To Bilal, Havva, Hakan, Ayhan, Öznur Çamyar and Deniz Bulut

DETERRITORIALIZATION AND THE MODERN STATE: THE CASE

OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

of

Bilkent University

by

İSA ÇAMYAR

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2002

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

…………………………………..

Assistant Prof. Dr. Aslı Çırakman

            Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

…………………………………..

Assistant Prof. Dr. Fuat Keyman

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

…………………………………

Dr. Kürşat Ertuğrul

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

…………………………………

Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan

            Director

ABSTRACT

DETERRITORIALIZATION AND THE MODERN STATE: THE CASE OF

EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

İsa Çamyar

M.A, Department of Political Science and Public Administartion

Supervisor: Assistant Prof. Dr. Aslı Çırakman

July 2002

This thesis examines the impact of deterritorialization as an important dimension of globalization on the contemporary evolution of the modern state. The modern state has been a territorial phenomenon in the sense it has used strategical approaches to space in order to control it. The effective use of such strategies has enabled the modern state to achieve and maintain unprecedented degree of territoriality, that is a control over a physical space. However, with the rise of the trend of deterritorialization constituting the spatial logic of globalization, the territoriality of the modern state has become problematic. Thus the basic characteristics of the modern state, which have been founded in its territoriality, are being eroded under the effects of deterritorialization. The case of European Integration is analyzed to reveal the extent and scope of deterritorialization and to show how deterritorialization has challenged the territoriality of the modern state.

Key Words: Modern state, Territoriality, Globalization, Deterritorialization, European Integration

ÖZET

`ALANSIZLAŞMA` VE MODERN DEVLET: AVRUPA BÜTÜNLEŞMESİ ÖRNEĞİ

İsa Çamyar

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yardımcı Doç. Dr. Aslı Çırakman

Temmuz 2002

Bu çalışma küreselleşmenin önemli boyutlarında biri olan ` alansızlaşma` eğiliminin modern devletin evrimine olan etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Modern devlet belli bir alanı stratejik bir yaklaşımla kontrol etmek istediği ölçüde alansal bir olgu olmuştur. Alansallık stratejisinin etkin kullanımı modern devlete daha önce görülmemiş ölçüde fiziksel alan kontrolu anlamına gelen alansallık kazandırmıştır. Ancak, küreselleşmenin uzamsal mantığını oluşturan alansızlaşma eğiliminin belirmesiyle modern devletin ülkeselliği sorunsal olmaya başlamıştır. Böylece, alansallığıyla tanımlanan modern devletin belirli temel karakteristikleri alansızlaşmanın etkisi altında aşınmaktadır. Bu çalışmada Avrupa bütünleşme süreci ülkesizleşme eğiliminin vücut bulduğu bir örnek olarak incelenerek, ülkesizleşme eğiliminin modern devletin ülkeselliğine olan etkisi bu süreç bağlamında irdelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modern Devlet, Alansallık, Küreselleşme, Alansızlaşma, Avrupa Bütünleşme süreci

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work would not have been possible without the help, encouragement, guidance, friendship and love of some people. First of all, I am indebted and very grateful to my supervisor Professor Aslı Çırakman. She always encouraged, guided and supported me to finish this thesis. She read the manuscripts and helped me in editing the final version of the thesis. All my thanks and gratitude go to my dear Professor. I was also very lucky because I had a roommate and friend like Halit Mustafa Tagma. He and Bülent have always been with me, even in the most difficult time of my life when nobody was around. Their friendships have always been and will be important for me, and I thank Mustafa and Bulent, my dear friends, for everything. Galip and Burak are the others whom I wish to thank for their friendship. And of course, all my love goes to Deniz Bulut, to whom this work is devoted. Her love is blessing for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This work is about one of the most difficult and equally important questions of the contemporary world. This question is about what the nature of the contemporary modern state is. The thesis aims to make a contribution to the ongoing discussions on the nature of the contemporary states under the effects of globalization and deterritorialization. The analysis here is successful to the extent that it enables one to see the continuity and the discontinuity in the contemporary stage of the evolution of the modern state. The conviction that guides this thesis is that an attempt to understand the contemporary state would remain flawed if it does not take into account the impacts of the globalization on the structural and functional evolution of the modern state. Specifically, this thesis explores the limits of deterritorialization as a dimension of globalization and in this way it seeks to evaluate the way it affects the contemporary stage of the evolution of modern state.

With globalization, the world is getting more and more deterritorialized, meaning that the significance of the physical boundaries and constraints are declining. Deterritorialization has been experienced in different ways in different spheres of social life. The modern state could not remain unaffected by this process. The main argument of the thesis is that the territoriality of the modern state is being eroded under the influence of the trend of deterritorialization. This erosion has had such implications that it has forced the contemporary state to take an almost new form so that the classical state theories are no more able to provide an adequate understanding of the contemporary state.

There are two main premises that inform the analysis in this thesis. The first premise is that the modern state, which is taken to refer to the modern nation-state as originated and evolved in the Western Europe, is a historical phenomenon. This is so not only in the sense it has a history of its own, but also it is a product of specific types of social, economic and political relations. The modern state has owed its defining characteristics to the specific socio-economic and political contexts. Any change in these contexts will find repercussions in the structural and functional characteristics of the modern state. This thesis argues that the modern state in its origin and development has been founded in territorial economic, political and social relations, which means that these relations are bounded to a territory and defined on a territorial basis. In fact, the modern state itself has reinforced the territorialization of the economical, social and political interactions.

The second premise is that the so-called spatial analysis has a potential to make a lot of contribution to the understanding of the contemporary state. The spatial analysis seeks to bring the place back into the social and political analysis, where it "has long been treated as dead, fixed" (Agnew and Duncan, 1989: 1). The spatial analysis also points out that space and more specifically place should not be taken as given, but they matter. The spatial characteristics of a phenomenon circumscribe its existence. This thesis argues that like all phenomena, the modern state has spatial properties circumscribing its existence. One of the most important ways in which globalization could affect the modern state is by changing its spatial characteristics or by changing the spatial dynamics of the milieu in which it operates.

Informed by these premises, the study is divided into three chapters. In the first chapter, I will explore the territorial character of the modern state. First, I attempt

to give a general understanding of the phenomenon of territoriality. Territoriality referring to a specific approach to the physical space with an intention to control it with whatever exists on it is not particular to the modern state. Many other political associations preceding the modern state as well as different groups and individuals in different parts of daily life have used it. The first chapter will argue that the particularity of the territoriality of the modern state is the degree of territoriality that modern states have achieved. When effectively practiced, territoriality has given the modern state an enormous power over the physical space it claims, greater than those achieved by pre-modern political forms. It will be argued that the modern state is a territorial phenomenon. Its territoriality has shaped its basic institutional structure and its specific characteristics, such as sovereignty and power.

The main concern of the second chapter is to analyze the process of globalization and deterritorialization. Globalization has marked a change in the spatial character of economical, social and political phenomena and relations. The world has been "a space of place" (Castells, 1996), in which the constraints of physical environments have been predominantly organized and shaped the economic, social and political interactions. A globalized world has brought about the decline of the significance of these constraints of physical space and caused a relative shift from the space of place to "the space of flow" (Castells, 1996). This shift is characterized as the process of deterritorialization. The main argument of this chapter is that as an integral dimension of globalization, deterritorialization has posed a challenge to the territoriality of the modern state and contributed to the erosion of it. Since many of the defining characteristics of the modern state, such as sovereignty, authority and

legitimacy, have been defined with reference to its territorial character, the erosion of the territoriality of the modern state has also problematized these characteristics.

In the third and last chapter, I attempt to study European Integration as a case of deterritorialization. Europe is an interesting case for two reasons. First of all, it is the birthplace of the modern state. The modern state in its traditional form first came into existence in the Western Europe and from there it was imported to the different parts of the world. The European states exemplify the unprecedented degree of territoriality that the modern state has come to possess and reveal the importance of the territorial character of the modern state during its evolution. The second reason is that European states have engaged in the process of integration. This chapter argues that this integration involves the creation of a deterritorialized space at the European level. The flow of economic, social and political actors and factors without hindrance characterizes this space. However, the argument of a deterritorialized Europe needs at least two qualifications. The first qualification is that the deterritorialization of Europe refers to an ongoing process. In other words, this study does not mean to refer to a completely deterritorialized Europe, but a deterritorializing Europe. The second qualification is that deterritorialization goes hand in hand with reterritorialization at the global level. It involves a reconfiguration of the spatial levels in the form of the creation of one Europe with strong external borders.

After exploring the deterritorializing dimension of European Integration, I will attempt to elaborate the implications of this dimension for the different aspects of the European states. The chapter argues that since deterritorialization has eroded the territoriality of the European states, it has also problematized their other aspects, like sovereignty, power, constitutionality, legitimacy, taxation. This chapter is an attempt

to show that the European states operating within an increasingly deterritorialized economic, social and political environment are undergoing significant changes. With these changes, the European states are taking a new form that is different from the territorial modern state, which has a strong control over its territorial jurisdiction.

CHAPTER 1

TERRITORIALITY AND THE MODERN STATE

One of the most intriguing questions concerning the contemporary condition of the modern state is the way in which it is related with globalization and the specific ways in which globalization affects the modern state. It is argued that globalization has affected the modern state and is likely to do so in the future, among other ways, by modifying its spatial dimension. Through challenging the spatial dimension of the modern state, globalization and more specifically deterritorialization intrinsic to globalization are likely to reshape the structural and institutional characteristics of the modern state. The modern state, like other phenomena, has spatial properties, which constitute its distinctiveness as a phenomenon. Territoriality is the term that has been used to describe this spatial characteristic of the modern state. This chapter seeks to analyze first the nature of territoriality as a general phenomenon and later a more specific phenomenon of the territoriality of the modern state. It will be argued that territoriality underlies the different aspects of the modern state, such as its sovereignty, power and authority.

1.1. TERRITORIALITY: AN ATTEMPT TO DEFINE IT

The notion that natural and social phenomena and more specifically human interactions take place within a spatial context has underlied almost all theoretical

attempts in different fields. Space, in the most general sense of the term, is taken as a general physical and social context or framework that encompasses things, people and their relationships. Space provides an ontological basis for the " coexistence and simultaneity, order and disorder" of phenomena (Paasi, 1996: 18). It is a very general term, and to catch the distinctive character and specificity of human experience with space, one needs to devise perhaps more specific terms like place and territory.

Place may refer to a "culturally constructed space" (Paasi, 1996: 10). It is a kind of space, which contains subjective and cultural elements rather than just objective ones. It is a time specific-space which is not fixed but fluid, it is constructed out of the classification, categorization and distinguishing of space by human beings (Paasi, 1996: 7). Territoriality, on the other hand, is more specific than place. It could be taken as a space that is distinguished by the political and cultural nature of the ways in which human beings approach it. In what follows, territory will be treated basically as " a juridico-politically" as well as culturally constructed concept. This preference is informed by the analytical value of the characterization of territoriality as a juridico-political concept in that it well describes the distinct and systematic way in which the modern state approaches to space, people and resources on it. The distinctiveness of the approach of the modern state to space is the intention to exert a systematic and large-scale control over space.

The review of the approaches to territory and territoriality would be an appropriate starting point for an elaboration of these notions. The early formulations of territory and territoriality borrowed insights from biological science, and led to the biological explanation of human territoriality. This approach sees a parallel between animals' disposition or instinct to fix a physical area as their place and occupy there

and the tendency of human beings to occupy a space. Biological approach takes this disposition as an inherent and inborn character of both animals and human beings who are supposed to have identical instincts in developing attachment to a particular place. Territoriality is basically instinctive rather than social and cultural. These biological explanations have come under harsh critics and been largely discredited for their neglect of the social, political and economical dimensions of territory and territoriality (Sack, 1986; Lovell, 1998).

Another approach is social psychological, and it marks an advance over that of biological. This approach explains territoriality as a matter of both the material and immaterial necessities for survival. The problem with this explanation is that although it directs attention to social aspects of territoriality, it stresses the psychological elements of human's occupation of a specific place often at the expense of missing the complex and multidimensional aspects of territory and its role in the social, political and economical configuration of societies (Sack, 1986).

The complex nature of territoriality has been well recognized. This recognition has given rise to more sophisticated and socio-cultural formulations of these notions. Casimir (1991) provides a review of the existing definitions of these notions in the literature. He discusses Godeliern and Taylor's definitions of territoriality. The former focuses on the social and cultural functions of territory in that it serves as a place, where the members of a society could satisfy their material and immaterial necessities to survive. So territory could involve stretch of land, water and airspace. Taylor, Casimir argues, provides a broader definition, stressing cognitive, sentimental and behavioral aspects of territory and their functionality in giving an order to basic human activities (Casimir, 1991: 19). Casimir expresses his dissatisfaction with these

formulations and puts forward his own, which, he argues, encompasses those aspects of territory that these formulations have failed to grasp. Casimir (1991: 20) suggests that

> Human territorial behavior is a cognitive and behaviorally flexible system which aims at optimizing individuals' and often groups' access to temporarily or permanently localized resources, which satisfy either basic and universal or cultural-specific needs and wants or both while simultaneously minimize the probability of conflicts over them.

As this brief discussion has shown, territory and territoriality are complex phenomena with different social, economical, political and psychological dimensions. However, in pointing out its juridical-political dimension and its connection with power, few of the existing accounts of territory and territoriality have been as complete as Robert David Sack's. Robert David Sack (1986) provides a more specific and concise elaboration of the notions of territory and territoriality, even though his account is not as broad as Casimir and Taylor's. His detailed elaboration of these notions depicts the political dimension of human territoriality along with its other aspects, which the aforementioned theories share to varying degrees. Sack argues that territoriality is an ever-present dimension of human interaction and offers a perception of territoriality as deeply related with power and politics with socio-cultural aspects. According to Sack's well-known definition, territoriality refers to " the attempt by an individual and group to affect, influence or control people, phenomena and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area" (Sack, 1986:19). Territoriality has to do with a particular way of approach to a geographical area. Therefore, it is a particular strategy to deal with space. This space, over which a degree of control is exerted, is called territory.

9

First of all, territory and territoriality are historically and socially constructed. Their boundaries and content are the products of the interaction between social, economic and political actors and the decisions and actions of different sets of actors. One space could be territory at one time and not in other times. What makes a space territory is that individuals and groups approach to that space with an intention of controlling and structuring things, peoples and resources as well as shaping relationships among themselves within this space. The construction and reconstruction of territory and territoriality require persistent efforts on the part of the social actors to establish and maintain control over territory (Sack: 1986). As Sack points out, an example could illustrate the distinction between calling a space, a place or a territory. A geographer could draw the map of an area where corps are grown or the geographical extension of activities as a place, but when a government formulates policies to support the agricultural activities there, this place turns into territory (Sack, 1986: 19).

Sack calls territoriality as a spatial strategy, a specific way of approaching space. It is a spatial strategy to control people and things by controlling the place where they exist. Thus, territory is what he calls "the geographical expression of social power" (Sack, 1986: 5). It refers to a particular way in which society and space are related. The control of place, which turns it into territory, involves the establishment of different degrees of accession to resources and people, their definition and construction with reference to the territory they are occupying. Territory is established by specification of its boundaries and properties through a control over things and people.

Another characteristic of territory is that it is a matter of degree rather than a matter of kind so that different places have different degree of territoriality. Different degree or intensity of control is exerted over different places. For example a prison is more territorial than a room in a house. And territoriality is asserted in many different ways in daily life, such as in job descriptions, legal rights in land, brute force or power and also in cultural norms (Sack, 1986: 20).

Territory and territoriality should be understood not only as a material phenomenon but also as a social cultural entity, which is loaded with meaning, values, signs and signification. Territory provides an ontological ground for the construction of group identity and consciousness. Groups can be defined on the territorial basis, with reference to their occupation of a particular place and their claim to possess it. Territory may become an integral part of the way groups define themselves and distinguish themselves from others. Territorial identities can be formed on the basis of certain socio-cultural distinctions. These territorial identities represent and signify the boundaries that are both assumed to divide different communities and unite the community they disclose. The socio-cultural character of territoriality suggests that territory and territoriality are discursive constructs with discursively articulated boundaries. This is what Shield (1991) called, " social spatialization, the constant construction of territories at the level of social imaginary"(Shileds, 1991: 32). Territories are associated with images and identities, which constitute their contents. The role of territory in the definition of 'the other' is well implicated in the formulation of social spatialization, which has two dimensions, " the language of difference and the language of integration" (Paasi, 1996: 15). The language of integration refers to the homogenizing effect of territory on the social

11

experience taking place on it. Social interactions on the same territory are defined as representing a homogenized and more or less unitary phenomenon by virtue of their happening on a given territory with clear boundaries. The language of difference is about the delimiting or demarcating effects that territoriality could have in differentiating a homogenized group from the others. Those who happen to exist within the boundaries of a territory are different from those located in other territories. Therefore, territory with its homogenizing and differentiating effects provides a basis for the dichotomies such as 'the insider-outsider' and 'us-them' (Paasi, 1996).

Paasi argues that the construction of mental representation, images, meaning, symbols and significations is important for the establishment of territory and territoriality. The creation of territory and territoriality on the discursive level is a part of the formation and interactions of diverging social groupings that create the legitimate distinctions of social world and believe in these distinctions. Territory and its boundaries have normative implications, which means that they embody a hierarchy of values. They represent value judgments that people make about the use of space. The specific use of space could be regarded as morally good or bad. In this respect, territory is "the cultural categorization of geographical space and places"(Shields, 1991: 4). This ranking of territory in terms of values affects the degree of the accession to resources and people on that territory.

Sack (1986) identifies ten different aspects and affects of territory and territoriality. Of these aspects and effects, seven of them are relevant for the analysis of territoriality within the framework of the modern state. The first one is the notion that territoriality involves a specific form of classification by area. Territoriality helps

things to be classified and categorized according to their location. This proves very efficient under certain circumstances. For example, a state may claim that whatever exists on its territory falls under its jurisdiction, thus creating a categorization according to location in space. Instead of categorization by kind, it involves categorization by referring to an area where things and their relations exist. It is a way of asserting control over things without specific reference to them, but with reference to space, which they occupy (Sack, 1986: 32). The second aspect of territoriality is that it is communicated by boundaries that constitute territoriality in itself (Sack. 1986: 32). Boundaries could be visible and invisible socio-cultural entities. As noted, boundaries are socially and historically constructed. The historical nature of boundaries accounts for the construction and reproduction within the context of the contested interests. Boundaries are both physical and discursive constructs. A set of meanings and values is attributed to them. They are demarcating lines, which signify not only the end of territory, but also the point where social political and economical distinctions are very strongly felt. It is "the place of exclusion or inclusion, a place of association and dissociation"(Paasi, 1996: 24). Furthermore, boundaries have physical manifestations, which might be buildings, walls or any other physical marker of demarcation. Moreover, boundaries have socio-cultural aspects. They regulate and direct the interactions between different social groupings. Boundaries not only mark the separation of social groups, but also they condition specific ways in which groups interact. In other words, boundaries mediate social relationships (Paasi, 1996). The third aspect of territoriality is its strategic use to enforce control over space. Political and social actors make a deliberate attempt not only to claim a control but also to maintain that control over things, people, their relationships and access to

resources. The fourth dimension of territoriality is that it not only establishes power structure but also reifies it. Through territory, power becomes visible and concretely manifested. It is a particular form of the materialization of power. This is particularly striking in the case of the modern state. As will be analyzed, the degree of territoriality is the expression of the degree of the control and power that the modern state exerts over the space (Sack, 1986: 33). The fifth one is the distraction of attention from the controller and controlled to the territory. Particular types of behavior are assigned to a given territory and people are asked to conform to these patterns of behavior because of their happening to be within that territory. Territory turns into an agent in its exercise of such power (Sack, 1986: 34). The sixth is that it could make relationships impersonal by allowing categorization. The last and the apparent one is that territory can be seen as a container or mold constituting the spatial properties of events (Sack, 1986). Territory constitutes the spatial dimension of events and relations by circumventing them.

Territoriality as a strategic approach to space is perhaps most successfully practiced by the modern state when it is effectively used. From its very origin, the establishment of a juridico-political control over a specific place marks the evolution of the modern state. The fact that the modern state has a strong territoriality, a control over a physical place, has affected its structural and institutional characteristics.

The modern state has been theorized in immensely different ways, which are often difficult to be reconciled. However there are some elements that have been identified as nominal, which almost all state theories explicitly and implicitly recognize. Territoriality is one of these elements, on which different theories put different degrees of weight as an explanatory variable. The modern state has been

treated basically as a territorial phenomenon in at least two senses. One is that its origin, evolution, operation and power are conditioned and mediated by and through the parameters of territorial space. The other is that territoriality as a strategy provides a basis for the use of power and is one of the main characteristics of the state.

The modern nation state is a distinctively geographical or territorial phenomenon not just in the sense that it occupies a space, but also mainly in the sense that territory and territoriality shape the forms, functions and power of the state. The modern state has acted for a long time and still today as a focal point around which politics has supposed to revolve, and as an actor that structures the political, economical and social processes within society that it rules. In the evolution of the modern state, territoriality has served it as a basis for its claim to sovereign power and helped it establish an effective administrative structure throughout the territory, which also constitutes its jurisdiction.

The significance of territory and territoriality for the state, as noted, is well established, and these elements are incorporated into many definitions of the modern state. Charles Tilly (1975) provides one of those definitions. He defines the state, as a "centralized, autonomous, formally coordinated" institutional structure "controlling the population, occupying a definite territory" and "differentiated from the other organizations in the same territory" (Tilly, 1975: 70). When Tilly (1975: 27) delineates the way in which the modern state differs from its precedents, he puts emphasis on the territorial character of the modern state as its defining feature,

> (I) It controls a well-defined, continuous territory, (2) it is relatively centralized, (3) it is differentiated from the other organizations, (4) it reinforces its claim through a tendency to acquire a monopoly over the concentrated physical coercion within a given territory.

15

Michael Mann (1993) also stresses the territorial aspect of the modern state. He argues that the modern state is "a differentiated set of institutions and persons embodying centrality to cover a territorially demarcated area over which it exercises some degree of authoritative, binding rule-making, backed by some organized forces" (Mann, 1993: 55). Giddens is also among those who perceive territory as a place with demarcated boundaries within which the state exists as a set of "institutional forms of governance maintaining an administrative monopoly and rule being power sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence" (Giddens, 1985: 121).

As the discussion on the definition of the state illustrates, territoriality is perceived as an indispensable element for a political association to be called 'state'. The territorial character of the modern state has been taken as a given. The project of the state building involved the construction of territoriality, which is defined as the attempt of the increasingly centralized power structure to control, influence and shape resources, people and their relations within the space it claims to rule. Territoriality served the state elites as a strategy to establish a centralized, autonomous, differentiated and internally coordinated political structure. The centralization, autonomy and coordination resulting from the consolidation of territoriality reinforced the territoriality of the modern state in return. But, it is important to recognize that territoriality is a matter of degree and a historical phenomenon. Some states are more territorial than others, meaning that some states are more successful in establishing a control over a physical place. The territoriality of the state is historical in that it is the result of a historical process. Then, how the territoriality of the state has historically been established is an important question. Because it may reveal that

the territoriality of the modern state is possible in a specific historical context. When this context changes, as it did in the last decades of the twentieth century with globalization, the territoriality of the modern state is also likely to change.

1.2. THE TERRITORIALITY OF THE STATE: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

All political associations throughout the human history have been territorial in the sense that they have occupied a space and claimed some kinds of power and authority over the resources and people on this space, which turns into a territory. What distinguishes the modern state from its precedents is what might be called, in Sack's term, the degree of territoriality and the type of means and techniques to establish it (Sack, 1986). This territoriality has become one of the most defining features of the modern state. It has been the modern state that has achieved the highest degree of territoriality compared to its precedents (Giddens, 1985).

The evolution of the territoriality of the state is an integral part of the process of the state formation. The modern state, beginning from the sixteenth century and even from the fifteenth century onwards, gradually came into conflict with alternative sources of power within the territorial area it was coming to grasp. This is to say that alternative forms of political formations might have prevailed in the case of the failure of the emerging modern state form.[1] Also, from the sixteenth century absolutism onwards, the conventionally understood form of modern state came into existence as a process, which has had its ups and downs, continuities and

---

[1] See (Tilly, 1975) for the discussion of the rival forms of political formations that might have prevailed instead of the modern state in its formative stages. Tilly delineates the rivals of the modern state as the empire, the theocratic federation, the trading network and the feudal system. He argues that the fractured and decentralized political scene, the weakness of corporate structures, the openness of the European periphery, the growth of cities, trade, merchants, manufacturers and early capitalists made the modern state more favorable and likely alternative.

discontinuities. Before moving to the discussion of the construction of the territoriality of the modern state from the sixteenth century onward, a review of the precedent forms of political associations in terms of their territoriality would reveal and illustrate what is distinctive about the territoriality of the modern state.

1.2.1. Territoriality in the Traditional States

The way in which traditional states are categorized is a highly contested issue. Traditional states may take a variety of forms, such as the classical city-states, empires and different forms of the political organizations of the Medieval Europe. These traditional states are different from the modern state in terms of their territoriality. Although they hold " the capacity to exercise force and some elements of territoriality" (Pierson, 1996: 40), they did not have the kind and degree of the territoriality that the modern state would later come to possess. They might have exercised some sorts of rule over a particular territory, but generally they lacked the administrative and military capacity to govern, meaning day-to-day exercise of control and surveillance over their subject. Pierson argues that these states might have extracted the resources and affected the life of the subjects they claimed to rule in merciless and arbitrary ways, but the extraction of the resources and the administration of people in the sense prevalent in the modern time were flawed by the technical incapability and insufficient organizational structure (Pierson, 1996; Giddens, 1985).

Charles Tilly argues that the pre-modern rule was mostly exercised through indirect means, such as the delegation of power and authority to the local authorities and elites. The pre-modern states did not have borders that clearly set the limits of

18

their jurisdiction, but frontiers, which might be taken as a "zone of confrontation" rather than a clearly defined demarcation (Giddens, 1985). Two of the immediate precedents of the state, empires and feudal states, are particularly illustrative.

Empires lacked the degree of territorial integrity that the modern state later attained. Therefore, empires were not as capable as in controlling and penetrating their territory as the modern state. Since the pre-modern rule was through indirect means, and a local elite might have an extraordinary power at its local, there was an ineffective and weak control of the center over its peripheries (Morris, 1998, 30). The farther from the center, the weaker the degree of control they might have wielded over the territory with people and resources, the more indirect their rule becomes. Also there was no such thing as the system of empires, whose territorial boundaries would have been exclusive and have functioned on the basic principles that the modern state system has been operating. As Morris (1998: 31) clearly points out;

> Imperial boundaries did not operate to demarcate areas of exclusive jurisdiction on the basis of the shared practices and mutual recognition of rights but to keep the environment safe through the establishment of clients and the control of trade.

The feudal system that constituted many of the background conditions for the origin and development of the modern state[2] was very weak in terms of territoriality. Feudalism, as defined by Pierson (1996: 41), is

> A social world of overlapping and divided authorities, a loosely structured system of personal and clientalistic relationships, (of lords and Vassal) which, taken together, form a famously pyramidical if rather fissiparous social hierarchy.

---

[2] See (Tilly, 1975) for what were these background conditions that paved the way for the rise of the modern state. Of the conditions he analyzed, the predominance of peasantry and the decentralized character of political structure are not only closely related with the feudal system but integral parts of it.

The personal nature of rule and the low degree of territoriality characterized feudal type of rule. This was based on " particular (voluntary or involuntary) relations between individuals"(Morris, 1998: 33) and there was no complex and secure control over particular geographical areas. Morris argues that it was not territory but personal ties and relations that acted as the determinant of loyalty and identity, inclusion or exclusion in the social and political life (Morris, 1998).

Christopher Morris (1998: 23) describes the political nature of the feudal system with respect to territoriality as follows,

> As Medieval Europe consisted of complex, crosscutting jurisdictions of towns, lords, kings, emperors, popes and bishops, while all were unified as parts of Christendom, power was fragmented and shared by many different parties, allegiances were multiple and there was no clearly defined hierarchy of authority. No single agency controlled, or could possibly control the political life in the ways now routine for the modern states. Several features are important to note. Not only was power fragmented and control of territory denied any one group or institution, but also the relations of authority overlapped and were not exclusive, and no clear hierarchy was discernible.

The general state of the territoriality in the preceding political formations was generally diffused and was at low intensity. If it was intense at some degree, this intensity was never as stable and secure as would be the case in the modern state due to the lack of the institutionalized and efficient infrastructure, techniques, and means. The state of territoriality in the pre-modern states is well depicted by Tilly (1990: 39-40),

> The emperors, kings, princes, dukes, caliphs, sultans and other potentials of AD 900 prevailed as conquerors, tribute-takers and rentiers, not as a head of state that durably and densely regulated life within their realms. Inside their jurisdiction, furthermore, rivals and ostensible subordinates commonly used armed forces on behalf of

their own interests while paying little attention to the interests of their nominal sovereigns. Private armies proliferated through much of the continent…. Within the ring formed by these sprawling, ephemeral states, sovereignty fragmented even more, as hundreds of principalities, bishoprics, city-states, and other authorities exercised overlapping control in the small hinterlands of their capital.

Beginning with the fifteenth century, the territorially fragmented political forms with low degree of territoriality gave rise to a different political formation called the absolutist state. As Held (1999: 35) pointed out, the social, economic and political dynamics behind the erosion of the traditional forms of state and transition to absolutism were about,

> Struggles between monarchies, princes and barons over the domain of rightful authority; peasant rebellions against the weight of taxation and obligation; the spread of trade, commerce and market relations; the flourishing of Renaissance culture with its renewed interest in the classical political ideas; transformation in technology especially military technology; the consolidation of national monarchies; religious strife and the challenge to the universal claims of the Catholic Church; and the struggle between church and the state.

With the transition to the absolutism, the territoriality became a prominent strategy and aim for the political elite. The absolutism also marked the beginning of the emergence of a rudimentary form of a central and effective authority structure, which would later culminate in the modern state and help the modern state establish a strong territoriality.

1.2.2. Absolutism

Despite widespread discussion on whether to include the absolutist state in the traditional state or modern state, there is some agreement that it preceded the modern state in many respects. It set the main processes in motion, like centralization,

21

bureaucratization and institutionalization, which culminated in the modern state. Sometimes it is taken as a transitional form standing somewhere in between the traditional states and the modern state. But, Poggi describes the absolutist state as "the first institutional embodiment of the modern state" (Poggi, 1990: 42).

Anderson's analysis of absolutism provides strong insights into the development of territoriality in the absolutism. With absolutism a number of the defining characteristics of the modern state first appeared in their rudimentary forms (Anderson, 1974). Within the political, economical and social contexts and struggles leading to the rise of absolutism, a standing army was established, and a permanent bureaucracy with a centralized administration system came into existence. The entrenchment of a systematic and statewide taxation and a formal diplomatic service with permanent embassies abroad and state policies to promote the community and economic development accompanied the establishment of a centralized institutional and bureaucratic structure (Anderson, 1974). All of these developments were made possible by the pursuit of the strategy of territoriality by the state-builder and in return strengthened the territoriality of the emerging state and the rulers' degree of control over their territory.

During the absolutist period, as Poggi (1990) pointed out, a number of small units were gradually brought under a single and stronger political association. Attendant to these developments were the increasing capacity of central power to rule and control in both qualitative and quantitative terms. The unifying territory and a unified system of legal order began to be effectively reinforced. An international system consisted of a system of states competing with each other was coming into existence. In this system, each state increasingly recognized the exclusive jurisdiction

of the other state. Both internal and external aspects of the emerging states were becoming crystallized.

Development of an international system was probably the most important aspect in the establishment and further consolidation of territoriality (Giddens, 1985: 37). Being part of such a state system played a great deal in the evolution of the modern state. The evolution of an international system facilitated and, in many respects, gave impetus to the centralization and territorial consolidation of the states. Thus, the external aspect of sovereignty and the exercise of autonomous power by each state in its own respective territory had gradually become crystallized. The competition between the states caused further consolidation of the territorial grasp of the state, giving each state a jurisdiction over a given territory, the boundaries of which came to be defined in more exclusive terms. Pierson (1996: 48) concisely describes this situation in the following words:

> In the absolutist period, this was expressed in the emergence of a new
> international order premised upon a number of sovereign states that
> recognized the legitimate existence of other sovereign states within
> their own jurisdiction.

The boundaries of the jurisdiction gradually became more clearly defined on a territorial basis. In time, the principle that each sovereign state has a complete, absolute authority within its own territory so that no external force could intervene in anyway, became the organizing principle of the emerging international system. The modern state was building up its own capacity to effectively enforce its claim to a territory. A new bureaucratic type of administration, new forms of communication and transportation, new techniques of social control were becoming part of the routine state activity. The development of the institutional mechanisms and power

techniques gradually increased the state's capacity to penetrate its territory with resource and people on it.

However, the absolutist state was not really a modern state, it carried traditional features too. Although standing armies were coming into existence, and the centralized authority was taking steps to ensure the monopoly over the means of violence, it was the mercenary armies rather than conscription that were recruited. The appearance of bureaucratic administrative structure and system of taxation was another important part of the development of the modern state. However, bureaucratic agencies were either bought or inherited (Pierson, 1996). Taxation was not regularized, even though some wartime or extraordinary taxations had turned into 'normal'. Although the absolutist state was not a modern state, it is beyond doubt that the process of territorial consolidation that the absolutist states had initiated this period later culminated in the modern state.

1.2.3 From Absolutism to the Modern State

Absolutism brought the expansion of state power, and the deepening of its penetration in the territory it claimed to rule as well as the institutionalization of the interstate system. The internal and external aspects of the modern state reinforced each other, and the modern state was becoming crystallized with an enormous power within its own territory.

Three important developments occurred in the absolutist period that stimulated the growth of the territorial consolidation and centralization of the modern state. Warfare was one of these developments. The importance of warfare has been well taken up by Tilly (1975: 42). He pointed out that " war made the state, and the state

made war". In other words, warfare gave stimulus to the establishment of a more regular standing army relying increasingly on conscription rather than mercenaries, the extraction of resources and the development of the means and techniques that would ensure this extraction. Warfare preparation and warfare gave " the most potent energizing stimulus to the concentration of administrative resources and fiscal reorganizations" (Giddens, 1985: 112) that would come to be the defining characteristic of the emerging state. The development of the means of violence stimulated by warfare also strengthened the state's grasp over its territory. As Tilly (1975: 73) pointed out

> The formation of standing armies provided the largest single incentive to extraction and the largest single means of state coercion over the long run of European state making. Recurrently, we find a chain of causation running from (1) change or expansion in the land armies to (2) new efforts to extract resources from the subject population to (3) the development of new bureaucracies and administrative innovations to (4) resistance from the subject population to (5) renewed coercion to (6) durable increase in the bulk or extractiveness of the state.

The variable of warfare could be taken as the derivative of some other developments, such as the emergence of the international states system. The international state system was the second factor that stimulated the unprecedented increase in the territorial consolidation that the modern state has achieved. The emerging state system was not only the general context in which the state has evolved, but also a very integral part of the formation of the modern state (Giddens, 1985; Tilly, 1975). The system was competition ridden. The states were not divided by frontiers, but by borders that demarcated them more strictly. The new state system came to function on the basis of certain principles, such as the respect for each state

to exercise absolute rule within its own territory. Development and institutionalization of this system and rivalries and interactions among the states further reinforced the territorial consolidation of the modern state.

The third factor behind the territorial consolidation of the modern state was the economic expansion. Spread of capitalism stimulated economic expansion and industrial revolution, and later industrial revolution helped states to consolidate their territoriality in three ways. The first is through providing resources either by freeing the resources from the hands of the traditional forces or by creating certain new basis of resources that the state could extract through different specialized institutional structure. The second way is bureaucracy, which is defined by Weber as " the generic forms of administration in all large scale organizations of modern society" (Pierson, 1990: 20), which would not have been constructed without the help of a monolized and commercialized market economy. The third way is that economic expansion, which gradually took a capitalist form, required the framing of certain infrastructural and institutional settings. According to Mann (1994: 349), for the expansion of capitalist economic system, such conditions were to be obtained:

> (1) Increased military protection abroad, (2) more complex legal regulation of property and market transactions, and (3) domestic property forms (like the right to common land).

Obtaining these conditions entailed a more active and interventionist state with accompanying new techniques and institutions. All of these caused the expansion of the state both in quantitative and qualitative terms, and a new and different kind of social life came under the direct control of the state. Thus, the state's grasp over its people and resources within its territory strengthened.

Warfare, the formation of an interstate system and economic expansion acted as a catalysis by which more differentiated, a coherently coordinated, hierarchical and centralized state structure came into existence. The penetration of the territory by the modern state became gradually more secure, stable and deeper to the extent that would have been unimaginable for its precedents. With a greater territorial consolidation and deeper penetration over its territory, the modern state monopolized the access to the resources and people on the territory. This increasingly exhaustive monopoly came to be an organizing principle of the emerging international system. The territory of the modern state came to constitute its jurisdiction.

The relatively strong territoriality of the modern state has shaped its structural and institutional characteristics. The position of the state in the whole political life, its power, and sovereignty were all shaped by the effective use of territoriality. By the means of territoriality, the modern state came to be the center of political life and center of the political power with a single governmental structure that clearly defined its territory. In other words, there has been a territorialization of politics. The boundaries of politics have been redefined on a territorial basis, and the modern state has stood at the center of this territorialized politics. The rights and obligations have been accordingly territorialized. Regardless of their origin, personal and social background, individuals came to have political rights and obligations simply by virtue of being in a place and circumscribed by markers and limits" (Morris, 1998: 37). Laws apply to everybody who happens to be within the boundaries of the territory of the state. The rule that the state exercises became more direct. Unlike its precedents in which rule was exercised through intermediating local and administrative elites with a great deal of power, there was increasingly less mediation between the state

and the subjects. A direct rule was established and reinforced through the penetration of the society through more formalized, rationalized bureaucratic, administrative and legal structures (Morris, 1998: 38).

The territoriality of the modern state has also been substantial for its autonomous power in that the modern state's power " derives from the utility of centralized, institutionalized, *territorialized*[3] regulation of many aspects of social relations" (Keyman, 1997: 68). In this regard, Fuat Keyman's quote (1998: 68) from Mann is revealing:

> The political power network derives from the utility of centralized, institutionalized and territorialized regulation of many aspects of social relations. It consists of the regulation and means of coercion centrally administrated and territorially bounded, which… constitutes state power.

Territory, in turn, reflects the autonomous power of the state in relation to social and economical forces within its territory as well as the other states.

In his discussion of the origin and nature of the state power, Mann developed his classification of the state power as despotic and infrastructural. Despotic power is " the range of actions which the elite is empowered to undertake without routine, institutionalized negotiation with civil society groups" (Mann, 1994: 334). He argues that many of the historical state forms very strongly showed this type of power that was often unlimited, harshly and arbitrary.

The second type of state power is that of infrastructural power, which accompanied the rise of the modern state and its territorial consolidation. It refers to "the capacity of the state to actually penetrate the civil society, and to implement

---

[3] The italic belongs to me

'logistically' political decisions throughout its realm" (Mann, 1994: 334), which corresponds to the territory it claims to rule. Through its infrastructure, the modern state acquires an ability to grasp and effectively regulate the activities of civil society. The modern state has become able to reach almost every aspect of social life and every inch of the territorial area it rules over. This ability is not unstable, unsystematic and temporary, but regular, systematic and bureaucratic through the institutions of infrastructure. The modern states are often strong in terms of infrastructural power, but weak in terms of despotic power. The strength of the modern state in terms of infrastructural power is related to the degree of its territoriality (Mann, 1994: 344).

The expansion of the infrastructural power of the state, Mann argues, is through the techniques and means of the political control, which empower the state to effectively exercise its administrative, coercive and extractive power through its territory and effectively establish boundaries against outside forces. These techniques and means range from the conceptually coordinated division of labor to the improvements in the communication and transportation of people, goods and resources, aided by the development of road system and communication technologies. These new technologies increased the administrative power and surveillance capacity of the modern state (Giddens, 1985: 181). Giddens argues that the power of the state increased when it was territorially consolidated with "the growth of communication, which involved the mechanization of transportation, the severance of communication from transportation by the invention of electronic media, and the expansion of the documentary activities of the state, the upsurge in the collection of information used for administrative purposes"(Giddens, 1985: 173).

The basis of the state power is assumed to stem from the territorial consolidation of the state, and its control over a territory. Mann treats the territorial centralization of the state as " the most important precondition of the state power"(Mann, 1994: 341). Also the means and techniques of power that the state possesses are not only specific to the state, the civil society forces could hold some forms of them at their disposal. However, the distinctiveness of the state power comes from its being centralized over a territory, over which it has an authoritative power. Thus, among other things, the territorial centralization and consolidation give the state autonomous power over the society it rules and against the external forces. The power of the state extends through a territory with clearly defined boundaries. The state is " a central place and a unified territorial reach" (Mann, 1994: 342).

The general process of what Giddens calls internal pacification is an illustration of infrastructural power of the modern state. The internal pacification was, as Giddens argues, the result of the employment of surveillance techniques and means to neutralize and even to eliminate the alternative sources of power. Surveillance is "the primary means of concentration of authoritative resources" (Giddens, 1985: 181) and a processes through which different techniques of control is devised. This process was aided by the development of "the new forms of administration, new techniques for record-keeping, new techniques for the transmission and processing of both people and information" (Poggi, 1990: 17). Supported with these new means and techniques, the modern state has acquired an extent of power to govern and a degree of instantaneity in accessing resources and people on its territory, which would have been unimaginable for the traditional states. Thus, the modern state has come to be the main center of power in society it rules.

As in the case of the autonomous power of the modern state, the territoriality of the modern state has constituted the underlying basis for its sovereignty. Sovereignty is the claim of the state to be the ultimate source of authority having the right to make laws, rules and regulations within a given territory and the recognition and the respect of this claim by other states (Pierson, 1996; Poggi, 1990). Sovereignty is associated with the territorial consolidation and centralization of the state power, and it has been used to characterize the state's power and position in its relation to society it claims to rule and the state system of which it is a part. Sovereignty is the direct expression of the territorial character of the state in that the success of the state in claiming and enforcing sovereign power is the result of the territorial consolidation of the state. Territorial consolidation has caused the more effective and successful claim of the state to control the territory constituting its realm. This has further strengthened the state's position as the holder of the sole authority within its territory. In principle, this claim has been exclusive, meaning that outside forces are denied of sharing a degree of control over the territory. Sovereignty has historically come to have internal and external aspects marked by the territorial boundaries. The internal and external aspects of sovereignty correspond to one of the most basic distinctions, that of the domestic versus the international. Whatever falls inside of the clearly defined territorial boundaries became associated with the domestic that is internal aspect of sovereignty; and the outside of the territorial boundaries came to constitute the realm of international that is external dimension of sovereignty.

In its internal dimension, the modern state has been marked by its differentiation from the other social organizations. This is a feature that distinguishes the modern state from other political associations and organizations preceding it.

31

Separation of the state as an institutional ensemble with the territorial consolidation increased its autonomy and created the problem of its relationship with other organizations and social actors. This was solved at least partially by the increasing centralization of political power in the central institutional setting within the increasingly demarcated territorial area (Tilly, 1975). The centralization and differentiation of the political power and increasing control being exerted over the territory went hand in hand and constituted the necessary conditions for the emergence of the state's sovereignty (Tilly, 1975).

The external dimension of sovereignty has also accompanied the territorial consolidation of the states. The development of the territoriality of the modern state has gone hand in hand with the emergence of a new international state system, which occurred at the early modern age, and the accompanying process of the construction of a new spatial level called international by the interactions of the states (Tilly, 1975; Giddens, 1985; Mann, 1993; Keyman, 1997; Morris, 1998; Pierson, 1996). Sovereignty came to define the relationships between the states and the non-intervention of states into a given state's claim to rule and hold the right to make binding rules within a given territory, backed by the legitimate use of means of coercion. This principle was first formally declared in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and came to be one of the most cherished principles of the international relations. As the state system became institutionalized and more clearly and aggressively defined and demarcated every part of the earth, this principle has underlied the documents and organizations that regulate the relations of the states. The modern states are externally sovereign to the extent that they are autonomous in ruling the territory they claim.

1.3. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

In this chapter, an effort has been made to examine the character of territory and territoriality as a general strategy in approaching space. It has been argued that territory is a subcategory of space. The question has been raised as to what makes a space territory. Mainly, it has been argued that space turns into territory when groups and individuals approach it by making a deliberate attempt to control it and whatever exists on it. The modern state is one of the most successful institutions that turn space into territory. The modern state has established and maintained territories by effectively devising power and surveillance techniques and a huge administrative and legal structure. Territoriality has become very important in that many of the defining characteristics of the modern state are rooted in its control over its territory. The modern state is sovereign, autonomous, able to rule and tax its people and act as the center of the political life, insofar as its territoriality or control over the territory that it claims is strong and secure.

However, the salience of the territoriality of the modern state has come under challenges with the developments in the recent decades that are brought under the general term globalization. Globalization seems to have unleashed forces that defy the territoriality of the modern state and made it problematic. More specifically, what is so challenging in globalization for the modern state is that deterritorialization as a dimension of globalization has made the constraints of physical space and the importance of territoriality increasingly and relatively less relevant. For this reason, it is globalization and deterritorialization that are the main concern of the next chapter.

In this regard, the next chapter attempts to discuss how the territoriality of the modern state has become problematic with the trend of deterritorialization.

CHAPTER 2

GLOBALIZATION AND DETERRITORIALIZATION

Territoriality as a general phenomenon and the territoriality of the modern state in specific were the main concerns of the previous chapter. The territoriality of the modern state is taken to refer to the control of the modern state over a particular place. Territoriality referring to the spatial dimension of the modern state has affected its structural and functional evolution and come to be one of its most defining characteristics. However, the territoriality of the modern state that is the effective control of physical space has become problematic. This is so because of the globalization and in consequence deterritorialization of space. This chapter is designed to analyze the globalization of economical, social and political relations in the recent decades, which, this work argues, has affected and is likely to problematize the territoriality of the modern state. I will first deal with globalization as a general process and then move to the discussion of deterritorialization with implications for the territoriality of the modern state.

There is a widely shared sense that the present time is an age of transitions. The world is experiencing profound changes in every aspect of human life, over the nature and scope of which there have been widespread discussions (Scholte, 2000; Waters, 1995; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999; Albrow, 1996; Strange 1996). To characterize the present phrase of the human history and to describe the

multiplicity of the trends and processes going on at different levels of global experience, a loosely defined cover term globalization has been used. Globalization as a general process has been characterized in different ways: as the cultivation of the process of modernization, as a different phrase from modernization, as the westernization or Americanization, as a result of the ascent of capitalism, as a new cultural logic or postmodern age.[4]

All these characterizations of the present and the process of globalization may hold of some truth, but what is important to see is that different ways of conceptualization of the process are the manifestation of the complexity and multi-layered character of the process. This complexity makes a consistent definition of the process of globalization very difficult, a factor that seems to account for the diversity of perspectives in the literature on globalization.

One thing that different conceptions of globalization would share is the link between globalization as a process and the changes in the spatial and temporal organization of social life. Especially, the spatial dimension of social life has been emphasized. Held pointed out that globalization is related to " a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions"(Held, 1999: 16). Waters suggested that globalization is " a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede, and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding"(Waters, 1995: 3). Scholte (2000: 3) identifies " the transformation of social geography marked by the growth of supraterritorial space" as the defining feature of globalization. This emphasis on

---

4 See (Roland Axtman, 1998) for the depiction of the varieties in the use of the describing globalization

spatial dimension of globalization is also evident in different characterizations of globalization, such as time-space compression, time-space distanciation, the disembedding of social relations from their local constraints, the space of flow or reterritorialization and deterritorialization (Brenner, 1999). It is the last characterization of the spatial dimension of globalization that occupies the thrust of this chapter. As will be elaborated, deterritorialization is taken as a substantial and defining element of globalization, which is the result of the reorganization of space in such a way that social relations and interactions are to varying degrees deterritorialized. It means that the geographical or territorial properties of social interactions exert increasingly less constraining power on the structuring of these interactions. Before analyzing a more specific phenomenon of deterritorialization, one needs to discuss the general process of globalization because of the necessity of putting deterritorialization with a larger picture of which it is a part.

2.1. GLOBALIZATION

Although the term globalization is very often used in the analysis of different aspects of the contemporary world, the sense in which it is used is hardly specified and often taken for granted. But the specification of the sense in which the term is used seems very important because of the ambiguities, uncertainties and doubts surrounding the debates on its nature, causes, periodization and different manifestations. The ambiguities, doubts and uncertainties in different perceptions of globalization reflect the complex, contradictory and multilayed character of the process. Therefore, the use of the term globalization requires the specification of the sense in which it is used. This chapter attempts to specify the sense in which globalization is taken here.

2.1.1 The Problem of Definition

The analytical value of the term globalization depends on its ability to catch something new about the contemporary world, which the conventional conceptual tools prove ill-equipped to comprehend. Globalization could be defined in a way that enables those studying the present age to identify the distinctiveness of the present age. One of the most important problems of the different ways of definition of globalization is that they focus on one manifestation of globalization and equate it with the whole process. Westernization, universalization, modernization and liberalization[5] are significant in pointing out one trend contained within globalization, but not exhaustive in covering the whole of the process. These different conceptions of globalization seem to miss the logic of globalization, which, this chapter argues, refers to the changes in the spatial temporal dimensions of human experience. It is at this point that the spatial analysis helps a great deal. That is also where the strength of the conceptions of globalization that stress the spatial dimension of the globalizing world lays.

The significance of the spatial dimension of human experience is recognized by many attempts to define globalization (Harvey, 1989; Giddens, 1990; Castells, 1996; Soja, 1989; Cox, 1997; Keyman and Saribay, 1997). David Held provides one of the most insightful attempts. He defines globalization as a change in the way interactions are spatially organized across established borders[6]. He identifies four

---

5 See, (Scholte, 2000), where Scholte takes as different ways in which globalization has been defined. He tries to go beyond these definitions and suggests that globalization ought to be perceived as 'Deterritorialization' referring in his terms the rise of supraterritoriality.

6 See (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999), for a comprehensive account of globalization.

distinct features of the process. The first one is the extension of the scope of the interaction in the global scale across the established regional, national and local boundaries, which have divided the societies and prescribed the way they exist. The second characteristic he points out is the deepening of the interaction in terms of the flows of individual, investment, capital, goods and people at an unprecedented scale. The interactions are not only extended over the globe, but also the time dimension of the experiences is compressed. There is in his term a speeding up of the interaction and processes. These are made possible through the worldwide network of communication and transportation. Also, there is an increase in the velocity of the flow of the diffusion of ideas, goods, information, capital and people (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton 1999).

As Held formulates, the changes in the spatial dimension of social interaction are the defining aspect of globalization. Globalization has been associated with the emergence of new levels of experience and the restructuring of the existing ones. In other words, what has happened is the construction, reconstruction and institutionalization of different fields and levels of human interaction. Transnational or supranational as distinct from international is one of the layers emerging and institutionalizing with globalization (Keyman and Saribay, 1997; Rosenau, 1990). The activities of the multilateral institutions, transnational corporations and political formations fall into the realm of transnational or supranational. The construction of these layers has affected the nature and significance of the traditional layers of human experience. The already existing layer of 'the international' based on the relationships between the nation-sates, groups and the individuals being part of different nation-states is losing its significance with the rise of the transnational or the supranational.

The local has acquired a different significance and become more inclusive, open rather than exclusive, apathetic and closed as it used to be. The national level, which is defined by the boundaries of the jurisdiction of the nation-state, has been redefined in such a way that it is increasingly losing its rigidity and significance. This is a situation reinforced by the aforementioned rise of the transnational and the resurgence of the local (Axford, 1995; Calleya, c2000; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999; Mittelman, 1996; Strange, 1996).

The periodization of globalization or putting it in a particular historical context is another aspect of the identification of the process. The question arises as to whether the contemporary globalization is a novelty or a repetition of a general trend that has precedents in the previous ages. There are different responses to this question. One of them comes from the so-called 'hyperglobalists', who argue that globalization belongs only to the present stage of human history (Ohmae, 1995; Ruggie, 1993). The globalization represents a break from localized, nationalized societies divided by artificial political, economical and cultural boundaries. The globalization as evolved in the second half of the twentieth century and more specifically after the 1980s and 90s has unleashed the globalizing forces that have dismantled the artificial boundaries. Skeptics, on the other hand, argue that the novelty of the present age should not be overstated (Hirst and Thompson, 1995). The world has been experiencing globalization waves in different periods of time, the most recent of which was those in the second half of the nineteenth century. The current form of globalization has precedents, which make it not as typical as the hyperglobalists suggest. Also, the boundaries in different forms and the territorial

character of human experience still persist (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999).

The third approach that seems as the strongest one is what Held calls "transformationalist thesis", which points out the novelties of the current form of globalization while acknowledging the common points that the current form shares with its precedents. For the transformationalists, the current globalization is the phenomenon of the last four decades. In the previous ages, globalization as the intensification of the interconnectedness of human societies has existed in different forms. What distinguishes the current trend of globalization from its precedents is the unprecedented success in overcoming the constraints and the limitations behind the increase in the scale of the interconnectedness accompanying the changes in the spatial dimension of human experience. In the previous patterns, social interconnectedness had been constrained by the technological and infrastructural inabilities (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999).

Different individuals, groups, political and economical actors with their different concerns, problems and interests have contributed to the rise of globalization by following globalizing strategies. The infrastructural framework provided by the aforementioned development in the communication and transportation technologies has enabled them to pursue their strategies successfully. Economic actors seeking to get more profit have extended their economic activities beyond the boundaries of their national economies. The states seeking to pursue their increasingly similar national interests have created the levels of international and transnational, to pursue these interests. The individuals in different parts of the world perceiving of sharing similar interests have come together and formed a transnational platform.

Different societies and regions have experienced the process of globalization in different ways with varying intensities. The diversity in the degree of involvement in the process is reflected in the global division between the North and the South. The countries in the North are much more involved in the process than the Southern countries and are basically the main beneficiaries of it (Axford, 1995). The differences in the degree of the involvement in globalization and the degree of having access to the benefits of the system has created a gap between the counties of the North and the South. This point has been taken up in the literature in different ways, and it has been argued that interdependence and interconnectedness often used to characterize globalization seem to mask deep unevenness, dependence and asymmetry among the constitutive elements of the global system (Axford, 1995; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999; Mittelman, 1996).

Globalization is an ongoing process containing uncertainties, ambiguities and contradictions. Globalization involves the interaction of different trends, such as homogenization, standardization, universalism, transnationalism, localism and deterritorialization. These contradictory trends are experienced in different spheres of life in different ways and intensities. The examination of the globalization in the different spheres of life, mainly in economy, culture and politics, would indicate the complex and multilayed character of globalization.

2.1.2. The Globalization of Economy

It is generally held that the economic forces give impetus the current globalization. The present time is characterized by a globalizing system of economic activities. A globalizing economy is also a deterritorializing economy. In a deterritorialized

economy, economic actors and factors are detached from their national and territorial context and flow with minimum hindrance throughout a global system. Such an economy has been promoted by the increase in the number of the corporations and the financial institutions. These economic actors operate beyond the national economic boundaries and influence the decision on the production, location and distribution of the economic resources and power in different parts of the world. But it is important to note that there is no such thing as a globalized economy, but there is a world economy being globalized, meaning that globalization in economy is a matter of degree rather than kind as is often the case in the other spheres of life. Then the question is how a globalizing economy would look like. Waters provides a concise account of the ideal type of globalized economy. Before elaborating what a globalized economy means, one must note that there are different aspects of economy, and each aspect is globalized in different ways and to different degrees. An empirical analysis of the world economy would show to what extent the world economy has become globalized, which is beyond the scope of the chapter (Gill and Law, 1988; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999; Ohmae, 1995). The depictions of a globalized economy that Waters makes is an ideal type, and the world is globalized to the extent that it approximates to this ideal type.

In a globalized economy, trade would be characterized by an " absolute freedom of exchange between localities" (Waters, 1995: 94). It means that there would be an unhindered flow of capital, goods, and people, which the removal of not only the tariff duties but also non-tariff and cultural barriers. In the field of production, there would not be an international division of labor of the kind that has prevailed in the international economy between the core countries having a capital

intensive and high value adding production pattern and peripheral countries having labor intensive and low value adding production pattern. Instead of the international division of the labor, which creates structural constraints on the pattern of production prevalent in the developing countries or peripheral countries, a globalized economy would be like the one in which the type and volume of production would be determined by the physical or geographical advantages in a given locality (Waters, 1995).

In terms of investment in a truly globalized world economy, there would be a minimal foreign direct investment (FDI), meaning there would not be a point in calling an investment as foreign, and FDI would be replaced by trade and production alliances. The organizational logic of a globalized economy would be "flexible and responsive to global market" (Waters, 1995: 94). Also the world market is globalized to the extent that the financial market would be "decentralized, instantaneous and stateless."(Waters, 1995: 94). Lastly, in labor market, there would be a free movement of people. Labor would not be permanently identified with a specific place (Waters, 1995).

What the analysis of a globalized economy suggests is that with globalization, the spatial dimensions of the economic activities would change. Economic relations for a long time have been under the constraints of the physical space. Physical space has been shaping the type of production, exchange and distribution. However, with a globalizing economy, economic transactions and interactions are less and less constrained by the physical space; the economic activities are more and more deterritorialized.

2.1.3. The Globalization of Culture

The term 'globalized culture' would sound disturbing for some, because it has a connotation that there is one homogenized culture, which is totalizing and suppressive of local cultural patterns. What happens in the realm of culture is to a large extent the homogenization of culture. There has been what might be called a deterritorialization of culture, that is to say that cultural practices are detached from the particular localities and become available in different parts of the world for every people. This has brought about, as skeptics and critics argue, the standardization and homogenization of the cultural practices and of the way they are consumed. The standardization of cultural practices could be the result of the unevenness of influence in different cultures' confrontation with others and the imposition of one culture over others (Robertson, 1995: 40).

However, the globalization of culture is more complex than this depiction seems to suggest. Although nobody would deny the predominance of the cultural patterns of particular localities in their confrontation with others, a globalized culture implies heterogenization as well as homogenization. Waters defines an absolutely globalized cultural landscape as the one in which a common but hyper differentiated field of values, tastes and style opportunities is accessible without constraints for each and every individual for the purpose of consumption and self-expression (Waters, 1995: 126).

Featherstone argues that there are different shapes that a globalized culture could take. One of them is about the emergence of a truly transnational culture, which, as elaborated above, signifies the rise of novel or synthesized cultural forms that are not linked to any particular society or cultural group. The other form that a

globalized culture could take is the relativization of different cultures. Globalization and the erosion of the mostly artificial boundaries dividing people bring about the confrontation of different cultures, which have been previously homogenized and self-closed. The confrontation with other cultures forces each culture to perceive itself relative to others. This relativization involves the reflexive examination of one's own cultural practice, which further causes either transformation or resistance to other's (Waters, 1995: 126).

As in the case of economy, the globalization of culture would manifest itself in different forms in different " -scapes" of the cultural life, as Waters analyzes. In what he calls sacrispace, referring to religion, there would be a detachment of religious beliefs from a specific territory and also people in different parts of the world would adopt them. In what he calls ethnoscape, there would be an extension of cosmopolitanism and universal promotion of diversity. Econoscape would be characterized by the worldwide creation of simulations and representations and their worldwide dissemination. In the mediascape, there would be a global distribution of images and information. And in the leisurescape, tourism would be universalized (Waters, 1995: 156).

The globalization of culture brings the issue of the relation between the global and the local into the picture. The relation between the global and the local has often been thought as one of conflict, meaning that they are perceived in a somewhat zero-sum and exclusive way. It is assumed that globalization refers to the dissolution of the local and the emergence of a unitary cultural structure. There are, on the other hand, those who argue that the globalization has brought about the heterogenization

of the world, in which the local asserts itself in the face of the alleged challenges that the global poses to it (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, 1999).

However, some argue that the relationship between the global and the local does not have to be exclusive (Keyman and Saribay, 1997, Robertson 1995). To describe the complex relationship between the global and the local, in which both is taken to contribute to the constitution of the other, the term glocalization has been devised. Robertson, who provided one of the most elaborate uses of the term, argues that there is a need to overcome the dichotomy between the homogenization and heterogenization thesis. This can be done, he argues, by showing that the global and the local are not opposite or completely separate things, but are constructed in their confrontation (Robertson, 1995). What characterizes globalization is " the creation and incorporation of locality, processes which themselves largely shape, in turn, the compression of the world as a whole" (Robertson, 1995: 40).

The globalization of culture, like economy, brings about the change in the spatial dimension of social and cultural interactions. The cultural or the social have been the phenomenon of 'the local', which is territorially defined, relatively stable, closed and often parochial. With cultural globalization, the cultural and social practices of one locality have become available throughout the globe, in many different localities. Cultural practices could no longer be confined to a particular place but be practiced in different parts of the world. Whether globalization of culture has brought about the standardization of culture or its heterogenization is a contested issue. However, it is certain that the constraining and determining effects of physical space in the sense of local place are becoming increasingly less relevant. Therefore,

one may safely argue that there is a deterritorialization of cultural practices within today's global world.

2.1.4. The Globalization of Politics

In the political realm, globalization is accompanied by what might be called as the transnationalization or internationalization and localization of politics with "the dispersion of power" throughout the different levels of experience (Strange, 1996; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999). There has been an exclusive link between territory and political power; power had to operate within constrains and limitations of territory or physical space, which has been done by the nation-states. With the internationalization of political, the states are involved in collective activities with other states. They create a pool of sovereignty to pursue their national interests. The transnationalization of the political activities (Rosenau, 1990) extended the limits of the political power and activities and stimulated the formation of supranational type of organization, UN, EU. The transnationalization of politics has been accompanied with the appearance of a nascent transnational civil society. The emerging civil society consists of the nongovernmental organizations, associations and social movements, which organize, mobilize and exercise ' people's power' across the national borders (Strange, 1996; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999).

The states often acted as architects of the strategies and the policies promoting globalization, but it seems at this stage that as the political globalization deepens, it is more likely to lose its centrality. Traditionally the modern states kept the monopoly over the containment of the politics and constituted a focal point around which the whole business of politics revolves. The form and intensity of the contemporary

political globalization pose a threat to the nation-state. With the diffusion of power through different levels, the states no longer claim to be the sole holder of power and authority (Strange, 1996). Power is dispersed throughout the global structure and detached from a national territorial context, meaning politics is deterritorialized. In its extreme form, political globalization leading to the formation of regional and global scale governmental structures.

Even though the state is technically and practically more able to intervene into the processes within the society it rules, the political globalization has brought about the extension of the arenas and networks of political activities, which transcended the national political jurisdiction. Political globalization has also diffused political power so that non-state actors, like the Multinational Cooperations (MNCs), have come to reserve an enormous power (Strange, 1996). Parallel with these developments is the emergence of new political issues, such as global security and economic sustainability. This further led to the blurring of the basic distinctions such as domestic and foreign, or private and public, which have structured the modern politics. Managing and handling of the transborder issues entail to transcend the distinctions and the need for transborder coordination and regulation. Supranational cooperation causes the rise of transborder identities and interests.

What makes the contemporary economical, cultural and political life more global is the change in the spatial dimension of the activities in these realms. This change has been in such a way that economical, political and social activities are less and less structured by the physical constraints of a place and more and more detached from a specific territorial area. Such a change in the spatial dimension is called

deterritorialization. It is this dimension of globalization that, this chapter argues, poses a serious challenge to the territoriality of the modern state.

2.2. DETERRITORIALIZATION

As noted before, the logic of globalization lies in the changes that the spatial and temporal dimensions of human existence have undergone. These changes have amounted to what Harvey (1989) called a time and space compression. Insofar as the interactions and transactions are underlied by this logic, they are global. Deterritorialization is one dimension of these changes in the spatial organization of the social life. Scholte (2000) presents deterritorialization as the dynamic that accounts for the whole process of globalization, but it seems that his perception does not do justice to the complexity of the process. In this chapter, I will trace deterritorialization as a crucial dimension of globalization. Among others contained in the general process of globalization, there is also reterritorialization. Deterritorialization refers to the diminishing importance and the relevance of the physical space or territory as a structural property of human interaction, whereas reterritorialization refers to the rearrangement of physical space so that physical boundaries are reconstructed at different spatial level. Reterritorialization mainly shows that the world is not completely deterritorialized, territory and territoriality are still relevant to varying degrees. However, the thesis argues that deterritorialization is more relevant for the contemporary condition of the modern state that reterritorialization. This is so because it is deterritorialization that seems to pose one

of the most important challenges that the modern state has to face by eroding its territoriality.

In almost all stages of human history, human beings always acted within the constraints of physical space and (or) territory. Human interaction has been limited by physical boundaries and it occupied a space (Agnew and Duncan, 1989; Anderson, 1996; Immerfall, 1998; Sack, 1986, Wolch and Dear, 1989). This has been the organizing principle of social experience[8]. Physical space has come to have different features, geographical, cultural and symbolic. In the social realm, individuals living within a bounded geography and circumscribed by the constraints of physical place form a community. They come to have certain ways of living, which further leads them to form a collective identity. They also develop common and collective organizations by virtue of occupying a territory. Along with sociological effects, this generates political and economic impacts. In economic respects, the form and the nature of the economic activities are more shaped by the constraints of physical space within which they are located. Thus, the constraints of physical space circumscribe the production and distribution of economic wealth and resources. In political terms, the exercise of power is limited within the reach of a limited place. This creates the ontological base for many forms of political associations that have reigned throughout human history. This is particularly true of the state building and the accompanying process of nation building. Territory defines the reach and boundaries of state authority and the administrative rule, setting and symbolizing the boundaries

---

[8] Scholte presents deterritorialization as the dynamic that accounts for the whole process of globalization. See (Scholte, 2000). But, it seems that his perception does not do justice to the complexity of the process. In this paper, deterritorialization is treated as only one dimension of globalization.

of state authority. The modern states draw on "the transcendent and primordial patterns of attraction of their citizens to a territorially bounded societies" (Sack, 1986; Wolch and Dear, 1989) and at the same time need to "symbolize the territorial boundaries of the nation" (Sack, 1986: 98).

In the age of globalization, with the technological and infrastructural improvements, we see the extension of the realm of the pursuable actions. Human interaction is liberated from the constraints and limitation of where it is located. The established boundaries based on geographical space have come to be blurred and transcended. New types of spaces, which are defined less by a geographical fixity, have appeared. But, transcending the existing boundaries does not mean to say that the border itself in the widest sense of the word is disappearing. However, it is to say that the base, form and permeability of the borders are changing. New kinds of space, which are not based on territory, have come into being. In that respect, deterritorialization involves reconfiguration of territory rather than its disappearance. It is not to suggest that territory is no longer completely irrelevant, deterritorialization refers to the change in the way in which social interactions and space are related. So it involves the partial diminishing importance of the social effects of physical location and spatial setting. Therefore, deterritorialization refers to a shift from "the space of place" to "the space of flow"(Castells, 1996: 423-428). To the extent that the world is deterritorialized, the territorial character of the economic, political and social relations would be eroded. The economic, political and social interactions would take place through the space of flow and be detached from the limits of the physical place.

A physical space has two main dimensions "place as a fixed location" in physical geographical terms and "distance referring to the length of a tract that connects between locations". In the space of place, people, capital and goods are fixed with rigidity. Space in the globalizing age has relatively turned a setting through which there is a relatively more constant flow of goods, peoples, and capital. Such kind of space has more open, fluid and permeable borders, which do not signify the complete exclusion but the regulation of flow. The traditional territorial space constitutes contiguity, homogeneity and clearly identifiable borders, but the space of flow brings heterogeneity, uncertainty, ambiguities as well as homogeneity in some respects (Scholte, 2000: 46).

What are the main dynamics, which have made today's world relatively more deterritorialized? In answering this question, it is important to recognize that the search for the main dynamics behind deterritorialization runs the risk of reducing the complex phenomenon of deterritorialization to the effects of a few factors at the expense of excluding other possible factors that might have contributed to the unfolding of deterritorialization. But, the examination of some of the prominent factors that might have contributed to the rise of deterritorialization will illustrate its historical character. Scholte puts forward four different factors that have changed the spatial dimension of human interaction and created a more deterritorialized world.

Rationalism in Scholte's term is one of the dynamics that has contributed to the rise of a deterritorialized world. It refers to the mentality that has acted as a framework that enables economic and political actors to perceive the world in more

global terms. This mentality is characterized by "scientism in its perception of 'objective truth' having universal validity; secularism in its perception of the humanity and world in earthly terms; anthropocentrism in its perception of the earth as the home of human species and instrumentalism in its opposition to the territorial divisions for efficiency concerns" (Scholte, 2000: 106). This point is well taken by Roland Robertson. For him, globalization as a concept refers to, among other things, the growing consciousness of being in a global world shared by increasing number of people.[12] Having a global consciousness makes one to locate himself or herself in terms of the globe, and increasingly relativizes individual and national reference points in relation to general supranational ones (Waters, 1995: 40-43).

Capitalism is another and, probably, the most important factor contributing to the rise of an increasingly deterritorialized world. As already stated in the Marxist literature, capitalism has a profit-oriented logic, which forces it to move beyond the established borders and restructure economic life in deterritorialized ways with implicit and explicit political and cultural implications (Wallerstien, 1979; Gill and Law, 1988; Waters, 1995). Capitalism has facilitated globalization by its very logic of unceasing search for profit in different parts of the world. The capitalist logic has pushed the formation of a world market to increase its profit and driven the extent of the market on a global scale to find relatively more advantageous places for production and consequently for accumulation. Capitalism has also created what is called the economy of scale supported by the development of global accounting of prices and tax liabilities (Wallerstien, 1979; Gill and Law, 1988; Waters, 1995;

---

12 See (Waters, 1995: 40-43), for an elaborate discussion of Robertson's notion of global consciousness and its significance

Scholte, 2000). The standardization of cultural tastes and the consumerist culture that capitalism has promoted worldwide are other ways in which it has contributed to the rise of deterritorialization.

Similarly, the unprecedented breakthroughs in information, communication and transportation technology accompanied by the socioeconomic and political impetus to go beyond the local and territorial boundaries acted as the material forces behind the current trend of deterritorialization. The spatial and temporal constrains, which had prevented the emergence of the interaction of a truly global scale, became irrelevant through such developments[13]. The information and communication technologies have always had liberating effects on human relations with the natural world in the sense that technology has removed the natural or physical constraints circumscribing human interactions.

In the last 50 years with the introduction of electronic digital technology and its use in the creation of faster, reliable and powerful information and communication technologies we have witnessed an unprecedented breakthroughs in the information and communication technologies. This has brought about the hitherto unimaginable extension and deepening of human relations on the global scale and removal of the many geographical constrains that used to structure the economic, political and social spheres of human life. The information and communication technologies have contributed to the rise of trend of deterritorialization involving a shift from the space of place to the space of flow. This happened not only by extending scope of human interaction on the global scale

---

[13] See (Mohammadi, 1997), for an extensive study of how technological improvement has contributed to the shrinking of the world.

but also by an increase in the speed of life. The information and communication processes supported and sustained by the electronic and digital technologies have acquired a level of instantaneousness. Economic transactions in different parts of the world with the help of the information and communication technologies have become so rapid that it has become a matter of moving fingers on the table of a PC a few second. This could happen regardless of the fact that between these two centers there exists thousands of miles. This is a simple illustration of what deterritorialization is all about and how important role the information and communication technologies play in the trend of deterritorialization or the construction of the space of flow where there is a flow without any physical hindrance.

The regulationary frameworks working at either intergovernmental or supranational levels are other important factors that contributed to the flourishing of the contemporary trend of deterritorialization. These frameworks include international and supranational political and economic institutions, such as the UN, EU, NAFTA, IMF, the WTO. There are four important ways, in which the regulatory frameworks, Scholte argues, have promoted a more deterritorialized world. The first one is that these regulatory frameworks or institutional structures promote the standardization of techniques and procedures resulting in the homogenization of the procedures and techniques, which facilitated the rise of a deterritorialized space by the movement of the people, goods, and capital. The second way is the liberalization of cross-border movements of money, investment, and finance. This liberalization has been achieved within institutional contexts, which the regulatory frameworks have provided. The third way, according to Scholte, is through ensuring the right of private

property for global capital, thus providing an incentive for the capital to be invested in places other than their home countries. And the last, but not the least important one is the legalization of the global organizations and activities. This framework provides a legal basis for the global type of transactions and interactions by regulating them.

There are at least two important points that need to be elaborated to comprehend the nature of deterritorialization. The first one is that deterritorialization, like globalization itself, is a matter of degree. There is no such a thing as a deterritorizalized world or space, where territory would no longer make sense, but there is a deterritorializing world, where the conditioning and constraining impacts of physical spaces is relatively compensated. In other words, in Scholte's term, deterrritorialization is a relative rather than an absolute development (Scholte, 2000, 42). Related with the first point is the fact that deterritorialization goes hand in hand with reterritorialization, which in the globalizing world manifests itself in the form of localism and regionalism (Scholte, 2000). Also, as Brenner points out, deterritorialization at one level depends on the territorial fixity of mainly technological infrastructure at another level (Brenner, 1999: 39-48).

Deterritorializing impact of globalization has significant implications for the territoriality of the modern state and for its other specific characteristics. With the rise of a space of flow, there have emerged a variety of transnational activities, which can escape the control of the state. The loosening of the modern state control over different activities makes it increasingly less able to perform the basic functions for which it was instituted, such as the establishment and the maintenance of law and order and the ensuring of the security and the well-being of its citizens (Strange, 1996; Axtmann, 1998). The modern states are no longer to contain the politics within

57

its territorial boundaries. The more deepened this trend, the more acute this problem of global governance to turn out to be. This is a problem that would potentially involve the fundamental questioning of the state, its structure, power and functions and even at the extreme its existence.

Thus, the sovereignty of the modern state, its being the sole rule making authority within its jurisdiction, is likely to be eroded. The economical and political forces acting in an increasingly deterritorialized space could exert influence on the policy making structure of the state. Also, there has been a deterritorialization of the political and civil societal processes, the attachment to the national level of socio-political relations have loosened. The deterritorialization of the economical, social and political process has led to the questioning of the meaning and value of the traditional political institutions and processes, like citizenship and the legitimacy of the state. Citizenship, legitimacy, rights and obligations have come to be defined on a more global basis rather than on the basis of the attachment to a particular state and its territory.

2.3. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

In this chapter, the focus has been on deterritorialization, which is the most relevant dimension of globalization for the analysis of the modern state and its territoriality. I have been arguing that deterritorialization constitutes the spatial logic of globalization along with reterritorialization. It has been suggested that the developments and trends that are brought under the term globalization are marked by the change in the spatial dimension of economical, social and political processes. Until the recent decades, the

physical space has exerted a significant power over ways in which socio-economical and political events are structured. Globalization and as an its essential dimension deterritorialization have caused the questioning of the relevance and significance of these constraints. But it has been argued that deterritorialization has been relative and associated with a sort of reterritorialization at another level. The overall effect of the deterritorialization is the loosening of the rigidity of the physical constraints and boundaries.

This has strong implications for the territoriality of the modern state. The modern state has established rigid physical boundaries and limits to the socio-economical and political processes. Thus, it has constructed a strong control over a physical space, constituting its territoriality. Its territorial character has defined its structural characteristics, the contents and scopes of the politics and the related processes. However, with the recent developments, some sort of deteritorialized economical, political and social spaces have appeared. These spaces have transcended the boundaries of the modern state and increasingly problematized the relevance and significance of the territoriality of the modern state with implications for its different aspects, such as its sovereignty and its autonomous power. To what extent deterritorialization exists and in what ways it affects the different aspects of the modern state are the questions that the next chapter will discuss with a specific reference to the European context.

CHAPTER 3

A 'DETERRITORIALIZED' EUROPE AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR THE EUROPEAN STATES

The previous chapter pointed out that deterritorialization is an important development, since it indicates a decline on the territoriality of the state. The territoriality of the modern state, which I have discussed in the first chapter, was the sole indicator of its sovereignty like its many other characteristics. In this context, the case of Europe is particularly interesting. One may reveal the extent and manifestation of deteritorialization in general as well as the specific implications of the deterritorialization for the European states by exploring the extent and scope of European integration. The integration process that Europe has engaged in is a manifestation and further promoter of globalization in its attempts to create an economically, socially and politically unified space (Axtmann, 1995). The European integration, it is argued, involves the construction of a deterritorialized economical, political and social space within Europe. However, at a global level, this integration brings about a reterritorialization as well. For instance, the emergence of a 'fortress Europe' can be seen as a case for reterritorialization. This chapter examines the historical evolution of the integration and thus attempts to bring an understanding to the creation of a deterritorialized space within Europe and its implications for the

European states. Furthermore, it also attempts to reveal how the territoriality of the modern state has been declining in the European case.

3.1. EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The idea of a unified Europe could be dated back to the Middle Ages, when the notion of a unified world of Christianity was an ambitious project pursued by especially the Catholic Church (Baldwin, 1994; El-Agraa, 1998; Owen and Dynes, 1992; Rosamond, 2000; Sidjanski, 2000). This notion persisted to the early modern times and influenced the visions of many intellectual and political figures. However, the rise of the modern states and their further ossification led to the disappearance of this idea. Europe came to be composed of a variety of different and diverse nation-states based on the exclusive claim to sovereign authority within a clearly defined territory. Europe could then be best characterized as the space of place with internal economical, political, social and cultural barriers established and protected by the states, that is the manifestation of the territoriality of the modern state.[15]

Deeply divided and diverse economical, political and social configuration of Europe played an important role in the outbreak of two world wars. These wars destroyed the state system of the prewar years. After the Second World War, It was felt, especially, by the US with a strong concern with the peace and stability on the continent that some form of cooperation, if not absolute integration, was necessary. At first it was thought that the peace and stability on the continent could be achieved by the incorporation of Germany into a strong economic cooperation with the other states, especially with France. In the face of the rise of two super powers, the USSR,

---

[15] See Chapter 1

on the one hand, posing a threat to the European states and the US, on the other hand, seeking to establish an security block on the continent against the USSR, the European states come more closely together (El-Agraa, 1998; Calleya, 2000).

As noted, the cooperation started after the reception of the Marshal Plan from the US for the reconstruction of the post-war Europe. The European Coal and Steel Community was established in 1951 for the purpose of developing cooperation in the organization of the most important energy resource and for promoting the cooperative spirit among the European states, especially among France and Germany. Following this development was the establishment of the European Economic Community with the Treaty of Rome, by six western European countries: France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands and Italy. At the same time the European Atomic Energy Community was established. The Treaty of Rome was designed as an agreement between the parties on increasing economic cooperation and integration. Later in 1967, the EEC, Euratom and ECSC were combined, and the European Community was established, as the cooperation eventually turned into integration. In 1973, the European Community extended to include Britain, Denmark and Ireland. In 1981 Greece and in 1986 Spain and Portugal were included into the Community.

The 1970s could be seen as the 'bad times' of the community. This period witnessed the slowing down of the integration, which might be explained by the economic problems of the time and the concern of the member states with their individual national interests. However, beginning in the mid-1980s there emerged a renewed enthusiasm for the integration, with the influence of some political leaders, like Jacques Delors. This renewed interest in the European integration involved the

revival of the notion of Economic and Monetary Union and the completion of the internal market without borders within which there would be an unhindered flow of capital, goods, labor and people. Achieving these objectives required the revival of the Treaty of Rome. Out of all these the Single European Act was signed, defining the main short term and long-term objectives of the integration. The Act speeded up the process and the scope of the integration, which was extended to include social and political dimensions. The integration of these spheres was spelt out as the ultimate goal of the European Integration, which was later very clearly and decisively expressed in the Maastricht Treaty in 1991 (Owen and Dynes, 1992; Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000).

The process of European integration has been about the creation of what might be called a deterritorialized European space, which is characterized by the absence of internal borders and the unhindered flow of the capital, goods, services and people. This common space is to be achieved through the establishment of economic and social cohesion, common consciousness and joint action for the protection of environment, research and technological development and the construction of a general network of transportation. The attainment of higher levels of social standards and the strengthening of the mechanisms of unhindered exchange and interaction of different cultures within the union, the removal of the internal border controls, the harmonization of legal, political and social standards and the achievement of an Economic and Monetary Union are some of the crucial targets to achieve a deterritorialized space (Owen and Dynes, 1992; Petrakos, Marrier and

63

Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000). There is a notion of 'spillover effect'[16] referring to the process of ever deepening economical, political and social integration; the economic integration requires some degree of social and political integration. European integration involves building economic, political and social spaces. In other words, a more deterritorialized space is aimed at in the sense that there emerges a space of flow.

3.1.1. The Construction of a Deterritorialized Economic Space

The creation of an economic space involves constructing a single deterritorialized market, which is not divided by internal barriers of trade, and freeing the movement of capital, goods, people and service. From the very beginning, economy has been the basic component of the integration process. The establishment of the ECSC and EURATOM was motivated by economic concerns. In the founding document of the European Economic Community, the Treaty of Rome, economic and monetary union was put as the ultimate point that the cooperation would amount to. With the economic integration, technical, physical and fiscal barriers were to be removed. The economic integration also enabled individuals to move around any part in the community without hindrance through an integrated system of transportation, to work and make business in any European country on the basis of harmonized production standards, and to do all these as if it was his or her home country (Owen and Dynes, 1992; Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000).

---

[16] This term is used by the functionalist approach to the European Integration to explain the processing of the integration and how different aspects of life in Europe have gradually come to be a part of the integration process.

The establishment of a European Central Bank was also targeted as the integration intensified. Later, the Maastricht Treaty in 1991 provided a very clear crystallization of this notion of economic integration and put Europe further on the road for economical integration. Before the Maastricht Treaty, the adoption of VAT directive in 1978, referring to the 'Value Added Taxation' system, formed the Community's indirect taxation system, by which the Community would be able to allocate revenues from the national governments. In 1979, the European Monetary System was established to provide stability for frequent currency fluctuation with a fixed exchange mechanism, and developed the European Currency Union to which the currency of each country was linked (Owen and Dynes, 1992; Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000).

In 1985 'the White Paper' prepared by a commission headed by Jacques Delors stressed the revival of monetary union, the completion of internal market promising deregulation and free competition. To complete the establishment of a common market, a number of legislatures were enacted, and the Treaty of Rome was amended. The White Paper expressed the intention to eliminate technical problems, remove the internal barriers within the community to trade and unify the twelve separate economies into one market. The internal barriers could be threefold: physical, fiscal and technical. The existence of these barriers creates what Jacques Delors called the "balkanization of the economic life". The Paper repeated the intention of the construction of a common market, which was firstly declared in the Treaty of Rome. It also pointed out the importance of the creation of a common market, which required the establishment of a common custom tariff.

All these attempts led to the birth of the Single European Act in 1986. In the Maastricht Treaty of 1991, important decisive steps were taken on the road to the completion of an internal market. The completion of an internal market involves the construction of an area without frontiers. In this area, an economic and monetary union and the standardization of industrial production are achieved, and the internal frontiers are opened up to facilitate the free movement of economic means and actors. One point that has been raised in all treaties is that the economical unification could be ultimately achieved when the border control is completely abolished. The Schengen Group, including Benelux Countries, Germany and France, exemplified the removal of border control. The countries in the Schengen Group agreed to remove the border control among the countries in the Group (Owen and Dynes, 1992; Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000).

With the economic integration, we see the increasing mobility of economic actors. A citizen of a member state could establish his or her own business in any other member country, and a worker in a given country could take up employment in any member country too. The removal of barriers behind the movement of labor is as much important as the free movement of capital. It is a production factor, and the integration has created the mechanisms to ensure the flow of investment and the production factors to the most productive parts of the common market. Thus, professionals, workers and the unemployed are given a chance to look for employment outside of their country. Those individuals are supposed to be treated equally. These points were stressed in the Single European Act as well as in the Treaty of Rome and in the White Paper. This mobility requires the elimination of the barriers stemming from the national differences, different educational standards and

linguistic differences. There have been attempts to standardize the education and training and extend the language education. Each individual, regardless of his or her original country, could engage in his or her business activities throughout the community (Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Rosamond, 2000).

Another aspect of economic integration is Economic and Monetary Union (Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Owens and Dynes, 1992). This objective has its root in the Treaty of Rome. Later the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty confirmed this objective. A system would be established which would allow banking services across frontiers on the basis of a single license and eventually liberate capital. This system was set in 1990. The system also involved the creation of a European Central Bank to control the money supply throughout the community. Also the integration of banking, insurance, credit and brokering sectors was put as the target that the community would ultimately achieve. Ultimately, Economic and Monetary Union aimed at establishing a single currency and a European Bank, which controls money supply throughout the community (Owens and Dynes, 1992).

The community wide network of transportation system is important for the fluidity of the capital, goods, service and people, because it has reduced the strength of physical barriers. The establishment of Customs Union or Common Custom Tariff (CCT) or Common External Tariff is also a part of the efforts to ensure the flow. With the free flow of production capital and labor across national borders without impediments, service, banking, insurance and transportation services can be sold freely throughout the common market regardless of national frontiers (Petrakos, Marrier and Gorzelak, 2000; Owens and Dynes, 1992). The economic integration and the emergence of some sort of a deterritorialized economic space have come in to

67

existence. The economic activities have increasingly been detached from the national and territorial contexts. A community wide economic network where economic actors and the factors of production could flow without any hindrance has developed. The construction of such a space has obvious repercussions for other spheres of life within the community. Social sphere is one of them.

3.1.2. The Construction of a Deterritorialized Social Space

Although the European Integration had overwhelming economic overtones in its early stages, the social life of the member states could not remain unaffected. Later in its unfolding the integration came to include the creation of a common social space. The spillover effects might explain this, that is the need for social policies to make economic integration go on steadily. From the early stages, the social dimension was seen important, even though as noted, it was not given much importance out of conviction that the social differences among the member countries did not matter for the economic integration (Owens and Dynes, 1992; McCormick, 1996; Preston, 1997; Prince, 1993).

The ECSC and EURATOM suggested social policies to counter the reverse affects of the integration in the sectors that they controlled. The Treaty of Rome stressed the importance of harmonization of the social systems throughout the Community when it was in the process of formation. The establishment of European Social Fund in 1960 aimed at improving employment opportunities for workers in the common market and promoting life standards. The standardization of social system has aimed to increase the employment and geographical mobility of workers. It has involved the provision of helps and funds for redundant workers, retraining them and

settling them in other areas where employment was available. It has also assisted workers to maintain a certain level of income when there was a temporary reduction and suspension of employment. The early attempts to harmonize and promote a single social space were limited, but constituted an example for further attempts as the importance of this dimension came to be recognized (Owens and Dynes, 1992; Maclean and Howorth, 1992).

In the 1970s, there was a growing pressure on the community to take into account the social dimension. This pressure was the result of the rising unemployment, eventual worsening of living conditions and the necessity to counterbalance the adverse affects of the economic and monetary integration. Later, it was deemed that the social policies were a necessity for the success of the economic integration. The creation of the European Development Fund in 1975 by the European Council was the result of this growing consciousness. This program was designated to ensure social development in the less favored regions within the community, reducing the existing differences and redressing disparities between various regions and the backwardness of the less developed regions. The program contributed to the appearance of a community level social system unified in the way of dealing with social problems (Maclean and Howorth, 1992: 130).

In 1974, the Council of Ministers agreed on the Social Action Program. This program declaired that the attainment of full and better employment through the community and the improvement of living and working conditions were necessary for social harmonization to realize. The other objectives that the Social Action Program sought to achieve were as follows: the increasing involvement of management and workers in the economic and social decisions of the community, involvement of

workers in the management of the enterprise in which they are employed, the increasing concern with retirement age and the equal treatment of men and women and making these standards common through the community (Maclean and Howorth, 1992: 132). The Social Action program took important steps in the achievement of European social union and the social development of all countries concerned.

In the 1980s, the creation of European social space had three objectives. These were to place employment problem at the heart of the common social policies, increase the social dialogue between employers and employees at the national and community level, and improve consultation and cooperation on matters of social protection. It was designed to strengthen the social dimension of the community activities to counter the potential and actual human costs of economic liberalization within a single market (Maclean and Howorth, 1992; Owens and Dynes, 1992).

The 1989 community charter of the fundamental social rights of workers, the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty later stressed on the importance of the standardization and harmonization of the social standards in different parts of the community. It has been declared that the harmonization of social systems also involves the freedom of movement, employment remuneration, the improvement of living and working conditions. Social protection is given to the disadvantaged section of society. Also, vocational training, health protection and safety at the workplace, information and consultation of workers are provided (Maclean Howorth, 1992). The harmonization of social spheres also ensures that no country and region has comparative advantages over the others by adopting low tax, or low cost measures in order to attract investment away from particular regions (Maclean and Howorth, 1992: 6).

The creation of a unified social space has brought about the deterritorialization of social standards within the community. The deterritorialization has taken place in the sense and to the extent that there is a standardization of the general conditions of living, working, training and education at the European level. The similar social conditions have increasingly become available throughout Europe. The deterritorialization in the economic and social spheres has found a corresponding development in the political sphere.

3.1.3. The Construction of a Deterritorialized Political Space

Like the social integration, political integration is an area, which has become an integral part of the process as the integration has deepened. From the very beginning, what was in the mind of those who played a role in the closer cooperation of the European states was the ultimate construction of some form of a federative structure, which would be characterized by the demise of the sovereign nation-states.

Partly as a result of the increasing economical and social cohesion and the changing economical and social configuration associated with the creation of a single economical and social space, it is not surprising that there has been an increasing pressure on the political structure of the European states to change accordingly. The changes that the European states have undergone are the concessions that they have given in terms of their sovereign authority on many issues, particularly on economical matters. The emergence of concerns, problems and interests at the Community level created a problem of governance and transcended the capacity and border of the states. These problems have brought the states of Europe together and forced them to construct organizations and institutions that can operate at a

supranational level. The emerging transnational institutional structures that coordinate the process of cooperation and integration in different spheres could operate with the power invested by the member states. The investment of power involves " the pooling of sovereignty" at the transnational level or the delegation of some power of the member states to these structures (Marks, Scharpf, Schmitter and Streeck, 1996; Sandholtz and Sweet, 1998).

The institutional structures of the Community are manifold. At the very beginning, the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Atomic Energy and the European Economic Community were established. Later these institutions were unified under the umbrella of European Community, which later came to be called as European Union with the increasing intensification of the integration. In its internal structure, different institutions such as the European Commission, the Council of Ministers, the European Parliament and the European Council, operate. The detailed discussion of the historical evolution and the basic functions of these institutions[17] is beyond the scope of this chapter, but it seems important to point out that European Union created a series of decision making bodies and executive mechanisms to handle the issues concerning the community. The resulting political integration has brought an increasing detachment of politics from the national level and the 'Europeanization' of the national politics (Rometsch and Wessels, 1996: 35).

Along with the development of the political structure of transnational character, the creation of a deterritorialized political scene within Europe was further stimulated by some other developments. The rise of the notion of European

---

[17] See (Nugent, 1994), for a detailed discussion of the historical evolution and the basic functions of the institutions of the EU.

citizenship, the increasing activities of interest groups and political parties articulating and pursuing their interest at the community level rather than within the confines of their national political system are some of these developments (Duff, Pinder and Pryce, 1994; Rhodes, Heywood and Wright, 1997). Thus, an increasingly deterritorialized political structure where the interactions of political forces and the exercise of power are not limited to the jurisdiction of the territorial states has gradually crystallized.

However, the extent of the creation of a political space in Europe seems more difficult and painful than that of economic and social. Behind the creation of a single political space lies the long-cherished state tradition of individual states. It has been claimed that the diminishing of the significance of the states is an illusion because it was the states themselves that initiated the process of integration out of their own conviction that it was compatible with their national interests (Milward, Lynch, Ranieri Romero and Sorenson, 1993; Milward, 1992). Furthermore, integration is one strategy that the states deploy in their pursuit of the national interest[18]. However, as will be elaborated, although the European states still persist, there has emerged European level political associations, which have supranational as well as intergovernmental characteristics and which reserve a degree of authority over the member states. Europe is giving birth to curiously different types of political associations, with Union level political institutions, which are increasingly turning into power centers within Europe, while the member states are undergoing significant

---

[18] See (Milward, Lynch, Ranieri, Romero and Sorensen, 1993), where there is a very strong emphasis on the remaing superiority of the European States and the argument that the integration is just one strategy for the states to pursue their national interests

changes within their structure. It is this complex condition of European states within an increasing deterritorialized Europe that the remaining part of the chapter explores.

3.2. THE EUROPEAN STATES WITHIN THE EU CONTEXT

The European Integration has been about the construction of a space of flow at the Community level, where economic, social and political activities are gradually and with an increasing intensity deterritorialized. The crucial question is how the European states have been implicated in the whole process or what sorts of implications deterritorialization that manifests in the erosion and (or) problematization, if not disappearance, of the physical barriers limiting the scope, extent and the nature of the social existence carries for the European states. Given the territorial and sovereign character of the modern state, one would be quick to point out that it is apparent that the deterritorialization causes to the decline of the state by eroding its territoriality, which constitutes the basis for its sovereignty and power.

The analysis that follows will show that although the decline of the territoriality of the states within a deterritorialized Europe is in some respects true, it seems more appropriate to characterize what happens to the European states as a transformation rather than a decline per se. The point is that the European states seem to be giving way to a curiously different and new political formation, the basic characteristics of which fit to neither the conventional nation-state nor international organization models. This section will be divided into two parts. In the first part, attention will be on two approaches to the European Integration: intergovernmentalist and neofunctionalist and their ideas on the state's relation with the integration process. And in the second part, the question is how far deterritorialization as a vital

aspect of European integration has affected the basic characteristics of the European states.

3.2.1. Intergovernmentalists versus Neofunctionalists[19]

Intergovermentalist and neofunctionalist are two approaches, which have been predominant in the literature on the European Integration. They are designations to explain the dynamics, origins and unfolding of the integration process. Although these theories have a lot to say about the different aspects of the integration, in this section I will emphasize and discuss the views of these two approaches on the European states relating themselves to the integration process.

Intergovernmentalists informed by the realist and neorealist presumptions treat the process of integration as carried out by the nation-states and its representatives. The states have always stood at the very center of the whole process. The states are perceived as the main motors of the process; it is the states that initiate and further the process according to their perceived interests. The whole process of integration is designed for the protection and enhancement of the power and interests of the member states. Through engagement in cooperative activities with other states, the member states pursue power and seek to realize their national interests. The European Union has not and will not likely to displace the European states. They are very envious of delegating their sovereign power to an external political structure. The European states surrender some portion of their sovereignty only to the extent that it serves their interests. The European Union is basically an intergovernmental

---

[19] Sometimes, this dichotomy is formulated as intergovermentalist versus supranationalist, See (Sandholtz, Sweet, 1998), (Rosamond, 2000)

organization limited to the collective pursuit those tasks that protect and strengthen the sovereign authority of the member states (Sandholtz and Sweet, 1998; Nugent, 1994; Keohane and Hoffmann, 1991).

Neofunctionalist approach counters the intergovernmentalists in their insistence on the centrality of the nation-state and perceives the integration process as the creation of a supranational level, which is not divided by artificial boundaries and barriers. Neofunctionalist thesis is based on the premise that the European integration would ultimately amount to some sort of a federal structure, which will replace the European states. The European integration involves a shift of the political authority from the national level to the supranational level and the delegation of power to a higher authority independent of the constitutive states. The nation-states give up their sovereign authority first in low politics, including economic matters, and later in high politics, referring to security and defense issues. The integration has dynamics of its own which make it for the state in Europe too costly if it does not join or if it withdraws. The dynamics of integration force individual states to recognize the growing authority of the European level governmental structure.

It is no longer the states that exclusively predominate the political scene; there are other actors like the transnational actors acting across borders and sub national groups pursuing their regional interests autonomous of the states that they are formally a part of. These forces have played a significant role in the further deepening and extension of the integration. Political power is no longer at the monopoly of the individual states. It is misleading to depict these states as the main motor of the process of the integration by only claiming that they formally hold power and they sign the basic treaties.

Although the two approaches seem to hold truth in their account of the relation between the state and the European Integration, they could not grasp the complex nature of the European integration and the way in which the states have been related to the integration. The European Union is a very complex institutional structure containing contradictory elements. Its contradictory nature reflects the complex ways in which the state has been related to the process. The European Union seems to contain both intergovernmentalist and supranationalist elements. The complex character of the European Union is evident in the institutional structure of the Union; the Commission and the European Parliament acting mostly above the national political actors embodying the supranationalist elements, and the Council of Ministers and The European Council representing the intergovernmental dynamics built into the whole process.

As Keohane and Hoffman argue, there are at least three unique aspects of the EU, which make its relation with the constitutive states ambiguous. The first one is that it is "neither an international regime nor an emerging state" (Keohane and Hoffmann, 1991:10). Like any other international regimes of international organization, it is established to fulfill some shared objectives and to provide means and techniques to achieve these objectives that the constitutive actors have a joint interest. However, the EU is " much more centralized and institutionalized than an international organization and receives much more higher degree of commitment from its members" (Keohane and Hoffmann, 1991: 10). Although the EU is largely within the confines set by the formal declarations of the member states, it is beyond the international organizations in its elaborate structures with a degree of authority and power that no international regime could enjoy. " No other international

organization enjoys such reliable effective supremacy of its law over the laws of member states with a recognized court of justice to adjudicate disputes" (Keohane and Hoffmann, 1991: 11). Also, It has some policy responsibilities in some areas such as external trade, agriculture, and competition policies, and decision-making power is also delegated to the Union. But, it is far from being a state or, as some federalist would like to suggest, the United States of Europe. Its power is still to a large extent derived from and confined to the member states. Its legislative and executive power does not come close to that of the member states. The member states still retain their sovereign power on high political issues, the competence of the Union is largely limited to those of low politics.

The second uniqueness, Keohane points out, is the strong supranationality in the EU along with its intergovernmental character. As Keohane quotes from Haas, it refers to " the existence of governmental authority closer to the archetype of federation than any other international organization, but not yet identical with it" (Keohane and Hoffmann, 1991: 15). The third aspect is that the European integration is still formally based on intergovernmental bargaining. The formal influence of the European states does not mean that the influence of many other actors is marginal or not an issue in the process.

The unique character of the EU is related with the unique character of the European states constituting it. The European states have acted, at least formally, as the main actors of the integration and the consequent creation of an increasingly deterritorialized space within Europe. The integration and the creation of a deterritorialized space in return have affected the European states. These mutual interactions between the European states and their increasingly deterritorialized

economical, social and political environments have resulted in transformations in the European states. The European states have been losing their territoriality, which has crucial implications for the institutional structures of these states.

3.2.2. A Deterritorialized Europe and the European States

The construction of an increasingly deterritorialized Europe has direct implications for the territoriality of the European states. It has also implications for the defining characteristics of these states. In this section, the focus will be on the defining characteristics of the European states as modern states and the implications of a deterritorialized Europe for each of these characteristics. Pierson's treatment of the modern state provides a comprehensive and concise account of the defining characterisitcs of the modern state (Pierson, 1996), which are applicable to the European states[20]. The essential components of the modern state are, as Pierson elaborates, the control over the means of violence, sovereignty, territoriality, authority and legitimacy, citizenship, constitutionality, and taxation. In this part, I take each of these characteristics and examine them within the context of European Integration. This examination would provide answers to the following questions: What kinds of implications deterritorialization carries for the European states? How much has the European politics been deterritorialized? How could deterritorialization, to the extent that it exists, possible affect the current and future evolution of the European states?

---

[20] One important aspect of the literature on the modern state, theories like liberal, Marxist or Weberian theories of the modern state, is their eurocentrism. When these theories talk about the modern state, what they usually have in mind is the type of political association that emerged in Europe from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onward. The European states are taken as the prototypes of the modern state, which later imported to the different parts of the world.

3.2.2.a. Control Over the Means of Violence

The control over the means of violence, which finds its institutional manifestation in the police, army and the administration of justice, has been set as the essence of the modern state (Pierson, 1996: 8). As Pierson points out, the specificity of the modern state stems not from the use of the means of violence per se, but from its holding the right to use it. The modern state not only holds the right to use violence, but also establishes the legal and political limits and conditions of its use by other social forces.

Territoriality is implicated in one important way in the monopoly of violence. To the extent that the state can ensure the control of the use of means of violence, it will be able to consolidate its territoriality. This further enables the state to establish internal security within its territory and protect this territory from an external threat. This aspect concerns the foreign and external security and defense policies and policing of the state. Deterritorialization of politics within Europe would be expected to lead to the decline of the control over the means of violence because it refers to the blurring, if not completely breaking, of political boundaries. Therefore, its control over the territory will become very difficult, even in the extreme case meaningless.

Within the EU context, the member states still hold the monopoly of the means of violence, which is an important indication of their remaining and persistent statehood. However, there are ongoing discussions on the common foreign and security policy, which, as set in the Treaty of European Union, constitutes the second pillar of the EU. These debates have strong implications for the state holding the means of violence at its disposal. Although the member states have already developed

a strong cooperation in policing, foreign, defense and security issues had been and are still seen as high politics. The catalyzing events that initiated the debates for the establishment of a general framework for common defense and security policies were the dissolution of communism in the Eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s and the Gulf War in 1991. The European states had difficulty in facing the challenges that these events posed and convinced themselves that they could encounter the turns and twists of the new world order and the emerging global political system under the Union's umbrella (Duff, Pinder and Pryce, 1994: 84). This conviction caused the establishment of the Common Foreign and Defense Policy as one of the main components of the EU in the Intergovernmental Conference in Maastrich and in the Treaty on the European Union in 1991. The Amsterdam Treaty in 1996 confirms the importance of the Common Foreign and Defense Policy. If brought to its extreme, the establishment of such a common framework would mean the delegation of the power to use the means of violence to the community level, the establishment of the community level police and army structure. All this would lead to the erosion of one of the most important characteristics that constitute statehood.

However, the states are resistant to such a move. They retain the power to decide the specific issues concerning foreign, defense and security issues. Unanimity is required to make further policy developments (Duff, Pinder and Pryce, 1994; Nugent, 1994). There is a cooperation rather than convergence of the national police forces; the details of cooperation have to be decided by what might be called the intergovernmental negotiations. There are debates on the formation of a Community

81

level army, which would be designed to protect "the integrity of the Union"[21].

Nevertheless, the member states seem to be hesitant to give up their essential

privilege. This suggests that although the growing integration, which gained a new

momentum in the early 1990s, has a potential to erode, probably, the most vital

character of the modern state, the states hold the ultimate right to decide about the use

of the means of the violence. This further suggests that the European states retain

some degree of their territoriality, even though they do it under the constrains of the

structural and functional imperatives of the Union, of which they are a part.

3.2.2.b. Sovereignty

The question of sovereignty has always been very important in the history of the

evolution of the EC. The implication of the integration and the deepening of the

integration in terms of sovereignty have always been shaping the degree of the

commitment of the member states to the integration and their attitude towards

specific policies and programs. Sovereignty is also one of those aspects of the

statehood, which is most affected by the emergence of a deterritorialized Europe. The

issue of sovereignty has been approached in different ways. Particularly,

intergovernmentalists have described the EU as the pooling of the sovereignty by the

constitutive states to achieve the commonly agreed policy objective. However, some

others, like neofunctionalists, have depicted the power of the EU as the delegation of

power to a higher center independent of the member states. Actually the two

approaches seem to hold partially true. In some respects, the EU could be seen as the

---

[21] A phrase used in the Treaty on the European Union, which shows the perception of some form of
European identity

82

pooling of sovereignty as the operation of some institutions of the EC illustrates. In some other respects it is the delegation of power to a higher level. In the EC, the European Commission and the European Parliament occupy this high level. The analysis of these institutions, their power and competence, would show the state of sovereignty in the EU.

Probably the most important institution of the EU is the Council of Ministers in that it is the ultimate decision maker within the EU. The intergovernmentalists and nationalists would endorse it because it is the forum where national interests are represented. Intergovernmentalist would argue that it is where one sees the clearest institutional embodiment of the pooling of sovereignty within the EU. The Council of Minister developed from a special Council of Ministers of the ECSC, established at first by the Benelux Countries to protect their national interest and power. The Merger Treaty named the Council as the Council of Minister in 1965. The strong hold that the Council of Minister has kept over the decision-making process shows the reluctance of the member states to surrender their sovereignty. It consists of a number of committees. COREPER is probably the most significant one of all where national delegates meet every week in the Committee of Permanent Representatives. In the Council of Ministers, national government ministers accept, reject or amend policy proposal coming from the Commission, which are amended or recommended by the Parliament. However, there may be a case where the policies made by the Council of Ministers can be referred to the Court of Justice by the Commission and the Parliament on the basis of its unconformity with the basic rules and laws of the EU. Although the Council of Ministers has retained its dominant position over the years, it seems to have lost some of its power with the changes in voting procedure and the

introduction of the Qualified Majority Voting. These changes forced the representatives of the national governments to go beyond their narrow national interest and come up with common decisions. These changes also increased in the power and the legitimacy of other institutions (McCormick, 1996: 13).

The European Commission, however, could be taken as one of the institutional manifestations of the delegation of sovereignty. It is the executive, bureaucratic and administrative branch of the EU. Its area of competence includes the initiation of the policies sent to the Council of Ministers, overseeing and implementation of the EU laws. It consists of the twenty commissioners each responsible for a particular policy area, appointed by the member states and approved by the parliament. It prepares the draft of legislations. It represents the supranational aspect of the EU and as such played important role in the extension of the reach of the EU. It has propagated for the EU and acted as a supranational institution, which emphasizes the interests of Europe as a whole, rather than the interests of a state or sets of states. It is seen as the guardian of the founding treaties and laws made at the EU level. It grew out of the separate administrative agencies of the founding communities, each of which had its own high authority. With the Merger Treaty in 1965, these three commissions merged in 1967 into a new commission of the European Community, known shortly as the European Commission. But with the establishment of the European Council and the introduction of the direct election to the European Parliament, it lost its power (McCormick, 1996: 13) .

The European Parliament, like the European Commission, represents the supranational character of the EU. At first sight, it might be thought of as the legislature of the EU. It does not have three important characters of legislation; it

cannot introduce laws, enact laws and raise revenue (McCormick, 1996: 13). What it does is often about supervisory and advisory functions. It can ask the Commission to propose a new law or suggest amendments on draft legislature sent by the Commission. The European Parliament also has the same power with the Council of Minister on the budget of the EU and has the power to approve and reject the Commission. It can take the Commission and the Council of Ministers to the Court of Justice in the case of unconformity with the Treaties. It grew out of the Common Assembly of the ECSC and turned into the European parliament in 1962, it did not have much power, but in early 1970s it was granted greater power on the budget. Furthermore, in 1979 direct election to the Parliament was introduced and it became the only elected institution in the EU. This gave an increasing legitimacy that no other institution had with the right to claim to represent the people of Europe (McCormick, 1996: 13).

The Court of Justice is one of the other supranational institutions of the EU, which makes the ultimate decision on the constitutionality of the laws enacted by the Council of Ministers. The founding treaties, significant document and the previously enacted laws provide a basis for the Court of Justice to make decision. It also represents the ultimate point to which the reference concerning the EU laws could be made by the national courts. It also deals with the disputes involving EU institutions, member states, individuals and co-operations. It has contributed to the deepening of the integration by providing the treaties stability and strength. Its competence also includes defining the reach and meanings of the treaties (McCormick, 1996: 13).

The European Council and many other institutions also constitute important components of the European institutional framework. The European Council is the

forum where the heads and the foreign ministers of the member states meet twice a year. It serves as a steering council and as a board of directors for the EU. It represents both the supranational and intergovernmental tendencies. It was created in 1974, but its formal recognition is given in the Single European Act (SEA). It has been important in the launching of major initiations, such as the European Monetary System in1978, the SEA 1986 and the Maastrich Treaty in 1991, and thus in the deepening of the integration. In addition, as the reach of the EU extended, there have emerged a number of institutional bodies and a large bureaucratic structure, such as the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank. These institutions represent the accumulation of sovereignty above and beyond the border of the states and thus the decline of the territoriality of the states.

It is very hard to categorize the European Union in terms of pooling of sovereignty or delegation of sovereignty. There is no doubt that the nation states have not allowed the EU to become a complete supranational institution. The operation of some institutions is on the basis of the delegation of power to a higher center independent of the constitutive states (Rosamond, 2000; Sidjanski, 2000).

As established before, the EU has a supranational as well as intergovernmental character. Membership in the EU means that a member country should be ready to surrender a portion of their de jure sovereignty or delegate their sovereignty to a higher authority.[22] The membership within the EU brings some obligations for member countries and requires member countries to accept an

---

[22] This point was also declared as a substantial precondition in the Copenhagen Criteria, which delineate the basic conditions for a candidate country seeking to be part of the Union to obtain before the accession to the Union to be completed.

institutional and legal setting, which contains limitations and constraints on sovereignty in some fields or delegation of some degree of autonomous power to a supranational center. The member countries should be ready to accept the supremacy of EU over national laws, especially in some policy areas such as external trade policy, the imposition of economic sanctions and the adoption of common policy, the harmonization of social and technical standards.

Being a member state also entails a readiness to accept the legislatures enacted at the EU level to be directly applicable to the national level. The national legal system must adopt and incorporate the EU case law and establish the necessary mechanisms to oversee and comply with and make part of their legal systems. The third implication is that the statue of the national legislature has to be changed. The supranational character of the founding treaties and the milestone documents of the EU requires national legislations in accordance with EU laws, which brings a challenge to or erosion of the sovereignty of the national parliament. It also requires giving an opportunity to affect, if not decisively, the union policies, which necessitates administrative reforms working with other national administrations (Preston, 1997).

Sovereignty, which is probably the most important indicator of the territoriality of the European states, is being undermined by the rise of a deterritorialized political space. Deterritorialization, involving the creation of a European wide network of economic, political and social interactions, has increasingly detached the political, economical and social power from the national, territorial context of the individual states. This has problematized both the convenience of the strategy of the territoriality as an approach to space and the degree

of the control of the European states over their own territory. European states do not seem to be the sole holder of the sovereign authority under the trend of deterritorialization.

3.2.2.c. Territoriality

Territoriality is the aspect of the European states that has most directly affected by the construction of a deterritorialized economical, social and political spaces within Europe. The decreasing importance and relevance of the physical constraints and boundaries and the establishment of some form of the space of flow replacing the space of place with the deepening of the integration in Europe would hinder the control over the physical space and consequently the degree of territoriality that the European states have been enjoying.

One specific indication of the erosion of the territoriality of the state is the absence of the legal and physical barriers behind the movement of the people, goods and capital across the boundaries. In the EU context, the gradual establishment of a single market and the subsequent attempt to achieve the monetary and fiscal unification, and the accompanying attempt to remove or at least minimize the technical barriers behind the movement of economic factors have made the national political boundaries more and more flexible. The flexibility of the border is measured by the degree of border control and check, which is the physical embodiment of the territoriality of the state.

One of the most striking attempts to remove border control was made in 1990. The five of the member states, Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, reached an agreement, by which the border control would be gradually

removed among the parties involved. Italy soon aspired to be a part of that agreement. This attempt exemplifies how ready the states were to reconsider their territoriality and the extent to which deterritorialization could reach.

3.2.2.d. Authority and Legitimacy

It is well taken that while the modern state holds the ultimate right to use the means of violence in its daily functioning, the power it claims needs legitimizing (Pierson, 1996: 22). The stability and survival of the modern state has often been to large extent dependent on its ability to ensure the consent of the ruled and the recognition of the state by the ruled as the sole legitimate authority. The attempt to legitimize its power have been more or less universal in the history of the states, even though the source that the states have made appeal to have been different[23].

The growing deterritorialization of the economic, political and social activities could possibly create problems for the European states to ensure its authority and legitimacy in at least two respects. The first one is through the erosion of the European states' capacity to fulfill main functions, the performance of which has proven to be essential for their legitimacy. These functions are economic developments and prosperities, the public order and security. The ability of the state to perform these functions has been dependent on the degree of power and control that it is able to exert over the people and resources on a given territory. To the extent that the capacity of the state to control its territory decreases, it will be unable to fulfill them. One of the debates on the European states is that the capacity of the state

---

[23] Weber, in his classical account, provided a classification of the sources of appeal that the states have used as tradition, charisma and in the modern time legal-rational authority.

to control over the macro economic developments has declined. This is, it has been argued, true for the other functions of the state too.

The decline of the capacity to fulfill the basic functions, which each state experiences in different degree, seems very difficult to measure. There are different accounts of this. Alan Milward put forward one of the most sophisticated accounts. He argues that the two world wars, the main actors of which were the nation-states, destroyed the state system of Europe. The formation of the European Community and the further deepening of the regional integration manifest the state's inability to carry out the essential functions that it is instituted for. The establishment of a regional cooperation, which gradually moved toward regional integration, has enabled the European states to retain their salience and provided what he calls " the rescue of the European Nation-state" (Milward, 1992). Although Milward's point seems well-taken, the European union providing rescue for the European states itself shows that the European states are not what they once used to be, and their capacity to perform their basic functions has declined. The weakening of the European states is likely to give rise to different political alternatives, such as a European level governing structure.

The other way, in which the deterritorialization of economic, social and political activities at the Community level could possibly and adversely affect the legitimacy and authority of the state, is through undermining the main legitimizing discourse and institutions, such as democracy and nationalism. Democracy has been a prevalent means for legitimacy in the Western Europe. Especially after the collapse of communism and transitions to democracy in the recent decades democracy has

become the sole remaining regime with no alternative[24]. What is peculiar about democracy in the modern time is its embeddedness in the national, territorial political process contained by the nation-states. With the Europenization of politics, the boundaries and scope of the national has become problematic, which has been accompanied by the extension of the public sphere beyond the national boundaries. The influence of the transnational economic and political forces has become increasingly important in the formulation and implementation of national policies. This has made the accountability and legitimacy of the member states particularly problematic. This general problem has been portrayed by the term " democratic deficit". Although the phrase democratic deficit has been used to describe the problems at the European level institutions in terms of democracy, it seems to have relevance concerning the problems of democracy at the national level.

Nationalism is another source of legitimacy for the modern state. Like democracy and any other components of the modern politics in general , the discourse of nation and nationalism, in its evolution in the modern age, has been embedded within the territorial character of the politics and the state. Nation is a community whose boundaries are territorially defined; one of the major criteria for nationhood is the occupation of a particular territorial space, usually established and forced by the state. Particularly after the French Revolution, the state came to be seen as the embodiment of the nation and nationalist discourse became one of the most significant legitimizing tools available for the state. With the increasing deterritorialization one main question is raised is, which is to what extent national type of social formations have eroded and have been replaced by a transnational and

---

[24] Actually, more specifically liberal democracy was seen as the victorious ideology

91

subnational type. To the extent the national level is eroded, nationalism presuming the national level as its ontological basis would be a less effective means for legitimation.

The question about the state of the nationalities and nations in the European context has been discussed within the context of a more general debate. The question is whether there has been emerging a European society beyond and above the established nationalities. Michael Mann gives an elaborate account of this question and argues that there is no such a thing as what he calls 'Euro' that is an internally cohesive and enclosed society. However, there is an extensive network of interaction covering Europe, which is also a part of more global economical, political and cultural networks of interaction. The existence of such a gradually institutionalizing network of interaction is expected to bring about the decline of the significance of the national borders and the limits of the national. To the extent that this is obtained, the legitimacy and authority of the states are likely to be questioned. Therefore, the sources of the legitimacy that the European states have been resorting to are at the very substantial level related with their territorial character. As the trend of deterritorialization problemetizes the territorial character of the European states, it also problematizes the sources of legitimacy.

3.2.2.e. Citizenship

Citizenship, in a general sense referring to the entitlement to participate in a given political community with accompanying rights, obligations and freedoms, is one of the most essential components of the modern politics. As the modern nation-state crystallized, the people subject to the state power were turned from subject into

citizen. Although citizenship has always been claimed as universal, this universality has been valid only within the jurisdiction of the nation-state. Like other elements of the modern politics, its scope and content have been defined by its embeddedness into the national and territorial politics. Citizenship in modern times has been national, in that citizens are at the same time the members of a particular nation. Citizenship has been territorial, meaning that one's citizenship is basically determined by his or her being within the territorial boundaries of the modern state.

Deterritorialization as existing in the EU is likely to problematize the way citizenship is perceived and experienced by eroding the territoriality of the state. This is evident in the widespread discussion on the state of citizenship in the Union. There have been attempts to redefine the citizenship within the European context so that it will be more inclusive when compared with the conventional understanding of citizenship. This will further enable the citizens of a given member state to have similar rights in other member states.

The debates going on had repercussions in the Maastrich Treaty, where the issue of citizenship was introduced into the European Union agenda. Before the Treaty, the citizenship in Europe had largely remained   within the confines of the national politics. In the Maastrich Treaty, the notion of the citizenship was incorporated into the Cooperation on Justice and Home Affairs, the third pillar of the EU. It was based on an already accepted and formalized principle of the free movement of the people of the member states across national borders in the increasingly integrating market (Duff, Pinder and Pryce, 1994: 104). A member of a given state within the Community could move to any place in the Community and

can utilize the rights to "share the social benefits of the host country, including housing, medical care, education and social security rights" (Mancini, 1991: 165).

The rise of a transnational society at the European level consisting of the groups and individuals acting across borders has been the main dynamic behind the rise of European citizenship as an issue. Although there is a substance to this emerging notion, there are ambiguities created about the type of citizenship prevalent in Europe. However, it seems that deterritorialization eroding the territoriality of the European states is also undermining the territorial power of the states over citizens and thus the basis of the citizenship. The ambiguity has to do with the fact that the national and territorial type of citizenship still persists while it is being redefined on a more universalistic and inclusive basis (Mancini, 1991).

3.2.2.f. Constitutionality

Constitution or constitutionality is another prominent characteristic of the state, about which the deterritorialization intrinsic to the Integration seems to have implications. Constitutionality of the modern nation-state refers to the existence of a general legal framework, which embodies "the rules of the game" of the political process within the national politics. Historically, it has been related with the territorial aspect of the state in that it is a designation to regulate the political process whose boundaries are defined territorially and nationally. It provides the general legal framework for the formulation of laws, rules and regulations and might be argued that it is "creating or at least securing the existence of the state" (Pierson, 1996: 18) as such. As Pierson (1996: 18) suggests

The idea that the states constitute a distinct and rule-governed domain with power, which is (at least formally) distanced from society and the economy, is distinctively modern. The modern states do indeed exercise a form of power that, at least formally, is public, rule-governed and subject to lawful reform.

This characteristic constitutes the basis for some other defining features of the state, like its differentiation from society and economy, impersonal power, bureaucratic organization (Pierson, 1996: 19).

One of the characteristics of the EU that distinguishes it from an international organization is "the unprecedented law-making and judicial power it has been given" (Mancini, 1991: 177). The community gradually came to have instituted some level of constitutionality. But, the use of the constitutionality within the European context needs to be qualified in that it is constitutional in the sense that it constitutes a system of rule binding the member states and gives a legal existence to the entity called the EU and its institutional structures. It is different from an international regime in that it is formulated and implemented in a more systematic and institutionalized way. It is also different from the constitution of the modern states in terms of its limited scope and the lack of an institutional setting, as in the states, to back the implementation of rules by force.

The main instruments for the construction of the community wide legal system are the Treaties, EU legislation, international law, the general principles of law, and judicial interpretations (Nugent, 1994: 208). Of these sources, the Treaties, the EU legislation and judicial interpretation are particularly important. The treaties are the main documents that set the direction and path of the integration. The Treaty of Rome, the SEA and the TEU are the milestones of the process, which determined

the parameters and limits of the legal order. Some parts of the Treaties have the statue of the law. While some other parts of the Treaties are not of law statue, they affect the interpretation and decision of the actors of the Community's legal system (Mancini, 1991: 177). The Decisions of the EU institutions constitute another source of legal order. These decisions are guided by the principles embodied in the Treaties. Judicial interpretation also plays a prominent role in the formation of the legal order within the Community. The decisions and the interpretations of the Court of Justice in specific cases clarify the ambiguities on the articles of the founding Treaties and ensure the 'right' applications of the community laws.

The court of Justice has been particularly important in the constitutionalization of the legal system and, thus, made remarkable contribution to the institutionalization of the EC and the deepening of the integration (Mancini, 1991). The certain responsibilities that it is charged of give it a privileged stance. Nugent argues that the Court of Justice has two main functions. One is its responsibility for monitoring the application of the law and thus ensuring the consistency and uniformity in their interpretation and applications. The second is that of the direct implementation of the law. He argues that four other tasks follow from these responsibilities. The first is the clarification and strengthening of the status of the EU laws. The second is the extension and strengthening of the EU policy competence. The third is that it guaranties to make laws within the existing policy competence. The fourth is the clarification of the jurisdiction of the community institutions (Nugent, 1994: 220-229).

One of the characteristics of the EU that makes it supranational is the existence of a legal system and common laws that ' promote uniformity' and the

supremacy that it claims in the interpretation and application of these laws. These laws abide to the member states that have to give in some degree of their sovereignty and become subject to a legal order beyond their individual jurisdictions. However, like many other aspects of the EU, the characterization of this aspect of the EU needs some qualifications. The scope of the EU laws is more limited when compared with the national laws. It is basically concerned with the economic aspects of the Community, and the policy areas like education, health, criminal and family laws are to a large extent outside of the jurisdiction of the Community law. Also with the exception of the common commercial policy, no policy areas are controlled exclusively by the EU laws. They often coexist with the national laws (Mancini, 1991), even though there are an increasing harmonization of the national and the EU laws. Although these qualifications seem to prove the remaining constitutionality of the member states, they illustrate the eroding effects of deterritorialization on the state's control over its legal order in that the EU laws are affective in ensuring the uniformity and consistency in the legal systems of the member states. So, the territorial character of the legal order, which is to say that laws apply only to those being the territorial boundaries of the states, are being eroded.

3.2.2.g. Taxation

Pierson argues that without a substantial and regular amount of tax revenue, the modern state is not likely to maintain its system of rule (Pierson, 1996). Taxation is an institutional manifestation of the extractive and redistributive aspects of the modern state. In some accounts of the state, taxation is pointed out as the one of the most essential features of the modern state that marks it off from its predecessors

(Pierson, 1996: 31). In one of these accounts, Tilly argues that wars acted as a motor behind the formation of the modern state, which required the extraction of large amount of resources (Tilly, 1975: 74). Not only wars but also everything the state does need to be financed some way. Taxation is and actually has become one of the most prominent ways of financing the activities of the state. The expansion of the state activities, the increasing importance of the state's redistributive functions and its increasing role in the social and economic developments entailed the greater reliance on taxation and gave rise to 'tax state' (Pierson, 1996: 32). The efficient taxation indicates the high degree of the territoriality of the state, which reinforces the capacity of the state to tax people on its territory.

Deterritorialization would be expected to create problems for the states to tax people and capital because of their presumably constant flow. In this respect, the European states retain the right and capacity to tax. The member states within the EU still retain the right to tax, even though they have allowed the EU to have a small budget consisting of the indirect means, like Value Added Tax, excise duties. The EU has made great efforts to harmonize the taxation policies of the member states, which aim at removing the competition advantage resulting from the differences in the taxation levels. On the one hand, the states have succeeded in protecting their privilege to levy tax from what they perceive as their citizens; on the other hand, they have to make taxation on a standardized basis.

3.3. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

Globalization defined as the establishment of the transnational level manifests itself in the construction of a European Community or Union beyond and above the

national borders. One of the crucial consequences of the Integration is the deterritrorialization of the economical, social and political activities, detaching these activities from the national territorial context and making it possible for economic, social and political actors to move throughout the Community wide network. In other words, deterritorialization within the European Context refers to the establishment of a space of flow or a network of interactions, making the territorial boundaries within Europe increasingly irrelevant.

In the economical sphere, deterritorialization has specifically taken the form of building one market not divided by the social and political boundaries, where economic activities flow without hindrance. The social sphere has also deterritorialized, even though deterritorialization in this sphere is not as enormous as in the economic realm. The deterritorialization in the social sphere has taken the form of the harmonization of the social standards throughout Europe so that similar social patterns are available in different parts of Europe at the same time. The establishment of the European level bureaucratic and political institutional structures can be seen as the materialization of the deterritorialization in the political realm. Deterritorialization in the political sphere has brought about the extension of politics beyond the national boundaries and the Europeanization of the national politics. The Europeanization of the national politics involves intermeshing of national and European level institutional structures in their operations and the increasing irrelevance of the national political boundaries in confining the limits of the politics.

The existence of the deterritorialization in the European integration does not mean that the whole process is a deterritorialization. As noted before, the European Integration, like globalization, is a multilayed process including different trends at the

same time. Deterritorialization at the community level goes hand in hand with a sort of reterritorialization at the regional level. The increasing irrelevance of territoriality and the physical barriers within the Community requires the increasing relevance of territory and physical constraints at the global level. In other words, a deterritorialized Europe is possible, if the boundaries of a unified Europe are secured against the outside.

Another point that the European case illustrates is that deterritorialization is a matter of degree. Territory or what has been called as the space of places is still important to some extent. Particularly at the political and social realms, the divisions, borders and exclusion based on territory or the space of place still persist. However, it is no doubt that the notion of territoriality has been questioned and reconstructed within the Community level. This is apparent from the attempts to create, as discussed, a common economic, social and political space, which might be conveniently called the space of flow without physical impediments behind the flow of the economic, social and political actors and factors. Given the stage of the integration, to which the European states and societies have come, there seem to be a likely prospect for the deepening and intensification of the trend, which will lead to the increase in the extent of deterritorialization or the creation of a deterritorialized space within the European context. Therefore, the analysis of European Integration as deterritorialization at the community level and the reterritorialization at the global level illustrate the multilayed and complex character of globalization.

Within the European Context, politics has become deterritorialized to the extent that politics is not embedded in the national, territorial physical contexts. Europe is creating new kinds of political formations. These formations fit neither to a

territorial sovereign modern state nor to a global political structure, but have the characteristics of the modern state and the global governance structure to varying degrees. The European Integration has been taken as a stage in the long evolution of the modern state (Bornschier, 2000). Although the European states are still there, they are not what they used to be at least according to the conventional theories of the modern state. They have been undergoing transformations under the increasingly deterritorializing momentums of the European integration. As a result of these transformations, Europe is giving birth to a new type of state and, perhaps in the long run, a new type of political association. It can be said that the European states are undergoing a transformation within increasingly deterritorialized economic, social and political contexts. We may need new theoretical tools to understand states that operate within an increasingly deterritorialized context, since the conventional theories of the modern state seem to be less-equipped in grasping such contexts.

CONCLUSION

The main concern of this study was to analyze how the trend of deterritorialization as an intrinsic dimension of globalization has affected the contemporary evolution of the modern state. In providing an answer to this question, a spatial analysis that is studying phenomena by focusing on their spatial properties is adopted. This adoption is informed by the conviction that the spatial analysis could make an important contribution to the attempts to comprehend the nature of the contemporary state. In this thesis, territoriality is taken to refer to the spatial character of the modern state. It has been argued that deterritorialization, referring to the changes in the spatial characters of human interactions that globalization has brought about, has challenged the spatial character of the modern state, that is its territoriality. In an increasingly deterritorialized world, the modern states have been transformed so that their territorial power has declined. IN this way, the modern states in the contemporary world are changing in many respects. In developing this argument, the emphasis was put first on the territorial nature of the modern state and the significance of territoriality with reference to the historical formation of the modern state. Secondly the erosion of territoriality within an increasingly deterritorialized world was emphasized. Lastly European integration, which exemplifies the rise of deterritorialization and its implications for the modern states, is analyzed.

The first chapter delineated the general phenomenon of territoriality as a specific approach towards physical space in controlling people and resources on it. Furthermore, I attempted to show the consequences of this approach to space, that is

the establishment of some degree of control over a specific space. This chapter also tried to show that among other political associations, it is the modern state that has practiced the strategy of territoriality in the most effective way. The modern state has achieved a degree of territoriality that precedent political formations as well as individuals and groups living within the jurisdiction of the modern state could not attain. The establishment and maintenance of a strong control over a particular physical space has been an intrinsic part of the evolution of the modern state. The territorial character of the modern state has been so important that it has brought about the territorialization of political, social and economic relations and processes so that the different aspects of the modern state have come to be defined in terms of its territoriality.

The second chapter discussed the recent problematization of the territoriality of the modern state with the rise of the trend of deterritorialization within globalization. Globalization has brought significant changes in the spatial dimension of human interactions. This thesis argues that globalization is defined, among other things, with reference to the rise of the trend of deterritorialization. This trend signifies the appearance of a relatively and increasingly deterritorialized world, in which economic, social and political interactions are less constrained by the physical space. In other words, the appearance of a deterritorialized world refers to a shift from the space of place to the space of flow. The space of flow, which is characterized by the existence of as few hindrances as possible behind the movement of economic, social and political actors, is gradually replacing or changing the meaning of the fixed space of place with strong boundaries. What does the rise of deterritorialization imply for the modern state? The thesis argues that

deterritorialization has problemetatized the territorial character of the modern state. Given the importance of the territoriality of the modern state for the specific character of its institutional structure, deterritorialization has challenged and changed the main characteristics of the modern state.

In the third and last chapter, the case of European Integration was analyzed as a case that makes globalization and the trend of deterritorialization manifest. This is so because European integration involves the construction of deterritorialized economic, social and political spaces in Europe. Europe is becoming a space of flow within itself rather than the space of place as it used to be. In this emerging space, economic, social and political interactions are increasingly becoming detached from their territorial and national contexts that the individual European states have been providing. This chapter also acknowledged the fact that European Integration is a complex process. It involves a deterritorialization at the Community level as well as a reterritorialization at the global level, referring to the emergence of a Europe with strong external forces. The third chapter also explored how this trend of deterritorialization has affected the defining characteristics of the European states as modern states. It has been argued that within a deterritorialized Europe, the states are not what they used to be. Their territoriality has been eroded. Since different characteristics of the European states have roots in their territorial character, the erosion of territoriality has resulted in the changes in the structure of the European states.

Although the European states still retain serious degree of statehood, the characteristics that constitute their statehood, such as their control over the means of violence, authority, sovereignty, constitutionality, taxation, are under challenge with

reference to an increasingly deterritorialized economic, social and political space in Europe. In my analysis, I have attempted to show that although it is still ambiguous whether the European states are giving way to a whole new type of political formation, it is beyond doubt that they are changing and are not what they once used to be. Perhaps, we need to develop new conceptual tools to understand the states that operate within an increasingly deterritorialized context. This is so because the conventional theories of the modern state assume that the states are embedded in territorial and national politics. However, territorial character of politics is becoming increasingly problematic vis-a-vis deterritorialization.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agnew, John A and James S. Duncan (eds.). 1989. *The Power of Place*. London: UNWIN HYMAN.

Albrow, Martin. 1996. *The Global Age*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Anderson, Malcolm. 1996. *Frontiers*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: New York: Verso.

Appandurai, Arjun (ed.). 2001. *Globalization*. London: Durham: Duke University Press.

Axtmann, Roland (ed.). 1998. *Globalization and Europe: the Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. London: Pinter.

Baldwin, Richard E. 1994. *Toward an Integrated Europe*. London: Center for Economy and Policy Research.

Bartelson, Jens. 1995. *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Beetham, David and Christopher Lord. 1998. *Legitimacy and The European Union*. New York: Longman.

Bornschier, Volker (ed.). 2000. *State-building in Europe: The revitalization of Western Europe Integration*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Brenner, Neil. 1999. "Beyond State-centrism? Space, Territoriality, and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies", *Theory and Society* 28(1): 39-78.

Cerny, Philip G. 1997. " Paradoxes of the Competition State: the Dynamics of Political Globalization", *Government and Opposition* 32(2):251-274.

Casimir, Michael J. and Aparna Rao (eds.). 1991. *Mobility and Territoriality*. New York: Oxford: Berg.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of Network Society*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

-----.1991. *The Information City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cox, Kevin R.(ed.). 1997. *Spaces of Globalization*. New York: The Gilford Press.

Dear, Michael J. and Steven Flustys. 2002. *The Space of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Duff, Andrew, John Pinder and Roy Pryce (eds.). 1994. *Maastricht and Beyond*. London: Routledge.

Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequence of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
-----. 1985. *The Nation-state and Violence*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gill, Stephen and David Law. 1988. *The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems, and Policies*. London: Harvester-Wheafsheat.

Goodman, S.F. 1990. *The European Community*. London: MACMILLIAN.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodenity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Cambridge: Blackwell.

Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformation*. Sanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Hirst, Paul, Grahame Thompson. 1995. " Globalization and The Future of The Nation State", *Economy and Society* 24(3): 408.

Hinsley, F.H. 1996. *Sovereignty*. New York: Basic Books INC.

Hoffman, John. 1998. *Sovereignty*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

----- and Laura Brace (eds.). 1997. *Reclaiming Sovereignty*. London: PINTER.

Holl, Augustine and Thomas E. Levy. 1993. *Spatial Boundaries and Social Dynamics*. Michigan: International Monogaphies in Prehistory.

Holland, Martin. 1992. *European Community Integration*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Immerfall, Stephen (ed.). 1998. *Territoriality in the Globalizing Society*. New York: Springer.

Keohane, Robert O. and Stanley Hoffmann (eds.). 1991. *The New European Community*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Keyman, Fuat. 1997. *Globalization, State, Identity/ Differences*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

----- and A. Yaşar Sarıbay (eds). 1997. *Küreselleşme Sivil Toplum ve İslam*. Ankara: Vadi.

King, Anthony D. (ed.). 1991. *Culture, Globalization and The World System*. London: MACMILLIAN EDUCATION LTD.

Lovell, Madia (ed.). 1998. *Locality and Belonging.* Routledge: London: New York.

Lutzeler, Michael. 1994. *Europe after Maastricht*. Oxford : Berghahn Books.

Maclean, Mairi and Jolyon Howorth (eds.). 1992. *Europeans on Europe*. London: MACMILLIAN.

McCormick, John. 1996. *The European Union*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Mann, Michael. 1994. " The Autonomous Power of The State: Its Origin, Mechanisms and Results". In John A. Hall (ed.), *The State: Critical Concepts*, Vol I. Routledge: London: New York, 331-354.

-----. 1993. *The Sources of Social Power*, Vol II. Cambridge University Press: New York.

-----. 1998. *States, War& Capitalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Marks, Garry, Fritz W. Scharpf, Philippe Schmitter and Wolfgang Streeck. 1996. *Governance in The European Union*. London: Sage Publication.

Milward, Alan. 1992. *The European Rescue of The Nation State*. London: Routledge.

-----, Frances M. B.Lynch, Ruggero Ranieri, Federico Romero and Vibeke Sorensen.1993. *The Frontier of National Sovereignty: History and Theory, 1945-1992*. London: New York: Routledge.

Mittelman, J.H. 1996. *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder: Lyne Rienner Publisher.

Mlinar, Zdravko (ed.). 1992. *Globalization and Territorial Identities*. Albershot: Avebury.

Morris, Christopher. 1998. *An Assay on The Modern State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moussis, Nicolas. 1991. *Access to Europe*. Brussels: EDIT-EUR.

Nugent, Neill. 1994. *The Government and Politics of The European Union*. London: MACMILLIAN PRESS LTD.

Ohmae, Kenichi (ed.). 1995. *The Evolving Global Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business Review.

Owen, Richard and Michael Dynes. 1992. *Tuttle Guide to the Single European Market*. Boston: Vermont.

Paasi, Anssi. 1996. *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness*. New York: John Wiley& Sons.

Petrakos, George, Gunther Marier and Grzegorz Gorzelak. 2000.*Integration and Transition in Europe*. London: New York: Routledge.

Pierson, Christopher. 1996. *The Modern State*. London, New York: Routledge.

Preston, Christopher. 1997. *Enlargements and Integration in the European Union*. London: New York: Routledge.

Prince, Geraldine (ed.). 1993. *A Window on Europe*. Edinburgh: CANONGATE PRESS.

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1990. *The State, Its Nature, Development and Prospects*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rhodes, Martin, Paul Heywood and Vincent Wright. 1997. *Developments in West European Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Richardson, Jeremy (ed.).1996. *European Union*. London: New York: Routledge.

Robertson, Roland, Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash (eds.) 1995. *Global Modernities*. London: Sage Publications.

Rometsh, Dietrich and Wolfgang Wessels (eds.). 1996. *The European Union and Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Rosamond, Ben. 2000. *Theories of European Integration*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Rosenau, James N.1990. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

----- and Ernst-Otto Czempiel. 1992. *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruggie, John Gerard. 1993. " Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations", *International Organization* 47(1): 139-174.

Sack, Robert David. 1986. *Human Territoriality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sandholtz, Wayne and Alec Stone Sweet. 1998. *European Integration and Supranational Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sbragia, Alberta M. 1991. *Euro-Politics*. Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institutions.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Shields, Rob.1991. *Places on the Margin*. London: New York: Routledge.

Shurmer-smith, Pamela and Kevin Hannam. 1994. *World of Desires, Realm of Power*. New York: Edward Arnold.

Sidjanski, Dusan.2000. *The Federal Future of Europe: From The European Community to The European Union*. Ann Ardor: University of Michigan Press.

Smith, David M. and Michael Chrisholm (eds.). 1990. *Shared Space: Divided Space*. London: UNWIN HYMAN.

Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: New York: Verso.

Strange, Susan. 1996. *The Retreat of The State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion Capitalism and European State*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

----- (ed.). 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-system*. London: Academic Press.

Waters, Malcolm. 1995. *Globalization*. London: New York: Routledge.

Werlen, Benno. 1993. *Society*, *Action and Space*. London, New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Martin.2001. " Will the Nation State Survive Globalization?", *Foreign Affairs* 80(1):178-190.