CONVENTIONALLY, THE WAY THAT POWER AND SOVEREIGNTY IN THE WORLD SYSTEM HAVE BEEN CONCEPTUALIZED IN DISCIPLINES SUCH AS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY (IPE) HAS BEEN CLOSELY RELATED TO PARTICULAR NOTIONS OF TERRITORY AND GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE: POWER IS SEEN TO BE THAT EXERCIZED BY (LEGITIMATE OR ILLEGITIMATE) POLITICAL AUTHORITIES WITHIN CONTAINED GEOGRAPHICAL PARAMETERS; SOVEREIGNTY PERTAINS TO THE TACIT AND OVERT YIELING TO THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH GEOGRAPHIC-POLITICAL BODIES BY OTHER LIKE ENTITIES, AND UPON WHICH THE CONTRIVING OF INTERACTION ON WORLD SCALE OCCURS. THE RECENT 'SPATIAL TURN' IN SOCIAL SCIENCES HAS GONE SOME WAY TO DISRUPT WHAT AGNEW (1994) HAS LAMENTED AS THE 'TERRITORIAL TRAP' OF THE STUDY OF AUTHORITY AND POWER. BRIEFLY, INFLUENCED BY THE MOVE IN PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES THAT EMPHASIZES SPACE NOT AS A NEUTRAL CONTAINER WITHIN WHICH SOCIAL RELATIONS OCCUR, BUT AS A CONSTITUTIVE ELEMENT AND ACTIVE FORMER OF THOSE SOCIAL RELATIONS (CF. LEBEBVRE 1991), THE 'SPATIAL TURN' HAS INVITED DIFFERENT CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF ASPECTS SUCH AS STATE POWER. SEEN IN THIS FRAME SPACE OCCUPIES AND AFFECTS POLITICAL SOCIETIES; SOCIAL GROUPINGS IN TURN ACT UPON AND CREATE SPACE(S); AND ENTITIES SUCH AS THE STATE CAN BE VIEWED AS MANIFESTATIONS OF COLLECTIVE SPATIAL IMAGININGS WHICH ARE NOT NECESSARILY TERRITORIALLY BOUND. INSTEAD, THE STATE IS A PARTICULAR CONFIGURATION OF SPACE UPON WHICH SOCIAL RELATIONS ARE STRUCTURED, MEANINGS OF SOVEREIGNTY ARE ASSIGNED AND POLITICAL AUTHORITY IS BASED.

IN TANDEM WITH THIS MOVE TOWARD CHANGED UNDERSTANDINGS OF STATEHOOD AND POWER, CONCEPTS SUCH AS DETERITORIALIZATION AND RETERRITORIALIZATION HAVE BECOME WIDELY ABBRIVED TO PROCESSES OF ALTERED STATE FORMS, IN PARTICULAR AS REACTIONS TO GLOBALIZATION. SPECIFICALLY, FORCES ASSOCIATED WITH GLOBALIZATION ARE SEEN TO LEAD EITHER TO THE WEAKENING OF STATE POWER AND THE ATTENDANT RISE OF ALTERNATIVE POLES OF POLITICAL
authority, economic or otherwise in form (deterritorialization) or to what scholars such as Brenner (2004) have termed the recalibration of state power (i.e. reterritorialization), where state authority is exercised in different guises and at different levels (such as through participation in international/supranational organizations or at substate level, such as through urban governance), but where, essentially the state continues to exercise a regulating influence on the movement of international capital.

Notions of the deterritorialization and/or reterritorialization of authority are useful for describing seemingly disparate processes of capitalist transformation and political shifts in the contemporary era. It is significant however, that what has developed into a rich and resourceful body of scholarship (e.g. Brenner 2004, Brenner et al. 2003, Evans 1997, Hazbun 2004, Ó Tuathail 2000) has tended to neglect how the decamping of the state, the resetting of authority and the reframing of territory are being affected by the current intensification of international mobility and population flows. Historically, migration has been a fundamental force in the formation and change not only of political territory, but also of societies. The longue durée of migration has been a persistent, if largely obscure shaper of nations, state territories and of cultures. In the contemporary era, however, migration across international boundaries has taken on a distinctive form, first in the increased pace with which such movement is able to occur, due in large part to globalization, and second in the political meaning that migration—in the effects it evokes from state authorities and societies—has taken on, as increasingly in receiving countries international relations become defined around convergent goals of stemming undesired population movements and preventing additional burdens on national tax bases. More fundamentally, however, migration as a force unsettles well accepted and understood parameters of territory, and relatedly, political authority and identity (Appadurai 1996, Gupta and Ferguson 1992).

It is this relationship between migration, territory, power and sovereignty that forms the focus of this chapter. It is investigated how current-day shifts in authority in Southern Africa can be understood in terms of deterritorialization and reterritorialization and how migrant flows are a factor in such processes. In particular, it is examined how different types of migration regimes may be said to exist in the Southern African region, characterized by networks or interlinked chains of migrant movement, and the existence of migrant spaces that are sepa-