

---

## COCTA News

At the two joint international conferences in Washington, DC between Aug.28 and Sept.4, 1988 of the International Political Science Association and the American Political Science Association COCTA launched a number of panels on various topics in conceptual and terminological analysis. Here we will report on a paper in the new group of Development. It was given by Douglas C.Nord at the University of Minnesota at Duluth, MN and Geoffrey R.Weller at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Ont., Canada. For further information, please write to the authors of this interesting paper. COCTA will try to put together a group of scholars interested in Development, intra-nationally as well as inter-nationally.

### **Establishing Political Institutions for the Periphery: A Comparative Analysis**

A great deal of research has been conducted on the theory of center-periphery relations. Most of this has been in an international context with there being a much lesser concentration upon center-periphery relations within a given national jurisdiction. Those studies that have dealt with this set of relationships within a national jurisdiction have tended to ignore the political patterns and forces that have emerged in the periphery as well as the types of political institutions that are often erected to either conduct certain elements of the center-periphery relationship or to cope with the political patterns manifested in the peripheral regions.

This paper attempts to analyse the similarities and differences between the variety of specialized political and bureaucratic institutions that have been developed in the northern hinterland regions of Canada, the United States and the Nordic countries. Not all of the circum-polar peripheral regions of the world are discussed here for the simple reason that information is not so readily available in all cases, especially with regard to the Soviet north.

Unfortunately it is not always clear just which areas constitute the "northern" or "peripheral" regions of the nations under discussion. This may partly explain why there are so few comparative studies of them. In Canada, the peripheral regions are not only the two territories of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, but also the northern regions of many of the provinces.

The provincial north as it is now coming to be called is a truly forgotten, but immense, peripheral set of regions. In the Prairies the provincial norths are roughly the northern two thirds of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. The boundaries are those of the Northern Alberta Development Council, the now defunct Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the Manitoba Ministry of Northern Affairs. In Ontario, the provincial north is the 90% of the province that is encompassed by the boundaries of the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. In Quebec, the provincial north is normally considered to be the area covered by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agree-

ment. In Newfoundland, the provincial north is normally considered to be the Labrador. The government of British Columbia is the only province with an extensive northern region that has persistently avoided creating an agency that could be said to be principally "northern" in orientation, and as a consequence there is no commonly accepted definition of a northern region in that province.

In the United States, the northern hinterlands are regarded as not only Alaska but also parts of the northern areas of certain states in the "lower 48" which are commonly viewed as "northern" in their respective jurisdictions and have characteristics similar to those of the provincial north in Canada and the northern areas of the Nordic nations. For the purposes of this paper, most examples will be taken from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan known as "northern" Michigan, northern Minnesota and, of course, Alaska, although northern hinterland regions can be also found in northern Maine and New York.

In Scandinavia, the areas under consideration in this paper are those commonly accepted as "northern" in each of the nations under discussion. In Finland, the north is commonly held to be the provinces of Lapland and Oulu. In Sweden, it is the five counties of Norrbotten, Vasterbotten, Jamtand, Vasternorrland, and Gayleborg. In Norway, it is the three counties of Nordland, Troms, and Finnmark. For Denmark the appropriate area is Greenland.

This paper will begin by discussing the similarities and differences between these regions in terms of physical setting, population and settlement patterns, economic bases, links with their respective southern centers, as well as social patterns and political patterns. This will be followed by an analysis of the wide range and great depth of problems faced by these peripheral regions. There will then be a discussion of the range of bureaucratic and political institutional responses to these problems and an attempt will be made to create something of a typology. The next section of the paper will analyse the wide range of problems faced by these institutions relating to such matters as ideological motivations, staffing, location, relative power and influence, and high degree of politization. The paper then moves to compare the policy outputs of the different types of agencies and institutions in order to determine which produced the most adequate results. The paper then attempts to draw conclusions as to what patterns may be observed in the range of institutional responses to the problems resulting from peripheral status.

---

To receive a copy of the paper, please contact the authors. The new COCTA group on the concept of development will look at both development within a country, as do D.Nord and G.Weller and development differences between nations.

Jan-Erik Lane, Chairman

Department of Political Science  
University of Umea, S-901 87 Umea, Sweden

## INTERCOCTA Report

(Compiled from a Letter to the Members of the INTERCOCTA Sub-Committee of Nov.1988 by Fred W.Riggs, Honolulu, HI)

*Summer Meetings.* The major substantive events were two roundtables on problems of ethnic terminology, held during the Zagreb and Washington Congresses. Both went well, according to the plans announced in COCTA News 1987-3. The Zagreb symposium was extended to two sessions and very well attended. Excellent papers were presented on the development of ethnic terminology in the USSR (by T.TABOLINA) and Yugoslavia (by I.SUMI). Robert JACKSON gave a most interesting paper on legal concepts evolving in Canada to handle new problems of administering a multi-cultural society. Other presentations were made by Margarita del OLMO of Spain, M.K.GAUTAM of Netherlands (and India), Nancie GONZALEZ of USA, Theodor VEITER of Austria and Jaganath PATHY of India. More than 20 persons attending the symposium asked me to send them follow-up materials - a possible nucleus of anthropologists for future involvement in our work.

I also gave a paper on "Modes of Ethnicity" during the symposium on contemporary ethnic processes organized by Academician Yu.V.BROMLEY (USSR) and Silvo DEVETAK (Yugoslavia), and Marjorie BALZER (USA). The paper is based primarily on data compiled in the INTERCOCTA glossary for ethnicity research, and tries to establish some of the main contexts for the concepts and terms used in ethnicity research.

No papers were presented at the Washington symposium on problems of ethnic terminology, but we held a lively discussion based on materials generated for the Zagreb congress. Other COCTA-sponsored sessions were also relevant to INTERCOCTA concerns. In particular, Jan-Erik LANE presented a paper on concepts of "Development", which stirred up lively interest. A special COCTA-sponsored roundtable on concepts of the "State" was held during the conference of the American Political Science Association, following the IPSA Congress. Participants included Lane, Ali Kazancigil, Ralph Braibanti, Ali Farazmand, Dwight Waldo, and Aristide Zolberg.

KAZANZIGIL opened the discourse by commenting on his experience in editing a symposium "The State in Global Perspective" (Gower/UNESCO, 1986). He attempted, in vain, to secure consensus on a core concept of "the state" which would be used by all participants. Ultimately, each of his 14 authors insisted on defining this term according to personal preferences. We seemed to agree that the "state" does not constitute a suitable subject field for an INTERCOCTA glossary, but it could well provide the focus for a "key concept" monograph similar to the volume on "Growth" by Henry TEUNE which has now been published by SAGE. I presented my paper on the "Interdisciplinary Tower of Babel" at an IPSA panel organized by Ali KAZANCIGIL and Henry TEUNE and I discussed the COCTA and INTERCOCTA experience in a roundtable led by Mattei DOGAN.

*New Projects: French, German, and Spanish Glossaries.*

A Russian glossary for ethnicity research has been

prepared at the Institute for Ethnography in the Soviet Academy of Sciences under the direction of Yu.V.Bromley, with the support of staff members L.M.Drobizheva, Mikhael N.Gouboglo, and Tatjana V.Tabolina. Their work has now been published by the Institute, in Russian, with extended commentaries and a bibliography on the INTERCOCTA encyclopedia project and on contexts for research on "Ethnos and Ethnic Processes" in the USSR. An English translation of the Russian text has been prepared by Goldie Blankoff-Scarr (Belgium) and it is now being prepared at UNESCO for publication in its series, "Reports and Papers in the Social Science".

A parallel project to develop a French INTERCOCTA glossary for "Interethnic Relations" has been prepared by Eric de GROLIER, consultant to the ISSC. A draft version has been presented to UNESCO and a few copies have been made for limited distribution, primarily to French specialists who will offer comments for further revision. Interestingly, de Grolier found that "ethnicity" is not used in French as the name for a field of study - he substituted "inter-ethnic relations". The Russian equivalent, as noted above, turned out to be "ethnos and ethnic processes".

While at Bonn in July, I met with Dr.Karl A. STROETMANN and his staff at the Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften. I made a presentation on the INTERCOCTA project, after which we discussed the possibility of developing a parallel glossary in German. Stroetmann said that his center would be much interested in taking on the project provided they could find enough specialists on ethnicity to work with them. Among the participants in the congress at Zagreb (a week after the visit in Bonn) were a number who promised to take an active interest in this project, including Dietrich TREIDE of Leipzig, Dr.Theodor VEITER of Innsbruck and Dr. Regina ROMHILD of Frankfurt.

In Zagreb was also Felix SCHUSTER, who had represented the Latin American Social Science Council (CLASCO) at our workshop in Caracas. He introduced me to Dr.Cecilia HIDALGO, head of the Argentine Anthropology organization. She told me that she would like very much to take responsibility for developing a Spanish-language version of the ethnicity glossary. Among those also interested in this project was Dr.Margarita del OLMO of Madrid.

On my way home via Paris I visited with Dr.Zourab GUELEKVA at UNESCO and strongly recommended that UNESCO provide support to help launch the German and Spanish versions of the Ethnicity glossary. He appeared to be very supportive and I am waiting to hear what concrete steps have been taken. I believe that if we have five different versions of this glossary, each prepared independently in a different language, we will have an ideal data base for inter-lingual comparisons that will help us understand how scholars working in these languages analyze and handle a wide range of inter-ethnic questions.

*Sponsorship.* A most interesting possibility for additional sponsorship and support of the INTERCOCTA program involves closer relations with the terminology committee of the International Standardization Organization: ISO/TC37. While in Vienna, I met with Christian GALINSKI, director of INFOTERM, and members of his staff,