

Carl Schmitt, Space and Geopolitics

Seyed Rohallah Hosseini - PhD Candidate of Political Geography, Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Morteza Ghourchi * - Assistant Professor, Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning, Faculty of Earth Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Behzad Malekpour Asl - Assistant Professor, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Received: 30/06/2024

Accepted: 10/01/2025

Abstract

Generally, in geopolitics and political geography the influence and the relevance of scholars of various other disciplines have been largely ignored. Therefore, in order to understand the geopolitics of Germany, this research analyzes the philosophy of Carl Schmitt, who was an influential figure during Weimer and Nazi (officially the National Socialist German Workers' Party) eras. Schmitt's theories (The Political) have been incredibly impactful on Germany during Hitler's reign and is still greatly helpful in understanding the theories and viewpoints on politics and geopolitics, especially when it comes to the geopolitical developments of the 21st century. In this research, descriptive-analytical method was used to explicate the impact of Carl Schmitt's thought on geopolitical issues. The results of this research demonstrate a connection between the transcendental and concrete concepts of Carl Schmitt which he utilizes in order to present his spatial theories, which deal with the organization of space in line with his overall geopolitical goals.

Keywords: Carl Schmitt, The Political, Space, Nomos of the Earth, Grossraum.

* E-mail: m_ghourchi@sbu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

This article is a beckoning to a return to a fundamental understanding of the concept of space and theory and the function of The Political in shaping geopolitical discourses; but instead of resorting to the “dominant thought on geopolitics and space” which in most cases relies on the theories of people such as Rudolf Kjellén or Karl Haushofer, it seeks a critique based on The Political thought of Carl Schmitt and the theory of “The Political” and “a theological understanding of space”. As geopolitical discourses are situated within the conditions and the relationship between the forces of power, geopolitics being political is not an accident but a main factor of its very identity and this illustrates the necessity of pondering the function of The Political – and of course, the misunderstandings of it – from the viewpoint of enacting order on space.

The works of Schmitt can be divided into three periods: (1) The Weimer period which includes his most seminal works; (2) the Third Reich period during which he deals with space more and turns to more concrete theories and pays considerable attention to the Nazi expansion toward Eastern Europe in his explorations of space; (3) the post-Reich period during which he deepens his theories. One can also divide Schmitt’s works into the two spatial and non-spatial periods. The spatial period began after the establishment of the Third Reich when he became concerned with space and began associating with political geographers. This article will focus on this second spatial period, although the intertwined nature of these periods must not be ignored. This article claims that Schmitt’s attention to space which is one of the concepts studied in geography shows that he finds the organization of space on three scales – local, regional, and global – and the role of sovereignty in this regard, very important. His theoretical roots are mostly found in theology and like most theorists of geopolitics, he pays special attention to the organization of space as it will take place through The Political by delineating between friend and enemy. In the twenty first century, his theory of The Political and the manner of organization of space between “us” and “the Other” which creates friend and enemy (especially his concept of *Grossraum*) has become important. Therefore, our main question is: what was Schmitt’s understanding of space in his second period of life?

The political and geopolitical discourses based on Schmitt’s ideas are in fact the ideology of using space and decisionmaking in this regard from powerful

groups. The guiding ideology studied in this article – which provides us with the viewpoint into how space is organized – is the idea of “The Political” which studies space on three scales (the local, the regional, and the global) and the role of the sovereignty in shaping it. Considering the above, this article attempts to study the role of space in the philosophy of Carl Schmitt in regards to The Political. This research is necessary as it demonstrates that space in Schmitt’s thought, in contrast to what scholars of geopolitics believe, does not serve a function of political dominance but it is rooted in theology.

2. Concepts

2-1. The Political (Friend and Enemy)

For Schmitt, The Political is an assumption embedded within the concept of the state (Schmitte, 1932). According to Ivan Ilyin, “the savage, deprived like a child of political self-consciousness, may actually not know of the very fact of his citizenship” and he also adds that “The Political possesses its own essential paths and forms and people have never succeeded in violating and trampling on them with impunity” (2014:179,204). According to Hobbes (1651) the right of declaring war and peace is the right and at the discretion of the sovereign.

The political is the most extreme and final of enmities and each concrete enemy will become more political as they approach the ultimate point on the spectrum, i.e. the spectrum between friend and enemy. The state, as a whole, as an organized political unit, decides on the delineation between friend and enemy (Schmitte, 1932).

Any type of conflict – religious, economic, social ethical, etc. – would transform into a political conflict if it is powerful enough to effectively divide people into friends and enemys. Therefore the delineation between friend and enemy is at the center of The Political. He believes that as ethics is about good and evil, aesthetics is about beautiful and ugly, and economics is about profit and loss, politics is about friend and enemy. In fact The Political is able to derive its force from the most varied sources of human activity, i.e., conflicts of religious, economic, ethical, etc. nature (Schmitte, 1932).

According to Chantal Mouffe, The Political is based on identity. Creating an identity necessarily requires differentiation, e.g. black and white, man and woman, etc., i.e., recognizing difference is the precondition of every identity. When it comes to collective identities, we are always creating an “us”, which can only exist in contrast to “them”. Of course, this relationship is not

necessarily always hostile, but we must accept that under certain conditions, it is always possible for the relationship between “us and them” to become hostile, i.e. transforming “us” and “them” into friends and enemys. This takes place when there is the suspicion that they question our identity or might threaten its existence. According to Schmitt, for the “us and them” relationship to become political, it must be hostile (Moufe,2005).

The delineation between friend and enemy harkens the most extreme of unity or separation; integration or divergence. This delineation might exist both theoretically and practically without simultaneously relying on other delineations such as moral, aesthetic, economic and other distinctions. A political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly, an enemy need not be an economic rival, and it may even be profitable to do business with him. Even so, this enemy is an Other, and it is enough for this enemy to be existentially and extremely an alien Other in order to define his nature, in a manner which makes conflict with him possible in the ultimate analysis (Schmitte,1932).

According to Schmitt, if the distinction between friend and enemy is eroded, the entirety of political life will also disappear. If a group announces that it does not recognize the enemy, another group will arise which will seize power by recognizing the enemy. If there are people who lack the will or force to survive within The Political arena, The Political arena will not disappear, but only the weak will perish.

Schmitt conceptualizes friends and enemies both domestically and within foreign policy as necessary for sovereignty. In every case in the history of politics, both in the domestic and foreign arenas, unwillingness or inability to delineate between friend and enemy is a sign that The Political has ended. So much as that Machiavelli in the twelfth chapter of *The Prince* (Whether fortresses and other strategies rulers frequently adopt are useful), a text which implies the distinction between friend and enemy in the entirety of its text, says: “some rulers have disarmed their citizens; some have kept subject towns divided in factions; some have encouraged hostility towards themselves”, and in the twenty first chapter: “A ruler will also be respected when he is a genuine friend and a genuine enemy” (Machiavelli,2009:82,88). [ADD REFERENCE: Machiavelli, N. (2009). *The Prince* (T. Parks, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1532)]

Schmitt first wrote his theories *The Political* and the delineation between friend and enemy in the book *Leviathan* in 1938 utilizing a mythological language, narrating a war between Leviathan (sea monster) and Behemoth (land monster). As it is evident with title of the book, he was influenced by and critical of Hobbes, who had written two separate books named after the aforementioned mythical monsters. Leviathan is in fact derived from Kabbalah¹ which also appears in the Torah in the chapters 40 and 41 of the Book of Job as the strongest and the most gigantic of sea monsters. In this book, Leviathan, a sea creature, faces against Behemoth, a land creature. Leviathan represents all sea powers and Behemoth all land powers and they engage in a fight. Behemoth attempts to tear away the flesh of Leviathan with its horns and teeth and Leviathan tries to strangle Behemoth by blocking its mouth and nose using its fins. It is for this reason that Schmitt states that this story provides an intriguing analogy of defeating a nation through embargoes. In this story, the Jewish people stand aside and observe the struggle between Leviathan and Behemoth until they kill each other and then they survive by eating their carcasses.² These mythical narratives have influenced the great wars fought in Europe. Schmitt and Hobbes consider mainland European states to be Behemoth, with a land culture, and the UK to be Leviathan, with a seafaring culture, and in the end, Leviathan is defeated. In fact, the thesis and anti-thesis of friend or enemy or *The political* manifests paradoxically as idea and counter-idea (Meyer et al, 2011:691) when it enters geography. Schmitt studies these concepts through lens of space and counter-space, where the land represents space and social life and water represents counter-space where the industry flows on its bed. *Nomos* is rooted in land while water is fluid and lacks *nomos*.

2-2. The Political and Space

According to Claudio Minca (2017), the main through line found in all writings of Schmitt is his belief in the mutual relationship between space and *The Political*. According to Schmitt, there are neither political ideas without space nor spaces without political ideas. In his spatial theories, he considers theology, *The Political*, and the idea of space and attempts to avoid thinking of space as empty and infinite (which he considered to be the Jewish

1. Kabbalah is a Jewish mystical sect believed to be founded by Isaac Luria.

2. This version of the story is attributed to Isaac Abarbanel.

understanding of space), but to instead inject The Political into space and to spatialize The Political. He distinguishes the inside from the outside and organizes The Political space based on friend and enemy. Spatializing The Political basically refers to spatial divisions which can impose order on chaos by identifying the “Others” and though this organization, fully bordered political units can be created which prevent wars. To put it in other words, in fact these land divisions between the states created a balance of power which reduced the number of wars.

According to Schmitt, there is no final science of space and whatever exists can be referred to as “half a dozen notions of space” (Simons,2017:17), which, unfortunately, have not been conceptualized. Therefore in his second period¹ he attempted to conceptualize space by utilizing concepts in his writing such as nomos of the Earth, Grossraum, land versus the sea, and the Partisan Theory. Although Schmitt was not a geographer, but in the second period of his life and with the ascension of the Third Reich and with a concrete turn in his works, he placed space at the center of his scholarly attention and in this manner he became similar to geographers. His books, *The Nomos of the Earth, Land and Sea*, and *State, Movement, People* fall into this category.

Schmitt lived at the time when geopolitical discourses were at the height of their prominence but he refused to use the term “geopolitics”. Despite this, he has said and it is apparent in his writings that he was familiar with the writings of Halford Mackinder, Karl Haushofer, and Friedrich Ratzel. According to Meyer (2011) Schmitt did not study space merely in a strategic capacity but his theories also deal with the relationship between theology, politics, and space. The main through line for Schmitt, in all of his works on geography, is *The Political*. He believes that the distinction between friend and enemy must be studied by understanding its spatial aspect. This politico-spatial link reached its logical conclusion later in his theories of Grossraum and the tension between land and sea.

According to Claudio Minca (2017), political order is in fact based on political differences that are stabilized through spatial differences. Schmitt’s concept of *The Political* is founded upon this tension between difference and order; difference requires order and order demands difference. Therefore, in

1. In this period, Schmitt spatializes his theory of *The Political* by turning from a transcendental approach to a concrete one.

this conceptualization of The Political lies embedded the idea that political struggle necessarily takes place in space and vice versa; political struggle produces a specific kind of space which is divided space. In summary, these interconnected processes are what is referred to as spatializing The Political, the core of Schmitt's philosophy.

From the point of view of geography is very important to point out that The Political is spatial in a concrete manner. Even though it is possible for The Political to invoke a sui generis state of the human condition but it always contingent on a specific "concreteness" which, if rejected, would result in conflict. Additionally, The Political does not simply take place in space but it generates a specific political space which is defined by dividing friends and enemies. Schmitt emphasizes "the tangible condition" and points out that the delineation between friend and enemy is defined against a border between inside and outside in space. Political distinction is necessarily manifested in geographical difference for Schmitt:

Further, The Political did not simply take place in space but itself produced a particular form of political spatiality defined by the division between friends and enemies. By emphasizing the 'concrete situation' Schmitt implies that the friend-enemy distinction is mapped against, or rather 'situated' at, the borderline of an inside/outside relation. Political difference necessarily takes the form of spatial difference,

In other words, The Political always manifests on the border between inside and outside in space (Minca & Rowan,2014:4). Therefore, it must be noted that Schmitt theorizes space through the lens of The Political and this is evident in all of his writings on this issue, including Grossraum, nomos of the Earth, and land versus sea. All three spatial theories of Schmitt can be considered a spatial history of modernity.

3.Research Findings

3-1.Grossraum

"Schmitt's first attempt to imagine a new political form beyond the state capable of respatializing The Political came with the concept of Großraum" (Minca & Rowan,2017:165). Grossraum was Schmitt's new model for spatializing The Political.

By the end of the 1930s, space (Raum) had become a key term in the writings of Carl Schmitt. His essay "The Spatial Revolution: From

Total War to Total Peace”¹ appeared in the journal *Das Reich* in 1940 (1995f), “The Großraum Order of the International Law with a Ban on Intervention for Spatially Foreign Powers”² (2011) followed in 1941. His article “Spatial Revolution: On the Spirit of the Western World”³ (1942) and *Land and Sea* (1997a;2001) were published in 1942 and *The “Nomos” of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum* (1997b;2006a) in 1950, although Schmitt composed the majority of the latter text during the final year of the war (Simons, 2017:1).

“Interest for Schmitt’s Großraum re-surfaces after the end of the Cold War, and becomes the subject of open discussion and appreciation in the 2000s” (Orsi,2019:5). Grossraum literally “means ‘great-space’, but has a sense of a ‘sphere’ of influence, and ‘geopolitical space’ may be closer to the meaning. By the term Schmitt intends to grasp an area or region that goes beyond a single state (that is, a specific territory), to comprehend much larger scale spatial orderings, complexes or arrangements” (Elden,2010:19).

Schmitt, in his articles “The Grossraum Order of the International Law with a Ban on Intervention for Spatially Foreign Powers”, and “Grossraum and Space in International Law”⁴ attempted to theorize Grossraum in a bid to become close to the leader of Germany during the Nazi era. Unlike his other spatial theories that are descriptive, here he plays the role of an advocate for the Third Reich. In this theory he tries to prevent the influence of other powers in mainland Europe by creating a wedge between inside and outside. It can be said that in this theory he attempts to cast Germany as a hegemon which attempts to create a spatial order against the domestic space-less enemy (i.e. the Jewish people) and foreign enemies (i.e. the US and the UK). It can be stated that Schmitt portrays Germany as Behemoth against the US and the UK as Leviathan, whose seafaring order is liberal.

The basic outlines of the Großraum concept can be summed up in one paragraph. A predominant power (the Reich) exists within a larger territorial space (the Großraum), in which it essentially acts as hegemon. This larger space is a geopolitical category, but should also

1.“Die Raumrevolution: Durch den totalen Krieg zu einem totalen Frieden”

2.“Völkerrechtliche Großraumordnung mit Interventionsverbot für raumfremde Mächte”

3.“Raumrevolution: Vom Geist des Abendlandes”

4.“Raum und Großraum im Völkerrecht”

be characterised by sufficient cultural homogeneity to allow the 'political idea' of the leading Reich to radiate and to unify (Hooker, 2010:133).

Schmitt's concept of Grossraum can be analyzed in comparison with other geographical theories such as Ratzel's concept of Lebensraum, Monroe's doctrine, and Haushofer's continental divisions.

3-2. Lebensraum

Schmitt's concept of The Political is a biopolitical concept, in which he argued that "from the moment a community was articulated in the triad state–movement–people, it belonged to a 'vital' communitarian order based upon its fundamental loyalty to the Führer" (Monica & Rowan, 2017:137). This biopolitics was stated in his book *State, Movement, People* which was his most explicit articulation of this biopolitical theory. This book demonstrates the contrasts between Schmitt's Grossraum and Ratzel's Lebensraum. The main difference is that Schmitt's Grossraum is mainly ideological while Ratzel primarily believed in racial divisions. In this book, Schmitt's definition of "people" was different from its modern definition, which lacked a deep metaphysical foundation in Schmitt's opinion. He considered the society to be political, which was based on the distinction between friends and enemies.

In *State, Movement, People*, in particular, the people, while still described as the sovereign subject, are conceptualized as the 'apolitical element' of the triadic matrix that Schmitt theorized to try to understand and legitimate Hitler's regime. For Schmitt, the new German community in the making under Nazi rule should consist of three key elements: the state, as administrative apparatus; the 'movement', as The Political leadership acting in the name of the people; and, finally, the people, literally consisting of a multitude 'living in the shadow and under the protection of decisions reached in the higher regions of The Political order': 'the organizational basic lines are set by the State, Movement, People triad, consistently in agreement with the logic that State, Movement, People are distinct but not divided, linked but not fused' (Schmitt, 2001:22). However: The new State structure is marked by the fact that The Political enmity of the people, and thereby, all the regulation of its public life appear to be ordered into three distinct series. The three series do not run parallel one to the other, but one of them, the Movement, which carries the State and the People, penetrates and leads the other two. (Schmitt, 2001:11) Political unity is thus to be based on the

configuration and coordination of these three elements: the state, the movement and the people. The relationship among them must not be understood simply as a division of power, since although they 'run' indeed 'parallel one to the other', one of them, the movement (read the Party), the one that sustains the state and the people, provides the constitutive element of the whole. Each one of the three words: State, Movement, People, may be used alone to denote the whole of The Political unity. (Minca & Rowan, 2017:138)

According to Schmitt, a political idea is embedded within each specific nation which determines the characteristics of The Political. The integration of a specific space and a political idea is relevant to the relationship between friends and enemies. The spatialization of The Political acts as a prohibition for enemies to intervene in the Grossraum. He believes Germany to be the dominant power within the European Grossraum with its own specific politics.

In fact, Schmitt supported the idea of political order based on the natural outgrowth of the people and in his opinion State-Movement-People reach a state of alliance through a historical process at the outset of which each represents the other two. The alliance of the trio creates a political idea which determines the identity of friends and enemies which he tried to apply to his theory of Grossraum. Schmitt attempted to theorize about The Political as a concrete order integrated with history and biopolitics. Therefore, here The Political is a biological concept.

According to Claudio Minca (2014), Schmitt attempted to understand the friend vs enemy binary as a spatial relationship in which Grossraum reaches a state of equilibrium. In this process, Grossraum is a spatial organism which distinguishes friends from enemies. He also argued that the word "groß" refers to the quality of an expansion in state rather than merely its quantity, therefore he was not simply comparing vast and small spaces. His organic idea is based on a structure based on a trio of factors: an integration of the collective will, a political movement, and the motivation inspired by a powerful political idea in an organic unity. This is what Schmitt had referred to as "a comprehensive qualitative state" prior to these theories. "Although Schmitt believed that new principles of international law were unfolding first and foremost in Germany, he had nevertheless expressed a belief that his

Großraum theory should be ‘applicable to all Lebensräume and other historical situations’ (Hooker,2010:139).

3-3.The Monroe Doctrine

Schmitt’s classic example of a Großraum in the wider international political-economic sense is the Monroe doctrine, where the United States declared that the whole of the Americas was off-limits to European powers, in terms of both colonization and influence. Something similar happened in Eastern Europe after the end of the Second World War ... In attempting to find a model for a Großraum concept in international law, Schmitt turned to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, which he claimed was ‘the first and until now, the most successful example of a Großraum principle in the modern history of international law’ (Hooker,2010:83). It offered, he claimed, the ‘best approach and point of departure’ for considering the concept of a Großraum in international law ... its ‘original meaning [was] marked with three key phrases: the independence of all American states; non-colonization in this space; non-intervention of extra- American powers in this space’ (Elden,2010:19).

“This fusion of a politically self-assertive nation, a political idea and a continental large space lay at the ‘core of the great original Monroe Doctrine’” (Minca & Rowan,2017:167) and “The transformation of a spatially conceived principle of noninterference into a spatially undifferentiated general system of interference was made possible by the fact that Woodrow Wilson substituted for the original and true Monroe principle the ideological idea of liberal democracy and its associated images, especially those of ‘free’ world trade and [a] ‘free’ world market” (Legg,2011:48). As it is evident in the map below, the Monroe Doctrine’s spatial area in itself became a source of inspiration for the theory of Grossraum and Haushofer:




Figure (1): Monroe Doctrine

3-4. Haushofer

Unlike Schmitt, who avoided the concept of Lebensraum, attempted to incorporate Ratzel's idea into his own theory of continental politics. Haushofer, influenced by Ratzel and similarly to the Monroe Doctrine, thought of geopolitics in terms of continents. He divided the globe into four divisions, each having a hegemon to impose order. Haushofer incorporated space into his theories like Schmitt. But he differed with Schmitt in that he, similarly to the other theorists of geopolitics at his time, he was mainly concerned with geostrategy and utilized Ratzel's Lebensraum but Schmitt mostly adopted a theological view toward The Political in order to give order to chaos in the field of international law in his theory of Grossraum. Schmitt was invoking Haushofer when he argued that "the meaning of space and political idea do not allow themselves to be separated from one another".




Figure (2): Pedro Rocha Fleury Curado 2016

Thus, a genuine Großraum was grounded upon the mutually constitutive relationship between a particular space and a specific political idea: ‘it is an important part of a determinable political idea that a certain nation carries it and that it has a certain opponent in mind, through which this political idea gains the quality of The Political’ (2011c:78). The fusion of a space and a political idea was therefore crucially tied to a specific set of friend–enemy relations governing the relations between the ordering nation and the ‘spatially foreign forces’ banned from intervention within the Großraum. While the Monroe Doctrine provided the original model, Schmitt’s key reference for this new form of international order was the fast expanding Nazi Reich. Indeed, the work on Großraum order was shaped by the demands of legitimizing Nazi foreign policy, which accounts in part for the shifts in position and the additional materials progressively added to successive editions between 1938 and 1941. (Minca & Rowan, 2014:9)

In Schmitt’s 1939 lecture in Kiel, the concept of Großraum was a source of controversial interpretations. In this early introduction of the concept, delivered just two weeks after Hitler had invaded Czechoslovakia, Schmitt referred to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. Shouldn’t Germany, he asked, pursue its own Großraum as well? ... Admittedly, the temptation to position himself as a theorist of the new order brought him no support from the SS (Hell, 2009:297). On the contrary, after he seemed to be useful for a time (Müller, 2003:39), it was precisely this theoretical doctrine of spatial understanding that made him lose favor with the Nazis. A short while later, Hitler gave a speech at the Reichstag that referred to the Monroe Doctrine in response to Roosevelt’s call to end aggression. Soon after this speech, Schmitt

learned that Hitler believed that he himself had invented the idea of a German Monroe Doctrine. This was a further step in Schmitt's dissociation from National Socialism, but it also demonstrates the assimilability of Schmitt's terminology (Simons,2017:14-15)

“Concerning the spatial extent of the European Großraum Schmitt was rather imprecise, referring at times to ‘East European space’ or ‘Central and Eastern European space’, and at others to ‘Middle and Eastern European space’” (Minca & Rowan,2014:9). “the transitions Schmitt alludes to gave birth to the ‘modern’ spatial order” (Elden,2010:23).

It is here that the concepts of Großraum and territory are disassociated. Within a Großraum, Schmitt now claims, dominant powers exercise influence, but do not seek to incorporate the land as with previous colonization. The first step, Schmitt suggests, is that the dominant power is not seeking the territorial annexation (territoriale Annexation) of the controlled state, but rather to absorb it into its spatial sphere of influence, its spatiale Bereich, spatial field or area, which Schmitt calls its Raumhoheit, its spatial supremacy (Elden,2010:23).

Therefore the concept of Grossraum is close to the theories of political geography and its roots can be detected in Ratzel's Lebensraum, Haushofer's continental divides, and the Monroe Doctrine, which divides space into inside and outside and to centralize The Political (friend/enemy divide), attempts to elevate space into the center of attention within theory, especially Eastern European space, and to apply The Political to Europe; to impose order on its space with Germany as the central hegemon; a hegemon which incorporates its own political idea and is defined against “the Other” i.e. the US and the UK.

3-5.Nomos of the Earth

One of Schmitt's other spatial theories, based on The Political (friend vs enemy), is nomos of the Earth which was first mentioned in an article in *Jus Publicum Europaeum* magazine. This theory studies the concept of “land” as opposed to the “sea” and also deals with the spatial categorizations of land. In his book, *Land and Sea*, Schmitt also deals with the concept of open seas. These two areas of the globe are pitted against each other as a ploy to explain The Political (distinction between friend and enemy) and in his book, *Leviathan*, Schmitt refers to them as Behemoth and Leviathan respectively. In this section nomos of the Earth will be explained, as the theory which

explains land, and in the next section land vs sea theory will be discussed, as it will deal with waters.

“In *The Nomos of the Earth*, ‘land appropriation is the primeval law founding act’, a concept that takes us back to the beginning of political life, naming ‘the originary and primordial relation of law to the earth and to the soil’”. The text adds that “For Schmitt, *nomos* stems from the unity of space and law, driven by the complex interaction of *Ortung* and *Ordnung*, which create spatial limits through taking an outside” (Mabon,2019:3).

Nomos denominated a foundational unity of space and law, yet this should not be understood to presuppose a neutral, universal or undifferentiated concept of space on which order rested. Rather, *nomos* points to the process by which order is grounded in the differentiation of spaces. *Nomos*, above all, concerns spatial difference (Mabon,2019:214).

Owning the land establishes order within its space in the literal sense of the word. “The significance of this tension for Schmitt was that insofar as every spatial order relies upon acts of land-appropriation, it is historically contingent”; “Although the distinction between land and sea is the explicit focus of his book by that name Schmitt elaborated the relationship between each element and the form of social order it determines more fully in *The Nomos*” (Minca & Rowan,2017:223,198):

Central to Schmitt’s account of the spatial history of modernity, as presented in *Land and Sea* and *The Nomos* in particular, is the distinction between land and sea. He argued that these two geo elements had determined two distinct forms of human existence, one terrestrial and the other maritime, each with its own set of concepts of power, war and law. From land and sea emerged ‘two different worlds’ (Minca & Rowan,2017:197)

Schmitt attempts to understand space in the modern period in his articles, “*The Spatial Revolution: From Total War to Total Peace*” and “*Spatial Revolution: On the Spirit of the Western World*”, through the lens of the concept of spatial revolution. Schmitt believes that in history, multiple spatial revolutions have taken space, which mark the beginning of a new epoch. During the modern era, two spatial revolutions have occurred. Consciousness of space leads to a new *nomos* of the Earth.

Spatial revolution is a major concept in Schmitt’s philosophy because, according to him, it causes a vast change in the material geographical conditions of human societies and their understanding of space. The

discovery of new territories alone does not lead to a spatial revolution. Rather, a spatial revolution occurs when the dominant understanding of space changes, or in other words, spatial consciousness changes as a concept. According to Schmitt, all important historical developments involve a new understanding of space. Schmitt believed that two spatial revolutions had occurred during modern period; in fact, modernity was merely a space-historical development for him. The first revolution was the discovery of the new world and circumnavigating the globe by Europeans in the 15th to 17th centuries, which led to a fundamental change in the spatial consciousness of the European people. This change was caused by the discovery of new lands, which in international law manifested in the writing of the European public law. The second spatial revolution was caused by the development of new transportation-communication-energy technologies and most importantly warcraft technologies. The scale of both revolutions was global, but the difference between them was that in the second revolution, spatial consciousness changed in ways that it incorporated the contradictory principle of spacelessness, which weakened the importance of spatial division in the imposition of political order. During this period, Schmitt studied the impact of technology and space and focused on the fundamental relationship between space and The Political. The spatial consciousness of the 20th century gave new shape to the world through the development of modern technologies. This revolution in itself would lead to a world without The Political. Since The Political space for Schmitt was a divided space based on The Political, he could not accept global unity. Therefore, the key task of international politics was to develop political forms that are able to re-spatialize The Political matter on a global scale in order to change the path of global spatial-historical developments from their path towards global unity (Minca & Rowan,2017:194).

The first spatial revolution, which leads to the creation of the European-centered global order known as European public law, refers to the spatial context of all laws. This means that all laws are only laws because they are situated in a specific space. In other words, in the nomos of the Earth, all the orders are the order of space that leads to the unity between law and space in all legal, political and social forms. This unity between law and space itself has a criterion and a main practice that creates spatial order, which is nomos.

According to Schmidt, *nomos* is related to the most fundamental legal question, which is the existential question of theological jurisprudence.

Schmitt points out that *nomos*, as a spatial order, has a history of three thousand years stemming from ancient Greece. This history was forgotten in the legal philosophy before the second spatial revolution, so it can be concluded that The Political was also forgotten in this field. He considers the reason for this to be the positivist legal method, which caused legal philosophy to be separated from space, a phenomenon which he calls spaceless jurisprudence. The second spatial revolution or the second *nomos*, in addition to being Europe-centric, also incorporated seas and oceans. It can be said that in this period, liberalism seeks to deal with land as if it is an open sea. In fact, this spatial order is the new form of international law, or European public law.

In addition to the emergence of *nomos*, Schmitt also theorizes its decline. According to Schmitt, the great achievement of European public law was to limit the war through the division of space, which worked in two ways: the distinction between Europe and the New World and the distinction between land and open seas. In his conceptualization of the spatial revolution, Schmitt distinguishes between the intergovernmental order of the continental Europe and the newly discovered free space, which causes rivalry between powers to take place in a space beyond the mainland. The New World had a disorderly atmosphere where the conflict in Europe could be transferred to. For this reason, the European order can be imposed upon it and change the collective spatial consciousness, therefore, one of the achievements of European public law is to prevent war in Europe itself, which can be said to have reached a balance of power. In summary, The New World allowed war to move beyond the mainland rather than take place in Europe. According to Schmitt, the state constitutes the main core of European public law, because in this period Europe is living in a common European soil and belongs to a singular European family. In this period, the states recognized one another and the European soil was divided under their mutual agreements. This is why Schmitt says that in this period Europe was acting based on a relativist rationality.

According to his account, in the beginning of the 20th century, the second spatial revolution of *nomos* occurred, and the European understanding of the Earth changed once more due to the development of new technologies of

transportation and war and the rise of the United States as a superpower (Schmitt also mentions Japan as a rising power, but the US is more important because of its role as a superpower). In this second revolution, the European-centered spatial order collapsed and a new spatial consciousness, which he calls the paradoxical principle of spacelessness, emerged. In this period, the poverty of European legal thinking was apparent due to a lack of understanding of the nomos of Earth and space, which itself was caused by the influence of positivism. Schmitt considered the Berlin Conference to be the focal turning point of this development.

3-6.Land and Sea

Another of Schmitt's theories which spatialize The Political is the land and sea theory, articulated in an eponymous book. In the previous section, his theories of land were explained under the title of the nomos of the Earth. When it comes to the sea, the second spatial revolution is important, which is explained in more details in *Land and Sea*. But it must be emphasized that in Schmitt's theories, nomos of land is different from nomos of sea. He discusses the second spatial revolution, where the global space was transformed and the old world was pitted against the new.

Land and Sea, among Schmitt's works, is the one that is most preoccupied with geography, a work which can be considered to be at the same level as the writings of major scholars such as Ernst Kapp and Alfred Thayer Mahan. But as Schmitt himself points out in his book, *The Nomos of the Earth*, he was mostly influenced by Mackinder. This book presents a narrative on a global scale that maps the relationship between land and sea forces and the changing perceptions of space. For Schmitt, land and sea created different forms of political relations. Their history is defined by the struggle between them; the struggle that is analogized in the battle between the mythical beasts of land and sea, Behemoth and Leviathan. From his point of view, world history is the history of wars that sea powers have launched against land powers or continental powers. In this book, Schmitt emphasizes the existential importance of the sea or to the UK, or its exclusively maritime existence, in the course of the modern history of Europe and the world. The British were able to be seafarers and built a global empire by mastering the oceans.

Schmitt was influenced by Ernst Kapp, a German geographer and philosopher who explicated the stages of the rise of European powers in a pamphlet

entitled “The Comparative Sciences of Earth”¹ in which he explains the stages of the rise of sea powers. There are three stages: potamic, thalassic, and oceanic (Minca & Rowan,2017). According to Kapp, the history of the world begins with the potamic period, that is, with the river cultures of the East in the Mesopotamia, Tigris, Euphrates and Nile and in the empires of Assyria, Babylon and Egypt. After the potamic period, the thalassic period begins, which refers to the culture of the inland seas of the Mediterranean sea basin, which takes place during the ancient Greek and Roman eras and the Mediterranean Middle Ages. In the last stage, which coincides with the rise of the greatest powers, begins with the discovery of the American continent and circumambulation of the Earth and seafaring culture now transforms into an oceanic culture. In his opinion, the Venetian Navy remained in the thalassic stage even after this period. Schmitt believes that the transformation of the UK from a terrestrial culture into a marine culture occurred between the second and third stages of Kapp’s history. It is during this period that the British spearheaded a spatial revolution by taking over the seas and oceans, unlike the rest of the world prior to this point in history, which is a history of land acquisition. He expressed hope that a new spatial revolution is imminent, which would stem from the ground and air superiority of the Nazi regime. He claimed that the spatial conquest of air would create a new world that overcomes the previous separation of land and sea elements and includes new spatial concepts, new practices, and new spatial orders.

Schmitt was also influenced by another geographer and international jurist, Halford Mackinder, who believed that terrestrial power was expanding and progressing with the creation of the railroad, which would enable land powers to overcome the UK as a marine power. He situated this land power within a geographical area which he dubbed “heartland” which spans from what is today Western Russia to Alborz mountain range and considers Eastern Europe to be the key to influence in this region. Mackinder defined a sea heartland against Russia’s land heartland which covered the Baltic Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. This binary harkens the battle of Behemoth against Leviathan.

1.Philosophische oder vergleichende allgemeine Erdkunde in wissenschaftlicher Darstellung der Erdverhältnisse und des Menschenlebens nach ihrem innern Zusammenhang

In *Land and Sea* Schmitt tried to analyze fundamental changes happening in the world and their causes. If we discuss the work from this standpoint, *Land and Sea* can be seen as a systematic work in which we can outline five major areas: 1. land and sea as antagonistic elements; 2. spatial revolution and its consequences; 3. the world-historical tension between Catholicism and Protestantism against the background of the antagonism between the land and the sea; 4. the industrial Revolution and socio-technical progress as the foundational factors of new elemental forces; 5. in a given world-historical situation a man has the possibility, to make a choice between the elements and therefore transcend any former spatial limits, whilst gaining new spatial consciousness and horizons. Schmitt considers the opposition between land and sea as a universal-historical thesis: “World history is the history of the wars waged by maritime powers against land or continental powers and by land powers against sea or maritime powers”. He uses biblical symbols to denote this world-historical opposition: a land power symbolically is represented as a giant land beast, Behemoth, and the symbol of maritime power is represented as a giant sea beast Leviathan (Tavadze,2013:45).

In *Land and Sea*, Schmitt has employed many symbols and myths. He was even inspired by a French expert in military strategy, a man named Admiral Castex, who mentioned “sea against land” in his book of military strategy (Minca & Rowan,2017). In this book, Castex mentions that for centuries, the primal opposition between land and sea has been a point of interest, likening the tension between Russia and the UK in the 19th century to a battle between a bear and a fish.

From the point of view of European public law, all lands belonged either to European states or to those who had equal status with European states. But the sea was outside this specific spatial order. It was not a state nor a colonial territory, nor was it an occupied space free from any kind of a state’s spatial sovereignty. Because land is surrounded by seas due to its very geometry, it can be said that a sea power can encircle any land power due to the inherent limitations of land.

Although the story of Behemoth and Leviathan is a mythical allegory, but Schmitt believed that it adequately represented the real history of European powers because on the one side stood land powers which were continental states of modern Europe (France, Spain, Germany) and on the other side stood sea powers which included such maritime empires as the Netherlands, the US,

and most importantly, the UK. Schmitt was not aiming to tell tales through these allegories but he wanted to draw attention to two spatial consciousnesses within distinct geometries of political orders, warfare, and international law which were created by continental European and Atlantic maritime powers. Land powers emphasized stability and order based on their limited spaces, while the sea powers pursued an international and global order based on free trade and movement, a disagreement which he symbolizes through the simile of Behemoth and Leviathan, and he is critical of Hobbes, and states that his writings are not merely symbolic and mythological. In his understanding of the spatial history of modernity, Schmitt extends this narrative to its logical conclusion and claims that continental land powers are being eclipsed by the growing maritime imperial powers and criticizes the German geopolitical tradition that exclusively studied limited land orders and did not pay attention to the seas.

Schmitt believes that the British managed to kick start the second spatial revolution thanks to their maritime dominance which was achieved in the first spatial revolution. He believed that the British used to rely on their cattle industry as the main resource in their economy but they significantly transformed in the 16th century and made the vital decision to turn to the sea. This decision changed the very political and historical essence of the island, transforming the inhabitants into a seafaring people. This process allowed the UK to be the focal point of humanity's seafaring culture; i.e. they collectively based their existence on the sea. Schmitt suggested that the key to balancing the tension between land and sea is the UK, which emerged as the great European sea power in the 17th century: "The UK Island was the link between different order of land and power". The UK managed to act as the "sovereign of the balance of land and power" by dominating the seas.

Schmitt placed the emergence of the technological revolution that led to the modern spatial awareness in the 20th century in the same course as the development of the UK's maritime existence, and the Industrial Revolution which affected the existence of the great Leviathan. He says that just as the British once left behind a terrestrial existence to embrace the sea, they now left behind their marine existence to embrace a world of machines. According to him, the industrial revolution had turned the children of the sea into machine builders and machine servants, and in this way, the real existence of the sea, which was the secret of British global power, was faced with its own

core, a development which was the beginning of the decline of the British Empire. At the same time, the United States emerged as a maritime power and pursued its interests in the expanding model of interventionism, armed with a set of universalist ideas. Because the UK's spatial consciousness was dependent on the maritime space, it was hostile to the territorial expansions of continental European states.

It was during this period that technology and the emergence of the US as an imperial power and globalization caused the humanity to move away from both the land and the sea. History entered the era of modernity. Schmitt, who was one of the early experts on the impact of air warfare on the broad political structures, argued that the air force introduced a new dimension to humanity's spatial existence and fundamentally changed the existing spatial concepts and possibilities. In fact, due to the acquisition of a new means of transportation as well as new weapons, the standards and criteria of space were radically transformed and the humanity's capabilities of dominating nature and other fellow human beings reached the greatest heights that had ever been witnessed in history. The spatial revolution that he describes here is especially direct, powerful and obvious. Therefore, in this period, asymmetric wars can be launched regardless of the borders between states or the distinction between land and sea. In fact, with the development of the air force, the distinction between land and sea, which was based on the relationship between the domination of the entire oceans and complete global supremacy became possible, which were impossible until recently, was added. He believed that it might be more accurate to symbolize air force with the element of fire rather than air, and decided to add Phoenix (Minca & Rowan, 2017:202), the great mythical creature of the skies and fire, to his coterie of mythical creatures representing world history in addition to Behemoth and Leviathan. This spatial revolution also transformed *The Political* by transforming its spatial aspect and changing the conceptualization of the enemy.

Therefore, the key point of space, according to Schmitt, is *The Political*, which transforms the delineation between friend and enemy away from a transcendental understanding into a concrete one and situates it on a geographical map and ultimately attempts to impose order on geographical space by dividing it into inside and outside.

4. Conclusion

Carl Schmitt was a major German philosopher in the Weimer and Nazi and post-Nazi eras who had interactions with geographers such as Halford Mackinder and Haushofer and was also influenced by other geographers such as Ratzel, Ernst Kapp, and Mahan but he believed to owe the most to Mackinder. Generally, his theories can be divided into three periods: Weimer, the Third Reich, and the period of deepening theories; and also to two periods of non-spatial and spatial. In his Third Reich and spatial periods he mostly acted as an advocate of the Nazi regime but in his other periods he mostly theorized in a descriptive manner.

Schmitt was mostly concerned with ordering space, a concern which led him to add a spatial dimension to theories that were originally non-spatial, e.g. his theory of *The Political* (tension between friend and enemy) which closely resembles Mackinder's heartland theory and Hobbes's philosophy. By spatializing *The Political*, the mutual influence of the theorists within the fields of geography and geopolitics is further illuminated. Schmitt believed that neither political philosophy exists without space nor space without political philosophy. His theories such as *Grossraum*, *nomos of the Earth*, and *land and sea* are all based on the distinction between friends and enemies and he attempts to impose order on space through these theories.

Among his most important spatial theories is *Grossraum*, in which a centralized state with a specific political philosophy of its own and in solidarity with a specific nation and parties prevents other states from intervening in its territory and thus creates an organized geographical space. Additionally, Carl Schmitt's theories can be significantly helpful in understanding the roots of the theories of many major classical scholars in the fields of political geography and geopolitics such as Mackinder and Mahan for contemporary scholars; e.g. the conflict between land and sea powers which was symbolized in the war between *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* as narrated by Schmitt and Hobbes; a tale first mentioned in the *Book of Job*.

5. Acknowledgment

This article is extracted from doctoral dissertation. We would like to thank Professor Kazem Nosrati, Deputy of Research and Faculty of Earth Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University.

References

1. Abu-Lughod, J. (1987). *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. .* an Introduction by G. Schwab.
2. Bendersky, J.W. (1983). *Carl Schmitt. Theorist for the Reich*, Princeton, NJ:
3. Carl Schmitt (1933). *State, Movement, People*.
4. Elden, Stuart (2010). *Reading Schmitt Geopolitically* Wildy, Simmons & Hill Publishing
5. Ernst, Kapp (1845). *Philosophische oder vergleichende allgemeine Erdkunde in wissenschaftlicher Darstellung der Erdverhältnisse und des Menschenlebens nach ihrem innern Zusammenhang*, 2 vols, Braunschweig: George Westermann.
6. Giorgi (2013). *LAND AND SEA: CARL SCHMITT'S PHILOSOPHICAL GEOGRAPHY*.
7. Giovanni, A (2010). *OurTimes Paperback – Illustrated*, February 16.
8. Hobbes, T. (1914). *leviathan*, digitalibraryindia, JaiGyan.
9. Hobbes, T. (2010). *Behemoth*, [Place of publication not identified]: Nabu Press.
10. Hooker, William (2009). *Carl Schmitt's International Thought Order and Orientation*.
11. Ivan Ilyin (2014). *On the Essence of Legal Consciousness*, by Ivan Aleksandrovich Il'in, Edited, Introduced, and Translated by William E. Butler, Philip T. Grier, and Vladimir A. Tomsinov.
12. J. PETER BURGESS (2009). *The New Nomos of Europe*.
13. Legg, Stephen (2011). *Spatiality, Sovereignty and Carl Schmitt Geographies of the nomos*.
14. Louiza, Odysseos; Petito, Fabio (2007). *The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt*.
15. Mabon, Simon (2019). *The world is a garden: Nomos, sovereignty, and the (contested) ordering of life*
16. Machiavelli, N. (1891). *Principe*, Clarendon Press.
17. Meyer, Robert; Conrad, S; Janosch, P (2011). *Spatial contestation? – The theological foundations of Carl Schmitt's spatial thought*.
18. Minca, Claudio; Rowan, Rory (2014). *The question of space in Carl Schmitt*.
19. Minca, Claudio; Rowan, Rory (2017). *On Schmitt and Space*.
20. Mouffe, C. (2005a). *On the Political*, London: Routledge.
21. Roberto, O (2019). *On the Relevance of Carl Schmitt's Concept of Großraum in Contemporary International Politics*.
22. Salter, Michael (2012). *The Return of Politicised Space: Carl Schmitt's Re-Orientation of Transnational Law Scholarship*, *Tilburg law Review*.
23. Schmitt, C (1942). "Raumrevolution: Vom Geist des Abendlandes." *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung* 54: 219–221.
24. Schmitt, C (1996). *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

25. Schmitt, C (2001). *State, Movement, People*. Washington, DC: Plutarch Press.
26. Schmitt, C (2003). *The Nomos of the Earth*. New York: Telos Press.
27. Schmitt, C (2008). *Political Theology II*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
28. Schmitt, C (2008). *The Leviathan in the State Theory of Thomas Hobbes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
29. Schmitt, C. (1991). "Die planetarische Spannung zwischen Ost und West und der Gegensatz von Land und Meer." In *Schmittiana: Beiträge zu Leben und Werk Carl Schmitts*, vol.3, ed. P. Tommissen. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 19–44.
30. Schmitt, C. (1995). "Die Raumrevolution: Durch den totalen Krieg zum totalen Frieden." In *Schmitt 1995g*, 388–394.
31. Schmitt, C. (1995). "Raum und Großraum im Völkerrecht." In *Schmitt 1995g*, 234–268.
32. Schmitt, C. (1995). "Raum und Rom—Zur Phonetik des Wortes Raum." In *Schmitt 1995g*, 491–495.
33. Schmitt, C. (1995). *Staat, Großraum, Nomos: Arbeiten aus den Jahren 1916–1969*, ed. G.Maschke. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
34. Schmitt, C. (1998). *Politische Romantik*, 6th ed. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
35. Schmitt, C. (2007). *The Concept of the Political*. Springer, Chicago & London (Expanded Edition of the Translation of the 1932 edition. Translated and with
36. Schmitt, Carl (2015). *Land and Sea A World-Historical Meditation*, Translated by Samuel Garrett Zeitlin Edited and with Introductions by Russell A. Berman and Samuel Garrett Zeitlin.
37. Schmitt, C. (1995). "Völkerrechtliche Großraumordnung mit Interventionsverbot für raumfremde Mächte: Ein Beitrag zum Reichsbegriff im Völkerrecht." In *Schmitt 1995g*, 269–371.
38. Simons, Oliver (2017). *Carl Schmitt's Spatial Rhetoric* Princeton University Press.

COPYRIGHTS

©2023 by the authors. Published by the Iranian Association of Geopolitics. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

