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Abstract

Waltz’ theory of international politics faced strong criticism from John Gerard Ruggie because of its impossibility to explain fundamental, systemic change of an anarchic world of territorial states. According to Ruggie, the challenges from European integration and globalisation to the territorial fundament of states particularly require a thorough exploration of the concept of political territoriality. Miles Kahler suggests considering territoriality as an institutional variable. Conceptualising territoriality as an institutional variable does not only allow for comparisons of time and place on the extent as to which territory matters in various instances of political organisations. It also enables to determine where and when the fundamental distinction in the discipline of political science between Comparative Politics (focusing on what happens within territorial states) and International Relations (focusing on what happens between territorial states) is justified to be made, and thus to determine where and when anarchy marks international order.

The paper presents a conceptualisation of political territoriality based on the work by the political geographer Robert Sack. In his seminal work Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History, Sack does not only defines what territoriality is (a strategy to control persons, relationships and phenomena by controlling a geographic area), but also what it does. The implications of a territorial strategy Sack discerned are summarised here as the logic of territoriality, comprising geographical fixity, impersonality, geographical inclusion/exclusion and centrality. The more the territorial strategy is used, the more this logic of territoriality leaves its imprint on political institutions and behaviour. The paper also shows how this analytical instrument might help to explore when and where politics have approached the Waltzian image of an anarchic world of territorial states. The case of France illustrates how the logic of territoriality provides a more varied view on the use of territory in organising security before and after 1648.
1. Introduction

In 1979, Kenneth Waltz launched a theory of international politics in which states feature a key role.\(^1\) John Ruggie contested Waltz’ “ahistorical” assumption of a hierarchical Westphalian state, leading to Waltz’ thesis that the international system is anarchic and decentralised, effectively forcing them to survive as they are. Waltz’ theory would thus theoretically exclude the possibility of functional differentiation among political units as well as change for the international system itself.\(^2\) Waltz’ theory could therefore not account for the transformation from the also anarchic Medieval Europe harbouring a wide variety of function-based guilds, territorial princedoms, person-based allegiance to feudal lords and popes towards the modern system of states.\(^3\) Neither could Waltz’ theory address the potential change of the international system beyond Westphalian territoriality, for example in the European Union, which is rather a more complicated issue for IR studies:

\[\text{We are not very good as a discipline at studying the possibility of fundamental discontinuity in the international system; that is, at addressing the question of whether the modern system of states may be yielding in some instances to postmodern forms of configuring political space. We lack even an adequate vocabulary; and what we cannot describe, we cannot explain.}\(^4\)

The Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648) are commonly referred to as the symbolic starting point of the modern state. Internal and external acknowledgement of its monopoly of force provides the state sovereign rule within its territory, dividing the hierarchy of domestic politics from the anarchy in international politics. At least, that has often been the (implicit) assumption in the analyses of politics within states (Comparative Politics) and between states (International Relations). As a consequence, political territoriality is often understood only in its Westphalian guise of the fixed, contiguous and clearly demarcated territory of a sovereign state in which all policy-making is bundled. If political territoriality is explored at all, its Westphalian understanding has hampered reflection upon the changing use of territory. This Westphalian view of territoriality has come under severe criticism in recent years:

---


\(^3\) Idem, ch. 5.

discourses through which the current system of territories is perpetually reproduced and transformed. Most of the literature simply assumes statehood, without identifying the basic elements of state, not to talk about challenging them.5

and

It is truly astonishing that the concept of territoriality has been so little studied by students of international politics; its neglect is akin to never looking at the ground that one is walking on.6

According to the political geographer John Agnew, this negligence is due to the “territorial trap” in political analysis, consisting of the assumption of territorial sovereignty, the separation of domestic and foreign realms of politics, and the designation of distinct societies by state borders.7 These spatial images underpinning theories in political science preclude outcomes deviating from the Westphalian state. As long as the political world is neatly carved up in sovereign states, the Westphalian assumption dividing Comparative Politics and International Relations would not be necessarily problematic. However, just establishing the fact that the political world is more or less ordered by Westphalian territoriality requires empirical investigation. In addition, it may well be that the use of territory even in a world of states is much more varied across the world than is assumed. Westphalian territoriality can have different meanings and significance for failed states in Africa than for China or India.

Today, globalisation and above all European integration are said to challenge the Westphalian underpinnings of the state and its analysis all together. Some have even proclaimed the simultaneous end altogether of the political relevance of states, geography and political territoriality. More modest claims speak of variable geometry in Europe. In a recent state of the art overview, political scientist Miles Kahler asks for a more refined empirical judgment of how globalisation and European integration are related to political territoriality in states and other political entities. He proposes therefore to perceive territoriality as an “institutional variable” of a political unit:

A taxonomy of institutional composites or bundles is required in order to define unit variation. (…)Territoriality is often identified as a core institutional feature of the modern state. It is also a key dimension of unit variation: most political organizations are territorial in some sense but their territoriality differed from contemporary practices and interstate conventions. (…)Modelling the institutions of territoriality, which are central in defining state and unit variation, should become a central part of the institutional research agenda on the state. (…)Treating the state and other units in world politics as composites of institutions has the attractive side

---

Making political territoriality a variable avoids the narrow focus of the question of whether Westphalian territoriality does or does not mark politics, policies, and polities in Europe. In addition, conceptualising territoriality as an institutional variable does not only allow for comparisons of time and place on the extent as to which territory matters in various instances of political organisations. It also enables to determine where and when the fundamental distinction in the discipline of political science between Comparative Politics (focusing on what happens within territorial states) and International Relations (focusing on what happens between territorial states) is justified to be made, and thus to determine where and when anarchy marks international order.

This paper presents a conceptualisation of political territoriality based on the work by the political geographer Robert Sack. In his seminal work Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History, Sack does not only define what territoriality is, but also what it does. In section 2, the paper presents conceptualisation of political territoriality, followed by a section on the implications of a territorial strategy of control, labelled here the logic of territoriality. The paper shows in section 4 how this analytical instrument might help to explore when and where politics have approached the Waltzian image of an anarchic world of territorial states. Preceded by a reflection on territoriality in security studies in section 5, the case of France illustrates how the logic of territoriality provides a more varied view on the use of territory in organising security before and after 1648.

2. Conceptualising political territoriality

The assertion of territorial control has been explained as an innate, instinctive inclination of human beings to possess and to defend an area against intruders, similar to animals. Although every individual human being requires some space to live, and feels emotionally attached to certain places, the diversity of political entities in the past and present shows that neither individuals nor social collectives seek instinctively fixed, closed, and clearly demarcated territories for their survival or the protection of property. People may feel more comfortable and relaxed when they control ‘their’

---


territory, yet the scale and size of the territory they consider as their ‘natural’ home, or as their fatherland - their backyard, city, region, village, state, federation, neighbourhood, empire, etc. - is indeterminate. Moreover, people may feel ‘home’ in several overlapping, nested or intersecting territories, as the slogan of the French communists in the 1950s illustrates: “France is our country, but the Soviet Union is our fatherland.”11 Therefore, perceptions of natural necessity for a political unit to have a certain territorial living space should not be taken for granted. Instead, these perceptions should be considered as rhetorical means to strengthen people’s loyalty towards a certain political entity. Thus, asserting territorial control is a human choice, stemming from human “intentionality”12 instead of natural instinct; it is in Sack’s words “a conscious act.”13 This does not deny that the geographic environment has an impact on relationships of power and rule. The environment certainly influences boundary-making and centre-periphery relations, but it is a political choice whether and which geographical factors are used to mould political relationships.14 Therefore, any political territory requires maintenance, as Anssi Paasi explains:

[t]eritories are not frozen frameworks where social life occurs. Rather, they are made, given meanings, and destroyed in social and individual action. (...) Territories are always manifestations of power relations. The link between territory and power suggests that is important to distinguish between a place as territory and other types of places. Whereas most places do not, territories – especially states – require perpetual public effort to establish and to maintain.15

Thus, the political use of territory is neither an innate instinct nor necessarily Westphalian. Moreover, boundaries can be vaguely defined or of a non-geographical nature. A definition of the political use of territory should therefore avoid any socio-biological or Westphalian bias. Robert Sack has written one of the first and few works offering a historical understanding of political territoriality that is not exclusively informed by the Westphalian state. His understanding of political territoriality is thoroughly human16 and defines it as follows: “the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area” and also as “a geographical expression of

---

This definition clearly shows that political territoriality is a human activity used to create and mould political relationships through socially constructed territories.

That may include the physical demarcation of a geographic area, as well as the establishment of coercive and socialising mechanisms and institutions to uphold territorial control. According to Sack’s understanding of political territoriality, territory is not a passive given, but is actively used by political actors. Sack’s definition covers a wide variety of political use of territory, ranging from nomads’ temporary control of oases, and electoral districts, to the temporary control of streets in Catholic neighbourhoods by the Protestant Orange Marches in Northern-Ireland. It also includes vaguely defined boundaries such as imperial limes (frontiers), or the non-contiguous use of territorial control such as in mediaeval Burgundy or the Habsburgian Empire. In fact, his definition does not make a qualitative distinction between external and internal borders, meaning borders of and within the Westphalian state respectively. Internal and external borders only differ to the extent of asserting control. Thus, based on Sack’s definition, the claim made by John Ruggie, that the European Union might go “beyond territoriality,” seems rather unlikely, as immigrants trying to enter the Schengen region experience every day. That is not to say that the European Union might yet go “beyond Westphalia”, in which Sack’s definition of political territoriality may allow us to better discern a non-Westphalian order of territorial control, giving a more refined impression of the changing political use of territory in the European Union.

Being a product of human intentionality, why then, would political actors use territory to shape relationships of power and rule? Political territoriality is an efficient means for classification, communication and enforcement, as Sack succinctly explains:

Territoriality involves a form of classification that is extremely efficient under certain circumstances. Territoriality classifies, at least in part, by area than by type. (…) We need not stipulate the kinds of things in place that are ours or not yours. Thus territoriality avoids, to varying degrees, the need for enumeration and classification by kind and may be the only means of asserting control if we cannot enumerate all of the significant factors and relationships to which we have access. This effect is especially useful in the political arena, where a part of the political is its concern with novel conditions and relationships. Territoriality can be easy to communicate because it requires only one kind of marker or sign – the boundary. (…) Territoriality can be the most efficient strategy for enforcing control,

---

18 Paasi, A. (2003), supra note 5.
Thus, territoruality helps facilitate the communication concerning assignment of political responsibilities and tasks, and the enforcement of political control since it is relatively easy to visualise through demarcation. Classification by territory also simplifies the planning of policy output, as territorial planning is more easy to visualise and to be separate the process of planning from the actual persons, dynamics, and events within that area. This understanding of political territoruality does not include any function such as protection in advance. Nevertheless, a territorial strategy of control may serve certain political purposes, such as protection and planning, better than other strategies. The efficiency of exercising functional policy choices such as planning healthcare facilities or protecting property and persons may therefore suffer if territorial strategies for political control are less or no longer available in the European Union.

3. The logic of political territorality

Although political territorality is a product of human intentionality, it may yet have (unintended) implications for political relationships. A territorial strategy sets a certain institutional logic in motion enabling and constraining political behaviour. So that the more political territoruality shapes the institutional arena of politics, the more certain patterns of behaviour within political systems and between political systems may appear. Charles Tilly concluded from his analysis of states’ formation: “Statemakers did not seek to create the organization; they sought to sustain the activity.”

By adopting certain strategies of political control, polity-makers may yet steer towards a certain type of political organisation, although they may not even be aware of that. Thus, the variation in political territoruality not only refers to its active, intentional use, but also to its implications for relationships of power and rule. These implications are labelled here as the logic of political territorality.

Political science research may discern the institutional tendencies influenced by territorial strategies that were not necessarily anticipated, desired, intended or considered in advance by political actors. The logic of territorality would emerge in any historical and social context when territory is used for political control, although in certain conditions that logic can develop more extensively. Sack presents a list of
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20 Sack, R. (1986), supra note 1, p. 32; emphasis in the original.
23 Idem, p. 22.
24 tendencies and combinations of tendencies to understand the logic of territoriality in all its facets. For the sake of clarity, these 24 are reduced here into 4 implications. Sack claims that his list of 24 tendencies is not a definitive list. Similarly, the four implications examined below to not represent a complete list but are intended to be an effective starting point to help understanding changing political territoriality. The more political territoriality is used by emphasising territorial boundaries, the stronger certain logic might be expected both within and between polities. As the principle of territoriality is the basis for power and rule of the Ideal type Westphalian system of states, it may not be accidental that territoriality is so often associated or even equated with Westphalia. Political territoriality and territorial boundaries may have a peculiar impact on the functioning of a political unit and its relations that may be very close to the functioning of ‘the’ Westphalian state.

3.1 Geographical fixity
As mentioned earlier, communicating territorial control is often more efficient, because it is less complex than enumeration by kind or persons and is more easy to visualise. City walls, fences, barbed wire, palisades, “no trespass” signs, border guards, ghetto walls, landmarks and boundary stones easily show the territorial circumscription of power and rule. Particularly since the sixteenth century, advanced mapping techniques of land area (sea maps had already been quite accurate) allowed envisioning territorial control at the table of generals, tax intendants, kings, administrative planners and statisticians.24 An image of a political territory at accurate scale instead of as a symbolic impression of the personal belongings of a king or the peculiarities of a region, provided a fixed geographical icon for a political system. Geographical fixity also facilitates comparison between political units regarding economic income, happiness, electoral participation or whatever else, just by counting per territory, even if the relevant political relationships are not territory-based. In addition, a single territorial reference also allows summarising succinctly complex and changing networks of political relationships. Networks of power and the rule of nations or governments can be identified as “France” or “Paris”, and visualised through the image of, for example, the hexagone. The ease of communicating territorial control facilitates its relative permanence, also because the territorial control is not fully dependent on any change of phenomenon or persons in the demarcated area. That can lead to what might be called “fictive fixity,” the idea that the territory has been there even before it was created and will be there forever. History textbooks

on European nation-states often represent this de-historicising effect, in which history, present, and future is explained teleologically in the framework of a recently crafted national territory.\(^{25}\)

Thus, political territoriality implies a tendency to geographical fixity of political space. This fixity may explain why territorial conflicts are the fiercest when certain territorial images overlap. Person-based or function-based strategies of political control are much less geographically fixed. In medieval times, the capriciousness of dynastic marriages, allegiances and feuds continuously influenced the geographical scope of power and rule, while function-based polities are inherently unlimited since it depends on what political actors do, often being geographically flexible in seeking the most efficient scale of operation. The tendency of geographical fixity does not mean that people would fixate exclusively on one territory. In federations, citizens may feel attached to the territory of the federation, perceiving the member state’s territory as a “secondary territory.”\(^{26}\)

### 3.2 Impersonality

A territory can be used to refer to the complex networks of political relationships such as of a nation. It may thus become a depersonalised and reified expression of power and rule, obscuring the actual political relationships:

> Reification through territory is a means of making authority visible. Displacement through territory means having people take the visible territorial manifestations as the sources of power […] The territory is a physical manifestation of the state’s authority, and yet allegiance to territory or homeland makes territory appear as a source of authority.\(^{27}\)

The “iconography”\(^{28}\) of a political entity often includes a territorial reference to symbolize the belonging of individuals, societies and their authorities together. Geographical fixity and impersonality may provide a “magical mystical perspective”\(^{29}\) to a political entity making it seem as if it has always existed. Impersonality also features in non-territorially organised entities, such as a religious order or a company. The easy visualisation of territory, however, strengthens the impersonal nature of political relationships.

---


\(^{27}\) Sack, R. (1986), supra note 13, p. 38.


The extent as to which impersonality can work through a political entity depends on the genesis of the territorial boundaries to demarcate the area controlled. Territorial boundaries can be the expression of the geographical spread of a previously existing political entity, which has been described by political geographer Richard Hartshorne as “subsequent boundaries.” In contrast to this “social definition of territory”, so-called “superimposed boundaries” indicate the “territorial definition of social relationships.” Then, territorial boundaries are applied to mould persons and phenomena into a certain framework. Imposing territorial boundaries also creates the illusion as if persons and phenomena were not previously present in that territorial area, “emptiable space” in Sack’s words, and to plan regardless of these people and phenomena. Referring to the Weberian description of impersonal bureaucracy, Sack explains:

Planning for change and thinking of the future means imagining different things in space. It involves imagining the separation and recombination of things in space. Territoriality serves as a device to keep space emptiable and fillable.

An impersonal, emptiable space makes it possible for the territory to be considered as a tabula rasa, on which a blueprint of a new society can be projected. Particularly through city planning, political actors have tried to mould people into synoptic, transparent and controllable schemes. For example, Baron Hausmann constructed a star shape pattern of streets in late 19th century Paris in order to make the city easily accessible for police and military to respond quickly to crush revolts which were endemic in the former medieval town quarters. Previously, during the French Revolution, the revolutionaries had conceived of France as a blank sheet from which they could create a fully new regime. It is for this reason that the conservative thinker Edmund Burke criticised the French Revolution, because it did not take into account the historically grown, illustrating the tension between socially defined territory and territorially defined society.

Superimposed and subsequent boundaries collided also in other instances. Native Americans and also African tribes were “surprised” by European colonialists

---

31 Sack, R. (1986), supra note 13, p. 36.
32 Ibidem, p. 33.
33 Ibidem, p. 38.
geographically delineating their property and political space. A similar collision occurred in municipal redistricting in the Netherlands. Often for reasons of providing the provision of public goods at an efficient scale, the Dutch government has merged cities with their surrounding villages. The people in the villages protested particularly against this imposition of new territory, since they did not feel connected to the people in the city or that they belonged to the new territory and preferred to remain in their traditional village territories.

The idea of a historical link between people and the area they live in is also an important part of Ratzel’s organistic state theory. The idea that certain people belong to a certain geographical area is therefore referred to as ‘organic territoriality.’ Did Ratzel present this idea as a historically and environmentally determined given? Here ‘organic territoriality’ refers to a socially constructed idea and perception that a political group is historically rooted to the soil they are living on. The (imagined) link between political groups and the area they live on have been influential in Catholic and Protestant political thought on states and federalism. Citizenship based on ascendancy, *ius sanguinis*, is reminiscent of this imagined link, while *ius soli* indicates that citizenship is determined by the place of birth. ‘Dynastic territoriality’ is another example of subsequent boundaries. For along period, the ups and downs of royal, imperial, clerical and princely dynasties determined the geographical scope of power and rule in Europe. Notwithstanding the personal origin of subsequent borders, the very use of territory to express the relationships of power and rule of communities, dynasties, nations or empires will have a similar, yet weaker effect upon the functioning of the political system as superimposed borders. For example, geographical fixity and impersonality increasingly have marked the power and the rule of dynasties in Europe so that at one point the death of a king no longer changed borders and the internal political system under the exclamation: “the king is dead, long live the king.”

Another example of subsequent territorial boundaries is ‘imperial territoriality.’ An empire is rather a person-based polity, being foremost based on a civilisation of values. Imperial boundaries are therefore vaguely delineated, relatively unfixed, transitional temporary zones (in short: frontiers). Frontiers indicate the reach of coercion and persuasion of the civilisation’s values, reflecting the cultural fringes of an imperial civilisation, they are “rather a phenomenon of ‘the facts of life’ - a

manifestation of the spontaneous tendency for growth of the ecumene.” An ancient example of imperial territoriality is the Roman Empire in its expansive period. Modern “spheres of influence” and “spheres of responsibility” in international politics feature the territorial scope of a great power’s authority integrating certain countries or regions into a loose political system. The 1823 Monroe Doctrine, in which United States President James Monroe justified the influence of the United States within the Western Hemisphere, and Russia’s “Near Abroad” exemplify imperial territoriality.

3.3 Exclusivity/ inclusion
In contrast to frontiers, borders are rather precisely defined, linear and well-demarcated lines, indicating the “outerline of effective control exercised by the central government.” Boundaries do not necessarily seal off a political system, but rather function as ‘filters’ or ‘screening instruments’ to regulate access to and exit from a political system, often differentiating between members and non-members. For example, tourists may be allowed to enter a state’s territory only temporarily, while a state’s citizens may stay indefinitely. An “open border’ situation refers to a centrifugal orientation of the actors contained within the borders”, in which territory functions as ‘springboard of opportunity’ for, for instance, trade across its borders. The more closed a boundary is, the more it interrupts cross-boundary contacts, and the more actors within boundary areas are bound to turn to the central authority in their political area for value satisfaction. The stricter the boundary control, the less permeable it is, the stronger the focus is on the internal centre: “The centripetal effect of [closed] borders [is] the orientation towards the interior of the people inhabiting the

---

39 Kristof, L. (1959), supra note 11, p. 270.
40 Idem, p. 272.
42 Kristof, L. (1959), supra note 11, p. 272.
Thus, closed linear territorial boundaries function as “locking-in mechanisms” with a separating, “inner-oriented” impact, being “a manifestation of centripetal forces.” These linear boundaries create a situation of peripherality for those members close to the boundaries since the centre’s tight grip prevents exchanges across those boundaries. The other side of external exclusion is, however, the internal inclusion of those peripheries.

The political territoriality of closed borders has a separating tendency, dividing an inside from an outside, shaping the political relationships within and between territories. Peter Taylor has captured that internal and external shaping in the concepts of “containers” and “interterritoriality”, respectively. In the formation of states in Europe, territorial boundaries have functioned internally as a “container” in which military, political, but also economic, cultural and social relations are bundled, as has been the case with the creation of identity within state boundaries: “territoriality is connected both with the creation of state boundaries (exclusion of the Other) and with internal social-spatial control (the social construction of ’us’).” Mercantilist, protectionist, and especially autarkic economic regimes, strongly emphasize the closing of territorial boundaries around an economic system. Politically and administratively, closed boundaries concentrate the decision-making, planning and execution of tasks within the territory. These may include, the right to participate in decision-making, the circumscription of formal competences, the right of receiving, consuming and producing social benefits, and the persons and other factors that planners must take into account. In the Middle Ages jurisdiction seemed to resemble geographical ink blobs on the map, in part for being determined by person-based power and rule, a closed territory fostered a territorial and thus contiguous image of power and rule. Increasing coincidence and congruence of territorialities within the political realm, but also of social, economic and cultural territorialities can be called ‘bundling territorialities’, while the decreasing coincidence and congruence is ‘unbundling territorialities.’ The latter does not necessarily mean that territoriality is

---

46 Houtum, van (1998), supra note 44, p. 16; emphasis in the original.
no longer used as strategy, but that the ex/inclusive impact of territorial boundaries is for some reason weaker since political territorialities and non-political territorialities coincide less.

The closed territorial boundaries of one political entity also affect relations with political actors on the other side of the boundaries, because relationships at that territory are blocked and considered a violation of the territorial integrity of the political unit. A unit’s territorial integrity requires recognition from the outside. The territorial exclusion and concentration of political life within a territory, also implies the acceptance of politics outside the territory. Imperial territoriality considers frontiers just as a temporary dividing line between the civilisation and the inferior barbarians outside, which are to be subjected to the economic, military and cultural will of the empire as soon as it is able to do so.\footnote{Cf. Kratochwil, F. (1986), supra note 41, p. 32.} The demarcation of the outer-line of effective control implies, however, the recognition of the right of existence of political entities outside the territory. In other words, a closed boundary stimulates, but also requires, mutual recognition of territorial integrity. Because of this mutual nature of interterritoriality, “[t]erritories do not exist in isolation…”\footnote{Taylor, P.J. (1995), supra note 48, p. 3.} The mutual recognition of territories came about in Europe from a stalemate between clashing religions and between the geopolitical aggrandizement of competing dynasties and expanding nations. The numerous agreements and treaties made to maintain the mutual recognition of territories also show the inherent normative nature of the society of territory-based political units.

The image of a territorially delineated political unit is rather easy to visualise, to communicate and to imitate. Sack speaks in this respect of territoriality’s tendency to “engender more territoriality”\footnote{Sack, R. (1986), supra note 13, p. 34.}, as a white spot on the map asking to be filled, making today’s world a map to be carved up in territorial units. Once established, these territorial units are also relatively difficult to change. Interterritoriality also implies that a government can only be meaningful if it holds a claim on a territory, even if it is in exile or lacks effective control. Claims for national self-determination or regional autonomy are often expressed in territorial terms to facilitate communication and recognition. The Convention of Montevideo (1933) is usually referred to as the legal norm of an acknowledgement of a government by fellow governments in order to become a legitimate participant. In the convention, effective control of territory is a key criterion. The more the mutual exclusivity of territories is emphasised in this society of governments, the stronger territorial borders are, and the more political life
will be concentrated within a territory. The closeness of territorial borders is thus fundamental to the “containership” within a political territory, and interterritoriality in inter-polity relationships. As a matter of fact, wherever territorial boundaries are set, containership and interterritoriality appear. Not only in inter-state relations, but also at the municipal, provincial or regional level the same effect will occur if territory is used as a means of control. As stated before, so-called internal borders within states and external borders of states do not differ qualitatively.

Non-territorial boundaries can also have an exclusionary and inclusive influence. Being relatively easy to communicate and enforce, the impact of territorial boundaries are however expected to be stronger than non-territorial boundaries. Blocking physical access and communication infrastructure to cut off contacts across territorial borders can be more effectively enforced than blocking contact across personal or functional borders. Pre-1991 Albania and present-day North Korea are examples of this effective enforcement. This territorial effectiveness is also shown in political relationships in which person-based separation is sought, such as in the homelands under the South-African Apartheid regime or ghettos in cities. Although the previous discussion of containership and interterritoriality suggest otherwise, closed borders do not necessarily lead to the creation of a society of states. The Iron Curtain exemplified a closed boundary, but it also reflected the stalemate between the Soviet and American spheres of influence in Europe. Thus, the genesis of this boundary impacts on the tendency towards further ex/inclusion.

3.4 Geographical centrality

As pointed out earlier, the exclusionary impact of territorially closed boundaries has a centripetal effect. This is not only the way political territoriality fosters geographical centrality. Enforcing control through political territoriality is less labour intensive and easier to visualise than person-based or function-based control. Territoriality provides an effective disciplinary instrument for surveillance from a hierarchic centre, as centralised supervision requires relatively few guards within a clearly visualised area to keep outsiders out and insiders’ in.\textsuperscript{55} Political territoriality also facilitates the assignment of tasks and responsibilities, because these are relatively easy to visualise through a boundary. Enumeration by kind or person would make it much more complex and less easy to visualise (and thus communicate) who or what is responsible and accountable. In addition, bundling of territorialities requires coordination and priority setting among the various functions bundled in a political centre. The more

\textsuperscript{55} Idem.
political territoriality influences political behaviour, the stronger its exclusionary and centralising effect. As a consequence, the political centre can begin to dominate priority setting and coordination, becoming the primary power within the 'bundled' territory. A capital can be seen as the geographical visualisation of this centralised, fixed, impersonal, and exclusive power.

As has been previously stated, territoriality is a relatively efficient way of communicating accountability and planning the delivery of goods. Territorial planning and accountability are, however, effective only to a certain extent. Mismatch between the actual scale of human activities and social dynamics on the one hand, and the scale of planning and accountability on the other hand, causes spill-over effects, blurring of responsibility and hampering the efficient provision of public services. Furthermore, too much centralised power within a territory may lack the flexibility and the necessary expertise in certain policy areas to deal with cases of mismatch. That mismatch may yet be maintained on purpose to divert attention from the real origins of certain phenomena or social conflict. In addition, mismatch between territory and function may also be pursued in order to fragment power, such as in the federal systems of government in the USA and (West-) Germany.

Cases of mismatch can be solved by creating task-specific, one-purpose jurisdictions, flexibly adjusting to the most efficient scale of operation. This task-driven logic is a functional one, resulting in geographically overlapping jurisdictions. The choice between territorially bundling tasks or functionally unbundling tasks depends on the following reasoning:

…we find that government’s role in providing public goods territorially is explained in two ways. First, it is pointed out that externalities tend to be contiguous in geographic space. But this contiguity in space is more likely a result of the fact that public goods are provided territorially. The second reason is therefore more fundamental. It argues that public goods are provided by political territorial units because they can levy taxes to support them while attempting to contain or exclude externalities and free riders. (...) Many services are not completely independent of one another and can benefit by sharing boundaries with services that might theoretically have somewhat different geographical ranges. (...) It may pay, therefore, to have them all share boundaries in a multi-purpose district.

---

Expanding on this way of reasoning, the political scientists Liesbeth Hooghe and Gary Marks advance another argument on the size and diversity of political systems with regard to the choice mentioned above:

Large (i.e., territorially extensive) jurisdictions have the virtue of exploiting economies of scale in the provision of public goods, internalizing policy externalities, allowing for more efficient taxation, facilitating more efficient redistribution, and enlarging the territorial scope of security and market exchange. Large jurisdictions are bad when they impose a single policy on diverse ecological systems or territorially heterogeneous populations.\(^6^0\)

A multi-purpose jurisdiction is an instrument used not only to bundle accountability and coordinated planning, but also to share risks. Fiscal centralisation is there to share the financial burden of risks and coordination costs among participating one-purpose jurisdictions. Conflicts concerning the redistribution of tax resources may result in further centralisation. Participating jurisdictions decisions regarding purposes may need side-payments and deals with other policy issues. This centralised bargaining is effectively the centralisation of interest aggregation. Institutionalisation of this process of centralisation is subsequently enhanced since it requires from the members of a multi-purpose polity more effort to escape to another multi-purpose polity or a variety of one-purpose polities, than to voice its demands and grievances within the more fixed, institutionalised framework of a territorial, multi-purpose polity. This incentive to stay within the territorial, multi-purpose polity allows for the creation of a common identity with an exclusionary effect: others do not enjoy the provision of services, nor do they share the members’ identity.\(^6^1\) The mobility of members belonging to a multi-purpose polity would then be largely contained within its territorial confines. The stronger the borders of a (multi-purpose) polity are, the less easy it is to redraw them. Municipal borders are therefore in general easier to redraw than national borders.

Functional territoriality refers to the strategy to draw territorial borders according to the geographical scale of a certain function. It is thus a mechanical or instrumental definition of territory (in contrast to the social definition of territory in organic territoriality). A functional logic of organisation is exemplified in David Mitrany’s “aterritorial logic of functionalism”\(^6^2\) found in EU integration theories. Mitrany, the intellectual father of functionalism, expects that a world organised according to task-specific issue-arenas would destroy the exclusionary tendencies of

\(^{60}\) Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2003), supra note 57, p. 235.
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the territorial nation-states. However, co-ordination among policy arenas and endurable structures of accountability also require a (territorial) centralising of the bundling of tasks.\textsuperscript{63} The distribution of tasks across several levels has consequently been discussed among the European Communities and its successors on the basis of efficiency of scale and (democratic) accountability. This debate on efficiency of geographical scale has also been marked by ‘organistic’ attachments to (national) territories, which are not necessarily improvements for an efficient allocation of values or an effective organisation of accountability and democracy. As mentioned previously, similar discussions on territoriality, functionality and personality are common in municipal redistricting, in which the need for an efficient scale of public service provision, the attachment to local neighbourhoods and central coordination and accountability not always go together.

4. Anarchy, functional differentiation and (geographical) distance
The use of territory as a strategy of control has tendencies of geographical fixity, impersonality, exclusivity and centrality – in short the logic of political territoriality. Closed territorial borders enhance the logic of territoriality, in its extreme resulting in geographically fixed, impersonal, mutually exclusive, and centralised political systems. The Ideal-type state and political territoriality are thus closely connected; the state is an extreme example of territoriality and its logic. It is therefore the logic of territoriality, rather than anarchy which is responsible for maintaining states in international politics. The anarchic and decentralised nature of international politics is a result of the logic of territoriality \textit{in extremis}. In order to explain the constitution of a (non-) Westphalian order in politics it is necessary to explain when and how political territoriality has been adopted and (both internally and externally) accepted as a feasible strategy and principle of polity-formation, and how the logic of political territoriality could work to its extreme, i.e. mutual exclusivity, impersonality, internal centrality, and geographical fixity. This may be a conceptual starting point to help explain the systemic transformation from the mediaeval to the Westphalian order and to the post-modern era that John Gerard Ruggie has been looking for.\textsuperscript{64} Kenneth Waltz claims that because no central power can force states to cooperate across their borders permanently, states should help themselves, and thus become like-units, without functional differentiation among them.\textsuperscript{65} An exploration of systemic change might begin from the starting point that the less territoriality is used as political
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strategy and the less the logic of territoriality can work through political life, the more functional differentiation might be expected. Therefore, explaining systemic change would require understanding the circumstances and reasons political actors use territoriality, and the circumstances in which its logic can work through.

A similar argument can also apply to intra-territorial politics. When power is geographically fixed, centralised, exclusively held and bundled in a polity, its members have one point where to address their demands and grievances, to coordinate and negotiate the allocation of values. Thus, the fixity, exclusivity and centrality of a territory-based polity decrease the costs, while they increase the effectiveness of cross-local mobilisation of functional and personal demands from the entire territory. As the Rokkanian argument goes, the relatively closed territorial borders of the European states allowed for the formation of national parties and movements. Thus, a strong logic of territoriality weakens geographically organised and expressed representation. If, however, power is flexibly located, dispersed, decentralised, unbundled, and non-exclusive, members have multiple points where to direct their demands and grievances. Then, cross-local mobilisation of demands across the entire territory of the political system will be more costly and less effective, since multiple authorities have to be addressed and members are fractured according to the fragmented authorities. Instead of territory-wide, polity-wide mobilisation of demands, members of a political system would seek the address for their demands with those whom they feel enough of a bond to come together in a common effort. This might be based on religion, ethnicity, kinship, race or any other source of mutual trust, and that might be organised through non-contiguous virtual networks. The expectation of being locked in a fixed territorial system would thus be exchanged with the conviction of belonging to the same group, sharing the same interests, or identity.

Geographical proximity is however helpful in order to decrease the costs for mobilising demands. In addition, coordination of some tasks may yet be feasible at close geographical distance. The paradoxical implication is that while a strong logic of territoriality stimulates the non-territorial representation of demands, a weak logic of territoriality seems to foster a geographical representation of demands. Studies of regionalism also suggest that territory is a relatively easy marker for distinctiveness. These territorially represented demands are easily visualised and communicated,
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clustering private, public, personal and functional, economic and political demands from a particular region.

A strong logic of territoriality would thus limit functional differentiation in the international sphere, while fostering functional differentiation within states. In contrast, a weak logic of territoriality fosters functional differentiation in the international sphere, while fostering foremost the geographical concentration of politics within states. In principle, territoriality and its logic applies to all levels and scope of politics, whether municipal, national, regional, international or worldwide. It thus offers the conceptual vocabulary of (territorial) political strategies and polity-formation that is independent of the territorial divide between Comparative Politics and International Relations.

5. Territoriality and security studies
The Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648) are often seen as the starting point of an anarchic order of territorial states. This paper rejects the rigid historical classification based on the presumed dominance of Westphalian territoriality since 1648. Instead, it will show the variation in territoriality before and after 1648 in a classic instance of state formation, France. The logic of territoriality shows nevertheless how the strategy of territoriality may eventually lead to the principle of territoriality. Before doing so, the paper focuses on how a Westphalian bias has hampered studying territoriality and security.

In recent years, war studies have increasingly paid attention to the territorial factor, such as the size, shape, and proximity of state territories. It appears that the probability of (military) escalation, a larger number of casualties, and repetition is higher in territorial than in non-territorial conflicts. Territorial conflicts are also less likely to be resolved peacefully. That is not just because of the geographical concentration of natural resources, such as diamonds, water, or oil, or to communicate effectively who should share the burden of collective defence. In particular the indivisibility of a communicated territory complicates compromises, indicating the fixating power of geographical visualisations of polities. Recent research on territorial conflicts and globalisation indicates the territoriality is an effective

means of communication also among migrants in the diaspora. A loss in a territorial conflict is fairly easily visible, which make states reluctant to compromise with irredentist movements or neighbours because their reputation would be quickly tarnished.

Studies of territorial conflicts thus give an impression why territory is used as strategy for control; particularly because of the effectiveness and efficiency of communication. It also shows that an aspect of the logic of territoriality, geographical fixity, hampers the solution of conflicts. The focus of those studies is however mainly on state territories, state borders, and military conflicts. Variation in the use and significance of territoriality has been barely analysed, whereas territoriality is more than the borders of sovereign states. Also neo-realist as well as traditional security studies in International Relations have taken state sovereignty and territoriality for granted, and have exclusively focused on military security. In those studies, the Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648) has often been presented as the starting point of an era in which the survival of a political system requires military defence of territorial sovereignty.

However, territory has always been used as security strategy throughout history, and not only in a Westphalian mould. The Hadrian wall to ward off Pictian attacks at the Roman Empire is a clear example. The political boundaries did not coincide with the security boundaries in the Roman Empire, as the former was largely based person-based citizenship. The Hadrian wall was also rather part of a security buffer zone, instead of being a strictly demarcated border as the usual Westphalian understanding of state borders has it. In addition, palisades of villages, the walls of mediaeval cities and fortresses, as well as the safe havens of churches show a variety of security territorialities. Meanwhile, the supreme and universal authority of pope and emperor in Mediaeval Europe indicate that sovereignty is not necessarily based on territory. These examples are drawn from the European past before the Peace Treaties of Westphalia. Nevertheless, Westphalia did not automatically mean an equation of territoriality, sovereignty, and military security. The treaties aimed at the restoration of the political order within the Holy Roman Empire and the European society of Christian nations. The treaties did not contain any reference to sovereignty nor formally sanctioned the existing collective independence of the Swiss cantons and the
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Dutch Provinces. The conceptual merging of sovereignty and the principle of territoriality has rather been a theoretical construct of nineteenth century German state theorists imposed on history afterwards.\textsuperscript{73} Presentation of the period since 1648 as dominated by state territoriality rather obscures the wide variety in using territory in organising security in this particular period.

The fictive fixity of a Europe of territorial states has resulted in a territorial trap in security studies, taking territorial sovereignty, the separation of domestic and foreign realms of politics, and the distinction of societies according to state borders for granted.\textsuperscript{74} Particularly neo-realist and traditional security studies predominantly focus on military conflicts between states, as if military conflicts are something exclusively foreign. Security is not just a matter of territorial war, but, to follow the Copenhagen School in International Relations, security is what people make of it. For example, as migration is increasingly considered a threat, police forces have been tightening up control at borders, such as between Mexico and the United States. In addition, the war on drugs, and later against terrorism has involved military forces at home, at borders, and abroad since the 1970s.\textsuperscript{75}

Due to their focus on military conflict among territorial states, police and crime studies have been largely neglected in International Relations as being insignificant for international politics.\textsuperscript{76} This negligence goes at certain costs, not only because changing understanding of security will be missed, but also because the history of policing offers usually more in-depth, fine-grained insights in states’ (re)formation than military history does.\textsuperscript{77} The maintenance of public and social order often reflects better the distribution of power within states or other political entities than their defence by military means to extinguish inimical forces. For their part, police and crime studies have often focused on domestic or local phenomena, neglecting the significance of (military) security issues at larger scale.\textsuperscript{78} In the last three decades, organised crime and European integration have gradually raised the attention
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to security at a larger scale.\textsuperscript{79} However, geographical studies of crime remain predominantly focused on urban crime and policing.\textsuperscript{80} That may be justified because most petty crime offences take place at close distance of a criminal’s living place, but organised crime is often embedded in transnational contacts and networks.\textsuperscript{81} The territorial trap in security studies should be avoided to explore and explain territorial variation in the organisation of security. The concepts of state sovereignty, territoriality, and military security should therefore be disentangled. The logic of territoriality offers the analytical opportunity to explore territorial variation, regardless on what level security is organised.

6. The logic of territoriality and security in the French areas

6.1 Territorialisation of security

European rulers have often used buffer zones to protect their entities rather than strict territorial control. A buffer zone confronts enemies with friction costs before they can strike at the core of the attacked polity, providing the latter time to mobilise its means of violence to counter the attack. Because the speed and mobility of transportation of armies did not change significantly between the Roman Empire and Napoleonic Europe, buffer zones have long been the security instrument for particularly continental polities. Maritime polities such as the Dutch Provinces, Venice, Sweden, and the English Kingdom rather organised their security based on water; both against external invasions as well as internal resistance. Waterways were most efficient infrastructure for the development of trade and industry, the extraction of financial and personal resources to wage war, and the provision of protection. Land infrastructure required for long much more investment to construct and maintain. Therefore, “[u]ntil the eighteenth century, the greatest powers were maritime states, and naval warfare remained crucial to international positions. (...) only in our time have such essentially landbound states as Russia and China achieved preponderant positions in the world’s system of states.”\textsuperscript{82}

The challenge for landbound powers existed of organising an efficient security infrastructure. They were confronted with the costs of large-scale security operations.


over land, while subjects in border areas could use geographical exits relatively easily. The defence of landbound security systems was often based on the personal linkages between central rulers and regional magnates and their armies. The areas today collectively called France exemplify how a security infrastructure gradually changed from a person-based security system into a territory-based one led from a geographical centre, Paris. King Philip the Fair (1285-1314) was the first one who levied taxes and drafted armoured men for the defence of the realm of the French kingdom, albeit only in case of emergency. The personal ties between king and regional magnates remained dominant in the French royal security infrastructure. In the sixteenth century, the buffer zones of the areas controlled by the French king of consisted of local fiefs, cities, provinces, and regional lords. Under the rule of Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642) and King Louis XIV (1643-1715) attempts were made to close territorially the gates of the Paris-dependent areas to prevent ‘foreigners’ to align with ‘internal’ lords to invade and raid these areas. For example, Richelieu issued the doctrine of the royal monopoly of force, while his idea of a standing army would be a way to keep the lords in control.  

To separate foreigners from insiders, the French marshal Sébastien Le Prestre seigneur de Vauban (1633-1707) planned and constructed a linear defence line of fortresses along the borders of Paris-dependent areas, while demolishing fortresses of magnates, cities and fiefs scattered around the Paris-dependent areas. He thus used territory as an effective and efficient means to visualise and to communicate the range of Paris’ say. Vauban also advanced the idea of efficient planning of security within the Paris-dependent areas. First, he aimed at professionalisation of the armed forces. That proved to be difficult, as these forces were led and owned by regional magnates. Yet these forces were gradually fused into a Paris-led system of defence, while offering these magnates a say in Paris security politics. Vauban’s line of defence territorialized France, changing war from big battles between ad hoc coalitions of allied lords into lengthy sieges of frontier bulwarks. It induced a territorial, impersonal distinction between inside and outside of the French areas, instead of the more unpredictable, personal bonds between Parisian kings and regional magnates and their forces. In addition, the line of defence geographically fixed the French security system, setting further tendencies of containing in motion. For example, Vauban considered the Paris-controlled territory and its residents as a valuable resource. He therefore proposed a system of taxation based on land property
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and trade to fund the security efforts. That would require a permanent bureaucracy to register and map people and properties in the French territory, instead of the then adhocacy of taxation. Although Vauban’s idea was not immediately accepted by his contemporary rulers, later administrators adopted and implemented it.

French kings yet sought territorial aggrandizement out of dynastic grandeur or imperialism, because the collection of rights and titles is most easily made visible through the acquisition of territory in the cartographic era. Next to the invention of land maps, the idea of natural frontiers emerged in the 16th century. The frontiers of Gaul in Caesar’s time, the Pyrenees, Alps, Rhine and seas, should justify the internal control of the French king, as well as the expansion of the French king’s say to the Rhine. His administrative staff also suggested the Rhine as natural frontier to stop kings acquiring more territory and overstretch the military capacity of the French army, illustrating the potential conflict of outward-looking imperial inclination of French dynasties and the inward-looking geographical fixity of Vauban’s security system.

In mediaeval times, person-based mechanisms (such as slavery, feud settlements, kinship, feudal privileges, the Christian faith, and rules of honour) have been predominant in the control of people and phenomena for security reasons. Urban guards, the nobility, and church police (e.g., the Inquisition) took responsibility for security in cities, the countryside, and the Christian civilisation, allowing also victims to detect and prosecute felonies. Averting threat of criminality or other threats was of a partly private, voluntary, fragmented, immobile, and passive nature, despite the official responsibility of kings for justice, law and order in their realm. In contrast to the nobility and clergy, the movement of ordinary people was increasingly territorially circumscribed since the late middle ages; only by permission of the local authorities someone could leave the area (for example, by a declaration of good behaviour). That reflected the moral and economic concerns among ruling classes to regulate vagrant poor, particularly after demobilisation.

Often considered as a threat locally, central rulers used armed forces ad hoc in cities and the countryside to collect taxes or suppress revolts. In the 17th and 18th century, first steps towards penetration and centralisation of policing occurred in the French areas to ensure tax collection, the observance of royal justice, and the residents’
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loyalties towards the centre. The much hated intendants obtained in 1621 a policing function supporting their tasks of taxation and administering royal justice, which met fierce resistance, such as in the Fronde. The centre yet started to penetrate further the French society by appointing chief constables in cities, and by collecting information on political and criminal suspects, particularly in Paris. It also enhanced its grip on the countryside by appointing rural policemen and by strengthening the central command over the local and regional constabulary forces (gendarmerie) in 1720. Made more mobile, these military police forces started active and regular patrols to restore public disorder more effectively. Later on, the central government also employed the gendarmerie in cities. Territorial patterns in patrolling aimed at the effective surveillance of the French areas. Nevertheless, the gendarmerie remained fairly locally and regionally fragmented and oriented due the sale of positions to local and regional persons of noble or other distinguished origin.

Concerns about political loyalty rose considerably during the turbulent years of the French Revolution and its aftermath. Measures to ensure the political loyalty of security forces as well as the residents of the French areas led to a further centralisation, unification, extension, militarisation, and professionalisation of police forces, as well as a further central penetration of those forces into the French areas as well as into people’s life, including their opinions. Initially, local guards consisting of citizens looked for a prominent role in the security organisation to replace the much hated police forces of the ancient regime. However, revolutionary rulers soon preferred professional, militarised, and centralised police forces being a more disciplined and reliable instrument of political control, culminating into the establishment of a separate ministry of police in 1796 led by Joseph Fouché. A separate police apparatus not only controlled political opponents more effectively by employing violence and collecting intelligence more systematically, it also helped to enforce mobilisation of conscripts throughout all French areas for wars abroad. Penetration into countryside remained however fragmentary, and particularly after the closing of the ministry of police in 1815, tensions remained between municipal police and central security organisations. Nevertheless, centralisation of security organisation did occur within the relatively fixed territory of France throughout the 17th and 18th century. In addition, the French occupying power entailed centralisation of security organisation within annexed or conquered areas throughout Europe, such as in the Batavian Republic.

6.2 Controlling “masterless men”

For his imperial conquest of Europe, Napoleon Bonaparte enjoyed the previous territorialisation of security in the French areas. These areas did not only provide the necessary financial resources for his army. The general mobilisation of 1793 also showed that the residents living in these areas could be used as cannon fodder. The accompanying territory-wide bureaucracy and infrastructure to mobilise and support conscripts enhanced the central grip of Paris on the French territory. French troops served in the levée en masse across the entire European continent. Making ordinary people relevant for security operations at such a scale also required a convincing narrative why they should fight and die for the defence of a French territory. The rulers of France argued that they and the ordinary people belonged to one and indivisible nation circumscribed by territorial boundaries. Thus, the territorial strategy for organising security resulted into the ideal of a geographically exclusive and fixed nation. Conscription of lower classes and the development of national loyalty in France and elsewhere also served as a means to prevent military professionals from disloyalty towards the central rulers and the nation. The establishment of police forces to control the military, the tight hierarchy within the military, the containment of armed people within barracks, and the prohibition of private possession of weapons also aimed at preventing violence turning against the central rulers.

After Napoleon’s attempts to rule Europe, the European dynasties and their governments and diplomats sought means to limit imperial and nationalistic enterprises within Europe. They aimed at preventing intervention in their territories by a system of counter-balancing alliances, initially foremost to block French imperial initiatives. European governments tried to strengthen their exclusive hold of means of violence within their territories. The Austrian diplomat Clemens von Metternich and other European rulers therefore proposed in the 19th century to exchange regularly information on potential opponents towards the political and social-economic establishment, such as political exiles and refugees abroad, in particular communists and anarchists. The European governments also agreed to prohibit hiring mercenaries as well as privateering at sea to enhance their monopoly on violence. ⁸⁹ Although the various dynasties in Europe maintained inter-personal relationships, territory thus became the prime indicator of the scope of authority regarding security. Instead of a bundle of rights, authority was redefined in the full and exclusive say within a territory. Interterritoriality (territory-based mutual exclusivity) consequently marked the mutual relationships security systems in 19th century Europe, entailing concepts

like territorial integrity, non-intervention, and territorial sovereignty. This territorialisation of security system has been the source of inspiration for the 19th century concept of Territorialstaat, on which quite some sociological as well as (neo-)realist IR theories have been premised. Perhaps for this reason, the IR theories missed what happened within the territories with regard to security, where different security threats became an increasing concern for political authorities in 19th century Europe.90

The French invention of large-scale use of ordinary people in an army posed the rulers with a new security problem. It was not that they bore weapons, because conscripts were disarmed as soon as possible after a war. Rulers particularly feared potential political assertiveness of the lower classes, since the revolutionary years had broken the feudal system and serfdom as control mechanisms of the now “masterless men”.91 In addition, the French Revolution has spread the idea of freedom and rights of every single individual throughout Europe. Potential receptiveness of the growing labour class concentrating in urban areas to revolutionary ideologies posed a further threat to the political and social-economic establishment. The decriminalisation of movement within French territories throughout the 19th century put the security issue even more in the political spotlights. For a long time, traders (whether foreign or not) could more easily travel than the lower classes. Free movement for all persons within French territories was considered beneficial for economic growth. Diminishing social fixity and increasing geographic mobility of the lower classes posed rulers for the problem how to protect the cities’ and wealthiest’ properties from roaming beggars, bandits, and thieves. Border control of the collective French territories would be needed to keep vagabonds and bandits out, but also to prevent a loss of labour force, brains, or cannon fodder. Central rulers thus become involved with border control and policing at a much larger scale and intensity than before.

Previously, central rulers in Paris and elsewhere in Western Europe did not care much about theft and violence, which was considered to be a fact of life particularly at the countryside. City governments and regional lords exercised occasionally local, fragmented, and often ad hoc policing to prevent beggars to overburden the local charity, or to suppress farmers’ rioting. Throughout Western Europe, police forces remained yet relatively fragmented and locally oriented, despite the introduction of certain centralising elements from the French period, such as a mounted police force at the countryside. Central rulers started to extend, centralise, professionalise, and

militarise police forces when they faced growing political opposition since 1830. A continuous range of political revolutions, and coups d’état, the rise of socialist and communist labour movements, and armed fascist and communist groups evoked as response an increasing penetration of security forces throughout Western Europe until the Second World War. For example, confronted with their ineffective response to labour unrest, British authorities established a well-organised police corps in London in 1829, the metropolitan police force, which was soon adopted in Paris and Berlin afterwards. Particularly 1848 can be seen as turning point since when central rulers employed armed force less internally, while increasingly using militarised police forces as a more refined, mobile, and quick reaction to political opposition. Militarised police forces could yet be useful in military operations in time of war. Militarisation of weaponry, organisation, stationing, discipline, and operation not only aimed at facilitating the suppression of threats at home and abroad, but also at ensuring the loyalty of police forces. By relegating citizens’ guards towards a reserve position, central rulers further sought to put aside the less reliable parts of their security organisation. Attempts to subordinate municipal police in cities to central command, and the establishment of intelligence services enhanced the centralisation of security organisations and ensuing penetration of societies in Western Europe. In the countryside, newly established ministries of the interior or war took over the policing through semi-military gendarmerie. The gendarmerie did not just secure tax payments, public order, and the properties of the wealthiest, but also provided the back-up force for what might be called the “colonization” or “domestication” of the peasantry. Conscription served as an instrument forcing peasants to become loyal towards rulers within a nation.

In contrast to the daily experience of policemen and common explanations in police history, crime rate is thus not a significant reason for the establishment, extension, and evolution of police forces. Instead, it has been rather an issue of defending the existing political order in society and within the police forces. After first steps towards “nationalisation” of police forces in the French period (1795-1815), only a second phase of nationalisation between 1830 and the Second World War resulted in a rather successful hold of the monopoly on the means of violence in Western Europe, several centuries after the Treaties of Westphalia. A fluid distinction
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remained between police and military forces, both regarding their organisation and employment abroad and at home. The tendency of centralisation of security within the French territory could not overcome the inter-territoriality between locally based police forces; exchange of information or assistance across the territorial borders of police areas remained often difficult. Thus, the organisation of security within the French territory did not only face conflicting territorialities in the sense of local vs. central, but also local vs. local.

Already during the French Revolution, the new French parliament discussed measures to introduce documentary substantiation of identity and the right to stay to prevent deserters from exiting. Later in the 19th century, ministries of the interior across Europe introduced identification documents (indicating their “nationality”) and border control to assure military recruits to stay and prevent them from exit, while welcoming as many (former) citizens entering to serve in the army. Particularly during the First World War, central rulers introduced initially temporarily measures such as passports and tight border control to watch aliens as potential subversive fifth column. The measures became permanent, particularly when during the economic crisis of 1930s immigrants and aliens were considered a threat to labour and wealth within state territories. Also for reasons of the spiritual or biological purity of the nation, public health, the sustainability of welfare arrangements, or public order, the rulers’ “routine suspicion” turned from the “masterless” lower classes to foreigners during the 19th century and early 20th century. This increasingly territorially based pattern of inclusion and exclusion of security systems was accompanied with a separation within security forces. The police forces focused on security within the territory, while military forces concentrated on security of the territory.

7. Conclusion

Although centralisation and locking-in effects also originated from non-territorial strategies such as person-based royal, imperial and national loyalties, the evidence from the French case did not contradict the expected implications of territoriality of geographical fixity, impersonality, inclusion/exclusivity, and centrality. Territorialisation of security of the French kingdom eventually enhanced inclusive tendencies in cross-regional voice structures and loyalty bonds towards the political centre in Paris. The more territoriality has been used as a security strategy at national level, the more the logic of territoriality left its imprint on the national organisation of
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security, leading eventually to the legal principle of territoriality for national states in the 19th century. However, the ensuing anarchy in international politics (at least from a legal perspective) provides not the full picture of the organisation of security. The evidence presented also showed that dynastic, imperial and local territorialities left a significant mark on the organisation of security next to state territoriality. A successful, public monopoly of violence within states, in other words the centralising implication of territoriality, has become a reality in Western Europe only in the late 19th century, and police organisation remained fragmented over various levels. In addition, non-territorial class distinctions remained significant security boundaries until the routine suspicion turned to territorial outsiders in the early twentieth century. In sum, security organisation since 1648 was not just a matter of state territoriality. Security has been a much more variegated phenomenon than the image of a Westphalian Europe neatly carved up in territorial states suggest.