

## **Meta-Anti-Geopolitics: Moving Beyond Violent Binary Oppositions toward Multifaceted and Anti-Hegemonic Approaches**

**Eskandar Moradi \*** - Assistant Professor, Political Geography, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.  
**Seyed Mohammad Taghi Raeissadat** – Assistant Professor, Political Geography, Department of Management, Touran Institute of Higher Education, Damghan, Iran.

Received: 12/07/2025

Accepted: 03/10/2025

---

### **Abstract**

In recent decades, geopolitical analysis has been shaped by binary, state-centered narratives that perpetuate conflict, exclusion, and hierarchical power structures. Both traditional and critical geopolitical discourses have often relied on oppositional categories like state/non-state, East/West, and friend/enemy, which oversimplify complex realities and reinforce hegemonic frameworks. This paper seeks to move beyond these epistemological limitations by proposing a meta-anti-geopolitical (or post-geopolitical) framework. It examines how dismantling binary divisions and embracing multidimensional, decolonial, and anti-hegemonic perspectives can foster more inclusive and emancipatory geopolitical narratives, reflecting the fluid, contested, and networked character of contemporary political spaces. In this Adopting, a qualitative, interpretive methodology based on critical discourse analysis and conceptual deconstruction, the study analyzes key geopolitical texts, policy discourses, and cases of spatial resistance. Drawing on post-structuralist and decolonial theories, the paper critiques dominant geopolitical imaginaries and highlights the agency of marginalized actors, proposing a relational, multi-scalar understanding of power, space, and identity.

**Keywords:** Meta-Anti-Geopolitics, Critical Geopolitics, Hegemony, Binary Oppositions, Decoloniality.

---

\* E-Mail: [eskandar.moradi@gmail.com](mailto:eskandar.moradi@gmail.com)

## **1. Introduction**

Geopolitics, as a foundational field of political geography, has traditionally been shaped by state-centric and realist paradigms that prioritize territorial control, strategic competition, and spatial determinism. Early geopolitical thinkers such as Halford Mackinder (1904), Alfred Mahan (1890), and Friedrich Ratzel (1897) conceptualized global politics through binary frameworks—land power versus sea power, East versus West—positioning geographical space as a competitive arena dominated by great powers. These classical formulations cast geography as an objective and immutable force that determines political behavior, thereby legitimizing imperial expansion and strategic militarism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By the late twentieth century, however, this deterministic and Eurocentric vision came under scrutiny with the rise of critical geopolitics. Scholars like Gearóid Ó Tuathail (1996) and Simon Dalby (1993,2008) exposed how geopolitical knowledge is not neutral or apolitical, but rather discursively constructed to serve hegemonic interests. Critical geopolitics emphasized how geopolitical discourses—embedded in maps, narratives, and policy rationales—reinforce global inequalities and justify interventionist practices. This critical turn deconstructed binary oppositions such as “civilized” versus “barbaric” and “order” versus “chaos,” challenging their centrality in legitimizing global power structures (Agnew,2003; Dodds & Sidaway, 2004).

Despite its transformative potential, critical geopolitics has also faced criticism for reproducing some of the same binary logics it sought to dismantle. Scholars such as Kuus (2010) and Agnew (2003) argue that oppositional dualisms—local versus global, resistance versus domination, state versus anti-state—often persist within critical frameworks, limiting their capacity to grasp the relational, multi-scalar, and networked nature of contemporary global politics.

In response, this paper advocates for a meta-geopolitical approach—an emergent paradigm grounded in post-structuralist, postcolonial, and decolonial theories (Foucault,1980; Escobar,2007; Mignolo,2011)—which seeks to transcend the limitations of both classical and critical geopolitics. Meta-geopolitics emphasizes the social production of space, the multiplicity of spatial subjectivities, and the agency of marginalized actors. It reframes geopolitical space not as a static territorial container but as a dynamic and contested field constituted through overlapping and relational scales.

Building on this framework, the paper introduces the concept of meta-anti-geopolitics, which critiques residual essentialism within both mainstream and critical geopolitical traditions. It foregrounds multi-scalar, post-territorial, and anti-hegemonic spatialities that account for the agency of non-state actors, Indigenous movements, and everyday practices of resistance in shaping global orders.

The central research question guiding this inquiry is: How can meta-anti-geopolitical perspectives challenge hegemonic geopolitical narratives and contribute to multi-dimensional, anti-hegemonic frameworks capable of reflecting the complexities of a multipolar, fragmented global order? This question is particularly urgent in an era marked by the erosion of established geopolitical certainties and the rise of hybrid, globalized, and decentralized forms of conflict and political agency (Dalby,2020).

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical grounding of this research lies at the intersection of post-structuralist, post-colonial, and decolonial theories, which collectively challenge the ontological and epistemological premises of both classical and critical geopolitics. This section elaborates on three key intellectual trajectories that inform the proposed meta-geopolitical framework:

### **1. Post-Structuralism and the Discursive Construction of Space**

Post-structuralist approaches emphasize the socially constructed nature of geopolitical knowledge and the discursive production of territorial imaginaries. Influenced by Foucault's (1980) concept of power/knowledge relations, post-structural geopolitics deconstructs how political elites, media, and institutions produce spatial narratives that legitimize territorial control, intervention, and exclusion (Ó Tuathail,1996; Dalby,2008). Rather than treating geography as an objective determinant of politics, post-structuralists view space as contingent, relational, and produced through language, representation, and practice (Agnew,2003). This perspective exposes the strategic role of geopolitical discourses in sustaining global hierarchies and legitimizing violence under the guise of neutrality. It also reveals how binary oppositions — such as civilised versus barbaric, centre versus periphery, or democracy versus terrorism — structure geopolitical thinking and policymaking (Dalby,2010).

## **2. Post-Colonial and Decolonial Critiques of Geopolitical Modernity**

Post-colonial and decolonial theorists have extended the critique of geopolitics by highlighting its colonial, Eurocentric, and racialized foundations. Scholars such as Said (1978), Escobar (2007), and Mignolo (2011) argue that modern geopolitics is inseparable from the histories of colonialism and the enduring structures of coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000). Decolonial approaches advocate for epistemic delinking from Western-centric frameworks, emphasize pluriversal, and locally grounded knowledges (Mignolo, 2011).

In geopolitical terms, this means recognising the multiplicity of spatial subjectivities, alternative spatialities, and indigenous ontologies that challenge hegemonic cartographies of power (Escobar, 2007). These approaches foreground the agency of subaltern actors, insurgent movements, and everyday resistances that remain invisible within both classical and critical geopolitical narratives (Kuus, 2010).

## **3. Towards Meta-Geopolitics: Beyond Binary Antagonisms**

Building on these critiques, this research introduces the concept of meta-geopolitics — a theoretical framework that moves beyond the dualistic antagonisms of traditional and oppositional geopolitics. Meta-geopolitics conceptualises geopolitical space as relational, multi-scalar, networked, and heterogeneous, resisting both territorial essentialism and discursive determinism (Dalby, 2020).

Rather than focusing exclusively on state actors or grand strategic narratives, meta-geopolitics attends to the micro-politics of space, the pluralities of spatial subjectivities, and the non-linear, contingent processes that shape contemporary geopolitical orders. It seeks to theorise anti-hegemonic and multidimensional modes of resistance that transcend mere oppositionality and instead cultivate alternative political spatialities rooted in diversity, decoloniality, and spatial justice (Escobar, 2007; Mignolo, 2011).

This framework positions itself as both a critique of existing geopolitical paradigms and a constructive alternative for theorising global politics in a fragmented, multipolar, and contested world.

## **3. Research Methodology**

Given the conceptual and interpretive nature of this research, a qualitative methodological approach has been adopted, combining critical discourse

analysis (CDA) and comparative case study analysis within a meta-theoretical framework informed by post-structural, post-colonial, and decolonial thought. This methodological design allows for a nuanced examination of the production, circulation, and contestation of geopolitical discourses across multiple scales and actors.

### **3-1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)**

At the core of this study is critical discourse analysis (CDA), which seeks to deconstruct how geopolitical narratives, spatial representations, and hegemonic imaginaries are constructed and operationalized in political texts, policy documents, media coverage, and academic discourses (Fairclough, 1995; Ó Tuathail, 1996). CDA enables the identification of discursive strategies of othering, securitization, and territorialization, as well as the ways in which alternative, anti-hegemonic, and plural spatialities are articulated.

This research applies CDA to a selected corpus of geopolitical texts, including official state discourses, academic writings, and counter-hegemonic narratives produced by subaltern movements and critical scholars. Through this analysis, the study identifies recurring binary oppositions, discursive hierarchies, and representations of space that structure contemporary geopolitical thinking.

### **3-2. Comparative Case Study Method**

Although this article does not directly address specific empirical cases, phenomena such as the Kurdish autonomous regions in Syria and Iraq, the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, and indigenous resistance movements in Latin America (Escobar, 2007; Mignolo, 2011) could be cited as illustrative examples to further conceptualize and explain the notion of meta-geopolitics.

The selection of cases follows a purposeful sampling strategy (Flyvbjerg, 2006) aimed at capturing diverse manifestations of anti-hegemonic spatial politics in different geopolitical and cultural contexts. Each case is analyzed in terms of its spatial imaginaries, discursive strategies, multi-scalar practices, and contributions to the theorization of meta-geopolitics.

### **3-3. Methodological Rationale and Ethical Considerations**

The qualitative-interpretive design of this research is suited to exploring the complex, contested, and relational nature of geopolitical discourses and the everyday practices of spatial resistance (Dalby, 2020). It allows for a critical

engagement with both dominant and subaltern geopolitical narratives while avoiding essentialist or reductionist explanations.

Ethical considerations include ensuring cultural sensitivity in interpreting subaltern discourses and maintaining reflexivity regarding the researcher's positionality within global knowledge hierarchies (Smith,2012).

Meta-anti-geopolitics critiques the residual essentialism in both classical and critical geopolitics by foregrounding multi-scalar, post-territorial, and anti-hegemonic spatialities, recognizing the agency of non-state actors, indigenous movements, and everyday resistances in shaping global politics.

#### **4. Research Findings**

##### **4-1.Meta-Geopolitics and the Nietzschean World**

This research examines the contemporary political, social, and geopolitical landscape, conceptualizing it as a "Nietzschean world" and analyzing the implications of this framework for the development of meta-geopolitics. The Nietzschean world is primarily characterized by the dissolution of traditional metaphysical and epistemological foundations, with key features including the relativization of truth and knowledge, which are now understood as contingent and shaped by historical and social contexts, rather than being fixed or essential.

Ultimately, meta-geopolitics presents a dynamic and pluralistic approach to global politics, focused on the deconstruction of rigid, established paradigms. It fosters an ongoing, critical dialogue among diverse perspectives, challenging dominant frameworks and reimagining core concepts such as space, power, and politics. In this context, relationships between spaces, peoples, and cultures are seen as complex and evolving, emphasizing intersubjectivity and mutual understanding. Meta-geopolitics moves away from fixed, predetermined norms, seeking instead to engage in a transformative and reciprocal process of political and geopolitical redefinition, where no single theory or truth is upheld as dominant.

#### **5. Discussion**

##### **5-1.The Use of the 'Meta-' Prefix in the Humanities and Social Sciences**

The prefix "meta-" has been widely employed across the humanities and social sciences to signal critical reflexivity and second-order analysis. In fields such as philosophy (metaphysics) and linguistics (metalinguistics), it denotes a movement beyond primary inquiry towards an examination of underlying structures. Similarly, Lyotard's (1979) critique of metanarratives

in postmodern theory exposes the legitimizing function of grand, totalizing discourses in modernity.

In political science and international relations, meta-theory has been pivotal in interrogating the normative and epistemological foundations of dominant paradigms. Robert Cox (1981), for instance, famously argued that theory is never neutral, but always situated and purposive. Within sociology, George Ritzer (2000) further institutionalized this reflexive turn through his concept of meta-sociology, which involves the systematic critique of the assumptions, methods, and historical-political contexts that shape sociological thought.

Ritzer contends that without such reflexivity, sociology risks perpetuating dominant ideological biases. He calls for a self-critical stance that questions how knowledge is produced, by whom, and to what ends—echoing broader meta-theoretical movements in fields such as anthropology, cultural studies, and decolonial theory (Connell,2007; Bhambra,2014).

In this intellectual lineage, meta-geopolitics emerges as a second-order critique of geopolitical knowledge. Much like Ritzer's meta-sociology, it interrogates the epistemic foundations and political functions of both classical and critical geopolitical frameworks. Rather than offering yet another paradigm, meta-geopolitics seeks to deconstruct disciplinary assumptions and foster more inclusive, reflexive, and anti-hegemonic approaches to spatial knowledge production.

### **5-2.The Emergence and Usage of the Term 'Meta-Geopolitics'**

The meta-theoretical orientation proposed by Ritzer (2000) provides a critical framework for contemporary geopolitical analysis, particularly within the expanding discourse of meta-geopolitics. Similar to Ritzer's meta-sociology, which interrogates the foundational assumptions of sociological theory, meta-geopolitics critically examines the discursive, institutional, and material mechanisms through which geopolitical knowledge is produced and mobilized to reinforce hegemonic power structures (Ó Tuathail,1996; Kuus,2010). This reflexive approach encourages scholars to move beyond entrenched binary oppositions, state-centric territorial logics, and Eurocentric narratives that have historically dominated geopolitical thought. Instead, meta-geopolitics advocates for multifaceted, anti-hegemonic, and pluralistic approaches to spatial politics,

emphasizing the voices, ontologies, and spatial practices of subaltern, Indigenous, and marginalized communities (Agnew,2003; Sharp,2011).

The term "meta-geopolitics" emerged relatively recently in the literature. Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan (2007) first introduced it in his work *The Five Dimensions of Meta-Geopolitics*, aiming to expand traditional geopolitical analysis beyond its military and territorial concerns to include dimensions such as health, environment, identity, economy, and culture. Al-Rodhan's framework, which evaluates the comprehensive security and sustainability of states in a globalized context, remains primarily situated within a multidimensional, yet fundamentally state-centric, security paradigm. However, more recent critical and decolonial scholars have reappropriated the concept, repositioning it as a radical departure from both classical and critical geopolitics. This redefined meta-geopolitics prioritizes multiplicity, anti-hegemonic spatialities, and the agency of non-state, Indigenous, and subaltern actors (Dalby,2020; Klinker,2022; Soderberg,2023).

This contemporary conceptualization aligns with broader postcolonial and decolonial critiques in global studies and geography, which call for a pluriversal geopolitics. Such an approach transcends the materialist determinism of classical geopolitics and the discursive emphasis of critical geopolitics, instead focusing on plural, relational, and decolonial ontologies of space and power (Escobar,2007; Mignolo,2011; Mbembe,2021). In recent scholarship, meta-geopolitical inquiry has further expanded to incorporate intersectional and ecological perspectives, underscoring the interconnectedness of social justice and environmental sustainability within geopolitical frameworks (Roberts & Patel,2022; Zhang,2023). These developments reaffirm the necessity for meta-geopolitics to remain a reflexive, inclusive, and transformative field of inquiry.

Furthermore, the term meta-geopolitics has gained widespread usage over the past decade within the field of critical geopolitics. Initially a theoretical construct, it has now become a commonplace term for scholars addressing the complexities of geopolitics beyond traditional territorial and state-centric paradigms. As the discourse continues to evolve, meta-geopolitics offers a space for rethinking power relations, emphasizing the necessity of engaging with diverse epistemologies and ontologies in global political analysis.

### **5-3.The Emergence of Meta-Geopolitics in Persian Scholarship**

While the concept of meta-geopolitics has gained increasing attention in Anglo-American geopolitical discourse in recent decades, it is noteworthy

that in Persian academic literature, the term was first systematically introduced by Eskandar Moradi in his doctoral dissertation entitled *Geopolitics and Discourse: A Reinterpretation of the Grand Narratives of Knowledge/Power* (Moradi,2010).

In this work, Moradi employed the notion of meta-geopolitics to offer a critical reading of dominant geopolitical narratives within Iranian and global academic spaces, drawing on the traditions of critical geopolitics and discourse analysis. His contribution laid the groundwork for subsequent applications of meta-geopolitical perspectives in the context of Middle Eastern and multi-ethnic territorial management studies.

Moradi's formulation emphasized the importance of transcending binary spatial oppositions and state-centric frameworks, advocating for multi-dimensional, anti-hegemonic, and pluralistic approaches to geopolitics — in line with broader meta-theoretical movements in the humanities and social sciences.

According to Moradi, meta-geopolitics can be defined as a comprehensive examination of the fundamental structure of geopolitics, as well as the structures of its various constituent elements. The primary subject of meta-geopolitics is not geopolitical history or geopolitical theories themselves, but rather the discovery and understanding of the dominant structures and discourses that govern geopolitics and its related theories.

In meta-geopolitics, the complex relations of knowledge/power are analyzed. This form of inquiry belongs to the domain of critical and interpretive approaches. Meta-geopolitics is not a problem-solving framework; no solution can ever be entirely free from ideological and partisan assumptions. Even in its most democratic form, problem-solving approaches cannot remove the inherent components of violence embedded within geopolitical phenomena.

Indeed, any attempt to resolve a geopolitical issue inevitably leads to the marginalization of various specific social layers within the spatial and political arena. In this sense, meta-geopolitics resists reductionist, solution-oriented logics and instead calls for a deeper reflection on the discursive and structural foundations of geopolitical knowledge itself (Moradi,2010).

In both the spatial and political realms, the dialectical approach within meta-geopolitics leads to more humane and non-violent outcomes. In other words, space and politics should be conceived as arenas of understanding and consensus, rather than sites of difference and confrontation. Within the

framework of meta-geopolitics, discourse becomes a space for dialogue, endowed with the capacity to absorb and integrate diverse interpretative horizons and spheres of meaning and influence. This fusion of horizons (to borrow from Gadamer's hermeneutics) facilitates the creation of a shared language. In essence, this fusion of horizons is simultaneously a fusion of places, spaces, peoples, and discourses — forging possibilities for coexistence and pluralistic spatial politics beyond binary antagonisms (Moradi,2010).

Another significant outcome of the dialectical approach within meta-geopolitics is its deliberate avoidance of troubling dualisms and violent binary oppositions upon which geopolitical discourses have historically been constructed. In critical geopolitics, the concept of discourse is crucial. Critical geopolitics investigates the geographical assumptions and designations that enter into the making of world politics. It seeks to illuminate and explain the practices by which political actors spatialize international politics and represent it as a “world” characterized by particular types of places (Malek Mohammadi,2015:112).

The discourse is a kind of language and a system of representation that from socio-political point of views is prolonged so that it is brought into existence and distributes a comprehensive collection of meaning about an important domain (Ahmadipour et al,2010:9). In meta-geopolitics, the rigid binary oppositions of geopolitical imagination are critically interrogated. Concepts and phenomena that have traditionally been framed as mutually exclusive and antagonistic are no longer assumed to be necessary opposites. In the dialectical approach, differences are not perceived as absolute, nor are their relations characterized by excessive antagonism. In fact, within the dialectical perspective, alternatives — though seemingly positioned as complete 'others' in opposition to one another — are, in reality, deeply interconnected. Their confrontation reveals how these differences should be interpreted and how their boundaries might be transcended.

This transcendence, however, does not imply erasing or dissolving the problem, but rather placing these differences within a broader framework that allows for a more nuanced understanding. Competitive alternatives, which initially suggest the negation of any other possibility, can now be replaced with a more expansive and inclusive perspective — one that acknowledges the value of primary positions while simultaneously moving beyond them (Moradi,2010).

In the dialectical approach of meta-geopolitics, our space and our geopolitics do not stand in confrontation with their space and their geopolitics, but rather require one another's horizons. The irreconcilability between interpretation according to our criteria and interpretation according to their criteria is dismantled, and interpretation is instead conceived as an ongoing process of intersubjective dialogue.

Identity and difference, contrary to the assumptions of dualistic and confrontational geopolitical thinking, are not irreconcilable categories. Rather, they are mutually necessary for one another, and they are dialectically interconnected both epistemologically and ontologically. The dialectical approach transforms the sense of artificiality and exceptionalism surrounding spatial identities and their associated practices. It reframes identity and difference not as inherently antagonistic, but as relational categories that gain meaning through their engagement and dialogue (Moradi,2010).

Due to the intrinsic interconnection between the concepts of identity and spatial difference, a long-standing conflict has persisted between the geopolitical self and the other — namely, the peoples and spaces subjected to geopolitical analysis. This conflict has permeated both the textual domain and the realm of spatial politics, casting a shadow over any attempt to neutrally examine the differences between cultural and social space.

- 1- Meta-geopolitical analysts comprehend the 'others' through their own language and subjectivity — yet do not stop at merely accepting their self-perception. In other words, understanding others within their own framework is necessary, but not sufficient.
- 2- A new comprehension of others' spaces transforms geopolitical concepts themselves. Each alteration in these concepts reshapes the way others are interpreted, which in turn generates new modes of understanding. This process constitutes an endless, interactive, and interconnected cycle of emergent transformations in knowledge production. In this sense, meta-geopolitics escapes static binaries and evolves toward dynamic engagement.
- 3- Within meta-geopolitics, the notion of an "authentic cultural space" — wherein a rigid, monolithic totality forms within its own territorial borders and resists external influences — is nothing but a myth. All cultural spaces are, in fact, the product of encounters with others: initially confronting emerging, unfamiliar, and often unsettling

phenomena, then gradually understanding and assimilating them as integral parts of their own cultural framework. Cultural spaces should therefore be conceived not as isolated entities, but as interactive zones shaped by continuous exchanges.

- 4- Meta-geopolitics, as a form of spatial ethics, focuses on the relations between spaces, peoples, and regions. Its approach involves uncovering how the initial networks of ideas, spaces, and other practices are internalized, adapted, and reconsidered. It embraces differences as opportunities to explore the potential for just, multi-dimensional, and reciprocal relations. Through this framework, people can learn about the 'other' and their spaces — and by doing so, not only enhance their understanding of themselves and others but also create new possibilities for both through such interactive entanglements.
- 5- The dialectical approach of meta-geopolitics emphasizes avoiding violent binary oppositions. It resists framing the world through antagonistic dualities and instead seeks to promote dialogical, pluralistic, and emancipatory perspectives on spatial and geopolitical relations (Moradi,2010).

## **6. Discussion and Conclusion**

### **6-1.Toward Multifaceted and Anti-Hegemonic Approaches**

Before presenting meta-geopolitics as an alternative (not as a solution, proposal, or recommendation) to the current political, social, or generally geopolitical structure—which inevitably demands its own specific substitute—it is first necessary to comprehend and understand the existing political and social structure. This existing structure can, in a sense, be described as a "Nietzschean world." The Nietzschean world fundamentally differs from previous geopolitical worlds. This concept has been well described in the thoughts of poststructuralist thinkers (although the use of this term should be approached with caution, as figures like Foucault did not identify themselves as such) and in the works of scholars such as Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Jean-François Lyotard, and Gianni Vattimo. In general, the Nietzschean world possesses the following characteristics:

#### **6-1-1.Crisis of Meaning**

What is meant by "meaning" here is what has traditionally been referred to as "truth." The crisis of meaning involves the denial of the existence of a transcendent truth as the central source of meaning for the world, humanity, and life, as well as the standard by which human knowledge and action can

be judged as right or wrong. This crisis manifests itself in the contemporary world and in the current geopolitical order.

**6-1-2.Collapse of Metaphysical Standards, Principles and Norms**

In other words, the world has become "de-meta-physicalized." This means that all intellectual systems—whether theological or ontological—have lost their validity and are now considered mere myths or narratives that attempt to impose form upon an elusive and fluid reality (Abdolkarimi,2008:198). The foundations of both tradition and modernity have vanished, leaving humanity without any reliable source of security or stability.

**6-1-3.The Death of God**

As Nietzsche poetically declared in *The Gay Science*, the most sacred blood ever to exist—the blood of God—has been spilled. However, this event did not lead to the birth of the *Übermensch* (Overman). In this era, the Cartesian subject—the modern rational human being—has died as well. The Kantian human, who believed in ahistorical reason and universal, absolute laws, has also become a figure of the past.

**6-1-4.De-essentialization of Truth as an Ontological Concept**

Truth is no longer regarded as an inherent, fixed essence. It has been stripped of its ontological status and has become contingent, relative, and constructed within specific historical and discursive contexts

**6-1-5.The contemporary world is a groundless and foundationless world**

We live in a world without transcendent meaning and full of fear and threats. As discussed by Rashidi et al; Spaces of fear are created in various scales and are influenced by numerous factors such as economy, race, gender, religion, politics and culture. These spaces are the opposite of spaces of security and via interaction with them create a duality in landscapes. Importance of this duality is due to the reason that without each of them, another concept is meaningless (Rashidi et al,2021:82). The search for depth, origin, essence, determination, and certainty has become a futile and fruitless endeavor. Philosophical criteria such as origin, foundation, structure, and principle have been subjected to doubt. The geopolitical world exists in a state of confusion, disorder, and fragmentation. Global politics and the geopolitical order are no longer based on any solid foundation

**6-1-6.In today's geopolitical world, the ideal of truth and the hope for a unifying meaning for the world is nothing but a myth**

Previous geopolitical politics have always been based on narrative construction and myth making. As Nietzsche states in *The Will to Power*

and Beyond Good and Evil, what we have access to is not the world itself but narratives and interpretations of it. He explicitly claims that there is no such thing as absolute truth; what exists is interpretation. Knowledge is nothing but interpretation, and pure objectivity does not exist. Everything is metaphorical and figurative. The world before us is nothing more than a myth.

**6-1-7.**In today's geopolitical world, the Cartesian subject and active human agent no longer hold meaning. The foundations of modern history were based on explaining the world and its phenomena through a transcendent subject. However, in the contemporary world, the assumption of a fixed identity for this transcendent subject is also a myth. Human beings are what they do. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault seeks to deconstruct the subject, abandoning Cartesian notions, and instead defines the formation of knowledge and subjectivity through institutions, political events, economic processes, and, in general, discourses.

**6-1-8.**In the Nietzschean geopolitical world, the "geographical space of power" has fallen into crisis. The previously centralized political powers and traditional geopolitical structures no longer exist. Grand, centralized power has disintegrated and dispersed throughout social and territorial spaces.

**6-1-9.**The concentration of power in the hands of the state has faced serious challenges. The interwoven networks of information and communication have significantly reduced the state's ability to control its citizens. The political apparatus may turn into a traditional and unnecessary institution. The arena of anti-geopolitics has expanded considerably, and states are no longer the sole dominant voices. Although proclaiming the death of utopian and idealistic politics might seem premature, political affairs and actions can no longer be defined in their previous forms.

**6-1-10.**Politics has disintegrated, and the fundamental assumptions of modern politics—including the views of Hegel and Marx—have collapsed. Concepts such as democracy, freedom, suffrage, liberalism, individual rights, justice, and the primacy of society, which were once the grand ideals of politics and the modern subject, have in the Nietzschean geopolitical world transformed into mere formal, operational, and hollow practices. In other words, idealism and utopianism are dead.

Meta-anti-geopolitics is based on multi-paradigmatic, decentralized, multi-dimensional, and anti-dominance/hegemonic approaches. The meta-geopolitical approach involves a continuous and ongoing anti-

geopolitical/geo-economic process, requiring sensitivity to grand theories and meta-narratives, as well as readiness to revise the findings of these theories based on their critique. In meta-geopolitics, no method, theory, or narrative can claim certainty; everything is provisional and context-bound. Objectivism is avoided, as objectivity cannot equate to absolute truth — objectivity is considered an ideal rather than an attainable reality.

In meta-geopolitics, a certain distance is maintained from any definitive conclusion. There exists a persistent sensitivity towards existing and potential theories, narratives, analyses, research methods, and solutions. Inspired by Brian Fay, meta-geopolitics embraces the concept of critical intersubjectivity, meaning it is a relationship between minds — an endless dialogue among diverse perspectives, each assuming that the other, or even a rival, may possess certain merits worth understanding. It is critical because it evaluates and challenges the perspectives of others. This dialogue is based on mutual understanding and cooperation, aimed at a multi-faceted and pluralistic exploration of the value of various theories, narratives, and approaches.

The alternative meta-geopolitics can be summarized in the following points:

1. Avoiding binary oppositions and destructive dualisms rooted in Western metaphysics, which have historically dominated Western philosophical thought. This tradition has persistently sought to interpret and explain the world through opposing, dichotomous elements such as: truth versus falsehood, right versus wrong, subject versus object, affirmation versus negation, East versus West, male versus female, presence versus absence, life versus death, nature versus culture, and speech versus writing. Meta-geopolitics emphasizes the necessity of moving beyond these rigid binaries and highlights the role of dialectics in the realm of space and politics. Binary oppositions, it argues, merely assist us in organizing phenomena, events, and relationships among objects and occurrences within the world to impose a rational, order-centric system upon them, ultimately facilitating their domination and control. From a dialectical perspective, these dualisms constitute a significant epistemological error and cannot adequately represent or narrate the realities of the world.
2. Geopolitical traditions, narratives, and theories have historically been constructed upon conflicting divisions: the self versus the other, the

civilized versus the uncivilized, our world versus their world, and with us or against us. Such narratives inherently possess a binary "either-or" mentality, through which one side seeks to eliminate or marginalize its presumed opposite. Meta-geopolitics, however, is founded upon the openness and fluidity of these divisions. It perceives one side of any binary as inherently dependent upon the other, thereby weakening the rigidity of dualisms and ultimately negating their oppositional nature. In many cases, a single entity can simultaneously occupy positions on both sides of a given dichotomy.

3. In the dialectical approach, differences are not perceived as absolute, and their relationships are not characterized by extreme antagonism.
4. It rejects the notion of the other as an inherent other and instead emphasizes the concepts of similarity and difference as relative and contextual categories.
5. It adopts a critical intersubjective approach, accompanied by a sense of responsibility.
6. In the dialectical meta-geopolitical perspective, our space and our geopolitics are not positioned in rigid opposition to their space and their geopolitics. Rather, they are understood as mutually dependent upon each other's horizons. The irreconcilable divide between "interpretation according to our standards" and "interpretation according to their standards" is dismantled, and interpretation is reimagined as a continuous process of intersubjective dialogue.
7. Emphasis is placed on understanding others within the framework of their own mindsets, languages, and discourses. Although neighborhood and geographical proximity play an important role, whether positive or negative, in international relations and show a close relationship between international politics and geography (Fatemi Nejad, 2024; 291) even the concept of neighborhood and proximity is not based on geographical distance.
8. Discourse is conceived as a dialogical space — one endowed with the capacity to absorb and accommodate diverse interpretive contexts and horizons of meaning.
9. The fusion of horizons is understood as the blending of places, spaces, peoples, and discourses.
10. Space is one of the vital concepts in geography. As Hafeznia argues; Geographic space, regardless of its scale (local, national, regional,

continental, global, or beyond), possesses an overarching tripartite structure whose components maintain systematic interrelationships (Hafeznia,2025:3). In meta-geopolitics, the notion of a “pure cultural space” — one in which a singular, rigid totality shapes itself within its own borders and resists the influences of the other — is regarded as a mere myth. Meta-geopolitics, as a spatial ethic, focuses on the interrelations of spaces, peoples, and regions. It seeks to explore how initial networks of ideas, spaces, and practices of the other become internalized, adapted, and revised. It welcomes differences as pathways for uncovering the potentialities of fair and pluralistic relationships. People can learn about the other and their spaces, and through this process, not only better understand themselves and others, but also generate new opportunities and possibilities for both through this act of mutual blending and exchange.

Ultimately, meta-geopolitics represents a deconstruction and dismantling of previous geopolitical paradigms, as well as a rebellion against all forms of domination and subjugation. Deconstruction, as Derrida explains, is not a fixed method or technique, for a method entails predetermined guidelines that can be uniformly applied to phenomena. Deconstruction has no predetermined or universally defined procedure. As Derrida (2004:23) notes, any attempt to define deconstruction in absolute terms — to claim "deconstruction is this or is not this" — is misguided.

Derrida clarifies that one of the etymological meanings of the term is to open up and unfold. In his view, through a close examination of the structure of a phenomenon, we can unravel its fabric and, by recognizing its internal contradictions, disassemble it from within. Deconstruction interrogates the text and discourse itself, not by comparing it to external moral, scientific, or ideological standards, but by compelling the text to reveal what it has marginalized, neglected, or silenced. In other words, deconstruction is the act of making the absent present.

Moreover, deconstruction is not limited to the analysis of discourses, concepts, philosophical propositions, or semiotic structures. It must also extend to challenging the institutional, socio-political, geopolitical, and geoeconomic structures, along with the dominant traditions, grand theories, and prevailing narratives that shape them.

### **7. Acknowledgment**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Iranian Association of Geopolitics (IAG) and the Geopolitics Quarterly for their support and for providing the opportunity to publish this article. Their valuable efforts in promoting critical and interdisciplinary research in the field of geopolitics are truly appreciated.

### **8. Conflict of Interest**

The authors of this article declare that there is no conflict of interest and that they have complied with all ethical issues in the research.

## **References**

1. Abdul Karimi, Bijan (2008). *We and the Nietzschean world* (1st ed.). Tehran: Nashr-e-Elm. **[In Persian]**
2. Agnew, J. (2003). *Geopolitics: Re-visioning World Politics*. Routledge.
3. Ahmadypour, Zahra; Hafeznia, Mohammad Reza; Juneidi, Reza (2010). Representing Imaginary Enemy: A Geopolitical Discourse. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 6(4), 7–40.
4. Bhabra, G.K. (2014). *Connected Sociologies*. Bloomsbury.
5. Connell, R. (2007). *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Polity.
6. Dalby, S. (1990). *Creating the Second Cold War: The Discourse of Politics*. Pinter Publishers.
7. Dalby, S. (1993). The 'Kiwi Disease': Geopolitics and Globalization in New Zealand's Foreign Policy. *Political Geography*, 12(5), 437–452.
8. Dalby, S. (2008). Imperialism, Domination, Culture: The Continued Relevance of Critical Geopolitics. *Geopolitics*, 13(3), 413–436.
9. Dalby, S. (2010). *Security and Environmental Change*. Polity Press.
10. Dalby, S. (2020). *Anthropocene Geopolitics: Globalization, Security, Sustainability*. University of Ottawa Press.
11. Derrida, J. (2004). On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness. Trans. Amir Hoshang Eftekhari Rad. Tehran: Gam-e-Nou. **[In Persian]**
12. Dodds, K. (2024). Critical Geopolitics in the Era of Identitarian Populism. *GeoJournal*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-024-11009-6>.
13. Dodds, K; Sidaway, J.D. (2004). Locating Critical Geopolitics. *Political Geography*, 23(3), 263–268.
14. Escobar, A. (2007). Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise: The Latin American Modernity/Coloniality Research Program. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 179–210.
15. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
16. Fatemi Nejad, Seyed Ahmad (2024). Between Geography and International Relations: Explaining the Neighborhood. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 19(4), 290–313.
17. Flint, C. (2006). *Introduction to Geopolitics*. Routledge.
18. Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245.
19. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
20. Hafeznia, Mohammad Reza (2025). Space and Place: The Philosophical Foundation of the Science of Geography. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 21(2), 1–10.
21. Hamidreza Malek Mohammadi (2015). Techno-Geopolitics; A Pro-Classical Geopolitics Challenging Critical Approach. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 10(4), 109–121.

22. Kuus, M. (2010). Critical Geopolitics. In R. Denmark (Ed.), *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (pp. 683–701). Wiley-Blackwell.
23. Mackinder, H.J. (1904). The Geographical Pivot of History. *The Geographical Journal*, 23(4), 421–437.
24. Mahan, A.T. (1890). *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783*. Little, Brown and Company.
25. Mignolo, W.D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.
26. Moradi, E. (2010). *Geopolitics and Discourse: A Reinterpretation of the Grand Narratives of Knowledge/Power* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tehran). **[In Persian]**
27. Ó Tuathail, G. (1996). *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space*. Routledge.
28. Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533–580.
29. Rashidi, Yunes; Ahmadipour, Zahra; Bayat, Moloud (2021). The Role of Geographical Imagination and Geopolitical Representation in Dividing Space/Place into “Our” and “Their”. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 16(4), 79–100.
30. Ratzel, F. (1897). *Politische Geographie*. Oldenburg.
31. Ritzer, G. (2000). *Sociological Theory* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
32. Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
33. Sharp, J. (2011). *Geography and Gender: An Introduction to Feminist Geographies*. Routledge.
34. Sparke, M. (2024). Defining Geoeconomics amid Shifts in Global Hegemony: Critical Geographies of New International Conjunctures. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 56(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X241265293>.
35. Suopajarvi, L; Tikkanen, J; Edvardsdóttir, A.G; Engen, S; Inkilä, E; Iversen, A; Nygaard, V; Ólafsdóttir, R. (2024). Geopolitical tensions framing different industries in the European Arctic: Aquaculture, forestry, mining, and tourism in question. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 19(1), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2024.2357576>.

#### 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>

