



LUND UNIVERSITY

The Materiality of Territorial Production - A Conceptual Discussion of Territoriality, Materiality and the Everyday Life of Public Space

Kärrholm, Mattias

Published in:
Space and Culture

DOI:
[10.1177/1206331207304356](https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331207304356)

2007

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Kärrholm, M. (2007). The Materiality of Territorial Production - A Conceptual Discussion of Territoriality, Materiality and the Everyday Life of Public Space. *Space and Culture*, 10(4), 437-453.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331207304356>

Total number of authors:
1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

The Materiality of Territorial Production

– a conceptual discussion of territoriality, materiality and the everyday life of public space

Mattias Kärrholm

Department of Architecture & Built Environment, LTH

Lund University

Box 118, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden.

Phone: +46 46 222 73 23

mattias.karrholm@arkitektur.lth.se

This is the author's accepted manuscript of: Kärrholm, M. (2007) "The Materiality of Territorial Production, a Conceptual Discussion of Territoriality, Materiality and the Everyday Life of Public Space", published in *Space & Culture*, 4 (10) 437-453.

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://sac.sagepub.com/content/10/4/437>

DOI: 10.1177/1206331207304356

The Materiality of Territorial Production

– a conceptual discussion of territoriality, materiality and the everyday life of public space

Abstract: This article brings together research on territoriality and actor-network theory in order to develop new ways of investigating the role of materiality and material design in the territorial power relations of urban public places. Using the public square as a main example, I suggest some new ways of conceptualizing the production and stabilization of territories in the everyday urban environment. Setting out from a brief outline of the history of territoriality research, I re-appropriate the traditional approaches from the viewpoint of actants rather than persons or institutions, suggesting a distinction between four different forms of territorial production. I then go on to conceptualize some material ways of stabilizing the effects of these territorial productions. Finally, I argue that public space can be seen as constituted by a territorial complexity, thus pointing to the relationship between materiality and public space, via territorial stabilization and production.

Keywords: Territoriality, materiality, public space, ANT, everyday life, urban design.

Introduction

The relationship between the material design and the everyday use of urban public places has been notoriously problematic to explore. Some researchers have been sceptical regarding whether the investigation of such a relationship is useful, and some have even regarded it to be beyond the capacity of language (Forty, 2000:117). In this article I argue that the relationship between materiality/space and use (or, as formulated in previous decades, between form and function, or between man and the built environment), not only can be explored, but that it is fundamental to urban studies as well as to studies of everyday life. The problem of these relationships seems, first of all, to be of a conceptual and theoretical nature. This has also been stressed by the large number of anti-Cartesian approaches launched in recent decades, and of which we follow one in this article: actor-network theory (ANT). However, this article is primarily about the exploration and re-appropriation of an old concept that seems to be strangely underused in the contemporary discourses about space and urban life – namely *territoriality*. Issues of territoriality are important inherent aspects of material design and everyday use. We are constantly obliged to observe territorial divisions and classifications, such as parking lots, motorways, and walkways in our daily activities in the city. Territorial regulations affect our behaviour and movements in urban space, both explicitly and in more obscure ways, and these types of regulation are often supported by material forms and designs. Furthermore, today, in our globalized cities, we can see a wide range of phenomena (from the transformation of old building types to new information and surveillance techniques) that transform the traditional territorial structures of the old modernist era. In spite of this, territoriality has never been as much used as, for example, the concept of place (Cresswell, 2004), not even when it comes to aspects of spatial control (cf. Dovey, 1999; Markus, 1993).

The concept of territoriality

One reason for this neglect could very well be that the concept has a long and somewhat problematic history. Territoriality began as a political concept (lat. *territorium*) and was used to describe foreign states, as well as the area surrounding a town, or under its jurisdiction, (OED; Malmberg, 1994:49). From the 15th century, we also have the words *terratorium* (vulg. lat.) and the French *terroir* used to indicate a district of certain geological and/or geographical qualities (Gottman, 1975:29-33). The most important transformation of the concept was, however, in the 18th century, when territoriality also came to be used metaphorically by Oliver Goldsmith in order to describe space appropriated by birds through singing. This behavioral notion of territory (in German often distinguished from *Territorium* as *Revier* and in Swedish as *revir*) was developed during the 20th century. In the 1950s and 60s it was used to describe a human behavioral phenomenon in the social and behavioral sciences: *human territoriality*¹ (Edney, 1976; Malmberg, 1980). Human territoriality was at first described very much in analogy with zoological territoriality, focusing on defensive and aggressive behavior. In the 1970s this approach was developed by Irwin Altman and others to include a softer ‘perceived ownership’ of places, that is places appropriated, but not necessarily defended (Altman, 1975). Simultaneously, the concept of territoriality was still very much alive in a traditional political sense, notably within human and political geography (Soja, 1971; Gottman, 1973). In these studies, territoriality was seen as an intentional power strategy and a way of exerting administrative and spatial influence in society. One of the most influential studies in this field to date is a book by Robert Sack from 1986, very explicit in its non-psychological and non-behavioral approach, but still bearing the somewhat confusing title of *Human Territoriality* (Sack, 1986). In the last decade we have also

¹ Some previous attempts to use territoriality in a human (behavioural) context can be noted in anthropology, as early as the late 19th century (Malmberg, 1980:70-83).

witnessed a new interest in the political aspects of the concept, especially in the field of geopolitics (Delaney 2005).

Although there certainly are other uses,² territoriality has, since the 1960s primarily been divided into two different fields of interest, that is, human territoriality (Hall, 1959; Altman, 1975; Edney, 1976; Malmberg, 1980; Brown, 1987; Bell et al, 1996) and politico-geographical territoriality (as represented by e.g. Soja, 1971; Gottman, 1973; Sack, 1986; Häkli, 1994; and Paasi, 1996). This division bears many resemblances to discussions found in other fields of research where dichotomies such as e.g. *gemeinschaft/gesellschaft*, subjective/objective, organic/mechanic, nature/culture, structure/agent and space/place, have come to play an important part. A parallel discussion can for example be found in the related field of research investigating the construction of local communities (Cohen 1985).

Human territoriality and politico-geographical territoriality have sometimes become mixed up. Soja noted this problem, when commenting on the situation in the early 1970s: “the then prevailing view of territoriality was filled with bioethological imperatives which obscured any social-political interpretation” (Soja, 1989:150). Unfortunately, these two approaches often seem to be unaware of each other, and one can still see how they lead to occasional conceptual mix-ups, problems or neglects (MacAndrew, 1993; Rapoport, 1994; Agnew, 2000: cf. Kärrholm 2007).

Definitions representing a social or behavioural approach:

The act of laying claim to and defending a territory is termed territoriality. (Hall, 1959: 187).

Territorial behavior is a self-other boundary regulation mechanism that involves personalization of or marking of a place or object and

² Notably Deleuze & Guattari (1988), and Husserl, (in Steinbock 1995). But see also Shils (1975) and Pollini (1999), who discuss territoriality from a more sociological perspective.

communication that it is 'owned' by a person or a group. (Altman, 1975:107).

[territory is] a meaningful aspect of social life, whereby individuals define their scope of their obligations and the identity of themselves and others. (Shils, 1975:26).

human territoriality can be viewed as a set of behaviours and cognitions a person or group exhibits, based on perceived ownership of physical space. (Bell et al, 1996:304).

Definitions representing a politico-geographical approach

Territory is a portion of geographical space that coincides with the spatial extent of a government's jurisdiction. (Gottman, 1975:29).

Territory is first of all a juridico-political one: the area controlled by a certain power. (Foucault, 1980:68).

territoriality will be defined as the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area. This area will be called territory. (Sack, 1986:19).

[Territoriality is] a strategy which uses bounded space in the exercise of power and influence. (Johnston, 1996:871).

1. Some definitions and descriptions of territoriality

The actant-perspective

Here is why the word 'territory' is so apposite: because the order and security it provides are not static phenomena, but mobile. Much like the space marked out by a territorial animal, territory constantly shifts as it is continually remarked and re-presented in different ways. And much as these territorial creature can only extend their territories at great cost, so we might also note the sheer difficulty of

sustaining this process of remarking. (Brown & Capdevila 1999: 41 f.).

Territoriality could, to sum up, be described as a specific kind of power, using space as its medium (Sack 1985, Johnston 1996). If we were to take Sack's definition in isolation, it is broad enough to be applied to the psychological (as in MacAndrew, 1993) as well as geographical approaches, and there are of course resemblances between the two. Most importantly, territoriality has in both approaches been preoccupied with the actors of territoriality rather than with the territories or with the consequences of territorial production. Irwin Altman focuses on the psychological needs and behaviours of the person who produces the territory, whereas Sack is mainly preoccupied with the strategies, rules and reasons used by the territorial producer. One reason for this preoccupation (at least in the politico-geographical approach) is the tendency of territories to become a way of justifying an exercise of power or a certain type of conduct: the control of the ruler has been replaced by that of the territory. Such a tendency can be told from expressions like "it's the law of the land" (Sack 1986:33). As a response to this tendency, researchers have often tried to get beyond the polished surface in order to find the strategies or reasons underpinning the construction of territorial order. What social rules and relationships have been disguised in the shape of a territory? This unmasking, however, neglects the question of 'what does this territory do?', in favour of a 'what is the extra-theoretical function of this territory?' – in other words the functions the territory 'actually' serves and the discourse that initiated it (Hacking 1999:19ff.).

To Sack, territoriality is a deliberate strategy or attempt to delimit a territory. If we are interested in the relationship between territorial control, and everyday practices, Sack's perspective might be problematic, since it conceals the fact that imagined control or surveillance might be just as effective as "real" control. Furthermore, routinization and socialization are important to the ways in which we use different territories; incorporated behaviors and practices are not so quickly

undone. Territories cannot, in this sense, be turned on and off at will (as suggested in Sack 1985:2), since they tend to remain productive long after their walls are torn down. If we are to study the territorial power relations that affect everyday life, we need to look at territoriality *in actu* rather than at the intentions or strategies that anticipate that territory. Following this line of thought it would be more appropriate to define territoriality as *spatial delimited and effective control*, than to define it as an attempt or a strategy. One could also describe territoriality as a kind of spatial institutionalization (Paasi 1999), suggesting that a certain place could be regarded as more or less territorialized, rather than as being territorial or non-territorial. A territory is, in short, a spatial *actant*,³ and it brings about a certain effect in a certain situation or place (the network). Territories need to be constantly produced and reproduced (by way of e.g. control, socialized behaviors, artifacts, etc.) in order to remain effective – borders and control are thus, the result of territorialization, rather than vice versa (Brown & Capdevila, 1999).

The actant perspective is a fruitful one, since it turns the questions of what caused a certain territorial effect into an empirical one. The territorial power is then described as a network of different actants of artefacts, persons, rules of conduct, laws, etc. (cf. Latour, 1991, and others), suggesting that territoriality is an altogether mobile and dynamic phenomenon (Brown & Capdevila 1999). Territories are also material, they are not just constituted by the person setting and managing the rules of the territory, but also by the boundaries and material characteristics of that territory.

³ I here make a distinction between actor and actant, related to the one suggested by Greimas (Greimas 1987, pp. 106-120, cf. Hammad, 2002, and Latour 2005:71), following the line of semiotic discourse where actant is used to describe element that modifies a situation at a more abstract level without figuration (and “actor” as something with figuration in a specific situation such as, for example, concrete individuals, a certain artefact, etc.).

4. Territorial production

What kind of territories do we find in public places? First, urban places are not like blank pages waiting to be written on, but rather like some kind of palimpsests (Lefebvre, 1991: 142 f.). There is nothing unambiguous or hierarchical about the territorial structures of a place. Territories are produced everywhere. They can be stable and enduring, or immediate and ephemeral. Territories are also produced in different ways, in different contexts and by different means, and do encompass a wide range of phenomena such as a nation, an urban district, a parking space or someone's favourite bench. If the concept of territoriality has come to denote a number of different phenomena (cf. Altman & Chemers 1975:122), the actant perspective makes it possible to re-appropriate different uses of territoriality as different forms of territorial production, in response to the question: how is this territory produced (and constantly reproduced)? What kind of activated control are we talking about?⁴ I distinguish here between four different forms of territorial production, which we are likely to find in public places (fig. 2).

	Impersonal control	Personal control
Intended production	Territorial strategy	Territorial tactics
Production through use	Territorial association	Territorial appropriation

2. *Forms of territorial production.*⁵

Territorial strategies and *tactics* are intentional attempts to mark or delimit a territory. In other words, the territorial control is directed

⁴ The concept of production as used here is inspired by Lefebvre's use of production as "the result of repetitive action" (Lefebvre, 1991:75),"while products do not press all creativity into the service of repetition (Lefebvre, 1991:77). In this article I focus primarily on the micro-scale.

⁵ This table does not suggest that the possible number of territorial productions are exhausted. One could easily add, for example, *territorial operations* (taking up the discussion of personal space) or *territorial administration* (territoriality as discussed by Häkli, 1994).

explicitly towards the ordering of a certain area (the territory). Territorial strategies represent impersonal, planned and to some extent mediated control, and often involve the delegation of control to things, rules, etc. Territorial strategies are to some extent always planned at a distance in time and/or space from the territory produced, whereas territorial tactics involve claims made in the midst of a situation and as part of an ongoing sequence (in daily life). Territorial tactics thus often refer to a personal relationship between the territory and the person or group that mark it as theirs.

Territorial associations and *appropriations* represent productions that are not planned or intentionally established, but are consequences of established and regular practices. These practices may be the effects of rational and planned decisions but are not made with the explicit intent of producing a territory. Territorial appropriation produces territories through a repetitive and consistent use of an area by a certain person or group who, at least to some extent, seem to perceive this area as their own. The object of territorial appropriation could for example be one's home, one's street or one's regular table at a restaurant. The object of territorial association represents an identifiable area, characterised by a certain usage and those specific conventions and regularities that underpin this usage. These areas do not necessarily have to be considered by any person or group as 'their own' - but are nevertheless associated to by others as pertaining to a certain function or category of users – examples could include bathing places, climbing trees or a gravel path in the park where people play boule.

Different forms of territorial production often operate at the same place, mobilising different sets of artefacts, rules, etc. A bench could be associated as the territory of sandwich eating students at lunchtime, while another group of youths could appropriate it at night. The same group could mark the bench by way of territorial tactics (this does not mean, of course, that the appropriation is transformed into tactics, but that territorial tactics are added to the territorial appropriation in order to produce two different forms of territorial production). The bench is also a

piece of street furniture and is as such maintained, and regulated by way of a territorial strategy. Together, this would make the bench an object of four different forms of territorial production: it is a place consisting of several different territorial layers. A differentiation of different forms of territorial productions thus makes it possible to provide a first survey of the landscapes of territorial power relations and their different concentrations, as found at a certain place.

It should be noted that the distinction made here between strategies and tactics is similar to the more general one made by Friedrich Wilhelm von Bülow: “Strategy is the science of military movement outside the enemy’s field of vision, tactics within it” (quoted in Certeau, 1988: 212), and, although related, not the same as the one made by Michel de Certeau. For Certeau, the relationship between strategy and tactics is between discipline and anti-discipline, between the production of those in power and the production of consumers (Certeau, 1988). The relationship between strategy and tactics thus seem to be fixed as two different sides of a power relation, in a dialectical way. The different forms of territorial production presented here are not based on who is in charge and who is not. Instead, they represent a way of describing the occurrence of different territorial productions operating at the same place, without predetermining the power relations between these productions axially, or in terms of strength or formality. Hence, several different territorial strategies could be produced at the same time and at the same place (public places maintained and produced by authorities by way of territorial strategies might, for example, simultaneously be restricted by the territorial strategies of some dominant group or subculture). The relative strengths of different territorial productions need to be investigated empirically. This way of sorting different forms of territoriality, by posing the question of how the territory was produced, can be distinguished from the more traditional ways of classifying that tend to respond to the question of what (actor, mechanism etc.) produced the territory, and in distinctions such as, between informal and formal

territories, or between group and individual territories (cf. Malmberg, 1980; Brown, 1987; and Bell et. al. 1996).

Theoretically, the different forms of territorial productions suggested, each has its own genealogy, and can be traced back to different, related uses within the research of territoriality. The history of territorial strategies is thoroughly discussed by R. Sack (1986). Hall (1959) and Goffman (1963) were pioneers of the study of territorial tactics, whereas a more recent example can be found in Manar Hammad's inventive experiments on spatial privatizations and conflicts during a conference in La Tourette (Hammad, 2002). Aspects of what I call territorial appropriations have been thoroughly discussed in studies by I. Altman (often from a perspective of privacy), and by writers such as Korosec-Serfaty (1973), following the more Lefebvrian tradition. Aspects of what I refer to as territorial associations have been dealt with by D. Crouch (1994) and, to some extent, by Deleuze and Guattari (1988).

5. Territoriality and ANT: the materiality of territoriality

Sitting at an urban square it is quite easy to recognise the material nature of everyday territorial production. People sit where there are benches; they wait for busses at bus stops, etc. One might also come to realise how vital territories are to everyday life: knowing how to behave on both sides of a pavement kerb could be a matter of life and death. In fact, we are constantly obliged to take different territorializations into consideration, territories such as pedestrian crossings, cycle ways and parking spaces, all have their proper designs and rules of conduct. Some places are signposted with territorial rules, such as 'no smoking', 'no parking', or 'no walking on the grass'. At other places, territorial regulations can be a more latent part of the ongoing life. Behaviours and practices regarded as improper also often involve some kind of territorialization. Statements such as 'You cannot behave like that', often imply a tacit specification: 'at this place' or 'in this territory'.

Territorial production both constitutes and is constituted by the material environment, and the concept could be used as a way of addressing the relationship between materiality and use by way of spatial control. The approach to territorial power implied above bears many resemblances to power as described by Foucault (Foucault 1980, 1982, see also Deleuze, 1999). Foucault claimed that power relations need constant maintenance, and the main task of the researcher is to investigate how certain power relations are accomplished, kept active, and forming clusters of disciplinary relations, resistances, etc. Foucault's general perspective on power is made concrete and more applicable to artifacts and micro-scale situations if read through ANT (Law, 1994; Lee & Brown, 1994). ANT is very explicit in terms of the powers of materiality, and has been described as a kind of *semiotics of materiality* (Law, 1999). It would, however, be fair to claim that ANT could be just as good in discussions on spatial aspects as on material ones, and that ANT thus could accurately be described as a *semiotics of spatiality/materiality*.⁶

A territorial practice of power can be described in terms of network stabilizations where connections between a set of actors or actants (such as rules and regulations, borders, sub-territories, walls, locks, pavement, behaviors, norms) become increasingly stable and predictable.⁷ The advantages of this perspective are several. First, it opens up a possible way of investigating the meaning of materiality and artifacts through the roles they play in different territorial networks, where some functions might remain constant while others change. The same material object might thus be a different actant in another territorial network production, implying a plentitude of potential actant roles for every object (cf. Law, 2002; Law & Singleton, 2003). This perspective also gives us a concept of power that matches the scheme of different territorial productions: the

⁶ Places are more often treated as the product of a network than as an integral part of a network (see Latour, 1997), but, to the interesting ANT-discussions on material artifacts – such as a doors, keys, and sleeping policemen, that has been made – one could just as easily add discussions on spatial artifacts, such as pedestrian crossings, town squares and dining rooms.

⁷ The territorialization of a network could, in the sense of the word used by Latour, also be described as a framework (Latour, 1996).

power of a certain place might be layered into a whole set of territorial networks, opening up possibilities for the investigation of the co-operation and co-existence of different territorial productions and powers at a specific place. There is also much to be won with a model of description that sees power in terms of landscapes rather than vectors (in the spirit of Nietzsche, Foucault, Deleuze, Latour, etc.). A discussion of power relations does not necessarily have to imply a spectrum ranging from power at one end to freedom/resistance at the other. Nor does power have to be studied through resistance, transgression or failure⁸ – but could just as well be studied by asking 'how does this place function?'. In discussing the landscape of territorial power, we can apply a non-polarized and non-hierarchical strategy. That is, hierarchies and axialities might well exist but they are the product of stabilized power relations rather than a point of departure. Especially within the field of urban planning and design, it is important to use a view of power that does not regard homogenous functional zoning, or, 'one place/one function', as being natural or pre-given orders.

6. Territorial stabilizations: the territoriality of materiality

After poststructuralism and constructivism had melted everything that was solid into air, it was perhaps time that we noticed once again the sensuous immediacy of the objects we live, work and converse with, in which we routinely place our trust, which we love and hate, which bind us as much as we bind them. (Pels et al, 2002:1)

Even if the idea of territorial network stabilization is a good way of acknowledging the territorial role of artifacts, it is not sufficient in itself. Observing a place, one might note that some effects or procedures seem to occur quite regularly although the territorial network supporting them has been destabilized. People might use a local bathing place, even

⁸ Since this was suggested as a good research strategy by Foucault in the 1970s, a lot of people have followed this line of investigation (also in ANT). Some (such as Cresswell, 1996:10) have

though the local authorities have closed it down, removed signs, bathing-huts, etc. There is no longer any territorial strategy to support and stabilize the network, perhaps just some mementos in the form of leftover artifacts. Still, the material conditions for bathing remain, and the territorial association might be strong enough to produce it as a territory (and it might thus continue to be an important local bathing place).

Tim Dant has pointed out that ANT, although it emphasizes the importance of a ‘sociology of the missing masses’, has actually never, in detail, been used to study “the interaction or the lived relationship between human beings and material objects” (Dant, 2004:81). I think it is also fair to say that the focus of ANT studies is often on networks and programs rather than on artifacts and places. Places are often entangled in a whole range of different and perhaps even conflicting networks, traditionally studied in isolation in different disciplines. In order to be useful from a perspective of material studies, the de-differentiation of ANT would thus need appropriate re-differentiation (cf. Albertsen & Diken 2003, and suggestions made by Latour 1998).

At a general level we can find this re-differentiation, for example, in the writings of e.g. John Law and Annemarie Mol. In a series of articles, they challenge “the tendency of networks to insist that there is nothing valuable, nothing firm, beyond the network.” (Law 2002:97, see also Mol & Law, 1994; Mol & Law, 2001; De Laet & Mol, 2000). This is not so much re-differentiation from inside ANT as a more far-reaching rewriting of ANT, following an ANT-and-after trajectory (Law & Singleton, 2003), supplementing network topologies with i.e. fluid topologies, Euclidean topologies and fire topologies – in other words other means of establishing homomorphism than network topology (Law, 2002). These are constructive and innovative ideas, and have to a large degree inspired the following discussion on different forms of territorial stabilization. However, I do not unreservedly subscribe to the critical aspect of these new spatialities. ANT has often been described in

even claimed the study of transgression to be the only way of investigating a correlation between appropriate behavior and place.

Machiavellian terms, viewing power from the point of view of the person responsible for the program (Lee & Brown 1994, Law 1997, De Laet & Mol 2000, Vandenberghe 2002). Although critique of the ANT focus on “the master of the network’ is legitimate, and, certainly points out an important field of theoretical development, it is not inherent to or obligatory in an ANT-description. This could be clarified by emphasizing the distinction between network description and network stabilization. If viewed as forms of stabilization, fluid, Euclidean and network stabilizations could, in fact, all be described in terms of actants/networks, where ANT is a way of viewing the world from a perspective of becoming. Bearing this in mind, I suggest a differentiation of three different forms of territorial stabilization: *body*, *sort* and *network*. It should be noted that these forms of stabilization are not about shape invariance alone (cf. Law, 2002), but about shape invariance as connected to certain recurrent territorial effects.

Model of description:	Territory as actant/network
Forms of stabilization:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network • Body • Sort

3. Territorial power

Using *body stabilization* (referring to both human and non-human bodies), it is possible to address the issue of how the persistence of stable material features can lead to territorial effects remaining constant even when other actants or territorial sorts change. This stabilization has to do with the fact that we all have bodies, and, more precisely, that certain artifacts, from an empirical perspective, tend to produce similar possibilities/limitations on bodily actions within different contexts. Although bodies are enacted and the *body-we-do* (Mol & Law 2004) can differ dramatically, a simple empirical investigation might show that

bodies of a similar sort (for example human bodies) also share a lot of common features when it comes to possible actions (generally, we do not walk through walls, we do not stand up and sleep, etc.). The building of a six feet stone wall could thus be an effective way of stabilizing the possible bodily movements to and from a territory. Such a stabilization might, however, not just be accomplished by the persistence of certain Euclidean shapes, but also through other stable, material features, such as textures, elasticity, hardness, light conditions, etc. A sleeping policeman is a good example of body stabilization, since it tends to produce a lot of cars driving slowly, regardless of speed limits, road signs, rules, etc. (Latour, 1999). The car is also a good way of ensuring bodily stabilization, since it provides the acting persons with quite uniform bodily shells, where the impact of a certain material design seems easy to predict (cf. Sheller and Urry, 2000). The sleeping policeman could thus be a good way of stabilizing the territorial production of, for example, a pedestrian crossing. However, we might also see examples of territorial body stabilization that work by way of the human body (cf. Dant, 2004; and Warnier, 1999). At the square, one might find walls, benches, water, etc. putting limits on movement within or across certain territories. We might also find material barriers and boundaries limiting or enhancing the possibilities of visual territorial control. In a more large-scale perspective, territories might be made accessible or inaccessible through their position in certain spatial structures (Kärrholm 2004).

Using *sort stabilization* it is possible to address effects that are held constant even when actants, relations or material aspects are transformed: the territory remains effective even if the actants or forms are changed, as long as they can still be associated with the same *sort* of territory. There are, of course, many other territorial sorts. Our everyday places are full of them, and new ones can be enacted at an instant (as soon as we recognize a place as a 'bathing place' or a 'picnic-place' and relate it to a certain use). A territorial sort is often spread by the coining of a name, names such as 'smoking room', 'boudoir', 'market square', that can be used in order to legitimize a certain rule of conduct, and in this way the

formation of a territorial sort resembles the formation of a concept (Markus 1993:30). Different territorial sorts are often also the objects of certain territorial strategies, and thus of network stabilization. The point is that if the territorial strategy is replaced or removed, similar territorial effects might still be produced, i.e. by way of territorial association or a quick reference: ‘quiet, this is a reading room’. Territorial sorts are always material and can be described as a kind of fluid topologies (De Laet & Mol, 2000; Law 2002), a family of possible network structures that all produce similar territorial effects. Different actants can be replaced (within certain limits), without affecting the territorial production. Territorial sorts can also take on different forms and still work: different bus stops, pedestrian crossings, outdoor cafés etc. might produce similar territorial effects irrespective of whether or not they have a common material denominator. Of course, we might reach a point where the territorial sort could no longer be produced, where too many actants have been replaced, or something too unfamiliar to this specific sort of territory has been introduced (cf. Law, 2002).

Network stabilization alone does not give a satisfactory description of the different territorial roles of materiality. Networks can be used to describe material effects, but this does not say anything about how these effects were accomplished. Territorial stabilizations by way of network, sort and body is a first step towards specifying different forms of material territorial institutionalization – that is, institutionalization seen as the stabilizing of recurrent effects and practices, rather than as the construction of an identity (Paasi, 1996). The different forms of stabilization are not mutually exclusive, but can be more or less manifest in different examples and situations. Thus, they represent an analytical effort to distinguish possible themes of a description (where further forms could be added to the list), and do not in any sense represent an absolute classification into different categories of power. The forms of stabilization are ways of describing a specific territorialization (and thus co-operate within a given territorial production). An out-door café might for example be regarded as more or less stabilized by all three forms: (1)

artefacts supporting comfortable seating while hindering the through movement of passers-by, (2) a strong network constituted by actants or actors such as waiters, menus, tables, chairs and a good chef, and (3) of course by an atmosphere and design readily associable to 'the out-door café'. Territorial stabilizations might also be used to describe territorial conflicts across different territorial productions: the material redevelopment of a certain square might thus stabilize the territorial association to a certain territorial sort (square-as-park), while destabilizing another (square-as-market-place).

8. Territorial complexities

Territorial research has mainly been elaborated on the topic of the privatisation of space (cf. Kärrholm 2005). However, by developing an actant perspective and different forms of territorial production, we see that the concept of territoriality is just as satisfactory for dealing with aspects of how new territorial productions are established and how they open up a place to a wider range of uses, as for dealing with homogenisation and exclusion. One important point when discussing territoriality in terms of different forms of territorial production is the possibility of changing focus from singular territorial domination to territorial co-operation and intertwining, and thus supplementing the focus on privatisation with that of 'making public'.

There are, of course, many definitions and ways of dealing with public space (Weintraub, 1997; Madanipour 2003; Sheller & Urry, 2003). One common approach has been to see public space as a space characterised by the co-presence of strangers (an approach attributed to such thinkers as Ariés, Goffman and Sennett). Seeing public space as an interpersonal sphere of sociability, one often tends to focus on space accessible to different kinds of people or groups (Lofland, 1998). In order for a place to become accessible to many different people it must, however, also be a place of varied activities. A place that is officially open to all kinds of people but nevertheless only accessible to a certain category of users,

such as cars, bikes or shoppers would, of course, also (indirectly) imply restrictions on which people are allowed to be at that place.

In an empirical investigation (Kärrholm 2005) of territorial productions at three public square in Lund, Sweden, it was found that the square that seemed to be most accessible and open to different groups and activities (Mårtenstorget), also had the largest number of territorial productions, as well as the most flexible material design, enabling it to be mobilized in different territorial networks at different times. This square had a large number of territories stabilized by way of networks rather than body or sort. At another central square of Lund, Clemenstorget, it was the other way around. Certain uses were secured through territorial subdivision, and then supported by material designs (such as fences and walls, grassy areas and hedges) that seem certain to exclude at least some of the undesired activities by way of body stabilization. The accessibility of the square was to some extent predetermined, and the territorial corpus was so convincingly designed that it actually reduced the possibilities of new superimposing territorial productions. This could certainly imply a territorial association that was easy to read, though, possibly at the expense of preventing a proliferation of new associations and territorial sorts.

It seems that 'making accessible' (and in this respect 'making public') cannot be equated with the erasing of boundaries. In fact the opposite seems more likely: the access to space has to be subdivided (in time or space) to accommodate different uses, and to make room for as many different categories of users as possible. A certain degree of territorial differentiation and superpositioning could very well bring about a much greater degree of accessibility. Spatial rules and conventions are necessary if we are to be able to act (and co-act) at all. We can recall Foucault at this point: power is productive (Foucault, 1982). My suggestion is that the publicness of place could be described as the result of different territorial productions (and thus stabilizations) intermingling at a place, and providing it with some kind of territorial complexity. More territorial orders also indicate more possibilities. The danger of

exclusive, one-sided use does not lie in territorial homogenisation alone, but in the lack of superimposed territorial productions. One way of looking at public space – adding to others, from Goffman's dramaturgical model, to the idea of mobile publics as put forward by Mimi Sheller (2004) – would be to regard public space as a result of all territorial productions of a certain place.

Territorial division and production seem to support co-operation among a wide range of different interests. Public space always embodies the co-presence of different territorial productions. Following Law and Mol (2002), one could describe such a territorial complexity by elaborating on three crucial aspects.

First, territorial complexity is characterised by a large number of territorial productions – within each form of production (strategies, tactics, etc.) as well as taken together. At the shopping mall there is for example often just one dominant territorial strategy. The dominant production need not be a territorial strategy, but could just as well be a place dominated by the territorial appropriation and association of a certain group, thus somehow tending to exclude the possibility of other productions. As these places become scenes of new territorial production, complexity increases (Mol & Law, 2002: 7).

Secondly, territorial complexity is characterised by a large number of territorial layers at each place. These multi-layered territorial productions follow different rhythms (Lefebvre, 1991), shifting between absence and presence in a regular manner during the day, the week, the year, or with less regular phenomena such as the weather (rain vs. sunshine).

Thirdly, territorial complexity is characterised by heteronymic relationships among different territorial productions. Territorial complexity is about how different territorial productions interrelate. Within territorial complexity one might expect that different territorial productions are not reduced to units within a larger scheme (such as parking spaces in a parking lot, or shops in a mall), but that there are territorial layers of equal importance at a place. Hence, a place of territorial complexity is also a place of territorial *heteronyms*.

Complexities can include rigid orders, but these orders come and go, and can always be seen within a more complex context of different orders. The concept of heteronyms comes from the Portuguese author Fernando Pessoa (Pessoa, 2002), who went beyond the concept of pseudonym and its hierarchical connotations, acting as a substitute for the author's 'real' name and identity. In the works of Pessoa, Fernando Pessoa is just one of many heteronyms (of equal rights) such as Bernardo Soares, Alberto Caeiro, Ricardo Reis and Álvaro de Campos. A heteronymic territorial relationship represents a plenitude of different territorial productions, existing in the same place and without the preconception that one is dominant, or in any profound way outranks the others. Territorial heteronyms are different in scope and strength, but they do not have any predetermined relationship or hierarchy of one being more correct than the others. Territorial hierarchies might of course be established (at the cost of territorial heteronymity and complexity), but these must be maintained through constant work and the mobilisation of resources.

In discussions on space in general, and territorial complexity in particular, it is thus important to acknowledge that the territorial regulation of a place might not be at one but several levels. The regulation of a place could involve several different, co-operating or competitive territorial strategies (or other forms of production) set by different organizations, at different scales, etc. One might perhaps guess that a place of territorial complexity thus might be laden with territorial conflicts. This might well be the case, but such conflicts are probably more often the result from tendencies of territorial homogenisation or hierarchisation. The territorial strategy of a park to act as a territory-of-leisure for different groups, ages, etc. might for example be destabilized by the territorial appropriation of drug-users taking over the park. As people stop using the park, the territorial appropriations and associations made by other groups and usages disappear, and complexity decreases. The authorities might choose different paths to increase territorial complexity again. One way is to try and settle the conflict by accommodating for different groups and uses to be co-present at the same

place, drug-users, as well as children and families (one example here is Tompkins Square Park in New York, as discussed by Hajer & Reijndorp 2001:120 ff). Another and perhaps more common way is to find means of evicting the drug-users, and thus to move the group or problem to another place in the city. In terms of territorial complexity this strategy would however be the less favourable one.

9. Investigating the territorial stabilizations of public space

The idea of territorial complexity opens up for a territorial discussion of materiality and the everyday life of public space. This is also an essential point in this article: public space is a matter of material design, suggesting that material and spatial design must always be acknowledged as a question of political importance (cf. Latour, 2004). Seeing the connections between territorial stabilizations and territorial complexities is a way of addressing these issues, both theoretically and empirically. I have thus tried to establish conceptual conditions that make it possible to go on and investigate these relationships in ways that are more concrete: How do the different forms of territorial stabilization intermingle at different places? How have the territorial productions that constitute the territorial complexities of these places been stabilized? How do the different material designs and forms of territorial stabilization affect the possibility of complex territorial production? Subtle material transformations might sometimes result in unexpected changes in terms of territorial production. Territorial complexity could, of course, put pressure on material design – in complex places, the same designs might need to be able to play different roles in different territorial productions. But what about the other way around: how does architectural design affect territorial complexity? An interesting contrast to the furnished European squares of the 1990s full of litter boxes, letterboxes, benches, kiosks, bus shelters, advertising pillars and the like, were the open paved squares common to European cities of the early twentieth century. Such a territorially unsettled or ‘neutral’ square, lacking the inscriptions of territorial orders, would, if established today, potentially be accessible to

pedestrians, bicycles, cars and buses at random. Would this then be a place of great territorial complexity? A neutral space open to the public might seem a good recipe for publicness and accessibility. However, this would not be revealed until some kind of territorial complexity had, in fact, evolved. Multi-layered territorial productions involve accessibility for different groups and uses, and thus constitute a certain neutrality of space. Neutrality must be seen in this sense as the result, and not as a point of departure. Although artefacts play an important role in social relations, it is more difficult to pinpoint what difference various designs of these artefacts might make. It can, however, be noted that neither the heavily subdivided and furnished squares full of artefacts, nor the open paved squares with no marked borders at all represent a guarantee of territorial complexity (in fact, they both seem to imply the opposite).

10. Conclusions

The concept of territoriality has seldom been utilized to its full potential. It has either been treated too narrowly, limiting the scope of its potential, or too universally, without being specific about differences among various kinds of territorial phenomena. Furthermore, it has often been treated with a focus on just one isolated type of territorialization, or on the territoriality of one group or one actor, dealing for example with aspects of exclusions, defense, or spatial homogenizations. Sorting territorial claims into different forms of productions (strategies, tactics, appropriations and associations) enable a distinction between different kinds of spatial claims, as well as an investigation of *multi-layered territorial landscapes*. Using the theories of Foucault and Latour it was also possible to de-differentiate discussions of territorial power and open up for investigations of how territorial practices and effects might function and be stabilized, or de-stabilized, rather than placing power in pre-defined institutions or blocks. Such a discussion of territoriality reduces territorial claims to the level neither of individuals/groups, nor to the level of society, but enables a discussion of territorial production as a collective effort of human and non-human actants. It ensures a certain

degree of complexity, and to some extent it enables discussions beyond dichotomies such as public/private or inclusion/exclusion.

The paper sets up a conceptual framework for empirical investigations of territorial structures, and is mainly preoccupied with discussion of *how* power relations are stabilized and can be described. This does of course not mean that we can neglect the effects of already assembled and reified asymmetries. A lot of powerful relations are already there, stabilized and institutionalized. However, the first task is to describe and explain the territorial hierarchies, asymmetries, conflicts and homogenizations – not to repeat them, or explaining power with power (Latour 2005:61). It is only when the stabilized territorial productions have been described, and the actants (such as funds, resources, artifacts, etc.) that contribute to these asymmetries of power are identified, that we can begin a process of redifferentiation, categorizing and defining important territorial institutions, agents and groups. Starting out with such a genealogical focus on *becoming* (the actant perspective), rather than *being*, it seems possible to leave behind a lot of fixations and schisms in territoriality research.

The three different forms of territorial stabilization that were discussed enable material aspects to play a more articulated role in the discussion of territorial power, and more specifically, of the accessibility and openness of public space. Together, the concepts of *territorial production*, *stabilization* and *complexity* provide us with a more dynamic and materially enriched discussion of territorial phenomena and everyday life, aspects which traditional research on territoriality often have lacked.

Literature

Agnew J. (2000). "Territoriality". *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, ed. Johnston et. al. Oxford: Blackwell.

Albertsen, N. & Diken, B. (2003). "What is the Social?" on-line article, published by Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YL, UK at

- <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Albertsen-Diken-What-Is-the-Social.pdf>, publ. i rev. 2003-11-13, (visited 2004-05-14).
- Altman I. (1975). *The Environment and Social Behavior*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Altman I. & Chemers M. (1980). *Culture & Environment*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Bell P. et al. (1996). *Environmental Psychology*. 4th ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College.
- Brown B. (1987). "Territoriality," *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*, ed. Stokols & Altman. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown S. & Capdevila R. (1999) "Perpetuum Mobile: Substance, Force and the Sociology of Translation". *Actor-Network Theory and after*, ed. J Law & J Hassard. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers/ Sociological Review.
- Certeau M. de (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Cohen, A., (1985), *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, Routledge, London & New York.
- Cresswell T. (1996). *In Place/Out of Place*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Cresswell T. (2004). *Place*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crouch D. (1994). *Territories, Places and Cultural Identity*, Odense.
- Dant T. (2004). *Materiality and Society*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Delaney, D. (2005). *Territory*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Deleuze G. (1999). *Foucault*. London: Continuum.
- Deleuze G. & Guattari F. (1998). *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Dovey K. (1999). *Framing Places*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Edney J. (1976). "Human Territoriality", *Environmental Psychology*, 2nd ed., ed. Proshansky et. al. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Forty A. (2000). *Words and Buildings*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Foucault M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*, ed. C Gordon. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault M. (1982). "The Subject and Power", in Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P., *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press.
- Goffman E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Macmillan.
- Gottman J. (1975). "The evolution of the concept of territory", *Social Science Information*, vol 14, 3–4/1975.
- Gottman J. (1973). *The Significance of Territory*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Greimas, A. J., (1987), *On Meaning: Selected Writings in Semiotic Theory*, Univ. of Minnesota Press & Frances Pinter, London.
- Hacking I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.
- Hajer M. & Reijndorp A., (2001), *In Search of New Public Domain*, Nai, Rotterdam.
- Hall E. (1959). *The Silent Language*. New York: Doubleday & Co.
- Hammad M. (2002). *The Privatisation of Space*, Lund: LTH.
- Häkli J. (1994). *Territoriality and the Rise of the Modern State*. Helsinki: Geographical Society of Finland.
- Johnston R. (1996). "Territoriality" in *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, ed. A. & J. Kuper. London & New York: Routledge.
- Johnston R. (2000). "Out of the 'Moribund Backwater': Territory and Territoriality in Political Geography, *Political Geography* 20, (2000), pp. 677–693.

- Korosec-Serfaty P. (1973). "The Case of Newly Constructed Zones: Freedom, Constraint and the Appropriation of Spaces". *Architectural Psychology*. ed. R. Küller. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kärrholm M. (2004). *Arkitekturens territorialitet*. Lund: Dep. of Architecture.
- Kärrholm M. (2005) "Territorial Complexity, a Study of Territoriality, Materiality and Use at Three Squares in Lund", *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research*, 1/2005.
- Kärrholm, M. (2007), "Territory, A Short Introduction, Delaney David", Book review in *Geografiska Annaler*, 89 B, 1/2007, pp. 76-78.
- Laet, M. de & Mol A. (2000), "The Zimbabwe Bush Pump: Mechanics of a Fluid Technology", *Social Studies of Science*, vol 30, 225–263.
- Latour B. (1991), "Technology is Society made Durable", *A Sociology of Monsters*, ed. J Law. London & New York: Routledge.
- Latour B. (1996). "On Interobjectivity", *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 4/1996, vol. 3, 228–245.
- Latour B. (1997). "Trains of Thought, Piaget, Formalism and the Fifth Dimension", *Common Knowledge* vol. 6, 170–191.
- Latour B. (1998). "How to be Iconophilic in Art, Science and Religion?", *Picturing Science-Producing Art*, ed. Caroline A. Jones & Peter Galison. London and New York: Routledge.
- Latour B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social, An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Latour B. (2004). *Politics of Nature*. Cambridge Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.
- Law J. (1994). *Organizing Modernity*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law J. (2002). "Objects and Spaces", *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 19, 91-105.
- Law J & Singleton V. (2003). "Object Lesson" publ. by the Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YN, UK at

<http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-Singleton-Object-Lessons.pdf>

- Lee N. & Brown S. (1994). "Otherness and the Actor-Network, The Undiscovered Continent", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37, 772–790.
- Lefebvre H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lofland L. (1998). *The Public Realm*. New York: Aldine de Gruyters.
- MacAndrew F. (1993). *Environmental Psychology*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Madanipour A. (2003). *Public and Private Spaces of the City*. London: Routledge.
- Malmberg T. (1980). *Human Territoriality*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Malmberg T. (1994). "Er territorialitet tabu?", *Territorialitet, Rumlige, historiske og kulturelle perspektiver*, ed: J. Tonboe. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.
- Markus T. (1993). *Buildings & Power*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mol A. & Law, J. (1994). "Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anemia and Social Topology", *Social Studies of Science*, vol. 24, 641–671.
- Mol A. & Law J. (2001). "Situating Technoscience: an Inquiry into Spatialities", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol 19, 609–621.
- Mol A. & Law J. (2002). "Complexities: An Introduction", *Complexities, Social Studies of Knowledge Practices*, ed. Mol & Law. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Mol A. & Law J. (2004). "Embodied Action, Enacted Bodies: The Example of Hypoglycaemia", *Body & Society*, vol 10 (2-3): 43-62.
- Oxford English Dictionary* (1989). vol. XVII (Sv–Thrivingly), 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Paasi A. (1996). *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pels D. et. al. (2002). "The Status of the Object, Performances, Mediations and Techniques", *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 19, 1-21.
- Pessoa F. (2001). *The Selected Prose of Fernando Pessoa*. New York: Grove Press.
- Pollini G. (1999). "Socio-Territorial Belonging", *Territorial Belonging Between Ecology and Culture*, ed. Renzo Gubert. Trento: University of Trento.
- Rapoport A. (1994). "Spatial Organization and the Built Environment", *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, ed. Tim Ingold. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sack R. (1986). *Human Territoriality, Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheller M. (2004). "Mobile publics: beyond the network perspective", *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, vol. 22, 39-52.
- Sheller M. & Urry J. (2000). "The City and the Car", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24, 737-757.
- Sheller M & Urry J. (2003). "Mobile Transformations of 'Public' and 'Private' Life", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(3), 107-125.
- Shils E. (1975). *Centre and Periphery*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Soja E. (1971). *The Political Organization of Space*. Washington: Association of American Geographers.
- Soja E. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies*. London & New York: Verso.
- Steinbock A. (1995). *Home and Beyond*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

- Vandenberghe F. (2002). "Reconstructing Humans: A Humanist Critique of Actor-Network Theory", *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol 19, 51–67.
- Warnier J. (2001). "A Praxeological Approach to Subjectivation in a Material World", *Journal of Material Culture*, 6, 5-24.
- Weintraub J. (1997). "The Theory and Politics of the Public/Private Distinction" *Public and Private in Thought and Practice*, ed. Weintraub & Kumar. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.