

12-30-2018

The Development of Concept of Territory in International Relations

Ghifari Athallah Ramadhan

Indonesian Ministry of National Development Planning, ghifariramadhanathallah@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/global>



Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Law Commons](#), and the [Political Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ramadhan, Ghifari Athallah (2018) "The Development of Concept of Territory in International Relations," *Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional*: Vol. 20 : No. 2 , Article 5.

DOI: 10.7454/global.v20i2.348

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/global/vol20/iss2/5>

This Critical Literature Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

The Development of Concept of Territory in International Relations^{*}

Ghifari Athallah Ramadhan Indonesian

Ministry of National Development Planning, Republic of Indonesia

Email: ghifariramadhanathallah@gmail.com

Abstrak

Konsep teritori, sebuah ruang spasial yang dipolitisasi, tidak terlalu banyak dibahas di dalam Ilmu Hubungan Internasional meskipun teritori merupakan tempat di mana hubungan internasional terjadi. Melalui artikel ini, perkembangan mengenai konsep teritori dalam Ilmu Hubungan Internasional akan dieksplorasi. Dengan mengeksplorasi tema-tema utama terkait dengan perkembangan teritori dalam Ilmu Hubungan Internasional, diharapkan pemahaman komprehensif mengenai teritori dalam Ilmu Hubungan Internasional dapat diketahui. Narasi seperti “dunia tanpa batas” (borderless world) dan juga “kembalinya geografi” (return of geography) dapat dipahami. Telaah literatur yang penulis lakukan memetakan lima tema utama. Tema pertama adalah awal mula teritori, diikuti dengan tema kedua yaitu awal mula geopolitik. Tema ketiga adalah kritik terhadap konsep teritori dan geopolitik, dilanjutkan tema keempat dengan respon terhadap konsep teritori dan geopolitik. Tema terakhir adalah mengenai unit politik alternatif yang tidak berbasiskan pada teritori. Artikel ini kemudian menyimpulkan bahwa definisi dari “teritori” itu sendiri harus diperluas, karena pada era kontemporer teritori yang tidak berbasiskan pada ruang spasial seperti internet menjadi semakin marak. Pada akhirnya, penulis berharap artikel ini dapat berkontribusi pada dinamika konsep teritori itu sendiri dalam Ilmu Hubungan Internasional.

Kata Kunci:

Teritori, Geopolitik, Deteritorialisasi, Reteritorialisasi

Abstract

The concept of territory, a politicized space, is not really explored in International Relations, even though territory is where International Relations happen physically. This article explores the development of the concept of territory in International Relations. By seeing the development of the concept of territory in International Relations, I could see the main arguments regarding territory. For example, I could understand the argument behind the jargon of “borderless world” or “return of geography”. In order to fully explain the development of the concept of territory in International Relations, I divide my research into five parts. First, I would describe the beginning of territory itself; how a neutral geographical space turned into political geographical space. Second, I would talk about the implication of politicization of the geographical space itself, geopolitics. Third, I would describe the critics of the concept of territory and also geopolitics. This will be joined by the fourth part about the respond the critics of the concept of territory and geopolitics. Lastly, I would talk about the non-territorial political community as alternative to traditional territorial-based state. This article then concludes that the definition of territory itself needs to be broadened, as non-spatial space is now a territory, such as the Great Firewall of China. Ultimately, I hope to show the current discussion of territory in international relations study and what could be discussed more in this rarely talked concept in international relations.

Keywords:

Territory, Geopolitics, Deterritorialization, Reteritorialization

^{*}The writing does not reflect the view of the institution author working on.

INTRODUCTION

Territory in International Relations

One of the most intriguing question in International Relations is the status of territory. Territory is the basis of where International Relations physically takes place. Another concept derived from territory, geopolitics, is even stated as science of statecraft (Sidaway 2001, pp.225). The basic actor of International Relations, the state, is grounded in physical territory. Within the physical territory of given state, the state is free to do what it wishes and free from intervention of other states (Siltz 2009, pp.185). From the concept of territory, then, the concept of sovereignty was born where other states do not have rights to interfere other states's affairs. The concept of sovereignty is respected throughout history and violating it would mean violating the sanctity of sovereignty and ultimately, the territorial space of a state (Sempa 1990, pp.16-18).

Throughout history, the concept of territory has been very dynamic. The dynamic could be summarized by two words: deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Deterritorialization could simply be described as "spatial manifestations of contemporary changes under way in the relationship between social life and its territorial moorings" (Popescu, 2010). In the context of International Relations, deterritorialization means that the physical space's (territory) importance is reducing. What I mean by this is that people think "beyond" territory when talking about International Relations, i.e. International Relations is not bounded by territorial confinement. This proposition has been repeated time over time, especially after the end of Cold War, when people are talking about "End of History" (Fukuyama, 1989), "The World is Flat" (Friedman, 2005), or even "Borderless World" (Ceglowski, 1998). This optimism is exaggerated by the prospect of globalization, in which interaction between people will be easier. In the contemporary era, one takes deterritorialization as granted. An Indonesian could talk with an American thousands mile away with Korean-made device.

Besides technological advancement, it was also the change of economic and political nature that push deterritorialization. After the fall of Berlin Wall, world was pushed towards integration to prevent war from happening, such as the integration of many European states into European Union. Liberal theorist talks about economic integration and interdependence would prevent war from happening, and pushes for that agenda. Today, we see the world as connected as before with one change in one place could heavily affecting another faraway place. One would not dream to conquer another

territory for risk of damaging their economy. With this regard, it seems that economic integration changes the territorial-based economy into integrative one.

Another is political nature. Before the end of Cold War, politics is all about territory: who could conquer a territory and what would be gotten from that conquest. It was a state (a territorial entity) fighting another state (a territorial entity) for a territory. By this regard, one could see today on how much things have changed. What we see today is a state (a territorial entity) fighting non-state actor (could be territorial or non-territorial entity) for sometimes obscure reason. This is best shown by the advent of many terrorist groups and terrorist actions in the world. Terrorist groups are mostly not territorially-based, meaning that they do not possess certain territory or after any territorial-based goals. Usually their goal is political, not territorial, in which they will spread fear and uncertainties. In the times of state to state war, ordinary citizen knows that they are not likely to be target of the conflict or they will know that a state of war is commencing. This is different with the case of terrorism, in which people could be target of terrorist act instantly and without notice. Now, whoever could be attacked whenever (Sandler 2015, pp.1). The phenomenon of terrorist groups shows us the nature of security threat in the contemporary era. We are more likely to hear news about terrorist attacks rather than a state attacking other state. This makes people think that conflict is more likely done by non-territorial entity rather than territorial entity such as states.

The second is about reterritorialization. It is the opposite of deterritorialization in which territory is stated to become more important. This is clearly shown in last decade, in which narrative such as “return of geopolitics” could be found in many writings. Empirically, it is shown by states that try to assert their own territorial sovereignty, said to be lost by the advent of globalization. The Russian takeover of Crimea (Rojansky,2016) and the Hostility in South China Sea (Kaplan, 2011) are the most cited example by the supporter of the return of geopolitics narrative. In socio-economic perspective, the return of territory could be seen by the rise of populism in recent years. The narrative of populism is basically a reterritorialization: the suspicion of globalization and narrow nationalism as shown in western countries.

On the other hand, the security context of reterritorialization, the advent of terrorist groups, is taking interesting turn. There is tendency of contemporary terrorist

groups to hold a piece of territory and even challenging sovereignty of a respective state. This is shown by terrorist group ISIS that has shown anomaly, where they conquer territory and act like a government of the state that they control instead of creating fear and uncertainty as they usually do.

This dynamic shows us the importance of understanding territory and shows how territory is taken for granted in the study of International relations. From that background, it is then to importance more the concept of territory itself and its place in International Relations. To fully understand the concept of territory, I do literature review to know about the development of the concept of territory; from how they arise to what is the future of the concept. By doing intensive literature review, I found five main themes when talking about the development of concept of territory. The five themes are 1) the beginning of territory, 2) the beginning of geopolitics, 3) the critics on territory and geopolitics, 4) respond to the critics on territory and geopolitics, and 5) alternative non-territorial political entity. This article explores the five themes and then end with conclusion.

DISCUSSION

Main Themes of Conceptual Development of Theory in Internastional Relations

The beginning of territory

This part would speak the beginning of territory from two aspects, historical and cultural. By understanding those two aspects holistically, we could understand how politically neutral geographical space could be transformed into political space. From cultural aspects, it is interesting to see the effect of human on a physical space. One human activity would transform a physical space differently from another human activity in a given physical space.

From historical point of view, it should be understood that territory is the basic of all political activity, even the concept of territory itself is not as old as human history. At the beginning, the notion that a neutrally physical space could be politicized and occupied was unimaginable by hunter-gatherers. Before the arrival of the concept of territory, human lives in anarchy (in philosophical meaning). What it is meant by anarchy is that human lived an egalitarian life without much social stratification (Marshall 2009, pp.ix-xi). This, combined by the fact that no human life permanently in one area and keep moving from one area into one another as the consequence of hunter-gatherer lifestyle, makes attachment into a physical space unimaginable.

This is then changed drastically by the advent of the agricultural revolution, in which human shifted from being hunter-gatherers into food producers. One of the results of this revolution is that humankind find themselves having food surplus as the advantage of being a food producer. From this surplus, what is called “redistributive economy” arose, in which the surplus could be distributed to the non-food-producers, which in turn became the ruling class and starting social stratification (Diamond 1999, 125). Another consequence is that food production made it is very hard for human to live a nomadic life because they need to tend their surroundings and there is no guarantee to find another fertile surroundings. The ruling class then used the surplus from their food producing society to fund big projects like irrigation to building armed forces. Foundation of armed forces is one of the most important innovation in the development of territory. As the basic meaning of territory is simply “physical space occupied with violence” (Lunstrum 2009, pp.884-885), the creation of armed forces then led the ruling class to monopolize violence and ultimately changing a neutral physical space into politicized space. The combination of sedentary life, social stratification, and monopolization of violence led to the founding of “proto-state” such as the one we could find in feudalism. The concept of territory is the further reinforced in Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. As one of the most central treaty in human history, the Treaty of Westphalia established another important concept regarding territory: sovereignty. With Treaty of Westphalia, a state now could not easily interfere with another state’s affairs with violation of state’s sovereignty is a serious problem in contemporary International Relations.

Relating cultural aspect, how a neutral political space be transformed into political space called territory is very heavily affected by the culture of humans living of that space. To understand this more clearly, the Germanic concept of cultural landscape/ *Kulturalandschaft* (Potthof, 2013, pp.50) should be taken into account. According to this concept, there are three ways how culture could redefine territory, 1) landscape as veil, or how territory represents power, 2) landscape as text, how territory reproduce power, and 3) landscape as masculine gaze, or how territory represents the people living on it. Landscape as veil is basically how the bigger the territory is, the more power or prestige the territory has. The power is of course based by the human living in that territory. On the other hand, landscape as a text talks about how territory reproduces power. This is

heavily based from the discourse about a territory by the human living on it. One of the examples is the United States of America, in which United States of America is called as “new world” which is different as “old world”. This is of course represents how the territory of the United States of America reproduces power. The third, landscape as masculine gaze, is shown clearly by the example of The United States of America which the vastness of the territory represents its people who loves freedom and individualism.

The Beginning of Geopolitics

The logical consequence of politicization of physical space is how the physical space relates to political activity. There is no single, clear definition on geopolitics. James Sidaway (2001, pp.225-234), for example, says that the definition of geopolitics itself would change if order (*gestalt*) is changed. For that reason, the definition of geopolitics that will be used is “international politics that is affected by geographical factors” (Sidaway 2001, pp.225-234), (Gottman 1951, pp.153-154).

How geography affects international politics is not new, as writer from Sun Tzu into Clausewitz have talked about the importance of geographical feature in war. After the Napoleonic war, Europe had their own geopolitical arrangement, called Concert of Europe. This arrangement would prevent any big countries to dominating Europe (Nye 2007, pp. 67-68). In this era, the fear of geopolitical domination of a country such as Germany (Behr, 2011) that is blessed by having resource-rich territory is still persistent, as shown by one of the goals of European Union is to contain Germany.

Beyond empirical aspect, geopolitics is also explored academically. In International Relations, it should be understood that there are three assumption regarding role of geography). First, it should be understood that territory has socio-historic context. Second, territory affects, not deciding, the success of a state. The third assumption is that there is also critical geopolitics which ask what actually a territory “represents”.

From that assumption, it should be known that territory is combination of two aspects (Gottman 1951, pp.153-154), social (role of human) and static (the space itself). In social aspect, it should be understood that everyone has different view about a geographical space (perception of space). For example, people who live in cold climate would have different perception of space compared to people who live in hot climate.

There are two contribution of geopolitics to a state. First is nationalism. Because every state defines its territory and has monopoly on violence, a state could say that its own territory is unique. Second is order, because territory gives different power to state,

in which there will be strong and weak state. There are basically four factors when talking about how geography affects International Relations (Hussein Alatas, 1977). First is distribution of land and sea. Basically, state that is more centered on sea (maritime) would have different outlook with state centered on land (continental). Secondly is topographical, for example, it is explained that people who lived in mountains have tendency to create an authoritarian government because of its concentration of people. Third, is hydrographic network on how water source could be source of conflict between countries.

When talking about three influential thinkers on geopolitics, at least there are three thinkers: Halford Mackinder, Alfred Mahan, and Friedrich Ratzel. Halford Mackinder's thinking is one of the most influential in the age of colonialism, in which he divided the world into two parts, heartland and world islands (Mackinder 2017, pp. 150). Heartland is region consisting European countries ranging from Spain to Russia. On the other hand, world island is the rest of the world which are very rich in natural resources. Mackinder perfectly captured this by saying "whoever rules heartland would rule Eastern Europe, and whoever rules world island would rule the world". At the time of writing, Mackinder advocated the conquest of Russia because Russia is the contender with the rest of the heartland. Many governments followed Mackinder advice, for example the British government fought for influence with Russia in Central Asia, in a process called the Great Game (Foreign Affairs, 1980).

Another thinker is Alfred Mahan and Friedrich Ratzel. Mahan advocates for the development of strong navy to break through geographical isolation of a country. By having a strong navy, a geographically isolated country could have trade with other countries in the world (Mahan 1987, pp.100). On the other hand, Friedrich Ratzel talked about *raum* (space) (Abrahamsson 2013), pp.37-39). Ratzel likened territory with human, who needs more space as it grows. Ratzel's thought is then used by Nazi to justify its conquest of other countries in the name of *lebensraum* (living space).

Critics on the Concept of Territory and Geopolitics

One of the most enduring things about concept of territory and geopolitics is its critics from many aspects. The word that is used time and time is deterritorialization, in

which territory is seen as no more important in International Relations. One of the most cited argument for deterritorialization is technological advancement, especially information and communication technology. The other argument is from academic thinking, who thinks that the concept of territory itself is very state-centered and not human-centered. As the result, state security, which is linked to state territory, negates the security of people living inside the territory. As the result, in this part, in addition to talk about critics of territory and geopolitics from technological and academic aspects, I would also talk about critical thinking on territory and geopolitics.

First is from technological aspect. How could technological advancement lead into deterritorialization? The answer for the question is very simple, it is about speed. With increase in technological advancement, so do with speed. In the context of territory, technological advancement decreases the effect of space itself; a very far place could now be travelled at faster rate (Virilio 1995, pp.329-330). Consider for example, the crossing of Atlantic Ocean. When human still using sailing ships, it would take about two months to go from London to New York. With steam engines, the travelling times was reduced into fifteen days. The advent of airplanes in military conflict, probably, presented one of the factors that led into deterritorialization. With airplanes, territory does not act as barrier. Before, civilian could feel safe at war, mainly because war is fought far away from home. With airplanes, that safety net disappears, as hostile airplane could penetrate an enemy territory and then drop bombs to the civilian. In the contemporary era, what happens is war maybe does not need to take place in physical space at all, as shown by cyberwarfare.

Another consequences of technological advancement in deterritorialization is terrorism. Terrorism takes place wherever, whenever, and whoever could be the perpetrator or the victim of terrorism (Gagne, 2016). Moreover, with technological advancement, everyone now can learn the basic of terrorism and do the act by him/herself. This fact then leads to the rise of lone wolf terrorism (Gagne, 2016) with single perpetrator and no clear goals. Because terrorism is unpredictable and happens inside a state, it could be said that terrorism “takes” the concept of monopolization of violence from the state as the state could not give preventive measure from terrorism. This, then lead to critics that territory-based state could not longer be counted on to give safety— one of the fundamental function of the state—to its citizens.

From theoretical aspects, basically there are four factors from the state that is affected by deterritorialization (Gilley 2009, pp.499). First is sovereignty, second is

borders, third is integration, and fourth is security. In the context of sovereignty, deterritorialization clearly affects state's sovereignty, because now state has to compete with another actor such as terrorist groups. Regarding border and integration, previously, state is able to integrate its citizens to live as what the states want. Because today's world is more and more connected, it is harder for state to incorporate what it wants to its citizens. The Cold War, for example, ends because communist countries could not prevent the idea of democracy to spread among its citizens.

From critical point of view, critics asked whether the states really "represents" the people living in its territory. For example, the EZLN (Ejercito Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional), a Marxist organization that operates in Mexico, declares that the Mexican government does not represents the people living in a territory called Mexico. To achieve that, EZLN is involved in many armed rebellions throughout Mexico. If this rebellion succeeded, then it is possible that a state could lost its legitimacy and replaced by non-state actors (Watson 2001, pp.95). Moreover, the concept of territory and geopolitics itself is criticized time over time because its association with Western hegemony and imperialism (Sidaway 2001, pp.86). In the era of Cold War, war would happen to keep some "geopolitical interest" of many countries such as shown in Vietnam War which is geopolitical interest between United States and Soviet Union.

As the result, it is very understandable to read the critics of territory and geopolitics. Technological advancement, rise of non-state actors, and critical interpretation really affect the concept of territory and geopolitics. Based on this thinking, we shall now see the respond of the critics of the concept of territory and geopolitics.

Respond to The Critics Concept of Territory and Geopolitics

If in the previous chapter the critics of the concept of territory and geopolitics has been explored. In this chapter I will explore the respond of those critics. To have better understanding about the respond, in this chapter I will divide the respond into two parts, theoretical-academic respond and empirical proof as a respond to the critics of concept of territory and geopolitics.

First is theoretical-academic respond to the critics of concept of territory and geopolitics. One of the most commonly cited as the proof of how territorial state fails is

terrorism, because terrorism does not operate in territorial logic. This is then changed by contemporary terrorism such as ISIS, which clearly show territorial and territorial-based state logics. Terrorist groups with territorial logic, besides conquering a territory such as shown by ISIS, will also have distinct pattern of attack. Terrorist groups who operate with territorial logic will take advantage of a weak government in a state. In a state with weak government, terrorist groups will concentrate it attack in government building as opposed to attacking sporadically. The logic is that attacking government building is a symbol of “weak government” and that the terrorist group is going to oppose or even replace the weak government. Moreover, the attack is likely to be repeated instead of only attacking once in order to reinforcing the images that the government that they are attacking is weak. That is the territorial and territorial-based state logic that is used by current violent non-state actors, there are tendencies to replace the government and to conquer territory as opposed to sporadic and not really obvious goals of previous terrorist groups.

The other example of violent non-state actors acting with territorial logic is separatist and insurgency groups. Albeit similar, those two actors have very different goals (Bulhaug 2002, pp.418-419). Separatist’s goal is to separate its territory from a respective state while insurgent’s goal is usually replacing the government in a respective state. As a result, those two non-state actors have very different territorial logic. Separatist groups tend to set it base far from the state’s capital in order to be undetectable by the government and to escape to other state if government troops attack them. On the other hand, insurgent groups will likely to stay near the capital to attack the capital and removing the government.

The territorial logic of non-state actor is also shown by the natural resource distribution in a given territory. in this context, natural resource distribution could be differentiated in two groups: lootable and non-lootable resources goals (Bulhaug 2002, pp.419-420). Lootable resources such as diamonds and golds are used mostly by insurgent groups because they are easy to be extracted and does not required special skills to extract it. On the other hands, non-lootable resources such as oil fields are mostly used by separatist groups. Non-lootable resources also promotes separatist groups because non-lootable resources will attract foreign states into the conflict.

International institutions such as IMF and UN is said to erode territorial-based state’s sovereignty from above because of its power to impose its will to states. Critics say that these international institutions are what makes territory no longer important. Contrary to this belief, what really happen is that international institutions are

reconfiguring the global order. Instead of deterritorialization, what happen is reterritorialization by international institutions. Not only reterritorialization, what happen is suprateritorialization (Elden 2005, pp.10), in which an institution from geographically far state, exerts it power and will to a territorially-based state.

As a result, it could be said that what happen is reconfiguration, not deterritorialization. The process of deterritorialization is a logical consequences of the reconfiguration that is happening in contemporary world.

In empirical context, the technological advancement that happens is of course used as the argument for deterritorialization. It is often forgotten that technological advancement, like the argument about international institution, reinforces territory instead of diminishing it. Consider the example of rule of airplane and railway in wars. Yes, of course they reduce the time needed to travel in a geographical distance but in the same time they reinforce the concept of territory itself. By reducing travel time in a geographical space, train and airplane make it easier to *conquer* a territory. This is perfectly captured by philosopher Paul Virilio who says that airplane is responsible for territorial expansion while railway is responsible for securing a taken territory (Virilio 2001, 329-338).

One of the most controversial contemporary issue in war is human terrain project by U.S. Armed Forces. It involves anthropologist who will analyze and taking data of human in a warzone in order to provide data to the armed forces. This phenomenon clearly shows that technology is not simply diminish the importance of territory, but reinforces the importance of territory. Technological advancement allows anthropologist to gather and to provide data to the armed forces about territorial context in where they are working (Kassel, 2015).

Other empirical proof about the reinforcement of territory is about the narrative of Clash of Civilization by Samuel Huntington. Huntington says that after Cold War, conflict would happen between different cultures. The implication of conflict between culture is the melting of territorial boundaries, as culture itself is not bounded by physical space; an Indonesian could live in United States or a Brazilian could live in Japan. The conflict, based on this premises, should be everywhere, as shown by initial stage of post-Cold War terrorism in which terrorism does not know any boundaries and can happen

everywhere. What happened was contrary to that premises: the primordial conflict still confined in a bounded territory such as Middle East, South Asia, or Eastern Europe. As have been shown by the First World War, where there were a geopolitical alliance such as Axis and Entente, contemporary world also shown geopolitical alliance such as Axis of Evil which consists of Iraq, Afghanistan, and North Korea. The invasion of Iraq ultimately shown how intra-state conflict still exists, in which a territory-based state is fighting another territory-based state.

The importance of geography in a state is also still an issue for some countries, especially Russia (Marshall 2016, pp.ix). Being a relatively flat in western side that faces Europe, Russia is very insecure about its European neighbor as Russia could be invaded easily—as shown in First and Second World War. In 2013, when Ukraine had talks about joining NATO, Russia seemed realize its insecurity and as result, invades Crimea. This is basically a kill two-birds-with-one-stone policy. At one time, Russia is solving its insecurity of invasion from the West while at the same time, Russia as a very cold country, secures a port that is not frozen all the year, Sevastopol.

As a result, whether theoretical or empirical, there are arguments about reinforcement of the concept of territory and geopolitics. From this discussion, then, it should be discussed about the final form of development of concept of territory, which is not based on physical space.

Alternative Political Entity

In this theme, I would talk about political entity that is not based by physical space, called non-territorial political community.

The first is what is called post-territorial political community. What is a post-territorial political community? Post-territorial political community is the respond from the inability of traditional states to address important issues. They are not based on physical space but are not bounded by territory. What does, therefore, differentiates them with the non-state actors that I have previously discussed? To put it simply, there are several characteristics of post-territorial political community (Chandler 2007, pp.116). First, post-territorial political community is there is no specific place where the community is based. Mostly, Non-territorial political community is very informal, even exceeding the informalities of traditional non-state actors. If traditional non-state actors still have obvious identity such as name, institution, vision and mission, non-territorial

political community does not have that. Usually, post-territorial political community is based on internet, with people do not have to join the movement

The second characteristics of non-territorial political community is individualizing political movement. If previously any political movement compels people to join the movement, now it does not need people to join it at all. Demonstration against an issue, for example, does not compel people to join the movement at all. Basically, the second characteristic means that “everyone can be activists”. The third characteristics is that because there is no single, obvious goal, the differences, not the unity, is what emphasized. Inter-non-territorial political community relations is strengthened by the difference of goals, not the similarity of it. Fourth and the last characteristics is that the issue that is advocated by non-territorial political community is emotional instead of intellectual. Because the issue is often emotional, a non-territorial political community disappears after achieving its emotional goals. Non-territorial political community does not have an obvious goal but rather their goal is raising awareness into an issue they are advocating—even with no concrete result.

For clearer example, the terrorist group Al-Qaeda could be used (Chandler 2007, pp.117-118). What Al-Qaeda doing is not direct terrorism; it is very seldom that they attack directly into a target. What they are doing, instead, is being mediator for a terrorist act. For example, when a terrorist attack happens, Al-Qaeda says that they are “responsible for it” even though they are not the perpetrator. Individuals who will commits terrorist act is gathered under Al-Qaeda name after their act “succeed” even though these individuals are not member of Al-Qaeda. Basically, it could be said, that AL-Qaeda is “globalizing individual jihad” by taking responsibility of many single, unrelated act of terrorism, under its banner.

CONCLUSION

As have been stated before, there are five main themes when we are talking about the development of the concept of territory in International Relations. After reading this article, maybe readers will wonder why my choices of themes is quite arbitrary. In fact, it is not easy to capture the literature regarding whole development of the concept of

territory in International Relations. To answer this question, let us now reiterate the themes one by one.

First, regarding the beginning of territory, it is very important to understanding the history of territory itself. In International Relations, there is tendency to take territory for granted, as if territory is something natural upon human society. Actually, it isn't. As the basic definition of territory is "space occupied by violence", it needs violence to transform space into a territory. In history, "violence" is always connected into "monopoly of violence" which is owned by the state while the state itself is the logical consequences of agricultural revolution. The second theme, about the beginning of geopolitics, is also important because geopolitics is basically how a politics regarding to a state's territory. Geopolitics really affects a state behavior and especially its own foreign policy. As a result, the link between the first and second theme is the beginning of territory and then its consequences, geopolitics.

The third theme and fourth theme are related to each other. The critics of the concept of territory and geopolitics is important to make us realize that what is called territory is not natural and a socio-political construct. Moreover, the critics allow us to realize how a traditional territorial-based states face the contemporary world condition. The critics is then responded by the respond of the critics, by saying argument about how territorial-based states is and will be relevant despite advancement in many sectors. The last theme, about non-territorial political community, shows us the alternative for territorial-based states. While the traditional territorial-based states derive its power from top to bottom (from government to people), the non-territorial political community is very individualized and relying from participation of its citizens (from bottom to top).

As a result, it is clear about the justification of the choosing of the themes. The first and second themes is about the past, how territory and geopolitics arose. The third and fourth part is the contestation between deterritorialization and reterritorialization in contemporary world. The last theme is for the future, in which the alternative of territorial-based states is discussed.

What is needed to be explored more, then, is the literature of many forms of territorial-based political entity. In the past, there are a lot of form of territorial-based political entity, from chiefdoms, suzerainty, and tributary states. The theme is not really explored to describe more about the development of territory and state itself, as state is ultimately the final stage of evolution from those many territorial-based political entity that I have mentioned above (Diamond 1999, pp.125).

Lastly, the concept of territory itself needs to be broadened. The notion of territory as only physical space faces the concept of non-physical space such as the internet. What is interesting is that many countries are trying to “territorializing” this non-physical space. Take example of China, in which its cyber space has been “territorialized” and then heavily guarded and patrolled. The Great Firewall of China, as it is known, is very hard to penetrate even tech giants like Google is having difficulties. As a result, the notion of territorialized non-physical space needs to be explored more.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamsson, C. (2013). On the Genealogy of Lebensraum. *Geographica Helvetica*. 68. 37-44
- Behr, Hartmut (2007). Political Territoriality and De-Territorialization. *Area*. 39. 112-115.
- Bulhaug, Halvard, *et al.* (2005). Geography, Strategic Ambition and the Duration of Civil Conflict. Presented in *Conference of Mapping the Complexity of Civil Wars International Conference Center for The Study of Civil War*. Zurich, Swiss. September 2005
- Ceglowski, Janet. (1998). Has Globalization Created a Borderless World?. *Business Review*.
- Chandler, David. (2007). The Possibilities of Post-Territorial Community. *Area*, 39, 116-119
- D. Kaplan, Robert. (2011). The South China Sea is the Future of Conflict. *National Interest*. Retrieved from <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/08/15/thesouth-china-sea-is-the-future-of-conflict/>.
- Diamond, J. (1999). *Guns, Germs, Steel*. New York, New York:W.W.Norton.
- Friedman, Thomas L. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York, New York:Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, Francis. (1989). The End of History. *The National Interest*.
- Gagne, Andre. (2018). Global Terrorism: A New Age of Unpredictability. *Opencanada.org*. Retrieved from <https://www.opencanada.org/features/globalterrorism-new-age-unpredictability/>.

- Gilley, Bruce. (2009). The Meaning and Measure of State Legitimacy: Result for 72 Countries. *European Journal of Political Research*. 45. 499-525.
- Gottman, Jean. (1951). Geography and International Relations. *World Politics*. 3.153-154.
- Kassel, Whitney. (2015). The Army Needs Anthropologists. *Foreign Policy*.
retrieved from <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/07/28/the-army-needsanthropologists-iraq-afghanistan-human-terrain/>
- Lunstrum, Elizabeth. (2009). Terror. Territory. and Deterritorialization: Landscapes of Terror and the Unmaking of State Power in Mozambican ‘Civil’ War”. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 99. 884-892
- Mackinder, Harfold. (2017). Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction. London: Forgotten Books.
- Marshall, Peter. (2008). Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism. London, United Kingdom: Harper Perennial.,
- Marshall, Tim. (2016). Prisoners of Geography: Ten Maps that Tell You to Know About Global Politics. London, United Kingdom: Elliott and Thompson Limited.
- Pospecu, Gabriel. (2010). Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization. In Barney Wharf (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Geography*. SAGE Knowledge.
- Potthof, Kerstin. (2013). The Use of ‘Cultural Landscape’ in 19th Century German Geopolitical Literature. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* 67. 49-54.
- Rojansky, Matthew. (2017). The Ukraine-Russia Conflict: A Way Forward. *National Interest*. Retrieved from <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-ukrainerussia-conflict-way-forward-19282>.
- S. Nye, Jr, Joseph. (2007). Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History *6th Ed*. New York, New York: Longman Classics.
- Sandler, Todd. (2015). Terrorism and Counterterrorism: An Overview. *Oxford Economics Paper*.
- Sempa, Francis. (1990). Why Teach Geopolitics?”. *International Social Science Review*. 65. 16-18.
- Sidaway, James. (2001). Geopolitics: Twentieth Century Spectre. *Geography* .86. 225-234
- Siltz, Anna. (2009). Why Do States has Territorial Rights?. *International Theory* 1. 185-213.

- Syed Hussein Alatas. (2013). *The Myth of Lazy Native: A Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos, and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th Century and Its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- T. Mahan, Alfred. (1987). *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History. 1660-1783*. Dover, New York: Dover Publications.
- The Great Game in Asia. (1980). *Foreign Affairs*.
- Virilio, Paul. (2001). My Kingdom for a Horse: The Revolutions of Speed. Interview by Jean De Loisy, Patrick Javault. *Queens Quarterly*. 329-339.
- Watsons, Iain. (2001). Rethinking Strategy and Geopolitics: Critical Responses to Globalization. *Geopolitics*. 6. 87-116.