

FEBRUARY 2003 / VOL. 18 (1)

IPSA World Congress in Durban

The IPSA World Congress 2003 in Durban and Our Research Committee in It

In most respects the recent 19th IPSA World Congress in Durban, South Africa from 30 June to 3 July 2003 was not a very encouraging event, neither for IPSA as a whole nor for our Federalism and Federation Research Committee. First of all, attendance was deplorably low for both:

As to IPSA, only altogether 1,154 members participated in the Congress (1,849 in Quebec City 2000 and 1,470 in Seoul 1997).

Regarding the Committee, we had just three of our 91 listed members in the Business Meeting (as compared to 35 in Québec and about 12 in Seoul). Of our only two panels one had to be cancelled because of withdrawals of all paper givers in the last minute, while the remaining one (RC 28.1 on fiscal territorial federalism) was finally left with two of original six. Moreover, two of the four absentees – J.O. Prats of Spain and M. Faroukshin of Russia – did not even find it necessary to inform the Congress Secretariat or the Committee Chair about their withdrawal, so that such rather grave misconduct would seem to justify their being named here. However, the two remaining papers finally given – G. Gribanova of Russia on “Regions as Political Actors” and J. Wehner of Germany on “Fiscal Decentralisation in South Africa” – turned out to be genuine successes, and their abstracts will soon be published on this website. To fill in on the time so regrettably gained in the panel, I gave an informal report on the demarcation of competences between the EU and its Member States in the recent draft for a European Constitutional Treaty by the Brussels Convention. For further details on the Committee’s activities the minutes of the Durban Business Meeting in this Newsletter should be consulted.

It can hardly serve as a convincing excuse or consolation that other research committees seemed to encounter similar troubles during this World Congress: Not a few panels had to be cancelled without previous notice for absence of the programmed paper givers, so that interested participants (including your rapporteur here) frequently found themselves in the unpleasant situation of having to cope with unforeseen gaps in their time plans – a situation which was all the more discomfiting as it was not advisable for reasons of personal security to walk from the rather isolated venue of the Congress to anywhere, let alone to the city of Durban.

The proceedings of the Congress were doubtless highlighted by their first and their final events: The (folkloristically colourful) Opening Ceremony climaxed in a remarkable keynote-speech of the Executive Deputy President of South Africa, Mr. Jacob Zuma, on the role of Africa in an globalising world and the potential contributions of political science in this context. The Closing Plenary Session, chaired by outgoing IPSA-President Dalchoong Kim of Korea, staged an excellent panel discussion on the “Search of a Just Peace and Enduring Reconciliation: The Middle East, the Balkans, and the Korean Peninsula” between H.K. Lee (former Prime Minister of Korea), K. Kaiser (Germany), I. Turan (Turkey) and D. Nabudere (former President of African Political Science Association).

Between these events, however, there was a lot of poor organisation, beginning with a programme obviously printed in the last minute (thus containing numerous mistakes) and ending with many changes at very short notice. Needless to say, this did not substantially contribute to the working atmosphere of the Congress and to the motivation of its participants.

It is difficult to say who was responsible for this, but it was certainly not the Local Organising Committee's fault only.

The problems of discipline with paper givers flunking out of their commitments, which not only our Committee had experienced rather severely (see above), were also raised in the RC Chairs Meeting at the end of the Congress. Replying to a question of mine the new IPSA President, Max Kaase of Germany, informed the Meeting that the IPSA Executive Council is considering to accept papers in future only after the paper givers will have paid their Congress fees and that such fees will be forfeited in cases of non-existent or insufficient excuses for non-compliance with the commitments. Another amendment to the IPSA Rules will concern RC officers to the effect that in future their terms of office should not exceed two IPSA-terms of three years each (which will not affect our Committee's elections in this year, but will do so at the end of the new term beginning with them, i.e. in 2006). Max Kaase further informed the RC Chairs Meeting that the IPSA website will soon contain the Internet addresses of all Research Committees, so that there will be quick and full access to their activities. Our Committee's member Michael Stein of Canada, who had been elected as the first RC Liaison Representative to the IPSA Executive Council in Québec, gave a very impressive report on his achievements and recommendations on behalf of the RCs. He was re-elected for another term in a contest with Yolande Cohen, also of Canada, by a majority of 11 : 9 with 1 abstention and 1 invalid vote. Although this appears at first sight as a narrow vote, its interpretation shared by most participants was that this result was not directed against Michael Stein and his work, but that it was rather more a demonstrative reflection of unrest and dissatisfaction with the present structure of IPSA and the dominating role of the national associations vis-à-vis the research committees and the individual members. After a partly controversial debate on this, a review of that structure by the IPSA Committee on Organisation and Procedure was agreed upon with the support of the new President Max Kaase, who gave the impression that constructive co-operation rather than confrontation with the research committees, also in their natural capacity as representatives of the individual members, will be one of the guidelines of performance in his new office. If so, then this would certainly be to the advantage of both "sides", and maybe it would also help to avoid such failures as the Durban Congress.

Uwe Leonardy, RC28 Vice Chair

2003 Business Meeting Minutes

Membership Appeal

Membership Renewal Reminder The following renewal reminder was sent to RC28 members earlier this year:

[from April 3 email]

The time has come for our tri-annual membership drive for the IPSA Research Committee on Federalism and Federations. The normal cycle is the period that brackets each World Congress. Thus, the 2003-2006 cycle applies to most members.

Dues remain at \$45.00 for three years. Checks should be made payable to "IPSA Federalism Research Committee" and sent to Robert Agranoff, Federalism Research Committee, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, 1315 East Tenth Street, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA. Checks should not be bank drafts but full checks with your bank's routing numbers on them. Should you wish to make an electronic transfer, the full routing and account numbers for the Bank One (Indianapolis) IPSA account are: 074000010 628423634 1003.

To date, fifteen members have renewed their dues, and five others had advance paid until 2005 or 2006. If you have not done so, please forward your dues to the Chair.

2003 Nominating Committee Report

IPSA Research Committee 28:

Comparative Federalism and Federation

Report of the Nominating Committee*
(Lloyd Brown-John, Michael Burgess, Uwe Leonardy)

Chair:
Robert Agranoff, USA

Vice Chair:
Uwe Leonardy, Germany
Michael Burgess, UK

Publications:
Rudolf Hrbek, Germany

Programmes:
Maureen Covell, Canada

Past Chair:
Lloyd Brown-John, Canada

Executive Council:
Dirk Brand, South Africa
Frank Delmartino, Belgium
Gisela Färber, Germany
Alain Gagnon, Canada
Franz Gress, Germany
Ben Hoetjes, Netherlands
John Kincaid, USA
Preston King, UK
Luis Moreno, Spain
Cheryl Saunders, Australia
Alan Tarr, USA
Ron Watts, Canada

* Elections are being conducted by electronic email ballot because of the low attendance at the World Congress RC28 business meeting.

2003 Treasury Report

RC28 Financial/Statement 2002

INCOME

2002 Dues Paid	\$455.00
----------------	----------

Carryover, nonencumbered(\$650 Dedicated [1898-650] State of Discipline Grant Money)	400.00
IPSA Website Grant	650.00
<i>Total-Non-Dedicated Income</i>	\$1505.00
EXPENSES	
Inisfil Conference Expenses	\$127.43
Innsbruck Conference Expenses	\$800.00
Newsletter/Website Production	\$ 493.76
Expenses of carry-overs from IPSA check-offs, low income country members postage (for those not on electronic mail)	65.72
<i>Total Expenses</i>	\$1879.34

RC28 Joins Federalism Report

News About Members

News About Members

Alain G. Gagnon has become the Canada Research Chair in Quebec and Canadian Studies at the University of Quebec-Montreal. His new e-mail address is Gagnon.Alain@uqam.ca.

The following profile was released with the announcement of Gagnon's Chair earlier this year:

The homogenization of culture and of social models is one of the features of globalization that is the most widely criticized, as it threatens to cause small communities to be replaced by large majority national groups. Alain-G. Gagnon, a professor at the Université du Québec à Montréal, has had a productive career that has enabled him to examine the challenges faced by multinational and multicultural communities and to propose solutions which will allow them, for example, to avoid the standardization that comes with globalization.

Dr. Gagnon is one of Canada's foremost experts on comparative federalism and on Quebec-Canada studies. He is also one of the most prolific researchers in the fields of Quebec politics, comparative federalism and federal-provincial relations. He has published over 30 scholarly works, and contributed numerous chapters to books and articles to scientific journals. He has published works in both French and English and his works have been translated into Spanish, Catalan, Korean, Japanese and Portuguese. He is regularly invited by the media in Canada, the USA and Europe to provide analysis of current political events in Canada.

As Canada Research Chair, Dr. Gagnon will endeavour to examine how political communities are constructed in a regional, national and international framework. he will also explore the

notion of representation from three important angles: cultural and political diversities, multiple identities and federal citizenship. In 1996, Dr. Gagnon was instrumental in the creation of a research group that was formed to examine multi-national societies, a group whose activities he has been coordinating ever since. He also played a central role in the creation of the International Association of Quebec Studies, which today has 800 members and which provides a network for more than 2,000 Quebecists around the world.

Luis Moreno has received a two-year leave from CIES in Madrid to study European nationalism and federal arrangements at the Institute for European Studies in Rome. Luis can still be reached at Imorfer@iesam.csic.es.

Uwe Leonardy has become a Senior Fellow, Centre for European Integration Studies, University of Bonn, Germany. Uwe's e-mail is uwe.leonardy@web.de.

Franz Gress has retired from Goethe University in Frankfurt, but continues to be involved in federalism activities, including RC28's State of the Discipline Project. Franz's new e-mail is F.Gress@gmx.de.

Ron Watts is spending two months at the Constitution Unit University of London, UK as an advisor/scholar to the research programme on "Devolution and Constitutional Change" for the UK Economic and Research Council.

Bertus de Villiers is teaching constitutional law (part-time) at the University of Western Australia. He continues as Manager, Native Title and Legal Section, Golfields Land Council, Kalgoorlie, Western Australia.

Robert Argranoff and Micheal McGuire long-term 237 city study of federal-state-local interaction, Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003).

Conferences

Federalism and Trans-Border Integration in North America February 2003

This meeting, organized by the Centre for North American Politics and Society of Carleton University, Ottawa and sponsored by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Forum of Federations, was held in Ottawa, February 7 and 8, 2003. The conference focused on the impact of globalization and economic integration on federalism in each state; the impact of federalism on policy-making in foreign economic trade and social policy; and, future prospects of multi-level governance in North America.

The conference was keynoted by Prof. Richard Simeon of the University of Toronto, and also featured talks by Kent Weaver of the Brookings Institute (U.S.) and Carlos Gadsen, Director General of Mexico's Instituto Nacional para el Federalismo y el Desarrollo Municipal. Some fourteen different panels were featured, on economic development, environmental policy, social policy, policy process, intermestic politics, subnational government and many others. Five members of RC28 took part in the conference.

A publication of some of the conference papers is planned. For further information, contact conference chair, Prof. Laura McDonald of the Center for North American Politics and Society. The Conference e-mail is nafederalism@yahoo.com.

The Allocation of Powers in Federal Countries June 2003

A Conference on Federalism and Autonomy was held in Barcelona, Spain on June 6 and 7, 2003. The conference was sponsored by the Observatory of the Evolution of Institutions, Pompeu Fabra University as the final phase of the Comparative Study of the Allocation of Powers in Politically Decentralized Countries. The project is designed to comparatively assess the level of self-government experienced by subnational governments in federal and decentralizing countries. The thirteen-nation study involves an extensive questionnaire involving levels of responsibilities, intergovernmental relations, local and municipal government, and financial relations. Countries included in the study are: United States, Brazil, Belgium, Canada, United Kingdom, Argentina, Germany, Australia, Italy, Austria, Mexico, Switzerland, and Spain. Four members of RC28 participated in the Conference. Three served as country experts. In attendance were Peter Pernthaler, Austria, and Robert Agranoff, United States. Cheryl Saunders, Australia, was also co-author of the Australia study.

The project report is currently available in Spanish and will be available in English near the end of 2003. For further information, contact project director Enric Argullol, enic.argullol@dret.upf.es or Clara Velasco of the Observatory Academic Secretariat, clara.velasco@dret.upf.es.

Which Federalism
Bari, Italy, November 2003

The Scuola Superiore dell'Economia e delle Finanze will sponsor an International Conference on Federalism with a particular focus on the Italian case. The theme for the two-day conference is "Which Federalism?" and participants will be asked to present studies and analyses of federal systems, problems, theories and experiences from around the world, with particular attention to states of the European Union. The conference will convene at the Castel del Monte near Bari in the Puglia region of Italy on 13-14 November 2003.

The Scientific Committee that is planning the conference is comprised of scholars from the Scuola Superiore, Università Carlo Cattaneo, Universidad Complutense Madrid, London School of Economics, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Topics include: Constitutional and Political Frameworks, Fiscal Frameworks, Policy Frameworks, the New EU Constitution, National Papers (Germany, UK, Portugal, Greece, and Scandinavian countries), with several focused papers on the Italian case.

For further information contact Federico Porto of the Scuola Superiore at Federico.porto@finanze.it.

The "F" Word Again

DIALOGUE: Post War Iraq—The "F" Word Again Editors

Note: I have prepared the following statement in the hope of stimulating additional/comments, amplifying comments, rejoinders related to the use of federal, autonomy, devolution and territorial management in post-conflict divided countries.

Please feel free to comment, even in brief form. A rejoinder of 500-1500 words is preferred, but any and all will be welcomed. It need not be referenced. Please transmit them electronically to Agranoff@indiana.edu.

As another armed conflict winds down once again the media begin borrowing the word "federal" from the shouts of those groups who seek a share of the power. It also comes from their loosely presumed experiences of stable democracies that appear based on power

sharing models. “Talking heads” that guest appear to fill the post-battle coverage on CNN, Fox, MSNBC, Sky, and others like to throw in a reference to a post-Saddam Hussein Iraq that is federal. It is media shorthand for their conclusion that many interests need representation in a new governmental framework that is 15-20 percent Sunni Arabs, 60 percent Shiite Arabs, plus Turkomans, Assyrians and other Christians. In a feature on “Rebuilding Iraq,” *The Economist* (2003) asserted that after establishing sovereign power across the whole territory, the second move should be the creation of institutions involving all main factions in holding the state together through “the devolution of power to distinct regions on a federal pattern.” In Fareed Zakaria’s new book, *The Future of Freedom* (2003), he concludes that diversity, properly handled, can be a source of strength in Iraq. “But power will have to be divided, shared and checked. The constitution of a new Iraq should create a federal state, with substantial local autonomy.” Added to these voices are such writers as those on the Indiana editorial pages of the *Bloomington Herald-Tribune*, *Fort Wayne Sentinel*, and *Hammond Tribune*, who have also suggested federal solutions for Iraq. In the wake of conflicts in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Macedonia, Sri-Lanka, among others, the federal spectre has been raised for these ethnically divided societies, a sort of media catch-all to characterize various forms of regionalization, ethnic accommodation, deconcentration, and, of course, devolution of power and power sharing.

Who cares about a label? Perhaps in media-speak or in the popular literature sold at Borders Bookstore (fill in the large mega-book chain conglomerate of your country—the ones where the clerks know the books only if you have the title and author, not subject, and it is on the computer) it makes little difference which non-centralizing phrase is used, and in most of the world’s large federal countries, federal sounds good! But scholars of federalism, the readers of this dialogue, know that there are real differences in what is called federal or federation, and all of the other means of dealing with ethnic or territorial or ethnic/regional issues.

What is in a name? In a number of cases it is quite significant. In some of the most notable peaceful transitions or velvet revolutions the use of the term “federal” by some groups wanting forms of autonomy or power has been countered by more powerful forces for centralized rule. Federal was portrayed as dangerous and threatening to the stability of the country, despite what most observers would call genuine need for forms of territorial management of a decentralized, self-rule nature. Among others, this was the situation in three cases familiar to this writer.

First, in Spain’s post-Franco transition, the call for federalism and federation, particularly by Basque nationalists and left-wing parties or factions of parties, were countered by cries that federating Spain would lead to the dissolution of the state, bring back the anarchic conflicts of the local confederated units of the First Republic of the 19th century, and most important, a dangerous slope that could legitimize “self-determination” or the right of regions to withdraw from Spain. As a result, despite Spain’s many federal-like features, the Constitution of 1978 includes a proviso that prohibits autonomous communities from federating (Agranoff 1996; Moreno 2001).

Second, in South Africa’s transition the calls for a federal system were held up as a possibility by three small forces: a small group of intellectual leaders interested in the benefits of power-sharing as a contribution to ethnic and racial stability after apartheid; the Inkatha Freedom Party in Natal, which called for confederal like association, and right-wing white supremacists who saw a federal South Africa as a blueprint for continued white-rule in some areas, even with a freely associated white Volkstaat within black-ruled South Africa. The majority African National Congress (ANC) interests, on the other hand, opposed a federal state with some vigor because it became the catch word for diluting or negating the long struggle for nonracial majority rule. Also to ANC divided would continue regional disparities that were contrary to the social justice and economic equity agenda of the ANC, and a federal state was regarded as “Bantustan homeland” government all over. These issues contributed to a South African

transition that included nine rather weak provincial governments, where the center maintains effective control (Simeon and Murray 2001).

Third, in newly independent Ukraine transition advocates of a federal system based their arguments on the ethnic linguistic and regional diversity of country. In the southeast and Crimea it was Russian-oriented, in a newly independent nation that was fast becoming Ukrainian in power-brokering, language, culture, education, and more. In the west it was Hungarian speakers and right-wing nationalist Ukrainians, who opposed any nationwide ethnic Russian political or cultural accommodation. A federal state would seal-in everybody's regional ethnic preferences and give all a share of power (Sasse 2001). To the country's mainstream leaders, such constitutional talk weakened the new country. Before regional power can be shared within a state, a state must be built first, became the rallying cry. Besides, the economy can only transition with centralized control. Ukraine's first president, Leonid Kravchuk said it all for those who wielded the levers of power, "Ukraine is not ready for a federal system, not now, not for a hundred years." Nor does it have one. The Constitution of 1996 identifies Ukraine as a unitary state, and with the exception of Crimea's limited autonomy. Ukrainian regions (oblasts) currently have more state administrative power than self-rule or real power sharing responsibilities (Brown 2002).

Our colleagues no doubt know that the word federal is probably not appropriate in most of the post conflict and transition situations for which it is applied. As in the cases of the three transitions just mentioned and in the post-conflict situations we are probably referring to forms of devolved autonomy rather than federation. Federalism, or most particularly "to federate" refers to forms of constitutionally divided shared rule, along with self rule (Burgess 1993; King 1982; Elazar 1987). In about twenty-five or so countries this type of power sharing or shared rule is the situation. But in the vast majority of countries, territorial management normally flows through various forms of devolved autonomy (Urwin 1994).

A core process for the provision of autonomy comes from the process of devolution, which has been defined as the transfer of power from central governments to autonomous units holding "corporate status" under state legislation (Cohen and Peterson 1999: 26). Devolution can occur by established units of highly centralized federal systems shifting power downward, through the recasting of unitary systems in a more federal direction, and by unitary states transferring power to regions and localities. While situations of devolution bear similarities to the power sharing aspects of federation the differences are critical. The two forms are similar in that under devolved regional autonomy the constitution may guarantee, or at least recognize and define, the existence of regional governments. The powers of regions are frequently constitutionally enumerated, although devolved regions usually possess no exclusive powers of their own, but only concurrent powers that may have to give way to central preemption. Also, a constitutional court usually exercises judicial review over central-regional relations, much like a federation. Finally, regions not only have an elected parliament and government, but the bodies of regional government may not be dissolved or suspended by central government officials.

Devolved regions, on the other hand, normally lack exclusive powers like federal systems. With few exceptions, they are not represented as regions in the second chambers of national parliaments. Moreover, they are usually unable to construct their own structures of local and area governments, free from central advice and control. Devolved units have less fiscal autonomy, particularly with regard to taxation than do constituent units of federal systems. Finally, in many devolved units a central government official can block the enforcement of regional legislation pending a constitutional court appeal. Thus, despite notable degrees of autonomy by devolved units, the central government holds more sway over regions than would be the case under true federation (Zariski and Rousseau 1987: 33).

Building on the Anglo-American tradition of analytic positivism Gordon Clark (1984) extracts two “primary principles” of [local] autonomy: the power of initiative, or the power of a government to act in a “purposeful goal oriented fashion;” and the power of immunity, or “the power of localities to act with out fear of the oversight authority of higher tiers of the state” [198, 199]. Michael Libonati (1991) suggests that application of this dichotomous test fails to take into account two additional factors. One is the degree of freedom from central preemption, which in some cases the center controls, in others local control prevails, and in many cases concurrent authority is the norm. Concurrence suggests substantial degrees of interaction through the fourth means, that of intergovernmental relations. “Local autonomy also flows from recognition that a local government has capacity and standing as a collective entity to participate actively as a party in decisions by other governmental agencies which affect its interests and responsibilities...” [88].

This suggests that however complicated intergovernmental and central preemption processes are, devolved autonomy is a somewhat different beast than federal shared rule. It involves measures of self-rule, aspects of democratic-based territorial governance, in forms of decision and execution that contain degrees of freedom of initiative with immunity. Also, devolved autonomy means the possibility of a territorial or local government to have an independent impact on the well-being of their citizens (Wolman and Goldsmith 1990). But power is not constitutionally shared in the federal sense.

One of the lessons of post-conflict settlements is that linked political and economic reconstruction includes not only nation building and transfer of power from occupier/victor to local institutions but territorial management. In the twenty first century this normally involves complex sets of networks and agreements, along with institutions that include forms of rule by disparate, normally territorial interests. Reaching such accommodations are never easy, but to confuse federal or shared rule devolution (Agranoff 2003) with other forms of self-rule by devolved autonomy is no service to the struggling international community that face intractable reconstruction based on plural interests. These are among the hardest power and state-building challenges. Consequently, inserting the “F” word into the dialogue when it is not at issue does little good. On the other hand, who listens to federalism researchers?

Robert Agranoff
Indiana University-Bloomington, USA
RC28 Chairperson

References

Agranoff, Robert. 1996. “Federal Evolution in Spain.” *International Political Science Review* 17:4(October): 385-402.

Agranoff, Robert. 2003. “The Emerging Theory of Federal Autonomy and Its Challenges,” in Peter Bussjaeger and Anna Gamper (eds.), *The Homogeneity of Democracy, Rights, and the Rule of Law in Federal Systems*. Innsbruck, Austria: Institut für Föderalismus.

Brown, Trevor L. 2002. “Local Autonomy Versus Central Control During Transition: Explaining Local Policy Options in Post-Soviet Ukraine,” *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 20: 889-909.

Burgess, Michael. 1993. “Federalism and Federation: A Reappraisal,” in Michael Burgess and Alain-G. Gagnon (eds.), *Comparative Federalism and Federation*. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press.

Clark, Gordon L. 1984. “A Theory of Local Autonomy,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74:2 (June): 195-208.

Cohen, John M. and Stephen B. Peterson. 1999. *Administrative Decentralization*. West Hartford, CN: Kumarian.

Economist. 2003. "Rebuilding Iraq," April 19, pp. 17-23.

Elazar, Daniel J. 1987. *Exploring Federalism*. Tuscalvosa, AL: U. of Alabama Press.

King, Preston. 1982. *Federalism and Federation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins U. Press.

Libonati, Michael E. 1991. *State Institutions and Local Autonomy*. Washington, D.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Moreno, Luis. 2001. *The Federalization of Spain*. London: Frank Cass.

Sasse, Gwendolin. 2001. "The New Ukraine: A State of Regions." *Regional and Federal Studies* 11:3(Autumn): 69-100.

Simeon, Richard and Christina Murray. 2001. "Multi-Sphere Governance in South Africa," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 31:4(Fall): 65-92.

Urwin, Derek W. 1994. "Back to the Future – Again? A Reassessment of Minority Nationalism in Western Democracies," *Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences* 3(1): 1-23.

Wolman, Harold and Michael Goldsmith. 1990. "Local Autonomy as a Meaningful Analytic Concept." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 26:1(September): 3-27.

Zakaria, Fareed. 2003. *The Future of Freedom*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Zariski, Raphael and mark O. Rousseau. 1987. "National Power and Local Governance" in Raphael Zariski and Mark O. Rosseau (eds.), *Regionalism and Regional Devolution in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Praeger.

Durban Paper Abstracts

RC28 ISAP World Congress Conference Papers

The following abstracts cover the presented papers for the World Congress of IPSA in Durban, 28 June – 4 July 2003.

G. Garibanova, Herzen University, Russia
GGaribanova@yandex.ru
Regions as Political Actors

"Region" is an elusive concept which takes on different meanings in different cultural and political contexts. We'll speak about changing role of regions -sub-national political and administrative units in modern political process. We'll try to evaluate the main factors that determine their changing political power as internal and external actors, in other words -their ability to influence j the process of making decisions concerning the region by the political forces from their environment. Analyzing the situation in Russia we want to pay special attention to three main groups of factors: objective (population, territory (size & place), natural resources, economic potential, social stability, etc.), subjective (level of political control over the region, the ability of regional authorities for political mobilization, including: type of political regime, relations among l the regional elite, attitude to opposition and mass media,

relationship with business and professionals, individual characteristics of the regional political leader), the federal center policy (importance of the region for the whole situation in the country , access of the regional authorities to the federal governmental bodies, role of the regional leader in federal politics, political image o the region and its leader). This kind of analysis gives us an opportunity to evaluate the existence of financial, organizational and human resources for lobbying (the bargaining power) of different regions. Under the influence of the multifaceted process of enhanced supra-nationalism, regionalism and globalization the specific weight of this factors changes; in accordance with this we see the changes in their role as political actors.

Joachim Wehner, Independent Researcher; Fiscal Decentralisation in South Africa
joachim@idasact.org.za

An initial assessment of provincial budgetary developments since 1997

This paper considers budgetary developments in South Africa's provinces in the context of the country's decentralisation process since the democratic transition. It outlines the legal and institutional contours of the intergovernmental fiscal system, and goes on to review central trends in provincial budgeting since 1997, the first year in which provinces had responsibility to draft and implement their own budgets. The analysis shows that provinces are delivering increasingly improved budgeting outcomes, in terms of aggregate discipline and the composition of spending. Also, first steps have been taken to strengthen the efficiency of spending, although much work remains to be done in this area. The paper concludes with a discussion of variables that are likely to impact on the extent to which provinces will gain increased budgetary flexibility and maturity in future years, and some comments on the lessons from the South African case with regard to fiscal decentralisation in general.

2003 Committee on Federalism and Federation

Committee on Federalism and Federation

This Research Committee was organized in 1983. It is devoted to exploring scholarly knowledge about federations and federal arrangements in a comparative perspective. Its members are from six continents and include political scientists, lawyers, economists, political geographers, and political sociologists from many federal and nonfederal countries. Knowledge about federalism is researched and exchanged about specific countries as well as cross-national phenomena.

As an active committee, it meets virtually every year. Every third year it holds a committee conference, such as the 2001 Jávea, Spain conference, to exchange papers and to organize its work agenda. The next year it meets jointly with another organization, the International Association of Centers of Federalism (a group of research centers). The 2002 joint meeting was held in Innsbruck, Austria in November. The third year of the cycle the Committee meets and sponsors panels as a part of the World Congress of Political Science. The 2004 meeting is scheduled for Barrie, Ontario (Kempfenfelt Bay), October 14-17.

Several publications have been produced as a result of these meetings, including:

C. Lloyd Brown-John (ed.), *Centralizing and Decentralizing Trends in Federal or Non-Federal Countries* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993).

Bertus De Villiers (ed.), *Evaluating Federal Systems* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1994).

C. Lloyd Brown-John (ed.), *Federal Type Solutions and European Integration* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995).

Robert Agranoff (ed.), *Managing Diversity: Asymmetry in Federal Countries* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999).

Peter Bussjäger and Anna Gamper (eds.), *The Homogeneity of Democracy, Rights and the Rule of Law in Federal or Confederal Systems* (Vienna: Wm. Braumüller, 2003).