

Received 22/08/2023

Accepted 09/10/2025

Critical Geopolitics in International Relations: A Study in Discourse Analytical Context

Ben Messahel Alaerrahmane

Laboratory of New Political Sciences, M'sila University, Algeria.

alaerrahmane.benmessahel@univ-msila.dz

Abstract

This article presents a theoretical study related to a new approach in the field of international relations under the name of critical geopolitics. It also presents the epistemic and methodological foundations that it adopts, especially with regard to the part of geopolitical discourse and the methodology of its analysis. Thus, the study raises a discussion about the discourse in the field of critical geopolitics as a tool for social research, with an introduction A clearer presentation of the methodology used for its analysis, considering discourses as a pivotal study in this discipline, and the most subjective element of research and the most subject to the influence of (geographical) policy practitioners. The study concludes that critical geopolitics relies on Foucauldian studies of discourse based on the duality of power/knowledge, discourse theory of Laclau and Mouffe, and critical analysis of discourse.

Keywords: Critical geopolitics, geopolitical discourse, discourse theory, critical analysis of discourse, power/knowledge.

ملخص:

المقالة دراسة نظرية تخص مقارنة جديدة في حقل العلاقات الدولية بمسمى الجيوسياسية النقدية، كما تطرح الأسس الإستيمية والميتودولوجية التي تتبناها، خاصة فيما يخص جزئية الخطاب الجيوسياسي ومنهجية تحليله. وبذلك تطرح الدراسة مناقشة حول الخطاب في مجال الجيوسياسية النقدية كأداة للبحث الاجتماعي، وأكثر عناصر البحث عرضة للتغيير والأكثر تعرضاً لتأثير ممارسي السياسة (الجغرافية). خلصت الدراسة إلى أن الجيوسياسية النقدية تعتمد على الدراسات الفوكودية للخطاب القائمة على ثنائية القوة/المعرفة، نظرية الخطاب للاكلاو وموف، والتحليل النقدي للخطاب.

كلمات مفتاحية: الجيوسياسية النقدية، الخطاب الجيوسياسي، نظرية الخطاب، التحليل النقدي للخطاب، القوة/المعرفة.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 1980s, international relations theory was the subject of major methodological and theoretical debates, which challenged mainstream studies. This resulted from the introduction of contemporary social critical theory and post-structuralist topics in international relations by a new generation of practitioners. Given the close intellectual proximity of international relations to geopolitical concerns. Current debates have attempted to reinvigorate world politics theories from a geopolitical perspective. Research efforts on spatial formations in international politics have resulted in renewed interest in considering the latter as a productive force in political practice. By submitting claims about the places and monitoring how those claims are produced in the specified places. In other words, monitor where that spatial knowledge is produced, and how it is circulated to inform understanding about geographies in global politics.

In the Critical Approach to Geopolitics, he argues that geopolitical writing is always politicized and suggests that geopolitics should be conceived of as a mispractice whose representative productions must be examined, as geopolitical discourses alter the cultural and political interpretive systems that state leaders use to give meaning to their actions and justify them in the eyes of the public. It is concerned with the assumptions and geographic mappings that underlie global policy-making. The latter examines the assumptions and geographic designations that go into making global policy.

Through the above, we pose the following research problem:

How did geopolitical discourse contribute to shaping global politics? And how are representative productions examined in critical geopolitics?

A group of sub-questions branch out from this problem, as follows:

- What are the intellectual and theoretical foundations of critical geopolitics?
- What is the importance of discourse in critical geopolitics?
- How do contexts of discourse analysis contribute to enriching and expanding analytical approaches in critical geopolitics?

Accordingly, the current research paper deals with a basic hypothesis that: "The geopolitical discourse has the ability and power to build the political and social reality and draw the global map and locate places."

The sub-hypotheses of the study are:

- Geopolitical discourse is a major tool in critical geopolitics, directing spatial policies in global politics.

The geopolitical discourse is linked to the context in which it arises, and it is part of the process of building reality and describing it.

Study Objectives: The study seeks to present the field of critical geopolitics as a new approach in the field of international relations, as well as examining the intellectual and

theoretical foundations, especially those related to geopolitical discourse, to reveal how to build global policies.

Study methodology: The study calls for the use of the historical approach by highlighting the path of establishing geopolitics and the etymologies of the critical approach. The study also employs the comparative approach to examine the most important differences between discourse analysis and critical analysis of discourse in critical geopolitics. The study is also based on post-structural studies represented in the deconstructive approach of Jack Derrida, and postmodern studies represented in Michel Foucault's archeology.

Therefore, the issue will be addressed through three main axes:

2. Critical Geopolitics: Historical and Conceptual Context.

Critical geopolitics is primarily based on a critique of the classical geopolitical tradition that emphasizes the influence of geographical realities—a priori-proved neutral—on world politics. In traditional geopolitics, geography is a series of material and physical facts waiting to be discovered, and in turn represents one of the factors influencing the exercise of power. ontology and epistemology.

2.1 Towards a definition of the concept of geopolitics

The prevalence of the term geopolitics does not require an in-depth study of the definitions presented about it, as much as it needs to clarify what is meant by it precisely because of the complexity and depth it carries. In recent decades, the concept has been circulated more clearly by researchers, media professionals, the masses, and even decision makers; While reformulating it in a way that explains the fundamental changes that occurred in the late twentieth century and in a way that bears responsibility for the past because it is closely linked to Nazi thought and imperialism.

Meaning and connotations of geopolitics are presented in order to disambiguate it. In this, Gerard Toal prefers to use an alternative term for geopolitics: "geo-politics". That is, in a manner represented in separating the vocabulary of the term, in order to combine geography and politics¹. There are those who take geopolitics as a way of thinking about politics with geography in mind (not thinking about geography with politics in mind). Geopolitics is also considered, in one of its meanings, as the spatial determination of international politics, and thus it is inherent in any presentation of the political process on a global, regional or national scale.

The other side of the acknowledgment of unaudited common terms is their operational use, and in the case of geopolitics it is presented by two introductory points:

- First: Geopolitics is a scientific practice, and it is often viewed as a sub-field of political geography, political science, and international relations. Geopolitics can also be understood as a constantly reshaping academic field that is articulated in books (text) and articles through certain development paths and ideas of key scholars.
- Second: Geopolitics is a political practice that combines power, place, "the world" and themes into unique combinations.

Geopolitics, then, must be understood not only as an academic theorizing of politics, but also as the political action of all kinds of actors who have sought to shape political spaces. According to this perspective, geopolitics is a set of discursive practices that “spatialize and represent international politics as a world characterized by particular kinds of places, peoples, and dramas” ².

2.2 Critical Geopolitical Etymology: Foundation and Uses:

Geopolitics has been revitalized by presenting it in a “critical, critical approach”³. This coincided with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, after the field's revival in the 1970s. In 1986, with the fall of the Wall and the unification of the two Germans, he published an article entitled *The Revival of Geopolitics* in the leading scholarly journal *Geopolitical Quarterly* ⁴.

Critical geopolitics is a new science introduced in the United States in the course of the 1980s, which attempts to move beyond classical geopolitics. In order to revive geopolitics untouched by the imperialism, racist politics and environmental determinism that ruled the 1940s⁵. In doing so, critical geopolitics presented a set of important explanatory variables needed to understand post-Cold War geopolitics. It relies on postmodern and post-structuralist thought in the social sciences, and the works of French philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault whose main goal is epistemological criticism⁶. In doing so, he reformulates notions of geopolitics by showing how the “spatiality” of international politics is determined by powerful political actors who portray it as a “world” characterized by specific places, people, and events⁷.

Originally, this study agenda referred to foreign policy studies through discourse analysis. In 1992, John Agnew, jointly with Gerard Tual, published a paper entitled “Geopolitics and Discourse: Practical Geopolitical Thinking in American Foreign Policy” ⁸. Biduha created an impetus for the study of critical geopolitics through the works of John Agnew, Simon Dalby, and Gearóid-Tuathail in particular.

What we mean by critical geopolitics can be clarified through a set of declarative strategies, which are as follows:

- An intellectual and political tradition: Critical geopolitics is concerned with 'examining' the assumptions of geography, naming, and understanding that go into global policy-making' and how places ⁹and people are brought together to narrate and explain events. As Simon Dalby says¹⁰: “Critical geopolitics is a political project committed to challenging the specifics of politics and the dangers used to justify violence.”
- In its relations with other disciplines: Critical geopolitics emerged from the work of a number of scholars in the fields of geography and international relations.
- In terms of the objectives of the study: Critical geopolitics aims to understand world politics in terms of the ways that elites and masses follow in the spaces of political action. The goal of a critical geopolitical perspective is thus to question knowledge that is taken for granted and to expose the biases it contains and the power relations that underpin it. In sum, critical geopolitics aims to revisit and deconstruct the epistemological core assumptions and ontological commitments of classical geopolitics. Critical geopolitics attempts to study how

international policies are depicted spatially or geographically, and thus reveal the policies involved in writing the geography of global space.

- In terms of practice: the importance of studying the political process of the forms of geographical understanding, while recognizing that graphs are specifications of the political reality that have a political impact. To construct critical geopolitics is to say that we must not confine our attention to the study of the geography of politics within logical spaces given a priori given and given, but that we should investigate the politics of the geography of politics. This is an exercise in critical geopolitics¹¹.
- In terms of the theoretical background: Critical geopolitics stems from postmodern criticisms that put the epistemological limits of the practices underlying Cold War geopolitics into question. As well as the structural turn in social studies, in addition to Wallerstein's theory of international economics. Monetary geopolitics is not a single research program. Rather, it is a set of methods. In a broad sense, critical geopolitics tends to differ from other areas of critical science, such as Marxism, Foucault's theories. Like most post-structuralist ideas, critical geopolitics pays more attention to lower levels of government than to macro-level or global economic processes¹².
- In terms of the nature of the phenomenon: Critical geopolitics is a much broader cultural and social phenomenon than what traditional geopolitical thought describes in statecraft. as geopolitics that frames all foreign policy practices by focusing on a country's own cultural myths. It is a reimagining of "geopolitics" as a discursive exercise by which thinkers in the field of international politics "characterize" international politics in a way that represents it as a "world" characterized by certain kinds of Places, Peoples, and Drama¹³.

Accordingly, monetary geopolitics can be defined as:

A wide socio-cultural phenomenon, and specialized knowledge used by practitioners of the art of governance, and that the various aspects of its practices are interconnected, and emerge in the daily life of states and nations. Their production sites are numerous and spread, they may be "high" (such as a national security memorandum) and "low" (such as a newspaper headline), visible (such as images that move states to action), discursive (such as speeches justifying military actions) and traditional (such as religious motives in foreign policy discourse) and postmodernism (such as the administration of pain Science and electronic warfare) or in the dramatic practices of decision makers (waging war).

It is these diverse practices that shape the behavior of international politics, where its meaning is sustainably shaped by diverse representative practices across cultures and is the essence of the geopolitical critical approach ¹⁴.

1.3 Intellectual foundations of monetary geopolitics:

In order to examine the content of monetary geopolitics, it is necessary to understand the intellectual frameworks and the main premises on which they are based. As an intellectual and social process of classical geopolitics, this research agenda is fueled by a critical approach that represents the launching pad for its founding ideas, which we mention as follows:

- **Skepticism:** Questioning the scientific view that seems neutral and objective to the classic or "traditional" geopolitical realism. Where he is disturbed by the "scientific view assumed

out of nowhere” by saying that classical geopolitics as a science that emerged in the late nineteenth century is an important component of the perception of international space that geopolitical experts showed earlier¹⁵. In this basis, critical geopolitics argues that spaces of global politics are 'produced' in representations and practices, and thus this social-spatial space of international affairs becomes visible in various mapping exercises¹⁶. That is, it does not treat geography as an innocent framework within which international politics is conducted or as a structural element that sets limits to rational policy-making. In such a view, critical arguments make it clear that geography is important in world politics, but not in the classical geopolitical sense, so that critical geopolitics is not about purported natural forces or the constraining/enabling of geographical factors in politics. Instead, it deals with geography in international politics as socially constructed and linked to larger questions of identity/difference/risk, for example. In order to explain this form of geography, critical geopolitics extends sociospatial theorizing into the study of international affairs and questions the spatial theories and assumptions that guide action in international affairs. As a sub-discipline of human geography, it seeks to provide some theoretical rigor and "continuing social and positivist critiques of political theory"¹⁷. Also, as an important project it attempts to uncover what is hidden in existing accounts of geopolitics and international politics.

- **Statecraft:** O Tuathail and Dalby¹⁸ suggest that the 'specific cultural myths of the state' should be taken into account in critical geopolitical studies and that geopolitics should be understood as spatial (material) practices, charade) of statecraft itself. The influence of post-structuralist practices has heightened awareness of the intertwined nature of foreign/security policy, power, and space. This was followed by a set of basic critical geopolitical investigations into the ways in which the maps of global politics are simultaneously being mapped and published¹⁹. In such a conception, geography must be understood as the writing of the land, the active production of “global political space.” by different types of intellectuals in statecraft such as political leaders, critics, preachers, advisors, and institutionally bound intellectuals²⁰. The focus thus shifts more generally to the spatial specification of politics²¹.

- **Power, knowledge and discourse:** Geopolitics currently tends to take the form of discourse that can be understood discursively. Geopolitics have taken this definition to the letter, making the world a discursive construct in a way that has problematic consequences for understanding how (and then why) ground power is actually exercised. By highlighting the use of geographical language to illustrate the fact that geography is a discourse and a form of power/knowledge, rather than just a natural and political aspect of international politics²². who, over the past decade, have sought to investigate geopolitics as a social, cultural, and political practice, rather than as a plain and readable fact of global politics. The goal of critical geopolitics is to highlight the use of geographical language to illustrate the fact that geography is a discourse and a form of power/knowledge, and not merely a natural and political aspect of international politics²³.

2. Critical geopolitics: a study of cognitive frameworks and structures.

The outbreak of the Cold War between the United States of America and the Soviet Union provided context for discourse illustrated as theory and practice, and the geopolitical knowledge produced throughout the United States represented hostility to the Soviet Union by linking geography with ideology from which it was difficult to separate. However, the post-war period produced an epistemological shift in geopolitics, dealing with the context of

the production of geopolitical knowledge in light of the relations and structures of power, which studied the analysis, production, spread and consumption of geopolitical knowledge.

1.2. Discourse in Critical Geopolitics: A Cognitive Approach.

The concept of discourse was used in critical geopolitics in a 1992 paper, where Gearóid Tuathail and John Agnew first identified what a reimagining of geopolitics using the concept of discourse could look like. They define discourses as “the collections of social and cultural resources that people use to construct meaning about their world and their activities” and “the sum of the capacities, the rules according to which readers/listeners and speakers/audiences are able to take what they hear and build it into a meaningful organized whole”²⁴. Thus, the adoption of the concept of discourse in critical geopolitics brought attention to the contexts of the geopolitical construction of meaning²⁵ and then worked to represent the insoluble relationship between space and power in an idea summarized by John Sharp in that²⁶: “Strategies of power always require the use of space, and thus the use of discourses to create certain spatial images.” The Geopolitical Discourse “The geopolitical “is relied upon and used by officials and leaders to shape and represent global affairs”.

Concepts of discourse range from the narrowest linguistic textual description to macro-concepts—which attempt to define theoretical ideological groupings or “discourse formations” that systematically organize knowledge and experience and suppress alternatives through hegemony²⁷. Thus, discourse is the domain of language use, united by shared assumptions and by which words are used and take on specific meanings²⁸ ‘discoursed connotations’. In this respect, discourse simply means “the way we use language to construct meaning or the way words instill meaning”²⁹. In this respect, discourse simply means “the way we use language to construct meaning or the way we infuse words to form meaning or significance”³⁰.

The concept of discourse has been and continues to receive a great deal of attention in critical geopolitics. O’ Tuathail indicates that “the concept of ‘geopolitical discourse’ is more closely related to critical geopolitics than to any other field of study”³¹. Although geopolitics is one of the concepts of the twentieth century; However, it can be understood as a new field of discourse concerned with ground power. Thus, critical geopolitics tends to take the form of a discourse that can be understood discursively. In this regard, Simon Dalby argues that the “significance of criticism” in critical geopolitics usually refers to a problematic discourse rather than an alternative political project.

The literature on critical geopolitics includes studies of a variety of settings, drawing on multiple intellectual and theoretical sources³². It can be put forward as follows:

1. Postmodern Theory:

The postmodern work related to the work of “Michel Foucault” considers the theoretical background to the dualism of power and knowledge, in which he opposes the prevailing concept in rationalist theories that: “knowledge is immune to the operations of power”, and instead argues that: “power produces knowledge in actuality”³³. Every power need knowledge and every knowledge depend on and reinforces existing relationships of power.

Critical geopolitics builds on the work of Michel Foucault, who views geography as a form of discourse and knowledge associated with power in terms of power tactics and

strategies³⁴. Discourse portrays it as referring to power-driven knowledge, and some accepted truths that They are constructed historically and together form larger systems of truth. Accordingly, critical geopolitics assumes that geography and politics are inevitably co-forming, and that space is force; It raises international policy analyzes based on the development of spatial assumptions that are necessarily based on certain geographical assumptions and puts them under the microscope, according to Merje Kuus³⁵. While critical geopolitics assumes that classical geopolitical thinking builds, manages, and organizes space through language, in this the latter seeks to deconstruct the dominant fixations of the spatial imagination associated with geography as imbued with power by examining discursive processes, their associated 'geopolitical realities', as well as the social mechanisms through which geopolitical truth claims and larger geopolitical truth systems are produced.

Emphasizing the idea that geographical knowledge can be self-produced and can be used to exercise power. Km is examined throughout the text as the most important channel for the production of geographical knowledge³⁶.

Muller ³⁷notes that critical geopolitics focuses on the ways in which an autonomous person controls texts, transforming them into a means through which power is exercised. By controlling the dominant discourse, it becomes an important means of exercising power within the state; The exercise of power is deeply intertwined with the production of knowledge and discourse.

With this knowledge, there is a function that enables it to become a power or authority in the hands of the one who possesses it. It can be said that knowledge is an authority as it is formed from the fabric of knowledge and is not merely an external relationship. The production of maps (world regions) illustrates and embodies the importance of this relationship.

2. post-structuralist theory:

In post-structuralist analysis, discourses are practices that “systematically shape or create the things they speak about.” In this respect, the discourses are themselves a form of practice. Thus, there is no dividing line between theory and practice ³⁸. From this angle, dominant theories are dominant discourses that shape our view of the world and our ways of understanding it.

In the Critical Approach to Geopolitics, he argues that geopolitical writing is always politicized and suggests that geopolitics should be conceived of as a wrong practice whose representational yields must be scrutinized ³⁹. It is concerned with the geographical assumptions and appointments that underlie global policy-making ⁴⁰. Writings of authoritarian forms of geographical knowledge.

This is done by understanding discourses in the world of discursive practices, and linguistic semantics, taking into account that everything, especially geography and global politics, can be represented through systems of symbols. That is, understanding texts represents an important way to represent geography and international politics. In other words, performances and representations opened an important path for geopolitics, considering the political space as a flexible creativity with A political purpose and multiple possible meanings⁴¹.

3. The Constructivist Theory:

Critical geopolitics examines the structural and social implications of geopolitical imaginations and geopolitical identities, the imaginary spatial location of people, regions, states, and the shifting boundaries that accompany this situation⁴². The discipline of geopolitics studies the conflicting discourses in different forms of stories (written and spoken productions observed by the media) and cultural representations of space⁴³. Accordingly, geopolitics is seen as relating to that ideological process of constructing spatial, political, and cultural boundaries that demarcate the inner space as separate from the other threat⁴⁴.

Within this context, it can be said that the scientific mission of critical geopolitics depends on two central points:

- Considering that discursive representation is not neutral; The individuals in power are those who are "authorized" to produce "realism" and thus knowledge. In this context, power is knowledge and the ability to produce what is considered "right"⁴⁵.
- Considering the discourses as representative practices, critical geopolitics seeks, accordingly, to document and dismantle the dominant geopolitical discourses - and to develop a new problem that makes the topic of "geography", "maps" and "geopolitics", the characteristics of the geographic / cartographic / geopolitical, and "geographical techniques" emerging from global positions of power, and as a result of the effects of power relations⁴⁶.

3.1 Typologies of Critical Geopolitical Discourse:

Critical geopolitics has come to consider political discourses, examines their spatial assumptions, raises questions about power relations, challenges the role of the state, and how institutional analysts in it perceive the world. In this regard, we monitor three types of political discourses, represented in:

1 - **Formal geopolitics:** symbolizes the geopolitical logic and geopolitical knowledge that is produced in strategic institutes, think tanks, academic circles, and think tanks associated with geopolitical thinking and geopolitical traditions, by thinkers and analysts.

2- **Practical geopolitics:** Refers to the everyday forms of geopolitical reasoning that political leaders and civil servants use to explain and legitimize their foreign and security policy. It is found in the geopolitical discourses of government representatives and foreign policy bureaucrats⁴⁷

. Practical geopolitics is closely related to formal geopolitics because of two factors:

- First: Theories and strategies that emerged from universities and think tanks aim to provide guidance to policy makers as well as legitimizing their decisions.
- Second: Most of the scholars who contribute to the production of official geopolitical knowledge usually work as advisers or ministers in national governments at times.

In a deeper sense, practical geopolitics includes the everyday forms of geopolitical reasoning that foreign policy decision-makers use to explain their policy to the public. The so-called "geopolitical cipher" differs from institutional or strategic knowledge produced within a formal geopolitical framework in that it is based on a well-understood geopolitical

narrative. Geopolitical narratives are taught through formal schooling and are used as tools of socialization through the imposition of some form of geographical and historical identity/concepts. It is used in political statements and appears in ordinary and stereotypical discourses that use various binaries.

3- Popular geopolitics: Geopolitical narratives found in the media, cinema, novels and cartoons. Due to the rapid improvement in communication technology, popular geopolitics has recently become an important topic for an increasing number of academic studies⁴⁸.

Most geopolitical logic takes place in formal or practical geopolitical fields. Foreign policy decision-makers use geopolitical practical logic when trying to make others feel spatial about the world and also resort to formal forms of geopolitical epistemology to respond to foreign policy issues effectively.

3. Contexts of Discourse Analysis in Critical Geopolitics:

Critical geopolitics defines the understanding of discourses in the realm of discursive practices, linguistic semantics, bearing in mind that everything, especially geography and world politics, can be represented through systems of symbols. That is, understanding texts represents an important way to represent geography and international politics, in other words, presentations and representations opened an important path for geopolitics, considering the political space as flexible creativity with a political purpose and multiple and potential meanings. Then I tried to analyze geopolitical discourses to reveal the processes of building and drawing the global map.

3.1 Critical Analysis of Discourse in Critical Geopolitics:

Critical geopolitics have argued that discourse analysis in geopolitics must take into account the particular political and social contexts in which geopolitical power is embedded⁴⁹. However, Müller says: "The frequent claims to conduct discourse analysis in critical geopolitics are accompanied by a lack of methodological specifications on which this analysis is based"⁵⁰.

Critical discourse analysis can be defined as a type of analytical research that studies the mechanisms of power behavior, its misuse, and the reproduction of dominance and inequality in societies. At the same time, critical discourse analysis studies the responses and resistances of dominant forces in societies.

Critical discourse analysis uses terms such as power, hegemony, ideology, class, gender, discrimination, utility, reproduction, institutions, social structure, social system, apart from some other analytical ideas, such as the central idea about the social power of groups or institutions, defined primarily by the frameworks of control in society.

The term "discourse analysis" is used to refer to several different approaches to analyzing language (both spoken and written) and very different methods. Within linguistics, its use usually denotes a continuing concern with the organization and functions of a text. It can mean research on mono texts as well as on dialogue. Within sociology, psychology, anthropology, and educational research, it usually refers to the analysis of discourse episodes in a social context. It can also be used to refer to the general social atmosphere of ideas related to a topic rather than specific conversations⁵¹.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is used in constructivist theory in the social sciences. International relations have seen a marked increase in the use of methods that critically analyze the discourse of world politics. And with the persistence of voices that reject the possibility of a “value-free” science, and their assertion that discourse is inherently part of the social structure and is affected by it, and is produced in the midst of social interaction. These assumptions are the basis of most texts that belong to the perspective of critical geopolitics, which studies inequality in societies, media and political discourses and patterns of control in society, as well as ethnic, nationalism, racism and antisemitism. As Peter Taylor says: "Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) allows for a detailed investigation of the relationship of language to other social processes, and of how language functions within power relations." It provides a systematic framework for analysis - within which researchers can articulate how policy texts work. On this basis, the analysis of geopolitical discourse has a critical importance represented in revealing how the international geopolitical system is written, because it - the discourse - directs action and practice in the world⁵². Thus, discourse analysis is the main component of this approach. While Tual says, “To study geopolitics, we must study discourse, which can be defined as the representational practices through which cultures shape meaningful worlds. And since geopolitics is a discourse with distinct ‘universal’ foundational aspirations, we must be attentive to the ways in which Global space is named, metaphors spread, and visual images are used in the process of making these stories and constructing images of global politics”⁵³. As for Dodds, he says: The use of symbolism, metaphors and metaphors can be in the formation of political understanding⁵⁴.

Critical geopolitics needs to analyze critical discourse because it does not take what is written for granted. It aims to critically investigate social inequality as it is expressed, indicated, shaped, legitimized, etc. by the users of language (or in discourse). Classical geopolitics is characterized by reductionism and divisions, as well as the geopolitics of state intellectuals, who adopted the “us versus them” division, which assumes that “we” are positive, “good” and “they” or “others” are negative). By analyzing discourses critically, we open up the possibility of examining power structures and ideologies in a transparent manner. Critical analysis also relates the analyzed text to other intertextuality discourses.

Critical discourse analysis derives part of its persuasive power from the fact that there is no blueprint for the development of discourse analysis. There are no unified methods in critical discourse analysis, rather there is only a methodology at the general level. Presentation of the basic postulates of the critical analysis of discourse as a major method of analysis in critical geopolitics:

Fairclough and Wodak ⁵⁵summarize the basic principles of CDA as follows:

- Deals with social problems.
- Discursive power relations.
- Discourse is society and culture.
- Discourse is an ideological work.
- The speech is historical.
- The link between the text and society is the mediator.

- Analysis of explanatory and explanatory discourse.
- Discourse is a form of social action.

3.2 Discourse Analysis Methodology in Critical Geopolitics:

In his paper, Müller⁵⁶ proposes a methodology for discourse analysis in critical geopolitics based on three basic dimensions:

- Context analysis (near and far).
- Analytical form of analysis (post/structural and explanatory interpretation).
- The political position of the analysis (involved and detached).

He asserts that these three dimensions reflect the main concerns that have emerged in discussions about the concept of discourse in critical geopolitical studies and that have appeared, implicitly or explicitly, in almost every empirical study. Which we will show later.

a. Analysis context:

Critical geopolitics asserts that the construction of global politics is always linked to the specificity of contexts, as meanings move between social and political situations. Since everything that is not explicitly expressed in data but shows its effects is an interpretive framework, it must be understood as a relevant context the fixations of meaning that occur in discourses. The discourse analyst's job is to create the context for the reader to participate in the construction of discursive meaning. He usually has to deal with multiple and overlapping contexts, as well as contextualize the problem under study.

“Muller” asks how to determine the types of texts relevant to the research question to be examined, and where do we draw the line between what is considered context and what is not? The type of context to be included is the most distinguishing characteristic among the various discourse analytical approaches and determines the objectives of the analysis and the type of data to a large extent. There are two types of contexts in this:

- Near context: Represents a feature related to a piece of text or an interaction between two parties. For example, the opportunities in which people talk and the type of interaction that arises between them (eg: interaction between student and teacher in class). Ethnographic research is a central component of this context. In this it is necessary to combine close textual and ethnographic analysis of social structures and settings.
- Remote context: represents the general social aspects, such as class, gender, race or culture. Thus, the research was in geopolitical identities and the centrality of geopolitical culture and the perception of identities as an integral part of social structures. Geopolitical culture is understood as not only shaped by state institutions, but rather by its historical experiences and geographical integration, as well as the internal power networks of society.

B. The analytical form of the analysis

Qualitative approaches to text analysis have traditionally relied on the explanatory-explanatory form of analysis, which can be meaningfully extended to discourse analysis. This

research attempts to reconstruct the implicit rules, shared experience and collective knowledge of social actors.

- **Explanatory hermeneutic analysis:** The focus on the subject as a product of meaning is in line with the general trend of agent-centered interpretation that captures both the intentionality of the textual production and its social context. Explanatory interpretation treats discourses as supra-subjective structures that enable and constrain human agency. Its analysis often tends to concern itself with the agency of individuals in creating meaning, “telling the right kind of story to the right audience at the right time”. Thus, this analysis constitutes the mainstay in the critical questioning of the formation of geopolitical identities.
- **Analysis / Structural Discourses:** The latter stresses the processes and mechanisms of constructing meaning and its social implications. This is achieved by looking at how discourses are produced, constantly challenged and transformed.
- **Discourse Analysis in the Archaeological Tradition of Michel Foucault:** It deals with discourse as a collection of data that is systematically organized and subject to certain rules. Accordingly, the analysis of post-structuralist discourse draws on the rules that define the field of discourse and examines how they come into play, how social discourse organizes the world, and on the processes and mechanisms of constructing meaning and their social implications.

c. Analysis of the political situation:

The political position of discourse analysis raises questions about how phenomena such as hegemony and unequal power relations or social inequality are shaped. This approach views the discourse analyst as an active force in society and politics. In adopting a critical perspective, the discourse analysts are primarily concerned with and motivated by pressing social issues and must take a clear socio-political stance; by articulating their point of view, perspective, principles and goals. Their critical goals are Ruling elites who legitimize, support, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice. Their criticism of the discourse represents a political criticism of those responsible⁵⁷.

The radical political impulse has been the main driver of the success of the critical attitude towards geopolitical ideologies and truth claims. In this, the discourse analyst sets out to reveal the ideology implicit in the assumptions of geopolitical discourses. And revealing the productive effects of geopolitical discourses as creating powerful ideologies.

CDA is not unlike the majority of critical geopolitical writings, deliberating on theories in which actors are the main agents of social change. Therefore, he believes that groups or institutions can exercise power and social control in public discourse, and thus influence the minds and actions of others⁵⁸. The challenge for CDA, then, is to relate texts to ideologies and power relations, to embed texts in the social conditions of their production⁵⁹.

In the latter, it can be said that critical geopolitical scholars examine the discursive constitution of geopolitical issues that draws on different discursive approaches, most commonly Foucault's archaeology and Jacques Derrida's deconstruction. Foucault's influence on the literature and quality in critical geopolitics in his insistence on the need to empty the interdependence between power / knowledge in the discourse⁶⁰. Critical geopolitics builds on Foucault's discourse from the idea that the construction of discourses and genealogies of

knowledge needs to be analyzed, not in modes of perception, forms of ideology, or types of consciousness but in relation to the tactics and strategies of power. Hence, these studies have argued that by analyzing the many significant concepts, narratives, and practices that are contained in geopolitical discourses, it is possible to understand the power of discourses influencing international politics.

Critical geopolitics was inspired by the discourse theory of Laclau and Mouffe, which aims to understand social construction and practice through discursive construction⁶¹. Müller proposes employing discourse theory to reformulate discourse concepts in critical geopolitics in order to focus on the little things left out in discourse. The latter is characterized by ambiguity and complexity, given its multiple intellectual backgrounds, which made it lack conceptual accuracy⁶². In addition to its ambiguity, discontent has grown in recent years with the socialization of critical geopolitical research and the new emergence of social research spaces in human geography, serious concerns have arisen that the concept of discourse is too narrow to accommodate the "little things". Discourse is composed of words, verbs, objects, and agents (both human and non-human), and their composition creates divisions with competing meanings. Therefore, the theory emphasizes the relationships between attitudes and social actions they express and ascribe to themselves and in opposition to other attitudes and institutions of social action, including the state⁶³. Go back to this discourse theory depicts practices as an integral part of discourse, which opens up a complete vision of society. The incorporation of practice into discourse results in the possibility of engagement with forms of social production that transcend texts, while maintaining a critical focus on hegemony as a central element of critical geopolitical inquiry.

4- Conclusion

Critical geopolitics in the nineties of the twentieth century represented one of the most important theoretical contributions to geopolitical thought and in the field of international relations. Perhaps the main problem addressed by critical geopolitics is the performance of geographical discourse in world politics. and the ways in which the global political landscape is mapped geographically by truth systems. What has come to be known as "critical geopolitics" is a constellation of research whose ostensible goal and center of interest is "geopolitics". It relies on a set of strategies to deconstruct and reformulate geopolitical discourses.

Thus, the main conclusions that can be recorded in the conclusion of the research focus on:

- Critical geopolitics criticizes the fixed worldview. Building on the post-structuralist tradition of Michel Foucault, it rejects the intrinsic influence of geography, and proposes an alternative view of how geopolitics can function as a conceptual framework, by positing the way elites imagine and articulate geographic concepts that shape the construction of reality.

Along with the concept of discourse, discourse analysis has gained great popularity as a major methodology in the social sciences. Existing geopolitical discourses have been greatly influenced by post-structuralist, postmodern and constructivist theories in international relations.

- Critical analysis of geopolitical discourses and forms of knowledge and power that are historically established and identified with discourses and practices within the ideological productions written about the geographical space constitute the essence of critical geopolitics.
- Geopolitical discourses are in fact produced by practitioners of geopolitics, not by theorists, although these two groups include both "statement intellectuals". However, practitioners are usually under the influence of theorists.

5- Bibliography List:

- ¹ Gearoid O Tuathail, Critical Geopolitics. U.S.A: University of Minnesota Press.1996, p. 65.
- ² Gearóid, Ó Tuthail, & John Agnew, "Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy". Political Geography, 11 (2), 1992: pp. 190-204.
- ³ (Haverlouk, Beauchemin, & Muller, 2014, pp. 19-20)
- ⁴ Leslie Hepple, "The revival of geopolitics", Political Geography Quarterly, 5 (4), 1986: pp. 521-536.
- ⁵ T. Haverluk, Kevin M. Beauchemin, Brandon A. Mueller, "The Three Critical Flaws of Critical Geopolitics: Towards a Neo-Classical Geopolitics". Geopolitics, 19 (1), 2014: pp. 19-39
- ⁶ Sara Rana Gokmen, Geopolitics and The Study of International Relations. A Thesis Submitted to In Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements for The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Department of International Relations: Middle East Technical University.2010, p. 71.
- ⁷ Gearoid Ó Tuathail & John Agnew, Op.cit, P.192.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Simon Dalby, "Recontextualising violence, power and nature: The next twenty years of critical geopolitics?" Political Geography (29),2010: pp. 280-288.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit, p. 70.
- ¹² S N Grinyaev and D A Medvedev, "Transformation of the political and geographical space of the Arctic: an approach of postcritical geopolitics," 4th International Scientific Conference "Arctic: History and Modernity" Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 302. Russie.2019, p. 4).
- ¹³ Gearóid O Tuathail & John Agnew, OP.cit, p. 192.
- ¹⁴ Gereard O Tuathail, Simon Dalby & Paul Routledge, The Geopolitics Readers. London: Routledge, 1998, p. 4.
- ¹⁵ Gearoid O Tuathail, Critical Geopolitics. Op.cit, p. 29.
- ¹⁶ Merje Kuus Geopolitics and Expertise: Knowledge and Authority in European Diplomacy, Wiley-Blackwell, 2014 2010, P.68.
- ¹⁷ Klaus J. Dodds, Critical Geopolitics and the Writing of Foreign Policy. A thesis Submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the requirements for the degree of PhD. the Faculty of Social Science, USA,1993, pp. 83-84.
- ¹⁸ Gearoid, O. Tuathail, Simon, Dalby, & Paul Routledge, Op. cit, 1998, P.5.

- ¹⁹ Gearoid O'Tuathail, The Bush administration and the "end" of the Cold War: A critical geopolitics of US foreign policy in 1989. Geoforum, 23 (4), 1992: pp. 437-452.
- ²⁰ Gearoid O'Tuathail, Critical Geopolitics, 1996, p. 158.
- ²¹ Simon Dalby, "Critical Geopolitics: Discourse, Difference, and Dissent". Sage Journals, 9 (3), 1991, pp. 171-18
- ²² Leslie Hepple, Op.cit, P. 522..
- ²³ Gearóid O Tuathail & John Agnew, Op.cit, p. 192.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Martin Müller, 2010, p. 2.
- ²⁶ Joanne Sharp, "Publishing American identity: popular geopolitics, myth and The Reader's Digest", Political Geography Volume 12, Issue 6, 1993, p. 492.
- ²⁷ Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit, p. 77.
- ²⁸ Martin Muller, "Reconsidering the concept of discourse for the field of critical geopolitics". Political Geography, 2008, pp. 322-338. p. 324.
- ²⁹ Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit, p. 77.
- ³⁰ Simon Dalby, "Critical Geopolitics: Discourse, Difference, and Dissent", OP.cit, P.187.
- ³¹ Martin Muller, "Reconsidering the concept of discourse for the field of critical geopolitics". Political Geography, 2008, pp. 322-338. p. 324.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Gearaird O Tuathail, Simon Dalby, & Paul Routledge, Op.cit, p. 4
- ³⁴ Ning An, Confucian Geopolitics: Chinese Geopolitical Imaginations of The US War on Terror. China: Springer.2020, p. 17.
- ³⁵ Merje Kuus, "Critical Geopolitics", 2010, P.3.
- ³⁶ Martin Müller, M., & Paul Reuber, "Empirical Verve, Conceptual Doubts: Looking from the Outside in at Critical Geopolitics". Geopolitics (13), 2008: pp. 458-472.
- ³⁷ Martin Muller, "Reconsidering the concept of discourse for the field of critical geopolitics", Op.cit, P.328.
- ³⁸ Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit, p. 77.
- ³⁹ Julien Mercille, "critical geopolitics and the 1950 Bomber Gap". Geopolitics, 498-518.2008, p. 498.
- ⁴⁰ John Agnew, Re-visioning World Politics, 2nd, New York & London, Routledge, 2003, p. 3.
- ⁴¹ Martin Muller & Reuber, Empirical Verve, Conceptual Doubts: Looking from the Outside in at Critical Geopolitics, Op.cit, p. 50.
- ⁴² Martin Muller, Op.cit, p. 324.
- ⁴³ Kurečić, Identity and Discourse in Critical Geopolitics: A Framework for Analysis, 2015, p. 2)
- ⁴⁴ Simon Dalby, Op.cit, p. 173.
- ⁴⁵ Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit, p. 77.
- ⁴⁶ Garoid O Tuathail, Critical Geopolitics, Op.cit, p. 20.
- ⁴⁷ Gearóid O Tuathail & John Agnew, Op.cit, p. 192.
- ⁴⁸ Joanne Sharp, Op.cit, p. 493.
- ⁴⁹ Gearóid O Tuathail & John Agnew, Op.cit, P.192.

- ⁵⁰ Martin Müller, “Doing discourse analysis in Critical Geopolitics”. L’Espace Politique (3), 2010 : pp. 1-21, P.1.
- ⁵¹ Petar Kurečić, “Identity and Discourse in Critical Geopolitics: A Framework for Analysis”. Conference: –, Society & Technology Book of Papers. Opatija. 2015, p. 6.
- ⁵² Sara Rana Gokmen, Op.cit , p. 79.
- ⁵³ Ibid, p. 78)
- ⁵⁴ Klaus Dodds, Geopolitics in a Changing World. USA: Prentice Hall, 2000, p. 35.
- ⁵⁵ Fairclough and Wodak, “Critical Discourse Analysis”. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). London: Sage. (1997: 271-280)
- ⁵⁶ Martin Müller, Op.cit.
- ⁵⁷ dijk teun a. van, “Principles of critical discourse analysis”. Discourse and Society, 4, 1993: pp. 249-283. P.253.
- ⁵⁸ (Vandjik, 2006) (Van Dyck, 2001)
- ⁵⁹ (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 2003, 2006).
- ⁶⁰ Simon Dalby, Creating the Second Cold War: The Discourse of Politics. USA: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1990, p. 174.
- ⁶¹ Martin Muller, Op.cit, P.324. 2008.
- ⁶² Ibid, p. 324.
- ⁶³ Martin Muller, “Doing discourse analysis in critical Geopolitics”. 2011, from l'espace politique : <http://espacepolitique.revues.org/index1743.html>.