

methodological basis, and with more sustainability and depth. In fact, the work is already being done. In this task, a special role is naturally assigned to the University of Mäqälä (Tigray), which is supposed to play the role of the main education and research center of North Ethiopia, and I expect that soon the new publication, ITYOPIS, will bring forth the first results of this work.

I feel that ITYOPIS can successfully fill the gap, presenting the records and research of the local cultural contexts of northern Ethiopia. From the editorial point of view, I think that contributions must not necessarily be long elaborated articles with large registers of quoted literature, which claim to solve important problems. One would expect from ITYOPIS less theoretical but more descriptive contributions, which indeed describe and record different cultural phenomena.

I think that journals of a scale like ITYOPIS can be successful only in case it has a constant stream of the materials coming from the local researchers. An international cooperation is very important, but it is more substantial to have a journal presenting studies carried out specifically by local students who may be inexperienced but have strong points in deeper acquaintance with the subject of the study, namely the local cultural context. I hope that a sufficient number of authors will be produced in the future by those institutions of Mäqälä University which deal, in different ways, with the social anthropology and history: the College of Social Sciences and Languages, the College of Business and Economics, and the Institute of Paleoenvironment and Heritage Conservation. Besides, there is a strong hope that also philology will sometime be added to anthropology and history. We can also expect that the journal will become an effective instrument in directing the research of young students, advising them and providing them with a valuable opportunity of getting experience in academic writing, or simply in summarizing their research in a comprehensive and clear way. I hope that the example of ITYOPIS, produced in the University of Mäqälä will be seriously considered by other Ethiopian universities and research institutions, and after some time we will see the results: sizable and ever growing records of the traditional cultures of Ethiopia, preserved for future generations and future studies.

* * *

Use and Interest of the Notion of Territory in Horn of Africa Studies

by Sabine PLANEL¹

“Territorial studies” constitute a promising approach to renew analysis of space in the Horn of Africa and especially in Ethiopia. It allows us to go beyond an outdated perception of space, where spaces are defined according to their nature (i.e. rural vs. urban, agricultural or commercial), or according to their ethnic/regional belonging, and not according to their dynamic(s). The

¹ Geographer, researcher at the Research Institute for Development (IRD, France) and posted at the French Center for Ethiopian Studies (CFEE) in Addis Ababa.

territory is a notion that focuses on social or political dynamics of space(s). It associates a space and a social framework, mostly a political one (Cox 2002, Agnew 1994).

The territory is a meaningful notion that refers to various academic literatures including all social sciences and not only geography. Sociology, political science and anthropology have developed different understandings on this notion, but we will focus on the geographic approach for the purpose of this paper.

For many years, territory has been understood in geographic literature but in other social sciences as well, as a bounded space, ruled by a single power (national state, or local administration). Since the 1970's the notion has become a core concept in the French geography and its use has changed to a more dynamic understanding of space. This evolution has to be understood in a globalisation context, where the powers have been multiplied. Until recently, it has received less attention in the Anglophone literature, where it used to be considered as a bounded and homogenous space (Painter 2010). Of course, territory is raising the question of its boundaries, or its spatial homogeneity but it cannot only be defined on these criteria.

French theory has developed a complex understanding of territory mainly based on cultural or political approaches (Allies 1980). Despite many distinctions among French geographers, territory is apprehended as a process; a social, cultural or political process that frames and appropriates space and then, but simply as a consequence, draws boundaries and unifies space. Territory, on the contrary to space, cannot be defined by its nature – which it does not have referring to geography² – or by its boundaries which are irrelevant in order to define the specificity of this sub-category of space.

Finally, territory can be identified as a social process that has as its origin, a stake in and objective to appropriate, plan, or simply transform space; it is a process that comes from space and transform it at the same time (Raffestin 1980, Sack 1986). This process mobilises or, more literally, puts in motion the geographical space whatever can be its characteristics. The differences between territory, territorialisation or territoriality are so minor; they are just stressing on different points of view on the process. Territory is not considered as a product, even a socio-spatial product - except for some economists - but as the result of a process at a specific time. Territoriality can be considered as the ability for a social group to appropriate itself a space, then to shape it and not simply to occupy it³.

Three dimensions of space (politic, history and culture) represent the core of the notion of territory, or territoriality. All these dimensions are deeply

² Economists mostly in Regional Economy or Economic Geography (Krugman, Sachs) have another understanding of the notion. In few words we could say that they associate to the specific dynamics of territorialisation a specific nature of space, an economical one.

³ If all territories are obviously spaces, all spaces are not necessarily territories. For geographers, the territory is a sub-category of space.

intertwined in the socio-spatial reality and practices. We will artificially separate them for the purpose of a clear understanding.

Cultural dimension of territoriality

Culture is mobilised by geographers to identify and characterise a territory. Practices, representations, perceptions are so understood as the result of a socio-territorial interaction and as a matter of consequence they inform us about the on-going or inherited logics of territorialisation. This interaction and its results are supposed to be singular and to distinguish one territory from another. In this perspective, any cultural dimensions of space such as landscape, toponomy, religious value/signification ... are interesting to question in the perspective/hypothesis of a territorialisation's process. From the opposite perspective, territorialisation addresses new questions to cultural studies, by inscribing cultural production(s) into space.

Two aspects of this cultural dimension of territorialisation have been particularly studied – and particularly in French geography – the local prism of territoriality, or its necessarily bottom-up dynamic, as the Anglo-Saxons would say, and as a correlation the importance of membership feeling in the making or recognition of a territory. Daily practices – “routines” (Di Méo 1998) –, individual perceptions/representations of familiar as well as unfamiliar spaces convey shared ideas on a common destiny that deeply associates a specific group to a specific space (Bonnemaison 2000). This association between a social group and a space marks the space itself and confer it a new and singular identity, sometime very visible. This association is a territorialisation process, the deeper and the more ancient will be the association, and the more efficient will be the territorialisation process. Measuring and characterising the local feeling of membership represents then an interesting tool to analyse territoriality.

Historical dimension of territoriality

Territory is also an historical process. Without History space cannot be considered as a territory, as an example new and artificial administrative delimitations are not sufficient to build territory, but from this situation administrative space can evolve into a further stage of territorialisation. In the African context, where local spaces and peoples used to be considered as an-historic, the existence of an accomplished territorialisation process could provide a strong argument in favour of the recognition of the historical dimension of every society, even in sub-Saharan Africa. The territory is necessarily an historical process insofar as its making results from a long-run process of adaptation, remobilisation and transformation of inherited structures/institutions, values or ideologies. For example, the history of indigenous or traditional powers constitutes an important part of territorial studies.

Through the historical analysis of territory, we can observe and describe different dynamics of territorial making as well as territorial articulation. Patterns of articulation between territories, i.e. their relations from one to the others, are constituent of the process of territorial making. As any other social reality, territories individualise themselves by distinguishing them from others spaces, as well as other territories. National integration movement, centre/peripheries relations, regional or local separatisms, represent the most common dynamics of territorial making, and all of them deserve to be analysed in a long-term perspective. In a similar perspective, taking in consideration the “path of dependency” (Mahoney 2000) constitutes a very interesting way to analyse the territorialisation process, by underlying the importance of social movements such as adoption, integration, rejection, adaptation of new structures/institutions of powers, new ideologies of space...in their duration.

Political dimension of territoriality

Territoriality is mainly a political process (Antheume, Giraut 2005). The territory varies from space because of its framing⁴, which can be understood as a spatial meaning of the notion of “empowerment”; a form of empowerment on space and not on social groups or individuals, as it is mainly used in the social sciences. Defined as an empowerment on space, the territory comes under political geography; it is made of a game of powers deeply rooted into spatial stakes and with the objective to rule, to control, or simply to appropriate space (Dubresson, Jaglin 2005, Sack 1986). In this perspective, the analysis of territorial institutions or any else structure of power dealing with space represents a core issue in territorial studies. Territorial institutions can vary from one context to the other, depending on the structuration of local political space; in a very restrictive understanding these institutions are mainly territorial administrations, but in other situations they can be any kind of powers, such as schools, churches, agricultural cooperatives, CBO... etc.

History, operating (working), or spatial impacts of any territorial institutions convey the whole relationships of powers that shape the territory. Then we can define the territory as produced by an endless political compromise on or about space. According to this understanding of the notion, it is possible to stop the territorialisation and even to impulse a kind of deterritorialisation process by giving an end to this political compromise, through authoritarian ways of ruling space, or through fossilized policies of space’s conservation or protection.

These remarks lead us to point out two main methodological stakes about the recognition of this political dimension of territory, both of them should renew spatial studies in the Horn of Africa, and especially in Ethiopia. On one hand, the territory constitutes a very appropriate tool to understand and analyse the political dimension of space, without any reference to ideological

⁴ French geographers use the very meaningful notion of “encadrement”.

positions. It's absolutely not a normative neither a dogmatic notion, there is no good or bad paths to become a territory, the literature simply observe different modalities of framing space into a territory. This characteristic of territoriality can be considered as very useful in the sore political context of East Africa. Finally, this notion by going beyond the ideological dimension of political organisation can deeply and clearly analyses the real circulation of powers, the "gouvernementabilité" of space as Michel Foucault (ed. 2004) would say.

On the other hand, as an intimate correlation with its political nature, the territory constitutes an interesting tool to consider the scalar structuration of any space and not only of the State's space (Brenner 2004). Because, the territory is produced by a complex interaction of various powers, it functions as a multi-scalar entity (Swyngedouw 2004). Although in the social science literature, territory is mainly observed and analysed from the local level, its full comprehension needs to rescale the analysis at every appropriate level. Even, the more local territory, such as agricultural common land for example, require to be analysed by taking in consideration regional, national and even global dynamics. In the very specific Ethiopian case, the analysis of every territory as a multi-scalar socio-spatial construction should enlighten the organisation of the federal space, by deconstructing its architecture.

For all these reasons, the territorial approach deserves to be adopted, or at least experimented, by social scientists interested on space analysis in the Horn of Africa, as well as somewhere else.

Bibliography

- John AGNEW (1994), «The territorial trap: The geographical assumptions of international relations theory», *Journal of International Political Economy*, 1, p. 53-80.
- Paul ALLIES (1980), *L'invention du territoire*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Benoît ANTHEAUME – Frédéric GIRAUT (2005), *Le territoire est mort, Vive les territoires ! Une (re)fabrication au nom du développement*, Paris: IRD Editions.
- Joël BONNEMAISON (2000), *La géographie culturelle*, Paris.
- Neil BRENNER (2004), *New State Spaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kevin COX (2002), *Political Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guy DI MÉO (1998), *Géographie sociale et territoires*, Paris: Nathan Université.
- Alain DUBRESSON – Sylvie JAGLIN (2005), «Gouvernance, régulation et territorialisation des espaces urbanisés, Approches et méthodes», in: Benoît ANTHEAUME – Frédéric GIRAUT, *Le territoire est mort, vive les territoires !*, Paris: IRD Editions, pp. 337-52.
- Michel FOUCAULT, ed. (2004), *Naissance de la biopolitique*, Paris: Gallimard, Seuil.
- James MAHONEY (2000), "Path dependence in historical sociology", *Theory and Society*, vol 29, n°4, p. 507-548.
- John PAINTER (2010), "Rethinking Territory", *Antipode*, vol. 42, n°5, 1090-1118.
- Claude RAFFESTIN (1980), *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*, Paris: Litec.

Robert David SACK (1986), *Human territoriality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eric SWYNGEDOUW (2004), "Globalisation or 'glocalisation'? Networks, territories and rescaling", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17, p. 25-48.

* * *

« Ethiopia and Africa » :
Another Perspective in Modern Ethiopian Studies
by Giulia BONACCI¹

It is many years now that scholars of history, anthropology, sociology or political science are pleading for breaching the boundary between Ethiopian studies and African studies (James 1986). In that perspective, the « prospective integration of work on Ethiopia into the mainstream of African historiography » (Crummey 1990:119) has been forseen as a major step in the fruitful development of Ethiopian historiography. This is a perennial concern, which ten years ago was far from achieved (Bahru 2000:17). If progress has been made since then, the overall objective of bridging Ethiopia and Africa remains unfulfilled. Such an objective calls for comparative studies, as well for the conceptualisation of research themes that would encourage scholars to encompass Ethiopian historiography as well as other fields of knowledge. This has become an even more acute need as the field of modern Ethiopian studies (19th and 20th centuries) remains in search of narratives that could reframe the « battlefied » represented by the scholarly discourses on ethnicity and subjectivity, and by the instrumentalisation of memory and history (Triulzi 2002). Therefore, the deepening of alternative themes and perspectives of research could contribute both to a disentanglement of Ethiopia from itself, and to a scholarly dialogue between Ethiopia and Africa.

In his seminal paper on Ethiopian historiography, Bahru Zewde underlines the change of emphasis from political history to economic history, and to a certain extent to social history (Bahru 2000:11, 17). Social history is indeed a well-needed tool to study the fabric of contemporary societies, and represents a disciplinary approach with great achievements in the fields of African studies. Social historians of the 19th and 20th centuries often demonstrate an interdisciplinary concern as they have to work with a variety of sources and diverse documentation. Oral history, cartography, observation and critical analysis of sources are major tools of the social historian, borrowed from sister disciplines like anthropology, sociology and ethnography, and re-assessed within the historical praxis. With a qualitative concern and the use of changing scales in its focus (Revel 1996), social history has a role to play in the

¹ Historian, researcher at the Research Institute for Development (IRD, France) and posted since September 2010 at the French Center for Ethiopian Studies (CFEE) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.