

## Chapter 3

# Approaches to the Study of Political Geography

Carl Sauer in 1927 defined political geography as "the wayward child of the geographic family where method and material are free at the choice of the student". Sauer's statement was time-tested in the sense that the contemporary political geography lacked concrete methodological approaches, and whatever little was available that too concerned itself with geopolitik which stood in contrast to political geography. The reason for the lack of methodological approaches to the contemporary political geography may be attributed to the lack of professionalism. The organismic paradigm of the Ritter-Ratzel heritage did not make any deep insight into the problem of approaches in the contemporary politico-geographical scholarship.

It was not until 1935 that Derwent S. Whittlesey came out with an approach to the study of political geography. This could be said as the first attempt towards an approach to this subfield of geography which sought to reply Sauer's statement on the credibility of political geography in 1927. Whittlesey's approach to the study of political geography was contained in an article entitled, "The Impress of Effective Central Authority upon the Landscape", published in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* in 1935.

### Whittlesey's Law-Landscape Approach

"By 'central authority' is meant sovereignty over an area of marked diversity. To be effective, the central government must exert more than nominal control over its area. Today effective central authority is a function of the nation-state", says Whittlesey.

In this article, Whittlesey examines various ways by which politics can modify the landscape. He divides his treatment into four major sections—expressions of security, special features of boundaries, expressions of government activity, and the effects of the legal system. His subsequent dis-

discussion suggests the wide scope of political impress on the environment.

In the case of political security, he rates effects upon the distribution of settlement, the form of cities, and even the architecture of buildings. He envisions political boundaries as providing special features (such as military garrisons), special economic functions (here he anticipates Loesch), and even levels of personal risk. He further delineates the broad range of governmental impact upon the landscape—post office architecture, land and street patterns, migrations, regional development, and the lavish development of capital cities. Finally, in his particularly stimulating discussion of laws and the landscape, Whittlesey analyzes the role that tariffs, embargoes, and land laws play in various geographical distributions.

To begin with, although the political impress may be conceived in man-land terms, we are dealing with a variety of spatial distributions, some of which are visible in the landscape and others which may be illuminated only very indirectly. It may be useful, therefore, to structure political impress on the environment into four major components—political goals, agents of impress, processes and effects.

*Political goals* include such objectives as security, autarchy, spatial integration, status and economic growth. Nearly all governments seek security, although its rank among other goals may vary in relation to perceived threat or hostility in the environment. The Cuban government of Fidel Castro has lived with a high degree of both perceived and actual hostility, and security has been a prime objective of the regime. Autarchy, an objective perhaps more prized at earlier periods of history than now, is still a strong consideration among nation-states. The Soviet Union, especially in the years following 1928, made autarchy a keystone of its economic and foreign policy. The United States has sought to reduce its reliance upon external strategic minerals through stockpiling and technological innovations. A country's position along the autarchy-interdependence continuum may greatly affect its willingness to engage in inefficient resource exploitation.

The degree of spatial integration or segregation sought by a political system may vary widely. Urban political leaders may seek to segregate ghettos from other residential areas or they may genuinely attempt at integration. Nation-states such as Canada, the Congo, India and the Soviet Union have taken strong measures to foster the spatial integration of culturally diverse and often widely separated areas. Status, often an important objective, takes such diverse forms as citation as an 'all-American city', the presence of a national airline, the erection of a steel plant, or ordinances requiring one-acre minimum lot size. Rapid economic growth often provides an index of the efficacy of political leadership, and a government can rise or fall on this issue. The military regime in Greece, for example, justified its coup on this basis. In re-

gard to the environment, such a goal may entail a particular stance concerning the degree of public intervention into the harnessing of natural resources for the national 'good'.

*Agents of political impress* are the vehicles or means by which political processes manifest themselves in the environment. The legal system, legislation, interest groups and voluntary associations, political partitions and degrees of political security are all examples of such agents. The political partitioning of space, particularly that separating national political systems, is critical. Discussions of boundary impact really centre upon the differential impact of divergent policies and degrees of centralized power.

The legal system, along with prevailing customs and mores, may regulate extensively the use and development of the physical environment. Regulations concerning property are basic to spatial patterns in any political unit. Alternative systems of land survey and tenure, inheritance and dowry arrangements may produce such contrasting landscapes as the seigneurial land patterns in French Canada, communal landholdings in Africa or pre-European North America, checkerboard land patterns in the contemporary Midwest, or the fragmented lands of Mediterranean Europe.

Legislation, one of the most direct means available for regulation or development of the physical environment, offers a wide range of ordinance types. At the community level in the United States property and income taxation, building codes, subdivision ordinances, zoning, and planning all exemplify these measures. At higher levels in the political hierarchy, tariffs, embargoes, pricing systems, national domains, government quotas on production and developmental projects can be utilized in political impress.

Finally, the degree of political security prevalent in a particular area can leave its mark in a variety of ways. Settlement patterns and architectural types reflect this variable. Mediterranean settlements often perch on hilltops in the protective shadow of churches, castles, or monasteries. As political security increased over time, maritime or land trade precipitated a downslope growth of settlement. The wide streets of Paris constructed to ensure security against possible uprisings, present another example. The threat of nuclear war at present has given rise to efforts, not all of them successful, to disperse key industrial firms and military bases.

Only several *processes of political impress* will be noted here. *Symbolization* refers to political activities which create on the landscape symbols designed to signify certain values to indigenous inhabitants or to others. In occupied territories and along hostile boundary lines, especially those separating competing ideological and political systems, 'showcases' sometimes appear to symbolize the success of a particular path. Landscape symbols may also have a calculated function, such as the political integration, independence from for-

eign powers and developmental potentialities of the interior which the new capital cities of Brasilia and Islamabad proudly proclaim.

Political symbolism in the landscape may assume a variety of styles. Chicago's lakefront is a homage to the city of the 'master plan'. Every community expresses its values and aspirations in its monuments, restorations, public buildings and architecture. Some national governments maintain boundary makers and supporting patterns to indicate past glories or disputed areas, whereas others go to great lengths to eradicate any suggestion of prior political sovereignty. The changing of names on gravestones in the South Tyrol represents an extreme measure of the latter type.

*Redistribution* constitutes another very basic process of political impress on the environment. Utilization of the environment often involves the collection of funds from diverse areas of a political systems to finance projects in spatially-concentrated locales. The process, often a purposeful one, may have its roots in political goals, such as providing incentives in Canada or Australia for settlement and resources exploitation or supporting the Appalachia programme in the United States. The spatial distribution of funds for developmental projects has always been a serious bone of contention between different segments of a state.

*Spatial competition and conflict* is a process closely related to and by no means mutually exclusive from redistribution. Within any political unit local interests vie for the rewards of redistribution and developmental schemes. Success in competition not only brings tangible benefits for the local citizenry but strengthens the reservoir of support for politicians among their constituents. Again, the issues are multifarious—government contracts, shipyard closings, hospitals, libraries, school sites, highways, etc. This process illustrates the useful perspective provided by the spatial structure of a political economy. Actually, the analysis of the entire process can take the form of a game in which players representing various geographical sections of the political system compete for the spatial allocation of public funds.

*Effects* are the last analytical component of political impress on the environment. Some of these effects (e.g., land and street patterns) would be visible in the landscape, whereas others (e.g., prices, land values) would not. Geographers have at their disposal various techniques and concepts for analyzing these effects. Thus, the analysis can focus on geometry movement, networks, nodes, hierarchies and surfaces. On the other hand, it is possible to discuss effects in terms of their structural-functional attributes. In that sense any kind of barrier takes on a divergent function in regard to spatial-political integration.

"Examples of cultural impress of effective central authority upon the landscape can be multiplied indefinitely. The cases cited suffice, however, to point to a group of geographic phenomena often overlooked. Each deserves

more detailed study, particularly in its regional setting. Phenomena engendered by political forces should have a recognized place as elements in the geographic structure of every region."

This approach which was first of its kind in political geography seems to have been drawn from the contemporary American possibilist paradigm. The law-landscape approach of Whittlesey could not make any immediate breakthrough in the contemporary politico-geographical studies but in the latter decades it did inspire a lot of people to think in terms of law-landscape change in the political areas. A few years later, in 1939 Whittlesey attempted to define the subject matter of political geography: "The kernel of political geography is the political area. Every political unit describes an areal pattern of nuclear core, constituent or administrative regions, problem areas, vulnerable zones, capitals, strategic spots and boundaries—all affecting its success even if not vital to its persistence. These features take form with respect to specific conditions of the natural environment. Commonly they harmonize with the earth conditions and the peopling of the place at the time of their origin. Once established, they tend strongly to perpetuate themselves...The political areas which endure longest are noted for making frequent alteration by law in order to keep their institutions abreast of changing times."

He continues to say: "A factor in the persistence of those political areas which retain their identity is the pertinacity of the past in the realm of government. Political feeling is one of the strongest of all human imitations. Political attachments are correspondingly tenacious, and some part of the heritage of environmental conditions long vanished remains in the political order of every period. The political geography of few, if any, areas can be understood without recourse to their past. Study of the present-day political landscape must be supplemented by a review in their original setting if such relics of past landscapes as survive in the patterns of today. The present can be set in its perspective only by reconstruction of the fragmentary records of history, and in some places the still more meagre remains of archaeology."

On the *relationship between law and region*, Whittlesey points out: "The agent whereby the political structure of any area is constructed is the law. Like any other human concept, the law freely flits from one region to another. Laws are frequently enacted which are so at variance with nature in the political area affected that they have to be rescinded...Others, while somewhat inharmonious, manage to operate; to some extent they modify utilization of earth resources. In time, the fundamental law in each political area becomes roughly suited to the few compulsive conditions laid down by nature...Variations in culture patterns in uniform environments on opposite sides of a political boundary are common, and prove the possibility of modifying the landscape by political means. The operations of law can be traced only through patient

study of the incidence of individual laws...Even in the region of its origin every legal system is subject to continuous alteration to conform changes... in the character of human occupation itself. The interplay of law and region is incessant. Each affects the other and in the process is itself modified. As in every other aspect of geography, earth conditions permit a wide range of laws in most regions, and at the same time, set limits that nullify laws which stand outside the permitted range."

Whittlesey seems to have drawn this conceptual framework in political geography from his concept of 'sequent occupation' which sought to bind together morphological-historical and legal approaches, current in his time, within the purview of the contemporary American possibilist paradigm. In fact, the morphological approach and historical or genetic approach stood in contrast to each other. The former concentrated on the study and analysis of features such as location, size and shape, boundaries, capitals and core areas and the regional breakdown of the states' area into natural or cultural and other types of regions while the latter sought to study the objective of explaining how a state had come into being in the area within its present boundaries. It was Whittlesey who sought to combine the approaches together but Richard Hartshorne was, to some extent, averse to these approaches, because to him, the morphological approach was 'dull and static', while to that of the historical/genetic approach, he remarked, "it is not clear to me...that such historical studies of genesis are essential for every study in political geography...or a necessary preliminary section, in the study of the political geography of any state."

In view of the persistent weaknesses in the morphological and historical approaches, Richard Hartshorne offered yet another alternative approach which sought to study/analyze the functions of politically organized areas, i.e., the sovereign state—the intrinsic fundamental function of the state is "to establish itself as an effective unit, rather than merely in international law". In an article entitled, "The Functional Approach in Political Geography", published in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* in 1950 Richard Hartshorne attempts to present his approach. Here, in the approach, he attempts to bring forward the regional paradigm in political geography.

### **Hartshorne's Functional Approach**

"The fundamental purpose of any state, as an organization of a section of land and section of people, as Ratzel first put it, is to bring all the varied territorial parts, the diverse regions of the State-area, into a single organized unit."

### **Analysis of the Political Geography of a State: Internal Functions**

"What does the state attempt to organize in all regions of the state-area?" In

all cases, it attempts to establish complete and exclusive control over internal political relations—in simplest terms, the creation and maintenance of law and order. Local political institutions must conform with the concepts and institutions of the central, over all, political organization.

In many social aspects—class structure, family organization, religion and education—a state may tolerate considerable variation in its different regions. But because of the significance of these factors to political life, there is a tendency—in some states a very marked effort—to exert unifying control even over these institutions. In the economic field, every modern state tends to develop some degree of unity of economic organization. Every state must strive to secure the supreme loyalty of the people in all its regions, in competition with any local or provincial loyalties, and in definite opposition to loyalty to any outside state unit.

Throughout this statement of the organization of the state-area as a unit, the geographer is primarily concerned with emphasis on regional differences. The state, of course, is no less concerned to establish unity of control over all classes of population at a single place. In political geography, the interest is in the problem of unification of diverse regions into single whole; the degree of vertical unification within any horizontal segment concerns not only as a factor aiding or handicapping regional unification.

Our analysis of the primary functions of any state leads directly to the primary problem of political geography. For no state-area constitutes by the nature of its land and people, a natural unit for a state, in which one merely needs to create a government which shall proceed to operate it as a unit. The primary and continuing problem of every state is how to bind together more or less separate and diverse areas into an effective whole.

For the political geographer, this presents a wide range of specific problems for analysis. In every state-area, larger than such anomalies as Andorra or Liechtensteir, the geographer finds: (1) regions that are more or less separated from each other by physical or human barriers; (2) regions that in greater or lesser degree diverge in their relations with outside states; and (3) regions that differ among themselves in character of population, economic interests, and political attitudes. Let us look briefly at each of these types of problems.

### *Centrifugal Forces\**

Geographers are familiar with the effect of particular types of physical features in handicapping communication between regions...In most modern

---

\* Centrifugal forces are those which lead toward division and may even threaten the breakup of the state.

states, however, these problems have largely been overcome by the development of the telegraph and the railroad. They continue to be of importance, however, in parts of the Balkans, in the highland states of Latin America and in China.

Since state organization requires communication not only from one region to the next, but also from a central point to each peripheral region, distance itself is a centrifugal factor. Obviously distance within a state depends on its size and shape. Size and shape are significant to the state in other, quite different respects, but...suggest...wait until...have determined that in...analysis, rather than attempt to proceed deductively from size and shape to consequences.

Of human barriers, the most common is the absence of humans. Uninhabited or sparsely inhabited areas were, until recently, difficult and dangerous to cross. It was primarily on this account that relatively low mountains, in Central Europe or the Appalachians, long functioned as dividing zones. Further, the presence of such relatively empty areas created, and still create, a feeling of separation in the regions on either side. Both on this account and because of distance, oceans continue to function as the strongest separating factor, other than the Arctic ice, even those which have long been crossed with relative ease.

Perhaps, the most difficult barrier to overcome is separation by a zone populated by a different people, especially an unfriendly people. The Germans have apparently convinced the world that the separation of East Prussia by the Polish Corridor was an experiment that is never to be repeated.

Serious difficulties may arise for a state if any of its regions have closer relations with regions of outside states than with those within the state. This is commonly the case where a boundary has been changed so that it now cuts across an area formerly within a single state. The partition of Upper Silesia in 1922 presented a particularly intense case. But there are many cases, not dependent on boundary changes, in which a region has closer connections, particularly economic connections, with regions of other countries than with other regions of its own state. We are familiar with the political importance of this factor in each of the major regions of Canada, each more closely related in certain respects with the adjacent areas of the United States than with the other regions within the dominion. In some cases mutual interdependence among the regions of the state-area is less than the dependence of individual regions in remote, overseas country. This is a major problem of the Australian Commonwealth in which each state unit is primarily dependent on separate trade with Great Britain.

Separation of regions by barriers or by divergence of outside connections is commonly less important than the centrifugal forces that result from diver-

sity of character of the population. To secure voluntary acceptance of a single common organization requires some degree of mutual understanding; obviously this is easier in a population homogeneous in character. Further, where regions differ in social character, the tendency of the state to force some degree of uniformity of social life meets with resistance. Thus, the very attempt to produce unity may intensify disunity. Hungary, before 1918, was the classic example, since then Yugoslavia has been perhaps the leading, among several successors.

What particular social characteristics may be important depends on the particular state. Everyone thinks of language and religion...education and standards of living, types of economic attitudes and institutions, attitudes towards class and racial distinctions, and, especially, political philosophy.

Racial differences, as studied by the physical anthropologist, may be of no relevance to our problem. The distribution, percentagewise, in the different countries of Europe, of blondes and brunettes, dolichocephalic versus brachycephalic—what does it matter? These facts have no reflection in social or political attitudes in those countries. Though standard material in most geographies of Europe...have no significance to political geography, or for that matter, to geography in general.

In contrast, the United States is a country in which regional differences in attitudes of people toward the racial components of the regional groups—as indicated by skin colour—are of tremendous importance in social, economic and political life. We have mapped and studied the underlying differences in racial composition but we have not studied the phenomenon itself, namely, the differences in attitudes. We need a map, a series of maps, portraying different kinds and degrees of Jim Crowism in the United States. These...would rate as a first requirement for an understanding of the internal political geography of the United States, for in no other factor do we find such marked regional cleavages, such disruption to the national unity of our state. For geography, in general, in one quarter of our country, these attitudes are fundamental factors in every aspects of the human geography, and are significantly related to its physical geography.

Geographers are more familiar with differences in economic interests since these are more closely bound to the land. But these seldom seriously disrupt national unity. It is true that almost every modern state has experienced marked political tension between the divergent interests of highly industrial regions and those of still primarily agricultural areas. But these differences tend to lead to interlocking rather than competing interests. Even when competing, economic differences..., are easier to compromise than differences in social and political attitudes.

Furthermore, the state is only in partial degree an economic unit. Since it

is basically a political unit, the state necessarily imposes the greatest degree of uniformity in political life. Political attitudes are peculiarly inflexible. If a region is accustomed to one set of political concepts, ideals and institutions—most people especially if its people feel that they have fought in the past to establish those political values—it may be extremely difficult to bring them under the common cloak of a quite different system. Even when regions, formerly in separate states, have voluntarily joined together to form a state, on the basis of common ethnic character—for example, the three Polish areas in 1918, or the Czech and Slovak areas—the marked difference in past political education led to difficult problems.

In times and areas of relatively primitive political development such factors were no doubt of minor importance. In long-settled areas of relatively mature political development, these may be of first importance. The classic example is, again, Alsace. Thanks particularly to the French Revolution, the people of that province had become strong supporters of political concepts, ideals and institutions that could not be harmonized within the semifederal, authoritarian monarchy of Hohenzollern Germany.

Conversely, one may understand, on this basis, the negative reaction of the Swiss in 1919 to the proposal that the adjacent Austrian province of Vorarlberg should be added to their state.

### *Centripetal Forces*\*

The preceding discussion of political attitudes points to an essential ingredient that has been lacking in the discussion up to this point. We have been considering a variety of centrifugal factors in the regional geography of a state-area which make it difficult to bind those regions together into an effective unit. In considering how such difficulties may be overcome, we have not asked whether there was any force working to overcome the difficulties, anything tending to pull these regions into a state.

The omission...has been the single greatest weakness in our thinking in political geography. If we see an area marked clearly on both physical and ethnic maps as suitable for a state, but which for many centuries was not integrated as a state—as in the Spanish peninsula, the Italian peninsula, or the German area—we cudgel our heads to find factors in the internal geography that will explain the failure. We forget that before we speak of failure, we must ask what was attempted.

One of the concepts that prevented integration in Italy is likewise the key to the failure of medieval Germany to develop a unified state, at the time when

---

\* Centripetal forces are those which lead to unity and coherence of the state.

kingdoms of France and England were being effectively established. For centuries the personal holding of the title of King of Germany, and whatever opportunity that might give, were far more affected by the higher title of Emperor. Inspired by the grander idea of reincarnating the empire of Rome, they fought to build a state, straddling the Alps, uniting many different peoples. The sacrifices made in the vain attempt to accomplish the greater idea destroyed the possibility of achieving the lesser when later emperors finally were reduced to, considering German unity.

The fact that a country has a name and a government, that an international treaty recognizes its existence as a state and defines its territorial limits—all that does not produce a state. To accomplish that, it is necessary to establish centripetal forces that will bind together the regions of the state, in spite of centrifugal forces that are always present.

### *The State-Idea*

The basic centripetal force must be some concept or idea justifying the existence of this particular state incorporating these particular regions, the state must have a *raison d'être* or reason for existing.

Although ignored in much of the literature of political geography, this is not a new thought. Ratzel defined the state as a section of land and a section of humanity organized as a single unit in terms of a particular, distinctive idea...At the primitive level, Ratzel explained that this idea may be no more than the will of a ruler to which, for whatever reasons, all the regional parts through their local leaders grant their loyalty. In such a case, as in the empire of Charlemagne or that of Ghengis Khan, the state may endure hardly longer than the lifetime of the individual ruler. In the attempt to perpetuate the binding idea of loyalty to a personal ruler, there evolved the concept of hereditary monarchy. Where that succeeded, however, we find there was always something more—politically-minded people in the various parts of the kingdom came to regard the state, for reasons independent of the monarch, as representing something of value to them.

To be sure, a state in which the original idea has lost its validity will not fall apart at once. The forces of inertia, vested interests, and fear of the consequences of change may help it going more or less effectively for some time. But inevitably a structure that has lost its original *raison d'être*, without

- 
- \* State-idea is a complex of traditions, experiences and objectives. It is made up of written history, folklores, stories of national heroes, religious beliefs, and the language and art forms in which these things are communicated. It is the body of the literature, the painting, the architecture, the music which are distinctively national. And it is the characteristic economic, social and political institution.

evolving a new one, cannot hope to stand the storms of external strife or internal revolt that sooner or later will attack it. For when that day comes, the state to survive, must be able to count upon the loyalty, even to the death of the population of all its regions. "Those states are strongest", Ratzel had concluded, "in which the political idea of the state fills the entire body of the state and extends to all its parts."

What does this mean for the study of the political geography of a state? It means...we must discover the motivating centripetal force, the basic idea of the state. Under what concept, for what purposes, are these particular regions to be bound together into one political unit, absolutely separated from every other political territory. We must discover and establish the unique distinctive idea under which a particular section of area and of humanity is organized into a unit state...until we can determine for any particular state the idea under which it is organized, we shall have no basis on which to analyze its political geography, we shall not have started on the significant contribution that geography can make to the study of states.

The idea of an Iraqi state sprang from two factors: (i) the recognition by the 'great powers' of the special strategic and economic significance of the Mesopotamian region, and (ii) the need to provide 'a pied a terre' for Arab nationalism banished from Syria. On the basis of these two considerations, there was established a territory embracing the settled Arab region of the Tigris-Euphrates plain, together with adjacent but dissimilar regions of mountain and desert tribes, the whole to be developed as a separate Arab state.

To determine the distinctive idea of such a state, therefore, we must study the current situation rather than the remote past. In the well-developed modern state, politically-minded people in all regions of the state-area are conscious of their loyalty to the state and have some common understanding, even though not clearly phrased, of what that state means to them. In such a case, we may recognize, the existence of a nation—as something distinct from the state itself.

### *The Concept of Nation*

...in the most primitive level, the concept of nation represents simply a feeling of kinship, of belonging together, an extension of the concept of family, more properly an extension of the concept of the in-group versus outsiders. While usually expressed in terms derived from the language of the family—terms like 'blood', 'bread', 'race', etc., it is in reality less of kin and more of kind—similarity of cultural rather than of biological characteristics.

The direct significance of this elementary concept of nationality to the state lies first in the fact that all peoples tend to prefer government by those of their own kind, even if inefficient or unjust rather than any government over

them by foreigners, however, beneficent. The second reason is that the individual seeks to identify himself with his state, nationality, someone said, is 'pooled self-esteem'. Indeed, the state is sure of the loyalty of the people only if there is such identification. Each citizen must feel that the state is 'his' state, its leaders, 'his' leaders. For this to be possible, he must feel that those who operate his state, who govern him, are people like himself.

The main purpose of a state, however, is not the furtherance of a particular language or culture. Its main purpose is political. The values over which it has complete control are political ones. As the people in a state mature in positive political experience, their feeling of belonging together becomes less dependent on common adherence to particular political concepts, ideals, and institutions. It is for the sake of these that they are ready to devote their ultimate loyalty to their state.

It is difficult to summarize the analysis of the concept of nation into a single statement but for those readers who wish a definition: "a nation may be defined as a group of people occupying a particular area who feel themselves held together in terms of common acceptance of particular values that are of such prime importance to them 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."

The relations between the state and the nation are mutual and manifold. In the older nation-states of Western Europe, the nation was in no small part the product of the state. William of Normandy...established the kingdom of England, later expanded to include Wales. In the process, however, whatever degree of Anglo-Saxon nation had developed was destroyed in the conflict with the Norman French conquerors. But, in the course of centuries, the state created a new nation—the English.

Likewise, there was no French nation—not even a common language of what we think of as the single to French people—until centuries after the kings of France had established more or less effective unity over the state area...call by that name. In Norway and Eire, the relation of state and nation was reversed; the nation antedated and demanded the state. The Polish nation also antedated the Polish state. The Hapsburg monarchy did not disintegrate directly because of the large number of different ethnic regions of which it was formed, but rather because that state never evolved political concepts or institutions that could gain acceptance...

The United States...presents still a different type. The nation antedated the state but was itself originally only a part of an older British nation that had been developed by the United Kingdom. One further ramification may be briefly suggested. Once the concept of a nation has been well established within an area, its spread outward is not necessarily limited by the frontier of

the state-area.

### *The Concept of the Core-Area*

A core-area is neither sufficient nor essential to the evolution of a nation or state. What is essential is a common idea that convinces the people in all the regions that they belong together. Historically, in certain states, a core may have played a major role in spreading that idea to other regions and it may continue today as in France, Argentina or Mexico to focus the interest of the regions on itself as the centre of what has become a functioning unit but the common idea for a state may develop where no core-area exists.

### *The Application of the State-Idea in Political Geography*

Whatever is found to be the *raison d'être*, the underlying idea of the state, it is with this concept...that the geographer should start his analysis of the state-area. What use is he then to make of it?

His first concern is to determine the area to which the idea applies; then, the degree to which it operates in the different regions; and finally, the extent of correspondence of those regions to the territory actually included within the state.

On this basis we may approach the most elementary problem in political geography, namely, that of distinguishing within the legal confines of its territory, those regions that form an integral part of the state-area in terms of its basic idea, and those parts that must be recognized as held under control in the face of either indifference or opposition on the part of the regional population.

If the idea of the State is based on the recognition of the existence of a nation, then the major geographic question to consider is whether there is close correspondence between the area of the nation and that of the state. Are there regions within the state whose populations do not feel themselves parts of the nation? Are there regions of the nation that are not included within the state—the issue of irridentism?

“The entire area over which the nation extends, but in a varying degrees of intensity, may then be compared with the area presently included in the state. We have thus determined not only the areal correspondence of state and nation, but also the regions in which the national character is partial rather than complete. We shall thereby have presented, in part in map form, the basic factors and relationships involved in the primary problem of political geography—the analysis of the degree to which the diverse regions of the state constitute a unity.”

### *Internal Organization*

...one other problem for analysis—the relation of the internal territorial organization of the state-area to the regional diversities...though all the regions of a state are closely included under the state-idea, have complete loyalty to the overall concepts of the national unit, regional differences inevitably cause some differences in interpretation and implementation of those concepts.

If these differences are relatively minor, as in most of France or in Uruguay, the regions may accept unitary government from a single central authority. If the differences are great, the attempt to impose such a uniform system may provoke opposition endangering the national unity. Since such regional differences are important in most countries, most states attempt to operate under a uniform, centralized government, the number of examples of this type of problem is very large. Spain at the moment provides one of the most striking example.

Certain states recognize openly the need to permit diverging interpretations of the overall concepts of that state and hence significant differences in the institutions and laws thereunder. This is the system of a federal state, of which Switzerland provides the oldest example and the United States the largest. In both cases, a notable degree of regional heterogeneity is guaranteed by the constitutional division of power.

The possible ways of organizing the state-area are not limited to the unitary and the federal systems. The United Kingdom...has evolved in the course of its long history a most complicated system under which Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands—each has a different degree of autonomy adjusted to its particular linguistic, religious, economic and political geography.

### *Analysis of External Functions*

In a functional approach to the analysis of the political geography of a state, the first half was concerned with the internal problems of the state-area. The second half is concerned with the external relations of the state-area to the other areas of the world, whether those are also recognized as states, controlled by outside states, or unorganized. For convenience we may group these relations as territorial, economic, political and strategic.

### *Territorial Relations*

Under the territorial relations we are...concerned in the first instance with the degree to which adjacent states are in agreement concerning the extent of territory which each includes. Whether the area in question is large or small, agreement ultimately requires the determination of a precise boundary. The

first thing to know about an international boundary therefore, is the degree to which it is accepted by all the parties concerned-i.e., the adjacent states and the population whose statehood is determined by the location of the boundary. The second question concerning any international boundary (whether or not it is fully accepted) is the degree to which its boundary function is maintained by the bordering states, the degree, that is, to which all movements of goods and persons across the line are effectively controlled by the boundary officials. In examining that, the geographer will, of course, observe the ways in which the control is made easier or more difficult by the character of the zone through which the boundary line is drawn.

The use of territorial waters by merchant ships of a foreign state, commonly for the purpose of entering the ports of the country concerned, represents the most common occurrence of use of territory of one state for the purpose of another state. In this case, the purpose is mutual. In other more special cases problems arise from the desire or need of the people of one state to utilize the territory of a foreign country to have access to still other countries or in some cases to a different part of their own state....

Nearly all states recognize the need to providing transit service for trade across their territories between states on either side.... Most important are provisions for transit from an inland state to the sea-coast in order to have access to the countries of the world accessible by sea routes.

### *Economic Relations*

In the analysis of a state-area, the need to consider its economic relations with outside areas arises from the fact that in many respects a state operates, must operate, as a unit economy in relation with other unit economies in the world. The difficulties arise because while it must operate completely as a political unit, a state-area operates only partially as an economic unit. ...The first problem is to determine to what extent the economy of one state-area is dependent on that of others, though the mere analysis of self-sufficiency is only a beginning. In general, the geographer will analyze the economic dependence of one state-area on others in terms of the specific countries concerned and their location and political association in relation to the state....

Since all sound trading is of mutual advantage to both parties, to say that one state is economically dependent on any other necessarily implies also the converse. But the degree to which any particular commodity trade shipping service or investment is critically important, varies in terms of the total economy of each of the two states concerned. It is only in this sense that the common question "is a particular state economically viable?" has any validity, since every state above the most primitive level is in some respects critically dependent on others.

The problem is far from simple but perhaps we can suggest two generalizations. As between two countries that differ greatly in the size of their total national economy, the economic relationships between them are more critically important for the lesser countries. This is true because these economic relationships...will form a larger proportion of the total national economy of the lesser state.

The second generalization rests on the fact that the critical significance of the trade depends on the possibility of alternatives, of finding other sources for needed supplies or other markets for products which must be sold to maintain the national economy.

In the nineteenth century, international economic relations, though both supported and retarded by state action, were generally operated as the private business of individuals and corporations. With the depression of the 1930s, the rise of totalitarian states, and the last war, there has been an increasing tendency for the state itself to direct the operations of international trade and investment. In these respects states function increasingly as economic units so that the economic relations among them become increasingly important in the politico-geographic analysis of the state.

### *Political Relations*

The most obvious form of political relation of a state to any outside territory is that of effective political control—as a colony, possession, dependency or 'protectorate'. Commonly we recognize only a small number of states as colonial or imperial powers...The legal forms of colonial relationship vary widely—even within a single empire, such as that of Great Britain. Further, these legal forms may or may not express the reality of the relationship, the degree to which political organization is imposed and operated by the outside state. It is the latter...that is our concern in political geography.

One characteristic of colonial areas that is of particular concern from our present point of view is the degree to which the governmental system of the home state is extended over the colonial territory...Many imperial powers have always extended their legal systems into colonial areas...so that within any colonial area, there may be an overlapping of two authorities—one having jurisdiction over citizens of the home state, the other over native people.

Many countries recognized by treaty as independent states, and functioning in large degree as such, are nonetheless under some particular degree of political control by an outside power...The clearest case of political domination of supposedly independent states by an outside state today is found in the obvious control by the Soviet Union over the internal policies as well as foreign policy of the 'satellite' states on its west, from Poland to Bulgaria, even though this relationship is expressed in no formal treaties. Nearly all the states

of the world have accepted certain political commitments in joining the United Nations, insofar as this applies to all states, such commitments are universal rather than geographically distinctive.

### *Strategic Relations*

In this analysis of the external relations with other state-areas, we must certainly recognize that the state-area as a unit, has virtually important strategic relations with the other areas of the world. Every state-area in the world lives in a strategic situation with other states, a situation that may be in part created by its own actions and policies but in major part is determined for it by those other states.

...Switzerland in modern times... is situated in the midst of a group of larger neighbours, each fearful of expansion of power by the others. In this situation Switzerland has found its best hope for security in a policy of armed neutrality because such a neutralized area was in the mutual interest defensively, of the neighbouring powers. In a much earlier period, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when Austria was the only major power bordering Switzerland, and many of its neighbours were small states, the Swiss Confederation followed a very different policy of strategic relations, frequently allying itself with any of these various neighbours in conflict with the others. The strategic relations of a state, in other words, must be adjusted to the particular strategic situation in which it finds itself at any time.

...In studying the relations which such an area operating as a unit, enters into with other areas, we are concerned with engagements which it has, or has not, made with other units, whether for defensive or offensive purposes. Interpretation of these associations necessarily involves an appraisal of the space relationships of all the strategic areas involved, whether as power units or as territories of passage. The problem is logically inherent in the political geography of states and its geographic quality seems clear.

Thus, to summarize, the state-area... is an organized unit of land and people, organized by man according to a particular idea or purpose. The state-area is an organization that has genesis, structure and function. Logically, therefore, the analysis of a state-area may be approached from any or all of these three viewpoints.

The fundamental internal function of the state-area is to establish itself as an effective unit... This requires the conception and establishment of an idea of the state, a purpose or set of purposes... to overcome the centrifugal tendencies. Externally, the state-area functions as a unit area in friendly or unfriendly relations with other state-areas, relations that may be classified as territorial, economic, political and strategic. Its specific relations with any outside area may involve a complex of all these and further they are interrelated to its simi-

lar relations with all other outside areas in a world system which forms a single whole. The study of these interrelations among state-areas is primarily a study in space relationships among unit-areas, a system that must be sufficiently flexible....

In his 'functional approach' Hartshorne appears to have combined 'processual inferences' from structural elements, with that of some behavioural elements, notably the 'state-idea'. Undoubtedly, the functional approach heralded a new era in the politico-geographical scholarship, and for years to come it dominated the subfield. It tended to strengthen the idiographic tradition in political geography, drawing much from what is called 'neo-Kantianism.'

However, Hartshorne's functional approach simply considers the sovereign state only for its application whereas the approach could not be successfully applied to the analysis of 'dependent' or 'protectorate territory', or to any other types of political territories/ regions, other than the 'state'. Hartshorne could not specify what really constitutes the state-idea? What are its ingredients and variables, and how to map and measure its spatial dimension? Hartshorne does not clearly distinguish between the state-idea and the national-idea? Are they same or different? Is the national-idea necessary for the state-idea or vice versa or not at all? There are some states where the state-idea stands in contrast to the national-idea, e.g., South Africa; the former Soviet Union, India and others. Similarly, it is not necessary that the *raison d'etre* should reflect the state-idea or vice versa.

Large number of states which have appeared in the post-1945 period do not seem to have developed the state-idea, but they continue to hold the same *raison d'etre* which their colonial masters had cultivated. India is the best example where no state-idea, unique to its state-area has developed but its *raison d'etre* reflects the colonial legacy. The Republic of South Africa is another example, which has a *raison d'etre* without a state-idea. It is not necessary that all States should have the state-idea and *raison d'etre*. There cannot be any universal validity to the state-idea-*raison d'etre* model. At best, the model can be applied only to the core states of the world economy.

However, the Hartshorne's model seems to have provided an alternative approach to Jean Gottmann who developed a particular theory of political integration in an article entitled, "The Political Partitioning of Our World: An Attempt at Analysis", published in *World Politics* in 1952. The theory of the political partitioning seems to have been based on the philosophy of exceptionalism, as it is particularly based on the analysis of the unique and the particular.

### Gottmann's Political Partitioning Model

...Political world is a limited one; it extends only over the space accessible to

men. Accessibility is the determining factor; areas to which men have no access do not have any political standing or problem. ...Partitioning thus results from accessibility; all the vast globe was partitioned as it was discovered and mapped. The political units or territories, as they emerged, acquire a position in space which became and remained a major characteristic of each unit. A position is not a simple thing, easily describable....

...Every position in our partitioned space can be termed unique.... The uniqueness of its territory's position provides each country with a unique historical background. The uniqueness of a geographical position is indeed essentially a political product, which means a work of man—all the more so as it is the accessibility of space to man which causes its political partitioning and makes of it organized, differentiated space.

...Relations between one compartment of this space and the others cannot exist unless there is movement across the limits of the territory considered.... The extent of accessibility is determined by an analysis of the existing status of traffic, communications, transportation and trade. The French language describes this set of movement across space by the very useful word 'circulation'. It encompasses all the variety, the complexity and the fluidity of the exchanges developing throughout the world. Movement seems...to cover the flow of people, armies, material goods, capital, messages, and ideas across the space open to men's activities, in all directions and for all purposes. Let us use the expression 'movement factor' to describe all these processes.

...Analysis of the movement factor as it applies to a position, whether point or area, helps us to understand easily the motives and imperatives of the policies and political problems focused on or emanating from that position. Movement, however, makes for fluidity and change...briefest glance at history demonstrates how migration, travel, trade relations, evaluation of transportation techniques, cultural relations, and so forth, have constantly brought about changes inside the countries participating in them. These changes inevitably create fluidity and instability. If the movement factor has made for change and instability, it has always encountered an established order as well, favouring a certain pattern of flow and resisting change....

The abstract strength of an existing order is rooted in the spirit of the nations involved. Spirit is another difficult notion, the use of which may appear rather unscientific. What it signifies here is a psychological attitude resulting from a combination of actual events with beliefs deeply rooted in the people's mind...the word 'iconography' to describe the whole system of symbols in which people believe. These symbols are many and varied. A national iconography...encompasses the national flag, the proud memories of past history as well as the principles of prevailing religion, the generally accepted rules of economics, the established social hierarchy, the heroes quoted in the schools,

the classic authors. ...A national iconography usually stops at a boundary: the frontier line is in grave danger.... For any group of people, the iconography is the common cherished heritage. It is a powerful factor and it fights for stability and resist change...two main factors or groups of factors—'movement' and 'iconography'—which oppose one another in the play of forces constantly shaping and reshaping the political map.

...We find an unbroken thread woven through the history of practically every region of the world which shows how the movement factor and the local iconography combined to support the establishment of political authority over a certain area. The fluidity of the political map shaped with the help of such complicated and varied forces may be easier to understand once a method of analysis is applied which follows these two dominant leads: what...called the movement factor and the iconography. ...An understanding of how iconography and movement combine to shape political authority and limit it in space may perhaps help in the further analysis of the world's partitioning.

Like Hartshorne, Gottmann also hypothesizes two dominant sets of forces—circulation and iconography—which act upon the coherence of the political unit. He identifies iconography as a force for stability and coherence, whereas circulation (or the movement factor) leads to political change. He argues that circulation and iconography are not always in spatial conflict, rather they focus at crossroads, though it would seem that circulation usually comes first, creating crossroads, and the iconography fixes itself at the point so established. In fact, the political integration is the interplay of these two forces.

There are similarities and differences between the ideas of Hartshorne and Gottmann. While Hartshorne recognizes circulation as a means of overcoming the physical barriers to political integration, to Gottmann it creates instability and leads to change. Similarly, iconography can be recognized in Hartshorne's theory as one of the centrifugal forces and it does not always make for the stability but to Gottmann iconography leads to coherence and unity, and above all it resists movement and change.

However, Gottmann has identified the basic ingredients and variables of iconography, and it is clear from his identification of iconography, that it is nothing but the 'national-idea' which may be one of the ingredients of the state-idea. However, iconography is not necessarily the state-idea. Gottmann's approach, somehow appears to be applicable to West European countries or the countries which form the core of the world economy. Some of the larger states of the world always have the problem of conflict between the national-idea which is historical and tradition-bound and draws inward and the state-idea which is politics-bound and looks outward. The Soviet Union disintegrated because of the sustained conflict between the Russian national-idea and the Soviet state-idea. There can be conflicts of lesser and greater iconog-

raphies, of sectionalism and nationalism, of national and international iconographies. Another of Hartshorne's ideas, that of the Naturity of states, expresses a state-area coextensive with the national iconography".

While Hartshorne was making an appeal for a more functional approach, he also recognized that many answers to the questions he raised were to be found in the past, hence, many aspects in the evolution of a political region could not be ignored. The main problem was to find an approach that assured relevance of material in tracing past events and processes. Stephen B. Jones was to fill this need, and he came out with a paper entitled, "A Unified Field Theory of Political Geography", published in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1954. This theory (or 'mental gadget' as Jones called it) is concerned with the evolution of politically organized space and is built upon the ideas of Whittlesey, Hartshorne, on several interesting conceptual statements of Gottmann concerning the evolution of political partitioning based on accessibility, and by Karl Deutsch.

### **Jones' Unified Field Theory: Idea-area Chain**

The theory simply states that 'idea' and 'state' are two ends of a chain. The hyphen with which Hartshorne connects them represents the other links of the chain. One of the links is Gottmann's circulation which...shall call movement.

The chain is as follows: political idea-decision-movement-field-political area. This 'chain' should be visualized as a chain of lakes or basins and not an iron chain of separate links. The basins interconnect at one level, so that whatever enters, one will spread to all the others.

Political idea, in this sequence, means more than just the state-idea. It means any political idea, it might be the idea of the state or it might be the idea of a speed limit on a country road. It might merely be a gregarious instinct, not consciously expressed. War begins in the minds of men, and so do all other politics...A favourable decision is a necessary prerequisite to action. A formal parliamentary decision is not necessarily meant...Though most of the fishermen in the basins of idea and decision are political scientists, Gottmann and Hartshorne, both geographers, enter them when they speak of iconography and the idea of state.

Both political scientists and geographers have studied the phenomena at the other end of the chain—political area. This term is used very inclusively to mean any politically organized area, whether a national state, a dependent area, a subdivision of a state, or an administrative region or district. It includes all three categories of areas listed by Fesler—general governmental areas, special or limited purpose governmental areas, and field service areas. The one common characteristic of all political areas is that they have recognized limits, though not necessarily linear or permanent. An administrative centre within

the area is common, but not universal.

Movement...is essentially Gottmann's circulation. What new twist is given comes from placing it in a chain of concepts relating it to decisions. Every political decision involves movement in one way or another. There may be exceptions...Some decisions create movement, some change it, some restrict it. Some create a new kind of movement to replace or to control the old. The movement may not involve great numbers of men or great quantities of matter—it may consist only of radio waves—but usually persons and things move as a result of political decisions. These politically-induced movements may be thought of as 'circulation fields'. The movement of state highway patrolmen produce a field, shipments of military-aid materials produce a field, the despatch and delivery of farm-subsidy checks produce a field.

The existence of a political area, field, movement, or decision conditions what may take place in the basin lying idea-ward... Benjamin Thomas has shown how the political area of Idaho, created upon a flimsy and essentially negative idea in the first place, conditioned further political thoughts and decisions until the present Idaho-idea is as firm as any.

The essential characteristic of a field in physics, is not movement but spatial variation in force. The gravitational field exists even when no apples fall. Since we are not bound to a physical analogy, this distinction need not greatly concern us. However, it may sometimes be important to keep in mind that movements and fields are not necessarily identical...Movement to polls creates a field but it is not identical with the field of the party powers. A field exists in time as well as in space. Applying the ideas of Whittlesey, we may say it has a time dimension as well as a space dimension....

### ***Application to Political Areas***

Application of this theory to a case of one new national state is fairly simple. Zionism is the idea, the Balfour Declaration the conspicuous decision, permitting migration and other movements. A field of settlement, governmental activity, and war leads to the State of Israel. Such telegraphic brevity oversimplifies history, but the theory seems to fit. For a state with a longer and more complicated evolution, history could not be so readily compressed. The theory provides a path between geographical and political study...It does not reduce political geography to five easy steps. It does not permit world politics to be shown on a chart in five column captioned as 'idea', 'decision' and so forth. It may, however, provide some intellectual clarification and it may prove a handy way of working back and forth among historical, political and geographical ideas and date.

...the process of national integration whether looked at by geographers... can be interpreted as a process of changing field. Conceivably, the outlines of

the political area may not change. The former colony of Burma is perhaps en route to becoming a true nation-state without change of boundaries or capital, but a study of the political fields would show changes.

One virtue of the field theory is that it is not confined to politically organized areas. It is applicable without difficulty to an unorganized area like the Mediterranean; which is undoubtedly a political field...decisions may affect the Mediterranean as a whole and may create or control movement over the entire sea. The ideas may vary: Mussolini's dream of a new Roman empire, Britain's concern with sea command, the American strategy of the containment of communism...The accumulation of decisions created a field, the sea conditioned it.

In the case of administrative areas, a political area may arise from a decision with little or possibly no intervening movement. A new government agency may lay out its field service areas before it actually engages in any actions. In some cases, analysis will show that these field service areas reflect pre-existing fields, such as the areas used by other branches of government or known fields of economic activity and in many cases existing boundaries will be followed. It is possible, however, that an administrative area might spring directly from a decision, and reflect no existing field. TVA may be an example.

There is nothing deterministic about the idea-area chain. A given idea might lead to a variety of areas, a given area might condition a variety of ideas...study of Micronesia under four rulers demonstrates this point. Although the area ruled was not identical in all four eras, it was basically the same. The number of possible uses for these small islands was limited. Nevertheless, the four rulers—Spain, Germany, Japan and the United States—made different choices. Then fields were different in kind and intensity. If one insists...that a theory must be able to predict specific behaviour, then the field theory may not deserve its name. With no theory whatsoever, a well-informed person with some map-sense could have predicted many American problems and decisions in Micronesia. As a guide to study, however, the field theory is applicable to such cases.

### ***Studies of National Power***

Studies of national power may also be fitted into the field theory... Lasswell and Kaplan define power as "participation in the making of decisions". If power is participation in the making of decisions, if power is necessary before an idea can produce movement, then we can easily fit power into our theory. Hartshorne distinguished between political geography and the study of power...a geographer might sometimes tackle the question of "how strong is a state"? If no one else had done so, but that in so doing he was "migrating into a field whose core and purpose is not geography, but military and political

strategy". That power is linked with decision supports Hartshorne, to the extent that geography has been more closely associated with the other end of the chain, but our aim is to pull political science and geographer together, not to separate them. If power is more concentrated in the basin of decision, it is by no means absent in the others.

### ***Boundaries, and Capital Cities***

The unified field theory fits boundary studies into the general pattern of political geography. A boundary is, of course, a line between two political areas but it is also a line in a region....The boundary region is truly a field in which the line between the political areas conditions much of the circulation. A boundary field may even be or become a political area as in the case of buffer states and frontier provinces.

Studies of capital cities may be expressed in a field-theory terms.... The idea of, or need for central administration leads to a decision on the site of the capital. The choice is conditioned by the field and in turn distorts or recreates the field. Once the capital is chosen and the field about it established, many further decisions and movements are conditioned, leading in most cases to the creation of a primate city much larger than any other in the country.

Not only capitals but other cities may also be brought into the scope of the theory...many of the problems of a growing city arise from the fact that its circulation expands faster than its iconography. The metropolitan district outgrows the political limits and vested local interests and loyalties make political expansion difficult. A sort of 'metropolitan-idea' may develop leading usually to functional authorities rather than to political integration. In a few words, the urban problem is to make the political area fit the field.

### ***Kinetic and Dynamic Fields***

Since politics consists of conflicts and the resolution of conflicts...these fundamental activities must be expressible in field terms. There are conflicts of ideas but they do not amount to much until they are embodied in decisions that create or obstruct movement. (It may be wise to re-emphasize that 'movement' includes such things of little bulk as messages and money. A restriction on foreign exchange is restriction on movement). Fields may be in contact, but not in conflict if the movement is merely kinetic. But if there is a dynamic aspect, conflict often will arise. For example, New York city's growing need for water forces its activity in this respect to be dynamic, bringing conflict with other claimants to Delaware River supplies. The international oil industry is inherently dynamic since new sources must be discovered. The result is potential conflict, sometimes anticipated and resolved at least pro tempore. The relations of political dynamics to such fundamentals as resource needs and

population pressures have of course been repeatedly studied, and the present theory does little more than incorporate them into the concept of the field.

There are no upper or lower limits on the magnitude of an idea. Man thinks easily of the world government and can dream of spaceships and planetary empires. There are upper limits on decisions, movements, fields and political areas though these limits change with events...such ideas as the great religions, nationalism, liberalism, and communism have, insofar as they could produce decisions and movements, created fields. Whittlesey has shown how man's ideas of space have changed through primal and regional to worldwide conceptions, ideas, fields of exploration, in some cases political areas have expanded, reached above and below the earth's surface, and made better use of time....Toynbee holds that every culture tends to evolve its 'universal state', a domain roughly co-extensive with the culture. If this is true, then we have another example of the chain from idea through a vast number of decisions...and movements, creating a field and tending towards a political area which would be the universal state of that culture.

### *Utility of the Theory*

The unified field theory according to S.B. Jones, satisfies the first requirement of a successful theory, i.e., a compact description. It may reduce the apparent diversity of aims and methods in political geography...it may help to unify not only the theories of political geography but political theories in general. It may help complete the tie between morphology and function, between region and process. It may show a relationship between grand ideas and the earth's surface.

This unified field theory can provide no more than a clue to explanation, if it even attains that success. It can hardly provide an ultimate answer to any question. But to relate several disciplines, to show connections, may give hints. The user of this theory is at least sure to be warned against single-factor explanations and be led to seek contributions from sister sciences.

It is as a tool for better work that...the chain of words in which theory is expressed constitutes a sort of check list.. by means of which one can orient oneself and tell when one should explore further. To return to the analogy of a chain of basins, one knows through which basin one has entered and where one can travel back and forth. If one begins with the study of a political area, ideas lie at the other end. If a study begins with movement, the scholar knows he should explore in both directions. For some of the basins one may need pilots from other disciplines but at least one has a map of the chain. The theory tells students of geography and politics what...they need to learn from each other, what each has to add, but not how each fences himself off.

Another possible effect of this theory upon geographical work is that it

may inspire the making of new types of studies and the compiling of new kinds of maps. Many maps either show or imply a field, but with the idea-chain in mind...The theory is 'geographical' in that it makes mappable through the concept of field, the results of ideas and decisions that are...not mappable.

The idea-area chain may unite in one concept two main parts of geographical theory, the possibilist and regionalist views. Possibilism focuses on main choices among environmental possibilities. Choices are decisions. They imply ideas and must lead to movements. The regional or chronological approach, beginning with the study of areas, can lead through movement to decisions and ideas.

Finally, the unified field theory may have utility outside academic circles. It seems possible that the concept can be used as an aid in evaluating diplomatic and strategic ideas and plans...diplomacy and strategy begin with ideas, lead to decisions, result in movement and therefore, produce fields. In reverse, diplomacy and strategy are conditioned by the political areas and fields of the earth which limit the possible decisions and practical ideas.

However, the literature of contemporary political geography is wanting in methodological approaches by which general theory and hypotheses can be developed and tested. The four traditional approaches in political geography discussed above, have offered conceptual frameworks for looking at problems rather than specific methodological directions that can be used in theory building. What is needed is a methodology to link effectively political process and its spatial attributes—methodology that, having identified a specific political process, can pinpoint spatially significant phenomena which relate to this process, can observe the impact of these phenomena within some control context, and can correct one process or parts thereof to another...to suggest a model that, though presented as descriptive, may with further research be developed into a normative one.

Works of political geographers as Whittlesey, Hartshorne, Gottmann and Jones are contained in the conceptual building blocks for advancing theory. Whittlesey's emphasis on the law-landscape impress, Hartshorne's linking of functionalism to geographical space, Gottmann's recognition of the disconfirmation between political ideas and political area, and Jones' attempt to develop a unified field theory for linking political ideas and political area are the underpinnings of modern political geographical thought. However, with the exception of Jones, none attempted to suggest a holistic approach, applicable to all levels of the political hierarchy. Moreover, the limited concern with the methodological design may have inhibited the development of useful expository models based on these contributions which could, in turn, have led to a normative model. Thus, Saul B. Cohen and Lewis D. Rosenthal have provided

an alternative approach to the study of political geography, in an article entitled, "A Geographical Model for Political System Analysis", published in the *Geographical Review* in 1971.

### **Political Systems Model**

They contend that political geographers turn more directly to political processes and to the spatial consequences than has heretofore been the case, and that their efforts be cast within a political geographical systems framework. Process is the key to the spatial arrangements and relationships with which the geographer is uniquely concerned. This is not to say that the political geographer should be less geographical or spatial, but that without more attention to the political...Explanation of areal arrangements and landscape is the object of the geographical study of political processes. Whatever predictive value the model developed here may have applied not to the political process, but to the geographical consequences of political process, Political geography is concerned with the spatial attributes of political process.

### **Political Process**

A major point of departure for analysis of political process is the 'political system' within which process operates. Indeed, the concepts of process and system are inseparable. The bases for political systems are the societal forces that shape political institutions and the transactions through which the institutions operate, together with the pertinent environment. In such a context, the political system can be viewed as the end product of the processes by which man organizes himself politically in his particular social and physical environment and in response to outside political systems with their unique environments.

Other elements of the framework of analysis are the 'locational perspective' and the 'open/closed political system'. The locational perspectives in which the political system is viewed by those both within and outside it, is essential to the understanding and the analysis of political process. Where the system is assumed to be (on the local, regional, or global scale) has a great deal to do with the strategy for shaping the system, both by those who guide it and by those who would try to change or otherwise affect it.

Locational perspective is related to perceived needs for external links or connectivity—that is, the degree to which the system is open or closed. Although no system, be it physical, economic or political, ever achieves a completely open or completely closed state, political systems can be classified according to their position along a spectrum, ranging from most nearly open to most nearly closed.

The relationship of the political system to the landscape is direct and far-

reaching which may hypothesize that the open system molds landscapes that are the products of interdependence. Patterns of agglomeration, features of specialized resource use (intensity and fast rates of change), port-of-entry build-ups, internationally diffused features and symbols—these are some of the landscape consequences of the open system. The closed system molds landscapes that are the products of self-containment. Patterns of uniform spread, features of diversified resource use (extensivity and slower, more even rates of change), large numbers of interior central-place facilities, nationally diffused features and symbols—these are consequences of the closed system. Viewing a system within its open or closed context, then provides a benchmark from which to interpret and forecast landscape change.

Since open/closed systems are produced by the movement of men, goods and ideas, the system can be measured through indexes such as visa and immigration policies, diplomatic and other political ties, tariff and trade practices and the use of communications media.

Time scale is implicit in any discussion of process, not just with reference to the open/closed system of locational perspective. In considering relationships between the process and spatial attributes, there are several different time dimensions. The introduction of the transaction and its diffusion from place to place may be short term. The resulting area formation and area interaction, and the attendant changes in basic political structure, take considerably longer. Finally, the relationship of changing political structure, as a process in effecting change in their societal forces, and attendant fundamental landscape change, would take still longer.

...Political processes are inseparable from the overriding societal forces by which man orders his political life. Formal political institutions and social structures such as kinship, class, status, authority, communication, elitism, and bureaucracy are mechanisms (aided by symbols and myths) by which man makes operational such forces as nationalism, internationalism, federalism, capitalism, socialism, democracy, totalitarianism, imperialism, colonization, tribalism, religion and racism. These are examples of societal forces; when such forces, or the ideas and beliefs behind them; relate directly to the political system they become appropriately defined as ideology. Although some of the forces are primarily political (nationalism, democracy, totalitarianism), others that are commonly thought of as economic or cultural are implemented through the political structures of a society and are therefore, included.

By casting political process within the context of societal forces, it becomes operationally feasible to view individual transactions as interconnected episodes. Thus, the transactions dealing with the prevention of land fragmentation may be viewed within the principal forces of feudalism and democracy. Legal systems of primogeniture and land consolidation are interlinked with

kinship and class structure, reflecting such human drives as self-preservation, authority, security and territorial affinity, and are instruments that have preserved or changed the social order. In the case of primogeniture, this law of undivided inheritance by one principal heir maintained class structure in feudalism by warding off dilution of wealth and power. The same law when applied to small farmers and peasants, fulfilled a secondary function of guarding against uneconomical farm plots.

Land consolidation laws, such as those promulgated in north-western Europe since the mid-eighteenth century, helped to change kinship and class structure by altering relationships of individuals to the village, and to the family. Most consolidation laws served to change the social order, encouraging democracy directly by aiding the emergence of an independent farm class, or indirectly by encouraging economic progress in the hope of maintaining political stability.

Concern with overriding societal forces, then...can find a focus in the study of acts of governing that flow from these forces, the act of governing, whereby man applies power, usually through law, to shape the institutions by which the governing process operates, is the key to law-landscape analysis. Significant subsets of governance are elections and other form of leadership legitimation and succession, the degree of compliance with rules of law and tradition, and the perpetuation of military, social-class and trade-union elites. These acts are made operational by specific political transactions, legal, quasi-legal, and extra-legal, the spatial characteristics of which form the analysis thread.

### ***Spatial Attributes***

A basic objective of analyzing process in a spatial context is to examine man's behaviour in space. The law-landscape theme is viewed, therefore, as a reflection of the broader political process-spatial attributes theme. We may be concerned with man's activity in space...or with man's impact on space, which eventually may lead to landscapes with changed or different characteristics whose aggregation will shape or reshape political areas.

'Spatial' is defined as the distributional patterns of political processes and the spatial relations of these patterns with pertinently related phenomena, using space in its sense as a boundless medium. Such patterns and relations form unique 'political action areas' or fields of action. In the political context such action may or may not be synonymous with 'political area'. Indeed, though the action area may not often be identical with the political area at the outset, the interaction of political process and landscape impact comes to a close when action field and political areas are identical. In the usual sequence, it is a major objective for the central authority to establish eventually a state of con-