

## JUNE 2004 / VOL. 19 (1)

### Editorial—Lessons from the Geese

I was on a research trip to Louisville, Kentucky in April of this year, waiting for an appointment with a city/county highway engineer. I ran across an interesting column in Right of Way magazine, a periodical that we federalism specialists certainly never read. The Executive Vice President of this international association mused about the changing seasons, particularly fall, when in the U.S. geese fly north in V-formation and honk. He related the inspirational thoughts of Dr. Robert McNeish, a biologist and former Baltimore school superintendent and motivational speaker. They appear to be relevant to the RC28, Federalism Research Committee:

Fact 1: As each goose flaps its wings, it creates “uplift” for the birds that follow. By flying in a “V” formation, the whole flock adds 71 percent greater flying range than if each bird flew alone.

Lesson: People who share a common direction and sense of community can get where they are going quicker and easier because they are traveling on the thrust of one another.

Fact 2: Often when a goose falls out of formation, it suddenly feels the drag and resistance of flying alone. It quickly moves back into formation to take advantage of the lifting power of the bird immediately in front of it.

Lesson: We must be as committed to our goal as geese, and stay in formation with those headed where we want to go. We are willing to accept their help and give our help to others.

Fact 3: When the lead goose tires, it rotates back into the formation and another goose flies to the point position.

Lesson: It pays to take turns doing the hard tasks and sharing leadership. As with geese, people are interdependent on each others’ skills, capabilities, and unique arrangements of gifts, talents or resources.

Fact 4: The geese flying in formation “honk” to encourage those up front to keep up their speed.

Lesson: We need to make sure our “honking” is encouraging. In groups where there is encouragement, the production is much greater. The power of encouragement (to stand by one’s heart or core values and encourage the heart and core of others) is the “quality of honking” that we seek.

Fact 5: When a goose gets sick, wounded, or shot down, two geese drop out of formation and follow it down to help and protect it. They stay with it until it dies or is able to fly again. Then they launch out with another formation or catch up with the flock.

Lesson: If we are as committed to each other as geese, we will stand by each other in difficult times as well as when we are strong.

As in the case of the changing seasons, there is a natural rhythm and flow to your involvement in RC28. Together we try to express our shared interest in comparative federalism. Many of us who have flown in our research committee flock have found it to be uplifting to career and professional aspirations. Those few of us who have carried the committee over the years hope that some day you will also accept the responsibility somewhere near or at the point of the V

for part of our journey. And when appropriate, we hope you will honk your encouragement to those who do take a place on the edge of leadership.

In this regard, in another section of this newsletter there is a call for volunteers to serve on committees. Among others, in the next year or so a nominating committee will be announced that will select a new chairperson and slate of officers to serve from the 2006 Congress in Japan to 2009. As was the agreement when I agreed to re-election in 2003, it would only be until the next World Congress, after which a new chair will take over. It is approaching the time when the lead goose drops back into the formation, allowing another to assume the point position.

Robert Agranoff  
RC28 Chairperson  
2000-2005

### **Committee Volunteers Sought**

Your assistance is needed for four RC28 Committees:

Nominating Committee. To select a chair, officers, and executives for a 2006-2009 term. Three persons needed.

Scholar Award Committee. Each three years the committee now gives a distinguished comparative federalism scholar award for career-long contributions to the field. Ronald L. Watts was the first, 2003 recipient. Three persons needed.

2005 Program Committee. To assist Program Chair, Maureen Covell in planning, locating and organizing a meeting in fall, possibly jointly with IACFS. Two persons needed.

Directory of Federalism Experts. To help design and solicit names for an update of the 1999 volume. This is a joint project with the Forum of Federations. Lloyd Brown-John will assist but we seek one or two additional members.

If you are willing to serve on any of these committees, e-mail the chair, [agranoff@indiana.edu](mailto:agranoff@indiana.edu).

### **2004 Conference in Canada Postponed**

The Kempenfelt-Barrie Annual RC28 Conference, planned for October 14-17, 2004, has been postponed. There was an insufficient number of participants to guarantee the minimum number of rooms needed to access the facility. A conference will be planned for 2005.

Our thanks go to Maureen Covell and Lloyd Brown-John for planning this event and to Michael Stein for agreeing to chair a special panel on the State of the Discipline – Federalism project. Hopefully, that panel can be offered at the 2005 meeting.

2005 is the year normally set aside for a joint meeting with IACFS. This meeting could have a separate, one-day track for RC28. As recommended in 2002, it would be on the day preceding the IACFS business meeting day, so as to avoid overlapping meetings. Those RC28 members without IACFS responsibilities would then have one tour/recreation day. The joint meeting would be held on the third and fourth days. If IACFS meets in a generally accessible place and agrees to meet jointly, we will again combine our efforts, as was the case in Innsbruck, Austria in 2002.

If a joint meeting cannot be organized, RC28 will hold its own conference, presumably in North America or Western Europe.

Any suggestions should be forwarded to the Chair, [agranoff@indiana.edu](mailto:agranoff@indiana.edu) and Program Chair, Maureen Covell, [covell@sfu.ca](mailto:covell@sfu.ca).

### **RC28 Receives Grant for Directory Update**

In April we were informed by the IPSA Committee on Research and Training that RC 28 was awarded a \$500 grant to expand, update, and make Website-available our 1999 Directory of Experts on Federalism.

The original volume contained names and details of those who chose to Register with the Research Committee as “experts.” In every case, the individual notion of “expertise” was warranted. At the end of the volume was a compendium of others who were known to be very knowledgeable. They were listed because they too should be known although they chose not to seek formal registration.

The recipients of this compendium were free to contact those persons listed for consulting/advice on matters affecting constitutional, political, economic and social matters relating to complex federal political systems. As a global community of scholars, governments, and private companies seeking expertise on such difficult issues as managing diversity within unity found the volume helpful.

The revision of the directory is a joint project with the Forum of Federations in Ottawa, Canada. At our November, 2002 Business Meeting, it was voted and approved to approach the Forum for joint sponsorship. Ronald Watts acted as our “go-between.” The Forum agreed, and Karl Nerenberg of the Forum is our cooperating partner.

Discussions are underway about the format and RC 28 members and Forum contacts will be solicited electronically in a separate communication. The subscribers to the Federalism Report, a joint RC 28/IACFS/APSA Federalism Section biannual publication, will be solicited in hard-copy format.

Plans are to “post” the directory on the RC 28 and Forum directory sometime in 2005.

### **IACFS Meeting in Cape Town, South Africa**

#### **CALL FOR PAPERS**

The 2004 annual IACFS meeting will be held from 29 September to 3 October in Cape Town, South Africa, and hosted by Dr. Nico Steytler of the Community Law Centre, University of Western Cape. Papers are being solicited on the theme of local government in federal systems. Paper presenters need not be members of the IACFS.

Conference Theme:

The Place and Role of Local Government in Federal Systems

The theme of the 2004 conference is the place and role of local government in federal systems. Three level government – at federal, state/provincial, and local government – is common to all federal countries. However, the place and role of local government in those

systems vary markedly. In some, local government is a constitutionally recognized sphere of government; in others, it is merely a competence of the state/provincial government. Nevertheless, local government is increasingly playing a significant role in the governance of federal countries, placing new demands on the theory and practice of federalism. Moreover, its status is changing along with its governmental role.

The conference will be organized in sessions around specific themes, rather than the delivery of country reports. Countries with similar arrangement will be grouped together in a session. A country presentation could be made on more than one theme.

The following sessions are planned:

The constitutional recognition of local government: the shape and consequences of recognition (or non-Recognition)

Institutional arrangements: From villages to “cities states”

Powers and functions: the scope of local self-governments

Financing local self-government

Supervising local government: the limits of local self-government

Intergovernmental relations: the three-layered marble cake

Local government in decentralizing countries: Italy and the United Kingdom

Please submit proposals to:  
Dr. Nico Steytler  
Community Law Centre  
University of Western Cape  
Private Bag X17  
7535 Bellville  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Fax: 27-21-959-2411  
E-mail: [nsteytler@uwc.ac.za](mailto:nsteytler@uwc.ac.za)

### **Spatial Aspects of Federative Systems Congress**

FÖV-Congress, February, 23rd-25th 2005

#### Call for Papers

The Research Institute for Public Administration (FÖV, Speyer) invites submissions of papers to be presented at an international conference on public administration on February, 23rd-25th 2005. The core conference is held in cooperation with the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL, Hannover) dealing with “Spatial Aspects of Federative Systems”. Besides an open conference part shall present submissions from academic and governmental researchers in any field of administrative sciences (economics, law, politics, etc.). Original papers on all aspects of theory and applications of administrative sciences are welcome.

In various general sessions all subjects connected to the public sector shall be discussed on the bases of contributed papers and are due to offer a forum to recent progresses of administrative sciences. The conference language is English. Authors are hereby invited to

submit a paper for presentation, following the submission instructions on the homepage of the FÖV: <http://www.foev-speyer.de/Veranstaltungen/vorschau.htm>.

Deadline for the submission of papers or at least expressive abstracts is October 1st, 2004. Submitted papers will be selected by the Congress Committee on the basis of anonymous referee reports. Authors will be notified of the committee's decision by November 30th, 2004. Participation is free of charge for ordinary and corresponding members of the FÖV, the fee for non-members is €40,-.

For further information please contact:

Mr. Nils Otter: Tel. 0049 (0) 6232 – 654 – 398; e-mail: [otter@foev-speyer.de](mailto:otter@foev-speyer.de)

## **XX World Congress, IPSA, Fukuoka, Japan 2006**

July 9-14, 2006

The following essay is the charge for the next World Congress. As is the case with previous meetings, RCs will organize at least two panels. The content of the panels is in the case of RC28 the joint responsibility of the RC28 Chair and Program Chair. Our panel topics must be submitted to IPSA by December 31, 2004. Your ideas should be forwarded to [mcovell@sfu.ca](mailto:mcovell@sfu.ca) or [agranoff@indiana.edu](mailto:agranoff@indiana.edu).

Persons who are members or non-members of RC28 may approach either IPSA or RC28. All papers will be electronically registered with IPSA.

To register and for more information please visit <http://www.fukuoka2006.com>. Submissions and inquiries are to be directed to [info@fukuoka.com](mailto:info@fukuoka.com).

Is Democracy Working?

XX World Congress, Fukuoka, Japan 9-14 July 2006

Fundamental changes and developments in political relations at all levels and in all parts of the world have sparked a vigorous reassessment of democracy. In choosing the theme "Is Democracy Working?", President Max Kaase and the Executive Committee of IPSA have decided to focus on this revisiting of democracy and its impact on the boundaries and institutions of global, national, regional and local politics. It is a theme which we hope is sufficiently broad to encourage all our IPSA members to participate in the World Congress. We also hope that the scope and heterogeneity of interpretations the theme allows, and the ease of the on-line proposal submission, will encourage wide interest and participation in the Congress.

Conventionally, representative democracy has a central place in any analysis of democratic political behaviour, and has provided a rich vein of theoretical and applied data for scholars to explore. Today, many observe that representative democracy is in crisis and note a decline of confidence in public institutions. Many factors contribute to a lack of public trust in politics including the growing costs of political competition, the rising role of the leader in decision making, the centralization of government and the increasing remoteness of political leaders from the people they serve. Familiar questions focusing on ethical political values and behaviour are given a new framing, while fundamental concepts such as participation and representation are open to being revisited and recast in the context of a modern discourse on democracy and its institutions. Part of these discussions involves assessing whether people expect too much and, at the same time, too little from government. As a contribution to this

debate, we can usefully turn our attention to the relationship between democratic citizenship and education: Specifically, are our educational institutions, broadly defined, preparing democratic citizens? One response to the rise in anti-establishment attitudes and general dissatisfaction with the political order is for new technologies to be harnessed to address this crisis of legitimacy in democratic institutions. The development of e-government and e-democracy are seen as addressing the crisis in democracy, yet the question remains as to what extent democratic deficits of gender, race, class, ethnicity, religion (to name but a few) can be resolved by technological innovation. Is e-democracy taking the politics out of democratic representation?

The media, too, has an increasingly important role to play in shaping and influencing citizen's perceptions of what is important, and the global consolidation of media networks offers particular challenges – or opportunities – for shaping public views. Traditionally conceived, democratic institutions are the products of nation states and represent a state's political culture, traditions, ideologies and values. In today's world, the political interdependence of states is growing apace, and taking new forms, presenting challenges to the sovereignty of national institutions. Are democratic institutions capable of adapting and responding in a globalising context while retaining legitimacy at home?

Armed conflict – ethnic, regional, national, international – presents considerable challenges to existing democratic institutions and practices. Often, it is in the process of conflict resolution that the creative capacity of democracy is revealed, as new institutional configurations emerge from negotiated settlements. Exploring and comparing the causes, patterns, and consequences of conflicts in the world is an important way to assess the role democratic solutions play in securing peaceful outcomes. However, we must also attend to the limits of democracy in regulating and resolving conflict – what kind of conflicts can democracy resolve and what kind of issues might best be moved outside the domain of democratic decision-making? Inevitably, this leads us to considering the presuppositions on which a democratic system is built and to considering why some states succeed and others fail to construct robust and enduring democratic systems. A related issue is the question of democratising the international system: is it possible to manage and respond to international non-state actors and to meet the demands of international social integration democratically? What role do international forums play in shaping democratic institutions and practices?

To what extent can democracy be seen as linking very different political and cultural traditions? And can an understanding of democratic practice help in searching for solutions in an increasingly polarised world? As gaps in economic development between north and south persist, can democracy offer any solutions for bridging these gaps, and what form should these democratic solutions take? At the same time as consolidated democracies are experiencing a crisis in representation, newly-established democracies seek to find a path away from authoritarianism. This area of scholarship explores the conditions for the emergence of democratic systems and the changing relationship between state formation and democracy on the one hand, and civil society and political representatives on the other.

In assessing whether or not democracy is working we must of course continue to examine the effectiveness of contemporary electoral systems, campaign practices, and political parties. But we must also ask how well contemporary democracy accommodates non-electoral expressions of popular interest? Democracy has many aspects, one of the most visible being the recurrence of 'direct democracy' initiatives by citizens wishing to influence political representatives at sub-national, national and international levels. These expressions of general sentiment, such as anti-globalisation protests, anti-authoritarian movements and anti-war demonstrations have mobilised, or re-awakened, significant expressions of political views by a public that is less inclined to vote in elections. In recent times, the rise of unorthodox politics, especially the politics of terrorism, have posed an additional challenge to democratic societies and their governance. Understanding this challenge, and investigating the

phenomenon as a subject in its own right, can throw light on the strengths and weaknesses of democracy. More peaceful forms of direct participation, such as 'citizens' covenants and charters, or, more conventionally, popular referendums, are sometimes seen as offering a renewal of democratic legitimacy. Multi-ethnic states have the additional challenge of developing legitimate forms of interest representation and influence for significant, continuing minorities. In the meantime, interest articulation has widened its boundaries, and NGOs and other civil society organisations are increasingly brought into the decision-making in a quasi-influential role. Across East and West, North and South, non-governmental organizations and civil society agencies seek to fill the vacuum in social action left by failing states or atrophied welfare regimes.

Nor can we ignore the normative dimensions of democracy as we seek to assess its effectiveness as a political principle. The two main objectives of an ideal democracy – freedom and equality – are measures by which one may judge the quality of democracy. Each democracy expresses these fundamental objectives in different ways, and to varying degrees, in the political, social and civil rights it legislates for its populace. In this regard, normative democratic thinking provides a platform for the empirical consideration of the inter-related concerns of human rights, equality, development and sustainability. Analysing democracy from a normative perspective can throw light on the practices and priorities of democracies at different points in time, at different stages of development, contributing to quantitative and qualitative assessments of the condition of democracy, the nature and degree of accountability and responsiveness displayed by democratic participants. There is scope, too, for a reassessment of democracy and its compatibility with pluralism. A related area of study is the analysis of corruption as an aspect of political affairs in democratic societies. A fundamental question arising from corruption studies is to what extent such practices harm a democracy, and to what extent there is a willingness within political elites and popular culture to contain, if not eliminate, such practices? Where and how does the rule of law connect with freedom, equality and accountability?

Democracy is seen as a reasonably effective, if necessarily flawed, framework for making decisions and delivering public policies. Public administration is essential to the implementation of democratic decisions, and all democracies face the challenge of supporting an effective, efficient and fair bureaucracy. Taken from another angle, responsibility for making democracy work falls on bureaucrats as well as politicians. Yet, as scholars of public administration point out, the dominance of neo-liberal economic principles have in many instances changed the environment within which policy-makers carry out their tasks. Which perspectives and biases are favoured or excluded in policy-making, and how is the framing and implementing of public policy shaped by a responsiveness to sectional interests or wider societal interests? How open are policy processes to accepting, adopting and interpreting international treaties, covenants and commitments? To what extent is civil society involved in contributing to policy making processes? These are perennial questions contributing to an assessment of the extent to which democratic practices in a polity are responsive to the needs and concerns of the populace rather than serving the individual interests of elites.

Panels and special sessions related to the main theme will be grouped under 6 major sub-themes

The crisis and capacity of democracy – national and international perspectives

Democracy and the new world order

Institutional legitimacy, interest representation and democratic practice

Citizen participation, values and identity – democratic inclusion and exclusion

Public policies, bureaucracies and the quality of democracy

Theory, knowledge, and crafting better democracies

The members of the Program Committee will serve as session convenors for the sub-themes, actively seeking a limited number of panel chairs to highlight the theme across a broad spectrum of regions and sub-disciplines. These sub-themes can also serve as rough guidelines for those wishing to propose individual papers, panels, special sessions, roundtable discussions, or sessions of other types, and IPSA's Research Committees will be encouraged to consider the sub-themes when they propose their own sessions of panels. As Program Chair, I will make every possible effort to coordinate sessions so that it will be possible for those with sub-disciplinary interests to attend as many sessions within a given area as possible. I look forward to receiving your proposals and know that together we can make the XX World Congress an intellectually exciting and rewarding experience.

Yvonne Galligan, Program Chair

### **2004 Book Notes**

The Rules of Federalism, by R. Daniel Kelemen. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004; 242 pp. \$49.95

This book examines patterns of environmental regulation in the European Union and four federal polities – the United States, Germany, Australia, and Canada. Daniel Kelemen develops a theory of regulatory federalism based on his comparative study, arguing that the greater the fragmentation of power at the federal level, the less discretion is allotted to component states. Kelemen's analysis offers a novel perspective on the EU and demonstrates that it already acts as a federal polity in the regulatory arena.

In The Rules of Federalism, Kelemen shows that both the structure of the EU's institutions and the control these institutions exert over member states closely resemble the American federal system, with its separation of powers, large number of veto points, and highly detailed, judicially enforceable legislation. In the EU, as in the United States, a high degree of fragmentation in the central government yields a low degree of discretion for member states when it comes to implementing regulatory statutes.

Kelemen's theory of regulatory federalism is based on dual claims. First, vertical division of authority between central and subnational governments produces a "politics of competence," in which policy-making and implementation are divided between the two levels. Second, in federal countries, horizontal power fragmentation differentiation explains variations in the politics of discretion; as the number of "veto players" increases, subnational discretion decreases.

Case studies include the European Union, United States, Germany, Canada and Australia, mostly in the arena of environmental regulation.

Federalism and Territorial Cleavages, edited by Ugo M. Amoretti and Nancy Bermeo. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004; 498 pp. \$55.00

This collection of 17 essays assess why some territorial cleavages are more easily accommodated than others. In explaining accommodation across states the role of federal state structures as explanatory variables is primary. In addition to cross-cutting essays, cases include advanced industrial democracies – Switzerland, Belgium, Canada, United Kingdom, Italy, France and Spain – and developing and post-communist states – India, Russia, Turkey,

Mexico and Nigeria – all with a focus on issues of institutional design, electoral systems, secession movements and the limitations of the U.S. federal model. The central hypothesis examined is that the accommodation of territorial cleavages is facilitated by the shared rule/self-rule aspect of federalism, an institutional setting that is associated with divided societies. Since such claims are normally restricted to case studies, the effects and the contextual factors that shape them are not clearly specified. This volume examines the variations between states in accomplishing this purpose.

Federalism and Democracy in Latin America, edited by Edward L. Gibson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004; 377 pp.; \$18.95 (pbk); \$49.95 (cloth).

This anthology of ten comparative essays and theoretically framed studies of Latin American cases looks at the dynamics of federalism and its impact on politics and the practice of democracy. Although only four countries in Latin America are formally federal, they comprise 65 percent of the region's population. The region's three largest countries – Brazil, Mexico and Argentina – along with Venezuela have federal constitutions.

The volume promotes research agendas toward relatively unexplored dimensions of the politics of Latin American democratization. The manifold political processes lumped under the "democratization" label have involved well-analyzed struggles along different dimensions of conflict. These have included struggles between social classes, partisan forces, social movements, and economic interests. Less well analyzed have been the geographic dimensions of conflict – conflict between center and periphery, conflict between levels of government, and conflict between regionally organized collective actors. These dimensions of conflict, until now seen as hopelessly old-fashioned topics of study, are now back into the limelight, as new realities emerge that defy prior explanatory frameworks and push politics in unexpected directions.

Involving studies of federalism covering all four countries, plus cross-cutting studies of multinationalism, public spending, and electorally generated veto players, the volume provides a rare comparative examination of the federalism in Latin America, and the complex interaction between federal institutions and democratic change in the region.

Federalismo y autonomía, directed by Enric Argullol. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 2004. 473 pp., € 25.00.

For those who read Spanish, this volume compares the allocation of powers and federal processes across a broad range of policy arenas in 13 situations, all but one (U.K.) federal or countries with significant federal features: Germany, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Belgium, Canada, United States, Spain, Italy, Mexico and Switzerland. Each entry was prepared by an indigenous country federalism specialist in law, economics or political science.

Unlike the typical comparative study, the book is organized by topical area rather than by country. The authors were presented with a set of identical questions to answer, primarily in qualitative form. Analytical topics include: historical and general forces behind federal organization; laws and constitutional norms; recognition/guarantees of federalism; institutional forces; distribution of competencies; local and municipal governments; intergovernmental relations; financial relations; and, language concerns. This data reporting is preceded by a cross-cutting essay prepared by Argullol, covering the legal, political, juridical and intergovernmental common factors.

This truly comparative project is a product of the observatory of the Evolution of Institutions at University Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona. Many of the country papers were originally written in English. For further information or to request a paper in English contact [obsei@upf.edu](mailto:obsei@upf.edu).

## **2004 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.

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).