

Review of: "Geopolitical constructs of international politics - their cultural & ideological roots"

Hélder Marques¹

¹ Universidade do Porto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Geopolitics is undeniably nowadays in vogue. Wars always call our attention to the international sphere, taking into account that we naturally tend to focus on the national space. This article, besides well-written, is indeed quite pertinent. Undoubtedly, it has the merit of stressing the mere fact that the United Nations are somehow obsolete. The world nowadays is very different from what it was in 1945 and therefore it is not actual and does not correspond to the world's needs that the five World War II winners remain with the veto power. A reformulation is utterly required. As such, the author elegantly demonstrates how the league nations and diplomacy were a disaster, incapable of avoiding another war. Nevertheless, it must be wondered on which bases and assumptions are we going to erect that type of fair organisation, capable of eradicating conflicts establishing fair agreements among nations. The author is correct about suggesting that the UN is obsolete but what is the alternative? In order to create a new organisation, a new world order would be required and that is, probably, only possible with war.

The article presents a criticism to the Euro-centric way of seeing the world, and therefore geopolitics. However, the examples provided with China and Egypt are as not as useful as he wished to, perhaps, get his point. They lack applicability to support his assumptions and are temporally very distant from our time. The fact there was negotiations and some sort of diplomacy or, if we prefer, a way to solve conflict before Westphalia appears to be evident. Moreover, the author gives the impression that history cannot be understood in a euro-centric way. But he lacks solidity in providing wider cultural and historical experiences as it was his goal at the beginning. Certainly, narrow conceptualisations historically and culturally need to be extended but that doesn't get us to the point he wanted to make.

To sum up, the article is challenging and relevant. Perhaps, the mechanisms he uses to prove his correct assumptions regarding institutions are not the most accurate. In spite of that, the fact that international law does not cover every major State and the United Nations are obsolete are absolutely true. Concerning his visions about the transition from a unipolar to a multipolar world, there is a vast discussion ahead of us. The world is inherently unstable. It has ever been. Definitely, the world inevitably lacks order. As a result, when we speak of order, we must take into account that perhaps disorder is the most accurate word to describe what we witness. What are the arguments to consider that China and Russia are somehow rising? Are they economic, militarily? And what happens to the UK and France who would lose their veto power? What would be the criteria? Wouldn't that turn the world even more favourable to great power's expansionism? The fact that we are moving onto a multipolar world lacks evidence and solidity. From an economic, militarily and political point of view it remains still a unipolar world.

