

Chapter 8

Territory

Anssi Paasi

... territory is a compromise between a mythical aspect and a rational or pragmatic one. It is three things: a piece of *land*, seen as a sacred heritage; a *seat* of power; and a functional *space*. It encompasses the dimensions of *identity* (...)... of *authority* (the state as an instrument of political, legal, police and military control over a population defined by its residence); and of administrative bureaucratic or economic *efficiency* in the management of social mechanisms, particularly of interdependence____The strength of the national territorial state depends upon the combination of these three dimensions. (Hassner, 1997, p. 57)

Introduction

Territory is an ambiguous term that usually refers to sections of space occupied by individuals, social groups or institutions, most typically by the modern state (Agnew, 2000). As the previous citation from Pierre Hassner shows, several important dimensions of social life and social power come together in territory: material elements such as land, functional elements like the control of space, and symbolic dimensions like social identity. At times the term is used more vaguely to refer at various spatial scales to portions of space that geographers normally label as region, place or locality. Because contemporary territorial structures are changing rapidly, all of these categories imply many politically significant questions, above all, whether we should understand territories, places, and regions as fixed and exclusively bounded units or not (Massey, 1995). This forces us to reflect the responsibility of researchers in defining and fixing the meanings of words that may contain political dynamite. This has been an important question in the history of political geography and geopolitics, where the interpretations of concepts such as territory and boundary have been always simultaneously expressions of the links between space, power and knowledge (Agnew, 1998; O Tuathail, 1996; Paasi, 1996).

The term territory may also be used in a metaphoric sense. Becher (1989), for instance, speaks about "academic territories," referring to the way disciplines have their own internal power structures and "boundaries," and links to external "territories." The tradition of geopolitics illustrates that these academic territories, in the

sense of different academic vocabularies, may be crucial contexts in the production of the language that can be used in the interpretation of the spatiality of the world.

Only a few major studies have been written on territory by Anglo-American political geographers (Gottmann, 1973; Sack, 1986; Soja, 1971), in spite of its significance to social life and even though it has been among the primary sources of conflicts. As Gottmann (1973, p. ix) aptly reminds us, "Much speech, ink, and blood have been spilled over territorial disputes." Geographers have traced the meanings of territories and territoriality for the state and societies, and have expanded the reductionist views of ethologists and sociobiologists. The latter have often understood territoriality as an expression of the "basic nature" of human beings in organizing their social life, while geographers have in common stressed the social and cultural construction of territories and the power relations that are part of this construction.

One background for this conceptual vagueness is the fact that people simply mean different things when discussing the idea of territory: these ideas are contextual. One more problem is that territory is implied in many other keywords of political geography, such as nation, state, nationalism, and boundary, and it is practically impossible to write on these keywords without reflecting concomitantly the meanings of territory. Furthermore, the etymology of the term is also unsettled and different views exist about what "territory" originally meant. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (1989) states that it is usually taken as a derivate of *terra* - the Earth - but the original form has suggested derivation from *terrere* - to frighten - which implies that territory and power are inextricably linked. Further specifications in the OED express, or at least imply, social control, administration, governance, politics, and economy at various spatial scales. The modern meaning of territory is closely related to the legal concept of sovereignty which implies that there is one final authority in a political community (Taylor and Flint, 2000, p. 156). This also means that territory and the strategies that are used in the control of territories - different forms of territoriality - are two sides of the same coin.

This chapter considers territories as social processes in which social space and social action are inseparable. Territories are not frozen frameworks where social life occurs. Rather, they are made, given meanings, and destroyed in social and individual action. Hence, they are typically contested and actively negotiated. As Knight (1982, p. 517) has pointed out "territory is not; it becomes, for territory itself is passive, and it is human beliefs and actions that give territory meaning." Spatial organizations, meanings of space, and the territorial uses of space are historically contingent and their histories are closely interrelated. Sack (1986) has studied the history of human territoriality and concludes that two historical transformations have seen the greatest changes in territoriality: first, the rise of civilizations, and, secondly, the rise of capitalism and modernity. In the former, territoriality was taken into use to define and control people within a society and between societies; in the latter, territoriality was used to create images of emptiable space, impersonal relations, and to obscure the sources of power (p. 217).

This chapter goes as follows. After mapping the ideas of territoriality, it traces how the ideas of territory became significant along with the rise of the modern nation-state and nationalism and how they have become an almost self-evident part of current understanding of the spatialities of power. Therefore, the meanings of

territory will be reflected in relation to such categories as state, nation, and boundary. Territory became a popular term in the social and political sciences during the 1990s but it is understood differently in different contexts. It is still crucial among the categories introduced in political geography and political science textbooks, but is hotly contested in the fields of critical geopolitics, international relations, and economic and cultural geography. While the most extreme voices proclaim how territories and nation-states are vanishing from the globalizing world, most geographers have been more sensitive to the changing spatialities. For them the functions of territories and the meanings of sovereignty may change but states still remain major actors in the global constellation of power - while being an increasingly integral part of the global political economy (Agnew, 1998; Amin and Thrift, 1995). Cultural geographers have questioned the often-supposed homology between the state, nation, and society, and the belief in the existence of exclusive national cultures. On the one hand, the argument is that future social spaces and identities will be increasingly transnational and that new political networks will emerge. On the other, the rise of nationalism and ethno-regional activism suggests that people are also looking inwards in their states. These challenges for territory and territoriality, and their implications for political geography, will be discussed in the final section.

Human Territoriality

Most contemporary authors in social sciences make a clear distinction between human territoriality and other forms of territoriality, emphasizing that most portions of space occupied by persons, social groups or states are made into territories in a multitude of social practices and discourses by using abstract, culturally laden symbolism. This occurs in all social contexts, from local neighborhoods and gangs to nation-states and supra-state territories. Territories are always manifestations of power relations. The link between territory and power suggests that it is important to distinguish between a place as territory and other types of places (Sack, 1986). Whereas most places do not, territories - especially states - require perpetual public effort to establish and to maintain.

Sack (1986) outlined how different societies use different forms of power, geographical organization, and conceptions of space and place. Hence, territories are historically contingent while territoriality as a social practice seems to be based on some common principles. Sack (1986) defined territoriality as a strategy that human beings employ to control people and things by controlling area. Similarly territoriality is, he argues, a primary geographical expression of social power. Territoriality is an effective instrument to reify and depersonalize power. This is particularly obvious in the case of states, which exploit territoriality in the control of their citizens and external relations. This control occurs by using both physical and symbolic power (ideologies). While territoriality is in operation at a variety of spatial scales, at the societal level territoriality is instrumental in the regulation of social integration (Smith, 1986). Territoriality is crucial in defining social relations, and location within a territory partly shapes membership in a group (Sack, 1986).

Sack (1986) argues that the formal definition of territoriality not only tells us what territoriality is, but also suggests what territoriality can do. This effect is based on three interrelated relationships, which are contained in the definition. First,

territoriality must involve a form of classification by area, i.e. categorization of people and things by location in space. Secondly, territoriality is based on communication and particularly significant is the communication of boundaries. Thirdly, territoriality must involve an attempt at enforcing control over access to the area and to things within it or to things outside of it. Territoriality, as a component of power, is not only a medium of creating and reproducing social order, but is also a medium to create and maintain much of the geographic context through which we experience the world and give it meaning (Sack, 1986).

The territoriality of states in particular is deeply seated in the (spatial) division of labor: some actors concentrate on the production of the symbolic and material dimensions of territoriality (e.g. administration, economy, army) using their power as part of the social division of labor, whereas most people are rather reproducers. Key actors in the production of territoriality are politicians, military leaders, police, journalists, teachers, and cultural activists, for instance. The roles of these groups of actors may differ according to the spatial scale at which they act, but in the case of state territoriality their power is obvious. These actors may also mediate between activities occurring at different spatial scales. The organization of police and military forces as well as education and media usually effectively combine local-scale activities with national values (Herbert, 1997; Paasi, 1999; Schleicher, 1993; Schlesinger, 1991).

Territoriality is not, however, a stamp that is mechanistically put on social groups "from above," since processes occurring at different spatial scales come together in territories. Herbert's (1997) study of the Los Angeles Police Department shows how social processes occurring at various spatial scales and motives originating from different sources may come together in a territory. Police forces are - together with the army - one part of the "repressive sub-apparatus" (Clark and Dear, 1984) that modern states exploit in the control of spatial behavior by controlling space, spatial representations, and narratives. This occurs typically at the local scale. Herbert's study shows that the control of space is a fundamental source of social power and that origins of control may emerge from different sources and spatial scales.

Territories as Social Constructs

Instead of defining with a sentence or two what territories are and how they operate, it is more useful to understand them as social processes, which have certain common characteristics. The process during which territorial units emerge as part of the socio-spatial system and become established and identified in social action and social consciousness, may be labeled as the "institutionalization of territories" (Paasi, 1991, 1996). This process may be understood through four abstractions that illustrate different aspects of territory formation. These aspects can be distinguished analytically from each other, but in practice they are entirely or partly simultaneous. The first is a territorial shape - the construction of boundaries that may be physical or symbolic ones. Boundaries, along with their communication, comprise the basic element in the construction of territories and the practice of territoriality. Encompassing things in space or on a map may identify and classify places or regions, but these become territories only when their boundaries are used to control people (Sack, 1986).

Traditional political geography has taken the link between territory and boundaries very much for granted and boundaries have been understood as neutral lines that are located between power structures, i.e. state territories. It is, however, crucial to realize that the power of territoriality is based on the fact that boundaries - as lines of inclusion and exclusion between social groups, between "us" and "them" - do not locate only on border areas but also are "spread" - often unevenly - all over the state territory. Boundaries penetrate the society in numerous practices and discourses through which the territory exists and achieves institutionalized meanings. Hence, it is political, economic, cultural, governmental and other practices, and the associated meanings, that make a territory and concomitantly territorialize everyday life. These elements become part of daily life through spatial socialization, the process by which people are socialized as members of territorial groups. The emergence of the Finnish state and nation since the nineteenth century, for example, shows how spatial socialization requires effective mechanisms, such as symbolism and institutions, that will bind people together (Paasi, 1996).

Hence the second crucial element in territory formation is the symbolic shape which includes (a) dynamic, discursively constructed elements (like the process of naming), (b) fixed symbols such as flags, coats of arms and statues, and (c) social practices in which these elements come together, such as military parades, flag days, and education. These practices and discourses point to the third crucial element, the institutional shape. This refers to institutionalized practices such as administration, politics, economy, culture, communication, and the school system through which boundaries, symbolism and their meanings are produced and reproduced. Institutional shaping is typically very complex and the operation of one institution often supports several others. Fourthly, territories may gain an established position in the larger territorial system, i.e. have an "identity," narratives that individuals and organizations operating in the area and outside use to distinguish this territory from others. The institutionalization of territories at different scales is often an overlapping process. The institutionalization of the Finnish state, for instance, was based on the simultaneous creation of state, regional, and local institutions and symbols, and social practices, such as education and media, that ultimately fuse previous scales and draw people as part of the nation (Paasi, 1996). When territories are identified as historical processes, they may also come to the end, i.e. de-institutionalize. This holds also in the case of the most naturalized territory of the modern world, the state. The most dramatic recent examples have been the dissolution of the former Soviet Union into separate states and the merging of East and West Germany.

State Territoriality

Most theories of the state identify territory as one basic element of the state and sovereignty is typically related to a bounded territory. States have constructed international law and a state can usually acquire a territory only under this law (Biersteker and Weber, 1996). The territorial framework of state sovereignty has for a long time included a model of citizenship and territorially-based narratives of identity that typically draw on the past. The state uses its territorial power in control

of its citizens and, increasingly, those who have not achieved citizenship, such as refugees, immigrants, and displaced people.

For nationalists, sovereignty is the keyword and the state is seen as the primary political expression of community (Anderson, 1991). Loyalty to the state (patriotism) can either reinforce or conflict with nationalism and it is only within "real" nation-states that patriotism and nationalism support each other. The share of such states is only ten percent (Connor, 1992) which means that the institutionalization of state territories is typically a contested process. This is most obvious in the struggles of minority groups, such as Basques or Kurds, that are not satisfied with their cultural and economic position inside a state or several states.

The rise of the first "states" in Mesopotamia can be traced back 5000 years (Soja, 1971). However, while the ideas of dividing the land are very old, most ancient cultures and civilizations have left very little mark on the territorial organization of the current world. Different opinions exist on the relationships between the bounded territories of the past and those of the present-day world. Malcolm Anderson (1996, p. 13) argues that while the cosmologies in which old ideas of territory have been rooted are totally different from modern secular thought, some modern ideas of territoriality - e.g. on international frontiers and sovereignty - are based in part on Roman ideas of territoriality that were transmitted through the Catholic Church, rediscovered by political theorists during the Renaissance period, and regarded useful by jurists in the early modern period of European history. Isaac (1990, p. 417), for his part, has pointed out that the rulers of ancient empires (such as Rome) were not interested in defining the frontiers of their empires in terms of fixed boundaries and that territory was not so important as the control of people and cities.

The modern state system that emerged in Europe after the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), helped to establish the dominance of a horizontal, geostrategic view of the space of states and brought together territory and sovereignty. Rigid spatial boundaries became crucial only when the sovereignty of the state and citizenship came together. The emergence of states was related closely to the rise of capitalism and industrialism but the nation-state system cannot be reductively explained in terms of their existence. Instead, the modern world has been shaped through the complex interaction of the nation-state, capitalism, and industrialism (Giddens, 1987). The development of the abstract, metrical space went in hand with capitalism's need to increase production and consumption (Sack, 1986, p. 218). James Anderson (1996, p. 144) argues that the medieval era was characterized by spatial fluidity and mobility but temporal fixity in that change through time was typically seen as cyclical. The modern era that followed, for its part, was characterized by a more "mobile temporality" and time was associated with development and progress while space became more fixed, particularly with respect to the politics of states.

Territoriality became an institutionalized principle after the turn of the seventeenth century (Holsti, 2000). Practices defining the exact contents of bounded administrative units became one part of state building processes. Particularly within the Western nation-states, effective mechanisms of coordination, social integration, and administration were created. They stabilized the formerly dynamic functional spatial organization into a system of rigid, clearly delineated territorial units. State boundaries began to define the boundaries of society and polity. Sahlins (cited in

Soja, 1971, p. 15) wrote that "the critical development was not the establishment of territoriality in society, but the establishment of society *as* a territory." Along with this process, the membership in the state system - citizenship - was increasingly defined by birth or residence in states. While both the principles of territoriality and sovereignty are social constructs with a long history, it was only at the turn of the twentieth century that state territoriality and sovereignty began to manifest them in fixed boundary lines that were generally established instead of the former, more or less loose frontiers (Taylor and Flint, 2000).

The number of states has been continually increasing. Whereas about 50 states existed at the turn of the twentieth century, and some 80 in the 1950-60s, their current number is more than 190. Almost 120 new states have emerged since World War II as a result of decolonization (95 states), federal disintegration (20 states), and secessionism (2 states) (Christopher, 1999). Since the mid-1990s only a few conflicts between states have occurred, whereas the number of internal conflicts has been in the order of 26-28 per year. Some 500-600 groups of people identify themselves as nations, which means that territorial disputes will be with us also in the future. Christopher (1999) suggests that the current potential for new states is perhaps 10-20.

During this long process the state has become the most significant body in the control of territoriality that also effectively mediates between processes occurring at diverging spatial scales. The ability to exercise sovereign power over a defined area is the hallmark of a state, so laws as its instruments to exercise power are territorial too (Johnston, 1989, 1991). The state has one overwhelming advantage over other territorial entities - the monopoly of force and power. Several scholars have identified the territorial organization of the state as one precondition of state power. Giddens (1987) has famously defined the state as a bordered "power container" that is organized territorially. Similarly, Mann (1984, p. 198) reminds us how only the state is inherently centralized over a delimited territory over which its authority and power extends; territoriality is necessary for the definition and operation of the nation-state, and also for its autonomy in capitalist society.

State power is exploited both in the internal control of the society ("nation") and the state's external relations. While foreign and domestic affairs are, in practice, inseparable, there is a qualitative difference in how territoriality is exploited in these fields. More than any other institution the modern state exploits territoriality in its foreign policy through the principles of sovereignty and self-determination. The importance of boundaries for these principles becomes clear in the fact that the history of states is characterized by boundary disputes, which involves one further dimension of nation-states - military power. As to the internal control of the state, territoriality is present in the operation of the institutions and channels that Mann (1984) calls infrastructural power. This refers to the ability of the state to penetrate daily life within civil society, implement political decisions, and provide public goods and services among the citizens. While the state functions and the instruments to create images and narratives of nation - national education and media in particular - have emerged mainly since the nineteenth century and the widening of modern political and social citizenship took place during the early twentieth century, the power of the state and its capacity for intervention in social life have increased remarkably since 1945 (Smith, 1992).

Mann (1984, p. 208) argues that the greater the infrastructural power of the state, the greater will be the territorializing of social life. Agnew (1998) states that power is present in all relationships among people and the power of state relies on several sources it can tap into. Hence, infrastructural power is present at other spatial scales, too. Local and supra-state governments effectively use these mechanisms and accentuate the fact that state territoriality is not the only framework of power.

Territory and Identity

Like the ideas of sovereignty, ideas of national territory have also been in perpetual transformation. During the nineteenth century in particular, the ideas of the symbolic roles of the national territory changed fundamentally. A major medium for this change was nationalism, an ideology that slowly emerged in Western Europe during the eighteenth century and spread elsewhere with European colonialism. The basic factor in nationalism was to transfer group loyalty from kinship to local and other territorial scales (Anderson, 1988; Knight, 1982). Nationalism and romanticism influenced the new interpretations so that ideas of the link between land and nation became increasingly important. Nationalist discourses introduced expressions like "homeland," fatherland, and motherland that included a distinct territorial division between "us" and "the Other." Several scholars have shown how the songs, music, poetry, literature, and national figures - at times real people, at times allegories - are impregnated with territorial meanings (Murphy, 1996; Paasi, 1996). Territory became one of the key markers of national identity in this process and simultaneously changed from a pure bounded commodity - that can be sold and bought on the market - to a constituent of the national history, culture, identity, and political order (Holsti, 2000). More than ever, the state also entered into the everyday life of individuals in the form of mechanisms that again helped to create an image of what Anderson (1991) has labeled an "imagined community," a group of people who identify themselves with a collective while not knowing each other. National education, in particular, became a key institution in the socialization of citizens into national-territorial thinking. In spite of this fact, nationalism's relationships with territory have been ignored in research. Anderson (1988) states that nationalism is territorial in the sense of claiming specific territory but it is also partial, since "national interests" may be more in the interests of some part of a nation than others. Hegemonic groups may use space, boundaries, and various definitions of memberships (or citizenship) effectively to maintain their position and to control others inside the territory. This may occur by generating and maintaining social fragmentation as has been the case in some areas in Israel (Yiftachel, 1997). However, every nation is only a small part of humanity and visions inside one nation may differ radically from those of others.

"National identity" brings together the complex dimensions of nationalism and the national state. It is typical to see territory as one of the constitutive "ideas" of national identity (Knight, 1982; Smith, 1991; Williams and Smith, 1983). This is based on the implicit idea of the link between nation and state (and hence sovereignty). While noting the significance of territory (or "homeland") among such constituents of identity as common myths and historical memories, a common mass public culture, common legal rights and duties, a common economy, and

territorial mobility (see Smith, 1991, p. 14), scholars have not been interested to the same extent in the social and discursive construction of territory and territoriality, or in how these become a part of the historical narratives and myths of a nation and of local daily life or what Billig (1995) calls "banal nationalism."

Territorial identification is not usually based merely on territory itself but this requires elements that integrate people living in different parts of the territory. Various abstract symbols are needed to express physical and social integration. Territoriality may be hidden in this symbolism, i.e. in many cultures symbols are associated with more or less abstract expressions of power, group solidarity, and authority. Interestingly enough, territorial symbols often depict ideas and symbols of power (such as wild animals), not people (Duchacek, 1975).

Governance and administrative practices, media, and education (national socialization) provide a common horizon for "identity" and for understanding the spatial "reality" that surrounds social groupings. The development of "nations" is indicative of this. Most scholars who have analysed the formation of national identity remind us that nations usually require a territory, which they share with their larger social groups (Smith, 1991). Hence, the state has been very effective in the production of not only the physical infrastructure for its reproduction but also social practices and institutions (education, research, media, statistics, mapping, military, etc.) to create an image of itself as the most significant territorial entity that most people also effectively identify with.

Deterritorialiaization of the Contemporary World

The link between state, territoriality, and sovereignty - all symbolized by an idea of the existence of exclusive boundaries - has been so dominating in the spatial imagination of international relations scholars that it is possible to talk about a "territorial trap," a state-centered account of spatiality, which has tended to link state power and territorial sovereignty intimately together (Agnew, 1994). Taylor (1996) speaks about "embedded statism" where states have come to dominate over the ideas of nation and ultimately both categories have become naturalized as a major framework to human life.

According to Agnew (1994), the territorial trap is based on three analytically distinct but invariably related assumptions. First, it suggests that modern state sovereignty requires clearly bounded territorial spaces. Secondly, it assumes a strict distinction between inside and outside, and this suggests that there exists a fundamental opposition between domestic and foreign affairs. Thirdly, it assumes that the territorial state acts as the geographic container of modern society. These three assumptions take for granted an idea of the world as consisting of bounded, exclusive territories, without noticing that these elements are socially constructed and contested.

Academic scholars have been in a key position in the production of the territory-centered outlook on the world and in shaping the practices and discourses through which the current system of territories is perpetually reproduced and transformed. Most of the literature simply assumes statehood, without identifying the basic elements of state, not to talk about challenging them (Biersteker and Weber, 1996; Knight, 1982).

While the state is the main example of how territoriality and territory are exploited in organizing social relations, in practice state territoriality has always been unbundled by agreements and alliances between various territorial and nonterritorial bodies. The state has become more powerful both as an international actor and in its relations to society within its boundaries. Also the number of nongovernmental international organizations has increased perpetually. These processes mean that the territorial "pattern" of various spatial practices and representations has become more complex and these elements are increasingly overlapping. In Europe, some scholars have been ready to talk about a "New Medievalism," a situation characterized by overlapping authorities and administrative structures (J. Anderson, 1996). The re-articulation of international political space would thus lead to the "unbundling of territoriality" (Ruggie, 1993)

State territoriality is challenged by numerous actors that cross and question the boundaries of formal state territories. Movements aimed at promoting the emancipation of women, human rights or environmental questions cross the boundaries of existing territories forming new transnational social spaces. Economic flows cross boundaries at an increasing speed. New forms of communication (cyberspace and Internet) affect the roles of the state and its functions at a variety of scales. Current economic spaces of flows centered on some major world cities, ideas of cosmopolitan dimensions of place, etc. all challenge visions of the world as a grid of bounded territories. Jessop has characterized the current situation as follows:

... we now see a proliferation of discursively constituted and institutionally materialized and embedded spatial scales (whether terrestrial, territorial or telematic), that are related in increasingly complex tangled hierarchies rather than being simply nested one within the other, with different temporalities as well as spatialities ____ There is no pre-given set of places, spaces or scales that are simply being reordered. For in addition to the changing significance of old places, spaces, scales and horizons, new places are emerging, new spaces are being created, new scales of organization are being developed and new horizons of action are being imagined (Jessop, 2000, p. 343).

Political geographers and political scientists have increasingly called for openness in interpreting what territory, boundaries or place mean, arguing that there is no need to comprehend these categories as closed, strictly bounded entities as politicians, academics, and other actors have been used to doing (Agnew, 1994; O Tuathail, 1996; Shapiro and Alker, 1996). Taylor (1994) has reflected on the meanings of state territoriality and concludes that the state has different orientations. As a power container it tends to preserve existing boundaries; as a wealth container it strives towards larger territories; and as a cultural container it tends towards smaller territories, especially when the "nation" consists of diverging cultural groups that become increasingly consciousness of themselves.

Visions of territorially bounded national cultures have also been challenged. Identity and power are inextricably linked: identities are not neutral or naturally given but constructed for specific purposes (Jackson and Penrose, 1993). Cultural researchers in particular have challenged the myths of "national cultures" as "closed cells," entities that would be culturally homogeneous and exclusive. Instead, identities are "hybrids" that draw together influences that function across borders

(Yuval-Davis, 1997). This forces reflection on the links between political communities, identity, and the cosmopolitan elements of territory (Entrikin, 1999), as well as to identify transnational social spaces.

Discussion

Scholars operating in various fields are unsure of the current meanings of territory and boundaries. This uncertainty is based on tendencies that seem to challenge the dimensions of territory mentioned in the citation by Hassner (1997) at the beginning of this chapter. These tendencies are based first on the changing meanings of state territory as a seat of power and authority and how these elements are re-scaled between different territorial scales. Secondly, the dimensions of identity are becoming more complicated and are often linked with such questions as land ownership. Some scholars, most visibly Ohmae (1995), have been ready to argue that we are living in a borderless world in which the nation-state is taking its last breaths while new forms of economic regionalization will become significant.

These doubts on the future of territory are not a new phenomenon. As Keating (1998, p. ix) reminds us, "the end of territory as a factor in social and political life has been predicted regularly over the last hundred years, yet somehow it keeps on coming back." Geographers have had a more versatile perspective on the "future of state" and territory. James Anderson (1996) has observed that in the currently "fluid" situation scholars tend to overgeneralize the effects and tendencies of globalization. He opines that much of cultural, political, and economic life retains a relative fixity in space. Financial speculation and diplomacy, for instance, ultimately rest on the spatial fixity of factories, states, and "national interests."

The meanings of territory and identity are hence diversifying so that at the one extreme territorial identity is highly significant, while at the other, it is less relevant (Rosenau, 1997). Most people are "in-between" and are increasingly able to shift their identities. Rosenau contends that all along the continuum - including the two extremes - territory is not necessarily equated with nation-state boundaries. But while new transnational (and sub-national) communities, identities, and forms of citizenship are emerging, traditional ones (like the nation, state, and territory) are not disappearing; rather, they are changing their forms (Hassner, 1997). The major political problem still remains: how can we best give political recognition to various, often suppressed, identities (Knight, 1982)? Many of these identities are deeply territorially rooted, even if the identities of places are never "pure" (Sibley, 1995). While identity always seems to be based on differentiation from Others, this differentiation does not have to be based on hard boundaries between "us" and "them" (Massey, 1995).

While many of the challenges of the existing territorial order are based on the globalization of economy and increasing flows of information, these elements can also partly motivate new forms of territoriality that are linked with the past. The "first nation" movements in Canada and elsewhere are fitting examples of new challenges for territorial thinking. Often supporting traditional community and cultural identities, environmental values, and people's rights to land and old territories, these movements struggle to affect legislation and the forms of territorial governance that have been established by the hegemonic groups in the society. In

many cases these activities and interests cross existing state borders - often by using modern information technology. This border-crossing also characterizes social movements that bring together, for example, workers, poor people, women, and environmentalists, and resist the uncritical acceptance of neo-liberal attitudes and practices behind the current trends in globalization.

Future democratic societies will inevitably require increasing openness and "crossings" of cultural, symbolic, legal, and physical boundaries between territories at a variety of spatial scales, from the local to the global. Researchers, for their part, should be ready to deconstruct the constitutive, at times mystified, elements of territory, territoriality, boundaries, and identity narratives. It is obvious that territoriality is to an increasing degree turning into a continuum of practices and discourses of territorialities which may be, to some extent, overlapping and conflicting. They may be linked or networked partly with the past, partly with the present, and partly with a Utopian imaginary of the future forms of territoriality. The examples discussed in this chapter clearly suggest that new territories and territorialities may supercede the established political categories and identities at various spatial scales, and yet partly be linked with them. All this will provide an interesting challenge for the geographic imagination of political geographers and others dealing with the spatialities of power.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agnew, J. 1994. The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of International Political Economy*, 1(1), 53-80.
- Agnew, J. 1998. *Geopolitics: Revisioning World Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Agnew, J. 2000. Territory. In R. J. Johnston et al. (eds.) *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Amin, A. and Thrift, N. 1995. Territoriality in the global political economy. *Nordisk Samhällsgeografisk Tidskrift*, 20, 3-16.
- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Community*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, J. 1988. Nationalist ideology and territory. In R. J. Johnston et al. (eds.) *Nationalism, Self-Determination and Political Geography*. London: Croom Helm.
- Anderson, J. 1996. The shifting stage of politics: new medieval and postmodern territorialities? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14, 133-53.
- Anderson, M. 1996. *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*. London: Polity.
- Becher, T. 1989. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Stratford: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Bierstaker, T. J. and Weber, C. (eds.). 1996. *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Christopher, A. J. 1999. New states in a new millennium. *Area*, 31, 327-34.
- Clark, G. L. and Dear, M. 1984. *State Apparatus: Structures and Language of Legitimacy*. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.
- Connor, W. 1992. The nation and its myth. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*, 33, 48-57.
- Duchacek, I. 1975. *Nations and Men*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.

- Entrikin, J. N. 1999. Political community, identity and cosmopolitan place. *International Sociology*, 14, 269-82.
- Giddens, A. 1987. *Nation-State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gottmann, J. 1973. *The Significance of Territory*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Hassner, P. 1997. Obstinate and obsolete: non-territorial transnational forces versus the European territorial state. In O. Tunander et al. (eds.) *Geopolitics in the Post-Wall Europe: Security, Territory and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Herbert, S. 1997. *Policing Space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Holsti, K. J. 2000. Territoriaalisuus (territoriality). *Politiikka*, 42, 15-29.
- Isaac, B. 1990. *The Limits of Empire: the Roman Army in the East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, P. and Penrose, J. (eds.). 1993. *Constructions of Race, Place and Nation*. London: UCL Press.
- Jessop, B. 2000. The crisis of the national spatio-temporal fix and the tendential ecological dominance of globalizing capitalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24, 323-60.
- Johnston, R. J. 1989. The state, political geography, and geography. In R. Peet and N. Thrift (eds.) *New Models in Geography*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Johnston, R. J. 1991. *A Question of Place*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Keating, M. 1998. *The New Regionalism in Western Europe: Territorial Restructuring and Political Change*. Cheltenham: Elgar Press.
- Knight, D. 1982. Identity and territory: geographical perspectives on nationalism and regionalism. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 72, 514-31.
- Mann, M. 1984. The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results. *European journal of Sociology*, 25, 185-213.
- Massey, D. 1995. The conceptualization of place. In D. Massey and P. Jess (eds.) *A Place in the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, A. 1996. The sovereign state system as political-territorial ideal: historical and contemporary considerations. In T. J. Biersteker and C. Weber (eds.) *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 0 Tuathail, G. 1996. *Critical Geopolitics*. London: Routledge.
- Ohmae, K. 1995. *The End of the Nation-State*. New York: Free Press.
- Paasi, A. 1991. Deconstructing regions: notes on the scales of spatial life. *Environment and Planning A*, 23, 239-56.
- Paasi, A. 1996. *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness. The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russia Border*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Paasi, A. 1999. Nationalizing everyday life: individual and collective identities as practices and discourse. *Geography Research Forum*, 19, 4-21.
- Rosenau, J. N. 1997. *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruggie, J. G. 1993. Territoriality and beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations. *International Organization*, 47, 139-74.
- Sack, R. D. 1986. *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleicher, K. (ed.). 1993. *Nationalism in Education*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Schlesinger, P. 1991. *Media, State and Nation*. London: Sage.
- Shapiro, M. and Alker, H. R. (eds.). 1996. *Challenging Boundaries*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sibley, D. 1995. *Geographies of Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

- Smith, A. D. 1991. *National Identity*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- Smith, A. D. 1992. National identity and the idea of European unity. *International Affairs*, 68, 55-76.
- Smith, G. 1986. Territoriality. In R. J. Johnston et al. (eds.) *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Soja, E. 1971. *The Political Organization of Space*. Washington, DC: AAG, Commission on College Geography.
- Taylor, P. J. 1994. The state as container: territoriality in the modern world-system. *Progress in Human Geography*, 18, 151-62.
- Taylor, P. J. 1996. Embedded statism and the social sciences: opening up to new spaces. *Environment and Planning A*, 28, 1917-28.
- Taylor, P. J. and Flint, C. 2000. *Political Geography*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, C. H. and Smith, A. 1983. The national construction of social space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 7, 502-18.
- Yiftachel, O. 1997. Nation-building or ethnic fragmentation? Frontier settlement and collective identities in Israel. *Space and Polity*, 1, 149-69.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *National Spaces and Collective Identities: Borders, Boundaries, Citizenship and Gender Relations*. Inaugural Lecture Series, The University of Greenwich.