

State Territoriality and European Integration

Edited by
Michael Burgess
and Hans Vollaard



Europe and the Nation State

State Territoriality and European Integration

Territorial sovereignty has been fundamental to European states, but does territory still matter for political organisation in a 'Europe without frontiers?' This new book addresses the under-explored concept of political territoriality from historical, analytical and empirical angles, with a particular focus on the European Union.

This book addresses a topic of much contemporary debate: the future of European nation states in the context of European integration and globalisation. Seeking a better understanding of political territoriality in the European Union, the expert contributions to this volume include:

- Historical case studies illustrating how political territoriality gained its prominence in European states since the Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648).
- Analytical contributions tracing political territoriality in federations and multi-level polities, such as the European Union and the Brussels region.
- Empirical studies on welfare, defence and policing.

This new volume will appeal to a wide variety of audiences, ranging from Europeanists to political scientists, globalisation scholars and historians.

Michael Burgess is Professor of Federal Studies and Director of the Centre for Federal Studies (CFS) at the University of Kent in Canterbury, England. **Hans Vollaard** is Lecturer in Political Science at Leiden University, the Netherlands.

Europe and the nation state

Edited by Michael Burgess

(Centre for Federal Studies, University of Kent)

and Lee Miles

(Europe and the World Centre, University of Liverpool)

This series explores the complex relationship between nation states and European integration and the political, social, economic and policy implications of this interaction. The series examines issues such as:

- the impact of the EU on the politics and policy-making of the nation-state and vice-versa
- the effects of expansion of the EU on individual nation states in Europe
- the relationship between the EU and non-European nation states.

1 Poland and the European Union

Edited by Karl Cordell

2 Greece in the European Union

Edited by Dionyssi G. Dimitrakopoulos and Argyris G. Passas

3 The European Union and Democratization

Edited by Paul J. Kubicek

4 Iceland and European Integration

On the edge

Edited by Baldur Thorballsson

5 Norway Outside the European Union

Norway and European integration from 1994 to 2004

Clive Archer

6 Turkey and European Integration

Prospects and issues in the post-Helsinki era

Edited by Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe

7 Perspectives on EU–Russia Relations

Edited by Debra Johnson and Paul Robinson

8 French Relations with the European Union

Edited by Helen Drake

9 The Geopolitics of Euro-Atlantic Integration

Edited by Hans Mouritzen and Anders Wivel

10 State Territoriality and European Integration

Edited by Michael Burgess and Hans Vollaard

State Territoriality and European Integration

Edited by Michael Burgess and
Hans Vollaard

First published 2006
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

First issued in paperback 2011

© Selection and editorial matter, 2006 Michael Burgess and Hans
Vollaard; individual chapters, the contributors

Typeset in Garamond by Wearset, Boldon, Tyne and Wear

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical,
or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including
photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or
retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN10: 0-415-39046-X (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-415-66391-1 (pbk)

ISBN10: 0-203-96960-X (ebk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-39046-0 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-66391-5 (pbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-203-96960-1 (ebk)

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xii
1 Introduction: analysing Westphalian states in an integrating Europe and a globalising world	1
MICHAEL BURGESS AND HANS VOLLAARD	
PART I	
Territoriality in history	15
2 The quest for security: the case of the Dutch Republic	17
OLAF VAN NIMWEGEN	
3 The metamorphoses of European territoriality: a historical reconstruction	37
BENNO TESCHKE	
PART II	
Analysing territoriality in multi-level polities	69
4 Area and administration: a multi-level analysis of a multi-layered phenomenon	71
THEO A.J. TOONEN AND FRITS M. VAN DER MEER	
5 Territoriality and federalism in the governance of the European Union	100
MICHAEL BURGESS	

6	The hyphenated state, multi-level governance and the communities in Belgium: the case of Brussels	120
	WILFRIED SWENDEN AND MARLEEN BRANS	
PART III		
	European integration: a changing territorial state of affairs?	145
7	Territoriality and the EU citizen	147
	GERTJAN DIJKINK AND VIRGINIE MAMADOUH	
8	Building the Common Market but preventing chaos: the continuing relevance of the principle of territoriality in the field of taxation and the limits of a Europe made by judges	175
	HERMAN VOOGSGEERD	
9	EU social policy beyond national welfare regime	197
	ANTON HEMERIJCK	
10	When push comes to shove: the territorial monopoly of force and the travails of neomedieval Europe	228
	JÖRG FRIEDRICHS	
11	Europe, war, and territory	252
	PETER VAN HAM	
12	Conclusion: state territoriality and European integration	274
	MICHAEL BURGESS AND HANS VOLLAARD	
	<i>Index</i>	278

Contributors

Marleen Brans is Senior Lecturer in Public Administration and Public Policy at the Public Management Centre, Department of Political Sciences, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. She has published on local government organisation, comparative public administration and policy professionalisation.

Prof. Dr Michael Burgess is Professor of Federal Studies and Director of the Centre for Federal Studies (CFS) at the University of Kent in Canterbury, England. He specialises in comparative federalism, Canadian constitutional politics and European integration and his *Comparative Federalism in Theory and Practice* (Routledge, 2005) has just been published. Currently he is jointly editing (with John Pinder) a project entitled *Multinational Federations* to be published in 2006.

Jörg Friedrichs is Research Associate at the International University Bremen, Germany. He is working on a research project about the internationalisation of the monopoly of the legitimate use of force. His interests include the theory of European integration and European approaches to International Relations theory. Friedrichs has also published articles on new medievalism as a key to understanding the emergent post-Westphalian order.

Dr Peter van Ham is Deputy Head of Studies at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' in The Hague, and Professor at the College of Europe in Bruges (Belgium). His latest books are *Mapping European Security After Kosovo* (Manchester University Press, 2002) and *European Integration and the Postmodern Condition* (Routledge, 2001).

Dr Anton C. Hemerijck is Director of the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) and Senior Lecturer in the Department of Public Administration, Leiden University. He has published widely on issues of comparative social and economic policy and institutions. Between 1997 and 2000 he has been a research affiliate of the Max-Planck-Institute for the Study of Societies, working on the large comparative project 'Welfare and Work in the Open Economy', directed by Fritz W. Scharpf and Vivien A. Schmidt. He has also been involved in drafting

reports on social policy for Portuguese (2000) and Belgian presidencies (2001) of the EU, respectively with Maurizio Ferrera and Martin Rhodes, and Gøsta Esping-Andersen, Duncan Gallie and John Myles.

Dr Frits M van der Meer is Associate Professor in Comparative Public Administration and Management in the Department of Public Administration at Leiden University, the Netherlands.

Dr Olaf van Nimwegen is a historian in the Department of New History at Amsterdam University, the Netherlands.

Dr Wilfried Swenden is a Lecturer in Politics in the School of Social and Political Studies at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. His recent publications include a monograph, 'Federalism and Second Chambers: Regional Representation in Parliamentary Federations: the Australian Senate and German Bundesrat Compared' (P.I.E-Peter Lang, 2004) and an article in the *Journal of Common Market Studies* (June 2004). He recently completed a textbook on Federalism and Regionalism in Western Europe (Palgrave).

Dr Benno Teschke is Lecturer in the Department of International Relations at the University of Sussex, England. After receiving his PhD from the London School of Economics, he held positions as an Andrew Mellon post-doctoral fellow at the Center for Social Theory and Comparative History at the University of California, Los Angeles and as a lecturer at the University of Wales, Swansea. He has published in *International Organization*, the *European Journal of International Relations* and in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. Teschke is the author of *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations* which was awarded the 2003 Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize.

Prof. Dr Theo A.J. Toonen is Professor of Comparative Government and Public Administration in the Department of Public Administration, and Dean of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Leiden University, the Netherlands.

Dr Herman Voogsgeerd wrote his PhD thesis on the four freedoms of the European internal market. His research is mainly about the consequences of these freedoms, interpreted by the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg, for the nature of the European construction. He wrote contributions about legal pluralism on the European internal market and about 'special-purpose associations' in Europe. Currently he is working on the role of codes of conduct as an alternative instrument to legislation in the EU, for example, on areas such as corporate governance and the internal market for financial services. He is Lecturer in the Departments of International Organisations/International Relations and of Commercial and Labour law at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

Dr Hans Vollaard is Lecturer in Political Science and Coordinator of the EU-Studies Programme of the Faculty of Arts, and a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at Leiden University, the Netherlands. He studied political science at the same university between 1995 and 1999. His research project 'Territoriality in the European Union' deals with the impact of European integration on the territorial organisation of healthcare and security in the Netherlands and the European Union.

Preface

The Dutch city of Leiden is situated on the former frontier of the Roman Empire. Perhaps for this reason the most famous Leiden citizen ever, Rembrandt van Rijn, depicted the coronation of an emperor on his first known painting, now displayed in the municipal museum, 'De Lakenhal'. Rembrandt exemplifies the burgeoning international trade in paintings in the seventeenth century that emanated from the Dutch Republic. In this once faraway corner of the Roman and Carolingian Empires, the Republic was one the first polities that enjoyed some sort of sovereignty. Its declaration of independence was used later in both the French and American Revolutions to create, respectively, a fully sovereign nation-state and the first modern federation. The Dutch Republic remained for long however a curious combination of confederal, consociational and state-like authority structures.

Leiden fulfilled a heroic role in the Dutch struggle for independence against Habsburg imperialism. As an expression of thanks, the Dutch Republic granted the city a university in 1575. One of its first professors, Justus Lipsius, taught Roman history. Meanwhile, the victims of nation-state building and imperial rule across Europe fled to the safe haven of Leiden, peoples such as Flemish and Walloon, Protestants, Jews, Huguenots and the Pilgrim Fathers.

Consequently Leiden's own history contains many concepts currently used with respect to the *territorial* nature of the European Union (EU) and of its member states: Does the Council of Ministers situated in its Justus Lipsius Building in Brussels work towards a political entity resembling an empire, a consociation of sovereign states or a confederation? Leiden has clearly been an excellent location for a conference on political territoriality in the EU. Thanks to the generosity of the European Studies programme of the Leiden Faculty of Arts and the Leiden University Foundation, it has been possible to organise such a conference during the Autumn of 2003. With the help and support of Richard Griffiths, Peter Mair, Leony van der Splinter and Anna Little together with the paper givers, the conference has been a stimulating and reflective encounter, resulting in this collection of contributions on political territoriality in the EU.

Leiden's own history reveals and underlines just how much concepts

regarding political territoriality in the present-day EU are infused by past experience. Understanding how certain territorial configurations have emerged and functioned may be of considerable use in helping us to grasp the current territorial arrangements. Accordingly, this volume of essays provides the reader with the key concepts designed to analyse and explain territoriality and its changing expressions in the EU from a number of different scholarly perspectives. We believe that the issue of territoriality has been the subject of only cursory examination in the general political science literature so that a fresh exploration of this important area from a variety of different disciplinary approaches is long overdue.

Michael Burgess and Hans Vollaard

1 Introduction

Analysing Westphalian states in an integrating Europe and a globalising world

Michael Burgess and Hans Vollaard

In the early twenty-first century the territorial nation-state in Europe is delicately perched between two historical processes that are intimately interconnected, namely, European integration and globalisation. Contemporary pressures on the modern state as primarily a territorial association, whose integrity, stability and legitimacy derive from its capacity and effectiveness to provide physical security and general welfare for its citizens, have served to call into question its fundamental role and relevance to the needs of a new age. The principal purpose of this book is to shed new light upon the evolving relationship between the territorial state in Europe and the process of European integration in a way that both re-examines and reappraises the territorial basis of the state itself. While the contentious issue of globalisation is not part of our main remit, it has been nonetheless an intermittent subject of brief attention in some of the chapters that follow.

Questions that immediately spring to mind include the following: Is the state as a territorial association any longer adequate to provide physical security, welfare and effective socio-economic management? Is it the appropriate problem-solving unit to deal with issues of environment, economic prosperity, finance, migration and terrorism? Do experts' functional networks transcend the territorial limits to states' jurisdictions? Does the era of European integration and globalisation herald the end of citizens' attachment to national territories and do mobile citizens look for better performance from non-state providers of security, material benefits and services regardless of conventional state borders and boundaries? One of the fundamental characteristics of the image of the Westphalian state is the territorial demarcation of its supreme authority, as the famous nineteenth century German sociologist, Max Weber, emphasised in his ideal-type definition: '[der] Staat ist diejenige menschliche Gemeinschaft, welche innerhalb eines bestimmten Gebietes – dies: das "Gebiet", gehört zum Merkmal – das Monopol legitimer physischer Gewaltsamkeit für sich (mit Erfolg) beansprucht' (Weber, 1956: 27). But has this enduring image of the state now become an image of the past? Does Weber's ideal-type definition of the state any longer correspond with contemporary reality?

These questions that refer to the viability of the territorial state have

repeatedly been raised and discussed in political science. For example, John Herz (1957) initially claimed that *inter alia* nuclear weaponry would make territory irrelevant for the military security of states' populations. And according to Jean Gottmann (1973), espionage from air and space would simply render borders irrelevant as defensive mechanisms, just as in the ancient past mediaeval castles were undermined by guns and cannons. The example of environmental issues has also been used with consistent regularity to demonstrate that a 'world without borders' is increasingly necessary if we are to have an effective response (Brown, 1972). In short, an increasingly interdependent world tends to bypass territorially sovereign borders in economic, social and political perceptions and behaviour (Keohane and Nye, 1977). Indeed, even as stern a realist as Kenneth Waltz has acknowledged that the global scale of environmental problems and overpopulation might change the world's political configuration of territorial states (Waltz, 1979: 39). Sub-state regionalism and incremental European integration affecting different policy issues have been widely construed as erasing the territorial demarcation of state authority by merging state governments into multi-level systems of functional overlapping and non-hierarchical jurisdictions, while global networks of economic-financial metropolitan nodes were destined to replace a world carved up into territorially sovereign states (O'Brien, 1991). Some observers have viewed social constructions and perceptions underlying states' configurations as the result of time-space conceptions due to the image of the global village (Harvey, 1989).

Predictions of an end to the territorial state, however, have generated opposing views. Herz (1968) himself acknowledged that the nuclear threat did not crush the territorial urge of nationalism. Apparently, instrumental 'technical range' in military and political devices did not automatically alter the 'human reach' in politics (Jönsson *et al.*, 2000: 168). Intergovernmentalists have claimed that the European integration project is firmly in the hands of the territorially organised Member States, especially in issues of high politics. In work on processes of globalisation, it is acknowledged that territorial states still play a crucial role (Hirst and Thompson, 1995). Penal law on breaching intellectual property rights, for example, is still derived from territorial states. In the 1990s territorial sovereignty has never been more popular as witnessed in the birth of so many new territorial states following the break-up respectively of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union and the subsequent claims to territorial sovereignty. And the widespread demise of European states as a result of the new sub-state regionalism is also far from becoming a reality (Keating, 1998). Nonetheless, this is not to claim that a certain sense of unease and uncertainty is completely absent in the specific context of European integration. Questions concerning the current and future role of the territorial state in the European Union (EU), together with a conspicuous discourse about what concepts and explanations should be utilised to describe contemporary developments, are self-evidently relevant to the emerging public debate.

It is also interesting to note that so much of this emerging public debate about the purported demise of the territorial state has been expressed in the use and abuse of basic concepts by the prefix 'post'. Consider, for example, the following terms: post-modern; post-Westphalian; post-territorial; and post-sovereign. Such 'post' messages concerning the eclipse of states by processes of globalisation, 'glocalisation', 'fragmentation', and regionalisation have their origins in the fields of international relations, European integration, EU studies and regionalism. Unfortunately they do not directly address in what particular respects contemporary politics has changed nor do they indicate precisely in what direction such 'post-states' are heading. They merely cling to the assertion that we are witnessing the end of the Westphalian epoch of territorially sovereign states. Moreover, states existing from before this so-called 'post-period' have often been misrepresented as if they were fully sovereign, independent, uniform, territorially fixed, clearly demarcated and mutually exclusive when in fact they were nothing of the sort. The Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648) have often been taken as the decisive turning point in this world carved up into territorial units striving for security, sovereignty and common well being for their inhabitants. The weakness of proclaiming the end or the beginning of an era is that it deflects the eye from what are often subtle, incremental shifts in the nature of politics and polities before, during and after such a putative era (Evans, 1997). Claims about political change and the dawn of a new age can be substantiated only by empirical comparisons across time and place rather than by attempting to compare present-day politics with an image of *the* Westphalian state that never actually existed in reality. And researching incremental shifts also requires an analysis of states as 'composites of institutional variables', focusing upon how these variables are interrelated and how they themselves change across place and over time (Kahler, 2002).

Empirical and historical reflection on the subject of states and their 'territoriality' also alerts us to the need for modesty when making claims for qualitative transformations of political status. After all, we have witnessed large numbers of migrants and open borders before in the nineteenth century, while the subsequent twentieth century certainly did not herald the demise of territorial states. Even if globalisation and European integration might conceivably have reduced the importance of proximity as never before, this in itself does not mean that territory has lost its significance in politics (Ansell, 2004: 4). A similar argument follows for the alleged detrimental effects on nation states caused by a resurgent regionalism: 'The relevance of territory and territoriality in Europe has not necessarily anything to do with a regionalised Europe and new forms of territorial politics do not need to be regionalised politics' (Bartolini, 2000: 22). In other words, anticipated changes to the territorial underpinnings of the nation state should not be taken as assumptions but rather hypothesised, empirically verified and then explained.

Furthermore, the reliance upon historical-empirical analysis enables us

resolutely to resist the temptation automatically to introduce new concepts, theories and explanations deemed applicable to these allegedly new political configurations because they are simply not necessary. On the contrary, analyses of past polity formations and different levels of government demonstrate the continuing utility of existing concepts and analytical tools. The introduction of neologisms often obscures rather than clarifies the subject matter. Consequently, even if the EU and its member states do furnish an example of a polity that is historically unprecedented, this does not mean that existing theories developed to explain polities from an earlier age cannot be utilised to help explain and offer insights into contemporary reality (cf. Hix, 1999).

Empirical analysis and historical reflection should not of course be restricted to the enquiry into territoriality and the state alone. Linking insights from different intellectual disciplines in studying states and territoriality also has great merit. For far too long the territorial basis to states was simply taken for granted and served as a division of labour that separated studies of politics *between* territorial states (geopolitics) and politics *within* territorial states (Agnew, 1998). Very few scholars paid close attention to the territorial foundations of states and the varieties of territorial organisation among polities (see, for example, Gottmann, 1973; Sack, 1986; Kratochwil, 1986). Although functional theories of European integration and interdependency theories initially challenged the significance of the territorially demarcated authority of states, the territorial 'gatekeepership' of states between domestic and international politics was soon re-adopted in these theories. Accordingly, a potential qualitative change in the way that political authority is related to territory, functions and the personal characteristics of individuals and groups was left unquestioned and the territorial divide in the theories remained intact. Thorough analyses of differentiation among territorially and functionally organised polities and their mutual relations have been mainly limited to the fields of local administration and intra-federal politics without much theoretical reference to territorial states, globalisation and European integration.

It is important to note that an article written by John Ruggie (1993) on the political configuration of the EU in the mainstream literature on international relations registered a significant intellectual impact by calling attention to potentially qualitative shifts in the territorial organisation of states and supranational organisations. Soon after its publication, contributions from a diverse range of political scientists began to focus upon concepts and processes of re-territorialisation (Forsberg, 1996). An avalanche of newly invented concepts varying in clarity and utility to describe the authority amalgam of the EU followed (see, for example, Caporaso, 1996; Schmitter, 1996). Scholars like Gary Marks, Liesbeth Hooghe and Stefano Bartolini have started to develop explanatory contributions on shifts in territorial patterns in politics, synthesising work in the fields of International Relations, Public Administration, History, Regionalism, Federalism, Com-

parative Politics and Political Geography. They therefore aim explicitly to link 'islands of theorising' to challenge the issue of territoriality and the state. Taking stock of the state of the discipline of political science, Miles Kahler consequently claimed that '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' (Kahler, 2002: 79). This volume of essays situates itself firmly in this category, accepting the research agenda and collating diverse perspectives on the incremental shifts in the political territoriality of states, regions and the EU.

The political significance of territoriality

Most accounts of the historical and contemporary significance of territory in West European politics still suffer from a combination of ambiguity and a narrow focus. One basic task of the book is therefore to develop a set of indicators designed to assess the political significance of territory in all of its multi-faceted dimensions. Theoretical explorations of the way that territory first acquired significance in organising and ordering politics, policies and polities are still in their infancy (Ruggie, 1993: 174; Christiansen, 1999: 356; Newman, 2001). In particular, linkages to historical processes of re-territorialisation have been few and far between (Jönsson *et al.*, 2000), while explanations of the mechanisms of territorialisation in history would be helpful for us to understand in what sense territory matters more, less or differently in different contexts in the Euro-polity, its member states and the regions. As we have already stated above, historical analyses furnish an empirical basis for comparison, serving both to moderate the somewhat stereotypical image of *the* Westphalian state and to warn us against making premature and possibly false claims for another critical juncture in political history. We are constantly reminded that the principle of territoriality has been hotly contested ever since it first featured in West European politics (cf. Krasner, 1999).

Another goal of this volume of essays is to provide an historically based set of explanatory notions about the factors and circumstances that make territory matter more, less or differently in organising politics, policies and polities. It therefore focuses on the effect that territorial, personal and functional logics of political organisation might have upon political relations. Since indicators and explanations about territory's political significance are analysed from a diverse range of political science and historical perspectives, it is imperative that we arrive at a preliminary agreement concerning the meaning of the basic concepts that will be used, namely, territoriality, functionalism, extra-territoriality, de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation. The book therefore seeks first to define and refine these concepts in order to provide an analytical vocabulary of political territoriality.

In summary, we intend to arrange historically and empirically grounded concepts, indicators and theoretical notions to denote how and by what

measures the political significance of territory changes, as well as what impact such changes might have. The case studies presented are all from polities in Western Europe, the heartland of Westphalia, and from the most developed model of re-territorialisation, namely, the EU, although we should not forget that the concepts, indicators and notions derived from these cases are also, in principle, applicable to the historical processes of globalisation.

Concepts, indicators and theoretical notions

Territoriality is often associated with animal instincts in the territorial demarcation of living space (Ardrey, 1966). In recent years, territoriality has increasingly been perceived as a psycho-social construct that is neither a biological necessity nor an inevitable consequence of anarchy (O'Tuathail *et al.*, 1998). Political territoriality is consequently about 'modes and practices of territorial control for political purposes' such as demarcating polities and dividing political authority (Forsberg, 1996: 362–363). Political territoriality is a much more fluid and dynamic concept or intellectual construct than biological territoriality. This is because it not only refers to fixed, uniform and disjointed territorially demarcated state-like polities, but it also embraces polities deemed to be overlapping, nomadic and parcelised (Kratohwil, 1986; Ruggie, 1993). Clearly the relations between politics, space and place vary and the challenge is to map out precisely how they vary. In this book, then, we must try to meet this challenge and to indicate how territoriality, 'a spatial strategy to affect, influence, or control resources and people, by controlling area' (Sack, 1986: 19), matters in political relations.

An initial point of departure might be to think of the distribution and circumscription of basic competences to indicate political territoriality. The scope of political territoriality may be arranged according to territory, functional occupation or personal characteristics such as language and religion. Jurisdictions might overlap or they may be mutually exclusive depending upon whether supreme authority is rooted in territory (like territorial sovereignty), universalist claims (like empire) or on shared and divided rule (as in federations). A second indicator of political territoriality is the way in which rulers provide their services and allocate values and benefits. Patterns of decentralisation, deconcentration, the planning of public services in centres and socio-economic peripheries all denote the different ways that territoriality still matters in the day-to-day affairs of government.

The loyalties and identities of people who are ruled is a third indicator. The extent to which people feel emotionally attached to a particular territory (regional, national or Europe-wide), or define themselves according to functional occupation or personal characteristics (language, religion, skin colour) regardless of place of residence denote the significance or otherwise of territory related to key issues of legitimacy. Hierarchies among – and the exclusiveness of – identities and loyalties reveal both the strengths and

weaknesses of political territoriality in this regard. Moreover, the way that people articulate their interests and demands, support and protest, and generally express their feelings of both political satisfaction and discontent, can be construed as an indicator of political territoriality. The composition, policy aims and operation of interest groups, political parties and social movements is another indicator of the extent to which territory still features prominently in contemporary political systems. It is important to note, however, that patterns in the geographical distribution of certain political groupings and actors should not be viewed as political territoriality *per se*. Only if the geographical distribution gives rise to the issue of organising politics according to a specific delineated geographical area would we properly engage the concept of political territoriality. A fifth and final indicator is the range of action that affects the ruled. Here we are referring to the extent that (territorial) competences and governing patterns feature in the daily practices and movements of people. Van Houtum (1998), for example, has shown that entrepreneurs in Dutch–German and Dutch–Belgian *Euregios* still behaved as if the national borders existed even though they had already been removed, a perception that is reminiscent of the German *Mauer im Kopf* (wall in the head) that persisted despite the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

The five indicators identified above demonstrate how territory still matters in political relations and why it does not make much sense to speak about de-territorialisation (territory matters less) or territorialisation (territory matters more) in a general, imprecise way. The intricate and complex reconfigurations and reconceptualisations of political relations within states, regions and the evolving Euro-polity merely allow us to utilise the concept of re-territorialisation (territory matters differently). The important point here is to emphasise that territory *always* matters somehow in some way for social and political relations. This means that the key question to ask is how far its significance is changing or has already changed. With regard to the indicator of competences mentioned above, the processes of territorialisation and de-territorialisation have often been conceptualised in terms of ‘bundling’ and ‘unbundling’ territoriality (Ruggie, 1993). These terms refer, respectively, to the concentration and centralisation of competences within a single territorial jurisdiction and the break up of a territorially organised polity into separate (functional) units. In fully bundled territorial polities, authority is based upon the principle of territoriality, that is, its politico-legal scope of rule and supreme authority is demarcated by territory. This principle underscores the ideal-type image of what constitutes a state as defined by Max Weber and others. Accordingly, extraterritoriality simply means that certain exceptions and anomalies can exist in the principle of territoriality, such as the role of embassies and the *Mare Liberum* (Ruggie, 1993). The process of unbundling territoriality on one level might imply that a simultaneous process will occur at another level, as for example in the case of the continuous ceding of competences from the national to the EU

level. However, the unbundling of territoriality may also entail non-territorial forms of organisation.

In addition to territory, politics can also be organised according to both function (such as occupation or policy space) and personal characteristics (Forsberg, 1996: 363–364). Personal logic of organisation respects both individuals, such as human rights to be exercised regardless of where someone is or what they are doing (Watson, 1980; Benhabib, 2002) and groups, such as those in Belgium, where a system of ‘personal federalism’ divides the country according to language (see Chapter 6). The intriguing question is precisely how far these territorial, functional and personal logics of politics differ from each other and also how they are interrelated. Gary Marks and Liesbeth Hooghe (2003) suggest that functional ‘task-specific’ ‘one-purpose jurisdictions’ tend to expand towards often territorially organised ‘all-purpose associations’ for reasons of coordination, accountability and risk-sharing, while the latter have a tendency towards one-purpose jurisdictions for reasons of efficiency (see also Frey and Eichenberger, 1999). These tendencies may feature in the development of corporatist states – one of the well-known examples of functional organisation – inside the territorial boundaries of the EU’s Single European Market (SEM) (see Hemerijck: Chapter 9). Differences in organisational logics entail differences in the way that politics operates in polities. This volume of essays will seek to spell out how far empires, networks, unitary states, federations, neo-mediaeval and multi-level polities differ from each other in how territory matters and how the various organisational logics leave their mark upon each respective polity.

The sense in which political territoriality changes is a question that logically follows from that of the various organisational logics that we have just mentioned. Robert Sack (1986) has already furnished us with an extensive description of how territorial strategies facilitate classification, communication, authority enforcement, planning, impersonalisation of authority and reification of power. An all-purpose association therefore often adopts a territorial shape in order to provide an effective and efficient risk-sharing coordination and accountability structure. Consequently, the strategic behaviour of political actors can be analysed from this standpoint. Differences in patterns of conflict and political alliances arise according to how territory and organisational logics matter in polities. For example, interest groups and sub-state regions represent and organise their interests differently in territorially closed states from those in the multi-level EU (cf. Marks *et al.*, 1996; Schmitter, 1996). Depending upon what is required in political relations therefore political actors seek either territorialisation or de-territorialisation. Thus Claus Offe (1998) and Jan Zielonka (2001: 527) claim that solidarity, democracy and accountability can be firmly established only in territorially closed systems.

In summary, the way that political actors operate and how their activities are shaped and moulded within territorial, personal or functional polities

depends upon their psycho-social 'epistemes' and 'material environment' (Ruggie, 1993). We have to take into account many factors that help to determine both behaviour and outcomes. For example, technological opportunities to communicate, trade or fight, images of how the world is constructed, how property rights are defined and how feelings of (territorial) attachments are expressed can both facilitate and constrain such actors in forging alliances, integrating polities, creating new levels of governance, opening up borders, unbundling territory and generally behaving in ways that determine specific policy outcomes.

The structure of the volume: an historical, analytical, conceptual and empirical focus

The issue of political territoriality in an integrating Europe can be conveniently restated in the double-barrelled question whether and how territory – a delineated geographical area – matters in politics. Section I in this volume comprises two chapters tracing territorialising mechanisms in the formation of national states in Western Europe. Historical examples of military and social-economic mechanisms may offer explanations for the present-day formation of the Euro-polity, and the re-territorialisation of other polities within the EU area. In addition, historical reflection on states' early days also impels us to question and rethink conventional claims about the dominance of the territorial logic in politics from the Peace Treaties of Westphalia (1648) onwards. Since 'Westphalia' is usually still construed as the watershed in Europe's history of political territoriality between mediaeval and modern political formations, the validity of this periodisation of changing political territoriality should be re-evaluated.

The case of the Dutch Republic is explored by Olaf van Nimwegen in order to examine precisely how military security, territoriality and polity formation are interrelated. Officially accepted by the Treaties of Westphalia as a (great) power, and located at the nexus of German, French and English military powers, the Dutch Republic is an excellent case to explore how security issues could bring about a particular political territoriality. After presenting the case of the Dutch Republic, the effect on the Dutch Republic's territoriality of the political organisation and geographical location of the Low Countries, and the military pressures exerted from other military powers are evaluated. The Dutch Republic featured extensive buffer zones and weak centrality, contradicting the Westphalian image of hierarchical rule and clearly demarcated territories. Benno Teschke subsequently sets out the long-term historical alterations in the configurations between territoriality and political power in Europe from the Middle Ages to the present period. His argument is that the social dynamics that derive from historically contested social property relations provide the best guide for a social geography of political space. He rejects the prevalent premise in the globalisation and European integration discourses that equate 'Westphalian' with

'modern' sovereignty because he challenges the idea that the modern state was historically speaking in full control of its territory. Against this, Teschke's chapter provides a revisionist interpretation of absolutist territoriality and argues that the relationship between capitalist states and territoriality is structurally indeterminate, depending essentially on the strategies of territorialisation adopted and enforced by politically dominant classes in the EU and beyond.

Section II discusses different ways to analyse territoriality and organisational logics in multi-level polities. Theo Toonen and Frits van der Meer spell out different levels of analysis to explore changing political territoriality. They argue that the customary use of territoriality is seriously flawed due to the use of the historical construct of the Westphalian nation state in political science. Most European states can traditionally be typified as multi-level governance systems in which changes regarding their multi- and single-purpose nature as well as changes in the geographical scale of politics and service delivery have been the order of the day. They present examples to explain and understand the significance of territoriality in multi-level governance systems by paying attention to the worlds of the intergovernmental constitution (IGC), intergovernmental relations (IGR) and intergovernmental management (IGM).

Michael Burgess reflects on the conceptualisation of political territoriality and relates it to the conceptual bases of federalism and federation before applying these thoughts to European integration and globalisation. He also sets the notion of state territoriality in the specific context of the writing of the Constitutional Treaty for the EU, before concluding that its federal destiny as a union of states and peoples leaves open the question just what *kind* of federal entity it will become. In the intriguing case of the Brussels region, Wilfried Swenden and Marleen Brans explain and describe how principles of territoriality and personality interrelate in the complicated political strategies of minority representation in a multi-level polity. Their contribution explains, first, the position of Brussels within the multi-layered structure of the Belgian state and, second, assesses the recent revisions to the Brussels regional structure that is designed to accommodate both the concerns of the Dutch-speaking minority and non-Belgian residents that live together in the Capital Region. Their chapter also looks at the implications of the Brussels case study for the overall maintenance and stability of the Belgian federation. The Belgian example also serves to demonstrate that a growing European identity can exist alongside – but certainly cannot substitute for – ethno-linguistic nationalism as an important identity-marker.

Section III contains an empirical assessment of precisely how processes of European integration have changed political territoriality in the EU area. It therefore touches upon the neo-functionalist challenge of open borders to the territorial underpinnings of the EU member states, as well as the (perceived) indispensability of territorially closed systems to organise solidarity, security and general welfare. Gertjan Dijkink and Virginie Mamadouh investigate

how the EU affects the everyday lives of its citizens. Since political territoriality has been deeply entrenched in the perceptions and loyalties of individuals, current processes of de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation such as European integration and globalisation should also be examined at the level of the citizens. Eurobarometer data are used to analyse how Europeans perceive and identify with these new territorial institutions, through interaction, attachment and information. They also evaluate whether this affects their relation to nation state territories through changing patterns of interaction, attachment and information.

Taxation has been considered as one of the fundamental reasons why polities organised themselves territorially in the shape of states (cf. Tilly, 1975). From a legal perspective, Herman Voogsgeerd considers whether and why the principle of territoriality still dominates in the policy areas of taxation within the EU area. Although EU member states still retain their powers concerning taxation, they have to implement these powers within the framework of the evolving Common Market. In its decisions the European Court of Justice (ECJ) increasingly intervenes in the area of taxation. An interesting element here is that the Court explicitly mentions the fiscal principle of territoriality in its decisions. Evidently the principle is still important since it helps to prevent chaos in levying taxes, but there is no doubt that a conspicuous ambiguity now exists as a result of legal decisions that have some fascinating implications for notions of both territoriality and non-territoriality.

After the Second World War, the European welfare regimes were built within the territorial confines of national states. The creation of an internal market in the territorial area of the EU therefore poses a serious challenge to solidarity within these territorially closed welfare regimes. A combination of both territorial and non-territorial dimensions in the evolving EU social policy profile suggests a potentially significant impact on both the sustainability of these regimes and on the legitimacy that states derive from them. Anton Hemerijck provides a detailed survey that discusses exactly how functional and territorial underpinnings of welfare regimes in the EU are changing due to European integration. The overall implication is that territoriality retains its significance for European social policy but this wide-ranging policy agenda has become much more deeply embedded in an expanding EU economic and social policy space.

Security issues are also perceived as closely linked to the birth and endurance of territorial states (cf. Tilly, 1975). Looking at these issues, respectively, from an internal 'police' perspective, as well as an external 'military' perspective, Jörg Friedrichs sketches out three case studies that underline the extent to which the EU is already moving in the direction of a 'neo-medieval' polity. There is certainly evidence in these empirical cases of a distinct trend towards the trans-territorial management of force, but it is doubtful whether and to what extent this trend will ultimately endure. Friedrichs concludes that this movement has to be construed in the context of the resilience of the territorial state so that the contemporary hallmark of

the territorial monopoly of force in the EU is in reality one of overlapping jurisdictions. What we can conceivably expect in the future is a slow stop-go process towards the unbundling of territorial sovereignty.

Peter Van Ham addresses the post-Cold War role of the EU in terms of security and defence policies and postures. He looks at the role war plays in the political, social and psychological process of 'iconising' the space that feels and positions itself as 'Europe'. Given the general acceptance of the ideational and contextual aspects of territory, his key question is less *whether* territory is constructed, but *how*. What part do territory, distance and space take in the shaping of Europe's cognitive framework? Van Ham argues that the EU can emulate the lessons of state-formation by dealing with security and defence matters, even going as far as fighting wars. He analyses the development of the EU's strategic culture and its policies on 'failed states' and 'Weapons of Mass Destruction' proliferation as examples and concludes that there may be nothing like a 'good' European war to generate a European identity.

The concluding chapter draws together the main conceptual and empirical threads that serve to hold the book together. It sums up the historical lessons, analytical reflections and empirical insights that can be drawn from the variety of contributions emphasising the key indicators and theoretical notions used to scrutinise the political territoriality of states and other polities in an era of European integration and globalisation.

References

- Agnew, J. (1998), *Geopolitics: Revisioning World Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Ansell, C. (2004), 'Territoriality, Authority, and Democracy', in C. Ansell and G. di Palma (eds), *Restructuring Territoriality: Europe and the United States Compared*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 225–245.
- Ardrey, R. (1966), *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations*. New York: Atheneum.
- Bartolini, S. (2000), 'Old and New Peripheries in the Processes of European Territorial Retrenchment versus Expansion/Integration'. Unpublished paper.
- Benhabib, S. (2002), 'Political Theory and Political Membership in a Changing World', in I. Katznelson and H.V. Milner (eds), *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. 404–432.
- Brown, L. (1972), *World Without Borders*. New York: Random House.
- Caporaso, J. (1996), 'The European Union and Forms of State: Westphalian, Regulatory or Post-Modern?' *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 34(1).
- Christiansen, T. (1999), 'Territorial Politics in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(2): 349–357.
- Evans, P. (1997), 'The Eclipse of the State: Reflections on the Stateness in an Era of Globalisation'. Unpublished paper.
- Forsberg, T. (1996), 'Beyond Sovereignty, Within Territoriality: Mapping the Space of Late-Modern (Geo)Politics', *Cooperation and Conflict* 31(4): 355–386.
- Frey, B. and Eichenberger, R. (1999), *The New Democratic Federalism: Functional, Overlapping and Competing Jurisdictions*. Cheltenham: Elgar.

- Gottmann, J. (1973), *The Significance of Territory*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Harvey, D. (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Herz, J. (1957), 'Rise and Demise of the Territorial State', *World Politics* 9(4): 473–493.
- (1968), 'The Territorial State Revisited: Reflections on the Future of the Nation-State', *Polity* 1(1) 11–34.
- Hirst, P.Q. and Thompson, G. (1995), *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hix, S. (1999), *The Political System of the European Union*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Jönsson, C., Tägil, S. and Törnqvist, G. (2000), *Organizing European Space*. London: Sage.
- Kahler, M. (2002), 'The State of the State in World Politics', in I. Katznelson and H.V. Milner (eds), *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: Norton/Washington, DC: APSA, p. 79.
- Keating, M. (1998), *The New Regionalism in Western Europe: Territorial Restructuring and Political Change*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Keohane, R.O. and Nye, J.S. (1977), *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Krasner, S. (1999), *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kratochwil, F. (1986), 'Of Systems, Boundaries, and Territoriality: An Inquiry into the Formation of the State System', *World Politics* 34: 27–52.
- Marks, G. and Hooghe, L. (2003), 'Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance', *American Political Science Review* 97(2): 233–243.
- Marks, G., Hooghe, L. and Blank, K. (1996), 'European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(3): 341–378.
- Newman, D. (2001), 'Boundaries, Borders and Barriers: Changing Geographic Perspectives on Territorial Lines', in M. Albert, D. Jacobson and Y. Lapid (eds), *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, pp. 137–151.
- O'Brien, R. (1991), *Global Financial Integration: The End of Geography*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Offe, C. (1998), 'Demokratie und Wohlfahrtsstaat: Eine Europäische Regimeform unter dem Streß der Europäischen Integration', in W. Streeck (ed.), *Internationale Wirtschaft, Nationale Demokratie: Herausforderungen für die Demokratietheorie*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, pp. 99–136.
- O'Tuathail, G.O. and Dalby, S. (eds) (1998), *Rethinking Geopolitics*. London: Routledge.
- Ruggie, J.G. (1993), 'Territoriality and Beyond', *International Organization* 47(1): 139–174.
- Sack, R.D. (1986), *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitter, P.C. (1996), 'Imagining the Future of the Euro-polity with the Help of New Concepts', in G. Marks, F.W. Scharpf, P.C. Schmitter and W. Streeck (eds), *Governance in the European Union*. London: Sage Publishers, pp. 121–150.
- Tilly, Ch. (ed.) (1975), *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Van Houtum, H. (1998), *The Development of Cross-Border Economic Relations*. Dissertation KUB Tilburg.
- Waltz, K.N. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Watson, Ph. (1980), *Social Security Law of the European Communities*. London: Mansell Publishing.
- Weber, M. (1956), *Staatssoziologie*. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot.
- Zielonka, J. (2001), 'How New Enlarged Borders will Reshape the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(3): 507–536.

Part I

Territoriality in history