

Reflection of History and Historical Factors in the Paradigms and Thoughts of Political Geography

Omran Rasti * - Assistant Professor of Political Geography, University of Birjand
Fatemeh Sadat Mirahmadi - Ph. D of Political Geography, University of Tehran

Received: 11/05/2019

Accepted: 19/10/2019

Abstract

Through time, there has been a deep and complex relationship between history and geography. Today also most sub-branches of geography need to take history into consideration. In the meantime, since the invention of the term political geography, there has been a deep relationship between the discipline of political geography and history. However, explanation of this relationship has less been attempted by political geographers. The present study is a theoretical basic research which uses analytic-descriptive approach to investigate the impact of “history” and “historical factors” on the making of political geography. The results indicate that the way history and historical factors are used and the goals pursued by taking them into account in the paradigms and philosophical-intellectual views imparted into political geography have been different. History has played a major role in the thoughts offered in almost all views and approaches of political geography so that by removing this factor, many of the analyses in political geography would be incomplete.

Keywords: History, Historical factors, political geography, Geopolitics, philosophical-intellectual views.

*E-mail : orasti@birjand.ac.ir

1.Introduction

It is usually said that history is the science of time and geography is the science of space. However, from the past time, historians have been geographers and geographers have been historians (Ganji, 2009). Herodotus, the Greek historian who is known as “the father of history” is also known as the father of geography, as he studied historical events in the geographical context to investigate the environmental factors affecting those events (Mirheydar et al., 2014). Since then, the relationship and overlap between geography and history have been complex and unavoidable. Geographers are usually in need of historical explanations for understanding and explaining issues like the relations between human and environment, spatial distributions, and the characteristics of landscapes. Similarly, historians need to understand geographical -contexts in their studies (winder, 2009). Besides historical geography which focuses on the study of past geographies and their impacts on the formation of the geographies of today and the future (Gregory et al., 2009), other sub-branches of human geography also need to take account of history factor. In this vein, the discipline of political geography has had a deep relationship with history since its inception.

Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, who coined the term political geography in 1751, had a specific look into the history. He divided the study of political geography into two major areas: “theoretical political geography” (the study of the relationship between the statecraft, the natural environment, and the human) and “historical or positive geography” (the historical study of the emergence of the existing political structures). In his view, geography and history are the same mental entities. He considered history as the accumulated record of geographical knowledge, and in other words, the description of the sequence of past geographies (Heffernan, 1994). The plan for a book of political geography that Turgot presented in his paper consisted of extensive notes about seven political maps of the world in different historical periods (Hafeznia, 2014). In this plan, in discussions of the first political map of the world which is about the historical study of the relationship between natural world, distribution of population across the world, and formation of nation-states, Torgot’s theory about “human progress” has been presented as a comprehensive “historical and geographical theory”. This paper about political geography as well as a very relevant work about the world history provided a framework for such a

theory (Mirheydar, 2010). Turgot's theory about "progress" was a turning point in new philosophy of history (Meek, 1973). According to this theory, all factors combine in a progressive program to pave the way for the progress of human kind. The emphasis on human history in this theory leads to attention to geographical, social, political and economic condition which in turn results in the empowering and development of nations (Clarke, 1993). In fact, it was not accidental that the first statements of a four-stage theory of human development have emerged in a note on political geography. Because the scientific understanding of "the world geography" was the key to Turgot's whole theory (Heffernan, 1994). While in Torgot's thoughts political geography was a tool to understanding human history, the next generations of political geographers consider human history more as tool to better understanding of political geography. Since then, there has been a complicated relationship between political geography and history. Although the existence of a relation between political geography and history might be taken for granted, it has been less attempted by political geographers. The way history and historical factors have been used in the making of political geography has always been affected by different paradigms and approaches entered into this discipline, each of which presenting differing views about the nature of this relationship. In this respect, the present paper seeks to find answer to the following research question: "since the establishment of the discipline of political geography, what was the impact of using history and historical factors –in different paradigmatic formats- on the making of political geography?"

2.Methodology

The present study is a "theoretical basic" research using "analytic-descriptive" approach as its methodology. Due to the nature of the topic, data was collected through library and internet research. The required information was extracted from books and papers and categorized, and then was analyzed qualitatively.

3.Research Findings

3.1. Determinism

Since the 19th century to the middle of the 20th century, like many disciplines, especially history, that paid attention to the relation between human and environment, the texts of human geography were replete with

ideas about relationship between people and the natural environment. Geographers focused upon the issues of “control”, “impact”, and even environmental “determination” and later, the intervention of human in the environment and its change. These issues dominated political geography (Cox, 2005). Political geographers tried to explain political and social phenomena using arguments of natural sciences. They made attempts to show how natural geography offers direction and agenda for governments. On the other hand, by the introduction of the discussions of evolutionary biology into geography, not only was nation-state considered as an organism with its own needs and demands, but also ideas related to racial competition were introduced into political geography (Agnew and Muscarà, 2012). During this time, there were two major intellectual trends in political geography whose founders were German “Friedrich Ratzel” and English “Halford Mackinder”.

Ratzel affected by environmental determinism and Darwinism, considered state as an organism. He believed that the state organism is dependent upon the expansion and development of “lebensraum”. Accordingly, in its best condition, the state expands itself physically to adapt with the new level of needs and acquire additional space. State’s inability to acquire new lands and expand them means losing its life basis and hence, its decline. As states grow through time, the accessible territory for physical expansion gets more limited the result of which being aggressive competitions for territory among states (Bassin, 2006). Hence, conflict and war is inevitable as the state, like organism should grow to survive (Mirheydar et al., 2014). In Ratzel’s (1986) view, states with wider territorial spaces are more powerful; but these states also collapse and this process of merging and collapse, growth and shrinkage is the characteristic of many historical movements which are represented geographically as the exchange of smaller and larger levels. Thus, studying the history of any country reveals the fate of growing development of its geographical situation and Conflict on lebensraum is the engine of change and development in human history (Ó Tuathail, 1996). Ratzel’s organism view of the state was continued and developed by Rudolf Kjellen, the coiner of the term geopolitics and Karl Ernst Haushofer, Ratzel’s strict followers.

Mackinder as one of the key figures of geography, in general, and political geography, in particular, in paper presented in 1887 to The Royal

Geographical Society, considered geography as a science for bridging the gaps between natural and human worlds, and by emphasizing the history of empire argued that teaching of geography must be in line with revitalizing the power of British Empire (Mackinder, 1887). In 1904, he presented a paper entitled “geographical pivot of history” to The Royal Geographical Society, and the edited version of this paper was published in 1919 in the format of “Heartland Theory” (Dodds and Atkinson, 2003). In that paper, he indicated the importance of the internal basin of Eurasia, and considering the core of Eurasia as the Pivot Area named Heartland in 1919, defined geography and the history of land power (Flint, 2006). He considered understanding of this issue as the focus of understanding the new system (Blacksell, 2004). Mackinder (1904) divided history into three different epochs: The Pre-Columbian epoch when the “land” power dominated; the Columbian epoch (the 400-year history prior to 1900) when the “sea” power was dominant; and the Post-Columbian epoch when the importance of sea power decreased and land power gained importance. In this respect, the end of the 19th century is the end of a great historical period due to the end of the growth period of imperialism, completion of the world map, and end of geographical discoveries. In the Post-Columbian epoch (the 20th century) one should interact with a “closed system”. Mackinder stated that “we are for the first time in a position to attempt, with some degree of completeness, a correlation between the larger geographical and the larger historical generalizations. For the first time we can perceive something of the real proportion of features and events on the stage of the whole world, and may seek a formula which shall express certain aspects, at any rate, of geographical causation in universal history.” (1904:422).

By this analysis, Mackinder, in fact, was trying to specify time through spatial concepts, in other words, he was spatializing or geographicalizing history. In his narrative, the universal landscape is composed of two different scenes: on the one side there exist natural, climatic, geographical, material and spatial (back)grounds, and on the other, there are human, historical, political and cultural foregrounds or superficial layers. By studying the trend of historical changes and analyzing world political condition and relating it to natural geographical factors, he tried to analyze the background which shape the historical foreground, and finally concluded that in all times, social movements, affected by similar natural features, have

played roles (Ó Tuathail, 1996). Mackinder's principles gained many proponents in a short time, but also many criticisms were leveled against them on the part of many geographers, and by making some changes in his theory, some (like Nicholas J. Spykman and Donald W. Meinig) tried to match it with the historical, geographical and political realities of the world (Mirheydar, 1968).

3.2. The regional view

Since the 1930s, geographers in Europe and the U.S. were somehow freed from determinism and stepped toward a new paradigm of Chorology, i.e. interpreting and explaining the causal relations among phenomena in a given area. Richard Hartshorne, who introduced the concept of Chorology into geography, considered it as a synonym to "regional geography" (Shakoui, 2004). In this regard, the focus of attention in geography is determining regional differences (Johnston, 1991). Hartshorne (1939:636-637) believed that "Whereas the historical studies consider temporal sections of reality, the chorographical studies consider spatial sections ... geography, like history, is essential to the full understanding of reality." In France, Paul Vidal de la Blache, who considered regional geography as the focus of geographical science against systematic geography, used inductive and historical methods (Shakoui, 2004). Also, following other disciplines, functionalism and structural functionalism gradually found their way into geography. In particular, French scholars of regional geography, evidently influenced by functional social anthropology, considered the region as a functional unit (Holt-Jensen, 2018). The result of the introduction of the new chorological view into political geography was the interest among political geographers in studying states, first as "regions". Indeed, political geography was considered as "the science of political regions" (Dikshit, 1982). In this view, political geographers paid special attention to history in their analyses of the construction of the state.

Two major approaches can be recognized in attention to history in the regional paradigm of political geography. The first approach was attention to the changes of political regions throughout history. Derwent Whittlesey established this "historical-morphological approach". Educated in history, his mental background differed from individuals like Ratzel. Whittlesey mastered political geography science by studying "history" and his political geography was affected by historical geography (Ashworth, 2013). In fact,

he, smartly, combined the intellectual trend of geography with his own international, intellectual and cultural viewpoint enriched with historical data (Ackerman, 1957). Whittlesey (1939 quoted in Dikshit, 1982:17-18) considered “political regions” as the main subject of political geography, and more importantly, thought of state as a political region. He believed that every political region consisted of a spatial pattern including center, administrative regions, problematic regions, vulnerable regions, capitals, borders, etc. all of which playing a part in its success. All these features are formed under the influence of specific condition of natural environment. Hence, political geographers should study specific countries in the context of their natural environment.

Whittlesey, by adopting a historical approach, investigated the way countries emerged (Mirheydar, 2005). On this basis, political geography of the countries cannot be understood without looking back into their histories, and studying today’s landscape required investigation of past landscapes (Dikshit, 1982). In other words, studying a country’s political geography relies on a series of reconstructions of past geographies (Winder, 2009). According to Whittlesey, landscape consists of numerous recorded phenomena shaped throughout the history of the place and integrated into one another. For studying landscape, one should investigate the major fields that have occurred in the past and remain in today’s patterns. Whittlesey considered “effective central authority” as the main function of the government which is to be discovered by political geographer when studying landscape (1939 quoted in veicy, 2017:127). Whittlesey by using “Ecumene” as a key term and adopting a historical-morphological approach presented his views on the emergence, growth, and development of the states. That is, a state is formed and developed around a “core Ecumene” (Muir, 1991). Geographers like Pounds and Ball, Taylor, and Smith developed such studies about core areas after 1960s.

The other geographer of regional school, Richard Hartshorne, considered region as a functional unit and emphasized the necessity of adopting a functional approach to political geography (Holt-Jensen, 2018). While he did not overlook a state’s evolution, focused more on its function. That is, a state can be studied in two ways: either based on its development through time which is a “historical approach”, or according to its shape and structure which is a “morphological approach” (Muir, 1991). However, Hartshorne

(1950) criticized pure morphological approach for offering a vague description of what is only on the map and argued that if this approach is used for understanding state's function, geographers will be led toward geographical determinism. What is important in the first place, is a state's function. The functions of a state are also largely affected by its structure which is itself the outcome of its "past" development. The scientific study of a state should be started with its functions to understand how these functions are affected by the region's properties, structure, and content. The historical facts about the growth of that region should also be used for understanding structural features. In other words, although Hartshorne did not consider a state as an organism, he looked at it as an organization with growth, development, and function. States, whenever possible, expand their territories regardless of the need to do so, and then adapt their functions with the new structure. Therefore, one cannot explain a state's structure and function solely by studying its growth. He also believed that the state does not determine its regional structure, rather it should function within the structure brought by its history and geography.

The second approach toward history, which is different from the views of Whittlesey and Hartshorne, was developed by Jean Gottmann. Gottmann, educated in geography and history, was one of Vidalian geographers and had a more historical and humanistic approach toward the making states. As Muscarà (2005) states, Gottmann's emphasis was on factors that are transferred throughout history to generations and effectively help to fix and maintain a spatial organization. The distinguishing characteristic of Gottmann's political geography was its extensive reading of political theory and personal history and considering territoriality as something that is always historically conditional (Agnew & Muscarà, 2012). A major part of Gottmann's research was devoted to the problem of how political partitioning occurs (Muscarà, 2000). To answer this question, he focused on two contrasting forces: circulation and iconography. While circulation stimulates change and leads to the formation of new forms of spatial organization, iconography is a conservative force whose function is deepening and maintaining the spatial organization developed in the past (Mcneen, 1961). The emphasis in this idea is on investigating a pair of confrontations, i.e. material and spiritual elements. Political partitioning of geographical space is the result of the interaction between the forces of

external change (circulations) that trigger the movement of people, goods, ideas or information, and a set of symbols related to territory and system of beliefs (iconography) created by human societies and transferred via generations to create a group identity. These symbols which seek to stabilize the territory oppose any significant change. Another pair of contrasts can also be seen in Gottmann's work. To explain the historical fluctuations created in closed and open territorial systems, he used the continuous fluctuation in another pair of confrontations: the need for liberation and security on the one hand, and the search for resources and opportunities, on the other (Muscarà, 1998).

His historical approach to political geography, especially in his conception of iconography, is evident. Gottmann, who emphasized human psychology, put emphasis on the spiritual forces by denying materialism. In order to implement the vague concept of the “spirit of a nation”, he attempted to explain iconography (Muscarà, 2005). In his article in 1951, he stated: “the spirit of each nation is so different from the spirit of the other nations. ... This national or regional spirit is always made of many components: a historical background, and its interpretation, common to the members of the community, but alien to those beyond the border. The common link is preserved and often reinforced by the education that family and school give to the younger generations...” (Gottmann, 1951: 162-163 quoted in Muscarà, 2000: 289).

Therefore, people who record the past have a central role in providing iconography, and these people choose how to transfer this historical background to the growing generations. But iconography is strengthened by political reasons (Muscarà, 2000). Gottmann's historical approach to political geography can also be seen in his other works, such as “The Significance of Territory” (1973) in which he examines the significance of territory throughout history, including in historical and political writings.

3.3. Spatial view

In the 1950s, following the emergence of quantitative revolution and spatial view in human geography, a shift took place both in thought and in methodology (Mirheydar et al., 2014). The emphasis of spatial tradition was on the role of relative position, distribution of objects in relation to each

other and the relation of objects with each other (Cox, 2005). Considering geography as a “spatial science”, older views, such as regional and environmental, were overshadowed, and geographers focused more on discovering and analyzing space and using quantitative methods and focusing on spatial analysis were considered as the criteria for the scientific method (Agnew & Muscarà, 2012). Since in this view the emphasis is placed on the spatial arrangement of phenomena, they are often examined as established. On the other hand, this view tends to be a Law-based geography, seeking laws of the phenomena and applying such laws universally and comprehensively (shakoui, 2004). As a result, less emphasis is placed on the unique regional and natural characteristics as well as cultural and social processes (Pourahmad, 2006). For this reason, with the introduction of spatial view, the importance of historical text and historical features was reduced (Gregory et al, 2009).

In the 1950s and 1960s, the spatial perspective became the dominant view of human geography, with the exception of historical and cultural geography, but this intellectual change entered political geography with some delay (Agnew & Muscarà, 2012). Since the late 1960s, political geography adapted itself with new developments. Quantitative works were initially of limited use in political geography, and the use of quantitative methods and spatial analysis was largely limited to the geography of elections, voting and division of regions (Cox, 2005). In the development of space view, political geographers focused more on spatial processes and structures. In political geography, spatial analysis had two characteristics: spatial analysis of political phenomena, and attention to the spatial characteristics of political processes (Muir, 1975). For this reason, political geography did not have much to consider in the history of its studies. Nevertheless, some geographers tried to investigate the roots and evolution of the state during the historical process using the quantitative-spatial method. For example, Edward Soja (1968 quoted in Painter, 2005: 47) examined the territorial integrity of the state in East Africa through a quantitative analysis of the flow of communications.

3.4. Radical view

Since the late 1960s, a resistance to the “technical” version of geography which was based on positivism and quantitative methods, formal modeling

(often based on neoclassical economics) and the search for basic spatial laws of human behavior and organization arose (Lee & Philo, 2009). Geographers came to the conclusion that scientific and social laws are neither fixed nor eternal, but the rules of a particular spatial context, which are likely to change, so they cannot be universally applicable (Johnston, 1980). On the other hand, at this time political activists in social sciences, including geography, in response to issues like inequality, racism, the Vietnam War, environmental degradation, gender discrimination, the civil rights movement in the United States, etc. joined radical movements. Radical geographers and students realized that Positivism-based spatial view was unable to analyze such issues (Peet, 2009).

The radical geographers' critique of positivism was derived from social theory and Marxist principles (Golledge, 2008). With the introduction of Marxism into geography, historical geographical materialism became the focus of attention of geographers, an intellectual project which tries to present a Marxist science of geography by integrating historical and dialectical materialistic trends with clearly geographic concepts and sensitivities. Historical materialism emphasizes the importance and position of material production (material contradictions in the mode of production or the new modes of production) to understand their communities and their historical development. The challenge to apply historical materialism in the field of geography was that Marx's approach was not as geographically as it had to be. In fact, Marxist theory should examine the spatiality of the processes analyzed (Kirsch, 2009). The addition of a spatial dimension to historical materialism caused more complexities in its application in geography. David Harvey has made effective and sustained attempts to place space within geographical historical materialism (Gregory et al, 2009). In Harvey's view, "The Marxian theory teaches us how to relate theoretically, accumulation and the transformation of spatial structures and ultimately, of course, it provides us with the kind of theoretical and material understanding which will allow us to understand the reciprocal relationships between geography and history." (Harvey, 2001: 248-249). During the 1970s, a series of articles, mainly published in *Antipode*, examined the spatial implications of the studies of Marxist theorists and issues such as the contradictions in the historical dynamics of capital accumulation and the representation of these contradictions in space. They addressed the issue of

how these contradictions and spatial effects, i.e. unequal development, contribute to the formation of fundamental social contradictions. A group of studies conducted mainly by Harvey and his students, expanded the discussion of contradictions in unequal development. Another category of investigations influenced by the ideas of French philosopher and sociologist Henry Lefebvre and geographers influenced by him like Edward Soja formed the topics and theories on the complex production of space and social-spatial dialectics (Peet, 2009).

With the introduction of Marxism, especially structural Marxism, into geography and political geography, historicism was also strengthened. As Smith (2009: 246) states, “a structure was something theorized as a component in a macro historical process, itself theorized as an ‘engine of history’”. All talk of structures therefore implied historicism, the idea that history is governed by some fundamental ‘logic’ or plan”. The introduction of Marxist ideas into political geography initially led to a revision of the “state”. With his interpretations of Marxist theory of the state in the mid-1970s and emphasis on the analysis of the ways through which states preserve and guarantee many capitalist relations, Harvey inspired political geographers to focus on the state using a Marxist view (Painter, 2005). Radical political geographers specially examined issues such as spatial structures as consequences of state activities, spatial patterns created (including spatial inequalities and their roots) at various scales, and the spatial structure of the world’s economy (center, periphery, semi-periphery / north / South), spatial organization of capitalism and spatial power relations. Ronald John Johnston referred to “theory of the state” as the central issue of political geography (Mirheydar, 2010). Johnston’s book “Geography and the State” in 1982, by examining the nature and roles of the state, the relationship between the state and the contemporary world economy, the development of the forms of state in relation to the history of the stages of capitalism, and the geography of the forms of the state in relation to the global economy of capitalism showed that the state is essential for the reproduction of capital (Taylor, 2006). Johnston (1984) analyzed the functions of the capitalist state using the infrastructure-superstructure model (the material infrastructure-ideological superstructure) and argued that the state as the central element of political geography could only be understood as part of the superstructure of a materialist infrastructure. The state has two

crucial roles in capitalism (the promotion and legitimation of accumulation) and for the advancement in political geography, it is necessary to understand these two roles as the cause of the state's existence.

John Rennie Short's book, entitled "An Introduction to Political Geography" in 1982, showed that political processes cannot be examined independently from economic processes (Taylor, 2006). He emphasized the analysis of strands that bind spatial structures, political processes, and the economic system. He examined the formation and development of the global economy since 1500, as well as the development of industrial capitalism, imperialism and neo-imperialism based on Immanuel Wallerstein Center-Periphery model, and contemporary economic relations and the effects of economic imperialism and decolonialization on the center- periphery relations. He showed, based on the concept of "unequal exchange" and on the basis of a historical analysis, how the form of labor division and trade in the economic world has led to transfer of value and wealth from the periphery to the center. He argued that the history of colonialism and neo-imperialism has imposed a definite structure on the world economy, in which the peripheral economies are oriented towards the needs of the center. The expansion of capitalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries led to the expansion trade around the world. In this situation, peripheral areas played a special role in the economic order of the world because their economies were based on the needs of the central countries, i.e. the export of materials to these countries (Rennie Short, 1993).

Clark and Dear (1984) proposed a theory to explain the characteristics and evolution of a capitalist state, and showed how the "social spatial structure" of the contemporary society is determined by the state apparatus. Using a "historical materialism" approach and a "hermeneutical-historical" methodology, they considered the capitalist state as an "institution" within a particular "historical and geographical context" and emphasized that social processes should be understood within a historical analysis of production and reproduction of social relations. Clark and Dear considered and analyzed the state as an institution embedded in structural capitalist relations (Painter, 2005). In this materialistic approach, the form and role of the state are derived from the capitalist social organization and the historical interpretation of the development of the state is taken into consideration. That is, by changing political conditions and methods of capital

accumulation, the form of the state can also change resulting in transformation of the roles of the state and its apparatus, including the proper arrangements of the representation and legitimacy. In fact, in this theory, the state is formed as a historical entity and at the same time it is an autonomous actor (Clark & Dear, 1984).

Peter Taylor has attempted to define a materialist framework for the discipline of political geography since the early 1980s. Taylor's geographical view of (1982) has a spatial orientation and considers the "geographical scale" as the principal organizing element of political geopolitical issues. Taylor used Wallerstein's world - systems theory as "a way of placing events in their proper geographic and historical context" (Driver, 1988: 500). That is, a "space-place matrix" is considered for political geography which is constructed based on Kondratieff waves and spatial position (center, periphery, and semi-periphery). This matrix is used to analyze various types of Political actions from global to family scale (Jones et al., 2004). Historical events are analyzed based on this matrix, which includes three spatial zones, as well as stages of economic growth and recession (Taylor & Flint, 2000). According to this matrix, the modern world - system is not formed and transformed passively; rather, it is the result of contradictions in the development of its material basis and has a cyclical nature. In a series of economic waves, after a rapid growth, an economic slowdown or recession is created. Each wave is the result of a reconstruction to solve a crisis. The main structural waves of the system are Kondratieff waves which are about 50 years old and include a phase A of the overall system growth (about 25 years) and phase B of the general system recession (about 25 years). Longer waves are the product of the collapse of hegemonic regimes, which completely combine superstructure processes with the development of material infrastructure. The Netherlands and after that Britain and the United States of America as the three world hegemony create a three-dimensional "temporal" structure for the modern world system, which is merged with the three dimensional "spatial" structure. The outcome is the creation of a "nine-dimensional spatial-temporal regional structure" in which geo-political issues are embedded and analyzed (Taylor, 2006).

In fact, Taylor's global system approach, by examining the growth and collapse of hegemonic states, and considering the different structural

position of countries in the global hierarchies and the changing histories of economic growth and decline, reconfigures arguments about the structure of states and their role in international relations and international political economy. In this view, governments are shaped not only by internal processes, but also by inter-state relations, requiring political geographers to re-examine the structure and function of states, including different forms of territoriality within the context of the global system (Glassman, 2009). Therefore, the global system approach provides a geo-historical framework for exploring issues of political geography. As Taylor argues, “world – systems analysis integrates time and space into its general social processes. Thus space is not a mere stage on which events unfold, every historical system has a specific spatiality associated with its temporal trajectory.” (Taylor 2006: 52).

3.5. Humanistic view

In the 1970s, humanistic geographers criticized both the spatial and the Marxist view. They emphasized the importance of human agency and the need to study perceptions, values and meanings. On the one hand, humanistic geographers criticized “spatial determinism” of spatial analysis (Cox, 2005), and, on the other hand, criticized the automatic functioning of large-scale historical processes, i.e. historical meta-narrations; and believed that historical and structural theories, by weakening human action, leads geographers to believe in political fate and political passivity. In contrast, they argued that humans deliberately act on the basis of their intentions, interests and values (Smith, 2009). In this view, the emphasis is put on the interpretation of one’s self, the induction of meaning by the individual and action based on those meanings, as well as on the activity controlled by the individual and the behavior resulting from the ability of the person to influence. The humanistic view of geography, in particular, led to focus on “place” (Cox, 2005). This view did not have much to do with geography. Among the sub-branches of human geography, cultural, social, and especially historical geography paid more attention to this view (Johnston, 1986); and in political geography this view was not very much considered. However, Anthony Giddens’s structuration theory created a transformation. That is, while there were two human geographies - one that was manifestly humanistic, and the other which focused on logic and structural constraints –

Giddens's structuration theory proposed that this dualism should be replaced with their duality (Gregory et al, 2009).

In this regard, John Agnew (1987), influenced by Giddens, presented a theory of place-based political behavior. Based on this theory, political activity is socially structured in places and people learn their policies in the place (Dikshit, 2006: 37). Accordingly, territorial states are also made up of places. In this theory, places are defined as entities which are formed "historically". The place is considered as a geographic or local context in which the social structure is questioned by the agency. Therefore, the political behavior is the result of the agency's activities, which is itself the result of social contexts created historically within which people live. In this theory, three aspects of place including local, location, and sense of place are identified: local is the smallest area in which social relationships are formed. Location refers to the function or the role of place in the world, and the relationship between the local and other place or places in the geographic space. The sense of place is also the link between people and place and mental direction created through living in one place (Agnew, 1987). Agnew's attempt to combine Giddens's theory with political geography and the consideration of places as historically created entities even today has a great importance in the studies of political geographers (Pringle, 2003).

Even though today a limited number of geographers use humanist perspective in their studies, the role of place, people, meaning and interpretive methodologies in the studies of political geographers, as the legacy of this view, still remains important and valid. On the other hand, humanistic geography was combined with neomarxism and postmodernism in the 1990s and played a role in shaping new cultural geography (Smith, 2009). The cultural turn in human geography turned attention to "meaning", and culture was introduced as a reservoir of making meaning to man. With the argument that the creation and extension of meaning systems in societies is based on the identity (Gallaher et al., 2009), and considering the fact that identity is related to place, the issue of place retained its importance in political geography. Political geographers have particularly focused on the relationship between place and national identity. In this regard, specifically those places that are considered as the symbols of a nation's historical development and represent the achievements of the nation (such as national

museums) and the fundamental cultural facts of the nation (such as history and popular culture museums) are of interest to political geographers (Jones et al., 2004). Another example is the study of the meaning of important historical monuments, and in particular the manipulation of their political meaning. For instance, the efforts made by the Italian state to define national identity through the historic work of Vittorio Emanuele II in Rome and the changes made by the Russian state in the design and architecture of the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow to reflect the identity of the Russian nation, have been analyzed by geographers (Sidorov, 2000).

3.6. Critical views

Until the late 1980s, the philosophical certainty and specific political commitments related to the economic-political perspectives were questioned and criticisms were leveled against these views for degrading “political” situation for “economic benefit” (Agnew & Muscarà, 2012). On the other hand, higher level of interaction between the new political geography and the social sciences affected its growth, and the term “critical” became commonplace (Flint, 2006). With the transition from the 1980s, humanistic geography was weakened, and at the same time, as it was mentioned, was combined with critical views. Radical perspectives continued to expand. However, instead of Marxism, more attention was paid to the “political economy perspective”, and geographers in their studies emphasized the priority of material relations and issues such as the role of competition, exchange of goods and social power of money. On the other hand, the emergence of a new cultural geography and its impact on political geography exposed this field to posts -postmodernism, post-structuralism and post-colonialism- which emphasize power relations of and its formation (Cox, 2005). The emergence of a new cultural geography led to close interaction with the “New Historicism”, an approach to literary and cultural studies that began in the 1980s in the United States and refers to intellectual traditions that emphasize the importance of historical contexts for the interpretation of cultural texts and procedures (Gregory et al, 2009). New historicism arose with the transition of traditionalist historicism from post-structuralist critiques. In this transition, history reached textuality and was considered as an ideological construct and a set of discourses. New historicism believes in the inseparability of history from the context, and in

fact, believes in the “historicity of the text” and “the textuality of the history”. New historians, under the influence of Foucault, focus on the issue of discourse and power (gaining, preserving, and exercising power) and look at text as a space for displaying power relations and the interactions of different discourses (Mirzababazadeh Fomeshi, & Khojastehpour, 2015). The new historicism approach does not, like the traditional approach, consider the author in the top, nor, like structuralist approach, abstracts the text from the author; rather, the author and the work are both the consequent of cultural and ideological discourse of their age and form part of the process of that dominant discourse (Rezvanian, 2014), the same issues that the new cultural geography emphasizes.

New cultural geography emphasizes power relations and their formation. The emergence of posts (postmodernism, post-structuralism, and post-colonialism) is of particular importance in the restoration of cultural geography. In these views, “discourse analysis” is central and the discourses that are influenced by various knowledge fields, whether general or academic, are the subjects of study. In particular, unpublished assumptions, emphases, and silences of discourses are considered in the analysis (Cox, 2005). According to these views, “every social theory is minor and is in a special geohistorical context, reflecting power relations, and in short, a “discourse”. Accordingly, social theories are interpreted as representations of special facts that are gender, race, or class-specific or define a particular western perspective, and recreate a set of unequal social relationships. In other words, “post” s-based thinking analyzes the social construction of knowledge by social groups in particular temporal-spatial contexts. Accordingly, “Knowledge is always context specific and reflects what is called positionality.” (Cox, 2014: 104). Before the emergence of these views, researchers paid less attention to the relationship between knowledge and power. But people like Michel Foucault and Edward Said showed how political knowledge is, and includes “discourses” or a set of thoughts, words, and terms formed in distinct historical-geographical contexts. The reason for the continuation of knowledge is that it is adopted by others and becomes part of general knowledge that defines a field like political geography (Agnew & Muscarà, 2012).

New historicism is especially applied in colonial discourse studies and post-colonialist perspective (Gregory et al, 2009). The post-colonial approach

addresses a precise and critical reading of colonial discourse and understanding of the complex histories through which colonialism has continued from the past. This approach is sensitive to “political consequences” of the manner in which history was made (Cullen et al, 2013). Analysis of the intersection of colonial power with the production of geographic knowledge as part of a broad effort in writing more critical histories of geography forms the focal point of postcolonial geographies (Blunt, 2005). In this regard, Edward Said's work inspired geographers to examine the relationship between knowledge and power (Jazeel, 2013). Edward Saeed analyzed the West-created “imaginative geography” about the East and showed how the Westerns described the East as a fantasy, foreign, mysterious, and dangerous land, and in contrast, distinguished the West from “outsider” areas considered a normal situation for it. Said argued that the imaginative geography of the West and the East are both products of the Orientalism discourse and signify a spatial policy (Blunt and Wills, 2016). Geographers inspired by Said have shown that geography has served colonialism in the nineteenth century (Jazeel, 2013).

Most postcolonial geographic research has sought to discover the silence of colonial files (Jacobs, 2001). Derek Gregory's works about the Arab and Muslim worlds has been very influential in this regard. In this regard, one can refer to European and American representations of non-western spaces, especially Egypt, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Warf, 2009). Gregory has shown how Western “imaginative geographies” tied to sexualized, patriarchal, and often racial images that effectively alienated Arabs in their own homeland, and how these textual and discursive practices have profound material implications, i.e. the exercise of control over Arabs. Gregory has indicated that orientalism is still continued as in the past in the policies pursued by the U.S. for reigning the Middle East (warf, 2011). In the “Colonial Present” (2004), Gregory analyzed the production of colonialism in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Palestine. By focusing on Afghanistan as a country that has always been the place of colonial and imperial power struggle, he points out how Afghanistan, in the late 20th century, as in the 19th century, was the scene of an international geopolitical rivalry, and both the U.S. and The Soviet Union treated it as an “other” foreign policy arena, and this country was used as an “other” space and society for colonial purposes. Gregory has examined the consequences of this “othering”

process and insists on simultaneous attention to history and geography and the various ways of integrating differences and distances (Gallaher, et. Al., 2009). Gregory (2004: xv) puts stress on the Marx's statement that "people make their own history", but still insists that "people make geographies, too and their actions literally take place."

There is a close connection between feminist and postcolonial critiques. Feminist criticisms, like postcolonial criticisms, associate knowledge and identity with the power relations. Both feminist and postcolonial critiques try to decentralize the apparently universal knowledge of the West and its embeddedness in a historic, spatial, or gendered situation. Using postmodern and post-structuralist approach, feminists, in particular, argue that the truth is subjectively interpreted depending on the position of the knower. Therefore, thoughts always depend on historical, personal and cultural contexts (Sharp, 2006). For example, feminists believe that recent writings on the history of geography have neglected the gendered construction of history (Domosh, 1991).

One of the concepts emphasized by Post-Structural Perspective is governmentality. Foucault's concept of governmentality has inspired geographers to review the relationship between the state and society (Gill, 2010). Geographers have especially paid attention to this relationship over the past times. Based on this concept, discourses not only form micro spaces, but also societies; and governmental discourses are made of "rationalities" and "technologies" (Murdoch, 2005). In this regard, one can point to a study by Boelen (2014). He has considered governmentality in relation to cultural politics and has examined the interactions between water, power and cultural policy in the Andes Mountains. By examining water control practices in Peru, Boelen has indicated that local worldview, water flows, and water control practices are intertwined. Since the ancient times, elites have tried to subject the people of Andes to create proper histories and "socio-natural orders" linking local water practices, worldview and belonging resulting in the establishment of governmental rationalities to guide the population's behavior. In the contemporary world, water policy still continues, and the governmentalities' attempt to stabilize or change the "water order" frameworks is at the heart of the water struggles.

Among the sub-branches of political geography, critical geopolitics has a special interest in new historicism. Critical geopolitics' engagement with

ordinary geopolitics occurs within a context of the literature of states' historical development, governmentality techniques, and the histories of the development of technology and territoriality (Ó Tuathail & Dalby, 1998: 3-7). Critical geopoliticians especially emphasize geopolitical knowledge/power. Accordingly, geography is a social and historical discourse and a form of knowledge/power that has always been closely linked with questions about politics and ideology. Critical geopoliticians, referring to the history of geopolitics, argue that geopolitics has always been a form of highly ideological and deeply politicized analysis. The purpose of producing geopolitical theories (from Ratzel to Mackinder, Haushofer, etc.) was to produce knowledge to help statecraft and increase the power of the state (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992). In this regard, Ó Tuathail (1996) considers one of the great ironies of modern geography its blindness to the history of geography for a long time. Using Derrida's views on deconstruction, Ó Tuathail emphasizes geopolitics' "textuality". That is, geopolitics itself is a term with multiple meanings. Reviewing the history of geopolitical development indicates a wide range of meanings and applications. Therefore, it can be studied only when it is embedded in a general context. Using a deconstructionist approach, the problem is addressed as to how geopolitics and "geopolitical tradition" have been textualized with different meanings in different "times" and in different texts. This argument reflects the fact that the researcher should be sensitive to heterogeneous geopolitical histories as a twentieth-century concept. Ó Tuathail also addresses problematizing geopolitics. He has questioned geopolitics by putting a hyphen between geo and politics (geo-politics). This Derridean tactic rereads geopolitical history and destabilizes it.

It should be noted that some scholars have combined political economy with critical viewpoints and provided novel pieces of research. John Agnew's work has been very influential in this area. Since the end of the 1980s, Agnew used the perspective of political economy in critical geopolitics and with a critical reading, provided a systematic historical account of geopolitics and analyzed geopolitical ontology, which he called "modern geopolitical imagination" (Ó Tuathail / Toal, 2005: 66-67). For Agnew (2003: 135), the modern geopolitical imagination is "The view of the world and its geographical workings that accompanied the rise of the state and capitalism in Europe and that was both stimulated by and informed the

European encounter with the rest of the world". This modern geopolitical imagination, begun from the sixteenth-century Europe, is a constructed view of the world and a system of depicting the world that has deep historical roots in European encounter with the world as a whole. The key feature of European modernity is the insistence and endeavor to rule the rest of the world, and the realization of this goal has changed over time with the transformation of the dominant technology, the method of economic organization, etc.... - as the material context. Agnew has analyzed the specific function of this imagination over the past two hundred years (Ibid).

In this approach, the characteristic of international political economy over the past two hundred years is the mastering space. Agnew and Corbridge (1995) analyzed the geographical processes inherent to discipline, subjection, exploitation and development of places that have existed in different ways during this period. In Agnew and Corbridge's view, geopolitics is regarded as both a procedure and a global materialist order as well as a discursive set of understanding and framing rules whose result is "geopolitical economy" approach, i.e. the combination of geopolitics and political economy (ÓTuathail, 1998). This approach to geopolitics is based on four theoretical assumptions: first, foreign power and the ability of government to rule their territory vary historically and geographically; second, the running forces of international political economy are changeable; third, the determining factor of the success or failure of different places and regions in the international political economy is not dependent on natural resources; rather it depends on the historical accumulation of assets and the ability to adapt to changing conditions; and fourth, as the patterns of trends, transitions, interactions, and the function of international political economy change, new representations of global spatial division and patterning emerge. In fact, this approach focuses on the geopolitical order of historical geography and examines the evolution of international political economy from 1815 around spatial ontology.

Accordingly, three "geopolitical orders" can be distinguished during the period from 1815 to 1990: The European concert - the British geopolitical order (1875-1815); the geopolitical order of the inter-imperial rivalries (1945-1875); and the geopolitical order of the Cold War (1945-1990). Each of these three geopolitical orders has been associated with a specific type of geopolitical discourse: Civilisational geopolitics, naturalized geopolitics,

and ideological geopolitics (Agnew & Corbridge, 1995). In fact, Agnew and Corbridge tried to explain a specific meaning of geopolitics by proposing a comprehensive “historical” and “material” theory of geopolitics (ÓTuathail, 1998).

4. Analysis

From the points mentioned so far, it can be understood that the use of the factor of “history “and “historical components “has had an important influence on the development of almost all views entered into the field of political geography (with the exception of the spatial/quantitative perspective). But the way the factor of history has been used in different views entered into political geography has been different. The use of the factor of history in the construction of political geography within the framework of paradigms entered into this field can be summarized in the following table.

Table 1. The use of the factor of history in the making of political geography in different views

View	The use of the factor of history in the making of political geography
Determinism	Environmental determinism (Developed by Ratzel): Considering the struggle for space, as a factor in changing human history Spatial determinism (Developed by Mackinder): Attention to geographical causality of the history of international politics
Regional view	Historical view to the construction of the state: 1. Using the historical-morphological approach to examine how the state emerged and the process of its evolution and as a political region through time. 2. Understanding the state’s structural features by relying on its political geography in the past. 3. Understanding a set of symbols, beliefs and thoughts that are passed on through generations and play a role in stabilizing and preserving a state as a spatial organization.
Spatial view	Ignoring the factor of history
Radical view	Spatiality of historical materialism: 1. Reviewing the formation and development of the global economy and global business and labor division from 1500, to analyze the center-periphery relationship based on the concept of unequal exchange 2. Investigating the development and transformation of the form and role of states in specific geographic contexts throughout history as a product of political changes and the transformation of capital accumulation methods 3. Reviewing the role and functions of states in international political economy, given the different structural position of states in the global hierarchy and the changing histories of economic growth and decline.
Humanistic view	Considering places as historically created entities
Critical views	Geo-historical situation of political geography knowledge: A critical analysis of the social construction of knowledge by individuals in specific historical and geographic contexts (Embeddedness of political geographical knowledge in historical situations)

Source: research findings

5. Conclusion

Since the invention of this term, political geography has had a profound relationship with history. Perhaps the first reason for this relationship is the fact that every political phenomenon, like a spatial dimension, has a temporal dimension. But the goals of considering historical factor and the way it has been used in each intellectual-philosophical views and approaches of the political geography have been different. In determinism view, geographers, using deductive reasoning, tried to use geographic knowledge to realize the goals of the national state and determine laws that would guide the orientation of the national state. In this view, history was used as an evidence for the consolidation of these laws. There were two approaches to history in this view. The former considered the conflict for space as a cause of change in human history, and the second approach sought geographic causation of the history for the changes of international politics. In the regional view, political geographers, through inductive reasoning, focused on the state as a political region, and in particular, national politics. In this view, the country's history in the context of their natural environment was taken into account in the analysis of the country's construction. That is, in order to understand the political geography of countries, the evolved structures of the past and the symbols transmitted from the past should be studied in order to help the effective management of the state and maintain the integrity of the state. Since the spatial view emphasized more on the spatial arrangement of phenomena, history and historical components did not play much role in this view. But with the advent of radical political geography, the importance of historicism in political geography was renewed and the role of historical materialism was highlighted in analyses of political geographers. Political geographers, focusing on material-historical spaces and using structural analysis and the disclosure of general structures - which create phenomena but are not visible - seek an accurate understanding of the spatial power relationships at various scales and the effect of these relationships on the creation of various spatial patterns, as well as on political action and reactions, in particular with regard to the form, role and function of states and the history of capitalist stages, and attempted to portray the spatiality of historical materialism. In the humanist view, places were considered as historically

formed entities, and the purpose was entering into the worlds of individuals using interpretative methodology and understanding of subjects such as the political behavior of individuals as the product of living in specific social context. In critical view, the geo-historic position of the knowledge of political geography was focused on. In these views, the purpose of attention to historical factor is to provide a critical evaluation of the knowledge of political geography as a knowledge produced in particular historical and geographical contexts and to challenge the representations of macro theories and skillful narratives. Finally, the issues raised in this paper show that the factor of history and historical components have played a decisive role in the development of all intellectual-philosophical views entered into political geography (with the exception of the spatial view) and the elimination of history from the discussions and ideas raised in these view will lead to their deficiency.

6.Acknowledgment

The authors would appreciate University of Birjand, for financial and spiritual supports for this research.

References

1. Ackerman, Edward A. (1957). Obituary: Derwent Whittlesey. *Geographical Review*, Vol. 47, No.1.
2. Agnew, John A., & Muscarà, Luca. (2012). *Making political geography*. Second Edition, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
3. Agnew, John A. (2003). *Geopolitics: re-visioning world politics*. Second edition, New York: Routledge.
4. Agnew, John A. and Corbridge, Stuart. (1995). *Mastering space: hegemony, territory and international political economy*. London: Routledge.
5. Agnew, John A. (1987). *Place and politics: the geographical mediation of state and society*. Boston and London: Allen and Unwin.
6. Ashworth, Lucian M. (2013). Mapping a new world: Geography and the interwar study of international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1.
7. Bassin, Mark. (2006). Politics from nature environment, ideology, and the determinist tradition. In J. Agnew, K. Mitchell & G. Toal (Eds) *A companion to political geography* (pp 13-29), third Edition, Malden: Blackwell publishing.
8. Blacksell, Mark. (2004). *Political geography*. London: Routledge.
9. Blunt, Alison, & Wills, Jane. (2016). *Dissident geographies: an introduction to radical ideas and practice*. Routledge.
10. Blunt, Alison. (2005). Colonialism/Postcolonialism. In D. Sibely, P. Jackson, D. Atkinson, & N. Washbourne (Eds) *Cultural geography: A Critical dictionary of Key Concepts* (pp175-181) London: L.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
11. Boelens, Rutgerd. (2014). Cultural politics and the hydrosocial cycle: Water, power and identity in the Andean highlands. *Geoforum*, Vol. 57.
12. Clarke, Ignatius Frederick. (1993). The future formula; or, are there lessons in history? *Futures*, Vol. 25, No 10.
13. Cox, Kevin R. (Ed). (2005). *Political geography: Critical concept in the social sciences*. London and New York: Routledge.
14. Cox, Kevin R. (2014). *Making human geography*. First edition. New York: The Guilford Press.
15. Cullen, Declan, Ryan, James, and Winders, Jamie, (2013) *Postcolonialism*. In N.C. Johnson, R. H. Schein & J. Winders (Eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography* (508-523), First Edition. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
16. Dikshit, Ramesh Dutta. (1982). *Political geography a contemporary perspective*. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Publishing company.

17. Dikshit, Ramesh Dutta. (2006). Political geography. Third Edition, Ninth print, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
18. Dodds, Klaus. & Atkinson, David. (Eds.). (2002). Geopolitical traditions: Critical histories of a century of geopolitical thought. London and New York: Routledge.
19. Domosh, Mona. (1991) .Toward a feminist historiography of geography. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, Vol. 16, No 1.
20. Driver, Felix. (1988). The historicity of human geography. Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 12, No. 4.
21. Flint, Colin. (2006). Introduction to geopolitics. Routledge
22. Gallaher, Carolyn. Dahlman, Carl T., Gilmartin, Mary, Mountz, Alison, & Shirlow, Peter. (2009). Key concepts in political geography. Sage.
23. Ganji, M. H. (2009) Application of Geography in History. Monthly Book of History and Geography, [In Persian], Vol. 134, No. 4.
24. Gill, Nick. (2010). New state-theoretic approaches to asylum and refugee geographies. Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 34, No. 5.
25. Glassman, Jim. (2009). Taylor, P. International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Vol 11.
26. Gottmann, John. (1973) The Significance of Territory, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville VA
27. Golledge, Reginald G. (2008). Behavioral geography and the theoretical/quantitative revolution. Geographical Analysis, Vol. 40, No. 3.
28. Gregory, Derek, Johnston, Ron, Pratt, Geraldine, Watts, Michael & Whatmore, Sarah. (2009). The dictionary of human geography, 5TH Edition, Malden: John Wiley & Sons
29. Gregory, Derek. (2004). The colonial present. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
30. Hafeznia, Mohammad Reza. (2014) A new approach to the history of the emergence and founder of political geography in the world. Geopolitics Quarterly (An International Journal), Vo. 10, No.1. **[In Persian]**
31. Harvey, David. (2001). Spaces of capital: Towards a critical geography. Routledge.
32. Hartshorne, Richard. (1939). The nature of geography: A critical survey of current thought in the light of the past (Conclusion). Annals of the Association of American geographers, Vol. 29, No 4.
33. Hartshorne, R., (1950). The functional approach in political geography. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 40, No. 2.
34. Heffernan, Michael. (1994). On geography and progress: Turgot's plan d'un ouvrage sur la géographie politique (1751) and the origins of modern progressive thought. Political Geography, Vol. 13, No. 4.

35. Holt-Jensen, Arild. (2018). *Geography: History and concepts*. Sage
36. Jacobs, Jane M. (2001). Postcolonial geography. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp 11838-11841), Amsterdam: Elsevier.
37. Jazeel, Tariq. (2013). Postcolonialism. In N. C. Johnson, R. H. Schein, & J. Winders (Eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography* (pp17-22), First Edition. Wiley-Blackwell
38. Jones, Martin, Jones, Rhys, Woods, Michael. (2004). *An introduction to political geography: space, place and politics*. Routledge.
39. Johnston, Ron. (1991). *Geography and Geographer: Anglo-American Human Geography*. Fourth Edition, London: Edward Arnold.
40. Johnston, Ron. (1984). Marxist political economy, the state and political geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 8, No. 4.
41. Johnston, Ron. (1980). Electoral geography and political geography. *Australian Geographical Studies*. Vol. 18, No.1.
42. Johnston, Ron. (1986). *Philosophy and Human Geography: An introduction to contemporary approaches*. Second edition. Maryland: Edward Arnold.
43. Kirsch, Scott. (2009). Historical-Geographical Materialism. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Vol. 5.
44. Clark, Gordon L. & Dear, Michael. (1984). *State apparatus: Structure and language of legitimacy*. Boston: Allen & Unwin LTD.
45. Lee, Roger. & Philo, Christopher. (2009). Welfare geography. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Vol. 12.
46. Mackinder, Halford John. (1887, March). On the scope and methods of geography. In *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography* (Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 141-174). Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers), Wiley.
47. Mackinder, Halford John. (1904). The geographical pivot of history (1904). *The geographical journal*, Vo. 170, No 4.
48. Mcnee, Robert, B. (1961). Centrifugal-Centripetal forces in international petroleum company regions. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 51, No.1.
49. Meek, Ronald L. (Ed.). (1973). *Turgot on progress, sociology and economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
50. Matjunin, Sergei. (2000). The new state flags as the iconographic symbols of the post-Soviet space, *GeoJournal*, Vol. 52, No. 4.
51. Mirzababazadeh Fomeshi, Behnam. & Khojastehpour, Adineh. (2015) Different Readings of Classical Persian Texts According to New Historicism. *Literary Text Research*, Vol. 19, No.1. **[In persian]**.

52. Muscara, Luca. (2005). Territory as a psychosomatic device: Gottmann's kinetic political geography. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 10, No. 1.
53. Muscara, Luca. (2000). Gottmann's geographic glossa. *GeoJournal*, Vol. 52, No. 4.
54. Muscara, Luca. (1998). Jean Gottmans Atlantic transhumance and the development of his spatial history. *Finisterra*, XXXIII, Vol. 65.
55. Muir, Richard. (1975). *Modern political geography*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD.
56. Muir, Richard. (1997). *Political geography: A new introduction*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
57. Murdoch, Jon. (2005). *Post-structuralist geography: a guide to relational space*. Sage.
58. Mirheydar, Dorreh. (1968) *Principles and Themes in Political Geography*. Tehran: University of Tehran press **[In Persian]**.
59. Mirheydar, Dorreh. (2005) *The Foundations of Political Geography*. Tehran: Samt **[In Persian]**.
60. Mirheydar, Dorreh., Rasti, Omran., Mirahmadi, Fatemeh Sadat. (2014) *the Basic Themes in Political Geography*. Tehran: Samt **[In Persian]**.
61. Mirheydar, Dorreh. (2010). *Tracing Readings of a Political Geographer During the past Five decades*, Mashad: Papoli **[In persian]**.
62. Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. (1996). *Critical geopolitics: The politics of writing global space*. London: Routledge.
63. Ó Tuathail/Toal, Gearóid. (2005). *Geopolitics*, In D. Sibely, P. Jackson, D. Atkinson & N. Washbourne (Eds), *Cultural geography: A critical dictionary of key concepts (65-71)*. London: L.B. Tauris & Co LTd.
64. Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. (1998). *Postmodern geopolitics? The modern geopolitical imagination and beyond*. In S. Dalby & G. O. Tuathail, *Rethinking geopolitics: Towards a critical (16-38)*. London and NewYork: Routledge.
65. Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. & Dalby, Simon. (Eds.). (1998). *Rethinking geopolitics: Towards a critical geopolitics (1-15)*. In *Rethinking Geopolitics*. London & NewYork: Rutledge.
66. Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. (1996). *Critical geopolitics: The politics of writing global space*. London: Routledge.
67. Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. & Agnew, John. (1992). *Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy*. *Political Geography*, Vol.11, No. 2.
68. Pourahmad, Ahmad. (2006). *Territory and Philosophy of Geography*. Tehran: University of Tehran Press **[In Persian]**.

69. Ratzel, Friederich (1896), "The Laws of the Spatial Growth of States". In Kasperson, Roger E. and Minghi, Julian V. (eds.) (1969), *The Structure of Political Geography*, pp.13-16. Chicago: Aldean
70. Rezvaniyan, Qodsyeh. (2014). *New Historicism. Literary Criticism*, Vol. 7, No. 25 [**In Persian**].
71. Matjunin, Sergei. (2000). The new state flags as the iconographic symbols of the post-Soviet space, *GeoJournal*, Vol. 52, No. 4.
72. Peet, Richard. (2009) *Radical geography*. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Vol. 9
73. Painter, Joe. (2005) *State: Society*. In P. Cloke & R. Johnston (Eds), *Spaces of geographical thought: deconstructing human geography's binaries*, (42-60). London: Sage Publication.
74. Pringle, David. G. (2003). Agnew, J.A. 1987: Place and politics: the geographical mediation of state and society. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 27, No. 5.
75. Rennie Short, John. R. (1993). *An introduction to political geography*. Second Edition. London & New York: Routledge.
76. Shakoui, Hossein. (2004). *New Trends in Philosophy of Geography*. Tehran: Gitashenasi [**In Persian**].
77. Sharp, Joanne P. (2006). *Feminist and postcolonial engagement*. In J. Agnew, K. Mitchell, & G. Toal (Eds), *A companion to political geography* (59-74), third Edition, Malden: Blackwell publishing.
78. Sidorov, Dmitri. (2000). National monumentalization and the politics of scale: The resurrections of the cathedral of christ the savior in Moscow. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 90, No. 3.
79. Smith, Jonathan M. (2009). *Humanism/Humanistic Geography*. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Volume 5.
80. Taylor, Peter J. (2006). *Radical political geographies*. In J. Agnew, K. Mitchell & G. Toal (eds), *A companion to political geography* (47-56), third Edition, Lodon: Blackwell publishing.
81. Taylor, Peter J. & Flint, Colin. (2000). *Political geography: World - economy, nation-state, and locality*. Fourth Edition, New York: Prentice Hall.
82. Taylor, Peter J. (1982). *A materialist framework for political geography*. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 7, No.1.
83. Veicy, Hadi. (2017) *Concepts and Theories of Political Geography*. Tehran: Samt [**In persian**].
84. Warf, Barney. (2011). Derek Gregory. In P. Hubbard and R. Kitchin (Eds), *Key Thinkers on place and space* (414-420). London: SAGE Publication Inc.

85. Warf, Barney. (2009). Gregory, D. International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Vol 4.
86. Williams, Rosalind. (1994). The Political and feminist dimensions of technological determinism, In S. Merritt Roe, M. Leo (Eds.), Collective Volume Article of Does technology drive history? The dilemma of technological determinism, London: MIT Press.
87. Winder, Gordon. M. (2009) Historical Geography. International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Vol. 5.