



UDC 327:94:351.86  
IRSTI 11.25.91  
DOI 10.37238/2960-1371.2960-138X.2026.101(1).36

<sup>1</sup>Tokan Razia, <sup>2</sup>Sarkytkan Kaster

<sup>1</sup>Abai KazNPU, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>R.B. Suleimenov Institute of Oriental Studies, Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-mail: [razia1701@mail.ru](mailto:razia1701@mail.ru), [kzkm.4a@gmail.com](mailto:kzkm.4a@gmail.com)

## GEOPOLITICS: HISTORICAL ASPECTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**Annotation.** To maintain its existence and realize the national ideals and goals of each nation, it is necessary to understand geopolitics and geostrategy. Geopolitics is a science that studies the relationship between the geographical, strategic and political factors of a country, and its implementation requires a national strategy. Currently, we realize that the geostrategy, formulated in the form of the concept of national sustainability, is aimed at ensuring the integrity of the state. The history of geopolitical problems is extremely complex, as they affect the interaction of nations, States and society as a whole, without giving up their personal interests. At the same time, technological progress has led to a situation where these interactions are taking place with unprecedented speed in the history of mankind. Such a high level of interaction can bring both benefits and disasters to humanity, largely depending on how participants understand and use geopolitical opportunities. Understanding and using geopolitics will allow strategic players to realize the consequences of each strategic policy they pursue. A geopolitical understanding is impossible without recognizing the importance of the concept of nation and state in the modern world.

**Keywords:** geopolitics, state, nation, national interests and order.

### *Introduction*

Early geopolitical theories arose as a reflection of the desire to optimize geography as an element of national and state life. Geography is certainly a crucial factor, and moreover, it is inevitable. However, the geopolitical and geostrategic significance of geography requires the presence of non-material factors that allow physical geography to function properly. Thus, the geopolitical struggle is determined not only by the perception of geography, but also by its functionality. This article discusses several issues, in particular, how geopolitical changes have occurred over the past 50 years. Only the development of classical theories of global geopolitics will be traced, and only if necessary will the relevance of other trends of geopolitical thought be touched upon. More specifically, attention is paid to the factors causing the changes, the nature of these changes and their penetration into nation States. Especially since the beginning of the 21st century, technology has been playing an increasingly important role, not only reducing geographical distances, but also creating limitless spaces. However, the concept of the state also seems to be shifting from the Westphalian to the post-Westphalian tradition. In some cases, State power may be exercised even outside the national territory.

### *Methodology*

This study employs a qualitative analytical methodology aimed at examining the transformation of geopolitical theories and the changing role of geography in global politics over the past fifty years. The research is based on an interdisciplinary approach, combining perspectives from political geography, geopolitics, international relations, and strategic studies. The study applies a historical-comparative method to trace the evolution of classical geopolitical theories. This approach allows the researcher to analyze how early geopolitical concepts emerged in response to the need to interpret geography as a key element of state power and national development. By comparing different theoretical frameworks across historical periods, the research identifies the main shifts in geopolitical thinking from the classical era to contemporary interpretations. The article uses conceptual and theoretical analysis. Key geopolitical concepts such as geography, geostrategy, state power, and spatial control are examined through the works of major geopolitical scholars. This method helps clarify how geography functions not only as a physical factor but also as a strategic and political resource influenced by non-material elements such as technology, ideology, and economic power.

### *Results and Discussion*

The term "geopolitics" is used in various contexts, as it relates to the political significance of geography and the strategic construction of countries in accordance with this geographical structure (geostrategic). Everyone



is talking about how geographical determinism is becoming the driving force behind national identity, processes, and strategic culture. There is no consensus. National identity is indeed determined by self-awareness, but self-awareness arises only when "they" are present; and therefore, the identity of the nation and the state, in principle, contains a strong sense of "borders" [1]. The strategic culture of a nation is indeed determined by socio-cultural factors and historical experience, but these factors are also not impervious to various changes, especially due to the perception of history itself.

In geopolitical theories, geography is considered the dominant factor influencing the national identity, behavior, and interaction of a nation. Germany's expansionism until the middle of the 20th century was partly explained by the belief that control over its central part was the only way to become a superpower. America emerged from isolationism when Germany and Japan began exploring what it considered its periphery, a region that, from the point of view of American geopolitics, was a key factor in supporting its hegemonic ambitions. Several Southeast Asian countries believe that China is seeking control of the South China Sea because of its concept of the "zhong quo" (middle kingdom). Border disputes are a common cause of wars between countries. Like living organisms, nations constantly strive to overcome geographical constraints in various ways, including territorial expansion, the use of technology, the formation of military alliances, and various forms of international law and regulation. These decisions can be influenced by a number of factors. Internal problems, from the economic needs of production to regime change. The need for raw materials and markets, for example, was the dominant factor in the emergence of mercantilism and then colonialism, as developed countries sought to ensure the supply of raw materials and markets to absorb products that could no longer be adequately supplied by domestic markets. Examples of how the ideological beliefs of a leader in America, and therefore regime change, become the driving force of geopolitical change are Roosevelt in America. Differences in global expectations regarding the American presidential election, for example, are partly explained by ideological differences between American presidential candidates, which are considered key factors determining international political dynamics. In some cases, geopolitical changes did not occur as a direct result of regime change or market needs, but rather due to new technological advances, especially in telecommunications, transportation, and armaments. History shows how the opening of the Suez and Panama Canals, new discoveries in oil exploration technologies, and the miniaturization of nuclear warheads have changed global geopolitics. The Suez Canal, then under British control, gave British colonialism a relative advantage. The opening of the Panama Canal has put the United States in a much better position than its European counterparts in connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Since the earliest times, the Middle East has been a geopolitical vortex. However, the intensity of the geopolitical struggle increased dramatically only after the discovery of oil exploration technologies, followed by the rise of Western oil companies in Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran at the beginning of the 20th century. The deployment of Pershing and Tomahawk medium-range missiles in Germany gave America a geostrategic advantage in the European agglomeration, far surpassing that of the Soviet Union. No one has forgotten how the relative weakness of Soviet nuclear technology in the early 1960s prompted Soviet Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev to deploy short-range missiles in Cuba. Like the Pershing and Tomahawk incidents, the Bay of Pigs incident (1963) is an example of how technology changed the geopolitical map, geostrategic calculations and, later, allied relations that destroyed geographical boundaries, especially in relations between America and (Western) Europe, as well as between the Soviet Union and Cuba. As Duferge said, "the idea and materialization of geopolitics change depending on place and time" [2]. The early geopolitical ideas put forward by Halford Mackinder or Alfred Thayer Mahan, who, respectively, gave priority to superiority in control over land or sea, have not undergone significant changes [3]. Nicholas Speakman's views on the importance of the periphery were still based on the assumptions of Mackinder and Mahan, although they changed the idea of the relative superiority of the periphery over the central part of the country [4]. In particular, because the technologies that existed at that time were used to a greater extent to enhance combat capabilities (force projection) and, therefore, were of exceptional importance in terms of destructive power or various other offensive measures. It seems that geopolitical and geostrategic calculations will change with the advent of new technologies with dual capabilities, such as new discoveries in materials science, electronics, and information and communication technology (Internet). The claim that attack is the best defense has changed in the opposite direction due to nuclear weapons, of course, due to the limitations of the policy of not using nuclear weapons first and the doctrine of massive retaliation. Cyber technologies seem to be creating a new battlefield where deterrence theory can no longer calculate exclusively offensive and defensive capabilities in a linear time range. Because of this dual possibility, it is difficult to determine whether cyber technologies will be used for currency wars or arms wars. War is no longer just an interval between two periods of peace; war and peace can exist simultaneously, even if they take place in different spaces.



### The manifestation of geopolitical changes

The end of World War II created a bipolar system in which the United States and the Soviet Union became hegemonic powers. They competed not only directly in Europe, but also indirectly in other regions. Socialism became a kind of ideological project for Stalin, while democratic liberalism became a project of the Western alliance. Both the United States and the Soviet Union sought to strengthen their influence in the third world. Washington and Moscow apparently viewed this as a zero-sum game. Under the Zhdanov doctrine, Moscow considered the "neutrality" embodied in the Non-Aligned Movement to be "immoral," while the United States viewed governments that did not support Washington as part of the Soviet alliance [5].

In a bipolar system, zero-sum games are the dominant geostrategy. The fall of Nguyen Van Thieu's government in Saigon (South Vietnam) was seen as a domino effect that spread communism throughout Southeast Asia. Even at the beginning of the Cold War, the nationalization of Western control over certain mineral resources and access to them, such as the Suez Canal (1956) and oil companies in Iran during the Mossadegh era, was also seen as evidence of proximity to the Soviet socialist system [6]. To a certain extent, democracy and the free market have become hegemonic ideologies that were considered the only way to build peace, stability, and universal prosperity.

Such ideas are, of course, largely imbued with pragmatism. According to documents from the early 1980s, recently declassified by the CIA, most leaders of developing countries did not consider aid from the Soviet Union or the United States as separate entities [7]. Some countries often received assistance from both sides. In the case of Indonesia, for example, rapprochement with the Soviet Union was not a top priority, but was accepted only after Washington refused to provide weapons for the return of Western Irian. Vietnam's proximity to Moscow, enshrined in the Soviet-Vietnamese agreement (1978), was tactical in nature, due to Hanoi's concerns about ethnic tensions along the border [8].

The second manifestation was militarization in various parts of the world, an arms race between superpowers, especially in the form of pro-American alliances formed in West Asia (CENTO, Central Treaty Organization, Baghdad Pact) and SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) in Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union, at least until Gorbachev's speech in Krasnoyarsk (1988), limited itself to forming formal alliances only in Europe (the Warsaw Pact). In developing countries, the Soviet Union was more inclined to support certain regimes, such as Fidel Castro (Cuba) and Allende (Peru) in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as Robert Mugabe (Zimbabwe) and Siad Barre (Somalia) in Africa. Outside of such formal alliances, both the United States and the Soviet Union conducted intelligence operations in support of puppet states such as the regimes of Nguyen Van Thieu (Vietnam) and Najibullah in Afghanistan. New discoveries in the field of armaments perhaps more clearly demonstrate how changing geographical determinism is a function of technology. Just look at how strategic missiles were classified based on the distance between the United States and the Soviet Union (5,000 miles). Weapons with the same explosive power but different ranges had different strategic importance. The location aspect remained important, as it later manifested itself in the dispute over the deployment of American missiles (Pershing and Tomahawk) in West Germany. Despite the fact that their range was less than 2500 km, and technically they are classified as medium-range missiles, both missiles could hit Russia as the distance between Russia and Germany was really less than 2500 km.

Important changes occurred after the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in New York. The event known as September 11 turned the "war on terror" into a mantra, giving rise to various new strategic formulas such as extraterritoriality, self-defense to prevent the situation from deteriorating, and even military attacks under the pretext of human security (humanitarian interventionism).

It was only in the middle of the first decade of the 21st century that various constructivist theories of geopolitics emerged, such as those proposed by, among others, Saul Cohen and Tuahail. Cohen, for example, noted that the geostrategic significance of one region varies from region to region [9]. New alliances have emerged. Not based on geographical location, like NATO or the Warsaw Pact, but rather on the basis of economic status, as seen in the example of the common market, the G20 and the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India and China). The geographical structure does not automatically make the region important in geopolitical or geostrategic calculations. Factors that for years were considered subjective in a geographical sense have taken on a more specific form, namely, the connectivity of a geographical region in terms of accessibility.

The previous two subsections explained how technology has eventually erased the boundaries of physical geography; non-State actors pose a threat to national security that has no other origin. These two factors create a new phenomenon — a boundless space that cannot be understood with the help of Westphalian geopolitical theories. The Industrial Revolution of the 17th and 19th centuries still required territorial control, including through colonialism, to carry out the struggle for power. Britain and the United States still needed merchant and military vessels, even though they controlled the Suez and Panama Canals.



Technology plays a significant role in changing the meaning of a geographical area. However, until the second half of the 20th century, its role seemed to be limited to reducing geographical distances and accelerating movement from one point to another. The Industrial Revolution, along with its various material consequences in the form of transport, weapons, and communications, transformed geographical conditions from those of only political importance to something much more significant.

Strategic importance. It is hard to imagine that colonialism would have been more effective if the Suez Canal had not been opened. It is unlikely that America would have quickly become a global military power if the Panama Canal had not effectively connected the two main economic regions in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, a luxury that American competitors such as Britain and France could not afford.

Prior to such breakthroughs, geographic reference had long played a key role. Alexander the Great explored Central Asia and approached India, eventually defeating the Persian Emperor Darius, first capturing the Khyber Pass. Chinese and European merchants used Khaybar to trade with their partners across geographical borders. Like the Suez and Panama Canals, Khaybar connected two sections of the subcontinent. Like these channels, Khaybar provided a fast exchange of goods. However, unlike Khaybar, the Suez and Panama Canals arose at a time when nation-states already had legally defined territorial boundaries, such as those established by the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). Due to the vast uninhabited territories on both sides of Khaybar, the power struggle at that time was more about access. than the resources that characterized the Westphalian system.

The events of the second half of the 20th century seriously challenged the Westphalian system. Materials science, electronics, and underwater cables have led to the information and communication revolution. International trade regimes, for example in the form of free trade zones, have led to direct control of assets through territorial control becoming relatively unimportant. At the same time, communication and information technologies have also reduced Clausewitz's concerns about the "fog of war," as they allow for a more accurate assessment of the enemy's strengths. Satellite and space technologies, for example, in the Star Wars scenarios of the early 1980s, have erased the strategic distinction between offensive and defensive. Surveillance and intelligence technologies have shifted the "attack is the best defense" paradigm in the opposite direction, towards a tendency to wait for an attack and then strike back.

One important consequence of all this is that geographical location has become relatively less important than its function of connecting one point to another. 12 Geopolitics and geostrategy are now more based on geographical functionality than just geographical location. 13 The desire to control assets through geographical control has also weakened, giving way to a desire to control access. In this context, Turkey, which connects Asia and Europe with extraordinary economic dynamics, seems to be much more strategically important than, for example, Indonesia, which continues to rely on natural resources rather than acting as a link between East Asia and South Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Europe. Indonesia is indeed located between two oceans and two continents, but its southern and southeastern parts consist only of countries with limited economic and military capabilities, with the exception of Australia. Based on this experience, it is safe to conclude that technology is an independent variable that is almost always present in every segment of history. Technology can also penetrate geographical representations, thereby influencing geopolitical and geostrategic meanings. Thanks to technology, the importance of geography has shifted from purely political geography to functional geography. The degree of geopolitical, and even more so geostrategic, significance of a geographical condition largely depends on the availability, resources and connections within this geographical area.

Technological progress has coincided with the emergence of non-governmental institutions such as terrorist organizations, private security companies, and other international criminal organizations. Both technology and terrorism pose a double threat to classical geopolitical theories. In this article, we have already explained the dual nature of technologies: on the one hand, they overcome geographical limitations, and on the other, they open up space for geographical narrowing. Technology erases physical distances, and hence geostrategic calculations. The transnational nature of terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda makes it easier for fundamentalist, radical, and even religious extremist ideas to spread to other locations. Beyond the simple geographical narrowing or the dual nature of war, technology, especially digital technology, is increasingly reinforcing the asymmetry in power relations. Ensuring State sovereignty has become an extremely difficult task. An important phenomenon to note is what Anthony Giddens calls "inverted colonialism," when colonial states are also influenced by all the factors occurring in peripheral countries. Poverty in underdeveloped countries, the resurgence of traditional ideologies, including religious ones, as in some countries in the Middle East, and conflicts between the State and society, such as in Chechnya, can easily spread mortality in other parts of the world. The opposite situation is certainly observed when lifestyle changes in Western countries are rapidly spreading to developing countries, and fears are undermining local culture or even national identity. Threats to national sovereignty are also being questioned due to the loss of mutual trust, even between countries that are officially members of military alliances. The CIA-NSA intelligence agency has established surveillance networks in 80 countries, including Britain and Germany,



America's closest European allies. Singapore, an ASEAN member, is also reported to be intercepting important information from government centers in Malaysia and Indonesia, which are also ASEAN members. Singapore, through the telecommunications company SingTel, is one of America's "eyes" in Southeast Asia.

#### Strategic culture and national security

Of course, the echoes of geopolitical changes vary depending on the region. The 16 nation-states have their own history, and for some, including Indonesia, geographical considerations seem to play an artificial role, at least somewhat veiled by historical experience. Dutch colonialism, for example, is the most memorable historical experience for the entire postcolonial strategic culture. Guerrilla warfare, the desire to fight as the center of gravity, and suspicion of foreign powers are themes that have constantly surfaced throughout Indonesian history. It is often overlooked that guerrilla warfare is more of an operational tactic against an enemy already on national territory and possessing a more powerful weapon system. Therefore, strategically, it is part of an asymmetric strategy.

Therefore, it is understandable why some concepts regarding reserve and auxiliary components still rely on the physical participation of citizens, for example, through basic military training and various symbols of patriotism, rather than using the technological or industrial capabilities inherent in these citizens. Difficulties arise when the relevance to modern warfare is viewed as a tactical necessity, for example, in the form of electronic warfare, even in the context of increasingly urgent cyber warfare. Various discussions about cyberwar tend to be considered in the context of defensive strategy. This option is probably insufficient, given that the warning time is calculated in seconds.

However, it seems somewhat strange that the discourse on modern warfare does not distinguish between the tactical phase, which is essentially unconventional, and the strategic phase, which is more based on the multidimensional nature of war, including ideological warfare. This confusion explains, among other things, why the phenomenon of proxy warfare is often discussed in the same context as various forms of modern phenomena such as pornography, radicalism, and modern lifestyles. Such a mismatch of tactical and strategic needs seems to reduce Indonesia's awareness of geographical space as a maritime Power. The debate about maritime security revolves solely around the question of whether it is a function of protecting sovereignty or enforcing the law. Moreover, the term "marine" is also blurred with the terms "sea" or "ocean", so that maritime affairs seem to be synonymous only with the management of marine resources and the function of the sea as a link between islands. The history of Dutch colonialism has also left a deep mark on Indonesia's understanding of the diversity of indigenous identities formed within the national territory. Cultural diversity, a serious problem for the nation-building process, is indeed partly related to geographical fetishism, but more often manifests itself in the context of vulnerability to foreign interference. Without historical factors such as federalist movements, which are considered to divide the "unitary state," regionalist sentiments and identity politics can still be interpreted within the framework of "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika," reflecting a spirit of integration rather than disintegration. As a result, national unity as a vertical relationship between regional and central authorities is often confused with "national unity," which presupposes egalitarian relations between different ethnic groups. Indeed, it is not easy for postcolonial countries to unite the scattered remnants of colonialism. Unity and integrity are key issues. Post-Soviet states are often described as "stable on the outside, fragile on the inside" because titular nationalist movements must coexist with other ethnic groups. Post-Soviet Azerbaijan needs to take into account not only the Azerbaijani majority, but also the Russian and Armenian populations. The Rohingya minority in Myanmar is partly the result of historical colonial differences, with the Rakhine people closer to Bangladesh than to the Burmese. Because of these difficulties, the strategic culture has always been focused on the domestic market. This has two consequences. First, the dominant concept in the strategy is national sustainability, not national defense. However, unlike the experience of some Western countries, which tend to consider resilience in an industry-specific and contextual context, such as the resistance of the Bavarian population to malaria, the Indonesian concept has a national character. Fears that the regions will create problems for the central government, a phenomenon that was especially pronounced during the Islamic Mataram era, remain a vivid memory of the modern Indonesian political elite.

Secondly, Indonesia has not yet formulated what Western literature calls instruments of national power. 19 Except at the academic level, it is difficult to find an equivalent to the operational concept of instruments of national power: for example, DIME (diplomacy, information, military and economic weapons), MIDLIFE (military, information, diplomatic weapons, law enforcement, information warfare, financial sanctions, economic weapons); or PMESII (political, military, economic, social, informational and infrastructural weapons). As a result, there is confusion between "instruments of national power" and "elements of national power." As a result, countering non-military threats remains an important part of national defense policy, without distinguishing whether to counter these non-military threats with a defensive or incentive approach.

#### *Conclusion*



Empirical notes and theoretical reflections Major world ideologies, religions, industrial technologies, and modern lifestyles coexist alongside traditional trends. Modern democratic political institutions also coexist with consensual political processes such as ongoing discussions.

To reach a consensus. What was previously outside the region has entered the national sphere. The development of technology, trade, and intercultural relations has gone beyond national or state identity. There is always the question of which way they enter this space: through persuasion, hegemony, or colonialism; and, moreover, whether they have sufficient resilience to curb, adapt, or adapt to these trends.; and, of course, to what extent these options are the best to minimize the impact of changes on social harmony, political and economic stability, as well as the security of the nation and the state. Since each option requires implementation tools, the most important question is always whether a country has sufficient appropriate tools and can use them effectively, including to counter various unforeseen circumstances. As Agnew and Codbridge point out, "nation-states must be wise in the face of increasing transnational liberalism. Territoriality alone is not enough for a State to be recognized internationally. In addition, "they also have international obligations to territories outside their national territory, at least to protect lives, provide public services, and provide humanitarian assistance." Both progress and accumulation are enhanced by modern technology. Similar to the impact of mechanical technologies that launched the industrial revolution, or kinetic technologies that launched the arms race, the information revolution has virtually destroyed geographical space. However, unlike previous revolutions, the information revolution provides equal opportunities for both States and non-State actors to control access to change. Therefore, especially in the context of domestic political governance, States can maintain their power. In the context of international relations, borders also become a space for mutual obligations and rights, as well as a place of conflict. Geographical borders have ceased to be a divider and have become a link between social, economic and political entities. Therefore, geostrategy should not only be operational, but also prudent. States need to develop a geopolitical strategy (geostrategy) in order to minimize risks and at the same time optimize opportunities arising from a number of geopolitical changes. Of course, this requirement cannot be fulfilled by relying solely on a national resilience strategy based on an inferiority complex; it also requires a national security strategy designed to integrate the instruments of national authority.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Burles, R. (2025). The geopolitics of history. *European Journal of International Relations*, 31(4), 839-861.
- [2] Crikemans, D. (2022). Geopolitical schools of thought: A concise overview from 1890 till 2020, and beyond. *Geopolitics and international relations: Grounding world politics anew*, 97-155.
- [3] Nickel, C. (2024). What do we talk about when we talk about the 'return' of geopolitics?. *International Affairs*, 100(1), 221-239.
- [4] Agnew, J. (2022). *Hidden geopolitics: Governance in a globalized world*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- [5] Park, J. (2023). Rethinking geopolitics: Geography as an aid to statecraft. *Texas National Security Review*, 6(4), 79-100.
- [6] Gillen, J. (2025). Tourism geopolitics: Roots and branches. *Tourism Geographies*, 27(3-4), 631-641.
- [7] Salisu, A. A., Lasisi, L., & Tchankam, J. P. (2022). Historical geopolitical risk and the behaviour of stock returns in advanced economies. *The European Journal of Finance*, 28(9), 889-906
- [8] Husain, S., Sohag, K., & Wu, Y. (2024). The responsiveness of renewable energy production to geopolitical risks, oil market instability and economic policy uncertainty: Evidence from United States. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 350, 119647.
- [9] Caldara, D., Conlisk, S., Iacoviello, M., & Penn, M. (2025). Do geopolitical risks raise or lower inflation?. *Journal of International Economics*, 104188

**Разия Токан, Кастер Саркыткан**

#### ГЕОСАЯСАТ: ТАРИХИ АСПЕКТИЛЕР ЖӘНЕ ҰЛТТЫҚ ҚАУІПСІЗДІК

**Аннотация.** Өзінің өмір сүруін сақтау және әр ұлттың ұлттық мұраттары мен мақсаттарын жүзеге асыру үшін геосаясат пен геостратегияны түсіну қажет. Геосаясат-бұл елдің географиялық, стратегиялық және саяси факторлары арасындағы байланысты зерттейтін ғылым және оны жүзеге асыру ұлттық стратегияны қажет етеді. Қазіргі уақытта біз ұлттық тұрақтылық тұжырымдамасы түрінде тұжырымдалған геостратегия мемлекеттің тұтастығын қамтамасыз етуге бағытталғанын түсінеміз. Геосаяси мәселелердің тарихы өте күрделі, өйткені олар жеке мүдделерінен бас тартпай, ұлттардың, мемлекеттердің және жалпы қоғамның өзара әрекеттесуіне әсер етеді. Сонымен қатар, қазіргі уақытта технологиялық прогресс бұл өзара әрекеттесулер адамзат тарихында бұрын-соңды болмаған жылдамдықпен жүретін жағдайға әкелді.



Өзара әрекеттесудің бұл жоғары деңгейі қатысушылардың геосаяси мүмкіндіктерді қалай түсінетініне және пайдаланатынына байланысты адамзатқа игіліктер мен апаттар әкелуі мүмкін. Геосаясатты түсіну және пайдалану стратегиялық ойыншыларға өздері жүргізген әрбір стратегиялық саясаттың салдарын түсінуге мүмкіндік береді. Қазіргі әлемдегі ұлт пен мемлекет тұжырымдамасының маңыздылығын мойындамай геосаяси түсіну мүмкін емес.

**Кілт сөздер:** геосаясат, мемлекет, ұлт, ұлттық мүдделер мен тәртіп.

**Разия Токан, Кастер Саркытқан**

### **ГЕОПОЛИТИКА: ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ И НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ**

**Аннотация.** Для поддержания своего существования и реализации национальных идеалов и целей каждой нации необходимо понимание геополитики и геостратегии. Геополитика — это наука, изучающая взаимосвязь между географическими, стратегическими и политическими факторами страны, а её реализация требует национальной стратегии. В настоящее время мы осознаем, что геостратегия, сформулированная в форме концепции национальной устойчивости, направлена на обеспечение целостности государства. История геополитических проблем чрезвычайно сложна, поскольку они затрагивают взаимодействие наций, государств и общества в целом, не отказываясь при этом от своих личных интересов. В то же время в данное время технологический прогресс привел к ситуации, когда эти взаимодействия происходят с беспрецедентной в истории человечества скоростью. Такой высокий уровень взаимодействия может принести человечеству как блага, так и бедствия, в значительной степени в зависимости от того, как участники понимают и используют геополитические возможности. Понимание и использование геополитики позволит стратегическим игрокам осознавать последствия каждой проводимой ими стратегической политики. Геополитическое понимание невозможно без признания важности концепции нации и государства в современном мире.

**Ключевые слова:** геополитика, государство, нация, национальные интересы и порядок.