

## **DETERRITORIALIZATION OF THE WORLD AS A CHALLENGE FOR CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY**

**Jakub POTULSKI**

University of Gdansk, Institute of Political Science,  
ul. Bazynskiego 4, 80-952 Gdansk, Poland, e-mail: wnsjp@univ.gda.pl

**Abstract:** Human societies have traditionally had clear territorial foundations. People knew and interacted with others within their community and, to a lesser extent, with people from neighbouring communities. Geography and distance mattered. Globalization, however, has led to the rise of “supraterritoriality” or deterritorialization, through which the constraints traditionally imposed by geography and distance have been substantially overcome. Some authors have associated contemporary globalization with a tendency towards deterritorialization, so that social space can no longer be wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial borders. Deterritorialisation is a name given to the problematic of territory losing its significance and power in everyday life. Territory, the concept suggests, is no longer the stable and unquestioned actuality it once was. Rather than it being an assumed given, its position and status now in question. Term deterritorialisation is one among many other – globalization, glocalisation, postcolonial, postnational, transnational, cyberspace – that have been coined to try to describe the rearranging and restructuring of spatial relations as a consequence of the technological, material and geopolitical transformation of the late twentieth century. For political geographers interested in conceptualizing the changing world political map, discourses of deterritorialization are significant as signs and symptoms of geopolitical change

**Key words:** deterritorialization, state, borderless world, globalization, political geography

IT revolution and globalization processes have led to a deep transformation of our social life and the change of relations between human activity and space in which this activity takes place. A growing correlation on a global scale, mutual conditioning of this what is global (external) and what is local (internal), high mobility of people, capital, ideas flowing freely on a global scale affect the increasing permeability of borders, which to a lesser extent perform their functions. The process of erosion of the present borders constitutes a challenge for contemporary political science due to the fact that borders understood as various barriers (political, geographical, cultural) dividing the global space were the main interest of political geography and its most popular subject of discussion in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Above all, it was connected with the influence which Friedrich Ratzel - one of the German scholars - had on political geography. His political geography was devoted to the analysis of the country in relation to space, geographical location and borders. Furthermore, for a long time the phenomena of political geography were

regarded as so closely connected with the functioning of the state power that in some previous works devoted to politics its every study was associated with the study of the machinery of the state power.

First political geographers focused on the state and attached importance to the role of borders and processes of establishing and reproducing the borders of a nation state. Borders were regarded as a factor determining territory where the state exercises its authority. It was commonly assumed that the essence of the nation border consists in the fact that it defines the scope of territorial authority of particular states and unacceptability of an activity on this territory of authority and the rights of another state, and it separated the territory of one state from other states. During the period of domination of new geopolitical order along with the principle of sovereignty of nation state, the borders determined the space of the state and its authority over it. Sovereignty meant the independence of the authority from any other authority in relations with other states and international organizations as well as from any other authority within the state. Borders constituted to a greater or lesser extent a barrier limiting the flow of financial resources, goods, human migration as well as cultural influence. Political geographers and also other representatives of political sciences regarded borders as solid, stable, empirical reality dividing global space into limited parts, which transform mostly as a result of conflicts.

At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century a debate on the problems of borders and their functions suddenly revived. It was connected with transformations which occurred on the political map of the world and together with the dissolution of multiethnic states of the Eastern Bloc which brought about the change of nationalistic and separatist moods and also the territorial change of configuration of sovereign territories and - what is even more essential - it was associated with the changing role of the borders and their understanding in the world which was becoming more and more globalised. Along with the political changes, IT communication and revolution the world was becoming more and more interdependent and "open", and the borders more and more "permeable" to the flow of goods, finances, services, people and also to ideas and cultural values. The changes occurring in the world caused that present cognitive categories of political geography which were appearing in the world of the primacy of modern nation state, efficient borders, clear sovereignty and territorial identity turned out to be inadequate for the understanding of modern world and their application was insufficient to explain the occurring phenomena.

Researchers dealing with the globalisation issues always remark that globalisation is a multidimensional process which comprises many aspects of our daily life. One of the key elements of globalisation processes is the reconfiguration of social space of man which means the growth in transplanetary connections between people (*globalization as respatialization*). All social analyses should include the spatial aspect. Human relations always occur "somewhere", that is they have a place, a location, a domain or a website. Space and place are one of the crucial elements - both in case of causes and effects - of social life. Therefore, the analysis of social reality cannot be complete without taking spatial component into consideration. The term itself - globalization (globality) - has its spatial connotations because it draws our attention to the character of the arena of human activity and experience: the whole social life. One of the characteristic features of the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century was the fact that people interact not only at the local, provincial, national or even macro regional level but also on a scale of the whole planet which has become "one place"<sup>17</sup>.

One of the specific features of globalization is a particular "deterritorialization" of some phenomena and social processes which means that the globalization processes contributed to the formation of bonds and interactions relatively separated from a specific location and due to this specific, transnational, economic, social and political space started to form. Globalization causes that places become less and less important in

---

<sup>17</sup> J.A. Scholte, *Globalization. A critical introduction*, New York 2005, 60.

a social environment, present barriers and distances are being removed and people accept transnational lifestyle more and more often. It has been remarked that the present world, which was structured by the existence of clear borders, underwent corrosion and there has been deterritorialization of the occurring phenomena and social processes which more and more often go beyond all the political, social, cultural and economic barriers and borders. According with this mechanism some social processes occur without a clear location in a territorially defined space of the globe. Moreover, the existing distances do not matter for their functioning, which means a radical departure from the principle of territoriality characteristic of modern social and political order; according with this principle phenomena and processes are assigned to a particular territory. Globalization has activated interactions and bonds without distances and relatively departed from a particular location<sup>18</sup>.

The impact of globalization on the reconfiguration of social geography of man has become the subject of the debate attempting to understand spatial consequences of globalization processes. Some authors started to identify modern globalization with a tendency to deterritorialized social phenomena. As Gerard O'Tuathail remarked the term deterritorialization was introduced to the discussions (similarly to other terms such as globalization, glocalization, cyberspace, post national, transnational) in order to enable an attempt to describe rearrangement and reconstruction of spatial relations as a consequence of technological, material and geopolitical transformation of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. O'Tuathail wrote that the term deterritorialization was used to analyze the problem of the loss of meaning of territorial assignments, so in other words the loss of its meaning and authority of territory/space in daily human activity. The notion of deterritorialization suggests that territory or affiliation to a particular territory is no longer something stable and unquestionable<sup>19</sup>. Progressive deterritorialization of the world constitutes one of the basic problems undertaken by the researchers of modern social environment. This notion suggests that together with the appearance of post-industrial society/IT civilization, there have been fundamental changes in the relations man-space. The discourse devoted to deterritorialization of the modern world is to a greater extent a discourse concerning the issue of disassembly of complex relations between geography, authority and identity which have defined and divided the world for most of the period of modern history. The issue of deterritorialization is often considered in the context of the consequences of IT revolution (Manuel Castells), formation of new global economy and free movement of goods and capital (Kenichi Ohmae), cultural globalization and free movement of people, ideas and lifestyles (Arjun Appandurai), and formation of risk society (Ulrich Beck), and also creation of new global system of authority (Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri).

One of characteristic megatrends of the development of modern civilization is the economization of social life connected with the process of re-orientation of national economies towards global economy. Economic globalization has become a permanent tendency on a worldwide scale. Some researchers believe that economic globalization of the world and neoliberal political thought play an important role in the processes of deterritorialization. There is commonly assumed opinion that the fall of communism at the beginning of the 1990s all over the world meant a definite victory of capitalism as the only form of economy on a global scale. At the beginning of the 1990s an American political scientist Francis Fukuyama wrote that a liberal state and a market economy proved their superiority over any other authoritarian system and eventually prevailed in the world, which constitutes a particular "end of history". The domination of the Western liberal model opened the way for a deepened economic globalization of the world and

---

<sup>18</sup> M. Pietraś, *Istota, ewolucja i czynniki międzynarodowych stosunków politycznych*, (in:) *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, ed. M. Pietraś, Lublin 2006, 33-34.

<sup>19</sup> G.O' Tuathail, *Borderless world. Problematising discourses of deterytorialization*, "Geopolitics" 1999, vol.4, nr 2, 139.

formation of post capitalistic global economic order often defined as “hyper capitalism”, “super capitalism” or “turbo capitalism”. This new, neoliberal economic order gained its full legitimacy at the time of the fall of communistic ideology and the fall of the Eastern Bloc, which was connected with acceptance of free market principles and its institutions by the states creating it. It brought about the ultimate domination of capitalistic economy and formation of new economic order comprising the whole world.

While analyzing the character of modern global economy it is indicated that the development of post-industrial society brought about great changes in the economy system. At present great economic powers have a transnational character and they get out of control of the state. Economy management moves to a regional, supranational or global level because national level cannot guarantee the effectiveness and efficiency to numerous economic activities. Global economy is regulated by scattered decisive system consisting of various geopolitical and geoeconomic actors<sup>20</sup>. Some modern economists, supporters of globalization of the world, think that in a global world dominated by market logics and supranational enterprises, nation state becomes an outdated institution hindering the adjustment of a given society to the functional requirements of global economy logics<sup>21</sup>. New principles of market economy force the state to resign from its present status, “commercialization of regulation sphere”, that is agendas, tasks, functions of the state, which, in principle, changes the character of political processes, authority tools and also relations. Decentralization of the state connected with the movement from hierarchical structures to scattered, network ones is deepened. Therefore, we deal with the rivalry between postmodern global economy logics which does not respect any present borders and divisions and modern logics of sovereign nation state trying to keep its control over a given territory establishing barriers for free business activity.

One of the greatest supporters of the thesis on deterritorializing influence of global economy on modern social and political order is a Japanese-born economist Kenichi Ohmae. Since the beginning of the 1990s Ohmae indicated that forming global economy (“new economy”) brings about the process of erosion of present borders established according with the logics of functioning of bureaucratized nation state arrogating to itself the right to exercise authority over a given territory. The formation of global economy causes that we live in a borderless world. Ohmae introduced the term borderless economy to the scientific discourse. He pointed that present borders become less effective and less closed than it was in the past. It is caused mainly by IT revolution but to a greater extent it is a result of multilateral and bilateral agreements in the sphere of economic exchange. Owing to this the world has become “borderless” space. Market logics prevails over all the other aspects of social and political life. Ohmae remarked that in the modern world four basic elements of economic life function beyond the present borders creating *borderless economy* and *borderless life*. These four basic elements are as follows: communication, capital, corporations and consumers – so as Ohmae wrote these are four great C’s of economic life: communication, capital, corporations and consumers<sup>22</sup>.

Hyper-globalists, such as Kenichi Ohmae, identify globalization with the expansion of liberalism and capitalistic economy. They emphasize that in the era of global capitalism being created modern institutions such as a nation-state and modern ideological conflicts lose their meaning. Globalization is associated with the appearance of global economy which is shaping borderless world with a homogenous global market functioning by means of production, trade and finance networks. It is often indicated that progressive globalization is a result of IT and communication revolution which enables an instant access to information in every sphere of activity. Therefore, a focus on the consequences of IT revolution for the spatial organization of a modern world is an important element of the discourse around deterritorialization of modern world.

---

<sup>20</sup> C. Jean, *Geopolityka*, Wrocław 2003, 210.

<sup>21</sup> K. Ohmae, *The Borderless World*, London 1990, 8.

<sup>22</sup> K. Ohmae, *The next global stage. Challenges and opportunities in our borderless world*, New Jersey 2005, 20-22.

Globalization of the world is indirectly connected with IT revolution. Characteristic “tightening of time and space” is the effect of the fact that modern technologies entangle the world with the networks of communication and telecommunication connections forming a dense network of channels which are used by people and information to move around the world. In the conditions of existence and functioning of electronic means of communication territorial distances have lost its present meaning which causes deterritorialization of activity and human experience, which to a lesser extent are connected with a specific spatial location. Modern technologies “pull out” the social activities from a located context and organize social relations over significant time and space distances from the beginning. As Anthony Giddens wrote in the conditions of late modernity place becomes more of a phantasmagoria, which means that the places of action are under social influences located remotely and are formed by them<sup>23</sup>.

It was Manuel Castells – a Spanish sociologist – who placed a special emphasis on this aspect of deterritorialization processes. He assumed that the starting point to analyze the complexity and changes of modern world should be IT revolution. New communication and information technologies create a global electronic network, practically without any control from the bureaucratic machinery of the state. As Manuel Castells wrote the state is not able to control the information any longer and at the same time its control over the citizens weakens. Globalization of media and electronic communication is equal with denationalization of information which causes that humanity gradually enters the era of non-territorial, independent from the state communication<sup>24</sup>. The thesis of a Spanish scholar states that the IT revolution causes that the spirit of our times is the spirit of the network: the basic principles of the network have become the driving force of individual, social, economic and political life. Network society is a society in which network form of organization replaces other forms, crosswise to present political, economic and cultural categories.

To a greater extent information technologies have a global and territorialized character and in a post-modern society they define the shape of conceptual connections between communication and geography, because, as it has been indicated, modern “network society” is a society “without a place”. The functioning of communication networks contributes to the deterritorialization of political, social and economic life<sup>25</sup>. Societies undergo structural transformation and as a result new forms and spatial processes emerge. What is interesting from the point of view of geopolitics, while writing about deterritorialization of the world influenced by information technologies, a Spanish scholar paid attention to the fact that network (and therefore, also an emerging network society) has its own geography – the geography of networks and nodes which manage the flow of information created in different places<sup>26</sup>.

Another element of a modern civilisational development, which has an influence on the progressive deterritorialization of the international environment, is the appearance of global problems. Civilisational development of a mankind has led to the emergence of global problems comprising all continents and societies. Emerging global problems have a character of critical threats (causing many disruptions in the lives of human societies), have a worldwide character (concerning all people), and furthermore solving them requires a wide international cooperation.

Modern man lives, according to Ulrich Beck’s definition, in the world of “globalised risk” going beyond any borders, from which we cannot be isolated. A German scholar pointed that in a modern development of international environment global threats assume civilisational threats such as: nature devastation, the spread of weapon of mass

---

<sup>23</sup> A. Giddens, *Konsekwencje nowoczesności*, Kraków 2008, 13.

<sup>24</sup> M. Castells, *Sila tożsamości*, Warszawa 2008, 289-293.

<sup>25</sup> D. Barney, *Spoleczeństwo sieci*, Warszawa 2008, 77.

<sup>26</sup> M. Castells, *Galaktyka Internetu*, Poznań 2003, 233.

destruction, depletion of natural resources or international terrorism. It means that we live in so-called risk society, in which the risk crossed the borders of the countries and enables the creation of supranational and super-class global threats having new social and political dynamics.

In modern world there has been a globalization of risk, firstly in the meaning of intensity (e.g. nuclear war may threaten all people) and secondly in the meaning of increasing number of accidental occurrences, which concern everybody or at least a great number of people on our planet. Risk has undergone universalisation, going beyond all the limits and territorial barriers – at present these are the events which territorial effects are unlimited. The emergence of global problems and deterritorialized risk constitute an important element of modern discourse devoted to the condition of modern world.

Global threats constitute the effect of modernization and force various social actors to coordinate their activities on a global level. In modern world the deterritorialization of threats to the safety and security of human societies is even more visible and therefore it requires a totally different way of describing the world and defining threats to safety and security of geopolitical entities, especially the state<sup>27</sup>. Risk society is the society of global risk. Its basic principle are the threats predicted and created by people, which cannot be limited in space, time and socially. They bear basic conditioning and institutions of the first industrial modernity (including nation states) <sup>28</sup> contributing to the progressive deterritorialization of the world.

Anthropology has played an important role in the discourses concerning deterritorialization of modern world. It indicated that the process of globalization and accompanying phenomena change the conditions defining forms and functions of culture. A term “end of history” appeared in anthropology and it shows the depreciation of place and location and constitutes a synonym of freeing modern man from the limits and spatial assignments<sup>29</sup>. For anthropologists, such as Arjun Appandurai, one of the features of post-modern world is the process of deterritorialization, which means that in modern world cultures are less determined locally, and remote events enter the sphere of daily experience even more strongly. The factor which is responsible for this phenomenon is eclectic media and mass migration connected with the processes of globalization. Migrations free people from spatial relations and assignments and by participating in this mobility they are included in the stream of human circulation allowing them to meet new cultural experiences. Media build extremely permeable and effective transterritorial channels of communication by which endless stream of information, contents, and cultural forms moves from various places to different destinations. These two mechanisms separate culture from geography, creating the world full of drifting cultures without specific space and people separated from places<sup>30</sup>. At the same time it is noteworthy that the idea of deterritorialization in anthropology does not directly imply the destruction of locality but rather “de-anchoring” of cultural experience from its traditional local ports. Places where we live are increasingly penetrated by external contents as a result of connecting them to the global channels of broadcasting. It causes that the most important indicator of cultural experience of an individual are the commercialized standards of global culture<sup>31</sup>.

Globalization is connected with a dynamic movement of ethnic groups, techniques, financial transfers, media images and ideological conflicts. Such status quo means departing from a linear model and going towards a model in which the pace, scope and cultural influence are separated and incoherent. Globalization of cultural trends cannot be put into the frames of arranged systems of linear conditioning. It is

---

<sup>27</sup> G. O'Tuathail, *Post-cold war geopolitics*, (in:) *Geographies of global change*, ed. R.J. Johnston, P. Taylor, M. Watts, Malden 2002, 187-188.

<sup>28</sup> U.Beck, *Na ile realna jest katastrofa klimatu*, (in:) *Ekologia. Przewodnik krytyki politycznej*, Warsaw 2009, 76.

<sup>29</sup> A. Appandurai, *Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy*, “Theory, Culture and Society”, nr 7, 1990, 295-310.

<sup>30</sup> A.Appandurai, *Nowoczesność bez granic. Kulturowe wymiary globalizacji*, Kraków 2005, 37-39.

<sup>31</sup> Z. Pucek, *Tożsamość przestrzeni wielokulturowej*, „Państwo i Społeczeństwo”, nr 3, 2004, 25-42.

better to understand them as categories of sets of conditionings overlapping each other, multiply determined, complex and chaotic, which at best assemble near the key “node points”<sup>32</sup>. Anthropologists think that modern communities are characterized by “a lack of the feeling of location”<sup>33</sup> and there is a need to focus on cultural dynamics of the deterritorialization phenomenon. This term is applied not only for obvious examples such as transnational corporations, but also for ethnic groups, political formations which more and more often function based on the methods which go beyond particular territorial and identity borders<sup>34</sup>. Nowadays civilizations move and mix, remote nations and tribes meet and permeate and their views exist next to each other creating a collage of values, meanings, traditions, customs and institutions. We live in the world where, thanks to communication revolution, people and experience travel and mix creating a great global network (patchwork) of connections. At present we rather have a phenomenon of “mesh civilization” instead of national societies which are separated and assigned to a particular location.

Another important element of the discourse on the problems of deterritorialization of the world is a dispute on the character of the authority in a global, post-modern society. Some scholars think that we deal with scattered and decentralized authority. Countries located on a political map have only a formal, decorative character. They do not govern in the societies and their legal status hides actual relations of governing and international hegemony. At present global hegemonies are realized by the global logics of the market which create electronic group consisting of anonymous, international investors who trade stocks, bonds and currencies by means of computers and networks. Countries have to accept the international logics of the functioning of global capital due to the fact that exclusion from the capital circulation means lack of profits and opportunities to develop which delegitimize the authority of political elites which will resist against global logics of the markets. Zygmunt Bauman indicated that we live in the era of post-panoptic order and the essence of panoptic relations lies in the fact that people who have authority tools which determine the destiny of less mobile partners of these relations can “vanish into thin air” – become unavailable and unapproachable. Bauman wrote that during the period of liquid modernity the majority is governed by a wandering and extraterritorial elite. *Modern global elite models itself on previous institution of “absentee landlord. This elite may govern not claiming responsibilities connected with administration, management and providing social welfare (...) Active participation in the life of vassal people is undesired (moreover, it is avoided like the plague because of unwanted costs and generally little efficiency), that is why “bigger” does not mean “better”, but it means “unreasonable” or rather “deprived of rational sense”. At present the reduction of sizes and weight as well as the increase in mobility are the synonyms of improvements and “progress”. A privilege of the people of the authority is the freedom of movement and not tightly holding onto the things which are considered attractive because of their reliability and solidity – massiveness, weight and durability*<sup>35</sup>.

Scholars Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri gave one of the most interesting answer to the questions concerning the character of post-modern system of authority. In the book *Empire* they attempted to analyze the essence of post-modern global hegemony. Referring to the notion of modern authority of a French philosopher and historian Michael Foucault, Hardt and Negri wrote that in *Empire there is no place of authority – it is everywhere and nowhere. Empire is u-topia; as a matter of fact it is no-place*<sup>36</sup>. Supranational, post-imperialistic authority does not originate from any specific place and it does not serve the interests of any particular nations.

Post-modern sovereign authority has assumed a new form becoming a national

---

<sup>32</sup> Ch. Barker, *Studia kulturowe. Teoria i praktyka*, Kraków 2005, 193.

<sup>33</sup> A.Appandurai, *op. cit.*, s. 45.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, 76.

<sup>35</sup> Z.Bauman, *Płynna nowoczesność*, Kraków 2006, 23.

<sup>36</sup> A.Negri, M. Hardt, *Imperium*, Warsaw 2008, 207-208.

and supranational system of organisms connected with a common logics of governing. Hardt and Negri describe this new, global form of sovereignty as Empire at the same time indicating that its arrival is connected with the fall of modern sovereignty and the Empire itself is a centralized and not territorial mechanism of governing gradually comprising the whole global domain with its open and widening borders <sup>37</sup>. As opposed to a present worldwide system in a global era there is no leader in the form of a country; however, there are certain supranational disciplinary and control mechanisms thanks to which present competition of imperialistic superpowers has been replaced with the idea of one centre, which decides for all the countries, including them in one structure, treating them with one, common law of supranational and post-imperialistic character<sup>38</sup>. As Hardt and Negri indicated Empire has some surprising features of character. A basic feature of Empire is lack of limits: its authority is borderless. It is a system of government engulfing the whole imaginable space and ruling over the whole civilized world. No territorial borders may dam its power and therefore it constitutes a system of government separated from a specific location and specific territory.

In their publication Hardt and Negri attempted to analyze new structure of international order and they suggested an interesting vision of global geopolitical structure. It is a description different from those offered by traditional geopolitical ideas. Above all, there are few references to spatial location – Hardt and Negri do not create a world map, which results from the character of post-modern geopolitical condition, in which authority and hegemony have centralized and non-territorial character. Researchers point out the diversity (pluralism) of the imperialistic international environment where global elements, such as nation states, nation state organizations and any other international organizations, are divided according to their functions and contents into political, monetary, health and educational structures and various kinds of productive activity roam among them<sup>39</sup>. The highest part of the pyramid of imperialistic power consists of three levels. At the top of the pyramid there is one superpower controlling global use of power. At the lower level the pyramid widens and it consists of a group of countries controlling the basic global monetary tools and therefore being able to regulate global exchange. These countries are included in various worldwide intergovernmental organizations such as G-8 or the Paris Club, London Club, Davos etc. At the third level there is a variety of associations locating the cultural and biopolitical power at global level. The highest level is comprised of powers and entities which have reached the hegemony at military, economic and cultural level. Below the first level which is made up of entities dominating in global order, there is a second level which is responsible for spreading orders and providing the communication of global power structure. The structure of this level consists of networks of flows (flows of capital, goods, technologies, people etc.) spread on the global market by supranational capitalistic corporations. At this level there are also sovereign nation states comprising of local, deterritorialized organizations and these nation states are often subject to the authority of supranational corporations. Nation states take over and distribute the flow of wealth to and from global power and discipline, if possible, population on its territory. The last and the broadest level of the pyramid of power, according to Hardt and Negri, consists of groups representing the interests of the total population in the global system. These are nation states which represent their citizens internationally as well as relatively organizations independent of countries and capital which are often perceived as structures of global civil society. Hardt and Negri claim that independent non-governmental organizations, so-called NGOs, such as Amnesty International or Americas Watchs, are the last branches of modern networks of power constituting a wide foundation of a triangle of global power.

The discussion on deterritorialization and creating “borderless world” is currently

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem, 9.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem, 23.

<sup>39</sup> Ibidem, 329.



one of the crucial elements of political geography, which as a scientific discipline focusing on the spatial aspects of human activity must find an answer to the question how to analyze spatial systems in their relation to power in the world where majority of processes assume global character, spatial distances in their present meaning lose their importance and human activity is often separated and independent of a specific location in space. For contemporary political geography the deterritorialization of the world is one of the most significant consequences of the processes of globalization because it forces a critical revision of all present definitions and theories which to a greater extent referred to the world in which borders and sovereign nation states played an important role. Moreover, political geographers must face with an emerging thesis on “the end of geography”<sup>40</sup>. In academic discourse this controversial thesis on “the end of geography”, to a lesser or greater extent, is based on the conviction that the time and space compression connected with the development of information technologies and globalization of the world cause that spatial distances in geographical sense lose their meaning. Many analysts state that we cannot talk about “the end of geography” but only about the changes in the relations space-man. Jan Scholte wrote that, regardless of the fact that as a result of globalization processes, “supra-territorial relations” were created and they contribute to the deterritorialization of social phenomena, “geography still has its significance” because every Internet user has an access to the network from a specific territorial location. Global products, global finances and global communication always belong to a territorial location and “global cities” such as London, New York or Tokyo still have latitude and longitude<sup>41</sup>.

Political geographers observe that time and space compression and the shrinkage of the world being the result of ICT revolution and the processes of globalization do not mean “the end of geography”. The processes of globalization change our daily experience; transform the character of human interactions and forms of communication creating “new human geography”. The statement that as a result of ICT revolution spatial distances lose their meaning does not mean that such terms as space, place, scale, and locality does not constitute an important element of human experience and therefore an important element of analysis. The fact that as a result of globalization spatial distances in an absolute understanding have shrunk does not mean that the spatial analyses have lost their significance. Political geography should consider the aspect of deterritorialization of the world and the fact that a majority of social and political activity occur in transnational space and also in cyberspace and is relatively separated from a specific territorial location. Conducted research should review the issue of relations occurring between politics and space in which political activity of man occurs and objectivizes.

The discussion on deterritorialization and formation of “borderless world” is one of the key elements of the discourse concerning the future of geopolitics as a scientific discipline. Changes in the organization of our social life connected with deterritorializing activity of communication networks are real, not virtual, and they affect the formation of complex relations between network technologies which serve the deterritorialization of human communication and activity and the world in which geography still plays an important role. As it is indicated, network society shows a deep tension between abstract lack of network location and human desire to settle their life in specific space.

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. W.E. Murray, *Geographies of globalization*, London-New York 2005, 5-7.

<sup>41</sup> J.A. Scholte, *op. cit.*, 77.

## REFERENCES

- APPANDURAI A., (1990), *Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy*, in *Theory, Culture, Society*, nr 7, p. 295-310
- APPANDURAI A., (2005), *Nowoczesność bez granic. Kulturowe wymiary globalizacji*, Universitas, Kraków
- BARKER Ch., (2005), *Studia kulturowe. Teoria i praktyka*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków
- BARNEY D., (2008), *Spółeczeństwo sieci*, Wydawnictwo SIC, Warszawa
- BAUMAN Z., (2006), *Płynna nowoczesność*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków
- BECK U., (2009), *Na ile realna jest katastrofa klimatu?*, in *Ekologia. Przewodnik Krytyki Politycznej*, Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, Warszawa
- CASTELLS M., (2003), *Galaktyka Internetu*, Dom Wydawniczy Rebis, Poznań
- CASTELLS M., (2008), *Siła tożsamości*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa
- JEAN C., (2003), *Geopolityka*, Ossolineum, Wrocław
- MURRAY W.E., (2005), *Geographies of globalization*, Routledge, Londyn-Newy Jork
- NEGRI A., HARDT M., (2008), *Imperium*, Wydawnictwo WAB, Warszawa
- O'TUATHAIL G., (1999), *Borderless world. Problematising discourses of deterritorialisation*, in *Geopolitics*, vol. 4, nr 2, p. 139-154
- O'TUATHAIL G., (2002), *Post-cold war geopolitics*, in R.J. Johnston, P. Taylor, M. Watts (eds) *Geographies of global change*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden 2002
- OHMAE K., (2005), *The next global stage. Challenges and opportunities in our borderless world*, Pearson Prentice Hall, New jersey
- OHMAE K., (1999), *The borderless world*, Harper Bussines, Londyn 1990
- PIETRAŚ M., (2006), *Istota, ewolucja i czynniki międzynarodowych stosunków politycznych*, in M. Pietraś (ed) *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin
- PUCEK Z., (2004), *Tożsamość przestrzeni wielokulturowej*, in *Państwo i Społeczeństwo*, nr 3, p. 25-42
- SCHOLTE J.A., (2005), *Globalization. A critical introduction*, Palgrave Macmillan, Nowy Jork