REGION AND REGIONALISM – A POLITICAL-GEOGRAPHICAL APPROACH[*]

The Earth's surface is such a large and diverse object to study that geographers as well as other scientists try to break it into smaller parts, commonly known as regions. According to popular dictionaries the region is just 'a particular part of the world' (Webster's 1988), or 'a large division of a country, a land, etc' (Longman Lexicons of Contemporary English, Harlow 1982). A more exhaustive definition gives us Clark's 'The New Penguin Dictionary of Geography', according to which region is defined as 'an area of the Earth's surface with one or more features or characteristics (natural or the result of human activity) which give it a measure of unity and make it differ from the areas surrounding it'. According to the criteria used in the differentiation, a region may be termed cultural, economic, morphological, natural, physiographic, political etc: and a region may be identified by single, multiple or 'total attributes' (Clark 1990).

The real world is made up of an immensely complex mosaic of regions and geographers have attempted to make sense of this mosaic by devising formal systems of regions. There is, however, no single or generally accepted set of regions, just the opposite. We can consider several kinds of regions according to different criteria. The most useful introduction to geographers' ideas of different kinds of regions were works by: Strahler devoted to environmental regions (Strahler 1960), Russel, Kniffen and Pruit on culture regions (Russel, Kniffen, Pruit 1969), Dickinson on city region (Dickinson 1964), and Dziewoński on economic region (Dziewoński 1961).

More generally, taking into account the man-environment balance, Haggett distinguishes two generally kinds of regions, namely: l) re-

---

[*] Praca została wydana w 1994 r. w serii wydawniczej Region and Regionalism, 1, Inner Divisions (red. M. Koter), University of Łódź, Department of Political Geography and Regional Studies; Governmental Research Institute Silesian Institute in Opole, Łódź–Opole, s. 9-32 (współautor Marek Koter).

gions of environmental challenge (World Environmental Regions), and 2) regions of human response (World Culture Regions) (Haggett 1982).

Geographers recognize usually two forms of regions: a single--feature region and a multi-featured region. The former may be a climatic, or a physiographic, or an agricultural region. The latter is what geographers call the geographic region, while non-geographers sometimes term the 'total' region.

According to Cohen, 'the geographical region is the organization of space, based on both quantitative and qualitative criteria, and expressing associations of various elements'. He considers the region to be 'merely' a device for separating areal features (Cohen 1973). Whittlesey, earlier, underlined much more human aspects of the region. For him region is 'a community of physical, biotic, and societal features that depict, or are functionally associated with man's occupancy of an area'. 'The region that is defined in terms of the entire content of the human occupancy of the area, is an association of interrelated natural and societal features chosen from a still more complex totality' (Whitllesey 1954). For Cohen, the geographic region is 'something more than a simple sum total of a number of single--feature physical and cultural regions' (Cohen 1973).

More recently much more exhaustive considerations on the substance of the region presented de Blij and Muller. They emphasize that 'Each of the major geographic realms of the human world ... possesses a special combination of cultural, environmental, historic, economic, and organizational qualities. These characteristic properties are imprinted on the landscape, giving each region its own flavor and social milieu. Geographers take a particular interest in the way people have decided to arrange and order their living space'. They underline that everyone has some idea of what the word 'region' means, and we use the regional concept frequently in its broadest sense as a frame of reference. 'But regional concepts are anything but simple' (Blij, Muller 1988).

According to de Blij and Muller an overriding characteristic of a region's contents may be its homogeneity or sameness. 'The internal uniformity of a homogeneous region can be expressed by human (cultural, economic) as well as natural (physical) criteria. A country constitutes such a political region, for within its boundaries certain conditions of nationality, law, government, and political tradition prevail throughout. Similarly, a natural region such as Rocky Mountains or the Mississippi Delta is expressed by the dominance of a particular physical landscape. Quebec and Com Belt are uniform cultural and agricultural regions, respectively. Regions marked by this internal homogeneity are classified as formal regions' (Blij, Muller 1988).

But regional distinctions are usually not always so clear and simple. Regions can be conceptualized also as spatial systems, such as those centered on an urban core, an activity node, or a focus of regional interaction. Here the communication patterns and the networks of all kinds of services confirm the close relationship between the metropolis and its tributary region, or hinterland. This time, region is not characterized by homogeneity but, instead, by a structured, urban-centered system of interaction. Such regions are termed by de Blij and Muller as nodal or functional regions. They add that 'the formal region might be viewed as static, uniform, and immobile; the functional region is seen to be dynamic, structurally active, and continuously shaped by forces that modify it' ... 'perhaps formal regions are less affected by change, more durable, and, therefore, more visible, but they may not be fundamentally different from functional regions' (Blij, Muller 1988).

To define a cultural region more than one condition must be satisfied and a greater number of ingredients taken into account, as for instance: dominant language spoken, adherence to a specific religion, land division, settlement patterns, special variations of architectural, artistic, and other traditions, government, law, and others. As a scientific term, culture refers to: beliefs (religion, political), values ('the rules of the game'), institutions (local, governmental), and technology (skills, equipment). The cultural geographers have a particular interest in the way that members of particular societies perceive, exploit and organize that portion of the earth that is theirs. Culture, to them, is expressed in many ways as it gives visible character to a region. As human works carve permanent imprints onto the earth's surface, the composite of the human imprints on the surface of the earth, that is the cultural landscape, as well as processes that shape cultural patterns, are central to geographical regional approach (Blij, Muller 1988). However, the broader, scientific concept of the culture facilitates the explanation of human behavior, which is also a subject of interest of modern geography concerning the regional aspects.

1. POLITICAL REGIONS

The main subject of interest of human geographers, including political ones, are all kinds of 'regions of human response', that is geographical regions, cultural regions, economic regions, city-regions, as well as a number of human-based formal regions. The political geographers, however, who investigate these regions, too, have obviously a particular interest in the political organization of space and political world divisions. From this point of view Cohen distinguishes three types of regions: political region, geostrategic region and geopolitical region (Cohen 1973).

As we mentioned above, the political region is a single-feature, formal region. Yet, while most regions of this type, or at least their boundaries, can scarcely lay claim to universal acceptance, the political region seems to be the most tangible and having its roots in 'reality'. Political divisions, either by states, or by groups of associated states, or in case of inner subdivisions, are all clear-cut. Their boundaries can frequently be seen on the ground, or at least they are mapped with precision. However, the political divisions are real, yet they have been often ephemeral. They are real and tangible for the moment, but if they lack firm groundings in broader political, social, economic and physical 'realities', then they are fleeting.

The geostrategic region is the expression of the interrelationship of a large part of the world in terms of location, movement, trade orientation, and cultural and ideological bonds. Control of strategic passageways on land and sea is frequently crucial to the unity of geostrategic regions. Thus, the geostrategic region must be large enough to possess certain globe-influencing characteristics and functions, because today's strategy can only be expressed in global terms.

The geopolitical regions are the basis for the emergence of multiple power nodes within a geostrategic region. Contiguity of location an complementarily of resources are particularly distinguishing marks of the geopolitical region. As it derives directly from geographic regions, the geopolitical region can provide a framework for common political and economic actions. The geostrategic region has then a strategic role to play while the geopolitical region has a tactical one (Cohen 1973).

The regions studied in political geography exist through the presence of some form of internal political unity, which may derive from the unification of the region under a single sovereign government or a single local authority, from the existence within it particular outlook or aspiration, from the functional unity of the region as an area of formal international co-operation, or from the existence of informal underlying supranational characteristics (Cohen 1973).

The majority of political-geographical investigations have been made with reference to the state for it constitutes the most distinctive and developed political-geographical form of region, a single organizational element of the world political structure. Geographers often regard the country or the state as the individual tile out of which the world mosaic of spatial organization is formed because it offers the best possibilities for comparative analysis, as statistical data concerning them are regularly available. Haggett underlines that countries are also decision-making units within which the central governments affect the man-environment relation of all the population. They are, too, clearly defined by boundaries that separate them from their neighbors, and these boundaries form noteworthy discontinuities in human or-

ganization, sometimes in the landscape itself. Simultaneously, countries are increasingly being organized as integrated economic units (Huggett 1972).

There are, however, several disadvantages of using countries as basic units, too, such as the extreme differences in size and number of population between the countries. Moreover, large countries have often a federal organization and exhibit immense internal contrasts in population density, cultural division, economic development, etc. Thus, although the country is a valuable and necessary element in both political and economic geography, it cannot be universally adopted by human geographers as a basic regional unit.

The state boundaries often act as walls which hide everything what is inside, behind which differences within the national state's structure can be blurred as if they would be covered with a fog. In fact, however, almost none of the bigger or medium-sized states is entirely homogenous. They consist of several historically, ethnically, culturally or functionally based territorial components, and, for that reason or simply just for administrative convenience, they are internally subdivided into smaller sub-units. These divisions as forms of political regions are amenable to geographical-political analysis.

Muir underlines that 'Any system and pattern of administrative units represents the outcome of human decision, though once established, a pattern may become entrenched and survive long after its raison d'etre has been forgotten, as did the English counties'... 'consequently administrative areas can be understood only with their milieu and with regard to the purposes for which they were adopted, the functions operated within them, and the influence a:ffecting their survival'. Thus, not only geographical but also cultural and functional factors should be taken into account, as well as political consideration both of evolutionary and revolutionary nature (Muir 1975).

All but the 'pocket' countries are composed of smaller 'countries' that usually differ from one another culturally, economically, and may also differ physiographically, ethnically and in degree of self-government. The origin of both the bigger countries (states) and smaller 'countries' (historical provinces or cultural regions) can be explained through the description of the evolution of the political organization of space and taking into consideration the development of the process of regionalism.

The emergence and evolution of political and cultural divisions of space should be considered on the broader background of human culture and behavior.

2. TERRITORIALITY

At least two aspects of human culture have a very distinctive geographical context, namely: territoriality and proxemics. Both territoriality, that is described by de Blij and Muller as 'an allegedly human instinct for territorial possessiveness', and proxemics, that is viewed as 'individual and collective preferences for nearness or distance in different societies' (Blij, Muller 1988), clearly have important spatial dimensions that are important in our considerations concerning regions.

The essence of both cultural and political region derives from the human territorial behavior and people's imperative of possessing their own territory. The subject of territoriality, on the other hand, can be understood only in terms of perception. The idea of territoriality was based primarily on research in ethology, that is the study of animal behavior. That was Robert Ardrey who first brought the subject forcefully to public attention in his book 'The Territorial Imperative' (Ardrey 1966). 'A territory', he writes, 'is an area of space ... which an animal or group of animals defends as an exclusive preserve'. The animals have an inward compulsion to possess and defend such a space. He concludes that 'man is as much territorial animal as a mockingbird' and that 'the territorial nature of man is generic and ineradicable'.

Every person likes to put a little distance between himself and the next person. This is, according to Glassner and de Blij, the 'personal space - an envelope of territory we carry about with us as an extension of ourselves' (Glassner, Blij 1989). They express that 'individuals exhibit territorial behavior in those small, confined places where they spend most of their time - home ... The Home ... expresses an individual's (or family's) personality. It is more than just a residence; it is a refuge, a fortress shielding the individual from problems of the world outside. There is certainly a strong desire to defend this home from intruders' (Soja 1971).

The most exhaustive concept of human (and animal) territoriality presented Edward Soja in his paper 'The Political Organization of Space'. He suggests that territoriality supplies the central bond between the political system and the geographical space. Territoriality, according to him, is 'a behavioral phenomenon associated with the organization of space into spheres of influence or clearly demarcated territories which are made distinctive and considered at least partially exclusive by their occupants or definers. Its most obvious geographical manifestation is an identifiable patterning of spatial relationships resulting in the confinement of certain activities in particular areas and

the exclusion of certain categories of individuals from the space of the territorial individual or group'.

Man, according to Soja, is 'a territorial animal and territoriality affects human behavior at all scales of social activity. At the individual level, for example, one of the clearest illustrations of human territoriality can be found in the Western concept of private property in the form of land.... Territoriality also operates on a larger societal scale as a means of regulating social interactions and as a focus for group membership and identity. From ... the mosaic of ethnic and economic neighborhoods in the city ... to the patterns of territorial regionalism and the system of nation-state ..., dynamic patterns of human interaction are structured by a territorial organization of space which both expresses and helps to maintain the integrity of the group. It is at this societal scale, where formal and informal institutions develop to maintain a social system that territoriality represents an essential component in the political organization of space' (Soja 1971).

The shape and size of territorial 'envelopes' vary in humans from culture to culture. It is commonly known that Englishmen, for example, keep further apart than Frenchmen or Poles, consequently in various cultures people perceive space and use it in different ways, that is, their territorial behavior also varies. Alland goes so far as to say that 'territoriality is born with and fed by the culture' (Alland 1972).

Sommer introduced an idea that human territorial organization relates to rank and hierarchy. He noted that the people of 'stronger' tribal groups generally possess better residential locations than those of 'weaker' tribal groups (Sommer 1969). There is a distinct correlation, too, between the status of a group and the size of territory; dominant people usually tend to have more and larger territories. These are examples of dominance behavior, and they may apply not only to tribal peoples but also to states.

By combining the concept of personal space, including dominance behavior, we can interpret many aspects of human behavior as indicating some form of territoriality. And if we define the concept of territoriality as a pattern of behavior, by which living space is fragmented into more or less well-defined territories, whose limits are viewed as inviolable by their occupants (Glassner, Blij 1989) it becomes obvious that political geographers have had to try to recognize this phenomenon.

It is evident that people generally feel more comfortable and perform better among familiar surroundings, both human and physical. They identify themselves not only with others of their group but also with a particular part of the earth's surface. On a larger scale, then, territoriality is manifested in neighborhood. Depending on peoples' mobility and the length of time, they may extend the territoriality that they exhibit toward their neighborhood to their counties, regions or

states. As a consequence people identify themselves as being from a particular area – county region – often with a touch of pride.

We described human territoriality as an imperative. It does not mean, however, that it is instinctive, rather it has been acquired and modified by learning – through cultural evolution. Tribal or ethnic groups tend to congregate in particular areas, and along with the feelings of togetherness they develop territorial loyalties. If the group is forced into isolated area, the territorial feeling may be even stronger. Such an isolation, especially if it has a form of enforced segregation, may help to preserve a native culture that would tend to change along with the general culture if the place of residence was less isolated.

Territoriality probably reaches its highest development on the higher level of the human organization. As Soja writes: 'Only when human society began to increase significantly in scale and complexity did territoriality reassert itself as a powerful behavioral and organizational phenomenon ... Thus, although 'cultural' territoriality fundamentally begins with the origin of the cultured primate, man, it achieves a central prominence in society only with the emergence of the state' (Glassner, Blij 1989)

Let us get acquainted then with the origin of the state – its emergence and evolution from the very beginning till the present day.

3. THE ORIGIN OF POLITICAL REGION (THE STATE) AND ITS EVOLUTION

What is remarkable in human existence from the very early stage of mankind history is the people's strong attachment to their territory and their sense of its limitation. The human behavior is territorially based. Every group's territory has its focal nesting site, its space, and its inviolable periphery. According to Muir, after a period of permanent occupancy and amalgamation of neighboring groups, the territory began to bear the stamp of its occupants (Glassner, Blij 1989).

The existence of cultural (if not political) regions were found within the sparsely populated megalithic Scotland of about 2000 B.C. The Bushmen of Kalahari, roaming people living in unhierarchical groups of about fifty members, retain clan territories. Each group of them has clearly established territory which that group alone may use, and they respect their 'boundaries' rigidly, while neighboring territories are avoided. Within their territories, lacking permanent settlements, the clans migrate between the waterholes which are the central places of the Bushmen world. Among the Australian Aborigines, who are intermediate between the clan and tribal stages, waterholes, as central places, have a special sig-

nificance which is not only economic but also spiritual. In case of pastoral Hotentots, who are members of a more complex form of politico-territorial organization, namely tribe, several further important differences emerged. The power of the tribal leader is greater and thousands of people may pay allegiance to the tribal chief. Simultaneously personally given laws emerged. The tribal habitat was centered on a headquarters – a seat of a ruler. Thus, the concept and reality of the central place appeared at this level, an event of a great importance (Glassner, Blij 1989).

De Blij correlates growing political sophistication with increase of the importance of central places and the centralization of political power (Blij 1967).

Social and political amalgamatiation superseded clan forms by tribal organization. This transition produced much more extensive regions, with population of tens or even hundreds thousands (Muir 1975). It was usually accompanied by increased centralization and remoteness of power, while the physiographic central place (waterhole or mountain) was generally replaced by a permanent political focus differing in function from other settlements.

Such a central place might be positioned according to: defensible site, a place at the centre of an area rich in resources, a location especially favorable as a market, a point of historical or religious significance. Some of the central places of tribally organized areas, endowed with particular advantages, had developed into real urban centers or even important capital cities. As such they achieved significance far beyond the limits of the tribal territory and functioned as foci for interregional trade (Glassner, Blij 1989). These oversized cities played a role in transforming tribally organized territory into something more complex – the state.

The limits surrounding the tribal territories have frequently been of a zonal nature, but not always. Where the borderland was unproductive, delimitation was neglected and the border zone constituted a political no-man's land, claimed by neither bordering tribe. Where, however, the border passed through an area of economic significance it was jealously guarded and carefully defined as a fixed boundary in a linear manner.

The transition from the tribal territory to the sovereign nation state, that has been regarded as the ultimate socio-political spatial form, has been accomplished by intermediate stages. There were several levels of political-geographical evolution. In same places tribal territories held sway, in others they had been superseded by patterns of kingdom and empire, as the more successful tribes conquered neighboring groups and brought them under their control. The expansion of political authority beyond tribal limits was usually a response

both to economic and political factors. In many of tribal states that achieved prosperity, it was the felicitous location of the tribal head-quarters that provided the impetus (Blij 1967). The growth of far-reaching trading connection gave this central places an influence be-yond the tribal confines and encouraged military operations to secure trade routes. Political expansion, development of commerce and the division of labor in turn required and generated extending networks of communication and larger and more specialized urban settlements.

According to Muir the nations of Europe did not evolve directly from tribal groupings. The Roman Empire, the closest approach to a mono-polar power system, did also not lead directly to the appear-ance of modern states. They were rather preceded by phases of prema-ture consolidation and of fragmentation. Fluctuation in the relative strengths of ruling elites of the tribal kingdoms, which emerged from the collapse of the Roman Empire, initiated waves of expansion and consolidation, as well as contraction and fragmentation. In medieval period several of newly established kingdoms were more extensive than their tribal predecessors and they found their unity under a nom-inal claim of kingship (Muir 1975).

Muir stresses that the central authority in medieval Europe was based less upon the purposeful organization of territory than upon the establishment of networks of personal loyalty and obligations between the ruler and the nobility. Medieval Germany, for example, was charac-terized by extreme political fragmentation under the veneer of unity which the nominal Reich provided. Imperial authority was unable to maintain effective centralized control as real power radiated outward from a number of regional nodes. As those nodes – cities – exerted con-trol over the tributary areas which supplied them with food, hundreds of small or medium sized state lets bad been formed. Dukes, earls, bishops and barons reigned supreme over their duchies, bishoprics and baronies. Nationalism bad no meaning at that time for the mass of ordinary people who found identity in terms of a series of parochial-isms Normans were Normans and Bretons were Bretons, neither were Englishmen or Frenchmen (Muir 1975).

The nations of Europe developed within the kingdoms and empires of medieval Europe, and, at least in Western Europe, states preceded nations. Glassner and de Blij underline that because the kings bad amalgamated diverse groups of people into their empire, the peoples within their borders often were quite varied in terms of language and religion. But if the state or king provided strong common interest, a nation was in the making. The roots of modern European nationalism lie, according to them, just in period of feudalism when a slow but no-ticeable improvement of circulation caused that among the peoples

living within a state framework there developed a feeling of belonging together (Glassner, Blij 1989).

It was, however, a long process as during the feudal period much of Europe was organized into a mosaic of hundreds of small feudal units, each with nobility and vassals and its more or less tenuous connection with higher authority. People and territories of such stateless existed in a permanent disequilibrium, experiencing many political changes, until Europe have adopted the sovereign state as a basic form of political region.

The emergence of modern Europe, according to Glassner and de Blij, may be dated on the second half of the fifteenth century when the Western-Europe's monarchies began to represent same thing more than mere authority. Feudal privileges were being recaptured then by the central authority, while, along to the rise of influential new class of merchants, there was progress in the parliamentary representation of the general population, too. At the same time the trend toward political fragmentation was weakened, giving way to territorial unity. Increasingly, some of the more important monarchies became centers of an emerging national consciousness and pride 'Europe was ready for change' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

Political change did come to Europe with an emergence of the sovereign state. According to Muir, the roots of state sovereignty are to be found in the Treaty of Westphalia, which in 1648 brought to an end the Thirty Years War between Protestants and Roman-Catholics. The treaty was a complex settlement among a number of authorities, but the most important was that the Holy Roman Empire conferred sovereign independence on princes who remained formally within Empire. Sovereignty involves the recognition by the sovereign of the exclusive rights of other sovereigns to govern within their respective states, and of the inviolable nature of the territory of other states. The continuity of these states was supported then by the general acceptance of a concept of legitimacy, whereby dynasties recognized each other as rightful sovereigns (Muir 1975).

Glassner and de Blij underline that 'by reducing the power of the Holy Roman Empire and strengthening the emerging States, it made the territorial State, rather than the individual sovereign, the cornerstone of our modern political system. This began a radical reduction in the number of States in Europe. Before Westphalia there were around 900 German States, for example. The settlement reduced them to 355. Napoleon I eliminated more than 200 of these, and by the time the Germanic Confederation was formed in 1815, only 36 were left to join it. The unification process continued, with the survivors growing stronger, until one German Empire finally emerged in 1871 with the unification of the remaining 24 German States. Similar processes were

going on elsewhere in Europe, with Italy (1869) and Germany being the last to consolidate into national States based on common culture, primarily language' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

The general acceptance of the doctrine of sovereignty brought a new order and permanence to the imitational relations and political units of Europe. In a longer prospect, however, the sovereignty was unable to guarantee the integrity of the no national state, while the nationalism provided a further guarantee for the national state.

State populations have consisted of series of combined and overlapping subgroups which may be defined by reference to kinship, regionalism, nationality or other criteria. In many states the relationship between the state, its territory and particular groups of its population has not been harmonious one. It may happen, for example, when a national distribution does not coincide to a desired degree with a state territory, when a minority groups seeks to secede from a state, or when conflicting communities find difficulty in coexisting within a state. For these reasons in the 19th and 20th centuries there was fairly general support for the idea of the sovereign nation state.

According to Glassner and de Blij, 'a nation state is a nation with a State wrapped around it. That is, it is a nation with its own State, a State in which there is no significant group that is not a part of the nation. This does not mean simply a minority ethnic group, but a nationalistic group that either wants its own State or wants to be a part of another State or wants at least a large measure of autonomy within the State in which it lives' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

In fact, it is not easy to find many examples of such pure nation states. The explanation of this can be probably found on the way of the investigation of the morphology of states.

4. THE MORPHOLOGY OF STATES

The morphology of the state means its form (size and shape) and its internal structure which is multidimensional.

Each state obviously has a location (absolute and relative), an area, and the geographical or spatial extent, and it must have limits. Most of the states consists also of a number of internal components. Many political-geographical enquires concerning the state have been made then in terms of the ways in which morphological components of the state, such as core areas, peripheries, minority territories, or border zones, have emerged and evolved and how they relate to the state as a whole.

There have been three distinctive political-geographical approaches to the question of the growth of states: Ratzel's organic view, the core area concept, and Jones's unified field theory.

In his 'Unified Field Theory of Political Geography' (Jones 1954) Jones viewed movement as a process involving the flow of ideas as well as goods and other tangibles. The idea, that came to be known as the 'idea-area chain', suggesting a one-way sequence of development from political idea to politically organized area (Glassner, Blij 1989), seems to be less useful in the context of the topic of this volume, especially in case of cultural regions.

The other two concepts derived from the reality that every adequately functioning state system has a nucleus, a central, enduring heart. Ratzel was the first who tried to define this reality in politico--geographical terms (Ratzel 1896). According to him, states tended to begin as 'territorial cells' which would then become larger through the addition of land and people, and eventually evolve into states or even empires. The state, however, was viewed as a form of organism governed by Darwinist laws, its success and security directly related to its ability to acquire space at the expense of competing neighbors. To Ratzel, rigid boundaries were anathema to the state which, deprived of its ability to expand, must decline (Muir 1975). Such a deterministic approach cannot be obviously accepted today.

The best known, and probably the most useful for our purposes, is the core area concept, the idea of state growth from a small core or cell.

5. CORE AREAS

It is obvious that opportunities for the concentration of people, as well as for the interaction and exchange, have always been greater in certain areas of the country than in others. One of the hallmarks of national spatial organization is then the evolution of core areas, foci of human activity that function as the leading regions of control and change (Blij, Muller 1988). As defined by Whittlesy (Whittlesy 1939) the core area is 'the area in which or about which a state originates'. The idea is that the core area, being particularly well-endowed in geographical resources such as fertility or modality, from an early date supports relatively high population densities at higher cultural and economic levels than those of surrounding regions. The commercial ascendancy and the ability to support armies allow the rulers of the core area to extend political control over adjacent areas, and so the states expands with the accretion of territory around its core (Muir 1975).

The significance of core areas, in which normally the capital city was situated, in the historical development of certain states has been proved. Muir confirms that the expansion of control from a nuclear area clearly influenced the growth patterns of a num-

ber of states, such as France and Russia for example. In some cases, such as that of Muscovite Russia, the limits of the state advanced with the extension of political control from the core; in others, such as early medieval England, more effective control was exported from the core area over territory which was enclosed by pre-existing boundaries (Muir 1975). Of twenty-five European states studied by Paunds and Ball, fifteen had distinct core areas and were considered to have grown directly by the accretion of territory around the core (Paunds, Ball 1964).

Muir underlines that the term 'core area' has been used to embrace past and present areas of political dominance, areas of intense national or cultural consciousness and areas of economic leadership. He distinguishes several types of core areas. The historical nucleus, the area where the state was born, is termed a 'germinal core area'. An area which has not played a germinal role but has been associated with an intensity of national sentiment and symbols, such as an area that include the state capital which provides practical expression of the national political consciousness, is called a 'national core area'. An area which is in leading economic position within a state is termed its 'economic core area'. In case if states include areas where, for historical and cultural reasons, separatist sentiments are strongly felt, usually by a national minority, and if these feelings can be associated with a particular cultural center which has played a leading role in separatist iconography, such a center, according to Muir, can be termed a 'separatist core area'. An area which has formerly served as a core area may be termed a 'relict (germinal, national, economic or separatist) core area'. Subsidiary areas associated with germinal, national, economic or separatist functions can be described as adequate 'secondary core areas' (Muir 1975).

We may recognize states with distinct core areas (Czechia, Great Britain) and those without distinct core areas (Albania, Belgium). The core area can be centrally located (Hungary, France) or marginally located (Slovakia, Argentina). We may recognize multicore states (Nigeria, Spain), single core states (Thailand, Egypt), and even no-core states (Mauritania, Chad). The last example is characteristic especially for Africa where a number of states are so sparsely populated or such recently created that they have no true cores at all, yet. The cores are developing here generally around the capitals, a process quite the revers of that observed in the course of history in Europe. Some core areas have a character of a small compact region (Greece, Sudan), some constitute rather a large area (Russia, Sweden).

Glassner and de Blij underline that the core area may also be viewed as performing two major functions within a state, both related to the scale. First it may be considered as the nucleus of a state's ecumene, that is that part of the total territory of a state in which the inhabitants participate in the national economic system, in which this system functions effectively. It can be also defined politically as a part of state's territory in which the people participate somehow in the political life of a country, and in which the government functions effectively (Glassner, Blij 1989).

6.   CORE-PERIPHERY STRUGGLE AND EFFECTIVE STATE AREA

De Blij and Muller associate concept of core area with a country's heartland – 'its largest population cluster, most productive and influential region, the area possessing the greatest centrality and accessibility that usually contains a powerful capital city'. They underline that such cores could not have developed without contribution from their surrounding areas. 'One of the earliest developments in ancient cities was the creation of organized armed forces to help rulers secure taxes and tribute from the people living in the countryside. So, core and periphery (margin) became functionally tied together. The core bad requirements, and the periphery gave'. They add that 'This core-periphery arrangements is a system that keeps regional development contrasts high. The core may give the impression of being a thriving metropolis … But the periphery is the land where underdevelopment reigns' (Blij, Muller 1988).

The main task of any government is to establish an effective control not only over the core area but over the entire territory of its state. The establishment of such control, however, is a gradual process which many areas have resisted because of the environmental barriers, the lack of convenient communication connections with the outer areas, separatism of certain groups of population, the recent nature of colonization, dispersion of the population, etc. Thus, although the sovereignty is indivisible, within most of the states there are areas which vary in the degree to which they are integrated into the functioning state system.

Muir points out that where the central authority is too weak and remote to impose effective control, unintegrated areas exist, either totally beyond the pale of state control, or subject to special arrangements between the government and indigenous elements. Areas beyond the effective state area are frequently associated with: defensively nucleated rather than dispersed settlement patterns, military rather than civil forms of policing, lack of the forms of security and stability normally provided by the state, and a lack of normal state services. Finally, we may conclude, after Muir, that 'continuous patterns of state

sovereignty overlie relatively discontinues patterns of effective governmental control and effective human occupancy' (Muir 1975).

It is obvious, that the possession of territories unintegrated into the effective state areas is more characteristic for the developing countries than developed ones.

The fact that the total state territory is likely to include areas of varying effectiveness of governmental control and human occupancy, encouraged scholars to develop a concept of the 'effective state area'. The term itself was introduced by Zaidi (Zaidi 1966) but its origins lie in Whittlesey's notion of an 'ecumene', seen as 'the portion of the state that supports the densest and most extended population and has the closest mesh of transportation lines' (Whittlesey 1954) and the James's concept of 'effective national territory' defined as 'that only part of total territory which actually contributes to the economic support of the citizens of the country' (James 1959).

Areas of varying degrees of integration occur between the extremes of 'core' and 'periphery' traditionally studied by political geographers. Zaidi, for his part, subdivided the effective state area into four zones: core area, sub-core, intensively effective area, and minimally effective area (Zaidi 1966). The last one may be identified as traditional periphery, marginal zone, frontier or borderland

7.   THE MORPHOLOGICAL MODELS OF STATES

Each state has unique morphological qualities such as size, shape and structure of political-geographical subregions within its boundaries. Whebell suggests, however, that it is possible to use simple models that would symbolize forms of states characteristic for three main world's macro-regions: the Old World, the New World and the Third World (Whebell 1970).

The Old World state model is ethnically based, although it may include some ethnic minority territories too small to function effectively in isolation. It consists of a number of cultural core areas which have come together as population expansion has replaced former frontiers of separation with frontiers of contact.

The New World model is based on spatial economic systems, while cultural differences are only incidental. Economic core areas originated as scattered enclaves of costal European settlement and were expanded along communication corridors leading to the interior. States are separated by geometrical boundaries drawn through frontiers of separation. In the course of European penetration the indigenous populations were frequently displaced into extra-ecumenical territories. Capitals are either coastal metropolis or forward capitals.

The Third World model expresses the coexistence of both ethnic and economic core areas. Developed native ethnic patterns of Old World type are, however, overlaid by the new economic patters of urbanization and communication of New World type, with the capitals as a costal economic focus. Political boundaries are superimposed upon the indigenous cultural systems, and are unlikely to reflect their extent (Muir 1975).

8. THE STATEHOOD AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY

The elements of statehood are: population, sovereignty and government. Each state is a complex relationship between these components, and the state derives its political-geographical personality from the interplay of them within the wider international system.

Most states today express, or at least partially express, 'the man-land pair bonding', a close relationship between a human group and certain territory. At the political centre of this territory there is an effective control, which is based on uncontested administration, binding the area to a population. The strength of the entire structure, and the territorial integrity, depends upon the degree of cultural similarity present in the population and upon a group's perception of this particular territory which it deems to be its own.

The territory of the state, precisely bounded and administered from a state capital, is united under the umbrella of state sovereignty, which concerns entire area, from its core to the most remote portion of the state. The state sovereignty terminates at the state boundaries that define usually the effective state area and represents interfaces between the sovereign territory of neighboring sovereign states. The presence of distinctive frontier zones, adjacent to certain boundaries, will depend upon the pattern of colonization within the state and relationships with neighbors(Muir 1975).

The control of sovereign territory is a factor common to all states, but there are differences among them in the effectiveness of this control, as well as in the disposition of political-geographical sub-regions. Muir underlines that 'though the state is united under sovereignty and government, interplay between political man and the land creates a political-geographical subdivision of state territory into sub-regions which vary in form and function' (Muir 1975). Frequently the state territory includes more than one core area, and these additional core areas may constitute nucleuses of distinctive political or cultural sub-regions that are the main subject of our interest.

9.   THE UNITARY STATE

It is obvious, that political geographers are interested in the ways in which states are organized in spatial-political terms. From the point of view of the political organization of states, in sense of the functions of the central authority and the stage of the distribution of power, we may recognize three categories of states, namely: unitary, federal and regional states.

As explained by Glassner and de Blij, 'The word »unitary« derives from the Latin unitas (unity) that, in turn, comes from *unus* (one). It thus emphasizes the oneness of the State and implies a high degree of internal homogeneity and cohesiveness ... The unitary State, therefore, theoretically has one strong focus, and its internal differences are few' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

The ideal unitary state should have a compact shape of states' territory, should be relatively densely populated and effectively inhabited, without isolated, less-productive areas with separate concentrations of population that could express centrifugal tendencies, and should have only one, centrally located area. Such a location 'brings all peripheral areas within the shortest distance of the capital city and makes the presence of the core area and capital strongly felt in all parts of the State. A single urban center that is disproportionally large and influential in the affairs of the State, where the central authority resides, and where national feeling is strongest, obviously constitutes a binding agent and a focus not only for the core area, but for the State as a whole' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

Although, for convenience, unitary states are subdivided into administrative units, the central authorities entirely control their local governments and determine how much power and competences should they achieve.

France is often seen as the best example of the unitary state. It has a compact territory with one distinctive more or less centrally located core area of a long history, the heart of which occupies a large capital city of undoubted eminence. It also has politically conscious population with much historical perception and strong tradition as well as strong national feeling, with an exception of same ethnic minorities occupying peripheral locations. Until the period of French Revolution, allegiances in France had been to individual historical provinces (such as Champagne, Bourgogne or Auvergne) rather than to France. That was Napoleon I who swept away the old system of loosely tied provinces and replaced them with 90 departments, each of similar size, and each headed by a prefect directly representing the central political al authority. Napoleon also developed an entirely new system of commu-

nication, focusing very strongly on Paris that has played a role of unification factor.

The unitary state system has been copied on all of the continents and nowadays much over hundred states represent a unitary form of organization. In fact, many of them express a considerable heterogeneity and display multicore characteristics that reflect centrifugal forces within formal unity. In respect to their internal ethnic or cultural variety, they might probably function much better as federal states. So far, however, a number of them on the world political map reaches only some twenty examples.

10. THE FEDERAL STATE

The term 'federal', according to Glassner and de Blij, 'has its origin in Latin »oederis« meaning league. Its implication is one of alliance, contract or coexistence of the State's internal, diverse regions and peoples' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

The larger a state, the greater may be the physiographic, racial, ethnic, or cultural diversity that may stimulate centrifugal processes. It seems evident that only political framework of federal state may function to the satisfaction of the majority of people of such a state. The federal framework can withstand centrifugal forces for it permits a central authority to represent the various entities within the state, such as provinces or regions. It is achieved owing to the fact that each entity is represented in the federal government, so that it has a voice in common interests concerning the entire federation as, for instance, defense, foreign affairs, communication etc. The federal government functions in a federal capital city located in an especially created 'federal territory' not belonging to any entity in order to avoid any form of regional favoritism. On the other hand, the federal state allows all these various entities to retain their own identities and to have their own capital city, autonomous government with premier or governor, their own laws, policies, internal budget, cultural institutions, customs, and, sometimes, even their own foreign representation.

By their flexibility, the federal arrangement seems to be a political solution for territories inhabited by groups of people of widely different ethnic or cultural origins, too small, or too dispersed, or too mixed together to create their separate sovereign states.

The federal framework is able to accommodate expanding territories as examples of the United States, India or Brazil show. That is obvious then that the federal state may have more than one core area, or a number of subsidiary cores. Their component areas may have quite different characteristics and can be partly isolated each from other by vast border zones sparsely inhabited by indigenous or other small

marginal groups of population dispersed within empty, unproductive areas, and lacking of political representation.

According to Robinson, 'a federation is the most geographically expressive of all political systems. It is based on the existence of regional differences, and recognizes the claims of the component areas to perpetuate their individual characters ... Federation does not create unity out of diversity; rather, it enables the two to coexist' (Robinson 1961). This coexistence is especially successful in cases where the differences mentioned above have their regional expression, that is, where various peoples see individual parts of their country as a homeland, emphasizing simultaneously a kind of patriotism to a common state as to a motherland.

In an age of an open market, economic planning and pervasive social legislation, state intervention into almost every sphere of political, economic and social life is inevitable. Thus, federal systems often shift from dualism towards a co-operative integrated federalism in which the autonomous units work in partnership with the state, recognizing its supremacy while protecting the principle of regional autonomy (Dikshit 1971).

Both unitary and federal states have been often criticized. In case of the former it is because of the centralization of power and lack of any form of autonomy for administrative regions. But also the federalism seems not to be a panacea to all problems of regional diversity. That is true, that federal model guarantees a division of power between the federal government and the governments of the component political units and that each level of government enjoys autonomy within its allocated sphere of control. However, the inner divisions of federal states have been mostly established according to ethnic criteria, with a special reference to bigger nations or nationalities and this may not satisfy other groups of the population.

11. THE REGIONAL STATE

A solution, 'a midway area between federalism and unitarianism', seems to be the regional state (the term first was introduced by the Spanish scholar Juan Ferrando Badia in 1978). According to Glassner and de Blij, 'Into this category we may place those unitary States in which considerable autonomy bas been granted to regions within them, generally regions of ethnic distinctiveness or remoteness from the core area' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

All the successful examples of regional states can be found in Europe, Italy being the first and probably the best one. Five Italian regions: Sardinia, Sicily, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Trentino-Alto Adige and Valle d'Aosta have been functioning under special autonomous stat-

utes since 1947, owing to their politico-historical and ethnical conditions. In 1970, however, another 15 regions elected their first regional councils (parliaments). These regions, to a large extend, were established according to former historic-political divisions of the country and obtained traditional historic-geographical names. Also Spain, that granted regional autonomy to Catalonia in 1977 and Basque provinces in 1978, completed the process of creating a region state in 1983 by granting autonomy to Extremadura, Castilla-Leon, the Balearic Islands, and Madrid. The United Kingdom, Belgium, and the Netherlands might be perhaps, too, good examples of regional states, for their basic historic-geographical provinces have long enjoyed a large measure of home rule. In case of Denmark and Finland only their overseas provinces, inhabited by native nationalities or minority groups, have had some autonomy and are gradually receiving more as the 'devolution' of power from the center to the peripheries continues.

Glassner and de Blij add that a special case of states that might de facto fit into category of regional states are those with federal constitutions in which, however, federalism was never very real and has gradually given way to centralization (Glassner, Blij 1989). The former Soviet Union, China, Burma and to some extend India, have been experienced such a manipulation. In these cases, instead of devolution, we may notice a step backward, although some forms of regional rights have been preserved.

The notion of a regional state is quite new and untested. Glassner and de Blij underline that 'There is both ample scope and real need for investigations into the utility of borne rule or autonomy as a device for governing as a device for governing are-as inhabited by minority ethnic groups or those separated from the area of a country or those with greatly different economic, physiographic, or political conditions ... The suggestion ... of a tendency toward equilibrium is worth testing. Perhaps it offers hope for resolution of some problems of government in this restless world' (Glassner, Blij 1989).

12. TOWARDS THE REGION

Desmond Morris, the author of 'The human Zoo' (Morris 1969) underlines that the transition from life among smaller (for instance tribal) groups to state communities has far outstripped mankind's capacity for biological adaptation. We seem to be still adapted to life in 'tribal' societies, within which relationships between members, and between members and leaders, were more personal, and hierarchies of dominance established. Many

tensions arise when we are transposed into a state milieu for the state community, or 'supertribe', is far too large to permit closer relationship between all members. Morris sees man's response in the establishment of regional or interest-based subgroups within the 'supertribes'.

Recently, also among geographers arises a need for the region--scale studies. Glassner and de Blij stress that 'In their quest for ever-new behavioral, statistical, or theoretical subjects, many con-temporary political geographers seem to be forgetting their roots. If they are, indeed, geographers – not social historians, political scien-tists economists, or sociologists – then they must be concerned with places, where things are happening. Those concerned with political units smaller than a state would perform a useful service if they would produce political geographies of Punjab (or) of the Midlands ... This would help us all to understand better the stories behind the headlines (Glassner, Blij 1989).

For most regional scientists today, however, the region repre-sents merely a taxonomic category, a functional subunit of certain wider, mostly national, space. Regionalization appears as primarily a technical task which can result in a variety of abstract divisions. The majority of these arbitrary lines, however, drawn on maps, have not been satisfactory to people for whom a region has been a real place, created by a particular group of people in interaction with their environment, an actual location, such as Brittany or Sax-ony for example, palpable to anyone who experienced it.

The intellectual concept of so called 'natural' regions, as well as "regionalism" as a modern political movement, had nineteenth--century French origins. It drew heavily upon 'la tradition vi-dalienne'. Vidal de la Blache's school of thought, expressed most widely in his works: 'Les regions francaises' (Vidal de la Blache 1910) and 'Les divisions regionales de la France' (Vidal de la Blache 1913), and followed by other scholars, were disseminated through-out France as his pupil s (de Martonne, Demangeon, Blanchard) continued his method of approaching the study of geography through regional monographs.

An important role in the birth of modern regionalism and re-gional policy played peripheral regions with a strong historical and cultural identity, such as Scotland, Brittany and Occitania. American regionalism was a response to the far-reaching social economic changes which occurred during the first half-a-century after the Civil War. According to Friedmann and Weaver, the economic dif-ferences between the well-developed, urbanized and industrialized North and the poor, rural, politically handicapped South dramati-cally increased then. The American South had always been an

agrarian society, and perhaps because of that, its culture exhibited a degree of regional unity. But after the Civil War politically the region was subordinated to the North while its traditional culture, its last proud possession, was being destroyed by machine industry and alien lifestyles. It caused a sudden intellectual awakening to these forces in the 1920th an 1930th which created both backward--looking Southern Agrarians and more liberal-minded New South movements (Friedmann, Weaver 1979).

It was not until the late 1930s, however, that regionalism's approach found the scientific interpretation and international audience. That was Lewis Mumford who, in his well-known essay 'The Culture of Cities' (Mumford 1938), set down the interpretation of regionalism on the base of an evolutionary history of Western civilization and explained the role of indigenous territorial society in creating urban culture.

To Mumford the region is an evolutionary product; rationally defined, it is the locus of human communities. As he wrote in 1938 'the region, as a unit of geographic individuation is given: as a unit of cultural individuation it is partly the deliberate expression of human will and purpose. The poles of these two aspects of regional life are the raw physiographic region and the city: they express the extremes of natural and human control. The human region, in brief, is a complex of geographic, economic, and cultural elements' (Mumford 1938).

13. REGIONALISM

Regionalism is a notion univocally associated with a region and, likewise, it is differently defined by particular branches of science. Geography itself credited regionalism with various contents. For example Pawłowski, who was a continuator of the Vidal de la Blache's school, described it as a 'movement aiming at distinguishing and examining certain objects and occurrences taking place on the surface of the Earth according to the innate regions, that is provinces' (Pawłowski 1934). Ormicki, for his hand, distinguished an economic regionalism defining it as an teleological (that is intentional) regionalism which is the basis of practical activity. On the other hand the building of structures of a cultural regionalism would be based on the development of physical and material living standards of a man (Ormicki 1934).

The contemporary understanding of the essence of regionalism puts aside the geographical determinism of the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, which regarded a geographical region as a 'natural region'. The essence of regionalism arises from the needs of a man

and his attitude towards a place, from his life and activities in various spatial dimensions. Thus, regionalism is always connected on one hand with a certain concrete fragment of space (sphere of life) – region, and on the other hand with a conscious feeling of separateness of a given group of population, and at the same time this separateness has, more or less so, territorial roots. All types of regionalism have, as their dormant feature, the attachment to one's own land, one's 'small native land'. There were various attempts of space classification from the point of view of its perception, creation and adoption by a man (Moles and Rohmer 1973, Strassoldo 1984 and others) but in all of them, however, there is a regional aspect.

Thus, regionalism should be, on one hand, connected with a certain element of spatial structure, and on the other hand with the existence of a group of people, which in a sociological sense may be called 'a regional corporate body'. Szczepański uses a term 'regional corporate body' to describe any group of people in which there was formulated and is still existent a certain social bond, and the source of this bond is a similar attitude of the inhabitants to a common property which is the land. Thus territorialism has a constitutive influence on the formation of bonds uniting the members of a regional corporate body (Szczepański 1967).

Ossowski concludes that a regional corporate body is a territorial collectivity which, more or less so, has a feeling of separateness, but it does not regard itself as a nation and usually is a part of national collectivity. Ossowski introduced notions of 'private fatherland' (or homeland) and 'regional, ideological fatherland' which are identified by the elements of regional bonds such as objective – a territory, and subjective – a conviction of inhabitants. A 'private fatherland' is perceived through a prism of individual experience of a man. On the other hand, the feeling of a 'regional ideological fatherland' is based on the conviction of an individual about his participation in the community's life, which is based on the unity of inhabitants and the territory. Thus, an area becomes a common property for an individual, and its inhabitants are the members of a mutual lot (Ossowski 1967).

Regionalism arises from a particular attitude of an individual, which is a reflexion of a certain state of individual's consciousness. Kwiatkowski defines such an attitude by means of the following set of features:

− the attachment to one's own area,

− the conviction that this area possesses positive features, which differentiate it from other territories belonging to the national fatherland,

− the conviction that the community inhabiting the area creates, or have created, some definite values which constitute an original culture,

− the feeling of identification with a community and its culture,

− the anxiety to manifest, through social activity, the attachment to a homeland and a positive evaluation of its features and identification with a regional corporate body and its culture (Kwaśniewski 1986).

Regionalism seems to be a result of a specific consciousness of a regional corporate body's members, resulting from a definite emotional attitudes of its members towards a concrete area. The members of such a body have a feeling of a territorial identity, and speaking more strictly of a regional identity. The origin of this identity can be varied. It may, for example, arise from the natural features of an area, which created a part of the consciousness, or be a picture of the consciousness containing symbolic elements of the space, created in the historical process of its delimitation.

An important, or perhaps the most important, factor of shaping the regional identity is the feeling of cultural identity. The problem of the identity is to some extent inscribed in the history of a society, not only regional, and in some periods of crisis or turning point it becomes an important motive power of social activities, among them regionalistic activities.

Modern regionalism arises from a protest against anonymity of life, obliteration of differences between people and their unification. It is to secure the optimal participation in the realization of state's aims without losing own identity. Regionalism causes the interest of people with the past, its cultural roots, what strengthens a modern creation of one's own region.

Regionalism and regional research always reflected the balance of power and political relations, speeding up or slowing the process of country's democratization. It served both the socialization of government's forms and the strengthening of authoritarian rule. Regionalism determines the strength and vitality of many nations and countries owing to the exemplification of community's subjectivity. It releases an additional social energy not only related to the cultural sphere but also to other spheres of life, especially economic. Thus, there is research, both in Western Europe and in Poland, for a 'sleeping potential' in local and regional communities and the stimulations of the so--called 'development from below'.

REFERENCES

Alland A., 1972, *The Human Imperative,* New York: Columbia Univ. Press. Ardrey R., 1966, *The Territorial Imperative,* New York: Atheneum.

Clark A.N., 1990, The New Penguin Dictionary of Geography, London: Penguin Books.

Cohen S.B., 1973, *Geography and Politics in a World Divided,* New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed.

De Blij H.L., 1967, Systematic Political Geography, New York.

De Blij H.L. and Muller P.O., 1988, *Geography. Regions and Concepts,* 5th ed., New York: John Wi1ey & Sons.

Dickinson R.E., 1964, *City and Region,* 2nd ed, New York: Humanities and London Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dikshit R.D., 1971, *Geography and Federalism,* 'Annals of the Assoc. of Amer. Geogr.', 61.

Dziewoński K., 1961, *Elementy teorii regionu ekonomicznego* (E1ements of the Theory of Economic Region), 'Przeg. Geogr.' 33, 4.

Fridmann J. and Weaver C., 1979, Territory and Function. The Evolution of Regional Planning, London: Edward Arnold.

Glassner M.I & De Blij H.J., 1989, *Systematic Political Geography,* 4th ed., New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hagget P., 1972, *Geography: a Modern Synthesis,* New York: Harper & Row.

James P.S., 1959, *Latin America,* 3rd ed., New York.

Jones S.B, 1954, *A Unified Field Theory of Political Geography,* 'Annals of the Assoc. of the Americ. Geogr.', 44, 2.

Kwaśniewski K., 1986, Regionalizm, Poznań: Wielkopolskie Towarzystwo Kulturalne, III Kongres Regionalnych Towarzystw Kulturalnych 1986.

Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English, 1982, Harlow: Longman.

Moles A. and Rohmer E., 1973, *Psychologie de l'espace,* Tournai: Casterman.

Morris D., 1969, *The Human Zoo,* London.

Muir R., 1975, Modern Political Geography, London: Macmillan.

Mumford L., 1938, *The Culture of Cities,* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Ormicki W., 1934, Regionalizm gospodarczy w Polsce [in:] Ruch regionalistyczny w Europie, ed. A Patkowski, t. II, Warszawa.

Ossowski S., 1967, Analiza socjologiczna pojęcia Ojczyzny, Dzieła, t. III, Warszawa: PWN.

Paunds N. J. G. and Ball S. S., 1964, *Core Areas and the Development of the European States System,* 'Annals of the Assoc. of Amer. Geogr.'

Pawłowski S., 1934, Regionalizm geograficzny i jego rozwój w Polsce, [in:] Ruch regionalistyczny w Europie, ed. A Patkowski, t. II, Warszawa.

Ratzel F., 1896, *The Territorial Growth of States,* 'Scottish Geographical Magazine', 12.

Robinson K. W., 1961, *Sixty Years of Federation in Australia,* "Geogr. Revue", 51, l.

Russel R. J., Kniffen F. B., and Pruit E. L., 1969, *Culture Worlds,* 2nd ed., New York: Macmillan.

Soja E. W., 1971, *The Political Organization of Space,* Washington: Assoc. of Amer. Geogr. Commission College Geography, Resource Paper No 8.

Sommer R., 1969, *Persona! Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ Prentice Hall.

Strahler A N. , 1960, *Physical Geography,* 2nd ed., New York: Wiley.

Strassoldo R., 1984, The Social Construction and Sociological Analysis of Space, after B. Jałowiecki, 1988, Społeczne wytwarzanie przestrzeni, Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza

Szczepański J., 1967, Socjologia, rozwój problematyki i metod, Warszawa: PWN.

Vidal de la Blache P., 1910, *Les regiofrancaises,* Revue de Paris, 15 dec.

Vidal de la Blache P., 1913, *Les divisions regiona/es de la France,* Paris, Alcan.

Webster 's New World Dictionary, 1988, 3rd ed, New York.

Whebell C. F. J., 1970, *Made is of Political Territory,* 'Proceedings of the Assoc. of the Americ. Geogr.', 2.

Whittlesey D. S., 1954, The Regional Concept and the Regional Method [in:] American Geography -inventory and Prospect, Assoc. of Americ. Geographers, Syracuse Univer. Press.

Whittlesey D. S., 1939, *The Earth and the State,* New York.

Zaidi L.H., 1966, Towards a Measure of the Functional Effectiveness of a Stale: the Case of *West Pakistan,* 'Annals of the Assoc. of Amer. Geogr.' 54.