

THE SELECT METHODS OF INVESTIGATIONS IN GEOSTRATEGY AND GEOPOLITICS

Jan WENDT*

ABSTRACT: After the years of silence and after avoidance of geopolitical researches and its subdisciplines, a renaissance of his knowledge has come out. In the latest past years, we can notice a conspicuous increase of interest in nearly all kinds of researches, which are made by political geographers including people who deal with geostrategical and geopolitical problems. When we talk about Poland we must say that the increased interest is a result of breaking a kind of taboo - taboo, which referred to the works of this sphere. Firstly, that the works were connected with the Third Reich politics and propaganda, and secondly, because of the easy way of censorship explanation, very common while making controversial studies in Poland during communistic times. The past ten years were abounding in accidents connected with boarder's changes and changes of geopolitical and geostrategical circumstances. Also, this is a period of time when the USSR fell into pieces, the European Community came into being, the process of globalisation has been progressing, and equally, a strong separatist and national movements have been developing not only in Europe. So, it's natural that interest in those problems has been native. Leaving back the classical fields of political geography, for instance: electoral geography or ecopolitic, we can surly state, we are just victims of a dynamic investigate development. The development refers to the rest geopolitical ranges - geostrategy and geopolitics, in particular. Because of that fount, it seems to be useful to tide up some notions connected with there disciplines and indicate the basic exploring methods of the occurrences shown in geostrategical and geopolitical works. To tide up all this vast matter - both subdisciplines have interdisciplinary character - a returning to the roots of those disciplines and indicating the original investigated methods were decided - particularly those which were dominated during the Second World War - were put into practise by the general geopolitical and geostrategical research workers. Next, J am going to present the research methods in English spoken countries and in comparison to them, currents researches being made in Poland. My intention is indicate the most common using of conceptions, investigated methods and talking about them in critical way in the aspect of geopolitical and geostrategical research development in Poland and Europe, especially the central Europe.

Key words: geopolitics, geostrategy, geostrategical position, geography.

Nowadays, the terms political geography and connected with it geostrategy and geopolitics are highly discussed. But quite large number of research workers and also mass-medias use these terms interchangeably often. Just to tide up the matter, firstly, it seems to be useful to definite the basic notions / ideas, then their research range and finally show the primary methods which are used in these geographical spheres. The political geography is a kind of scope, which deals with geographical spare and political processes" interactions. It's

* Department of Geography of Regional Development, University of Gdańsk; e-mail: geojw@univ.gda.pl

also described as an investigation of political phenomenon in spatial contexts or as spacious stadium of differences and similarities. One of the most famous Polish geographers - J. Loth - who was absorbed by the political geography defined its aim in this way: "The aims of political geography is to examine the country objectively from the different points of view. The final aim of political geography is to sum up own observation which are conversed to the particular countries and putting them together to compare their antagonistic forms and at the same time opening the way for new branches of researches. Each country presented in such way, and set against another countries becomes to be more and more clear, its individuality is getting more emphasised, and at last, we have a material which is not only a source of interesting observations. But first of all, they are very precious information for professional politicians and diplomats who just use the material in everydayness life."

In Polish and British literature, there are many definitions of political geography either refereed to the aims of research or to the area of its interests. It seems to be good to say that the investigations of political processes talking place in the space-time in the most basic attribute of political geography. Following S. Otok's political geography subject we can divide political geography into three ranges:

- The research of political areas;
- The research of the country;
- The research of political processes in behavioural meaning.

But the author says; either the subject of the research, or the researching orientations are still being modiflicated. Moreover, the political geography which is said to be a knowledge form a boarding line knowledge's among many scientific disciplines is a grateful field of researches for any geographers, and many cases for politologists, scientists, historians, army theorists and economists. According to many Polish researchers' works and following J. Barbag, the current political geography can be divided into three spheres:

- Landscape - which deals with researches of political outvotes' effect in geographical surrounding;
- Ecological - which tries to show and explain the ways in which people and any structure's adapt to political and geographical conditions of surrounding;
- Organic - based on the conception, which threats the country as a model of an organism, which created the appearing of geopolitics.

The author who created the term "geopolitics" was a Sweden publicist R. Kjellen. In his work "*Der Staat als Lebensform*" he called geopolitics "it's a knowledge about country as a geographic organism or a phenomenon in the space". He also indicated a row of branches describing various interests of the country, among which the politics, politics of, authority, economic politics, etnopolitics and social politics together with geopolitics play an important role. R. Sieger understood geopolitics as a geographical politics, -which according to him - means, labelling the art. Of country managing - from the geographical point of view. Geopolitics begins there, where we deal with political prediction in the aspect of space, which includes the economical and demographically potential of the country. From the many definitions of geopolitics, the definition created by the so-called "

Munich Geopolitical School" is presented in the best way. According to his "School", geopolitics is a range of knowledge from the biological and social borderline. "So, geopolitics is a discipline which tie up the geographical surroundings which the political processes. It is based on a wide geographical foundation, especially, political geography as knowledge showing political organisations of the space its structure's... Geopolitics wants and must be "a geographical soul of the country". E. Huntington, H. J. Mackinder, A. T. Mahan, understood the geopolitics in very similar way. And, in Poland, M. Kielczewski, J. Loth, W. Nałkowski, S. Pawłowski, E. Romer, J. Smoleński, and S. Srokowski had a special impute in the political geography's development.

K. H. Haushofer showed a difference between geopolitics and political geography in that way: "Political geography threats the country from the special point of view when geopolitics see the space from the country point of view". K. H. Haushofer throated geopolitics as a way for understanding the history and politics. It was only possible by drawing conclusions from the two factors: power and space interactions. But A. Haushofer claimed that the main problem of geopolitics is to estimate the changeable relations in the space between geographical surroundings and political forms, which are functioning in this surrounding.

He (A. Haushofer) equally noticed the human's role as co-creator of political and cultural factors while considering the conditions of people's ecumena a food base, in particular liability of the space in the quality aspect and the height of the harvest.

Using geopolitics to the theoretical explanations of colonial expansions, and also using it by Hitler's propaganda, geopolitics began to be "a pseudo-science" which has a very few research works. And a kind of science which even doesn't have any science property, and a science which was taken out of the official Sciences without making any essential critics. After the year 1945, there weren't any important research workers who were able to continue geopolitical investigations in ex-People's Democratic Countries. Meanwhile, geopolitics was developing in the Western Europe and the USA, particularly that the geographical surrounding, without any matter on a association with the geopolitics' notion, played any still plays an important role in the societies' developing, countries' organisms, in social, economical and military cases. It also influences on political position of the country because it finds the power in "a very close union with the geographical position" (and sometimes it's just result of that). First of all, in geopolitics, we investigate how one country is depended on another one in consideration of political and strategically aims, which in fact means dependency, and this is the easy way to do any geographical researches. Just the geographical positions, in obvious to have influence on the political position's character. It seems to be an irony, that in the 90's, after the USSR breaking down, there was again a fatum over the political geography, geostrategy and geopolitics. Now, it's connected with the Marx distortion of military and political conflicts' genesis, which were supposed to be mainly explained according to the Marx workers from the dialectical and historical materialism point of view. But, the moment, when we begin to consider only military aspects of geopolitical position we have to come into - so called by some scientists - geostrategical researches.

From the Foreign Politics point of view, geostrategy that differs from geopolitics and classical military geography is occupied in investigations of geosurroundings'

circumstances in own country and countries in neighbourhood. This fact, rather places geography simultaneously in classical geopolitics' frame than in military geography. But we must also remember, that so far, many scientists, particularly American, have used both names: geostrategy and geopolitics sometimes using them in changeable way. In many works, we can meet some models, which present the geopolitical development identified with geostrategy.

When we discuss about geographical and geopolitical position we come to conclusion that the geostrategical position is a result of three factors. They overlap geographical position the country or region in natural environment, political circumstances among particular countries in the specified time and military potential of the country and its neighbours'. From the military point of view, the place, which a country has in the geographical surrounding, can be described as a less or more profitable, in consideration of strategically way of thinking. The additional factors - except from the clear geographical conditions, which have any influence on the geostrategical position are elements connected with time: the level of economical development, the foreign policy. And finally, the number and structure of the population, which in fact, determinates the military potential of the researched country and its neighbours. The relations: country and its transport ways, the distance from the Sea, possessing any resources (fossil fuel and metals in general), large agglomerations which are the neuralgic points have a quite high influence on the geostrategical position - of course apart from physic - geographical position and the political position in the region. So, from the political and economical point of view, the place witch country have in geographical surrounding we can describe as a less or more profitable in consideration of geopolitical circumstances.

Among the people who continue the geostrategical researches in a wide meaning of the political geography, the research workers from the Western Europe and the USA dominate. Improving their examinations in the spatial aspect, they created many geopolitical conceptions e.g.: the conception of "heartland" by H. J. Mackinder, "the theory of borderland areas" by N. J. Spykman, "shatter - belt theory" by S. B. Cohen. The works of: P.O. Sullivan, J.W.Miller, A. Jenkins, D. Pepper, M. Roessler, J. R. Short or the researches of US Naval Institute are examples of the developed investigations which are connected with geo - military conflicts - in geographical aspect. But the works of P. Kennedy, S. P. Huntington, A. Ilies, W.A. Kolossov, Z. Brzeziński and G. Parker are the most important among the newest investigations. Also, among Polish research workers the problem of geopolitics has had some publications. One of the works by J. Wendt is scarified to geopolitical circumstances of the transit corridor in the central Europe and the second one by L. Moczulski which presents the geopolitics in historical aspect is a detailed and extensive as controversial. Taking into account above conceptions it can be said that the research problems are always lulled with the political transformation's, which happen in time. They absolutely lead us to the fact we should respect the methods of social science's as the best methods in political geography, geostrategy and geopolitics' researches.

The analysis of transformation in a dynamic aspect, putting political units together in the aspect of similarities and differences and searching for common geopolitical surroundings' features will play the dominate role considering the geostrategical and geopolitical subject of researches, homology and analogy among the political units and researched processes. J. Barbag follows G. Taylor says: "The problem is, in particular,

about confirming unanimity of surrounding and political forms but without deduction and aprioral methods and with using the prognostic extrapolation when predicting earlier known trends which were taking place in the transformation processes. It seems that the future step of care in generalising and drawing conclusions is the most important role of political geography and geopolitics, in particular. And as an American geographer R. Hartshorn wrote in his article in 1950: "...it's true, he hasn't created an atomic bomb in political geography, but his field is scattered by dynamite. It's not a place for any teenager's games."

Care in drawing conclusions, and the analysis of factographical materials is a result of a dual character of the geopolitical and geostrategical researches. From the one hand we can analyse "hard" measured part of factography which includes the environmental factors economical advantages and demographically potential. But from the second hand we must think about "soft" unmeasured factors like e.g.: the army spirit (bellicose), patriotic strain, the rate of war difficulties, the resistance of civilise, the soldiers training quality. And in geopolitics - territory quality, the relations with neighbours, permanence and reliability of signed international agreements and many other features, which can be only estimated in a tree - rate scale. Of course, there is common saying: "Good always stands on the strongest battalion side" but since David's and Goliath's we have known that not only a size of engagement in the flight but also many different factors. Unfortunately for the science based on model explanation of processes, - the factors which are not able to be quantificated, can decide about victory. When we try to present modern geostrategical, geopolitical and generally geographic methods of researches, we have a next problem. The problem is to designate the process essence and phenomenon's taking place in it. Following R. Chojnicki's division of scientifically explanation, especially, explanations in geography two ideas devoted to: nomological explanationism and postnomological explanationism, we can state that geostrategy and geopolitics will surly be closer to the analysis and explanations in postnomological expression than in nomological. Moreover, in the "internalistic version", nomological explanationism. Assumes that there are scientific rules in geography what, in fact, is very controversial in many cases. But, in the exterministic version" nomological explanationism puts geography in a consent role of rules and scientific theories taken from another branches of knowledge. As already quoted Z. Chojnicki writes in his work, this kind of explanation in the "relationism version" is quite common in geographical explanations. But in the "understanding version" which should be read as a closer to the notional relationism in which "understanding it's almost organised knowledge which means knowledge about relations between many different facts and rules. The relations are different kinds have decicatory, inductive, analogical. Although the postnomological aspect in comparison to the nomological as - in the metametodical aspect, considering its scientific character - less value. But to assume the development of cognitive description connected with the conception of systematic showing the reality and theories which can explain better the research processes than other ideas of explanation in geography. Similarly to the problem of choosing the right position in geopolitical and geostrategical methodology of researches. There is also a problem, which focuses with the specification of basic time, and space conceptions, which are the main reference system for the forms and geostrategical and geopolitical processes, and relations, which are taking place between them. In the considerations of specific investigations of these branches, which from the one side encircle the natural factors and post natural factors (economical

and demographically) and from the second side the factors, which are neither measured nor modulated. So, it seems to be proper to respect and represent Newton's conception of time and space to explain geostrategical and geopolitical phenomena on a micro level. In the relational aspect, after considering the time and spatial differences in a physical and social categories it will be adequate for these researches of the branches in mezzo and macro scale.

Thinking over the presented assumptions we should aspect the fact that the basic methods in geopolitical and geostrategical researches will be the interdisciplinary methods specific for both: natural and social knowledge. Balancing on the borderline of political geography, political science, army, sociology and history the explanation threats them in postnomological explanationism aspect and space and time in the relational aspect. But, as a great number of discussed works show the above research postulates while getting to know, explaining and eventually predicting researched phenomenon's and processes, are not always put on the first place which choosing adequate methods by the researches workers. Analyses, syntheses, deductives and dederatory belong to the most used methods. The social method of historical description supported by hypothetical, dederatory and inductive methods are a theoretical method very often used in geopolitics. The methods are vegonded to the detailed research processes of geopolitical transformation processes and for which the historical description has the prime value. Hypothetical, inductive and dederatory methods let verify the thesis by imprinting it in the known historical process or on the base of checked facts and proving the truth of the made thesis. The philological method very often met in historical researches let definite the range and setting of the ethnic minorities which is a very frequent subject of political and geostrategical researches. In geostrategy, using the statistic methods is very common. Also it's very common to use mathematical models, which are linked with classical for them, political and economical geography. Unfortunately, using mathematical and model methods, especially comparing measured elements of the researched phenomenon, very often meet a barrier, which is the result of choosing correct mathematical methods, which also results from specific of geopolitical researches - researches that take over factors not able to be qualificated. Because of that, in geopolitics and geostrategy the methods of aware arithmetic analyses, the measure of description, concentration and analyses of correlation rate are used most often. In comparison to its value, the geographical methods often-called cartographic method has a very small meaning. Probably its weariness is connected with a deterministic aspect very frequently shown in a negative way and used as on argument in expansion propaganda of some countries. But considering the coguitie advantages, it can be a very precious help in geopolitical researches and equally we can unique easy comparisons and considering many factors of the researched phenomenon's and processes. It's obvious that the geographical, mathematical and model methods will belong to the basic investigated methods of the geostrategy discipline. The comparative method, which has a lot of easy generalisations, is seemed to be dangerous. It's true that it's a basic condition to notice differences and similarities in order to use the method successfully. However in the geostrategical researches the method, especially in geopolitics, has many traps, which are linked with the great number of factors influenced on the researched phenomenon's and processes, what, in turn, is risky without taking all the circumstances in consideration. What is more, in the geopolitical researches, while comparing various areas or political units, we must always remember their not equal development in the historical process. So, the comparative

method is a very important tool, but always should be used with some kind of care in analyses and presenting conclusions. Interesting but often deceptive method in geopolitical researches is a method of drawing conclusion from the silence which comes from the methods of social sciences. This method let us get conclusions of dual kinds, because the lack the information about any phenomenon's or activities in the geopolitical World can prove either common functioning of this phenomenon's in common opinion or its lack. This kind of drawing conclusion is very useful coincidence the law outs linked the both side of the agreement or let estimate those outs by not doing any activities when such activities are expected to be.

Summing up the all above considerations we must say that they can be only an introductions to the elaboration of geopolitical and geostrategical methods. We also must indicate the basic problems linked with the methodology of these branches. Among all problems connected with geostrategical and geopolitical methodology we should put on the first place an issue - problematic according to many research workers - issue of scientific value of these branches. The issue, from the one side, is connected with the methodological weakness of these branches coming from the period of the XX century, and from the second side, fears connected their close deterministic aspect of the researches. Russia makes the fear deeper by the geopolitics and the Hitler propaganda connection, and using it to expansionistic politics leading by the USSR, and later after the year 1991. The next problem this time common for all geographical branches - is a problem of a precisely setting the field of researches and scientific aims; what - frankly speaking - can be difficult because of a wide range of geopolitical and geostrategical researches. Thanks to Z. Chojnicki's works, the issue of choosing adequate way of explains the process is a next barrier to choose correct research methods. The only clue for the research worker who deals with the geostrategical and geopolitical phenomenon's and processes, which all the theoretic of those branches agree with, is far moved care in presenting conclusions, while analysing and making any comparative researches. Similarly to political geography, the field of geopolitical and geostrategical researches seems to be rather a minefield than the floral may meadow or a scar mountain stoop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARBAG, J., (1987), *Geografia polityczna ogólna, /Political geography/,* Warszawa.
- BRZEZIŃSKI, Z., (1997), *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives,* Harper Collins Publishers, New York.
- CHOJNICKI, Z., (1999), *Podstawy metodologiczne i teoretyczne geografii, /Methodical and theoretical background of geography/,* Poznań.
- COHEN, S.B., (1963), *Geography and Politics in a World Divided,* New York.
- HAUSHOFER, A., (1951), *Allgemeine politische Geographie und Geopolitik,* Heidelberg.
- HUNTINGTON, E.B., (1945), *Mansprigs of Civilization,* New York.
- HUNTINGTON, S.P., (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order,* Harvard.
- ILIES, A., (1999), *Elemente de Geografie Politica,* Editura Universitatii din Oradea, Oradea.
- JENKINS, A., PEPPER, D., (eds.), (1985), *The geography of peace and war,* Oxford.

- KENNEDY, P., (1994), *The World Power*, Warszawa.
- KJELLEN, R., (1917), *Der Staat als Lebensform*, Leipzig.
- KOŁOSSOW, W.A., MIRONIENKO, N.S., (2001), *Geopolitika i političeskaja gieografija*, Aspekt Press, Moscow.
- LOTH, J., (1925), *Państwo Polskie w oświeceniu geografii politycznej*; *Studia społeczne i gospodarcze, /Poland in political geography/*, Warszawa.
- MACKINDER, H.J., (1942), *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, New York.
- MOCZULSKI, L., (1999), *Geopolityka, /Geopolitics/*, Dom wydawniczy Bellona, Warszawa.
- O'SULLIVAN, P., MILLER, J.W., (1983), *The geography of warfare*, New York.
- OTOK, S., (1998), *Geografia polityczna, /Political Geography/*, WN PWN, Warszawa.
- PARKER, G., (1998), *Geopolitics. Past, Present and Future*, London.
- RATZEL, F., (1896), *Über die Gesetze des raumlischen Wachstums der Staaten*, Petermans Mitteilungen, t. 42.
- RATZEL, F., (1897), *Über Geographie*, München.
- RATZEL, **f., (1901)**, *Der Lebensraum*, Eine biogeographische Studie, Tübingen.
- ROESSLER, M., (1990), " *Wissenschaft und Lebensraum*". *Geographische Ostforschung im Nationalsozialismus. Ein Beitrag zur Disziplingeschichte der Geographie*, Berlin.
- SHORT, J.R., (1993), *An introduction to political geography*, New York.
- SIEGER, R., (1924), *Unterschiede zwischen dem Wachstum der Staaten und dem der Aktionen*, Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.
- SPYKMAN, N.J., (1969), *The Geography of the Peace*, Harcourt.
- WENDT, J., (1999), *Geopolityczne aspekty tranzytu w Europie Środkowej, / Geopolitical aspects of Transit in Central Europe/*, iGiPZ PAN, Warszawa.
- *** (1928), *Bausteine zur Geopolitik*, Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.

Received:
U September, 2001