

Kydyrov Zh. S.

Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan

Contribution to classical geopolitics by F. Ratzel and R. Kjellen

Classical geopolitics was founded by such Western scientists as F. Ratzel, R. Chellen, A.T. Mahan, H. Mackinder, K. Haushofer, P. Vidal de la Blanche, A. Demangeon and others.

Everything that existed before the start of World War II refers to the foundations of classical geopolitics, and it should be noted that the thoughts and works of the above scientists were very relevant and in demand. We include these scholars among the classics for their significant theoretical merits, which were able to resist historical criticism.

Firstly, they created a new sphere of scientific knowledge, asking what determines the security of the state and sovereignty, the prosperity of the state, its strength, power and influence in the world.

Secondly, they focused on the analysis of the factors and methods that ensure the power of the state in the world, which in many ways helped states to formulate their geopolitical codes.

Thirdly, they were the initiators of creating a spatial approach to explaining the meaning of political events, operating with such basic categories as "space", "large spaces".

Fourth, starting with Mackinder, almost all authors presented geopolitical scenarios on a global scale, i.e. considered the world as a single functioning whole, having a rational explanation. Although their geopolitical constructions were not devoid of an ideological load, since every geopolitician was concerned, first of all, with the problem of the security and power of his fatherland, they still often managed to present a relatively objective picture of the world and determine the main trends in its further development.

Fifthly, representatives of classical geopolitics introduced the categories of geopolitics into scientific circulation, many of which are still used by scientists in the

study of the geopolitical picture of the world: “geopolitics”, “space”, “large spaces”, “geographical position”, “great powers” , "the planetary status of the state", etc. [1].

Classical geopolitics played a large role in the formation of geopolitics as a science, but it also has certain shortcomings, many of which can be explained by historical limitations.

Firstly, this is the use of actually only geographical determinism as the main methodological principle of the study of geopolitics, which was based on the recognition that it is the geographical factor, i.e. the size of the territory, the location of the country, its natural and climatic conditions, proximity or remoteness from the seas and oceans, and other geographical parameters determine the main directions of the socio-political development of a particular people, its character, behavior in the international political arena. Although already within the framework of classical geopolitics, representatives of the French school made, and not without success, the first attempts to overcome geographic determinism [2].

Secondly, it is an over-indulgence in the picture of planetary dualism - "sea forces" against "continental forces" or thalassocracy ("power through the sea") against tellurocracy ("power through the earth").

Thirdly, understanding geopolitics as the embodiment of state power in space, they promoted the desire for direct military or political control over territories, and in this context, the “anaconda” strategy was quite often promoted - blocking enemy territories from the sea and along coastlines, which should gradually lead to strategic exhaustion and economic strangulation of the enemy. Fourthly, considering the territorial space controlled by the state as the main factor of its strength and power, justifying the need for the state to strive for dynamic territorial growth, for the expansion of living space, some representatives of classical geopolitics (Ratzel, Kjellen, Mahan) recognized military expansion as a completely natural way of acquiring geopolitical power [3].

The classics considered the main category of geopolitics to be space, which they understood only as the ultimate territorial space, which has its own permanent boundaries. The prosperity of the state, in their opinion, is entirely based on the

properties of its territory. For its existence and prosperity, the state must provide itself with living space and strive for constant dynamic spatial and territorial growth. Only a significant territorial space provides the state with security, sovereignty, political strength and dominant positions in the world, distinguishes prosperous states from decadent ones. In this regard, they developed strategic and tactical methods with which they could expand their own territorial space, ensure dominant positions in the world and control over other regions.

For the founding fathers of classical geopolitics, the German geographer F. Ratzel (1844-1904) and the Swedish statesman and geographer R. Kjellen (1864-1922), geopolitics is the doctrine of the state as a geographical organism embodied in space. For them, the state is a living, complex organism that develops in space and does not recognize the principle of "inviolability of borders."

The state is born, grows, dies, like a living being. Moreover, the development of the state is objectively necessarily connected with the growth of the population, which no longer has enough land within the country and it rushes outward, i.e. to external colonization. And the "new space" acquired by the people is, as it were, a source from which the state feeling draws new strength. The disintegration of each state occurs when it gives up a large space.

According to Ratzel, a state, if it wants to be a "genuine" great power, must have as its spatial basis an area of approximately 5 million square meters. If the state is a living organism that is subject to the categorical imperative of expanding its territorial space, then the expansion of the state, including war, was quite natural for F. Ratzel and R. Kjellen.

F. Ratzel in his work "Laws of the Spatial Growth of the State" (1896) formulated seven basic laws of the spatial growth of states, many of which have not lost their relevance to this day:

1. The space grows along with the growth of the culture of the nation.
2. The growth of the state presupposes the further development of ideas, trade, i.e. increased activity in all spheres of society.
3. The growth of the state is carried out by joining and absorbing small states.

4. The border is a peripheral organ of the state, in which its growth, strength or weakness and all changes in the body of the state are manifested. A strong state is one that is able to maintain close ties between its border zones and the core. Any tendency to weaken this interaction will inevitably weaken the state and lead to the loss of the border zone, which may declare independence from the center or join another state.
5. In its growth, the state seeks to absorb the most valuable elements of the physical and geographical environment; coastlines, riverbeds, plains, areas rich in natural resources.
6. The first impulse to territorial growth comes to primitive states from outside, from higher civilizations.
7. The general trend towards the merging of territories, branching out, passes from state to state and is gaining strength. States in their spatial expansion strive for naturally closed configurations. And this desire to grow into natural boundaries can be satisfied within the boundaries of the continents [4].

Ratzel was one of the first to note the geopolitical significance of the sea. In his book "The Sea, the Source of the Power of Nations" (1900), Ratzel pointed out that the planetary scale of full-fledged expansion requires the development of naval forces from a powerful power. He called the Pacific Ocean as "Ocean of the future", which has an advantageous strategic position, unique resources and huge size. It was in the Pacific Ocean that Ratzel predicted a clash of the five leading powers of the world: England, the USA, Russia, China and Japan, while noting that in this conflict, spatial continental powers have an advantage over maritime powers that do not have enough space as a geopolitical resource.

R. Kjellen argued that the power of the state depends on the sum of factors such as natural geographical properties, first of all, the territory, as well as the economy, the people, the form of government. But under the economy, he did not mean the achievement of economic power, competitiveness, with the help of which it was possible to win a dominant position in the world, but the achievement of autarky, self-sufficiency and independence in relation to food and natural resources. Considering the

people as a factor in the power of the state, Kjellen, like all representatives of classical geopolitics, spoke purely about maintaining the population. As for the form of state government, Kjellen identified it with the constitutional and administrative structure. But at the same time, he argued that the strength of the state is a more important factor for maintaining its existence than the law, since the law itself can only be supported by force. He believed that the state is an end in itself, and not an organization that serves the purpose of improving the well-being of its citizens.

The geopolitical power of the state, according to Kjellen, can also be facilitated by three spatial factors: expansion, territorial solidity, freedom of movement. Each state has its own ratio of these factors. Thus, Russia had a large territory (expanded), territorial solidity, but not freedom of movement, since its access to warm seas is limited. Great Britain had freedom of movement due to her position on the ocean, a powerful fleet and dominance on ocean routes; huge expansion, thanks to its overseas dominions and colonies, but not territorial solidity, which was the weakness of the British Empire. Japan had territorial solidity and freedom of movement in the zone of the largest Pacific Ocean, but there was not a sufficient extent of the territory. The United States of America had the most favorable correlation of three factors for geopolitics: extended space, freedom of movement, and territorial solidity, which they used very effectively in the future.

Ratzel and Kjellen were the first to formulate an important geopolitical concept - the concept of "world power". So, Ratzel emphasized that large countries in their development tend to maximize geographical expansion, gradually reaching the planetary level, i.e. gradually become world powers.

The fate of the continental "world power" Ratzel in the future predicted Germany. This idea of Ratzel was brought to its logical end by Kjellen in his book *The Great Powers* (1910). He argued that the main subject of geopolitics are the great powers, which are "doomed" to subjugate small countries and unite them into large geographical and economic "complexes". He pointed out that separate "complexes" of this kind, in particular, the United States, the British Empire, the Russian Empire, developed in the 18th-19th centuries, and Russia was called the "central figure of the

planetary exhibition", since it is the sphere of intersection of two large cultural worlds - the Western Europe and East Asia. Because of this, it is more suitable than other countries than even the United States for an intermediary role in interstate relations. At the beginning of the 20th century, according to Kjellen, a large European "complex" should be formed under the auspices of Germany, because the German space has axial dynamism and can structure the rest of the European countries around itself. As you know, this idea of Ratzel and Kjellen about Germany as a "continental state" uniting the countries of Europe was "brilliantly resurrected" by the leaders of the Third Reich.

Literature:

1. Lebedeva T.P. Geopolitics http://uchebnik-online.com/soderzhanie/textbook_200.html
2. Nartov N.A. Geopolitics: Textbook for universities. - M.: UNITI, 1999. - 359 p.
3. Sorokin K.E. Geopolitics of modernity and geostrategy of Russia. — M.: Rossien, 1996.
4. Khorev B.S. Essays on geoglobalistics and geopolitics. - M. (without decree, ed.), 1997.