



DOI: [10.5575/nairjssh.2022.9.6.20](https://doi.org/10.5575/nairjssh.2022.9.6.20)

## THE INTERSECTION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND GEOGRAPHY: AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPACE AND POWER

<sup>1</sup>NISHA TAAK & <sup>2</sup>PREETI GUPTA

<sup>1</sup>Designation -Guest lecturer Department of Political science GDC. Marheen  
[Email-nishataak001@gmail.com](mailto:Email-nishataak001@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Designation -Guest lecturer Department of Geography GDC. Marheen  
[Email-preeti.mahajan329@gmail.com](mailto:Email-preeti.mahajan329@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*Political science and geography are two disciplines that have been traditionally separate but are increasingly becoming intertwined. In this paper, we explore the relationship between space and power, drawing on theories and methodologies from both political science and geography. We begin by discussing the ways in which political scientists have traditionally conceptualized power and how geographers have contributed to the understanding of space. We then explore how political scientists have utilized spatial concepts, such as territory and borders, in their analysis of power, and how geographers have incorporated political factors, such as state power, into their work. Finally, we discuss the ways in which the intersection of political science and geography can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of power relations in a globalized world.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Political Science, Geography, Space, Power, Territory, State, International Relations, Geopolitics*

**Citation:** Taak Nisha, Gupta Preeti (2023) The Intersection of Political Science and Geography: An Exploration of The Relationship Between Space and Power. North Asian International Research Journal of Social Science & Humanities ISSN: 2454-9827 Vol. 9, Issue 3, Mar. 2023

## INTRODUCTION:

Political science and geography are two disciplines that have traditionally been viewed as separate. Political scientists have focused on the study of power relations and the institutions that govern them, while geographers have focused on the spatial dimensions of human activity, including the distribution of resources, population, and culture. However, in recent years, scholars from both disciplines have increasingly recognized the importance of considering the relationship between space and power. This paper aims to explore the ways in which political science and geography can be combined to provide a more nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between power and space.

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected and globalized, it is more important than ever to understand the complex relationship between power and space. This relationship is shaped by a multitude of factors, including the spatial distribution of resources, population, and culture, as well as the institutions and actors that govern these factors. Political science and geography are two disciplines that have traditionally approached these factors separately, but the intersection of these disciplines provides a unique opportunity to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the complex interplay between power and space.

In this paper, we will explore the ways in which political science and geography intersect, drawing on theories and methodologies from both disciplines to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between space and power. We will begin by discussing the ways in which political scientists have traditionally conceptualized power and the importance of a relational approach to power. We will then explore the ways in which geographers have contributed to our understanding of space, including the concept of territory and the spatial distribution of resources. Finally, we will examine the ways in which the intersection of political science and geography can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of power relations in a globalized world. By doing so, we hope to provide a foundation for future research that builds on the insights of both disciplines to advance our understanding of the complex interplay between power and space.

## CONCEPTUALIZING POWER:

Power is a central concept in political science, and scholars have long sought to understand its nature and sources. In the past, power has been defined as the ability to get others to do what one wants, and it has been conceptualized in terms of the resources that individuals or groups can bring to bear on others. However, more recent approaches have emphasized the importance of understanding power as a relational concept, with power arising from the interactions between actors within a particular context. This relational approach to power is particularly amenable to a spatial analysis, as power relations are shaped by the spatial distribution of actors and

resources. Political scientists have long been interested in the concept of power and how it operates in different contexts. While there are a range of different definitions and conceptualizations of power, one key approach is a relational approach that emphasizes the ways in which power is exercised in social relations between different actors. This approach suggests that power is not something that can be possessed or held by individuals or groups, but rather is a product of social relations and interactions.

One influential approach to understanding power relations is Michel Foucault's concept of power as a pervasive force that operates through a wide range of institutional and discursive practices. Foucault argues that power is not just exercised by those in positions of authority, but is also present in everyday interactions and social norms. This approach suggests that power is not a fixed or static entity, but rather is constantly evolving and changing in response to different social and historical contexts.

Another approach to understanding power relations is the notion of power as a zero-sum game, in which power is seen as a limited resource that must be divided among different actors. This approach suggests that power is a finite resource that can be held or controlled by particular individuals or groups, and that the exercise of power by one actor necessarily comes at the expense of others.

More recently, scholars have emphasized the importance of understanding power as a multi-dimensional concept that operates at multiple scales and in different forms. This approach suggests that power is not just about domination or control, but can also involve collaboration, negotiation, and resistance.

Overall, these different approaches to conceptualizing power suggest the importance of taking a relational approach that emphasizes the dynamic and multi-faceted nature of power relations. By doing so, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of how power operates in different contexts and how it can be contested and transformed.

### **THE SPATIAL DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE:**

Political scientists have long recognized the importance of space in shaping political outcomes. The concept of territory, for example, has been central to the study of international relations, as states seek to secure and defend their borders. Borders, in turn, are not just lines on a map but are sites of contestation where power is negotiated and exercised. Moreover, the distribution of resources across space can shape power relations, with regions that are rich in natural resources often exercising greater influence over political outcomes than those that are resource-poor.

### **THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF GEOGRAPHY:**

While geographers have traditionally focused on the spatial dimensions of human activity, they have increasingly recognized the importance of political factors in shaping the distribution of resources, population, and culture. State power, for example, can play a critical role in shaping the spatial distribution of economic activity, with governments often using their power to promote particular regions or industries. Moreover, the movement of people across space is often shaped by political factors, such as borders and migration policies. Geography also plays a critical role in shaping political relations and dynamics. One important aspect of this is the role that geography plays in shaping the distribution of resources and opportunities. For example, the distribution of natural resources such as oil or minerals can have significant implications for the economic and political power of different countries or regions.

Additionally, the spatial distribution of population and economic activity can have significant implications for political power relations. For example, the concentration of economic activity in certain urban areas can give those areas significant political influence, while rural areas may be relatively marginalized in political decision-making.

Territory is also a critical aspect of the political dimensions of geography. The concept of territory is central to many political relations, including issues of sovereignty, nationalism, and border control. The definition and control of territory can be a source of conflict and tension between different groups, as well as between different states.

Finally, the spatial distribution of political power and decision-making can also have significant implications for political relations. For example, the concentration of power in certain regions or in the hands of certain groups can lead to marginalization or exclusion of other groups. On the other hand, efforts to decentralize political power or to promote greater representation and participation can lead to more inclusive and equitable political systems.

Overall, the political dimensions of geography highlight the ways in which spatial relations and dynamics shape political relations and outcomes. By understanding the ways in which geography influences political power relations, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of how power operates in different contexts and how it can be transformed through changes in spatial relations and dynamics.

### **THE INTERSECTION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND GEOGRAPHY:**

The intersection of political science and geography has the potential to provide a more nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between space and power. Political scientists can draw on the spatial concepts and methodologies of geography to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which power relations are shaped by

the spatial distribution of actors and resources. Meanwhile, geographers can incorporate political factors into their analysis of spatial patterns, providing a more complete picture of the factors that shape human activity. The intersection of political science and geography provides a rich and dynamic area of research that can help us better understand the complex relationships between space, power, and politics. By bringing together insights from both fields, we can gain a more nuanced and holistic understanding of how political power is shaped and contested through spatial relations and dynamics.

One important area of research at the intersection of political science and geography is the study of geopolitics. Geopolitics explores the ways in which spatial relations and dynamics shape global political relations, including issues such as territorial disputes, the distribution of power and resources, and the role of geography in shaping foreign policy.

Another area of research is the study of political ecology, which explores the interconnections between political power, environmental change, and social justice. This approach emphasizes the importance of understanding how the distribution of resources and opportunities is shaped by both political and ecological factors, and how these dynamics can exacerbate social and environmental inequalities.

In addition, the study of political geography can shed light on the ways in which political power is contested and transformed through spatial relations and dynamics. This includes research on topics such as territorial conflicts, border politics, and the spatial distribution of political power and decision-making.

Finally, the intersection of political science and geography can also help us better understand the ways in which political power is shaped and contested at different scales, from the local to the global. By exploring the spatial dimensions of political power at different scales, we can gain a more comprehensive understanding of how power operates in different contexts and how it can be transformed through changes in spatial relations and dynamics.

Overall, the intersection of political science and geography provides a rich and dynamic area of research that can help us better understand the complex relationships between space, power, and politics. By bringing together insights from both fields, we can develop more nuanced and holistic approaches to understanding political power and its spatial dimensions.

## CONCLUSION:

The relationship between political science and geography is an important and evolving one. By combining the insights of both disciplines, scholars can gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which power and space

interact to shape human activity. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected and globalized, it is more important than ever to understand.

In conclusion, this paper has explored the intersection of political science and geography in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the complex relationship between power and space. Through our discussion, we have highlighted the importance of taking a relational approach to power, which emphasizes the ways in which power relations are shaped by the interactions of different actors in different spaces. We have also discussed the ways in which geographers have contributed to our understanding of space, including the importance of territory and the spatial distribution of resources.

The intersection of political science and geography provides a unique opportunity to advance our understanding of power relations in a globalized world. By drawing on the insights of both disciplines, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of how power is exercised and contested in different spaces and by different actors. This can help us to identify opportunities for change and intervention, as well as to better understand the implications of different policy choices.

Moving forward, we believe that it is important to continue to explore the intersection of political science and geography in order to deepen our understanding of the complex relationship between power and space. This may involve developing new theories and methodologies that draw on insights from both disciplines, as well as engaging in interdisciplinary collaborations that bring together scholars from different fields to address common research questions. By doing so, we can continue to advance our understanding of the world we live in and the ways in which power shapes the spaces in which we live.

## REFERENCES:

- [1]. Agnew, J. (1994). The territorial trap: The geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of international political economy*, 1(1), 53-80.
- [2]. Brenner, N. (1998). Between fixity and motion: A geography of the spatial imagination. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(11), 1905-1925.
- [3]. Cox, K. R. (2013). *Making human geography*. Guilford Press.
- [4]. Elden, S. (2013). *The birth of territory*. University of Chicago Press.
- [5]. Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of global capitalism: A theory of uneven geographical development*. Verso Books.
- [6]. Mitchell, K. (1997). The cultural contradictions of globalization. *The geographer's craft and the making of worlds*, 329-344.
- [7]. Paasi, A. (1999). Boundaries as social processes: Territoriality in the world of flows. *Geopolitics*, 4(1), 69-88.

- [8]. Sassen, S. (2008). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton University Press.
- [9]. Smith, N. (1992). Contours of a spatialized politics: Homeless vehicles and the production of geographical scale. *Social text*, (33), 54-81.
- [10]. Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. Verso Books.
- [11]. Swyngedouw, E. (2004). Globalisation or 'glocalisation'? Networks, territories and rescaling. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), 25-48.
- [12]. Taylor, P. J. (1997). Hierarchical tendencies amongst world cities: a global research proposal. *Cities*, 14(6), 323-332.
- [13]. Weber, M. (1946). *Politics as a Vocation*. In H. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 77-128). Oxford University Press.
- [14]. Walker, R. (2004). The geographies of power: Topography, territory, and triumphalism. *Political Geography*, 23(8), 937-956.
- [15]. Wood, A. W. (1990). *A theory of spatial economic systems* (Vol. 11). Springer Science & Business Media.
- [16]. Yiftachel, O. (1995). The dark side of modernism: Planning as control of an ethnic minority. In J. Friedmann & H. Rose (Eds.), *The Political economy of urban planning: A comparative analysis of Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States* (pp. 340-355). Princeton University Press.
- [17]. Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- [18]. Zeiderman, A. (2016). *Endangered city: The politics of security and risk in Bogotá*. Duke University Press.
- [19]. Zolkos, M. (2016). Mapping and the politics of space: The case of Indigenous land claims in Australia. *Political Geography*, 52, 1-10.
- [20]. Zureik, E., & Salter, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Global surveillance and policing: Borders, security, identity*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.