

Geopolitical Theories Mackinder, Spykman, and Their Modern Relevance

Ankit Kumar

Research Scholar, C.S.J.M. University, Kanpur

Abstract:

Introduction of Halford Mackinder and Nicholas Spykman theory are still relevant in contemporary geopolitics. In 1904, Mackinder put forward his famous Heartland Theory, according to which whoever commanded the Eurasian 'hearth' would dominate the world. This, he said, is the physical centrality of the location, and historically, it has always been virtually impossible to anticipate the behavior of naval powers. Geopolitics, according to Mackinder, surprisingly influenced the 20th century strategy, the world war, and the Cold War. After that, Spykman came up with the Rimland Theory in the 1940s, with an emphasis on the circumatlantic or coastal margins of most of Eurasia. He said that ruling the so-called "Rimland" would provide economic and geopolitical advantages that were also power locations. The containment policy of the Cold War, aimed at preventing Heartland control, appeared to reflect Spykman's concept of positive interaction with Rimland countries. The Russian territorialism and the Chinese Belt and Road Developmental Plan replay the Mackinder in the Eurasia contest exchanges. The contemporary American efforts to contain China, especially through the US, translate Abe's Free and Open Indo-Pacific Strategy as Rimland Theory of Spykman. Both ideas help explain today's wars by painting stable conflict over some regions that result in global dominance. The contrasting concepts presented by Mackinder and Spykman prove that land and sea power theories are as relevant today as they were in the past and therefore demonstrate the heartland-seaboard equilibrium in world politics.

Introduction:

Geopolitics is the science that deals with relationships between geography and the politics of the world powers. To elaborate, it discusses space, territory, resources, climate, and where states and decisions are made in international relationships. It has also come out clearly that geography has defined empires and conflicts occasioned by territorial acquisitions and resource and position-seeking. I still believe it assists states in understanding security, interests, and relations and influences economic strategies, diplomacy, and military strategies in the modern international system and politics.

Geopolitics can be traced back to the twentieth century, when Swedish political scientist Dr. Rudolf Kjellén originated the word from geography and state power. From that time on, other commentators advanced this line of thought, and two of the most important thinkers produced a number of the most acknowledged theories in today's world; these include Halford Mackinder and Nicholas Spykman. There are two important theories of geographical realities. Halford John Mackinder's theory, which is Heartland Theory and Spykman's Rimland Theory.

In 1904, Mackinder introduced the Heartland Theory, which states that the heartland of the continent Eurasia determines world power. He said whoever controls the heartland controls Europe, Asia, and Africa and will be lord of the earth. This concept has been applied in managing wars such as the World Wars as well as the Cold War in order to manage Eurasia. On the other hand, Spykman challenged Mackinder on this assumption with the Rimland concept that was developed outrightly in the 1940s. He considered that the Rimland that includes Eurasia's shores is superior to the Heartland in the middle.

Spykman pointed out that whoever was in control of this Rimland, through which lay access to the world's most strategic land areas and sea trade lanes, would dominate world continental territories and seaborne trade. This idea culminated in cold war US foreign policy, especially in Soviet containment. Thus the politics of geography contains the arguments why governments apply some peculiar strategic plans and how geography shapes the relations of power. Explaining statehood: In this context, geopolitical considerations are required for analysing territorial behaviours, diplomacy, and power politics due to the fact that contemporary geopolitics has origins in the historical period of the world. These geopolitical ideas are actually the imperative concepts that continue to rule superpower power politics today, thus proving the timeliness of these ideas when it comes to anarchy politics in international relations.

Mackinder's Heartland Theory: An In-Depth Analysis

Overview:

The geography and political science have known one of the biggest landmarks in the history of geopolitical concepts thanks to Sir Halford Mackinder's Heartland Theory formulated in 1904. Mackinder was keen to explain new conditions for the management of world power when technological progress influenced the control of territories, and especially war. Accordingly, he wrote that the world could be split into distinct strategic areas, out of which the Heartland of central Eurasia was the most significant. Continent of East Europe Then he said, "Whoever controls East Europe controls Heartland; whoever controls Heartland controls World Island; and whoever controls the World Island controls the world." This statement sums up Mackinder's view that control of this 'heartland' would be equivalent to 'command of the world', and indeed this vast portion of it.

Mackinder's Heartland comprised about the central part of Eurasia, or the continent's inner periphery, which was not easily accessible to seaborne attack because of geographical features, a factor of significance for the time when powers such as Britain ruled the waves and trade. Mackinder was construing a fresh kind of power not in relation to seaworthy proficiency but with the status of being capable of wielding land power across great, unbroken territories.

Key Points of the Heartland Theory:

1. Geographical Pivot:

In his work, Mackinder called it the Geographical Pivot of History. This was not mere hypothesis but the actual evolution of the role of global regions within the system. Mackinder thought that the Heartland was the strategic node because it lies in the geographical centre of Eurasia. It was landlocked and was shielded by a string of natural defences that could lock out naval powers. This central position provided the Heartland with direct access to multiple regions: Western Europe, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia.

Mackinder supposed that a power that could control agricultural and mineral assets of the Heartland would have the grounds for colossal economic might and, therefore, army and political might. However, as technology improved, especially with rail-way infrastructures, it became more possible to exercise and exert power over the extensive geographical environment of Eurasia.

2. The heartland and historical context:

Mackinder's Heartland Theory represents the geopolitical leu of the first twenty years of the past century as well as his prognosis of the world's equilibrium in the future. When he was doing all of this, Britain was on the prime of its colonial power, and it had foreign colonies and colossal navy power. However, Mackinder predicted that a new scenario emerged: the return of the internalised state, where land power overtides sea power and would be partly due to the sprouting of rail roads and industrial development that brought even barren land's into economic production capability.

Heartland refers to a wide area that comprised parts of present-day Russia, Central Asia, and eastern Europe. Mackinder saw this area as the pivot for mastery of a realm he termed the World-Island, the landed masses of Eurasia and Africa together with Europe and Africa with the bulk of the world's people and resources. In his mind, control over the island means control over the world, as Mackinder had optimistically anticipated.

3. Historical Influence and Strategic Implications

Mackinder's Heartland Theory played a great role in both World Wars and later Cold War policies. The account that Mackinder provided during the First World War about the centrality of Central Eurasia to world politics influenced British perceptions of German eastward thrust. Germany's possibility to control the territory of eastern Europe and industrial regions of Russia was regarded as a direct threat to the balance of power in Europe. In the same way, its World War II case where Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union fought for control of the territories of the Heartland region rekindled Mackinder's theoretical assertions.

4. Challenges and Criticisms of the Theory:

However, as much as Mackinder's Heartland Theory was effective, it had its critics. There was Nicholas Spykman who insisted that the continental periphery of Eurasia, the Rimland essentially, had more value to the پيراس as the strategic heartland or the Heartland. Spykman's

Rimland Theory took root, but the U.S. policy in the circles of the Rimland as a rim of Eurasia was to counterbalance the Soviet Union.

The last two criticisms levelled against Mackinder's geographical prediction are related to the fact that the theory seems deterministic. Some schools of thought indicate that some ground in these arguments has been made by technological developments, especially in the areas of air power and ballistic missiles. This is because, as the process of globalisation, economics and technology change the styles in which power was previously projected. New factors such as the use of sea, air, and now cyber have introduced new perspectives into geopolitical power that the purely land-centred theory of Mackinder failed to capture.

5. Modern Relevance of Mackinder's Heartland Theory:

Thus, ignoring its flaws, Mackinder's Heartland Theory remains relevant today's geopolitics."The Heartland region still continues to be a centre of rivalry mainly between Russia, China, and the West. In Ukraine, Russian policies are inarguably serving the purpose of what Mackinder postulated about the centrality of Eastern Europe as the pace to the Heartland. In the same way, China with its Belt and Road plans to connect through infrastructure across and beyond Central Asia and into Europe can be understood as an effort to supply influence across the Heartland and to concentrate capital control in the region.

Mackinder's Heartland Theory formed and underpinned many of the geopolitical conceptions through much of the Twentieth Century, with a focus on the core mass of Eurasia. Though the problems of air power, technological progress, and the vastness of contemporary warfare have enriched the systems of geopolitical tactics, the truth of Mackinder 'that centrality breeds a decisive strategic advantage still holds good. Sovereignty over the Heartland endures to play significant Thirty years after the fact, some of the critical aspects of world power, as well as the power struggles taking place across Eurasia, the continued relevance of Eastern Europe, and the strategic calculations of both Russia and China, Therefore, as we argue, the Heartland Theory remains an important theoretical framework for analysing past, present, and future international relations.

Spykman's Rimland Theory: A Comprehensive Exploration

Overview:

During the 1940s, an American geopolitical thinker named Nicholas Spykman suggested a theory called the Rimland Theory. While Halford Mackinder envisioned the importance of the heartland for geopolitics, Spykman elaborated on why Eurasia was of great importance for that cause. Whereas Mackinder postulated the geographical locus—the Heartland—as the world-controlling core, Spykman believed that the actual strategic perimeter was what he termed the Rimland, the coastal periphery of the Eurasian landmass. Spykman vehemently responded by stating that Mackinder was wrong for claiming that 'Who controls the Rimland, controls Eurasia; who controls Eurasia, controls the fate of the world'. According to his perception,

Rimland played a strategic role as the barrier and a corridor connecting the Heartland to the seas' since this region was central to the world power.

Key Points of the Rimland Theory:

1. Rimland's Importance:

Spykman suggested that Rimland is the most crucial region for power distribution in the world because of its proximity to continents and the sea. The Rimland thus filled the role of a mediated arena between the Heartland as the landmass bearing distinct and significant geographical characteristics and the coastal and island states with present sea power. This area meant the densely populated and economically developed areas that were bound with the ocean to have easy access to the sea lines essential for conducting world trade and war.

And unlike a relatively self-contained Heartland, the Rimland was structurally prone to influence by sea powers, for better and for worse. Spykman also established that geopolitical keys to the success of the Euro-Asia control did not entail the control of its interior but rather the peripheral regions that allowed both access and defendability into the Heartland. Here, it was important to retain control over the Rimland in order to balance the overwhelming power of any would-be hegemonic Heartland power, a la Russia or an increasingly assertive China.

The Rimland could be seen as having filled the role of a strategic geopolitical barrier. As will be seen in later chapters, it served both as a barrier that limited Heartland's controlled territory and as a means of projecting power outward into Eurasia. Spykman saw the reason for keeping strong power out of this zone as this power could project power into Europe, Africa, and Asia and upset the balance of power.

2. Strategic Significance in History:

Many notions of Spykman's Rimland Theory were acutely significant in the understanding of the United States during the Cold War period. He has stated ideas that have contributed directly towards the policy of consideration, a policy that is directed towards the prevention of Soviet influence from getting beyond its boundaries, especially into the Rimland. Spykman's work was influential in guiding U.S. policies that aimed to maintain excellent alliances and Burgess around the coastal areas of Eurasia.

During the Cold War, the United States sought alliances and cooperation agreements with many Rimland countries for positions against the Soviet Union. Alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in Europe and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) in Southeast Asia, as well as bilateral defence pacts with Japan and the Republic of Korea, fit Spykman's dichotomy of semi-peripheral status in the Rimland ring. Thus the U.S. aimed at containing the Soviet Union and making it impossible for the Soviet Union to spread its influence to the Rimland—the most developed and geographically advantageous areas of the world in terms of economy and strategic position.

3. Rimland as a Strategic Buffer and Access Point:

One of Spykman's major insights was that the Rimland served a dual function: This was equally serving a dual purpose of encircling and containing the Heartland while at the same time underlining this bastion as a platform from where influence could be directed inward towards Eurasia. To the maritime states like the US and the UK, the Rimland was important to check any possible land power and the Soviet Union during the Cold War period.

Through intelligence and setting bases, the U.S. and its allies were able to lock-bite the Heartland powers by keeping influence on the Rimland states. Containment for which Kennan was well known but which is actually traceable to Spykman's thinking was about stopping communism from cascading from one country to another, which would pave the way for the Soviets to have their way in the Rimland.

4. Challenges and Evolution of the Theory:

Spykman's Rimland Theory has held a fair bit of expectations for its credentials as well as contained its fair share of controversy and critiques. Technological developments like air superiority, missile defence, and nuclear adeptness have shifted the sixth geopolitical-military balance. The advent of air and space power as major weapons platforms insulates dominating control of the continents from being the decisive factor in the current state of development of strategic forces. Furthermore, the current global economy has replaced the traditional terrestrial and naval power balance with a weight given to the economic power over the physical claimed geographical area.

Nonetheless, there have been dynamics in Spykman's paradigms in relation to adapting in the technological and political revolutions. The importance of the Rimland in strategic calculations can be viewed in the factors of the continuing US-China and US-Russia contest as well as from China's perspective. For example, China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) seeks to extend Chinese control over both the land and sea elements of the Rimland, and at the same time, the United States and its partners use key maritime zones to maintain a check on China's expansionism.

5. Modern Relevance of Spykman's Rimland Theory:

Currently, there are important lessons to be learnt from Spykman's Rimland Theory about the struggle for power and influence within and around the Eurasian continent. In the contemporary world, we can state that the Indo-Pacific strategy of the United States as a response to China's advances is an example of Spykman's views. With the purpose of maintaining the balance of power in this area and possessing the potential to counterbalance China's potential military space dominance, the United States builds close cooperating partnerships with the Rimland states like India, Japan, and Australia.

Spykman brought into the geopolitical theory what was missing in it through her Rimland theory that proactively provides a counterargument to Mackinder's Heartland theory that focusses on peripheral coasts of Eurasia. The Rimland, as pointed out by Spykman, is the centre stage for controlling Eurasia and thus the choice of the control of world power. This point of view contributed greatly to how the United States interacted with the rest of the world during the Cold War with frameworks such as containment and strategic alliances with Rimland nations. When in the bipolar world the role of Heim was thus crucial in the strategy of the bloc, today in the new multipolar world the Rimland again enjoys this importance with constant contests of power in regions such as Indo-Pacific and Middle Eastern regions.

Contemporary Implications of Geopolitical Concepts

Geopolitical theories are long-standing theoretical paradigms that have migrated from the past into the present and constitute influential critical lenses to approach contemporary international relations. These ideas are important for understanding the actions of superpowers as global power relations change in the contemporary century. The struggle for supremacy in Eurasia and other peripheral areas is not alien to the concept emphasised by Mackinder and Spykman based on the geographical factor that remains dominant in the struggle for power and dominance.

1. Heartland Relevance:

Mackinder's Heartland Theory still proves useful in explaining the geopolitical moves specifically of Russia and China in Eurasia. Mackinder suggested that the Heartland, including the area of central Eurasia, is geographically decisive for control over the world, and this idea is echoed in the present Russian regional planning and in the Chinese long-term Belt and Road Initiative project. Activities that Russia has recently conducted, especially in eastern Europe, or its efforts to gain control over the former Soviet republics are directly related to Mackinder's Heartland as the area of vital importance to both stabilising and controlling the region. The occupation of Crimea in 2014 and the control over territories in Ukraine can be viewed as two attempts to regain its natural position of power in the Heartland, which, according to Mackinder, controls the entire world's Eurasia.

China's Belt and Road Initiative also denotes Mackinder's Heartland thesis of dominance now, says Ikenson (2018). BRI is an elaborate connectivity and investment initiative that seeks to connect Asia, Europe, and Africa with a special emphasis on evolving overland routes across the Heartland. Through increasing the integration, the construction of connections, and the development of economic networks within the Central Asian region, China is guaranteed to strengthen its hold in Heartland as proposed by Mackinder. The move benefits China economically, but aside from economic gain, it will also penetrate most Eurasian countries and make China the powerful force that it is today. This is well depicted by focussing on railway, highway, and pipe-line constructions, showing that Mackinder believed that control of the Heartland could be dominated by a network of overland facilities. For China, the security of the Heartland becomes a priority since it aids the country's vision of reducing the reliance on

sea trading ways that are easily closed and that it get a strong base on the continents of Europe and Asia.

2. Rimland Relevance:

Rimland Theory of Spykman is as valid today as it was in the mid-twentieth century, especially for analysing geopolitics of the Indo-Pacific. According to Spykman, the coastal regions of Eurasia, known as the Rimland, were the strategic keys to world power. Today, the Indo-Pacific region has become the epicentre of competition in the world, and, therefore, with the help of Spykman's theory. The U.S. and its allies have focused most of their strategic planning on gaining dominance in the Pacific and Indian oceans for the qualities of access to sea lanes and containing China, which is a land power—a peripheral strategy by Spykman.

Spykman, for this reason, envisaged the formation of alliances such as the Quad, which comprises the United States, India, Japan, and Australia. It seems that close cooperation with the selected states from the countries on the verge of Eurasia is to provide the United States with a powerful counterbalance to China. The Quad is aimed at advocating for a 'Free and Open Indo-Pacific', something that is in line with Spykman's postulations in regard to the importance of the Rimland in containing access to both land and sea. This approach is designed to stop one country, which today is China, from achieving hegemony in the Indo-Pacific area, which is a crucial place of the overall trade connection and security.

The Rimland Theory remains right as the contemporary evolution, such as the increase in China's military expansion in the South China Sea. Therefore, the South China Sea is a part of the Rimland since controlling this area enables China to dominate the entire Indo-Pacific region in direct violation of the maritime dominance as enjoyed long by the United States. In return, the United States, along with its allies, has launched Freedom of Navigation Operations (FONOPs), carrying out navigation through the international waters to enforce the application of free passage through the sea for retaining influence over the Rimland. This conflict over the ownership of the South China Sea is perfectly in synch with Spykman's theory of the Rimland's significance in encircling the Heartland, thereby denying it dominance and equally using it as a tactical ground in launching a maritime potentiate.

3. Comparative Modern Application:

These theories allow students to view today's strategies from different points of view and are both still relevant today. Indeed, Mackinder's Heartland Theory can be useful in understanding why Russia and China attach so much importance to Central Asia and Eastern Europe as key areas that offer striking capabilities for gaining control over Eurasian space. The actions of Russia to keep a hegemonic hold over its 'near abroad' and of China using the Belt and Road for overland connectivity lap up Mackinder's tenets. These actions are fashioned to give a firm grip on the Heartland and guarantee that no outer force can extend authority into these vulnerable regions conveniently.

Alternatively, Spykman's Rimland Theory offers insight into why the U.S. and its allies invest a great deal of attention in the Indo-Pacific as a critical maritime periphery that creates the possibility of exerting pressure on the world in terms of power projection and business influence. The positioning of NATO in the West and Quad and AUKUS in the Indo-Pacific shows commitment to the containment of the Rimland by Western powers so that the heartland powers don't emerge as dominant.

Conclusion

Mackinder and Spykman's geopolitical theories, which formed the backbone of world politics, are still relevant and are still very much in force in the twenty-first century. The Heartland Theory by Mackinder and the Rimland Theory by Spykman offer two theories that offer a way of understanding the historical and contemporary contest for power by world powers with a focus in geographical factors that define power in the world.

The geography tradition of thought, Heartland Theory, was developed by Halford John Mackinder half a century earlier in the twentieth century and notes the centrality of the Eurasian landmass known as the Heartland as the pivot for control of worldmint. He still strongly believed that whoever gets control over this region would desire to dominate the world, which can be seen in both Russia and China today. Subversive actions sought by Russia for controlling eastern Europe and 'Belt and Road' in Asia intended by China also convey the reason for Heartland's signification for power accumulation. Thus, it is possible to observe how, in these cases, Mackinder's concepts still help us analyse regional contentious issues as well as economic and infrastructural integration projects focused on consolidating power over Eurasia.

References:

1. Mackinder, H. J. (1904). "The Geographical Pivot of History." *The Geographical Journal*, 23(4), 421-437.
2. Mackinder, H. J. (1919). *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
3. Spykman, N. J. (1942). *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
4. Spykman, N. J. (1944). *The geography of the peace*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
5. Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.
6. Cohen, S. B. (2009). *Geopolitics: The Geography of International Relations*. Rowman & Littlefield.
7. Kaplan, R. D. (2012). *The Revenge of Geography: What the Map Tells Us About Coming Conflicts and the Battle Against Fate*. New York: Random House.

8. Kennan, G. F. (1947). "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs*, 25(4), 566-582.
9. Grey, C. S. (1988). *The Geopolitics of Superpower*. University Press of Kentucky.
10. Dodds, K. (2005). *Global Geopolitics: A Critical Introduction*. Pearson Education.
11. Holslag, J. (2019). China's Belt and Road Initiative and the Future of Global Order. *Asia Policy*, 14(3), 66-72.
12. O'Tuathail, G. (1996). *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space*. University of Minnesota Press.
13. Mead, W. R. (2014). "The Return of Geopolitics." *Foreign Affairs*, 93(3), 69-79.
14. Grygiel, J. J. (2006). *Great Powers and Geopolitical Change*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
15. Scott, D. (2013). "The Indo-Pacific in U.S. Strategy: Responding to the Rise of China." *Rising Powers Quarterly*, 3(2), 19-32.