



Contributions to Political Science

Ferenc Gyuris

# The Political Discourse of Spatial Disparities

Geographical Inequalities Between  
Science and Propaganda

 Springer

Contributions to Political Science

Ferenc Gyuris

# The Political Discourse of Spatial Disparities

Geographical Inequalities Between  
Science and Propaganda

 Springer

# Contributions to Political Science

For further volumes:  
<http://www.springer.com/series/11829>



Ferenc Gyuris

# The Political Discourse of Spatial Disparities

Geographical Inequalities Between  
Science and Propaganda



Springer

Ferenc Gyuris  
Eötvös Loránd University  
Department of Regional Science  
Budapest  
Hungary

The present work is based on the author's PhD thesis, accepted at the University of Heidelberg under the title "The political discourse of spatial disparities. Propagandistic problematization and scientific legitimization in producing knowledge about geographical inequalities."

ISBN 978-3-319-01507-1                      ISBN 978-3-319-01508-8 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-01508-8  
Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013949685

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media ([www.springer.com](http://www.springer.com))

# Preface

This volume is the result of a two-and-a-half year Ph.D. program in the Institute of Geography at Heidelberg University. My aim with this work is to throw new light on some fundamental aspects of spatial disparity research, which had already become a major field of interest of mine during my bachelor and master studies in geography at the Department of Regional Science at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, Hungary. After several years of intensively studying here the methodology and empirical considerations of spatial inequality analysis, my attention gradually turned towards the underlying conceptual issues. I became especially interested in the motivations and goals of the researchers who had provided valuable contributions to the field of study, and whose works I had regarded for a long time basically as neutral and apolitical, a presumption that became apparently unsustainable as my knowledge of the corresponding literature expanded. I soon realized that a deeper understanding of these aspects was impossible without a comprehensive overview of related concepts originating from different disciplines, which to my best knowledge was missing before the present work. Furthermore, I found it necessary to undertake a reflexive evaluation of these theoretical contributions in order to reveal the complex motivations shaping the research of spatial disparities.

Of course, no scientific work can have the claim of being independent from the context in which it emerged. This book is also a situated product. It certainly mirrors its author's attitude, which has been shaped to a large extent by the personal experience of everyday life during the postcommunist transition in East Central Europe, and by the manifold influence I have gained while staying and travelling abroad, that enabled me to take a look at my "context of origin" from outside (or, better to say, from various "outsides") as well. The main outcome has been a firm personal belief in the desirability of open debates, the competition of ideas, the freedom of thought, and the eclecticism of concepts. Without a doubt, this way of seeing is reflected by my thoughts on tendentiously one-sided interpretations of the world even if these may also contain certain ideas I can share with regard to specific issues. In the meantime, however, an important experience of mine has been the remarkable diversity of views various people can have about the same subject.

This experience is largely incompatible with mechanistic interpretations, which (at least implicitly) can be found in many concepts on spatial inequalities, and which present a world where individuals act purely according to higher interests or faceless regularities, without having their own feelings, passions, and personal (even if not always attractive) views about what is desirable. Such considerations of mine certainly have their imprint on the current volume.

Writing a reflexive essay on a research tradition is never an easy task, but one with many challenges, where the support of those standing close to us is even more important than the material or institutional circumstances in which we are working. For this reason I am extremely grateful to my supervisor, Peter Meusbürger, for his valuable suggestions and careful commentaries on earlier versions of the manuscript as well as for the many inspiring and open-minded discussions we have had during my stay in Heidelberg. I also appreciate the patience and support I have received from him all during my graduate program, even in organizational issues, without which I could not have devoted so much time and energy to research. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the help of Johannes Glückler, whose well-grounded and constructive questions as well as pieces of advice concerning the organization of the research process eased my task to conceptualize research interests and find a feasible structure to my work. I have also benefited much from the kind remarks of Ulrike Gerhard and Marcus Nüsser on an earlier version, which have enabled me to make some findings of the essay more explicit.

I would also like to thank my Hungarian professors in the undergraduate programs without whose support I might have never arrived to the issues along which my thesis emerged. I am especially grateful to József Nemes Nagy, who first introduced me to the analysis of spatial disparities and from whom I have learned a lot with regard to the theory, methodology, and empirical aspects of this topic as well as about the functioning of its research practice. I owe a lot to Ferenc Probáld, with whom I have had many fruitful conversations on questions emerging during my research in the last two and a half years. I also appreciate the inspiration I got from Róbert Győri, who was the first to turn my attention to issues of discourse analysis and the political motivations of science.

For the chapters concerning spatial inequalities in “real existing socialist” systems, I am glad for Mária Csanádi and all that I have learned from her during common research projects and academic events in China about the analysis of party states, their functioning, and the structural changes through which they tried to adapt to changing circumstances. I am grateful to those friends and colleagues in China and Russia who have broadened my view of spatial disparities in communist and postcommunist contexts, especially to Qing Li (Beijing) and Elena Guseva (Moscow) for their help in finding some less conventional statistics on China and the Soviet Union for my research. I would also like to thank my friends Zoltán Gyimesi and Márton Czirfusz for the many stimulating conversations we have had on the relationship of politics and the production of knowledge, and Gergely Tóth, who turned my attention to some valuable works in political science on the functioning of political discourses. I would like to acknowledge the many talks with the friends in the Geographical Institute in Heidelberg, which provided me



useful feedback on how my research findings could be formulated in a more clear and straightforward way. I am also grateful to Michael Spaventa for proofreading the manuscript, and to the Springer team for its high quality editing job.

I appreciate the generous support I received from the University of Heidelberg Graduate Academy (Landesgraduiertenförderung scholarship) and the Kurt Hiehle Foundation, which enabled me to finance my research and associated travel costs and conference fees.

Finally, I am most grateful to my parents, without whose permanent support this work as well as my previous studies on the issue of spatial disparities would have been an impossibility.

Budapest, Hungary  
April 02, 2013

Ferenc Gyuris



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>2</b>	<b>The Debate Over Social Disparities and the Disparity Discourse</b>	7
2.1	Terminology and Meaning	7
2.2	The First Emergence and Development of Social Disparities	15
2.2.1	The Origin of Social Disparities	16
2.2.2	Intensifying Division of Labor and Its Implications on Social Disparities	19
2.2.3	Social Disparities and Power Asymmetries in Complex Societies	23
2.3	From Social Disparities to Their Analysis: The Tradition of Social Disparity Research	27
2.3.1	Conceptual Questions to an Analysis of the Debate Over Social Disparities	27
2.3.2	The Roots of Social Disparity Analysis in Ancient Greece	29
2.3.3	Additional Concepts to an Understanding of Social Disparities: Ancient Rome	33
2.3.4	Thinking About Social Disparities Under the Aegis of Christianity	35
2.3.5	Concepts About Social Disparities in the Age of Enlightenment: The Case of England	38
2.3.6	Enlightenment in France and the Issue of Social Disparities	40
2.3.7	Increasing Importance of Disparity Issues in Central and Eastern Europe	44
2.3.8	Social Disparities in the Light of (R)Evolutionary Ideas: Darwin and his Reception in the Marxist Approach	45
2.3.9	Social Disparities and “The Struggle for Existence”: Anti-Marxist Interpretations of Darwin	48

2.3.10	Concepts About Social Disparities After World War II: Reevaluation of the Individual Perspective . . . . .	51
2.3.11	Thinking About Social Disparities: Summary of an Historical Overview . . . . .	53
2.4	Which Equality? On the Legitimacy of Two Approaches . . . . .	53
2.5	Political Importance of the Debate Over Social Disparities . . . . .	57
2.5.1	Problematization of Social Disparities for Political Identity-Making . . . . .	57
2.5.2	Social Disparity Analysis as Political Discourse . . . . .	61
2.6	Science as Means of Legitimization in the Disparity Discourse . . . . .	65
2.6.1	Case Study of a Politically Contested Project by Representatives of Sciences: “The Spirit Level” and Its Reception . . . . .	65
2.6.2	Findings of the Case Study: On the Legitimate Authority of Sciences . . . . .	76
2.7	Changing Context and Altering Position of Slogans in the Disparity Discourse . . . . .	80
2.8	Social Disparities and the Disparity Discourse: Sub-Conclusion . . . . .	83
<b>3</b>	<b>Social Disparities Meet Space and Concepts Surrounding It . . . . .</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>A Contextual Analysis of the Emergence of Spatial Disparity Research . . . . .</b>	<b>93</b>
4.1	Spatial Disparities Without Spatial Disparity Research: The Pre-modern Age . . . . .	93
4.2	A Late Beginning for Spatial Inequality Research After the Industrial Revolution . . . . .	95
4.2.1	The Industrial Revolution and the Emergence of Social Physics . . . . .	95
4.2.2	A New Fashion in the Anglophone World: Spatial Disparity Research From “Moral Statistics” to Charles Booth and to American Social Surveys . . . . .	97
4.2.3	A Political Discourse in the Making: Problematization of Spatial Inequalities . . . . .	99
<b>5</b>	<b>Spatial Disparity Analysis and Anti-Capitalism: The “Classical” Marxist Tradition . . . . .</b>	<b>103</b>
5.1	Marx, Engels, and the Spatial Aspect of Disparities . . . . .	103
5.2	Rosa Luxemburg and the Concept of “Uneven Spatial Development” . . . . .	105
5.3	Lenin and the Problematization of “Uneven Spatial Development” . . . . .	108
5.4	Stalin: The “Basic Economic Law of Socialism” and the Claimed Communist Solution to “Uneven Spatial Development” . . . . .	110
5.5	The Marxist Approach to Spatial Disparities: Sub-Summary . . . . .	113

- 5.6 Science as Means of Justification in the Marxist Interpretation of Spatial Disparities . . . . . 114
- 5.7 Spatial Disparities and Marxism: A Brief Summary . . . . . 121
- 6 Non-Marxist Reactions to the Marxist Problematization of Spatial Unevenness . . . . . 123**
  - 6.1 Antecedents in Practical Life . . . . . 123
  - 6.2 Spatial Disparities as the Focus of Scientific Interest: The Cold War Context . . . . . 124
  - 6.3 Geopolitical Struggle and the “Relevant” Forms of Disparity in Space . . . . . 128
  - 6.4 Spatial Disparity Research: Analytical and Propagandistic Objectives . . . . . 131
  - 6.5 The Need for Scientific Substantiation and the Rising Star of Spatial Economics . . . . . 133
  - 6.6 The Stable Equilibrium Model of the Neoclassic: Strengths and Weaknesses . . . . . 135
  - 6.7 The Criticism of Neoclassical Economics and the Concepts of Spatial Polarization . . . . . 139
    - 6.7.1 Gunnar Myrdal, the “Vicious Circle” of Polarization, and a Straight Geopolitical Path into the American Sphere of Influence for the “Underdeveloped” World . . . . 140
    - 6.7.2 Hirschman’s Technocratic Polarization Model with Political Overtones . . . . . 154
    - 6.7.3 Williamson’s Inverted U Model: Empirical Background and Political Implications . . . . . 162
    - 6.7.4 Friedmann’s Concept About Spatial Disparities: A Technocratic Textbook Permeated by American Ideology . . . . . 178
  - 6.8 Neoclassical Reactions to Polarization Theory: Arguing Politically to Sell the Product . . . . . 183
  - 6.9 Spatial Disparity Research in Capitalist Countries During the Cold War: An Epistemological Conclusion . . . . . 188
- 7 Spatial Disparity Research After the Initial Decades of Cold War: End of the “Golden Age” . . . . . 191**
  - 7.1 Reasons for the Decline in the Spatial Disparity Discourse . . . . . 191
    - 7.1.1 Changing Circumstances in Global Geopolitics . . . . . 191
    - 7.1.2 Opening Up in Soviet Sciences: The End of Antagonistic Rivalry in the Scientific Cold War . . . . . 193
    - 7.1.3 Changing Economic and Social Attitudes: Devaluation of Spatial Equality as a Desirable Goal . . . . . 198
    - 7.1.4 Ambiguities Over the Validity of Scientific Concepts About Spatial Disparities . . . . . 202
    - 7.1.5 Reasons for the End of the Cold War “Golden Age” in Spatial Disparity Discourse: A Summary . . . . . 209

7.2 The Spatial Disparity Discourse Re-Evaluated: Neoliberalism,  $\beta$  and  $\sigma$  Convergence, Endogenous Growth Theories, and Krugman’s “New Economic Geography” . . . . . 210

7.3 An Alternative Path in Europe: A Neoclassical Boom in Spatial Disparity Research to the Extent it is Needed by Policy-Making . . . . . 224

**8 And Yet Spatial Disparity Is a Problem of Capitalism: Leftist Approaches in a Post-Fordist World . . . . . 231**

8.1 Global Inequality as a Product of the World Order: The Way to Dependency Theories . . . . . 232

8.1.1 A Lonely but Hard Marxist Opinion from the West: Paul Baran’s View About Global Inequalities . . . . . 232

8.1.2 Leftist Theories to Question the US Dominated World Order by Analyzing Global Disparities: The ECLA Structuralist Approach in Latin America . . . . . 235

8.1.3 Analyzing Global Disparities to Predict or Urge for the End of Capitalism: Neo-Marxist Dependency Theories and the World-System Model of Immanuel Wallerstein . . . . . 240

8.1.4 The Relation of Factual Knowledge to Orientation Knowledge in Leftist Dependency Theories . . . . . 245

8.2 Another Approach to Blame Capitalism for Spatial Disparities: David Harvey, Neil Smith, and the Uneven Development Concept Rediscovered . . . . . 257

8.2.1 The Marxist Interpretation of Uneven Development as “The Hallmark of the Geography of Capitalism” . . . . . 257

8.2.2 Remarks Regarding Blaming Uneven Development on Capitalism: An Empirical Investigation of “Real Existing Socialist” Countries . . . . . 270

8.2.3 Empirical and Theoretical Remarks on the Uneven Development Concept: A Summary . . . . . 327

**9 Political Functioning of the Spatial Disparity Discourse: A Summary . . . . . 331**

**10 Conclusion . . . . . 337**

**11 What to Do with the Discourse on Spatial Disparities? A Normative Outlook . . . . . 341**

**Summary . . . . . 347**

**Zusammenfassung . . . . . 349**

**References . . . . . 351**

# List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	The relationship of different forms of spatial unevenness .....	11
Fig. 2.2	The role of science and scientists in political discourses .....	80
Fig. 3.1	A cascade of hierarchical (geographical) levels .....	90
Fig. 6.1	Williamson’s cross tabulation with 16 countries according to their income class (in descending order from I to VII) and temporal change of regional income disparities ( $V_w$ ) during the postwar period .....	165
Fig. 6.2	A graphical representation of Williamson’s inverted “U” concept .....	167
Fig. 6.3	The connection of per capita GDP and regional disparities in the 16 countries analyzed by Williamson .....	169
Fig. 6.4	The teleological concept of “progress” in the developmentalist approach .....	172
Fig. 6.5	Connection of per capita GDP and regional disparities in seven of the eight countries considered by Williamson as “at least consistent” with his concept .....	174
Fig. 6.6	Connection of per capita GDP and regional disparities in the United States, the eighth country considered by Williamson as “at least consistent” with his concept .....	175
Fig. 6.7	Connection of per capita GDP and regional disparities in the countries analyzed by Williamson but considered as not “at least consistent” with his concept .....	176
Fig. 6.8	Friedmann’s schematized concept about the consecutive “sequence of stages in spatial organization” .....	180
Fig. 6.9	The esthetic of mathematics in neoclassical concepts about spatial inequalities. A section from the proof by Borts and Stein (1964) about the equilibrium growth of economy .....	187
Fig. 7.1	Cumulated number and areal extension of liberated non-self-governing territories and trust territories of the United Nations (1945–1990) .....	192