SURVEY:

REGIONALISM: SOME CURRENT ISSUES

Doreen Massey

SOME DEFINITIONS AND THEMES

The term 'regionalism' is a very inadequate one. Recent discussions in the CSE Working Group, however, failed to come up with anything that was both more accurate and less than a paragraph long. For the purposes of this survey, 'regionalism' is taken to refer to the analysis of intra-national spatial differentiation. Its concern is to study the mechanisms by which the process of accumulation generates uneven spatial development, and the effects of such unevenness on the development of a national social formation and particular areas within it. The scale is intra-national in the sense that it is at this level at which the spatial unevenness which is the focus of attention *occurs*. This does not mean, however, that such differentiation is *produced* solely by mechanisms defined at the national or intra-national level. Spatial unevenness in the process of accumulation, within a social formation, may just as well be dominantly the product of mechanisms operating at an international scale. The object of study, however, is spatial uneven development and its effects within a national economy. Such effects may occur at any spatial level within the social formation, from inequalities between major regions to patterns of growth and decline of particular cities (1).

The process of accumulation within capitalism continually engenders the desertion of some areas, and the creation there of new reserves of labour-power, the opening up of other areas to new branches of production, and the restructuring of the territorial division of labour and class relations overall. The geographical distribution of population is typically far more than a general tendency to agglomeration superimposed on a "territorial division of labour, which confines special branches of production to special districts of a country" (*Capital* 1, p.353), as occasionally implied by Marx. Even in those few areas where particular branches of production *have* entirely dominated the economy, it is not possible simply to assume that such areas will be the same as others equally so dominated. It is more than the branch of production which determines the characteristics of a region. Thus Gervais, Servolin and Weil (1965) distinguish three types

of agricultural region in France, a distinction based primarily on the nature and stage of articulation of capitalism with peasant production, and on the dominant form of class relations (quoted in Lipietz, 1977, pp.48-52). Such differences in the economies and class structures of particular areas may also be associated with significant differences in political relations. The resulting picture of 'regions' and of 'inter-regional relationships' is thus enormously complicated. The purpose of work within regionalism is to understand the formation, nature and effects of this spatial differentiation.

Why, however, should socialists be interested in the analysis of this aspect of uneven development? Briefly, the fact and the form of spatial differentiation can affect both political and economic development. The levelling-out of employment rates between regions figured in the UK National Plan as a means of increasing the available labour-force; in Italy regional disparities are argued to have been beneficial for accumulation (Secchi, 1977). Analysis of spatial differentiation can therefore be an important component simply in understanding the working of an economy.

But there are also much more immediate political reasons. Most obviously, analyses of uneven regional development can contribute to the debate on regional separatist movements. More generally, however, the present crisis is affecting different parts of the country in different ways and to different degrees. Such spatial differentiation can frequently operate in a divisive way in the working class. When faced with massive declines in local industry and jobs, community groups and unions have frequently fought as though the problem was one of and for their area. This, of course, is the way in which the 'problem' is represented by capital, and it has two main repercussions. First, it sets workers of one area against those of another in a chase after available jobs, for instance. The prime recent example of this has been the attempt to portray the inner cities as having lost out to the State-assisted peripheral regions. Here an important part of the work within regionalism can be to show the relation between the disparate problems and struggles of different parts of the country. A second repercussion of 'regional problems' is that localised economic problems are often understood as stemming from the supposed inadequacies of the particular areas and its people. The Red Paper on Scotland attributes some of the problems of Scotland to a shortage of local entrepreneurs (see Firn, 1975); the White Paper on Inner Cities of the present Labour Government lays much of the blame for the present decline of those areas on their inhabitants' lack of (appropriate) skills. A prime aim of studies in regionalism is to combat this spatial definition of phenomena and to analyse and point to the real causes of such disparities.

The purpose of this survey is to present some of the issues currently pre-occupying analysis within regionalism. However, because work in this field is as yet rather disparate (indeed coherent debates are only just now beginning to emerge), the paper has as an aim also to formulate some major lines of implicit contention and to argue for a particular approach to analysis. Many of the debates hinge on methodological issues, but their implications go way beyond methodology. Such issues include: whether or not one starts analysis from pre-given regions; the potential or otherwise of the regional analysis of Stuart Holland; the possibility of 'borrowing' formulations from underdevelopment theory. It is primarily around questions such as these that the structure of the paper is organised.

APPROACHES TO ANALYSIS

The concern, then, has been how to formulate approaches which enable analysis of the complexity of spatial differentiation; how to go beyond general references to 'uneven development'. The present section briefly indicates a number of approaches which have been attempted, each of which has yielded insights and information, but each of which also has its problems.

Abstract formulation and general laws

There have been a number of attempts to derive general propositions concerning the spatial form and development of the capitalist mode of production. First, the possibility has been investigated of elaborating a 'law of value over space' (see, for example, Hein (1976), Lipietz (1977)). At different levels of analysis, both these authors reject such mechanisms and proportionalities. Indeed Lipietz interprets the absence of any regulatory economic mechanisms over space as a fundamental reason for State intervention in the geographical organisation of capitalism (2). A rather different attempt at the formulation of general statements about the geography of capitalism has been to propose a characterisation of the system's component parts. Thus, Castells (1977) defines the urban as the space of capitalist consumption, the region as the space of production. Such attempts have in general been roundly criticised (Harloe, (1978) and Sayer (1977)), primarily as abstract and arbitrary.

Thirdly, there are a number of writings which propose a necessary tendency within capitalism towards spatial centralisation, not only of control, over the process of production, but of production itself. Such conclusions have a degree of empirical backing and an apparent radicalism, and are clearly stimulated by a desire to counter the conclusions of equality which emerge from neo-classical theory (see Holland, 1976; Purdy, 1977; Castells, 1977). Marx, too, was inclined to see an inevitable tendency under capitalism towards spatial concentration (see *Capital*, volume 1, p.352 and *Grundrisse*, p.587, both quoted in the discussion in Harvey, 1975). But, apart from their dubious theoretical status, the vulnerability of such a-historical generalisations has become apparent in face of the recent tendency for the regional decentralisation of production (see later, and criticisms in Mellor (1975), Harloe (1978) and Massey (1976)). Empirically, neither the neo-classical nor the 'centralisation' school is correct. Though apparently opposed, they share the same problem of substituting for historical analysis predictions derived from an a-historical formal model.

Given its political importance, the work of Stuart Holland merits a little more elaboration. Holland's (1976) argument is that a tendency to regional inequality is intrinsic to capitalism but that it has until recently been offset, primarily by State action. The present dominance of multinationals has undermined this ability of the State since these firms are able both to play off States against each other and to locate in the Third World, thereby ignoring the peripheral regions of metropolitan countries. The tendency to regional inequality has therefore re-emerged. Empirical evidence to the contrary is seen as an exception, merely 'disguising' the underlying trend (p.57). This is not in any way a class analysis, and indeed, by concentrating on regional rather than class relations, it has potentially divisive

implications. Equilibrium theory is simply replaced by an elaboration of Myrdal and Perroux; in order to account for the previous invisibility of the claimed empirical tendency, State regional policy has to be interpreted as unambiguously directed towards regional equality; the State is umpire between capital and the public interest – a role it would again play in Holland's proposed policy solution; present regional problems are in fact interpreted as the result, not of capitalism, but of a 'meso-economic sector' which, with its super-profits, has broken free from economic imperatives – again an important proposition since it enables the proposed solution of nationalised forms acting differently from their private competitors (3).

Holland's work does not, then, provide a jumping-off ground for analyses of spatial differentiation, nor even of the regional problem, though it has certainly raised some important empirical issues and highlighted the political significance of certain aspects of spatial uneven development. Its frequent acceptance as 'Marxist' – or at least as the best we've got – should be a stimulus to further work.

Approaches 'borrowed' from underdevelopment theory

Few of the Marxist classics treat the subject-matter of regionalism to more than a passing reference (cf, for instance, the comments of Harvey, 1975, p.274). This lack of forebears has produced a sense of unease, an important effect of which has been a tendency to adopt methods of analysis developed at 'other spatial scales'. In particular this is true of work at the international level, in imperialism and underdevelopment. However, this paper will argue that, while much may be gleaned from such analysis for the study of spatial differentiation within a social formation, it is *not* possible simply to transplant them to 'a lower level of spatial disaggregation'. The relations between nation states within world imperialism are not to be equated with 'interregional relations' within a nation.

First, there are empirical differences between nation states and their constituent 'regions'. These include, for instance, monetary unification and trade and customs policies (see, eg, Hechter, 1975). More fundamentally, the State as a focus for class relations is usually less strong at regional level than national (Lipietz, 1977). These are, of course, tremendous generalisations, and great variation exists in the degree to which such differences hold, but, as we shall see, they are indicators of potential problems in any simple transference of theories derived at the international level to problems of intra-national spatial differentiation.

A second, and related, implication of such transference is that there is a general problematic of 'the spatial', of which the basic idea is that geographical differentiation and 'inter-areal relations' at one scale are simply those of another scale writ large, or small. As Anderson (1975) points out, in such a problematic "spatial form and scale are considered in the abstract, forgetting that we are dealing with *social* divisions of territory and socially different types of territorial division" (p.15). The object of analysis is not arbitrary divisions of 'space' as such.

Thirdly, and most importantly, the theories discussed in the present section tend on the whole in their application at international level to take nation states as objects given to analysis. Whether or not this is correct at

an international level, this paper will argue that 'regions' are *not* necessarily pre-given to the study of intra-national spatial differentiation. Considerable debate exists on this, and as will be seen there are a number of different approaches to the problem. This paper will argue that regions must be constituted *as an effect of* analysis; they are thus defined in relation to spatial uneven development in the process of accumulation and its effects on social (including political) relations. Thus the analysis of the production of uneven development does not imply a pre-given regionalisation.

This is not to say, however, that there can never be reasons for analysing the place, within the overall process of spatially uneven development, of an already-specified region. The recent growth of 'regional nationalism' has inevitably brought such questions to the fore. For this to be a valid procedure, however, there has to be a clear reason for taking the regions as given. To take an example, what is the basis for analysing 'East Anglia' in terms of its 'interregional relations? As far as I am aware, there is no significant and specifically East Anglian social or political force. And if indeed East Anglia is a coherent entity in terms of economic criteria, this should be the result of analysis and not assumed from criteria and boundaries constructed in some other area of investigation. This point will be taken up again later.

There is another theme which underlies much of the work discussed in this section, though again it is by no means exclusive to it. Again, moreover, it is a subterranean theme rather than an explicit debate. This concerns the presence, or not, within regions of metropolitan capitalist countries, of pre-capitalist forms. The implications of most of the work reported here is that no such forms exist. The study of the North East of England accepts this implicitly. Carter (1974) explicitly adopts a market definition of capitalism and appear to equate being influenced by the dynamics of the CMP with being capitalist. Lovering (1977) points out that the internal colonialism model frequently applied to Wales lacks any concept of modes of production and their relations of conservation-dissolution. Moreover, having formulated a more coherent model, he finds no empirical evidence of the reproduction of non-capitalist modes. Only Lipietz (1975; 1977), writing in France, presents argument and empirical evidence for the opposite point of view. The issue is of course far broader than the problems of regional analysis, and stems from underlying theoretical and political positions.

Finally, it should be stressed that the theories of underdevelopment referred to here are all subject to debate and criticisms in relation to their application at international level. It is beyond the scope of this paper to deal with those debates. All that will be referred to here are those points which concern their use at regional level.

In one of the more thoughtful attempts to use *dependency theory*, Carney, Hudson, Ive and Lewis (CHIL) (1975) draw "on this body of theory. . . to suggest certain characteristic features of underdeveloped regions in the way Szentes (1971) has done for countries, and 'test' them against our British case study – the North East" (of England) (p.144). They argue "that the temporary externalisations of economic contradictions that characterised an imperial phase of capitalist development are, in some capitalist societies, and especially France and the United Kingdom,

being replaced, in part, by attempts to contain them internally" (p.157). Their argument involves analysing the contradictory place of the North East where "the basis of profitability . . . historically has involved depression of wages as they enter into costs of production, and/or the reproduction of a large reserve army of unemployed" (p.149), in an overall economy "the basis of (which) lies in high real wages and high demand for consumer goods within the domestic market, and on capitalist consumption and State expenditure to prevent realisation crises re-emerging whilst allowing continued capital accumulation" (p.149).

In another example, Carter (1974), in a discussion of bourgeois analyses of the Scottish Highlands, uses Frank (1970) to challenge the typical view of that region as the 'archaic' sector of a dual economy.

Significantly, at the empirical level the debates about this approach do reflect the problem of switching objects of analysis, from international to interregional. This is particularly the case in relation to class structure. CHIL, in their paper on N.E. England, talk of an "indigenous bourgeoisie" and advocate the use of Frank's work to explain how the local bourgeoisie has become increasingly controlled from outside the region (pp.153-4). Considerable scepticism of this position is expressed in Anderson (1975) and in a discussion reported in Harloe (1975, p.166). Lebas (1977, p.84) launches a general attack which clearly relates the identification of such regional classes to the demands of this type of approach. She talks of "a 'creeping parochialism', a characteristic often noted of research groups doing work 'on their region'. This incipient parochialism, compounded with the lack of concerted theoretical perspective, leads researchers to establish the questionable existence of 'regional bourgeoisies' ". As already argued in the present paper, however, such matters are clearly empirical questions. Mellor (1975) who severely criticises (on empirical grounds) the use of dependency theory, herself gives evidence of regional class distinctiveness within both working class and bourgeoisie.

Closely related to dependency theory are the concepts of *unequal exchange*. Lipietz (1977) and Sayer (1977) both examine the usefulness of this approach, and the concepts are referred to in a number of other studies. The positions follow those of Emmanuel (1972; 1975) and Amin (1973; 1976) with Lipietz's approach integrating concepts of 'external articulation' and 'unequal exchange in the broad sense' (spatial differentiation in the distribution of industries with high and low organic compositions), and 'integration' and 'unequal exchange in the narrow sense' (based on spatial differentiation of wage levels) with Rey's (1973) concepts of stages in the process of articulation to capitalism of non-capitalist modes.

Starting with criticisms made at the empirical level, Sayer (1977) follows Emmanuel in arguing that "unequal exchange in the narrow sense is unlikely to take place *within* countries unless there is some institutionalised differentiation of wages within each sector (eg, apartheid)". In fact, it is not clear that such a statement can be made *a priori*, but anyway the evidence for its empirical validity or otherwise is not unambiguous.

Empirical criticism is also made of unequal exchange in the broad sense. This is that, while the usual notion of this form of unequal exchange

would have low organic composition sectors in the peripheral regions, high organic composition sectors in the 'central areas', and consequently a flow of value (with profit-equalisation) from periphery to centre, in fact one of the characteristics of recent industrial investment in intranational peripheral regions in Western Europe and the USA has been its high degree of capital-intensity relative to that of the centre. Thus Sayer refers to "some interesting and possibly counterintuitive spatial and structural changes . . . and perhaps surprising inverse relationship between regional income and capital investment per employee" (p.6). (4)

The opposite point of view is put by Lipietz (1977). For him, unequal exchange in the broad sense represents the articulation of different modes, or different stages of modes, of production (see, for instance, pp.58, 61), but its *effect* is one of the bases for regional inequality of wages typified in the phase of integration and implying unequal exchange in the narrow sense. Moreover, it is as an empirical question of unequal exchange in the *narrow* sense that Lipietz raises current tendencies of manufacturing investment (pp.58-59). Here, however, the problem is not the specification of the mechanism of unequal exchange but simply a worry as to why the inequality of wages has not provoked the equilibrating reaction to be anticipated from the simple equation form (i.e. why do capital intensive plants form a significant proportion of the production processes presently being established in peripheral areas?). The 'answer', which Lipietz himself later discusses, is that the response of capital to spatial differentiation may take a number of forms, and cannot simply be predicted out of historical context. The present attractiveness of peripheral regions as a location is due to more than wage differentials.

There are, however, other questions to be answered about this approach. First, Lipietz follows Palloix in emphasising that even if unequal exchange in the narrow sense is occurring, an analysis which is simply confined to that can only register the fact of its occurrence, as the *result* of an already-existing regional differentiation. He explains such inequality by unequal exchange in the broad sense.

The second question refers to unequal exchange in the broad sense. The equalisation of the rate of profit between sectors with different organic compositions of capital is a tendency always in operation in a capitalist economy. The particular empirical phenomenon being referred to by this approach is the fact of systematic spatial pattern. What remains unclear are both the implications of this in terms of the nature of regional 'inequality' (in what sense is this unequal exchange?) and the mechanisms of production of that inequality.

The third line of work which tries to formulate regional questions in an 'imperialism' framework is that which uses the *internal colony* model. We refer here only to attempts to apply the approach to regions within metropolitan capitalism. Hechter's (1975) discussion of the British Celtic fringe is probably the best-known example. Hechter's own approach is not squarely within the Marxist tradition, and although he uses terms such as mode of production, this tends to refer to rural/urban differences rather than to class relations and modes of appropriation of surplus labour. His work has, however, been influential amongst Marxists and non-Marxists,

and particularly within the nationalist movements. Lovering (1977) provides a detailed discussion and critique of the use of concepts of internal colonialism within Plaid Cymru. His criticisms include the loose and incorrect use of the term 'exploitation', the conception of the State as a deliberate conspiracy, and the lack of empirical evidence for many of the claims of the proponents of the model – in terms, for instance, of class structure, and net flows of resources.

Finally, the use of all three of these approaches either implies or encourages an analysis of the production of spatial differentiation which starts from pre-defined regions (a characteristic, as we have seen, related to their original, international contexts). All the authors are aware of this problem and its implications, but it is difficult, using such approaches, to escape them. Thus, Carney, Hudson, Ive and Lewis take as given, without any analytical justification (5), the North East of England as 'a region', as an adequate theoretical object. Indeed, they refer to it as a 'social formation' (pp.149, 151). Moreover, in spite of their correct insistence (pp.140, 155) that 'inter-areal relations' do not exist, the test of the dependence model refers to 'direct economic dependence' and to 'trade dependence'. Their analysis is referring to important real phenomena, yet just as the definition of 'the North East' requires justification, so does the concept of a 'region'. Concepts of 'inter-regional relationships' imply the definition of spatial entities with some degree of internal coherence, whether economic or political. Such definition must be the result of analysis; it cannot be an intuitive or *a priori* starting point. The analyses of Wales referred to by Lovering, on the other hand, do have a reason, at least at the political level, for starting with a predefined region. Yet, as Lovering points out, the divisions and dependencies within Wales are comparable to those between Wales and England. Where there are such dislocations between 'political' and economic regionalisations, that itself may be an important phenomenon to analyse.

The attempt to conduct analysis on the basis of given regions, especially when combined with theories originating at the international level, can also (though it does not necessarily) entail political implications which have been much subject to attack. Mingione (1977) in discussing south Italy, writes "it seems certain that the *internal* regional imbalances which exist are not principally a result of imperialist exploitation... Rather they result from a process of centralisation and specialisation which is common to all capitalist development"(p.95). In a footnote, he adds "For this purpose I do not share the analysis of those authors who mechanically extend theories of imperialism to apply them to under-developed regions. The divergence becomes yet wider when one considers the political conclusions which these authors draw, ending by giving theoretical support to separatism, local nationalism and the rebellion of all the classes in underdeveloped areas against a hypothetical colonial domination" (p.109). Clearly, the authors of Plaid Cymru, for example, would take the opposite line. Again, it is not clear how, politically, one should understand "dependence", the concept of "a structurally deformed economy" or "externally-oriented accumulation" in a regional context. These are debates which link the analyses of 'regionalism' to those of nationalism and regional separatism.

Lipietz (1977) is aware throughout of these problems (see, for example, pp.25-26), and his regions and inter-regional relations *are* therefore the product of his analysis. But even in Lipietz's work problems arise when linking regions defined in terms of their histories to regions defined in terms of their relation to the presently-emerging spatial division of labour. Clearly there is no necessary one-to-one correspondence between the two and it may not therefore be appropriate to start (as Lipietz tends to) from a specification of the first for an analysis of the second. Such change over time in the 'regionalisation' of a social formation may involve a radical restructuring both in the 'shape' of the spatial variation and in the nature of the use made by capital of any given form of differentiation. In fact, what Lipietz is doing here is to handle implicitly a change in regional structure which we would argue should be made explicit in the framework of explanation.

From accumulation to spatially uneven development

The approach which is suggested here begins from the process of accumulation and analyses the production of spatially uneven development without any pre-specified regionalisation of that space. From analyses of accumulation, it produces concepts of geographical organisation in terms of the spatial division of labour.

We take as starting-point the historically-dominant processes of production, and define the uneven geographical distribution of the conditions for accumulation in relation to those processes. In general terms, this means beginning with those elements of accumulation which both have an effect on the rate of profit and are unevenly spatially distributed (Hein, 1976; Regional Social Theory Group, 1978). It is the fact that regional inequality is specified in relation to the evolving characteristics of production which makes this not an externally-provided regionalisation.

In any given period, new investment in economic activity will be geographically distributed in response to this pattern of spatial differentiation. But the nature of this response may vary. The term "spatial division of labour" is meant to refer to the *way* in which economic activity responds to geographical inequality in the conditions of accumulation – the particular kind of use made by capital of such inequality. This will differ both between sectors and, for any given sector, with changing conditions of production. The term does not, therefore, refer to a division between regions.

The nature of capital's response to spatial unevenness is itself a product of the interaction between the existing characteristics of spatial differentiation and the requirements at any time of the dominant process of production. This interaction is important – not only does production shape geography, the historically-evolved geographical configuration (both the fact of spatial differentiation and its particular nature) has its influence on the course taken by accumulation. Thus, for instance, it may be precisely the fact of spatial separation which enables the preservation for a longer period than otherwise of certain conditions of accumulation – low wages and lack of militancy may be easier to ensure (for capital) in isolated areas dependent on one or two individual capitals. In turn, the preservation of

such conditions may influence the kind of technological changes pursued by capital.

It should also be stressed that the forms of spatial differentiation relevant to the process of accumulation are by no means confined to 'the purely economic'. The degree of organisation and militancy of the labour force are well-recognised 'location factors' even within neo-classical industrial location theory. What such location theory does not recognise, of course, is that it is the specific form taken by class relations which determines these conditions. Such relations may be the basis for the lack of organisation of the labour force (Mandel, 1963, gives a detailed example of this from Flanders). Again, specific relations of land-ownership may prevent what would otherwise be the best location for a particular production process (Lipietz, 1975). State regional policies (which themselves may be a response to economic and local political conditions) may also be influential.

One schematic way of approaching this as a historical process is to conceive of it as a series of rounds of new investment, in each of which a new form of spatial division of labour is evolved. In fact, of course, the process of change is much more diversified and incremental, though certainly there are periods of radical redirection. In general, however, any new form of spatial division of labour will typify only the more advanced sectors of production, and may well vary between each sector. Between rounds, in other words, conditions will change. They will do so as a result of the combination of 'more purely spatial' changes with those in the requirements of production. First, the process of accumulation may be affected by changes in relative location through developments in transport and communication. The pressure towards improvements in these derives from the requirement both to cut costs of production and to reduce the time of circulation (*Grundrisse*, pp.533-538; see also Harvey, 1975). The effect is that "the relative differences (in distances) may be shifted about by the development of the means of transportation and communication in a way that does not correspond to the geographical distances". . . a fact "which explains the deterioration of old and the rise of new centres of production because of changes in communication and transportation facilities" (*Capital*, 2, p.253), Such shifts in the spatial surface produce changes in the relative competitive positions of individual capitals, in the relative prices of different commodities, in methods of production, etc. At a more aggregate level, they will change the relative competitive position of branches of production in whole regions, and even transform the conditions in a particular region to being favourable to a branch of industry not yet located there.

Second, changes in the characteristics of accumulation may occur either in the production requirements of specific branches – and therefore in their locational requirements (see e.g. Dunford, 1977; Massey, 1976) – or in the balance between branches of production with different locational demands. In either case, a different regional distribution of production will result.

This new distribution of economic activity, produced by the evolution of a new division of labour, will be overlaid on, and combined with, the pattern produced in previous periods by different forms of spatial

division. The combination of successive layers will produce effects which themselves vary over space, contributing to a new form and geographical distribution of inequality in the conditions of production, as a basis for the next round of investment. A spatial division of labour is therefore not equivalent to a 'regionalisation'. It is suggested, on the contrary, that the social and economic structure of any given local area will be a complex result of the combination of that area's succession of roles within the series of wider, national and international, spatial divisions of labour.

In general terms, there is probably an increasing degree of agreement that analysis should start from accumulation rather than from regions. Within that context, new debates are now emerging. One of these concerns the most appropriate unit for analysis. The preceding discussion is relevant both to individual capitals and to branches of production. Other work, however, has been done at a broader level. At a Departmental level a broad division has been postulated in the interwar period, between expanding Department II production in the S.E. of England and a stagnating Department I in the North (Carney, Lewis and Hudson, 1977). In contrast it is the regional implications within Europe of "accumulation imperatives in relation to the component parts of capital" (variable capital, circulating constant capital and fixed constant capital) which are examined by the Regional Social Theory Group (1977). In Italy, the distinction between leading, export-oriented and backward domestic sectors has been found to be important. Thus, Garofoli (1975a) analyses the connection between unbalanced regional development and the development of leading sectors. He does this by investigating the connection between the alternation of extensive and intensive phases of accumulation and the forms of use of labour-power. Secchi (1977) also distinguishes between extensive and intensive phases and analyses their different regional implications in Italy over the period from the late ninteenth century to the early 1970s, the extensive phases corresponding to a strong concentration of production and employment in the developed areas, the intensive phases to a combination of de-industrialisation and the location of large leading-sector plants in the backward areas.

So far, the discussion of the approach which starts from accumulation has concentrated on the response of capital to spatial differentiation. The second, and equally important, stage is the analysis of the effects of that response. This will be taken up in a later section. For the moment, we use this general approach to present some of the changes in regional economic patterns at present going on in the U.K.

AN EMERGING FORM OF THE SPATIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

For reasons of space, this section can only be indicative, but it seems important to present at least the main features of what appears to be emerging as a new form of intra-national spatial division of labour, and one which characterises certain expanding branches of productions, such as electronics.

Briefly, then, the characteristics of production which underlie this new use of space include: the increasing size of individual capitals and the

related features of a smaller number of larger plants in direct production (Dunford, 1977), complex units of production – e.g. chemical/petro-chemical complexes (Castells and Godard, 1974; Dunford 1977), the division of production into autonomously-functioning stages which can be also separately *located* (Lipietz, 1977; Massey, 1976), and the increasing separation within individual capitals of the function of overal control (Lipietz, 1977). Within production too there have been major changes – in particular the recent apparent acceleration of deskilling of direct work alongside an increase in research and development. Finally, the role of the State is typically of growing importance both in financing major individual projects (Castells and Godard, 1974; Blietrach and Chenu, 1975) and in the provision of 'regional infrastructure'.

Where such changes take place in an intranational context in which there is marked spatial differentiation in wage levels of direct workers, in levels of skill, in degree of organisation of the labour movement, and in the degree of presence of, for instance, banking and commercial capital, a new form of geographical organisation is arising. Such is the case in most countries of Western Europe and North America.

One use by capitals of such spatial differentiation is increasingly based on the geographical separation of control and R & D functions from those direct processes of production still requiring skilled labourers and of these in turn from mass-production and assembly work requiring only semi-skilled labour-power. (It should be noted that this is not some ideal-type-model, but simply a form frequently found amongst presently-leading sectors.)

This third stage of production is increasingly located in areas where semi-skilled workers are not only available (since they are everywhere), but where wages are low, and where there is no tradition – at least among these workers – of militancy. Typically this will involve the incorporation of workers with no previous experience of capitalist relations of production – drawn either from the remnants of pre-capitalist modes, from the collapse of a previously-dominant industrial branch (in which case it will be the women, not the workers employed in the former specialisation, who will be employed) or from areas where workers (again mainly women) do not become totally dependent on (nor organised around) capitalist production relations (e.g. seaside resorts with seasonal self-employment in tourism). Although the introduction of these factories into such (frequently depressed) areas is hailed by the State as beneficial, (6) its positive effects may be minimal. Wages and skills remain low, and it is not even necessarily the case that much new employment will result: one of the major characteristics of such factories is that they have few local links and stimulate little locally in terms of associated production (the Italians label them 'cathedrals in the desert'). A good example in the UK is given by Carter (1974) in his analysis of the Highlands. Some of these plants may themselves be relatively labour-intensive (such as electronics assembly), others employ very few workers (steel and chemical complexes are typical examples).

The 'second-stage' of production is typically located in the old centres of skilled work – primarily nineteenth century industrial towns and cities:

the critical characteristic of this stage, however, is its decreasing (quantitative) importance. More and more, standardisation and automation are enabling capital to be locationally freed from its old ties to skilled labour-power. It is the link between such changes in the production process and the possibilities open to capital as a result of the spatial differentiation of labour-power (together, of course, with the collapse of other sectors, characterised by a different spatial division of labour and formerly based in the cities) which is behind much of the present industrial decline of the inner cities (see Community Development Project, 1977; Massey and Meegan, 1978). In such sectors as electronics, it appears that this rung in the spatial division of labour is fast disappearing and that a simple dichotomy is emerging between the city-regions (rather than the inner cities) of the core, and the peripheral regions. Thus, changes in the labour-process as a result of competition, the use by capital of spatial differentation; and the reconstitution of the working class, here go hand in hand. The fact of geographical differentiation in the wages, skills, and organisational strength of the working class both influences the form of, and enables, particular developments in accumulation. The fact of the spatial basis of the organised strength of skilled labour-power both encourages spatial decentralisation from those bases when capital's dependence upon skill decreases, and thereby enables a much more effective undermining of the strength of the working class (7).

Finally, the central metropolitan regions (such as London, Paris) are typified by the presence of control functions, research, design and development, and by the significant presence of managerial and technical strata (it is this presence, rather than the absence of manual work, which is distinctive).

A number of points should be quickly made to round off this brief description. First, the pattern which has been described is an intra-national division of labour, but the precise form which it takes within any one nation will be determined also by the place of that nation itself within the international division of labour. (Thus Michon-Savarit (1975) analyses how the future pattern of spatial organisation and interregional relations within France might vary with different possible scenarios for the international division of labour.) Second, this is thus a very different *form* of spatial division of labour from, for instance, sectoral specialisation. Its economic repercussions are also different – regions at the 'bottom' end of the hierarchy, for instance, are placed in direct competition with countries in the Third World. Such changes in the form of the spatial division of labour can be misread as an end to spatial differentiation. Thus, to take one example, the development of locational hierarchies such as these has an important basis in the increasing level of 'technology' both in the production of given commodities and as an element of competition between capitals. Commenting on the relation between this change in production and regional differentiation, Mandel (1975) writes that "regional or international differences in levels of productivity no longer provide the main source for the realisation (??) of surplus profits. This role is now assumed by such differences between sectors and enterprises . . . There thus develops a permanent pressure to *accelerate technological innovation*. For the dwindling of

other sources of surplus profits inevitably leads to a constant hunt for 'technological renewal" (p.192). While it is true that inter-regional productivity differentials (ie *between firms*) are no longer a dominant source of surplus profit, the example just presented shows that this does not necessarily imply either that regional differentials have disappeared, or that they have ceased to be relevant to capitalist investment strategies. On the contrary, such differentials would appear to be important in the appropriation of precisely those sources of surplus profit which Mandel now sees as dominant. An adequate use of regional differentials within the *intra*-firm division of labour is an important component of *inter*-firm competition, and particularly so in those branches of production which combine fast rates of technological change with the assembly-line-production of standardised commodities. Finally, it is clear that the latest form of the spatial division of labour is establishing not only a different form of use by capital of spatial differentiation, but also a new shape of geographical 'regionalisation'.

THE EFFECTS OF SPATIAL DIFFERENTIATION IN THE PROCESS OF ACCUMULATION

The analysis of the evolution of a new spatial division of labour is, however, only the first stage in the study of spatial differentiation. It is next necessary to analyse the way in which this new use of space is combined with the geographical pattern of previous uses. It is the effects of this combination which produce both the distinctive characteristics of local areas, and the overall pattern of regional variation in a social formation.

First, there are the effects on any particular geographical location or area. Some examples of direct effects have already been referred to, but there are broader implications. Thus, taking initially just the economic level, the presently-emerging spatial division of labour does not characterise every branch of production. It arises from the combination of certain newly-dominant features of the process of production with a spatial configuration formed as a result of previously-dominant features. The 'new spatial division of labour' described here is therefore one (a) which is a feature primarily of new and advanced sectors of production, and (b) which is articulated with an inherited, and different, form of spatial division. New branches of production may be introduced, affecting the conditions of production of established local industry; large inter-regional or multinational capital may enter an area previously the preserve of local firms. This process of combination will therefore produce effects which go beyond the direct implications of the locational strategies of capital, and which will possibily produce precisely that regional specificity which a number of the analyses referred to earlier (and which started from a regional base) have correctly been trying to grasp.

Moreover, these effects are not confined to production. They will include, for example, locally-differentiated effects on class structure (Lipietz, 1977, p.85, Lewis and Hudson, 1977, are good examples). Gramsci's work also contains a number of comments on and analyses of this aspect of the impact of spatially-differentatied accumulation: Turin is

"the proletarian city, *par excellence*" . . ."precisely because of this powerfully united character of the city's industry" (in *The Historical Role of the Cities*, Gramsci, 1977), and similar analyses are made of Milan, Piedmont, and the city-countryside relationship. Mandel (1963) analyses the formation of the 'two proletariats' of Belgium as a result of the distinct economic development of the regions of Wallonia and Flanders. As is clear from both Gramsci and Mandel, such processes may also imply a potentially politically significant spatial differentiation in forms of class struggle. Castells (1977, ch.14) makes similar points in relation to 'urban social movements'.

It is the combination of effects such as these which produces the complex form of spatial variation which is the empirical phenomenon with which regional analysis is faced. This paper has argued so far that the *causes* of such complex differentiation can not be explained adequately by starting from any pre-given regionalisation. However, the examination of the resultant pattern of accumulation, and of its effects, may well require some method of spatial summary, and this may include the identification of 'regions'. Considering that it is so central, there is relatively little debate on 'the concept of a region' (either its possibility or its nature). One of the clearest positions is that of Lipietz (1977) who insists on the dominance, in the definition of any such entity, of distinctive social relations based primarily on the geographically-differentiated articulation of capitalism with pre-capitalist modes (see, for instance, pp.33, 26; and Lipietz, 1975, p.419). As already mentioned, such a position, also held by others in specific analyses, is disputed at both empirical and political levels. In Italy, a related debate focuses on what is the correct class characterisation of the South: Mingione (1977) follows Gramsci (1949) in arguing that the bourgeois revolution did not involve the South; Secchi (1977), discussing the twentieth century, attacks the common thesis that "the Italian system is characterised by modern (capitalist) activities mainly concentrated in the Northern regions, and by backward (pre-capitalist) activities concentrated in the southern regions" (p.36).

To return, however, to the 'concept of region', a different question which can be raised against Lipietz's definition concerns not whether the *particular* criterion is appropriate but whether there is any point in attempting to establish *any* criteria for universal application. It may be that regional specificity and coherence may be established on a variety of different bases – though 'class relations' in a general sense will evidently be a dominant component. Mandel's (1963) work on Belgium again provides a good example. Having begun from an analysis of the process of accumulation in relation to Belgium as a whole, he analyses the spatially-differentiated form that this takes, and the impact of this in turn on class relations (see above). His analysis is that Wallonia and Flanders are distinct in terms of date of industrialisation, the nature (branch, size, etc.) of industry, the degree of urbanisation and the nature of internal spatial organisation, and in terms of language, culture and religion, and politics – in relation both to nationalism and socialism. It emerges clearly not only that spatial separation has been very important in the construction of these characteristics of the Belgian national social-formation, but also that the integration between form of accumulation and politics and ideology, and the effect of

that, clearly warrants the identification within the country of two distinct regions.

It should not be assumed, however, that in every spatial analysis of a national capitalist economy such divisions will always emerge so clearly, nor that they necessarily cover the total geographical area of the state. Such a 'regionalisation' should not be forced on unwilling evidence. At the economic level, for instance, the combination of successive spatial divisions of labour may not produce in any sense coherent economies. It has already been mentioned that Lipietz's regions switch from those constructed through historical analysis (and which are based on the articulation of modes of production) to those characterised on criteria (primarily type of labour-power) relevant to an analysis of the present spatial division of labour. 'Region' may mean many things – in this case both a coherent spatial entity in terms of social relations and a geographical disaggregation on the basis of a single economic variable. Lipietz's is a perfectly feasible procedure so long as the different status of these regional types is fully recognised. Moreover, it is possible to summarise and analyse the effects of geographical differentiation without the construction of coherent regions. In the UK over the last decade or so, for instance, a definite change has been taking place in the form, composition and geographical distribution of the reserve army of labour. Some aspects of this have already been referred to (e.g. the decline of the 'inner cities'). This is an important phenomenon to recognise and to analyse but it is not necessary therefore to define, say, inner cities, as 'regions' the coherence of which extends beyond the distribution of this aspect of accumulation. In such cases, different geographical bases may well be appropriate for the analysis of different phenomena.

Finally, whether ot not coherent regions may be defined from the analysis, the rationale for any particular form of geographical summary should be related to its usefulness in analysing the *effects* of such differentiation. These effects will occur not only at the local level (as already discussed) but also as a result of the impact of the fact and form of spatial differentiation on the development of the social formation as a whole. A number of studies have been produced analysing this impact, in both economic and political terms. One point which emerges clearly from them is that no *a priori* assumptions should be made as to whether such effects are problematic or positive for capital. There is some tendency to assume that severe spatial inequality is necessarily a problem for capital, that regional policy is designed to cope with these negative effects, but that it is continually subordinated to the more pressing demands of accumulation. At certain historical periods this is undoubtedly true (examples include the UK in both the 1930s and 1963), but spatial inequality may also be functional. Both aspects appear in Secchi's (1977) study which emphasises the role of territorical inequality in both periods of growth and the crises of the Italian economy. Secchi carries this analysis through to the political implications of the spatial pattern, particularly in relation to systems of intercapitalist alliances. Garofoli (1975b) takes up the same themes. Carney, Lewis and Hudson (1977) examine the contradictory effects in the UK of the inter-war geographical specialisation in Departments I and II. They argue that: "The crucial restraint on the continued accumulation

of capital in the Department II industries of the South was the depressed conditions of consumption in those areas dominated by Department I production". Yet at the same time: "One of the conditions for the success of Department II production in the South was that a large mass of skilled labour was thrown out of work in the North and so acted as a reserve army sustaining reductions in production costs in the South by their presence and sustaining production needs for labour-power by their migration south" (p.58). Again, of course, such effects have more than simply economic implications. Mandel's article (Mandel, 1963) examines the very important political repercussions of Belgium's patterns of regionalisation, this time in terms of the labour movement.

IN CONCLUSION

This review has been something of a mad dash through a disparate and sometimes confusing field of work. It is hoped, however, that a number of points have been established. First, that there is such a field of study as regionalism, with a valid general object. Second, that within that field there are a number of very different stages of analysis and distinct questions. In particular, attention has been focused in this paper on the difference between the production of spatial unevenness, the effects of that unevenness, and the fortunes of particular regions. It is argued here that these must be carefully distinguished, both in terms of the questions being asked and in terms of the direction of causality involved. Finally, spatial differentiation can have important effects, both on the development of a national capitalist economy, and on the course of political struggle.

NOTES

Doreen Massey works at the Centre for Environmental Studies, 62 Chandos Place, London W.C.2. Much help was received in writing this survey from discussion in the CSE Regionalism Group, and in the Editorial Committee of *Capital and Class*, and in particular from detailed comments by James Anderson, Mick Dunford, Mike Geddes, John Harrison, Jim Lewis, Richard Minns, Diane Perrons and Andrew Sayer.

1 For reasons of space the present review has a very restricted scope. It is confined in its empirical basis, and to some extent in its propositions, to metropolitan capitalist countries, and it has had to omit consideration of a number of very closely related fields of work, in particular analysis of nationalism, and of the burgeoning debate specifically on 'urbanism'. Neither has there been room to consider the literature on state intervention in this field, particularly regional policy.

2 Although there is clearly a point here, this does seem overformal, and may have the effect of implying that the existence of theoretical equilibria implies a problem-free capitalist economy. It is nonetheless worth noting that the introduction of the spatial dimension plays havoc with neo-classical concepts of general equilibrium (see Massey, 1974).

3 A number of these points are elaborated further in Anderson, 1977.
4 Earlier in the same article Sayer examines the difficulties of using measures of capital intensity to indicate organic composition. It is clear, however, that he is referring to a real phenomenom in terms of the direction of differentials in organic composition. It is also the case, of course, that the workers in the different regions are applying labour-power of different skills, etc. (value).
5 Which is not to say that such a justification could not be provided. Elements of such an argument appear both in this article and in Carney, Lewis and Hudson, 1977.
6 Such developments are also frequently attributed to regional policy – which may well have encouraged them, but not in any sense against the trend of the changing requirements of accumulation. It is interesting to note that those who hold to the 'inevitable spatial concentration' model of capitalism, are also forced to attribute such developments solely to the effectiveness of state intervention.
7 Spatial separation and differentiation can also be important elements in more immediate strategies, either of individual capitals (for which geographical mobility may enable total changes in production which might otherwise be fought by the unions on-site) or of State policy (the way in which inner city workers have been set against those of peripheral regions is a good recent example).

REFERENCES

Amin, S., 1973, *L'Échange inégal et la loi de la valeur*, Anthropos – IDEP Paris.
Amin, S., 1976, *Unequal development*, Harvester.
Anderson, J., 1975, "The political economy of urbanism: an introduction and bibliography", Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Architectural Association.
Anderson, J., 1977, *Stuart Holland's regionalism: reformism reheated*, paper presented to CSE Regionalism Working Group, mimeo.
Bettelheim, C., 1972, Appendix I *Theoretical Comments*, in Emmanuel (1972).
Bleitrach, D., and Chenu, A., 1975, "Aménagement: régulation ou aggravation des contradictions sociales? Un exemple: Fos-sur-mer et l'aire métropolitaine marseillaise".
Brenner, R., 1977, The origins of capitalist development: a critique of neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review*, vol. 104, pp.25-92.
Carney, J., Hudson, R., Ive, G. and Lewis, J., 1975, "Regional underdevelopment in late capitalism: a study of the North East of England" in Masser, I. (ed.) *Theory and practice in regional science*, Pion, London.
Carney, J., Lewis, J. and Hudson, R., 1977, "Coal combines and interregional uneven development in the UK" in: Massey, D.B. and Batey P.W.J. (eds) London Paper in Regional Science, vol. 7, *Alternative Frameworks for analysis*, Pion, London.

Carter, I., 1974, "The highlands of Scotland as an underdeveloped region" in: E de Kadt and G. Williams (eds), *Sociology and Development,* Tavistock Publications, pp.279-311.

Castells, M., 1977, *The Urban Question,* Edward Arnold.

Castells, M. and Godard, F., 1974, *Monopolville: l'enterprise l'état, l'urbain,* Mouton.

Community Development Project, 1977, *The Costs of Industrial Change.*

Dunford, M.F., 1977, "Regional policy and the restructuring of capital", Sussex University: Urban and Regional Studies, Working Paper 4.

Emmanuel, A., 1972, *Unequal Exchange: a study of the imperialism of trade,* New Left Books.

Emmanuel, A., *et al,* 1975, *Un débat sur l'éxchange inégal,* Maspero, Paris.

Firn, J., 1975, External control and regional policy, in *The Red Paper on Scotland,* edited by Gordon Brown.

Frank, A.G., 1970, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution.* Monthly Review Press, New York.

Garofoli, G., 1975a, Produttività del lavoro e salari: uni analisi dei differenziali intersettoriali ed interregionali, *Archivio di Studi Urbani e Regionali,* no.3-4, pp.97-123.

Garofoli, G., 1975b, Un'analisi critica della politica di riequilibrio regionale in Italia: il caso del Mezzogiorno, *Archivio di Studi Urbani e Regionali,* no.3-4, pp.165-183.

Gervais, M., Servolin, C., and Weil, J., 1965, *Une France sans Paysan,* Le Seuil, Paris.

Gramsci, A., 1949, *Il risorgimento,* Einaudi, Turin.

Gramsci, A., 1977, "The historical role of the cities", in *Selections from political writings,* 1910-1920. Lawrence and Wishart.

Harloe, M. (ed), 1975, "Proceedings of the conference on urban change and conflict", Centre for Environmental Studies, Conference Papers 14.

Harloe, M., 1978, "Marxism, the state and the urban question: Critical notes on two recent French theories", in: Crouch, C. (ed),: *British Political Sociology Yearbook.*

Harvey, D., 1975, "The geography of capitalist accumulation: a reconstruction of the Marxian Theory", *Antipode,* vol. 7, No.2, pp.9-21 (also in Peet, 1977).

Hechter, M., 1975, *Internal colonialism: The Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536-1966,* International Library of Sociology, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hein, W., 1976, "The accumulation of capital on the world scale, the nation state and uneven development; Outline of a theoretical approach", Paper to CSE Working Group on the Neocolonial State, mimeo.

Holland, S., 1976, *Capital vs. the Regions,* Macmillan Press.

Lebas, E., 1977, "Regional policy research: some theoretical and methodological problems" in M. Harloe (ed), *Captive Cities,* Wiley, London, pp.79-88.

Lee, R., 1977, "Regional relations and economic structure in the EEC" in: Massey, D.B. and Batey, P.W.J. (ed), London Papers in Regional Science, vol. 7, *Alternative Frameworks for Analysis*, pp.19-38.

Lipietz, A., 1975, "Structuration de l'espace, problème foncier et aménagement du territoire", *Environment and Planning*, A, vol.7, pp.415-425

Lipietz, A., 1977, *Le capital et son espace*, Maspero: Economie et Socialisme, 34.

Lovering, J., 1977, "The theory of the 'internal colony' and the political economy of Wales", mimeo.

Mandel, E., 1963, "The dialectic of class and region in Belgium", *New Left Review*. vol.20, pp.5-31.

Mandel, E., 1975, *"Late Capitalism"*, New Left Books, London.

Marx, K., *Capital*, Lawrence and Wishart.

Marx, K., *Grundrisse*, Penguin.

Massey, D.B., 1974, "Towards a critique of industrial location theory", Centre for Environmental Studies, Research Paper No 5. (also in *Antipode*, Dec. 1973 and Peet, 1977).

Massey, D.B., 1976, "Restructuring and regionalism: some spatial effects of the crisis". Paper presented to CSE Working Group on Regionalism. Centre for Environmental Studies, Working Note 449.

Massey, D.B., and Meegan, R.A., 1978, "Restructuring vs. the Cities", *Urban Studies*, vol.15, No.3.

Mellor, R., 1975, "The British Experience: combined and uneven development" in: Harloe, M. (ed), 1975.

Michon-Savarit, C., 1975, "La place des régions francaises dans la division internationale du travail: deux scénarios contrastés", *Environment and Planning*, A, vol. 7, No. 4, pp.449-454.

Mingione, E., 1977, "Theoretical elements for a Marxist analysis of urban development" in: *Harloe, M. (ed), Captive Cities*, Wiley, pp.89-110.

Purdy, D., 1977, "Review of Holland's 'Capital vs. the Regions' and 'The Socialist Challenge' " *Capital and Class*, No.1.

Regional Social Theory Group, 1978, "Accumulation, the regional problem and nationalism" in: P.W.J. Batey (ed) London Papers in Regional Science, vol.8, Pion, London.

Rey, P-P., 1973, *Les alliances de classes*, Maspero, Paris.

Sayer, A., 1977, "The law of value and uneven development: some problems and possibilities for analysis". Paper presented to the Regional Social Theory Group, Regional Science Association, Lanehead Workshop, July. Mimeo.

Secchi, B., 1977, "Central and peripheral regions in a process of economic development: The Italian case" in: Massey, D.B., and Batey, P.W.J. (eds), London Papers in Regional Science, vol.7: *Alternative Frameworks for Analysis*, Pion, London.

Szentes, T., 1971, *The political economy of underdevelopment*, Akademiai Kiado, Budapest.