

## **Critical Attitude to the Function of Capital in the Urban Space of a Geopolitical Aspect<sup>1</sup>**

**Mojtaba Shoebi**- Ph. D Candidate of Political Geography, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

**Zahra Ahmadipour\***- Professor Political Geography, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

**Mohammad Reza Hafeznia**- Professor Political Geography, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

**Morteza Ghourchi**- Assistant Political Geography, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Received: 07/05/2021

Accepted: 02/12/2021

**DOR: 20.1001.1.17354331.1402.19.70.2.5**

---

### **Abstract**

From the geopolitics point of view, the city is considered a geographic space that a variety range of actors competes with each other for achieving power and benefits, and in this proceeding, economy and capital are in the spotlight. It can be said function of capital in urban space is much-expanded that causing the formation of contesting, so capital is studied in urban geopolitics. For this reason, capital is the major issue of this study and authors have tried to show how capital affects the spaces of urban geography with a critical approach. Ontologically, this study is descriptive-analytical research and has used library methodology to achieve the goals. Results demonstrate which, from a critical geopolitics point of view urban space is an important focus for presenting the appearance of spatial political economy, which in its framework a collection of spatial proceedings and functions of capital, is recognizable and displayable.

**Keywords:** Urban Space, Geopolitics, Capital, the Political Economy of Space.

---

1. This article is taken from doctoral thesis of Mojtaba Shoabi entitled “Geopolitical Explanation of the Role of Capital Flows in Urban Space Architecture (Case: Tehran City)” which has been done in the Department of Political Geography of Tarbiat Modares University of Tehran.

\* E-mail : ahmadyz@modares.ac.ir

## **1.Introduction**

The issue of capital and its functions in geographical space has long been considered by various researchers in the field of geography and has led them to study various aspects of this issue and its effects (Harvey,2019). In this process, each of these researchers tries to examine the different dimensions of this issue from different perspectives and discuss it in relation to other concepts Previously, Richard Pitt (2007) studied the function of power and capital, David Harvey (2001) the space of capital, and Mohammad Reza Hafezni and et al. (2012) the political economy of space. The analyzes of this group of researchers and other researchers show that the function of capital in space is so wide that it can have a wide range of effects and especially create consequences that are important to study further from the perspective of political geography and geopolitical knowledge. Hence, the researchers like Zahra Ahmadipour and Mostafa Ghaderi Hajat (2017) believe the scope of economic impact and functional elements like capital is so vast in geographical space in general and the city space, in particular, that can analyze and examine under the title “Geopolitics of the City”. These attentions to the capital issue, political economy, and city space show that because of explaining of evolutions scope that happens under the influence functions of economics it's necessary to study of different fields and approaches aspect. The role and function of capital, in the meantime, is one of those issues that has been less studied from a critical geopolitical aspect. So, the authors of this article have decided to study and analyze this issue from a critical approach and try to examine new aspects of this issue by considering the geopolitical approach and put on the audience.

## **2 .Theoretical Foundations of Research**

Space is one of the most geographical fundamental concepts that many geographers refer to as a relative concept (Mazúr and Urbánek,1983:139). Achieving the perception and meaning of space is possible only when it is examined in relation to other concepts. Likewise, it can be said that space is a concept that can only be understood in relation to other geographical phenomena such as landscape and human relations (Mazúr and Urbánek,1983:139). Even though these two concepts can't be used with the same meaning, space and place are two main and correlated concepts in human geography. Space is an abstract concept that in itself doesn't have a particular meaning. This is while place refers to how people are aware of or

attracted to/from a particular part of the earth. In this way, the place can be considered as a space that has a special meaning [for people]. "Phenomenological Theory" is the main theory on which this view is based. This theory seeks to find the basic features of direct and indirect experience in space. Yi-Fu Tuan (1977) and Edward Relph (1976) two theorists in the literature of human geography have been able to provide relatively comprehensive and complete definitions of space and place and determine their differences. In his research, Tuan sought to find the meaning of space, place, and environment. According to Tuan, the difference between space and place can be found according to the meaning man gives to some part of geographical space. These meanings are specifically got in the following two ways:

First: through a direct and unmediated way like through the human senses such as sight, smell, and hearing in a particular place;

Second: indirectly and in a perceptual way that is provided by symbols, art, and human biological experiences in the surroundings (Tuan,1977:6).

In this way, space can be considered as a place that has no special social meaning for human beings, because no value has been added to this space by humans (Tuan,1977:4). As Tuan pointed out, space should be considered as a place that has not yet been used by humans and has no direct relationship with human daily life. However, place is a position that can be defined as a place of creativity and human experience. Here the size of the place not only does not important but can also have different sizes. This place can be a neighborhood, city, area or even a classroom. In other words, place is an existence of space that is filled with the meanings and objectivity of human experience in a certain part of space. Places can be considered centers where people can meet their biological needs such as food and shelter (Tuan,1977:4). In this way it is not possible to limit the place to specific boundaries, and can find objective evidence of them over time. For example, human works and the functions that man has provided for a certain part of space as a place are examples of this. Edward Relph offers a similar view of place. The difference is that he believes that the relationship between people and places can be defined in terms of their belonging and non-belonging, which reflects their relationship with each other (Cloke and et al,1991). Relph emphasizes maintaining the relationship between space and place and does not view them as separate concepts. Because the quality of the place is due to the fact that it can provide the necessary ability for the

system and the focus of human attention, experiences and space activities (Seamon and Sowers,2008). Thus, as they (Seamon and Sowers,2008:44) have explained, space and space are dialectically structured in the human-environmental experience, because our perceptions of space are related to the places we inhabit and thus get the meaning of their spatial context.

In geography, the subject of this science is the knowledge of space and geographical places in all dimensions and scales (local, spheral, ultra-spheral) (Hafeznia and Kaviani Rad,2020). Place and geographical space are composed of three elements of humans, natural environment, and man-made environment that are interrelated. Each of these three elements has its own indicators and, in the meantime, the city and citizenship are indicators of the human element (Hafeznia and et al,2015:90). The role of man in the man-made environment is widely influenced by the cultural, political, economic, etc structures that govern space. In this way, it can be said that the place of the city reflects the processes governing the geographical environment that are the product of the political economy of space. The importance of politics in urban space is so wide that, according to Tonkiss (2006), urban spaces provide a place for political action and, by merging with politics, become a place to fight for access, control, and representation (Keating,1991). In other words, due to the competition and the impact of the political economy of space, the city is a spatial and political unit that achieves dynamism under the influence of the unequal geography of capitalism. This shows the importance and function of capital in urban spaces.

Adam Smith (Online Etymology Dictionary,2018) defines capital as that part of a person's securities that can generate income for him. Capital goods, real capital or capital assets are the part of wealth that arises in the production cycle and are used to generate wealth or the wealth production cycle. It should be noted here that capital is quite different from the concept of land or any other non-renewable resource (Boulding,2018). In other words, capital is produced and increased by human labor, while resources such as the earth cannot be increased, and this is their only value that grows under the influence of human economic performance in space. Another point that is important from the political economy of space is the difference between capital and capital goods with valuable but non-capital assets because capital goods can be used in the production process, but valuable assets such as houses or luxury cars are not usually, they are classified as capital but also as valuable goods because they can not be exploited in the

process of producing goods and services that can be sold. In developing this analysis, in the literature of Marxist political economy, capital refers to money used to buy items that are used to resell them for profit. For this reason, for Marx (2020), capital exists only within the framework of the economic cycle, which ultimately leads to the cycle of capital accumulation. According to Marx, this concept helped to form the economic foundations of the capitalist system. However, in most contemporary schools of economics, this form of capital refers more to the concept of financial capital, which is theoretically quite different from capital goods. In classical and neoclassical economics, capital is mentioned as one of the main factors (along with other components such as land and labor) that is used in economic production. Meanwhile, other economic factors also play a role in the production process, which are referred to as invisible variables. These variables include organization, entrepreneurship, knowledge, good intentions and management. From the point of view of classical economists, what makes capital an important factor in production is the following:

Like raw material or intermediate commodities, no commodity can be used directly, in the production process;

Unlike land or non-renewable resources, a commodity can be produced or progressed (Samuelson and Nordhaus,2009).

Marxist economists have added other differences to this concept helping researchers to present a critical understanding of the structure of the functioning of capital in the contemporary world:

Constant capital, which refers to capital goods; Variable capital, which refers to labor input. In this case, the cost is a variable that depends on the amount of salaries and wages paid during the term of the contract or employment of employees; Imaginary capital, which refers to invisible or abstract representations of physical capital such as securities (Marx,2020).

One of the factors that has made this particular classification important is its function in everyday urban life, because capital has its effects on both the material and spiritual dimensions of human life, and its effects are beyond the urban landscape created by capital and the governing structures. For this reason, some critical geographers believe that everyday life in the circulation of capital is reproduced in the capitalist system. This process of circulation has a kind of conflicting logic that implies struggle and class relations. In this regard, the main issue is to show how the process of capital circulation is in this conflicting logic, because the accumulation of capital in

a geographical process tends to produce urban space (Ahmadipour and Ghaderi Hajat,2017:71).

The importance of capital in the production of urban space and the creation of biogeographical experience in the city is due to the fact that cities, like various social spaces and divided economic spaces, often cause differences and separations. Cities, as David Harvey (2009) calls the urbanization of systemic injustice, reproduce patterns of economic and racial inequality (Tonkiss,2006:57). The problem of limited access to sources of power and capital in urban spaces creates competition that ultimately leads to the formation of spatial structures of the city in the form of the functioning of the capital system in an urban space. In this regard, David Harvey (quoted by Adele) believes that there is a relationship between competition and urban form that causes urban social alienation. Harvey joins urban issues to the critique of capitalist alienation in the early writings of Marx and Engels and critiques of this kind in the twentieth century too, and argues this function of capital in the city leads to the formation of injustice and the spread of inequality (Adele,2001:22).

According to (Pacione,2009), the function of capital in urban spaces has led to the perspectives that we know today as the capitalist construction of the city due to the various changes that cities have gone through. The issue of the importance of the impact of capital on the governing structures of the city and the formation of forms and economic, social, cultural, and political relations in the city caused that a large number of researchers in various fields of science such as political economy, sociology of the city, cultural studies and human geography pay to study urban issues affected by the functioning of capital. Such as patterns of industrial density and relationships of domestic companies, evaluation of urban market expansion, political economy of real estate and urban property relations; Social problems, including housing, transportation, education and investment in infrastructure; Changes in class struggle and other social conflicts in the areas of production, reproduction and urban governance; The role of government institutions, at different spatial scales, in intermediate urban reconstruction processes, reorganization of the urban governance regime; The evolution of urban social species and the consolidation of various forms of urban social movement have been wars and struggles (Pacione,2009). Geography experts have also tried to examine different aspects of the problem of spatial functions of capital in the city from the perspectives of

urban geography, human geography, political geography and even geopolitics.

Meanwhile, the geopolitical discourse, which previously focused on issues of transnational scale, as a result of the developments of the last few decades, it turned its attention to the phenomena and processes of space within the country, and tried to present new perspectives and analyzes on the issue of urban spaces to its audience and other researchers. Part of the importance of the function of capital for geopolitical knowledge stems from the fact that in recent years cities have shifted their position in both role-playing and global politics, and their scope of influence extends from the local scale to the global scale. There are cities in the world today that are referred to as "global cities" that have prestige and importance in the world. Their credibility also depends on the economic situation, infrastructure development, transportation, knowledge, the existence of multinational companies, de-industrialization of the city, and so on. Hence, we are faced with a kind of power and urban role-playing that can be studied in the context of the relations of power, competition and politics on an urban scale called urban geopolitics. Therefore, it must be acknowledged that the concept of power is at the heart of the city's geopolitical studies. Because cities are a geographical phenomenon that play an effective role in the power play between organizations and institutions related to land management (Ahmadipour and Ghaderi Hajat,2015:156). In other words, the location, processes and developments of the geographical space of the city in political, economic and cultural dimensions have caused its geopolitical importance (Kamanroudi Kajouri, Karami, & Abdi, 2010, p. 34). In this process, city power, regional and global competition, urban environmental values, urban conflict, policies related to urban development, history, urban culture, etc. form the foundations of the concept of urban geopolitics (Khalilabadi,2011:196).

The fundamental importance of the city in the processes of governing power and consequently for the study of geopolitics is due to the fact that throughout history, the city has always been the seat of rulers, a symbol and space for exercising power in the realm of government in the country, its regions and functions, as well as a suitable place to show the glory of power and ultimately a place to compete for power (Ahmadipour and Ghaderi Hajat,2015:156). This is what causes it for the thematic relationship between the city and geopolitical knowledge, three different relationships were

considered:

The relationship between the city and the government, which focuses on understanding the relationship between governmental and non-governmental institutions; The relationship between the official forces in the city and the daily activities of the city, which, while introducing and dynamizing the city, determines the tendency of the people towards non-governmental institutions; The relationship between the geography of violence and peace (Ahmadipour and Ghaderi Hajat,2015:159).

### **3 .Research Methods**

In this research, considering the subject and nature of the research, an attempt has been made to emphasize the analytical-descriptive research method more than anything else. In this process, the use of critical approach has provided an opportunity and background for researchers to study the role of capital in urban spaces from a new angle and to analyze and evaluate it from the perspective of geopolitical discourse, because critical approaches allow researchers to study aspects of the role of capital in geographical space that have been less considered in other studies. Thus, the critical approach used in this study provides an opportunity to, in addition to the productive effects that capital has to recreate the urban space, issues like the consequences of the importance of capital in the geographical spaces of the city and the resulting damage should also be studied. In this process, to achieve the goal, the most important tool for collecting the required data is the library studies approach, and to analyze the research findings, descriptive-analytical research method with a critical approach has been used.

### **4 .Research Findings**

From a historical perspective, the concept of city is tied up with two important factors, namely political power and capital (Habibi,2020). The role and impact of these two factors has evolved throughout history and even the complexity of their function and influence has been gradually increased, and its ultimate point can be seen in the appearance and introduction of a new concept called "world city". The term of world city was first used in 1886 by Illustrated London News to describe the city of Liverpool (Haggerty and et al,2009). The term found its way into scientific topics by Patrick Godes in 1915, but it took a few decades to draw the attention of researchers as an expert subject .



In any case, the concept, or more precisely the formation of the world city as a phenomenon, emerged since the late 1970s, when global capitalism began to experience the reconstruction and birth of a new stage of the international division of labor. In this period of globalization, the function of cities and the territorial sovereignty of nation-states underwent fundamental changes. At this time, the capitalist world consisted of a global network of companies and a global network of cities (Wang,2004:385). The first attempts to theorize the world city took place at the beginning of the 1980s. In 1986, John Friedman proposed the world city hypothesis (Timberlake and et al, 2012:74), which was supported and criticized by many researchers.

According to Friedman, cities such as Hong Kong, New York and London, which had high economic, cultural and capital potential, had the opportunity to expand their role beyond the borders of the territory in which they live and became a global city by active participation in global processes. This idea was carefully analyzed by other researchers and expanded, and eventually entered scientific and interdisciplinary studies. In the Following, by expanding this discussion and making it acceptable, Saskia Sassen (1991 and 1994) proposed a comprehensive definition, empirical study and a research plan for this paradigm (Hodos,2007:316).

In addition to the two important components of economics and politics, two local and national factors also play an important role in shaping the world city (Wang,2004:384). Today, what can be seen more than anything else is that globalization has left most of its effects on urban spaces. In other words, the focus of population and human activities in cities and the important role that they play in communicating at different regional, national and global levels suggests that globalization is rooted in the urbanization of capital. Thus, globalization has increased a new tendency toward urbanization in the global economy, in which the formation of the world city has been considered as a global feature and transnational connections and their position in the international division of labor is very important (Wang,2004:385).

In any case, it must be acknowledged that globalization is one of the most difficult modern concepts, and we can hardly provide a precise and comprehensive definition of it, and it has been abandoned in a range that is rich in practical bases (Ehteshami,2007:17). The prevailing definitions of globalization are significantly affected by this issue that in what scientific or executive field are these definitions and terms used? This indicates that not

only there is no comprehensive definition of this concept, but it is even possible that in different discussions, there are different perspectives and approaches to it, based on the function of the concept.

However, one of the definitions that use in this geographical study, seems to be a perspective that considers globalization as a term that used to describe a set of related processes that increase the dependence of social life in the (post) modern world (Pacione,2009:7). A world in which different phenomena and affairs are so intertwined that it is difficult to delimit between different domains. In this context, Robertson (1992:8) believes that the concept of globalization refers to the global interconnectedness and increasing global awareness in which different phenomena are communicating rapidly and on the global scales. The impact of globalization is so widespread that various fields such as economy, politics and culture are experiencing tremendous changes.

In this framework, globalization can be considered from various aspects that have a great impact on the survival of the capitalism of the city:

**Globalization of the economy:** Efforts to produce, exchange, distribute and consume goods and services (such as the growth of transnational corporations, the new international division of labor, the growth of foreign investment, the flexibility of production forms and a global financial system (Kresl and Gappert,1395).

**Globalization of politics:** Efforts to use and maintain power (such as the growth of transnational economic-political groups and addressing local issues in a global sense (Hall and Hubbard,1998).

**Globalization of culture:** attempts to produce, exchange, use and describe symbols that represent the truth, meanings, beliefs, priorities, manners and values (such as the global distribution of images and information, and the consequence of the cosmopolitanism of urban life) (Ritzer,2019).

The emergence and spread of the phenomenon of globalization, can be largely due to the presence of cities that are the center of local, national and global communication. In the last century, due to the expansion of global communications and the focus of capital in financial centers located in the megacities of the world, cities have increased their power day by day and have achieved financial, political, economic and cultural power that can limit the economic, cultural and political power of nation-states (Peet, 2007).

Some scholars believe that the development of cities such as Dubai, Cairo,

Dakar and Bangalore in the last few decades is an example of the rise of world cities and the expansion of the phenomenon of globalization, which has led to an increase in the importance of cities that are accumulating these sectors (capital, information, manpower, global communications and information, etc.) compared to other countries. According to by some researchers, the impact of globalization and capital flows is so widespread that it is weakening and destroying the foundations of the nation-state as a major social institution and replacing it with transnational, social, political, economic, financial and cultural structures (Salbuchi,2011:9).

This decrease in the executive power of governments in processes with different scales is accompanied by an increase in the power and role-playing of organization, institutions, and even the expansion of the number of international treaties that strive to make changes in the world economic, political and cultural relations, by creating convergence in the world economy and culture. On the other hand, cities that have an important position in their economic, social and political structures, tend to be directly involved in global processes by dividing the tasks and sometimes the power between governments and cities. This sometimes leads to globalization refers to a kind of globalization of cities.

Evidence shows that the goal of cities in gaining power is to compete with each other, and accept some of the responsibilities that have been fully in charge of national government in the last few decades, and stem from the power and influence that capital flows has brought to cities (Sassen,2017). Capital flow in recent decades, has given cities the opportunity to present themselves as a powerful non-governmental actor in the world system, and even to compete with each other and provide a special position for themselves in the world city system. (Sassen,2017:18).

In this process, capital, by creating new economic opportunities and providing new sources of income based on global interaction and communication, has enabled cities to not only review their traditional role, but also to help rebuild themselves by using the possibilities and opportunities provided by local, regional, national and global capital flows. A group of researchers believe that the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the first 1970s, which led to an increase in the importance of non-governmental organizations and currents, was one of the main factors in changing the situation of cities, which has finally paved the way for the expansion of the role of capital in cities.

In contrast, another group argues that globalization is only related to changes in the state of power of governments. There is also a third group that emphasizes the emergence of new forms of collective identity and political segregation, and by new information technologies, disrupts the foundations of national belonging as a paradigm of everyday social relations. These cases show that power and politics, under the influence of globalization of the economy and the impact of capital in global spatial flows, has a more fluid nature than in the past that its manifestations can be seen in urban spaces. For this reason, it can be analyzed in the framework of another concept called political economy of spatial.

Political economy is defined as an interdisciplinary knowledge (Katozian, 2020:36) which is based on understanding the processes of social change (Gilpin,1999:200) in the form of interaction between government and the economy in market performance. The center of political economy, i.e., the market, is the arena of the functional nature of the forces and features of each market (global, national, regional and local markets). The political economy of spatial, with its double emphasis on the creation of geographical space and its effectiveness in political economy, is a reflection of the interaction between the socio-economic transformation of a nation and the current economic and social philosophy, which is always reflected in the geographical space with ideological transformations (policies, free market, regional development, etc.) in regional politics (Hansen and et al,1997:20). In the political economy of space, the most obvious theoretical view in the development of regional space is related to the neoclassicists who by considering regions as large production units, believe that balancing between the regions in terms of employment and income is the result of poor market performance and recommend more regional equality with the movement of capital, migrant labor and equalization of prices through exchange (Adele,2001:68), and market failure, inefficiency of regions due to inflexibility, lack of risk-taking culture and extreme government intervention are the reasons for the difference in regional economies (Pike and et al,2016:68) and considers uneven development as a transition phase to the final balance (Sarraf,1998:23). In contrast, followers of old left and neo-Marxist approaches believe that capital is always looking for unequal geography and emphasizes the government's strategic role in reducing inequalities through regional policies by analyzing the international division of labor and industrial rotation (Pike and et al,2016:68). In the interim,

moderate attitudes, especially those based on social schools of the market (Western Europe and Japan), consider the correct role of the market and social balance based on the performance of the government in the economy . The political economy of development in the neoclassical perspective, with the intellectual background of renovation in the pattern of Rostov's five stages, in the struggle between government and market efficiency and inefficiency, took on an ideological aspect in the 1980s and paved the way for the collapse of state-oriented governments (Pike and et al,2016:545).

The result of this theoretical and practical rotation is the prevalence of neoclassical economic policies and the increasing tendency towards privatization (structural programs) in the economy (Mir Emadi,1995:117). In the interim, the political economy of developing countries (with a lot of variety) has been mainly influenced by such a pattern (Rostov growth pattern with the leading, complementary and acquisitive sector model). Loss of balances in the economic and social systems of these countries causes political economy of spatial to show the unbalanced spatial and regional pattern, in the shadow of the growth of the national economy (Ziaei,2004: 127).

Considering the above and referring to the published works by Nathaniel Beck and et al. (1995), (1996), and (2006), Christine Skrede Gleditsch (2002 a) and (2002 b), we can say that the geographical space has an undeniable correlation with political economy.

In this definition, any geographical space can be seen as the product of processes that are present in the country's political economy. In other words, the set of relationships that exist in the political economy of a geographical space determines the historical circulation of a place and thus causes spatial changes and developments to be influenced by the structures that determine economic policies in space. In addition, active researchers in the domain of political economy of spatial have concluded that by recognizing and examining the political economy of spatial, we can analyze the process that affect human daily life in space (Beck and et al,2006).

The substantial mobility of capital in the geographical space makes important the issue of wealth creation and value-added from the point of view of political economy of spatial, and this issue significantly increases the domain of competition in urban spaces, and any action that disrupts the relationship between political power and economic capital will ultimately lead to the action of capital. The reason for this is that in the era of

globalization, transnational corporations are global economic actors who have a very high power to influence other countries (Aghaei and Akbarian, 2011:9). This can also be generalized to smaller-scales. Because the cost of production increases in the prosperous regions of the city and this issue encourages capital to immigrate to cheaper regions for its own reproduction and use labor, land and resources to reproduce and grow wealth and transfer earned profit and income to the main areas of economic power. The city of Tehran is one of the prominent examples in this case. Since this city has been fundraising and attracting surplus production produced in the surrounding areas of the country after the Second World War, and has expanded its range of power in the geographical space of Iran, by concentrating manpower. The final result of this economic approach is the massive capital transfers by institutions that are associated with political power (Held and McGrew,2003:55). In other words, markets integration has led to an uninterrupted increase in the volume of trade and production of these institutions (Pilger,2021:175). As we can say that institutions and corporations that are in a spatial competition for the capital acquisition and control (Blacksell,2010:233), have made capital growth and expansion of activity as their main goal. The result of such a process in the global capitalist system is the unquestioning adherence of the institutions of power dominant geographical spaces, especially cities, to the policies and approaches of the financial institutions that are responsible for directing the mainstream economics in space. Therefore, the interaction of capital, political power and space contribute to the formation of space architecture in the city and make it a functional and important part of the geography of power. In geographical space, the distribution of power, resources and interests, capital flows, the performance of decision-maker institutions, etc. lead to the formation of a phenomenon that can be called "space architecture."

Space architecture describes the relationships within which power institutions share power, influence, and control geographical spaces. In other words, space architecture represents a set of power relations in a geographical space. Because any institution and structure that is more effectively present in the geography of power and environmental knowledge, can affect the spatial patterns of power and competition (Peet,2007).

This leads to a space being influenced by the spatial flow of capital and the

formation of competitions that can be described in the framework of the political economy of space. In other words, the city becomes a functional and representative center for capital, in which capital not only completes its spatial function, but also manifests its power, influence and presence. More explicitly, urban spaces are a reflection of the competitions that flow in the economic center of space and make it possible for a place to define its identity, function and capabilities in the framework of spatial role-playing of capital and actors who are competing for achieve it, and revise this definition over time due to the fluid nature of economic competition in space.

### **5 .Conclusion**

This research shows that from a critical geopolitics point of view, the urban space is an important focus for presenting the appearance of spatial political economy, which in its framework, a collection of spatial proceedings and functions of capital, is recognizable and displayable. The importance of finding the relation between city and capital for Geopolitical knowledge is due to the fact that capital and capitalist relations in space could have significant influences on power competition in urban spaces. Making and expanding of power contests in urban spaces take place more than anything in order to gain benefits, that not only is supplying goals of groups and actors, even could help them for definition, providing and exploiting new goals and benefits, as a functional tool. So, it can be said that city as the most focal dimension of spatial human activity, it has always been economic importance and in the during of time of this importance causes a variety range of actors are competing altogether for affecting on urban space and achieving to power resources. Spatial contests that are created in a city for gaining from opportunities and advantages of capital, causes the city to not only does it undergo a variety of changes over time, but also it becomes a breeding ground of power struggles, which are formed more than anything around the subject of the political economy of space. Among these, Geographical indication of the political economy of space has a major role in capital flow and achieving economic benefits. Therefore, it can be said that city is the reflector of changes and proceeds that the main part of it is been economic and it is affected by the function of capital. Thus, a portion of the growth and deterioration of urban depends on the function of capital and contests of capitalists, which in the city is used from the economy as an effective factor in power.

From the geopolitics point of view, it should be noted that a part of the competition of space is related to the function of capital because contest, without achieving economic advantages is impossible and each actor in urban space tries to guarantee its economic advantages, in addition, provides a cycle of increasing of power and benefits. On the other hand, can be assumed that in the city, economic benefits arising from the function of capital cause the emergence of power and link geopolitics and political economy. However, it is be noted that spatial role-playing of capital in the city, can not be considered a single pattern. Because the coordinate and properties of the geography of each space are different from each other, so these differences cause the different political economies of spaces. Geographical differences in this here, mean that role and function of capital in each geographic space- Regardless of the fundamental similarities of the function of capital in space, and place- can be unique. In the other words, it seems that can not use an absolute and single pattern for the function of capital in urban geographic spaces and its role in a contest of power. As a result, analyzing of power contest on geographic spaces and interaction with capital, it is necessary that each geographic space is studied singular and independently.

## **6 .Acknowledgment**

This article is taken from doctoral thesis of Mojtaba Shoaibi entitled “Geopolitical Explanation of the Role of Capital Flows in Urban Space Architecture (Case: Tehran City)” which has been done in the Department of Political Geography of Tarbiat Modares University of Tehran. I am especially grateful to Prof. Zahra Ahmadipour, who did not hesitate to help and guide me during my doctoral studies as a supervisor. Also, I am very thankful to Prof. Mohammad Reza Hafeznia as the group manager and advisor, who has always treated me sincerely and enlighteningly. I would also like to thank Dr. Morteza Ghorchi, the second advisor, for all her support, especially in choosing the subject of my thesis.



### References

1. Adele, M (2001). *Urban and Regional Political Economy*. (F. Raisdana, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Qatreh. **[In Persian]**
2. Aghaei, S; Akbarian, A (2011). Political Economy of Multi-National Companies & Developing Based Government. *Political Quarterly*, 41(1), 1-20. **[In Persian]**
3. Ahmadipour, Z; Ghaderi Hajat, M. (2015). *Political Organizing and Planning of Urban Space*. Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Samt. **[In Persian]**
4. Ahmadipour, Z; Ghaderi Hajat, M. (2017). *Political Organizing and Planning of Urban Space*. Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Samt. **[In Persian]**
5. Beck, N; N. Katz, J (1995). What to do (and not to do) with Time-Series Cross-Section Data. *American Political Science Review*, 9(3), 634-647. doi:10.2307/2082979.
6. Beck, N.; N. Katz, J. (1996). Nuisance vs. Substance: Specifying and Estimating Time-Series-Cross-Section Models. *Political Analysis*, 6, 1-36. doi:10.1093/pan/6.1.1.
7. Beck, N; Skrede Gleditsch, K; Beardsley, K (2006). Space Is More than Geography: Using Spatial Econometrics in the Study of Political Economy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(1), 27-44. doi:10.1111/J.1468-2478.2006.00391.X.
8. Blacksell, M (2010). *Political Geography*. (M. Hafeznia, A. Ahmadi, A. Abdi, & H. Rabiei, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Entekhab. **[In Persian]**
9. Boulding, K. E (2018). capital and interest. Retrieved July, 22, 2018., from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/capital-economics>.
10. Cloke, P; Philo, C; Sadler, D (1991). *Approaching Human Geography: An Introduction to Contemporary Theoretical Debates*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
11. Ehteshami, A (2007). *Globalization and Geopolitics in the Middle East: Old Games, New Rules*. London and New York: Routledge.
12. Gilpin, R (1999). The Nature of Political Economy. (M. Taghavi, Ed.) *Political and Economic Information*, 134 & 144, 200-207.
13. Gleditsch, K. S (2002 a). *All International Politics is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. University of Michigan Press; Illustrated edition (August 7, 2002).
14. Gleditsch, K. S (2002 b). Expanded Trade and GDP Data. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(5), 712-724. doi:10.1177/0022002702046005006.
15. Habibi, S. M (2020). *From City to City: Historical Analysis of Concept City and its Physical Form*. Tehran, Iran: Tehran University. **[In Persian]**
16. Hafeznia, M. R; Ahmadipour, Z; Ghaderi Hajat, M (2015). *Polotics and Space*. Mashhad, North Khorasan, Iran: Papoli. **[In Persian]**
17. Hafeznia, M; Kaviani Rad, M (2020). *Philosophy of Political Geography*.

- Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Research Institute for Strategic Studies. **[In Persian]**
18. Hafeznia, M; Mokhtari Hashi, H; Roknaldin Eftekhari, A (2012). Geopolitical Challenges of Regional Integration Case study: Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO). *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 8(25), 1-41. doi:20.1001.1.17354331.1391.8.25.1.7 **[In Persian]**
  19. Haggerty, S; Webster, A; White, N (2009). Retrieved from *Reviews in History*: <https://reviews.history.ac.uk/review/737>.
  20. Hall, T; Hubbard, P (1998). *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*. Chichester, England; New York: Wiley.
  21. Hansen, N, Higgins, B, Savoie, D (1997). *Regional Policy in a Changing World*. (Translators Group (Under-the-supervision: Parviz-Ejlali), Trans.) Program and Budget Organization, Center for Socio-Economic Documents and Publications. **[In Persian]**
  22. Harvey, D (2001). *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. Published, 2001 by. Edinburgh, England: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
  23. Harvey, D (2009). *Social Justice and the City*. University of Georgia Press.
  24. Harvey, D (2019). *The Enigma of Capital: And the Crises of Capitalism*. (M. Amini, Trans.) Tehran: Kalagh. **[In Persian]**
  25. Held, D; McGrew, A (2003). *Globalization/ Anti-Globalization*. (M. Karbasian, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Ghoqnoos. **[In Persian]**
  26. Hodos, J (2007). Globalization and the Concept of the Second City. *City & Community*, 6(4), 315-333. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6040.2007.00230.x.
  27. Kamanroudi Kajouri, M; Karami, T; Abdi, A (2010). Philosophical-Conceptual Explanation of Political Geography of City. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 6(19), 9-44. doi:20.1001.1.17354331.1389.6.19.7.7. **[In Persian]**
  28. Katozian, M. A (2020). *Iran's Political Economy: from Constitutionalism to the end of the Pahlavi Dynasty*. (M. Nafisi and K. Azizi, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Ney. **[In Persian]**
  29. Keating, M (1991). *Comparative Urban Politics: Power and the City in the United States, Canada, Britain and France*. USA: Edward Elgar Pub.
  30. Khalilabadi, H (2011). *Urban Geopolitics*. Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Noavaran Sharif. **[In Persian]**
  31. Kresl, P; Gappert, G (1395). *North American Cities and the Global Economy: Challenges and Opportunities*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
  32. Marx, K (2020). *Capital: Critique of Political Economy, Volume 2 (Vol. 4)*. (H. Mortazavi, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Lahita. **[In Persian]**
  33. Mazúr, E; Urbánek, J (1983). Space in geography. *GeoJournal*, 7(2), 139-143. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00185159>.
  34. Mir Emadi, T. (1995). *Political Economy Structural Adjustment Programs and the Latest Developments in Theories of Development Economics*. Political and

- Economic Information, 95 and 96, 117-121. **[In Persian]**
35. Online Etymology Dictionary. (2018). Retrieved 2018, from <https://www.etymonline.com/>.
  36. Pacione, M (2009). *Urban Geography: A Global Perspective*. New York, USA: Routledge.
  37. Peet, R (2007). *Geography of Power: Making Global Economic Policy*. London: Zed Books.
  38. Pike, A; Rodriguez-Pose, A; Tomaney, J (2016). *Local and Regional Development* (2 ed.). Routledge.
  39. Pilger, J (2021). *The New Rulers of the World* (4 ed.). (M. Shahabi, & M. Shahabi, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Akhtaran. **[In Persian]**
  40. Relph, E (1976). *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.
  41. Ritzer, G (2019). *The McDonaldization of Society: Into the Digital Age* (9 ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
  42. Robertson, R (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Sage Publications, Inc.
  43. Salbuchi, A (2011). *The Coming World Government: Tragedy and Hope?* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Second Republic Project.
  44. Samuelson, P; Nordhaus, W (2009). *Economics* (Vol. 19). McGraw-Hill Education.
  45. Sarrafi, M (1998). *The Fundamentals of Regional Development Planning*. Tehran: Regional planning Group. **[In Persian]**
  46. Sassen, S (2017). *Losing Control? Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization*. (M. Irani Fard, Trans.) Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Ghasideh Sara. **[In Persian]**
  47. Seamon, D; Sowers, J (2008). *Place and Placelessness*, Edward Relph. *Key Texts in Human Geography*, 43-51. doi:10.4135/9781446213742.n5.
  48. Timberlake, M; Sanderson, M. R; Ma, X; Derudder, B; Winitzky, J; Witlox, F (2012). Testing a Global City Hypothesis: An Assessment of Polarization across US Cities. *City & Community*, 11(1), 74-93. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6040.2011.01394. x.
  49. Tonkiss, F (2006). *Space, the City and Social Theory: Social Relations and Urban Forms* (Vol. 1st edition). London, England: Polity.
  50. Tuan, Y. F (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. London: Univ of Minnesota Press.
  51. Wang, J. H (2004). World City Formation, Geopolitics and Local Political Process: Taipei's Ambiguous Development. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(2), 384-400. doi:10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004. 00525.x.
  52. Ziaei, M (2004). *Regional Planning Analysis in Iran*. Ph. D Thesis. Tehran, Iran: Tehran University. **[In Persian]**