

SOCIAL POSITION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR
Center-Periphery Concepts and Theories*

by

Johan Galtung
Chair in Conflict and Peace Research
University of Oslo
Inter-University Centre, Dubrovnik

1. Introduction: The Center-Periphery Idea.

The point of departure for any Center-Periphery approach to the study of human society would be the observation that most societies we know, and indeed all societies that are known as states or countries today, seem to have some kind of verticality, or vertical gradient, built into them. The notion of Center and Periphery makes intuitive sense: one can ask a question like "What is the Center/Periphery of this country" almost anywhere in the world and people will find the question meaningful, and to a large extent give answers that exhibit a considerable degree of consensus.

But from this more intuitive concept to some type of operational definition of Center/Periphery that lends itself both to empirical work and to theory formation the road is not only long, but also tortuous, and indeed far from characterized by consensus. In what follows some of the steps along that road will be indicated, and it will very soon be clear that for each step taken some basic decision reflecting where one stands on social theory has to be made.

The first decision is out of some type of aesthetic consideration: we would like to develop a conceptualization that can be used at several levels of social analysis: in inter-personal, inter-district

inter-national and inter-regional analysis. At all these four levels it makes eminent sense, again intuitively, to talk about Center and Periphery: it is our task to try to give meaning to a concept that can be used equally well at all four levels.

Then, there is another basic idea which is more analytical: we would like to make a distinction between actors, systems and structures. The actors may be persons, districts, nations or regions for that matter; whatever they are they are capable of acting (in the sense of pursuing goals), and of interacting with each other. A system of interaction is characterized by a certain theme, a sector of social life as it is often referred to: work, education, economic transactions, family life, etc. And a structure of interaction would be something that ties the actors together not only in one system but in several systems, meaning that the actors meet each other and interact with each other in more than one context. A society, then, is a structure which is self-sufficient in the sense that it can persist even if it is cut off from the rest of the world (for this to happen it has to be capable of biological reproduction, of economic reproduction - satisfaction of fundamental needs - and of some kind of culturally meaningful integration that gives to the actors in the structure some kind of goal, some kind of meaning - sometimes harmonized, usually in disharmony).

Third, and now we are approaching more fundamental matters: a major distinction in social analysis has to be brought in. What is to be taken as the basic unit of analysis, the actors that are born and die, appear and reappear in the various systems, or the systems and structures? According to one's choice we may talk about an actor-oriented and a structure-oriented perspective of society. j

According to the former society is a set of actors, each with their characteristics, each with their individuality - here engaging in economic transactions, there entering the educational system, and so on - all the time with their individual intentions and capacities. According to the second perspective the individuality of the actors - be they persons, districts, nations, or regions - is much less important: what really matters is the structure of interaction in which they are embedded. This structure can be studied at the level of each single system and at the level of the total set of systems, the "structure" in a very comprehensive sense. Thus, the first perspective would tend to diminish the roles of the interaction structure and focus on the individuality of the actors - for instance a colorful political leader, or a superpower with its particular idiosyncracies; the second perspective would tend to disregard such idiosyncracies and focus on structures. The individual characteristics of a Rockefeller would be insignificant, what matters is the structural position "capitalist"; everything that can be said about the Soviet Union, and that is quite a lot, would be less important than a structural analysis of social imperialism³ - how the Soviet Union relates to countries in her "orbits" (according to Chinese analysis).

We shall make use of both of these fundamental perspectives in what follows, exactly because they lead to somewhat different ideas about Center /Periphery and social position.

Thus, following the actor-oriented perspective whether one is in the Center or in the Periphery would depend on some of the characteristics of the actors. Thus, in the educational system persons may have high or low education (for instance, using

completed primary school or secondary school as cutting points); districts, nations and regions may be classified the same way (using average educational level obtained as a variable and the same cutting points). One may then look at the same actor in one system after the other, all the time trying to find whether the actor possesses high rank or low rank in the system. One way of assessing this, incidentally, would be simply to ask the actors in the system: where would you like to be? ^[3]

According to the structure-oriented perspective one would do something quite different, although it might lead very much to the same result. The point of departure would not be the differences between the actors but relations between them, and the most important relation is the interaction relation. In terms of differences rank difference, between high and low, would serve the purpose of reflecting the verticality mentioned in the beginning. In terms of relations the best way of reflecting vertical interaction would be to introduce the notion of exploitation. If a relation can be defined as exploitative it should be possible to locate the exploiter and the exploited, identify them as actors, and we would immediately have the basic element in a Center-Periphery theory.

The problem, then, is that of defining "exploitation". Without going into detail let it only be said that the point of departure would be an analysis of the net consequences of interaction between the actors. ^[4] In an interaction process there is an element of exchange: something passes between the actors, as for instance in a trade relation. But there is also an element of in-change: as a result of the interaction process changes take place inside the actors themselves. Very often the exchange aspect

is more easy to register than the inchange: very much is known, and in detail, about how much work a worker would put into the factory and how much he receives in terms of wages and securities; very little is known about, for instance, the psychological impact on managers of having problem solving as their major occupation and on workers of having rather routineized work as their major plight. One idea would be here that some persons, districts, nations, regions due to interpersonal, intranational, international and interregional "division of labor" are stimulated, challenged much more than others; that this is never worked into any kind of exchange agreement but is like the hidden part of the iceberg; and in order to understand how much exploitation is going on one has somehow to add up the net asymmetric accumulation of value stemming from both exchange and inchange aspects of the process.

But the structure-oriented perspective has also one more approach to offer when it comes to defining Center and Periphery: the interaction network. Very often this network is extremely well known, for instance to the students of geography who can have it neatly displayed in front of him in the form of airlines and other transportation (or communication) networks, between regions, nations, and districts; or the social anthropologist/sociologist who might know something about interpersonal communication patterns. In such networks the terms "Center" and "Periphery" take on a very immediate sense ^[5] not lost by anyone who has ever seen a road map of France: no names on any city is needed to deduce very correctly from the road map where the capital of that country is located. (It is interesting to note that in countries that were much more recently unified, such as Germany and Italy, the road map or rail map does not so clearly identify the capital - these are countries with more than one Center.)

Thus we have located three approaches to Center/Periphery theory: in terms of rank, exploitation and interaction network. Let us now look at this in more detail.

2. Operationalization of the Center-Periphery gradient.

It will be remembered that the entire approach is based on the idea that social structures can be seen as constituted by more than one system, that there may be Center-Periphery gradients between the actors in any one of those systems, which means that when we are talking about Center and Periphery we should try to arrive at some kind of conceptualization and theory for the total structure, not only for the single system. This is actually very simple using the idea of an additive index: an actor is given a 0 or a 1 depending on whether it has low or high rank (actor-oriented perspective), or is exploited or an exploiter, in a peripheral or central interaction position (structure-oriented perspective) for each system. If we now have N systems all one has to do is to add up the values for each actors obviously yielding an index from 0 to N. Of course, in doing so one would be consistent and all the time make use of only one of the three methodologies just mentioned - ending up with the number of high statuses an actor has.

In one approach that we have tried to make use of for systems of persons (in fact for whole societies, "persons" meaning citizens usually above 15, 18 or 21 years of age, ^[6] we had N=8: age (young and old in the Periphery, the middle aged in the Center), sex (female versus male), geography I (rural versus urban), geography II (national Periphery versus national Center in terms of districts), income (low versus high), education (low versus high), occupation I (primary sector versus secondary and tertiary sectors) and occupation II (blue collar versus white collar and self-employed). One

has to be able to visualize this:

On the one extreme there may be an old woman living in a very peripheral part of the country, in the countryside, with low income, very little education, working as some kind of helper, paid or unpaid, on a farm -

On the other hand, there would be a middle-aged man (in his "best age") in a city in the Center of the country, high income and high education, being for instance manager in some tertiary sector institutions like a bank.

One of the very basic assumptions of this entire analysis can now be made more clear: the idea of conceiving of "Center" and "Periphery" ⁱⁿ a global way, not only referring to one system, but to a set of systems, to the total structure. In so doing this analysis is a conscious rejection of the idea of trying to reduce Center-Periphery gradients to one "essential" system, for instance position relative to the means of production. A few words about this, more will be said later.

This is actually a much less dramatic position than it may sound like, for if one system were really of basic significance relative to all the others then positions in all the others would be highly correlated with position in the first system. The essential character of that particular system would shine through and dominate our more pluralistic approach. On the other hand, if that position in fact is not of such an overriding importance then our more pluralistic approach would give more variety, possibly more insight, particularly into inconsistencies.

It should again be emphasized that it does not matter for the applicability of an additive index which of the three methodologies we use in order to classify actors one way or the other. Operationally, empirically, the actor-oriented approach is the easiest one: all one has to do is to have some rough idea about what is considered "high" and "low" in the structure. This, of course, varies from

one society to the other: in an analysis of Norway one would not include race, in other societies race would be included; in Norway "Party membership" would probably not be considered essential in understanding a persons position, in other societies it might be seen as a basic characteristic. Which systems are relevant for structural analysis might actually be decided by the actors themselves - simply by asking them.

For theoretical analysis, however, as we shall show, thinking in terms of exploitation and position in the interaction network is much more fruitful. "Rank" is so bland as a concept, it carries so little theoretical momentum. But this is not so much of a problem since there are all reasons to believe that the three are highly correlated.^[7] For "rank" and "prestige" is probably largely a reflection of exploitation, for instance of men's ability to exploit women. Similarly, high rank means resources, and resources can be used to set up exploitative relations - for instance by buying means of production. Both rank and vertical relations can be converted into central positions in the interaction network simply because they serve to attract all kinds of resources, including other actors. And central positions, conversely, can be converted into material and non-material resources, something known to any little point on the map that happens to be located on an important crossroads, at the confluence point of two rivers, at the point where two valleys intersect, at the oasis where two caravan routes cross each other.

Thus, a distinction has been made so far between Center and Periphery in a system, defined in any one of the three ways, and the more global Center and Periphery of a structure, defined by adding up the number of central positions; yielding an index from 0 to N, which is then referred to as an Index of social position.

The top range of this index would be the Center of the structure, the bottom range would be the Periphery and then there would be some kind of intermediate range. [8] So far we have been talking about actors who are individuals, but everything said above, the distinction between systems and structure and the three possible approaches can also be applied, mutatis mutandis to districts, regions and nations. It all becomes a question of which dimensions to choose. Formations, for instance, one would probably include something about age as a country, geography (both in the sense of degree of organization and location in the world communications structure), some dimension of economic achievement (some years ago that would definitely have been GNP/capita), some dimension of educational achievement (average years of schooling per capita?), the degree of industrialization and possibly also "tertiarization" (in other words the extent to which the economy is not in the primary sector), and the extent to which the population cannot be characterized as a "working class" population. [9]

It will immediately be seen that these dimensions (which also can be applied to districts and regions) are immediate translations of the dimensions used for individuals, translated to higher levels of social organization, except for sex. But then one might add some dimensions, for instance relating to power: area, population, military capability in terms of military hardware. One should not add too much, however, lest the index gets overloaded.

Looking at the items that enter this index for nations it becomes immediately clear what a "liberal" view it expresses when it is based on the actor-oriented perspective. There is no reason why one should stick to that, however. Introducing the structure-oriented perspective, basing the index on the idea of exploitation

one would look at economic transactions, political interaction, military relations, cultural relations in a broad sense and communication patterns and always ask: who gained most, who gained least or lose; who is dependant on whom in all the relations mentioned above, who is the sender and who the receiver, who is the teacher and who is the learner, who is the owner of the means of production, means of destruction and means of transportation/communication and who is only entitled to use them, and so on. ⁽¹⁹⁾ Again, the characterization of a nation as being in the Center or in the Periphery may not necessarily differ, the two approaches may yield the same result extensionally. But the meaning is different, and the exploitation approach, as mentioned, is much more suited for theory formation.

Then there is the third approach based on total interaction network which would lean very heavily on communication and transportation charts. It would be difficult to include in this concept the richness of the system diversity so easily introduced with the other approaches. Of course, one may talk about economic, political, military interaction - but they would all have a tendency to make use of, roughly speaking, the same communication and transportation channels which means that they would tend to lead to the same result and not to the interesting discrepancies that will be mentioned below.

3. Some further conceptual developments.

Whether based on one or the other of the two major approaches we always end up with a profile of the actors from a Center-Periphery point of view, on a set of dimensions or systems. Imagine,

for the sake of simplicity, that we are dealing with a very simple structure consisting of only two systems - for instance one "ascribed" that the actor cannot change (for instance sex if the actor is a person, mineral resources if the actor is a nation), and one that is "achieved" that has come about as the result of activities where the actor is at least partly responsible (for instance level of education in either case). The index of social position will have three values: 0, 1, 2. Of these three values the end points on the index determine the actor unambiguously: there is only one way of obtaining a zero and only one way of obtaining a 2. But there are two ways of obtaining a 1 - the profile 0,1 or the profile 1,0.

And that leads us to the type of development that has been very fruitful in the general Center-Periphery approach: in addition to adding the Center-Periphery scores in the various systems it has proven very fruitful to subtract them. If the scores in several systems are the same the difference is obviously zero, which simply means that the profile is equilibrated. If the scores are different there will be a non-zero difference, the profile is disequilibrated. Hence, with the simplest possible arithmetic operations one can use addition to get some kind of general impression of where the actor is located on the Center-Periphery axis, and the subtraction to get some impression of how equilibrated or disequilibrated the actor is. Obviously, the closer the actor is towards the end of the scale the fewer possibilities are there of disequilibrium - and at the very end (compare the description above of the two extreme individuals) there is total equilibrium. [1]

Given this we can now try to formulate some basic substantive perspectives arising from the concepts.

Our first remark concerns power. It may be objected that apart from a passing sentence in connection with nations this has not been touched at all; but it has been there all the time. The basic idea is simply this: to have power is to be in the Center, to be powerless is to be in the Periphery. More particularly, this opens for two perspectives on power: one derived from the actor-oriented type of analysis, and the other from the structure-oriented perspective. [12] According to the former perspective power is identified with resources, it is resource power: having high education, high income and so forth. Power is structural, it means being on top of some kind of vertical division of labor or in the Center of an interactional network. In those positions one may be poor in resources, the basic idea would be that structural position is more important. (Another idea, mentioned above, is that the two will tend to correlate: he who has much structural power will also tend to accumulate resources and vice versa - in fact, one basic analytical theme in social analysis would be to investigate the convertibility of one form of power into the other). Hence, instead of seeing power as something mystical in its own right we would like to see it as the sum total of Center positions, and correspondingly for powerlessness. This perspective should then be brought in from the very beginning and used as a criterion when it comes to deciding which dimensions to include in the analysis - it should be rich enough to comprise what one ordinarily would think should enter "power analysis".

Second, many findings from opinion studies seem to indicate that society looks very different from the Center and from the Periphery. It is not so simple as to say that the Center is status quo oriented and the Periphery is change oriented. The Center is

not necessarily totally status quo oriented, it might opt in favor of some type of gradualism, change by very small steps, but it is usually change that is intraparadigmatic, not challenging the basic structure. And as to the Periphery: it is probably generally true to say that it is highly change-oriented, only that some part of the Periphery may think in terms of transcendental change, of after-life, or of some type of utopianism, of a millerium to come in the distant future but not affecting concrete action here and now. And then there will definitely be another part of the Periphery which would think and act in terms of fundamental change, here and now. [13] But differently: the Center will be recruiting ground for conservative parties and liberal parties and social democratic parties (the latter may be recruited more from the middle of the social position actors, though); the Periphery will be the recruiting ground for truly radical parties and for, for instance, fundamentalist Christian parties [14]

One finding from the comparative study Images of the World in the Year 2000 [15] may illustrate this: the Center in most of the ten nations from which the data were drawn did not want any basic change, but thought that some kind of relatively minor changes would take place; the Periphery did want rather basic change, but did not think it were likely. In other words, both of them had their particular source of pessimism because of the discrepancy between what they hoped would happen and what they thought would happen - and this discrepancy is probably typical of the way the two parts of society experience the human condition.

Still another point: the Center dominates the public consciousness. The very fruitful idea postulated by Marx to the effect that "the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class"

is certainly relevant when using this approach. If attitudes are classified two ways, in terms of whether they are majority versus minority views and in terms of whether they are more pronounced in the Center than in the Periphery one finds a predominance of three types^[16]:

- Center views that are majority views where the Center has imposed itself or is in general alignment with the general mood of society
- Center views that are also minority views, in which case one might predict that they will later on become majority views because of the Center command of resources
- Periphery views that are also minority views - they are just complementary to the first category above.

What is very rarely found are Periphery views that are majority views - and when they are found it might usually be predicted that these are views that were held by the Center sometime ago but now are on their way out. However, in saying so we are only describing the normal state of affairs - like the man who looks out of the window on a windy winter day, the snowflakes are whirling around in all directions, but he nevertheless predicts ultimately they will fall down, covering the ground. What we have just said is the general trend: there are certainly moments in the history of a society where this trend is counteracted, where the Periphery pushes its will through the social organism.^[17]

And this is the third point: implicitly in what has been said above there is some kind of view of society as an organism where issues and ideas are launched at the top (sometimes by stealing them from the Periphery though), and then digested and handed on downwards in society along that gradient until ultimately it piles up in the Periphery as an archaic form or attitude - and then disappears.

And this leads to a fourth point: a very important characteristic of social systems would be how steep the gradient is, how different in fact, the situation in all regards is ~~be~~ between Center and Periphery. The steeper the gradient the more one would have to talk about a society as being constituted of two parts; living their parallel existence along railway tracks that will never meet, so to speak [18].

4. The theory of imperialism.

We can now build further on what has been said and use these concepts as building material for a theory of imperialism. For that purpose, however, we would have to think in terms of not only one but at least two collectivities, each with their structure composed of systems, each with their Center-Periphery gradient. Imperialism, then, is a particular way of linking two such structures together, and it will immediately be seen that a relatively steep Center-Periphery gradient at least in one of them is a condition for this to work [19].

To do this one has to think in terms of two levels: the level of nations and the level of persons, and we shall use capital letters for the former and lower case letters for the latter.

Imagine now for the sake of simplicity that we consider only one-dimensional imperialism, in one system and, as usual, resort to the case of economic imperialism. Basing it entirely on the structure-oriented perspective (for it is only within that perspective that a theory of imperialism can be formulated, since it is indeed a theory of relations between countries and classes, not only of differences between them) we would have to operate with three types of exploitation: between the Center and Periphery

nations; and within both nations, between the center in the Center and periphery in the Center (cC and pC) and between the center in the Periphery and the periphery in the Periphery (between cP and pP). Formulated in one special terminology: the bourgeoisie in either country exploits its proletariat, but in such a way that the net benefit is in favor of the imperialist power.

However, this is not enough to constitute a theory of imperialism. In addition to this double level exploitation pattern there is also a linkage between the two centers, between cC and cP. This linkage can be very concrete and take the form of white settlers in a colony, local representatives of a multinational organization, or some type of communication link via telesatellite, making the centers in the two countries parts of the same ongoing concern, harmonized with each other in interests, outlook, and usually also level of living. But differently: it is not only exploitation of one country by another, but a systematic use of the local bourgeoisie—here formulated more generally as the center in the Periphery—as a bridgehead which is characteristic of imperialism. Thus, imperialism is seen as a four-class relationship, based on all the four groups mentioned; it is not a two-class relation in general. It may, however, crystallize into a two-class relationship, by some of the mechanisms now to be developed.

First, there is the idea hinted at above of gradients that differ in steepness. The center in the Center can co-opt the periphery in the Center by means such as parliamentary democracy (sharing some of the political power), economic welfare state (sharing better the economic surplus), general education (bridging cultural gaps, at least to some extent) and so on - thereby making the local center and periphery coalesce more into one unit. Lenin

already referred to this under the heading of "labor aristocracy", and the general point is simply that through such mechanisms the pC in an international context ^{will} have the same interests as the cC/cP alliance. And thus the basis is laid for what is known today as the People's War of Liberation: the periphery in the Periphery fighting the triple alliance of the other three - like the people of Vietnam fighting Pentagon, American hardhats and Saigon.

The second reduction formula would be the National War of Liberation whereby the groups in the Periphery join together to fight the groups in the Center - as was found, for instance, in the Latin American wars of liberation at the beginning of the 19th century; and also, indeed, the American war of liberation. The pattern is important theoretically but perhaps not so frequent empirically in our day because the cP is so well co-opted and taken care of through all kinds of international organizations and supporting devices that their sympathy and mind and soul will be with the Center even though they are forced to live in the Periphery.

And then there is the third possibility, the possibility that Marx was indicating when the slogan "Proletarians in all countries, unite!" was launched. Generally speaking, the conditions do not favor this alliance: workers in the Center are not only at the geographical distance from the workers in the Periphery, but also at a considerable social distance from them and more importantly: it is not at all obvious that they have the same interests, at least not short term ones. But when they are brought closer together, for instance through the institution of "guest workers", and when in addition there is a crisis in the capitalist system so that they are more on an equal footing -

both suffering from the irrationalities of that economic formation, the conditions might be ripe for this type of crystallization. In that case the two gradients would be about equally steep.

We have already mentioned two conditions for imperialism to function: a certain harmony between the two centers, and an inegalitarian distribution of inequality - a steeper gradient in the Periphery than in the Center. In addition to this one might now add to the two-nation model considered so far by introducing such ideas as three-nation models (indirect imperialism: United States via Canada in the Caribbean, Japan via South Korea in Indonesia and so on); economic cycle imperialism where the whole global system can be seen as located on a cycle where the Center is engaged in research, administration and finance in addition to highly sophisticated processing and the Periphery is engaged in extraction of raw materials, relatively unsophisticated production and consumption (serving as a market), and also as a supplier of cheap labor; whether the labor is made use of at home or in the Center. And finally, there is the pattern of sub-imperialism: a view of the world as having a central imperialist power (the United States would today be the actor filling this structural position) surrounded by regions, and with a "favorite country" in each region that serves as an intermediate for a number of three-nation imperialistic chains within that region - in terms of economic exploitation, political control, military (including paramilitary) intervention, and so on. But all the time the basic ideas remain the same, using Center-Periphery gradients as building blocks.

5. Relations to Marxist theory.

This theory is in part intended as an expansion or generalization of Marxist thinking, fully aware that Marxists will not

necessarily, or indeed not, accept it as such. The intended generalizations are as follows.

First, of course, there is the extension to more systems. Thus, we want to be able to talk not only about capitalist imperialism but also for instance about what the Chinese refer to as "social imperialism", which we see essentially as the imposition on the Periphery by the Center^{of} a particular social structure. Hence, it is profoundly political and cultural, but can also be used for economic purposes although it is not the experience that the Soviet Union really engages in economic exploitation at present (except for some particular cases, perhaps Roumania and Czechoslovakia, in the past). It goes without saying that the structure imposed has to contain a vertical gradient, otherwise there would not be a bridgehead that could be used for imperialistic purposes - and the way this gradient is built into society seems to be by means of education, professionalism and individual mobility based on educational attainment, professional achievement and - indeed - loyalty. This is only one example of a formation of extreme importance to those who live under it, and we want the theory of imperialism to be broad enough to capture a phenomenon of that kind. In order to do that a multisystem approach is needed, building on a structural approach, not one system only. [20]

A second reason is very simple: social life simply is not that uni-dimensional as experienced by those who live in it. There is the added danger in uni-dimensional thinking that it may lead to uni-dimensional political action, trying to eradicate imperialism or vertical social structure in general by economic means only.

It is precisely this type of experience that is underlying the entire approach: it is tempting to think that the phenomenon on Herrschaft has been captured in terms of one dimension and to act politically according to this. But once some type of equality has been established along that dimension the same phenomenon seems very easily to reappear somewhere else.

On other occasions attention has been drawn to education as a type of Herrschaft pattern that under certain conditions may be as important as economic relations. [21] But as important as this is the importance of all kinds of inconsistencies in the rank profile. At this point it is tempting to indicate that Marx perhaps lived in a relatively simple society, where those who were rich were also well educated by the standards of the period and endowed with power in general. Today all kinds of combinations can be found, as evidenced by the distributions of population samples on social position indexes. In fact, it might be very interesting to carry out a comparative analysis using the extent to which the population in a country is crystallized into people with clear patterns at either end of the scale as a fundamental variable. Industrialized, capitalist, liberal societies seem to be relatively complex with a rather low degree of crystallization, and with rank disequilibrium playing a rather fundamental role. This aspect of class, being high in one and low in the other cannot be said to be taken adequately care of in marxist thinking, yet it seems to be rather important in how people perceive their own social situation.

Finally, one might draw the attention to the idea in connection with imperialism theory that the steepness of the exploitation gradient seems to matter considerably. More particularly, a rather vicious feature of modern imperialism is the extent to which the internal proletariat, here referred to as the periphery of the Center is tied to the center in the Center simply because they together share the spoils of general exploitation. As a consequence of this it will only be under relatively particular circumstances that the conditions for general proletariat cooperation throughout the world will be present. In earlier times that condition was perhaps more present than today, and again Marx may perhaps be said to have lived under simpler social circumstances. Thus, it was probably not Denmark that exploited Norway, but Copenhagen that exploited everybody else in Denmark-Norway.

6. Conclusion

Such are the essentials of Center-Periphery concepts and theories, starting with simple efforts to come to grips with public opinion data, ending up with more large -scale theorizing about imperialism. In a sense the idea is very simple: the basic unit is a system with some kind of Center-Periphery relation. This relation is defined in terms of "rank difference" or "exploitation relation" or " network position"; the former being the easiest for public opinion analysis, the second by far the most important in analysis of imperialistic systems and for theory information in general.

This is the building unit, the atom so to speak of the analysis. And from this atom various types of molecules can be formed, by adding, subtracting, and combining in more complex forms, as for instance in the imperialism theory.

N O T E S

* Paper presented as opening address, Nordic Conference on Methodology Research, Røros, Norway, June 1974.

1. This theme is developed in some details in chapter 2 of the author's The True Worlds: A Transnational Perspective, (New York, 1977).
2. For an attempt to analyze "Social Imperialism", see Johan Galtung, "East-West Security and Cooperation: A Sceptical Contribution", Journal of Peace Research, 1975, No.1; Appendix; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.V, ch.2 and "Social Imperialism and Sub-Imperialism: Continuities in the Structural Theory of Imperialism", Papers No.22, Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo.
3. This was in fact done in a study in Norway, in two communities, one industrial in the north (Mo i Rana) and one fishing village in the south (Ona-Sira). The results were similar, in agreement with the idea of the Index presented in the text (i.e. there was little doubt in the population as to what represented "under-dog" and what "top-dog" positions). However, the most pronounced and clear desire for mobility were along such axes as income, education and urban-rural. Occupation gives a much more complicated picture, and so do age and sex. There is actually an important and interesting correlation here between the strength with which people hold mobility wishes along such dimensions and the extent to which the dimensions correlate with attitudes and behavior.
4. This is developed to some extent in the author's "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", Journal of Peace Research, 1971, pp.81-117; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.IV, ch.13.
5. This sense is developed systematically in graph theory. See, for instance, the excellent article by Nils Petter Gleditsch and Tord Høivik, "Structural Parameters of Graphs: A Theoretical Investigation", Quality and Quantity, IV, 1970, No.1, pp.193-209.
6. See the author's "Foreign Policy Opinion as a Function of Social Position", Journal of Peace Research, 1964, pp.206-231, particularly p. 217; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.III, ch.2.
7. This idea is developed in the author's "Small Group Theory and the Theory of International Relations: A Study in Isomorphism", in Morton Kaplan, ed., New Approaches in International Relations (1968); Essays in Peace Research, Vol.IV, ch.1.
8. In the Index referred to in footnote 6 above the Index Values 0 - 2 was considered an operationalization of the Periphery, with 6 - 8 being an operationalization of the Center - the bulk of the population being located in the range 3 - 5. Often, however, it makes sense to use the Index from 0 - 8, all nine values, particularly because the correlations with attitude and behavior are so high and so regular, and this is lost by reducing from nine values to three.

9. For a suggestion along this line, see the author's "A Structural Theory of Agression", Journal of Peace Research, 1964, particularly page 115; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.III, ch.4.
10. This is developed in some detail in "Measuring World Development" (Publication from the Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo, No.11), by J.Galtung, A.Guha, A.Wirak, S.Sjølie, M.Cifuentes, A.Løvørak.
11. A general survey of approaches arising out of the Center/Periphery approach, including adding and subtracting scores for one actor, can be found in the author's "International Relations and International Conflicts: A Sociological Approach", Transactions of the Sixth World Congress of Sociology, (International Sociological Association, 1966), pp.121-161, particularly p. 124; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.IV, ch.9.
12. For a development of this theme, see the author's The European Community: A Superpower in the Making, (London: Allen and Unwin, 1973).
13. This difference is the basic abalytical variable used by Sorokin, referred to as ideational/sensate. According to our type of thinking both orientations should be found in the Periphery; in the Center one would probably find Sorokin's other two types, the "idealistic" and the "mixed" categories. Of course, occasionally pure types may make a break-through into the Center.
14. For an effort to relate social position theory to party distribution, see this author's "Social Position, Party Identification and Foreign Policy Orientation: A Norwegian Case Study", in James Rosenau, ed., Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy (New York: The Free Press, 1967), pp.161-193.
15. The Hague, Mouton, 1976.
16. This idea is developed and tested particularly in "Attitudes Towards Different Forms of Disarmament: A Study of Norwegian Public Opinion", IPRA Studies in Peace Research (Assen: van Gorcum, 1966), pp.210-238; also in Essays in Peace Research, Vol.II, ch.6.
17. The most dramatic recent example of this in Norway would be the referendum on Norwegian membership in the European Community 25 September, 1972, ending with a 53% rejection of membership. The correlation with social position was extremely clear and extremely strong: resistance was indeed a Periphery stand, acceptance of Norwegian membership a Center position. Nevertheless, the Periphery view became the majority view.
18. For a further development of this theme, see Nils H. Halle: "Social Position and Foreign Policy Attitudes", Journal of Peace Research, 1966, pp. 46-74.

19. This theme is developed in some detail in the author's "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", Journal of Peace Research, 1971, pp. 81-117; Essays in Peace Research, Vol.IV, ch.13.

20. This, incidentally, is a reason for the use of the word "structural" in connection with the theory of imperialism: it is not the theory developed from the substance of, for instance, production relations, but from the structure of interaction relations in general when they are constituted in a particular way. An other reason is, of course, that the theory expresses a structure-oriented rather than actor-oriented perspective on social affairs.

21. See two publications from the Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo: "Educational Growth and Educational Disparity", Papers No.1, and "Schooling and Future Society", Papers No. 7.