ap

HUMAN TERRITORIALITY: A SPATIAL CONTROL STRATEGY

BEŞERİ TERİTORYALİTE: MEKÂNSAL BİR KONTROL STRATEJİSİ[*]

Samet YILMAZ[**]

ABSTRACT

Human interactions have a spatial character. People have always tried to form their own geographical areas to create convenient living space conditions. Therefore, they claim control and ownership over certain areas for that purpose. In this context, human territoriality is one of the most distinct human activities aiming to establish a stabilized spatial order. People forge various territories on different scales, ranging from local to global. The world is highly compartmentalized, and each compartmentalization has distinct features. Territoriality is predominantly attributed to modern sates. It is a fact that modern state is the most visible manifestation of political/social territoriality in the world. However, territorial actions and forms are not just peculiar to modern states. There are many different territorial forms. These forms regulate social interactions among individuals and organizations. Private, home, public or interactive territories carry certain messages in practical life. This study deals with the roots of human territorial behaviour patterns. Human territoriality is a significant part of both human and political geography but it is also analysed in terms of biology

[**] Research Assistant, Uludağ University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Relations, sametyilmaz@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5232-5435, TÜBİTAK 2211-A Scholarship Student.

and anthropology. Although there are many overlapping statements among these study fields, they draw on different assumptions. The main aim of the study is to prove that human territoriality is a prevalent spatial and regulating strategy in various geographical scales of societal life.

Keywords: Human Territoriality, Spatial Strategy, Control, Differentiation, Human Interaction.

ÖZ

Beşeri etkileşimler mekânsal bir karaktere sahiptir. İnsanlar kendi coğrafi alanlarını düzenleyerek uygun yaşam koşulları oluşturmaya çalışırlar. Bu bakımdan belli alanlar üzerinde, bu amacı gerçekleştirmeye yönelik olarak kontrol ve sahiplik kurma iddiasında bulunurlar. Bu bağlamda beşeri teritoryalite, istikrarlı bir kontrol ve aynı zamanda düzen oluşturmaya yönelik beşeri faaliyetler arasında en belirgin olanlardan biridir. İnsanlar, mahalliden küresele giden farklı ölçeklerde çeşitli teritoryalar tanzim ederler. İçinde bulunduğumuz dünya kompartımanlara ayrılmıştır ve her bir kompartıman kendine özgü niteliklere sahiptir. Teritoryalite ağırlıklı olarak modern devletlere atfedilir. Açıktır ki modern devlet, siyasi ve sosyal açıdan teritoryalitenin en baskın görüngülerinden biridir. Ancak teritoryal eylemler ve formlar yalnızca modern devletlere özgü değildir ve farklı formlar vardır. Özel, evsel, kamusal, ya da interaktif mekânlar teritoryal bir nitelik alabilmektedir. Çalışmada beşeri teritoryal davranış kalıplarının temelleri üzerinde durulacaktır. Beşeri teritoryalite hem beşeri coğrafyanın hem de siyasi coğrafyanın temel araştırma alanlarından biridir; ancak aynı zamanda biyoloji ve antropoloji açısından da ele alınmaktadır. Her ne kadar bu disiplinler arasında beşeri teritoryaliteye ilişkin örtüşen önermeler olsa da söz konusu disiplinler farklı varsayımlar üzerinden analizlerde bulunmaktadır. Çalışmanın temel amacı beşeri teritoryalitenin, toplumsal hayatın pek çok veçhesinde görülebilecek yaygın bir mekânsal ve düzenleyici strateji olduğunu ortaya koymaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Beşeri Teritoryalite, Mekânsal Strateji, Kontrol, Farklılaştırma, Beşeri Etkileşim.

INTRODUCTION

People -individually or collectively- try to form their surrounding area so that they can ensure favourable conditions for their prospects. Since human activities have a spatial character, outputs of these activities also shape human interactions among individuals or groups. Human social, political and economic activities in space are mainly localized, and occupy specific places on earth surface (Soja, 1971: 3). In this sense, human territoriality is the most common form of demarcating the space, bringing about compartmentalization of individual and societal life.

Earth surface, if looked at with the naked eye, constitutes a meaningful whole. However, that surface is intensely compartmentalized in an intricate system since each compartment has a different spatial character influenced by language, culture, religion, economy, society, politics or natural factors. People seek for organizing their geographical areas such as claiming political control, or establishing distributive norms in order to arrange practical living processes. In addition, spatiality of human activity creates new relationship patterns since people and their organizations contact each other by only not sheer interactive actions but also by spatial characteristics of their area. In other words, spatial characteristics of earth surface, together with localized human activity, shape interaction patterns among individuals and groups.

There are plenty of factors inflicting on human interactions such as physical distance, relative location, socio-cultural and political factors, and functional organizations. In this sense, human territorial actions are one of the most significant attempts to form social, political, economic or cultural interactions on the earth surface. People demarcate a piece of earth surface for certain goals. Specific areas are constructed through territoriality, allowing people to have the opportunity for extracting material and moral potential of space. Since human territoriality can be seen in all geographical scales, there are many goals and categories for demarcation of space. So, what are the roots of territorial behaviours? Why do communities show territorial behaviours? Does it have rational or irrational motives? Which actions can be seen as territorial? What are the aims of territoriality?

The concept territoriality is handled by various approaches, the each of which have different prepositions regarding the foundations of territoriality. Biological, anthropological and psychological explanations attribute human territorial actions to some intrinsic factors, which is to be discussed in the study. However, territoriality is a social action, rationally and purposely performed by individuals and collective organizations. In this framework, the study will deal with the social aspect of territorial actions, drawing on theoretical developments

about the concept of territoriality. Thus, rather than making a detailed empirical research, the study will draw on theoretical approaches which underscore the social aspect of territoriality, bolstering the argument with the illustrations.

1. WHAT IS HUMAN TERRITORIALITY?

In its most general meaning, territoriality is the organizational tenet for exerting political and social power in a defined geographical space (Agnew, 2009a: 744). In addition, it could be seen as a discerned ownership claim by outsiders in order to organize functioning principles in societal life (Pitz, 2004: 250). Ownership is arranged in a shared space, in which individuals participated. Thus, human territoriality is also a form of communication among individuals.

Territorial behaviour pattern is an instrument for exerting control over an area whose limits are imposed. While the term is predominantly used to identify modern state, territorial behaviours could be seen among all segments of societies in any geographical scale. Individuals or communities resort to this spatial strategy in order to establish their own arrangements. This spatial strategy is conducted by excluding undesirable intruders. For instance, in individual level, one controls his/her room by excluding other members of a family in a house, or, in higher geographical scale, gangs try to impose control on their domain, and to keep other gangs out of that domain (Taylor, 1994: 151). Although these examples render human territoriality principally as a form of conflict, as mentioned above, individuals or groups sharing a common space establish norms or rules via territoriality in order to determine societal processes since human territoriality can bring about cooperation among individuals or groups.

As it can be seen from the relevant definitions, one could reach two deductions on territoriality: ownership and arrangement of area. *"When people create territories, they create boundaries that both unite and divide space along with everything it contains"* (Penrose, 2002: 280), and it is self-evident that *"every being-in-space is differentiated from that space from demarcation"* (Malmberg, 1980: 90). Thus, imposing boundaries, intruders are kept out; possessions are kept in (Malmberg, 1980: 91). Those facts could be seen all within the parts of societal life, ranging from individual life to modern state. How a specific human territorial behaviour emerges, and what distinguishes it from other territorial behaviours are depended on the characteristics of organizational principle and scale. Territoriality is less complex in individual level, generally aiming to merely protect an area while it is much more complicated in macro or societal level including various elements, e.g., identity and diffusion of political, economic or social resources.

The roots of human territorial behaviours can be explained in three approaches, each of which has different fundamentals. The first one sees territoriality as a biological behaviour pattern, marking similarities between

humans and animals. This approach mainly evaluates human territoriality in biological or organismic sense. The second emphasises anthropological and psychological factors. Although this approach has a different logic, it attributes human territorial actions to certain intrinsic stimulations. The third and more comprehensive one evaluates human territoriality as rational and social strategy in demarcating area. Theoretical presumptions of this approach rest on the view that human territoriality is a rational strategy which aim to establish control over an area.

2. A BIOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE?

Biological explanations to human territoriality, based on Darwinist natural selection principal, make analogies between animals and humans (Taylor, 1988: 17-19). The cardinal purpose and function of living organisms are primarily to maintain their life, and thus, territoriality is the most salient strategy in order to protect the *'living space'* of an organism. This action is stimulated by biological needs, and seen in both humans and other species. Organisms are programmed to safeguard their geographical area, and while acting this, they perform violent or non-violent (re)actions. Individual organisms are mainly tend to protect only themselves, while communitarian ones also aim to provide more living space for group-members, to regulate population, to consolidate functioning structure, and to diminish in-group violence and death rate (Edney, 1974: 960).

Robert Ardrey is one of the most important names evaluating territorial behaviours and actions belonging to both humans and other creatures. Ardrey claims that territoriality is stimulated by instincts. Therefore, both humans and other species have the same instinct to safeguard their living spaces. This instinct is a common characteristic of human beings in all periods of the history since current human actions are similar to those of pre-historic human. In Ardrey's point of view, territory is a spatial phenomenon in which creatures live, and provide their essential needs. There are two dimensions of this process. First one is that space is protected against outsiders, particularly against the same kind, and thus, continuity of the living space is ensured. Second, as a result of safeguarding the living space, control is claimed over the protected space. In this sense, creatures protecting their living spaces, named as *'territorial species'*, show territorial behaviours on the basis of defence and claiming ownership (Ardrey, 1966: 6).

There are three basic instincts leading humans to territorial actions: Security, stimulation and identity. Security is ensured by purifying the space to exclude dangers. Intruders are kept away from territory. To perform this, unwelcomed species are repulsed outside the territory, and dangers are eliminated before approaching. Stimulation is the main motive and instinct to reveal territorial actions. Identity or identification is the general result of territoriality, rendering

space meaningful for species living inside and outside. All these fundamental instincts create strategies for protection, including conflicts and cooperation (Ardrey, 1966: 130-143).

Ardrey illustrates Pearl Harbour Attack, conducted by Japan against the USA in 1941, as an example to prove how territorial behaviours and attitudes are dominant in human communities. Ardrey asserts that the declaration of war by the USA against Japan was a territorial action since the reaction of the USA was not a rational move, but an irrational one. In fact, the Japanese attack to the Pearl Harbour did not cause a severe damage to the American military service. In addition, Japanese leaders thought that the USA would retaliate after the attack; but, the risk of such retaliation was minor. Since the attack would not give much damage the USA, it would not react excessively. Therefore, Japanese officials made rational calculations about gains and losses of the attack. However, they did not consider probable irrational reaction of American society. Americans thought that this attack was not just against military power of the USA, but also against the living space of American society. They reacted to protect their territorial geographical area and entered into a total war. Ardrey underscores that even if communities establish a societal territory, they will behave as to territorial imperative. To put it into another way, human communities behave according to universal territorial principle to safeguard their territories (Ardrey, 1966: 173-186).

Another important name in this field of study is Konrad Lorenz. He analyses the behaviours of living organisms on the basis of instincts. He claims that humans are actually animals, and both of them are able to gain experiences. So, humans and animals exhibit similar behaviour patterns on aggressiveness, and notably, they protect their living space aggressively. In this sense, feeding, reproduction, fear, and aggression steer their actions (Lorenz, 2002: 86, 95). According to Lorenz, living organisms are in a struggle to safeguard their living space and resources to protect youth members; to establish balance between species; and to survive ultimately (Lorenz, 2002: XIII). Lorenz points out irrational factors of territorial behaviour on structural basis. He claims that if another species come the World and observes the human life, they will understand that the human life does not have rational motives. For instance, there is not any rational explanation why thousands of people sacrificed their lives for Napoleon Bonaparte or Alexander the Great (Lorenz, 2002: 228-229).

Until mid-way through the 20th century, these biological or organismic approaches based on evolution (hypo)thesis made an effect on territorial organizational principle of modern state. For instance, Swedish Rudofl Kjellen, who coined the term *'geopolitics'*, claimed that states need territory to survive, likening them to living organisms (Akengin, 2015: 40). Similarly, Friedrich Ratzel from German *'Geopolitik'*, emphasized that states should expand their *'lebensraum'*

in order to increase state power. Ratzel, affected by neo-Lamarckian evolution theory rather than Darwin, stated that qualifications of a unit are deterministically conditioned by environmental factors, and if lebensraum of a state does not satisfy the need, then it is a necessity to gain more territory to survive (Jones vd., 2004: 5).

Biological studies attribute human territorial behaviours and attitudes to the basic instincts of the living. Although they discriminate between humans and animals, this discrimination is analytical in effect. Humans and animals are different variations of same species. Because of this, biological propositions to human territoriality are criticised on following statements: 1. Humans can use space for various reasons (Soja, 1971: 31). 2. Humans can protect their territories without resorting to aggressive behaviours. 3. Animals need certain territories for food or shelter. However, this situation is not necessarily valid for humans. 4. Humans can have more territories (home, office etc.) than animals. Human territories can also have temporal characteristics. For example, students can claim ownership on tables or carrels in a library while studying (Taylor ve Brooks, 1980). 5. Collective territorial behaviours are more common than those of animals. 6. Humans can survive a territorial war without physical intervention in other territories, thanks to developing technology products. 7. Humans can share their territories with other humans without any conflict (Edney, 1974: 961-962; Malmberg: 1980: 52-53).

3. ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPLANATIONS

In addition to biological explanations to human territoriality, starting from the 1960s, the concept began to be handled in terms of anthropology, social and environmental psychology. Rather than making pure analogies between humans and animals, the concept was evaluated exclusively to human characteristics. In this sense, two dimensions of human territorial actions came forward. The first one was defending personal or collective spaces against other humans; and, more importantly, the second one is to separate relevant spaces from others by marking; that is, human territorial actions tend to highlight that marked spaces have distinct characteristics.

One of the most important studies in anthropology discipline is *'The Silent Language'* of Edward Hall published in 1959. Although Hall emphasises impact of cultural factors on human behaviours, he suggests that all organisms, either individual or collective, have physical barriers or boundaries to separate their spaces from external environment. It is named as *'organism's territory'*. Every organism has detectable limits marking where it begins and ends, and Hall calls protective behaviours as *'territorial actions'* (Hall, 1959: 187). Even though Hall acknowledges that all organisms have territorial actions, he mainly focuses on

humans. In his view, humans have more complex territorial behaviours on large scales, and culture is important factor for these behaviours. For instance, space is highly personalized for Americans, and they see differences or similarities between places in terms of personal experiences. In addition, the term space begins with place, and they make more references to places to which they are familiar (Hall, 1959: 193). For that reason, whenever Americans visit overseas, they experience cultural shocks (Hall, 1959: 199). Hall claims that behaviours under the effect of culture is a silent communication form; that is to say, culture is not directly said by human, but evinces itself via attitudes (Hall, 1959: 14-15).

In addition to culture, psychological factors are also significant on human territorial behaviours. According to Altman, territoriality consists of temporally performed preventive and reactive behaviours. Individuals claim control over an area via verbal, marker and environmental instruments. The main motive of such behaviours is psychological satisfaction (Altman, 1970: 8). Altman distinguishes territories as primary, secondary and public on the basis of psychology. Individuals exert exclusive control over primary territories, such as home, for a long time. Secondary territories are less psychological, and individuals have limited control in shorter periods of time. They do not assert exclusive ownership on such territories and share these areas with other individuals or groups. For instance, in a house where the television has the common usage by each member of a family, the member who first comes the room can claim right to watch whichever program he wants. Public territories such as parks, streets, beaches, seats on public transport etc., are performed limited control by individuals. They claim more control over primary and secondary territories by delimiting and personalizing (Werner ve Altman, 1995: 652-653).

Another psychologist putting emphasis on environmental factors of human territoriality is Robert Sommer. He suggests that human territorial behaviours are rather complex and should be distinguished from legally owned properties since such an approach would leave aside lots of territorial behaviours. For instance, individuals who live in cities, and who do not have a legal property would be excluded from territorial patterns. Sommer emphasizes physical ownership and surroundings. Individuals claim ownership over physical areas and objects, using mostly tangible symbols such as fences or plates (Sommer, 1966: 61). So, individuals personalize the territory, and defend it against the others (Edney, 1974: 962). In addition, physical environment can be classified according to intensity of interaction. Most saliently, there is (hu)man's proximate environment at any time. For instance, the proximate environment of a student in a class consists of a teacher, friends and his/her desk. This environment can be subdivided into immediately surrounding the individual and more distant space. The former is named personal space (Sommer, 1966: 60). It is different from territory. Personal space is centred on the body of individual, and so is movable while territory is

generally stationary. Boundaries of territories are rendered visible so that others can discern it (Sommer, 1959: 248). In this sense, territorial behaviours together with territory itself carry a message for outsiders, using markers. Namely, human territorial behaviours are a non-verbal communication form. Individuals and groups mark a space showing that it is distinct from other ones, and also give information about that space (Knapp vd., 2014: 123-127, Malmberg, 1980: 90-95).

To sum up, instinctive explanations to human territoriality suggest that territorial actions function as defending and separating space from outside. Biological perspectives underscore survival factor while anthropological and psychological explanations highlight that territories mark distinctiveness of space (Taylor, 1988: 84-85). In fact, both functions are bond to each other since defending ends up with separating marked space from other ones. Distinctiveness necessitates defending of space in question.

4. SOCIALITY AND TERRITORIALITY

Explanations of human territoriality that are mentioned above are mainly based on individual studies among various groups, or, on deductions in accordance with the researcher's own assumptions, rather than being parsimonious and theorized unity. For instance, a researcher who evaluates empirical data in terms of Darwinist natural selection principal would view territorial behaviours as biological or organismic necessity. However, as Robert Sack says (1983: 55), human territoriality is not merely about survival, and needs comprehensive explanations. Human territorial behaviours are socially and rationally directed strategy toward organizing space, and a constitutive element.

A Rational Strategy

Rationality of human territoriality is based on the idea that it is a behaviour pattern directed to establish control over an area by demarcating it. This kind of behaviour creates power relations against other individuals or groups, excluding them from that space. Surely, any territorial claim can emerge from biological and psychological stimulations, and such kind of behaviour can also be performed rationally for desired outcomes. The distinctive feature of human territoriality as a rational spatial strategy is that it is exclusive to human, and constitutive part of space. Individuals or groups deliberately and consciously exert this spatial strategy in order to establish spatial interaction patterns.

As a spatial control strategy, Sack suggests that human territoriality is primarily aiming to control over space; so, it is a salient geographical manifestation of social and also political power. Social, economic and political resources are distributed in accordance with the context of demarcation since human territorial actions are, above all things, about demarcating space (Sack,

1986: 1). Such kind of demarcation does not only distinguish space from others, but it also makes that space meaningful for interactions (Delaney, 2009: 196). This form of action is applicable to all geographical scales, ranging from micro (home, neighbourhood, local communities etc.) to macro levels (modern territorial state, regional systems, international system etc.). While private territoriality and territory are the most common in micro level, modern state is dominant political form of territoriality in macro level (Sack, 1986: 5).

Territorial actions are prevalent in various parts of practical life. Think about a parent cleansing their kitchen. Their children want to help the parent, and they are in action. However, parent does not want their children to be in the kitchen while cleansing since the children can get hurt. Such an action is happening at one part of the house, and this part constitutes a distinctive space, allocated for some needs, in that house. In geographical terms, the action has a spatial context. The parent can resort to two different ways to avoid their children getting injured. The first one is that the parent can talk to the children about the probable dangerous in the kitchen, and persuade them not to go into the kitchen. Besides speaking, the parent can also change spatial order of the kitchen, e.g. putting dishes at another place, in order that the children cannot reach them. In both situations, the parent tries to control their children's spatial actions, but instead of regulation accessibility to the relevant space, they do this without resorting territorial precaution. The second strategy for the parent is to control the children's behaviour by prohibiting them from entering the kitchen, or restricting entry while cleansing or cooking. Such a strategy is primarily territorial since the parent regulate accessibility to the kitchen; that is to say, entry into the kitchen is now bond to permission of the parent (Sack, 1986: 15-16). In this sense, territorial actions are aimed at regulating spatial accessibility, claiming control over space. However, this claim or control is not merely about prohibiting something or someone but also it is also intended to facilitate interactions or processes. For instance, electoral districts are determined so as to provide administrative convenience (Johnston, 2001: 683).

Character of territoriality or whether an action is territorial or not depends on context of interaction ways. While a geographical space can have territorial character in one time, while it does not have that in another time since territorialisation of a geographical space essentially constitutes a geographical context. A territorialized geographical partition is different from mere spaces or places. Unlike territories, it is not a necessity to claim constant control over a space or place. Yet, if a geographical partition has a territorial character, this is a process that needs reconstitution. However, any demarcation does not mean territoriality. For instance, a cartographer shows on map where corn is produced. Should this demarcation is aimed at establishing control over that area by individuals or a corporative initiative, then it is a territorial action. In addition to establishing

control, this initiative should be discernible by other individuals or groups (Sack, 1986: 19).

Whether or not an action toward spatial control is called territorial is depended on social and also historical context of interaction since the character of interaction changes if these conditions change. For instance, during the Ottoman Empire, people living in today Greek territory were under control of the Empire, and there was no clear line or demarcation according to nationality among peoples living within the empire. The separation among various groups in Empire was based on religious affinity called 'Millet System'. This system was not bound to decisive spatial separation, and so, the relations between different communities were not arranged by decisive and rigid spatial differentiation. However, with the rise of liberal nationalist notions starting from especially the French Revolution in 1789, the form of interactions began to change. The Greek population wanted to establish their own state with the appeal of nationalistic ideas. With the demise of the Ottoman Empire and foundation of the Republic of Turkey, the form of interaction between Greek and Turkish societies has been depended on more territorial premises of modern state including identity, culture and politics. The hard and linear borders between Turkey and Greece have separated two states not only politically, but also in terms of culture and identity. The form of interaction has been changed, so has been the context of spatial interaction.

Territorial Actions

Principally, there are three forms of actions which bring about territoriality. The first one is classification of a geographical space. Classification distinguishes a space from others, and relations among individuals or groups are arranged by this classification (Sack, 1986: 21). To illustrate, a child warns the rest of the family members not to touch some belongings in his/her room. This warning just classifies the belongings he/she signifies, and the rest of the family gets this message. This is not a territorial classification since ownership is constituted over belongings via classifying some items. If the child forbids the rest of the family members to enter his/her room, signifying that room belongs to himself/herself, then this kind of classification is performed by spatial demarcation. More precisely, the child classifies the room as his/her private or personal space, and imposes accessibility limits on the rest of the family. The message in this example is sent to the rest of the family via a spatial demarcation.

Secondly, territoriality is a form of communication. As mentioned above, the child forms a communication line with the rest of the family through demarcating his/her personalized territorial space. This behaviour pattern is an organizing principle for relations in the house since the rest of the family, if they see it appropriate or legitimate, will behave taking the child's claim into account.

So, as a demarcated space, his/her room itself would become a communication form. This kind of form generally is based on markers or signs at the ending points of space. These markers or signs carry a message for outsiders showing that demarcated space is deliberately and purposely allocated for some goals (Sack, 1986: 21-22). For instance, modern states have hard and linear territorial borders; that is, the separation between inside and outside, at least normatively, is decisive and constant. They use tangible markers such as border poles or buoys, fences, ditches, ramparts or walls and fortifications in order to show that marked space is under their exclusive jurisdiction (Kireevi, 2015: 99). Similarly, a house holder can put a fence around garden. Such an action shows that the garden is part of private territory, and fences are about restraining probable intruders. Furthermore, marking that this space is a private territory forms a communication line between owner and others. Fences are territorial limits; private territory is a (societal) boundary distinguishing it from public territory.

Thirdly, all territorial behaviours or action patterns must involve an attempt at enforcing over access to the area and to things within it. This attempt is a process of determining both inside and outside; that is to say, inside/outside dichotomy emerges in this process. Therefore, accessibility rules or conditions which are mostly formal are set up to regulate mobility across boundaries of demarcated area. Territorial and non-territorial actions are taken to block transgressions of territoriality, and probable transgressions can be punished (Sack, 1986: 22). In some cases, unwelcomed individuals, groups or organizations are expelled from territory violently or otherwise (Lyman ve Scott, 1967: 245-246). For instance, developed countries sometimes accept immigrant workers from underdeveloped ones. If these immigrant workers, who are generally low-paid, replace local or national labour in time, they may become unwelcomed segments of that society. In addition, territory can be isolated from external interaction (Lyman ve Scott, 1967: 246). Isolationist world policy of the USA since Monroe Doctrine in 1813 to the end of the Second World War could be an example for such a reaction. The USA did not want the European states to intervene in the American continents, and also it did not involve in issues outside its continents. Actually, such a behaviour was a reaction to protect territorial exclusivity of the USA against a probable European intervention.

Regulating accessibility to the area, together with geographical classification, entails creating boundaries or borders. Since territoriality brings about compartmentalization of spaces as bounded areas, managing boundaries and borders is essential to regulate accessibility to these bounded areas (Anderson ve O'Dowd, 1999: 598). Furthermore, boundaries and borders are also significant to discriminate a geographical space between others. It should be noted that psychical boundaries or borders are still important in partitioning earth surface. However, spatial separation is performed through various practices and

imaginations. Social and political organizations, especially modern states, seek for spatial demarcation through icons, discourse, practices or ideologies, culminating in dichotomization of space as inside/outside. These actions represent the notion of boundedness (Paasi, 2009: 223-224).

Despite the fact that forms of spatiality constantly change, principle of territoriality still reveals itself in social practices. The construction of territorial areas or *'blocks of spaces'* in Agnew's words (2005: 442) is not just experienced by means of concrete territorial border lines. Bordering or boundary-making processes should be handled comprehensively (Paasi, 1998, 2009). It is obvious that there are plenty of bounded spaces in the world, and these geographical orders bring about socialization of people through spatial formations. So, territorial actions and territories are salient geographical manifestations for such kind spatial socialization (Paasi, 2009: 226-229). The demarcation process and management of borders frame the institutionalization of separation lines. The demarcation and management of borders are related processes. The former signifies how the management of borders are performed. It does not merely mean to draw a line on maps or to put fence into physical landscape; it is a process through which differences and separation are constructed, thereby setting a connection between space and communities. Management is the centre of conducting spatial separation since permeability of border lines is determined and managed in accordance with demarcation (Newman, 2006: 148; Müller, 2013). Thus, territorial actions and territory are still operative to exert political and social control over geographical space (Diener ve Hagen, 2009).

These three constitutive attempts of territoriality could be historically seen almost all societies, ranging from local to global geographical scale. Configurations and outcomes of territorial behaviour patterns are varied depending on temporality. However, any territorial action certainly brings about regulative effects on the relations among individuals or groups. In addition, territoriality has different meanings or reasoning; yet it is always socially constituted since determining who and what is outside designated space is a constitutive behaviour pattern (Sack, 1986: 26). What is bounded is not just a space, but also a kind of sociality (Cox, 1991: 6-7). Territoriality has a relational character in essence, including such as production, culture, spiritual or material values. Thus, it is a kind of information conduit among various individuals or groups (Raffestin, 2012: 125-130).

5. THE MAIN FUNCTIONS OF TERRITORIALITY

Territoriality can have various goals, and any specific territoriality has its own distinctive characteristics. However, there are two general functions of territorial actions which can be seen all territorial forms: Spatial control,

differentiation and identification of space. Actually, these functions or outputs seem common to biological, anthropological and psychological explanations of human territoriality; but they are more complex, and comprise of entangled factors in terms of rationality of territoriality.

Spatial Control

The first function of human territorial actions is to claim and establish control over a territorialized geographical space. Human territoriality is based on territorialisation of power relations. Interactions of individuals or communities operate via territorialized geographical partition. The territorialized space is limited and enclosed, and so, the separation between inside and outside is forged (Delaney, 2009: 198). However, a territory does not have to be totally enclosed but the inside/outside distinction is necessary for territorialisation.

Territoriality is the manifestation of power relations (Storey, 2001: 6), and organizing principle of social relational impact mechanisms. In this sense, a social history museum can be illustrated. This museum represents one of the parts of societal life, and has some rules. Certain artefacts should be exhibited in the museum. Visitors are bound to a certain set of rules. First, they have to buy ticket to enter into the museum. During the visit, they should enter the museum from the specified points; walk in prepared lines and ways; avoid touching the exhibited elements; and exit from designated points. Not only visitors, but also the members of museum staff are bound to a set of rules. In this way, the inside and outside of the museum are separated from each other by the rules. These rules organize spatial interactions through the museum's territorial structure (Sack, 1993: 326-328). Geographically more extensive territorialities and territories regulates less extensive ones. Modern states, for example, not only have their own territorial character but they also arrange the scope of private territories via legal regulations.

Another important point of human territoriality and power relations is that although it can be expressed within the territorial context in terms of power relations and formal or informal rules of how and by whom power is used in any territory, the main focus regarding power is on the territoriality of a particular area. Rather than signifying who wields power, territoriality shows how that power is reified; so, the emphasis is not on who controls, or on who is controlled; rather on territory itself (Sack, 1986: 16). As Sack puts emphasis (1986: 33), territory itself is the agent who creates power relations since it makes relations impersonal. Since territoriality is a communication form, a power relation is imposed on referring to territory thereby exceeding any agent. The museum example given above shows this kind of relationship. The spatial rules of the museum bind both visitors and staff. Likewise, the European Union (EU), which aims to create an area of freedom, security and justice by transforming the relation patterns among member

144

states and their peoples, claim power or authority on this goal. The Union forges a legal system for that purpose, and Brussels, member states and candidate states are supposed to be tied the imagined area. Although some bodies such as the European Council, the European Commission or the European Parliament have legal authority, relations patterns are forged by the spatial ideation of the Union.

The fact that territoriality and territory are a source of control similar to an energy transmitter among actors is hinged on the content of what is encapsulated by space. Essentially, territoriality is a mould of space. The content of mould determines the level of control. To illustrate, modern state is a strong container including political, economic, social and cultural factors. It tries to penetrate into almost all aspects of societal life (Mann, 1984; Storey, 2001: 39). The basis of this penetration comes from sovereignty; modern state claims supreme authority on a well-defined space. Therefore, it imposes strict control over territory, and has a comprehensive and hard territoriality. In contrast to modern states, empires have weak territorial control over their area since boundaries or frontiers of empires are fundamentally fluid and more permeable than those of modern states (Münkler, 2007: 5-6). They generally serve as fortifications against urgent military threats like the Great Wall of China and the Hadrian Wall (Prevelakis, 2009: 363), or as facilitating conquests by pressing neighbouring regions (Kadercan, 2017). In addition, forms of control partly rest on the level of territoriality. At lower levels, control is relatively more personalized. For instance, individuals have more control over their personal spaces. On the contrary, as the geographical scale and comprehensiveness of territoriality increase, control is less personalized since it decreases because of others, and such territories are more steadily fixed (Porteous, 1976). Furthermore, control in these territories can be de-personalized. In modern territorial states, for example, although authority is harnessed through various state institutions and agents, it is originated from sovereign character of modern state which merges nation with state in an exclusively delimited area (Flint ve Taylor: 2014: 160).

Differentiation and Identification of Space

Territoriality differentiates demarcated geographical space, and transmits some messages to both insiders and outsiders. This is the result of communicative function of territoriality. Control over a space via territorial actions signifies that accessibility is bound to certain rules. As territory is a classification by space, difference and identification are reified through demarcated space. Territory is an instrument to control insiders by excluding outsiders. Therefore, territory is a clear and tangible message for regulating socialites. Inside means security, peace, efficiency and progress (Delaney, 2005: 19). *"Territoriality provides an essential link between society and space it occupies primarily through its impact on human interaction and the development of group spatial identities"* (Soja, 1971: 33).

Identification of space, together with power, is rather a complex process. It is classification of space with human symbols in which case exclusivity is claimed. This process embodies ideas, ideology, discourse and practical elements since identification continues together with power relations. Thus, territorialized space is essentially a container of social identifications. These spaces are differentiated from each other, and each space becomes a social container in which human interactions occur, gaining meaning (Blacksell, 2006: 20). For that purpose, lines are imposed to separate geographical areas from each other, and identification is set up according to ideational factors. Such an identification indeed establishes communication forms among actors in social life. There are lots of physical markers showing that spaces are divided or compartmentalized. These markers mostly dichotomize representations of spaces: *"the inscription of either/or; in/out; on/off; mine/not mine; public/private; and domestic/foreign (and so on) categories onto social space at territorial boundaries"* (Delaney, 2009: 203). Dichotomization of space is one of the main features of territoriality. This situation does not only bring in differentiation and compartmentalization, but it also identities to individuals or collective organizations.

Identification is related to two significant functions of territory. One of them is to provide a secure shelter to insiders. Individuals or collective organizations protect their existence thanks to territory. Secondly, in this secluded area, insiders have the opportunity to fulfil their needs. Therefore, territory serves as a *'springboard for opportunity'*; so, individuals try to establish territorial areas to provide security and opportunity. Such an area is identified as habitable and familiar by individuals and communities (Gottmann, 1973: 14-15). Identification by territory is quite intense in modern states, and citizens have political loyalty to them. Boundaries of modern states are secured areas for individuals who have some rights and liabilities on the basis of citizenship. This kind of relationship carries a message that there is a familiarity between territory and people or nation. Therefore, this situation is naturalized, and modern sates become dominant territorial form in world politics (Wimmer ve Schiller, 2002).

Meaning of territories generally is defined by rules or norms. They are communication norms consisting of meanings. These meanings are typically clear but depended on perceptions of audience. To illustrate, 'Keep Out' or 'No Trespassing' signboards state not to enter designated area but audience can attribute various meanings to that area, and show different reactions. However, they know that they will be punished in case of violation. Such kind of markers problematize legitimacy since it is necessary for acceptation of rules by audience. Acceptability depends on the legitimacy of rule. (Delaney, 2009: 204-205). Rules can also describe qualifications of an area. Constitutions of modern sates have such a function since they define characteristic of states within boundaries.

As mentioned above, territory is different from other geographical concepts, space and place. A place has distinct characteristics from others. Paris is known with the Eifel Tower, or New York has skyscrapers. These cities have their own characteristics distinguishing themselves from other cities. However, the distinctiveness these cities have is not established through claiming constant control across boundaries, but through highlighting unique and tangible buildings. Similarly, Soviet space which was set up by socialist ideology and practices was different from that of capitalist world. Nonetheless, there was also a Soviet territory since socialist space of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had constant boundaries in the sense of modern territorial state.

It should be noted that there is a difference between identification of space and identity of individuals or communities originated from space. Spaces can ensure identities to people. Germany means that Germans -in the sense of Benedict Anderson's nationalism notion- are living within its strictly defined boundaries, or, in primitive societies where mere kinship defines social interactions, tribes or clans signify that individuals living there are bound together with the same kinship. However, the identity of space is different from identities of people. All territorial actions do not have to confer specific identities to people. For instance, the external borders of the EU marks the limits of the area of freedom, security and justice, rather than the limits of Europe or European values since any society or individual can have European values without settling within the external borders of the EU. However, the European space is a distinct conceptualization, identified through demarcation. In this sense, the EU establishes neighbourhood policy with the states outside its borders on the basis of this identification of space. Therefore, identification of space and identity of individuals or communities originated from space are separate concepts.

6. INTERCONNECTEDNESS BETWEEN TERRITORIALITY AND TERRITORY

Territoriality, in its most basic form and function, is a set of actions aiming to demarcate a geographical area. In this sense, especially in Sack's formulation, territory seems the product of territorial strategies in various scales. So, it is basically a partitioned geographical unit controlled by a group of people, or an organization (Storey, 2001: 1; Paasi, 2003: 109). Territorial actions and attitudes bring about territorialization of a geographical partition. Territorialization is a process in which societal interactions are forged in terms of territory (Agnew, 2009b: 745). However, the relationship between territory and territoriality is not direct; that is to say, though territorial actions bring about territorialization of space, a specific territory can have further qualifications beyond the context of territorial actions. For that reason, it is needed to address two issues. The first is

the term territory itself; the second is the relationship between territory and territoriality.

The concept territory is predominantly used for the political and geographical organization of modern states. The territorial structure of modern states is constantly reconstituted through political practices and theories, international relations, international law or geopolitical imaginations (Ashley, 1988; Walker, 1993; Agnew, 1994; Taylor, 1996; Moore, 2015). However, there can be territories in various scales such as local, regional or continental (Brenner, 1999; Agnew, 1999). There have been many territorial forms or configurations regulating societal interactions in history. Ancient Greek geography could be illustrated in this sense. It is known that there were city states, named as *'polis'*, in Ancient Greek geography. These city states were spatially comprised of territories called *'khora'*, and citizens were socially bond to each other. City states in Ancient Greek geography were territorially seen as autochthon structures, and this spatial imagination was manifested through mythological expressions. It was assumed that the founders of polis were born from the very soil they were situated upon; that is to say, loyalty based on citizenship could not be gained later but with birth. Secondly, polis was imagined as autarkic and closed units. So, it could be more sheltered and stable organizations (Elden, 2013: 21-26; Gottmann, 1973: 17-19).

There are many conceptualizations about the content and functions of territory. These conceptualizations are different from each other, and incorporate various elements to operationalize territory. Saskia Sassen evaluates territory on the basis of authority and rights it has. To her, territory is a capability which is intrinsic to power relations. To put in into another way, it is a capability for claiming control and exerting power relations. In this framework, territory has had various authority structures and rights in times from the middle ages to the globalization. As a capability and a variation of authority and rights, territory is a sophisticated structure in which various organizations are clustered. So, it has different value in regulating power relations depending on time and space (Sassen, 2008). Stuart Elden claims that rather than bounded space, territory is political technology but not free of time and space. The qualifications of territory are bond to historical and geographical context (Elden, 2010; 2013). Joe Painter views territory as an effect, claiming that it is the outcome of networked socio-technical practices. Administrative units, notably governments, shape their territory to reveal its effect, establishing a spatial network including both human and non-human factors. By these practices, territory has an effect on socio-spatial relations, and gives them a form (Painter, 2010). These conceptualizations about ontological and also functional features of territory prove that the term can be conceptualized and operationalized in various ways. However, it seems clear that territory, in various geographical scales which are politically and socially constructed (Delaney, 1994; Marston, 2000), regulates societal interactions

148

In addition to the content of territory, ontological priority between territory and territoriality is a complex issue. It is the problematic whether territory will be defined on its own or as a result of territorial strategies. It is clear that as Saskia Sassen also points out, territory and territoriality are different from each other (Sassen, 2013: 24). Elden suggests that territory is logically prior to territoriality since territoriality is a set of actions directed to territory. Thus, territorial actions need territory in advance since these actions are ineffective without territory (Elden, 2010: 803). On the other hand, Marco Antonsich claims that bounded or demarcated areas should not be directly defined as territories; rather, these areas should be seen as *'territorial'*. Such a conceptualization provides that the concept territory can be used beyond modern state since almost all administrative organizations have territorial inclinations, and their territorial and spatial organization can have different characteristics from that of modern states. To Antonsich, demarcated territorial areas does not necessarily have to be linear; however, it must be a limit demarcated geographically (Antonsich: 2010: 423-424).

When the two discussions are evaluated together, it can be said that territory and territoriality are separate but interconnected terms. Territoriality means controlling a geographical area by demarcation, rendering this area territorial, whereas territory incorporates various elements in addition to demarcation. However, demarcation is essential to differentiate a territory from other geographical spatial blocks. Indeed, while Elden claims that territory is logically prior to territoriality, he also suggests that it is existentially the second (Elden, 2010: 803). For that reason, demarcation is one of the most important actions to forge the content of territory. In addition, as Painter points out, *"territory is never complete; but always becoming"* (Painter, 2010: 1094). It is constantly recreated by imaginations, discourses, icons or maps so on and forth. So, claiming constant control over space is an important part in territorialization of area since territorial actions should be continuous and stable. For instance, the Mughal Empire had no clearly defined border lines. Spatial differentiation was uncertain and fuzzy; that is to say, territorial structure of the Empire was politically weak, thereby representing soft territorial structures. However, the Mughal Empire, which was actually a nomadic society, had a territory in which all tribes had the right of migration. In such a nomadic societal organization, *"ownership means in effect the title to a cycle of migration"*. Furthermore, trade and migration routes had to be open to maintain mobility within the geographical area of the Empire (Kratochwil, 1986: 35-36; Burban ve Cooper, 2010: 4). Thus, though the Mughal Empire had a territory, territorial control over its geographical area through imposing clearly defined border lines was weak, and not constant.

7. CONCLUSION

Territoriality is a prevalent human action, and humanitarian organizations have terrestrial activities in one way or another. Daily life teems with compartmentalized spaces regulating human interactions. Territories such as private, personal, public, home etc. carry messages for outsiders signifying that marked space is different from other spaces. Therefore, territories more or less create separated living spaces for individuals and organizations. Indeed, each territory is linked to one another; that is, there is a mutuality among territories since each territory dichotomizes others in a complex relationship.

Territorial behaviour patterns are not exclusive to human beings, but also to animals. Animals try to safeguard their living spaces against unwelcomed threats. However, human territoriality is more complex, and humans use territories for various reasons, not just for safeguarding. The most important and salient feature or function of human territoriality is to regulate interactions among humans and their organizations through forming communication lines. Each boundary carries a message for societal life, and territories bring about more territories. Private territory not only forms the scope of public territory but it also stimulates other individuals to form their own private territories. Therefore, there is a mutuality between territorial areas in practical life.

Territoriality is a spatial strategy. Individuals and human organizations consciously and rationally impose boundaries on a certain geographical area. However, any human territorial actions, whether biologically or psychologically stimulated, can be a rationally performed attempt. Also, biologically or psychologically stimulated human territoriality is a rational move in itself since it is a reaction to genetic necessity. Yet, people can rationally and consciously establish demarcated spaces for various purposes without any biological and psychological stimulation. In this sense, territorial actions can be seen in a wide range of geographical scales.

Territoriality of modern states is politically and socially dominant form of contemporary world, and geographically and practically quite comprehensive containing almost all parts of societal life. In addition, this form is constantly reconstituted through political maps, international law, geopolitics or international relations. The legitimacy of modern state comes from exclusive sovereignty in strictly demarcated geographical area. However, other forms of territoriality simultaneously exist with modern territorial states. For instance, as an emerging polity, the EU also have territorial characteristics but it is limited in comparison to modern territorial states. Likewise, there are various territorial politics in sub-state level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agnew, John (1994), "The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory", Review of International Political Economy, 1 (1): 53-80.

Agnew, John (1999), "Mapping Political Power Beyond State Boundaries: Territory, Identity, and Movement in World Politics", Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 28 (3): 429-521.

Agnew, John (2005), "Sovereignty Regimes: Territoriality and State Authority in Contemporary World Politics", Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 95 (2): 437–461.

Agnew, John (2009a), "Territoriality", Derek Gregory, Ron Johnston, Geraldine Pratt, Michael J. Watts and Sarah Whatmore (Eds.), The Dictionary of Human Geography, 5th Edition (Singapore: Blackwell Publisher): 744-745.

Agnew, John (2009b), "Territorialization", Derek Gregory, Ron Johnston, Geraldine Pratt, Michael J. Watts and Sarah Whatmore (Eds.), The Dictionary of Human Geography, 5th Edition (Singapore: Blackwell Publisher): 745-746.

Akengin, Hamza (2015), Siyasi Coğrafya İnsan ve Mekân Yönetimi, 4. Baskı (Ankara: Pegem Akademi).

Altman, Irwin (1970), "Territorial Behavior in Men: An Analysis of the Concept", Leon A. Pastalan and Daniel H. Carson (Eds.), Spatial behavior of older people, (Micgan: University of Michigan Press): 1-24.

Anderson, James and Liam O'Dowd (1999), "Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance", Regional Studies, 33 (7): 593-604.

Antonsich, Marco (2010), "Rethinking Territory", Progress in Human Geography, 35 (3): 422–425.

Ardrey, Robert (1966), The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations (New York: Athenaeum Press).

Ashley, Richard (1988), "Untying the Sovereign State A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique", Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 17 (2): 227-262.

Blacksell, Mark (2006), Political Geography, (London: Routledge Press).

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

Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper (2010), Empires in World History Power and the Politics of Difference (New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

Cox, K. Robert (1991), "Redefining 'Territory'", Political Geography Quarterly, 10 (1): 5-7

Delaney, David (1997), "The Political Construction of Scale", Political Geography, 16(2): 93-97.

Delaney, David (2005), Territory: A Short Introduction (Malden: Blackwell Publishing).

Delaney, David (2009), "Territory and Territoriality", Rob Kitchin and Nigel Thrift (Eds.), International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, 11 (Amsterdam: Elsevier Press): 196-208.

Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen (2009), "Theorizing Borders in a 'Borderless World': Globalization, Territory and Identity Alexander", Geography Compass 3 (3): 1196–1216.

Edney, J. Julian (1974), "Human Territoriality", Psychological Bulletin, 81 (12): 959-975.

Elden, Stuart (2010), "Land, terrain, territory", Progress in Human Geography, 34 (6): 799–817.

Elden, Stuart (2013), The Birth of Territory (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Flint, Colin and J. Peter Taylor (2014), Siyasi Coğrafya Dünya-Ekonomisi, Ulus-Devlet ve Yerellik, 6. Basımdan Çeviri (Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık) (Çev. Fulya Ereker).

Gottmann, Jean (1973), The Significance of Territory (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia).

Hall, T. Edward (1959), The Silent Language (New York: Doubleday & Company Press).

Johnston, Ron (2001), "Out of the 'Moribund Backwater': Territory and Territoriality in Political Geography", Political Geography, 20: 677–693.

Jones, Marti, Jones, Rhys and Michael Woods (2004), An Introduction to Political Geography Space, Place and Politics (London: Routledge Press).

Kadercan, Burak (2017), "Territorial Design and Grand Strategy in the Ottoman Empire", Territory, Politics, Governance, 5 (2): 1-19.

Kireevi, A. Anton (2015), "State Border", Sergei V. Sevastianov, Jussi P. Laine and Anton A. Kireevp (Eds.), Introduction to Border Studies (Vladivostok: Far Eastern Federal University Press): 98-117.

Knapp, L. Mark, Hall, A. Judith and G. Terrence Horgan (2014), Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction, Wadsworth (Boston: Cengage Learning).

Kratochwil, Friedrich (1986), "Of Systems, Boundaries, and Territoriality: An Inquiry into the Formation of the State System", World Politics, 39 (1): 27-52.

Lorenz, Konrad (2002), On Aggression (London: Routledge Press) (Çev. Marjorie Kerr Wilson).

Lyman, Stanford M. and Marvin B. Scott (1967), "Territoriality: A Neglected Sociological Dimension", Social Problems, 15 (2): 236-249.

Malmberg, Torsten (1980), Human Territoriality: Survey on the Behavioural Territories in Man with Preliminary Analysis and Discussion of Meaning (The Hague: Mouton Publishers).

Mann, Micheal (1984), "The Autonomus Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results", European Journal of Sociology, 25 (2): 185-213.

Marston, Sallie A. (2000), "The Social Construction of Scale", Progress in Human Geography 24 (2): 219–242.

Moore, Margaret (2015), A Political Theory of Territory (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Müller, Andreas (2013), "Territorial Borders as Institutions", European Societies, 15 (3): 353-372.

Münkler, Herfried (2007), Empires the Logic of World Domination from Ancient Rome to the United States (Cambridge: Polity Press) (Çev. Patrick Camiller).

Newman, David (2006), "The Lines That Continue to Separate Us: Borders in Our `Borderless' World", Progress in Human Geography 30 (2): 143-161.

Paasi, Anssi (1998), "Boundaries as Social Processes: Territoriality in the World of Flows", Geopolitics, 3 (1): 69-88.

Paasi, Anssi (2003), "Territory", John Agnew, Katharyne Mitchell and Gerard Toal (Gearoid O Tuathail) (Eds.), A Companion to Political Geography (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers): 109-122.

Paasi, Anssi (2009), "Bounded Spaces in A 'Borderless World': Border Studies, Power and the Anatomy of Territory", Journal of Power, 2 (2): 213-234.

Painter, Joe (2010), "Rethinking Territory", Antipode, 42 (5): 1090–1118.

Penrose, Jan (2002), "Nations, States and Homelands: Territory and Territoriality in Nationalist Thought", Nations and Nationalism, 8 (3): 277-297.

Pitz, Jerry (2004), Encyclopedia of Human Geography (London: Greenwood Publishing)

Porteous, J. Douglas (1976), "Home: The Territorial Core", Geographical Review, 66 (4): 383-390

Prevelakis, Georges (2009), "Buffer Zone", Rob Kitchin and Nigel Thrift (Eds.), International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, 11 (Amsterdam: Elsevier Press): 362-367.

Raffestin, Claude (2012), "Space, Territory, and Territoriality", Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 30: 121-141.

Sack, Robert D. (1983), "Human Territoriality: A Theory", Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 73 (1): 55-74.

Sack, Robert D. (1986), Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sack, Robert D. (1993), "The Power of Place and Space", Geographical Review, 83 (3): 326-329.

Sassen, Saskia (2008), Territory-Authority-Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages (New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

Sassen, Saskia (2013), "When Territory Deborders Territoriality", Territory, Politics, Governance, 1(1): 21-45.

Soja, Edward W. (1971), "The Political Organization of Space", Association of American Geographers Resource Paper, 8: 1-54.

Sommer, Robert (1959), "Studies in Personal Space", Sociometry, 22 (3): 247-260.

Sommer, Robert (1966), "Man's Proximate Environment", Journal of Social Issues, 22 (4): 59-70.

Storey, David (2001), Territory: The Claiming of Space (Essex: Pearson Prentice Hall Press).

Taylor, Peter J. (1994), "The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World-System", Progress in Human Geography, 12 (2): 151-162.

Taylor, Peter J. (1996), "Territorial Absolutism and Its Evasions", Geography Research Forum, 16: 1-12.

Taylor, Ralph B. and Debra Kaye Brooks (1980), "Temporary Territories?", Responses to Intrusions in a Public Setting", Population and Environment, 3 (2): 135-145.

Taylor, Ralph B. (1988), Human Territorial Functioning An empirical, evolutionary perspective on individual and small group territorial cognitions, behaviors, and consequences (New York: Cambridge University Press)

Walker, Rob B. J. (1993), Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Werner, Carol M. and Irwin Altman (1995), "Territoriality", Tony Manstead and Miles Hewstone (Eds.), The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers): 652-653.

Wimmer, Andreas ve Nina Glick Schiller (2002), "Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences", Global Networks, 2 (4): 301–334.