



NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY

STUDY MATERIAL

**POST GRADUATE
GEOGRAPHY**

Paper : 6

Group : B (II)

POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

PREFACE

In the curricular structure introduced by this University for students of Post-Graduate degree programme, the opportunity to pursue Post-Graduate course in a subject is introduced by this University is equally available to all learners. Instead of being guided by any presumption about ability level, it would perhaps stand to reason if receptivity of a learner is judged in the course of the learning process. That would be entirely in keeping with the objectives of open education which does not believe in artificial differentiation.

Keeping this in view, study materials of the Post-Graduate level in different subjects are being prepared on the basis of a well laid-out syllabus. The course structure combines the best elements in the approved syllabi of Central and State Universities in respective subjects. It has been so designed as to be upgradable with the addition of new information as well as results of fresh thinking and analysis.

The accepted methodology of distance education has been followed in the preparation of these study materials. Co-operation in every form of experienced scholars is indispensable for a work of this kind. We, therefore, owe an enormous debt of gratitude to everyone whose tireless efforts went into the writing, editing, and devising of a proper lay-out of the materials. Practically speaking, their role amounts to an involvement in 'invisible teaching'. For, whoever makes use of these study materials would virtually derive the benefit of learning under their collective care without each being seen by the other.

The more a learner would seriously pursue these study materials the easier it will be for him or her to reach out to larger horizons of a subject. Care has also been taken to make the language lucid and presentation attractive so that they may be rated as quality self-learning materials. If anything remains still obscure or difficult to follow, arrangements are there to come to terms with them through the counselling sessions regularly available at the network of study centres set up by the University.

Needless to add, a great deal of these efforts are still experimental—in fact, pioneering in certain areas. Naturally, there is every possibility of some lapse or deficiency here and there. However, these do admit of rectification and further improvement in due course. On the whole, therefore, these study materials are expected to evoke wider appreciation the more they receive serious attention of all concerned.

Prof. (Dr.) Subha Sankar Sarkar
Vice-Chancellor

Third Reprint : January, 2020

Printed in accordance with the regulations of the
Distance Education Bureau of the University Grants Commission

POST GRADUATE GEOGRAPHY
[M.Sc]

PAPER : GROUP

PGGR-06 : B(2)

Writer : Dr. Sudipto Adhikari

Notification

All rights reserved. No part of this study material may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from Netaji Subhas Open University.

Mohan Kumar Chattopadhyay
Registrar



Group B (2)

Unit 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Geographical Perspectives of Formation of State; Nation and Nation-State: Core and Peripheral Areas, Capitals, Frontiers and Boundaries, Buffer Zones, Buffer States and Land-locked Areas	7-38
Unit 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Heartland and Rimland Geostatic Ideas of Mackinder and Spykeman	39-56
Unit 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Partition of India and its Geopolitical Implications	57-98
Unit 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Politics of World Resources; Political and Economic Blocks, Political Geography of Foreign Trade	99-118

Unit 1 □ Geographical Perspectives of Formation of State; Nation and Nation-State; Core and Peripheral areas, Capitals, Frontiers and Boundaries, Buffer Zones, Buffer States and Land locked Areas

Structure

- 1.1 State and Nation**
- 1.2 Core-Periphery**
- 1.3 Capital Cities**
- 1.4 Buffer Zones, Buffer States and Land-locked Studies**

1.1 State and Nation

State :

States are part of our taken-for-granted world and we hardly even query their existence. States can even appear to be natural phenomena. However, for being natural entities, modern sovereign states are entirely historical artifacts the oldest of which have in existence in their present shape and alignment only for the past three or four centuries. In 1500 Europe was a complex mixture of hierarchies and territories through which power was organized. Europe was politically highly decentralized. It was estimated that there were 1,500 independent political units in Europe at this time. One of the features of the complexity of European politics in 1500 was that territories having allegiance to the same sovereigns were usually spatially separated. Territories were accumulated by families through a combination of war, marriage and inheritance. The process could lead to successful claims on territory by a family across all parts of Europe, e.g. the most successful family of the period, the Hapsburgs, accumulated territories in Spain, Austria, Italy and Burgundy to produce a 'realm' that is the geographical synthesis of the modern European state. It is only at the end of this period that territorial claims begin to become focussed on accumulating land to produce compact and contiguous states.

Such spatial compactness and contiguity of political territory, produced a typology where each 'state' was defined in terms of an 'inside' and an 'outside'. Hence the fundamental nature of compact and contiguous states consist of the

relation, which we may term 'looking inwards' and 'looking outwards'. The former necessarily concerned with the states, relation with their civil societies, the social and economic activities that existed within their territories. The later case had to do with the states relations with the rest of the index state system of which they were parts. There were the same states that operated in both spheres, looking inwards (domestic policy) and outwards (foreign policy) simultaneously. For, political geography this topological model of the study is the key starting point for understanding the formation of states.

State apparatus for dealing with domestic and external relations did not evolve at the same time, but the domestic political institutions preceded external ones by about 300 years. The medieval victory of the papacy over the Holy Roman Empire produced a power vacuum that the papacy failed to fill. Hence, across Europe in the thirteenth century political power accrued to middle-range kingdoms to fill the gap. These kingdoms, some of which have survived (Portugal, France, England) and some which have not (Navarre, Naples, Burgandy), created only institutions to deal with internal affairs. They were really concerned with large scale estate management, and the first permanent institutions were high court and the treasury. There kingdoms were known as 'law states'. This form of political organization was to survive the crisis of feudalism after 1350, and was available, alongside other political entities as Europe began to construct the modern world after 1500.

However, the concept of foreign affairs had no meaning in the chaotic period of the times. War and dynastic marriages were family matter requiring the creation of no specialist arm of the state. The situation was slow to change, even during the sixteenth century with emergence of more compact state territories, e.g. the state with the most advanced apparatus at this time was France, but even here creation of separate institutions for foreign affair was slow. During the sixteenth century, the need for dealing with foreign matters was recognized, but this was an added responsibility of existing state apparatus. By the seventeenth century, France and other countries had evolved a state apparatus that included institutions to deal with external and internal relation. Unlike in the medieval period, there now existed an inter-state system, and all states had to compete as territorial entities to survive by looking both inwards and outwards. This was a new fashion of world politics premised on territory and sovereignty—a state further towards state formation.

Territory and Sovereignty

'Territory' implies a division of political power. In modern usage, the application to city-states in the antiquity, now has become obsolete. It is now applied to modern

state. A territory is the land belonging to a ruler of state. The meaning has been traced back to 1494, approximately the birth of the world economy. The modern meaning of territory is closely tied up with the legal concept of sovereignty. In fact, this is a way in which it can be distinguished from the original city-scale definition. Sovereignty implies that there is one final and absolute authority in a political community. The concept was not evolved in the classical Greek World—city territories were not sovereign. However, the concept can be traced back to the Roman Empire and the emperor's imperium over the empire. It is this concept that passed on to medieval Europe in Roman Law. But medieval Europe under feudalism was hierarchical system of power and authority, not territorial one. It was the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 that territory and sovereignty was brought together to define the modern inter state system. It recognized each state was sovereign in its own territory, i.e. interference in the internal affairs of a country was the first offence of international law. The result was formal recognition of a Europe parcelled up into 300 sovereign units. This was the original territorial basis of the modern inter-state system—the first 'world political map'.

Territory is the platform for engaging in international relations; sovereignty provides the legitimation. 'Sovereignty is the ground rule of inter-state relation in that i.e. identifies the territorial entities who are eligible to participate in the game'. Hence not all territories are sovereign states.

The first mosaic of sovereign territories was a direct result of the strife resulting from the religious wars in Europe in the wake of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. The crucial political issue of the day was order and stability, a rather the lack of it, and the territorial state emerged as the solution to the problem of security. Security provides a stability in which a territory's resources can be mobilised more completely. Security and opportunity were the two basic functions of the territorial state. The former relates to the origin of the inter-state system, the latter to the emerging world market.

In a competitive state-system, security requires more than recognition of sovereignty. It requires keeping up with the neighbouring states in economic terms. The rise of mercantilism was very much tied up with the rise of the territorial state in the seventeenth century. The Dutch state was a best example of a territorial state, being based on mercantilism. It offered an alternative *raison d'etat* focusing on economics rather their traditional *raison d'etat* emphasizing politics, war and the glory of the king. The power of the state ultimately depended on the success of the mercantilism. The exact nature of different states, policies in the world market reflected

the balance of power between landed and merchant interests. The former succeeded once overwhelmingly in Eastern Europe to produce its peripheralization, and the later in Western Europe, particularly, most successful in England, although France developed very strong mercantilist policies for a short period.

Today, it is not possible to become sovereign just by declaring yourself thus i.e. sovereign. It is never a matter for a single state, it is an inter-state arrangement because sovereignty can exist only for 'states who reciprocally recognise each other's legitimate existence within the framework and norms of the inter-state system. Since 1945, recognition of sovereignty has usually been confirmed by acceptance into membership of the United Nation. Hence the very first task of the new post colonial states of Africa and Asia was to apply to join the UN to prove their entry on to the world stage. This process of recognition has been repeated by the new states from the break up of the USSR and Yugoslavia. In short, sovereignty gives territories an international recognition and capacity in the world system. The territorial sovereignty is a feature of the modern state system that distinguishes from previous political system.

The operation of the twin principles of territory and sovereignty as the basis of international law has an important corollary : states have become the 'collective individuals' around which laws are framed. Hence, the 'rights of states' have priority over the interests of other institution. The Article 2 of the United Nation Charter upholds the territorial integrity of member states and outlaws intervention in their domestic affair.

In the make-up of the world political map, three types of political claims seemed to have played the most crucial role, and ranked in order they are effective control territorial integrity, and historical and cultural claims.

Effective control as a criterion for accepting a state's right to a territory is used to legitimate armed conquest. Sovereignty is normally accepted once effective control of a territory is demonstrated. India's incorporation of Goa into its territory after successful invasion of the Portuguese colony in 1961, is an example.

Territorial integrity can be used to challenge the right of a state that has effective control over a territory. Geographical claims can be at any scale. The most well known example is the Spanish claim to Gibraltar. Despite the wishes of the inhabitants, the United Nations voted in 1968 for the transfer of Gibraltar to Spain, because it was a part of the Iberian peninsular and that provided the basis for the territorial integrity claim.

Historical and cultural claims are much more varied in nature. Historical claims relate to priority or past possession of the land, while cultural claims have usually been associated with national claims to territory under the heading of 'national self-determination'. With few exceptions, today's independent African states have the same boundaries on the colonial territories they superseded, which took little or no account of indigenous African cultural pattern. Despite, this, boundaries of Africa drawn by European power after 1884 have largely survived intact. This is a very good illustration of the conservatism inherent in the inter-state system succeeding in blocking change in the pattern of the world political map. Generally, the new states do not support the division of another state, because it would be likely to lead to questioning the integrity of their own inherited territory. Today, most African boundaries are older than European boundaries. It is, indeed, a reality that the world political map is the ultimate result of power politics and conflict. It is a map of changing pattern of winners and losers. Territory provides a platform, sovereignty a justification, but neither is an adequate defence for a state against a successful action of power politics and conflict by a rival bent on its elimination from the world stage.

All states are autonomous entities that proceed along parallel paths but from different starting times and at different speeds.

Hartshorne (1950), Gottmann (1952) and Jones (1954) had developed theories of the modern states, particularly with regard to their geographical formation. For Hartshorne, the fundamental purpose of the state is to bind together its various social and territorial segments into an effective whole. The integration function can be carried out 'vertically' for social groups, and 'horizontally' for territorial groups. Gottmann, on the other hand, analysed the world political map, as consisting of a Mosaic of 'states' and concluded that it was based on two main factors : Movement (all kinds of movements) that causes instability, and 'iconography', (a system of symbol in which people belief), which causes stability. These two forces oppose one another, and the world map at any one time is the balance achieved between stability and instability. Break up and formation of states, according to him, may be the result of these two opposite set of forces.

Hartshorne who developed the theory of territorial integration, in his functional approach in political geography had identified two set of forces : centrifugal forces pulling the state apart are centripetal forces binding it together. Gottmann's movement and iconography are important examples of centrifugal and centripetal forces respectively.

Hartshorne identified one basic centripetal force of overwhelming importance—the state-idea. Every state has a *raison detre*, a reason for existence, and it is the

strength of this 'idea' that counteracts the centrifugal forces. In modern world, this state-idea, like Gottmann's iconography, is closely associated with nationalism.

Hartshorne's theory of territorial integration vis-a-vis the making of state provided a model for analysing particular cases. It was further developed by Jones in his 'unified field theory'. Hartshorne's concept of 'state-idea' was extended to form a chain of five related concepts : political-idea, decision, movement, field and political area. In the case of the modern states, the political idea is the *raison detre*, while decision is the specific treaty recognizing the validity of the idea. Movement is Gottmann's concept as required in operationalizing the decision to produce a field as the arena in which the movement occurs. Finally, a political area is defined as the territory of the state. Jones put forward the example of the establishment of Israel as follows : Zionesiss was the idea, the Balfocer Declaration of 1917 was the decision permitting movement (migration) which produced a field (the immigrant settlement pattern) generating war, that defined a state of Israel out of Palestine. When the chain was completed, the centripetal forces triumphed, when the chain was broken, centrifugal forces were deemed to be strong.

Creating New States by Partition

These are examples of states getting collapsed and partitioned. In political geography terms, there was no state-idea to build upon, so centrifugal forces overwhelmed the new creations and formations. The West Indies, Central African and East African federation collapsed, and Singapore seceded from Malaysia. This process of partition was to be seen in its most spectacular form in British India, where the partition produced Pakistan and India in 1947, after the loss of one million lives and the transfer of twelve million people. The partitions of the recent past have taken advantage of the political fluidity that is a feature of any geopolitical transition. In more stable periods represented by geopolitical world order, partitions are generally a much rare phenomenon. This is because every state partition represents a severe threat to the 'status quo'. It is for this reason that separatist movements usually command very little support in the international community, as in the case of Biafra that attempted to secede from Nigeria in the civil war of 1969-1971. It obtained little or no political support from other African states. In contrast, the separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan in 1971 was quickly accepted by the international community after its creation. The state promoted centrifugal forces when it required to develop very strong centripetal forces to survive as two separated territorial units. When partition came it was not interpreted as the result of a typical separatist movement but as a particular and necessary correction of post-colonial boundaries.

Bangladesh was an exception that would not affect the status quo. Within three years, the new Pakistan (formerly West Pakistan) recognized the new state of Bangladesh (formerly East Pakistan).

Since 1989, with the collapse of communist rule in Europe, new partitions have taken place. Beginning with Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, the old federation of the USSR has been dismantled into constituent parts : the world political map lost one state, and fourteen new states have been added. This is not the only revision that cartographer are having to implement. Yugoslavia collapsed to make for four sovereign states, and Czechoslovakia is now two states : the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Fortunately or unfortunately not much Asian states in the recent past, suffered or split partitioned, since the creation of Bangladesh.

Partitioned states are usually considered to be permanently separated. Here partition is the result of internal pressure. It is a way of solving a destructive diversity within a state. The classic examples are India-Pakistan partition from the last geopolitical transition and Palestine-Israel partition. The post-1989 partitions in East Europe are clearly of this type.

“A modern state is an area organized (geo)-politically in an effective manner by an indigenous, a resident people with a government in effective control of the area (territory). However, it is the notion of sovereignty that assumes the existence of the state, or the state is defined by its possession of sovereignty which is the supreme coercive power within the territory—the state gives orders to all and receives no order from none inside its recognized boundaries. Invasion by a foreign power or internal insurgency aiming at creating a new state is a violation of state’s sovereignty’. If it is not defeated the state no longer has a monopoly of coercion in the territory and faces extinction.”

Nation :

A state is made up of area (with its resources) of people, and of an effective mechanism of government. But in most states of the modern world the people themselves have some bond of union, holding them together and distinguishing them from the people of other share, over and above the land, the land area and the governmental mechanism which they state. We may think of the people of Bangladesh as being Bengalee. Their ‘Bengaleeness’ is demonstrated primarily by their common use of Bengalee language, though this is spoken also by a significant part of the population on either side of the international boundary i.e. in West Bengal, a constituent unit of India. But within the defined boundaries of Bangladesh, the Bengalees are themselves distinguished by a complex of social ideas and attitudes.

These in turn for decades and centuries, have been shaped and are known to us as 'Bengalee tradition or Bengali culture'. Their is the cement that binds the people together and makes them cohere into a Bengali nation. A nation is therefore, a cultural entity with a territorial specification and identification. As Bertrand Russell (1938) had expressed it : "A creed a sentiment of some kind is essential to social cohesion, but it is to be source of strength, and it must be genuinely and deeply felt by the great majority of the population". A sense of 'belonging together' also makes a people to cohere into a nation in due course of time.

A common nationality generally has several attributes, but very few have all of them. The most usual of them are common descent, language, territory, political entity, customs and traditions and religion : "...common language and a same of ethnic kinship, geographic unity and contiguity, a common historical experience and frame of political thought, a common area of economic mutuality, and sometimes, the fear of a common foe tend to synthesize and cohere a group of people into a nation.... A common religion was usually regarded as an equally important prerequisite until modern religiously pluralistic nations....refuted the theory" (Niebuhr. 1959).

As Hartshorne (1950) put it : "...a nation....as a group of people occupying a particular area who feel themselves held together in terms of common acceptance of particular values that they demand that their area and people should be organized in a distinct state, as the political agency by which those values may be preserved and furthered".

Each nation has a view of itself and, at the same time, a concept of other nation. It knows what it perceives to be its national space, and this space it is probably prepared to defend. It may, on the other hand, embrace territory to which it has little emotional attachment and which it may be prepared to abandon, without too much soul searching in an emergency. The nation's concept of itself, like its attitudes to other peoples, is a product of its history and tradition. It is not always a national attitude and a really devoid of a kind of self congratulatory egotism. The folklore which helps to give a nation a a sense of unity also tends to represent it as more noble, more just, more democratic than others.

Nationalism and Nation-State

Nationalism is generally considered to be the most geographical of all political movements. Traditional political geography was largely organized around the trilogy of territory—state-nation, so that behind every successful territorial state there was a vibrant nation. Hence to territory becomes national 'homeland', sometimes even

'fatherland' a 'motherland', imbued with symbolic significance of nationalism and the state becomes the 'nation-state' as the ideal expression of the political will of the nationalism. Or, in other-words, nationalism is the political expression of nationhood, the nation-state is the politico geographical expression of nationalism.

Nation and nationalism continue to be important to our understanding in political geography for one basic reason that they are both explicitly territorial in nature. Nations do not simply occupy space like other social institutions or organizations, they claim association with particular geographical location. They share this property with modern sovereign state and this shared territoriality is expressed in the concept of nation-state. Nationalism is not an eternal expression of nation through the ages but consists of a family of political practices that are barely 200 years old.

There are two interpretation of nation and nationalism 'primordial' and 'modernist'. According to the primordial interpretation, nations are historical communities with a common ancestry. Therefore, the origins of today's nations are to be found in yesterday's tribes. This produces an evolutionary view that culminates in a world of nation, each with its own particular and unique genealogy. The essentiality of this view or interpretation lies in the primordial ties of ethnicity and language. For primordialists, ethnic communities emerged out of the prehistoric times and entered history as the basic units of human experience. In this view, nations are natural and perennial. The human species is genetically divided into a limited member of kin-related groups of individuals. These groups have always existed, although they may not have always expressed themselves as forcibly as in the very recent past. Hence all periods of history will contain nations, and some of these will have survived migrations, assimilations and conquests to form the origins of modern nations : the Chinese, the Germans and Indians have survived while the Babylonians and Assyrians have not survived.

The modernist views nationalism as a historically recent phenomenon that has provided a unique and powerful link between politics and culture. Nationalism as a term engaged only in the late nineteenth century and as an idea, it can be traced back to the earlier concept as the 'principle of nationality'. This principle was very simple and powerful one-every nation has the right to its own state. This idea seems to have emerged in the eighteenth century, became a major force in world politics in the nineteenth century and has come to dominate the politics of the twentieth century. 'The basic characteristics of modern nation and everything connected with it is its modernism'.

Nationalism as a force for challenging existing states derives from another important change in the nature of this politics that happened in the late nineteenth

century. At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, a Europe of twenty-seven 'nation-states' was constructed. Today, the number is even higher, but the implication of opening the possibility of statehood to all ethnic groupings that may be 'nation' has global implications for the stability of the world political maps.

Is there any authentic example of a nation state in the sense of one people, one state? Most of the states have a degree of mixed population that makes their credentials as nation-states doubtful. Nevertheless, lack of 'cultural purity' has not prevented most states in the world claiming to be 'nation-states'. However, those states could be put into the category of nation-states where over 60 percent of the population are from one ethnic group. But this is not fair, given the 'ideal' of the nation-state. Of course Iceland, Japan and Somalia are best example of ideal nation-states where the dominant ethnic group constitutes more than 95 percent of state's population.

Divided Nation

As there are examples of 'partitioned' states, so there are examples of 'divided' nation. Germany (1949-1990), Korea, Mongolia, China and Vietnam (1955-1974) are examples of divided nation. These states had cultural and linguistic unity before partition or division. These partitions or divisions were the result of outside forces and were not considered permanent by their population. Vietnam and Germany have been reunified, and in the other cases there remains the concept of one nation despite the two states.

Nation-building

Nation-building (or political integration in the context of such nation-states that consist of a mosaic of different ethnic communities, aspiring for the status of nations) refers essentially to the process of bring together culturally and socially discrete groups into an organic (i.e. fully functioning) spatial system and establishment of a strong national identify inseparably bound with the territory of this system. The process attempts to create a sense of territorial nationality that eliminates subordinate parochial loyalties. Successive territorial re-alignments and reorganizations of the Indian states since 1953 were aimed at eliminating 'loyalties' towards the erstwhile princely states. In a federal system, it is the 'state-idea' that brings together the diverse regions of the states into a common political system. Nation-building is essentially a geographical phenomenon as it involves innovation diffusion of the political idea through the length and breadth of the state, justifying *raison d'être* of the state.

Distinction between the State and the Nation

Although the relations between the State and the Nation are mutual and manifold, but there are differences between the two. Firstly, the nation is a cultural entity, while

the state is a legal entity. The nation is tradition-bound, and historical, but the state is politics-bound, i.e. it is created by the political will. Secondly, the nation is a natural unit of the society, while the state is an artificial unit of the World's political space. Thirdly, the nation is permanent, but the state is a temporary phenomenon. The Bengalees remain but East Pakistan disappeared. The nation cannot be eliminated, but the state can be destroyed. Fourthly, the nation is mobile that it can abandon its place of habitation and moves to newer place when threat loom large over it, but the state is immobile, and it perishes if it loses its 'raison detre', or if it loses the war. Fifthly, the state can have more nations within its bounds, which the nation cannot do. Finally, both can pre-ale each other, e.g. the state of England created the English nation while the Norwegian and the Polish nation antedated Norway and Poland. However to some political geographer, there are no differences between the state and the nation, rather they are synonymous, and inseparable.

1.2 Core-Periphery

The principle of centrality has been a feature of geopolitical world-views. It is founded on the proposition that, however complex the pattern of international relationships may become, there is always a 'central place' which enjoys a position of particular significance. Such pre-eminence need not necessarily be exclusively political, it may include political, commercial, technological, cultural, demographic or military elements in various combination. A place endowed with such qualities can be a city, a nation or a region, and in geopolitical terminology it can be variously described as a core region, a zone, a belt, a centre of gravity or a heartland. While the actual location which have been deemed as fulfilling this role have changed considerably over time, the basic idea of there being a 'centre', within a particular state, region or the world as a whole has remained. The corollary of the existence of a world centre is bound to be that of the existence of a world periphery, an edge, which is in all ways its opposite. While the centre is that place where power in many different forms is concentrated, the periphery is the area which is, by definition powerless. Between these two extremes there is a gradation from absolute centrality to absolute peripherality.

It is in this grey area between the middle and the edge that the complex relationships and rivalries of the geopolitical world have been played out and where those aspiring to future power have lain in wait.

During the 1970s, as the bipolar world which had existed for a quarter of a century began to unravel, its geopolitical justification came to be challenged. Other

world-view, until then frozen out by the cold war, began to reappear, and the most influential of these was the core-periphery view. The most significant new contribution to the centrist condensation was the world systems analysis. From the 1980s this came to be particularly associated with the work of George Modelski and Immanuel Wallerstein. Viewing the world as a 'system' with a basically core-periphery structure, they proposed a totally different global scenario from that of the cold war. This new centrism was part of what can best be described as 'planet earth' thinking which arose from an increasing realisation that the most important contemporary issues were those which confronted humanity as a whole and were too large for any one country and too complex for any one ideology to tackle successfully. Important among the issues which now came up for examination was the rapid depletion of the world's finite reserves/resources and the very real possibility of the exhaustion of many of them within the foreseeable future. This led to the question of the inordinately large share of these resources being used up by the countries of the developed world, which in turn pointed to the extreme of global wealth and poverty that continued to exist a generation after the European empires had been replaced by the independent states in Africa and Asia.

It has been observed that during this period global economic inequality had increased rather than diminished. With the increased integration of the planet, "the most advanced are dependent on the most backward and vice-versa" development is the reverse side of the underdevelopment. Consequently a large section of the globe, containing majority of its people, was relegated to the periphery of the system which was designed to channel the greater part of the world's wealth towards the centre. By the 1970s this was seen to be hardening into a pattern of development and underdevelopment which split mankind into 'haves' and 'have-nots' on a global scale. The realisation of this imbalance was one of the prime causes of the beginnings of the 'geopolitical paradigm-shift' from the perception of a world divided by ideological confrontation to that of a world divided by differences of wealth. Taylor (1981) saw the effects of Walterstein's approach as putting the North vs South conflict 'at the centre of the stage' in place of the East vs West conflict.

In the light of the dawning realisation that one of the most fundamental problems was global inequality, the cold war confrontation came increasingly to be seen not only all irrelevance but, as a result of the armsrace which it had encouraged, a profligate waster of valuable resources. With the questioning of assumptions underlying the cold war came also a questioning of the assumptions underlying the nature of that

geopolitical world produced by it. These were based on the belief that these existed an irrevocable and permanent split between two great centres of power each holding to an ideology which was mutually exclusive and incompatible with the other. The difference between the two in a great variety of way was observed to be great that the term 'worlds' had been invoked to describe them. The term 'world', much used in the past to describe those geographical areas remote from the Western ecumene, had been transferred to the great ideologies, which were seen as being virtually geographical phenomena possessing the kind of permanence associated with the physical features of the world surface. In order to be effective in addressing the new set of issues, peri- and post-cold war thinking required to be freed itself from the two worlds' ideological baggage. This came about through the interdependence within a finite space implied in the earth bound ideas and the scotching of the cold war myth of the 'mighty opposites' in a divided world. As the balance of terror stained to abate, the superiority of the west became more evident, and this pointed increasingly towards the existence less of a 'mighty opposites' than of a single world centre. The rationalisation of this took the form of world-systems analysis.

A system can be defined as being a grouping of related elements organised for a purpose. The systems approach consists in the analysis of physical and social systems with a view to understanding the functioning of complex and dynamic situation in brood outline. By the 1970s the systems approach in social sciences was being applied to the first of international relation and politics. While systems analysis has a wide application in geopolitics and political geography, the main objective of the present account is to assess its importances in the development of the contemporary core-periphery world view. The basic proposition of the world systems analysis is that these is indeed a world system that operates as a functioning whole.

The world systems dates from the opening up of the world by the Europeans in the sixteenth century i.e. by 1557 the European world-economy had arrived and was surviving early vulnerability on its way to becoming the only historical example of fully developed world-economy. As it expanded, it eliminated all remaining mini-systems and world-empires to become truly global by 1900. The most fundamental spatial characteristics was that it was based on a core-periphery structure. Within the framework of this systems there were four fundamental types of change :

1. **Transition** : It was an internal process, where one system evolves into another, e.g. mini-systems have begotten world-empires in certain advantageous circumstances in both the old and New Worlds. Similarly one world-empire, that of feudal Europe, was the predecessor of the capitalist world economy.

2. **Transformation** : It occurred as external process as incorporation. As world-empires expanded they conquered and incorporated former mini-systems. These defeated population were reorganized to become part of a new mode of production providing tribute to the conqueror. All peoples of the continents beyond Europe have experienced this transformation over the last 500 years.
3. **Discontinuity** : Discontinuity seemed to have occurred between different entities at approximately the same location where both entities shared the same mode of production. The system was broken down, and was replaced by a new one. For example, the sequence of Chinese states could be a classic example. The periods between these separates world empires were anarchic, with some reversal to mini-system, and were commonly referred to as Dark ages.
4. **Continuity** : It occurred within systems. Despite popular image of 'timeless' traditional cultures, all entities were found to be dynamic and continually changing. There were two types of changes : linear and cyclic. All world-empires have displayed a large cyclical pattern of 'rise and fall' as they expanded into mini-systems until bureaucratic-military costs led to diminishing returns in contraction. In the world-economy, linear trends and cycles of growth and stagnation form an integral part of the analysis.

Modern social sciences have devised many 'stage models' of development, all of which involve a linear sequence of stages through which societies i.e. countries are expected to travel. The basic method is to use an historical interpretation of how rich countries became rich as futuristic speculation of how poor countries can become rich in their turn. Advanced countries are on the top and the states of the Third World are on the lower rungs. The way of conceptualising the world has been very popular in geography, where stage models are applied to a wide range of phenomena such as demographic change and transport network. All assume that poor states can follow a path of development essentially the same as that pursued by the current 'advanced' states. These development models of social change expose the weakness of the multiple society assumption. If social change can be adequately understood on a country-by-country basis then the location of the ladder (five stages of economic growth) does not matter; each society is an autonomous object of change moving along the same trajectory but starting at a different dates and moving at different speeds. However, the world-system analysis totally refutes this model of the contemporary world. The fact that some countries are rich and other one poor is not merely a matter of timing along some universal pathways to affluence, rather, rich and poor are part of one system and they are experiencing different processes within

that system. The world-system analysis is a challenge to developmentalism : the simplistic world of an international 'ladder' is superseded by the sophisticated concept of the capitalistic world-economy.

Wallerstein (1974, 1979) has identified three basic elements of the world-economy. **First**, the world-economy consists of a single world market, which is capitalist, whose logic permeates economic decision throughout the system. This means that production is for exchange rather than use, i.e. producers do not consume what they produce but exchange it on the market for the best price they can get. These products are known as commodities, whose value is determined by the market. Since the price of any commodity is not fixed there is economic competition between the producers. The concrete result of the single world market has been uneven economic development across the world.

Second, in contrast to a single world market, there have always been a number of political states in the world-economy, so that no one state is able to dominate finally. Hence the inter-state system is a necessary element of the world-economy. However, single states are able to distort the market in the interests of their national capitalist classes within their boundaries, and powerful states can distort the market well beyond their boundaries for a short time. There is a competitive state system in which a variety of 'balance of power' situations may prevail. For nearly all of the period since the Second World War, the balance of power was bipolar, organized around the USA and the former USSR', under conditions of globalization a very different bi-polar contest may be emerging between the United States and the European Union.

Finally, there is a three-tier structure which is 'political' in nature but is more subtle than previous one. According to Wallerstein, the exploitative processes that work through the world-economy always operate in a three-tier format. This is because in any situation of inequality three-tiers of interaction are more stable than two tiers of confrontation. Those at the top will always manoeuvre for the 'creation' of a three-tier structure, and whereas those at the bottom will emphasize the two-tier of 'them' and 'us' the continuing existence of the world-economy is therefore one in part to the success of the ruling groups in sustaining three-tier patterns throughout various fields of conflict : core, periphery and semi-periphery.

The semi-periphery is political in nature as a stabilizing force between the economic-geographical extremes. It plays a key role in the dynamics of the world-economy, since it is the semi-periphery where the most acute class struggle occurs when it becomes the focus of periodic restructuring.

The Concept of Core and Periphery

It is now commonplace to define the modern world in term of core, meaning the rich countries (North America, Western Europe and Japan) and periphery meaning the poor countries of the Third World. The core-periphery pattern is often treated as a static, almost natural, and phenomenon. The world-economy use of the terms 'core' and 'periphery' is entirely different. Both refer to complex processes and not directly to areas, regions or states. The latter only become core-like because of dominance of core processes operating in that particular area, region a state. Similarly, peripheral areas, regions or states are defined as those where peripheral processes dominate. Core and periphery processes are opposite types of complex production relation. In simple term, core processes consist of relations that incorporate high wages, advanced technology and a diversified production mix, whereas periphery processes involve low wages, more rudimentary technology and a simple production mix. These are general characteristics, the exact nature of which changes constantly with the evolution of the world-economy.

However, space itself can neither be core nor periphery in nature, rather the core and periphery processes structure space so that at any point in time one or other of the two process predominates. Since these processes do not act randomly but generate uneven economic development, broad zones of 'core' and 'periphery' are found. There is a general assumption that 'the core exploits and the periphery is exploited'. But this cannot occur as zones exploiting one another, it occurs through the different processes operating in different zones. Or, in other words, the core dominates (although it in turn may be dominated from outside) while the periphery is dependent. The dependence is structured through the relations of exchange between the core and the periphery.

World Systems : Core-periphery Dichotomy : Geopolitics

As mentioned earlier, both Modelski (1978) and Wallerstein (1974) have engaged in world-systems analysis, however, with a different prospective. Modelski approached the whole question from an international prospective and in doing so, he discovered 'a symmetry to international politics that is the very anti-thesis of anarchy'. He observed that there is a global political system which is autonomous of other systems. It is a subject of constant change, and this manifests itself as 'a recurrent pattern'. Since the global system came into being in the sixteenth century it has taken the form of succession 'long cycles' (period associated with the dominant position one particular power, each normally lasting for around a century, after which control is increasingly lost and a new cycle will begin. A century is the life of about three

generations : one generation builds, the next generation consolidates and the third loses control), and from then on it has become possible to talk of world power as opposed the more geographically limited power of earlier times.

The cycles have centred on a succession of states which have functioned as the vehicles for change within it. These were the 'world power'. As the global connection were brought into being by the use of the sea and by the deployment of sea power, world powers are essentially sea powers. Modelski distinguished between global power, which had a wide maritime reach beyond Europe, and the true world powers that attained at a given time a commanding position within the system. According to Modelski, there have been four such powers : Portugal (1494-1517), the Netherlands (1579-1609), Great Britain (1688-1713 & 1792-1815) and the United States (1914-1945). The emergence of these world powers manifested five long cycles and there constituted the 'core' maritime power, commanding the world system during their respective periods of hegemony. The rise and fall of the world power can be attributed to intra-septemic changes in patterns of trade, industrial development, and technological advance. According to Modelski, the structure run down and have to be reconstructed and this reconstruction takes form of cyclic change. The essence of global power is functional network control.

While Modelski emphasizes political factor, and in particular the state as the essential driving force within world-system, Wallerstein places the emphasis on economic factors, in particular on the 'capitalist world economy'. The state was conceived of as being a result rather than a cause, and it is 'the world-economy' which is responsible for the nature of the world geopolitical order, and for the cycles to which it is subject at any given time. A world-economy can be defined as being an economically autonomous area of the world which is able to provide for the greater part of its need. Composed of a hierarchy of zones each with its own particular economy, it possess is a unity that extends across political frontier. It has a core-periphery structure, and one overreaching economy dominates the whole. Core-periphery analysis seeks to explain the inequality within it. (see above).

European world-economy, according to Wallerstein was the matrix of capitalism. Using the term 'hegemony' to describe that power which was at the centre at any particular time, he sees this position as being firmly based on economic supremacy. According to him the first world power was the Netherland rather than Portugal, and a true world-economy did not really come into being until the twentieth century. He referred to the 'hegemonic cycles' of the Dutch, British and Americans, which related to "three logistic waves (upto 300 years of the world economy)". Wallerstein's 'world systems project' is conceived of as being an alternative to the Marxist world new.

Using Wallerstein's model as a basis, Taylor (1985) asserted that : 'In world-systems analysis geopolitics is about rivalry (East versus West) in the core for the domination of the periphery by imperialism (currently North over South). However, Wallerstein's world-economy approach presents an opportunity for political geographers to return to the global scale of analysis without paying any homage & Mackinder which was probably the fact most well-known geographical model throughout the world, known for its remarkable achievement of longevity. While Mackinder points towards East-West conflict, Wallerstein places the North versus South conflict at the centre-stage. Wallerstein's approach is deeply embedded in the economic base of the global situation whereas Mackinder-type approaches only consider the workings of the political superstructure.

The world-economy approach appears to have facilitated a kind of post-Marxist radical progressive world-view sustained by a post-Mackinder geopolitical world view. In this way geopolitics was firmly tied to the world-economy approach and world order can be regarded as being 'relatively stable structures that define distinct periods of world politics'.

Although having its origins in systems analysis which can be traced back to ideas current in the 1950s and 1960s, the idea of the world-economy and all that it entails for geopolitical thinking is very much a product of the peri-and post-cold war years. The immense potential ascribed to the heartland had not materialised and the spectre of Soviet power was increasingly perceived to be illusory. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990 appeared to be conclusive proof of this and consequently demonstrated that the associated continentalist idea had also been a false one. The cold war image of the maritime world as a weak and scattered periphery around a powerful Soviet world centre, its strength founded on the enormous potential of the heartland, gave place to that of a West as the centre of the capitalist world-economy and with the United States as its contemporary hegemonic power. The world had been turned inside out and the core-periphery view now appeared more appropriate than the binary or pluralist one to describe and explain the 'new world order'.

The world-system that exists today is a coherent and susceptible to rational analysis and interpretation. It has a distinct spatial structure which comprises a core, a middle and a periphery. The core cannot be explained in terms of one set of characteristics, such as political or military ones, but has many attributes which together form a multi-faceted and complex whole. In this conjuncture 'world-civilization and world-economics join hands and help each other'. The North Atlantic has been the centre of gravity of the whole system, and place from which it has been

controlled. There is a cycle of growth, ascendancy and decline which has produced a succession of hegemonial power within it. The conflicts associated with cyclic changes are what may be called 'the contest for centreship'.

The Semi-periphery Category

Discussion on the core-periphery dichotomy remains inconclusive without a brief account on the semi-periphery colasp concept. Core and periphery do not exhaust, Wallerstein's concepts for structuring space. Although these processes occur in distinct zones to produce relatively clear-cut contrasts across the world-economy, not all zones are easily designated as primarily core or periphery in nature. One of the most original elements in Wallerstein's approach in his concept of semi-periphery. This is neither core nor periphery but combines particular mixture of both processes. There are no semi-periphery processes, rather, the term 'semi-periphery' can be applied directly to zones a areas when they do not exhibit a predominance of either core or peripheral processes. This means that the overall social relations operating in such zones involve exploiting peripheral areas, while the semi-periphery itself suffers exploitation by the core. India and China in the contemporary world-system may be put in this category because of being the victims of exploitation by the United States of America, European Union and Japan and exploitor of the African countries, while the Russian federation has been relegated to the peripheral category because of its fluctuating economic growth.

The semi-periphery is interesting because it is the dynamic category within the world-economy. Much restructuring of space during periods of 'crisis and economic stagnation' in the system involves zones rising and sinking through the semi-periphery. Opportunities for change occur recessions, but there are only limited opportunities—not all the semi-periphery can evolve to become core. Political processes are very important here in the selection of success and failure in the world economy. Wallerstein actually considers the semi-periphery's role to be more political than economic.

Suggested Readings

Modelski, C. (1978) 'The long cycle of global politics and the nation state' *Comparative studies of Society and History* 20 : 214-235.

Parker, G. (1998). *Geopolitics : Past, Present and Future*. London pinter.

Taylor, P. J. (1981) 'Political geography and world economy' in A.D.

Burnett and P. J. Taylor (eds) *Political studies from spatial perspectives*. Chichester : Wiley.

Taylor, P. J. (1985) Political Geography : London Longman.

Wallerstein, I (1974) The Modern World System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origin of The World Economy in the Sixteenth Century : New York Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I (1979) The Capitalist Economy. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

1.3 Capital Cities

A capital city is destined to become an epitome of the national life, in which their history and tradition are enshrined....its....authority is buttressed by increasing size and wealth which accompany multiplication of administrative business and concentration of trade and industry at the political centre. "(Whittlesey 1939). A capital embodies and exemplifies the nature of the core areas of the state and is the reflection of the wealth, organization and power of the political entity. Spale (1942) defines a capital city as the place, wherein the political authority of a territorial unit is concentrated, it is the seat of the legislature, the head-quarter of the executive, exercising a higher or lower degree of supervision over local administration according as the structure of the government is highly centralized or federal. It is often, although not invariably, the cultural focus of the country...."

Functions of the Capital

A capital city is the place for parliamentary and legislative gatherings and is the residence of the chief of the state. Here is a prime place for the state's reception of external influences, for other states which have relation with the state build and locate their embassies here, international organizations of trade have representation here. In most states, the capital city is also the most 'cosmopolitan' city of the country. It is on the capital city depends the geographical pattern of the forces of integration and disintegration. If it acts as the binding agent, then the forces of integration are arranged in a more expressive way across the entire state. The capital city is the 'creator' of the 'state-idea' that justifies the 'raison detre' of the state. The integrating of role of the capital city is to be found in a federal polity, where it carries forward the nation-building process in a much greater way than in a unitary state system.

Capital cities must also be a source of power and authority, either to ensure control over outlying and loosely tied regions of the state or to defend the state against undesirable external influences. In the changing strategic situation of the world, this function is diminishing, reminiscent as it is of city-state times. But the

capital is most frequently located in the economic heart of the country, from which much of the image of strength of the state emanates.

“The capital is often the link through which the state in process of formation receives the vital external influences that impregnate its internal potentialities, for as Vidal de la Blache remarks, ‘no civilized state is the sole architect of its own civilization’. Examples of the importance of this organizing ‘head-link’ function are numerous. Calcutta’s existence as a capital was due to its position at the entrance of the English sea-ways into India, especially before the Suez Canal gave Bombay an advantage in distance to England. These were gates by which Western concepts entered to destroy and to build; the return to Delhi—New Delhi—pertains curiously both of “historical imitation, and of the creation of a new federal capital” (Spale 1942).

Location of the Capital

The normal and logical location for the capital is in the core area, where it can most easily embody and represent the tradition and historical values of the state. In such a location the present government may derive a kind of sanction from the presence there of the evidences of centuries of continuous rule. Paris, London, Rome, Delhi, Cairo, Athens, Stockholm, Moscow and many others are themselves monuments to the past of their respective nations.

More complex are instances where the capital has been shifted from its ancient or original site to one better adjusted to later needs. In some cases, these changes reflect rapidly changing geo-political requirements and environments. A simple example is the shift of the capitals of Burma (present Myanmar) and Thailand from the original inland location at Mandalay and Ayutthaya to coastal locations, at Rangoon and Bangkok respectively. In India the traditional site had lain between Patna and Delhi. Patna i.e. Pataliputra on the bank of the Ganga was the original capital of ancient India, particularly, during the period of the Mauryan rules, but it shifted to a site near Delhi, during the medieval Muslim period. During the entire Mughal period, the site of the royal seat rotated in and around Delhi and Agra, because the threat to the empire lay to the west. Under the British influence, however, the capital was moved to the port of Calcutta and then again moved to Delhi in 1910. The ‘locational’ shift from the coastal to the interior was necessitated because it was the natural site for the capital of a continental empire including the basins of both the Ganga and the Indus. One of the prime reasons for the shift from Calcutta to Delhi was conditioned by the presence of a vast stretch of frontier, inhabited by people with hostile and aggressive attitudes that posed consistent threat to the British empire.

In some cases, however, locational shifts of the capital cities, reflected conflicts between the desire for the capitals to remain rooted in their original and ancestral soils, and the urge to move towards frontiers, i.e. in the direction of influences, commercial and cultural, and strategical which the states desired to benefits and profits. Locational shifts of capitals, from one site to another site, may be viewed in terms of 'historical imitation'. "The process of historical imitation may not be primarily geographical, but its origins and its effects are so. The shift of the Russian capital from it. Petersburg back to Moscow may have been a more measure of military precaution, but it symbolised a Russia turning back to its vital springs in the indeterminate marches of Europe and Asia. Because Muscovy proper was geographically and historically the true heartland of Russia, the return, conditioned in part by the loss of the western fringes of the empire, has a geographical as well as political significance".

Pakistan has moved its capital from the cosmopolitan part of Karachi to an interior site, Islamabad, close to India vis-a-vis Jammu & Kashmir. This shift was conditioned by the defence strategy, and other military factors. But the shift of the Brazillian capital to a site in the virgin bush of the interior : Brasallia, manifested the desire to colonise the vast western marches of the country that lay 'untapped' (resources) for decades. In most of the cases the 'shift', a frontier location was chosen : Delhi, Islamabad and Brasallia, all how frontier location, in true sense of the term.

Canada, Ceylon, China, Italy, Japan, Philippines, Turkey, United States all these countries have witnessed or experienced changes in the locational site 'of then' national capitals, since 1700 A.D.

Types of Capitals

Study of capital cities quickly leads to the conclusion that there are several distinct types of capitals, so that a classification may be possible. According to some geographers these are 'natural' and 'artificial' capitals. This calssification suggests that certain capitals have emerged and developed as the state system grew increasingly complex, while other have been simply the result of arbitrary decision. However, Spate (1942) attacked this classification, arguing that any decision leading to the establishment of an 'artificial' capital is itself the result of pressures created within and by the system—To him, Brasilia is no less 'natural' a capital than Rome, since the need for Brazil to penetrate its Western interior generated the creation of Brasilia just as the complexity of the Roman Empire generated multifunctional Rome.

As early as in 1939, Jefferson, in a paper, entitled : 'The Law of the Primate City', published in Geographical Review, concluded that London, Copenhagen and Mexico

City were several times as large as the second city of their respective countries— Britain, Denmark and Mexico. These capital cities, according to him became the 'primate city' of their respective countries, because they expressed the national disposition more completely than any other city in their countries. "Primacy of a leading city is thus an earmark of indense nationalism. Here are the nation's mind and soul..... A country's leading city is always disproportionately large and exceptionally expressive of national capacity and feeling" (Jefferson 1939). However, these are exception to this concept. This 'law' holds no relevance in those states where new sites have been selected for capital cities, and the capitals were shifted. Pakistan, Brazil, Canada, Australia and Nigeria have several cities relatively larger than their capitals and these cities are culturally and economically more expressive of their 'Nation'. In the Republic of South Africa, Johannesburg is the largest city, but not the capital.

Blij (1972) proposed a morphological classification of capital cities. Capital cities were viewed in relation to their positions with reference to the state territory and the core area of the state. He identified there classes of capital cities :

1. Permanent Capitals

These capital may also be called historic capitals. They have functioned as the leading economic and cultural centre for their state over a period of several centuries. Rome, London, Paris and Athens are examples of permanent capitals, as they have remained the capitals for their respective countries for many centuries and through numerous stages of history. These capital cities are situated in the political 'core area' of their respective countries. In fact, London, Rome, Paris, and Athens seemed to have guided the spatial arrangement and growth of the political core-area of the countries. It is difficult to say which predated whom : the capital cities or the core-areas?

2. Introduced Capitals :

Introduced capitals are those capitals which are established or localized on newer sites, abandoning the older sites. This may be called the shift or movement of capitals from older to newer sites. This movement and/or shift normally occurs when the core areas of states shift over a long period of time, e.g. such shift of site has occurred in Switzerland where decision was taken to move the functions of government to a more appropriate site.

Tokyo and Brasilia are 'introduced' capitals. The selection of Tokyo as the national capital manifested the desire of the Japanese government to be out-ward

looking i.e. the leadership wanted a capital that looked out over the sea for sea was to become Japan's lifeline of survival and prosperity. Kyoto was an interior city with no future of expansion. Brasilia's selection as the probable site reflected the desire of the Brazilian government to build a new capital deep in the interior was the realization that the nation's eyes could be diverted in that direction—a direction the nation had long and excessively ignored. With the establishment of Brasilia as the new capital began a new era for an inward-looking Brazil. Rio de Janeiro as a capital was abandoned. 'Introduced' capitals are more in nature of 'artificial' capitals. It is quite natural for a state to periodically reassess its capital City's functions, effectiveness and service, and in that case an escape to a new site often appears desirable.

3. Divided Capitals :

In the Netherland, Republic of South Africa and Bolivia, the functions of governments are not concentrated in one city, but divided among two or even more. Such a situation reveals—and even reflects—compromise rather than convenience. In the Netherland, Amsterdam is the titular capital and the official residence of the Monarch. It is the 'official' capital but the Parliament site in the Hague, the legislative capital. In the Republic of Africa, Pretoria is the 'administrative' capital Capetown is the 'legislative' capital, while Bloemfontein is the judicial headquarter. The arrangement appears to satisfy the desires of the Africans and English-speaking South African. In Bolivia, the small town of Sucre is the legal capital, but La Paz is the larger town, housing legislature and other government offices. There is intense rivalry between these two cities, still there is no uncertainty in the polity in Bolivia.

Apart from these three types of capitals, Pounds (1972) has added one more type : the 'federal capitals'. Federation as a mode of government is generally a concession to the size or to the cultural variety of a state. However, weak the central government may be in a federal state, a capital is nevertheless necessary. The location of a capital in a federation requires more consensus and compromise between the federating units because it is the location of site for the capital city that often leads to vigorous dispute and conflict, particularly at the time of the formulation of the constitution. The choice of a location for the federal capital has been difficult in Canada and Australia.

Due to bitter rivalry and hostility between the English speaking and French-speaking Canadian, a neutral site at the cross-roads of language—a small village on the Ottawa river was selected. However, it was not until the adoption of the federal constitution, in 1867, that this same site on the Ottawa River became the city of

Ottawa, the capital of Canada. In Australia, the rivalry was between the coastal cities of Sydney and Melbourne. However, the constitution of Australia provided for the establishment of a capital on a territory to be acquired by the federal government. In 1911 a site was chosen amid Blue Mountain, and the city of Canberra was founded. Brazil also faced the same problem while moving the capital from Rio de-Janeiro to Brasilia in 1960. But not all federation have faced the problem of rivalry in the choosing the site for the capital cities, e.g. India and Argentina.

The capital in most state is thought of an something more than the seat of the legislature and of administration. It has also the role of focusing sentiment and strengthening the bonds which hold the nation together. If one of the roles of the capital is to unify, a central location might be thought the best. Centrality of Ankara, Delhi, Paris and even Madrid are examples, as they have provided greater desirability in organizing unity out of diversity, but there are many successful capitals like Washington and Canberra and even Peking and Tokyo, which are eccentric in location.

Suggested Readings :

Blij, H. J. de (1972) *Systematic Political Geography* : New York. Wiley

Jefferson, M. (1939). 'The Law of Primate City' : *Geographical Review*, 29 : 2 : 226-232

Pounds, N.J.G. (1972) *Political Geography* : New York. McGraw Hill Company.

Spatz, O. H. K. (1942). 'Fuction in the Development of Capital Cities' : *Geog. Review* 32 : 4 : 622-631

Whittlesey, D. (1939). *The Earth and the State* : NewYork Holl.

1.4 Buffer Zones, Buffer States and Land-locked States

The 'buffer zone' idea was developed by Lord Curzon after the First World War when, as Great Britain's foreign secretary, he was involved in the drafting of the peace treaties. He firmly believed that such a zone was necessary to separate the German and Russian spheres and the mosaic of small states between the two was intended to be a buffer of this sort. The shape of Europe as it finally emerged from the council rooms of versailles, **Trianon** and **St. German's**, wrote Strausz-Hupe (1942), 'unmistakably bears the stamp of the Curzonian school of thought. Curzon believed that 'scientific knowledge had precedence once ignorance', and this now made frontiers 'capable of being connected into the instruments and evidence of peace. Curzon's prime concern during the concluding year of the nineteenth century,

and also during the beginning of the twentieth century was with the Anglo-Russian confrontation in Central Asia, and particularly with the vulnerability of the Indian Empire to invasion from the north. His solution to this problem was the advocacy of 'buffer zones' separating the spheres of influence of the great powers and so preventing 'irreconcilable collision' from taking place. He saw these buffer zones as being 'on the outskirts of empire' ruled by 'twentieth century marcher lords' (Curzon 1908).

Despite his advocacy, in practice no such zone even came into existence between the British and Russian Empires although there were places, such as Afghanistan, the small Himalayan kingdoms and Tibet that managed to sustain a fragile independence between the spheres of the two great protagonists. However, Woodman (1969) said that to create buffer areas across the Himalayan and Trans-Himalayan region were designed to prevent Russian and Chinese invasion of the British Empire in South Asia, and the very 'buffer concept' was a part of the British frontier philosophy.

The concept of the buffer zone is also to be found in Fairgrieve's work (1932) but to him it was 'crush zone of small states', which although separating land and sea power, was itself in a precarious position. In the opinion of Stausz-Hupe, the concept of the buffer zone was never a really satisfactory answer to the problem of frontier, and the Curzonian type of buffer zone although dressed up as an area of peace, is in reality still a zone of confrontation.

Cohen's (1973) 'shatter belt' concept consisting of small states lying at the crossroads of the two mutually exclusive great global strategic regions. Trade-Defendent Maritime world and Eurasian continental power, in West Asia and South Asia, also gives credence to the buffer concept, however, in a different fashion and pattern. The word 'shatter' refers to the break-up of the force of impact in the cushion of separation provided by the intervening state. The word, 'Buffer' has a similar meaning: the reduction of impact as a result of physical separation of the competing powers. Thus, the buffer zone is in fact a higher order frontier, and states within it may well face absorption by rival forces.

In pre-and-post war II periods, the buffer zones played the most crucial role in the global geopolitics, separating warring nations or powerful states, and maintaining stability. Buffer zones used to be high-order frontiers, most of which once a period of time disappeared as the powerful states absorbed these geographical entities and incorporated or integrated them. A buffer zone, however in some cases may not be a high-order frontier, rather it may consist of few small nations e.g. Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria, together used to form a buffer between the Soviet Union and Germany. Their absorption by the power core of the Soviet Union, and the partition

of Germany, eliminated the possibility of the development of an effective buffer zone in one of the theatres of Communist-Capitalist competition.

In Southeast Asia, also, the attempt at absorption can be observed. The state of Laos, which was created artificially out of the former Indo-Chinese realm, was to serve the purpose of acting as a buffer between Communist and Non-communist sphere of influence. Internal opposition to the status quo existed, and **enemities** were fanned by outside support given to pro-western elements as well as pre-communist elements. Infiltration from the north and arm shipments from Western power led to the crisis in the late 1950s, but although actual warfare did not occur its scope remained limited. Laos functioned well as a buffer state. While supporting infiltration China did not openly invade the country, Western powers supported anti-communist activities but did not strike China.

Ideological differences between the former Soviet Union and China in the 1960s had brought into focus another potential buffer zone that extended along the Sino-former) Soviet boundary in Mongolia and, possibly Manchuria. It was the desire of the erstwhile Soviet Union to seek for a population movement/migration east ward, into Siberia. The desire on the part of the former Soviet Union had objectives other than just the economic, for the Soviet Union (former) had long desired to render the occupation of its eastern 'frontier' more effective. China's claims to ethnic and historical affinities with the people of this border region of the former USSR, and its aid and propaganda programs in Mongolia, all were designed as a prelude to competition for a buffer zone. The boundaries of the political entities were defined and delimited, but the goal was not penetration and partition, but the control and allegiance of the Central authority. Further more, China's overthrow and absorption of authority in Tibet, and its boundary disputes with India was designed to absorb Tibetan entity and integrating it. It also served to focus attention upon expansionist tendencies that might not remain confined to non-Communist sphere (de Blij 1972).

'Dependencies' in Africa, south of the Sahara used to form a broad buffer zone between the Black nationalist spheres and the white dominated spheres in South Africa. As the areal coverage of the Black nationalist spheres increased through the absorption of the intervening entities in the 1960s, so decreased the areal coverage of the dependencies, and the distance between the Black nationalist Africa and the White dominated Africa in South Africa. By 1972, the territorial coverage of the Black nationalist African sphere zone increased manifold and the intervening buffer zones decreased. Rhodesia and the Portuguese dependencies of Angola and Mozambique may be historically regarded as forming a buffer zone between 'Black' Africa and the Republic of South Africa.

Some buffer zones have slowly emerged through a process a 'spontaneity' i.e. desire among the states in the zone, seeking for peace and stability in the entire region or keeping the entire region from being developed into a zone of potential conflict. However, the buffer zone that developed in Africa during the 1960s, can also be put in this category because the emergence of the buffer zone between the Black Africa and the White Africa also manifested a desire, a kind of spontaneity on the part of the Black people to have a separating zone or a zone of penetration vis-a-vis the White Africa in the South.

Some buffer zones, on the other hand have been created artificially. During the nineteenth century, the British in South Asia feared most the growing of Russia to the north. For this reason, they created a buffer zone consisting of Persia and Afghanistan between British territory and Russia. A long, narrow extension of Afghan territory, the Wakhan Province, stretches eastward to join up with Chinese Sinkiang. Though British-occupied territory lay within 25 kms of the Russian border, the two were never contiguous. The Himalayan kingdom of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan were regarded as an eastward continuation of this protecting belt of the buffer zone.

It was during the era of colonialism that the relevance of buffer zone was realised in a greater way. It was a kind of geopolitical compulsion and a necessity also, given the way, the expansion and penetration of the sphere of influence of the European colonial powers in Africa and Asia had been taking place. The buffer zone there in Africa emerged of their own because the encroaching European colonial power were not sure of their territorial limits in the interior parts of the continent therefore, substantial parts remained unexplored, and gradually developed into buffer zones separating the British, the French, the Belgium and Dutch areas in the continent.

Buffer State

A buffer state is a small political unit, created artificially, between large nation. It is a state sandwiched between more powerful and usually rival neighbours, and by its existence helping to allay potential friction between them and contain their expansionist policies. The position of these states is very tenuous and their histories tend to be brief and somewhat temptuous, with one or the other of the powerful neighbours unable to resist the temptation to expand and annex the land on its border. The annexation of Tibet by China in 1950, and the merger of Sikkim with India in 1975 are examples of the buffer state being absorbed and merged. The buffer states survive "because they separate states that otherwise be powerful neighbours and because the attempt to conquer them would be met, not by the relatively weak resistance of the buffer, but by the much stronger opposition of the other neighbour".

Buffer states are purely a mechanical device of international politics, they are not merely transitive but also transformative because they adjust tensions of the two political "voltages to permit at least some flow of current without danger that flying sparks will fire the whole house". Today, the buffer countries are neither subordinate nor really neutral. They are now 'powers' actively engaged in international politics, and though 'uncommitted' in the East-West and North-South conflicts, they have not withdrawn from—to the contrary, are active in—politics that affect conflict.

With regard to the relationship between the buffer zone and the buffer state, it is said that the former is a naturally evolved political phenomenon and the latter is an artificially created political phenomenon. A buffer zone usually consisted of buffer states. Most of the buffer zones have disappeared on account of penetration, annexation and absorption by the powerful states. Similarly the buffer states have lost their geopolitical relevance because of (i) satellite geopolitics, and (ii) globalization process that tends to make political boundaries redundant.

Land-locked States

Some three dozen states (not including a number of micro-states) possess no sea coasts, and are therefore 'landlocked'. The number of landlocked states have increased following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Almost all of these states possess more than one neighbour, and it is upon these neighbour that they depend for the transit of their overseas trade-vis-a-vis-their external commercial functions. All these states require the oceans to carry a part of their external commerce, and the jealousy with which coastal states guard their rights on the high seas as well as in territorial water indicates the importance they attach to these events. The landlocked states, thus, is in a strategic and economic disadvantageous position, unless it is guaranteed the right to use the high seas as do coastal states, the right of innocent passage in others territorial water, a share of port facilities along suitable coasts, and means of transit from that part to the state territory. Normally, the landlocked states face the crisis of 'isolation' in the global politics, a number of land boundary disputes have arisen directly out of landlocked states efforts to secure a permanent and free access to the open ocean.

Bolivia, Paraguay, Republic of Czech, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Tadjikistan, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Nepal, Laos, Zambia, Malawi, Niger, Chad are some of the prominent land-locked states. These states tend to be politically and economically weak, and to an extent owe their survival to their buffer position between the more powerful maritime neighbours. However, not all land-locked states are buffer states, for example. Afghanistan no longer functions as a buffer between Iran and Pakistan, but it is a landlocked state.

Access to the coast and the high seas is an essential part of the state system. The question is how such access could be best provided, with a minimum loss of sovereignty on the part of the coastal states providing transit, and with a minimum degree of dependence of the landlocked state upon the whims of the coastal state. However, there are three possibilities for a landlocked state to gain access to the sea : first, any river that is navigable and traverses both the landlocked state and the coastal state may be declared by international agreement to be an international river, similar to the high seas in the freedom, second, the landlocked state may be provided with an actual corridor or strip of land leading either to the open ocean or to an international river, and the third, the landlocked state may be guaranteed the use of adequate facilities at a specified port, and freedom of transit along a connecting railroad and/or road.

1. International Rivers

There is considerable difference in the practice of nation with regard to rivers which they share with one another. In some instances the right of navigation is reserved only to the vessels of those states which border the river; in other there is complete freedom to navigate the rivers except in time of war. During the last century and a half, by a series of international agreements the following rivers have been opened to international commerce : in North America, the St. Lawrence, the lower Colorado and Gila and the Rio Grande; in South America, the Amazon and most of its tributaries, and the River Plate, and its navigable tributaries; the Scheldt, and a member of canals which give access from Belgium to the Netherlands and the sea; the Danube, Elbe and Oder. Other European rivers including Niemer, the Vistula and certain of its tributaries and the Dniester were also at one time regarded as international rivers, though recent boundary changes have had the effect of turning them into national rivers.

In Africa, the Niger, Congo, Zambezi and Shire are open to the ships of all nations, and in Asia, the Shatt-at-Arab, the Ameer and the rivers of China, although on the east Asiatic rivers this freedom is now somewhat theocratic.

In certain instances the rivers enumerated here serve an outlet for inland states, and give them access to the sea. In a few instances—Bolivia, Paraguay, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Austria, the Republic of Czech and Slovakia, Hungary—these countries have no natural outlet to the sea other than down these rivers. It has come to be widely accepted that an upstream state has the right to navigate the lower reaches of a river if this is necessary in order to further its commerce or to reach the sea. The absence of alternative outlet to the sea strengthen this right.

2. Corridors :

A corridor reaching to the sea coast implies a transfer of sovereignty over an area of land in order to give to the inland state an assured outlet to the Ocean. It is implied that this consideration is alone responsible for determining the boundaries of the territory in question and that historical and ethnic factors are not of importance. It is inevitable that a state would prefer to control a corridor rather than to have transit rights or the freedom to use a river. Any attempt to close a corridor would be a violation of national sovereignty, while interfering with the right of passage might be more condoned or excused. Exclusive control over a corridor and over the commerce that would use it was in line with mercantilist economic thought in the eighteenth century.

The most famous example of the type was the Polish corridor, established after the end of the First World War, however, at the initiative of the US President Woodrow Wilson. The creation of the corridor gave Poland the right to use the Port of Gdynia, but in turn the Germans were permitted free transit on railroads crossing Poland between Germany and East Prussia.

Another example of a corridor was that of Finland and its Arctic corridor established in 1920. Though Finland has an extensive coastline on the Baltic sea, most of it is ice-bound for a long period in winter, whereas the newly acquired strip of Arctic coast is ice-free through the year. It was the intention of Finland to establish a port at the end of the corridor, and the site selected for the purpose was **Petsamo**. The port of Petsamo was occupied by the Soviet army in 1940 but this possession was resumed in 1944 when the USSR (former) abandoned its claim.

Three other regions of the world have been particularly productive of corridor which include : the Danubian and the Balkan lands, the Middle East and the Central **Asiatic** states. In each, the geopolitical fragmentation of the region, accompanied the geographical barriers to the movement, has made access to the sea unusually difficult.

3. Right of Transit

The third and last solution to the problem of the landlocked state is that of free transit. This is the means of access upon which most of the landlocked states of the world depend. In 1921, a Freedom of Transit Conference was held at Barcelona, and some forty coastal states signed a convention which was later ratified by more than three quarters of them. This convention held that : 'such states as are signatories shall assist the movement of goods across their territory from landlocked states to the nearest seaport, levying no discriminatory toll, tax, or freight charges'. Although several

conventions to this effect was held under the aegis of the United Nations in 1957 and 1958 at Geneva, but nothing substantive was achieved. However, several draft proposals were prepared and the rights of the landlocked states were recognized.

The question of the rights of the landlocked states was again taken up in 1964 and 1965 by a committee of 24 delegates representing landlocked, transit and other interested states. The draft of the convention was prepared by the Afro-Asian landlocked states, but the convention of mid 1965 could not guarantee the freedom of access that the landlocked states desired. Nepal and Bhutan are yet to gain the right to transit of the nature that they desire across India and Bangladesh.

Suggested Readings

1. Blij, H. J. de (1972) *Systematic Political Geography* : New York. Wiley
2. Cohen, S. B. (1973) *Geography and Politics in a World Divided* : New York. Random House
3. Curzon, N. S. Lord (1908) *Frontiers* : Oxford. Clarendon.
4. Pounds, N. J. G. (1972) *Political Geography* : New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company
5. Strausz-Hupe, R (1942) *Geopolitics : the struggle for space and power* : New York Putnam
6. Woodman, D. (1969) *Himalayan Frontiers* : London. The Cresset Press.

Unit 2 □ Heartland and Rimland Geostatic ideas of Mackinder and Spykeman

Structure

2.1 Geostrategic Models of Mackinder and Spykman

2.2 Frontiers and Boundaries

2.3 Boundary

2.1 Geostrategic Models of Mackinder and Spykman

There have been two major traditions in the study of international relations—realism and idealism. The former has been the dominant tradition and has built upon a series of classical works on statecraft and interstate rivalry, for example, the sixteenth century writings of Machiavelli and the nineteenth century writings of Clausewitz, belong to the category of the realist approach to international relation. All such studies emphasize the compelling insecurity of the state and hence advocate policies of high military expenditure. This reduces to crude power politics : the stronger imposing its will on the weaker. War, or at least the threat of war, is therefore central to realist prescriptions for, and interpretations of, international relation. It is for this reason that idealist have condemned realists as a moral. Realism was interpreted a representing the Old world's way of conducting international relation. "Whereas realism left the strong states to take responsibility for world affair, the new idealism required the control of such power by means of the collective action of all states". Hence, whereas realisms sees only international anarchy, idealism is a liberal doctrine that attempts to place international relations on a firm 'constitutional basis'. The First World War was interpreted as the inevitable culmination of realist thinking in international relation while the formation of the League of Nations marked the beginning of the idealist approach to international relation.

Mackinder's Geopolitical model (1904 & 1919) may be interpreted as one of classics of realism, while that of Spykman's model (1944), represented idealism in international relation. However, both 'realist' Mackinder and 'idealist' Spykman shared what was basically a state centred view of the world, and made all such models liable to biases in favour of authors and/or strategists own countries. Both, realist and idealist approaches to international relation, particularly, those concurred with the entire globe, appeared to how emphasised the geographic relationships of

politics, in a 'deterministic' way—a heritage a tradition that Friedrich Ratzel set forth in his 'Anthropogeographic in 1882', that spoke of 'environmental determinism' in shaping the politics. This heritage was further carried forward by Rudolf Kjellar (1864-1922) on a 'national' reconstruction basis. It was Mackinder who said that no politics could not sustain itself unless it was built upon the formation of physical geography. 'Deterministic' reflections can also be found in Spykman's model but not in a 'crude' way as being found in Mackinder's model. The Darwinian heritage of 'natural selection and struggle' also, got manifested in the strategic thinkings of Mackinder and Spykman in a more 'explanatory way'.

Contemporary politics, historical continuity and experience, spatially shifting balance of power, emergence of non-conventional power and relative decline in the power-potentials of the traditional power in global prospects, even-changing diplomatic relations and pattern in Eurasian realm, following the rise of Germany and the consolidation of the Russian empire and technological revolution in communications and warfare, appeared to have motivated strategic thinkings of Mackinder and Spykman in a more 'explanatory way'.

Contemporary politics, historical continuity and experience, spatially shifting balance of power, emergence of non-conventional power and relative decline in the power-potentials of the traditional power in global prospects, even-changing diplomatic relations and pattern in Eurasian realm, following the rise of Germany and the consolidation of the Russian empire, and technological revolution in communications and warfare, appeared to have motivated strategic thinking of Mackinder, particularly, towards the end of the nineteenth century. Mackinder put all these changing and emerging political scenario and trends in Eurasia, following the shifting of balance of power from the 'Occamic' realm to the 'continental' realm, in a geographical framework, and put forward his famous strategic model which was probably, aimed at warning Great Britain, the lone 'sea power' of the contemporary world, for the possible dominance and emergence of the land power.

Mackinder's Model of global strategy is 'realist' in nature, in the sense that its attempted to represent a project the Old World's way of conducting international politics i.e., the stronger unit attempting to impose its 'will' on the weaker units, with the shifting balance of power. This exactly what Mackinder had to say in his strategic model.

Despite its neglect in geography, Mackinder's model remained probably the most well known geopolitical model throughout the world. This world model was presented on three occasion covering nearly forty years. The original model was

presented in 1904 as 'The geographical pivot of history'. The ideas were refined and presented after the First World War (1919) in *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, where 'pivot area' becomes 'heartland'. Then in 1943 Mackinder at the age of eighty-two provided final version of his ideas : 'The round the world and winning of the peace', (*Foreign Affairs*, 1943). Despite this long period covering two world wars, the idea of an Asiatic 'fortress' remained the centerpiece of his Model, and was largely responsible for its popularity since 1945.

1. The geographical pivot of history

The geographical pivot of history was identified to be "characterized by a very remarkable distribution of the centre and north, the river have been practically useless for purposes of human communication with the enter world. The Volga, the Oxus, and the Jaxardes chain into salt lakes, the Obi, the Yenisei, and the Lena into the frozen ocean of the north...Thus the core area of Eurasia...is wholly unpenetrated by waterways from the ocean". The geographical pivot of history was that vast area of Eurasia drained either inland lakes or to frozen northern ocean and inaccessible to ships and to sea power.

The pivot area was enclosed on heart, south, east by the 'inner' or 'marginal crescent', consisting of those areas of Eurasia from Scandinavia to Manchuria which are drained to the ocean and are, presumably, accessible to sea power. Outside this again, and separated from it by seas of varying width, and the lands of the 'outer' or 'insular', crescent.

The geographical pivot area was more or less a steppe land supplying a widespread if often scanty pasture. Mackinder said that : "European civilization war....the outcome of the secular struggle against Asiatic invasion". This generalization he attempted to appeal to historical detail : "Through the steppes....three came from the unknown recesses of Asia by the gateway between the Ural mountains and the Caspian Sea, in all the centuries from the fifth to the sixteenth, a remarkable succession of Turinian nomadic peoples :—Hun, Avars, Bulgarian, Magyars, Khazars....A large part of modern history might be written as a commentary upon the changes directly or indirectly ensuing from these raids. The Angles are Saxous....were driven to cross the seas to found England in Britain. The Franks, the Goths and the Romans....were compelled....to stand shoulder to shoulder on the battlefield of chalons making common cause against the Asiatic....Such war the harvert of results produced by a cloud of ruthless and idealess horsemen sweeping over the unpeded plain—a blow....from the great Asiatic hammer striking freely through the vacant space" (Mackinder 1904).

Mobility i.e. 'horse and camel mobility' was relatively easier across the steppe, and 'ruthless and idleless' horsemen could turn in any direction they wished from their homeareas i.e., the pivot area. Thus, Mackinder conceived of the pressure of these Asiatic nomadic peoples as exercising as profound an influence on the course of history in the middle east, and south and southeast Asia as he supposed that it had in Europe.

With regard to the relationship between the pivot area and the inner crescent, Mackinder found a certain persistence of geographical relationship. This relationship—one of continuing outward pressure from the pivot area that seemed to continue and to be intensified. "Is not the pivot region of the world's politics that vast area of Euro-Asia which is inaccessible to ships, but in antiquity lay open to the horse-riding nomades and 'Is not today about to be covered with a network of railways?' (Mackinder 1904).

Mackinder had predicted that if Turkic and Tatar nomades, equipped only with the horse and camel, could so shape the course of history in the peripheral land of the inner crescent what might not a Modern power, its mobility enhanced by the railroad, achieve in this respect? This might happen if Germany were to ally herself with Russia it could also happen were the Chinese.....organized by the Japanese, to overthrow the Russian Empire and conquer its territory". He further contended that "in such an event, France, Italy, Egypt, India and Korea would become so many bridgeheads where the outside navies would support armies, 'in order to prevent the power of the pivot area from expanding down to the sea'.

Mackinder presented his model of the geographical pivot of history at a time when the railroad had for some sixty years dominated the transportation. Therefore he wrote at the end of the railway age, not at its beginning. The pivot area had dominated the course of human history in the age of horse and camel mobility, how much more would it dominate if the pivot area were to become crisscrossed by railroad lines. This railroad network had still, after the lapse of half a century, not been built, after the lapse of instead, the aircraft, whose existence in 1904 Mackinder had barely acknowledged, has come in many respects to replace the railroad. He in fact failed to take account of this new form of mobility.

Mackinder belonged to the nation which was the leading sea power of his time, dominating the prominent sea lanes, connecting the great ocean he visualized the naval powers of the inner and outer crescents : France, Italy, Japan and Great Britain itself, as patrolling the sea-ways and influencing, if not controlling, the power that encircled the first area. He believed that the large power of the maritime powers

as extending over the basins of all river draining into the ocean, except, of course, those which flamed to the Frozen Arctic and were thus inaccessible. But to assume that because a river flows to the ocean its basin can therefore be dominated by a maritime power is naive in the extreme. Even if the rivers will be navigable to their sources—which of course, none of them are—the experience of maritime powers in sending warships up the Chinese river would demonstrate the contrary (Pound 1972). The map, on which Mackinder showed his World Island together with the pivot area was in fact a Mercator projection of the world enclosed within an ellipse, was misleading.

2. The Heartland : Democratic Ideals and Reality

Fifteen years after the publication of the 'pivot' model Mackinder in 1919 presented a somewhat laboured and extended version of his 1904 thesis in a small book, entitled *The Democratic Ideals and Reality*. Here, in this new book, he incorporated certain new ideas, and certain modifications, based on the changing global Eurasian political patterns, during this one and half decade, following the 'eastern question', and the outbreak of the First World War, and the resultant political consequences that Europe and Asia witnessed.

Mackinder in his 1919 publication, emphasized the relative ease of movement through the south Russian steppe from the pivot area, here for the first time called 'the heartland', into Eastern Europe. This he contrasted with greater difficulty of movement from the heartland into the peripheral region of south and east Asia.

To quote Mackinder (1919) : 'There was no impediment to prevent the hordes from riding westward into region drained by European rivers and the Dnieper and Danube. In contrast to this open passage from the Heartland into Europe is the system of mighty barrier i.e., the Himalayan which separate Heartland along its eastern and southeastern border from the Indies the connection between the Heartland, and especially its more open western region of Iran, Turkestan, and Siberia is much more intimate with Europe and Arabia than is with China and India'.

The pivot had a relatively small spatial extent, but the 'heartland' was designed to have an extended spatial extent. 'The Heartland, for the purposes of strategic thinking, includes the Baltic Sea, the navigable middle and lower Danube, the Black Sea, Asia River, Armenia, Persia, Tibet and Mongolia The Heartland is the region to which modern, under modern conditions, sea power can be refused access, though the western part of it lies without the region of Arctic and Continental drainage'.

Failure of the allied navies, during the First World War, to force entry through the Turkish straits into the Black sea and into the Baltic sea which the German had mined, made it clear to Mackinder that the capability of the sea power, controlling the a vast extensive area of the World Island standed falling or weakening, rather, he war continued that the dominance of the sea power war on the verge of being wanned in the face of the emerging land power in the World Island.

However, Mackinder no longer regarded the heartland as completely invaluable to power of the inner marginal cnescent. Indeed the heartland had its 'Achille's heel, that region of the south Russian steppe through which the German armies had advanced in 1917. He was longer contemplated the possibility of the Japanese controlling the heartland and using it as a spring board for control of the Old World vis-a-vis World Island. Instead, if any power outside heartland itself could do this, it would he from west, by way of the steppe corridor that join the heartland with Eastern Europe. At no point does he appear to have evisaged the possibility that the Russians themselves might organize and develop their own vast spaces and resources. The heartland had lost none of its focal importance but this importance would be realised most probably by any power that succeeded in approaching it by way of Eastern Europe and the steppe. The events of the first World war, Mackinder (1919) said "were the result of a fundamental antagonism between the German who wished to be Master in East Europe, and the Slavs who refused to submit to them".

Addressing himself to the statesmen of Great Britanis and her allies, Mackinder wrote, "Unless you would lay up trouble for the future, you cannot leave such a condition of affairs in East Europe and Heartland, an would offer scope for ambition in the future, for you have escaped too narrowly from the recent danger some airy cherub should whisper to them from time to time this saying.

Who ruler East Europe commands the Heartland :

Who ruler the Heartland commands the World Island :

Who ruler the World Island Commands the World". (Mackinder, 1919)

The events of two world war in the last century had given some slight measure of support to this 'conclusion' of Mackinder. Twice the German armies, from their basis in Eastern Europe, invaded Russia and these invasions were made possible only by the open nature of the terrain in European Russia. However, it is more than possible that the determining factor was not the physical geography of the area but contrasting technical levels of the opposing forces. Yet on both occasions, the German armies failed to penetrate deeply—if at all into the pivot area which he originally conceived it. The same could be said of Napoleon's invasion of Russia in

1811-1812. Should we believe an Mackinder had said, that the heartland is immune to attack from the maritime states?

On several occasions in the past two or three centuries, armies from states of the Marginal crescent had invaded Russia, but failed either to reach or to establish themselves in the heartland. However, it would be wrong to assume that the headland must, of geographical necessity, always remain inviolate. These invasion took place in the source of wars between states of the Marginal crescent.

3. Heartland vs Midland Basin (1943)

In 1943, Mackinder presented yet another modification of his own heartland model of 1919, which was two strongly influenced by contemporary events, following the defect of Germany and the victory of the Soviet army. Nevertheless, the heartland according to him was slice the greatest natural fortunes on the earth. For the first time, it was manned by garrison sufficient both in number and quantity.

He separated off from the heartland that part of the Soviet Union lying east of the Yeniesi River, which he called the 'Lenaland'. In opposition to 'heartland Russia', he established the 'Midland Basin', consisting of the North Atlantic Ocean, the Eastern United States and Western Europe. East Central Europe, the former German realm, thus separated the Midland Basin from the Heartland. These two areas are Mackinder described as enveloped and insulated by a griddle of desert. Saharan, Arabian, Iranian, Tibetan and Mongolian—extending through the rugged and desolate Lenaland to Alaska, the Canadian Arctic, and the deserts of Western America. Within this griddle of desert and tundra, Mackinder pressured that the Midland Basin and the Heartland would be acting together in amity to eliminate the danger that sprang from the militant Germany. But, it did not happen, rather, these two ocean in the post-war world became mutually exclusive to each other China entered the communist sphere and emerged powerful and the deserts between the Midland Basin and the Heartland could not prevent the spread of cold-war rivalries to central Africa. The fundamental error in this as in Mackinder's earlier two model war his inability to make allowances for technological advance. Nevertheless, R. E. Walters in 1974 commented that the heartland theory stands as the first pressure of Western military thought. Ronald Peagon, the US president was quoted as saying in 1988 that his administration explicitly cited Mackinder's theory on the basis of its geopolitical strategy. Mackinder initiated the geopolitician's craft of claiming a dispassionate but complete view of the world, which translated into belief that the Western power could control global politics. The war much more than the geostrategist portrayed in political geography.

Mackinder's thesis immediately became one of the most intensively debated geographical ideas of all time. Arguing as late as 1943, Mackinder said that : 'it is more valid and useful today than it was twenty or forty years ago". It became impossible to reject his original thesis out of hand and equally impossible to accept all its implications. However, numerous attempts were made to reshape the heart-land thesis and to bring it into closer accord either with historical and geographical fact or with existing political realities. One of the earlier attempts to reshape the heartland thesis was that of N. J. Spykman. He disagreed with Mackinder's heartland thesis, as he felt Mackinder had overemphasised the potentialities of the heartland, but in many respects, according to spykman, the real power potentials of Eurasia lay in what Mackinder called the 'Inner or Marginal crescent' to which he used the term 'Rimland'.

RIMLAND : THE GEOGRAPHY OF PEACE : 1944

Spykman accepted the 'opposition between Russian land power and British seapower' but he emphasized the role of the tier of states which encircled the heartland i.e., the rimland. With somewhat greater insight, Spykman demonstrated, and pointed out relevantly that history involving the heartland never really was a single landpower-seapower opposition. The historical alignment has always been in term of some member of the rimland with Russia or Great Britain and Russia together against a dominant landpower. Mackinder's dictum about global strategy, therefore, appeared to be false to him. Spykman said that if at all these need be a slogan for power politics of the world, and he countered with his own model :

"Who controls the rimland rules Eurasia",

"Who rules Eurasia controls the destinies of the world".

To Spykman, the heartland lacked that geostrategic significance which the rimland possessed, and he thought that it was a combination of land and sea power controlling the rimland that would in all probability control 'the essential power relation of the world', because this combination would emerge on the owner of for greater resources, man power, and mobility, than the heartland or any other combination. Spykman urged that American policy should be directed to the control of the rimland states or, at least, to the prevention of their control by the Soviet Union. Truman's policy of aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947 was in line with this strategic thinking, so also the policy of 'containment' advocated by George F. Kennan. However, it cannot said with certainty that the policy advocated by Truman and Kennan, and later by Acheson and Dulles, derived directly from the ideas of Spykman or of any other political geographical thinker. Nevertheless, a ring of postwar anti-Soviet Military alliances in the rimland

such as, NATO in Europe, CENTO in West Asia and SEATO in South East Asia, were formed under the American leadership and their military alliances were aimed at preventing the control of the rimland by the heartland Soviet Union i.e., 'containing the fortress'.

The heartland-rimland dichotomy in the postwar world in the last century provided sustenance to the cold-war, leading to what was to become the nuclear arms race vis-a-vis nuclear deterrence. Even with the demise of the cold war, the 'lesson of Mackinder and Spykman' are still used to argue for continued vigilance by neo-conservatives resisting military cut backs despite the demise of the USSR. Some ideas, it seems, hence disappear—as long as they continue to have an ideological utility.

2.2 Frontiers and Boundaries

The usual starting point in this subject area is to distinguish frontier from boundaries. This is necessary since the terms are commonly used interchangeably. Kristof (1950) uses the etymology of each term to derive their essential difference. Historically, the word 'frontier' implied what it suggests, that is, that which is 'in front'. The frontier was not an abstract term in line, on the contrary, it designated an area which was part of a whole, specifically that part which was ahead of the hinterland. Hence it is often called the forehead a borderland or march. The frontier is neither a legal concept nor a political or intellectual concept. It was rather a phenomenon of 'the facts of life'—a manifestation of the spontaneous tendency for the growth of ecumene. In antiquity, and later too, the frontier was on the margin of the inhabited world, but each particular ecumene also had frontier. It is not the end (tail) but rather the beginning (forehead) of the state. The frontiers between ecumenes became meeting places not merely of different ways of physical survival, but also of different concepts of good life, and hence increasingly political in character.

The boundary, however, indicates well established limits (bounds) of the given political units, and all that which is within the boundary is bound together, i.e., it is fastened by an internal bond, i.e., 'Boundary' is a term appropriate to the present day concept of the state as a sovereign (or autonomous) spatial unit, one among many. Sovereignty is territorial, hence it must have a certain known extent, a territory under exclusive jurisdiction limited by state boundaries. The modern sovereign state is bound within and confined to its legal limits. The boundaries bind together an area and a people which live under one sovereign government and law and are presumably

integrated not only administratively and economically, but also by means of a state-idea a 'crede'.

Kristof (1950) identified the following differences between frontiers and boundaries :

1. The frontier is outer-oriented. Its main attention is directed toward the outlying areas which are both a source of danger and a coveted prize. The frontier often develop their own interests quite different from those of the central government they feel neither bound by the centre nor binding its realm. The boundary, on the other hand, is inner oriented. It is created and maintained by the will of the central government. It has no life of its own, not even a material existence. Boundary is, in fact, the outer line of effective central exercised by the central government.

2. The frontier is a manifestation of centrifugal forces. On the other hand, the range of vigor of centripetal forces is indicated by the boundary. The frontiersmen are always hostile, and their interests are quite different or diametrically opposite to the that of the interests of the state, they sustain secessionist forces, very much against the state, but the boundary is the 'carrier' or 'bearer' of the state-idea i.e., the *raison detre* of the state, hence it manifests and strengthens the forces of integration.

3. The frontier is an integrating factor. Being a zone of transition from the sphere (*ecumene*) of one way of life to another, and representing forces which are neither fully assimilated to nor satisfied with either, it provides an excellent opportunity for mutual interpenetration and sway. The boundary on the otherhand, is a separating factor. The boundary separates the sovereign political units from one another. The boundary remain always a fixed obstacle, and impedes integration across borderline.

4. The frontier is a phenomenon of history, like history it may repeat itself, but again like history, it is always unique. The boundary is defined and regulated by law, national and international and as such its status and characteristics are more uniform and can be defined with some precision.

5. Frontier are characteristics of rudimentary socio-political relation—relation marked by rebelliousness, lawlessness and/or absence of laws. The presence of boundary is a sign that the political community has reached a relative degree of maturity and orderliness, the slage of law-abidance.

6. Both frontier and boundaries are manifestations of socio-political forces, and as such are subjective, not objective. But while the formers are the result of rather spontaneous, or at least ad-hoc solutions and movements; the latter are fixed and enforced through a more rational and centrally co-ordinated effort after a conscious choice is made among the several preferences and opportunities at hand.

However, the concept of frontier now seems to have been abandoned as the frontier has ended with the closing of the world system in the last century. Now, there is a world with one system, so there are no longer any frontier—they are now phenomena of history.

Frontier everywhere have been replaced by boundaries, which are a necessary component of the sovereignty of territories. Sovereignty must be bounded : a world of sovereign states is a world divided by boundaries. Boundaries are therefore an essential element of the modern world economy. But the process of boundary making is very different in the various sections of the world-economy.

Boundary concept

Boundary concepts have varied with time and space and one generation Jones (1959) has identified five types of boundary concept—‘**natural**’, ‘**national**’, ‘**contractual**’, ‘**geometrical**’ and ‘**power-political**’. The categories are not exclusive to one another, and boundaries can be identified as reflecting the power politics of their respective producers. These concepts of the boundary, reflect the different ideas of the state in the evolving world-system vis-a-vis world economy.

The idea of ‘natural’ boundaries is a product of the strength of the French state in the eighteenth century Europe and its use of the new rationalist philosophy to claim larger ‘natural’ territory.

In contrast, the idea of ‘national’ boundaries is the Germanic reaction to French expansionist ideas. These two concepts are rationalization of particular power-political positions in the core and semi-periphery of the world-economy. In the periphery, also, two types of boundary emerged. In non-competitive areas in the nineteenth century, such as India and Indo-China, the boundaries reflect the expansion of one core state at the expense of weak pre-capitalist social formation. This is where frontier were extended and then converted to boundaries. The formation of buffer states in the periphery, such as Afghanistan between Russia and British India, and Thailand between French Indo-China and British India in the nineteenth century revealed the resultant pattern of the evolution of the boundary.

In competitive arenas, the boundaries are usually far more arbitrary as they reflect contractual arrangements between competition. It is in these areas that ‘clear’ international boundaries are necessary to prevent disputes. Hence such boundaries commonly follow physical features such as rivers or else are simply geometric lines, usually of longitude or latitude. Examples of such ‘contractual’ boundaries are the USA’s western boundaries to north and south along the 49th parallel and the Rio Grande,

respectively. The most competitive arena of all, Africa in the late nineteenth century, has the most 'contractual international boundaries'. Here the concepts of 'natural' or 'national' boundaries had no relevance or ethnic groups and river basins are divided up in complete contrast to the boundary processes then evolving in the core.

Geometrical boundaries in Africa reflect geopolitical rivalry among the European core countries particularly, during the nineteenth century, when these countries sought to perpetuate their territorial claims in the dark continent. But for the lack of knowledge of the geography of the continent, these core countries preferred geometrical boundaries to physical or ethnic boundaries. These are all contractual boundaries in the real sense.

With regard to the power-political concept of the boundary is concerned, Jones cited the example of Spykman who in his *America's Strategy in World Politics* (1942), stated that a boundary was not only a like demarcating legal system but also a line of contact of territorial power structure. "Specific boundaries at any given historical period become then merely the political geographic expression of the existing balances of forces at that period" (Spykman 1942). The power of a state is like the dynamic force of every organic entity, and other things being equal, all states have a tendency to expand. Spykman's boundary concept closely resembles the boundary concept of Karl Hanshofer, the exponent of German 'geopolitik'. The boundary was defined as being the 'biological battlefield in the life of peoples'.

2.3 Boundary

Boundaries appear on maps as thin lines marking the limit of state sovereignty. In fact a boundary is not a line, but a plane—a vertical plane that cuts through the airspace, the soil and the sub soil of adjacent states. This plane appears on the surface of the earth as a line, because it intersects the surface as is marked it does so. Boundaries can be effective underground, as they are effective above the ground, for most countries jealously guard this airspace.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the functions and the classification of the boundary, it is necessary to define the ideal sequence of events in the boundary-making. The first stage is called the 'negotiation', which is carried forward by the contending parties. The process of negotiation may continue for long, and unless a consensus is reached between the involved parties; the process continues, provided the contending

parties seek to perpetuate this territorial alignment. It is during the process of negotiation, the geographical coordinates are identified on the map and this process of identification of geographical features is called the 'definition' of the boundary.

When the treaty maker have completed this definition of the boundary in question, their work is placed before the cartographers who locate the boundary as exactly as possible on the large map. This is called the process of the 'determination' i.e., the boundary has been exactly located on the map joining the geographical co-ordinates.

Finally, then remains the task of marking the boundary on the ground. For this purpose, both the actual treaty and the cartographic materials are employed. Boundary 'demarcation', as this process is called, has by means taking place along every boundary defined and delimited : only a minority of many miles/kilometer of the world's boundaries are actually marked on the surface.

FUNCTION

The function of boundaries have changed over time. The most important role of boundary was the defines i.e., to defend the territorial sovereignty of the state. Until quite recently, it was conceivable for a state to attempt to fortify its boundary to such an extent that it would be invincible. But advancing technology has diminished the importance of the defensive function of boundaries, and states no longer rely upon fortified border for their security. The French built then 'Maginat Line' along its northeastern bound but it soon collapsed before the advancing German army in 1940. Although the 'defence' function of the boundary has diminished, but its commercial function has remained intact. The boundary function as a tariff wall against outside competition for its market and thus ascites internal products. The local industries, and products may prosper, owe their prosperity to the protection thus afforded.

The boundary, of course, also has a legal function. State law prevails to this line. Taxes must be paid to the government by anyone legally subject to taxation, whether he resides one or one hundred kilometres from the border. All states have laws. All boundaries mark the limits of territory where such laws apply. All states have economic polices. All boundaries in some degree have economic importance.

All states are theoretically sovereign. Thus all boundaries mark the limits of sovereignty.

There is a set of functions that derives from the particular state system of which the boundary is a part, and from the conditions prevailing in the adjacent state. Some boundaries, however, do not separate strongly contrasted states. The function of dividing boundaries all very different from those that separate states possessing vastly contesting internal conclusion.

A well-defined boundary restricts the dynamics of centrifugal forces, operating from either side of the boundary, and at the same time, tends to strengthen the dynamism of centripetal tendencies, spreading from the political core of the state-system. It is the boundary on which depends the 'raison de etre' of the state.

However, the relevance of the international boundaries is diminishing gradually because of the increasing trend of the globalization that transcend the national boundaries. Boundaries have become almost redundant in the European Union.

CLASSIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

The classification of boundaries can be done on the basis of two different types of criteria. They can be grouped from the point of view of their static characteristics, e.g., their correspondence to physiographic features, their separation of ethnic regions, and their straightness etc. This is, basically, a descriptive classification. The classification is called the 'morphological' classification of boundaries.

Boundaries can also be classified according to their relationship with the cultural landscape. Some boundaries were established prior to the permanent occupation of areas by the present inhabitants. Some boundaries, however, were established after the permanent occupation of areans by the present inhabitants. A classification based on such considerations is called the 'genetic' classification of boundaries.

A MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

Morphological boundaries can be further subdivided into (a) physical boundaries and (b) anthropogeographic boundaries. Physical boundaries are there which follow the conspicuous physical feature which are static in their natural occurrences, while the anthropogeographic boundaries are there which follow the cultural features, particularly, the pattern of their distribution.

A. PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES ARE FURTHER SUBDIVIDED INTO THOSE WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE :

(1) to follow the course of or a mountain hill ranges; (2) to follow the time of river, canals and lakes; (3) to run through a desert, a forest, or a swamp; (4) to conform

with some other physical feature that may once have been conspicuous in the landscape.

MOUNTAIN AND HILLS

“A definite line of watershed carried by a conspicuous mountain ridge or range, is undoubtedly the most lasting, the most unmistakable and the most efficient as a barriers”. Generally, through not always, mountain ranges separate cultural groups by virtue of the relative difficulty in crossing them. For the same reason, they have always been thought of as good strategic or military boundaries. The Andean boundary between Chile and Argentina are the Himalayan boundary between China and India are example of the mountain. The 1881 boundary treaty between Chile and Argentina, and the 1914 boundary agreement between Tibet and India established the respective boundaris. However, these treaties/agreements generated lot of confucious, boding to serious boundary disputes between the involved countries. The Chile-Argentina boundary does not follow the crest line, as there is no crest line in the Andes, but the marking of the boundary has been done by erecting a huge statue of the Christ at a place where the boundary crosses the summit of the Upallata Pass. The disputed Himalayan boundary between China and India, on the other hand, follow the watershed-cum-high crest of the eastern Himalayan. The Sino-Indian boundary is still called the McMahon Line.

It is easier to define and delimit a mountain boundary, but is equally difficult to demarcate it on the ground. It is difficult to mark the ‘delimited’ boundary on the ground became of the lack coincidence between delimitation and actual demarcation, and this leads to serious problem between the involved states.

RIVERS AND LAKES

Rivers and Lakes have the advantage of being more clearly marked on map and more narrowly defined on the land than mountains and hills. For this reason they have often been adopted in boundary delimitation. River boundaries may follow the median line, the windings of the navigable channel, or one or other of the banks, or they may link up running points in the stream. It was decided in 1920 that in navigable rivers the boundary should follow ‘principal channel’ (thalweg) and in other cases the median line. The water lend of rivers varies, rivers themselves change their courses and islands sometimes make it difficult to establish a median line.

The boundary in lakes commonly follows the median line, but this, as the example of the Great Lakes shows can be extremely difficult to define. Nevertheless, the

International Waterways Commission has traced an acceptable line and principles which it used to have been adopted in many parts of the world. It has, for example, been adopted in Lake Victoria and in the new Lake Kariba.

Most rivers are subject to slow changes in their courses, with erosion on one hand and deposition of the other. They are also liable to sudden changes when they abandon their old beds and assume a new. Much of the border disputes between Murshidabad (District of West Bengal) and Rajshahi (District of Bangladesh) result from the shifting courses of the Ganga-Padma river. Sometimes the appearance of an island in the midst of the river, such as in the Usuri river between Russia and China, has caused the boundary dispute between Russia and China. A similar nature of dispute very often emerges between Bangladesh and the Indian province of Tripura because of frequent emergence of an island in the Kushiya river that defines the international boundary. Such problem are not common with regard to the lake boundaries.

Forests, Swamps and Deserts

These physical features are more known for their role as cultural barriers rather than as political boundaries. They act as divides between cultural regions. The northeastern part of Europe still provides salient example of role of forests as cultural divides. They used to separate the Finns from the Russian, the Russian from the Lithunian, and the Lithunian from the Poles. Though much less effective as cultural barrier, marshes once served on a basis for boundaries between states. Marshes along the lower Rhine and Meuse, through their influence on military campaign, influenced the location of the boundary between Belgium and Netherlands. Similarly Pripat marshes in White Russia were, between the First and the Second World War, traversed by the boundary between Poland and the tames Soviet Union. The boundary between the Indian Province of Gujrat and the Pakistani Province of Sind passes through the Rana of Kutch which is a broad belt of marsh, once stood as a cultural divide between the Hindus and the Muslim. However, it is rare for one of these barrier areas to be deliberately chosen for alignment of an international boundary. Deserts have been great cultural barrier, for example the Sahara used to separate European dominated Meditarrean region of Africa from the block dominated African culture lying to the south, with many international boundaries now passing through the deserts in Africa.

B. ANTHOPOGEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES

Boundaries which follow cultural features, such language, religion nationalities etc. are put under this classification of the boundary. These boundaries are the politics-geographical expression of the nationalist movements. They are a feature of the post-First World War period when boundaries in Central and Eastern Europe were readjusted with a view to separate nationalities on the principle of each nationality the right of sovereign political status. They are both the 'outcomes of both suppression and expression of nationalism', being the major causes of the outbreak of the First and the Second World War that finally culminated in the emergenes of the nation-states. India-Pakistan boundary belongs to this category as the boundary follow the religions pattern. Nevertheless a sizeable body of Muslim population continues to line in India. Similarly ethnic differences exist across the boundaries between Israel and Palestine (though a lizeable Palestine people continue to reside in Israel).

Anthropogeographic boundaries sometimes coincide with physical boundaries, such as one lying along the pyrenees between Spain and France, separating the French nationality from the Spanish nation. This boundary along the Pyrenees may be reflection of the historical role played by the physiographic feature in functioning as a barrier.

C. GEOMETRIC BOUNDARIES

These are straight line boundaries following lines of latitude or longitude or in some cases drawn from fixed points. The example of the first (straight) type boundary can be found in North America where the boundary between Canada and the United States west of the Great Lakes is mainly of the geometric variety, many of the boundaries of Africa, especially those traversing the desent region, are straight lines also. The state of Gambia in West Africa has its boundaries fired by arcs dawn from the centre of the River Gambia.

Geometric boundaries were drain either because the areas through which they lie were considered to be useless at the time of boundary definition or because rapid boundary delimitation war necessary for certain reason. Many of the straight-line boundaries of Africa, were defined at the 1884/1885 Berlin Conference, where the various colonial power met to decide the limit of their hitherto ill-defined spheres of influence.

A. GENETIC CLASSIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

The genetic classification of boundary is based on the relationship between the boundary and the cultural landscape at the time of the boundary was established. The original idea behind this approach was Hartshorne's and it was formulated in a paper, published in 1936 in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* the identified three major groups of genetic boundaries :

(1) **Antecedent boundaries** : Boundaries which were defined and delimited before the development of most features of the cultural landscape. Some of the geometrical boundaries in Africa, Australia and in North America belong to this category. The US-Canada boundary west of Great Lakes in North America is a good example. A 'pioneer' boundary is one that runs through absolutely, unoccupied and underdeveloped country which Hartshorne called as virgin.

(2) **Subsequent boundaries** : Boundaries which are defined, delimited and demarcated after the cultural landscape had been almost fully evolved. Most of the anthropogeographic boundaries that developed as a result of suppression and expression of nationalism belong to this group. India-Pakistan boundary may be cited as an example.

(3) **Superimposed boundaries** : Truce lines are defined, delimited and demarcated after the pattern of settlement have fully developed. Such boundaries, without any confirmity. Colonial boundaries in the older settled regions of Africa offer examples of this type. At the moment the boundary between North Korea and South Korea is a good example of superimposed boundaries. If the line of control (LOC) in Jammu & Kashmir is accepted as the international boundary between India and Pakistan, it will be good example of this type of boundary. The LOC is a long-existing truce line for more than half-a-century old, and if its recognised, it will be an 'entrenched' boundary in the Hartshonian terminology, and may affect the cultural landscape in the long run.

(4) **Relic boundaries** : Boundaries that have currently lost their political function, but which nevertheless are discernible in the cultural landscape. Abandoned boundaries when redrawn to conform to the cultural division of the landscape, then relic boundaries get political expression.

Unit 3 □ Partition of India and Its Geopolitical Implications

Structure

- 3.1 Concept of Nationalism**
- 3.2 The Bengal Division and Muslim League**
- 3.3 Organization of Indian States Since Independence**
- 3.4 Political Geography of Foreign Trade**

3.1 Concept of Nationalism

To know the geography of partition of the Indian sub-continent, it is necessary to know the history of the Nationalist Movement that changed the political landscape of the land, called : India. The Nationalist Movement in India was a political movement with strong economic, social and religions aspects. It was essentially a creation of and a reaction against foreign rule. It started as a movement of protest which eventually became a movement of revolt.

Nationalism is generally considered to be the most geographical of all political movements because of its space-centric characteristics. Nationalism is a doctrine or an ideology of a nation that every nation requires its own sovereign state for the true expression of culture. The true expression of cultural distinctiveness involves movement across the space, particularly the extent of the spare where the cultural traits are crystallized, and deeply rooted in. Nationalism emphasizes the common and ubiquitous ideology, particularly. The uniqueness of each nation, the qualities that make one confident in identifying with a particular set of symbol, and histories. The Nationalist Movement in the subcontinent started with an ideology that Indian Nation, being a natural unit in the community of the societies with a common history, must have its own sovereign state for the true manifestation and expression of its cultural heritage and distinctiveness.

Nationalism is a complex phenomenon wherever it is encountered but in India it was particularly complex because of the environment in which it arose and became of the many forces, internal and external that affected. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries India experienced a great re-awakening, produced nodoubt by

the western impact upon it, and by the search to find its own identity in a changing situation.

Nationalism was powerfully stimulated by the work of many persons and organizations where efforts were directed to the re-discovery and revitalization of the past and to the preservation of ideals and faiths. Even movement which were essentially non-political ne even reactionary in their fundamental outlook contributed to the development of a nationalist upsurge.

The nationalist movement in India, however, was always dominated by Hindus. This is certainly not surprising, for the great majority of Indians were Hindus. Moreover, reader the British the Muslim lost much of their former position and influence, and the Hindus benefited more from the opportunities opened up by the British to enter the trades, professions, and governmental and education service Muslims were further alienated by the many evidences that in the minds of some of the Nationalist leaders the struggle for 'swaraj' in its various forms was linked with a revival or reaffirmation of Hinduism. However, it was during the formative stage of the nationalist movement, particularly, during the closing period of the nineteenth century that the "seeds of Hindu-Muslim cleavage vis-a-vis partition of the subcontinent were sown to extent an to have caused the great Indian nation divided and split almost after sixty two years".

The Indian nationalist movement that began with the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885, can be called 'liberation nationalism', because it sought for independence from the British rule. Both Hindus and Muslims unitedly initiated the national liberation movement against the British government. Hindus and Muslims were the pacts of the single dominant 'Indian nation', in spite of religions difference. The 'feeling of belonging together' brought the two longest communities to share and experience of some common characteritics of genre devie expressive of what may be called 'unity in diversity'. Both Hindus and Muslims felt the Britishers, being the common enemy of both, and a joint fight against them would yield a positive results. Nevertheless, the Hindu-Muslim mutual inclusiveness with a common characteristics of a shared lifestyle (genredevic) and an ideology against the British rule, started weakening. Hindu-Muslim bond was gradually converted into a cleanage, and the inclusiveness replaced by exclusiveness. The nationalist movement against the British rule got split along the communal pattern—the movement which was earlier designed and intended for complete freedom of the land from the foreign rule but, how it turned to be designed for the division of the nation and the land. Out of

the nationalism movement developed the Muslims nationalist movement in the early years of the beginning of the movement against the British rule. The rise of the Muslim nationalisms ultimately culminated in the partition of the Indian subcontinent along the communal religious line/pattern.

The beginnings of Muslim nationalism can also be traced back to the years prior to 1885. The rise of Muslims nationalism may be attributed to a reaction against the difficulties which the Muslims experienced after the consolidation of British rule and particularly after they failed to hold their own with Hindus in the economic and political field. The British held them in large measure responsible for the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857. Yet in the years following the 'Mutiny', when Muslim fortunes and spirits seemed to be at a low ebb, a change in their political, if not economic, status set in.

The moving spirit in the rise of Muslim nationalism was Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898) who urged the Muslims to cooperate with the British and to preserve their identity against the Hindus. He advised the Muslims to remain aloof from the Indian National Congress, on the ground that it would inevitably come under Hindu domination. In the circumstances, he said that the Muslims could not identify themselves with the Hindus, rather the Muslim must seek their own salvation along different lines. In 1877 Sir Syed Ahmad Khan founded the Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, that later developed into the Aligarh Muslim University. The Aligarh movement, of which he was the leading spirit, continued regeneration of the Muslim in India and laid the basis for a more active Muslim political movement at a later.

3.2 The Bengal Division and Muslim League

There was an extremist group in the Indian National Congress that sought for extreme steps to oust the British from India. Those who believed in extremism were called militant nationalist. This group was active in Bengal, Punjab and Maharashtra. The extremists emphasized the political struggle rather than social and economic reforms. The extremist group preached a kind of Hindu revivalism which gave new life to the nationalist movement, but which at the same time further alienated many Muslims from the nationalist movement. However the British move to partition Bengal in 1905, along the commercial line, was excessively designed to cause further alienation of the Muslim from Hindus. It was aimed at weakening the process of the Bengali nation-in-making. The Bengal partition in 1905 was conditioned to give precedence of religion over the language so that the linguistic homogeneity irrespective of religion affinities could not hold together the two communities Hindus and Muslim.

The Bengal partition was strongly resented and renounced by the Bengalis. The opposition to the Bengal partition was so strong that the British had to withdraw it in 1909. Nevertheless, the partition of Bengal in 1905 had already created a perpetual crack in the minds of both the communities : Hindus and Muslims, particularly, in the minds of those who believed in what may be religion fundamentalism. A new type of dynamism thus appeared to have been set in, despite the withdrawal of the Bengal partition, that in the decades to come fueled communalism in Bengal.

A new dynamism, in the form of the foundation of the Muslim League in 1906 by Aga Khan was set forth that aimed at organizing the Muslims of the subcontinent in a way as to differentiate them from the Hindus. Bulk of the Muslim population moved towards the Muslim League, however, a small part of the population continued to be close to the Indian National Congress, although it was branded as a Hindu Organization, looking after the interests and aspiration of the Hindus only. The foundation of the Muslim League undoubtedly weakened the Indian Nationalist Movement, because bulk of a dominant human group, or a dominant principal community of the subcontinent with numerical superiority in certain areas and regions left itself aloof from the main struggle for freedom.

The British, to cause further Hindu-Muslim split with the object of weakening the nationalist movement made a provision of separate electorate for the Muslims in elections in the Indian Council Act 1909, popularly called the Morley-Minto Reform. Although, the provision for separate electorate was strongly resisted and resisted, but it necessarily provided strength to the 'emerging Muslim nationalism' in India. Because of the divergent view between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League with regard to the Nationalist movement that mutual exclusiveness between the two communities widened to a greater extent. However, in order to bridge the gap and to replace the 'cleavage' into 'linkage', both the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League decided on a joint Movement against the British rule. It was at the Lucknow session of the congress in 1916 that an endorsement was made, called the 'Lucknow Pact' for cooperation between the two. But, the pact was short-lived because of inherent inner contradictions on the one hand and hardening Muslim nationalism on the other hand that followed changes and counter-changes against each other, by the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. It was during the period of the non-violent non-cooperation movement since 1919, that the 'Lucknow pact' lost its significance, rather the period saw "the end of the alliance between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, specially after the Khilafat issue had ceased to have much relevance and significance". End of the

Congress-League pact had disastrous effect on the rapidly changing political landscape of the subcontinent, while the bulk of the Indian population sought for complete liberation and freedom, the Muslim population, except a small part of it, wanted its accession of numerical superiority be organized territorially to give expression to its religious distinctiveness, so the dichotomy that emerged was 'Indianness vs Muslimness'.

Demand for a separate Muslim homeland : PARTITION

Since the early 1920s, Muslim nationalism had been developing apart from the main nationalist movement. Most politically conscious Muslims of contemporary India had tended to accept the view of Sri Syed Ahmed Khan, that Muslims should remain aloof from the Congress and should look to their own interests. The foundation of the Muslim League in 1906 and the granting of separate electorates in the Morley-Minto reforms of 1909 tended to emphasize the political as well as social and religious distinctiveness.

Gradually, the idea that a separate Muslim homeland became a geopolitical necessity, and the Muslims should have a separate political status, within or without the British Empire. The process of the Muslim nation-in-the-making started. In 1930 the great Muslim poet-philosopher of the subcontinent, Muhammad Iqbal said in his presidential address to the Muslim League that : "I would like to see the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan, amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appear to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India". However Iqbal made no suggestions for the parts of Bengal, particularly, East Bengal which contained a Muslim majority.

In 1933 Rahmat Ali Choudhury prepared a nomenclature for a politico-geographical organization of the Muslim areas and territories of North-West India, and its adjoining areas : PAKISTAN (Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan). Although proposal of Rahmat Ali Choudhury was ridiculed by the Muslim League and Md. Ali Jinnah. A group of Muslim students in London started what may be called the Pakistan Movement, and within seven years, since the word : PAKISTAN was made to announce, prominent Muslim leader found something concrete in it, and the Muslim League which had earlier rejected the nomenclature, demanded a separate Muslim League.

It was at the Lahore Congress of the Muslim League in 1940 that a resolution was passed which stated that the Muslim majority areas in the north-western and eastern zones be grouped as sovereign states in the sub-continent. The prominent Muslim leader of the League came out with a 'two-nation theory' as a basis for the partition of the subcontinent. They said the Muslims of India were not just a minority group but were in fact a separate 'nation' with territorial identification and a strong system of belief (iconography). In his presidential address at the Lahore session of the Muslim League in 1940 that adopted the Pakistan resolution Md. Ali Jinnah asserted'. "Muslims are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homeland, their territory and their State".

By the time the Muslim League had come out flatly for Pakistan the Congress was locked in a basic struggle with the British Government over the issue over the issue of India's involvement in the Second World War. When, upon the outbreak of the war in Europe in September, 1939, the British Government declared that India too was at war with the Axis power, the Congress strongly protested, but the Muslim League supported it. In 1942 the Congress took the 'Quit India' resolution while the Muslim League's approach to the resolution was, rather, ambiguous. While most of the Congress leaders spent the rest of the months of the war in prison, but the Muslim League leaders spent their time hobnobbing with the British, supporting each and every decision of the British Government with regard to India's involvement in the Second World War. After the cessation of the Second World War, communal rights in Muslim Punjab and Muslim Bengal, besides the Central Provinces and Madhya Desha of the Northern India where the Hindus held demographic superiority. Mutual hostility between the Hindus and Muslims reached such a point after the Second World War that an urgent decision was required so as to avert communal holocaust of a wider spatial dimension, throughout the subcontinent. Partition along Hindu-Muslim territorial pattern was found to be the only paragon/remedy to the emerging problem of communalism or violent ethnocentrism. Thus, partition along the communal-religious lines was inevitable, however, taking into consideration the spatial pattern of distribution of Hindu and Muslim population.

It was through the enactment of Indian Independence Act 1947, passed in the House of Commons, that two independent nations : India and Pakistan (West Pakistan and East Pakistan) came into existence in the Indian sub-continent. Partition forever divided the Indian nation which had always remained as a 'united nation', now stands

'divided nation' and 'divided state'. The Indian Independence Act 1947 provided specific provision for the Indian states, particularly for their future political destiny, that they had option either to India or to Pakistan, but under no circumstances should they remain independent. It was through the Instrument of Accession that the Indian States could decide their future political destiny and there was a provision of 'standstill agreement' in the Independence Act that stated : "so long the decision to accession to either of the Nation is not finally takes, the states will enjoy the right to transit across the territories of both the Dominion And it will be the duty of the Dominion to provide safe passage for the movements and flows of people and goods of the states".

In stead of transferring the Paramountcy to the Congress and to the Muslim League, the British Government allowed it to be lapsed, and as a result, all the Indian States thereupon became 'independent' but thanks to the Indian statesman that a peaceful accession of nearly 556 Indian states war achieved except for the states of Jammu and Kashmir, Hyderabad and Junagadh. Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India after being attacked by the tribal Muslim infiltration, locked by the Pakistani army, while a minimum force was applied to secure the accession of Hyderabad where the majority Hindu population sought for their merger with India, but the Nizam wanted his state to be merged with Pakistan in total disregard of his subjects aspiration. The accession of Junagadh was achieved through a plebiscite.

Commending on the major consideration that led most of the Congress leaders to acquiesce in partition, V.P. Menon (1957 : 440) said, "The Congress had accepted the division of the country on two major consideration. In the first place, it was clear from the unyielding altitude of the Muslim League that a United India would either be delayed or could only be won at the cost of a civil war. Secondly, it was hoped that the establishment of a separate Muslim State would finally settle the communal problem which had for so long bedevilled Indian politics and thwarted all progressive aspirations, that India and Pakistan would thereafter live in peaceful relations with each other, and that all men of goodwill on either side would be free to concentrate on improving the economic condition of the common people". Partition could not provide the required panacea to the Hindu-Muslim dichotomy in the subcontinent, instead of living in peaceful coexistence, both India and Pakistan has gone on war in 1948, 1965, 1971 and in 2001. Pakistan could not hold on its eastern wing i.e., East Pakistan. It emerged as an independent sovereign state in December 1971, with a nomenclature of Bangladesh.

GEPOLITICAL IMPLICATION OF PARTITION

Partition, as a political decision vis-a-vis a political process greatly affected the (political) geography of the Indian sub-continent-space, land, territory, resources and population, all stood divided and partition. Partition left significant imprints on the landscape that the political space of the subcontinent redefined and repartition. The great Indian Nation became a divided nation and the erstwhile Indian State stood divided also, and a new rivalry relations, thereupon, got crystallized. It changed the emotional territorial bond that the people who once generations had developed a deep sense of attachment with the land.

Following specific geopolitical implication of partition could be identified which still remain fresh in the minds of the people who now belong to the second and third generations since partition in 1947. Some of the implication and/or problems still remain to be resolved even after more than 60 years of partition.

(1) The Refugee Problem

The aftermath of partition was necessarily bitter and violent. Instead of averting a communal holocaust, the division of the subcontinent was occasioned one of the major internal human disaster of modern times. Hundreds of thousands of people on both sides of new political boundaries, especially in the divided Punjab and Bengal, were massacred. The rejoining once independence soon gave way to worst crisis to humanity through murder, writings, and innumerable lesser acts of violence, accompanying by a mass reporting of people, who, abandoning most of this worldly possessions, moved from one side of the frontier/political boundary to the other, under hazardous and trying condition, often involving loss of life and harassments of all units. By June 1948, some five and a half million Hindus and Sikhs had crossed West Pakistan had crossed from West Pakistan into India, and about an equal number of Muslim had moved the other way. Similarly some one and a half million Bengali Hindu crossed once to India from East Pakistan, and some one million Bengali Muslim together with some 40,000 Bihari Muslim crossed over to East Pakistan from West Bengal and Bihar. This mass movement of people created a major demographic problem-refugee problem of unspecified discussion that put strain and stress on the economy of both the countries. The flow of people from either sides never fully ceased, rather it continued in both direction ever since, although on a lesser scale.

After a few weeks the worst human sufferings were over, and the New Government of India began to bring the situation under control. Thus at the very outset it faced and overcame a major crisis. As V.P. Menon (1957, 432). The communal holocaust, the two-way exodus of refugees, their protection and the rehabilitation of those who had

come to India—all these provided the Government of India, at a time when the administrative machinery was already out of joint as a result of partition, with a task which was as stupendous as any nation ever had to face. If in its initial stages the situation had not been controlled with vigour, the consequences would have brought down the Government itself”.

At a press conference in February 1959, Nehru said : ‘When we decided on partition I do not think any of us even thought that they would be this terror of mutual killing after partition. So we paid a double price for it, first, you might say politically, ideologically; second, the actual thing happened that we lived to avoid”.

It can be said that political upheavals following the Indian Independence Act 1947 and redrawing of political frontiers/boundaries along religious pattern, transfer and division of sovereignty and changes of regimes from the British to the natives have found million of people into exile and caused mass movements far in excess of those normally resulting from supply and demand on the world employment market. This mass movement of million of people across the new political boundary and their subsequent settlement in new levels, undoubtedly, provided the required sustenance to the growth of communalism, to which both India and Pakistan have suffered most. In India, particularly, Muslim constituted a significant minority and they have not integrated with the dominant Hindu nation, rather they preserve all aspects of their own culture and religion, but the massive influx of Hindu and Sikh population, from across the boundaries following partition, necessarily sustained an anti-Muslim feeling that in turn gave input to communal tension—one of the most important and biggest challenge to the secular fabric of Indian tradition of tolerance and synthesis.

Communalism is one of the major consequences of partition that still causes ‘some amount’ of instability in the geography of Indian federation. Pakistan and for that rattle Bangladesh do not have significant minority population, rather, whatever Hindu and Sikh populations dared to stay even after partition, and mass movement/migration, latter they were forced to flee usually by government action in the 50s. A majority of them fled to India, and other moved to Europe and America. Today, there is no problem of communalism in Pakistan and in Bangladesh because Hindus and Sikhs are almost non-existent rather they preferred to merge with the dominant Muslim nation.

Those who fled Pakistan and India soon after partition of their own are called ‘Flüchtlinge’, and those who left their homelands, usually by government action, may be called ‘Vertriebenen’ or ‘Heimatvertriebenen’. Bulk of the refugees whether

Muslims or Hindus or Sikhs were 'fluchtlinge', because they were forced to leave their homelands and belonging by the locals. Had they remained they might have been subject to political, social, economic and other disabilities. Even today, there is refugee problem particularly with regard to granting citizenship to the refugees and providing rehabilitation to them. These people, called refugees, do not have voting rights.

(2) The Kashmir Question

Perhaps the biggest challenge that emerged as a result of partition has been the Kashmir question and that has left a diabolic imprint on the political space of the subcontinent. It is one of the major geopolitical implications that has caused the nuclearization of the subcontinent's geopolitics. The genesis of the Kashmir question lies in the two-nation theory on the one hand and the loopholes in the Indian Independence Act 1947 which was rather ambiguous with regard to the political destiny of the Indian States. The Indian Independence Act 1947, had made a provision that 'the Indian states would have to accede to either of the Dominions' : India and Pakistan, through signing the 'Instrument of Accession', and there was no other alternative for them. The British Government, however, terminated the paramountcy or suzerainty of the crown once these Indian states. "Legally the Indian states there upon became independent. But it was absolutely absurd to think of the subcontinent divided into two large new independent nations carved out of British India with one of these nations divided by some thousand miles of territory, and peppered with scores of other 'independent states' ranging in size from Hyderabad and Jammu and Kashmir to a few small areas." (Palmer, 1961, 88)

However, the accession of the Indian States to India was secured by peaceful negotiations before August 15, 1947, and in a little over two years after independence the political geography of India was rationalised by the merger or the consolidation and integration of the Indian states. India was unified as never before in the history. All but three of the Indian states whose territories were geographically contiguous to the new State of India had acceded to the Indian Union. The three exceptions were significant, particularly since they imposed further strains on the already unhappy relation with Pakistan : Junagadh, Hyderabad and Jammu & Kashmir.

Junagadh became a part of the Indian State after a plebiscite in February, 1948. Hyderabad acceded to India in November 1948. These two Indian states had Muslim rulers with Hindu majority, so not much problem was involved with regard to their accession because the people wanted merger. But the case of Jammu & Kashmir was different.

The state of Jammu & Kashmir was consisted of four different political/cultural landscapes. Muslim northern Kashmir (Gilgit & Baltistan tyear); Buddhist Ladakh, Hindu Jammu Area, and the vale of Kashmir with mixed population, but the Muslim constituted the bulk of the population. Nevertheless, Jammu and Kashmir had a Muslim majority population, but with a Hindu ruler.

The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir refused to accede either to Pakistan or to India prior to August 15, 1947, contrary to the advice of the Governor-General Lord Mountbatten. Rather he wanted both India and Pakistan to sign the 'Standstill Agreement' with him. The Indian Independence Act 1947, had a specific provision of the 'standstill agreement', according to which, pending the decision of the Indian States with regard to their political status vis-a-vis their accession to either of the states, both India and Pakistan were required to provide transit right to the Indian States, across their territories so that their commercial function with the outside world could be maintained, and this could be done through signing the 'standstill agreement'.

Pakistan was quick enough to sign the standstill agreement with the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir with the objective perception that it implicitly amounted to accession of the State with Pakistan. India, however, refused to sign the standstill agreement and declared that it would sign it only when the Maharaja agreed to accede with India. But, it needs to be mentioned here that even during the British period, Jammu and Kashmir's enjoyed transit right across the territories of the Punjab and Sind, and used the port of Karachi. The city of Jammu was linked with Sialkat by a single track broadgange railway that used to carry the bulk of people and trade of Jammu and Kashmir to the outside world. Hardly, there was say such link with the mainland of India rather there was a narrow link rood with no practical relevance, it resembled with a 'widened cart track'.

Pakistan, however, consistently exerted pressure on the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir to replace the standstills agreement by accession, on in other words, Pakistan wanted the Maharaja to sign the Instrument of Accession in its (Pakistan) favour. But, the Maharaja resisted the pressure. He was apprehensive that such a more might cause its embarrassment to the Hindu population of Jammu region which in turn could anger the Government of India, similarly, if he had decided to accede to India, there would have been Muslim uprising in Northern Kashmir and in the vale and that would have been beyond his capabilities to suppress. The Maharaja was in dilemma what to do and what not to do? This was perhaps the

reason that he preferred to distance from both India and Pakistan, and maintained an independent stand. However, Pakistan believed in the fact that being a Muslim majority state Jammu and Kashmir should accede to Pakistan as had been the case with the British provinces where the 'principle of cultural-religious contiguity' was followed to bring about the division of territories between that nation. Pakistan wanted the same principle be followed in the case of Jammu and Kashmir.

Delay on the part of the Maharaja to take a final decision with regard to accession to Pakistan raised doubts to his motives that Pakistan could not sustain any longer. Pakistan, however, faced a problem of tribal uprising in its North-Western Frontier Province where the tribals wanted merger with Afghanistan. Similarly, the tribals of Baltistan and Gilgit of Kashmir, also revolted that worried the Maharaja. In order to calm down the uprising in the NWFP, Pakistan motivated them to invade Jammu and Kashmir to help the tribals of Baltistan and Gilgit. A massive infiltration was planned with the object of 'forced' accession of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan. The security system of the Maharaja was too weak to resist the infiltration, this was what was perceived in Pakistan. It was felt that the collapse of the security system of Jammu and Kashmir would be inevitable once infiltration on a large scale, beyond the boundary was undertaken. It actually happened. Tribals, backed and encouraged by Pakistan had pushed to within a few kilometers of Srinagar, the capital of Jammu and Kashmir. The Maharaja appealed for help, that India refused, however, on Lord Mountbatten's advice, to send unless the Maharaja acceded to India. On October 26, 1948, Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India. However, Lord Mountbatten announced on October 27, 1948 that 'as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir, and the territory cleared of the invader, the question of the accession should be settled by a reference of the people'. But, Pakistan could not wait further when it saw the success of the Indian army in pushing back the invader. The Pakistan army, then, openly involved, and crossed over the boundary. India and Pakistan nearly became involved in a war over Kashmir in 1948. However, because of the intervention of the United Nations that the war could be ceased.

Since January, 1949, a cease-fire line (that later i.e., in 1972 came to be known as line of control) has prevailed, and the State has been in fact divided along the cease-fire line (line of control). Repeated efforts by the United Nations and by the

U. N. society Council to workout a plan for steps leading to a resolution to the Kashmir conflict acceptable to both India and Pakistan have failed.

Kashmir accession to India was final and irrevocable. The State Legislative Assembly endorsed the accession, and the State became one of the countituent units of the Indian Union. Pakistan refused to accept the accession and renowned it an saying illogical, unpractical, and without any legal sanction. Instead, it insisted that the destiny of the State should be determined by a vote of the people. India's contention was that the accession was legally denable, given the provision if the accession of India States in the Indian Independence Act 1947 wherein the Rules had the right to take decision of their kingdom because the sovereignty lay on them not on then subject. The Maharaja was alone competent modern the rule, to take decision on the accession. Pakistan contention was more motional and religion-inspired rather, than legal. It wanted to apply the principle of the 'two-nation' theory, so as to claim their accession of the state. Pakistan had attempted military solution to resolve the Kashmir conflict, and for that it invaded Jammu and Kashmir in 1948, 1965, 1971 and in 2001. In 1965 and 2001 it engineered massive infiltration, although the attempt to push the line of contend (LOC) to further east, and to redraw it, were foiled by the Indian security tones.

The Kashmir conflict is a politics-territorial consequence of partition. It is a conflict, emanating from the faulty provision of the Indian Independence Act 1947. The nuclearisation of South Asian geopolitics may be said to an implicit geopolitical implication of partition of the subcontinent along the religions pattern. The split of the 'Indian nation' as an result of the partition into the Muslim nation and Hindu nation, has made both of their 'enenia' to each of them with political dynamium of mutual exclusiveness, confined to their respective political bounds.

(3) The Canal Water Question

One of the major implications of partition was the disruption of the Punjab canal system. Most of the canals went to West Pakistan while most of the river with their sources went to India vis-a-vis China, besides, most of their courses travel long across the Indian territories. However, the Indian part of the Punjab became a 'day zone' with no canals. "As consequence of partition the question of the use of the water of these rivers, whose annual flow in twice that of the Nile, became crucial for Pakistan, but for some years no progress war mode in resolving this life-or death issue'.

Large part of former West Pakistan had too little water and was dependent on rather uncertain supplies which had to be made available through some half dozen of the rivers which make up the Indus River system—the vital artery of former West Pakistan. Three of these rivers—the Jhelum, the Chenab and the Indus itself rise in Tibet or in remote parts of Kashmir, but three other—the Beas, the Ravi and Sutlej—flow through North-West India into West Pakistan, and can therefore, be directed for India's uses. 'Rainfall is scanty in the plain area and without the river and the irrigation system, the plain of the Indus basin would be desert'. But with the system of irrigation developed over the last hundred years, the river supported a population of about 50 million in the drive northwest of the subcontinent mostly the Punjab, which was approximately one-tenth of the total population of the subcontinent. However, partition put roughly 40 million people to West Pakistan side and the remaining 10 million people to Indian side.

Here, it needs to be mentioned that the boundary line of the new states was delimited by a boundary commission, whose term of reference delegated to it the obligation "to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab, on the basis of uncertainty the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslim. In doing so, it will take into account other factor (Spate 1947)." The other factor were primarily economic in nature. When the boundary commission made its inquiry, passions were high and it is understandable that the religion differences necessarily influenced the course of the boundary. 'meanwhile the most serious 'other factor'—the desirability a necessity of avoiding so far as possible any disruption of the canal systems on which the prosperity of all communities depended—was largely lost sight of or at most received formal lip service (Spate 1947)".

The irrigated area chiefly affected by partition was that lying between the Ravi and the Sutlej river. Here canals, originating in territory that was to become Indian, delivered water to fields that were to become Pakistan. As mentioned above that partition or division of the irrigated area was the fact that all rivers of the Punjab had their sources in the Indian held part of Kashmir. Since partition of the Punjab in 1947, there was a prolonged dispute between India and Pakistan regarding the division of the Water. Pakistan's need was, however, greater, but India was in a position to control the large part of the water. Whatever solution might be adopted, a heavy capital investment would certainly be required both for extension to the canal system and for building of dams and other works. The International Bank, for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank became interested in adapting

the irrigation system to the new structure of political boundaries. In collaboration with the United States, United Kingdom and a number of the commonwealth countries, a plan was worked out to provide the capital, while India and Pakistan, worked out the technical details. In 1960 two treaties were signed, one between the World Bank and all the countries providing the capitals, and the other between India and Pakistan.

The treaty allocated the water of the eastern rivers—the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej—for the use of India, and of the three Western river—the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab—for the use of Pakistan. The agreement created the Indus Basin Development Fund of about \$900 million to finance the construction of irrigation and other works in Pakistan provided for in the Indus Water Treaty. Approximately \$640 million is to be supplied by the participating Governments, \$174 million by India under the Indus Waters treaty, and \$80 million by a World Bank loan to Pakistan.

To quote Pounds (1963 : 326) : “Very little water, if it might be expected would be allowed to flow by way of the Eastern River into Pakistan, and the more easterly parts of the later could be obliged to obtain their irrigation water from the Western Rivers. This would clearly require elaborate hydraulic engineering works and much of the vast capital investment has been used for this purpose. The effect of the new irrigation canals has been to slow the flow from mainly northeast to southwest direction to one more nearly from north to south. This complex and costly arrangement may be said to be due to the simple fact that the Punjab was partitioned more regard to communal feelings than the hydraulic engineering.”

The refugee problem, the Kashmir conflict and the Water disputes were the major geopolitical consequences and implication of partition of the subcontinent in 1947. Although, the refugee problem have, to a greater extent, been resolved, but the communal passions so created as a result of partition along the communal religious patterns, are causing havoc in some of the sensitive region of the Republic that have raised question to India's 'secular raison detre'. Similarly, the Kashmir conflict between India and Pakistan has given rise to, what may be called 'nuclear geopolitics' in the sub-continent with an ever-increasing nuclear arm race and armageddon scenario. The Kashmir conflict has also sustained cross-border terrorism to cause collapse of the system in Jammu and Kashmir. The water-disputes have by and large, resolved exception few minute areas of disputes and conflicts.

References :

1. Menon, V. P. (1957) : *The Transfer of Power in India*. Princeton. N. J.
2. Palmer, M. D. (1961) : *The Indian Political System*. Boston.
3. Pounds, N. J. G. (1963) : *Political Geography*. New York.
4. Spate, Q. H. K. (1947) 'The Partition of the Punjab and of Bengal,' *Geographical Journal*, Vol. 110 : 201-222.

3.3 Organization of Indian States Since Independence

Immediately after the plan to partition the subcontinent and to grant independence on August 15, 1947, was announced by the British Government, the Indian Government decided to set up a states ministry to handle the problem of the integration of the Indian states. The Indian Independence Act of 1947 did not propose a solution for the problem of the Indian states, but it terminated the paramountcy or suzerainty of the crown over these political units. Legally the Indian states, numbering more than 500, thereupon became independent. It was a gigantic problem to secure the accession of these 'quasi-independent' Indian states, particularly after the lapse of the paramountcy.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was placed in charge of the states ministry, and in the next two years or so this determined and influential man, who also served as Deputy Prime Minister until his death in 1951, "by a combination of cajolery and firmness not only secured the accession of most of the Indian States to the Indian Union but also merged and integrated many of them and laid the foundation for their full integration into the new Indian nation". The accession of the states to the Indian Dominion was by and large secured by peaceful negotiation before August 15, 1947, except for Junagadh, Hyderabad and Jammu and Kashmir, whose accession to the new Indian nation took some time. In a little over two years after independence the political geography of India was rationalized by the merger or the consolidation and integration of the Indian states. Patel's first act as states Minister was to appeal to all the Princely rulers of Indian states in territories contiguous to the Indian-Dominion-to-be to accede to the Union in three subjects, foreign relations, defense and communication. A similar appeal was made by the Governor General Lord Mountbatten, in an address to the Chamber of Princes on July 25, 1947. In a remarkable display of cooperation, the Indian Princes responded to the appeal, and all but three of the Indian states whose

territories were contiguous to the new Indian nation had acceded to the Indian Dominion.

Junagadh, a Hindu small state with a Muslim ruler in Kathiawar, became a part of the Indian Dominion after a plebiscite in February 1948. Hyderabad, the largest of the Indian states, with a Muslim ruler and a Hindu majority, agreed to accede to the Dominion in November 1948, after the police of the Nizam surrendered before the Indian army which 'invaded' the state in September 1948. On being invaded by the Muslim tribal infiltration, the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, unable to sustain the pressure of invasion and infiltration, appealed to the Government of India for help. The Government of India refused to send help unless the Maharaja acceded to India. On October 26, 1947, he acceded to India. Jammu and Kashmir was a Muslim majority Indian state with a Hindu ruler. In 1948 both India and Pakistan nearly became involved in a war over Kashmir. However, since January 1, 1949, a cease-fire line has prevailed, and the state has been divided along the cease-fire, that, later in 1972, came to be known as the 'line of control'. Roughly 1/3rd part of the state is under the occupation of Pakistan, while a substantial part of Ladakh, a constituent unit of Jammu and Kashmir is under China's occupation since 1957.

With the integration and accession of Indian states, which were geographically contiguous to the Indian Union, the number of 'constituent' political units went to 27. The newly created system of 27 political units or for that matter states was expensive, inequitable, and asymmetrical. The boundaries framed after the integration of Indian states, followed by their merger with the British Provinces, were economically, linguistically, culturally and administratively as proved to be illogical and impractical.

Indian Constitution and Organization of States :

The Republican Constitution of India was proclaimed on January 26, 1950, and it made provisions for the organization of Indian states, consisting of both the territories of the former Indian states and the British Provinces that had created an asymmetrical politics-administrative system of 27 political units. These political units, numbering 27, were divided into four parts A, B, C and D, similar in their constitutional make-up based on the principle of federalism.

1. The constitution of India provided for nine Part 'A' states : Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, the Punjab, United Provinces and West Bengal—Corresponding to British Provinces.

2. Eight Part 'B' states were created that included Madhya Bharata, Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU), Rajasthan, Samashtie, Travancore-Cochin, Hyderabad, Mysore and Jammu and Kashmir. Except the last three Part B States, the former five states were formed by joining together other former Princely States, large and small. These were the earstwhile Indian States.
3. The Constitution also provided for ten Part 'C' States—Ajmer, Bhopal, Bilaspur, Cooch-Bihar, Coorg, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Kutch, Manipur and Tripura. The list was amended almost immediately to change the name of the United Province to Uttar Pradesh, to omit Cooch Behar from the list of Part 'C' States and to add Vindhya Pradesh to the list.
4. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands were listed in a Part 'D' category. Part 'A' and Part 'B' States were regarded roughly as of equal status (Jammu and Kashmir was in a rather different state, because of the disagreement with Pakistan over this territory), but Part 'C' States were definitely of lesser status, and was in fact administered by the President of India, through a Chief Commissioner or Lieutenant Governor. Executive power in Part 'A' States was exercised by a Governor, appointed by President of India, in Part 'B' States the executive head—except in Jammu and Kashmir—was known as a Rajpramukh, while in Jammu and Kashmir, the same was called Sadar-i-Riyasat.

However, in 1953 the number of States was increased to 28, when a separate State of Andhra was created out of the upper part of Modern State. It was the first linguistic State to be created in the Union.

Linguistic Movement and (Re)-Organization of the States

The unequal states of Part A, B, C and D states necessarily made the Indian federation highly asymmetrical, geographically inexpensiveness and administratively inefficient. It lacked the true character of a federation, the feudal boundaries were drawn without any regard to either the physical or the cultural features. Even the boundaries of the British Provinces were illogical in the sense that they were drawn only for administrative purposes, ignoring the regional interests and aspirations of the local and/or regional cultural entities. Independent India inherited and most unrealistic internal administrative boundaries which were further complicated by the merger of the territories of the Indian States with those of the territories of the British

Provinces, followed by the grouping and categorization of Part A, B, C States. The cultural loyalty that remained subdued and, rather, hidden during the British period, started expressing its territorial identity. The first of its kind of cultural-loyalty, expressing through linguistic regionalism occurred in the upper part of the Modern State where the Telegu-speaking people declined to stay further with the Tamil-speaking people. In December, 1952, Potti Sriramalu, in a gesture of self-sacrifice that aroused the Telegu-speaking people of north Modern State, fasted ante death is Modern on the issue of a separate state for his people, and shortly afterwards the Government of India, against its own deceives, province the create a separate State of Andhra. The new state came into existence in the fall of 1953.

The Indian National Congress had always supported, of course, implicitly, the organization of the subcontinent along linguistic, and a decision to this effect was taken, dating back of 1921. But, soon after independence it took a return and opposed its own decision. Nevertheless, a three-man commission, known as the Das commission was set up in 1948, to investigate the question of linguistic territorialization of the republic. But, the commission strongly disapproved the formation of linguistic federation on the ground that it might loosen the federal structure to the extent as to have weakened the unity and antiquity of the newly born Republic. However, not satisfied by the observation of the Das commission, the congress appointed another commission, known as the JVP committee in 1949. The JVP committee gave an ambiguous recommendations, because it expressed its concern not in such a strong way as did the Das commission with regard to the formation of linguistic states.

Growing agitation for the creation of linguistic spread to different region after the formation of the state of Andhra in 1953. The Ministry of Home Affair, Government of India, then, appointed a three-man states Reorganization Commission on December 29, 1953, to inquire into the demands of the linguistic entities that sought to create this own territories in a way an to give (geo)-political expression to their identity.

After careful consideration, the commission recommended that the number of states of Union be reduced from 28 to 16 with three union territories. The Commission was conscious of the unity and indegriety of the newly-born Indian Republic. It emphatically declared that none of the federating units would be

sovereign and independent. However, the recommendation of the commission were partially modified in the Lok Sabha (Lower House of the Parliament). The arrangement was changed, however, in the State Reorganization Act of 1956 and in the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act of 1956, both of which went into effect on November 1, 1956. The new map of India was organized mainly on a linguistic basis. The only major exception to the linguistic basis of (re)-organization, after November 1, 1956, were the state of Bombay, which was enlarged on divided and the Punjab, where the linguistic situation was complicated by other factor. After the re-organization the Indian Republic consisted of fourteen states of equal legal status—the distinction between part A, Part B, and Part C states disappeared—and six Union Territories—Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands—which were centrally administered.

Bearing in mind that its first task was the 'presentation and strengthening of the unity and security of India' the commission warned against excessive deference to linguistic feelings, for 'further emphasis on narrow loyalties by equating linguistic region with political and administrative frontier must diminish the broader sense of the unity of the country. Nevertheless, the commissioned recommended new linguistic states for the south and it warned that "further deferment of a general reorganization will cause dissatisfaction and disappointment".

Listed in order of number of person speaking each language as a Mother tongue, the coincidence of language and state was as follows : Telegu-Andhra Pradesh; Tamil-Madras; Bengali-West Bengal; Kannada-Mysore; Malayalam-Kerala; Oriya-Orissa; Assamese-Assam.

Having in effect conceded the essentially linguistic basis of states (re)-organization, the Indian Government found that its decision were generally welcomed in most of the country, but definitely unpopular in linguistically frustated Bombay State and the Punjab. The Commission, also, disapproved the formation of tribal state, in spite of 'increasing' tribal nationalism in central India and in northeastern region.

On May 1, 1960, yielding at long last to the continuing agitation among both the Marathi—and the Gujrati-speaking peoples of Bombay State, the Government of India divided Bombay State into the two States of Gujrat, with a temporary capital

at Ahmedabad, and Maharashtra, with its capital in the city of Bombay. This brought the number of Indian States to fifteen.

The Naga, a district tribemen of the northeast under the political control of the Assam Government, had been claiming for complete independence since 1928. Since, they lacked any well-organized political organizations and parties, they could not succeed in their claims, rather, they were made to be part of Assam. When the member of the States Reorganization Committee visited them, they demanded for a separate Naga State. Since, the commission was against the creation of tribal state, the demand for a Naga State was rejected. However, in 1960, it was announced that the Indian Government had accepted in principle the demand for a separate Naga State, to be carved out of Assam, as one of the constituent unit of the Indian Republic. Finally, a separate Nagaland State was created in 1963, raising the number of States to sixteen. It was the first tribal state to be created in the Union. The creation of Naga State was designed to contain the growing discontent and hostile activities of Nagas against the Indian State.

The Akali Dal, the militant Sikh organization had long been demanding a separate Sikh State within the Union along the linguistic line, but the linguistic issue in the Punjab was complicated by the fact that the two main languages, Hindi and Punjabi, were linguistically similar, therefore, the bifurcation of the Punjabi Subha along linguistic line was not possible. However, locational vulnerability of the Punjabi Subha, being a frontier political unit, and the growing religious dicotomy between the Sikhs and the Hindus that made the Government of India to concede the demand leading to the bifurcation of the punjab in 1966. The Hindi-Hindu area of the Punjab were territorially grouped and then, taken out of the Punjab as a New State Haryana. Although, a simple study of the split of the Punjab may appear to be an outcome of linguistic chauvinism, but a deeper study would reveal that it was more a result of intolerance religiosity of the Sikh people. With the creation of Haryana the number of State in the Union rose to seventeen.

On account of being sandwiched between China in the north, Myanmar (Burma) in the east, and Bangladesh (eastwhite East Pakistan) in the southwest, the north-eastern region of the Indian Republic is linked to the mainland by a

narrow strip of land, called the chicken neck. Its location has always remained vital and vulnerable too. Here, the forces of disintegration were territorialized in such a way that the entire integration with the mainland always remained threatened. Moreover, the various tribal people had long been seeking to be recognized as Nation and sub-nation. It was a region of instability, in spite of several political changes. The process of political integration and organization of the north-eastern region, therefore, started with the enactment of the North-East Areas Recognition Act of 1972, and, as a result, there emerged the states of Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland and the Union Territory of Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh which were latter given statehoodness. In fact, all these politics-territorial units were parts of Assam, and the tribal entities that belonged to there units had long expressed their discontent against the Assamese, and they strove for their recognition or nations and subnation. The organization of the northeastern areas was a geopolitical necessity. The reorganization of the northeastern regions pacified the feelings because of the attainment of the state-hood.

Creation of New states and bifurcation of States continued as a political process so as to strengthen the participatory-democracy on the one hand and to give territorial recognition of cultural entities on the other hand. Towards the end of the last century three States : Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh underwent bifurcation and/or split : Jharkhand (Bihar); Chhattisgarh (Madhya Pradesh) and Uttarakhand (Uttar Pradesh) were created. The territorial organization of these new states was necessitated to contain growing problem of tribalism and economic deprivation that the regions which were taken out and made states, underwent for years together. States like Assam, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh are likely to bifurcated in the coming future. The Government of India is seriously thinking to set up a second states Reorganization Commission to look into problems of Bodoland, Karbialong, Cachar in Assam; Gorkhaland in West Bengal, Vidarbha in Maharashtra and Telangana in Andhra Pradesh. These are the sub-state units are some of them all district councils with some administrative power to deal with local affairs, therefore, the territorial organization of these sub-state territorial units either into Union Territories or into states, cannot be ruled out if the Indian state is to sustain the pressure of movement.

Incorporation of Foreign Possessions and their Organization

Portugal and France had some territorial possessions in the subcontinent and most of them occurred in the Peninsular Region of the Indian Republic. These were fine French possession : Chandernagor, Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanaor. The first one integrated to India in 1949 without any referendum. While the remaining four were transferred to India by France on November 1, 1954 again without any referendum. Similarly the Portuguese possession like Dadra and Nagar Haveli merged with the Union on July 21, and August 2, 1954, but the Merger of Goa, Daman and Diu was not smooth, rather, these Portuguse territories were forced-acceded through the military actions. They became parts of the Indian territory on December 19, 1961.

People of these Portuguse and French possession had long desired to be assimilated in the Indian cultural system and they had supported all kinds of such movements that sought for their liberation from the foreign rule. Later, these territories were made either Union territories or merged with the neighbouring states of the Union Goa which was a Union Territory, later became a state of the Union.

In 1975, Sikkim became a part of the Indian Union through a referendrum. It was the 22nd state of the Union when it acceded to the Indian Republic. The accession was conditioned by an amendment to the constitution, passed in the parliament on April 26, 1975. The accession of Sikkim and the merger of the Portuguse and French territories, infact enlarged the spatial extent of the Republic, and the political geography of it, also, underwent some fundamental changes.

The Republic of India consists of a Mosaic of different nationalities and communities with territorial specification and identity and that makes it, rather, a geopolitical necessity to effect territorial re-alignment and re-adjustment, therefore, the process of the (re)-organization of the territories cannot be put to an end. Sub-state regionalism is the bey, at the moment, to call for realignment of territories for smaller to groups of cultural entities irrespective of their demographic size. Moreover, tribal nationalism, particularly, in central and northeastern parts of the Republic, is a dominant 'emerging' phenomenon that requires conscious effort on the part of the government to give territorial identity by organizing spatial dynamics i.e., to respect

the sense of attachment that the tribal nationalities have developed with this land once generation.

Linguistic reorganization and territorial organization, particularly, since 1953 have not weakened the Indian State, rather, they have strengthened the federal fabric of the Union to the extent as to have sustained the forces of disintegration. The earlier fear that the linguistic (re)-organization of territories would lead to the collapse of the Indian State system has proved wrong, rather in a participatory democracy such re-alignment of territories with cultural identities is a necessity.

Suggested Readings :

1. Menon, U. P. (1956). The story of the Integration of the Indian States, New York
2. Menon, U. P. (1957). The Transfer of power in India. Rinehart, New Jersey
3. Palmer, N. D. (1961). The Indian Political System, Boston
4. Sukhwai, B. L. (1985). Modern Political Geography of India, New Delhi

3.4 Political Geography of Foreign Trade

“Every state carries on trade, however, limited in scope this may be in some instances. Trade may be a source of strength, or excessive dependence upon certain goods and markets may spell weakness. Trade can be, and sometimes has been, used as an instrument of policy, and an evaluation of the significance of trade in the power potential of the state is necessary..... The control of foreign trade became an instrument of policy during the middle Ages in Europe, and during the earlier centuries of modern times it was developed, in effect, into a powerful weapon” (Pounds, 1963 : 27 & 279).

Informal Imperialism and Trade

Keith Buchanan (1972) in his ‘The Geography of Empire’ has mainly concentrated on the contemporary dominance of the United States in the world-economy. He points out that whereas this decolonization process has provided formal independence from a single imperial state, it has not provided independence from the imperial systems as a whole. In world-system, there is a change of

strategy by core states from formal to informal imperialism, and it is through the control of trade that informal imperialism is sustained by the powerful core states. It is not a new phenomenon. The size of each hegemonic power has led to a period of informal imperialism through the control of the trade. There have been only three hegemonic powers in the history of world economy, and each is associated with one of the three classic examples of informal imperialism that revealed how the control of the world trade has helped developed the informal imperialism.

First, in the mid-seventeenth century Dutch hegemony was based, in large part, on the Baltic trade, where by Eastern Europe remained politically independent while becoming peripheralized. Dutch merchants dominated the trade, but there was no Dutch political control. Second, in the mid-nineteenth century Britain employed the 'imperialism of free trade', when Latin America became known as Britain's 'informal empire'.

Finally, in the mid-twentieth century American Hegemony was associated with decolonization, to be replaced by neo-colonialism—political independence of the periphery tempered by economic dependence.

In the above three cases of informal imperialism, the peripheral states did not gain from the openness of their national economies—Eastern Europe still lags behind Western Europe, Latin America is still a collection of peripheral and semi-peripheral states, and Africa and Asia are part of a 'South' periphery in which mass poverty has shown little sign of abating in recent decades. States that have 'caught up' have employed very different policies. This leads to the second paradox concerning free trade, which is that most politicians in most countries at most times have realized that it does not work. Most politicians have found that the interests of the groups they represent are best served by some political influence on trade rather than simply leaving it all to the 'hidden hand' of the market. This raises the question who is right—'economic theorists' or 'practical politician'? The answer is that they both are right sometimes. It all depends on the world economy location of the state in question. The table below shows how different trade policies are related to different zones of the world-economy through the three hegemonic cycles.

Table : Trade policies through hegemonic cycles

Cycle	Core	Semi-periphery	Periphery
	Universal theory	Political strategy	Dilemma are conflict
Dutch	Grotius's 'Mare liberum'	England Mun's Mercantilism France : Colbertism	Eastern Europe : Landowner vs burgehers
British	Smith's 'laissez fair' Ricardo's comparative advantage	Germany : List's protectionism USA : Republican tariff policy	Latin America 'European party vs American Party'
American	Modern Economics orthodox's free enterprise	USSR Stalin's socialism in one country; Japan : hidden protectionism	Africa and Asia 'Capitalism vs Socialism'.

Source : P. J. Taylor & Colin Flinl (1985) : Political Geography. World Economy, nation-state & locality

The orthodox economic advocacy of free trade on a reflection of structural advantage of core powers, in particular hegemonic core power, in the world-economy. Such ideas can be traced back beyond Adam Smith to the original Dutch hegemony. Not surprisingly, the first great, trading state of the modern world-system was concerned for freedom of the seas, and this was expressed in the work of the Dutch political writer Hugo Grotius. His 'Mare Liberum' became the classic statement in international law justifying Dutch claims to soil wherever, there was trade to be carried on, in 1609. As the most efficient producers of commodities, hegemonic core states promote 'economic freedom' in the knowledge of that their producer can beat other producer in any competition : the Market favours efficient producers, and the efficient produces are concentrated in the hegemonic state by definition. In such a situation, it is in the interests of the rising hegemonic power to present freetrade as 'natural' and political control as 'interference'. Hence, from Grotius through Adam Smith to Modern economics, economic freedoms are presented as universally valid theory marking the self-interest of the economically strong. The orthodox economics, normally, represents a classic case of attempting to organize non-

hegemonic interests off the political agenda. There is nothing natural about free trade, the World Market or any other socially constructed institution.

All organization is a bias. However, in case of the World Market, it is clear that the bias is in favour of core states, and hegemonic core states in particular. The whole history of the world economy is testimony to this fact. The purpose of inter-state politics or rivalry is either to maintain this bias or to attempt to change it. The former political strategy is the free trade one, which is associated with informal imperialisms. This is neither more nor less 'political' than protectionism, mercantilism or formal imperialism, which attempt to change the 'status quo'. The former is political non-decision making, the latter is political decision making.

The most famous mid-nineteenth century German economist Friedrich List had attempted to nationalize his unorthodox position by arguing that there are three stages of development, each of which requires different policies. For the least advanced countries, free trade was sensible to promote agriculture. At certain stage, however, such policy must give way to protectionism to promote industry. Finally, when the latter policy has succeeded in advancing the country to 'wealth and power', then free trade is necessary to maintain supremacy. Both Modern champions of free trade—Britain and United States—were major advocates of mercantilist policies before their hegemonic period : England against Dutch and the United States against Britain. Since Germany in the mid-nineteenth century was a 'semi-peripheral' state in the world-economy it practical protectionism. Free trade was not good for Germany, particularly, for her infant industries which were yet to grow-up and develop. The USSR autarily—'socialism in one country'—'socialism in one country' and subsequent controlled trade can be best interpreted an anti-core development strategy of the USA, Britain, France etc. And the 'hidden protectionism' if past—Second War Japan is still an issue of convention with USA today.

There used to be disputes within the peripheral counties of the world-economy on the best trade policy in the mid-nineteenth century. In the mid-nineteenth century, Latin America was subject to intense revalry between the American interests and the European interest. The American interests concentrated on protection of local production and upnessented the local industrialist while the latter, i.e., European interests favoured free trade, supported by larded interests, who wished to export their products to the core and receive back better and cheaper

industrial goods than could be produced locally. European interests, however won the political contest and fair-trade triumphed. Free trade in the periphery of the world-economy was termed as 'peripheral strategy'. In Eastern Europe, the counter-Reformation represents the triumph of catholic landed interests over local bugher interests, because the landed interests there had adopted a peripheral strategy and opened up their economy to the Dutch. But, for long China practiced a protectionist trade policy. In any particular state the periphery, which strategy is adopted will vary with the interval balance of political forces and their relation to the core-interests. Asian and African have revealed both semi-peripheral and peripheral strategies—a combination of 'populist socialism' and 'capitalism' in their trading policies. However, in world-system, both semiperipheral and peripheral strategies failed politically and economically in most of the countries of Asia and Africa. Nevertheless, free trade on the tariff policy was advocated by the periphery because much of their external political space-relationship depended on it.

Mechanism of trade

Complete freedom of trade remain an idea whose realization must be judged highly improbable if not impossible. Nevertheless, some easing of restrains on trade in both possible and desirable.

During the latter nineteenth century and early twentieth, many states gradually raised the level of their tariffs, they began to grant preferential rater to those which they particularly desired to favour. Sometimes a state confined various degrees of preference, corresponding in some way with the political valuation set upon the friendship of each state. The most for reaching preferential trade agreements ever mode were those negotiated at Ottawa in 1933 by the member of the British commonwealth that a reversion to the earlier function of the British empire. The most important art of the empire was now mode up of self-governing Dominions, induct themselves on building up manufacturing industries. The commence of the British Empire was based on the export by Great Britain of finished and manufactured goods to her coloris in return for the import of raw materials and food stuffs. The Ottawa negotiation in 1933 was designed to straighten the political unity of the Empire.

The mechanism of preferential tariffs and the system of quotas being manipulated in order to weld political partners move closely together, to establish a political

dependence or conversely terminate the dependence of one state on another that might become hostile. Trade, in each such case, is being used as a weapon in a conflict. If peace is to be assumed, it is surely as necessary to remove the causes of economic warfare, as is to eliminate those of military conflict. A number of examples can be cited in this case of preferential tariffs, for example New Zealand, in order to secure a share in the British market for her better, cheese and frozen meat, entered into an agreement for preferential tariffs with Britain. The USA had once granted preferential tariff to Philippine sugar. India is contemplating to grant preference to Pakistani raw material, in a gesture to strengthen on-going confidence-building measures.

An alternative to preferential tariffs was the open door policy, that made trade more liberal. The new regulated commercial policy that emerged in the border areas was that all corners could be and, indeed had to be served, provided that there were goods left for sale, and all corners were free to sell to the territories involved. There were to be no discriminatory or preferential tariffs. Tariffs were not forbidden, but they had to be the same for all. To secure open door for trade and commerce the hegemonic core power had often forced the Latin American, African and Asian countries. There are historical evidences to reveal that war was thrust upon the Spanish-American colonies by the British in the eighteenth century to secure entry in Latin America. In fact war resulted when the trading restriction exceeded. The war an extreme example of the exercise of a trade monopoly over a major part of the earth's surface.

It would have been desirable to extend the open door system more widely, but clearly no state would have readily opened its commercial door in this way and thus deny itself the use of the commercial weapon in the pursuit of its policies unless it had been certain that other states would follow its example.

In 1919 the opportunity arose of offering the 'open door' to the colonial territories taken from Germany during the First World War. There were in Africa and the Southwest Pacific, in all about ten separate territories. They were entrusted, as mandates, to other powers: France, Great Britain, Belgium, Japan, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. The door was 'open', though not wide open. The freedom to trade without payment of duties with the mandated territories was limited to the members of the League of Nations. However, some League member did not fully honour the obligation.

One of the mechanisms used in the nineteenth century towards liberalizing of trade was to write into commercial agreements a 'most-favoured-nation' (MFN) clause. By this clause in a treaty all favour which either contracting party has granted in the past, or will grant in the future, to any third state must be granted to the other party. In general effect of this clause was gradually to reduce the tariffs tends of all countries to the level enjoyed by the most-favoured trading partner of each. It was designed to make general the lowest tariff value with the object of securing more outlets for goods as old markets started showing declining trends not only in the global scale but also in the regional and local scales. The new countries were engaged in building up industries, some of them uneconomic and justified only by the strategic advantages to be gained from them. Such industries had, of necessity, to be highly protected. Nevertheless, tariffs were tending to increase irregularly in the 1920s.

Conferences designed to bring about a general lowering of tariffs met with little success, and the tension that resulted from this commercial conflict played a part, though certainly not an essential part, in generating the frictions that culminated in the Second World War. The root to every war has been paved with good intention. From the First World War, came proposals for liberalizing trade and for preventing control over trade and resources from being used as an instrument of political policy. Out of the Second World War came the Havana Conference of 1946, the Havana Charter, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which was later replaced by the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

The Havana Charter was designed to secure a far-reaching liberalization of trade, and to create an atmosphere of peace in the international trade pattern. A compromise agreement was reached at Geneva in 1947 and was embodied in the agreement commonly known as GATT. More than half of the new countries that appeared on the ruins of the European colonial in Africa and Asia ratified this agreement, and these new states together with old serving states of Europe and North America became involved in 80 percent of the world's trade. The agreement laid down rules for the conduct of international trade and provided a reversionism for a wider extension of the most-favoured nation clause and for lowering of tariffs, easing of quota restrictions and prevention of the practice of dumping. The agreement also sought to regulate and simplify the rules governing goods in transit and the mechanics of

custom examination and valuation. Its operation nevertheless remained sufficiently elastic to give some protection to the under-developed. Newly emerged countries, which were trying to protect their young economics, and to some other countries caught in balance of payments difficulties and therefore obliged to limit imports. GATT had been trying to improve the need of developing countries to increase the exports and thus to earn the foreign exchange necessary for their own interval development.

As a result of the negotiation initiated by GATT ones the years, since its inception, states became able to buy and sell more widely than before, and given the fact that they normally bought and purchased in the cheapest market and that had encouraged the production of goods in areas best suited to produce than. GATT was confined to the non-Communist Block. The Communist Block had given shape to a trading block based on broad economic cooperation, however, with the Soviet Union, Monopolysing the trade block in a way as to ensure its political hegemony. This trading block was established in 1949, and was known as Council of Economic Mutual Assistance (CEMA) or COMECON.

The post-world war, then, had two main international trading system : (i) free-economic capitalist block, necessarily controlled by GATT, and (ii) controlled-socialist block, necessarily looked after by the USSR. These two international trading systems were mutually exclusive, and politically surcharged. Some newly independent countries, like India, that adopted a neutral geopolitical code in their foreign policies, preferred to maintain 'equi-distant' trading ties with the GATT and the COMECON, but most of the countries which got aligned with the US-sponsored political and military blocks, continued to be guided by the principles of GATT, so far as their international trade was concerned. However, GATT created economic differential between the rich and poor nations, between the developed and developing and under-developed countries. GATT become more political with the rich powerful core countries, welding considerable power and influence in deciding the destiny of the developing and under-developed poor countries of Asia-Pacific Ocean and African realm.

There are evidences to show the rich and hegemonic core power of the world-system had attempted to exploit the developing and under-developed countries for political ends by purchasing primary products from there countries, and selling them at higher rates elsewhere. This practice of buying a large part of either agricultural surplus or resources was not new, rather in the 1930s the German

government negotiated a series of agreements with the countries of southeastern Europe by which it undertook to buy a large part of the agricultural surplus of these countries. The inefficient agriculture of southeastern Europe could not find market and was in the dilemma outlined above. Germany rescued these countries, paying them relatively good. The whole exercise was politically motivated. It is practiced even today by the United States and Great Britain. Pre-emptive buying is buying up all a most of an available product in order to prevent anyone else from doing so. Pre-emptive buying, though a trade policy during the year, preceding the outbreak of the Second World, however, continued during the entire cold war period. The practice of the pre-emptive buying was necessitated by the political nature of the international trade pattern. This was usually practiced by the United States during the cold war period, that in order to prevent a strategic mineral of any African countries, falling into the hands of the USSR, it used to purchase the entire workable resource of the mineral. Even, today, when the world is threatened by the emerging Islamic terrorism, the United States is trying to go for pre-emptive buying of strategic minerals from such countries of Asia and Africa which have rich resources base of strategic minerals, so that those minerals could not fall in the hand of the terrorist. Russia is also trying to go for pre-emptive buying of such strategic mineral from the Central Asiatic Republics which have large resource of known strategic minerals, with the object of preventing them falling into the hands of the Muslim terrorist.

Nevertheless, the objective of pre-emptive buying is to place the seller in a dependent position politically. There used to be numerous examples of the use of the pre-emptive buying commercial policy for political ends as each block attempted to bring an uncommitted state into some kind of dependence upon itself during the cold war period.

The World Trade Organization : WTO

The World Trade Organization i.e., WTO was established on January 01, 1995, replacing GATT which became a centre of trade rivalry between the core and peripheral countries. The WTO was established with the object of regulating the international trade through a more conscious and conscious approach, however, without any pre-conceived notion of core-periphery conflict. It was aimed to be more effective and stronger than GATT in enforcing trade obligation over the member states of the WTO. The headquarter of the WTO is in Geneva. The blue print of it

was finalized during the Uruguay talks, held successing for several year, between the developed and developing and underdeveloped countries. One of the basic purposes of the WTO was to give effect to 28 multipurpose agreements which were finalized during the Uruguay talks.

The World Trade Organization was founded with the following basic principles :

1. To excute multi-purpose trade agreements which were included in the agenda;
2. To make available a common space and for a dias for all its member states for negotiations;
3. To help solve trading conflicts between the member states;
4. To monitor national trade policy of the member states;
5. To provide organizational and legal base for multi-purpose agreements, and
6. To maintain a coordination with other international agencies, related with the decision-making process of the international economic policy.

One of the distinguishing features of the WTO is the member of the member-states in the organization. It includes countries like that which used to be members of the former CEMA or COMECON. The fall of the Socialist Regime in the lobe 80s and the early 90s in Eastern Europe with the collapse of the Soviet Union had opened up a new vista in the international order and that had its impact the international trade pattern. Former socialist countries of East Europe, such as Romania, Bulgaria, Poland etc. and most of the C'S (Commonwealth of Independent States that emerged after the collapse of the USSR) also became member of the WTO. Even China switched over to the Market economy along with Russia, which had earlier opposed the formation of the WTO. Then, the areal extent of the WTO, across the surface of the planet expanded and widened to incorporate all the independent and dependent political regions. The area of operation of GATT was limited, but that of WTO, it has been consistently increasing its area of operation over the years. A fundamental difference between GATT and WTO is that while the former was mainly concerned with the trade of the commodities while the latter is necessarily concerned with the services and intellectual property rights, besides trader in the various commodities. Some of the fundamental principles besides the aforesaid basic principles of the World Trade Organization are :

- (i) To reduce discriminatory behaviour among the member-states, with regard to trading partnership. The most favoured nation states be given to all trading partners, if and there should be no discrimination in giving MFN states—the principle is that if any state desires trading to reduce tariffs and concession on particular commodities it must be given to all member-states of the organization. Apart from it, there cannot be any discrimination between the imported goods and home products, rather the two should be treated equally.
- (ii) Through agreements, member-states should strike to reduce obstacles, coming in the way of trading relation between them, with the object of establishing open trading system; border taxes and tariffs be reduced to such level as to widen the openness of the system;
- (iii) To reduce subsidies on the export, and
- (iv) Need to introduce maximum uniform rates for border tariffs by the member-states.

Member-states of the World Trade Organization arrived at on the following three major agreements; which include :

- (1) General agreement on coast taxes and trade which included all industrial products and other consumable items.
- (2) General agreement on services which have impacts on trades on banking insurance advice and other;
- (3) Agreements on intellectual property rights which have impacts on patent, copyright and trade marks etc.

Liberalization, privatization and globalization have widened the geography of the World Trade Organization to the extent as to have spread across the length and breadth of the world-system, however, with a new world-order/world-economy. But, the political geography of the World Trade Organization is now, involved in a conflictual spatial global pattern of trading relation between the developed and the developing and under-developed nation with former attempting to imposing their trading hegemony over the latter, i.e., this developing and poor nation and they have been resisting hegemonistic attempts at each and every global meet of the World Trade Organization since its inception in 1995, both this 'developed' and 'developing' countries had clashed with each other over the

questions of subsidy to agricultural products patent and right intellectual property rights, and doping etc.

Free Zones and Free Ports

World Trade Organization has emphasized the creation of more free zones and free ports, in an attempt to boost liberalization and privalization in the foreign trade potentials.

A free zone is just a convenience, designed to allow goods from several countries to be gathered together at major shipping, or entrepots, from which they can be more conveniently shipped to distant parts of the world. Some parts of the world have so little trade of this own—i.e., trade in goods which are produced or consumed in the state in question—that they are overwhelmingly entrepots. Hongkong is a good example. A free zone such as on Stalen Island, in the port of NewYork, is quite indegnate to meet the demands/needs of Hongkong, which is entirely a free port to which commence of Formes (Taiwan) and the Chinese mainland, of the Philippines, Vietnam, and Campuchia and of the other ASEAN countries is brought for transshipment and export to Europe, America, or other distant parts of the World. Singapore and Tangier fulfill a similar function. Gibraltar is also a free port, thought its importance, compared with that of the other named, is quite small.

Free ports generally occur in countries which have rather, very small territorial extent, and have in any case very low tariffs. It is technically difficult to develop a free port in a country which maintain a high tariffs to the case with which smuggling could be carried on. Aden, the Canary Islands, Colon, on the Panama Canal, and Port Said, on the Suez Canal are examples of traditional free ports.

However, only a section of a port, the free zone, is thus free of customs. Free zones occur in many parts of the World but are most common in Europe. Free zones in the United States were established without any intention of providing a convenience for one country in particular. However, free zones in the Scandinavian countries serve the needs of all countries. These were much political conflicts with regard to the formation of freezones vis-a-vis free ports for land-locked countries of Southeast Europe like former Czchoslovakia which got a ninetynine year lease of free zones in the German ports of Hambing and Stettin, as per the Treaty of Vevsailler, but it created lots of geographical problem for Czechoslovakia. And, in

order to get rid of politics-strategical problem, Czechoslovakia entered into an agreement with Italy in 1921, for the use of a free zone in the Italian port of Trieste.

Hungary, another landlocked state in Southeastern Europe also negotiated for the use of free zones in Trieste and Fiume (Rijeka). France similarly used Belgium ports, similarly arrangements were there for the handling of Polish commerce in the port of Danzig (Gdansk) up to 1939. The Palestine state before the formation of Israel offered to Iraq the use of a free zone in the port of Haifa which the latter declined to accept. Until 1939, USSR had such sights in the Latvian port of Riga. There are three free-zones in the ports of Beirut and Tripoli (Lebanon), designed to serve the needs of the Middle Eastern States in their hinterlands, and the port of Arica, in northern Chile, which, in a similar fashion used to serve the needs of Peru and Bolivia. Similar arrangements still exist for the handling of the Nepalese and the Bhutanese commerce in the Indian port of Calcutta. The arrangements were finalised during the British period, but have been given a new orientation through fresh agreements between India and Nepal and India and Bhutan.

The free city is an extension of the meaning and purpose of the freezone and free port. Danzig (Gdansk) was a best example of free city. The reasons for its creation/ establishment as a free city were manifold, but the most important were : its population was overwhelmingly German, yet as a port, its main function was to serve the commerce of Poland. There was reason to believe that Polish interests would not be well served if the port were a port of Germany, yet to allow it to be incorporated in Poland would be violate the political aspirations of most of its citizens. So the city of Danzig (Gdansk) was made a free city, responsible to the League of Nation. Danzig was in a custom union with Poland, though politically separated, but it lost its free city status during the Nazi regime. Similar situation arose in case of Fiume (Rijeka) which was mainly Italian in population, but had to serve as outlet for hinterland that had become mainly Yugoslav. Allotted first to Yugoslavia, then siezed by D'Annunzio, Fiume was established as a free city in 1920 and ultimately incorporated it into Italy. Since 1945, Fiume (Rijeka) has again become a port of Yugoslavia.

Right to Transit

It, in fact, came to be accepted that an inland and land locked state has the right, "to have the same facilities for access to the sea.....as if the journey had taken place

on the territory of single state". The issues involved were classified at the Barcelona Conference on Freedom of Transit. About forty nation signed the convention on Freedom of Transit that was adopted in 1921, and thirty-two them immediately ratified the convention. The signatories undertook to assist the movement of goods across their territories, to levy no discriminatory tolls or taxes, and to fix freight charges which, 'having regard to the conditions of the traffic and to consideration of commercial competition between routes, an reasonable as regards both their rates and the method of their application.

Legally, then, such island and landlocked states got the right to export and import goods through any convenient ports across the territory of their neighbours, on there had all acceded to the Barcelona conference. British India permitted Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim to use the port of Calcutta vis-a-vis the transit right. Nepal and Bhutan still enjoy the privileges of the right transit right for their foreign trade.

Some countries which did not sign the international convention nevertheless entered into bilateral agreements with their neighbours, permitting them the right of access to the sea. The movement of Canadian goods across northern Maine to the Mailtime Province and the port of Halifax was governed by an Anglo-American Convention of 1871, and that treaty is still valid to be carried forward.

While there has no change in the legal status of transit rights during part couple of decades, the actual practice of nations has probably deteriorated on the whole. States have used as an instrument of national policy their ability to interfere with the right of transit of goods across their territory. The Middle Eastern Islami countries have consistently interfered with the rights of Israel that included obstruction and destruction of pipelines.

The threat or even the fear that transit rights would be denied has prevented some countries from making use of rights which were legally theirs. Though there has been no overt interference with the movement of goods, the fear of such interference has not always been absent from India and Pakistan and from Turkey and Syria. The freedom of movement established between the two world wars was prejudiced by the division of the greater part of the world into two hostile camps. The East-West divide by the Iron Curtain and Bamboo Curtain during the hey-days of the cold war, greatly obstructed and restricted the transit rights to countries falling within there restrictive geo-political bindings. The fall of the Socialist

Regime with the cessation of the cold war vis-a-vis superpower confrontation has greatly reduced the restrictive approaches that the countries experienced with regard to this Trade and Commerce across their neighbours territories.

The right to sail the high seas is an absolute right guaranteed in international law. The territorial water over which a state claims sovereignty are also regarded as "open to merchantman of all nation for inoffensive navigation....and it is the common conviction that every state has by customary international law the right to demand that in time of peace its merchantman may inoffensively pass through the territorial maritime belt of every often state".

Bulk of the international trade is Maritime trade and is conducted by nearer of ships, which are loaded and unloaded in ports. The right of access to ports is clearly fundamental importance, and was assured in a convention, held in Geneva in 1921, under the auspices of the League of Nation. The international trades through the straits are still governed by the guidelines laid down at that convention. The straits of Gibraltes, the Turkish straits, the Danish straits and the straits of Magellan, and the straits of Malacia are the only straits that have been subject to international regulation, and in each instance it has been agreed that they should be open to all peaceful marigation. The rule thus established and applied may be said to apply to all other states.

Canals which have been cut from sea to sea and all large enough to be used sea-going ships are analogous to straits. They can be regarded as artificial straits of extreme nonowner. The movements across the canal, like the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, the Kiel Canal and Cornith Canal and still guided by the resolution of the Geneva Convention of 1921 that read! "Canals shall be free and open to all vessel of commerce of all nations on team of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination any such nation, or its citizen, or subjects, in respect of the conditions or changes of traffic or otherwise".

The Maritime traffic/trade across the Suez Canal had to be governed by the 1888 Suez Canal Convention, which was held in Constantinople, that said : "The Suez Maintain Canal shall always be free and open, in time of won as in time of peace, to every usual of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag. Consequently, the High contacting Parties agree not in any way to interfere with the free use of the canal, in time of war as in time of peace".

But the nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt in 1956 and its closure in 1956 and 1967, and in 1973 had serious economic repercussions in the rest of the

world. Egypt was attacked by Britain, France, and Israel for the opening of the canal. Egypt had often closed the trade movement across the Suez Canal, particularly when the wars broke out in the Middle East, between Israel and Arab Nation. The Suez Canal was long closed during the 1973 Israel-Arab war when the Arab Nation put all embargo against the West, and that continued for ten year. The closure of the Suez Canal in 1973, forced the cargo vessels of the western and eastern nation to take long route round the cape of Good Hope. The trade was badly hit and became time-concerning. The closure of the Suez Canal, in fact, made the Panama Canal more involved so far as the west-bound and the east-bound trades were concerned. Egypt was found to withdraw the ban it imposed on the movement of goods across the Suez Canal. It found the UN economic sanction that had bad effect on its economy and international understanding.

Similarly, the Kiel Canal was entirely at the disposal of Germany until 1919. Its purpose was as much strategic as commercial. However, the Treaty of Versailles declared the canal to be open to the peaceful trade and commerce of all nation, and as subsequent decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice : “..... It has become an international waterway intended to provide easier access to the Baltic for the benefit of all the nation of the world the Kiel Canal must be open without any distinction between war vessels and vessel of commerce. In 1936, the German government denounced the clause of the Treaty of Versailles, and allowed passage only to vessels of states, which it regarded as friendly to itself. With the end of the second World War, the canal has again been open as condition of equality, though this new freedom is yet to be guaranteed by any international treaty.

Then, all canals which are suitable for oceangoing vessels and whose function is to join sea to sea are open as freely to the shipping of the world as straits, but the examples renew that this freedom was not achieved without great difficulty, and in face of the vested interest and exclusive privileges of many states.

Role of Pipeline in Petroleum trade

The role of pipeline has assumed a special geopolitical significance following the importance of petroleum in international trade. It is usually transported in specially built and equipped vessels, but the cost of transportation of petroleum by specially built vessels is relatively high, but the cheapest cost is by pipeline. Transcontinental pipeline and/or intra-continental pipeline across the territory of

one or two or more countries necessarily reveals the transit right that an island or landlocked country enjoys for trade and commerce. The first international agreement to construct a pipeline was made between Great Britain and France and related to the Middle Eastern lands for which they had mandate. It was not until 1932-1934 that pipelines were completed from the Iraqi oil fields to the Syrian port of Tripoli and the Palestine port of Haifa. During the cold war period, the COMECON countries of the Socialist East Europe were linked with the USSR through pipelines for the flow of petroleum from the USSR to these countries. India and Iran are trying hard to come to an understanding for the flow of petroleum from Iranian oil fields to India through Pakistan's territory. The negotiation is going on between India, Iran and Pakistan.

The construction of an international pipeline for the inland flow of petroleum raises a problem of transit more complex than those considered so far. An international pipeline requires the construction of new transportation facilities, and one, furthermore, may be of no direct value to the state whose territory is nearly crossed by it. Pakistan has raised this issue to both India and Iran as to what benefit would it get if it allows its territory to be crossed by the India-Iran petroleum and gas pipeline? In spite of being the cheapest means of conveying oil overland it is also one that is most vulnerable. A number of interstate oil pipelines have found closure because of conflictual patterns of relationship between the states at the regional and continental levels.

For a state to draw a considerable part of its oil supply by pipeline across the territory of a neighbour implies a considerable degree of trust. Pipelines can be built only as a result of international agreement by the countries directly concerned. Although the tripartite agreement between India, Iran and Pakistan is in the process with regard to the construction of an Iran-India pipeline through Pakistan, but the possibility of interruption of the transit traffic in oil and natural gas in the Pakistani territory cannot be ruled out.

International air transportation

Not much trade is done by air transportation because (i) very high cost of transportation is involved; (ii) Not all kinds of goods can be transported through air navigation; (iii) there are specific corridors which require to be maintained for air transportation; and (iv) there is a specific fly limit for the air-back traffic.

However, it is a principle of international law that a state theoretically possesses sovereignty over its own air space as fully as it does over what lies in the rocks

beneath its surface. There has been some question whether this sovereignty extends indefinitely outward into space and the most widely held opinions are that it does, at least, as far out as powered aircraft can fly.

The convention for Regulation of Aerial Navigation was drawn up at the Paris Conference in 1919 that said : "...every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty in the airspace above its territory and territorial water". The participating countries, however, undertook to accord to all other signatories the 'right of innocent passage' while reserving the right to restrict and to limit this right for reasons of safety and/as strategy.

After the end of the Second World War, there was another convention on International Civil Aviation in 1947 and it followed the likes of the Paris convention of 1919. The new convention asserted the 'right of innocent passage and also the 'right to make emergency landing in the territory of other state. This new convention was ratified by all such states which became dependent upon the USA, but the COMECON states with dependence on the USSR remained outside the purview of the convention. International trade through air transportation, then was necessarily confined between the US allies of northwestern and western Europe, and the items mostly consisted of light goods and pharmaceutical products, including light motor vehicles. Gradually, air trade expanded between the USA and Japan.

The cessation of the cold war and the end of the superpower rivalry in the 90s of the last century widened the scope of the international air trade, on the former COMECON countries joined the international network for trade and commerce in light goods and pharmaceutical products.

However, every country today still restricts flights across its territory by the airplanes of other countries, usually allowing them to use certain specific corridors. Corridors created on a result of the East-West conflict after the Second World War ceased to be operated following the end of the superpower rivalry and the cold-war as well in the early to 90s of the last century. Long-distance flights have made the air transportation of goods and other manufactured products quite easier, but the availability of air-fields of that level is yet more serious difficulties owing to the length of runway required by the long-distance jet planes.

The air trade is mostly confined to the North Atlantic region particularly, between the developed countries on the either sides of the North Atlantic Ocean, between the countries of the European Union, and between USA-Canada and Japan, and between the European Union and Japan. The former Socialist and Communist States together with the developing countries still lag behind in all-bourne trade.

However the technical requirements of air-craft and the restriction of states over which the aircrafts fly combine to hamper a mode of transportation that should be freest of all.

The above discussion reveals that there is much politics in international trade. Even after the end of the cold and super power rivalh, the politics stile continues to effect the pattern of foreign trade. The developed countries carry on more trade in the aggregate but they carry it on principally with each other. The developed and the most industrialized states are the most important trading partners of one another, while the developing and less developed countries carry on very limited trade between themselves. Most of their relatively small volume of trade is with the developed countries. A large part of world's trade consists of the exchange of the manufactured product of the developed countries for the raw materials and food-stuffs of the developing and less-developed countries. There is a direct association between the volume of trade per head and the level of economic development. This can be tested by running a correlation between GNP per capita and forign trade per capita. Nevertheless, the North-South geopolitical differentials, each and conflictual pattern greatly control the pattern of international trade with contemporary world.

References :

1. Pounds, N.J.G. (1969/1973) Political Geography. New York
2. Taylor, P.J. & Flint, C. (1985) Political Geography : World-economy, Nation-state & locality (First Indian Reprint, 2004). Delhi
3. Weigert, H.W. et al (1957) Principles of Political Geography. New York

Unit 4 □ Politics of World Resources; Political and Economic Blocks, Political Geography of Foreign Trade

Structure

4.1 Politics of World Resources

4.2 Political and Economic Blocks

4.1 Politics of World Resources

Resources in the context of Political geography can be defined as 'anything a nation has, can obtain, or can conjure in support to its strategy'. Such a definition is certainly wide, as it should be for resources are as tangible as soil, an intangible as leadership, as measurable as population, as difficult to measure as patriotism. There is no common unit and no statistical summation is possible. Power is defined as the 'capacity to participate in the decision making process, may be at the regional or global level, whichever is geopolitically suitable or required'. There is a positive relationship between resource and national power, but it does not mean that the resources-rich nation are powerful nation in the world deciding the global politics. If we look at the various global cycles of world economy, put forward by Modelski and Kondratieff, we find that the earlier nation that initiate world-empires in different centuries were not resource-rich nation in true sense of the term. Or, we can say that the earlier core countries such as Portugal, the Netherlands and Great Britain that dominated the world politics since the fifteenth century to the early part of the twentieth century were not resource-rich countries, yet they decided the destiny of the world. Even today, Japan can be cited as an example of a resource-deficient country, but it plays a decisive role in the world-system being one of the core countries.

Nevertheless, resources constitute an element of national power, because the economic strength that a nation owns, is all due to the resources available within its territory. Economic strength is, therefore, an instrument of political power that given the nation the capacity to participate in the decision-making process. It is impossible to consider the population of a nation, its efficiency and effectiveness, without at the sometime discussing the natural resources which available to its use. Soil, minerals,

and metals may be regarded as primary resources in the estimate of national power. Scanty of natural resources puts strain on the national power vis-a-vis the national policy, and the nation loses its relevance in the regional politics.

Few resources can be used in the forms in which nature has given them to us. They need to be smelted, refined and fabricated. Potential resources, that might be made available only after the difficult and costly laying down of a railroad and construction of mines and smelters, all of which might take five or more year, do not greatly help. If the decision-making authority initiates a policy now, it needs the support of resources at once, not at some hypothetical date in the future. Of course, it might take plans for futures action and delay the implementation of there plants until specific resources are available for immediate use. Such integration of resource planning with the states external policy has been known. On several occasion in the past centuries the responsible power in a state were forced to admit that : 'we shall be in a position to risk was only if certain resources are available' and thus to delay political action until a safety margin in resources has been achieved. So in order to be considered in the military power potential of the state, the resources must be developed and available or available after only a very short delay. The stage of industrial development of a state is of prime importance in the power potential. Not all industries, of course, add to a state's power or contribute to its ability to enforce its policy as to resist demands that might be made to it.

S. B. Jones (1954) proposed a fivefold classification of the degree of availability of resources :

1. Power resources available immediately. These include active mines and factories which are already producing objects with immediate power potential such as the steel sheet, and chemical fertilizer.
2. Resources available only after activation. Among such resources would be standly equipment and any plant not currently in production. In a sense, then resources also include the mothball fleet. The time required for activation varies from few hours to several week according to the need for 'warming up'. An integrated steel works might require two to three weeks before full production would be reached.
3. Resources available only after conversion. An automobile factor could turn from the production of cars to that of light trucks only after retooling, that might take many months unless jigs and other equipment has been prepared in advance. Similarly most factors producing consumer goods could convert

to the manufacture of goods having power potential only after a considerable time lag.

4. Resources available only after development, such on fuel resources or ore deposits known to exist but awaiting the opening up of a mine or the construction of a processing plant. Such resources had given much comfort to American in the past but which are less comforting now. The decision to resort to war is likely to be made only in the light of resources that are already in some phase of development. On the other hand, if a war should last longer than expected, it is likely that resources, undeveloped at the start, would be exploited before the conclusion. The construction of such highways on the Burma Road or the Alaskan Highway are in effect, wartime resource development which were not wholly anticipated when the war began and also the development of the atomic bomb.
5. Hypothetical resources, coal, petroleum, ore bodies and other resources where existence is only presumed but not proved cannot be said to have any power value. To this category must also belong the future development of cheap nuclear power, the harnessing of the tide and the air, and the use of other such potential resources. The atomic bomb was hypothetical until 1945.

The degree of the availability of resources are of course not rigidly separated pigeonholes, but they do differ in kind as well as in degree. A given power resource is not confined to one category. Many exist in all time-fold classification of degree of the availability. Oil, for example, may be immediately available in storage tanks. Idle wells and refineries can be activated. Non-essential use can be curtailed—this would be conservation. New wells may be drilled in proven fields—this is development and favourable structures may be wildcatted on the hypothesis that oil exists in them. Intangibles like leadership can exist in all fine degree of availability of resources. How power resources are distributed through the availability series reflect the national strategy vis-a-vis the global politics. The United States for example, traditionally has left as much of its power as possible in the convertible and development states (levels). This is the reason that it tends to determine the destiny of the world politics, particularly, since the cessation of the cold war and the super-power confrontation. The USA would spring to arms overnight if they were attacked as it was noticed during the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001. It has a maximum sustainable rate to play a very decide dominant and deciding role in regional and global politics.

The degree of availability of resources, mentioned above are closely related to three aspects of the national economy : fat, slack and flexibility.

A state sometimes possesses, in addition to the types of a resources already mentioned. External assets, such as overseas investment, or currency holdings. It is usually desirable to hold to these, but they could be sacrificed, i.e., they could be used to purchase other resources needed more immediately. Great Britain sold foreign investments in order to be able to purchase resources during both the world war and also traded certain Caribbean bases for a number of old destroyers, which in 1940 constituted a much more valuable resources than a few square miles of soil in the West Indies. Such expendable resources are sometimes called 'fat'.

'Slack' is another surplus aspect of resources : the failure to make the fullest use of existing resources. This is particularly noticeable in reference to labour. A forty-hour week could be increased to forty-five or forty-eight hours, at the sametime, a plant that operates on a one—or two shift basis could be used all the time. In wartime such slack is always taken up quickly and is used to replace the services of labor that is taken into the armed forces.

The term 'flexibility' is the ability of an economy to permit rapid shifts from those kinds of production which are not essential in wartime to there which are essential is a sign of its flexibility such as "the ability of technicians to make typewriter factories over into machine gun factories".

'Fat' and 'slack' correspond to resources available after activation, and 'flexibility' covers the two concepts of 'concession' and 'development'. The United States of America is perhaps, the only country in the contemporary world-systems which has the requisite potential with regard to the degree of availability of resources, including 'fat', 'slack' and 'flexibility'. The United States, known for its relatively high wages, advanced technology and a diversified production mix, for the past half-a-century, or more domina, has been dominating the global geopolitics, dictating the destiny of the peripheral countries of the world-system. The other core countries of the world-system are no where close to the USA in term of the power potentials with regard to the leguce of availability of resources, including 'fat', 'slack' and 'flexibility'.

"Possession of large reserves of essential minerals and mineral fuels is an assert of great importance, and possession of a 'corner' on a rare but essential mineral—petroleum or the terro-alloy metals—could be the pretext for a species of political blackmail".

Food Resources :

“An adequate supply of foodstuffs is a condition of human welfare, and its assurance is necessarily a primary preoccupation of government. If a food supply is not assured in time of peace, it certainly would be precarious in wartime, when movement and transportation are usually more restricted and the labor force available to produce it is reduced. A state usually needs to be able to call upon a reserve food supply in emergencies of this kind”.

No power in the contemporary world can claim to be completely self-sufficient in respect to foodstuffs, because in instance in the area large enough to embrace the variety of environment necessary to produce the range of food that is now thought desirable. Among the core countries the United States and France come closest to being self-sufficient, while China and India are to an extent, lying close to being self-sufficient that is exemplified by their agricultural growth during the past few years. The USA, China and India are large state with variety of environment, enabling the countries to produce the range of food, from tropical to temperate qualities. It is true that these three countries including France also, could survive without importing foodstuff for a considerable time, if necessary, though diets may become somewhat monotonous and some form of rationing would be unquestionably necessary. Brazil is also emerging as a self-sufficient state. It also produces variety of foodstuffs. Australia is a surplus state in terms of wheat production like that of Argentina. Their wheat production much exceeds that of their requirement, so the surplus they export to European and Asian countries. Argentina used to export wheat to Great Britain, but during the First World War, it stopped exporting wheat to Great Britain, forcing it to import wheat from its old European rival : France.

Russia, though largest country in the world, very often depends on the import of foodstuffs, particularly, wheat from the western country. Even during the cold war period, the United States of America used to export wheat to the former USSR, despite the fact that the two were mutually exclusive and engaged in war politics of what was called the ‘superpower rivalry’. Russia is often faced with the problem of ‘crop-failure’, and that could be the reason of the being dependent on the import of the foodstuffs. Russia could not make substantial increase in the field of agriculture. It is more concerned with the development of its military potential rather than agricultural potential.

However, the United States, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and host of other countries are dependent on imported foodstuffs and that must be counted as a

negative element in its power inventory. A successful land or water blockade can cut off the supply of imported food, and during the past, a significant object of strategy had been to do just this. In the World War I the German submarine warfare so reduced the movement of foodstuffs into Great Britain that the possibility of starvation became very real. During the World War II, the same strategy was less successful than during the first, largely because convoys could be protected more effectively by means of aircraft. It was a policy of the Allied power in both the wars to cut off the supply of goods to Germany.

The United Kingdom and Japan are very much vulnerable to a blockade, partly because of their heavy dependence on imported food, partly also because, surrounded as they are by the sea, the danger of a blockade is all the greater. Same is the condition with the Persian Gulf countries, particularly, Iraq and Iran that their import of food-stuff supply can be cut off by the US fleet, guarding the straits of Hormuz. The United States of America has already threatened Iran of grave consequence including blockades if it proceeds with its nuclear programmes. Taiwan is vulnerable to a blockade by China. Conflicts in Africa, between the countries, may be said to emerge from food shortage and starvation. Food has always been a strategic issue in international politics and is often used to gain access to the foreign policy affairs of the needy countries. During the late 60s of the last century when India faced a worst famine, the American help was conditional, and quite for sometimes India had to carry on the US obligation in her external space-relationships, or in other words, quite for sometimes, the U.S. influence was very much reflective in India's foreign policy, but the crisis in that Pakistan in 1971 and America's consistent military support to Pakistan compelled India more into Russian fold for survival.

Mineral Resources

Distinguishing between the strategic relevance of food resources and mineral resources in the political geography of the state, Pounds (1972) made the following observation that. "The situation concerning mineral resources differ, however, in two major respects from that of food resources. In the first place, the soil, given careful management, will go on producing without significant variation. Mineral resources, however, all exhaustible and every known deposit if worked continuously, will run out. Mineral resources are consequently, an unstable factor in national power. Second, food resources are, by and large, peristable. It is true that 'wheat and other grains can be stored for many years, but this usually necessitates a careful control of humidity and temperature as well as protection from insects and rodents. Most

minerals, on the other hand, can be stocked-piled, and the majority do not deteriorate if left exposed to the weather. These two greatly modify the intrinsic power implication of mineral resources”:

The extraction of mineral resources is more narrowly localized than the production of crops. There are few inhospitable parts of the earth's surface that one not capable of yielding some foods, but mineral resources are distributed much less regularly than cultivable soils. Not a single developed state is self-sufficient. Therefore, there is large trade in minerals—both fuels and minerals from which metals are obtained. Trade in minerals, some the beginning of the world-economy, has been a potential strategic weapon in the regional and global politics. Even within, a nation, the movement of minerals from the producing area to the consuming areas after creates much heat when the question of the payment of royalty arises.

Fuel resources : Coal of all kinds as well as petroleum and natural gas are more widely distributed than most metallic minerals. If chronology is to be developed then it can be said that coal in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century was an index of power potential. Those countries in Europe that wielded power such as Great Britain, France and Germany, and the Czarist Russia, were the major coal producing countries, and their industrial complexes were situated in the vicinity of coal fields that provided the essential fuel. It was indeed a reality that the balance of power in the continent during the late nineteenth century was always in favour of these countries which used to produce bulk of Europe coal, and where core processes were dominant to control the world politics. The rise of the United States in the early twentieth century can also be attributed to the coal 'factor' that its industrial hub—the source of its military potential also lay in the vicinity of the Appalachian coal areas. The occurrence of coal in Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, and the USA in the earlier part of the twentieth century largely destined the military potentials of these countries on the eve of the out-break of the World War I. Except Russia, all these North Atlantic littoral countries emerged as the most industrialized nation of the contemporary world to determine the world politics.

Modern China is a 'coal-based' power in the contemporary world, so is India, emerging on the pattern as a regional power. However there was little politics involved with regard to the movement of coal from the surplus producing countries to the coal deficient countries. Much of the African and Latin American countries do not have substantial coal reserves and these countries have attempted to alternative source of fuel. Earlier, these used to be trade in coal but the fuel was never used as a weapon in the diplomatic circle.

In some areas hydroelectric power has been developed as an alternative to solid fuel. Naturally the trend is most marked in countries short of a lacking in coal. Switzerland, Australia, Italy, France, Norway, Sweden in Europe, Japan in Asia, Canada to an extent) in North America. These countries have developed bulk of their water power potentials. The development of waterpower or hydroelectric power requires huge capital investment which the countries in the periphery of the world system cannot sustain. Coal is certainly the cheap source of fuel power, and developed countries harnessed this cheap source of power to satisfy their economic and political developments.

Petroleum soon replaced coal as the alternative source of fuel necessary for industry and transport. It was found to be more 'desirable' and 'flexible' than coal in term of potentialities. International trade in petroleum and petroleum products is far more important than that in coal. There is much politics involved in the movement of petroleum. Much of the crisis arising out of the super power rivalry during the cold war period was centred on the Middle East oil.

West European nation, particularly Great Britain, France, Germany (West) and Italy soon switched over to petroleum on the chief source of fuel for in their industries and transportation. Declining coal production, however, compelled them & depend heavily on the supply of the Middle East oil. Most of the oil fields in the Middle East were in the hands of the foreign companies of there West European countries. These foreign companies used & take the bulk of the royalties earned from the oil sale. It was during the Suez crisis in 1956 that the geopolitics of petroleum was realised when the Arab nations of the Middle East stopped the oil flow to European countries which well involved in the Suez crisis. By the time of the Suez crisis, the USA had already started importing oil from the Arab nation. After the European industries were badly hit when the flow of oil was stopped. The Middle East oil-producing Arab nation formed an organization called OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries), to Monitor the oil price at the international market. In the meantime, the Arab nation started nationalising the oil wells which the western countries resisted, but failed. Again in 1967 and in 1973 during the Arab-Israel war, the Arab nation stopped the oil flow to the Western Countries that sided with Israel. This step created acute energy crisis in the west, worst hits were Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy and Japan. For long the embargo continued crisis in the Middle East has always been petroleum-oriented. The discovery of oil in the North Sea, and in some non-conventional areas has to an extent, lessened the

Western dependence on the Middle East oil. Russian oil is getting an access to West European countries.

There is non much politics with regard to the flow of natural gas from Iran to India across Pakistan, and from Myanmar to India across Bangladesh. India and Iran have long agreed for this movement of natural gas but some have international politics has put some hurdles so that it cannot initiated, and in case of Myanmar which had earlier agreed to the pipeline proposal, ultimately concluded a treaty with China. Bilateral relation have worseweb. The intervening countries : Pakistan and Bangladesh have also played wrong politics, sabotaging the proposed deals.

Nuclear and atomic power have now emerged as the industrial power and some countries, such as the USA, Russia, France, Great Britain, Germany, Japan and even India and China have made technological advance in this power sector. The atomic power is being used for industrial purpose. However, it is too early to say that the use of atomic power has done more than underline the existing power ratios among the states of the world.

Second in importance only to strategic fuels are the strategic metals. The significance of steel and of a number of non-ferrous metals, especially copper, aluminium, lead, zinc, in, manganese, nickel and a number of other necessary metals, needs no emphasis. They are even more necessary in time of war for the manfactor of large quantities of military equipment. It has been commonly held that the loss of control over any such materials in war-time is a matter of very grave concern. The loss of the tin mines of Malaya to the Japanese, the cutting off of the Swedish iron-ore supply by the German, even the possession by the enemy of the mercury mines of Italy and Yugoslavia well thought to hold serious consequences to the Allied powers during the Second World War. Strategic minerals are defined "as those minerals required for essential uses in a war emergency, the procurement of which in adequate quantities, qualities and time is sufficiently uncertain for any reason to require prior provision for the supply thereof. No country can possibly be self-sufficient in this range of minerals through the United States and Russia more nearly approach self-sufficiency than any others.

It is difficult to estimate the importance of the possession of metallic ores in assessing national power, but it is easy to overestimate the importance of minerals in the power equation, and it is almost incorrect to claim that wars have been taught merely to gain possession of ore deposits. However, if wars are not fought for control of economic resources, this control is nevertheless an important weapon in war. The

restriction, by whatever means, of the enemy's access to scarce materials is a legitimate policy of war. This may be affected by direct blockage, in which the actual flow of materials is cut off. It may also be accomplished by diplomatic or commercial means if an actual blockage is geographically impossible. The struggle to prevent Germany and her allies from receiving an adequate supply of wolfram, the ore tungsten, is one of many examples.

Manufacturing Industries

A highly developed manufacturing industry is one of the most conspicuous determinants of power. Every great power of modern times has been an industrial power. No policy, however, blustering and aggressive, is likely to be effective unless supported by the ability to manufacture the machines of war. The less developed countries realize that a key to political power is industrialization. Industrial capacity is an important measure of political power. Industrialization in Great Britain in the nineteenth century gave her the necessary power to build the world-empire. In this contemporary World, Japan is fast expanding, taking over the US economic hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region. It is possible because of her even expanding industrial power. India's industrial growth has increased to double digits, obviously, it has grown into a power in the Indian Ocean region. Similar is the case with China, its power equation now transcend the oceanic barriers, and spare-barrier as well.

Suggested Reading :

1. Adhikari, S. (1996) Political Geography, Jaipur. Rawat Publication.

4.2 Political and Economic Blocks

States and Nations over many countries have attempted associations of various kinds, and about an often as these effort succeeded they failed. Although conflict between the states is inevitable, but survival depends not on a conflict between the states is inevitable, but survival depends not on a conflict but on cooperation and collaboration between states and between nations. Regional conflicts and regional cooperation, are in fact, so mixed that it is sometime difficult to tell which of the predominates in particular decision. The relevance of regional groupings in the field of regional politics and economy has increased manifold since the cessation of the World War II in 1945. The post-World War II era has been one of unprecedented activity in the field of supranationalism and regional groupings. In virtually all parts of the world and in practically every conceivable sphere states are seeking alliances,

treaties and other form of association. The determination of states, seeking for association, was reflective of something distinct which they had not thought of earlier. The states agreed to give up some their sovereignty in return for the security, economic advantage, political identification, cultural strength or whatever benefit they perceived to accrue from their involvement.

These association or groupings are the voluntary one because the involved states with the ultimate purpose of forming a unified entity, decide on such cooperation and collaboration. These grouping are functional in nature. These groupings necessarily manifest 'requirement', a kind of loyalty that the involved states express, being focused upon a region which distinct in terms of its geography and people. Geographical contiguity, however, is a prerequisite condition for the amendment of regional association.

Several distinct types of regional association a blocks can be distinguished, but many, however though begun, in order to foster collaborations in one specific sphere, have produced cooperation in other spheres also, e.g. an economic block may develop into a political block or the vice-versa, depending upon the regional requirement of the involved states.

1. Political Blocks or Groupings

Comparatively few timely political groups are in existence. In fact, the borderline between political blocks with those of cultural organizations is often very difficult to define. Perhaps the most significant development in this field in "the council of Europe" which was formed in 1949. By 1948 the cold war had become a reality, and many of the states of Western Europe began to group themselves as if in self-defense. In 1948 the representatives of five of them met at Brussel's and signed a treaty by which they all decided to collaborate in 'economic', social and cultural matter for collective self-defence". Later, the German Federal Republic and Italy joined the organization. The seven-member states, however, agreed in 1955 to establish the Western European Union.

The Brussels powers also agreed in 1949 to establish a council of Europe with the objective of achieving a greater political unity between its members for safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage, and facilitating their economic and social progress. The council of Europe has no political power today, rather its geopolitical validity has disappeared with establishment and enlargement of the European Union.

In 1963, thirty African States formed 'the Organization of African Unity (OAU) with headquarter at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Its purpose was to coordinate the policies of these states on certain vital political and economic issues. Foremost among these were the elimination of the last traces of colonialism in Africa, safeguarding of independence of member states, and opposition to the white-dominated policies of South Africa and Rhodesia. The OAU had achieved some successes, as it had contributed to the solution of many tribal and other problems, notably the Nigerian civil war, which were parts of the legacy of colonialism. Although the numbers of the membership of the OAU have increased, but its effectiveness is yet to achieve a decisive level.

'The former Central African Federation' was a political block, although the economic argument was stressed by those who favoured the union between Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia and Nysaland, the main object quite obviously was political. Another African union, the Mali Federation, was based largely upon political consideration, and it, too, failed. The ex-Federation of the West Indies and the ex-Federation of Malaysia both represented efforts to establish political units first, with integration in other spheres to follow.

'The Organization of American States' is but a recent expression of the mutual interests of the American and moves in this direction have been going on for more than a century. American unity has strong foundations, for many of the Latin American republics fought themselves free of Spanish domination, except Brazil and Haiti, share the heritage of the Spanish language and culture, and the United States is the strongest trading and investment partner to most.

The Pan-American Union emerged out of the 1890 Washington Conference aimed at greater political unity, and the next important steps were taken at the 1933 Montevideo Conference. Subsequent events in Europe led to a general concern over the possibility of German-Italian war efforts in American, and conferences held in 1939 and 1940 called for joint action to present that danger. It was at the Bogota Conference in 1948 that the formation of the Organization of American States was solemnized. At present only Canada is not a number of the OAS because of being a member of Commonwealth. Similarly Cuba does not participate in it. Political action on the part of the members of the organization was taken in the form of sanctions against Cuba. The Island countries of the Caribbean region and however, scared by the intention of the USA as the later had made sexual attempts to interfere in their domestic and foreign affair. Brazil, inspite of being a member of the organization, has always been an opponent of the USA.

'The Arab League' was formed in 1945 as a result of the Alexandria protocol signed by Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yeman in 1945 itself. Later Libya, Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria and Kuwait joined the organization. The Arab League was formed at a time when Syria and Lebanon were still under the French mandate, Transjordan under a British mandate while Iraq and Egypt well bound by 'still' valid treaties with Great Britain. The establishment of the Arab League was an event of great importance in the modern history of the Arabs as it reflected their collective will to project greater political unity. The non-Arab Muslim like Turkey, Iran and Pakistan are not its members. The Alexandric Protocol that laid down this political framework for the Arab League did not stress on union or federation, leaving it to individual members of the organization to evolve stronger forms of association if they wished in the future. The Arab League, at present, has 22 members with the Palestine State becoming a fulfilled member of it.

The formation of the Arab League may be said to have stemmed from the : (a) growing Arab solidarity with Palestinian problem; (b) linguistic homogeneity of the Arab language, being spoken in Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Arab States; (c) common economic requirements; (d) growing liberal secularism; (e) growing threats of Israel, and (f) growing urge for an Arab confederation. The Association of the South-East Asian nation (ASEAN) was formed in 1967 as a political grouping, designed to achieve greater geopolitical unity, and to maintain independence from the Communist and non-Communist pressures. The organization consists of east while British, Dutch and French and the US colonies in the South-East Asia. The members are Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Brunei, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. Myanmar is all set to enter the ASEAN by the end of the year. The ASEAN has become one of the political realities of the region. Its members have gained sufficient confidence to feel that they could work cooperatively with the local communist states and also with local non-communist states. The ASEAN is now a stable political organization with the economic mutuality. Some of the member of the ASEAN have achieved relatively higher economic growth that appear to have provided more strength to the political set up of the organization. The European Union, and the United States have sought for greater cooperation with the ASEAN. China has recognized its political and economic viability in the region, and is likely to enter into an agreement with the organization.

'The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)' was formed in 1985, with Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the

Maldives having signed the historic pact at Dacca. Afghanistanis all set to become of it. The members of the SAARC have common political history and historical experience and habitation on account of being a British colony. South Asia is an independent cultural realm with geographical unity. Even since the partition and independence to the countries, attempts were made to forge a political alliance in the region so that the regional interests/aspiration could be projected. The purpose of the SAARC was to seek maintain the political identity and distinctiveness of the South Asiatic region, besides, it sought for cooperation in the field of telecommunication, meteorology, shipping, infrastructure, agricultural rural sector, joint ventures, and in the scientific and technical fields. It was also designed to seek greater cooperation in the fields of some selected commodities, education, science and technology, commercial movement and culture.

The SAARC is yet to emerge as an alternative viable to the ASEAN because of inherent inter contradiction between the numbers. With regard to the scope of cooperation there is considerable confusion, e.g., Sri Lanka, the Maldives and Pakistan wanted the organization to be more comprehensive are emphasised more or political cooperation, while India and Bangladesh emphasized on economic cooperation. On the issue of institutionalization, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh well in favour of institutionalized cooperation but India, Pakistan and the Maldives, however, favoured the development of it to be precede by a greater regional cooperation. Political happenings in Nepal, Pakistan and in Sri Lanka on the one hand and bilateral rivalries between India and Pakistan necessarily stand in the way of the smooth functioning of the SAARC. These factor often delay the annual SAARC meet. In spite of all these problem, the SAARC has continued to exist with a 'raison detre'.

Economic Blocks or Groupings

In many ways the most significant phenomenon to be discussed in relation to regional association and blocks among states is that of economic grouping or blocks. No state is self-sufficient in term of resources, rather states have to depend on one another for resources and finished products. This dependence and interdependence lead to a kind of economic mutuality in a particular region consisting of several states with a range of economic requirements. An association necessarily satisfies the regional economic aspiration and requirements of the 'involved' states. A host of continental-centric economic groupings and association have come into being following the end of the World War II, and in some of them there is evidence of growing political solidarity.

It was as early as in 1922, a custom unions was established between Belgium and Luxembourg. Custom barrier and even boundary checks were abolished along the boundary separating the two states. Their currencies became freely exchangeable, and a common market was established between the two states. This union was extended by the incorporation of the Netherlands. This formed the BENELUX, the agreements for the establishment of this union was signed even before the end of the war, in London in 1944. This union i.e., Benelux was to become the forenames of economic cooperation in Western Europe. It did not formally begin to function until 1948, but this union was soon to be superseded by other and longer association.

In 1948, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), was established, with the specific object of coordinating the Murshall plan funds contributed by the United States to spird the recovery of Europe from the ravages of the second world war. This organization i.e., OEEC in which most non-Communist European States. France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg participated administered the evil given to Europe and scrutinized European needs. Thus the representatives of the various member states became aware of the needs of their neighbouring and fellow states.

In 1950, Robert Schumar, the French Minister for foreign affairs, proposed a common market for Western Europe in coal, iron and steel and raw materials from which the later was made. Schuman's plan found its recognition by the six OEEC members, and in 1952, was established the European coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Great Britain which had shown interest earlier, later declined to join it probably because of the hegemony of its arch rival French in the organization. The object of the ECSC was to reduce the cost of production, and to remove barriers to the flow of labor and capital, so that maximum integration could be achieved. The ECSC, however, continued until 1959. The six ECSC member-states sought for more economic cooperation, and a treaty to this effect was signed in Rome in 1958, that led to the formation of the European Economic Community (EEC), otherwise known as the Common Market. The main economic objects of the EEC were (i) Creation of a custom union with free movements of goods, labor and capital, and (ii) Coordination of agricultural policies and integration of national transport system. The Rome Treaty came into effect in January 1959 that superseded the ECSC. The

first reductions on tariff were made in 1959 itself, the process so initiated was completed in 1968.

However, in 1960, there European States that stayed away from the EEC, decided to form another economic association to balance the growing threat of the EEC to their foreign trade. Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland (with associated Liechtenstein), and the United Kingdom formed the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), which was later joined by Finland and Iceland. These states sought for free trade among themselves in industrial goods, a goal they achieved by the end of 1966. The EFTA neither sought for a common external tariff nor abolities of barriers to trade to agriculture products.

Though the EEC and EFTA were mutually exclusive to each other, yet they decided on merger because of contemporary geopolitical compulsion. On July 22, 1972, both the economic blocks sought to create one free trade zone of the seventeen European States (the original EEC six, the EFTA den, plus Ireland). Tariffs on industrial goods were to be abolished over the five year period April 1973 & July 1977. The merger of the EEC and EFTA together, finally led to the formation of the European community—a more ambitions multinational undertaking that sought for greater European unity.

'The European Community'—was truly expressive of a multinational regional economic spelter on a continental scale. It brought about drastic change in the landscape and economic geography of the European continent except that portion where the socialist system prevailed. Landuse definition and regional specialization occurred not within the limited area of national boundaries but within far wider scope of spatial organization of the entire community area. The European Community created a common custom union that removed all kinds of tariffs and other restrictions for more economic consolidation and integration. It adopted a common agricultural policy, aiming at stable and improved economic conditions for multinational farmer. It initiated a plan to improve working condition in industry, in level up wages, and to increase the mobility of labour within and between its member states. Associated with this war the verification of the transportation system, the adoption of common standard, sizes and rates, and the construction facilities where needed. The member of the European community, particularly those which once had their colonies in Africa, had granted their former colonies

products a privileged access to the EC market. It was through the treaty of Yaounde, some nineteen states of Africa were allowed to be associated with European community, while Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania got themselves associate with the EC by the treaty of Arusha.

In addition to its economic goals, the eventual political union was a stated goal of the European community. A more 'politically flexible and economically viable union', in place of the existing structure was felt by the member of the community because of : (1) the growing political and economic hegemony of Germany that might districts the balance within the EC, and (2) the growing US and Japanese economic hegemony which had already influenced the economic growth of the EC to the extent that the EC was compelled to put more tariffs and trade restriction over the entry of certain kind of American and Japanese products into Europe.

It is in this background, the member of the European Community signed the famous Maaschtrist Treaty and then came into being the European Union : Fifteen European nation, most of them were the former members of the EC acknowledged their participation in the European Union. The National legislatures of these countries also ratified the Maaschtrist Treaty, though a few nation ratified the treaty quite late, probably because of some opposition from within their citizenries. Some former member of the former Socialist Block and the former Soviet Union and Turkey have applied for membership of the European Union. Even Russia was offered this membership of the Union, but it declined.

Apart from being a custom union, the European Union attempted to initiate a common currency, the Euro dollar, for its member-states. It has sought for greater economic cooperation among the member state, so that it could emerge as an alternative viable to the United States and Japan.

Economic cooperation or block was not confined to the capitalist part of Western Europe, an economic block also came into being in the Central and Eastern Europe of the socialist realm. In 1949 was established the 'Council of Economic Mutual Assistance' (CEMA), at the initiative of the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had issued an invitation to all countries of Europe irrespective of their affiliation, for participation in broad economic cooperation. Countries like Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary,

Poland and Romania accepted the invitation and joined the CEMA but Yugoslavia declined the membership. Detailed of the progress of economic collaboration between these states were not fully made public, but it was known, then, that some agreements were reached between Poland and Czechoslovakia for the use of one another ports and for the coordination. It was widely held that considerable progress was made in fitting the economic plans of these countries together so they could complement one another, and also in adjusting them to the plans of other countries within the block. Established in 1949, CEMA or COMECON was centralize and administer trade agreements and credit as well as technical assistance within the block. COMECON was an agreement between government which themselves controlled all industrial undertakings and all trade within their respective states. However, trade in the block continued to be based mainly on bilateral agreement negotiated between them. CEMA or COMECON fundamentally differed from that created in the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association. The later was based on private enterprise and guaranteed to the producer freedom to sell his products within the area when he could find a market, with certain limitation, freedom to establish his works, whenever he found it profitable. However, with the derive of the Socialist regime and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in the 90s collapsed the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance.

In term of economic association, the Latin American countries well not behind the European countries. The first of this kind was that of the 'Central American common Market (ODECA)', formed in 1960. It was consisted of EL Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica that joined later. The ODECA sought for closer economies between the member-states which could facilitate economic development in the region as a whole. A General American Bank was set up to facilitate movement of investment capital. However the ODECA could not last long, and finally, it was abandoned by the members.

The 'Latin American Free Trade Association' (LAFTA) was formed in 1961 by an association of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Latin the association widened with incorporation of Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela. The objects were to : (1) create a custom free Union of Latin American republics; (2) remove trade and tariffs restrictions on the movement of commodities

within the union, and (3) increase production with a higher level of welfare, not withstanding the small volume of mutual trade between the member-states. Land reforms, Tax reform, improvement in agricultural infrastructure and increase in industrial growth, check on inflation and population control, were part of the duties of the recipient states of the Union. Despite the massive US said the LAFTA is yet to achieve a substantial economic growth compared to European economic requivalisation.

Recently, the 'North American Free Trade Association' (NAFTA) was formed with the USA, Canada and Mexico as its members. It was formed with the objects of creating a custom union, and putting tariffs and trade restriction on the entry of the Japanese and European products in North America. Entry of the Japanese and European products in North America. Entry of the Japanese and European products for the couple of years has substantially affected the economy of all the three countries, particularly, the USA whose economic was badly hit. Nevertheless, the NAFTA maintain sustained economic ties with Japan and the European Union.

The 'Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperations (APEC)' was formed in 1989. It is out of the trans continental economic groupings consisting of the countries of Asia, North America, South America, beside Australia—or in other words, the APEC is consisted of the USA, Canada, Mexico, Japan, China, South Korea, Taiwan, Hongkong, New Guinea, Chile, New Zealand, Russia, Eucador, besides the member countries of the ASEAN. The APEC aim at free flow of goods, services, and capital in a manner consistant with the WTO terms, and expects coordination with the non-APEC members of the WTO towards further multilateral trade liberalization with full investment. It seeks to create a free market zone in the pacific oceanic region.

The concept of 'South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA)' is gaining momentum in South Asia, despite the inherent inner contradiction between the South Asian Nation. There is a proposal to develop a custom union a common market as well, corresponding to the entire South Asiatic region, with the object of protecting regional products. The nation have agreed in principle that this 'most favoured nation' states be granted on bilateral basis within the Union. The proposed SAFTA will have power to control and regulate trade, transportation and communication

between the states of the union. However, it is not clear how long it will take to become a reality.

Regional groupings, thus, have virtue to virtually all parts of the world. The time of the blocks, groupings, the alliances and the union has arrived. Inevitably, the progress of politics-territorial organization always having an oscillating one, these will be breakups and setbacks, but the trend appears to have all the earmarks of permanency, and a new politics-geographical map is being forged.

Suggested Readings :

1. Adhikari, S. (1996) Political Geography. Jaipur-Rawat Publication
2. De Bw. J. Harm (1972) A Systematic Political Geography. NewYork. Witey
3. Pouds, J. G. (1972) Political Geography. NewYork. McGraw title Book Co.

NOTES

NOTES

মানুষের জ্ঞান ও ভাবকে বইয়ের মধ্যে সঞ্চিত করিবার যে একটা প্রচুর সুবিধা আছে, সে কথা কেহই অস্বীকার করিতে পারে না। কিন্তু সেই সুবিধার দ্বারা মনের স্বাভাবিক শক্তিকে একেবারে আচ্ছন্ন করিয়া ফেলিলে বুদ্ধিকে বাবু করিয়া তোলা হয়।

— রবীন্দ্রনাথ ঠাকুর

ভারতের একটা mission আছে, একটা গৌরবময় ভবিষ্যৎ আছে, সেই ভবিষ্যৎ ভারতের উত্তরাধিকারী আমরাই। নূতন ভারতের মুক্তির ইতিহাস আমরাই রচনা করছি এবং করব। এই বিশ্বাস আছে বলেই আমরা সব দুঃখ কষ্ট সহ্য করতে পারি, অন্ধকারময় বর্তমানকে অগ্রাহ্য করতে পারি, বাস্তবের নিষ্ঠুর সত্যগুলি আদর্শের কঠিন আঘাতে ধূলিসাৎ করতে পারি।

— সুভাষচন্দ্র বসু

Any system of education which ignores Indian conditions, requirements, history and sociology is too unscientific to commend itself to any rational support.

— Subhas Chandra Bose

Price : ₹ 150.00

(Not for sale to the Students of NSOU)