



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Political territoriality in the European Union : the changing boundaries of security and healthcare

Vollaard, J.P.

Citation

Vollaard, J. P. (2009, June 11). *Political territoriality in the European Union : the changing boundaries of security and healthcare*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13883>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13883>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 4

Explaining changing political territoriality in the European Union

*Just as closure and structuring are linked theoretically,
so are exit and destructuring.
This, then, is the nucleus of a theory of boundary-building and
political structuring and exit-options and political destructuring.*
Stefano Bartolini¹

4.1 The improbability of France

From a historical perspective, it is a small wonder that France exists. The Polish-Lithuanian Empire, swallowed by its neighbours, or the Holy Roman Empire, a diverse collection of small interdependent territories seem a more likely fate for the present republic *une et indivisible*. The attempts to create a dominant Kingdom of France from a power centre at the Ile-de-France often failed. Supported by other power centres, peripheral Catalonia and Flanders could escape from the control of the King of France. During the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) other peripheral areas (at least from the Parisian perspective) like Guyenne and Brittany, and later Normandy and Navarre also tried to shake off Parisian dominance. Competition on the title of the King of France and its legal, political and tax entitlements allowed regional magnates and Flemish cities to switch loyalties to their own advantage. The competition from Burgundy's princes seemed to overwhelm the French King in the 14th and 15th century. Linguistic variations and the legal patchwork in the French areas indicated the enduring strength of localism and provincialism. The 16th century Wars of Religion between Protestant and Catholic magnates, in addition to German, Spanish and English interference, made the birth of an undivided and centralised France of its present size even more unlikely. Attempts to centralise taxation, linguistic and legal diversity proved once more a fertile ground for fragmentation in a continuous series of revolts, such as the 17th century Wars of

the Fronde. Only in the 19th and 20th century did peripheral Savoy and Alsace-Lorraine come under permanent Parisian control, while say over Corsica remains problematic until today. Switzerland and the Rhineland eventually remained outside its reach.

Considering the various histories of the areas today collectively called France, it is no surprise that the historian Samuel Finer concludes:

...many state boundaries are both factitious and adventitious. Some states are historic anomalies (...). In other cases, the boundaries are – or were – factitious. This is notably true of France: indeed territorially speaking, France is quite *improbable*.²

Moreover, Paris rather accidentally became the power centre of France, instead of Tournai, Lyon, Aachen, or Laon. The Parisian power centre originated in the tenth century from the dominance of the Counts of Paris, the Capet family, and the effective use of their royal title.

Notwithstanding the improbability of France and its borders, France is often cited as the classic example of the state. How did Paris manage to integrate into and maintain the *hexagone* eventually, and how did Paris use territory as a means of control to end up with a polity later to be called state? A selective reading of the various histories of the areas today collectively called France follows in section 4.2 to show the improbabilities of territorial integration. Section 4.3 presents theoretical lessons drawn from the French example to analyse changing political territoriality in the European Union. Section 4.4 focuses on the problems of territorial fixity in present-day theories in political science. Stein Rokkan offers a theoretical framework to explain changing political territoriality embedded in processes of polity-(re)formation, while avoiding the problems discussed in the previous sections (see sections 4.5 to 4.8). This is in preparation for Chapter 5 which provides a Rokkanian re-interpretation of European integration and discusses the potential disintegration of the European Union.

¹ Bartolini, S. (2005), *Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building and Political Structuring between the Nation-State and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 53.

² Finer, S. (1974), 'State-building, State Boundaries and Border Control: An Essay on Certain Aspects of the First Phase of State-Building in Western Europe considered in the Light of the Rokkan-Hirschman Model', in *Social Science Information*. Vol. 13, no. 4/5, p. 96; emphasis in the original.

4.2 French history of territorial integration

The use of territorial borders was not uncommon in the histories of the areas today collectively called France. The loosely bounded territories in the Roman Empire survived in counties and dioceses for quite a while. The division of Charlemagne's empire by the Treaty of Verdun (843) took administrators years to delineate on the ground the West-Frankish part from the Lotharingian and East-Frankish parts. Authority was understood as bundles of rights and privileges that were related to different territories and groups. Officially lend by God and his earthly deputies, the conditionality of (land) property determined this idea of the bundles of rights. Strategies of control and cohesion were the person-based allegiances between lords and vassals, between merchants, and between men and God based on Christian values, laws and norms, knightly honour, noble privileges, clerical administration, guild regulations, mediaeval merchant laws, regional customs, and local kinship traditions. Geographical areas could be sold, exchanged and partitioned among the various dynasties. The King of Franks had only direct access to resources in Ile-de-France, while his say was scattered across the West-Frankish areas like ink blobs on paper. In the territories, several lords could hold different rights (conditionally). This geographical non-contiguity and incongruence was the consequence of person-based authority relationships.

The person-based allegiances to lend and protect the rights over lands obtained however an increasingly contract-like nature. Jurisdiction and bureaucracy became subsequently linked with those land-based contracts, and thus geographically delineated, resulting in the territorialisation of political space.³ The maintenance of hereditary feudal domains by certain families also fostered a sense of geographical fixity and impersonality, because the jurisdiction could be differentiated from the individuals holding it in those territorial principalities.⁴ Already in the 11th century this kind of territorialisation was widespread throughout Western Europe. Although basic ideas of authority and property were still person-based and conditional, this local territorialisation gave birth to the notion of territory-based authority. Customs duties were increasingly levied at borders as early as the 13th century. The need for land-bound resources such as food for the (growing) European population may have increased the political value of territorial control, at least locally. Moreover, the

³ Dodgshon, R.A. (1998), *Society in Time and Space: A Geographical Perspective on Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 62.

notion of the absolute hold of territory emerged from studies of Roman law, particularly in Roman cities. However, application at the larger scale remained to be seen at that time.

Fusing a stronger territorial element into his (hereditary) authority claims, the Paris-based King of the Franks changed his title into King of France in the Capetian period. Collecting royal rights (so-called regalia), he seized the right to appeal to the Crown, the right to defend appellants against vassals, the right to maintain peace and wage war, and to arbitrate in conflicts in his jurisdiction. Later on, the King of France also declared himself as Emperor of his kingdom. With that title he became the universal defender of the Christian faith within the West-Frankish territories instead of the Holy Roman Emperor. This also meant that rulers had to swear allegiance to him instead of the Holy Roman Emperor seated in the Germanic area. These formal authority claims meant that the King of France could more effectively uphold authority in the West-Frankish territories. Nevertheless, the King faced strong competition to his rule in the 12th and 13th century, even though King Philip II (1180-1123) effectively showed his state-building power in warfare and made the first steps towards imposing taxes on the entire kingdom.

The Hundred Years' War lead to an increase in provincial nationalism demanding more say for local magnates in matters of taxation and the use of force.⁵ Local magnates could fairly easily withdraw from the actual power of the Paris-based King of France, as the many revolts against him exemplify. However, the Habsburg family, German princes, and the King of England had bad luck in marriages or mismanaged their tax collections. As a result, they were less able to claim authority by tradition or use force in the West-Frankish areas, allowing the Paris-based King of France to fight back. Eventually, the military forces and administrations of local magnates ('internal' competitive centres from the Parisian perspective) were slowly fused into the royal framework by increasingly making the nobility royal functionaries. Clientelism to the King gradually enhanced the central grip on the proprietorship, command and recruitment of the army. King Henry IV (1553-1610) and Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642) both demolished the fortresses of 'internal' competitors, introduced forces and made (initially ad hoc) tax intendants directly subordinate to the central government

⁴ Idem, p. 87.

⁵ Finer, S. (1974), *supra* note 2, p. 106.

instead of the local magnates. They also asked for maps to distribute garrisons and forts across the French territories to help maintain control.⁶

Marshal Sébastien Le Prestre de Vauban (1633-1707) is celebrated in particular as one of the political engineers who helped meld the French territories together. The relatively open borders at its eastern and northern edge required strong efforts to prevent internal competitors from seeking external support. In addition to demolishing many more fortresses of local magnates, he also constructed a line of defence at the open boundaries north, east, south and west of the French royal realm.⁷ Vauban's line of defence helped to territorialize France. Next to the invention of land maps, the idea of natural frontiers emerged in the 16th century. The frontiers of Gaul in Caesar's time, the Pyrenees, Alps, Rhine and seas, were used to justify internal control by the French king, as well as the expansion of the French king's influence say to the Rhine. His administrative staff also suggested the Rhine as natural frontier to stop kings acquiring more territory and overstretch the military capacity of the French army.⁸

The geography of the British Isles allowed the course of England to develop in different direction, since the surrounding seas functioned as buffer to outside interventions. English Kings could therefore gamble and rely predominantly on maritime forces for defence and control. Rulers in the French areas were forced to maintain much larger and more expensive land armies requiring more taxation and the ensuing administrative and control arrangements.⁹ In contrast to those in French areas, internal competitors in the British Isles had fewer opportunities to escape from London's power, and fewer outsiders to provide support for their escape. As a consequence, the political agenda of the British Isles is much more marked by disagreements with the Scottish, Welsh, Irish, parliamentarian and lords' claims for more say in British politics or in their own areas. Whereas French kings faced the continuous threat of regional magnates escaping from the French political system, English kings 'only' struggled with regional powers about their say within the English political system. Samuel Finer therefore stated that French historiography "is obsessed by

⁶ Escolar, M. (2003), 'Exploration, Cartography and the Modernization of State Power', in N. Brenner et al. (eds.), *State/Space: A Reader*. Malden (MA): Blackwell. p. 34.

⁷ Gottmann, J. (1944), 'Vauban and Modern Geography', in *The Geographical Review*. Vol. XXXIV, no. 1, pp. 120-128; Hebbert, F.J. & Rothrock, G.A. (1990), *Soldier of France: Sebastien Le Prestre de Vauban 1633-1707*. New York: Peter Lang.

⁸ Finer, S. (1974), *supra* note 2, p. 96.

⁹ Idem, p. 114.

the demon of exit” from the power centre, while the English one is marked “by the angel of voice.”¹⁰

Whereas water functioned as a (not always effective) defensive buffer for the British Isles, it was also significant for polity-formation in Europe in another respect. Water provided for a long time the most efficient infrastructure, which is required for taxation, administration and control. The accuracy of ancient maps of coastal waters indicate this. Polities like the Roman Empire, the Nordic Union, Venice, Denmark, and the Seven United Provinces emerged around water. The Danish political scientist Gorm Harste once quipped that instead of focusing on territories as the basis of state formation in European history, it would be more apt to concentrate on “water-tories” in this respect. In contrast to those seaborne polities, the French and other continental areas had to wait for the introduction of railroads in the nineteenth century before their infrastructure would be more efficient. Even though the development of accurate land maps in the sixteenth century facilitated an efficient system of supply stations for French troops, it is still said that Napoleon could barely travel faster on land than Caesar did.¹¹

Marshal de Vauban proposed to map precisely the Paris-controlled territories and enlist its inhabitants. Such a map not only provided an effective basis to levy taxes (similar to the English Domesday Book), but also to envision France as united entity ruled from a centre in Paris.¹² Particularly because of the printing press, this geographical image of France could be multiplied and copied. The Versailles garden symbolised for example the disciplinary hold of the French king on its areas. According to Vauban, a clearly demarcated and carefully mapped territory would also be the strategy to provide security for and generate wealth from the diversity of French peoples and regions. Maps thus no longer functioned to depict the power and glory of princes and kings or regional peculiarities, but rather as a pragmatic instrument “to plan and manage [...] centralized development policy.”¹³ In the late 17th century the introduction of a poll tax was adopted based on Vauban’s ideas. The economist Antoine de Montchrétien (1576-1621) did already plea before Vauban for more internal trade and migration of labour to slash out economic inequalities within the

¹⁰ Idem, p. 115.

¹¹ Jönsson, C., Tägil, S. & Törnqvist, G. (2000), *Organizing European Space*. London: Sage. p.179.

¹² Gottmann, J. (1973), *The Significance of Territory*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

French territory, and foster French international competitiveness.¹⁴ Minister Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683) politically pursued this mercantilist agenda, bundling an economic and a political system into a single territorial container.¹⁵ Paris-based ministers attempted to reform the formerly regional economies to a French-national level, while the territorial organisation of taxation and administration turned lands into provinces. It does not come as much of a surprise that French minister of finance Anne-Jacques-Robert Turgot (1727-1781) coined the concept of political geography, using statistical inventories and geographical information to levy taxes.

Thus, bundling territorialities became gradually more meaningful in the 16th century, even though serious border control had only started at that time and was not fully established until much later.¹⁶ The Treaties of Westphalia (1648) should therefore not be seen as the establishment of the ideal type state. Instead, they arranged the rights of Calvinists, Lutheran and Catholic princes and cities within the Holy Roman Empire, and once more sanctioned the independence of the Dutch and Swiss complex political conglomerates. The territorial sovereignty of unitary states was neither a guiding idea nor an immediate outcome of 'Westphalia'.¹⁷ Westphalia was rather a geographic stalemate of the post-Reformation clashes between Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism. Westphalia replaced the Augsburg Treaty formula (1555), which allowed regional princes to determine the religion of his principality. Westphalia froze the established geographical pattern of religion, while guaranteeing some protection of minority faiths. Regional entities held the *ius territorialis*, but within the jurisdiction of the Holy Roman Empire, administrated and arbitrated by the Emperor, diet and imperial courts.¹⁸ Swedish, Danish and also English

¹³ Escobar, M. (2003), *supra* note 6, p. 42.

¹⁴ Gottmann, J. (1973), *supra* note 12, p. 61.

¹⁵ Taylor, P.J. (1994), 'The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World-System', in *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 151-162.

¹⁶ Finer, (1974), *supra* note 2, p. 95; Sahlin, P. (1989), *Boundaries: the Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

¹⁷ Teschke, B. (2003), *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations*. London/New York: Verso; Osander, A. (2001), 'Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth', in *International Organization*, Vol. 55, pp. 251-287.

¹⁸ Axtmann, R. (2003), 'State Formation and Supranationalism in Europe: The Case of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation', in M. Berezin & H. Schain (eds.), *Europe without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship and Identity in a Transnational Age*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press. pp. 118-139.

rulers held territories in the Holy Roman Empire and therefore seats in the Diet, indicating a lack of geographical mutual exclusivity.

Subsequent treaties arranged the stalemate between dynasties rather than states and this would mark European politics until the 19th century.¹⁹ Geopolitical accumulation was still pursued by the various dynasties for their personal grandeur or imperial interests, since territorial gains are rather easily to communicate. The Polish-Lithuanian, Habsburg, Prussian, Russian, Ottoman and later the Soviet Empire also pursued non-Westphalian strategies to maintain internal cohesion and external consolidation. Next to an endless list of treaties, the rivalries of dynastic and imperial territorialities led in certain cases to “liquidatory equilibrium”, as the partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Empire exemplified.²⁰ The increasing territorial expression of the scope of power enhanced fixed images of what areas should belong to kings and emperors. Thus, their rivalries obtained a zero-sum nature, as the partitioning of rights and privileges over people and territories became less and less of an option. Locked in a territorial stalemate on the European continent, kings and emperors used imperialism to spread their way out across the world. Castilian kings stood at the fronts of their Christian civilisation in Andalusia and later in the Americas, while economic imperialism was pursued by the Dutch and the British in the Americas, Africa and Asia. Because they were locked in a territorial stalemate in Europe, kings and emperors also sought other means to sustain the flow of income to Europe following Vauban-like mercantilist ideas. Kings and emperors were thus forced to care about their territories and subjects to increase their income. Particularly in England, parliamentary representatives of these territories and their subjects became involved in the politics of war and conquest, which had until then been the exclusive domain of kings, emperors and other nobility. These representatives diverted the focus of decision-making to their interests, increasingly hampering attempts by the English kings to seek geopolitical accumulation on the European continent.²¹

Meanwhile, the representatives in France of the common people had barely the opportunity to escape from Paris’ power, while the French king, the local magnates and the Catholic Church prevented them from voicing their

¹⁹ Teschke, B. (2002), ‘Theorizing the Westphalian System of States: International Relations from Absolutism to Capitalism’, in *European Journal of International Relations*. Vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 5-48.

²⁰ Idem, p. 28.

²¹ Idem.

dissatisfaction. The level of taxation to fight wars abroad and suppress domestic resistance weighed too heavily on people's shoulders. The only option left was to raise their voices to claim power for the representatives of the common people of France, even though most of these them were often not aware of belonging together, or of living in France per se, particularly the peasants in the countryside. The representatives of 'the' French people nevertheless argued that 'it' had paid the price for France's improbable history of integration, and demanded compensation and self-determination during the French Revolution. Instead of the royal dynasties, the French nation should be the proprietor of French territory:

...the absolutist-centralist states not only tried to close their borders, they also choked the channels of representation within the territory. (...) you cannot reduce both the exit and the voice options at the same time without endangering the balance of the system. This is what happened in the absolutist-mercantilist states. They had to go through much more violent transitions to mass democracy than the states which managed to keep a better balance between exit controls and voice channelling during the crucial phases of state-building.²²

The French Revolution provided citizenship to those living in the French areas. The rights and obligations of citizenship were linked to the territory of France (*ius soli*). Personal passports were introduced to control the borders to prevent royalty from fleeing, and enemies from entering. The passport also prevented French citizens from leaving, replacing feudal restrictions on their freedom of movement.²³ A large population was required as necessary cannon fodder and labour force.

The nobility-based regions were replaced by new borders imposed in France to delineate *départements* and *cantons* at an efficient scale based on the maximum travel distance for citizens to reach an administrative and legal centre.²⁴ In the violent aftermath of the French Revolution, the new authorities introduced a united legal framework within the French borders. They also managed to encourage their fellow citizens to fight for their country (instead of only for their local magnates). Although the idea of dying for one's (local)

²² Rokkan, S. (1975), 'Dimensions of State Formation and Nation-Building: A Possible Paradigm for Research on Variations within Europe', in C. Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press. p. 589.

²³ Torpey, J.C. (2000), *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

fatherland was not new, the revolutionary authorities were the first to apply it at such a large scale to their fellow citizens. Napoleon used them to create a European empire. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, French rulers grafted an institutional and physical infrastructure –national education, conscription, social security, national television, telegraph, rail roads and star-shaped street patterns in Paris – to discipline and foster a sense of loyalty to an imagined French nation among those living in the French areas.²⁵ The passport also functioned particularly after the First World War to keep social security profiteers from the French territory.²⁶

The 19th century Concert of Europe provided an external assurance of the territorial integrity of the French state. Exact demarcation of boundaries only started in the nineteenth century.²⁷ Even then however, sovereignty was still considered a bundle of royal rights (regalia), rather than an indivisible title to supreme authority.²⁸ The Concert of Europe also functioned as a check on French imperial ambitions on the European continent. A number of conferences were also used to seek another balance between the Concert's great powers. While Bulgaria and Albania were administered collectively by the great powers, they carved the rest of the world into territorial pieces. European imperialism imposed borders particularly in Africa. These territories were so easy to communicate that they became the new bases of de-colonised states despite being superimposed. Today, the acquisition of territory is no longer necessary to access the resources of the former colonies.²⁹ Whether through neo-colonist or capitalist arrangements, the borders of the newly established states were no longer an obstacle for trade with French (state) companies.

Whereas European imperialism used territory to define societies on other continents, 19th century Europe gave rise to the idea of the social definition of space (organic territoriality). Mixed with the imperial territoriality of Prussian and later German rulers, it brought about a powerful connection between rulers

²⁴ Anderson, M. (1996), *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 110.

²⁵ Maier, C.S. (2002), 'Does Europe need a Frontier? From Territorial to Redistributive Community', in J. Zielonka (ed.), *Europe Unbound: Enlarging and Reshaping the Boundaries of the European Union*. London: Routledge. pp. 17-37; Weber, E. (1976), *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France 1870-1914*. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press.

²⁶ Torpey, J.C. (2000), *supra* note 23.

²⁷ Sahlins, P. (1989), *supra* note 16.

²⁸ Finer, S. (1974), *supra* note 2, p. 86.

and people that could challenge France three times in seventy years (1870; 1914; 1940). Although reluctantly acknowledged, the French were for the most part dependent on the USA for its military and economic protection from German as well as Soviet imperialism. Due to Soviet imperialism, only after 1989 a Westphalian state plus national self-determination became a prospect for the people of Yugoslavia, the Soviet-Union, Czechoslovakia and the rest of the former Warsaw Pact. Most of these countries however sought to share sovereignty in the European Union, in which France's improbable path to integration and survival has brought it together with among others Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy and Spain. Where the improbable path of European (dis)integration might lead is the subject of Chapter 5. Here the focus is on explaining changing political territoriality, of which the French example has shown its dynamism long before and after the treaties of Westphalia.

4.3 The theoretical lessons learned from French polity-formation and boundary-making

This chapter seeks to explain changing political territoriality in the European Union. This is actually a question about how political territoriality and polity-(re)formation are related. European integration and Europeanisation are two sides of the same coin: the creation of a Euro-polity through the institutionalisation of European governance, the making of European boundaries, and European penetration into lower levels of government. Previous examples of polity-formation provide lessons for analysing how polity-formation and changing political territoriality are related. The history of the areas referred to today as France shows that (the formation of) a polity is a continuous struggle of internal cohesion and external consolidation depending on a contingent combination of geography, infrastructure, demography, cultural, linguistic, legal and religious differentiation, the centre's prestige and military capabilities. Territorial borders are both strategies for and the result of that struggle. The struggle between the maintenance and the transcendence of French boundaries did depend on political ideas (defence of Christian faith; feudalism; nationalism; spatial images), as well as the strategic institutional

²⁹ Rosecrance, R. (1999), *The Rise of the Virtual State: Wealth and Power in the Coming Century*. New York: Basic Books.

opportunities and geographic circumstances for (territorial) control.³⁰ This multi-dimensionality of political territoriality had already been emphasised in Chapter 2, and should be taken into account when explaining changing political territoriality.

Borders are a means and the outcome of a struggle, rather than a given or an inevitable result of European history. Even though the selective reading of histories of the French areas has done no justice to their complexities, let alone of other polities elsewhere in Europe, it has been shown that the eminent example of the state is a historically contingent result. 1648 was not and did not inevitably lead to a world of Westphalian states. An explanation of changing political territoriality therefore requires a historical and contextual understanding, without taking for granted the 19th century image of the ideal type state. The French example shows us that claims of changing political territoriality must be modest. The history of states and of France in particular was an unexpected outcome, which was not foreseen, intended or even unwelcome for political actors from the very beginning of 'French' history. Theories of polity-formation should therefore avoid teleological reasoning, and should not exclude any outcome in advance.

Another lesson from the French experience in explaining changing political territoriality concerns the mutual dependence of external consolidation and the internal structuring of a polity. As the 19th-century historian Otto Hintze pointed out, based on the experience of the formation of Prussia, that changing political morphology depends on both internal forces as well as external circumstances. The French example also clearly shows that external challenges (invasions; competing authorities) and internal structures (marriages; tax collection; conscription) have had a contributing impact. Moreover, it also demonstrates that the definition of what is inside and what is outside changes over time. The political geographer Jean Gottmann argues that explanations of changing political territoriality should therefore touch upon the "kinetic" dialectic between movement (in his words, "circulation") and the partitioning of space ("iconography"), and not take a static territory as a given.³¹ Although all processes of polity-formation have been confronted with tensions between mobility and stasis, centrifugal and centripetal forces, and the mutuality of inside

³⁰ Cf. Ruggie, J.G. (1993), 'Territoriality and beyond', in *International Organization*. Vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 139-174.

³¹ Gottmann, J. (1980), 'Organizing and Reorganizing Space', in J. Gottmann (ed.), *Centre and Periphery: Spatial Variation in Politics*. London: Sage. p. 221.

and outside, present-day theories on polity-formation barely touch upon these issues extensively.³²

A growing number of scholars are advocating sensitivity to institutions and history in explaining the evolution of states and polities in general, and concentrate on the mechanisms of change and stability of every polity. Such an approach provides a general and comparative ground for explaining the formation of polities. For example, Simon Hix and Markus Jachtenfuchs argued that it does not make sense to develop a special theory for Sweden, England or the European Union, but for political systems in general.³³ The formation of the European Union could be better understood by comparison to other polities and their mechanisms of boundary maintenance and internal re-structuring. The rise of a new political system – *in casu* the European Union – should not automatically be conflated with new theories. Theoretical ideas of the mechanism of polity-formation drawn from previous cases could be applied to the Euro-polity. That is not to say that the European Union would end up as a Westphalian state, but mechanisms of a polity's formation may help explain both the formation of fifteenth-century France and the twentieth-century European Union.

4.4 The territorial trap in EU studies

As the French example shows, a theory of changing political territoriality should be comparative, multi-dimensional and historically contingent, and should take the tensions between mobility and stasis, inside and outside and centrifugal and centripetal forces into account. That is quite a challenge. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, theorising changing political territoriality has been a neglected issue in political science. That holds for International Relations, Regionalism and Federalism studies, Comparative Politics as well as Political Geography. Centre-periphery theories do yet take into account internal and external forces, as well as social and geographical factors, they are not a coherent set of hypotheses but rather geographical expressions and images of power relations.³⁴ Although European integration is seen as a serious challenge to Westphalian territoriality, studies of European integration and Europeanization

³² Cf. Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 3.

³³ Hix, S. (1999), *The Political System of the European Union*. Basingstoke: MacMillan. pp. 4-5; Jachtenfuchs, M. (2001), 'The Governance Approach to European Integration', in *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 245-264.

lack refined explanations of changing political territoriality, including the 'French' lessons mentioned above. Their basic problem is the so-called "territorial trap", the assumption of territorial state sovereignty, the ontological separation of intra-territorial domestic realm and inter-territorial foreign realm of politics, and the distinction of societies according to state borders.³⁵

In Europe after the Second World War, the first wave of theories on political transformation basically argued according to the same Westphalian lines. Functionalist and also liberal interpretations expect that cross-border technocratic co-operation in policy areas will eventually dissolve 'the' Westphalian states fully, whereas the enduring significance of the principle of Westphalian territoriality is key to realism. Furthermore, intergovernmentalists expect territorial states to survive due to European integration, while neo-functionalists and federalists expect the outcome of European integration to be a European supranational state divided in respectively functional or territorial subunits:

...intergovernmentalism and neofunctionalism share a conventional concept of the state. They implicitly adhere to a Weberian notion of the state as a hierarchical structure of authoritative decision-making enjoying external and internal sovereignty. 'Supranationalism' which neofunctionalism tries to explain and intergovernmentalism dismisses, is based on such an understanding.³⁶

Although a territorial outcome of European integration might eventually be proven to be empirically correct, it should not be assumed before evidence is provided. Explanations of the formation of a Euro-polity and transformation of the EU Member States should transcend the territorial state bias, but should not exclude the territorial state as a potential outcome, nor as a fictive starting point. The significance of territoriality should not just to be narrowed down to a yes/no question on Westphalian territoriality. The process of European integration may be instead a re-territorialisation of political structures that has yet deviated from the Westphalian template of state territoriality.³⁷

³⁴ Claval, P. (1980), 'Centre/Periphery and Space: Models of Political Geography', in J. Gottmann (ed.), *Centre and Periphery: Spatial Variation in Politics*. London: Sage. p. 70.

³⁵ Agnew, J. (1998), *Geopolitics: Revisioning World Politics*. London: Routledge. p. 49.

³⁶ Risse-Kappen, T. (1996), 'Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union', in *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 34, no. 1, p. 57.

³⁷ Forsberg, T. (1996), 'Beyond Sovereignty, Within Territoriality: Mapping the Space of Late-Modern (Geo)Politics', in *Cooperation and Conflict*. Vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 355-386.

Another wave of European studies focusing on Europeanisation have touched upon the issue of politics and territory, such as research on the impact of European integration on intergovernmental relations in the (semi-)federal Germany and Spain, and the position of the regions in a multi-level Europe.³⁸ Both studies of multi-level governance and Europeanisation, however, focuses more on daily decision-making and substantial problem-solving than on when and how structures of power and rule in the EU-area have shifted:

‘Europeanisation tends to be discussed in substantive terms, while the procedural characteristics, which can only be adequately grasped from a longer-term perspective, are often neglected.’³⁹ The fairly detailed empirical studies of the Europeanized (parts of) policy areas may show bits and pieces of the new political configurations that emerge, but they do not show a macro-level, overarching view, and the fundamental polity-forming mechanisms of re-territorialisation in the EU area. Klaus Goetz has already sought to discuss territory and Europeanisation head on, but still only arrives at the question whether a single state or a group of states is the appropriate unit of analysis.⁴⁰

The lack of a thorough-going exploration of changing political territoriality may be excused by the fact that these studies of European integration and Europeanization did not seek explanations of the changing nature of (state) borders and the mechanisms of re-territorialisation. However, this negligence of the issue of territoriality also stems from a more fundamental conception of political life in political science. Since state borders are often used as the dividing line between theories explaining politics within territorial states and theories explaining politics among territorial states, (state) territoriality is overlooked too easily. This territorial divide hampers a full understanding of polity formation in the EU-area, and in particular the relation between European integration and territoriality. As Hans Daalder has noted:

The long-standing assumption of a natural division of labor between the study of international relations engaged in analyzing the interactions of states, and comparative politics concerned with the study of processes within states, always

³⁸ See, for instance, Börzel, T.A. (2001), ‘Europeanization and Territorial Institutional Change: Towards Cooperative Regionalism?’ in Green Cowles, J.A. Caporaso, T. Risse (eds.), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. pp. 137-158; Le Galès, P. & Lequesne, C. (eds.) (1998), *Regions in Europe*. London: Routledge.

³⁹ Hix, S. & Goetz, K.H. (2000), ‘Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems’, in *West European Politics*. Vol. 23, no. 4, p. 16.

⁴⁰ Goetz, K.H. (2006), ‘Territory’, in P. Graziano & M.P. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills: Palgrave. pp. 73-87.

rested on somewhat dubious ground. It left unclear what scholars were to handle the formation of (new) states; it glossed over the importance of domestic political processes on the making of foreign policies; it belittled what became known in the international relations literature as 'transnational' politics; and it postulated a degree of political independence for 'sovereign' states which never completely fitted the realities of an interdependent world.⁴¹

This division of labour is also visible in the distinction between studies of Europeanisation and European integration. This might be for good reasons, but it has certain costs:

While it is necessary to disentangle European integration as an explanatory variable and the European effect as a dependent variable, both will need to be "re-entangled" if we wish to do justice to the real-life interdependency of forces of economic, political and cultural change.⁴²

Johan Olsen argues something similar in an overview of Europeanisation literature:

A focus on uni-causal relations and the language and logic of fixed dependent and independent variables, can become a strait jacket preventing an adequate theoretical and empirical analysis of European dynamics of change. However, no coherent empirical research programme is possible if everything is seen as endogenous and in flux.⁴³

An explanation of changing territoriality should encompass instead of assume 'the territorial divide' between politics within territorial states affected by the EU (comparative politics; Europeanization studies), and politics among territorial states within the EU (International Relations; European integration studies). Taking states and their borders (implicitly) for granted prevents the analysis of changing borders and the territorial underpinnings of politics. Political analysis would thus remain trapped in "a 'state-centered' account of spatiality of power."⁴⁴

The territorial trap when analysing politics in the European Union easily leads to the perception that European integration is leading to the hollowing out

⁴¹ Daalder, H. (1993), 'The Development of the Study of Comparative Politics', in H. Keman (ed.), *Comparative Politics*. Amsterdam: Free University Press. p. 39.

⁴² Hix, S. & Goetz, K.H. (2000), *supra* note 39, p. 23.

⁴³ Olsen, J. (2001), *The Many Faces of Europeanization*. Working Paper 01/2. Oslo: ARENA. p. 21.

⁴⁴ Agnew, J (1998), *supra* note 35.

of territorial states, while (re)nationalisation is seen as an automatic loss of European influence in politics.⁴⁵ Domestic and foreign politics are, however, not necessarily zero-sum games as the reasoning of functionalism and realism/intergovernmentalism seem to imply. The loss of state authority over economic, cultural, social or information systems may lead simultaneously to the shrinkage, the expansion or the entanglement of the foreign and domestic realms, or to a differentiated impact depending on the place or the policy area. Similar to the debates on the relation between globalization and ‘the’ state, European integration and Europeanisation are fully intertwined with the reconfiguration of the states, and cannot be studied from a fixed image of a territorially divided world. States are not so much replaced as well as enmeshed in processes of globalisation and European integration. Due to this interdependence, explanations and outcomes cannot be designated separately to the regional, national, European or global level.

A theory of polity-formation and changing political territoriality should therefore overcome the (territorial) fragmentation in theory and research practice to explore the European challenge to (Westphalian) territoriality. In International Relations scholars like John Ruggie, James Rosenau and Miles Kahler have therefore posed the question of how to deal theoretically with transformative change beyond the Westphalian state.⁴⁶ Some scholars have already attempted to overcome the territorial divide in analyses of political reconfiguration. They have aimed at finding scientific tools to avoid thinking about political reformation based on the template of state territoriality. Yosef Lapid and others introduced the analytical triad of ‘Identities, Borders, Orders’ (IBO) as an “antidote to reification and essentialism” known in state-based Realism and Liberal-Institutionalism.⁴⁷ This triad takes into account the continuous efforts to (re)set the boundaries of political identities in the processes of political transformation. This IBO-approach is a “heuristic tool” to get rid of static assumptions of ‘the’ territorial state, focusing on the processual, mobile, fluid, relational, dynamic, and discursive nature of politics instead. Although these concepts and approaches are helpful for not taking borders for granted,

⁴⁵ Clark, I. (1998), ‘Beyond the Great Divide: Globalization and the Theory of International Relations’, in *Review of International Studies*. Vol. 24, p. 480.

⁴⁶ Ruggie, J.G. (1993), *supra* note 30; Rosenau, J.N. (1997), *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁴⁷ Lapid, Y. (2001), ‘Identities, Borders, Orders: Nudging International Relations Theory in a New Direction’, in M. Albert, D. Jacobson & Y. Lapid (eds.), *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Minneapolis (MN): University of Minnesota. p. 11.

they lack a detailed explanation of when and how political territoriality is changing in significance. In effect, the same argument largely accounts for approaches in multi-level governance. This “compelling metaphor”⁴⁸ has helped to illustrate *that* the making and implementation of EU-policies is running through less territorialized, non-hierarchic, de-centralized, and flexible networks, yet it gives no explanation of to *when and how* political territoriality is significant at the regional, state or EU-level.

Theoretical connections between the domestic and foreign political realms have been put forward by Robert Keohane and Helen Milner following the work by Peter Gourevitch on the international impact on domestic politics (the so-called “second image reversed” approach).⁴⁹ They scrutinise the mutual interdependence of the international structure and the domestic configuration of power. Although they spend considerable effort to show this linkage, they do not question the nature of the divide between domestic and foreign politics itself. They instead analyse the second-image reversed, rather than the third and second image merged. Nevertheless, Keohane and Milner hint at the work by Albert Hirschman, which may provide the way out of territorially divided analyses of political formation.⁵⁰ The Norwegian political scientist and sociologist Stein Rokkan has used Hirschman’s work, while fulfilling the French lessons discussed above.

4.5 Rokkan, Hirschman, and Bartolini

In 1970, the publication of Hirschman’s book *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States* resulted in a “Copernican revolution” for Rokkan.⁵¹ In particular, because Hirschman’s taxonomy taught him to avoid assuming and reifying territorial states in comparative analyses of polity-formation: “He would no longer take its borders as given.”⁵² The work by political geographers such as Friedrich Ratzel, Karl Haushofer, Richard

⁴⁸ Rosamond, B. (2000), *Theories of European Integration*. Basingstoke: MacMillan. p. 110.

⁴⁹ Keohane, R.O. & Milner, H.V. (eds.) (1996), *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Gourevitch P. (1978), ‘The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics’, in *International Organization*. Vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 881-912.

⁵⁰ Keohane, R.O. & Milner, H.V. (1996), *supra* note 49, pp. 19, 244, 250.

⁵¹ Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Flora, P. (1999), ‘Introduction’, in S. Rokkan (1999), *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe: The Theory of Stein Rokkan* (edited by P. Flora, S. Kuhnle, D. Urwin). Oxford: Oxford University Press., p. 59.

Hartshorne and Derwent Whittlesey and by the sociologist Talcott Parsons also influenced him to conceive of the formation of the territorial state as a function of both internal and external factors, of centripetal and centrifugal forces.⁵³ According to Rokkan, polity-formation is the mutual interdependence of a polity's external consolidation (boundary demarcation) and its internal structuring (institutionalising voice and loyalty). Boundary demarcation is a continuous struggle between "boundary transcendence" (exit) and "boundary maintenance." The maintenance of boundaries can be pursued by strengthening the boundaries, but also by increasing the loyalty of the members of a polity. External consolidation enables authorities to extend their central grip with the set-up of an effective and efficient internal hierarchical organisation; since authorities know better to whom and what value satisfaction should be directed. Thus, planning to allocate values is easier for a fixed group within an externally consolidated polity.

Rokkan's main argument regarding the formation of West-European states briefly summarized is that the territorial closure of states eventually enhanced their internal structuring by establishing a secure, liberal and democratic welfare state. Samuel Finer points out how processes of state formation unfolded throughout Europe: "To secure its taxes, without which it had no army, the centre tried to coerce. To coerce, it needed an army. This is the extraction-coercion cycle. It gave rise to voice on the one hand, exit on the other, and is central to the analysis of the growth of the territorial state in terms of exit, voice and loyalty."⁵⁴ Since rulers managed to lock members in a polity while centralising taxation, the stage was set for further internal structuring. The external consolidation of boundaries provided an essential ingredient for building up internal voice structures.⁵⁵ State rulers established borders to block the exit of their members and the entry of non-members, and fostered loyalty in them for the state. This external consolidation allowed for internal institutional developments of participation by the state's residents through the judiciary and mass democracy (voice), and internal solidarity through redistribution within a territorially closed community. Depending on the geographical and social opportunities for members to escape from states' territories, the internal

⁵² Mjøset, L. (2000), 'Stein Rokkan's Thick Comparisons', in *Acta Sociologica*. Vol. 43, p. 388.

⁵³ Rokkan, S. (1975), *supra* note 22, p. 583; Rokkan, S. (1999), *supra* note 51.

⁵⁴ Finer, S (1974), *supra* note 2, p. 98; emphasis in original.

⁵⁵ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, pp. 36ff.

structure of states became more rigid.⁵⁶ The processes that strove to create solidarity systems changed the relationship between authorities and members in polities from mere domination to an exchange of acceptance for welfare provisions.

Political reconfiguration in Europe today greatly differs from previous instances of polity-formation, because relationships of power and rule are now moulded in generally liberal democratic states with a strong sense of nationalism and welfare provisions. Whereas wars dominated the origins of states, the European Union and its Member States are now reorganising themselves peacefully since the substance of political relationships have changed. Moreover, the dynamic between internal structuring and external consolidation seems to be reversed in the European Union. EU-policies aim at the opening of states' territories and extending EU boundaries. This would consequently imply a weakening of the internal structure of the individual EU-Member States (as long as they do not anticipate or respond to this potential weakening). Nowadays, citizens may choose to leave a state territory instead of voicing their dissatisfaction through democratic means within their state. However, Member States may still foster national loyalty to prevent their citizens from leaving: "whereas today the general talk is about the decline of the nation State, Rokkan's perspective also leaves open the possibility that the process of European unification may lead to a revivification of national thinking and acting."⁵⁷ From a Rokkanian perspective the internal structuring of the Euro-polity might be difficult, since its boundaries are unconsolidated due to the various geographic enlargements and the increase of co-operation in many policy domains. The constitutionalisation of the Euro-polity through the recent series of Intergovernmental Conferences (IGCs) may yet keep its internal structuring strong enough.

Rokkan's study follows the French lessons set out above. His scheme is based on the mutual interdependence of both internal and external factors shaping polity-formation. His explanation can encompass both social and

⁵⁶ Rokkan, S. (1999), *supra* note 51, p. 230; Hirschman, A.O. (1974), "Exit, Voice, and Loyalty": Further Reflections and a Survey of Recent Contributions', in *Social Science Information*. Vol. 13, no. 1, p. 16; Finer, S. (1974), *supra* note 2.

⁵⁷ Flora, P. (2000), *Formation of External Frontiers and Internal Structuring: Europe and its Nations. A Research Perspective on Rokkan's Lines*. (translation I.L. Fraser). EUI-RSC seminar paper. Mimeo; published as Flora, P. (2000), 'Externe Grenzbildung und Interne Strukturierung: Europa und seinen Nationen: Eine Rokkanische Forschungsperspektive', in *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*. Vol. 10, pp. 157-166.

geographical factors with respect to exit options, voice structures, loyalty and authority, which are the basis of explaining changing political territoriality and polity-(re)formation. Moreover, Albert Hirschman emphasizes that he developed the taxonomy “exit, voice and loyalty” to include sociological, economic and political mechanisms for renovation and reconfiguration of (political) organisation in order to exclude any biased understanding of organisational evolution.⁵⁸ Furthermore, both actor-oriented factors (exit, voice and loyalty) as well as institution-oriented factors (boundary maintenance, voice structures) should be part of a meaningful explanation.

Doubts may nevertheless be raised with respect to the state-bias of his work, since Rokkan has developed it for the very purpose of explaining the formation of the territorial state. In an overview of Rokkan’s work, Peter Flora argues that Rokkan’s notions are helpful for scrutinising polity-formation in the EU-area despite its initial focus on nation-states: “At first glance, [Rokkan’s concepts] appear closely tied to his analysis of the development of the nation-state, but a closer look reveals promising perspectives also for examining the process of European unification.”⁵⁹ Flora also points out that “out of European unification a new political unit is arising, which Rokkan’s theory must still prove itself capable of analysing fruitfully.”⁶⁰ Moreover, Rokkan himself did not develop his theoretical notions extensively into a consistent set of propositions to precisely detect the internal-external mechanisms in an empirical research project. Based on the social and geographical factors influencing the internal and external forces of polity-formation, he drew maps of the European continent’s polities:

The essential rationale for my ‘typological-topological’ model of Europe is that it generates hypotheses about the interaction between external and internal boundary-building strategies in the history of the organization of the different territorial systems: the policies pursued in controlling external transactions also affect internal channelling of voice.⁶¹

These typological-topological maps are merely of a suggestive nature, and as Charles Tilly argued “[i]t is hard to see how Rokkan could have gotten much

⁵⁸ Hirschman, A.O. (1981), *Essays in Trespassing: Economics to Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁵⁹ Flora, P. in Rokkan, S. (1999), *supra* note 51, p. 89.

⁶⁰ *Idem*, p. 89.

⁶¹ Rokkan, S. (1974), ‘Entries, Voice, Exits: Towards a Possible Generalization of the Hirschman Model’, in *Social Science Information*. Vol. 13, no. 1, p. 49.

farther without laying aside his maps and concentration on the analysis of the mechanisms of state formation.”⁶² Unfortunately, Rokkan only cursorily dealt with these mechanisms. Stefano Bartolini, however, has done a magnificent job in further exploring the potentials of Rokkan’s notions with respect to all polities within the present EU area. Peter Flora and Maurizio Ferrera have also contributed to the application of Rokkan’s ideas.⁶³ Following the Rokkanian line of argument Bartolini writes: “As closure and structuring are linked theoretically, the same applies to exit and de-structuring. This is the nucleus of a theory of boundary-building and political structuring and exit-options and political de-structuring.”⁶⁴

Bartolini has described his earlier explorations as “speculative.”⁶⁵ That may not come as a surprise especially in light of Hirschman’s remarks about Rokkan’s use of his taxonomy ‘exit, voice, and loyalty’. Although Hirschman does acknowledge that Rokkan’s application of his taxonomy might be analytically helpful for understanding polity-formation in Europe, he is somewhat apprehensive in applying it to European integration.⁶⁶ Hirschman’s taxonomy was primarily aimed at explaining the reform and recuperation of existing “fully established” organisations in decline, and not so much with processes of integration like the EU Member States. Nevertheless, Hirschman admits reformulating processes of polity-formation in terms of exit, voice, and loyalty, may reveal how certain forces and factors mould polities in the EU-area.⁶⁷ Moreover, Hirschman’s taxonomy has been developed to analyse responses to the (declining) performance of an organisation in the delivery and

⁶² Tilly, C. (1990), *Coercion, Capital and European States: AD 990-1990*. Cambridge (MA): Blackwell. p.13.

⁶³ Bartolini, S. (1998), *Exit Options, Boundary Building, Political Structuring*. Working paper 98/1. Florence: EUI; Bartolini, S. (2004), ‘Old and New Peripheries in the Processes of European Territorial Integration’, in C.K. Ansell & G. di Palma (eds.), *Restructuring Territoriality: Europe and the United States compared*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 19-44; Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1; Ferrera, M. (2003), ‘European Integration and National Social Citizenship: Changing Boundaries, New Structuring?’, in *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 611-652; Ferrera, M. (2004), ‘Social Citizenship in the European Union: Towards a Spatial Reconfiguration?’, in C.K. Ansell & G. di Palma (eds.), *Restructuring Territoriality: Europe and the United States compared*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 90-121; Ferrera, M. (2005), *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Flora, P. (2000), *supra* note 57.

⁶⁴ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 53.

⁶⁵ Bartolini, S. (1998), *supra* note 63, p. 4.

⁶⁶ Hirschman, A.O. (1974), *supra* note 56, p. 15; Hirschman, A.O. (1981), *supra* note 58, pp. 242ff.

⁶⁷ Hirschman, A.O. (1981), *supra* note 58, p. 284.

allocation of values among its members. Thus dealing with value (dis)satisfaction, it might at least be suitable in analysing contemporary EU Member States in which legitimacy is increasingly based on output and performance in welfare instead of warfare.

Hirschman also expressed his doubts about applying his taxonomy to European integration because the EU is a unique case. In his eyes, the case of European integration would provide a feeble empirical basis to evaluate the applicability of exit, voice and loyalty in newly created polities. However, the European Union as well as its Member States and regional entities such as Flanders and Bavaria are all instances of polities and therefore all cope with the internal-external dynamic. Although the Euro-polity, state polities, and regional polities differ from each other, they all share similar mechanisms of exit, voice and loyalty through the mutual processes of external consolidation and internal structuring. Therefore, these mechanisms are applicable to the formation of whatever polity, including the European one.

In principle, Rokkan's explanations of how states territorialised through polity-formation mechanisms also applies to the Euro-polity today. This is, however, not to say that the European Union is evolving into a Westphalian state. The internal structures of national political systems in Europe have changed drastically because they are now democratic. The lack of participation had an important impact previously on the course of polity-formation:

The decisive thrust toward the consolidation of the machineries of territorial control took place (...) before the lower strata could articulate any claims for participation. This gave the national elites time to build up efficient organizations before they had to face the next set of challenges: the strengthening of national identity at the mass level, the opening of channels for mass participation, the development of a sense of national economic solidarity and the establishment of a workable consensus on the need for a redistribution of resources and benefits.⁶⁸

Notwithstanding the far-reaching changes in European polities' internal structures and outer-circumstances between 1500 and 1951, mechanisms of polity-formation derived from historical examples may provide the framework for analysing instances of polity-formation today.⁶⁹ Moreover, to discuss the

⁶⁸ Rokkan, S. (1975), *supra* note 22, pp. 597-598.

⁶⁹ Cf. Tilly, C. (1975), 'Western State-Making and Theories of Political Transformation', in C. Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press. p. 601.

future of the Euro-polity is perhaps more helpful with the assistance of old theories rather than formulating new approaches beforehand.

4.6 Exit, voice and loyalty

Rokkan understood polity-formation as a continuous tension between forces of boundary transcendence versus boundary control. He described the ensuing interdependence of polities' internal structuring and external consolidation in terms of Hirschman's exit, voice and loyalty. Hirschman's taxonomy intends to analyse the behaviour of unsatisfied members in any social organisation. Members include individuals and other actors. Hirschman's basic position is that (aggregated) actions from unsatisfied members eventually generates pressure on the management, rulers or authorities of an organisation to reform and thereby to recuperate the entire system. Members use two mechanisms, *i.e.*, exit and voice, to express dissatisfaction that can start the processes which mould individual actions into systemic reforms.

Members can choose to leave an organisation if they are dissatisfied with its values. This route is called "exit". Such an exit can be physical by moving (*e.g.*, voting by feet, emigration, secession), institutional or behavioural (*e.g.*, cancelling membership, refusing orders, switching lords). France's withdrawal from the military branch of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation exemplifies an institutional exit. This latter example also illustrates that exits can be partial. Although France no longer participated in the military branch of the NATO, it remained a member of its political branch. Similarly, several EU Member States opt-out from policy areas like foreign affairs, defence or immigration.⁷⁰ Voice is:

any attempt at all to change, rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority with the intention of forcing a change in management, or through various types of actions and protests, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion.⁷¹

"Voicers" try to change the organisation by articulating their grievances and desires, demanding for a satisfactory improvement of the system and its products, or an expansion of their role and input into the organisation's affairs.

⁷⁰ Weiler, J.J.H. (1999), *The Constitution of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 34ff.

⁷¹ Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *supra* note 51, p. 30.

These voices can be expressed through formal and informal channels for complaints, representation, and protestation.

Members may voice their dissatisfaction, because they have no option to leave the system. Even if members do have such an option, they may be too loyal to the system and choose to voice their complaints instead of leaving the deteriorating system. Loyalty can be defined as attachment to an organisation, built upon feelings of solidarity, trust, and common identity among the organisation and its members.⁷² Loyalty intervenes with considerations of exit and voice; it is a psychological factor impacting actual behaviour.⁷³ Loyalty can therefore serve also as an internal psychological penalty for exit behaviour.⁷⁴ Loyalty may also prevent members from voicing criticism, since their commitment to the organisation prevents them from doing so.

Members might be dissatisfied with certain products the organisation provides, but can remain loyal to the entire organisation; the object of dissatisfaction is thus not necessarily the same as the object of loyalty.⁷⁵ A “diffuse” attachment to the organisation may also foster the voicing of “specific” demands because members expect their organisation to deliver good output. However, after a while, dissatisfaction with the organisation’s products may induce disloyalty to the organisation in general: “When values cease being allocated in an acceptable fashion, even durable loyalties erode and fade, and the stage is set for their redistribution and a shift in authority patterns.”⁷⁶

The use of exit and voice depends on considerations regarding the possibilities of improvement, and the costs of letting their voice be heard and their effectiveness.

...the conditions holding over the resort to voice when exit is available depend on: (a) the extent to which members are willing to trade off the certainty of exit against the uncertainties of an improvement in the deteriorated product via voice; (b) the estimate that members make of their ability to influence the

⁷² Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 31.

⁷³ Dowding, K., John, P., Mergoupis, T. & Vugt, M. van (2000), ‘Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Analytic and Empirical Developments’, in *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 37, p. 481.

⁷⁴ Bartolini, S. (1998), *supra* note 63, p. 12.

⁷⁵ Dowding, K. et al (2000), *supra* note 73, pp. 471, 491.

⁷⁶ Ferguson, Y.H. & Mansbach, R.W. (1996), *Politics: Authority, Identities, and Change*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. p. 36.

organization; (c) the presence of loyalty mechanisms and expressive motivations which may lower the costs of voice.⁷⁷

A consideration for members is the uncertainty associated with exiting. The costs of exiting to an unknown organisation or situation may be higher than expressing voice in a known organisation. The more a member knows about another organisation, the easier exiting becomes.⁷⁸ A member's calculation of costs and benefits further depends on the infrastructure to exit and voice. When institutions exist to voice dissatisfaction, the costs are quite different than in a system without or with weak voice institutions. The institutionalisation of voice is found more in externally closed polities, since fellow-voicers have few opportunities to defect from the collective efforts to express dissatisfaction and have no other option left to express their dissatisfaction: "...the lower the opportunity for exit, the higher the propensity to invent institutions of complaint communication; i.e. the propensity to structure and institutionalise voice."⁷⁹ In other words, in a situation of "full exit", voice and investment in voice structures are less expected.⁸⁰

The costs of collectively organising voice are perceived to be lower since voice institutions can be used again. Because voice behaviour is repeated, uncertainty and even distrust gradually disappear in favour of mutual and standardised expectations. This stabilisation of behaviour into institutionalised and standardised patterns would not occur if members could easily choose to exit.⁸¹ This routinized behaviour within a closed polity entails mutual loyalty and the socialisation of a political identity, making voice an even more secure instrument of expressing dissatisfaction in the members' own polity.⁸² Collective voicing also entails a centralisation of claims and political divisions in the polity's centre.⁸³ Members may start to link issues and exchange different resources among each other and with the authorities to soothe their dissatisfaction. In this way, central institutionalisation of voice in closed polities gives way to "resource convertibility".⁸⁴

⁷⁷ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 36; see also Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *supra* note 51, p. 77.

⁷⁸ Hirschman (1970), *supra* note 51, p. 81.

⁷⁹ Bartolini, S. (1998), *supra* note 63, p. 17.

⁸⁰ Bartolini (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 48.

⁸¹ Bartolini (1998), *supra* note 63, pp. 36-37.

⁸² Dowding, K. et al. (2000), *supra* note 73, p. 492.

⁸³ Bartolini (2005), *supra* note 1.

⁸⁴ Bartolini, S. (1998), *supra* note 63, p. 35.

The costs and benefits of voice may also depend on the reaction a member can expect. If retaliation by the authorities is the response to an outspoken dissident, the costs are much higher.⁸⁵ Costs and benefits of voice may also change due to the behaviour of other members. If affluent members leave, the poor may raise their voice to require them and their money to stay, since these are necessary for the maintenance of the organisation in general. Calculation between exiting and expressing dissatisfaction also depends on whether it refers to a public or private good.⁸⁶ If it is possible to withdraw from the production of a public good (*e.g.*, taxation), while still enjoying the consumption (*e.g.*, security), exit will be more likely. If however enjoying the consumption of a public good also involves its negative externalities, voicing would be the more likely choice.

In literature reflecting on Hirschman's theory of exit, voice and loyalty, further contributions to his thought have been made. Hirschman concentrates on the opportunities of expressing dissatisfaction for insiders of a political system. The option of entry should, however, also be taken into consideration, particularly because boundaries are discussed.⁸⁷ Actors can also voice their discontent from outside. Furthermore, authorities may try to prevent outsiders from letting their voice to be heard to prevent insiders from becoming aware of their dissatisfactory situation. In addition, de-consolidation of boundaries may also emerge from an outsiders' entry. Hirschman repeatedly emphasized that exit and voice are not mutually exclusive; for example, someone can leave while voicing his or her dissatisfaction. A dissatisfied person would thus face two questions: a. should I stay or go? and b. should I raise my voice or keep silent?⁸⁸

While Hirschman focuses on the micro-level of the way in which firms, individuals or local magnates may respond to a situation of deterioration, Stein Rokkan has added a macro perspective, linking micro behaviour to systemic features, including boundaries. As has already been concluded from Bartolini's elaboration on the institutionalisation of voice structures, systemic features influence an actor's use of exit and voice. Bartolini describes the process of making "individual voice to achieve systemic relevance" as voice structuring.⁸⁹ Structuring involves institutional channels (*e.g.*, electoral system; territorial and

⁸⁵ Hirschman, A.O. (1981), *supra* note 58, p. 244.

⁸⁶ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, pp. 6-7.

⁸⁷ Ferrera, M. (2005), *supra* note 63, p. 31.

⁸⁸ *Idem*, p. 29.

⁸⁹ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 37.

interest representation), political organization (*e.g.*, political parties, interest groups), and networks of relationships to express one's voice towards the power centre. As a result of the institutionalisation of voice, a rather stable pattern of cleavages and centre-periphery distinctions emerge. The systemic counterpart of loyalty is defined by Bartolini as "system building". System-building involves the making of identity, trust, solidarity and social capital through cultural integration, social sharing institutions, and participation rights.⁹⁰ Rokkan notes that authorities may seek to strengthen loyalty "forcing the component parts to stay within the given system."⁹¹ Authorities may not only aim at fostering loyalty to prevent exit: "High fees for entering an organisation and stiff penalties for exit are among the main devices generating or reinforcing loyalty in such a way as to repress exit or voice or both."⁹² The establishment of boundaries is the systemic counterpart of exit and entry.⁹³

The establishment of boundaries is the fundamental prerequisite for internal voice structuring and system-building. As mentioned earlier, Rokkan's basic contention on polity-formation is the mutual interdependence of a polity's external consolidation (boundary maintenance) and its internal structuring and system-building. This has been defined in brief as the "bounding-bonding nexus" by Maurizio Ferrera.⁹⁴ External closure at the macro-level leaves micro-players no other option than to voice when dissatisfied. Condemned to stay together, micro-players may start to exchange resources within the closed system, learn about the behaviour of others, and stabilise and institutionalise their (coalition of) voices (structuring). Thus, internal cohesion is a result of external consolidation. Internal cohesion makes the option of exit less profitable, and therefore, internal cohesion also enhances external consolidation.

4.7 No functionalist determinism

Rokkan's theoretical notions are worthy of further exploration given the territorial reconfiguration within the EU-area, since they meaningfully link issues of legitimacy (dissatisfaction and exit), democracy and other forms of participation (voice), solidarity (loyalty), and political territoriality (boundary-making). His ideas help explain the trajectory of the territorial (re)formation of

⁹⁰ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, pp. xiv, 31.

⁹¹ Rokkan, S. (1999), *supra* note 51, p. 100.

⁹² Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *supra* note 51, p. 93.

⁹³ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 3.

⁹⁴ Ferrera, M. (2005), *supra* note 63, p. 4.

both the EU Member States and the Euro-polity dependent on the institutional paths taken by them and their subunits, as well as the present settings and environment they are in, without a 'Westphalian' bias.

On the one hand, the Hirschman-Rokkanian framework reflects the interaction between members' micro considerations in expressing dissatisfaction. On the other hand, it reflects the macro structures of material and institutional exit and voice options (unconsciously) shaping and steering the expression of dissatisfaction, and the authorities' (re)construction of voice and loyalty structures. Polities are the outcome of actors' individual choices, but they are also constructed on purpose by authorities. This neo-institutional approach thus comprises both the mutual shaping of actors' individual choices and the opportunity structures. This leads to the observation that initial preferences expressed through exit or voice do not necessarily correspond to the final outcome of the game. Actors' complaints against a certain proposed law may eventually result in an (grudgingly) accepted adoption of the law because the actors lack accepted voice structures, lack any exit options, or are bribed by side-payments.

According to Rokkan's line of argument, the process of European integration, that seeks to unfreeze internal borders and construct external boundaries, *must* affect the territorial underpinnings and the internal structuring of polities within the EU-area. In other words, if European integration had not opened state borders and allowed members of the Member States to exit, then the Member States would have taken different formation paths. Despite other contributing factors that may also have an impact on polity-formation, *i.e.*, de-industrialisation, global migration, ageing, and changing modes of production, the relationship between the formation of the Euro-polity and changing political territoriality can thus be explained. As a matter of fact, if the Rokkanian notions are helpful to analyse polity-formation and explain changing political territoriality in the EU-area in relationship to European integration, they may also be successfully applied to the other processes mentioned.

The Rokkanian-Hirschmanian framework of exit, voice and loyalty is based on functionalistic notions as biological references and as Rokkan hints at in his introduction has Parsonian influence.⁹⁵ As a consequence, every polity is expected to function according to the mechanisms of exit, voice and loyalty through the processes of internal structuring and external consolidation.

⁹⁵ Rokkan, S. (1999), *supra* note 51, p. 101.

However, the outcome of these processes is contingent on the material, geographic, social, institutional and epistemic circumstances in which political actors operate. Thus, despite its functionalistic tendencies, Rokkan's framework does not follow structural-functionalist or systemic determinism with respect to the specific functions or direction of polity-formation (such as self-sufficiency, stability, survival, or equilibrium). Consequently, polities are not necessarily seen as fulfilling certain functions or seeking a certain balance or stability. No isomorphism is expected, unless the circumstances, mechanisms of exit, voice and loyalty, and reasons of dissatisfaction are similar. Depending on the social and geographical configuration of exit, voice and loyalty, dissatisfaction can both lead to the further integration as well as the disintegration of a political system.

The aim of the empirical case studies in the following chapters is to determine whether these mechanisms are of any help in explaining the present political realities of the EU and its Member States. Because of the neo-institutionalist notions underlying the empirical analysis, the political actors under study might be unaware of the implications and consequences of their actions. Furthermore, the collective result of individual behaviours requires an explanatory framework at a collective level. Thus, the theory on polity-formation has primacy over the views and perceptions of political actors, and it is selective in fact-finding making some facts more relevant than others. Whether the Rokkanian approach presents a theoretically and an empirically convincing case on changing political territoriality in the European Union depends on the extent in which actors' actions seriously contradicted the mechanisms described.

The presented mechanisms also have an implication with regards to causality. If they are aware of the exit, voice, and loyalty mechanisms, political actors can anticipate and prevent the perceivably undesired effects of primary exits or stimulate the mechanisms for their benefit. It is important in this respect to closely scrutinise the motivation of political actors to see whether they indeed reasoned from the mechanisms of exit, voice and loyalty. Even if they did not apply, the mechanisms may still function. This may lead to the trap in the case studies that exit, voice and loyalty always come true in the eyes of the researcher. Similar criticism has been expressed before, that Hirschman's taxonomy is only applicable in retrospect, loyalty being an "post-hoc equation filler" of what has not been exit and voice.⁹⁶ Be that as it may, Rokkan's notions yet offer a way to

⁹⁶ cf. Barry, B. (1974), 'Review Article: "Exit, Voice, and Loyalty"', in *British Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 4, pp. 95-96; Ferrera, M. (2005), *supra* note 63, pp. 35-36.

describe and analytically structure the (hi)stories of polity-formation and changing political territoriality: “Independent and dependent variables are not fixed in this scheme. It merely signals the importance of the network of relationships between these factors when interpreting the external relations and domestic structuring of any political formation.”⁹⁷ In addition, Rokkan’s scheme sheds light on political actors’ differentiated but structured exit and voice options available to express dissatisfaction. A partial solution for making (hi)stories fit with the theory is to use a variety of sources in the careful process-tracing of motives, actions and effects in order to limit biased data selection.

4.8 Political territoriality and polity-formation

While avoiding the territorial trap, Rokkan provides a scheme to understand how the political use of territory is embedded in processes of polity-formation, and polity-reformation. Explaining changing political territoriality in the European Union refers to the use of territory as a strategy of control, as well as the implications of territory for the functioning of political formations. Essential to the Rokkanian perspective on polity-formation is the mutual relationship between boundary maintenance on the one hand and a polity’s internal structuring and system-building on the other hand. In particular, territorial boundaries influence the internal cohesion of a polity. Territorial boundaries are easily made visible and communicable, facilitating control of actors’ entry and exit. A geographically fixed image of a polity effectively indicates the range of loyalty, separating polity’s members from non-members. In addition, the geographical fixity of a polity enhances its exclusivity, cutting security, economy, culture and society systems to the territory’s size, creating the separation between intraterritorial and interterritorial politics (*cf.* Chapter 2.3.5). The fixity of territorial boundaries also facilitates voice and its institutionalisation. ‘Voicers’ expect to remain in the same territorial container, and therefore start to link issues and convert resources among each other to deal with their dissatisfaction. To sum up, authorities, first enjoying the effectiveness of territorial control to maintain boundaries and to enhance loyalty, are increasingly confronted with strengthened voice if they cannot satisfy their members. Dissatisfaction about rigidity of territorial boundaries is foremost expected in peripheries, because they have the greatest chance of being confronted with the mismatch of systems of politics, economy, culture, society

⁹⁷ Bartolini, S. (2005), *supra* note 1, p. 4.

and security. This mismatch may however not be seen immediately and accurately because of the territorial collection of data, and cannot often be effectively dealt with due to the geographical fixity of the polity involved and adjacent polities.

Due to the strength of a geographically fixed image, territory may leave its mark on political behaviour and institutions even if actors have more (physical or legal) opportunities to leave and enter the territory. Yet, if authorities make less use of territory as a means of control a polity will be gradually less marked by geographical fixity, impersonality and centrality. More exits and entries across the system's boundaries may also weaken functional or personal coalitions of voice across the territory. Internal differentiation of a functional or a personal nature would then gradually be replaced by cooperation of political actors at a closer (non-territorial) distance. Whether political strategies, behaviour and institutions in the European Union are less influenced by territory, remains to be seen in the empirical studies to be examined in the chapters that follow. First, propositions will be drafted to structure the empirical exploration.