

Sociology and Regional Science in Canada

Chris Southcott
Department of Sociology
Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1

When regional science first came into being in the late 1950s, it was intended to be an interdisciplinary area of research including most social sciences. According to Walter Isard, sociology was to be an essential part of the discipline. Despite this, regional science has evolved with little contribution from sociology. The discipline has become dominated by economists and, to a lesser extent, geographers.¹ There are some indications that the absence of sociological input may have had a negative effect on the development of regional science. Certain authors such as Friedmann, Weaver, Stöhr, Gore, and Harvey have pointed to problems with the regional development theories used by regional scientists that can be related to the absence of what might be termed "a sociological perspective".

It is difficult to determine why sociology and regional science have developed such an estranged relationship. While regional science organizations may not have gone out of their way to attract sociologists to their meetings it cannot be said that they did anything to keep them away. Sociologists have been interested in regional development and regional problems and yet they have not shown much desire to add their voices to help create a "true" regional science. This paper seeks to add to a better understanding of why a situation of what appears to be mutual indifference developed between the two disciplines.

As is the case elsewhere, regional science in Canada exhibits a relative absence of sociological contributions; this despite the fact that Canadian sociol-

-
1. An indication of this can be seen in a summary analysis of the membership list of the Western Regional Science Association published in the Association's Fall 1991 Newsletter. Of 450 members listed as belonging to various academic, government, and private institutions, many of them interdisciplinary, 128 members could be identified as belonging to economic departments or economic research institutions. The next most clearly identifiable academic group was geographers, with 49 members. Sociologists totalled only 6.

ogy has devoted much attention to the study of regionalism and regional inequalities. The one exception to this situation is in Quebec where franco-Quebecois sociologists are more involved in regional science than elsewhere in the country. The particularities of the Canadian situation can give us clues to the nature of the relationship between sociology and regional science. By studying the differences between anglo-Canadian sociology and franco-Quebecois sociology, and, in particular, those differences which explain the greater degree of involvement of franco-Quebecois sociologists in regional science, we can better understand the divide between sociology and regional science.

According to several observers the main differences between anglo-Canadian and franco-Quebecois sociology are that, whereas anglo-Canadian sociology tends to be deterministic, structuralist and fatalistic, franco-Quebecois sociology tends to be more constructionist, voluntaristic, and concerned with collective action (Jackson 1985; Juteau and Maheu 1989). While anglo-Canadian sociology is primarily concerned with creating explanatory theories of regional disparities, franco-Quebecois sociology is more concerned with developing projects which bring change to regions. In this sense, franco-Quebecois sociology is more "instrumentalist" than anglo-Canadian sociology. As such it is open to other disciplines, such as regional science, which promise help in this regard.

The Origins of Regional Science

An analysis of the original conditions under which regional science was established show that it was strongly influenced by a positivistic vision of the social sciences and, according to some authors, by an economic Keynesianism which had been given new life in the United States in the immediate post-war era (Benko 1984). The 'modernist' optimism which dominated thought in America following the war gave rebirth to the notion that social science could be used to 'plan' a better society. Social scientific techniques could be used to solve social and economic problems. Human beings, through the work of scientists, could manipulate their society so as to improve it. To quote a former president of the Regional Science Association,

"Our association was born in a unique intellectual climate. In the years following the Second World War, the prestige of the scientist reached levels never before attained; for the war's final phase witnessed the first direct and decisive application of science in the realm of human conflict. It appeared for a while that scientists might bid for a share of political power and come close to the realization of Platonian ideals. At long last, wisdom and virtue seemed to have become accepted as synonymous, and vast amounts of money began pouring into scientific enterprise" (Czamanski 1976: 8).

Part of the optimism over the possibilities of science was the belief that it could be used to solve regional problems and 'optimize' spatial phenomena. To quote Isard,

"After World War II a sudden increase in the intensity of interest in regional analysis developed. In the United States, many regional problems had been either generated or aggravated by the war. Disruptions and displacements were common. At the same time, planning as a profession, which before the war had been seriously questioned by social scientists and laymen in North America, began to be widely accepted" (Isard 1979: 9).

This optimism regarding the use of science in solving regional and spatial problems started to translate itself into a desire, among certain academics, to create a new field of study and a new "professional society". These desires emerged in the late 1940s and early 1950s at meetings of economists interested in regional problems. These were meetings organized, in large part, by Walter Isard during the annual conventions of the American Economics Association. In the words of Isard, these meetings started to attract "planners, sociologists, geographers, a few engineers, and stray individuals from other disciplines" (Isard 1979: 10).

The new field of regional science was to be primarily an interdisciplinary social science field. Initially therefore much of the work was dedicated to doing an inventory of useful spacial and regional concepts and techniques used in the pre-existing social science disciplines (Isard 1979: 10). Yet, Isard and others in the newly formed association pointed out that regional science was more than an accumulation of regional aspects from other social sciences. They believed that regional science was in the process of developing concepts and techniques unique to itself; that regional science was greater than the sum of its parts borrowed from other social sciences and, as such, should be considered a unique discipline (Isard 1960a: 10).

Despite the enthusiasm of Isard, regional science had a hard time convincing other academics that it was a separate discipline and that it was necessarily interdisciplinary. Others felt that it was simply a "high falutin name for regional studies or for older fields such as geography and economics" (Rodwin 1959: 3). Isard, and others, justified the uniqueness of regional science by attempting to show that an interdisciplinary approach was essential for the proper scientific understanding of spatial phenomena.

Many felt that, logically, regional science should be considered a "theoretical social science geography" (Maass 1956: 43). Isard's initial reply was based on the fact that geography was "not at a high level, academically speaking" (Isard 1979: 9). Geography was too descriptive, lacked highly developed theoretical and analytical techniques, and employed an overly simplistic methodology. In regard to future possibilities for geography, Isard claimed the two

should remain separate disciplines because the subject matter of geography and regional science was too vast (Isard 1960a: 13).

Regional scientists, such as Isard, had an even harder time convincing other academics that regional science was not just 'regional economics'. As early as 1959 researchers were commenting on the emphasis placed on regional economics by regional science. It was noted that in its initial five years of existence, 63% of papers presented in the *Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association* dealt with regional economics (Rodwin 1959: 5). Of the other disciplines: 6.7% dealt with planning, 5.7% with geography, 3.8% with political science, and 3.8% with sociology.

Isard responded that it was natural to see regional economics dominate regional science since the other disciplines were not, as yet, as scientifically developed as economics (Isard 1960a: 26). At the same time, Isard proclaimed that regional science is "very much more than regional economics" for three main reasons. The first reason is that regional science goes beyond the traditional utilitarian logic which characterizes traditional economics. Regional science is developing concepts and techniques which integrate social goals with individual goals (Isard and Reiner 1965: 6). The second reason seems to stem from the Keynesian influences of the post-war era in that he notes the inability of traditional economics to understand the potential of governments as players in solving regional problems. "Regional science is also critical of economics for failure to recognize the role of government authority and administration in the shaping of regional economics" (Isard and Reiner 1965: 14).

If the amount of attention given to the different reasons is an indicator of their relative importance then the third and final reason discussed by Isard as to why "regional science goes beyond regional economics" is the most important (Isard 1960a: 31). According to Isard "society transcends the economic". All decisions made regarding spacial phenomena are based on goals espoused by the three major classes of decision makers; individuals (or households), entrepreneurs (businessmen or firms), and public bodies (governments) (Isard and Reiner 1965: 2). These goals do not exist *a priori* as the utilitarian classical economist would have us believe but are derived from "an underlying value system". These value systems are not constant, nor universal, but vary through history and according to region. "Hence, it is relevant, perhaps even imperative, that we examine the interrelations of value systems with the fused frameworks and their numerous subsystems relating to a system of regions" (Isard 1960a: 29). Since sociology was, at that time, considered the discipline most concerned with modern values and culture, it, along with other social science disciplines, is required by regional science to accomplish this task (Isard 1960b: 684).

Sociology and Regional Science

Isard, therefore, defends regional science against claims that it is the same as regional economics by showing how sociology is required to play an important role in the creation of a "valid" regional science. Regional science would be more 'holistic' than regional economics since other disciplines, such as sociology, would eventually provide the new science with operationalized cultural, value-based variables which they could plug into their models.

Before we discuss this relationship in detail, we can, in fact, see that a relationship between sociology and regional science predates the creation of Isard's positivistic vision of regional science. As a social phenomena, regional science depended upon the creation and popularization of a social discourse which stressed the importance of regions and regional problems. In the United States, this discourse was supplied in large part by the work of pre-war sociologists. Regional sociologists such as Howard Odum and Rupert Vance at the University of North Carolina played an important role in emphasizing the importance of regions as social units of analysis. Isard recognized their initial contribution but was disappointed by the fact that sociologists had started to lose interest in regionalism (Isard 1979: 9).²

Isard was also influenced by the ideas of sociologists, linked to Odum and Vance, who saw the need to 'go beyond' the technical limitations of sociology in order to properly understand, and help, the development of social solidarity as conceptualized by Emile Durkheim, one of the founders of sociology. It is significant that he defended the idea that regional science is a distinct social science, that regional phenomena must be considered 'sui generis', by referring to Vincent Whitney, a sociologist who studied under Odum and Vance (Isard 1960a: 11-12).

Despite Isard's use of concepts developed by sociology and despite his insistence on the importance of including cultural values in the models developed by regional science, he also pointed out that the disciplines dealing with culture have little to offer regional science at the moment because they are still at relatively primitive stages of development. Implicit in these statements is the idea that, although the contributions of sociology and other such disciplines are necessary for the establishment of a 'valid' regional science, their underdevelopment relative to economics means that the contributions of these disciplines must be 'bracketed', *ceteris paribus*, so as not to slow down the operational

2. It should be mentioned as well that other academics attracted to regional science, especially because of questions relating to urbanization, were influenced by the ideas of social ecology developed by Robert Redfield and others associated with the sociology department at the University of Chicago (Webber 1964).

progress of the new discipline.³

This 'bracketing' of sociology by Isard seems to reflect the general direction of regional science in its first twenty years of existence. Despite warnings from the occasional sociologist that the principal concepts being used by regional science, such as 'space', do not exist *a priori* but are culturally determined and culturally relative (Webber 1964), questions relating to cultural values that could not be properly 'operationalized' were by and large ignored. As Funck (1975: 180) notes "regional science was reduced to a field of merely technical, non-substantial knowledge. Interdisciplinary cooperation remained a claim rather than a fact; at best there existed a delivery-on-request relationship with other disciplines".

Critical Trends in Regional Science and Sociology

Although Funck and others writing in 1974 were predicting that a "new regional science" was emerging, and that this new regional science would include a "systematic study of value judgements" (Nijkamp 1975: 188), others continued to point to similar problems continuing throughout the late 70s and the 1980s. Friedmann and Weaver, Stöhr, and Gore, while maintaining, to a certain extent, the instrumentalist aspect of regional analysis found in regional science, criticized the abstract positivism inherent in Isard's vision. Friedmann and Weaver attack the emphasis placed on abstract "functionalist" ties and called for increased attention to "territorial forces" which "derive from common bonds of social order forged by history within a given place" (Friedmann and Weaver 1979: 7). Stöhr pointed to weaknesses in top-down regional planning so clearly evident in Isard's vision of regional science. He calls instead for a "bottom-up" paradigm for regional development (Stöhr 1981).

Gore (1984) following the direction of these earlier criticisms, seems to come more to the point when he states that fields such as regional science are more concerned with studying abstract concepts, such as space, than actual regions. According to Gore, this is linked to their attempt to emphasize their status as a separate professional scientific discipline. The emphasis in regional science has been to create an abstract positivistic science with coherent explanatory theoretical models. According to Gore and similar critics, the resultant relative down-playing of concrete regional situations has limited the ability of regional science to pursue its original goal of understanding what actually happens in regions.

3. Evidence that Isard brackets sociology is found in his now classic work, Isard (1960b). Although this is supposed to be an introductory textbook to the 'interdisciplinary' field of regional science, it deals predominantly with regional economics. Although the book is 784 pages in length, Isard uses only two pages to discuss a possible role for sociology.

Perhaps without realizing it, these critics seem to push regional science and sociology together. This is done through the development of a common discourse. Friedmann, Weaver, Stöhr, and Gore all use the arguments of writers familiar to most sociologists to make their point; Samir Amin, Ahgri Immanuel, Johan Galtung, Jurgen Habermas, Alain Touraine, and Robert Lafont among others.

The trends that we see developing in the 1970s in regional science are similar to post-war trends in American sociology. The main difference is that the enthusiasm for positivism seems to have died sooner among most sociologists than it appears to have died among regional scientists. The years immediately following the Second World War saw the re-emergence of positivism in American sociology. Talcott Parsons, the chief architect, envisioned a positivistic, structural functional "grand theory" of society. Sociologists had a specialized task within this endeavour to find the secrets of the "normative order". Sociology was to discover how culture constructs common values and, in so doing, assure functional order. According to sociologists such as Paul Lazarfield, this would be achieved through "abstracted" empirical techniques. The creation of these empirical techniques, in combination with the use of the "grand theory" would allow the creation of an instrumental scientific profession (Hawthorn 1976).

This vision of sociology seems to be the closest to that envisioned, and desired, by Isard. Such a sociology, when its empirical techniques became as developed as those of economics, would provide regional science with the quantitative data on values and goal formation necessary for his mathematical models. This type of a scientific sociology would have been seen as a logical progression from the 'not-as-yet-scientific' pragmatic and territorial approaches of Odum and Vance.

By the late 1950s, however, this vision was being attacked in the United States by sociologists such as C. Wright Mills. Using epistemological arguments supplied by Max Weber and others, and using the political arguments of American philosophical pragmatism, Mills "took apart Parson's 'grand theory' and Lazarfield's 'abstracted empiricism' and in so doing went to the heart of the professional codes." (Hawthorn 1976: 216).

From the late 1950s therefore, two epistemological extremes developed. One extreme "continued to pursue a programme aimed at constructing a natural science of society centring on causal laws derived from or tested by observational data with the aid of statistical techniques". Within this group "doubts about positivist presuppositions in social analysis are assumed to be resolvable by greater attention to the details of data collection and statistical techniques" (Halfpenny 1982: 120). The other extreme rejected the positivist paradigm altogether and turned instead to "anti-positivist programmes for sociological analysis and research".

According to sociologists such as Anthony Giddens, this latter extreme has become the dominant paradigm for sociology. Under this paradigm, sociology

is a loosely defined social science (emphasis placed on social) with no precisely defined divisions between it and other social sciences. It has, as its main focus, "the study of social institutions brought into being by the industrial transformations of the past two or three centuries" (Giddens 1987: 9). Its main distinguishing feature is a 'sociological imagination' involving "an historical, an anthropological, and a critical sensitivity".

Regional Science and Sociology in Canada

With these seemingly similar trends in both regional science and sociology are we seeing a 're-convergence' of the two disciplines? Although the influence of the 'reformers' within certain regional science organizations is questionable, one can hypothesize that their influence in Canada would be relatively stronger than elsewhere because of their presence here.

A more evident reason for presuming that relations between regional science and sociology would be closer in Canada is because of the traditional importance of regional issues in Canadian academic scholarship. The Canadian school of political economy, in particular, has long promoted an interdisciplinary attempt to understand regional development in Canada. This school included academics from disciplines such as economics, history, political science, sociology, and geography. Writers such as Harold Innis, Vernon Fowke, Donald Creighton, S.D. Clark, and Mel Watkins, to name just a few, all discussed regional issues using similar discourses.⁴ This school has had a very important influence on Canadian sociology.

Despite conditions which would seem to be conducive to close relations between sociology and regional science in Canada this appears not to be the case. By and large the two disciplines seem ignorant of each other. Of the many sociologists working on regional issues most seem unaware of the existence of regional science. Regional science is rarely, if ever, mentioned in publications by sociologists.

This apparent lack of interest by sociologists in regional science is also apparent in contributions to the *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*. From 1981 (vol.4, no.1), the first year that the journal started to list the academic departments of contributors, to 1990 (vol. 13, no. 2/3), the journal published 197 articles.⁵ Of these articles, none of the authors were identified as being sociologists or members of sociology departments. Given that some sociol-

4. For an excellent summary of Canadian political economy and regional issues see Marchak (1985). Another good summary is contained in Brodie (1990).

5. The category 'article' used here includes not only those publications listed as articles in the journal but also research notes, comments, and review essays. It does not include book reviews.

ogists are located in interdisciplinary institutions, further analysis identified 6 of the articles as being written by sociologists. This compares to 76.5 articles written by economists, 49 articles written by authors of non-identified disciplines,⁶ 36.5 articles written by geographers, and 25.5 articles written by regional and urban planners. Sociologists contributed, therefore, slightly more than 3% of the articles published in the *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*. It is interesting to note that this percentage is even less than the 3.8% found by Rodwin in his 1959 study of *Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association* (Rodwin 1959).

Most noteworthy about these articles is that 5 of the 6 articles written by sociologists were in a special theme edition related to regional studies in Quebec (vol.12, no.1 1989).⁷ All six of the articles were written by franco-Quebecois sociologists. Until 1993 there had never been an article published in the journal written by a readily identifiable anglo-Canadian sociologist.⁸ The difference in involvement between anglo-Canadian sociologists and franco-Quebecois sociologists is further evidenced by the fact that three of the latter have even served in editorial positions with the journal.⁹

Why have franco-Quebecois sociologists dealing with regional issues been more interested in regional science than anglo-Canadian sociologists? What are the differences between the two sociologies that may cause one to ignore regional science? To answer these questions we must turn to the differences between the two sociologies already noted by observers. Jackson (1985) was one of the first to refer to these differences. He stated that they related to different emphases being placed on the notions of agency and structure. Sociologists in Quebec "have responded to quite a different socio-cultural milieu and, accordingly, have developed variations on the classical heritage distinctly different from those common to English Canada" (Jackson 1985: 616). These differences stem from the interest of franco-Quebecois sociologists in being involved in changing their society. "It can be said that sociology in Quebec has tended to be much more engaged with Quebec society as an object of enquiry than has the discipline in English Canada".

In his introductory description to English Canadian theoretical perspec-

-
6. It should be noted that some other 'sociologists' might be found in this category through further analysis; just as some of those belonging to urban and regional planning departments might consider themselves sociologists. An analysis of the references used by these authors does little to indicate that many of the authors in these categories are 'sociologists'.
 7. The sociologists were Bruno Jean, Hugues Dionne, Serge Côté, and Danielle Lafontaine, all members of GRIDEQ, as well as Béatrice Sokoloff of INRS-Urbanisation, Montréal. Jean was the guest editor of the edition.
 8. The summer 1993 edition of the *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, based on the special theme "Women in Regional Development" does include an article from the well known anglo-Canadian sociologist Barbara Neis and a sociological article by Joy Mannette and Marie Meagher.
 9. These are Bruno Jean, Béatrice Sokoloff, and Danielle Lafontaine.

tives, Jackson points to a wide array of stances. Yet, he also highlights the dominance of political economy and structural theories. In his conclusion, he goes further and states that despite the variety of theories used by anglo-Canadian sociologists "the weight of anglophone Canadian sociology appears to be on the side of determinism, structure, and lament" (Jackson 1985: 618).

Franco-Quebecois sociologists have noted that their sociology is less fatalistic than that of anglo-Canadian sociologists because of the continuing importance that the former places on bringing about social change in Quebec. In their introduction to the special issue of the *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* on the 'state of the art' of francophone Quebecois sociology, Juteau and Maheu quote a statement written by Guy Rocher in 1974,

"...francophone sociologists, especially those from Quebec, have a strong sense of belonging to a society that seeks its identity and that makes a great effort to take its destiny into its own hands and plan its collective future itself. It is therefore not unusual that francophone Quebecois sociologists are especially interested in theories and models that place the emphasis on what I call the collective voluntarism of society in its destiny and historical action." (Rocher in Juteau and Maheu 1989: 377)

Juteau and Maheu contest that, while English Canadian sociologists were concerned with similar questions as that of their Quebecois counterparts, with the cultural and material constraints imposed on them by the 'power of the American empire', they "did not propose as clear a method for a means of collective action" (Juteau and Maheu 1989: 377). Franco-Quebecois sociology seemed more concerned with the questions of praxis, with "collective social action and of recomposition of subjective totality". They had a tendency to be more "constructionist" than their English counterparts.

Has this been the case so far as sociologists dealing with regional issues are concerned? Have anglo-Canadian sociologists emphasized the development of deterministic and fatalistic theories about regional development while franco-Quebecois sociologist worked on actual 'projects' to change regional situations? A brief description and analysis of work of both sociologies on regional issues should help us answer these questions.

Anglo-Canadian sociology and Regional Development

Regional development has been an important area of study for anglo-Canadian sociology. Brym, in his writings on English Canadian sociology, points to regional economic development and underdevelopment as one of the four main subjects examined by English Canadian sociologists (Brym and Fox 1989). It is interesting to note that much of the attention given to regional development

is linked first and foremost to an attempt to explain Canada's development in relation to the United States. The concern for inequalities existing between regions within Canada seemed, until the late 1970s, to be of secondary importance to the inequalities that existed between Canada and the United States. Many of the theories used to explain differences between regions within Canada were developed initially as a means of explaining the relationship between Canada and its omnipresent neighbour to the south.

This work on regional inequality can be seen as having two main historical phases; the first characterized by cultural explanations, the second by political economy (Brym and Fox 1989; Marchak 1985). The first phase, influenced by 'the modernization paradigm' popular in the 1950s and 1960s, and expounded by such writers as Clark, Lipset, and Porter, tended to identify internal regional cultural 'defects' such as the lack of entrepreneurship as the reasons for inequalities between Canada and the United States and between regions within Canada. The solution to the problems do not require major structural changes but only cultural changes such as the promotion of more desirable norms, values, and attitudes among the population in that region. Sociologists can help solve the regional problem by teaching the local people to act more like Americans, or at least more like Ontarians; arguably the closest thing to America in Canada.

In the late 1960s, these ideas became intolerable for an increasingly nationalistic/anti-American academic audience. Throughout English Canada, the notion that the solution to Canada's problems was to become more like the Americans was denounced as a myth propagated by American sociology in the service of American imperialism (Matthews 1983: 6). In some of the more disadvantaged regions of Canada, it was seen as a myth propagated by Toronto-based academics in the interests of Ontario imperialism.

As a result, new theories were sought which could counter these 'voluntarist' theories and show that the blame for regional inequality did not lay with the underdeveloped region, but with 'outside' forces beyond the control of these regions. Thus anglo-Canadian sociologists turned to three main theoretical sources for inspiration: dependency theory, newly emerged from Latin America and the initial work of Frank; staples theory, English Canada's own historical contributions to political economy; and Marxism.

When dependency theory first appeared in Canada in the late 1960s, it engendered a substantial amount of enthusiasm because it criticized the underlying paradigm of modernization upon which the 'entrepreneurial thesis' was based. It was also seen as having "unique indigenous roots" in that it was perceived as complementary to Canadian staples theory and the "hinterlander" school of historical development.¹⁰ Davis (1971: 12) popularized it as an alter-

10. For an indication of the importance of Canadian staples theory, see Drache (1977). For a description of the "hinterland school", see Brodie (1990).

native to "static, abstract, ideal-typical (and) ahistorical" conceptualizations of Canada coming from the United States. Archibald (1971: 117) wrote that dependency theory could be used to explain how the Maritimes suffered from its resource-based status as a satellite of Central Canada and the United States. For Archibald dependency theory also showed that the solution to the situation could only come through "socialist planning and judicious use of public ownership...".

While many saw value in dependency theory's criticism of modernization theories, there were concerns about the theoretical weaknesses of Frank's version of the theory. They saw this type of theory as being vague and conceptually inadequate. Friedmann and Wayne (1977: 408), writing about Frank's theories, stated that "the basis of this confusion is the primacy given to relations of exchange rather than relations of production". They believed that the theory could have some value if it was joined with more logically coherent Marxist theory.

This set the stage for the next phase of work on regional inequalities: the theoretical elaboration of a critical approach through the application of Marxist theories with strong structuralist tendencies. The term structuralist is used here not in a purely Althusserian sense but to note that in these theories the emphasis is placed on external structures rather than regional agency. These tendencies appeared in the work of Clement, Veltmeyer, and Cuneo.

Clement (1978: 93) was critical of the fact that "very little in the way of theory, model building, or empirical research" has developed from dependency theory. In part this was because some variations of dependency theory emphasize "geographical distinctions rather than class distinctions". He attempted to show that regional exploitation occurs when centrally located capitalist elites use contemporary structures and institutions to favour one region over another. In so doing, he hoped to show that it was not regions that caused the problem but "decisions of men". Answers to the problem are to be found in the reshaping of "the institutions in which these inequalities are rooted".

Veltmeyer's criticism of dependency theory took a different tack from that of Clement in that, rather than emphasizing the source of the problem in the 'decisions of men', he attempted to create a theoretical framework which highlighted the source of the problem in the logic of capitalism. He postulates that "underdevelopment in Atlantic Canada can best be understood in terms of Marx's concept of an industrial reserve army" (Veltmeyer 1979: 19). In other words, the logical and structural requirements of capitalism require that some regions be used to provide unemployed workers to counteract the system's tendency towards a declining rate of profit. This is what has produced uneven regional development.

Cuneo's analysis of regionalism in Canada is somewhat different from Clement and Veltmeyer in that his theory has little if any connections to dependency theory. His arguments have been categorized as a "more formal Marxist position" (Matthews 1983: 52). The structural requirements of contemporary

finance capitalism creates a concentration of capital, and hence of the capitalist class, in a central region. This produces variations in regional class structures. Those with a higher percentage of workers, peripheral regions, "grow slowly economically because of their lower rates of capital investments" (Cuneo 1978: 153).

While these writers did have their critics in the 1970s and early 1980s,¹¹ and while criticism of their notions increased in the late 1980s,¹² these authors represented the dominant discourse on regional issues in anglo-Canadian sociology in the 1970s and 1980s; a discourse which viewed regional inequality as a "normal structural process" of capitalism rather than the result of "an institutional malfunction" (Barrett 1980: 282). There were others that took a somewhat different perspective from Clement, Veltmeyer, and Cuneo, in particular Brym and Sacouman (1979) who tended to stress the interaction of different capitalist 'modes of production', but they shared a common thread. This thread was that regional inequality was the result of larger structural components of capitalism over which local actors had little or no control. It was not that authors did not feel change was possible but that any realistic changes had to occur on a much larger scale than the local region. Hence, whether these authors intended this or not, one is left with the impression that the local actors can do little on their own to change their situation.

Franco-Quebecois Sociology and Regional Development

The difficulty of 'classifying' regional studies done in Quebec has already been noted by at least one sociologist (Lafontaine 1989). It becomes even more difficult if one is trying to isolate the sociological discourse. Perhaps to an even greater extent than in English-Canada, much of this work is interdisciplinary. As such it is difficult, and to certain extent counter-productive, to isolate sociologists from the historians, geographers, and economists who use similar concepts and similar theoretical perspectives.

The comparison of the two sociologies on the question of regional inequality is also complicated by nationalism. Whereas anglo-Canadian sociologists discuss the place of provincial societies in the larger national, continental, and international contexts as questions of 'regional disparities' or 'regional inequalities', franco-Quebecois sociology of the 1960s and 1970s tended to see this as a question of 'national inequalities'. It was not so much that a particular geographic region was suffering from uneven development, it was that a nation was.

11. See, Richards and Pratt (1979), Barrett (1980) and Clow (1984) as examples of sociologists taking a less structuralist approach to regional inequality.

12. See, Mathews (1983), House (1986), Laxer (1989) and Carroll (1990).

This importance placed on the national question led to some important differences of approach to the regional question when compared to English-Canada. One of these differences was in regard to the 'unit of analysis'. Whereas anglo-Canadian sociologists studying regional inequality tended to perceive their unit of analysis as being provinces or groups of provinces, franco-Quebecois sociologists studying regional disparities tended to perceive their unit of analysis as intra-provincial territories. Since Quebec was seen as a nation, and since regions and nations were often seen as different concepts, regions were best categorized as territories within Quebec (Desrosiers et al. 1988: 34). As a result, anglo-Canadian sociology tends to study inter-provincial inequalities while franco-Quebecois sociology tends to study intra-provincial (or intra-national) inequalities.

These differences understood, we see similarities between franco-Quebecois sociology and anglo-Canadian sociology on regional issues in the 1960s. Both drew their inspiration from modernization theories popular at the time which highlighted the importance of culture and which utilized a structural analysis emphasizing the functions of different structural levels. This is seen in the works of "Laval" sociologists such as Dumont and Martin in the early 1960s (Lafontaine 1989: 123).

These similarities mask several important differences however. The first was that, unlike the primarily theoretical work of English Canada, sociologists studying regional issues in Quebec were closely linked to the state planners who were attempting to 'mold' Quebec society (Harvey 1980: 75). While anglo-Canadian sociologists were trying to create theories which would account for regional differences, franco-Quebecois sociologists, caught up in the energy of the Quiet Revolution, were involved in projects which tried to use science and technology to correct regional inequalities. In one of the more notable projects, the Bureau d'aménagement de l'Est du Québec (BAEQ), the "influence of sociology was central" (Dionne cf. Lafontaine 1989: 121). It is interesting to note that at this time in Quebec the role of sociology in regional development was very close to that envisioned by Isard in that it sought to assure regional "equilibrium" through the "rationalization of spacial resources" (Lafontaine 1989: 119).

Another important difference between the modernization theories used by the anglo-Canadian theorists of the 1960s and the work being done in Quebec was that one of the main objectives of sociologists involved in regional development issues in that province was the empowerment of the local populations through "l'animation sociale" (Gagnon 1978: 117). These sociologists had a deep belief that Quebec society should be 'modernized' through the development of greater participation of local regional populations in the 'modern' social institutions of the day.

This desire for increased local empowerment, and the realization that this was not happening under the planners running programs such as the BAEQs led to the next phase of work by sociologist on regional issues; a phase domi-

nated by criticisms of those structures inhibiting regional participation. Unlike anglo-Canadian sociology however, the main enemy was not the constraints of class or capitalism per se, but rather the constraints of "technocracy". According to Gabriel Gagnon the experience of programs such as BAEQ led to two opposing axes in franco-Quebecois sociology (Gagnon 1978: 117). One continued to cling to functionalist ideas and continued to work closely with state planners. Another came to realize that their efforts at social animation were not increasing local participation, but were more an attempt to sell the planners' ideas to the population. This experience created a tendency to see technocracy as the principal hindrance to a participatory society.

Relying heavily on the theoretical work of Touraine and other "post-industrial" French sociologists, much of the attention devoted to regions in the 1970s and early 1980s was related to "la résistance à la technocratie" (Gagnon 1970: 215). As early as 1970, Gagnon started to develop theories of regional development which would increase local participation and overcome the constraints placed on social groups by the technocratic ideals of state planners. Simard (1977) published an important work in the mid-1970s which analyzed how programs such as BAEQ served to promote the interests of the "technobureaucracy" over the interests of the local communities. Godbout (1983) uses the experience of the BAEQ to show how experts provoke participation and then use it against democratically elected representatives.

All of these criticisms of technocracy are accompanied by the exhortation of an alternative project described alternately as the "la société participatoire", "la société autogestionnaire", or "la communauté auto-déterministe". While some sociologists concentrated on describing the technocratic constraints to the achievement of this type of society, others were more interested in describing the possible vehicles by which these constraints could be challenged. While some analyzed the new regional political and administrative mechanisms put in place in Quebec (Sokoloff 1984), others took up the Tourainian challenge to examine the potential of regional-based social movements to challenge the existing order (Gagnon 1981; Dionne 1984).

This interest in social movements, which had started in the early 1970s and which tended to emphasize the ability of local actors to play a major role in the construction of their regional societies, did not mean that the structural marxism so evident in anglo-Canadian sociology was absent from the franco-Quebecois sociological discourse. It was quite popular in the early to mid-1970s and still remains in evidence. As far as regional development is concerned the most referred to example of this theoretical tradition is the early work of Séquin, a historian who used "sociological concepts" to describe the early development of some of Quebec's 'peripheral' regions (Bouchard 1978: 8). In *La conquête du sol au 19e siècle*, his most cited work, Séquin (1977) attacks the notion that the colonization of the region was a result of religious and nationalistic impulses. Instead, using the dependency theories of Amin and Frank, he attempts to show how the colonization, and subsequent "under-devel-

opment" of the region, was the result of the logic of capitalist development. The colonization movement, based on subsistence agriculture, supplied a reserve of cheap and flexible workers for the newly emerging forest industry and, as such, created a relationship of dependency between the peripheral regions and the larger urban centres.

Séguin's work, which constituted a criticism of one of the traditional tenants of French-Canadian nationalist mythology, immediately came under criticism. Most of the critiques centred on how, under Séguin's thesis, the social actor is perceived as the slave of structural constraints. Bouchard (1976: 371) questions those theories of social class that don't include some notion of "volonté collective", and that don't include both "the object and subject of change". Dussault (1978: 28) criticizes the notion that the cultural manifestations of the colonization movement can be seen as the "dominant ideology of a dominant class". Both he and Morissoneau (1978) believe that this movement can be better seen as a nationalist social movement which was attempting to counter the capitalist tendencies of the period.

While Séguin (1985: 175) himself later wrote that his analysis might have been weak when it came to "cultural manifestations", the structuralist tendencies continued to exercise a certain influence (see, Savaria 1975; Jalbert 1980; Boismenu et al. 1983). What appears to happen, however, is that while the emphasis on social movements grows continuously starting in 1970, Marxist sociology starts to decrease around 1978 (Descent et al. 1987).

The regional studies of the 1980s often used structuralist analysis in their research but, following the Tourainian model, these analyses remain subservient to the notion of the autonomous social actor. Franco-Quebecois sociologists studying regional inequalities do not seem to have given up the belief that local actors are able to resist structural constraints to the extent that anglo-Canadian sociologists have given up this belief. This is especially notable in the regional interdisciplinary research groups set up in different regional universities in Quebec and in particular the Groupe de recherche interdisciplinaire en développement de l'Est du Québec (GRIDEQ) based in Rimouski, and the Groupe de recherche et d'intervention régionale (GRIR) based in Chicoutimi.

Thus at GRIDEQ, Jean (1989: 6) writes about the possibilities of local endogenous development brought about by ideological changes which has allowed "the return of the actor". Dionne (1984), at GRIDEQ, has written on locally-based social movements and the possibility for change which could come from these movements. At GRIR the same emphasis is given to the possibilities of regional empowerment. While not sociologists, writers such as Klein and Gagnon use sociological theories in their analyses of potential for change coming from "associative movements" (Klein and Gagnon 1989) and local partnerships (Gagnon and Klein 1992).

It should be noted that the sociologists working at these regional research centres, along with some at urbanisation research centres at the Université de Montréal and the Université de Québec, are those most involved with regional

science in Canada. It is these sociologists who contribute articles to the *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, serve on its editorial board, and attend the annual meetings of the Canadian Regional Science Association.

Conclusions

We have seen that, although sociology was originally intended to be a vital part of the development of a regional science in the 1950s, it was seen by founders of the discipline, such as Walter Isard, to be at too primitive a stage of development to be of use to the new discipline. Sociology, along with other disciplines dealing with culture, was put to one side until it was able to develop more rigorous empirical techniques. Regional science, in the meantime, was to carry on its development using the tools provided by more 'advanced' disciplines, such as economics.

In the 1960s, many sociologists started to question the possibilities and usefulness of the type of discipline envisioned by those earlier sociologists who might have shared Isard's notions of sociology. The epistemological attack on positivism placed a barrier between sociology and the founding vision of regional science. Sociologists turned more and more to a non-positivistic, critical analysis of social institutions. The dream of an instrumentalist 'science of society' became an object of attack.

In English Canada, this translated into a sociology intent on explaining the structural constraints of Canadian society. Regional research concentrated on explaining the external forces which created regional underdevelopment and which hinder endogenous regional development in peripheral areas. This type of analysis can be termed fatalistic in that it portrayed regional actors as having little power to change the situation of the region without massive structural changes occurring in the regions of the 'centre'. English Canadian sociology would have little use for a discipline such as regional science which could be perceived as lacking a critical analysis, being engaged in 'naive instrumentalism', and still clinging to an outdated positivism.

Franco-Quebecois sociologists, on the other hand, heavily influenced by the beliefs accompanying the Quiet Revolution and nationalist movement of the 1960s, were much more optimistic about the possibilities of shaping their societies. While being critically aware of the structural barriers to social action, they seem not to have given up hope that it was possible for local actors to improve their situations. In regional analysis this meant a search for ways that regions could empower themselves. Regional science represents an area of study that could provide tools to enhance the possibilities of regional empowerment.

This perspective enables one to understand the attraction of regional science for franco-Quebecois sociologists as well as the relative lack of appeal of regional science for anglo-Canadian sociologists. There are undoubtedly

other factors involved as well but this explanation will hopefully contribute to a better understanding of what might lead to a greater involvement of disciplines such as sociology in regional science. This could happen if regional science were perceived to be less concerned with the development of abstract theoretical and empirical concepts and more concerned with the more practical concerns of local actors. To use the terms of Gore, regional science needs to be less concerned with "space" and more concerned with "regions". Such an emphasis would also need to allow a critical analysis of the external and internal constraints placed on regional actors.

For this to happen, sociology would also have to shift its emphasis away from fatalistic critical analysis of structures towards a more constructionist critical analysis of regional actors. Sociologists would have to believe that a rigorous study of regional societies could lead to viable answers to regional problems. It is this requirement on the part of sociology which probably poses the biggest problem to a 'rapprochement' of the disciplines. While regional science, and Canadian regional science in particular, has shown a shift towards a greater concern with regional actors since the late 1970s, anglo-Canadian sociology has been slow to show a similar shift. There are signs, however, that this may be changing. The continued criticisms of the fatalism of structural analysis and the interest being shown in social movements and the conditions of regional actors, such as women, suggests that anglo-Canadian sociologists dealing with regional issues may, in the future, show a greater interest in regional science.

References

- Archibald, B. 1971. "Atlantic Regional Underdevelopment and Socialism", in L. LaPierre and others (eds.), *Essays on the Left: Essays in Honour of T.C. Douglas*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Barrett, L.G. 1980. "Perspectives on Dependency and Underdevelopment in the Atlantic Region", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 17: 273-286.
- Benko, G.B. 1984. "Regional Science: Evolution Over Thirty Years", *International Social Science Journal*, 36: 699-712.
- Boismenu, G. 1983. *Espace régional et nation. Pour un nouveau débat sur le Québec*. Montréal: Boréal Express.
- Bouchard, G. 1976. "L'histoire de la population et l'étude de la mobilité sociale au Saguenay, XIXe - XXe siècles", *Recherches sociographiques*, XVII: 353-372.
- _____. 1978. "Démographie et société rurale au Saguenay, 1851-1935", *Recherches sociographiques*, XIX: 7-31.
- Brodie, J. 1990. *The Political Economy of Canadian Regionalism*, Toronto:

- Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Brym, R., and B. Fox. 1989. *From Culture to Power: The Sociology of English Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Brym, R., and R.J. Sacouman (eds.). 1979. *Underdevelopment and Social Movements in Atlantic Canada*. Toronto: New Hogtown Press.
- Carroll, W. 1990. "Restructuring Capital, Reorganizing Consent: Gramsci, Political Economy, and Canada", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 27: 390-416.
- Clement, W. 1978. "A Political Economy of Regionalism in Canada", in D. Glenday, H. Guindon and A. Turowetz (eds.), *Modernization and the Canadian State*. Toronto: MacMillan.
- Clow, M. 1984. "Politics and Uneven Capitalist Development: The Maritime Challenge to the Study of Canadian Political Economy", *Studies in Political Economy*, 13: 117-140.
- Cuneo, C. 1978. "A Class Perspective on Regionalism", in D. Glenday, H. Guindon and A. Turowetz (eds.), *Modernization and the Canadian State*. Toronto: MacMillan.
- Czamanski, S. 1976. "The Evolving Epistemology of Regional Science", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 37: 7-17.
- Davis, A.K. 1971. "Canadian Society and History as Hinterland Versus Metropolis", in R.J. Osenberg (ed.), *Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change and Conflict*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.
- Descent, D., G. Simard, et M. Trépanier. "Le conflit social et la société québécoise: de l'analyse marxiste à la sociologie des mouvements sociaux", *Sociologie et société*, XIX: 125-143.
- Desrosiers, L., J.-P. Montesinos, R. St-Louis, and R. Robert. 1988. "Un aperçu général sur le développement régional au Québec", in B. Higgins and D. Savoie (eds.), *Canadians and Regional Development at Home and in the Third World*. Moncton: Canadian Institute for Research on Regional Development.
- Dionne, H. 1984. "Le mouvement populaire en milieu rural, un certain parcours", in B. Jean and D. Lafontaine (eds.), *Région, régionalisme et développement régional: Le cas de l'Est du Québec*. Rimouski: GRIDEQ.
- Drache, D. 1977. "Staple-ization: A Theory of Canadian Capitalist Development", in C. Heron (ed.), *Imperialism, Nationalism, and Canada*. Toronto: New Hogtown Press.
- Dumont, F., et Y. Martin. 1963. *L'Analyse des structures sociales régionales. Etude sociologique de la région de Saint-Jérôme*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Dussault, G. 1978. "L'Utopie colonisatrice contre l'ordre économique", *Recherches sociographiques*, XIX: 57-78.
- Friedmann, H., and J. Wayne. 1977. "Dependency Theory: A Critique", *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 2: 399-416.

- Friedmann, J., and Weaver, C. 1979. *Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Funck, R. 1975. "Regional Science: Frontiers or Boundaries?", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 34: 179-181.
- Gagnon, A. 1981. *Les Opérations Dignité: Naissance d'un mouvement social dans l'Est du Québec*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Gagnon, C., et J.L. Klein (eds.). 1992. *Les partenaires du développement face au défi local*. Chicoutimi: GRIR.
- Gagnon, G. 1970. "Les Iles de la Madeleine: Eléments pour une anthropologie de la participation", *Recherches sociographiques*, II: 215-254.
- _____. 1978. "Sociologie, mouvements sociaux, conduites de rupture: le cas québécois", *Sociologie et société*, X: 103-121.
- Giddens, A. 1987. *Sociology: A Brief but Critical Introduction*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Godbout, J. 1983. *La participation contre la démocratie*. Montréal: Saint-Martin.
- Gore, C. 1984. *Regions in Question*. London: Methuen.
- Halfpenny, P. 1982. *Positivism and Sociology: Explaining Social Life*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Harvey, F. 1980. "La question régionale au Québec", *Revue d'études canadiennes*, 15: 74-87.
- Hawthorn, G. 1976. *Enlightenment and Despair: A History of Sociology*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- House, J.D. 1986. "The Mouse That Roars: New Directions in Canadian Political Economy - The Case of Newfoundland", in R. Brym (ed.), *Regionalism in Canada*. Richmond Hill: Irwin.
- Isard, W. 1960a. "The Scope and Nature of Regional Science", *Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association*, 6: 9-33.
- _____. 1960b. *Methods of Regional Analysis: An Introduction To Regional Science*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Isard, W., and T. Reiner. 1965. "Regional Science: Retrospect and Prospect", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 16: 1-16.
- _____. 1979. "Notes on the Origins, Development, and Future of Regional Science", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 43: 9-22.
- Jackson, J.D. 1985. "Introduction: The State of the Art and New Directions", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 22: 615-618.
- Jalbert, L. 1980. "Régionalisme et crise de l'Etat", *Sociologie et société*, XII: 65-73.
- Jean, B. 1989. "Development in Its Place: Issues in Local Development", *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, XII: 5-8.
- Juteau, D., and L. Maheu. 1989. "Introduction: Sociology and Sociologists in Francophone Quebec: Science and Politics", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 26: 363-393.

- Klein, J.L., et C. Gagnon. 1989. *Le social apprivoisé: le mouvement associatif, l'état, et le développement local*. Hull: Asticou.
- Lafontaine, D. 1989. "Les études régionales québécoises", *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, XII: 111-139.
- Laxer, G. 1989. "The Schizophrenic Character of Canadian Political Economy", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 26: 178-192.
- Maass, A. 1956. "The Nature and Scope of Regional Science", *Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association*, 2: 40-43.
- Marchak, P. 1985. "Canadian Political Economy", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 22: 673-709.
- Morissonneau, C. 1978. *La terre promise: le mythe du Nord québécois*. Montréal: Hurtubise.
- Matthews R. 1983. *The Creation of Regional Dependency*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Nijkamp, P. 1975. "Regional Science: Paradise Lost or Paradigm Lost?", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 34: 189-193.
- Richards, J., and L. Pratt. 1979. *Prairie Capitalism*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Rodwin, L. 1959. "Regional Science: Quo Vadis?", *Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association*, 5: 3-20.
- Savaria, J. 1975. "Le Québec: est-il une société périphérique?", *Sociologie et société*, VII: 115-127.
- Séguin, N. 1977. *La conquête du sol au 19e siècle*. Montréal: Boréal.
- _____. 1985. "Commentaires", *Recherches sociographiques*, XXVI: 175-178.
- Simard, J.-J. 1979. *La Longue Marche des technocrates*, Montréal: Saint Martin.
- Sokoloff, B. 1984. "Le Choix des régions: un nouvel enjeu pour le pouvoir local au Québec", *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, VII: 251-264.
- Stöhr, W. 1981. "Development from Below: The Bottom-up and Periphery-Inward Development Paradigm", in W. Stöhr and D.R. Taylor (eds.), *Development from Above or Below?*. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.
- Veltmeyer, H. 1979. "The Capitalist Underdevelopment of Atlantic Canada", in R.J. Brym and R.J. Sacouman (eds.), *Underdevelopment and Social Movements in Atlantic Canada*. Toronto: New Hogtown Press.
- Webber, M.M. 1964. "Culture, Territoriality, and the Elastic Mile", *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 13: 59-69.
- Western Regional Science Association. 1991. *Newsletter*, Fall.