



Geopolitics in the nineties: one flag, many meanings

V. D. Mamadouh

AGIDS, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130, 1018 VZ Amsterdam, the Netherlands

E-mail: v.d.mamadouh@frw.uva.nl

Received and accepted 11 March 1999

Key words: critical geopolitics, geo-economics, geopolitics, géopolitique, political geography

Abstract

This article provides an overview of recent publications on geopolitics. The diversity is overwhelming. Publications are therefore divided into four 'schools': neo-classical geopolitics, subversive geopolitics, non-geopolitics and critical geopolitics. These four schools are distinguished on two dimensions. The first is the distance to the object under study (practical/applied *versus* academic/reflective). The second refers to the position towards the state system (states as the principal geopolitical actors *versus* attention for other political actors and interests). Despite their differences, the four types of studies share a growing interest in geoeconomics.

Introduction

This article provides an overview of recent publications on geopolitics. Though the review focuses on the nineties, it would be wrong to assume that the revived interest for geopolitics has been caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. The revival occurred already in the seventies. In 1986, as the fall of the Wall and the reunification of Germany still seemed an utopia, an article entitled *The revival of geopolitics* was published in the leading scientific journal *Political Geography Quarterly*. In that article, Leslie Hepple looks back on fifteen years renewed interest for this subfield of geography (Hepple, 1986).

But the term 'geopolitics' is not only in use among geographers: it is very popular among political scientists interested in international relations, among diplomats and military experts, and among journalists. This article will focus essentially but not exclusively upon the contributions of geographers. There are two reasons for that. First, there are strong historic ties between geopolitics and political geography. Second, the prolific and innovative nature of the work of political geographers in the field of geopolitics in the nineties fully warrants such attention.

Classical geopolitics

An overview of the contemporary literature on geopolitics can not avoid some problems of definition. This compulsory exercise, the definition of a key concept, is in this case extremely laborious. The concept is not only contaminated by the historical legacy of the (mis)use of the ideas of the German school of *Geopolitik* by the nazi-regime. It suffers profound confusion. There are plenty meanings and

connotations in the contemporary uses of the word 'geopolitics' which remain often implicit and are often contradictory. In most cases (but not always) it is about states, relations between them and their geographical context.

It is well known that the neologism 'geopolitics' originates from the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellén. In 1899 Kjellén introduced five neologisms to label key features of the state: the other four (demopolitik, ekonomipolitik, sociopolitik, kratopolitik) did not strike root but 'geopolitik' did. With this term, he pointed at three geographical features of a state: topopolitik (the location of a state in relation to other states), morphopolitik (the form of the territory of a state) and physiopolitik (the surface and the physical characteristics of this territory) (Holdar, 1992, 1994). Right from the beginning, Kjellén introduced some confusion, as 'geopolitik' meant both the characteristics of a state and the study of these characteristics.

The neologism 'geopolitik' took hold among German geographers, under the leadership of Karl Haushofer and his colleagues of the *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* (1924–1944). These geographers were mainly inspired by the work of the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel who had laid down the fundamentals of a biological theory of the state (biological analogies were prevailing at that time in the social sciences) in his book *Politische Geographie* (1897). In addition, Haushofer was inspired by the Anglo-Saxon geostrategy, especially the work of the British geographer, Sir Halford J. Mackinder, and of the American admiral, Alfred T. Mahan. Both had developed theories about the importance of controlling seas and continents for the global balance of power.

At the end of the Second World War the term Geopolitik was tightly associated with nazi-propaganda. The American geographers Isaiah Bowman and Nicholas Spykman

introduced the expression 'democratic geopolitics' to label geopolitics in service of a democratic regime (O'Loughlin, 1994, p. ix) but it was in vain, the term fell into abeyance.

The basic elements of the classical geopolitics are resumed in a few words: the state is conceived as a living organism, therefore borders are conceived as flexible (they change in the course of the 'life' of the state, in other words a state enlarges its territory when its strengths are growing at the expense of older states in decline); finally, following social Darwinism, the evolution of the political organism is determined by its environment. Typical for the classical geopolitics is geographical determinism as opposed to the 'possibilism' advocated by the French school of geography.

A few would like to reserve the use of the term 'geopolitics' for the German theories of the first half of the twentieth century and the schools they directly influenced, as in Mussolini's Italy and Franco's Spain (Raffestin, 1995; Blouet, 1994). This is completely unrealistic in view of the contemporary popularity of the word among political geographers, political scientists interested in international relations, military experts and the media. Consequently we need to examine how the term is currently used.

This article is an attempt to present recent publications¹ by classifying them into four 'approaches'. The names and the delimitation of these 'geopolitical schools' is somewhat arbitrary but it reduces effectively the great diversity encountered in the publications related in one way or the other to *geopolitics*. These four schools are distinguished on two dimensions. The first is the distance to the object under study: at the one hand practical advises to political actors are highly recommended, at the other hand academic reflections refrain from ties with geopolitical policies. The second refers to the position towards the state system: at the one hand states are conceived as the principal geopolitical actors, at the other hand attention is paid to other political actors and to the internal diversity and the conflict of interests inside the states. The four approaches are indicated in Table 1. They will be discussed below in chronological order, meaning from the moment that they have manifested themselves in the scientific community.

Neo-classical geopolitics: geopolitics en geostrategy

Academic geographers may have been scared by the role of geopolitics in the nazi-propaganda; the neglect of geopolitics at the beginning of the Cold War by military experts had a different origin. In their case, the neglect was brought about by the radical change of the relation between power, military technology and geography. To clarify this evolution, it suffices to remind of the two most important changes which gave the impression that geography did not matter any more. The first was a material cause, the technological progress both in general (especially the improvement of transportation and communication technology with essential consequences for logistics related to both trade and

strategy) and in particular regarding the waging of war (namely the production of nuclear weapons). In addition there was a political cause: the dominant view during the Cold War was that the world was divided between two ideologies: market capitalism and liberal democracy at the one side, communism and people's democracy at the other side. This global perspective reduced conflicts to an ideological struggle between Good and Evil. Territorial disputes concerning resources and the like were neglected and therefore geopolitical approaches fell into abeyance.

The revival of geopolitics is connected to the decolonisation of Asia and Africa, where many states declare themselves non-aligned to one of the two blocs, and with the emergence of conflicts between states belonging to the same bloc, such as the estrangement between China and the Soviet Union and later on the territorial disputes between China and Vietnam, Vietnam and Cambodia, Iran and Iraq. The term 'geopolitics' itself has been popularised by the American diplomat Henry Kissinger in the seventies (Hepple, 1986; O'Loughlin, 1994; Dijkink, 1996; Ó Tuathail, 1996; Parker, 1998).

In neoclassical geopolitics, the strategic value of specific attributes of territories play the leading role. Next to 'geopolitics', the core concept is 'geostrategy'. Neoclassical geopolitics correspond to what the layman expects geopolitics to be: it is about the effects of geographical location and other geographical features on the foreign policy of a state and its relations with other states. It is also concerned with the strategic value of geographical factors (resources, access to the sea, etc.). This also corresponds to the definitions provided in general dictionaries. In this context, Napoléon Bonaparte is often quoted: 'La politique d'un état est dans sa géographie' (e.g., as an epigraph in the atlas of Chaliand and Rageau, 1983)².

Neoclassical geopolitics distinguishes itself from classical geopolitics on many points. First, the state is not conceived as an organism, and borders are given. The state remains however a black box: reasoning occurs in terms of 'national interest' and 'national security' as if the state was one person. There is a sharp distinction between internal affairs and foreign policy. The world of international relations remains the domain of experts. Subsequently geographical determinism is no more at stake, but a powerful contextual effect is considered. The physical environment puts restraints and offers opportunities: 'geography does not repeat itself' states Neville Brown in a reflection about the growing length of the war front (Brown, 1992, pp. 74–76).

During the eighties, there was a growing interest for *nuclear geopolitics*, this means geopolitics and geostrategy in the nuclear age. In a reader published in a series of the NATO Scientific Affairs Division (Zoppo and Zorgbibe, 1985), the geopolitical analysis of the nuclear deterrence is introduced as an improvement to the realistic approached to international relations. It was also in the circles of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation that the Institut international de géopolitique/International Institute of Geopolitics

¹This article does not claim to offer an exhaustive inventory as it is obviously limited by the physical (in)capacities of the author to access publications in certain languages in certain places.

²Dijkink lets the French President François Mitterand (1981–1995) quote Napoléon! (Dijkink, 1996, p. 1).

Table 1. Four geopolitical approaches

	Practical/applied	Academic
States	neo-classical geopolitics, <i>geopolitics, géostratégie,</i> <i>geo-economics</i>	non-geopolitics <i>political geography</i>
Other political actors	subversive geopolitics <i>géopolitique interne et externe</i>	post-structuralistic geopolitics <i>critical geopolitics</i>

has been established in 1982 in Paris and Washington, under the leadership of the French Gaullist Marie-France Garaud. The institute publishes under the title *Géopolitique* two journals, one in English and one in French. Among the founding members of the institute one can find diplomats, politicians, military experts and academics (such as Huntington and Luttwak). Special issues of both journals are typically devoted to hot items in term of security: the USSR, the Gulf War, Space, Islam, etc.

The classical elements of Mackinder's geostrategy are still considered to be important, e.g., the traditional theme of maritime superpowers (Modelski and Thompson, 1988; Gray, 1988; Girardet, 1989; Gallois, 1990; Chaliand, 1990; Coutau-Bégarie, 1985a, 1995), the control of specific seas and islands (Coutau-Bégarie, 1985b, 1987, 1993; Besnault, 1992; Cordonnier, 1995; Vigarié, 1995; Catley and Keliat, 1997; Simpson-Anderson, 1997), the strategic relevance of specific regions (Hafeznia, 1994 on Kashmir; Delavaud, 1993 on Asia; Martel, 1991 on Libya) or the importance of geopolitical insights for security policy of one's country (Brill, 1994). Moreover geopolitical analyses have been published regarding new resources and energy sources, drinking water, etc. In *The Strategic Revolution* (1992) Neville Brown brings up poverty in the Third World, the global climate change and environmental issues (see also Brown, 1994, for a study of water as strategic resource, see also Sironneau 1996; and Perkins, 1997 on the relation between national security policy and high yielding agriculture).

In the eighties and nineties, many atlases have been manufactured to portray a global view of the uneven distribution of resources and of conflict sources (Chaliand and Rageau, 1983, 1985; Touscoz, 1988; de Marensches, 1988; Valaud, 1989; Boustani and Fargues 1990; Boniface, 1993; Chaliand, 1993; Chaliand and Jan, 1993; Kidron and Segal, 1981, 1984; Kidron and Smith, 1983; Freedman, 1985; Anderson, 1993; Seager, 1995). It is also worth mentioning the noticeable handbook *Strategic Geography: NATO, the Warsaw Pact, and the superpowers* by Hugh Faringdon (1989), a revised edition of *Confrontation* first published in 1986 (see also Segal, 1986). Reference books in this tradition include a lexicon (Soppelsa et al., 1988) and two dictionaries (Zorgbibe, 1988; Plano and Olton, 1988) both rendered largely obsolete by the collapse of the Communist regime in the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless geopolitics lost strength. Regarding warfare, speed has become more important than strategic location on

the globe (some speak about chronopolitics, see Ó Tuathail, 1993b for a critical account, see also Gray, 1997), but more structurally economic power has become more important than military power. Edward Luttwak presents this point of view in his article *From geopolitics to geo-economics* (1990) and later in his book *The endangered American dream* (1993). Luttwak wrote originally about (geo-)strategy (Luttwak, 1983, 1986, 1987; Luttwak and Koehl, 1991). He posits in the two publications mentioned above, that economic power has become more important than military power (the Soviet Union has lost its position and itself for lack of economic power). But his message is also alarming, his book has therefore been given the odd subtitle *How to stop the United States from becoming a third world country and how to win the geo-economic struggle for industrial supremacy*. Geo-economics point out the fact that states compete with each other for economic power, and no more for territorial power. All the more the neologism geo-economics is odd, when the term 'ecopolitics' seems more proper³.

Just the same, the term catches on. It seems that geo-economics is becoming the twin sister of (neo-)geopolitics instead of geostrategy. Such an evolution is observable in *A dangerous peace, The geopolitical transition from bipolarity to new rivalry* (Rusi, 1997) in which the author, a Finnish diplomat, predicts the strategic landscape of the twenty-first century on the basis of the political and economic power of the states. Still more traditional geostrategic approaches are still around (see Brzezinski, 1997, or Kemp and Harkavy, 1997).

Subversive geopolitics: everything is geopolitical!

At the end of the seventies, the term 'geopolitics' acquired a subversive meaning in France with the help of Maoist geographers. Geographical knowledge is important for those waging war, hence the observation of the French geographer Yves Lacoste who entitled his radical analysis about geography *La géographie ça sert d'abord à faire la guerre* (1976). His analysis of the logic behind the bombardment of the dikes in North-Vietnam by the American army made

³Or the less elegant terms 'geo-political-economy' (in: Corbridge and Agnew, 1991) or 'geopolinomics' (in Demko and Woods, 1994). Still 'ecopolitics' is confusing because it is also used as a contraction of 'ecology' and 'politics' (for example in Kuehls, 1996 who presents an analysis of ecopolitics from a geopolitical perspective).

Lacoste famous in the United States (Ó Tuathail, 1994, pp. 325–29, 1996, p. 161; Dijkink, 1996, p. 4). According to Paul Claval it was also the failure of the guerilla activities in South-America that stimulated the interest of these ‘soixante-huitards’ for geography (Claval, 1994, pp. 127–8). Anyhow, it is clear that Lacoste wants to apply the power originating in geographical knowledge against the superpowers. He pleads for an active (political) geography, as opposed to applied geography, and seeks to connect to the work of the nineteenth century anarchist and geographer Elysée Reclus.

From 1976 on, Lacoste and his associates publish their own journal: *Hérodote*. As from number 27 in 1982, the subtitle changed into *Revue de géographie et de géopolitique*⁴ but the format remained unchanged: special issues are prefaced by Yves Lacoste who elaborates the building blocks of a new geopolitical approach. In the course of time, a specific school matures, a geographical analysis of situations in which different groups put contradictory claims on a particular territory (Foucher, 1988, p. 439). It concerns the ‘rivalités de pouvoir sur des territoires et sur les hommes qui s’y trouvent’ (Lacoste, 1993, p. 3). In addition, territorial conflicts become a matter of geopolitics according to Lacoste, only if they are the subject of a democratic debate (Lacoste, 1993, pp. 1–45; Durand and Ruano-Borbalan, 1994, p. 34).

Because there are as many points of view as there are protagonists (Lacoste, 1986, p. xvi), the word is used in the plural, *les géopolitiques*, contrary to the conventional usage in French, e.g., *la géopolitique*. Furthermore the geopolitical approach can be applied at different levels of analysis: ‘les états n’ont pas le monopole de la géopolitique’ (Lacoste, 1986, tome 1, p. xiii). The analyses focus naturally on the nature of the claims of the political actors in a particular area. Lacoste speaks of ‘représentations géopolitiques’, a reference to theatre and tragedy. Maps play a special role in the development and the diffusion of such representations. Finally, the territorial conflict (rather than the state or the state system) is the unit of analysis.

As mentioned earlier, this geopolitical approach is appropriate for all territorial conflicts: *ergo* also inside states. *Internal geopolitics* have become more and more important in Lacoste writings as witnesses by the publication in 1986 of the three volumes of *Géopolitiques des régions françaises*. The three volumes of this reference book deal with the 22 administrative regions in metropolitan France (but not the areas overseas). The analyses consist essentially of what others would call electoral geography. In democracies, elections are pre-eminent opportunities for geopolitical views to compete with each other (Lacoste, 1986, p. xiii). At the same time, a special issue entitled *Géopolitiques de la France* (*Hérodote* nr. 40, 1986) dealt with internal and external geopolitical themes (such as the formation of the *départements* in 1790 and the relationship with Germany).

Lacoste and associates published also a voluminous *Dictionnaire de géopolitique*⁵ in which ‘geopolitical situations’ and ‘geopolitical views’ were explained for a broad public

(Lacoste, 1993, 1996). Lacoste is also a co-editor of the economic and geopolitical yearbook *L’état du monde* (Gèze et al., 1983).

At the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of *Hérodote* in 1996, a special issue was devoted to the *Périls géopolitiques en France* (nr. 80). In his introduction, Lacoste remarks that France is not threatened by foreign dangers anymore, but by internal threats: the most important threats identified are the movements appealing to regional identities, notably in Corsica, and the ties of the (grand-) children of the immigrants from North-Africa with the pan-Arabic nation. Lacoste looks for the origin of these problems at the weakening of the idea of the ‘nation’ and its declining mobilising power. The nationalistic undertone of the journal *Hérodote* and the work of Yves Lacoste has been severely criticised. It has been called ‘soft nationalism’ (Raffestin et al., 1995, p. 292): cultural differences and diversity are respected, but all revolves around the nation. These authors provide several examples of essays in which patriotism is to be valued and the world to be interpreted as a competition between nations. They also blame Lacoste for his striking anti-German feelings in a editorial introduction about the German reunification in *Hérodote* nr. 68: *La question allemande* (1993) (Raffestin et al., 1995, pp. 293–294).

A look at the themes discussed in *Hérodote* in the nineties confirms its nationalistic preoccupations, but most issues reach much further than the French nation and the French interests, for example special issues such as the Balkans (nr. 63, 1991), the remains of the Soviet Union (nr. 64, 1992), Serbia (nr. 67, 1992), Japan (nr. 78–79, 1995), the Caucasus (nr. 81, 1996), South-Africa (nr. 82–83, 1996) or Indonesia (nr. 88, 1998). Nevertheless, the nation is currently the dominant subject in the work of Lacoste as shows his recent book *Vive la nation!* (1997) and in *Hérodote* with a series of special issues on the national question (on Italy and on Spain in 1998, one on the United Kingdom has been announced).

Other publications⁶, sometimes (based on) PhD theses defended at the *Centre de Recherches et d’Analyses Géopolitiques* (Paris VIII), include the analysis of German Geopolitik by Michel Korinman (1990, 1991) and the study of the Basque Country conducted by Barbara Loyer (1997). In 1991, Michel Foucher published a revised edition of his encyclopedic study of borders and their constitution in Europe (1988, 1991, see also regarding the new states in Central Europe: Foucher, 1993, 1996).

The vitality of geopolitics in France is remarkable. Numerous introductions have been published (such as Claval, 1994; Moreau Defarges, 1994; Wackerman, 1997). Next to the publications about geopolitics and geostrategy (that have been introduced above as neoclassical geopolitics) the geopolitical approach from *Hérodote* has been influential⁷.

⁶Although the author is not directly involved in the Lacoste group, explicit reference to this approach is found in the work of Ropivia (1994) on African integration.

⁷This is not the case outside France, in spite of the reputation of Lacoste and the publication of a translated anthology from *Hérodote* (Giroi and Kofman, 1987). A noticeable exception is Italy, where many *Hérodote*

⁴Previously it was *Hérodote: Stratégies-géographies-idéologies*.

⁵See the review elsewhere in this issue.

The distinction between subversive and neoclassical geopolitics fades away when the first approach deals with states and their relations, although subversive geopolitics pays more attention to contradictory interpretations of the national interest. Subversive geopolitics has been influential among political scientists too, such as Pascal Lorot and François Thual who wrote extensively about the history of geopolitics and the geopolitical method (Lorot, 1995; Thual, 1993a, b, 1995b, 1996a, 1997b; Lorot and Thual, 1997; Thual and Chaumade, 1998⁸), specific regions (Thual, 1996b, 1997a) or specific religions (Thual, 1993c, 1994, 1995a, see also Botiveau and Cesari, 1997). Another interesting contribution is the *Géopolitique et géostratégies des drogues* by Labrousse and Koutzousis (1996) in which the drugs wars between drugsmafias and states have been analysed (see other publications of the Observatoire géopolitique des drogues, such as Koutzousis, 1995; see also Boekhout van Solinge, 1998).

By the end of 1996, a new geopolitical journal appeared *LiMes: Revue française de géopolitique*, a sister journal of the Italian journal *LiMes* which have been published since 1993⁹. The French and the Italian journals share the same editors-in-chief: the French Michel Korinman (until 1993 a member of the editorial board of *Hérodote*), and the Italian Lucio Caracciolo, but they have different scientific boards and networks of correspondents. The collaboration had led earlier to French publications (Korinman and Caracciolo, 1995a, b).

The first French issue of *LiMes* was entitled: *La France en question*. In 1997 an issue was devoted to the United States and another to the European Union, *L'Europe sans l'Europe*, in which attention was paid to monetary issues. The concept of 'ethnomonetarisme' is introduced to analyse the preferences of the French, Italian, German and British public opinions regarding partners for a common currency (predictably the majority of the British and the Germans would prefer to keep their own currency). As in *Hérodote*, much attention is paid here to internal geopolitics, such as the electoral support for the Front National in several French regions in *LiMes* 1997/2. Each delivery of *LiMes* (about 300 pp.) contains a large number of contributions by academics and journalists, but also diplomats and prominent politicians¹⁰ and the reports of round-table discussions. Many contributions are originally written in Italian, German

or English. This seems to point at an emerging European debate, which too often ends in the assertion of irreconcilable national positions.

Last but not least, geoeconomics has been paid attention too. One of the political scientists mentioned above, Pascal Lorot, is the director of the *Revue française de géoéconomie*. Its first issue was published in March 1997¹¹. In his introductory article *De la géopolitique à la géoéconomie* (Lorot, 1997, pp. 23–35) Lorot introduces and criticises Luttwak's approach (see above) before formulating his own research agenda. According to Lorot, geoeconomics is the analysis of the economic strategies of the states (Lorot, 1997, p. 29) especially those regarding international trade. The first issue, entitled *Pourquoi la géoéconomie?* contains further an interview with Yves Lacoste who declares himself in favour of this new approach as a complement to geopolitics, but certainly not as a substitute. Moreover contributions are devoted to the relation between states, enterprises and markets, to monetary issues and to the importance of technology.

Finally, the geographer and former *Hérodote*-editor Michel Foucher, presently the director of the Observatoire européen de géopolitique, has also discussed geoeconomics as the new dogma. He emphasises that geoeconomics is practiced by states between which war is no longer conceivable (Foucher, 1997).

Non-geopolitics: the political geography of international relations

Outside France, geographers rediscovered geopolitics too. I have called this school non-geopolitics because it is about the 'neutralisation' of geopolitics. These geographers oppose the abuse of geographical knowledge and plead for a scientific, neutral, geography of international relations. This school originates in the revival of political geography at the end of the seventies and the beginning of the eighties.

In January 1982 the first issue of *Political Geography Quarterly* is delivered. The opening is a research agenda in which the editors in chief, Peter J. Taylor and John O'Loughlin, list 21 themes that deserve the attention of political geographers. Three of them are related to geopolitics: geographical perspectives on the relations between states, one concerns the revival of geostrategic studies (Editorial Board, 1982, pp. 9–10) implicitly. The two editors also notice that the geostrategic analysis by Sir Harold Mackinder is no doubt the most famous political geographical piece outside the field. Moreover, they maintain that the East-West conflict displays many similarities with the two powers-model put forward by Mackinder, but they mention many developments that call for further research in the field (such as decolonisation, the globalisation of the economy and the advancements in the field of military technology, see also Brunn and Mingst, 1985). In the following years, many geopolitical articles have been published in the jour-

articles were translated and published in the journal *Hérodote/Italia* (1978–1982) later *Erodoto, Problemi di geografia* (1982–1984) (see Antonisch 1997; on publications of Lacoste in German, see Dürr & Sandner 1991).

⁸See the review elsewhere in this volume.

⁹The first two issues of the Italian *LiMes* dealt with the following topics: 'war in Europe' and 'the world according to the Vatican', they were published in 1993 when the crisis of the Italian state culminated: they contain articles about the Italian national interest, especially on the Balkans and in Central Europe (Raffestin et al., 1995, pp. 300–303). The crisis mood is obvious from a map of the 'geopolitical strength field' in which Italy finds itself: the map depicts many internal and external threats such as trade wars, immigration, the islam, the mafia, the instability in Albania.... (see a reproduction in Pfetsch, 1993, p. 223).

¹⁰In the first issue we find for example a contribution of the Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi, the president of the French Assemblée Philippe Séguin, the British Foreign Minister Malcolm Rifkind, and the president of the German Bundesbank Hans Tietmeyer.

¹¹By Fall, 1998, the seventh issue was devoted to French competitiveness *La France, toujours compétitive?*

nal *Political Geography Quarterly* and since 1992 due to an increased frequency, *Political Geography*. In his review of the 75 issues of the journal published until November 1996, Stanley Waterman assesses the importance of the agenda points of the beginnings: external state relations accounts for 17% of the articles, of which half for the revival of geostrategic studies (Waterman, 1998, p. 379), and three of the 22 special issues¹² (p. 380).

In this perspective, geopolitics and political geography are almost synonymous, but the second term has scientific connotations, while the first has political connotations. For Anglo-Saxon political-geographers such as Peter J. Taylor and John O'Loughlin, geopolitics points at two types of 'theories'. They distinguish between the 'practical geopolitics' of those who conduct the foreign policy of states and the 'formal geopolitics' of academics and other observers who reflect upon international relations¹³. In practical geopolitics, there is an urge for frames of thinking to guide short term behaviour. Simplistic theories able to reduce the complexity of reality to one clear conflict between good and evil, between us and them, are welcome. They serve to define the interests of a state, to identify (possible) threats and to formulate appropriate policies dedicated to the state's interests and to the contention of the perceived threats; in short: geopolitical codes. This is what O'Loughlin calls applied political geography (O'Loughlin, 1994, p. viii) while Taylor introduces the term ordinary political geography (Taylor, 1990, pp. 1–5).

Formal geopolitics' mission is to analyse practical geopolitics critically but also to provide new insights for a 'more humane' geopolitics. The reclamation of the term 'geopolitics' is an attempt by (political) geographers to denounce the use of geographical knowledge by the state and especially by its military machine: 'It is time to reclaim the geopolitical theme from its hijackers in the strategic community' (O'Loughlin and Heske, 1991, p. 37). This is diametrically opposed to the agenda of Mackinder and his followers who wanted to put geography at the service of the state¹⁴: it is about 'understanding not promoting' foreign policy (O'Loughlin and Heske, 1991, p. 54).

Non-geopolitics is the study of the spatial distribution of power between states (Taylor, 1993, p. 330), especially between the major powers and supranational actors such as such as the United Nations or NATO (O'Sullivan, 1986). This school comprises, beside political geographers, the political scientists involved in the so called 'peace studies' (as opposed to strategic studies). For that reason, this approach could also be called peace-geopolitics¹⁵.

It is a matter of patterns in international relations: the political geography of war and peace (Pepper and Jenkins, 1985; Kliot and Waterman, 1991; O'Loughlin and van der

Wusten, 1993b; Williams and Williams, 1993). Jan Nijman examines the pattern of the involvement of the two super powers in armed conflicts of third parties during the Cold War (Nijman, 1992, 1993); Tom Nierop analyses regional patterns in diplomatic and political ties between states (Nierop, 1994; see also Van der Wusten and Nierop, 1990; O'Loughlin and Van der Wusten 1990; Parker, 1991; Vogeler, 1995; and Hartman and Vogeler 1993; about alliances: Starr and Siverson, 1990; see also geographies and histories of international relations such as Poulsen, 1995; Kennedy, 1987; Watson, 1992). Sloan deals with the geopolitical policy of the United States from 1890 to 1987 (Sloan, 1988) while LeDonne (1997) analyses the geopolitics of the Russian Empire from 1700 to 1917 (for the relation of Russia with Asia see also Hauner, 1992). A geopolitical analysis of Anglo-Irish relations has been provided by Sloan (1997) with an emphasis on the changing strategic importance of Ireland for the United Kingdom since the Middle Ages. The relation between geopolitics and foreign aid has been addressed as a specific topic (Conteh-Morgan, 1990; Grant and Nijman, 1995; Fielden, 1998).

Since the end of the Cold War, the configuration of the new world order to replace the familiar ideological opposition between East and West has been a major topic of investigation (Williams, 1993; O'Loughlin and Van der Wusten, 1993; see also Cohen, 1991; Taylor, 1993; Smith, 1993; Demko and Wood, 1994). Awaiting a new world order (c.q. a geopolitical order) we find ourselves in a geopolitical transition: a few options are open. The non-geopolitical authors explore these options through scenarios (O'Loughlin, 1992; Kolossov, 1996; Borko, 1997; Kolossov and Treivish, 1998; Baker Schaffer, 1998). Peter J. Taylor looks back to the previous transition, to the beginning of the Cold War to review the options available to the British government at the time and (geoeconomic, geopolitical and geostrategic) dilemmas this world power in decline had to confront (Taylor, 1990).

Political scientists are discussing the geopolitical transition as well. A recent example of their work is the collection of essays published by the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo under the title *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe, Security, territory and identity* (Tunander et al., 1997). This volume is an exploration of the new European order, especially regarding the position of the state in the light of the European unification. Subsequently the book scrutinises the position of Russia (inside or outside Europe?) and the consequences for the geopolitical order in Europe: will the Cold War be followed by a Cold Peace? Finally attention is paid to the construction of the 'other', the Islamic world and the specific role of the Balkan as a buffer between Europe and the 'other'.

Worth mentioning is the SOAS/GRC Geopolitics Series¹⁶ published by the UCL Press (Schofield 1994; McLachlan, 1994; Gurdon, 1994; Wright et al. 1996; Carter and Norris, 1996) and the journal edited by Richard

¹²*Political Geography Quarterly* 6:2 (1987), 8:4 (1989) and *Political Geography* 15:6 (1996).

¹³Because academics and other opinion makers such as journalists and publicists often advise ministers and presidents, the distinction is primarily analytical. Nonetheless it is an important distinction.

¹⁴'Geography enlisted as an aid to statecraft and strategy' (Mackinder, quoted in: Short, 1993, p. 18).

¹⁵See also the subtitle of O'Loughlin and Heske (1991).

¹⁶SOAS stands for School of Oriental and African Studies, GRC for Geopolitics and International Boundaries Research Centre (both in London).

Schofield: *Geopolitics and International Boundaries*¹⁷ since 1995. Many regional studies are devoted to border conflicts and other geopolitical transformations following the breakdown of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War: in Europe (Rusi, 1991), in Central Europe (Carter et al., 1996; Prévelakis, 1998; Buckwalter, 1998), in Eastern Europe (O'Loughlin et al., 1998), in Crimea (Dawson, 1997), on the Balkans (Carter and Norris, 1996; Hall and Danta, 1996; also Prévelakis, 1997); much studied countries and regions are Turkey (Fuller et al., 1993; see also Olson, 1992 about the Kurdes), the Caucasus (Wright et al., 1996), Afghanistan (Kahn, 1998; McLachlan, 1997), Iran (Fuller, 1991; McLachlan, 1994), the Gulf states (Schofield 1994), the Persian Gulf (Puri, 1993), India (Puri, 1997a, b; Bakshi, 1994; Dikshit, 1996), Kashmir (Moskalenko and Shaumian, 1995), Central Asia (Banuazizi and Weiner, 1994; Puri 1997a, b, Belokrenitsky, 1995, Houbert, 1997), East Asia (Rumley et al., 1996; Lele and Ofori-Yeboah, 1996; Rozman, 1997; So and Chin, 1998; and on Taiwan see Fu, 1992), South Asia (Gupta, 1997; see also Vaughn, 1994), the Indian Ocean (Houbert, 1992; Chaturvedi and Saigal, 1996), Eastern Africa (Gurdon, 1994; Medhanie, 1994); Chad (Joffé, 1997) the Great Lakes area (Prunier, 1997), Southern Africa (Sidaway and Simon, 1993) and the Western Sahara (Zoubir, 1997; Zoubir et al. 1993) and polar regions (Chaturvedi, 1996).

The borderline between neo- and non-geopolitics is often very slim: because these regions are often strategically important areas. Such an uncertain case is *A sense of siege: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*. Graham Fuller and Ian Lesser deal in this book (1995) first with the perceptions the Islamic world and the Western world have of each other, as well as with the dilemmas they provide to each other, and then turn to the (geo)strategic dimension of a (possible) clash between both worlds (see also Fuller, 1991 on Iran; Fuller et al., 1993 on Turkey).

Important themes in non-geopolitics are the (territorial) features of states and the constitution of the state system. Accordingly, Van der Wusten (1993, 1997) deals with the growing gap between strong and stable, democratic and economically prosperous states on the one hand and weak states where civil war, poverty and anarchy are prevalent on the other hand. Kolossov and O'Loughlin (1999) introduce the concept of pseudo-states. New carriers of geopolitics emerge at the subnational and supranational levels (Van der Wusten, 1998), see also the special issue of *Political Geography* regarding the United Nations (Glassner, 1996) in which geopolitical themes are addressed, such as the role of the UN in border conflicts (Prescott, 1996; Rosenne, 1996), or the two most important border crossing problems: migration (Wood and Potts, 1996) and pollution (Momtaz, 1996). O'Sullivan (1995) formalises geopolitical force fields in a gravity model which he applies with two simple indicators (armed force and distance between capitals) to determine the

spheres of influence of different regional powers in Central Asia after the breakdown of the Soviet Union.

The territory of states is a major topic as shows the World Boundaries Series edited by G. Blake (Schofield, 1994; Schofield and Schofield, 1994; Grundy-Warr, 1994; Girot, 1994; Blake, 1994) and *Landlocked states* (Hodder et al., 1997 published first as a special issue of *Geopolitics and International Boundaries* 2:1). Other authors focus on the population of the states, especially on international migration (Grosfoguel, 1997; MacLaughlin, 1993; Knights, 1996; Liu and Norcliffe, 1996; also King, 1996; Wood and Potts, 1996; Chimni, 1998). The French anthropologist Albert analyses the effects of the national security doctrine of the Escola Superior de Guerra in Brazil on environmental policy and policy toward Indians lands in the Amazon (1992).

Finally, geoeconomic themes are not foreign to non-geopolitics either (e.g., O'Loughlin, 1993; Lele and Ofori-Yeboah, 1996; Gupta, 1997) but the approach is still much more state-centric than the analysis of the geopolitical consequences of capitalism provided by David Harvey a decade earlier: it focuses on the economical competition between states whereas Harvey was presenting a theory in which the dynamics of capitalist accumulation explains state formation and geopolitical relations between states (Harvey, 1985).

Political geographers also look back to the history of geopolitics to which two special issues of *Political Geography Quarterly* have been devoted: in 1987 *Historical studies of Geopolitics* (vol. 6 nr. 2) and in 1989 *Historical studies of German Political Geography* (vol. 8, nr. 4). In the last volume with Gerhard Sandner as guest-editor (Sandner, 1989a), the contributions, all from German geographers, deal with the evolution of the views on Central Europe (Schultz, 1989), the relation between ideology, (political) geography and geopolitics (Fahlbusch et al., 1989; Kost, 1989; Sandner, 1989b). The territorial ideologies after 1945 (regionalism, nationalism, peace movement) are also addressed (Ossenbrügge, 1989). *Political Geography (Quarterly)* published several additional contributions about classical geopolitics (Paterson, 1987; Bassin, 1987; Heske, 1987; Parker, 1987; Herb, 1989; Paasi, 1990; Holdar, 1992; Fukushima, 1997).

In the eighties and nineties, several overviews of the geopolitical thinking were published (O'Sullivan, 1986; Hepple, 1986; and Parker, 1985, 1988, 1991a, b; later also Claval, 1994; Moreau Defarges, 1994; Parker, 1998), as well as a *Dictionary of Geopolitics* (O'Loughlin, 1994) which introduces key authors, concepts and theories¹⁸. More focused publications include studies of classical geopolitics: Kjellén (Holdar, 1992), the German *Geopolitik* and its relations to the nazi regime and to the Weimar Republic (Bassin, 1987; Kost, 1988; Herb, 1989; Sprengel, 1994; Murphy, 1994, 1997; Rössler, 1990; Sandner and Rössler, 1994; Lariu, 1998; about Haushofer see Ebeling, 1994; Heske, 1987), but also British geopolitics (Kearns, 1993, 1997), Italian *geopolitica* (Atkinson, 1995; Gambi, 1994), Finnish geopolitics (Paasi, 1990), Japanese geopolitics (Fukushima, 1997; Takeuchi, 1994), or the French school during the interwar

¹⁷In 1999 (vol. 3) the title has been abridged into *Geopolitics*, although most contributions until now has been about borders and border disputes. David Newman is the second editor.

¹⁸See the review elsewhere in this volume.

period (Parker, 1987). The history of the geopolitical notion of Europe has been explored by Muet (1996) and Heffernan (1998).

In addition to the publications mentioned above, German contributions include a special issue of the academic journal *Geographische Zeitschrift* devoted to political geography (Sandner and Boesler, 1993). It includes a review of the revival of geopolitics in Russia (Grisai and Kolossov, 1993) and in Germany (Sandner, 1993) as well as the challenge the geopolitical transition is for political geographers (Van der Wusten, 1993).

Last but not least, some French contributions can be mentioned as 'belonging' to non-geopolitics, from both geographers and political scientists: regional studies (such as Taglioni, 1995; Prévélakis, 1997), general books (Claval, 1994; Wackermann, 1997), and the many publications about the state and its fading territoriality, globalisation and delocalisation (Durand et al., 1992; Laïdi, 1992, 1998; Dolfuss, 1994, 1995; Badie, 1995; Cohen 1996; Boniface, 1996; Ramonet, 1997¹⁹, on the position of cities in this process see also Veltz, 1996) including the surprising *Géopolitique du football* (Boniface, 1998) on the role of football in international relations.

Some of the non-geopolitical authors carefully avoid to use words related to geopolitics. Nevertheless, by the mid-nineties, the term 'geopolitics' has also become a fashionable cry²⁰: often, it is no more than a handy contraction of 'political-geographical', while 'geo-economical' does not mean much more than 'economic-geographical' (e.g., in Warf, 1997). At other occasions it points at global relations, e.g., world-politics and world economics (eg the heading of the sections of Johnston et al., 1995; on this use see Anderson, 1998; another example in Wallerstein 1991; also in Falk, 1997, about international law and false universalism). Worth mentioning is the anachronistic use of the word in studies of 'international relations' and competition between political entities in the past (such as Baugh, 1998) or even before modern states emerged (Teschke, 1997).

Post-structuralistic geopolitics: critical geopolitics

Critical geopolitics is a new flag and it is a self-designation by contrast with the other 'labels' presented here. The term has been introduced in the United States in the course of the eighties²¹: it points originally to studies of foreign policies by means of discourse analysis. This approach is embed-

ded in the post-structuralism of French philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault in which discourses are deconstructed. Geopolitical perceptions are problematised, knowledge and discourses about the geographical features of international relations are the very research object. This approach belongs to a broad school of post-modern social sciences involved in discourse analysis. One of the authoritative authors in this subfield, Gearóid Ó Tuathail²² distinguishes three dimensions to critical geopolitics: the deconstruction of geopolitical traditions, the deconstruction of contemporary discourses and the exploration of the meaning of spatial concept such as 'place' and 'politics' (Ó Tuathail, 1994b). Ó Tuathail and Dalby (1998b) identify three kinds of geopolitics: popular geopolitics (in mass media, cinema, novels or cartoons), practical geopolitics (foreign policy, bureaucracy, political institutions) and formal geopolitics (strategic institutes, think tanks, academia) all three contributing to the spatialising of boundaries and dangers (the geopolitical map of the world) and the geopolitical representations of self and other (the geopolitical imagination).

Critical geopolitics focus at first and foremost on the geopolitical arguments in the foreign policy of the United States. In *Creating the Second Cold War, the Discourse of Politics* (1990) Simon Dalby analyses the arguments of those who agitated against the *détente* in the US at the beginning of the eighties. After the *détente* activated by the Republican President Nixon and his Foreign Affairs Secretary Henry Kissinger, a new 'freezing' was advocated. Dalby examines in the first place the publications of a lobby group called the Committee on the Present Danger which was influential during the presidency of Ronald Reagan.

In *Critical geopolitics, The politics of writing global space* (1996), Gearóid Ó Tuathail reviews the history of the geopolitical tradition. He opens his book with the 'geographical invention' of Ireland in the English geographical imagination, to illustrate the power of discourses. After two introductory chapters on geopolitics in which Mackinder gets the leading part²³ and on critical geopolitics, he deals with several geopolitical constructions: Mackinder and the British Empire, the American discourses on German Geopolitik during the second World War, critics of the classical and the neoclassical geopolitics such as Wittfogel, Lacoste or Dalby (partly published earlier in Ó Tuathail, 1994d), the American vision on Bosnia at the beginning of the nineties and the American visions and vertigo by which he describes the quest for a new vision on global relations, such as the alarming analyses by Edward Luttwak on the decline of the United States (see above) and by Samuel Huntington on the clash between the Western and other civilisations (Huntington, 1993, 1996). Ó Tuathail had exposed the 'geo-economic discourse' at an earlier occasion, with reference to the Amer-

¹⁹Not to be confused with the special issue of *Manière de voir* (whose editor is Boniface) published the same year by *Le Monde diplomatique* (whose director is Ramonet) with the same title: *Géopolitique du chaos*. Ramonet's book has been published in English in 1998.

²⁰For example in the title *Geopolitics and Geoculture* for a collection of articles by Immanuel Wallerstein (1991); Eronen, 1998, or the addition of 'geopolitics' in the English title of translated works such as the inviting *Blue Geopolitics* about the United Nations (Fisas, 1995; see also: Serbin, 1990, and Chorbajian et al., 1994).

²¹The oldest mention of the term I have found was the title of the PhD thesis defended by G. Ó Tuathail (1989) *Critical geopolitics: the social construction of state and place in the practice of statecraft* (Syracuse University, New York).

²²Gerald Toal is the English transcription of this Irish name which he reclaims.

²³Mahan, and Spykman, but also Ratzel, Kjellén and Haushofer are presented under the heading 'other productions of global space' (Ó Tuathail, 1996, pp. 35–53).

ican perception of the Japanese danger (Ó Tuathail, 1992, 1993a).

Slightly different is John Agnew's attempt to re-visioning geopolitics. In *Mastering Space: Hegemony, territory and international political economy* John Agnew and Stuart Corbridge (1995) present new geopolitics. At the core of their reinterpretation, lies the idea that the territorial state is not an a-historical (or trans-historical) entity, and that international relations should be studied in their historical context. In the first part of the book, they present a somewhat simple periodisation of global relations. They posit three world orders: the Concert of Europe (1815–1875), the British geopolitical order (1875–1945) and the geopolitical order of the *inter-imperial rivalry* (1945–1990). Each world order fits a specific *geopolitical discourse*, which they label civilizational geopolitics, naturalized geopolitics, respectively ideological geopolitics (see also Agnew, 1998, chapter 5). In the second part of their book, they deal with the contemporary geopolitical disorder and the question of the American decline, also discussing possible competitors (Germany, Japan, China and the European Union). Their conclusion illustrates the limitations of state centred thinking: things are going bad for the American territorial economy, but the American companies are booming. We should talk about international affairs (crossing state borders) and not any more about international relations between states. Finally Agnew and Corbridge submit in the third part the ingredients of a new geopolitical discourse that would fit this new world order, a surprising turn in a critical study.

Ó Tuathail and Luke (1994) labels this new order transnational liberalism and the fitting discourse enlargement geopolitics. For Ó Tuathail the geopolitical orders and discourses distinguished by Agnew (1998, Agnew and Corbridge, 1995) are all modern geopolitics. He complements this classification of modern geopolitics, with a new category: postmodern geopolitics, using Luke's model of three geopolitical natures (1994): agrarian antiquity, modern industrial capitalism, postmodern informational capitalism. Modern and postmodern geopolitics differs on how global space is represented (maps vs. GIS), how it is divided (East/West vs. Jihad/McWorld), how global power is conceptualised, how global threats are spatialised and how major actors are identified (geopolitical man, states and leaders vs. networks and cyborgs) (Ó Tuathail, 1998b). In another article, the new *fast geopolitics* (a geopolitical imagination based on flows) is opposed to *mass geopolitics* (a geopolitical imagination centred on territorial mass) underlining tensions between acceleration and containment (Luke and Ó Tuathail, 1998).

Two special issues devoted to critical geopolitics have been published in the authoritative scientific journal *Environment and Planning D Society and Space* (1994, vol. 12 no. 5) and *Political Geography* (1996, vol. 15, no. 6/7), both featuring Simon Dalby and Gearóid Ó Tuathail as guest editors. The contributions are very diverse but they all problematise the relation between geographical knowledge and power (Dalby and Ó Tuathail, 1996). These authors have also co-edited *The Geopolitics Reader* (Ó Tuathail

et al. 1998)²⁴ and two collections of papers: *An unruly world?* (Herod et al., 1998) and in *Rethinking Geopolitics* (Ó Tuathail and Dalby, 1998a). In the meantime, the school is firmly established and it is presented as such in the most recent political geography textbooks (Anderson et al., 1995; Muir, 1997; Agnew, 1997).

Authors that can be counted under the heading critical geopolitics are working in the first place on the contemporary discourses that justify the foreign policy of the United States (Ó Tuathail and Agnew, 1992, Ó Tuathail, 1992, 1993a, b; Dalby, 1988, 1990a, b; Sidaway, 1994; Weber, 1994), but also the foreign policy of other states, such as the United Kingdom, especially about the Falklands war (Dodds, 1993b, 1994a, b, 1996, 1998), South American states (Dodds, 1993a, 1994c) and other states in the Southern Oceanic Rim (Dodds, 1997) especially South-Africa (Dodds, 1994c), Namibia (Simon, 1996), New-Zealand (Dalby, 1993) and Australia (Dalby, 1996c). Geopolitical discourses from the past are fascinating too (Crampton and Ó Tuathail, 1996; Bassin, 1996) whereas Clarke et al. analyse the meaning of the *Endlösung* in the light the lack of *Lebensraum* established by German geopolitics (Clarke et al., 1996; Doel and Clarke, 1998; see also Bassin, 1987). Paasi analyses the changing perception of the Finnish-Russian border in Finland (Paasi, 1995), Gibson the indigenous self-determination in Australia (1998, 1999). And Tyner addresses the relations between geopolitics and eugenics in the case of Japanese Americans after Pearl Harbour (Tyner, 1998). Attention is also paid to international actors and arenas such as the IMF (Popke, 1994), the environmental top in Rio (Dalby, 1996a), international trade union geopolitics and geo-economics (Herod, 1998), as well as global issues such as global trade (Corbridge and Agnew 1991), geo-governance (Roberts, 1998 on globalization-from-above and globalization-from-below), world order (Agnew and Corbridge, 1989, 1995), (Cold) war (Stephanson, 1998), global security (Dalby, 1998), cyberspace (Der Derian, 1998; Luke, 1998; Herod, 1998; Luke and Ó Tuathail, 1998) and the related notion of *global flow-motions* as 'structured events flowing in-information under high-speed acceleration' (Luke and Ó Tuathail, 1998, p. 73).

Besides policy acts and speeches by politicians and diplomats, ample attention is paid to the mass media²⁵, e.g., the construction the outside world in the *Reader's Digest* (Sharp, 1993, 1996; see also Dodds 1996, 1998; Dalby, 1996a; Myers et al., 1996; Sidaway, 1998; and Sharp, 1998 on American movies). Other topics include international migrations as threats (Teschfahoney, 1998), discourses on local workfare as opposed to federal welfare in US (Peck, 1998).

Many contributions deal with the theoretical bases of critical geopolitics (Ó Tuathail and Dalby, 1994; Dodds and Sidaway, 1994; Ó Tuathail, 1994b, c, d; Dalby and Ó Tuathail, 1996; Dalby, 1991), the connections with 'development theory' (Slater, 1993, 1994; Ó Tuathail, 1994a)

²⁴See the review elsewhere in this volume.

²⁵The deconstruction of the representation of mainland Chinese women in the media in Taiwan and Hong Kong by Shih (1998) has no direct connection to critical geopolitics.

or 'gender theory' (Dalby, 1994; Sparke, 1996) the meaning of key concepts such as territoriality and sovereignty after the Cold War (Luke, 1996, 1998). In the special issue in *Political Geography* (1996), Ó Tuathail and Dalby are involved in a discussion about the correct deconstructivist approach. According to the first author, Dalby centres his analyses too much on texts and neglects the institutional and material context in which 'geopolitical discourses' are produced (Ó Tuathail, 1996b, c; Dalby, 1996b).

Finally, the deconstructivist approach has been applied to internal conflicts regarding power and territory, e.g., political culture (Bonura, 1998), national identities in Turkey (Rygiel, 1998), the shaping of Finnish provinces (Häkli, 1998a, b), the Oklahoma bombing (Sparke, 1998), the territorial tactics of the Los Angeles police department (Herbert, 1996, 1997), movements of resistance such as the Zapatista insurgency in Chiapas (Routledge, 1998; see also Routledge, 1994, 1996, 1997; Slater, 1997; also Dalby, 1991; Roberts, 1998), or urban segregation in South Africa (Robinson, 1997), whereas Charlesworth (1994) analyses discourses about the commemoration of the holocaust.

The borderline between critical geopolitics and non-geopolitics fades away as empirical political geographers pay attention to the perceptions of geographical features, respectively to power relations between political actors. The other way round, the distinction evanesces when authors analyse 'geopolitical discourses' not only as text but also in the institutional and material context in which they are formed and popularised. The separation between internal and external affairs is then directly contested (see also Rosenberg, 1994), as in the books by David Campbell about the connection between foreign policy and national identity (1992) and the 'narratives' over the Gulf War (1994). Both types of 'academic' political geographers join efforts in several collections of essays (e.g., O'Loughlin, 1994; and Demko and Wood, 1994) and special issues of academic journals (*Geopolitics* 3:1).

In a book published in 1996, *National Identity and Geopolitical Visions, Maps of Pride and Pain*, the Dutch political geographer Gert-Jan Dijkink explores the connection between national identity and geopolitical visions. A geopolitical vision is an idea about the relation between the own place and the rest of the world (Dijkink, 1996, p. 11). A geopolitical vision contains for example naturalised territorial borders, a core area, a geopolitical code (friends and foes), a model, a national mission and/or impersonal forces (1996, pp. 12–14). Dijkink portrays the transformation of geopolitical visions in the context of the geography and the history of a state. A great virtue of this book is that it presents eight 'stories': we call on Germany, Great-Britain, the United States (twice because we also travel in time), Argentina, Australia, Russia, Serbia, Iraq and India. It is striking that in this book and in many analyses of discourses, maps are rarely used to illustrate the content of 'geopolitical discourses' or 'visions', instead reproductions of political cartoons representing leaders or enemies are more likely to be included. This is surprising when compared to the influ-

ence Lacoste and associates confer to maps in geopolitical discourses and the extensive use of maps by authors working in the three other geopolitical perspectives.

Maps themselves have been put under critical review, yet by non-geopolitical authors (Atkinson, 1995; and more generally Bell et al., 1995; Herb, 1997, 1989; Schultz, 1989; see also Retailié, 1996, for a critique of taken for granted uses of maps in geopolitical approaches by both Lacoste and Garaud).

Conclusion

This overview has presented the varied uses of the term 'geopolitics'. In all cases, geopolitics are about power and space, usually about the state and its territory, often about power relations between states. Four categories of geopolitical perspectives have been introduced (Table 1) to present the many approaches encountered. Of course, this scheme arbitrarily reduces diversity but it works well, even if the distinction is sometimes fading away (especially between the two active types, between the two academic types, and between the two state centred types).

Striking is the vitality of geopolitics in France, especially the neo-classical and the subversive variants, and to a lesser degree non-geopolitics, whereas non-geopolitics and critical geopolitics take root in the United States and the United Kingdom. By contrast, the term geopolitics is hardly used in the Netherlands or Germany.

In the different approaches, all core elements of classical geopolitics are knocked into pieces. Even the very existence of the state as a territorial construct is challenged: some authors think that state borders do not amount to anything much in the global economy, or that states are undermined by the rise of supranational and subnational authorities, whereas others consider that the feature of the state as identity construct is much more important than its territorial component. And the views regarding the actual geopolitical (dis)order diverge too, although there is a common and growing attention for the economic competition between states. Correspondingly geoeconomics supersedes more and more often geostrategy as the twin sister of geopolitics.

Journals

Geopolitics and International Boundaries (1995–), since 1999: *Geopolitics*.

Géopolitique, Revue de l'institut international de géopolitique (1982–).

Géopolitique, Review of the International Institute of Geopolitics (1982–).

Hérodote: Stratégies-géographies-idéologies (1976–), since 1982: *Hérodote: revue de géographie et de géopolitique*.

Hérodote/Italia (1978–1982), then *Erodoto, Problemi di geografia* (1982–1984).

LiMes: rivista italiana di geopolitica (1993–).

LiMes: revue française de géopolitique (1996–).

Political Geography Quarterly (1982–), since 1992: *Political Geography*.
Revue française de géoéconomie (1997–).

References

- Agnew J. (ed.), 1997: *Political Geography, a reader*. Arnold, London.
- Agnew J., 1998: *Geopolitics: Re-Visioning World Politics*. Routledge, London.
- Agnew J. & Corbridge S., 1989: The new geopolitics: the dynamics of geopolitical disorder. In: Johnston R.J. & Taylor P. (eds), *A World in Crisis: Geographical Perspectives*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 266–288.
- Agnew J. & Corbridge S., 1995: *Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy*. Routledge, London.
- Albert B., 1992: Indian lands, environmental policy and military geopolitics in the development of the Brazilian Amazon: the case of the Yanomami. *Development & Change* 23: 35–70.
- Anderson E.W., 1993: *An Atlas of World Political Flashpoints: a Sourcebook of Geopolitical Crisis*. Facts on File, New York.
- Anderson E.W., 1998: The effects of globalization on geopolitical perspectives. *Geojournal* 45: 105–108.
- Anderson J., Brook C. & Cochrane A. (eds), 1995: *A Global World?* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Antonisch, M., 1997: La geopolitica italiana nelle riviste *Geopolitica*, *Hérodote/Italia* (Erodoto), *Limes*. Bollettino della società geografica italiana Serie XII, Vol. II, Fascicolo 3, 411–418.
- Atkinson D., 1995: Geopolitics, cartography and geographical knowledge: envisioning Africa from fascist Italy. In: Bell M. et al. (eds), *Geography and Imperialism, 1820–1940*. Westview, Boulder CO, pp. 265–297.
- Badie B., 1995: *La fin des territoires, Essai sur le désordre international et sur l'utilité sociale du respect*. Fayard, Paris.
- Baker Schaffer M., 1998: Speculations about geopolitics in the late 21st century. *Futures* 30: 443–452.
- Bakshi J., 1994: India's geopolitical importance in the United Nations. *India Quarterly* 50 (4): 93–98.
- Banuazizi A. & Weiner M. (eds), 1994: *The New Geopolitics of Central Asia and Its Borderland*. Tauris, London.
- Bassin M., 1987: Race contra space: The conflict between German 'Geopolitik' and National Socialism. *Political Geography Quarterly* 6: 115–134.
- Bassin M., 1996: Nature, geopolitics and Marxism: ecological contestations in Weimar Germany. *Transactions* 21: 315–341.
- Baugh D.A., 1998: Withdrawing from Europe: Anglo-French maritime geopolitics, 1750–1800. *The International History Review* 20: 1–32.
- Bell M., Butlin R.A. & Heffernan M.J. (eds), 1995: *Geography and Imperialism, 1820–1940*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Belokrenitsky V.Y., 1995: Central Asia in the new Eurasian geopolitics: implications for Pakistan and Russia. *Pakistan Horizon* 48 (3): 25–38.
- Besnault, 1992: *Géostratégie de l'arctique*. Economica/Fondation pour les études de Défense nationale, Paris.
- Blake G.H. (ed.), 1994: *Maritime Boundaries, World Boundaries*, Vol. 5. Routledge, London.
- Blouet B.W., 1994: Geopolitics Revisited. *Journal of Geography* 92–93: 285–287.
- Boekhout van Solinge T., 1998: Drug use and drug trafficking in Europe. *TESG* 89: 100–105.
- Boniface P., dir., 1993: *Atlas des relations internationales*. Dunod, Paris (new edition published in 1997 by Hatier).
- Boniface P., 1996: *La volonté d'impuissance, La fin des ambitions internationales et stratégiques?* Seuil, Paris.
- Boniface P., dir., 1998: *Géopolitique du football*. Editions Complexe Interventions, Paris.
- Bonura C.J. Jr, 1998: The occulted geopolitics of nation and culture: situating political culture within the construction of geopolitical ontologies. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*, Routledge, London, pp. 86–105.
- Borko Y., 1997: Possible scenarios for geopolitical shifts in Russian-European relations. In: Tunander O. et al. (eds), *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe*. Sage, London, pp. 196–213.
- Botiveau B. & Cesari J., 1997: *Géopolitique des islams*. Economica, Paris.
- Boustani R. & Fargues Ph., 1990: *Atlas du monde arabe: géopolitique et société*. Bordas, Paris (translated as: *The Atlas of the Arab World: Geopolitics and Society*. Facts on File, New York, 1990).
- Brill H., 1994: *Geopolitik, Deutschlands Chance*. Ullstein, Berlin.
- Brown N., 1992: *The Strategic Revolution, Thoughts for the Twenty-First Century*. Brassey's, London.
- Brown N., 1994: *Climate Change: a Threat to Peace*. Research Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism, London.
- Brunn S. & Mingst K., 1985: Geopolitics. In: Pacione M. (ed.), *Progress in Political Geography*. Croom Helm, London, pp. 41–47.
- Brzezinski Z., 1997: *The Grand Chessboard, American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. Basic Books, New York.
- Buckwalter D.W., 1998: Geopolitical legacies and Central European export linkages: a historical and gravity model analysis of Hungary. *The Professional Geographer* 50: 57–70.
- Campbell D., 1992: *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Campbell D., 1994: *Politics Without Principle: Sovereignty, Ethics and Narratives of the Gulf War*. Lynne Rienner, Boulder, Co.
- Carter F.W. & Norris H.T. (eds), 1996: *The Changing Shape of the Balkans*. UCL Press, London.
- Carter F.W., Jordan P. & Rey V. (eds), 1996: *Central Europe After the Fall of the Iron Curtain: Geopolitical Perspectives, Spatial Patterns and Trends*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Catley R. & Keliat M., 1997: *Spratlys: the Dispute in the South China Sea*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Chaliand G., 1990: *Anthologie mondiale de la stratégie: des origines au nucléaire*. Robert Laffont, Paris.
- Chaliand G., 1993: *Atlas stratégique*. Fayard, Paris.
- Chaliand G. & Jan M., 1993: *Atlas nucléaire civil et militaire: des origines à la prolifération*. Payot, Paris.
- Chaliand G. & Rageau J.-P., 1983: *Atlas statégique: géopolitique des rapports de forces dans le monde*. Fayard, Paris (nouvelle édition en 1991; translated as: *Strategic Atlas of World Geopolitics*. Penguin, Harmondsworth 1985, third edition in 1992).
- Charlesworth A., 1994: Contested places of memory: the case of Auschwitz. *Environment and Planning D. Society and Space* 12: 579–594.
- Chaturvedi S., 1996: *The Polar Regions: a Political Geography*. John Wiley, Chichester.
- Chaturvedi S. & Saigal K., 1996: The Western Indian Ocean and new geopolitics. *Africa Quarterly* 36 (3): 1–10.
- Chimni B.S., 1998: The geopolitics of refugee studies: a view from the South. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11: 350–374.
- Chauprade A. & Thual F., 1998: *Dictionnaire de géopolitiques: états, concepts, auteurs*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Chorbajian L., Donabedian P. & Mutafian C., 1994: *The Caucasian Knot: the History and Geopolitics of Nagorno-Karabagh*. Zed Books, London (modified translation of: Donabedian P. & Mutafian C. *Arsakh: Histoire du Karabagh*. Sevig Press, Paris 1991, with an extensive introduction by Chorbajian).
- Clarke D.B., Doel M.A. & Mc Donough F., 1996: Holocaust topologies: singularity, politics, space. *Political Geography* 15: 457–489.
- Claval P., 1994: *Géopolitique et géostratégie. La pensée politique, l'espace et le territoire au XXe siècle*. Nathan, Paris.
- Cohen E., 1996: *La tentation hexagonale, la souveraineté à l'épreuve de la mondialisation*. Fayard, Paris.
- Cohen S.B., 1991: Global geopolitical change in the post-cold war era. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81: 551–580.
- Conteh-Morgan E., 1990: *American Foreign Aid and Global Power Projection: the Geopolitics of Resource Allocation*. Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- Corbridge S. & Agnew J., 1991: The U.S. trade and federal deficits in global perspective: an essay in geo-political economy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9: 71–90.
- Cordonnier I., 1995: *La France dans le Pacifique Sud: Approche géostratégique*. Publisud, Paris.
- Coutau-Bégarie H., 1985a: *La puissance maritime*. Fayard, Paris.
- Coutau-Bégarie H., 1985b: *Géostratégie de l'Atlantique Sud*. PUF Que sais-je? Paris.
- Coutau-Bégarie H., 1987: *Géostratégie du Pacifique*. IFRI, Paris.
- Coutau-Bégarie H., 1993: *Géostratégie de l'océan indien*. Economica/Fondation pour les études de Défense nationale, Paris.

- Coutau-Bégarie H., dir., 1995: *La lutte maritime pour l'empire de la mer: histoire et géostratégie*. Economica, Paris.
- Crampton A. & Ó Tuathail G., 1996: Intellectuals, institutions and ideology: the case of Robert Strausz-Hupé and 'American geopolitics'. *Political Geography* 15: 533–555.
- Dalby S., 1988: Geopolitical discourse: The Soviet Union as other. *Alternatives* 13: 415–442.
- Dalby S., 1990a: *Creating the Second Cold War, the Discourses of Politics*. Pinter, London/Guilford, New York.
- Dalby S., 1990b: American security discourse, the persistence of geopolitics. *Political Geography Quarterly* 9: 171–188.
- Dalby S., 1991: Critical geopolitics: discourse, difference and dissent. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9: 261–283.
- Dalby S., 1993: The Kiwi disease: geopolitical discourse in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Political Geography* 12: 437–456.
- Dalby S., 1994: Gender and critical geopolitics: reading security discourse in the new world disorder. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 595–612.
- Dalby S., 1996a: Reading Rio, writing the world: the New York Times and the 'Earth Summit'. *Political Geography* 15: 593–613.
- Dalby S., 1996b: Writing critical geopolitics: Campbell, Ó Tuathail, Reynolds and dissident skepticism. *Political Geography* 15: 655–660.
- Dalby S., 1996c: Continent adrift? Dissident security discourse and the Australian geopolitical imagination. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 50: 59–76.
- Dalby S., 1998: Geopolitics and global security: culture, identity, and the 'pogo syndrome'. In: Ó Tuathail G., Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 295–313.
- Dalby S. & Ó Tuathail G., 1996: Editorial introduction: The critical geopolitics constellation: problematizing fusions of geographical knowledge and power. *Political Geography* 15: 451–456.
- Dawson J.I., 1997: Ethnicity, ideology, and geopolitics in Crimea. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 30: 427–444.
- Delavaud C.C., 1993: *Géopolitique de l'Asie, un continent écartelé*. PUF, Paris.
- Demko G.J. & Wood W.B. (eds), 1994: *Reordering the World: Geopolitical Perspectives on the 21st Century*. Westview Press, Boulder, Co.
- Der Derian J., 1998: All but war is simulation. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 261–273.
- Dijkink G., 1996: *National Identity and Geopolitical Visions: Maps of Pride and Pain*. Routledge, London.
- Dikshit R.D., 1996: India's policy of nonalignment: a geopolitical analysis. *Asian Profile* 24: 313–319.
- Dodds K.-J., 1993a: Geopolitics, cartography and the state in South-America. *Political Geography* 12: 361–381.
- Dodds K.-J., 1993b: War stories: British elite narratives of the 1982 Falklands/Malvinas War. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11: 619–640.
- Dodds K.-J., 1994a: Geopolitics and foreign policy: recent developments in Anglo-American political geography and international relations. *Progress in Human Geography* 18: 186–208.
- Dodds K.-J., 1994b: Geopolitics in the Foreign Office: British representations of Argentina 1945–1961. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 19: 273–290.
- Dodds K.-J., 1994c: Creating a strategic crisis out of a communist drama? Argentine and South African geo-graphs of the South Atlantic. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 56: 33–54.
- Dodds K., 1996: The 1982 Falklands War and a critical geopolitical eye: Steve Bell and the If... cartoons. *Political Geography* 15: 571–592.
- Dodds K., 1997: *Geopolitics in Antarctica: Views from the Southern Oceanic Rim*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Dodds K., 1998: Editorial comment: Unfinished business in the South Atlantic: the Falklands/Malvinas in the late 1990s. *Political Geography* 17: 623–626.
- Dodds K., 1998: Enframing Bosnia: the geopolitical iconography of Steve Bell. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 170–197.
- Dodds K.-J. & Sidaway J.D., 1994: Locating critical geopolitics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 525–546.
- Doel M.A. & Clarke D.B., 1998: Figuring the Holocaust: singularity and the purification of space. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 29–61.
- Dolfuss O., 1994: *L'espace monde*. Economica, Paris.
- Dolfuss O., 1995: *La nouvelle carte du monde*. PUF Que-sais-je? Paris.
- Dürr, H. & Sandner, G., 1991: Anmerkungen zu Lacostes 'Perspektiven einer neuen Geopolitik'. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 79: 4, 246–252.
- Durand M.-F., Lévy J. & Retaille D., 1992: *Le monde: espaces et systèmes*. Presses de la Fondation nationale des Sciences Politiques/Daloz, Paris.
- Durand O. & Ruano-Borbalan J.C., 1994: La géopolitique, fille de la démocratie. *Sciences Humaines* 36: 34–36.
- Ebeling F., 1992: *Geopolitik, Karl Haushofer und seine Raunwissenschaft 1919–1945*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.
- Editorial Board, 1982: Editorial Essay: Political Geography – Research Agendas for the Nineteen Eighties. *Political Geography Quarterly* 1: 1–17.
- Eronen J., 1998: A geopolitical approach to China's future as an empire. *TESG* 89: 4–14.
- Fahlbusch M. & Rössler M., & Siegrist, D., 1989: Conservatism, ideology and geography in Germany 1920–1950. *Political Geography Quarterly* 8: 353–67.
- Falk R., 1997: False universalism and the geopolitics of exclusion: the case of Islam. *Third World Quarterly* 18: 7–24.
- Faringdon H., 1989: *Strategic Geography: NATO, the Warsaw Pact, and the Superpowers*. Routledge, London.
- Fielden M.B., 1998: The geopolitics of aid: the provision and termination of aid to Afghan refugees in North West Frontier Province, Pakistan. *Political Geography* 17: 459–487.
- Fisas V., 1995: *Blue geopolitics: The United Nations Reform and the future of the blue helmet*. Pluto Press, London (translation of: *Desafío de Naciones Unidas ante el mundo en crisis*. Icaria, Barcelona, 1994).
- Foucher M., 1988: *Fronts et frontières: un tour du monde géopolitique*. Fayard, Paris.
- Foucher M., 1991: *Fronts et frontières: un tour du monde géopolitique, Nouvelle édition entièrement refondue*. Fayard, Paris.
- Foucher M., dir., 1993: *Fragments d'Europe: Atlas de l'Europe médiane et orientale*. Fayard, Paris.
- Foucher M., dir., 1996: *Les défis de sécurité en Europe médiane*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Foucher M., 1997: La fin de la géopolitique? Réflexions géographiques sur la grammaire des puissances. *Politique étrangère* 62: 19–31.
- Freedman L., 1985: *Atlas of Global Strategy*. Macmillan, London.
- Fu J.-K., 1992: *Taiwan and the Geopolitics of the Asian-American Dilemma*. Praeger, New York.
- Fukushima Y., 1997: Japanese geopolitics and its background: what is the real legacy of the past? *Political Geography* 16: 407–421.
- Fuller G.E., 1991: *The 'Center of the Universe': the Geopolitics of Iran*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Fuller G.E. & Lesser I.O., 1995: A sense of siege: The geopolitics of Islam and the West. Westview Press, Boulder CO.
- Fuller G.E., Lesser I.O., Henze P.B. & Brown J.F., 1993: *Turkey's New Geopolitics, from the Balkans to Western China*. Westview Press, Boulder CO.
- Gallois P., 1990: *Géopolitique, les voies de la puissance*. Plon, Paris.
- Gambi L., 1994: Geography and imperialism in Italy: from the unity of the nation to the 'new' Roam Empire. In: Godlewska A. & Smith N. (eds), *Geography and Empire*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 74–91.
- Géze F., Lacoste Y. & Valladao A.G.A., dir.: *L'état du monde: annuaire économique et géopolitique mondial*. La Découverte, Paris (yearbook, since 1983).
- Gibson C., 1998: 'We sing our home, We dance our land': Indigenous self-determination and contemporary geopolitics in Australian popular music. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16: 163–184.
- Gibson C., 1999: Cartographies of the colonial-capitalist state: a geopolitics of indigenous self-determination in Australia. *Antipode* 31: 45–79.
- Girardet R., 1989: *Problèmes stratégiques et militaires contemporains*. Daloz, Paris.
- Giro P.O. (ed.), 1994: *The Americas, World Boundaries. Vol. 4*. Routledge, London.
- Giro P. & Kofman E. (eds), 1987: *International Geopolitical Analysis: A Selection from Hérodote*. Croom Helm, London.
- Glassner M.I. (ed.), 1996: Political geography and the United Nations. *Political Geography* 15: special issue, United Nations.
- Godlewska A. & Smith N. (eds), 1994: *Geography and Empire*. The Institute of British Geographers Special Publications Series, Blackwell, Oxford.

- Grant R. & Nijman J., 1995: Foreign aid in the 1990s: crisis or transition? *TESG* **86**: 215–218.
- Gray C.S., 1988: *The Geopolitics of Superpower*. University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, NY.
- Gray C.S., 1997: *Postmodern War: the New Politics of Conflict*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Grisai O. & Kolossov V., 1993: Die Renaissance geopolitischen Denkens in Rußland. Neue Ansätze und Forschungsfelder, *Geographische Zeitschrift* **81**: 256–265.
- Grosfoguel R., 1997: Migration and geopolitics in the Greater Antilles: from the cold war to the post-cold war. *Review* **20**: 115–145.
- Grundy-Warr C. (ed.), 1994: *Eurasia, World Boundaries. Vol. 3*. Routledge, London.
- Gupta A., 1997: Issues in South Asia: geopolitics or geoeconomics. *International Studies* **34**: 15–24.
- Gurdon Ch. (ed.), 1994: *The Horn of Africa*. UCL Press, London.
- Hafeznia M.R.: Geopolitical analysis of the Kashmir crisis. *South Asian Studies* **11**: 125–130.
- Häkli J., 1998a: Discourse in the production of political space: decolonizing the symbolism of provinces in Finland. *Political Geography* **17**: 331–363.
- Häkli J., 1998b: Manufacturing provinces: theorizing the encounters between governmental and popular ‘geographs’ in Finland. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 131–151.
- Hall D. & Danta D. (eds), 1996: *Reconstructing the Balkans, A geography in the New Southeast Europe*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Hartman J. & Vogeler I., 1993: Where in the world is the US Secretary of State. *Journal of Geography* **92**: 2–12.
- Harvey D., 1985: Geopolitics of capitalism. In: Gregory D. & Urry J. (eds), *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. Macmillan, London, pp. 128–163.
- Hauner M., 1992: *What is Asia to us? Russia's Asian Heartland Yesterday and Today*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London (first published in 1990 by Unwin Hyman).
- Heffernan M., 1998: *The Meaning of Europe, Geography and Geopolitics*. Arnold, London, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Hepple L.W., 1986: *The Revival of Geopolitics. Political Geography Quarterly*. Supplement to Vol. 5, No. 4 (October 1986), s21–s36.
- Herb G.H., 1989: Persuasive cartography in Geopolitik and national socialism. *Political Geography Quarterly* **8**: 289–304.
- Herb G.H., 1997: *Under the Map of Germany, Nationalism and Propaganda, 1918–45*. Routledge, London.
- Herbert S., 1996: The geopolitics of the police: Foucault, disciplinary power and the tactics of the Los Angeles Police Department. *Political Geography* **15**: 47–57.
- Herbert S., 1997: *Policing Space*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Herod A., 1998: Of blocs, flows and networks: the end of the Cold War, cyberspace, and the geo-economics of organized labor at the *fin de millénaire*. In: Herod A. et al. (eds), *An Unruly World? Globalization, Governance and Geography*. Routledge, London, pp. 162–195.
- Herod A., Ó Tuathail G. & Roberts S.M. (eds), 1998: *An Unruly World? Globalization, Governance and Geography*. Routledge, London.
- Heske H., 1987: Karl Haushofer: his role in German geopolitics and nazi politics. *Political Geography Quarterly* **6**: 135–144.
- Hodder D., Lloyd S.J. & McLachlan K.S. (eds), 1997: *Land-Locked States of Africa and Asia*. Frank Cass, London (published as special issue in *Geopolitics and International Boundaries* **2**).
- Holdar S., 1992: The ideal state and the power of geography. The life-work of Rudolf Kjellén. *Political Geography* **11**: 307–323.
- Holdar S., 1994: Geopolitik – Origins. In: O’Loughlin J. (ed.), *Dictionary of Geopolitics*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., pp. 93–95.
- Houbert J., 1992: The Indian Ocean creole islands: geo-politics and decolonisation. *Journal of Modern African Studies* **30**: 465–484.
- Houbert J., 1997: Russia in the geopolitics of settler colonization and decolonization. *The Round Table* **344**, 549–562.
- Huntington S., 1993: The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs* **73** (3): 23–49.
- Huntington S., 1996: *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Joffé G., 1997: Chad: Power vacuum or geopolitical focus. In: Hodder D. et al. (eds), *Land-Locked States of Africa and Asia*. Frank Cass, London, pp. 25–39.
- Johnston R.J., Taylor P.J. & Watts M.J. (eds), 1995: *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World in the Late Twentieth Century*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Kahn I., 1998: Afghanistan: a geopolitical study. *Central Asian Survey* **17**: 489–502.
- Kearns G., 1993: Prologue: Fin de siècle geopolitics: Mackinder, Hobson and theories of global closure. In: Taylor P. (ed.), *Political Geography of the Twentieth Century, a Global Analysis*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 9–30.
- Kearns G., 1997: The imperial subject: geography and travel in the work of Mary Kingsley and Harold Mackinder. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **22**: 450–472.
- Kemp G. & Harkavy R.E., 1997: *Strategic Geography and the Changing Middle East*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace/Brookings Institution Press, Washington DC.
- Kennedy P., 1987: *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. Random House, New York.
- Kidron M. & Segal R., 1981: *The State of the World Atlas*. Pan Books, London (translated as: *Atlas encyclopédique du monde*. Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1981).
- Kidron M. & Segal R., 1984: *The New State of the World Atlas*. Pan Books, London, second edition.
- Kidron M. & Smith D., 1983: *The War Atlas: Armed Conflict, Armed Peace*. Pan Books, London.
- King R., 1996: The geopolitics of international migration in Europe: an introduction. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **21**: 62–63.
- Kliot N. & Waterman S. (eds), 1991: *The Political Geography of Conflict and Peace*. Belhaven Press, London.
- Knights M., 1996: Bangladeshi immigrants in Italy: from geopolitics to micropolitics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **21**: 105–123.
- Kolossov V., 1996: Geopolitical scenarios for Eastern and Central Europe in a Post-bipolar world. In: Carter F.W. et al. (eds), *Central Europe After the Fall of the Iron Curtain*. Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 63–72.
- Kolossov V. & O’Loughlin J.: Pseudo states as harbingers of post-modern geopolitics: the example of the Trans-Dniester Moldovan Republic. *Geopolitics* **3**: 1.
- Kolossov V. & Trevis A., 1998: The political geography of European minorities: past and future. *Political Geography* **17**: 517–534.
- Korinman M., 1990: *Quand l’Allemagne pensait le monde; Grandeur et décadence d’une géopolitique*. Fayard, Paris.
- Korinman M., 1991: *Continents perdus: les précurseurs de la géopolitique allemande*. Economica, Paris.
- Korinman M. & Caracciolo L., dir., 1995a: *Fractures de l’Occident. Elements de géopolitique*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Korinman M. & Caracciolo L., dir., 1995b: *A quoi sert l’Italie? La Découverte*, Paris.
- Kost K., 1988: *Die Einflüsse der Geopolitik auf Forschung und Theorie der politischen Geographie von ihren Anfängen bis 1945; ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der politischen Geographie und ihre Terminologie unter Berücksichtigung von Militär- und Kolonialgeographie*. Dümmler, Bonn.
- Kost K., 1989: The conception of politics in political geography in Germany until 1945. *Political Geography Quarterly* **8**: 369–385.
- Koutouzis M., dir., 1996: *Atlas mondial des drogues*. Presses universitaires de France, Paris.
- Krause K. & Williams M.C. (eds), 1997: *Critical Security Studies*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Kuehls Th., 1996: *Beyond Sovereign Territory: the Space of Ecopolitics*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Labrousse A. & Koutouzis M., 1996: *Géopolitique et géostratégies des drogues*. Economica, Paris.
- Lacoste Y., 1976: *La géographie ça sert d’abord à faire la guerre*. Maspéro, Paris.
- Lacoste Y., dir., 1986: *Géopolitiques des régions françaises*, 3 volumes. Fayard, Paris.
- Lacoste Y., dir., 1993, 1995: *Dictionnaire de géopolitique*. Flammarion, Paris.

- Lacoste Y., dir., 1994, 1995, 1996: *Dictionnaire de géopolitique des états*. Flammarion, Paris.
- Lacoste Y., 1998: *Vive la Nation! Destin d'une idée géopolitique*. Fayard Paris.
- Laidi Z., red., 1992: *L'ordre mondial relâché, sens et puissance après la guerre froide*. Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques Berg, Paris.
- Laidi Z., red., 1998: *Géopolitique du sens*. Desclée de Brouwer, Paris.
- Lariu S., 1998: La Geopolitik allemande et l'Europe médiane. *Géographie et Cultures* 27, 19–40.
- LeDonne J., 1997: *The Russian Empire and the World, 1700–1917: the Geopolitics of Expansion and Containment*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lele J. & Ofori-Yeboah K. (eds), 1996: *Unravelling the Asian Miracle: Explorations in Development Strategies, Geopolitics and Regionalism*. Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- Liu X.-F. & Norcliffe G., 1996: Closed windows, open doors: geopolitics and post-1949 mainland Chinese immigration to Canada. *The Canadian Geographer* 40: 306–319.
- Lorot P., 1995: *Histoire de la géopolitique*. Economica, Paris.
- Lorot P., 1997: De la géopolitique à la géoéconomie. *Revue française de géoéconomie* 1: 23–35.
- Lorot P. & Thual F., 1997: *La géopolitique*. Montchrestien, Paris.
- Loyer B., 1997: *Géopolitique du Pays Basque, Nations et nationalismes en Espagne*. L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Luke T.W., 1994: Placing power/sitting space: the politics of global and local in the New World Order. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 613–628.
- Luke T.W., 1996: Governmentality and contragovernmentality: rethinking sovereignty and territoriality after the Cold War. *Political Geography* 15: 491–507.
- Luke T.W., 1998: Running flat out on the road ahead: nationality, sovereignty, and territoriality in the world of the information superhighway. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 274–294.
- Luke T.W. & Ó Tuathail G., 1998: Global flowmations, local fundamentalisms, and fast geopolitics: 'America' in an accelerating world order. In: Herod, A. et al. (eds), *An Unruly World? Globalization, Governance and Geography*. Routledge, London, pp. 72–94.
- Luttwak E.N., 1983: *The Grand Strategy of the Soviet Union*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Luttwak E.N., 1986: *On the meaning of victory: Essays on strategy*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Luttwak E.N., 1987: *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Luttwak E.N., 1990: From geopolitics to geo-economics, Logic of conflict, grammar of commerce. *The National Interest* 20: 17–24.
- Luttwak E.N., 1993: *The Endangered American Dream: How to Stop the United States from Becoming a Third World Country and How to Win the Geo-Economic Struggle for Industrial Supremacy*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Luttwak E. & Koehl S., 1911: *The Dictionary of Modern War*. Harper Collins, New York (original edition: Luttwak E.: *A Dictionary of Modern War*. Harper and Row, New York/Allen Lane, London, 1971).
- McLachlan K. (ed.), 1994: *The Boundaries of Modern Iran*. UCL Press, London.
- McLachlan K., 1997: Afghanistan: the geopolitics of a buffer state. In: Hodder D. et al. (eds), *Land-Locked States in Africa and Asia*. Frank Cass, London, pp. 197–208.
- MacLaughlin J., 1993: Defending the frontiers: The political geography of race and racism in the European Community. In: Williams C.H. (ed.), *The Political Geography of the New World Order*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 20–45.
- Marenches A. de, dir., 1988: *Atlas géopolitique*. Stock, Paris.
- Martel A., 1991: *La Libye 1835-1990, essai de géopolitique historique*. PUF, Paris.
- Medhanie T., 1994: *Eritrea and neighbours in the 'new world order': geopolitics, democracy and 'Islamic fundamentalism'*. Lit, Münster.
- Modelski G. & Thompson W.R., 1998: *Seapower in Global Politics, 1494–1993*. Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Montaz D., 1996: The United Nations and the protection of the environment: from Stockholm to Rio de Janeiro. *Political Geography* 15: 261–272.
- Moreau Defarges Ph., 1994: *Introduction à la géopolitique*. Editions du Seuil, Paris.
- Moskalenko V. & Shaumian T., 1995: Conflict over Kashmir: current situation and outlook: a new geopolitical context. *Pakistan Horizon* 48: 17–24.
- Muet Y., 1996: *Les géographes et l'Europe. L'idée européenne dans la pensée géopolitique française de 1919 à 1939*. Institut européen de Genève, Genève.
- Muir R., 1997: *Political Geography, a New Introduction*. Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Murphy D.T., 1994: Space, race and geopolitical necessity: geopolitical rhetoric in German colonial revanchism, 1919-1933. In: Godlewska A. & Smith N. (eds), *Geography and Empire*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 173–187.
- Murphy D.T., 1997: *The Heroic Earth, Geopolitical Thought in Weimar Germany, 1918–1933*. Kent State University Press, Kent, OH.
- Myers G., Klak Th. & Koehl T., 1996: The inscription of difference: news coverage of the conflicts in Rwanda and Bosnia. *Political Geography* 15: 21–46.
- Nierop T., 1994: *The Global System and the Region; International Politics Since 1945*. Belhaven Press, London.
- Nijman J., 1992: The limits of superpower, the United States and the Soviet Union since World War 2. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82: 681–695.
- Nijman J., 1993: *The Geopolitics of Power and Conflict: Superpowers in the International System, 1945–1992*. Belhaven Press, London/Halsted Press, New York.
- O'Loughlin J., 1992: Ten scenarios for the new world order. *Professional Geographer* 44: 22–28.
- O'Loughlin J., 1993: Fact or fiction? The evidence for the thesis of US relative decline, 1966–1991. In: Williams C.H. (ed.), *The Political Geography of the New World Order*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 148–180.
- O'Loughlin J. (ed.), 1994: *Dictionary of Geopolitics*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn.
- O'Loughlin J. & Heske H., 1991: From 'Geopolitik' to 'géopolitique': Converting a discipline for war to a discipline for peace. In: Klot N. & Waterman S. (eds), *The Political Geography of Conflict and Peace*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 37–59.
- O'Loughlin J., Kolossov V. & Tchepalva A., 1998: National construction, territorial separatism, and post-soviet geopolitics in the Transdnister Moldovan Republic. *Post-Soviet Geography and Economics* 39: 332–358.
- O'Loughlin J. & Wusten, H. van der, 1990: The political geography of panregions. *Geographical Review* 80: 1–20.
- O'Loughlin J. & Wusten H. van der (eds), 1993a: *The New Political Geography of Eastern Europe*. Belhaven Press, London/Halsted Press, New York.
- O'Loughlin J. & Wusten H. van der, 1993b: Political geography of war and peace. In: Taylor P.J. (ed.), *Political Geography of the Twentieth Century, a Global Analysis*. Belhaven Press, London/Halsted Press, New York, pp. 63–113.
- O'Sullivan P., 1986: *Geopolitics*. St Martin's Press, New York.
- O'Sullivan P., 1995: Geopolitical force fields. *Geographical Analysis* 27: 176–181.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1992: 'Pearl Harbour without Bombs': a Critical Geopolitics of the US-Japan FSX Debate. *Environment and Planning A* 24: 975–994.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1993a: Japan as threat: geo-economic discourses on the USA-Japan relationship in US civil society, 1987–1991. In: Williams C.H. (ed.), *The Political Geography of the New World Order*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 181–209.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1993b: The effacement of place? US foreign policy and the spatiality of the Gulf crisis. *Antipode* 25: 4–31.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1994a: Critical geopolitics and development theory: intensifying the dialogue. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 19: 228–233.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1994b: Problematising geopolitics: survey, statemanship and strategy. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 19: 269–272.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1994c: (Dis)placing geopolitics: writing on the maps of global politics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 525–546.

- Ó Tuathail G., 1994d: The critical reading/writing of geopolitics: Re-reading/writing Wittfogel, Bowman and Lacoste. *Progress in Human Geography* **18**: 313–332.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1996a: *Critical Geopolitics: the Politics of Writing Global Space*. Routledge, London.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1996b: Review essay: Dissident IR and the identity politics narrative: a sympathetically skeptical perspective. *Political Geography* **15**: 647–653.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1996c: The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby. *Political Geography* **15**: 661–665.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1998a: Political geography III: dealing with deterritorialization. *Progress in Human Geography* **22**: 81–93.
- Ó Tuathail G., 1998b: Postmodern geopolitics? The modern geopolitical imagination and beyond. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 16–38.
- Ó Tuathail G. & Agnew J., 1992: Geopolitics and discourse, Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy. *Political Geography* **11**: 190–204.
- Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S., 1994: Critical geopolitics: unfolding spaces for thought in geography and global politics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **12**: 513–514.
- Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), 1998: *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London.
- Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S., 1998b: Introduction: rethinking geopolitics: towards a critical geopolitics. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 1–15.
- Ó Tuathail G., Dalby S. & Routledge P. (eds), 1998: *The Geopolitics Reader*. Routledge, London.
- Ó Tuathail G. & Luke T., 1994: Present at the (dis)integration: deterritorialization and reterritorialization in the new wor(l)d order. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **84**: 381–398.
- Olson R., 1992: The Kurdish question in the aftermath of the Gulf War: geopolitical and geostrategic changes in the Middle East. *Third World Quarterly* **13**, 475–499.
- Ossenbrügge J., 1989: Territorial ideologies in West-Germany 1945–1985: Between geopolitics and regionalist attitudes. *Political Geography Quarterly* **8**: 387–399.
- Paasi A., 1990: The rise and fall of Finnish geopolitics. *Political Geography Quarterly* **9**: 53–65.
- Paasi A., 1995: *Territories, Boundaries, and Consciousness; the Changing Geographies of the Finnish–Russian Border*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Painter J., 1995: *Geography, Politics and Political Geography*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Parker G., 1985: *Western Geopolitical Thought in the Twentieth Century*. Croom Helm, London.
- Parker G.: French geopolitical thought in the interwar years and the emergence of the European idea. *Political Geography Quarterly* **6**: 145–150.
- Parker G., 1988: *The Geopolitics of Domination*. Routledge, London.
- Parker G., 1991: The geopolitics of dominance and international cooperation. In: Kliot N. & Waterman S. (eds), *The Political Geography of Conflict and Peace*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 60–66.
- Parker G., 1991: Continuity and change in Western geopolitical thoughts during the 20th century. *International Social Science Journal* **127**: 21–34.
- Parker G., 1998: *Geopolitics: Past, Present and Future*. Pinter, London.
- Paterson J.H., 1987: German geopolitics re-assessed. *Political Geography Quarterly* **6**: 107–114.
- Peck J., 1998: Workfare: a geopolitical etymology. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **16**: 133–161.
- Pepper D. & Jenkins A. (eds), 1985: *The Geography of Peace and War*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Perkins J.H., 1998: *Geopolitics and the Green Revolution; Wheat, Genes and the Cold War*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Pfetsch F.R., 1993: Sicherheit als Begriff der internationalen Politik. *Geographische Zeitschrift* **81**: 210–226.
- Plano J.C. & Olton R., 1988: *The International Relations Dictionary*, fourth edition. ABC-Clio, Santa Barbara/Oxford.
- Popke E.J., 1994: Recasting geopolitics: the discursive scripting of the International Monetary Fund. *Political Geography* **13**: 255–269.
- Poulsen Th.M., 1995: *Nations and States: a Geographic Background to World Affairs*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Prescott V., 1996: Contribution of the United Nations to solving boundary and territorial disputes, 1945–1995. *Political Geography* **15**: 287–318.
- Prévelakis G., 1998: Les enjeux géopolitiques de l'Europe médiane. *Géographie et cultures* **27**: 5–18.
- Prévelakis G., 1997: *La géopolitique de la Grèce*. Complexe, Bruxelles.
- Prunier G., 1997: The geopolitical situation of the Great Lakes area in the light of the Kivu crisis. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* **16**: 1–25.
- Puri M.M., 1993: Persian Gulf Geopolitics. *International Studies* **30**: 437–474.
- Puri M.M., 1997a: Central Asian Geopolitics: The Indian view. *Central Asian Survey* **16**: 237–268.
- Puri M.M., 1997b: India's geopolitical strivings in Central Asia. *Man and Development* **19**: 43–77.
- Raffestin C., Lopreno D. & Pasteur Y., 1995: *Géopolitique et histoire*. Payot, Lausanne.
- Ramonet I., 1997: *Géopolitique du chaos*. Galilée, Paris.
- Ramonet I., 1998: *The Geopolitics of Chaos: Internationalization, Cyberculture, Political Chaos*. Algora.
- Retailé D., 1996: La vérité des cartes. *Le débat* **92**: 87–98.
- Roberts S.M., 1998: Geo-governance in trade and finance and political geographies of dissent. In: Herod A. et al. (eds), *An Unruly World? Globalization, Governance and Geography*. Routledge, London, pp. 116–134.
- Robinson J., 1997: The geopolitics of South-African cities: states, citizens, territory. *Political Geography* **16**: 365–388.
- Rössler M., 1990: *Wissenschaft und Lebensraum. Geographische Ostforschung im Nationalsozialismus. Ein Beitrag zur Disziplingeschichte der Geographie*. Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Hamburg/Berlin.
- Ropivia M.-L., 1994: *Géopolitique de l'intégration en Afrique noire*. L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Rosenberg J., 1994: *The Empire of Civil Society, a Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relations*. Verso, London.
- Rosenne S., 1996: Geography in international maritime boundary-making. *Political Geography* **15**: 319–334.
- Routledge P., 1994: Backstreets, barricades, and blackouts: urban terrains of resistance in Nepal. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **12**: 559–579.
- Routledge P., 1996: Critical geopolitics and terrains of resistance. *Political Geography* **15**: 509–531.
- Routledge P., 1997: A spatiality of resistance, Theory and practice in Nepal's Revolution of 1990. In: Pile S. & Keith M. (eds), *Geographies of Resistance*. Routledge, London, pp. 68–86.
- Routledge P., 1998: Going globale: spatiality, embodiment, and mediation in the Zapatista insurgency. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 240–260.
- Rozman G., 1997: Cross-national integration in Northeast Asia: geopolitical and economic goals in conflict. *East Asia* **16**: 6–43.
- Rumley D., Chiba T., Takagi A. & Fukushima Y. (eds), 1996: *Global Geopolitical Change and the Asia Pacific: a Regional Perspective*. Avebury, Aldershot.
- Rusi A., 1996: *After Cold War: Europe's New Political Architecture*. Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Rusi A., 1997: *A Dangerous Peace: the Geopolitical Transition from Bipolarity to New Rivalry*. Westview, Boulder, Co.
- Rygiel K., 1998: Stabilizing borders: the geopolitics of national identity construction in Turkey. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 106–130.
- Sandner G., 1989a: Introduction to Special Issue on Historical Studies of German Political Geography. *Political Geography Quarterly* **8**: 311–314.
- Sander G., 1989b: The Germania triumphans syndrome and Passarge's *Erkundliche Weltanschauung*: The roots and effects of German political geography beyond *Geopolitik*. *Political Geography Quarterly* **8**: 341–351.
- Sandner G., 1993: Renaissance des geopolitischen Denkens in der Geographie? Versuchungen, Herausforderungen, Perspektiven. *Geographische Zeitschrift* **81**: 248–252.
- Sandner G. & Boesler K.-A., 1993: Neue raumstrukturen globaler Politik, Herausforderungen für die Politische Geographie. *Geographische Zeitschrift* **81**: 197–198.
- Sandner G. & Rössler M., 1994: Geography and Empire in Germany. In: Godlewska A. & Smith N. (eds), *Geography and Empire*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 115–127.

- Schofield C.H. (ed.), 1994: *Global Boundaries, World Boundaries*, Vol. 1. Routledge, London.
- Schofield C.H. & Schofield R.N. (ed.), 1994: *The Middle East and North Africa, World Boundaries*, Vol. 2. Routledge, London.
- Schofield R. (ed.), 1994: *Territorial Foundations of the Gulf States*. UCL Press, London.
- Schultz H.-D., 1989: Fantasies of *Mitte*: *Mittelage* and *Mitteleuropa* in German geographical discussion in the 19th and the 20th centuries. *Political Geography Quarterly* 8: 315–339.
- Seager J., Reed C. & Scott P., 1995: *The New State of the Earth Atlas: a Concise Survey of the Environment through Full Color International Maps*. Simon and Schuster, New York (first edition: 1990).
- Segal G., 1986: Nuclear strategy: the geography of stability. *Political Geography Quarterly*, Supplement 5, s37–s47.
- Serbin A., 1990: *Caribbean Geopolitics: Toward Security through Peace?* Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, Co. (translation of: El Caribe, zona de paz?).
- Sharp J.P., 1993: Publishing American identity: popular geopolitics, myth and the Reader's Digest. *Political Geography* 12: 491–503.
- Sharp J.P., 1996: Hegemony, popular culture and geopolitics: the Reader's Digest and the construction of danger. *Political Geography* 15: 557–570.
- Sharp J.P., 1998: Reel geographies of the new world order: patriotism, masculinity, and geopolitics in post-Cold War American movies. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 152–169.
- Shih S., 1998: Gender and the a new geopolitics of desire: the seduction of mainland women in Taiwan and Hong Kong media. *Signs* 23: 287–320.
- Sidaway J.D., 1994: Geopolitics, geography and 'terrorism' in the Middle-East. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 357–372.
- Sidaway J.D., 1998: What is in a gulf? From the 'arc of crisis' to the Gulf War'. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 224–239.
- Sidaway J.D. & Simon D., 1993: Geopolitical transition and state formation: the changing political geographies of Angola, Mozambique and Namibia. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 19: 6–28.
- Simon D., 1996: Strategic territory and territorial strategy: the geopolitics of Walvis Bay's reintegration into Namibia. *Political Geography* 15: 193–200.
- Simpson-Anderson R.C., 1997: South Africa's maritime power in the Indian Ocean Rim. *South African Journal of International Affairs* 35: 367–385.
- Sironneau, J., 1996: *L'eau, nouvel enjeu stratégique mondial*. Economica, Paris.
- Slater D., 1993: The geopolitical imagination and the enframing of development theory. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18: 419–437.
- Slater D., 1993: Reimagining the geopolitics of development: continuing the dialogue. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 19: 233–239.
- Slater D., 1997: Geopolitical imaginations across the North-South divide: issues of different development and power. *Political Geography* 16: 631–653.
- Slater D., 1997: Spatial politics / Social movements, Questions of (b)orders and resistance in global times. In: Pile S. & Keith M. (eds), *Geographies of Resistance*. Routledge, London, pp. 258–276.
- Sloan G.R., 1988: *Geopolitics and the United States Strategic Policy, 1890–1987*. St Martin's Press, New York.
- Sloan G.R., 1997: *The Geopolitics of Anglo-Irish Relations in the Twentieth Century*. Pinter, London.
- Smith G., 1993: Ends, geopolitics and transitions. In: Johnston R.J. (ed.), *The Challenge for Geography: a Changing World, a Changing Discipline*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 76–99.
- So A.Y. & Chin S.W.K., 1998: Geopolitics, global production, and the three paths of development in East Asia. *Journal of Developing Societies* 14: 127–143.
- Soppelsa J., 1993: *Géopolitique de 1945 à nos jours*. Sirey, Paris.
- Soppelsa J., Battesti M. & Romer J.-C., 1988: *Léxique de géopolitique*. Dalloz, Paris.
- Sparke M., 1996: Negotiating national action: free trade, constitutional debate and the gendered geopolitics of Canada. *Political Geography* 15: 615–639.
- Sparke M., 1998: Outsides inside patriotism: the Oklahoma bombing and the displacement of heartland geopolitics. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 198–223.
- Sprengel R., 1994: *Kritik der Geopolitik, Ein deutscher Diskurs 1914–1944*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.
- Starr H. & Siverson R.M., 1990: Alliances and geopolitics. *Political Geography Quarterly* 9: 232–248.
- Stephanson A., 1998: Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In: Ó Tuathail G. & Dalby S. (eds), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. Routledge, London, pp. 62–85.
- Taglioni F., 1995: *Géopolitique des Petites Antilles: Influences européenne et nord-américaine*. Karthala, Paris.
- Takeuchi K., 1994: The Japanese imperial tradition, western imperialism and modern Japanese geography. In: Godlewska A. & Smith N. (eds), *Geography and Empire*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 188–206.
- Taylor P.J., 1990: *Britain and the Cold War, 1945 as Geopolitical Transition*. Pinter, London.
- Taylor P.J., 1993: Geopolitical world orders. In: Taylor P.J. (ed.), *Political Geography of the Twentieth Century: a Global Analysis*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 31–61.
- Taylor P.J., 1996: *The Way the Modern World Works: World Hegemony to World Impasse*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Teschke B., 1998: Geopolitical relations in the European Middle Ages: history and theory. *International Organization* 52: 325–358.
- Testahune M., 1998: Mobility, racism and geopolitics. *Political Geography* 17: 499–515.
- Thual F., 1993a: *Géopolitiques au quotidien*. Dunod, Paris.
- Thual F., 1993b: *Mémento de géopolitique*. Dunod, Paris.
- Thual F., 1993c: *Géopolitique de l'orthodoxie*. Dunod, Paris.
- Thual F., 1994: *Géopolitique de la franc-maçonnerie*. Dunod, Paris.
- Thual F., 1995a: *Géopolitique du chiisme*. Arlea, Paris.
- Thual F., 1995b: *Repères géopolitiques*. La documentation française, Paris.
- Thual F., 1996a: *Méthodes de la géopolitique, apprendre à déchiffrer l'actualité*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Thual F., 1996b: *Géopolitique de l'Amérique latine*. Economica, Paris.
- Thual F., 1997a: *Abrégé de géopolitique du golfe*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Thual F., 1997b: *Repères internationaux, l'événement au crible de la géopolitique*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Touscoz J., 1988: *Atlas géostratégique: crises, tensions et convergences*. Larousse, Paris.
- Tunander O., Baev P. & Einagel V.I. (eds), 1997: *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe; Security, Territory and Identity*. Sage, London.
- Tyner J.A., 1998: The geopolitics of eugenics and the incarceration of Japanese Americans. *Antipode* 30: 251–269.
- Vallaud P. (ed.), 1989: *Atlas géostratégique*. Hachette Jeunesse, Paris.
- Vaughn B., 1994: Shifting geopolitical realities between South, Southwest and Central Asia. *Central Asian Survey* 13: 305–315.
- Veltz P., 1996: *Mondialisation, villes et territoires, l'économie d'archipel*. PUF, Paris.
- Vigarié A., 1995: *La mer et la géostratégie des nations*. Economica, Paris.
- Vogeler I., 1995: Cold War geopolitics: Embassy locations. *Journal of Geography* 94: 323–329.
- Wackermann G., 1997: *Géopolitique de l'espace mondial: dynamiques et enjeux*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Wallerstein I., 1991: *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris.
- Warf B., 1997: The geopolitics/geoeconomics of military base closures in the USA. *Political Geography* 16: 541–563.
- Waterman S., 1998: Political geography as a mirror of political geography. *Political Geography* 17: 373–388.
- Watson A., 1992: *The Evolution of International Society: a Comparative Historical Analysis*. Routledge, London.
- Weber C., 1994: Shoring up a sea of signs: how the Caribbean Basin Initiative framed the US invasion of Grenada. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 547–548.
- Williams C.H. (ed.), 1993: *The Political Geography of the New World Order*. Belhaven Press, London.
- Williams C.H. & Williams S.W., 1993: Issues of peace and security in contemporary Europe. In: Williams C.H. (ed.), *The Political Geography of the New World Order*. Belhaven Press, London, pp. 100–131.
- Wood W.B. & Potts L.G., 1996: The UN and migration: falling behind. *Political Geography* 15: 251–260.

- Wright J.F.R., Goldenberg S. & Schofield R. (eds), 1996: *Transcaucasian Boundaries*. UCL Press, London.
- Wusten H. van der & Nierop T., 1990: Functions, roles, and form in international politics. *Political Geography Quarterly* 9: 213–231.
- Wusten H. van der, 1993: Politisch-geographische Herausforderungen in der gegenwärtigen Phase des geopolitischen Übergangs. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 81: 237–247.
- Wusten H.H. van der, 1997: Political geography at the global scale; The world stage, regional arenas, the search for a play. In: Dikshit R. (ed.), *Developments in Political Geography, a Century of Progress.*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Wusten H.H. van der, 1998: The state political geography is in. *TESG* 89: 82–89.
- Wusten H. van der, 1998: Das Ende der Geopolitik? Nationalismen, Regionalismen und Supranational Identitäten in der aktuellen Diskussion. In: Boesler K.-A., Heinritz, G. & Wiessner R. (eds), *Europa zwischen Integration und Regionalismus*. Franz Steiner, Stuttgart pp. 237–247.
- Zoppo C.E. & Zorgbibe Ch. (eds), 1985: *On Geopolitics: Classical and Nuclear*. Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht.
- Zorgbibe Ch., 1988: *Dictionnaire de politique internationale*. PUF, Paris.
- Zoubir Y.H., 1997: In search of hegemony: the Western Sahara in Algerian-Moroccan relations. *Journal of Algerian Studies* 2: 43–67.
- Zoubir Y.H., Volman D. & Dymally M.M., 1993: *International Dimensions of the Western Sahara Conflict*. Praeger, Westport, CT.