

GSAPS THE SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL THESIS

INTRASTATE CENTER-PERIPHERY RELATIONS: U.S.-GUAM AND DENMARK-GREENLAND ISLAND-CONTINENT AFFAIRS

4013S3129

Tatsuya Sakurai-Jyc Liu

Chief Advisor: Prof. Hatsue Shinohara

Keywords: Power, Periphery, Security, Guam, Greenland

Background: Over the past few years, with the rise of Guam's role as an integral strategic hub to the United State's Asia-Pacific rebalance strategy (Clinton, 2011), further autonomy to Denmark's island-periphery by way of Greenlandic self-rule in the Arctic (Statsministeriet, 2009), and the legal question of Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle by the U.S. Supreme Court on the commonwealth's constitutional-sovereignty (*Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle*, 2016), there is a renewed emphasis placed on the periphery's power in center-periphery relations in the modern era.

At first seemingly unrelated and relevant only on tangent, Guam, Greenland, and Puerto Rico do cover different issues in different regions. However, all three represent the periphery in center-periphery relations in their respective situations. As such, their bond and unity in being peripheral powers allows for the opportunity to examine across-boundaries the question of powers in the periphery chiefly in regards to political status and security.

In terms of power, in center-periphery relations, there is an observation where, for instance, in Denmark's case the center has relatively less power over her periphery---Greenland, as opposed to both the U.S. cases in which the center has relatively more power over her peripheries---Guam and Puerto Rico. Furthermore, more often than not, the situations observed are frequently concerned with issues such as political status (autonomy), security, and power; which is why the paper has chosen to focus on said subjects to provide clarity in more relevant areas.

This observation begs the question of not only why there is a disparity in peripheral power, but also to what extent peripheral power may or may not matter in negotiations vis-à-vis their centers, more simply what are the powers of the periphery? This paper posits that in order to understand such questions, the hierarchical relationship between center-periphery must first be understood under a more encompassing and comprehensive analytical framework than currently available.

Therefore, the main question concerns not who has more or less power, but rather where does that power come from, in what way is that power shaped or formed, and the implications or influences of said power.

Center-periphery relations have long been discussed as part of an either state-to-state format, i.e. Latin America v. U.S. (Escude, 1997), a socioeconomic world-systems perspective (Wallerstein, 2000), or in geopolitical terms (O'Tuathail, 2006) in mainstream discourse.

However, the hierarchical relationship between the center-periphery, in which the periphery is defined as the internal entities (i.e. territories, commonwealth) on the outer edges (hence 'periphery') of nation-states, has yet to be comprehensively examined as detailed in Methods.

With efforts to test the above framework, relevant interviews have been obtained over a two-year span on the island of Guam with political leadership, grassroots, and in-betweeners, oral arguments and decided opinions of the Supreme Court retrieved, as well as further whitepapers assessed on the Greenlandic direction in political status, there is a certain degree of significance and originality in framework and original sources to this paper.

In brief, *security starts from our borders. Given that logic, should we not be spending more time, emphasis even, on understanding our periphery?*

Research question: Mainly, does the notion of security supersede the powers of the periphery to become the single-most defining and therefore most-influencing dimension to center-periphery relations? What is the extent of power peripheral entities have in negotiations with their centers in terms of autonomy and security based on the nature of peripheral relations? (*Main aims include: defining and developing the framework to the center-periphery relationship, interpreting said relationship, then following up on the implications of the relationship on peripheral power, autonomy, and security*).

Justification: There is an apparent lack of *comprehensive* understanding in center-periphery relations, likewise, freshly observed phenomena, such as the U.S. rebalance, Greenlandic self-rule, and the Supreme Court-ruling, all call for more modern and thorough case studies such as the U.S.-Guam and Denmark-Greenland relationships in a compare and contrast format.

Methods: To understand the nature of peripheral relations, a comprehensive analytical framework utilizing five-dimensions, *history, culture, governance, natural resources*, and, *security*, is being developed to provide a more well-balanced picture to center-periphery relations. Specific aims of the framework include a) developing a more complete understanding of intrastate center-periphery relations using the five dimensions previously mentioned, b) to situate each dimension as a primary (short-term) or secondary (mid-long term) concern of importance for researchers and the wider audience to evaluate, and c) to assess the peripheral relationship given said dimensions and concerns.

The framework is currently limited in the following ways: a) providing more breadth as opposed to depth, b) suggestive (filling in the picture) rather than exhaustive (painting the picture). However, with that said, the framework is methodically applied in the following order: evaluating the nature of the peripheral relationship (stage 1), determining the importance of each facet based on immediate existential concerns (stage 2), and finally concluding the implications on the peripheral relationship as applied via the framework to individual cases (stage 3).

Hierarchy and the role it plays in distinguishing, perhaps even dividing, the powers of the periphery vis-à-vis the center versus the commonly understood IR-reference to state-to-state power is another critical point to in-depth analysis of said CP-relationship.

References

- Clinton, Hillary R. (2011), *America's Pacific Century*, *Foreign Policy*.
- Escude, Carlos (1997), *Foreign Policy Theory in Menem's Argentina*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- O'Tuathail, Gearóid (2006), *The Geopolitics Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle (2016), 579 U.S. ____, Supreme Court of the United States.
- The Prime Minister's Office (2009), *The Greenland Self-Government Arrangement*, Christiansborg, Copenhagen.
- The White House Office of the Press Secretary (2011), *Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament*.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2000), *The Essential Wallerstein*, New York: New Press.