, critical geopolitics destroy the existence of land on a conceptual level. The sea remains in fact, but here is its geopolitical alternative - the land (Heartland) disappears with the rejection of dualism as an objective reality. It is no longer regarded as an alternative to thalassocratic geopolitics and loses the chance even to exist in the form of a hypothesis. And Anglo-Saxon

geopolitics and its successes in globalization are postulated and taken not as a project for the reorganization of the world, but as a given, as something achieved and irreversible.

Obviously, the task of critical geopolitics is to disguise its thalassocratic character with postmodern simulacra. This should teach the intellectual and political elites of the land powers (first of all - Russia) to the fact that "the Sea finally flooded the Land" and external control over the heartland from the side of the civilization of the Sea is finally established.

The concept of critical geopolitics formulates the need to make the contradictions of the modern world internal problems of members of the global society, which is destined to live in a state of schizophrenic duality. This is the pragmatic side of critical geopolitics, its social "demobilization" message.

America, which serves as a fundamental guide for the Anglo-Saxon countries in building the Western system of international security, military planning and the activities of special services without any discussion of topical problems with external subjects of international politics on an equal footing. At the same time, such areas of critical geopolitics as geopolitical culture in its transnational aspect, geopolitical vision of the world from the point of view of universal values, the problem of preserving national cultures, national values and traditions of the peoples of world civilization in the processes of globalization do not fall into the field of view of Western geopoliticians.

In practice, critical geopolitics seeks to hide objective processes in the modern world behind due to their substitution by virtual simulacra, which makes a correct analysis of the socio-political state and international situation impossible.

The joint solution of the above issues will allow representatives of critical and classical geopolitics to bring their positions closer and organically combine discourse with an objective analysis of the geopolitical situation, based on the definition of political goals, available resources of the parties and risks, as well as taking into account the psychology of perception of the surrounding world by people of different civilizations and different confessional affiliations.

In conclusion, critical geopolitics can successfully fulfill the information and humanitarian function by sanitizing the human mental area from harmful viruses introduced into human consciousness destructive actors in international politics. Such interaction will open the way to building a comprehensive model of the geopolitical arrangement of the world and will allow focusing on an in-depth analysis of the humanitarian and psychological factors of political processes.

REFERENCES:

1. Kolosov V.A., Tikunov V.S., Zayats D.V. The world in the mirror of mass media: the use of anamorphoses in political and geographical analysis // Bulletin of the Moscow University. Ser. Geography. 2000. - No. 2. - S. 55-65.
2. Kolosov V., O'Tuathail G. An Empire's Fraying Edge? The North Caucasus Instability in Contemporary Russian Geopolitical Culture // Eurasian Geography and Economics. 2007. Vol. 48, No. 2. - P. 202-225. 5 Reordering the world: Geopolitical Perspectives on the 21st century. 1994. - 352 p.

3. Geoffrey Parker, *Geopolitics: Past, Present, and Future* (London: Pinter, 1998),
"Chapter3 "24-57.