

Geopolitics Quarterly, Volume: 7, No 4, Winter 2011

PP 120-136

Concept of Territory in Global Era

Mohammad Raof Heidari Far* - Assistant Professor of Political Geography, Payame Noor, Tehran, Iran

Received: 25/01/2011

Accepted: 20/01/2012

Abstract

Territory is one of the essential pillars of political geography. But, there are a lot of discussion about dissubjectivity and unimportance of territory at the age of globalization. The discourses about deterritorialization have attracted the academic and scientific groups so much that some believe that Globalization equals deterritorialization.

This article with a neo-realism approach has tried to analyze the process of Globalization having territorial vision. In other words, while it does not deny exterritorial and transnational processes but it put emphasis on reterritorialization of various phenomenon and processes at the age of globalization. The assumption is that territory and boundary can not be obliterated but their function have changed. Likewise, it is believed in this paper that for the needs of human to different and geography, the role of territory will remain for future and globalization and transnationalization do not diminish its role and situation in the communal human life.

Keywords: Globalization, Territory, Deterritorialization, Reterritorialization.

* E-mail: Amirhidry123@pnu.ac.ir

Introduction

Globalization is going on and its future is ambiguous. While this process has effected on our social life, it also contributes to the changes of our physical world. Time - space compression means people are out of isolation and geographic space is being redesigned by informationalization. New satellite, media and information technology in different areas brings a new role and new function for territory in global era. Globalization has changed the meaning and definition of some geographic concepts such as area, place, space, and region and in particular territory. While some believe that the end of geography is predicted, there are a large number of scholars who talking about permeability and reduction of the importance of the role and situation of territory and border in contemporary social life. However, the concept has been transformed i.e. its demise or permeability will be heard. Territorial Identities, territorial agents, territorial institutions along with the new function for territory consequently have become different in the present. However, we have to attend that Geography has been evolved by the new function for territory in this new condition while we have to consider that the link to and defend of land and territory and its ideology, thought, philosophy and emotion will still be produced.

Territory and border are key topics in geography. Territory and territoriality caused the power replacement in the world of geopolitics and also spatial construction and reconstruction which base partly on these kinds of subjects is being carried out; hence, geography is basically defined with tow factors and their effects on human both physically and emotionally. However, the significance of this term needs to debate though it has been a key subject in political geography and it helps to solve a lot problems and puzzles and to understand many issues and concepts in this academic field. Despite the importance of territory, globalization – for some people - is removing the importance. Unifying of different places and proximity of the different spaces means collapse of the territorial walls and end of geography. So, a basic study for discovering of the future of territory and geography is the main duty which each geographer should do. Also, revising and reviewing of the concept of territory in the era of globalization means attempts to find new approaches in geography.

Definition and Theoretical Discussions

Territory

According to the Farsi Dictionary of Dehkhoda, territory is defined as property, country, area, border and so on. Also, in the Dictionary, territory is defined as a place where belong to an ethnic such as Iranian territory or Indian Territory. In another Farsi dictionary namely Amid, territory is equal to country and it is a vast portion of land which an ethnic or a tribe live in. so, territory is a segment of the Earth which it has limits i.e. borders (territorial realm) and it is managed and organized by a powerful agent particularly the state (Mirheydar, 2005).

Peter Hogget points out that the term of Territory has different meanings in English language, so in the first step, it is useful to define it exactly. Guttman believes that the root of the territorial concept is Latinos and in the ancient period of the Grace, it was a region including a city and its proximate hinterland, but after the collapse of global empires it was disappeared too. In contrast, Hensley find it in the Roman Empire and believed that the occupied space of this empire was its territory.

Regular meaning of territory is now a space occupied by the state, so territory always means as a limited social space used by various states while they have territorial strategy. Even though each person tries to maintain his personal space for the sake of his Instinctive tendencies but territory relates to an organization such as the state. Though, the concept of territory has been confined simply to the realm of states but the fact is that except nation-state, others such as native groups, tribes, anti colonial movements and so on had their territorial posses or territorial claims.

Thus, territory is one of the essential pillars of political geography. Not only it is a geographical matter exclusively but also it has important role in definition of other phenomenon and processes like nation, the state, immigration and so on that considered in this field. However, territory was introduced by particularly political geographer as a part of the earth. But it is not complete introducing of territory. Although all scholars refer to territory as a segment of the earth that limited by border, it seems that territory should be political affairs. Territory has been analyzed according to sovereignty. Peter. Taylor and John Guttman believe that territory is defined when it escalate up to international relations. Although In modern era we saw some sort of cultural territoriality but official territoriality was political or cultural term in the national scale. It means that territory confined to sovereignty. Territory also has had important role from

primarily society to modern nations. All society was gotten their meaning from territory and it has crucial role in everyday life. Most of war, tension and revolutions are happened for the feels of territoriality. Most of men that were died in global wars fought just for their country and their soil while they hated their government. In sum, territory has important role in a lot of dilemmas, problems, processes and phenomenon in all of parts of history.

Contemporary Theses

There are some debates about rendering and eroding of role and importance of territory at the age of globalization. Globalists and also transformationlists believe that by arrival of digitalization, informationalization and cyberspace in our life, demise of the territory and also geography and borders are seems to be possible. In new millennia we have not any restrictions and barriers regarding to global economic and global communication. Globalists say with accelerations of speed such as increasing of communicational technology and time – space compression, territory and borders would be eliminated. The role of territory in everyday life in the age of informationalization, digitalization, and so on is nothing. Super territoriality in fields of politics, finance, economics, and intercommunications, and so on are eroding the role of the state and importance of territory in our life. Some body such as Ohmae spoke about demise of nation- state in the age of dominance of global firms. He advised commercial managements take advantages providing by non border and free world. This scientific group believe old and permanent figures of geopolitical realm would demolished by strengthening of global economics. In the other hand, scepticisms or realists are saying nothing is changed. They are in the other side of spectrum of defining of globalization. They told we have international relations instead of globalization. They discuss about gold period in history that refer to early of 20th. In that period, realists assert, we witness a huge transmission of immigrants that was higher in number comparing to these decades. Realists such as Paul Hirst and Graham Thomson think vice versa and believe to permanent and dominance of some player in international relations such as states and nations and so on. Non governmental organizations (NGOs) are obtaining their legacy from allowing of states. And a lot of global firms act in global atmosphere but saved their stocks in territorial base namely national soil. Other academics, in this regard, are transformationlists. Some scholars such as David Held and Anthony

McGraw and A.R Scholte believe that deep and strong changes was happened but political figures and shapes such as state would not ended. In fact, their strength was eroded by global forces but it is not true that we speak about unimportant role of these players in our life (Mirheydar and Heidari Far, 2006).

Here, it has been tried to analyze the relation between globalization and territory with a new realism approach. It means that not only globalization is not denied but it is believed that in new era of time & space compression we witness the importance of territory. For analyzing more curiously, we should consider the relation between scales. It means that we face a globalization of importance of territory. As Lefebvre told for understanding of the dilemma, the whole of scales were needed. In this era, the definition of territory does not perform by just the state at the scale of national, but nowadays it is introduced in all scales. Territory in the age of globalization does not introduce by sovereignty and eroding of sovereignty does not mean that territory is not matter. As in global scale we see deterritorialization, superterritoriality or some other terms. In the regional scale we see emerging of units such as EU,NAFTA and so on. In national scale some states strictly are careful about their territory. In local scales we see that some countries were produced like Montenegro. And some fundamentalists or other identities have return to territorial definitions and identities. As scholte has told these processes are being caused by moving from stat centrism toward polycentrism. Hence definition of territory have been changed from role of authority of the state in its property (sovereignty regarding to state centrism) toward the role of collecting actors in all scales (Murray, 2006: 33- 40).

Research Methodology

The methodology which is used in this project has shared an analytical – descriptive approach that its data and information in all parts of the paper has been collected from common places such as libraries and Internet.

Results

Deterritorialization

Geographers consider the debates in academic and political meetings about deterritorialization in the era of globalization. The fact is there are contradictory view about these tow concepts (territory and globalization) which they are essential in geography. While some body especially

geographers tries to prove the role and importance of territory in human life, others- critics- believe that geography and territory will not matter in future. Territorial mechanisms such as the state are going to collapse, disintegrate and weaken in uncertain fate and their deeds and functions do not have any territorial aspect. In fact, there is a gap between political, cultural and economic functions of the state and government with the phenomenon of territory. In one hand, security is not territorial but has transform to global. Terrorism, mass destruction weapons, cyber crime, global criminal organization, global disease such Hiv do not respect borders and pass all territorial limits. Human link to place and home has been cut and in the other hand universalism and universal human and development for the planet earth has its own value. Non- place processes, non-territorial institutions, organizations and companies achieve the promise of a new type of social relationships. New emerging phenomenon is near and some geographical concepts such as governance, The state, territory, country, borders, area, region, variety and the differences has been eliminated and new shapes such as global unity, global village, Global Nation, global government, global culture, global economy and ... Have been created. Unemotional to the place of birth or National territory led to non- territorial conflict, removing the war from international relations and clean the formula of we and others in social network. Discussion in this area is so hot that people like Ian Art Sholte in his book titled critical look at the globalization explains that with entry of the phenomenon into public life the detriment of the geography and territory occurs. Global and supra territorial space is a proof for the existence of the event. He believes that among definition for globalization such as westernization, internationalization, universalism, liberalization and deterritorialization, fifth alternative version is a properly definition and reality for globalization. However, globalization has had a direct impact on territory because globalization is not an assumption but a reality. Supra territorial trends in the global era have made a new concept from territory which differs from the past. Territory and border or territorial space in global era dose not save from global currents in all field of human life. If states strongly control their territorial spaces in the past but today they confront with new challenges in this regard.

Reterritorialization

But is this acceptable? What would happen about territory, territoriality, country, borders, the difference and what is generally Geography? Does

relationship between places exist? Does place die? And our town, village, our environment, rivers, mountains and everything around us will become meaningless? The reality is that globalization effects on our condition and has put such sad ideas especially on geographers. New technology, computers, Internet, satellite and increased awareness, knowledge and information among people changes their views and their knowledge and their cultural ideology. It is true that uncertainty, superstition about the real world surrounding us has eliminated, but emotions, feel and internal forces of human i.e. feel to place in the era of globalization will continue to future. Also, we must know instinctive force taken away while that is simply a part of human existence. Geographers have considered these ideas and have tried to formulate and speaking about globalization. Set of theoretical discussions which expressed by analysts of globalization called globalists indicate the end of territorial subject and border for social life in this new era. But we witness a kind of differences, identity, cultures instead of unity, single identity, and single culture in the world. While globalization is occurring localization also is being strengthened.

Cases mentioned about deterritorialization just one side of a coin, in the other hand there is complexity, ambiguous and unawareness about special construction by globalization. At another side of the fact, there is construction or reconstruction in new geography of global age. Today, although information, knowledge and communication have become global, but place building, regional processes and territoriality has also been transformed. Although geographic information was limit, local and national in time, but today global awareness and information has been flourished by media. Reinforcement of border and new method in control of territory has arrived meanwhile this events show there are changes in global age based on that famous substantial principle of geography. It is true that Westphalia territoriality has been evolved but new version from territoriality has been produced by globalization. All sovereign states in some new geographic-economic units such as European Union control and watch new greater territory named Europe or North America. Today, entry into European Union has been as difficult as national borders of despotic and military governments. Although non territorial machinist (according to classic term) is trying to capture new interests but new ratification in terms of territoriality i.e. regional identity has been emerged. Territorial machinism in developed world has been taken part from their precedence and provided new environment in the North for reconfiguration of geography. Meanwhile,

there still remains the same old model of territory and special inequality in terms of role of territorial concept. In the other hand, these countries have used new technology and strengthen their control on territory and border. Installation of cameras in borders, utilizing of new felicitities in there and so on is a reason for the existence of territorial configuration in contemporary space of all countries of the South (even in the North) which is based on Westphalia International Rules (Ackleson, 2004) also, there is still a link to place, dye for homeland, and territorial significance in political – social life of the present people.

US operation also is a reason for territoriality of its foreign politics. In addition, while it does not accept or participate in environment conferences and meetings, it is argued that it is seeking to enjoy from its national interest which strongly implicate by US even in the age of globalization. Competing with other regional powers in American continent, geographic isolation view between some officials and reinforced control to borders are all reasons for territoriality (Izadi, 2000). US Strategy of Rogue State is also a proof for territoriality of politics in this score. Confrontation and battle against independent countries can be both territorial influence and territorial interrelations. Tensions with countries like Cuba and North Korea is a manifestation of tow political- economic regimes (Communism and Capitalism) in two separated territories (Ó Tuathail, 1998).

Scales also can be an evidence for the existence of territory in the political discussion in this age. (knox,1998) in the postmodern epoch , there are identities based on territory that can represent and show themselves to the world with loud sound that they are still alive. This processes and event relates to glocalization. It means that in one hand, territory has been challenge by globalization but at another side separating movements in some countries like Sudan and national and local identities and cultures is trying to create new territories. Also some ethnics wish to become as an independent state. This processes for some is called techno- politics territoriality (Ó Tuathail, 1998). In sum, although territory is not a fixed and stable concept and its position and situation in both academic and political debates are in question but it is reconstructed by various names like new tribalism and reterritorialization.

The position of territory in global era

The continuing importance of territoriality is next to spreading globality. For example, it has been explicitly said that globalization brings a relative rather

than a complete deterritorialization of social life. Global relations have substantially rather than totally transcended territorial space. They are partly rather than wholly detached from territorial logics. Although territoriality places no insurmountable constraints on global circumstances, supraterritorial phenomena still have to engage at some level with territorial places, territorial governments and territorial identities. Much more globalization- more than is in prospect for a long time to come – would need to take place before territorial space became irrelevant (Scholte, 2000: 59-60).

Thus change (the proliferation of global connections) interrelates with continuity (the persistence of territorial spaces). The challenge for social research is to examine the intricate interplay of globality and territoriality. Thus, for example, contemporary military strategy combines supraterritorial technology like supersonic aircraft, missile rockets, radar and spy satellites with territorial weaponry like tanks and artillery. Most tele-communications operates work under the approval of territorial states and set their charges in relation to territorial units (that is, it costs such and – such to call Peru).

This is by no means to say that territorial geography has lost all relevance in the late twentieth century. We inhabit a globalising rather than a completely globalised world. Social relations have undergone relative rather than total deterritorialisation. Indeed, territorial places, distances and borders still figure crucially in many situations as we enter the twenty-first century. Among other things, territoriality often continues to exert a strong influence on migration, our sense of identity and community, and markets for certain goods. Yet while territoriality may continue to be important, globalisation has brought an end to territorialism (that is, a condition where social space is reducible to territorial coordinates alone). Alongside longitude, latitude and altitude, globalisation has introduced a fourth, supraterritorial dimension to social geography (Scholte, 1999).

The rise of supraterritoriality in no way means that territorial space has ceased to matter. We should not replace territorialism with a globalist methodology that neglects territorial spaces. We do not live in a 'borderless world'. Although contemporary history has witnessed the end of territorialism (where social space is effectively reducible to territorial grids), we have certainly not seen the end of territoriality. To say that social geography can no longer be understood in terms of territoriality alone is of course not to say that territoriality has become irrelevant.

On the contrary, territorial production, territorial governance mechanisms, territorial ecology and territorial identities remain highly

significant at the start of the twenty-first century, even if they do not monopolize the situation as before. For example, many communications links like roads, railways and shipping lanes remain territorially fixed. In addition, territorial borders continue to exert strong influences on trade in material goods and movements of people. It can take months to complete the dozens of documents required to export legally from India. Meanwhile countless localized products remain bound to particular territorial markets. Territorially based commodities derived from agriculture and mining have persisted at the same time that largely supraterritorial commodities like information and communications have risen to prominence. While US dollars and Visa card payments cross the planet instantly, many other forms of money continue to have restricted circulation within a given territorial domain. Most people today still hold their bank accounts at a local branch or do no banking at all. Much ecological degradation is linked to specific territorial locations, for instance, of overgrazing, salination or dumping of toxic wastes. In terms of social affiliations, some observers have suggested that territorially bound identities could even have become more rather than less significant in a world of diminishing territorial barriers.

So the end of territorialism has not marked the start of globalism. The addition of supraterritorial qualities of geography has not eliminated the territorial aspects. Indeed, contemporary globalization has been closely connected with certain forms of reterritorialization like regionalization, the rise of ethno-nationalist politics, and the proliferation of offshore arrangements.

Clearly, social space in today's world is both territorial and supraterritorial. Indeed, in social practice the two qualities always intersect. Supraterritoriality is only relatively deterritorialized, and contemporary territoriality is only partly supraterritorialized. Territorial relations are no longer purely territorial, and supraterritorial relations are not wholly unterritorial.

In short, contemporary society knows no 'pure' globality that exists independently of territorial spaces. The recent accelerated growth of supraterritoriality has brought a relative rather than a complete deterritorialization of social life. Global relations today substantially rather than wholly transcend territorial space. Although territoriality does not place insurmountable constraints on supraterritoriality, the new flows still have to engage with territorial locations. The present world is globalizing, not totally globalized.

Thus, for example, every Internet user accesses cyberspace from a territorial location. Global products, global finance and global communications always 'touch down' in territorial localities. Jet aircraft need runways. Supraterritorial military technologies like spy satellites are generally directed at territorial targets. So-called 'global cities' such as London and Tokyo still have a longitude and latitude. Global ecological changes have territorially specific impacts: for example, rising sea level has different consequences for coastal zones as against uplands.

Moreover, no social explanation is complete without a geographical dimension either. Space matters. To take one ready example, geographical differences mean that desert nomads and urban dwellers lead very diverse lives. Space is a core feature – as both cause and effect – of social life. On the one hand, the geographical context shapes the ways that people undertake production, organize governance, form collectivities, construct knowledge, relate to nature, and experience time. Concurrently, culture, ecology, economics, history, politics and Psychology also shapes the spatial contours of social relations (Scholte, 2002).

David Newman with an example of Israeli-Palestinian border discuss about the complexity of the case. He says that the exception some flows and (few) cultural characteristics, the world will not witness deterritorialism and weakening of link between national identity and territory. In contrast, the map of global politics is being reterritorialised because the territorial borders have been permeable and the new configuration of space occurs (Megoran, 2003:789). Local Identities will revive in the confront of a new territorial unit like the European Union which divided sovereignty. In deed, it is a recounting the local autonomy against the bureaucratic power of transnational organizations (Mcnei, 2000: 473).

Finally, globalization is not antithetical to territoriality insofar as the trend can be linked to many processes of reterritorialization. Such developments occur when certain territorial units decline in significance and other territorial configurations obtain increased importance. For example, globalization has in various ways encouraged the concurrent contemporary trend of regionalization. In addition, the spread of supraterritorial circumstances has in many countries helped local authorities to gain greater autonomy vis-à-vis the national states. Furthermore, globalization has contributed to ethnic revivals which have encouraged the disintegration of pre-exist territorial states (like Czechoslovakia, Soviet Union and Yugoslavia) and their replacement with new ones.

The preceding paragraphs have highlighted the continuing relevance of territoriality in the contemporary globalizing world. At the same time, it is clear that territory acquires different kinds of significance when it intersects with global spaces. The move from three-dimensional geography (longitude, latitude and altitude) to four-dimensional space (these three plus globality) fundamentally reconfiguration of geography has important implications for structures of production, governance, community and knowledge. We no longer inhabit a territorialist world, and this change requires substantial shifts in the ways that we theorize and practice politics (Schlote, 2000: 61).

Political geography and globalization

Globalization from the lens of political geography is that we do not assume globalization as a result from the tradition of universalism; thinking about expanding European- American ideas which reduce the value of the diversity of fundamental human. We can not predict the future of globalization, because it dose not yet occurred. But we can understand the changing contemporary world geography, their past trends and current dependence on the power, so we could predict the possibilities of future and participate into decisions about the choices offered. What we can be sure of it, is that the geographical knowledge is in the heart of discussions about society of 21st century.

In the case of economic globalization, the reality is that geography is involved in this process. At start, the first question of geography in this term is about inequality and welfare in the world, i.e. where welfare and good nourishment is and where poverty and hunger dominate on. Answer to the question reflects the locations that it actually concern with a point in space. Set of places and locations indicate the region. However, the disparities between spaces show that concepts of geography in the era of space will not disappear. Then, the flow of information, goods and people are connecting locations and places and areas to each other. Human – environment relationship which is reflecting the principle of geography will remain and shape the geographical features even in the age of space. Place, space, differences and similarities, space and place diffusion, disperse, separation, region, scale and so on will be produced.

Physical characteristics such as geomorphology, climatology and their effects on human physical factors are the stable option in regional differences. These elements seem to remain in the era of globalization, and become as a part of factors which make differences and helps to produce regions and cause

to keep geography of differences in the age of space alive. It is argued that with technology and its the entrance into the global arena and creation of common characteristics in the age of globalization, non-human factors such as climate, type of soil, topography, distance to sea, and other natural masses and features in all parts cause to reproduce differences and create of geographical figures such as places, regions, locality, and scale.

Globalization for eliminating of geography and geographical forms should first diminish all barriers that not only returns to the physics of the natural environment but also returns partly to the instinct, temperament, emotions and human nature. Remove of geographic barriers by this emerging phenomenon i.e. globalization, it primarily returns to interaction with the main issue both instinctively and culturally i.e. territoriality. (Kuby, 2004, 1) As we enter more in the information age, geography helps more to understand the world which is much more complex and unstable than in the past. With such understanding, we may not only appreciate the diversity of the world – i.e. places- but also we aware and know relationship between them and able to participate positively in the development of local, national and global projects (Knox, 1998: 15).

Globalization dose not become as a single geographical unit. Various countries, regions and localities respond to the large scale and shifting processes because to produce a single space for all. (Haggett, 2001: 578). Geography will not face with dis -subjectivity may even find more important than in the past. Places and regions, without doubt, will change due to global implications of new condition resulting from the information age. But geography also relevant for several reasons following: Transportation costs, the differences in resources, flexibility of local cultures and heritage from the past, the fundamental principles of political organization of space and people's desires (Knox, 1998: 52).

However, we must know that the existence of a simple division such as countries, territories, cities, towns, urban areas means that we live in such forms and figures that will shape our policies and vice versa until the city, village, Country, region, area, location, place and territory exist .geography is in existence as well so if geography in globalization die, these concepts die too (Knox, 1998: 358).

Territorial state will not eliminate from international relations. But, in fact, the new labor division makes it necessary for the state to be in exist. States, because of their link to territory are able to talk about their populations and take international responsibility. As they provide

legitimacy for transnational agents even though this case also come from people desires (Hirst, 2001).

For some bodies, states have lost their powers and abilities for organization of social life. Guehenno believes the end of nation state is obvious (Guehenno, 1995) And Shapiro believes that the end of sovereignty is seen. But others say the era of globalization strengthen the nation state (Glick-Schiller,1995: 59).

This issue that our world has changed into a single world is questionable. Even if the boundaries of national states in recent decades have become porous, mass communications dose not led to wipe out of regulatory control and management of national state. Conversely, lot evidence is available that elites of government have tried to increase their power over the currents.

New security technologies have emerged as the preferred policy solution to the difficult problem of screening for weapons and terrorist incursions into the United States through its international boundaries while maintaining flows of goods and individuals, key drivers of globalization and hallmarks of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) era. These new technological systems have various capabilities, ranging from prescreening cargo to identifying problematic travelers to detecting nuclear material in trucks. Deploying these systems in border communities, however, invokes a range of important economic, social, and political challenges, all of which are under examination in this work using a risk-centered approach to United States border security (Ackleson, 2005).

It means in the era of globalization, while technology makes it flourish, we see the use of technology for border surveillance and control too(Coleman, 2003). In this globalized world with technology expanding in all part, we do not see not only erosion of borders but also reinforcement of border controls according to current evidences. United States borders before and after September 11 represents that will not draw end of territoriality. United States now is very concerned about its border so that is unprecedented in all history. Also, it seems to be if it is not increased its concern, probably this sense can not undo. Our reasons for this concern is that instead of deborderization in era of globalization, we now see reborderizing and reinforcement of it in one of the freest borders in history (i.e. the Canadian and Us border), Namely, the Canadian- US border has taken a reverse trend in era of globalization. As there were not the age of globalization this border really was open but in this period strength and reinforcement of it is clear. At least, evidences are saying so (Huglund,

2003). However, we see globalization of border strength in these years which has been easy by technology.

Conclusion

It has been tried to show that despite some scholars such as Apadouri and Ohmaee pointed out, territory dose not loss its subjectivity in upcoming years. From one hand, according to the article globalization is a reality and in the other hand according to new realism approach used in the article and evidences around the world we are live in where territory in future will remain as a player. Territory is a main factor in social life in globalization and terms such as death of territory and elimination of its subject will not be relevant. The territorial instinct and emotion and sense link to place determines that human beings need to know themself and limits for him in places and immortality of territory despite the information explosion. Supra territorial and transnational flows and processes in the global era dose not refused but it is expressed alongside these streams reterritorlization and territoriality in the future of the world will be seen. In general, it can be said that based on objective evidence and realistic reasons statements like disappearance of territorial factor from social life would be meaningless. In addition, territoriality in 21st century is composed of two basic pillars: on one hand there is deterritorialitzation of flows and currents and in some cases and parts of human interaction – the communication, digitalization and virtualization of currents- cause to reduce of the significance of territory. But on the other hand, the second column is reterritorialization in the future which continues forever. Territory and territoriality is an integral part of human activities and enduring part of human and environment relationship. Attempts of developed states or countries of the North for reinforcement of borders and prevent of immigration- despite numerous discussions regarding the remove of border in global era- prove our claims.

Acknowledgment

The author has a specific debt to thank reviewers for their attention to the article and all time that they spent in the reviewing process.

References

- Ackleson, J (2004), Constructing Security on the U.S –Mexico Border, *Political Geography* 24(2).
- Ackleson, J (2005), Fencing in Failure: Effective Border Control is not Achieved By Building More Fences, *Policy In Focus. Immigration*, 14(2).
- Amid, H (1980), *Farsi Dictionary of Amid*, Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
- Castles, M (1997), *Power of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coleman, m (2003), The Naming of Terrorism and Evil Outlaws, *Geopolitics*, 8 (3).
- Cox, K. R. *Political Geography, Territory, State and Society*, Blackwell.
- Dalby, S (2005), Critique and Contemporary Geopolitics, A Lecture Presented at Trbiat Modares University, Tehran, 11 may 2005, *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Volume 1, No 1.
- Dehkhoda, A, *Dictionary of Dehkhoda*, eighth version, Tehran: University of Tehran.
- Dodds, K (2000), *Geopolitics in Changing World*, Prentice Hall, Pearson Avocation.
- Glick-Schiller, N (1995), From Immigration to Transmigration, *Anthropological quarterly*, 68 (1).
- Gereffi (1996), The elusive last lapin the quest for developcouvntry In: mittelman, J, (Ed), *Globalization*, Lynne riene, London.
- Glassner, M.I. and chuck fahrer (2004), *Political Geography*, third edition, New York John Wiley and sons.
- Guehenno, J-M (1995), *The End of the Nation-State*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Haggett, p (2001), *Geography A global Syntheses*, Prentice Hall.
- Harvey, D (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hirst,p (2001), Politics: Territorial or Non – Territorial? www.Theglobaliste.ac.uk/paulhirst.htm-uk.
- Huglund, D.G(2003), North American Cooperation in an Era of Homeland Security, *Orbis*,47(4).
- Johnston, R (2004), *Dictionary of Human Geography*, Oxford.
- Knox, p (1998), *Places and Regions in Global Context: Human Geography*, Prentice Hall.
- Kuby, M (2004), *Human Geography in Action*, New York John Wiley and sons.
- MCNeil, D (2000), McGuggenisation? National Identity and Globalization in the Bosque County, *Political Geography*, 19 (4).
- Megeoran, W (2003), International Boundaries and Geopolitics, *Political Geography* 22 (7).
- Mirheydar, D (2005), A study of the concept of Territoriality from the political Geography point of view, *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Volume 1, No 1.
- Mirheydar, D., and Mohammad Raoof Heidari Far (2006),the evolution of the Concept of Territory in the age of Globalization, *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Volume 2, No 2.
- Ohme (1995), *The End of the Nation State*, Harper Collins, London.
- Ó Tuathail, G(1996a), *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota press).
- Ó Tuathail G (1996 b), At The End Of Geopolitics? Reflections on Aplural Problematic Century End, www.toal.net/publication.
- Ó Tuathail, G (1998), De- Territorialized Threats and Global Dangers: Geopolitics and Risk Society. www.toal.net/publication.

- Ó Tuathail, G (1999), Borderless Worlds? Problematizing Discourses of Deterritorialization .
www.toal.net/publication.
- Scholte, J,A (1999), Global Civil Society: Changing the World? CSGR working paper
No.31/99, Zn: www.CSGR.com.
- Scholte, J, A(2002b), What is Globalization? The Definitional Issue-A gain, CSGR working
paper No. 109/02, in: www.CSGR.com.
- Scholte, J,A (2004), Globalization and Governance: From Statism to Polycentrism, CSGR
working paper No. 31/99 In: www.CSGR.Com.
- Scholte, J., A (2002 a), Civil Society and Democracy in Global Government, Global
Governance, 8.Listen.
- Read phonetically
- Dictionary - View detailed dictionary