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Abstract

Over the last decades, many social scientists have diagnosed a ‘disappearance of space’ (Paul Virilio). Others, however, have presented persuasive arguments for a ‘spatial turn’ (Edward W. Soja) that is the demand to recognise space as a key factor for the social sciences and humanities. Following the latter argument, the article shows the importance of space which is not just a neutral box in which history takes its course. On the contrary, humans are always thrown into a historically specific world and thus linked with their environment. They are both being influenced by the world around them and constructing a social understanding of their surroundings, and it is thus the challenge for studies of space and place to situate themselves between the two reductionist positions of spatial voluntarism and spatial determinism. The survey of more theoretical and empirical studies also shows the key importance of human attachment to ‘their place’ in identity formation, on a local, regional, national and transnational level as well as through qualitative features of landscape such as mountains or plains, rich or sparse vegetation, or the question of access to rivers, lakes and the sea. Such senses of belonging or Heimat are a key aspect of human existence and political action ranging from providing an important sense of community to a dangerous exclusion of alleged ‘others’.

Over the last decades, many social scientists have diagnosed globalisation and a ‘disappearance of space’ in the postmodern age. The instant availability of information on the World Wide Web, the unhindered flow of money and goods, ever-increasing mobility, and the dominance of a global culture are said to have made distance shrink, collapse or even disappear. Scholars employ these verbs to communicate the magnitude of the time-space convergence that has arisen out of the technological advances of the last forty years. Where one is located is far less important now than in the past; ‘what is more important as markets, societies, cultures and governments are becoming more connected is whether one is “connected,” how far one is from other places in time not in absolute distance, and how much one is connected with other places.’ While some thus argued that space has been losing its importance in the present day, there were others who advocated a ‘spatial turn’, that is, the demand that space be recognised as a key factor for the social sciences and humanities. While the former group claimed that we have come to live in a ‘global village’ (McLuhan) in the postmodern world, the latter diagnosed a fundamental ‘spatialization of the temporal’. As Foucault claimed as early as 1967: ‘The great obsession of the nineteenth century was, as we know, history. […] The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space.’

Overwhelming evidence has been produced to show that space has by no means lost its importance: differences between countries and regions are at the very core of globalization, and a global culture is appropriated very differently in different parts of the world.
‘World culture’, it is thus worth noting, ‘is not a replication of uniformity but an organization of diversity, an increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures.’ Considering space is not a nostalgic look at something lost in the present, but at an important aspect of social reality in past and present.

Why the fascination with space? Different factors contribute to this. First, the long historicist emphasis on change over time often led to a neglect of space in history and the social sciences. History appeared to be exciting, full of opportunities, while space seemed to be conservative and boring in its static solidity. While there has been a growing scepticism about the grand narratives of progress ranging from Marxism to modernisation theory, however, globalisation has made the importance of space as a polyphony of staggering variety and fluidity become more apparent: the simultaneous existence of rich and poor as well as different ethnicities, imperial encounters and the difficulties of post-colonialism, the clash of cultures, the challenges of migration, cosmopolitan cities and an increased attention to both regionalism and transnationalism. Secondly, while the ‘linguistic turn’ has led to a growing emphasis on culture, semiotics and discourses, a study of space seems to offer a chance for a new materiality and concreteness. And lastly, at least partially in contradiction to the previous point, space has turned out to be just as complex as time: not simply a neutral container, in which historical events take their course. Space is at least to a large extent socially constructed. Most spaces in which we move are largely made by humans; they exert power by establishing a hierarchy of opportunities and limitations. And a space like Jerusalem, for example, is seen very differently by Jews, Christians or Muslims, by natives or tourists, by Palestinians or Israelis. While a study of space can thus be fascinating because it offers the opportunity to ‘read’ the changing times through a close look at the visual evidence in space, we have to remain aware that different individuals and groups tend to read a space in very different ways.

Of course, in one sense emphasising the importance of space is nothing new. Historians have long considered the influence of the natural environment for topics such as agriculture and industrialization, international relations and war, and there are the more traditional attempts from Herder onwards to explain national character as a consequence of a people’s habitat. Arguably the most impressive older study of an area defined by geographic characteristics is Fernand Braudel’s monumental *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* first published in 1949. Braudel distinguishes the long durée of the relationship of humans with their environment, the medium durée of social and cultural history, with social groupings, empires and civilizations, and the short durée of political history. While the history of short-term events were no more to him than the ‘crests of foam that the tides of history carry on their strong backs’, his most powerful agents were the sea and the countryside around it. With his strong tendency towards geographical determinism, he believed that every human activity was strongly shaped by the landscape in which these humans lived. The ambition of his study of the Mediterranean, which opens with about 250 pages on the environment before humans enter the picture, was thus to provide a histoire totale starting with the material conditions which Braudel believed had such a strong influence on all human actions and thoughts.

The more recent emphasis on space as well as place has, however, different roots. Space is no longer regarded as a given setting in which humans operate, but as something which is intrinsically linked with humans: space not only influences human beings, it is also given meaning through the human perspective. Space cannot be taken as an objectively given because it is an a priori of human existence. From a phenomenological perspective, space is what humans encounter as space in their actions and thought. It is thus always charged with meaning and influenced by all kinds of human activities – especially
in intensively-used regions like Western Europe where the idea of untouched nature has long been nothing more than a myth. The understandings of space changes in the course of history as much as does human interaction with it. The human relationship with space is thus no longer purely the domain of geography, it has become a topic for all social sciences, cultural studies and for historical enquiry. The geographers Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin and Gil Valentine acknowledge this in what is one of the most useful summaries of the theories of space and place, when they stress that over half of the thinkers covered in their volume are not geographers.

In the English-speaking world, Henri Lefebvre played a crucial role in drawing attention to the fact that ‘(social) space is a (social) product’, and he also introduced the distinction of spatial practice/ espace perçu (the perceived, experienced and used space), representation of space/l’espace conçu (the space of knowledge, signs and codes), and spaces of representation/l’espace vécu (the imagined space of images and symbols). Equally important was the fact that the renowned sociologist Anthony Giddens assigned the same importance to space as to time in his seminal work *The Constitution of Society*. Instead of looking at further theoretical discussions of space, however, we want to turn towards the important distinction of space and place. ‘Space’ is used to denote an abstract, distant perspective, for example a scientific analysis, a bird’s eye view, or a modern map reducing space to a manageable, two-dimensional relationship which can give the sense (or illusion) of control. This sense of control can be further heightened by the advances in technology: the widespread popularity of Google Earth, for example, and the increasing importance of sophisticated Geographical Information Systems (GIS) can result in the feeling of having ‘space’ at one’s fingertips. However, in contrast to an understanding of space as a coordinate system of measurable distances, where there is no qualitative difference between different points in space, the very different phenomenological reality is that humans are always situated in a specific ‘place’ in a multifaceted relationship to their surroundings. This means that the relationship to place is real, specific, and based on tangible experiences. The many emotional relationships to a wide variety of places was explored convincingly 1977 by Yi-Fu Tuan, who looked closely at how the relationship to one’s surrounding emerges in children and exists in adults, and how humans experience spaciousness and crowding, mythical places, architecture and their homeland. The most convincing philosophical foundation, however, was laid much earlier by Martin Heidegger. Instead of discussing the huge current literature to the concept of place, we want to use this philosopher to show the importance of place and being located for the study of identities in history.

As a phenomenologist, Heidegger emphasised that space is an integral part of human existence. Humans are thrown into a world, that is, they always exist, prior to any thinking, in a specific place and within a specific historical context. Humans are thus not individuals making free choices, but live in a specific situation which provides different opportunities, but also blocks the opportunity for wholly different ways of existence. Human existence, he argues, is shaped by the ‘fourfold’, that is four relationships: to earth, to sky, to gods and to mortals. The relationship to earth means that humans do not live in an abstract place, but are intimately connected to a specific place with its landscape, its plants and its animals. The relationship to sky means an appreciation of the moon and sun, the changing weather and the changing seasons. The relationship to gods is a connection with the spiritual forces binding a community. Heidegger’s gods are not a-temporal and a-spatial. They are neither metaphysical and universal entities, nor ideals chosen by an individual (which might be easily dropped when the going gets tough), nor abstract principles, but the belief in something superior (heroes is the term used in *Being
and Time) a community shares because they share a common heritage, a sense of belong-
ing to a specific place (Heimat), and a sense of destiny which guides their actions in the
present and their wishes for the future. And last but not least, there is the connection to
mortal, that is, to humans fully aware of their mortality. They should accompany each
other on their way from birth to death.

On the one hand, the fourfold is an anthropological description of human existence:
humans always live within these relationships, whether they know it or not. But a con-
scious existence within the fourfold was also Heidegger’s idea of a fulfilled life. In his
opinion, such an existence found expression, for example, in a traditional Black Forest
farm house. The fourfold was a central part of the people’s daily existence, and it found
material form in their homes. The farm house stands in a wind-protected spot close to a
spring, and is thus well-connected with the earth. The roof is an ideal protection against
snow and storms, that is, the powers of the sky. Inside, there is a place for the Christian
cross honouring God, and a dining table provides the place for hours shared in commu-
nity with each other. The house even provides specific places for cradle and coffin, thus
expressing a communal existence in full awareness of death.

Heidegger’s analysis is very useful in understanding the complex relationship of humans
to their world, but it is also shaped by an overly harmonistic and naïve understanding of
belonging. While he accepted that there was no return to such traditional forms of living
(his description rather as a concrete exemplum for the dimensions of a complete
life), his concept of Heimat or belonging underestimated how much existence had long
been shaped by a wide variety of outside influences. Place is not, as Doreen Massey has
rightly argued, some static concept of an allegedly authentic existence, but a multiplicity
of heterogeneous influences and forces, relations, negotiations, practices of engagement,
power in all its forms. ‘What is special about place is not some romance of a pre-given
collective identity or of the eternity of the hills. Rather, what is special about place is
precisely that thrown-togetherness, the unavoidable challenge of negotiating a here-and-
now (itself drawing on a history and a geography of thens and theres); and a negotiation
which must take place within and between both humans and nonhumans… This is the
event of place.’ In today’s ‘postmodern’ existence, at least in the privileged West, peo-
ple can, as Lyotard has argued, ‘listen to reggae, watch a western, eat McDonald’s food
for lunch and local cuisine for dinner, wear Paris perfume in Tokyo and “retro” clothes
in Hong Kong’, but this global cultural repertoire gains, we argue, specific significances
within the different localities.

While humans tend to develop close ties to a specific place, such a relationship is
often not as benign and innocent as Heidegger suggests. A sense of place is shaped by
ideologies and understandings of the time: we perceive places, for example, as gen-
dered, as Romantic or Kafkaesque. The meaning of places is contested as they are
claimed by different users – ranging from the inhabitants to industrial developers and
tourists in areas of outstanding beauty, or from colonisers who claim to make best eco-
nomical use of the land to the colonised who claim the longest and deepest connection
to their home land. The fascist marches through working class neighbourhoods were
as much an attack on a sense of place – and a re-defining of the meaning of a place –
as the de-sacralisation of a holy place through, say, the desecration of graves. Places
have been specifically created to exert power as we will see below: For example, mon-
umental architecture tries to justify authoritarian rule and stabilize the social hierarchy;
the Panopticon cited by Foucault or the wide streets of Paris were designs to control
the mass of the population, and the greening of cities served to increase the health of the
population.
With the discussion of place, we already shifted, implicitly, into the terrain of identity. If humans experience a relationship to a place – whether we analyse it in terms of the fourfold or any other way –, then this relationship influences their actions and self-understanding, that is, their identity. A sense of place can take many different forms: We can experience a place as oppressive or holy, relaxing or invigorating. Humans can value a place for leisure time activities, thus loving it, for example, because it connects with childhood memories, because they use it for sport activities, or because it is their favourite holiday destination. Such an attachment to a place – be it motivated by as diverse activities as the desire for a Romantic gaze or hunting – frequently motivated the first moves towards environmental protectionism: a thriving area of research we unfortunately do not have the space to address here.

A sense of place is also a core foundation of national, regional, local, and personal identities. All such identities of belonging are intrinsically linked to a perceived relationship to one’s natural and social environment, one’s heritage and one’s personal and collective views of the present and visions of the future. The character of these relationships is, however, very difficult to determine, and the most controversial question in this respect has long been, as mentioned above, whether the past and the environment shape humans, as Braudel argues, or whether humans wilfully construct what they desire to see as their past and their environment.

This question gave rise to a heated debate in regard to national identity – still the most important spatial subdivision. In reaction to the traditional view of it as something natural, Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm came to stress in the 1980s that a sense of a national identity was largely based on an ‘invention’ of traditions and an ‘imagined’ sense of belonging. Much of their argument has found general acceptance: It is now commis opinio that national identities draw very selectively on the past, and that the understanding of the past is strongly shaped by nationalists who mobilize it for the present purpose of creating a nationalist identity. The ethnic past is very open and could be read in many different ways, but in the age of nationalism – that is in modern history, where industrialization, a revolution in communication and increased mobility bring the people of one area much closer together – it is turned into a heritage that offers a basis and legitimizes a closely integrated nation.

If an ethnic past is thus mobilized with a clear political goal in mind – to create and maintain a national identity –, the question is to what extent the historical reality actually matters. This was at the core of a debate between Ernest Gellner and Anthony D. Smith. For Gellner, the past was ‘inessential’. Some nations have a past, he argued, and some do not; but whatever this past might have been, it does not make ‘the slightest difference to the issue’ of nationalism. Opposing this position, Smith insisted ‘that, although we can often discern elements of deliberate planning and human creativity in their formation, nations and nationalisms are also the products of preexisting traditions and heritages which have coalesced over the generations’. Neither is it by accident, this leading expert of nationalism argued with much persuasive detail, that all nationalisms try to establish the story of historic roots leading into the present, nor is the content of such stories unimportant. On the contrary, most national identities draw their strength from the belief in a shared past and such beliefs are not wholly invented. The ethnic past provides the building blocks from which a national identity is built and the nature of the building blocks is important in the attempt to understand the particular form a particular nationalism takes.

What Smith has shown in regard to nationalism also applies to all spatial identities ranging from the regional to the transnational, or indeed identities connected with the
character of a landscape like an Alpine population or sea-farers. A comparable debate to that between Gellner and Smith rages here. On the one hand, the ‘spatial turn’ was deeply connected with the realization that space is not an objective box in which humans act, but socially constructed. However, if we see the space idealistically as nothing more than a result of human construction, then it also loses its specific relevance. The challenge is thus to keep in mind that space is ‘neither an exterior thing nor an inner experience’, but an integral part of human existence.30 Neither does a particular place determine what humans do and think, nor can humans do with a space whatever they like.31 In opposition to such a ‘spatial voluntarism’,32 it is important to emphasise that every specific space offers material opportunities and limitations and also shapes – through its ‘atmosphere’33 – human emotions. The open plain or being on top of the Yorkshire Moors, for example, can give humans a sense of freedom and power or make them feel insecure, but there is definitely a different atmosphere from that in a forest.34 And even the architecturally constructed space gains, in turn, a power of its own and thus influences human behaviour. While the study of a space can highlight the multitude of simultaneous developments, it is also fascinating because actions and intentions clash in and over one place. As Schiller rightly put it: ‘Objects clash hard in space.’ (‘Doch hart im Raum stoßen sich die Sachen’).35

A sense of belonging or Heimat operates in a system of concentric spheres. While the national has long found much attention, it was in particular a study by Celia Applegate (1990) that stresses the importance of more ‘provincial’ feelings of identity in the German idea of belonging or Heimat through a case study of the Palatinate. Paying equal attention to affinities towards locality, region and nation enables her to trace the complexities in the use and mobilisation of the term Heimat, thus showing that ‘Heimat has been the center of a German moral – and by extension political – discourse about place, belonging, and identity.’36 This approach has been taken further in particular by Alon Confino in his study on Württemberg as well as the edited volumes by Laurence Cole and David Blackbourn/James Retallack on Central Europe.37

Heimat is, of course, a very charged term, especially in the light of the dangerous forms it took in the Third Reich. This has been highlighted forcefully by Peter Blickle who disqualifies such an attachment to Heimat as an ‘irrational antihumanism’ which allegedly nurses ‘some lost sense of belonging in place of all the emancipatory promises with which the Enlightenment invested reason.’38 There is certainly some truth in this statement: the concept of Heimat has been (ab)used for reactionary and violent policies aiming at excluding and removing those seen as ‘others’. This is not disputed, however, by any of the current historians working in the field, but what such a sweeping moralistic judgement overlooks is (1) that other convictions and political ideologies are not necessarily more ‘rational’ or more harmless, (2) that Heimat can also be mobilised in emancipatory ways (witness in particular its role in the process of de-colonialisation), and (3) that the phenomenon of spatial identities is a powerful reality in societies which, above all, has to be adequately understood because it will not go away simply as a consequence of any academic condemnation.

As sense of home is, after all, not a German peculiarity. Robert Colls, for example, has shown the importance of landscape for the history of English identity,39 and David Morley draws on a wealth of literature to describe the importance of a sense of home in diverse nations ranging from Britain to Australia, in ethnic groups or among emigrants who frequently continue to call their place of origin ‘home’, try to re-create the atmosphere of their past in their homes or want their bodies to be buried in their native soil.40
It is, above all, in cultural studies and anthropology that local identities have found in-depth attention. An outstanding example is Jaro Stacul’s exploration of three villages in the Vanoi Valley (eastern Trentino). As an anthropologist, Stacul begins with a locality, and while he openly acknowledges that there are clear political dimensions and representations of local identity by political leaders, he stresses even more the importance of local ‘actors’ and that their behaviour and actions are part of a powerful meaning-giving system.

This sense of belonging or Heimat is at the very core of national, regional, local and personal identities. The work of Elisabeth Boa and Rachel Palfreyman spotlights the significance of this need to identify with a place by drawing on both Heidegger and Lefèvre: ‘Heimat is, then, a physical space, or a social space, or a bounded medium of some kind which provides security and belonging. As a surrounding medium, Heimat protects the self by stimulating identification whether with family, locality, nation, folk or race, native tongue or whatever else may fill the empty signifier to fuel a process of definition or of buttressing which feeds and sustains a sense of identity.’

Of particular relevance for historians is also the anthropologist Eric Hirsch because he ponders the question whether the many fundamental tensions over places and between space and place demand a historical dimension to understand the contemporary significance of landscape. Central to the expansion of the analysis of landscape have also become two seminal, largely geographical anthologies, the first edited by Michael Conzen which introduces ideas of landscape as place and also stresses the importance of region, the second, edited by Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, which introduces the idea of iconography or culturally produced images of landscape into the debate. For historians the work of Simon Schama on landscape and memory represents a similar kind of pivot. He argues forcefully that ‘landscapes are culture before they are nature; constructs of the imagination projected onto wood and rock.’ This view might be best described, in the terminology introduced above, as spatial voluntarism or the understanding of space as largely invented, thus ignoring ‘the power of the space itself’. Emphasising the need to take the material reality of space seriously ‘has nothing to do with spatial determinism, but with the fact that spatial arrangements are not without effect upon our behaviour. The multitude of possible actions is limited through space.’

A completely different approach to Schama, where the landscape is constantly in danger of disappearing behind cultural discourses, is taken by W. J. T. Mitchell in what he calls a surface model of landscape. He is, above all, concerned with the ‘remarkable capability of the surface of landscape to open false depth, selective memories, and self-serving myths.’ This unites a cultural and a material approach to landscape, which Mitchell uses to explore in particular Israel, Palestine and the American wilderness as landscapes that are riddled with ‘places of amnesia and erasure’ – which, deconstructed, reveal the real forces and identities that drove the process of mystification in the first place.

Last, we would like to draw attention to an edited volume on Nordic Landscapes (2008). It offers an impressive balance between addressing issues specific to individual nations and features common to the wider Scandinavian/Nordic region. Most importantly for our context is that the editors and contributors acknowledge that the idea of belonging/Heimat is at the centre of their discourse on landscape – an approach that should be further applied to other regions.

To conclude: This survey article addresses an interdisciplinary field of research which is marked by important theoretical debates, many rich empirical studies and even more avenues still open to explore. With our discussion of space, place, and identity we hope
to have shown, first, that space is not a neutral box in which historical action takes place. Human understandings of and relationships to space are to a large degree socially constructed, but natural and humanly constructed places also have power over humans (without, of course, determining their actions). It is thus important to explore the complex relationship of humans to their environment without falling into the traps of either spatial voluntarism or spatial determinism. Second, throughout history, space and place have played a key role in shaping human identities, at the local, regional, national and trans-national level as well as through the less well studied qualitative features of landscape such as mountains or plains, rich or sparse vegetation, or the question of access to rivers, lakes and the sea. While we hope to have shown with this article that impressive work has been performed, for example, also in the field of anthropology,50 this approach or paradigm is far from exhausted. Mike Crank and Nigel Thrift even claim that ‘space is the everywhere of modern thought.’,51 and the geographer Peter Gould follows Foucault in diagnosing the arrival of a ‘spatial century’52. While historians feel more uneasy about making such sweeping predictions about the future, it seems clear that the concepts of space, place and identity still deserve much careful attention. The theoretical studies have provided a framework for a wealth of historical studies, and such empirical studies will provide important material for discussing on a sounder empirical basis the relationship of humans and their environment. The historical discipline has been slow in integrating the new spatial-temporal thinking, possibly because there has been the fear – especially in the study of the German-speaking lands – of slipping back into some kind of geo-political arguments, blood-and soil rhetoric or Romanticism of landscape, but the new approach has developed a sophistication that transcends such unsustainable views.53
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