# Chapter One

# Introduction: State Personnel and the Reproduction of State Forms

Ellis Wynn was murdered in north Wales at the beginning of the seven-teenth century. The murderers, William ap [son of] Thomas ap Humphry and Anne verch [daughter of] Jhon, a married couple, remained at large for a number of months afterwards, even though their identities and crimes were well known within the local community and, indeed, further afield. The lack of progress in resolving the crime generated much consternation within the emerging state apparatus. For instance, Lord President Zouche of the Council in the Marches – the 'devolved' branch of the English state responsible for law and order in Wales – berated the local sheriff, John Wynn of Gwydir, in a letter, complaining that 'the murderers, in respect of their friends and kindred, are not apprehended; so that they are harboured by the Sheriff's tenants and friends, and are seen openly in market towns in the day time'. He continued, arguing that 'if such be the case, begs him to consider how much it concerns the breach of the peace of the land and what a plague it threatens to the country where such vipers are harboured, and what dishonour it will bring on him [the Sheriff], besides discredit and the plague of God both on him and his posterity. Will be glad if this remem-brance quickens him, but more glad if zeal does the same'. Not surpris-ingly after such a tongue-lashing, John Wynn was quick to respond. He defended himself vigorously, contending that the fact that 'the murderers were harboured amongst Wynn's tenants and friends is more than he knows or is persuaded will prove true. Cannot deny that the offender is his kinsman, but he that is dead was as near in blood (by the mother), and no kinsman is more sorry than the writer. Protests that he never favoured the murderer or any other notorious malefactor. If the murderer walk within Wynn's office he shall find neither favour nor support; but the country is wide, and he that standeth in danger of law may long escape the officers' hands'. Evidently, in this case, John Wynn was keen to defend his honour

as a key administrator of the English state in north Wales. The vigour of Wynn's protestations, however, may lead us to suspect that there was no little truth in Lord Zouche's accusations regarding the ignoble nature of his involvement in the case. We do not know whether William and Anne were ever caught by John Wynn nor whether they were prosecuted for the murder (quotes from Ballinger 1926: 41–2).

This footnote of history begins to illustrate the main concerns of this book. First, and most crucially, this brief example clearly demonstrates the fact that the state, at least in its English manifestation during the early modern period, should be viewed as a peopled organization. Certain individuals played a critical role in facilitating the process of state consolidation that was taking place in England and Wales during the early modern period. The English state's reliance on particular individuals to instigate state policies meant that it was dependent – perhaps more than most states (e.g. France, see Poggi 1978) – on the goodwill, conscientiousness and commitment of its key personnel living and working in various localities. Lord Zouche acted as the exasperated figurehead of Welsh 'regional' government within the English state at this time. Similarly, Sir John Wynn's lack of enthusiasm for his role as sheriff of Caernarfonshire can be used to explain, at least in part, the lack of penetration of an efficient legal system into the county during this period. State initiatives and forms during the early modern period, therefore, came about as a result of a complex interplay between various kinds of state personnel: key figures of state and more lowly officials. A key aim of *People/States/Territories* is to examine systematically – in conceptual and empirical contexts – the active contribution of various state personnel to the emergence of a state apparatus within Britain. In doing so, I seek to counter structural, sterile and static accounts of the state by showing that the state is both a 'political process in motion' and a 'peopled organization' (Peck 2001: 451).

Second, and perhaps a little more prosaically, the vignette illustrates the importance of various organizations within the English state apparatus during this period and their role in enabling the English state to govern its population and territory. The state apparatus refers to the 'set of institutions and organizations through which state power is exercised' (Clark and Dear 1984: 45). Two of the main characters in the above tale – Lord Zouche as Lord President of the Council in the Marches, and John Wynn as the sheriff of the county of Caernarfonshire – were appointed representatives of particular branches of the state apparatus. This much is clear. What is less recognized is the role of state personnel in shaping the various organizations that constitute the state apparatus and their associated state projects and strategies. I want to argue that state personnel are key contributors to state projects – or, in other words, those 'initiatives to endow state institutions with organizational coherence, functional coordination and

operational unity' (Brenner 2004: 88) – and state strategies, namely the 'initiatives to mobilize state institutions in order to promote particular forms of socioeconomic[, political, cultural or ecological] intervention' (ibid.). My goal in this book, therefore, is to illustrate the role played by people in reproducing, transforming and contesting state organizations, projects and strategies within particular historical and geographical settings. The iterative practices of state actors give meaning and permanence to the various organizations of the state apparatus. But this does not mean that state organizations are wholly static and unchanging. State organizations also evolve as a result of the intended and unintended practices of various actors who 'see the state' in different ways (Corbridge et al. 2005). The tale concerning the ineffective character of law and order in early modern Caernarfonshire illustrates, at an empirical level, how state organizations could be transformed through the enthusiasm or lack thereof of state functionaries. Building on this, a focus on the peopled character of the state apparatus shows how the latter can be contested by a variety of actors. It is possible to view the inactivity of Sir John Wynn, for instance, as an example of his contestation of the growing interference of the state in the lifeworlds of the inhabitants of north Wales. State organizations, being peopled, are never static and are continuously shaped by those individuals who person them. And, of course, it is likely that this relationship between state personnel and state organizations is recursive in character. The identities of state personnel are influenced by the state projects, strategies and organizations that structure their working practices.

Third, the account of the murder in seventeenth-century Wales demonstrates the importance of territorial considerations for all states (Gottmann 1973). Lord President Zouche and Sir John Wynn alike possessed responsibilities within territorially delimited areas of state jurisdiction, the former acting as the English state's representative throughout the whole of Wales and the latter as the sheriff of the county of Caernarfonshire. This specific instance also reflects broader conceptual concerns regarding the territoriality of the state. Mann (1984), for instance, has famously asserted that the main attribute of a state's power is its territorial form. Sahlins (1968: 5), too, has argued that pre-state societies were organized socially, through reference to ideas of kinship, and that part of the significance of the state-making process was the way it transformed this socially defined territory into a territorially defined society of the state. While there is some conceptual value in adopting such a viewpoint, it can be criticized for portraying state territories as physical entities that are devoid of social meaning and practice. I want to argue in this book that state *territoriality*, conceived of as an ongoing process or state project, is something that is inherently produced, transformed and contested by a variety of state personnel. People within the state apparatus shape the territorial extent of policies,

organizations and areas of jurisdiction and, in doing so, illustrate the social production of state territories. The practices and identities of state personnel are, equally, influenced by the territorial fabric of the state, which conditions their work.

The above discussion begins to highlight how I conceive of the state in *People/States/Territories*. In this book I am concerned with examining the organizational fabric of the state apparatus and the way in which this is underpinned by the state's control of a designated territory. I am less concerned with the functions of the state for their own sake, although such a theme is of importance when it impacts on the state's organizational and territorial make-up. Such a focus echoes the institutional aspects of Weber's classical definition of a state, in which the state is viewed as an organization that seeks to control a defined territory from a central node (see also Mann 1984). I want, however, to 'stretch' this definition of the state somewhat. The type of political control exercised by the state, as described by Weber and others, I would argue, lies as much in the realm of political aspiration as it does in political practice. Many states, in different places and different time periods, have asserted a degree of organizational control over a defined territory but have struggled to impose this ideology of rule on the state's people and territory. This is especially the case with medieval and early modern states, which are discussed at length in Chapters 3 and 4 of this book. For the purposes of this book, therefore, I conceive of the state as an ensemble of peopled institutions, which *seeks* to exercise power over a defined territory. The above definition also highlights the fact that the state apparatus should not be viewed merely as an organizational and/or territorial entity. It is also a highly peopled organization. *People/States/Territories* seeks to portray a state apparatus and territory that is continuously negotiated and translated by those individuals working within its organizations and boundaries. The distinctiveness of such an approach is apparent when one contrasts it with previous research conducted on the state. In the social sciences, there has been a tendency to underplay the significance of agents in reproducing state organizations and territories. Conventional Marxist state theory, for instance, has tended to promote abstract and structural accounts of the nature of the capitalist state. As an example, Offe's concept of 'structural selectivity' refers to the tendency for the capitalist state to favour certain interest groups (usually capital and the dominant class). Offe's ideas illustrate an essentialist logic, whereby the state functions as if it were an 'instrument of the interest of capital' (Offe 1984: 51; see also Driver 1991). Whether the state is viewed as something that works on behalf of 'capital' or certain 'classes', it becomes clear that much of conventional Marxist state theory has done little to highlight the active contribution that state agents may make to the reproduction of the state apparatus and territory (though see Miliband 1983: 60; Jessop 1990). The

value of the approach propounded within *People/States/Territories* when compared with Weberian state theory is less obvious yet, I would argue, it is just as distinctive. States within Weberian state theory are generally accepted to consist of a set of organizations and their related personnel, possessing a degree of centrality, a defined boundary that demarcates the territorial limits of the state and a monopoly of coercive power and law-making ability (see, for instance, Gerth and Mills 1991: 78; Mann 1984; 1986). But while there has been a certain awareness of the peopled character of state organizations within Weberian state theory, I would maintain that studies within this tradition do not tend to take seriously the purposive and active qualities of state personnel (though see Tilly 1984). Weber, for instance, referred to the bureaucratic qualities of functionaries within the modern state but did so solely in generic terms (Weber 1991: 208). Almost echoing conventional Marxist state theory, it is a *class* of bureaucrats or alternatively a state elite (Mills 1956; Mosca 1939) that is said to reproduce the modern state rather than particular state personnel, working either individually or in concert with one another. In general terms, therefore, social scientists have not explicated the contribution of state personnel to the reproduction of state organizations and territories. In charting the large-scale changes that have affected the state over time, social scientists have been less sensitive to the particular contributions of state personnel to this process.[1]

Various classes of historians – diplomatic, constitutional and bureaucratic *inter alia* – have examined in depth the contribution of various classes of state personnel to the reproduction of political forms. Work on the state of the early modern period – the time period with which I began this chapter – has, for instance, examined the peopling of the state. Corrigan and Sayer (1985) have maintained that we need to view the formation of the English state during the early modern period as a process of large-scale cultural, as well as bureaucratic and organizational, change, which was dependent upon the support of the 'political nation' (Underdown 1996). Braddick (1991: 2), too, has argued that 'the state is not a purely institutional phenomenon ... [it] creates and is created by a degree of normative consensus and organizational co-ordination'. His ideas draw our attention to the importance of the agency of state personnel – people like Sir John Wynn – to the whole process of state consolidation that took place in England and Wales during the early modern period. But while historians have shown a remarkable sensitivity to the peopled character of state forms, I would argue that their close focus on the particularities of the state within defined time periods has militated against them making broader statements concerning the significance of people for the reproduction of all states, in both organizational and territorial terms. My aim in *People/States/Territories*, therefore, is to tread a difficult historiographical and methodological route

by using detailed case studies of the peopling of different state forms within Britain as a way of addressing a more conceptual set of questions concerning the relationship between state personnel, state organizations and state territories. Focusing on the conceptual and empirical relationships between these three variables will enable us, I argue, to chart – in both analytical and methodological contexts – the continuously emerging political geographies of the state. But the themes discussed in this book should not be viewed as another account of the 'great men of history' and their impact on political forms. Admittedly, the availability of empirical evidence tends to draw one's attention to the practices and ideologies of individuals in the higher reaches of the political and bureaucratic hierarchies of the state. It can be difficult to excavate the more mundane aspects of the peopling of state forms, especially during earlier time periods. My aim, nonetheless, is to provide an account, where possible, of the association between a *range* of different types of state personnel and the state forms that they inhabit.

The empirical vignette discussed at the beginning of this book drew attention to the peopling of the state of the early modern period. Some might argue that the states of high and late modernity, based as they are on more sophisticated and bureaucratic means of social and spatial control, are likely to be less dependent on the contributions of individual state personnel. To what extent, for instance, do individuals in the apparatus of the contemporary state possess the agency to alter the trajectories of the organizations that they either work in or control? Poggi, for example, has argued that a key feature of the modern state is its 'depersonalization of political power . . . to the point of rendering relatively insignificant the . . . individual identities' of state personnel (Poggi 1990: 33). Rather than being a feature merely of so-called 'immature' states, I want to contend that state personnel have been key producers of the state apparatus during all time periods.

Jump forward nearly four centuries from the Sir John Wynn farrago to the year 1999 and focus on the furore concerning the nomination of the Labour candidate for the role of First Minister of the National Assembly for Wales. Alun Michael, the Labour Member of Parliament elected by the Labour Party as their candidate for the role, is experiencing a sustained grilling in the Welsh press. Described at various times as Tony Blair's 'placeman' and 'poodle' (Speed 2000a: 12), Michael's image is that of a tame politician, 'parachuted' in late in the campaign for the Labour nomination for the role of First Minister (Betts 2000a: 1). Though he ultimately wins the nomination, Michael is tainted, at least within Wales, by his strong association with the central Labour administration, and with Tony Blair in particular. Despite being described as one who 'ha[s] the Prime Minister's ear' (Speed 2000b: 1) – or in other words, one who can influence the decisions made by the Labour Party at the scale of the UK state – the popularly held conception is the opposite – that decisions being made, and

policies being implemented, by the Labour administration in Wales are being manipulated by the representatives of the central Labour body in London. Eventually, Alun Michael wins grudging support for his candidacy for the role of First Minister but is soon forced to resign for his failure to secure match funding for European monies destined for the most deprived areas of Wales. It is significant, in this respect, that Rhodri Morgan, Michael's successor to the post of First Secretary in February 2000, feels it necessary publicly to declare 'I won't be Blair's puppet' (Betts 2000b: 1). Morgan clearly illustrates his perceived need both to distance himself from Michael and to demonstrate his full commitment to the Assembly and all that it represents. This second vignette, I argue, illustrates the continuing role played by state personnel in shaping, and being shaped by, state organizations and territories. Despite their pretensions to bureaucratic impersonality, the state apparatus during both the modern and late modern periods has been inherently peopled in character.

As a way of elaborating on the peopling of the state apparatus, the empirical chapters in the book focus on state forms as they have existed in Britain from the Middle Ages to the contemporary period. The empirical focus of the book requires some contextualization at this stage. The main reason for adopting an historical framework is to enable a comparative study of state forms as they have existed in different time periods. The book, in this regard, owes a debt to Dodgshon's (1987; see also 1998; J. Anderson 1996) exemplary work on the historical geography of political, social and economic forms over the long term. But while Dodgshon's work has provided a wide-ranging and structural account of the major social and spatial changes to have affected humanity, *People/States/Territories* offers a far more focused account of how state personnel have transformed, and been affected by, state forms. Concentrating on the peopling of different types of state within Britain enables me to chart how different state forms may be characterized by diverse sets of relationships between state personnel and the organizational and territorial aspects of the state apparatus. The issue of unity of, and difference between, various state forms needs to be handled with care (in a related context, see Ashcroft et al. 1998). At one level, I want to contend that *all* states, in whichever time periods, have shaped, and been shaped by, the practices of state personnel. People have been at the heart of the reproduction and transformation of state forms throughout human history. But at the same time, it is likely that the relative contribution of state personnel to the reproduction of state forms has also been highly contingent. In one respect, we can hypothesize that the relative emphasis placed on the different elements within the triple dialectic of state personnel, state organizations and state territories has varied from one time period to the next. State personnel would have played more of a role in shaping state organizations during the medieval and early

modern periods, for instance, than they would have in the state of high
modernity. And yet it may be misleading to generalize even at this level.
The empirical stories recounted in this book portray state personnel as indi-
viduals who have contributed in crucial but haphazard ways to the repro-
duction of all state forms. While there may be some limited use in ascribing
a particular configuration of relationships between state personnel, state
organizations and state territories to different time periods *a priori*, I argue
that it is more instructive to examine the connections between these dif-
ferent elements as they unfold in particular empirical contexts. The rela-
tive importance of each of these three factors will be dependent, in the last
instance, on the particular set of circumstances that are present within spe-
cific state organizations, projects and strategies (in a related context, see
Corbridge et al. 2005: 7).

The extended time frame with which I approach this project also has a
bearing on how the people of the state are conceived. The vignette with
which I began the introduction was significant, for it spoke of a cadre of
state personnel whose work for the state was carried out on a part-time
basis. Sir John Wynn, as well as being a sheriff of Caernarfonshire, was also
a local landowner and, as I show in Chapter 4, was berated by individuals
in the higher echelons of the English state for spending too much of his
time and energy on his own personal interests. The situation was even more
complex during the Middle Ages, where the practice of government was
dependent in large measure on the cooperation of the heads and members
of kin-groups, which lay largely outside the direct control of the inchoate
states of the period. Efforts to distinguish between state officials and civil
society during this period, therefore, are fraught with difficulties. Even
during the modern and late modern periods, when an increasing bureau-
cratization of the state might have been expected to have delineated the
boundaries between the state and civil society in more detail, confusion
reigns. The continuing close links between an emerging class of professional
bureaucrats and patrons in civil society in the British state during the nine-
teenth century and the proliferation of quangos that exist in the British
state of today testify to a blurring of boundaries between the state and civil
society. In more conceptual contexts, too, many writers have sought to
extend our meaning of the state – and its people – into civil spheres.
Medieval political theorists, for instance, conceived of the state as some-
thing that was governed in an extensive and corporate manner. In this way,
the Roman notion of *quod omnes tangit ab omnibus approbetur* or 'what
touches all is to be approved by all' became the watchword of many
Dominican and Franciscan political theorists (Coleman 2000: 45–6). More
recently, Gramsci has argued that the state apparatus is broad in scope,
drawing in important aspects of civil society. If 'State = political society +
civil society', then we need to think of the state apparatus and its people

as something that is inclusive and broad-ranging in character (Gramsci 1971: 263). While there is much conceptual worth to these ideas, I treat state personnel in this book to be those individuals that staff the various organizations of the state apparatus and who are involved in developing and implementing its projects and strategies (Clark and Dear 1984). I recognize, nonetheless, that the demarcation of the line of separation between the people of the state and the broader civil society may well be problematic in certain instances.

As I have mentioned already, the geographic focus of the book is on Britain. But, of course, for much of the period in question, a reference to Britain, let alone a British state, would be a highly dubious one to make. It is evident that the political forms that have existed within the geographic space of Britain have been variegated in character throughout history. During much of the medieval period, for instance, it would be anachronistic even to refer to English, Scottish or Welsh states since each of these territories would have contained a variety of different, sometimes competing, political forms (Davies 1993; Frame 1990). The development of state organizations and territories, as well as the contribution of people to these emerging state forms, would have happened in a very piecemeal manner for much of the Middle Ages. Later periods only partly simplified this complex political geography. The process of consolidating an English and Welsh state form, which occurred during the sixteenth century, was followed by a Union of the English and Scottish crowns at the beginning of the eighteenth century (Morrill 1995). A subsequent Union of the Irish and British Parliaments took place at the turn of the nineteenth century but this unity was disrupted once again during the twentieth century: firstly, through the partition of Ireland and the creation of an independent Irish state and, secondly, through the recent process of devolution. These complex political geographies are, on the one hand, problematic since they demand both an in-depth knowledge of many political traditions and trajectories and a sensitivity to appropriate forms of political nomenclature. And yet, at the same time, these ever-mutating political organizations, territories and identities create an ideal test site for examining the continually emerging connections between state personnel and state forms. Britain, in this respect, offers a highly apposite, though by no means unique, case study for examining people/states/territories over the long term. Its political fluidity provides an excellent exemplar of the key methodological and conceptual claims that I seek to make in this book. I want to stress, too, that I do not seek to show in *People/State/Territories* how a British state came into being. Such an approach would be dangerously teleological by portraying a process of British state formation that was somehow predestined to happen. In any case, my emphasis on the peopled character of the process of state transformation that occurred within the geographic area of

Britain, I would argue, highlights its contingent character. In deciding how to shape, and accommodate themselves to, state organizations and territories, state personnel helped to ensure that the process of state consolidation that took place within Britain could have proceeded along a number of different trajectories.

The book begins by discussing previous contributions that have sought to show how people shape, and are shaped by, the state apparatus (Chapter 2). I stress in this chapter the constitutive role played by state personnel in actively reproducing, transforming and contesting the state apparatus, as well as the latter's impact on the former's identities and practices. The chapter discusses the tentative efforts made to people the state apparatus by medieval and early modern political theorists, as well as from Weberian, Marxist and post-Marxist perspectives. While these various epistemological frameworks can shed some light on the recursive relationships between state personnel, state organizations and state territories, they fail to take seriously the role of actors in producing state forms. The conceptual framework that informs this book is based on an understanding of: *state personnel* as active agents who possess a variety of different identities, subjectivities and prejudices; *state organizations* as the bureaucratic and programmed institutionalization of state power and which are, at least in part, the product of decisions and priorities of state personnel; *state territories* as the space over which states claim political power and which are the product of both the activities and proclamations of state personnel, as well as the projects and strategies of state organizations. The key, in this respect, is to examine the reciprocal and iterative relationship that exists between state personnel, state organizations and state territories, one in which each constituent element of the triple dialectic is continuously reproduced.

The empirical chapters that follow hone in on critical periods in the evolution of state agents, organizations and territories in Britain. Chapter 3 discusses the initial emergence of state organizations in Britain that took place during the Middle Ages. Efforts were made to shape a new organizational and territorial framework of government during this period, which illustrates the beginnings of a process whereby people, land and resources within Britain were being controlled through the systematic appropriation of space by state organizations under the control of certain key individuals. Chapter 3 begins by examining the feudal character of the medieval state before proceeding to discuss the role of the sovereign in embodying the inchoate organizational and territorial framework of the state. It then addresses a more widespread peopling of the state during the Middle Ages that took place in the context of 'local' forms of government, ones which were dependent upon kin-groups for their institutional sustenance. Throughout, I emphasize that the highly peopled character of the state during this period should not be used as testimony of its perceived

'immaturity'. Rather, I stress how the explicitly peopled nature of the medieval state actually contributed to its permanence and infrastructural power.

Chapter 4 deals with another key period in the transformation of the state within Britain. During the early modern period (between approximately 1500 and 1750), attempts were made to rid Britain of its numerous organizational and territorial anomalies as it came more firmly within the grasp of the English crown. Key transformations took place during the sixteenth century that enabled more systematic forms of state government to develop and I focus in this chapter on their contours within England and Wales. Elton's (1953) so-called 'Tudor revolution in government' led to a transformation of state bureaucracy in the English state's centre. Equally fundamental changes took place in the various localities of the state. One of the key developments was the instigation of a more systematic Commission of the Peace throughout the lands of England and Wales. Local landowners such as Sir John Wynn, acting as part-time officers of state, enabled the rulers of the English state to reach out in more effective ways to the various localities. The considerable latitude afforded to these officers of state, however, especially in the more remote regions, posed difficult questions regarding their perceived commitment to, or contestation of, emerging state forms. Focusing on the agency of state personnel during the early modern period, however, enables us to emphasize two important aspects of the process of state consolidation that took place during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The continuing embeddedness of state personnel in age-old patterns of patronage and kinship speak of a divide between medieval and early modern state forms that exists more in contemporary imagination than it did in early modern practice. Similarly, the active contribution of state personnel to the reproduction of state forms – whether in the centre or the localities – alludes to an early modern process of state transformation whose contours were highly contingent, variegated and plural in character, a point that has been made forcefully in more general contexts by Spruyt (1994).

The final two empirical chapters deal with a more contemporary reciprocal relationship between people, organizations and territories. Chapter 5 examines the peopling of the British state during the so-called 'Age of the Inspector'. The nineteenth century witnessed a second 'revolution in government' (MacDonagh 1958), characterized by an increased – albeit tentative and unwilling – intervention by the state in the social and economic fabric of Britain, through a bureaucratic and increasingly professional group of civil servants. My empirical focus on industrial regulation shows the qualitative shift in the number and extent of state organizations, their use of spatial and territorial order, and the key role played by state agents in facilitating and contesting these developments. Factory Inspectors' efforts to

grapple with the implementation of the 1833 Factories Act, in particular, show how state personnel were, once again, involved in shaping emerging state forms, often in difficult circumstances. In discussing these issues, I seek to show how the British state's ambivalent attitude towards state intervention of all kinds during this period was a producer – and, to some extent, a product of – Inspectors' attitudes towards industrial regulation.

Chapter 6 deals with the transformation of state forms that has taken place in Britain during the period of late modernity and, in so doing, acts as a counterpoint to Chapter 5. As a result of the creation of a Scottish Parliament, a Welsh and Northern Irish Assembly, and the devolution of power to various regional bodies in England, there has been a substantial territorial and functional recalibration of governance within the UK. Much has been written in the social and political sciences concerning this change, especially with regard to the formation of new state organizations and their related territorial remits. Less is known concerning the connections between state personnel and this organizational and territorial transformation and it is this lacuna that Chapter 6 seeks to fill. The significance of this process of devolution is that it has created new scenarios for the unfolding of the dynamic relationship between state personnel, organizations and territories. Rather like a mixture of fluids in a test-tube, devolution has agitated these three elements into new forms and combinations. In this changing political landscape, agents have had to make sense of their role within new organizations, their relationship with new territories of governance, along with their new responsibilities and working practices. Furthermore, it is these self-same individuals who have also been the agents of change, helping to create, through their actions, new organizations, the territorial remit of the new organizations and their associated strategies. Ron Davies' oft-quoted aphorism that devolution should be viewed as a 'process rather than an event' is appropriate as a way of conveying the continual emergence of the state in a post-devolution UK. Emerging, disappearing and re-emerging state organizations and territories have been driven forward by state personnel and have, at the same time, questioned the practices and ideologies of those self-same people. State personnel have been both producers and products of this state 'in motion' (Peck 2001).

Taken together, therefore, the various chapters in the book contribute to our conceptual and empirical understanding of the role of people in reproducing and transforming the state. In focusing on characters such as Sir John Wynn and Alun Michael, we begin to see how state personnel, in various guises, have shaped, and have been shaped by, state organizations and territories in Britain. It is in this context that we need to take seriously the role of people in shaping state forms if we are to fully appreciate the dynamic organizational and territorial transformation of the state over time.