



Original citation: Storey, David  (2020) *Tenuous Territories*. In: *A Research Agenda for Territory and Territoriality*. Elgar Research Agendas . Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 159-178. ISBN 978 1 78811 280 2 (print) 978 1 78811 281 9 (ebook)

Permanent WRaP URL: <https://eprints.worc.ac.uk/id/eprint/10004>

Copyright and reuse:

The Worcester Research and Publications (WRaP) makes this work available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRaP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is a draft chapter/article. The final version is available in *A Research Agenda for Territory and Territoriality* edited by David Storey, published in 2020, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd <http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781788112819>. The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher, and is for private use only.

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRaP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact wrapteam@worc.ac.uk

9

Tenuous territories

David Storey

Previous chapters have explored facets of territory and territoriality primarily at the level of the state, but it is important to observe that manifestations of territorialization exist at a variety of spatial scales. Although this may take on less obvious forms with less clear-cut boundaries, these informal divisions run through a wide range of social, cultural and political issues concerning race, class, gender and sexuality, so that what can be termed spatial enclaves of varying degrees of permanence are regularly created, sustained and contested (Sidaway 2007). This chapter explores some of these examples, demonstrating how particular social practices are spatialized and the ways in which territories are constructed, contested and used to achieve particular outcomes. Identity lies at the heart of these examples, which comprise territorial practices that result from defence, celebration or fear of those identities. Consequently, the chapter is concerned with raising questions about who may be permitted or encouraged to be in particular spaces, and who may be barred or discouraged from being there. In doing so, it sheds light on the ways in which space is conceived, used and organized, and highlights the ways in which identities – class, ethnic, gender, sexual – become territorialized across a range of sociospatial contexts. The chapter also highlights the use of territorial strategies in both managing and policing specific issues, and also in resisting particular forms of domination.

Class, ethnic and territorial segregation

Social divisions within society (encompassing race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and others) reflect inequalities that are reinforced and reproduced in a variety of ways. These inequalities may also be made more visible through spatial clustering. Urban inequalities are both reflected and reinforced through spatialized discourses of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ neighbourhoods. Moreover, discourses of securitization, operationalized through the deployment of various technologies, often leave many people relatively immobile and spatially confined, reflecting

what sociologist Bryan Turner (2007) referred to as an 'enclave society'. Parts of cities may become synonymous with a range of negative indicators such as high unemployment and crime, with such areas becoming characterized as dangerous places inhabited by people pathologized as an underclass. These feelings of alienation and animosity can fuel an intense stigmatization of those residing there, leading in turn to a stigmatizing of the places themselves. This stigmatization of place tends to be self-reproducing, serving to further reinforce class and ethnic divides. In more exaggerated narratives, some places come to be characterized as ghettos or no-go areas, terms that generally carry very negative connotations.

Segregation is clearly reinforced through various mechanisms. Attempts to regenerate older working-class areas tend usually to reshape the geographies of class rather than eliminate them, serving to reinforce economic divisions within society, thereby perpetuating the idea that some households do not belong in particular places. The residential territorializations resulting from gentrification highlight how broader global processes (associated with flows of capital) play out alongside, and are implicated in, the destruction and reconstruction of local territorialized identities (Butler 2007; Lees et al. 2015). The major regeneration schemes undertaken in recent decades in older industrialized and dockland areas in cities throughout Europe and North America reflect this transformation from manufacturing and working-class residential spaces into service sector zones occupied by middle-class residents. Dockland and waterfront areas, like other regenerated urban zones, have been transformed into different places, with quite different uses and symbolic meanings. United Kingdom (UK) cities such as Glasgow, Liverpool and Cardiff continually engage in processes of reimagination, sometimes entwined with attempts to garner official accolades that may further enhance the city's profile and boost its image, such as being crowned European Capital of Culture. Attempts to purify urban space are often accompanied by the displacement of many local residents, while others are rendered homeless. The poor become pathologized so that urban space can be cleansed and put to more profitable uses (Gowan 2010; Janoschka and Seguera 2016). Heightened levels of surveillance deter the more marginalized from encroaching into affluent residential and commercial spaces. In this sense, parts of the urban environment have been likened to spaces of incarceration whose residents are subject to various forms of surveillance and control (Davis 2006).

The parcelling-up of urban space could be said to reach its apogee in the phenomenon of gated communities (Atkinson and Blandy 2006; Glasze et al. 2006; Bagaeen and Uduku 2010). The apparent rise in the numbers and varied types of these within urban areas in various parts of the world in recent years could

be interpreted as a very obvious manifestation of attempts to control and limit access to portions of geographic space. The creation of residential fortresses where security guards patrol the perimeter of walled residential zones, in an effort to exclude those seen as undesirable, serves to maintain the 'undefiled' and 'exclusive' nature of the neighbourhood. The level of fortification of these developments may be quite varied, ranging from perimeter walls, gates and barriers, through the limiting of non-residential access by intercoms and associated screening devices, to more perceptual barriers or codes designed to deter (Figure 9.1). Individual streets, where homes are owned by a super-rich global elite, may be subject to private security and monitoring. In these ways, parts of previously public space become hived off, rendering them inaccessible to those not entitled to enter. Formal and overt security, combined with informal types of self-policing, where people are encouraged to report suspicious behaviour, reproduces ideas of who is allowed in particular places but also reaffirms the types of behaviour that are deemed acceptable in those places (see Yarwood, Chapter 8 in this volume). The increasing role of private security firms and the rise of forms of voluntary and community policing raise serious questions about legality and accountability.



Figure 9.1 Gated residential development, Worcester, UK

The idea of gating appears to be bound up with two interconnected factors: security and prestige. Discourses of safety and security serve as a useful rationale for developers to design, build and promote spatially exclusive housing

often surrounded by security fences and with highly limited public access regulated by intercoms and other screening technologies. Just as wider ideas of territory emerged alongside developments in technology, so too gating has evolved in tandem with technological advances in recent decades. In this way, residential homogeneity is both reflected and reproduced with the social and the spatial inextricably linked as 'gated minds' are translated into gated places (Landman 2010). While the forms it takes may vary somewhat according to place-specific circumstances, gating in its various guises touches on vitally important questions of the privatization of previously public space. In so doing it highlights important issues of sociospatial inclusion, exclusion and what can be seen as the territorialization of social life (Lemanski and Oldfield 2009; Rosen and Razin 2009). Extremely exclusive forms of gating can be recognized in cities such as Dubai and Singapore, where Pow (2011) points to the creation of micro-territories inhabited by a global elite who enjoy the specific environment while cocooned and protected from the outside world. Of course, these elites are simultaneously connected to that wider world in many other ways via work, travel and media so that, paradoxically, such mini-territories, though bordered and separated, function as inherently transnational spaces. Gating acts both materially and symbolically, protecting insiders against the threats lurking beyond the perimeter, with internal order contrasted with the perceived external chaos.

Exclusivity is sold through heightening the perceived risk of being outside.

The class nature of these segregated spaces is quite often closely associated with ethnic divisions. While highly ghettoized areas exist in many North American cities, the apartheid system in South Africa produced probably the most formalized version of racially segregated space from the late 1940s through to the early 1990s, and is a classic example of the utilization of a territorial strategy to attain political objectives. At localized levels, separate buses, public toilets and other amenities reflected this divide with a racial ideology mapped on to the South African landscape. Although apartheid ended in the early 1990s, its legacy means that a division of space lingers on in the social landscape.

In most United States (US) and European cities, segregation reflects the coincidence of class and ethnic divides. Clustering offers feelings of defence, mutual support and a sense of belonging and community, and may be a useful means through which group cultural norms and heritage may be preserved. It can also produce spaces of resistance whereby external threats, whether to cultural norms or of physical attack, may be reduced. Nevertheless, residential clustering is often more a function of necessity rather than of free and unconstrained choice. Discriminatory ideologies of race and class work to exclude people

from particular areas through the operations of the housing market and other processes, thereby translating social exclusion into geographical exclusion. In a similar vein the placing of refugees and asylum-seekers in detention centres and related forms of accommodation represents a separating-out of specific categories of people whose ability to negotiate society and space becomes seriously restricted as a consequence.

The types of segregation highlighted above become self-reproducing, as forms of spatial clustering further contribute to future rounds of marginalization and exclusion, so that the spatial divisions resulting from economic and social marginality have a tendency to lock people into a context from which it is difficult to extricate themselves. Territorial practices serve to reproduce particular social outcomes in a complex recursive relationship whereby society does not simply impact on space, but spatial arrangements in turn impact on society.

Geographies of policing and resistance

The ways in which social divisions are spatialized also means that they are subject to a variety of bordering and surveillance practices designed to control sections of society. The manner in which policing is carried out also reflects ideas of territory and territorial control, ranging from police having particular 'beats' or zones of responsibility, to the spatial tactics employed by police, for example, funnelling street marches and protests along agreed routes. Controversial strategies such as 'kettling' involve containing protestors in specific spaces. Recent years have seen an increasing range of security measures deployed in various contexts at places such as airports, national monuments, and so on, which highlight tensions over the securitization of public space thereby placing constraints on freedom of movement while increasing levels of public surveillance enacted through various methods.

While traditionally policing has been seen as the purview of state forces, in recent years the nature of policing has become ever more complicated, with an expanding array of agencies with often overlapping geographic and authoritative remits (Yarwood 2007). The increasing range of non-state actors engaged in forms of policing also brings with it a series of additional territorializations, with private security firms patrolling office blocks and shopping malls and enforcing codes of behaviour and prohibitions on activities such as taking photographs in certain spaces. The advent of citizen-based groups such as Neighbourhood Watch also rests on notions of local territories with people encouraged to report suspicious behaviour (see Yarwood, Chapter 8 in this

volume). Current government strategies in many countries appear designed to deepen trends towards greater community control and the broadening of policing partnership arrangements which might be interpreted as moving towards more heightened levels of surveillance.

However, policing is about more than simple law enforcement, it is also about the regulation and endorsement of specific values and moral codes (Mawby and Yarwood 2011). Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) in the UK and similar so-called 'bubble' laws in the USA also function to exclude people behaving in certain ways from specific places. Such instruments bring a territorial approach to dealing with particular behaviours that are seen to constitute a nuisance. They can be used to prevent specified individuals from being in particular places, streets, and so on, or to prevent individuals from repeatedly engaging in specified behaviours such as aggressive begging, disturbing neighbours or drunkenness in public places. Certain forms of behaviour are deemed unacceptable in public space and are punished through territorial exclusion. Regardless of our view of the rights and wrongs of such moves, and whether they might be deemed successful even on their own terms, they raise important geographical questions related to what is meant by public space, who is allowed to be where, and how people are expected to behave (Cameron 2007). Of course, the ultimate spatial sanction for law-breaking is imprisonment. In all societies, those who are convicted (or sometimes those merely accused) of criminal offences may also be excluded by territorial confinement (imprisonment) or controls on their movement. This has led to heightened interest in systems of incarceration and the experiences of these (Moran 2015). Ultimately, forms and extent of carceral spaces have expanded beyond conventional prison buildings to incorporate practices running through various facets of life.

As Philo (2012) has argued, contemporary security discourses emphasize strong boundaries, to keep some things in and/or to keep some other things out. There is an increasingly heavy emphasis on separation and demarcation although, as Turner (2007) has pointed out, the erection of barriers may often be as much symbolic as about the reality of security. Fences surrounding Ceuta and Melilla (Spanish enclaves on Morocco's Mediterranean coast) where Europe meets Africa provide migrants with practical barriers to crossing and highly symbolic evidence of the gulf between them and the perceived advantages of life in 'Fortress Europe'.

At a more micro scale, taken alongside the privatization and gating of residential zones referred to earlier, the proliferation of covered shopping malls can be seen as the erosion of shared urban street space and its replacement with

privatized, more exclusionary spaces of consumption. Where once streets were open to a broad public, many are now privatized spaces whose owners (invariably resorting to security firms who take on some police powers) can evict those seen to behave inappropriately or who simply look 'out of place'. The shopping mall has become a privatized and highly regulated space in which people may be excluded by virtue of their appearance or behaviour (Staeheli and Mitchell 2006). Shopping complexes are considered private space into which people are invited rather than having any automatic right to be there. These secure shopping centres, office blocks and apartment buildings, complete with gates and intercom systems, exemplify a trend towards sociospatial design whereby territorial strategies associated with crime prevention effectively exclude those who are not wanted. In part, these forms of exclusionary policing reflect broader geographies of fear and the perceived risk of crime associated both with specific groups and with specific geographic spaces (Pain and Smith 2008). Increasingly, space is patrolled by private security companies whose remit is territorially circumscribed, producing a patchwork of fragmented spaces patrolled by different companies leading to displacement of undesirables from certain streets and commercial zones (Paache et al. 2014). Export processing zones (EPZs) in countries such as the Philippines and South Korea might be seen to function in similar ways. Here there is a legal-political separation of a demarcated territory from the wider society of which it is formally part, allowing for the suspension or easing of 'normal' business regulations (such as environmental and labour laws, and taxation regimes) in order to encourage multinational corporations engaged in forms of production geared towards the export of goods (Park 2005). In a similar vein, recreational spaces such as golf courses, wider tourist complexes in regions such as the West Indies, or beach resorts in parts of Africa and South-East Asia, can be seen as further extensions of spatial enclaving designed to enclose the relatively privileged consumers from the excluded local 'other', while simultaneously sustaining and reproducing ideas of the exotic (Kothari 2015; Cohen 2018).

While there are many negative consequences of territorialization built on misleading ideas of race, class or ethnicity, it is dangerous to paint places simply as poor marginalized ghettos whose residents lie somehow passive and unable to resist the forces seemingly arrayed against them. Slum areas in cities are people's homes, the places in which their daily lives are lived out. These areas provide people with a sense of identity, belonging and community, and may be perceived as safe spaces from the world beyond. Despite their negative images, these are places where economic, social, cultural and political activities take place, and in which social networks bind people to place. In addition, the apparent consignment of the poor or of ethnic groups to certain areas can also of course provide the spatial framework for forms of resistance. The ghetto can

be used as a means of mobilizing residents, of providing the territorial frame with which people identify and within which they can operate with a view to improving their own conditions. An array of economic, social, cultural, political and environmental activities that mobilize senses of community and identity can coalesce in such spaces. Successful residents' groups often emerge and may become sufficiently well organized to be able to engage in lobbying, in forms of self-help, and in practical projects providing them with both material gains and a voice that might otherwise be denied them (Nijman 2009). Ghettoized spaces may also facilitate the mobilization of people in support of, or in opposition to, issues of direct concern to them such as transport provision, banking facilities, the provision (or non-provision) of a range of services and the preservation of open spaces. In this way a territorial strategy can be utilized in order to defend the interests of those who, if more spatially scattered, would be unable to do so. Resistance may also take more overtly subversive and sometimes socially regressive forms, such as street gangs laying claim to their 'turf', the renaming of streets and the placing of territorial markers such as graffiti.

Ultimately the contestation of space through various forms reflects resistance and an assertion of rights. They indicate the ways in which the meanings of place are disputed and, hence, they could be said to reflect contested ideas of community. The spaces to which people are consigned may provide the means through which they contest their marginalization. A territorial base may serve as a means through which an ethnic identity or a class identity is reinforced and reshaped, in part at least, in opposition to other identities. Other categorizations, such as religious affiliation, may also provide the basis for parallel territorialities (see Cunningham, Chapter 6 in this volume). Diasporic spaces associated with visible ethnic minority groups can provide a spatial frame which can be utilized in order to develop positive connotations. Chinatowns and other 'ethnic' areas in Western cities, for example, have often become sites on tourist and gastronomic circuits. While the commercialization of such areas and their culture may have clear positive dimensions, there is also a risk of co-option through which identity and difference become essentialized and exoticised; features to be exploited for commercial purposes. Such areas become contested spaces, and the subject of struggle over their identity and meaning. Just as there is a risk in depicting such spaces in negative terms, so too there is a risk in overly romanticizing them and their residents. Divergent perspectives within localities may mitigate against any single monolithic community identity or political strategy. Finally, we need to bear in mind that, while territorial frames may be used to further progressive forms of resistance, they can also be used in different ways in different places. The ability of more articulate and more affluent residents to oppose some forms of housing devel-

opment or land use conversion may be directed towards maintaining forms of exclusion, often associated with gentrification, rather than promoting inclusion. We need be wary of overly romanticized ideas of community that assume harmonious relations that somehow benefit all equally, ignoring underlying social fissures.

Gender, sexuality and space

When considering ideas of domestic space, the public-private divide takes on a heavily gendered dimension. Legal prohibitions combined with enduring social norms have worked to reproduce ideas of a distinction between a largely female domestic realm and a largely male public one, underpinned by a range of assumptions concerning gender roles, norms and behaviours. However, ideas of gendered space extend far beyond the boundaries of the home, radiating out into spaces of work, leisure and recreation. Historically, women who transgressed these boundaries were often portrayed in a negative light, an idea reflective of notions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ women. Women out alone at night might be seen as not conforming to what is expected of them. A crucial aspect of the relationship between women and place centres on the perception of some specific places as ‘unsafe’. Many women do not feel safe in certain public places, most notably darkened streets, and these geographies of fear have profoundly negative implications for the ways in which women negotiate their way through certain spaces. Feminist geographic approaches have usefully drawn attention to what might be seen as the geopolitics of gender (Dowler and Sharp 2001; Dixon and Marston 2011; Massaro and Williams 2013).

This view of women as playing a subordinate role has in the past been reflected in discriminatory attitudes and practices, particularly in relation to women in the paid workforce, with active discouragement through lower wages, if not actual exclusion, from many jobs. The confining of women to domestic space, and their exclusion from male territories, was a key element in male control and was reproduced through a range of bordering practices. While attitudes have shifted significantly in many countries, the division between a (largely) male public sphere and a (largely) female private sphere still has considerable resonance in many societies, although the extent of this is itself immensely geographically variable across the world.

Where women enter the workforce, they may still encounter territorial divisions in the workplace reflecting a ‘glass ceiling’. The presence of women in the armed forces periodically provokes debate over the supposed appropriateness

of women performing such roles. The deaths of female soldiers in recent years in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and elsewhere, and the presence of women in military combat, have been depicted in especially poignant terms in the media, while the appropriateness of women being engaged in military activity in a war zone rather than being at home playing the key role in bringing up children is never far below the surface. In Iraq and Syria, ISIS recruitment of young women (expected to perform circumscribed support roles, rather than 'frontline' action) has also provoked sets of responses which reflect the perceived abnormality of women participating in violent actions. Social processes reproduce attitudes that tend to naturalize a gendered division of labour in which women perform certain functions – such as home-making and child-rearing – which are acted out in domestic space. Socially constructed gendered difference is inherently also spatialized. Within the arena of sport and leisure, gender stereotyping remains prevalent. While there are undoubtedly marked changes, gendered ideas and practices about leisure activities and, hence, separate spaces for men and women are still common. Such social practices are built upon ideas of what is or is not acceptable behaviour for men and women to engage in (built on socially or culturally constructed notions of masculinity and femininity), and where such activities should occur. Stereotypes of women spending leisure time shopping while men attend sporting events, or watch them on television at home or in pubs, have a self-perpetuating quality. The acceptance and visibility of women in specific social contexts continues to be viewed as problematic in many places and serves to demonstrate the manner in which macro-scale political issues intersect with more intimate micro-geographies of gender (Pratt and Rosner 2012).

The home itself is not of course an undifferentiated space, as even here territorial divisions take place, of which the most obvious is the 'traditional' notion of the kitchen as a female preserve (Figure 9.2). Within most Western societies, deep-seated ideas about woman's role as home-maker, cook, cleaner, child-rearer, and so on, mean that women have often been historically presumed to 'belong' in some rooms and spaces more than others. While such ideas have been challenged, and to some extent transformed, they have considerable durability. These ideas are manifested in territorial expressions of power whereby the designation or apportionment of space within the domestic sphere reflects the relative status or roles of the individuals concerned. As Spain (1992, p. 111) long ago reminded us, 'houses are shaped not just by materials and tools, but by ideas, values and norms'.

Many countries still criminalize gay sexuality and almost everywhere sexual mores and regulations are highly territorialized. The mapping of 'gay territories' runs the risk of focusing on what some see as deviant behaviour as well as



Figure 9.2 Home spaces: kitchen

essentializing sexuality and reinforcing a gay-straight dichotomy. Nevertheless, the fact that those who identify themselves as gay and lesbian do, in some instances, become associated with particular (usually urban) spaces, suggests that another form of territorial behaviour may be evident. A concentration of visibly gay restaurants, bars and clubs results in the creation of what Castells (1997, p. 213) calls 'a space of freedom'. Places such as the Castro District of San Francisco and the more spatially confined 'gay village' in Manchester serve as important examples, while the city of Brighton has acquired an image as the 'gay capital' of the UK (Browne and Lim 2010).

The construction of such zones may arise for reasons similar to those associated with ghettos and other forms of segregated space. Protection and visibility may be particularly important. The idea of 'strength in numbers' may make people feel safer from homophobic 'gay-bashers'. Visibility may have an emancipatory effect through which identification as gay or lesbian within a culture that is predominantly straight, and in which a straight discourse dominates, may work to nullify views that see homosexuality as deviant or abnormal. Gay neighbourhoods become a means of asserting identities. Through spatial clustering, San Francisco's gay community gained political representation

and the city has become recognized as something of a 'gay capital' of the US, with a somewhat more liberal attitude. In this way, the designation of 'gay territories' plays a crucial role in raising awareness of gay people and issues and also provides a means by which some degree of power and self-confidence can be attained. Celebratory events such as 'gay pride' marches can be seen as an assertion of citizenship rights through staking a claim to public space. However, while gay spaces may constitute spaces of freedom, they can also be vulnerable to attack, with heightened visibility rendering people targets for homophobic assault, both verbal and physical.

As with 'ethnic spaces', sexual identities also become commodified with gay spaces promoted, commercialized and exploited. The 'pink pound' (or dollar, or euro) has been seen as aiding urban regeneration, frequently adding a strong commercial angle to these developments. One consequence may be the co-option of the identity in order to present an acceptable image of the group concerned which feeds into broader strategies of place promotion. Not surprisingly, some activists have expressed disquiet over the appropriation of such events and their dislocation from their original social and cultural roots and from their original territorial base. The fact that Manchester's 'gay village' and San Francisco's Castro District are firmly on the tourist trails of their respective cities may be lauded as an acceptance of identities previously scorned, but it can also be seen as a commercialization of that identity which may, to some extent, serve to further ghettoize it. The instrumental use of an identity for wider purposes of urban regeneration or place promotion is problematic. The complex intersections between different identities can create specific tensions which play out in different ways in different places. For example, the ways in which gay and lesbian identities are interconnected with processes of gentrification through which they take on a spatial dimension is apparent in places such as the Marais district in Paris, where tensions between 'old' and 'new' residents and within the 'gay community' emerge (Sibalis 2004). Similarly, the intersections of sexualized and racialized identities in post-apartheid Cape Town serve as another useful insight into how issues of identity play out in specific contexts (Tucker 2009). The relations between class, capital, sexual identity and place may be manifested in various complex ways. Sexual citizenship becomes implicated in wider processes of urban transformation, while sexualized spaces may continue to be quite highly regulated (Bell and Binnie 2004). The perception of gay spaces as the effective preserve of white gay males may lead to the emergence of different types of 'queer' neighbourhoods. As Nash (2013) highlights, Toronto's gay village is effectively incorporated into the wider image and social, economic and political structures of the city. In this way, it has been argued both gay identities and the spaces associated with them have become increasingly commodified.

Ultimately, we need to be wary of exoticizing space based on an essentialized version of sexual (or other) identities.

Openly gay behaviour may be accepted or tolerated in some places but may remain decidedly unacceptable elsewhere. Here of course there are profound links between the small-scale neighbourhood or urban territorialities and the wider policies of the city or state concerned (Giesekeing 2016). These considerations of gender and sexuality also relate to ideas of the body and what bodies are 'allowed' or 'tolerated' in specific places. This has serious implications for various minorities, migrants and protesters, and may serve to inhibit or impede their actions and behaviours (see Evans, Chapter 10 in this volume). Bodies occupying space can be used as a territorial tactic (through forms of protest), but these bodies may also be subject to violent disciplining, forced removal, and so on. All of this points to the need for further research on the circumscribing of space for certain categories of people and on attempts at transgressing that space (Smith et al. 2016).

Work, rest and play

At its most elementary level, the assertion of territoriality is reflected in claims to private property. Thus, people desire to mark their own home, to adorn it in their chosen style and, in various ways, to mark it out as theirs. These choices of course are simultaneously influenced by prevailing trends while constrained by household budgets. Homeowners are generally keen to stamp their personality on their home through the ways in which they choose to decorate it, alterations to layout, choice of colour schemes, furnishings, and so on. This personalizing of space is further manifested through such things as the display of paintings, posters or photographs and the collection and arrangement of ornaments. Fashions shift between more open-plan designs and those with more private separate spaces, reflecting the role of interior designers, style magazines, and so on. Gottman (1973, p. 1) suggested that people 'always partitioned the space around them carefully to set themselves apart from their neighbours'. This emphasis on the centrality of the home also has a broader cultural and political significance. Symbolic connections are often made between the domestic home and the nation, whereby images of the former are seen to give material meaning to the latter. The home is seen in some ways to be at the heart of the nation. In times of war, for example, people have been encouraged to fight for the 'homeland' and urged to defend 'hearth and home'.

Private property is commonly seen as an outcome of human territorial behaviour, representing a claim to space reinforced through the legal systems of many countries. It follows that we need to be careful to avoid the trap of translating a need for personal space into an ideological claim for the sanctity of private property. The centrality of the family home, encapsulated in such phrases as 'home, sweet home', glosses over the fact that the privacy which many of us associate with the home is comparatively recent and is specific to some societies. Where domestic space is limited (or for those who find it constrains them), life may be lived in the street much more evidently than the 'behind four walls' lifestyle many take as natural. We need to be mindful of social, ethnic and geographic differences in the ways in which the home is conceived (Morley 2000).

Hegemonic ideas of the home within Western societies, exemplified by such notions as the home being an 'Englishman's castle' or associated with the 'American Dream', can be argued to have led to an ignoring of internal tensions and, in particular, a consideration of the different positions, roles and experiences of men, women and younger people within this domestic space, as discussed earlier (McDowell 1999). While the home is commonly depicted as a refuge from the outside world, it may also be a site for domestic violence and fear (Squire and Gill 2011), and for some may come to resemble a prison. These issues were highlighted during the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic when strictures on remaining at home led to increases in cases of domestic abuse in the UK and many other countries. Similarly, teenagers may view the home as somewhere to escape from. In any event, the emphasis on the domestic idyll may have highly exclusionary consequences (Delaney 2005). Societal norms tend to treat the home as a closed environment where outsiders are unable or reluctant to intervene.

Even within buildings, micro-scale territorial behaviour can be recognized. The domestic home in many different cultural contexts is often spatially divided, not just in terms of gender but also in terms of age, with certain spaces being designated for women or for children (Spain 1992). As already discussed, the idea of the kitchen as a 'woman's place' is one example of this, while the banning of children from some rooms and the proprietorial attitude towards one's own room in a house also reflect a degree of territoriality. In the home, space is even being claimed at the level of 'my' chair, 'my' place at the table, and so on. There are also distinctions amongst those allowed to cross the threshold, with differential access for close family and friends on the one hand, and more casual acquaintances on the other. Even then, friends may be welcomed into the living room but are less likely to be invited into the more private spaces such as bedrooms (Morley 2000). In any consideration of the home, we need

to be mindful that it is not a straightforward and unambiguous entity. While for some it conjures up feelings of comfort and security, for others it may be a place of discomfort, alienation and tension (Blunt and Dowling 2006). Home is therefore a social construction in which social identities are (re)produced but which conveys different meanings to different people. Future research agendas might fruitfully explore these ideas of domestic territories and the liminal spaces between what is perceived as 'home' and 'non-home' (Brighenti and Kärrholm 2018). Equally, in workplaces some areas and rooms can be entered only by staff of a certain level and are out of bounds to more junior staff. These can be interpreted as managerial strategies designed to ensure a particular outcome: staff 'know their place' and can be more effectively controlled, sometimes through very obvious visual intrusion. Work hierarchies are reflected in the spatial arrangements of the workplace. These practices have clear outcomes. They may render it difficult for workers to organize through physically keeping them separate and through engendering a sense of difference between different sections of the workforce.

In a similar vein we might take the example of the university teaching room. Here a lecturer may exert a strong degree of territorial control, occupying a space at the top of the room while controlling (or trying to) who else may speak and when they may do so. Even in highly interactive and more student-led sessions, a lecturer, by virtue of their status, continues to exert control over the space. They can command the room and walk around it in ways which students cannot (or are discouraged from doing). However, such control has very obvious temporal constraints. What the students and lecturer may regard as 'their' room is usually limited to a regular timetabled slot. Before and after that time, their right to be there is denied, as other lecturers and students take over the space and control it.

Taking the idea of territory down to its most elementary level, the desire for personal space can be seen as a form of territorial behaviour. Humans like to have a pocket of space around them that is theirs and they resent others 'invading' their space (unless invited). This can be interpreted as a territorial claim to a portion of geographic space. While this might be taken as reflecting a natural tendency, it is evident that the amount of space needed appears to vary from one society to another, a fact noted long ago by Hall (1959). For many young people, their own room, apartment, and so on, may seem like a natural ambition, but for many of the world's inhabitants such a desire is completely unobtainable. For those living in overcrowded conditions, the amount of personal space available is extremely limited. For a homeless person, their 'own' space may be limited to a hostel bed in central London, a doorway in downtown Manhattan, or a small patch of pavement in San Francisco (Gowan 2010). In

environments where space is at a premium due to overcrowded conditions, the street may offer a form of personal space not available in the home.

At the time of writing, the Covid-19 epidemic has focused attention on 'social distancing' and people both isolating themselves at home but also maintaining a certain distance from others in social situations. This has given added meaning to ideas of personal space as well as lending increased impetus to ideas of separating home from non-home. People were advised to stay at least 2 metres apart from each other, leading to elongated queuing systems in supermarkets and a general sense of people keeping apart from each other and staying in their personal bubble of space. Even within the home, people with symptoms of the virus were advised to self-isolate in separate rooms. Of course, for many people in overcrowded living conditions and communal living arrangements such ideas are almost impossible to put into practice, highlighting yet again class and ethnic inequalities.

Sport provides an example of an activity in which territory and space are of obvious importance. Sport is deeply connected to questions of place and identity, with some sports intrinsically connected to particular places, Gaelic games in Ireland being a classic example (Crampsie 2017). Sports grounds and facilities occupy areas of urban and rural space and we can consider these in relation to wider ideas of inclusion and exclusion. Issues of gender or ethnicity may be important here, and the maintenance of men-only rules at some sports facilities results in a highly gendered division of recreational space. The prohibition on women attending football matches in Iran is one such example of spatial exclusion. Sports such as football and rugby thrive on inter-place rivalry and fans come to closely identify with their sporting 'home'. In some instances, this rivalry may be at a relatively localized yet highly intense scale, such as that between Arsenal and Tottenham Hotspur football clubs in north London. In some cases, wider sociocultural issues may overlay geographic rivalry, as with Celtic and Rangers football clubs in Glasgow, Scotland where the religious division between Protestants and Catholics is part of the cultural context for the antipathy and tensions between the clubs. Regional identities may also coalesce around rivalries between football clubs, as in the case of Dinamo Zagreb and Hajduk Split in Croatia, where hard-core fans appear to adopt a strongly territorial frame through which the rivalry is seen as an intense encounter between the two cities and reflective of a broader regional division between the north and the Dalmatian coast (Tsai 2020). At a still more micro scale, fans will occupy different sections of a ground, usually related to security considerations designed to keep 'home' and 'away' supporters apart. In some cases, minorities of supporters may try to 'take' the home section of the ground, while visiting fans sometimes like to be seen to assert control over

bars and streets in the host city or town, a version of territoriality of very short duration. In sport itself, territorial strategies of dominating the pitch, or areas of it, may be a fundamental tactic. In rugby, teams usually endeavour to keep play in the opposition's half, while tennis players may wish to dominate the court as a means of dominating their opponent.

In a rather different form of recreation we can think of the ways in which interactions with animals occur in controlled circumstances, while separating animal worlds from humans is a concern elsewhere. In Australia, for example, there are attempts to exclude sharks from some bathing spaces, while failing to consider quite whose space it is in the first place (Gibbs 2018; Hardiman et al. 2019). The existence of nudist beaches and swimming spaces provides another example of controlling behaviour through restricting (formally or informally) certain types of activity to spatially restricted leisure zones.

Conclusions

The examples provided in this chapter are evidence of the ways in which social relations take on a territorial form, and they highlight how these geographies help in turn to shape social relations. Social phenomena such as class, racial or gendered identities invariably embody a territorial component, with territorial strategies often used to control and police those who are defined as 'out of (their) place'. In this way particular ideologies are transposed onto space. People are confronted with wider practices through their use of space or through the ways in which they are allowed to use space. Power relationships take on a spatial dimension, even at the most mundane and everyday level. Issues of identity, particularly within multicultural societies, have a spatial expression as social divisions (associated with class, ethnic, religious, gender or other factors) are given material form through spatial divisions. The examples used here demonstrate the spatialization of wider ideas and they show how people are kept 'in their place', whether through overt mechanisms or through more subtle means. Social boundaries are often communicated through space. This can have serious implications, with some groups of people effectively treated as second-class (or indeed as non-)citizens denied full rights in the society in which they find themselves, confined to spatial enclaves which become characterized as dangerous and threatening spaces. Social and spatial exclusion has the effect of denying full access to those rights often thought of as inalienable for all people everywhere. Many territorial strategies have deeply discriminatory and exclusionary outcomes, giving rise to social and spatial

exclusion. They can be used to deny people effective participation in society through restricting choice, mobility and possibilities to participate.

However, just as dominant ideologies can be reinforced through territorial practices, so they can also be resisted. Territorial strategies are useful mechanisms in the assertion of identity, and spatial concentrations within particular geographic areas make visible people and issues that might otherwise remain unseen. They can be used to draw attention to exclusionary practices and to assert the right to be equal citizens. In doing so, this demonstrates the positive and negative dimensions to territoriality: it can be both a force for oppression and also one for liberation. Particular strategies can be used to assert an identity, and territorially transgressive acts can be employed to reclaim space and, hence, to assert basic rights. While many people do not necessarily freely choose their 'place', they may nevertheless identify with their immediate neighbourhood or locality. This sense of identity can in turn be converted into forms of action aimed at obtaining particular outcomes. The formation of community or residence groups reflects feelings of belonging or attachment to a particular place. It follows that notions of territory are connected with ideas of social power. The claiming of space is a political act, whether it occurs in the public or the private arena, and territories are a material expression of the fusion of meaning, power and social space.

References

- Atkinson, R. and S. Blandy (2006), *Gated Communities*, London: Routledge.
- Bagaen, S. and O. Uduku (eds) (2010), *Gated Communities: Social Sustainability and Historical Gated Developments*, London: Earthscan.
- Bell, D. and J. Binnie (2004), 'Authenticating queer space: citizenship, urbanism and governance', *Urban Studies*, **41** (9), 1807–1820.
- Blunt, A. and R. Dowling (2006), *Home*, London: Routledge.
- Brighenti, A.M and M. Kärrholm (2018), 'Domestic territories and the little humans: Understanding the animation of domesticity', *Space and Culture*, **21** (4), 395–407.
- Browne, K. and J. Lim (2010), 'Trans lives in the "gay capital of the UK"', *Gender, Place and Culture*, **17** (5), 615–633.
- Butler, T. (2007), 'For gentrification?', *Environment and Planning A*, **39** (1), 162–181.
- Cameron, A. (2007), 'Geographies of welfare and exclusion: reconstituting the "public"', *Progress in Human Geography*, **31** (4), 519–526.
- Castells, M. (1997), *The Power of Identity*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cohen, E. (2018), 'Backpacker enclaves research: achievements, critique and alternative approaches', *Tourism Recreation Research*, **43** (1), 105–116.
- Crampsie, A. (2017), 'Playing identity politics: the Gaelic Athletic Association in modern Ireland', in N. Koch (ed.), *Critical Geographies of Sport: Space, Power and Sport in Global Perspective*, Oxford: Routledge, pp. 108–122.

- Davis, M. (2006), *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, new edition, London: Verso.
- Delaney, D. (2005), *Territory: A Short Introduction*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Dixon, D.P. and S.A. Marston (2011), 'Introduction: feminist engagements with geopolitics', *Gender, Place and Culture*, **18**, 445–453.
- Dowler, L. and J. Sharp (2001), 'A feminist geopolitics', *Space and Polity*, **5**, 165–176.
- Gibbs, L. (2018), 'Shores: sharks, nets and more-than-human territory in eastern Australia', in K. Peters, P. Steinberg and E. Stratford (eds), *Terra Beyond Territory*, London, UK and New York, USA: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 203–219.
- Gieseking, J.J. (2016), 'Crossing over into neighbourhoods of the body: urban territories, borders and lesbian-queer bodies in New York City', *Area*, **48**, 262–270.
- Glazze, G., C. Webster and K. Frantz (2006) *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gottman, J. (1973), *The Significance of Territory*, Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Gowan, T. (2010), *Hobos, Hustlers and Backsliders: Homeless in San Francisco*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hall, E.T. (1959), *The Silent Language*, Garden City: Doubleday.
- Hardiman, N., S. Burgin and J. Shao (2019), 'News media portrayal of attributed stakeholder attitudes to shark management in Australia', *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, **24** (6), 548–563.
- Janoschka, M. and J. Sequera (2016), 'Gentrification in Latin America: addressing the politics and geographies of displacement', *Urban Geography*, **37** (8), 1175–1194.
- Kothari, U. (2015) 'Reworking colonial imaginaries in post-colonial tourist enclaves', *Tourist Studies*, **15** (3), 248–266.
- Landman, K. (2010), 'Gated minds, gated places: the impact and meaning of hard boundaries in South Africa', in S. Bagaen and O. Uduku (eds), *Gated Communities. Social Sustainability and Historical Gated Developments*, London: Earthscan, pp. 49–61.
- Lees, L., H. Shin and E. Lopez-Morales (eds) (2015), *Global Gentrifications: Uneven Development and Displacement*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lemanski, C. and S. Oldfield (2009), 'The parallel claims of gated communities and land invasions in a southern city: polarised state responses', *Environment and Planning*, **41** (3), 634–648.
- Massaro, V.A. and J. Williams (2013), 'Feminist geopolitics', *Geography Compass*, **7**, 567–577.
- Mawby, R.I. and R. Yarwood (eds) (2011), *Rural Policing and Policing the Rural: A Constable Countryside?*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- McDowell, L. (1999), *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moran, D. (2015), *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Morley, D. (2000), *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*, London: Routledge.
- Nash, C.J. (2013), 'Queering neighbourhoods: politics and practice in Toronto', *ACME*, **12** (9), 193–219.
- Nijman, J. (2009), 'A study of place in Mumbai's slums', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, **101** (1), 4–17.
- Paasche, T.F., R. Yarwood and J.D. Sidaway (2014), 'Territorial tactics: the socio-spatial significance of private policing strategies in Cape Town', *Urban Studies*, **51** (8), 1559–1575.

- Pain, R. and S.J. Smith (eds) (2008), *Fear: Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Park, B.-G. (2005), 'Spatially selective liberalization and graduated sovereignty: politics of neo-liberalism and "special economic zones" in South Korea', *Political Geography*, **24** (7), 850–873.
- Philo, C. (2012), 'Security of geography/geography of security', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **37** (1), 1–7.
- Pow, C.-P. (2011), 'Living it up: super-rich enclave and transnational elite urbanism in Singapore', *Geoforum*, **42** (3), 382–393.
- Pratt, G. and V. Rosner (2012), *The Global and the Intimate: Feminism in our Time*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rosen, G. and E. Razin (2009), 'The rise of gated communities in Israel: reflections on changing urban governance in a neo-liberal era', *Urban Studies*, **46** (8), 1702–1722.
- Sibalis, M. (2004), 'Urban space and homosexuality: the example of the Marais, Paris "Gay Ghetto"', *Urban Studies*, **41** (9), 1739–1758.
- Sidaway, J.D. (2007), 'Enclave space: a new metageography of development?', *Area*, **39** (3), 331–339.
- Smith, S., N.W. Swanson and B. Gökarıksel (2016), 'Territory, bodies and borders', *Area*, **48** (3), 258–261.
- Spain, D. (1992), *Gendered Spaces*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Squire, G. and A. Gill (2011), "'It's not all *Heartbeat* you know": policing domestic violence in rural areas', in R.I. Mawby and R. Yarwood (eds), *Rural Policing and Policing the Rural. A Constable Countryside?*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 159–168.
- Staeheli, L.A. and D. Mitchell, (2006), 'USA's destiny? Regulating space and creating community in American shopping malls', *Urban Studies*, **43** (5–6), 977–992.
- Tsai, D. (2020) "'A tale of two Croatias": how club football (soccer) teams produce radical regional divides in Croatia's national identity', *Nationalities Papers*, 1–16.
- Tucker, A. (2009), *Queer Visibilities: Space, Identity and Interaction in Cape Town*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Turner, B.S. (2007), 'The enclave society: towards sociology of immobility', *European Journal of Social Theory*, **10** (2), 287–303.
- Yarwood, R. (2007), 'The geographies of policing', *Progress in Human Geography*, **31** (4), 447–465.