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Appendix A Methods used

Introduction
For doing phronetic social science there would not be one fixed methodology (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 162). Nevertheless, the first chapter of the methodological framework (Chapter 4) showed that discourse analysis comes in handy when you take this alternative analytical route for social science, just as the Foucaultian approach to hereby focus on the relationships between politics and science when it concerns the concept of territorial cohesion. To tell how to study the concept in such a way, this methodological appendix subsequently discusses the specific methods used in the research’s discourse analysis below. Before the explanation of how actually to perform discourse analysis puts forward an absence of rules to follow (§A.2), however, what this interpretative method actually does during analysis will be treated (§A.1). An analysis analyses something though. The chapter’s third section therefore accounts for how this discourse analysis gathers information (§A.3). This chapter concludes these used methods by psychologically characterising their process and cartographically characterising the results they produce (§A.4).

A.1 What (this) discourse analysis does

A.1.1 Discourse analysis interprets texts by analysing interpretations
Although a discourse analysis does not lock itself up in the realm of text, the interpretative search for meaning of this methodology, in casu a mapping of ‘territorial cohesion’, does imply the analysis of interpretations which appear in texts – at least because linguistic representations of the world and linguistic practices form parts of a discourse. The precautions this section shows below as holding for text analysis are therefore also valid for the Foucaultian approach. For what the Foucaultian approach aims, however, brings us beyond text, via intertextuality, to practices, power, knowledge, and, eventually, strategies (see §A.1.2 to A.1.5). What is – not unsolvable, but – problematic for this research on the concept of territorial cohesion, is, then, that this path beyond text focuses on the historicity of regimes of truth (see §A.1.6). Nonetheless, to get beyond text analysis, first the question of how to interpret texts needs to be treated.

The extraction of meaning through textual analysis is associated with the hermeneutic model of interpretation which poses that an interpretation is produced as a result of ‘the interaction between the text being studied and the intellectual framework of the interpreter’ (Johnston&Prat&Watts, 2000: 825; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 155). When we try to understand something, we namely ‘bring to it a whole set of preconceptions [which] provide a context in which we make sense of and interpret the meaning of the text’ (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 23). To let the outcome of such an inductive process of interpretation be determined as much by the research object instead of the researcher, an attempt should therefore be made – in line with the Foucaultian approach which tries not to objectify before analysis – to bring as few a priori ideas as possible with us (e.g. no need to account for existing theories about structuring processes) (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588). Nevertheless, textual analysis remains inevitably selective: ‘in any analysis, we choose to ask certain questions about social events and texts, and not other possible questions’ (Fairclough, 2003: 14). Then again, these questions are what this research on territorial cohesion analyses: it orders interpretations of the concept shown in texts and their preconceptions. That is, the question this research asks about a text is ‘Which questions are and can be asked with territorial cohesion?’ – e.g. ‘Territorial cohesion on which geographical level?’ and ‘Does
territorial cohesion imply spatial planning?’ respectively (see Book II). Still, also this research itself carries its preconceptions with it to perform its “meta-interpretation” – as laid out in Chapters 2 and 3 on the analytical framework and Chapter 4 which situates the methodological framework. Thus, insofar this research interprets texts, both the interpretations of territorial cohesion shown by texts and the interpretation written down by this research are formed through the hermeneutic circle. This means a ‘tacking back and forth between our evolving contextual preconceptions of the text and the text itself, and between individual parts of the text and the text as a whole’ (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 23). The hermeneutic circle of interpretation has major epistemological consequences though.

The main dilemma of hermeneutics is that it cannot provide a basis to distinguish good from bad readings (e.g. in ac-/concordance with the text’s original meaning) (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 33). In large part this is a consequence of the hermeneutic tradition itself, as it considers the distinction between fact and fiction to be problematic (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). Meanings clarified through the hermeneutic circle of interpretation are, namely, not found but “fictions” “in the sense that they are “something made”, “something fashioned” – the original meaning of fictio – not that they are false, un factual, or merely “as if” thought experiments’ with no reference to the material world to which they refer and represent’ (Geertz, 1973/1975: 15; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). To make all meanings interpreted out of texts fiction, seems to leave researchers nothing but shaky ground to analyse texts – no matter that many methods of textual analysis can be used for this interpretative understanding (e.g. semiotics of structuralism, deconstruction or discourse analysis of post-structuralism), all since long in usage to explore social and cultural meaning (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 155). However, from the hermeneutic perspective the argument runs that ‘the active involvement of the researcher in the fashioning of interpretation, far from invalidating the resulting representations, is the precondition for true understanding, which is imagined as the outcome of an ongoing dialogue and engagement between the researcher and the meaningful objects he or she studies’ (Geertz, 1973/1975: 15; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). Making the meanings conveyed by texts “merely fictions” is thus a primary result of such a textual analysis – e.g. taking away the ground underneath those believing a text harbours one meaning only or even represents facts. Still, the tension for the researcher, also in this research on territorial cohesion, becomes: he is necessary for understanding, but may not interpret his own preconceptions into the text. How to deal herewith?

The obvious preconceptions of this research were mentioned in the previous chapter and based on an ontological understanding of the world as meaningful and therefore “text-like” (i.e. not only text) and a constructionist epistemology whereby structure and agency dwell in discourse. Without much (positive) theoretical preconceptions from this methodological framework to guide interpretation, every reading of a text might appear to be a good one. Hence, to not read and let interpretation run wild, the interpretation of a text must match, in line with the hermeneutic circle, the interpretation of its various contexts and vice versa – i.e. to understand text without interpreting own preconceptions into it, the researcher must place the text and its rhetorical organisation in its discursive and social contexts and practices. The sections below treat these issues in this order: A.1.2 on text and intertextuality, A.1.3 on the social context and practices beyond but related to text, A.1.4 on which kinds of texts to analyse, and A.1.5 on Foucault’s crux.

A.1.2 Passing through the intertextual territorial cohesion text
When an interpretation results from looking at how text and practice interconnect, the way to understand such interconnections becomes an important preconception and must be made explicit too. The Foucaultian approach taken, however, also leaves it open how text and
practices interconnect recursively, because an account of how they do should result from a particular analysis (see §4.5.2 on Foucaultian discourse analysis). The contextual preconceptions of text then thus evolve during the analysis – a way of understanding text surely in need of a researcher. Besides, this approach does not analyse text as a discourse analysis informed by political economy, as it does not study ‘the structure of text, vocabulary and grammar cohesion’ (Jacobs, 2006: 42), but a system of knowledge and its associated practices. Language is instrumental to create and reproduce this system and in the form of texts represents a body of statements which performs, for instance, rhetorical, legitimising, and/or synthesising activities (Jacobs, 2006: 44). When a text is not the research object itself this could make the context of a text even more important and lets us wonder what a Foucaultian research studies when it analyses territorial cohesion text. This context and research object are outlined below.

The discourse analysis chosen by this Foucaultian research to study the concept of territorial cohesion examines the rhetorical organisation of discourse, that is: ‘the argumentative schemes that organize a text and establish its authority’ (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164). Territorial cohesion statements were above already discussed as intellectual and strategic positions lacking (proper) argumentation, leaving us here with pro/positions (e.g. see §4.5.3 on argumentation). What is more, hereby it does not revolve around text in the sense of documents, but only text related to the signifier ‘territorial cohesion’, which is scattered over documents. The method used to analyse – not one document, but – the “territorial cohesion text” formed by documents leans against textual analysis insofar the latter deals with intertextuality. Namely, although texts often refer to other texts, especially government and legal documents (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159), the “text” formed by interrelations of texts takes centre stage in this research on the concept of territorial cohesion – i.e. the “territorial cohesion text” intertextuality constructs. When intertextuality ‘alerts us to the fact that organisational and official documents are part of wider systems of distribution and exchange’ (Atkinson&Coffey, 1997: 57; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159), this research looks at such texts from the angle of territorial cohesion as such a wider system. A consequence hereof is that the important contrast between intertextuality and assumption should be seen with a different light. The contrast would be that the former opens up ‘difference by bringing other ‘voices’ into a text’ and the latter reduces ‘difference by assuming common ground’ (Fairclough, 2003: 41). This research, on the other hand, through an interpretative step reconstructs the common intertextual ground of territorial cohesion pro/positions on which argumentations can be built (see Chapters 5 and 6 on mapping the concept’s meanings and usages, and Book II which maps them).

Considering text in an “intertextual way” does not only take us beyond a text in the plain and individual sense to the consequential need of cutting across documents for its analysis, but also towards discursive practice – a step which overlaps with discourse analyses informed by political economy. That is to say, studying discursive practice entails ‘the analysis of the processes in which texts are framed, that is, the context in which statements are made and feed into other debates’ (Jacobs, 2006: 42). An analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion should thereby distinguish between the discursive practices of the intertextual territorial cohesion text and the context hereof, its ground and situation of debates in which the concept is positioned (e.g. formed by Cohesion Policy, European spatial planning). The understanding of territorial cohesion argumentations as pro/positions can for this be extended to this discursive context while intertextually forms both. The involved discourse analysis tries, then, to demarcate the field where in uniform diversity the concept of territorial cohesion functions as tactical element. This study therefore differs from more common discussions of intertextuality which would begin with the question of which relevant
‘external’ texts and voices are (recognisably) included in a text and which (significantly) excluded (Fairclough, 2003: 61). It, namely, does not divide texts up according to their in-/exclusion and/or strength, but maps the distribution of the multiplicity of the discursive elements of ‘territorial cohesion’ over and through texts, texts which might either explicitly refer to each other or implicitly through the territorial cohesion sign. Yet, to discipline interpretation of text without bringing in own preconceptions, text must certainly be placed in its social contexts and practices – i.e. beyond territorial cohesion text in all senses and into the “text-like” world.

A.1.3 Go beyond text by reconstructing the social context and practices from text
To restrain interpretation of (intertextual) text, this research should with its discourse analytical method foremost highlight the social relations external to text, that is, the social setting as interpretative context in which text is located (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 115; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164); the more so, because not only the intertextual ground of the concept forms the territorial cohesion discourse, but also the practices in which the concept is used do. A Foucaultian approach thereby looks at the practices of power relations (see Chapter 2 on the analytical framework) and relates the discourse to wider power structures; also this is similar to how a discourse analysis informed by political economy considers social practice, but without the consideration of ideology (Jacobs, 2006: 42). Hence, the discourse analysis of this research is ‘concerned with the relationship between language and other elements and aspects of social life’ (Fairclough, 2003: 5). That is why it may be compared to, for instance, a study of how documents circulate through the networks of restricted social spheres, as official documents often do (Atkinson&Coffey, 1997: 57; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159). Again, the Foucaultian approach used is not oriented to the social character of texts though – e.g. as the linguistic theory and associated analytical methods of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) are (Fairclough, 2003: 5) –, but focuses on knowledge of the human world and power and discursive and meaning-making practices which also interconnect in the language of territorial cohesion texts.

Still, this step of the Foucaultian discourse analytical method as main way out of the realm of text nonetheless implies interpretation. Similar to the precautions shown above for an interpretation of text (e.g. the making of “fiction” through the hermeneutic circle), an interpretation of the power relations in the “text-like” world outside text has to deal with some issues. A structuring of a political debate, namely, ‘always incorporates certain assumptions about what politics is and how it works [and] the way one analyses discourses is very dependent on assumptions about structure and agency, as well as one’s own discursive contexts and concerns’ (Diez, 2001: 18). Of course, not all these assumptions for this research should be revisited here (see Chapters 2 and 3 for how this research understands politics from its discursive context formed by Foucault and spatial planning and §1.1.2 for its phronetic concerns and §1.2.2 and 1.5.2 for its (non-)treatment of structure and agency). It should be clear by now that it would make no sense, for instance, to use discourse analysis as method ‘if one believes that politics is essentially about the realization of structurally determined economic interest’ (Diez, 2001: 18) – i.e. why analyse discourse if it is an already identified structure which determines the political outcome anyways? The more striking might be, that to think differently outside the common ways to scrutinise instead of legitimate them, a Foucaultian questioning of events leads to the attempt to not refer to the consciousness, the will, or intention – i.e. in this removal of the doer from the deed own concerns and (lacking) preconceptions merge (Nietzsche, 1968: 356; Foucault, 1968, in Burchell&Gordon&Mililer, 1991: 59; Foucault, 1985: 9; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). A weaker version of the argument is enough to make these removals make any sense though. That is, this research does not hold that there is no (thinkable) reality in which structure or agency
exist, merely that for this research these are not the determining forces at work in the making of the concept of territorial cohesion (e.g. its knowledges). The question then becomes how an analysis of territorial cohesion can demonstrate this last point, or even show which forces do shape the concept?

With decisions as, arguably, points where forces prove themselves, the balance in power relations can be determined by analysing decision-making, whose specific outcomes should be studied by – as the pluralist approach to power teaches us – stressing concrete observable behaviour (Lukes, 1974: 12). Note thereby that ‘nondecisions which confine the scope of decision-making are themselves (observable) decisions’; although these may not be overt, specific to a given issue, nor taken to exclude potential challenges, dominance can already defend its status quo by supporting the established political process (Bachrach&Baratz, 1970: 50; Lukes, 1974: 18). The researcher should study such behaviour ‘either at first hand or by reconstructing behavior from documents, informants, newspapers, and other appropriate sources’ (Polsby, 1963: 113, 121; Lukes, 1974: 12). Studying concrete behaviour at first hand is not an option for this research. It therefore places the reconstruction of concrete behaviour besides the one of the distribution of the multiplicity of discursive elements (see §A.1.4 on which kinds of text to analyse and §A.3.1 on gathering information for which sources this research uses). Both reconstructions thus start from text to go beyond text. Even though it does not necessarily has to be the same document, this does turn the difference of interpreting practices and discursive elements into just another way of looking to text. Hence, it becomes essential how this research can interpret practices laying outside the text they peek through.

To reconstruct concrete behaviour the Foucaultian researcher “simply” starts to record from text ‘what happened on such a day, such a place, in such circumstances’ (Foucault, 1971, in Miller, 1993: 191), and then presents the data, events, and phenomena ‘together with their connections with other data, events, and phenomena’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). He hereby initially – in line with the concern of thinking outside common ways – ‘takes no position regarding truth-value and significance ascribed by participants to the practices studied’, moreover, he does not even preconceive one practice to be more valuable than another (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). The interpretation of practices with the text they peek through thus brings us to the relationship between practices and meaning.

The second step of this Foucaultian approach links practices and discursive elements. What particularly suits a discourse analytical research on the concept of territorial cohesion thereby, is that the recording and presentation involved in the first step leads to the documenting of the ‘[d]iscontinuities and changes in the meaning of concepts and discourses’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). A Foucaultian research should, namely, as its key task ‘identify how discourses exemplify conflicts over meaning that are linked to power’ (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Hereby the concern is not merely to isolate the hermeneutic horizon of meaning of the individual practice – i.e. demarcate the field of both meaning and concrete behaviour wherein the concept functions as tactical element –, but to elaborate its arbitrariness as well, notwithstanding its self-understanding as rational (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). It are, then, the various kinds of practices which give the methodological ground to link the reconstructions of concrete behaviour and distribution of discursive elements, because practices are ways of acting and thinking at once and a discourse’s complex set of competing ideas actualises itself in our everyday practices (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Daily discursive practices thus link power practices to meaning and discourse.

With this Foucaultian approach, the last step tallies the concerns of isolating and relativising the reconstructed horizon of meaning (note that this research calls for this step to be taken). It namely relates the discourse to wider power structures, whereby the researcher would try to understand the role these studied practices played in the total system of relations,
albeit *via* other horizons of meaning and/or historical or political contexts (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135) (see Chapter 2 on governmentality). Understanding the discourse’s role in the total system of relations therefore implies a placing of it which underlines the discourse’s own limits and a comparison with other rational grounds of practices (see possible future research). However, these three simple steps and their required stances beg the question: how to connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena, document changes in meaning, identify links between meaning and power relations, isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, have practices interpreted through text as ground and understand the role of them in multiple contexts? These questions will be answered below in section 2.2. Here another question remains, especially when text plays such a central role for the reconstruction of both discursive elements and power practices, that is: which texts to apply this generally stated mission to when studying the concept of territorial cohesion?

A.1.4 The kinds of texts to analyse

What does the above entail for the selection of texts to discourse analytically study the concept of territorial cohesion? To interpret the intertextual territorial cohesion ground of pro/positions on which argumentations can be build, this research of course analyses texts which mention ‘territorial cohesion’ (see §A.3.1 on which data to collect). Yet, because this discourse analysis considers the discursive elements of the concept tactically in force relations whose concrete observable behaviour of/in power practices are interpreted through text, some analytical separations lead to a selection of territorial cohesion texts (i.e. to not include every utterance of ‘territorial cohesion’). Namely, in accordance with the four kinds of power distinguished for this research (i.e. *auctoritas*, *potestas*, *pecunia*, *politique spirituelle*; see Chapter 3 on power) different kinds of texts can be identified through which power practices peek: texts about official competencies (e.g. Treaties, position papers), policy (e.g. Cohesion Reports, documents from the Ministers responsible for spatial development), funding (e.g. Financial Perspectives, EP reports on funding, interviews), and those that shape the debates (e.g. ESPON Reports, research articles). It are these kinds of texts mentioning territorial cohesion which form the intertextual text to interpret and analyse practices.

Then again, a discourse does not consist of text and practices, but of a system of knowledge and its associated practices. For texts to point to territorial cohesion knowledges an extra step of selection needs to be taken: here the policy texts and those that shape thought are especially important due to their stronger relationship to knowledge (see Chapter 9 on the meanings of the concept for a demonstration hereof and Chapter 2 on governmentality). The exploration of how the concept of territorial cohesion represents particular ideas, actions, institutions, physical artefacts, attributes or relations in the language of policy documents (Jensen&Richardson, 2003) thus fits the approach to discourse analysis of the above mentioned framework particularly well (see §4.4 on policy analysis). Hence, in its reconstruction of the distribution of the discursive elements of the concept this research’s discourse analysis selects territorial cohesion texts. To be precise, it selects texts concerned with official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate to reconstruct the concrete behaviour of power practices concerned with territorial cohesion, while it focuses on the policy texts and those shaping the debate to reconstruct the rhetorical organisation instrumental for the creation and reproduction of the concept’s system of knowledge (see §4.5.2 on Foucaultian discourse analysis).

A.1.5 Thoroughly applying Foucault’s crux: include science

This Foucault-based research on the concept of territorial cohesion should thus provide a sufficient description of the intertextual text which forms the ground of territorial cohesion pro/positions, ‘provide sufficient social and political context to explain changes in policy’,
and explore power relations (Jacobs, 2006: 45). Less common for scientific research hereby is to grasp Flyvbjerg (2001: 62), who holds that also social science itself can contribute to social development as know-how (techne) by ‘grappling with social, cultural, demographic, and administrative problems’. The same could be said of analytical scientific knowledge (episteme) or social science as phronesis – e.g. as policy science shaping the debate. With each of these tasks the social sciences can play an emancipatory role or control, repress, and legitimate (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 62). Which role social science – and possibly “spatial science” – plays when it concerns territorial cohesion is therefore worth closer analysis and depends on the specific interests and purposes science serves with the concept and in its specific context (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 62).

Moreover, this research is particularly interested in the scientific part of the territorial cohesion discourse situated on both the knowledge as practice side (e.g. the scientific analysis of territorial cohesion as a policy discourse), especially how the scientific part (e.g. scientific knowledge, discursive practices, meaning-making practices) relates to power practices (e.g. in policy-making) and wider power structures and vice versa. This involves a thorough application of the Foucaultian crux to territorial cohesion: study discourses on the level of their tactical productivity with the question ‘What reciprocal effects of power and knowledge do they ensure?’ (Foucault, 1980b: 102; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 124). Thereby looking at, for instance, how scientific knowledges solidify power relations by representing a part of the world as having social, political, or economic structures and actors (e.g. the same in the “territorial cohesion world” as elsewhere), and how power relations make it possible for certain knowledges to appear instead of others (e.g. through their influence on scientific practices concerned with territorial cohesion). Furthermore, a thorough application of the Foucaultian crux to territorial cohesion should, besides studying the tactical productivity of its discourse, account for the level of strategic integration (see Chapter 2 on governmentality). This with the question: What conjunction and what force relationships make it necessary to utilise the demarcated territorial cohesion discourse in a given episode of the various confrontations that occur? (Foucault, 1980b: 102; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 124). An understanding of the role of the territorial cohesion discourse in the total system of relations would therefore not only underline its limits and compare it to other rational grounds, but this post also makes it possible to see the discourse’s strategic value.

To summarise what is said above: this research’s Foucaultian approach to discourse analysis uses texts concerned with official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate to form (via intertextually) the territorial cohesion text to analyse. It analyses the system of territorial cohesion knowledge and its associated practices through this text. This by reconstructing, on the one hand, the rhetorical organisation of territorial cohesion propositions to get to the common ground for territorial cohesion arguments and, on the other hand, the positions taken in the concrete behaviour of the concept’s power practices, while discursive practices relate both. Hereby this analysis goes through the hermeneutic circle and understands the concept of territorial cohesion as tactical element in a context of other (also intertextual) debates and hermeneutic horizons and a social setting of power relations and wider power structures. In order to fully elaborate the arbitrariness of the territorial cohesion discourse this discourse analysis is especially interested in the role of this discourse’s scientific part and, finally, a survey of its strategic value in general confrontations.

Such an analysis thus implies lots of interpretative steps taken by the researcher to fashion an insight in the concept of territorial cohesion. Section A.2 on how to do discourse analysis deals herewith, and §2.3 on how to gather information discusses, amongst others, how to get the text to interpret. For now though, with what this Foucaultian discourse

* Techne can be characterised as ‘Craft/art. Pragmatic, variable, context-dependent. Oriented toward production. Based on practical instrumental rationality governed by a conscious goal. The original concept appears today in terms such as “technique,” “technical,” and “technology.” (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 57)
analysis is concerned *qua* text, can, in short, be put in a simple manner: what experts say when they talk as experts (Dreyfus&Rabinow, 1982: xxiv, 53), and therefore with what politicians, policy-makers, administrators, scientists and other researchers say when they talk about territorial cohesion.

A.1.6 Addendum: genealogy against the forgetfulness of newest history

When this discourse analytical research is concerned with what experts say when they talk as experts, a major question becomes: what makes a text expertise? From the above, the rhetorical organisation of the intertextual territorial cohesion text comes to mind as what defines the concept’s realm of expertise. However, hereby the argumentative schemes cannot be studied as what fits a text inside the realm of expertise as they do when you analyse what establishes the authority of one text (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164). There are three reasons for this. The first one comes forth out of the research object: although this research reconstructs the rhetorical organisation of the concept’s system of knowledge, the involved statements lack (proper) argumentation and the mapped territorial cohesion propositions therefore do not give enough information to clarify what establishes the authority of a text. The second reason is logical, in that the authority of a text is just not the same as a realm of expertise expressed by texts. More methodologically though, thirdly, this discourse analysis goes beyond text, and therefore what establishes the realm of expertise in which texts may fit should, arguably, also lie outside text, just as the reconstructed practices and distribution of discursive elements do. The question of what makes territorial cohesion text expertise thus remains.

From the Foucaultian discursive context of this research comes the claim that discourse constructs the realm of expertise. Discourses namely play a pivotal role in the establishment of ‘regimes of truth’, that is, ‘the grounds from which we assert understandings about the social world’ (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Because these regimes ‘to a large extent determine the acceptable formulations of problems and their solution’ (Jacobs, 2006: 44), texts are inside the realm of expertise when they express these accepted formulations. The domain in which texts can be taken as expertise is, then, a rule-governed system (Dreyfus&Rabinow, 1982: xxiv, 53): rules deny/accept texts inside the realm of territorial cohesion expertise (see Chapter 7 on the demarcation of a discourse). The task for a Foucaultian discourse analyst thereby is to analyse the language of these expert texts to set out ‘how regimes of truth are articulated and reveal evidence of contradictions or ruptures in the text which may be evident, albeit less explicitly’ (Lees, 2004; Jacobs, 2006: 41); such contradictions and ruptures come forward in the mapping of territorial cohesion pro/positions (see Chapters 5 and 6 on the mapping of the meanings and usages of the concept). This research thus analyses how the intertextual territorial cohesion text follows its rules of expertise while articulating the regime of truth (partly) established by the territorial cohesion discourse as a system of knowledge and its associated practices. So far so good.

Yet, the Foucaultian approach also is a historical one (see §4.6.1 on *Geschichte*). That is to say, Nietzsche’s method of genealogy Foucault further developed entails the tracing of ‘a pattern backward in time until some striking difference between current and historical practices is located’ (Poster, 1984: 89; Emigh, 1997: 657-658). Because such a tracing analyses text to interpret beyond it, these striking differences come up as ruptures in the analysed expert text, as ‘our understandings of politics are subject to historical shifts that are contingent on the diffuse ways that power is exercised’ (Jacobs, 2006: 44). The aim hereby is to use the difference between these practices ‘to undermine commonly held notions about the rationality of the current ones’ (Poster, 1984: 89; Emigh, 1997: 657-658). A Foucaultian discourse analysis thus tries to demonstrate the historicity of a regime of truth articulated by the texts of a realm of expertise.
To analyse understandings and associated practices that existed in history (of thought) and are still influencing statements and power relations of today (e.g. by still existing) is, however, something else then, as this research does, analysing a discourse that will be history but is momentarily in the making. How, then, to undermine the notions of the rationality of territorial cohesion practices with the historicity of its regime of truth by looking for the pattern under construction today instead of historically tracing it backwards? When this research namely looks at the developing pro/positions of the territorial cohesion discourse, the researcher’s sight is not one of historical hindsight, the historical distance does not provide a birds-eye view, and the practices and knowledges that might eventually lead to the actual territorial cohesion discourse can still have different effects (e.g. see §4.2.2 on the difference between texts construing and constructing social reality). It should thus be understood that the possible visions of a territorial cohesion discourse are multiple and one of them is its non-existence – making the attempt to determine the territorial cohesion discourse sound more heroic than it is.

Still, notwithstanding the major consequences for how this research analyses discourse (see §A.2 on how to do discourse analysis), also its description of a developing pattern through recent time can show the historicity of a regime of truth. That is, by illustrating that the ground from which we assert understandings about territorial cohesion is time-bound. This research therefore does not so much undermine commonly held notions by showing how they differ from older ones, but undermines the notions which are under construction today because they show that they are new and, perhaps, have no ground (yet) at all. To do this the genealogy of an existing pattern is not traced far backwards through history, but with a historical eye the recent though already covered traces are laid bare that can develop into the pattern of the territorial cohesion discourse – i.e. this research uses genealogical methods to not forget the history of the newest. Hence, even if the concept of territorial cohesion would imply a historical shift in our understanding and exercise of power, this research attempts to reveal our shaky regime of truth by undermining the expertise of the expert texts articulating the territorial cohesion discourse.

A.2 How to do (this) discourse analysis?

A.2.1 Traces of artisan activity
This research’s methodological framework delivers some questions for a more detailed methodical level than the one explaining what a discourse analysis actually does. Questions, that is, on how to study the concept of territorial cohesion in a discourse analytical way. To recuperate them: how to i) connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena, ii) document changes in meaning, iii) identify links between meaning and power relations, iv) isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, v) have practices interpreted through text as methodological ground and understand the role of them in their discursive and social contexts, and how to vi) use Foucault’s historical approach to the present? Partly, a general answer can be given here; and §A.2.2 to A.2.5 on guidelines treat specific answers. That is to say, besides particular instructions, two lines of reasoning hold for the interpretations in every analytical step of this research. Firstly, after personal experience this research poses that Hoggart&Lees&Davies (2002: 158, 165) are right in holding that discourse analysis, and the textual analysis involved, ‘is a craft skill [which] is not easy to render or describe in an explicit manner’. Hence, the main answer to the general question of ‘How to do discourse analysis?’ is that it appears more as an artisan activity than as an activity which can be grasped and executed by following certain methodical rules.

This striking unmethodological ground from which to work (meta-)scientifically could be less arbitrary when Flyvbjerg (2001: 20) tells us, after Dreyfus&Dreyfus (1986),
that many of our human undertakings, and especially those complex ones done by the more advanced (e.g. experts), are not so much done by following rules for it, but more on intuition. Even so, for a social scientist, admitting that he knows what he does but not how he does it (e.g. when interpreting), seems to be too honest. For discourse analysis honesty does not need to stop here though. This research, namely, also acknowledges that, as the making of ‘fictions’ through the hermeneutic circle of interpretation already suggested (see §A.1.1 on textual analysis), if language constructs, any account hereof through research and writing is a construction itself (Potter&Wetherall, 1987; Hastings, 1996: 196). A technique in use by discourse analysts can thereby signalise the researcher’s awareness of both his intuitive way of interpreting and analysing and the re/constructive nature of his activity: ‘present the data, analysis and conclusions in such a way that the reader is able to assess the researcher’s interpretations and claims’ (Hastings, 1996: 196). Although the discourse analytical method of this research thus does not (consciously) follow rules in its conduct, some particular considerations can lead the way too.

A.2.2 Considerations which guide what to look for and how to look

Some considerations guide this study of the territorial cohesion sign in text. This section straightforwardly puts them forward as five guidelines. To start with, you simply look for ‘that which is said and that which is hidden, the necessary articulations, and the forbidden ones, and relations between these’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 123). When reconstructing the distribution of territorial cohesion’s discursive elements, such a phronetical study of rationality and power should thus prevent that an own substantive infilling of the concept enters its interpretation of territorial cohesion text and thereby the research results (e.g. by not posing but looking for interpretations); this is obviously in line with the Foucaultian textual analysis: bring as few a priori ideas as possible with us when interpreting (see §A.1.1). Hence, this discourse analysis looks at what is said, hidden, forbidden, and necessary without an assumed idea of the concept.

Four other considerations do not so much guide what this discourse analysis looks for, but more how to look at text. The primary analytical guideline thereby is to use variation as a lever, that is: attend to differences in text, even minor variation, because the documents are oriented towards action (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Because in practice variation between texts is more common than unevenness within texts (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165), an analysis of the intertextual territorial cohesion text thus grasps the uniform diversity of the concept. The third guideline relates hereto: read the fine detail, as the analysis cannot identify what is a big or trivial issue from the outset (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). It is certainly not known which practice is more valuable than another one before the territorial cohesion pro/positions are totally mapped out. The fourth guideline is central to the discourse analytical approach and entails an orientation built into the analytical mentality by way of analysing rhetorical organisation: focus on rhetoric to draw how texts do not relate to some putative ‘reality’ but to competing alternatives (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 59; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Finally, here, to analyse the concept of territorial cohesion other discourse studies should be used as an analytic resource. This entails cross-reference ‘to examine whether features of discourse construction in other investigations can inform analysis’ (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). The territorial cohesion discourse under construction might, namely, have something in common with other discourses. Hence, to describe what is said, hidden, forbidden or necessary without an assumed idea of territorial cohesion when the concept appears, one should attend to
differences in and read the detail of text and cross-refer to other discourse studies, while always looking for competing alternatives in the rhetorical organisation.

A.2.3 Applying the guidelines to the detailed methodical questions

The considerations about what to look for in and how to look at territorial cohesion texts make it possible to answer the detailed methodical questions coming from §A.1 on what (this) discourse analysis does. Although this research criss-crosses multiple interpretive and analytical steps (see §A.2.4), for reasons of clarity this section treats its discourse analysis as if it follows a linear path. Logically wise the first step then becomes: connecting data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena. It is difficult to explain how to do this. Simply put it appears an almost “positivist” affair for the interpretative researcher. That is to say, he should first straightforwardly document what is said and thereby attempt to preserve the unique representations of the collected data (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 123). Secondly, when he has documented the data face value, the researcher should piece partial clues together – which is a general feature of documentary analysis (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137); leaving the issues of collecting data and distinguishing linguistic data and the information on events and phenomena it communicates to the side here (see §A.3 though). This research on territorial cohesion also pieces partial clues together in two steps, as it initially connects texts to form the intertextual territorial cohesion text, and then, in an analysis hereof, groups and connects the different data, events, and phenomena (e.g. different interpretations of territorial cohesion, separating the concept and its context). Of course, the interpretation should also use the guideline of attending to difference to distinguish the different groups before connecting them; whereby a disparate usage of words and phrases does not just reveal different meanings but dissimilar emphases for action too (Potter&Wetherell, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Coding procedures thereby help during the analysis ‘to discern patterns in the (usually) qualitative data so that descriptive codes, categories, taxonomies, or interpretative schemes that are adequate at the level of meaning of the informants can be established’ (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588). Note, however, that this research on territorial cohesion studies the interpretations given to the concept by experts, and therefore interprets beyond the level of meaning of the texts of these informants. Meaning: the descriptive codes, taxonomies, and interpretative schemes adequate at the level of territorial cohesion expertise are as what is said the intertextual starting point instead of the result of the analysis (see §A.1.6 for what constitutes expertise). At least superficially seen this shows how to connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena: form the intertextual territorial cohesion text by documenting the unique representations of what is said while attending to difference, use descriptive codes and categories to group data, events, and phenomena, notice the patterns by piecing partial clues together, and order the findings with taxonomies and interpretative schemes for an overview. While this does pragmatically deal with the problem of interconnecting data, events, and phenomena, a problem might remain nonetheless: does it not merely imply the act of interconnecting without telling how to do this? Section A.2.4 also further discusses the issue by going beyond the simple and linear methodical solution offered here and towards the hermeneutic circle.

After the data, events, and phenomena are interconnected, the practices can be traced out of the in taxonomies and interpretative schemes ordered text to form the research’s ground for interpretation. The intertextual territorial cohesion text and the categorised definitions of course show the traces of linguistic and meaning-making practices. By using the guideline of focussing on rhetoric in the analytical mentality, the organisation of competing alternatives comes up as the trace of struggles of argumentation, that is: as discursive practices. Still, it is not clear how to interpret the linguistic, meaning-making, and
discursive practices from texts, whether these are practices in which the concept is used or those in its context. Even less clear is how this works when it concerns power practices, even after the argumentative turn in policy analysis (see §4.4.3 on policy discourse analysis). What are, for instance, traces of (non-)decisions in policy-making? This would thus lead to a very instable position for doing a research in which practices should discipline interpretation, because its methods cannot explain how it interprets practices out of text, not to mention the related harder question of how to have these practices as methodical ground for interpretation, that is: after they are interpreted. Hence, to pragmatically deal with the problem of tracing practices out of the ordered text to form the research’s ground for interpretation, the researcher simply goes from text to linguistic practices, definitions to meaning-making practices, what is already said and hidden about concrete behaviour to power practices (see Chapter 6 on mapping usages for how this involves reinterpretation), and, by focussing on rhetoric, from organisations of argumentation to discursive practices. But, again, how to actually do this remains an unknown, one which §A.2.4 discusses with the hermeneutic circle as well.

With practices as ground for interpretation, this research on territorial cohesion can methodically both deal with how to document changes in meaning and understand the role of the practices in discursive and social contexts, as expressed in turn below. When a discourse analytical research documents changes in meaning, it cannot do this by preconceiving a meaning as given or even stable – such an idea would clearly contradict what it looks for. Besides, changes in meaning obviously implicate meaning-making practices; the meaning-making and discursive practices overlap when thinking practices are traceable by and through thoughts as crystallised thinking written down in texts as, for instance, definitions of territorial cohesion (Chapter 5 on mapping meanings further discusses meanings as a category of thoughts). The interpretative researcher should thus, on the contrary, directly follow the guideline of describing what is said, hidden, forbidden, and necessary when the words ‘territorial cohesion’ are mentioned without an assumed idea of the concept. What thus entails a looking for and documenting of explicit and implicit territorial cohesion meanings and an ordering of them as propositions (see §A.2.1); Chapter 7 shows how the forbidden and necessary articulations have to do with the territorial cohesion discourse. Nota bene, this research on territorial cohesion does not document changes in the meaning of territorial cohesion through time, but maps the different meanings which appear around now, that is, while the concept is under construction and (yet) without an once established “single meaning” which changed through time (again, see Chapter 5) – because all meanings are still there, the concept is perhaps not old enough for one of its meanings to decay or even to totally disappear (see Book II as demonstration hereof). In spite of this, documenting – not change in meaning, but – different meanings nonetheless follows the same guidelines: besides not filling the concept with an own idea of it, again use variation as lever to notice the different propositions of territorial cohesion definitions from what is said and hidden and pick them out of texts to put them in a taxonomy of the concept’s meanings.

Not only the territorial cohesion definitions which form the concept’s propositions can be fished out of text with practices as ground for interpretation, also territorial cohesion positions can. This is useful because they allow an understanding of the role of territorial cohesion practices in their discursive and social contexts. It are these positions, namely, which show for what the concept is used in (reconstructed) concrete behaviour, that is: as marks thereof. Here the guidelines of looking for what is said, focussing on rhetoric, and attending to difference help again: the interpretative researcher should look for what is competed when the words ‘territorial cohesion’ appear to get the concept’s positions (e.g.
whereon text contradicts). However, note that, in contrast to documenting definitions, positions do not appear in a void and can thus only be positioned in their discursive context and social context of power relations (see §A.1.3 on social context). These contexts should therefore be known to come up with the territorial cohesion positions in the first place. Moreover, because these positions mark contextual discursive and power practices in the form of usages of the concept, they lead to an understanding of the role of territorial cohesion practices in its discursive and social context (see Chapter 6 on mapping usages). Due to this, the guideline of reading the fine detail may be added to interpret positions, at least with more emphasis, to prevent to beforehand decide on which practice is more valuable than another one. Notwithstanding the use of these guidelines, a methodical situation comes into view which resembles the one of having practices interpreted out of text as ground for interpretation. That is, without the hermeneutic circle it is impossible to explain how positions of the concept’s usage lead to an understanding of the role of its practices in discursive and social contexts while spotting these marks of concrete behaviour already implies a noticing of the role these discursive and power practices play in their contexts. That this methodical problem cannot be solved here seems very thorny, because getting these positions is essential as step in the analysis: only after describing them their rhetorical organisation can be interpreted besides the rhetorical organisation of the various territorial cohesion propositions (see §A.2.4 though). Still, for now it should be clear that to interpret territorial cohesion propositions on the one side and on the other positions of the concept’s usages as marks of practices, which play certain roles in its discursive and social contexts, one should use variation as lever, focus on rhetoric, and read the fine detail to at least not logically speculate but interpretatively describe pro/positions out of what is said in the analysed intertextual text.

After the interpretative step beyond text via interconnecting data, events, and phenomena and practices as ground for interpretation to territorial cohesion definitions and contextual usages of the concept, the researcher can analyse these pro/positions to identify the links between meaning and power relations. This entails a linking of both rhetorical organisations by, again, piecing partial clues together. This time, however, it concerns clues constructed by this research’s interpretation. Furthermore, especially in this step of the discourse analysis the researcher should use the guideline of focussing on rhetoric, as this shows how discursive practices (i.e. thinking) link meaning and power relations (see §A.1 on what (this) discourse analysis does and the Chapters 5, 6, and 7 for the operationalisation of how this research will use the associated methods). To draft the rhetorical organisation of this conflict over meaning linked to power, one should certainly look for places where territorial cohesion definitions and the concept’s usages overlap and find – or, weaker put: suggest – correlations between meaning and power relations. A guideline which can be used to identify these links is related to the one of focussing on rhetoric competition: read the detail in order to (again) – not before, but – after the analysis decide what the scientific and/or political issues are, whether big or trivial; arguably, in the framing of these statements the power relations, or even the wider power structures, give issues their weight and the discursive context gives them their strategic/tactical value. Cross-referring also seems a sensible thing to do here, as other discourse studies might point to links between meaning and power relations which can also exist with the concept of territorial cohesion. To link meaning and power relations in this discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion three guidelines thus need to be combined to piece the interpreted clues together: focussing on rhetoric, reading the detail, and cross-referring.

---

^A To understand a definition one should understand the language with which the concept is defined. The hermeneutic circle of interpretation implied in the proficiency of a language, however, is not the one meant when discussing how to understand and position the concept of territorial cohesion here.
And so the above presented linear path for doing this discourse analytical research on
the concept of territorial cohesion cumulatively follows the guidelines dealing with the
detailed methodical questions in steps. First of all, the exact documentation of what is said,
variation as lever, and the usage of descriptive codes and categories come up with
interpretative schemes of interconnected data, events, and phenomena. With the addition of
focussing on rhetoric these schemes lead to the practices, which as ground for interpretation
form an important node to link the research steps. This also holds for the taxonomy of
different territorial cohesion meanings, which is arrived at by, building forth on such a
ground, also describing what is hidden besides what is said: the implicit and explicit
definitions of the concept. It are these propositions, namely, which allow for the leap from the
intertextual territorial cohesion text (i.e. data, events, and phenomena) to the identification of
links between meaning and power relations. Of course, these links can only be identified after
the interpretative description of the territorial cohesion positions. To take this step besides the
one towards meaning, the researcher should also read the fine detail, especially due to the
inherent connections of these positions with various discursive and social contexts whose tiny
differences might have great impacts on the concept’s usage. What is more, the interpretative
steps towards territorial cohesion pro/positions thus not only structure meaning as node in
this research, but by emphasising discursive and social practices focus on thinking and power
as nodes as well. Namely, to link the interpreted territorial cohesion propositions and
positions, one should, besides adding the guideline of cross-referring to other discourse
analytical studies, be aware of how thinking as daily practice connects meaning and power
relations; Chapter 5 on meaning, Chapter 6 on usages, and Chapter 7 on discourse elaborate
on these steps towards, respectively, territorial cohesion propositions, the concept’s positions,
and their links to operationalise this research. However, as mentioned above, the usage of
these guidelines through linear research steps leaves us with some problems and not yet
treated detailed methodical questions.

A.2.4 Tricky left over’s and when to start: analytic retroduction in the hermeneutic circle

The guidelines introduced in §A.2.2 (i.e. describe what is said, not have an own idea of
territorial cohesion, attend to differences, look for the rhetorical organisation, read the fine
detail, cross-refer) and the use of coding procedures seem to solve the detailed methodical
questions of how to document different meanings and to identify links between meaning and
power relations. That is, respectively, taxonomise territorial cohesion meanings by using
variation as lever to document the different propositions of definitions from what is said and
hidden in the intertextual territorial cohesion text, and piece the territorial cohesion
pro/positions together by focussing on rhetoric, reading the detail, and by cross-referring.
However, in this research on the concept of territorial cohesion these steps towards meaning
and links between meaning and power relations largely depend on the previous steps in the
discourse analysis. Previous steps, moreover, which remain methodically problematic, even
with the usage of the guidelines. The problems which rose in the application of the guidelines
to the detailed methodical questions above can be put under the banner of two main
questions: how to see patterns, and how to have practices as ground for interpretation? Below
it will be shown how the method to cope with the former question leads to a practical tactic
for the latter. What is more, this section corrects the linear path of how this research does its
discourse analysis as presented above into a criss-cross way of doing turned by the
hermeneutic circle. It thereby almost seems to provide the answer for the problems left by
§A.2.3 and to lead to the not yet treated detailed methodical questions of how to isolate and
question the hermeneutic horizon and to use Foucault’s historical approach to the present as
shown in §A.2.5. Before these issues can be treated, however, this discourse analysis of the
concept of territorial cohesion is in need of another guideline.
When to start analysing the data in the detailed archival research for which the Foucaultian stand provides such a firm basis to engage in (Jacobs, 2005: 45)? In short the answer is: ‘Analysis begins during data collection’ (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588) (see section 2.3 for how this research collects data). On the other hand, this merely seems to complex the analysis. Namely, what you found therefore not only determines what you can analyse, but what you analyse then also structures what you look for in archival collections (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). ‘This is blatantly circular – and points to the necessarily provisional and interactive essence of ongoing archival work’ (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). What thus happens with the hermeneutic circle in this research due to the intertextuality of the territorial cohesio text, is that while going back and forth between the increasing understanding of the data – or at least the evolving contextual preconceptions of it – and the data itself, what is considered relevant for analysis changes due to the analysis (e.g. the intertextual territorial cohesio text, territorial cohesio pro/positions as interpretation of text), which changes the outcomes of the analysis, et cetera – thereby also creating the risk that you continue until you can only see confirming facts (i.e. the confirmation bias). Moreover, because this research consists of various steps of interpretative analysis (i.e. interpreting outcomes of the analysis of interpretations), these particular process issues raised by the method of documentary analysis multiply, and it becomes even harder to neatly package the investigation in ‘methodological formulas that guarantee publishable results’ (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). Hence, when the work of documentary analysis is ‘iterative, requiring checking and cross-checking, viewing ideas from divergent angles’, reliant as it is on piecing partial clues together (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137), then for this research this not only holds for the data and analysis thereof, but for the criss-crossing of interpretative and analytical steps as well. So, if this corrects the picture of the methodical path followed by this research, complexing it immensely with many points of hermeneutic iteration, the question becomes how this research’s circular nature can solve the main two problems coming from §A.2.3.

The problems of how to see patterns and have practices as ground for interpretation can be dealt with one for one. The question of ‘How to see patterns?’ thereby came to us with the essential “first” interpretative step of the discourse analysis: interconnecting data, events, and phenomena from the intertextual territorial cohesio text by noticing the patterns in partial clues, grouping them in categories and interpretative schemes. That is, these means merely imply the act of interconnecting; moreover, actually the recognition of patterns permeates every step in the analysis to get the overall picture, whether it concerns an ordering of territorial cohesio definitions, the concept’s usages, or their links. The crux lies in weighing up the salience and dynamics of issues instead of just harvesting a multiplicity of evidence (Ritchie&Spencer, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 186). Most difficult to describe hereby is the mechanical process of obvious connecting and conceptualisation, because every step requires leaps of intuition and imagination (Ritchie&Spencer, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 186). The question of how to see patterns thus essentially comes down to the (yet) incomprehensible “mystery of creation”.

However, there is a practical way to scientifically deal with the, arguably, unsolvable methodical question on creativity: analytical retroduction. To begin with, analytic induction can be used as research strategy which goes against the confirmation bias, because it pays close attention to signals that challenge whatever images the researcher develops in a systematic examination of similarities (Ragin, 1994: 93). The deviant cases you find while tabulating instances of a pattern you think you identified in some data (e.g. with interpretative schemes) revise your understanding of this pattern (Silverman, 2006: 55). Applied to studying territorial cohesio this works as follows: i) during the accumulation of evidence, incidents of territorial cohesio text are compared which appear to be in a same category, ii)
the herewith established similarities and differences help to define categories (e.g. of territorial cohesion positions), and iii) the further exploration of relevant similarities among the instances of a category links these positions within the categories and refines the image (Ragin, 1994: 93-94). Nota bene, if relevant similarities cannot be identified, then either the group of positions is too wide and heterogeneous and a narrower category needed, or one should take another look at the evidence the intertextual territorial cohesion text offers and regroup possible similarities (Ragin, 1994: 94). The data procedure of analytic induction is therefore concerned ‘with the degree to which the image of the research subject has been refined, sharpened, and elaborated in response to both confirming and disconfirming evidence’, and thus both with constructing images of patterns and seeking challenges hereto (Ragin, 1994: 94). This working back and forth between evidence – or at least marks – and ideas befits the hermeneutic circle of data and contextual preconceptions in textual analysis and could be called retrodution, as it mimics ‘the interplay of induction and deduction in the process of scientific discovery’ (Ragin, 1994: 98). What is more, we can follow Popper’s advice for science here: falsify (see §4.1.1 on science or discourse). The method of analytic retrodution namely sees marks that could refute ‘as the best raw material for improving initial images’: negative cases are excluded when the relevant category is narrowed or become the main focus when the commonalities are regrouped to reconcile contradictory data (Ragin, 1994: 93-94) – e.g. deviant texts on territorial cohesion can add a new category of positions, thereby modifying the discerned pattern and, consequentially, the research outcomes. Thus, to deal with the absence of rules for the creative activity of seeing patterns in the intertextual territorial cohesion text, this research uses the method of analytic retrodution in the hermeneutic circle while trying to find marks that indicate other patterns than already thought of.

Analytic retrodution also leads to a practical tactic to solve the other main question of ‘How to have practices as ground for interpretation?’. The problem is that practices cannot discipline every interpretation, because they themselves need to be interpreted as patterns before they can form a ground for interpretation. Likewise, the positions of the concept’s usage cannot lead to an understanding of the role of these practices in discursive and social contexts, because territorial cohesion positions are necessarily contextual and therefore already imply these contexts. Then again, this second problem concerns the ordering of already reconstructed practices (i.e. interpreted out of text), and therefore entails an interpretative step disciplined by these practices. The first noted problem remains though.

A practical tactic which can be used to get to the practices which discipline the interpreting could be called ‘distinguishing interpretations’. Linguistic, meaning-making, power, and discursive practices cannot simply be traced from the intertextual territorial cohesion text. Analytic retrodution therefore has to deal with the hermeneutic circle involved in going back and forth between the text and the practices as created interpretations of text. Moreover, this step of the discourse analysis fundamentally changes in a circular research process, because now the step from the intertextual territorial cohesion text to an ordering of it in interpretative schemes helps to interpret the patterns of practices and vice versa – i.e. in the hermeneutic circle these steps can be taken “simultaneously”. Obviously, the falsification analytic retrodution entails becomes crucial to form the practices into a solid ground for interpretation, while it cannot be based on another. Thus, because analytic retrodution deals with how to see patterns, the passage from text (via interpretative schemes) to practices is dealt with. The practices therefore provide a relatively save ground for further interpretation. The chaotic multitude of detailed practices thereby disciplines the categorising and ordering of later interpretations. Simply put: the simplifications must not harm the nitty-gritty too much. Hence, through analytic retrodution the ground for interpretation is drawn out during this discourse analytical research of the concept of territorial cohesion: practices
are not so much the methodical ground needed to stand on to interpret, but the practical tactic of distinguishing interpretations can be used to let practices function as the leading interpretation for the other analytical and interpretive steps.

Analysing the intertextual territorial cohesion text thus allows for a rather easy falsification of interpretations beyond the one of practices. With steps of interpretation following each other, the outcomes nonetheless quickly become more provisional due to the weaknesses of the method – i.e. the researcher’s position is instable. The boundedness of this discourse analysis by interpreted practices instead of the practices themselves is an inevitable lack though: this researcher could not study the actual practices. Thus, to conclude, after this discourse analysis started during data collection and while the research continues circularly through data and analysis, it hermeneutically iterates the analytical and interpretive steps in search for structures in the intertextual territorial cohesion text by seeing patterns through intuition and imagination. These creative activities lack methodical rules and become increasingly instable. However, besides that the ways of interpretation can be traced, the creative activities are scientifically held in check by method of analytic retroduction to falsify and reconstructed practices as the – not only ordered, but also – leading interpretation to discipline them.

A.2.5 The conundrum: when to stop spiralling towards the hermeneutic horizon

It should be clear whether this discourse analysis’ Foucaultian method endlessly continues to go back and forth hermeneutically. We thus have to deal with the conundrum for those engaged in documentary research: when to stop (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137)? This relates to the left-over detailed methodical question of how to isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, because the interpretive analytical part of the research stops when it arrives at its destination: the borderline of the organisations of territorial cohesion pro/positions as the concept’s isolated hermeneutic horizon. The essential problem is, however, that the concept is still in its creative state of flux (e.g. §A.1.6 on the historicity of regimes of truth), and therefore new texts with new territorial cohesion pro/positions can appear, old ones decay, and emphases change. Hence, isolating the concept’s hermeneutic horizon, in its turn, leads to the question on using Foucault’s historical approach to the present. As a consequence, a key question then becomes: when to stop gathering data (see §A.3)?

This research intertwines the gathering with the analysing and interpreting of data, so it cannot stop analysing and interpreting before it stops gathering data. Yet, when you start gathering texts and instantly interpret them by grouping data according to what is said, the concept’s pro/positions will in due course form a dense cloud of similarities. It is this interpreted density which guides when to stop gathering data: while looking for new – and preferably deviant – territorial cohesion statements around this cloud and making broader and broader circling movements through the concept’s intertextual texts to map scattered dots of information, eventually, when it becomes unlikely to find another text which relates to the already identified pro/positions, you stop spiralling. Since the formation of the cloud of territorial cohesion pro/positions did not end yet, you should thereby gather data quicker than that new territorial cohesion texts surface. What makes this less stressing is that most of these new texts do not differ that drastically from the previously gathered ones. They thus often appear to signify an at least partial affirmation of the already interpreted and analysed territorial cohesion pro/positions – and analytic retroduction caters for the confirmation bias. Hence, in their reciprocal interdependence the analysing and interpreting of data continues during the gathering of it, but when the outcomes of the analyses and interpretations indicate that a further spiralling through the intertextual territorial cohesion text does not gather new insights, the gathering of data stops.
Knowing when to stop analysing and interpreting after you stopped gathering data is methodologically wise fundamental for this research. Another reason for why the hermeneutic horizon could better be isolated when the organisations of territorial cohesion pro/positions do not (rhetorically) compete anymore and crystallised into history is namely that the Foucaultian stand perhaps best suits more historical based analysis (Jacobs, 2005: 45). Yet, it is not the history of the present we are after, but actually the complex and not well-understood nexus of the history and future of the present denoted by the simple label of the “present”. Notwithstanding the lack of historical distance, the historicity of territorial cohesion’s regime of truth could still be shown by focussing on the newness of its notions and that they have no ground (yet) (see §A2.1.6 on newest history). The rules which deny/accept texts inside the realm of territorial cohesion expertise are, however, difficult to set up without the stability of such a ground made in history. This realm would be placed upon the ground formed by the regime of truth which the territorial cohesion discourse (partly) establishes. The concept’s hermeneutic horizon may therefore only be possible to draw with enough historical hindsight to differentiate between, for instance, statements within the final realm of expertise and inconsequential utterances. The Foucaultian stand thus does not perfectly suit this research – as it neither does other Foucaultian research of today. The methodical repercussion hereof is that the historical part of the Foucaultian methods should be adjusted to fit a research on the current formation of the concept of territorial cohesion.

Without the advantage of the by history formed known, trained and accepted, that is: a constrained viewpoint, we cannot circumscribe the hermeneutic horizon within which we move today, unaware we are of the limits traced by these movements. The question thus becomes: how to look with a historical eye to present developments (in thought). The answer is: albeit that only (Foucaultian) historians can identify the time bound rules of knowledge, this research can look at present developments while being aware that they are time-bound and follow rules – even though these rules can better be identified in a later period. Furthermore, as befits the artisan nature of this research, an explorative attempt can nonetheless be made to try and grasp the rules which isolate the concept’s hermeneutic horizon and thereby understand the “present” of territorial cohesion and the concept’s contemporary history through reflection. But, it should be kept in mind hereby, that the effect of using a historical based approach to the newest, is that we are unable to set these rules with any certainty – not even by (again) using analytic retroduction. The setting of these rules is thus strictly hypothetical. As a consequence, the possible visions of a territorial cohesion discourse are multiple at this moment – which does not matter to reach the aims of the research though (see Chapter 8).

For now it can be concluded that for this discourse analysis archival scholarship and historical analysis as problems (i.e. timing the stopping without hindsight or inert research object) lead qua method to a provisional solution. That is, you stop analysing and interpreting when you criss-crossed through all discourse analytical steps and can set up whichever hypothetical rules isolating the concept’s hermeneutic horizon. The only conditions here are that the interpreted practices also discipline this final discourse analytical step and no territorial cohesion text you gathered may falsify it. The same conditions hold for the steps leading hereto, this with the addition that they should lead to a following step, and their conclusion is thus in the end lead by the needs of the final step which circumscribes territorial cohesion’s system of knowledge and associated practices; a circularity with which analytic retroduction deals. The step after the identification of territorial cohesion pro/positions is therefore only finished when it traced the links between meaning and power relations thoroughly enough to set up the rules of the whole domain. The next chapters then operationalise how to come up with the (meta-)similarities which construct the developing
territorial cohesion domain as single category of pro/positions and set up the hypothetical rules for its hermeneutic horizon.

This research thus deals with the conundrum of documentary research with two guidelines related by the limits of the hermeneutic horizon of the concept of territorial cohesion. The first focuses on the reciprocal interdependence between the gathering of data and the analysis and interpretation of it (i.e. continue with the latter when the former does, stop the former when the latter tells so): spiral through the intertextual territorial cohesion text to reach the limits of the whole field of identifiable territorial cohesion pro/positions. The fundamental second focuses on the adjustment of the historical part of the Foucaultian methods concerned with setting up the rules of a realm of expertise to fit this research which tries to understand what this engendering concept is about. Without certain knowledge of the regime of truth (partly) established by the territorial cohesion discourse, this hinges on reflecting with a historical eye: be aware that the present developments are time-bound and follow rules which now can only be set up in an explorative attempt. So, to conclude, this research stops spiralling analytically and interpretively when it criss-crossed all discourse analytical steps both disciplined by the interpreted practices and not falsified by territorial cohesion texts and lead to hypothetical rules which can be thought of today as isolating the concept’s hermeneutic horizon.

A.2.6 To be explicit: an instable methodical ground

As could be expected with the methodology of this research on territorial cohesion, concerned as it is with the double hermeneutic and the essential instability involved in studying humans (see §4.6.1 which situates discourse analysis), it builds the study of the concept on methodical shakiness. That is to say, due to the artisan nature of discourse analysis, the research does not follow methodical rules but uses guidelines to direct its analysis while and after collecting data. Furthermore, it becomes increasingly instable, because its interpretive description of text in search for structures also follows a hermeneutic circle which iterates steps that cumulatively use the above-mentioned guidelines.

Roughly put the spiralling steps of the discourse analysis can be divided into three. The opening part forms the intertextual territorial cohesion text by documenting the unique representations from what is said and hidden with ‘territorial cohesion’ without an own idea of concept. This part simultaneously distinguishes practices from the texts as the leading interpretation: i) linguistic practices from the written texts themselves, ii) meaning-making practices from definitions, iii) power practices by reconstructing concrete behaviour, and iv) discursive practices from rhetoric organisations. The middle part then taxonomises the concept’s different definitions as proposed range of meaning. In parallel herewith it uses descriptive codes to piece together the different territorial cohesion positions in schemes of interconnected data, events, and phenomena presenting the concept’s usage field – the (contextual) fine details must be read, as these can define the concept’s role. The closing part links these mapped meanings and power relations by looking for how the interpreted rhetorical and detailed clues of the territorial cohesion pro/positions demonstrate the various minute and obvious ways in which thinking daily connects meaning and social practice on topics of interest in both science and politics (e.g. as shown by other discourse studies cross-referred to). All of this to explore the hermeneutic horizon of the developing concept, as this discourse analysis ends when it sets up the purely hypothetical rules which the territorial cohesion discourse performs and follows – regularities to be reflected upon with a historical eye.

The crisscrossing of discourse analytical steps gives this research the more reason to amply check the interpreted ordinations through analytic retroducation and present the constructed outcomes for easy and meticulous verification. The actual point made here
however, is that when the above explicit elaboration on how to study the concept does not show methodical stability, then – if not much social scientific research, at least – every territorial cohesion research may very well inherently, though often implicitly, suffer from the same flaws, or worse. Hence, the need to operationalise how to go from the concept’s meanings and usages to the system of territorial cohesion knowledge and its associated practices (e.g. how to connect meanings and power relations and the discourse’s rules, where do necessary and forbidden articulations fit). Before the next chapters do that, a more mundane issue of this research should be treated first though: the data on which the exploration of the concept’s hermeneutic horizon depends. As the discourse analysis spirals through the selection and processing of data, a central question herein namely is how to gather data in such a way to make significant information out of it.

A.3 How to gather information?

A.3.1 Which data to collect?

We should focus on the data of this research before the questions of how to collect a part hereof (i.e. interviews) and how to go from data to information can be answered in §A.3.2 and A.3.3 respectively. Important data issues are the criteria for selection, its sources, and the point to stop gathering data. First though, what are we talking about? A simple way to explain it is by following Ackoff (1989) on his path from data to wisdom. Here data is raw representation, whereof information can be made by understanding the relations of these representations, and likewise knowledge as patterns and wisdom as principles follow in turn (Ackoff, 1989). When you look at this research on territorial cohesion as such a path of abstraction, texts become the data (see §A.1.1 on linguistic representations), the territorial cohesion pro/positions information (see §A.2.3 on interpretatively describing), the order of these pro/positions knowledge (see §A.2.4 on structuring patterns), and the rules which isolate the concept’s hermeneutic horizon become wisdom (see §A.2.5 on exploring with a historical eye). Note that a discourse analysis thereby does not lay down principles as universal laws, but principally argues that there are only conditional principles. What is more, in accordance with the ontological and epistemological stance of its methodology, this research does not pose that the knowledge created by its discourse analysis is based on facts, but should be understood as “fiction” in the sense of a meaningful interpretation of, with texts as data, other meaningful interpretations (see §A.1.1 on hermeneutics). Thus, in short, texts as raw representations are the data of the concept of territorial cohesion as research object, and this research makes information and meaningful interpretations thereof.

Having texts as data leads to methodical difficulties too though. In a research which makes knowledge about knowledge, a linguistic problem arises: the language on the higher level of abstraction is the same as the language of the linguistic data reflected upon. Thus also to distinguish the research object’s data and the outcomes of the research’s interpretation of it, the next chapters elaborate on the vocabulary needed to operationalise its discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion. Another methodical problem concerns the interconnection of data, events, and phenomena (see §A.2.3 on the opening detailed methodical question). Where do events and phenomena fit in if they are neither data nor factual? Besides that text as raw representation of course represents events and phenomena, statements can be understood as the phenomena this research observes in the data (see §4.5.3 on θέσις), and when a statement is actually posed or held – whether observable or not – it is an event (in thought). There exist events and phenomena outside discourse, obviously, but the ones this research is concerned with do not, as this research investigates – not the linguistic features of texts, but – how data represents events and phenomena (see §4.2.1 on Foucaultian discourse analysis). The events thus take place in the practices indicated by the phenomena,
and this research tracks how they as territorial cohesion pro/positions turn into knowledge by solidifying into the strata which form a framework of linguistic and pictorial representations of the world (see §4.5.2 on what can be seen and said). The point for gathering information however, is that it should not only be clarified which vocabulary to use to reflect on text, but also how to sieve different information out of the same sets of data (see §A.1.4 for why this mostly holds for policy and research documents). The Chapters 5, 6, and 7 do just that.

Now it is overly clear how this research on the concept of territorial cohesion understands data, we can ask the question on selection: which data does it actually collect? Discourse analysis has been accused of selecting evidence to confirm the research arguments and of ignoring contrary data (Jacobs, 2006: 47). Even though this research has no idea what its argument is while it searches for data to map the whole field of statements, to make sure such bias and distortion are ruled out, still some measures should be taken. A practical way to overcome them ‘is to be explicit about the criteria for selecting discursive evidence’ (Jacobs, 2006: 47). A criterion to get an overview of the whole diversity of statements is that this research prefers those which are as contrary to each other as possible. To be included in this field, the data should obey two other criteria: that the text uses the words ‘territorial cohesion’ and has to do with the European Union. Because this research is concerned with the limits of the network formed by this particular territorial cohesion discourse, it thus collects data that are relevant to the members who experience these processes within the organisation (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588); note thereby that the discourse forms people as such members as well. This leads to the question of how to get these most contrary texts which both utter ‘territorial cohesion’ and are relevant for these European Union members.

Normally the ways to get data also depend on whether they are primary or secondary. Needless to say, due to the double hermeneutic this research on the concept of territorial cohesion always has interpretations as data, making the strict distinction between raw primary data and processed secondary data as artificial as can be. Nonetheless, a difference lies in that some texts meeting the selection criteria have other texts which also meet these criteria as topic, while other texts, such as the latter, simply have the topic of territorial cohesion. The more reflective texts could thus be categorised as “secondary data” (e.g. articles from scholars). Relatively seen, political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents become the “primary data” in that case, as long they come up with own statements instead of (explicitly) reflecting upon others. Note thereby that both kinds of text are not only analysed in the same way (Roe, 1994: 158), but that this research also finds both while searching in the common sources of libraries and the internet, thereby lead by the intertextuality of the documents. It turns out that many of these texts are policy documents. A large part of this research on the concept of territorial cohesion therefore focuses on policy documents as mirrors of ‘the changing balance of power between competing discourses’ (Richardson&Jensen, 2003). Still, these are only one element of the policy process, and the same kind of detailed attention could be given to other kinds of texts produced herein, such as formal meetings, informal discussions, and talk behind the scenes (Hastings, 1996: 209). Moreover, Roe (1994: 158) even holds that those with sufficient resources should (also) collect and analyse these “other texts” of a controversy in particular. What this research did, then, to add to the large chunk of the political, policy, lobby, funding, and research data from documents, is taking interviews in Brussels.a Hence, the ways to get the “primary” territorial cohesion texts and the “secondary” ones reflecting thereon (i.e. mostly research documents) are the same: spiral through the common digital and paper archives. That is to say, except for the interviews taken to complement the written policy data with spoken texts of the policy process.

---

a I could not have done the interviews for my research as I did without the help of the staff (i.e. representatives and employees) of The House of the Dutch Provinces, particularly those from the Regio Randstad organisation in Brussels, especially ir. H. Pluckel, then heading this representation.
Besides the data sources and the criteria for its selection, the point where one stops gathering data also determines the collection of texts. Due to this research’s methodology and methods, the guidance for pragmatic judgement hereon given by its empirical setting, researcher-subject relationship, and resource constraints merges with the one given by its themes and questions (Pettigrew, 1990: 272). When you interpret how discourse constructs social/spatial facts instead of empirically/positivisticly understand reality as an objective one “out there” to research, the empirical setting looses its straightforward empiric nature in the double hermeneutic; the research-subject relationship consequentially turns in the hermeneutic circle of interpretation. This results in having texts in documents as the principal “empirical” setting to research and an interpretative relationship between the researcher and the concept of territorial cohesion as “subject”. The researcher-subject relationship therefore has more to do with when to stop interpreting than when to stop gathering data; note for the latter that it is already impossible to collect all territorial cohesion texts to spiral through due to time-bound reasons. More guidance for when to stop gathering data comes from the resource constraints. For instance, from that this research creates an overview with a decentred outsider perspective, follows the constraint that detailed data about one particular aspect of the developments cannot be collected, associated as this might be with a particular insider’s perspective. Chiefly using documentary research relates hereto, save the interviews of course, as it does not get caught within one particular aspect and an insider perspective that easily. Therefore, although Roe (1994: 158) holds that those with sufficient resources should collect the other kinds of texts, for much of this research the limitation to documents follows from its aims. Where a resource constraint does come in though, is with time, and thus indirectly with funding. The question then becomes how these more specific data pointers from the research’s empirical setting, researcher-subject relationship, and resource constraints merge with the one of the research’s themes and questions to pragmatically judge when to stop gathering data.

The phase of data-gathering of the research on the concept of territorial cohesion ended in early 2006, since thereafter far less new data appeared to spiral through when seen from the territorial cohesion pro/positions. The guidance from the research’s “empirical” setting and the resource constraint of time enforce this judgement lead by its themes and questions, because then also less documents appeared, especially less “secondary” data, which due to the reflections in research documents has more to do with a main concern of this research, that is, the system of territorial cohesion knowledge. On top of that, the approximately 30 interviews carried out to add more inside information and details from “Brussels” to the policy documents for this (significant) aspect of the research object were conducted in early 2006. Thereafter this research would not add such “other texts” to complement the overview of the concept of territorial cohesion. Hence, even though there are no simple and absolute answers here, all these pointers for a pragmatic judgement suggest early 2006 as a good moment to stop gathering data of the specific period researched for this PhD-thesis.

A.3.2 How to interview?

Because (policy) documents can be selective with information, going beyond them to probe whether actions follow written texts is a sensible thing to do. Why this research choose interviews to do this, will be clarified below by explaining which kind of interviewing this entails and who were interviewed in Brussels and how. Hereby an ‘interview’ is understood as ‘an exchange of information between the researcher and the research participant’ (Elwood&Martin, 2000: 650). Note that this information exchanged during the interview should not be confused with the information the research creates from the data also gathered by doing these interviews. By interviewing this research tries to get extra data on the research
object, and this needs more information to exchange besides the information interpreted in
the data.

What suits this research is that interviews imply asking others about a case: how they
define territorial cohesion as a specific (policy) problem, identify and assess alternative ways
for action with the concept, and decide among them (Roe, 1994: 159). Intensive interviews
are particularly useful herein, as the study of this case requires depth. When conducted
sensitively, they namely help to explain complicated relationships and slowly evolving events
in their complexity and potential contradictions (Bryman, 1988; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002:
205-206). Intensive interviews can unravel these relationships and events effectively because
they can ask ‘why a story was told ‘that’ way’ (Bryman, 1988; Riessman, 1993: 2;
Hogart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 205). Such interviews are, however, not only an exchange of
information between the researcher and the research participant, but also a process whereby
they jointly ‘create knowledge’ through the interaction of linguistic expression,
mis/understanding, and societal positioning (Bryman, 1988; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002:
210). That is to say, the interviewer forms and asks questions the interviewee answers, they
thereby interpret meaning and intent, this while the person who does the research places the
person who participates in the role of research informant and the person interviewed
perceives the person who interviews as ‘researcher’ (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 210).
Although the intensive interview is thus a very appropriate way to get the data on the concept
of territorial cohesion this research looks for beyond (policy) documents (i.e. different texts
about the slow moving complexity of its policy process), the status of the joint knowledge
intensive interviews create while they are conducted is not clear.

With interviewing as an extra way for this research to get data, the knowledge created
during an intensive interview is instrumental: to know with certainty which “other texts” it
gives for the research’s analysis. The knowledge created during such an interview is therefore
about the interviewee’s story and reasoning. For instance, as the interviews are one of the last
times this research gathers data, and the researcher thus already has some understanding of
the concept of territorial cohesion, the interviewer should influence the account the
interviewee gives as least as possible with what the researcher already knows about what the
interviewee says. Especially then the interviewer must be ever aware that even with intensive
interviews there is a gap between lived experience and communication – i.e. during the
intensive interviews the double hermeneutic can cause misunderstanding (Giddens, 1987;
Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 210). Instead of asking whether the informants tell the truth, it
is thus more fruitful to ask what their statements reveal about perceptions and, see the next
section for this, what inferences can be drawn from them (Healey&Rawlinson, 1993;
Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 211). It is thereby of course the interviewer who should ensure
that the instrumental knowledge about what perceptions the interviewee communicated
during the intensive interview is created jointly. Before going into the details of what this
implies for how to interview, the ones whose perceptions this research infers from should be
treated: the selection of interviewees.

Also in a research which maps the development of the concept of territorial cohesion
interviewees ‘are selected not because they represent some abstract statistical norm, but
because they typify historical processes’ (Greele, 1991: 131). What is more, because the
interviews provide extra data, the interviewees do not even have to be representative of these
processes in an all-encompassing manner. While the “other texts” from these interviews do
not represent reality as fully as possible by giving a most elaborate and detailed picture, they
do add to the one from the (policy) documents and can represent, or perhaps explain, a part of
the practices in Brussels. The interviews are therefore conducted with people of organisations
which have a European Union office in Brussels and could have something to do with
territorial cohesion (e.g. politicians, policy-makers, administrators). Normally the starting point then becomes: interview the major actors in the controversy (Roe, 1994: 158). However, with territorial cohesion as a disputed battleground in itself, it is also disputed who these major actors are (see Chapter 6 on usages). Hence, this research interviews people without branding actors as important, just as it maps the argumentative ground without a pre-existing idea of the argument. Still, because the interviews are one of the last times this research gathers data, some actors constructed as important do give a lead (e.g. DG Regio). Besides of course carrying out one’s own search for organisations working with the concept, and thereby looking for the widest variety, this research uses the snowballing technique to get more interviews after the first one (Aaker&Day, 1990). This technique may give an idea of the circulation of territorial cohesion texts as if it were through the network of a restricted social sphere, because the existing research participants recruit future ones from among their acquaintances. Starting from the prior research outcomes on major territorial cohesion actors the inverse ways of snowballing and searching for variety thus select the interviewees from organisations in Brussels to get the extra data which typifies a (policy) part of the concept’s disputed processes.

The details of how to interview the persons selected from organisations in Brussels pick up the above left task for the interviewer again: the creation of joint knowledge about the perceptions these interviewees communicate via these “other texts”. To start with, the intensive interviews should be ‘open-ended, geared to letting the interviewee tell her or his story’ (Roe, 1994: 159). This can be done by in-depth semi-structured interviews which both have a frame of questions and give the freedom to divert (Valentine, 1997; Davies, 1999; Hogart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 205). Moreover, to not be locked into one set of questions for all interviews, you adjust the questions so that the research participants are asked about what with territorial cohesion is most relevant for them – which is also the most relevant to get from these interviews (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 236). The questioning should therefore not be used ‘as a way of constructing a putative middle ground between the controversy’s opposing parties’ (Roe, 1994: 159), but as a way of gathering more data to reconstruct a part of the controversial ground of arguments. Besides the interview questions, the interview site can influence the jointly created knowledge, this due to its link to societal positing (Elwood&Martin, 2000). As sources of differential power social identities (e.g. class) namely shape the relationships between researchers and participants (Gilbert, 1994; Katz, 1994; Elwood&Martin, 2000: 651). And participants may assert one identity (e.g. political official) in one location (Elwood&Martin, 2000: 652-653). This research should therefore have the working-place as interview site, unless this is impossible, because the data these interviews gather is what the interviewees have to say about territorial cohesion as a representative of the organisation for and in which they work. Obviously, also the recording of the interview can ensure that the knowledge about the interviewee’s perceptions is created jointly. Because in this research the researcher already knew much of what the interviewees said, the interviews did not have to be taped and notes were taken during the interview instead. These help to recall themes and key “facts”, but once an interview is completed the researcher should seek a quiet place as soon as possible to write up the relevant texts from the interview in as much detail as possible (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002, 240). One can send the recorded texts back to the interviewees (per e-mail) to check whether the accounts of what they said

---

a The interviewees were: two members of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), an official from DG Regio, an official from DG Employment and Social Affairs, four officers from DG Regio, two officers from DG Environment, two officers from DG Transport and Energy, an officer from DG Enterprise and Industry, an officer from DG Agriculture, a Member of European Parliament of the Committee of Regional policy, an administrator of the Committee of the Regions (CoR), representative of the Permanent Dutch Representation in Brussels, an officer from Dutch Ministry for Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (VROM), an officer from the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR), a Member of the Assembly of European Region’s Committee on Regional policies, Territorial planning, Infrastructures, Environment, Tourism (AER), an officer from the network of major European cities(EUROCITIES), an officer of the Council of European Regions and Municipalities (CEMR), a staff member of the European Association of Development Agencies (EURADA), a representative of Nordrhein Westfalen, an officer from Flanders, a representative of Brussels Capital Region, two officers of the East of England’s Brussels Office, and a representative of the North Netherlands Assembly.

b See Appendix B.
are correct; as this was carried out the research participants sometimes added more useful data. To create the joint knowledge about the perceptions of territorial cohesion the interviewees communicate as persons from and in organisations in Brussels the interviewer thus does three things: he uses in-depth semi-structured interviews with variable questions, has the interviewees’ workplace as interview site, and with the interviewee checks his notes taking during the interview.

A.3.3 How to go from data to information?
So, this research gathers the most contrary texts as primary data by spiralling through the common digital and paper archives where the sign ‘territorial cohesion’ appears in the political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents relevant for the European Union. Besides that the texts which reflect hereon form the secondary data, in-depth semi-structured interviews go beyond the documents to typify the slow moving complexity of the disputed concept’s policy process with more inside information and details. A picture drawn by searching for variety in interviewees, snowballing them, and centring on their perceptions of territorial cohesion with variable questions. During these intensive interviews at the interviewees’ organisations in Brussels, the interviewer is responsible for the joint creation of the knowledge instrumental to account for the interviewees’ stories (e.g. interviewees confirm the notes of the data taking during the interview). Shortly after the interviews in early 2006, the research’s stopped gathering data because then far fewer, especially secondary, data appeared in documents seen from the territorial cohesion’s hermeneutic horizon and no other spoken texts would be added for this PhD-thesis. Yet, these primary, secondary, and interview data sets are not information.

This leaves us with the issue of gathering information from its data. As noted above, this entails turning data into territorial cohesion pro/positions (e.g. inferring from interviewees’ perceptions). A process which revolves around first disaggregating and then re-aggregating the statements of the written and spoken texts. That is, all these texts should be disaggregated into discrete (problem) statements which assert relationships, thereby avoiding any attempt to determine whether what the texts say is related in fact (Roe, 1994: 159). Once these texts have been disaggregated into coded statements, one can re-aggregate them into interpretative schemes indicating dominances, such as the most commonly identified problems (Roe, 1994: 159). What can happen is that in this order no agreement appears over what the major issues are, but instead ‘a massive amount of circular and opposing argumentation’ (Roe, 1994: 160); that territorial cohesion, for instance, needs and causes policy coordination or has nothing to do with it respectively (see Book II). Processing data thus leads to a gathering of information because territorial cohesion pro/positions and their context give an understanding of the relations between representations in the sense of similarities and differences of data. Note that this step from data to information is an iterative one (e.g. coding already implies aggregation) and it is this iteration through which the territorial cohesion propositions and the concept’s positions and context are distinguished. However, this already brings us to the analysis and of meaningful interpretations as explained in §A.2 insofar it directed us to Chapters 5, 6, and 7 for the operationalisation of this research’s discourse analysis.

A.4 What you get

A.4.1 Method or artisanship: a psychological parallel
In an oddly honest fashion this chapter explicitly showed that studying the concept of territorial cohesion in a Foucaultian way rests on methodical shakiness: it is an artisan affair. To deal with the involved crisscrossing of discourse analytical steps in the hermeneutic circle
of interpretation while and after collecting texts as data, one wants the logical-linguistic left
and creative-spatial right hemispheres to cooperate (e.g. Szimony&Burgin&Pearson, 2008:
177-178); note that actually the brain is far more complex than such a dichotomy (e.g. Hines,
1987: 601-603). In their division of labour the left side takes care of the parts and reasoning.
This with the rule that you should without an own idea of concept document unique textual
representations – and thus read the fine detail of the different things said, especially when it
concerns the linguistic marks of practices –, and with analytic retroduction as method of
falsification. In so doing the left side functions as gatekeeper of the right side which grasps
the whole and sees patterns. Several guidelines are used to construct interpretations thereby:
i) disaggregate the written and spoken texts in statements and re-aggregate them, ii) piece
partial clues together, iii) distinguish practices as the leading interpretation, iv) iterate the
discourse analytical steps (e.g. interpret analyses of interpretations), and v) cross-refer.
Focussing thus on rhetoric competition you spiral through the intertextual territorial cohesion
text, both to pragmatically judge when to stop gathering data and to interpret the concept’s
hermeneutic horizon. Although such cooperation runs through the intertwined circular
processes of simultaneous analysis and data collection, evolving contextual preconceptions of
the text and the text itself, and interpretation of the whole and its parts, why this research
merely explores the rules demarcating the territorial cohesion discourse has yet another
reason. The main methodical catch is, namely, that it looks to the present with a historical eye
instead of being a historic study a la Foucault. To operationalise this discourse analysis of the
concept of territorial cohesion, the next chapters therefore manoeuvre between its ontological
and epistemological grounds and its technical means embedded therein.

A.4.2 Like cartography: detailed maps as outcomes
In what do the operationalised methodology and methods result? Instead of posing as
omniscient narrator and summariser, researchers on the phronetic path stay closer to
existence and gradually unfold the diverse, complex and conflicting stories, that is: they
would present a rich problematic in a “thick” and hard-to-summarise narrative (Flyvbjerg,
2001: 84-86). Or better, in this research’s case: detailed maps forming one picture. What
hereby makes up the base geography is what experts say when they talk as (contradicting)
experts about official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate where the sign
‘territorial cohesion’ shows relevant for the European Union; to be exact, this are texts from
political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents and additional perceptions of a
variety of snowballed interviewees from in-depth semi-structured interviews, which were
gathered until less appeared in early 2006. The maps increasingly zoom out from this earth of
primary, secondary, and extra data towards interpretations which just skim their surface with
a large brush. Two of these maps can be constructed via the concept’s intertextuality: the
taxonomy of territorial cohesion definitions and the interpretative schemes of coded problem
statements. Still, to get the picture of the territorial cohesion pro/positions’ order, the links
between these rhetorical organisations need to be mapped. It is on this picture of meanings
and usages, namely, that the concept’s hermeneutic horizon can be drawn by demarcating it
with purely hypothetical rules. These detailed maps and the picture they form allow the
reader to make different interpretations (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 86), as these outcomes are
presented here for easy verification: he can “proof-read” them while zooming in.

With these mappings of the concept’s arbitrary realm of expertise the question
becomes whether their picture offers enough sight on the battles to be able to see how the
territorial cohesion discourse needs to be used strategically in the confrontations that occur
more in general. To try and peek beyond this discourse’s tactical reciprocity, a two-sided
exploration of its strategic integration is thus called for (see §18.6). On one side we have the
practices in which the concept through usage plays roles in its discursive and social contexts.
A focus on power should thereby situate the reciprocal power-knowledge effects of this particular discourse into the general functioning of truth in wider power structures. The other side of this exploration should therefore set off from the viewpoint of the territorial cohesion meanings to seek our regime of truth. In so doing, these sides would theoretically compare the territorial cohesion discourse with theories which are – substantively related, but – not of territorial cohesion (i.e. cognate theories) and fit it in reflections on our time-bound understanding and exercise of power. The double result to expect from this is that: i) the distinction of this discourse coming from the research’s discourse analysis becomes more marked (i.e. a specification, what cannot be generalised) and ii) that the outcomes of this research enter studies on the role and (strategic) value of social science in our contemporary society through its emphasis on the concept’s relationship of power and scientific knowledge and practice (i.e. a generalisation). However, this PhD-thesis just carries out the mapping required for such explorations (see Book II).
Appendix B  Possible Interview Questions

Introduction
The following list of questions was used to structure the interviews with people who worked for European Union institutions, or organisations associated with them, in Brussels in 2006 and had more or less to do with territorial cohesion. As not every question in this list was appropriate for each interview (e.g. due to time constraints or the expertise of the interviewee), the list is not so much a checklist but a list of possibilities. Yet, for all the most important questions were those on meaning and usage, especially the concept’s usage, those on specific fields were used the most variable (e.g. someone who hardly deals with European spatial planning will not be questioned on it), and the ones on related topics were asked least often; and other questions, such as follow-up questions (e.g. why do you think this is the case), were added during the interview.

Meaning and Usage

Territorial Cohesion Usage:
- How much of your contemporary work is related to territorial cohesion (i.e. roughly/approximately)?
- How much importance does territorial cohesion have according to you (e.g. when compared to other topics as, for instance, Trans-European Networks (TENs), Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), Single European Market (SEM))?
- For which issues and activities do you not use the concept of territorial cohesion at the moment?
- For which issues and activities do you use the concept of territorial cohesion at the moment?
- For which policy-fields did you use the concept of territorial cohesion (mostly) (e.g. cohesion policy, spatial policy, SG(E)I, SF)?
- For which (other) issues do you think the concept of territorial cohesion will (mostly) be used in the future?

Territorial Cohesion Meaning
- What does the concept of territorial cohesion mean according to you (e.g. its definition, the picture shown or goal set by it)?
- How did you come at this meaning of territorial cohesion (e.g. from yourself, ESPON, DG XVI, national administration)?
- Do you think that other (political) actors have another account of territorial cohesion and, if so, how do you notice this?

Territorial cohesion in specific fields:

IGCs
- How is the debate on competencies conducted while the Constitutional Treaty was voted against by “the French” and “the Dutch” and (how) will this change (e.g. not, more formal, become a non-issue)?
- Are you in favour for a EU-competency for territorial cohesion?
- What would change in your lobbying, political and/or policy-making activities if the EU had a competency for territorial cohesion policy?
In which way is the debate about the competency issue for territorial cohesion policy different from the competency issue for spatial policy?

**European spatial planning**
- What is the substantive relation between spatial policy and cohesion policy?
- What is the substantive relation between territorial cohesion and polycentrism?
- Are there difficulties to reach territorial cohesion at the various levels (e.g. EU, transnational, regional, local), and if so: which territorial level should be emphasised?
- Will the possible sequel of the ESDP substantively differ from the ESDP when more focus is laid upon territorial cohesion, and if so: in which way (e.g. emphasis on SG(E)I, less notification of the urban-rural relationship, no account of environmental issues, less dominance of TEN-T projects)?

**Cohesion/Regional Policy:**
- What is the status of territorial cohesion compared to social cohesion and economic cohesion (e.g. no added value, on a par, social and economic cohesion fall under territorial cohesion)?
- Who do Services of General (Economic) Interest fit into the “territorial cohesion picture”?
- Is Cohesion Policy heading towards a new/other direction (e.g. as means for regional redistribution, as instrument for higher competitiveness)?
- Is territorial cohesion part of a (new) territorial way of thinking in the EU?
- Might territorial cohesion improve the effectiveness of Cohesion Policy by policy coordination (e.g. with other EU, national, regional policies)?
- Are there difficulties to reach economic, social and/or territorial cohesion at the various levels (e.g. EU, transnational, regional, local), and if so: which territorial level should be emphasised?

**Structural Funds:**
- What do you think territorial cohesion means in light of the SF (e.g. a change in Interreg programmes, ERDF and or and/or Cohesion Fund)?
- Does territorial cohesion mostly entail a redistribution of (financial) resources towards the less developed regions (i.e. convergence), a (financial) incentive for less developed regions to increase their competitiveness, a (financial) resource for regions with a high potential of development (regional competitiveness), or all of these objectives? (And when the latter is chosen: how to balance the various objectives)?
- How did/do you use the concept of territorial cohesion in the intergovernmental negotiations on the new SF-period and lobbying for funding of “your” projects?
- How can territorial cohesion play a part in the usage of SF (e.g. increase effectives by policy coherence, give the regions a major role)?

**Territorial cohesion related topics:**

**Community Model:**
- Which relationships do you see between the discussions on European governance (e.g. the EC’s White Paper) and the Community Model in your activities (e.g.
“good governance” and a coordinated polity, multi-level governance and the Community Method)?
- Which relationships do you see between the Community Model and the role of what government (e.g. regional, national and supranational) should do in the EU (e.g. SGEI, SGI, spatial planning)?
- Is there referred to territorial cohesion when the topics of European governance and the Community Model are discussed, if so: how (e.g. a compared to the Community Method other way of organising national decision-makers on the Community level in territorial policy)?
- Is there a special relation between the role of government in European governance and territorial policies, and if so: which (e.g. as making the administrative part of a “state”)?
- In which way does territorial cohesion policy (not) imply/mean policy coherence by territorial coordination of sectoral policies?
- How can territorial cohesion ensure the beginning of the formation of a “state polity” with coherent levels of EU-policy on the supranational, transnational, national and/or regional levels?

Territoriality:
- Is the question of territory addressed in your activities, and if so: how (e.g. as characteristic of a state/government, the geography of the EU)?
- How is territorial cohesion related to territories in your activities (e.g. to regional or national policy, territorial cohesion in which territories, which territories push territorial cohesion forward)?
- In which way is the territorial dimension of territorial cohesion discussed in those fields in which your activities relate to territorial cohesion (e.g. taken for granted, explicit disagreement, consensual deliberation)?
- Do you notice a lack in mutual correspondence between the various member states in ways of territorial governance, and if so: how?
- How can the concept of territorial cohesion construct the European type of a territorial way of doing things?

Democratisation of the EU:
- Do you think a (possible) “democratic deficit” might be a cause for the present slowing-down of European integration, and if so: in which way (e.g. people having the idea that the have no influence on the European matters, the unbalanced European integration resulting in dominance of economic policies)?
- Do you think the democratisation of the EU should be a matter of the Community level alone (e.g. creating a European “demos”, give more powers to the EP, make the procedures more transparent) or for a more multi-level approach (e.g. more powers for regions and local actors, creating strong regional/local communities)?
- Is the concept of territorial cohesion mentioned in discussion on the democratisation of the EU?
- Do you think that the making of territorial cohesion policy is a good example of a democratic decision-making process (e.g. in relation with the making of the ESDP, in accordance with the principles for “good EU governance”)
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Appendix C  Introduction of the reconstructed usage areas and order of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area

Introduction of the reconstructed usage areas

This appendix and the next three show how this research schematised the agenda-setting of territorial cohesion. That is, how it with an extended usage of Roe’s (1994) Narrative Policy Analysis mapped the un/certain usages of the concept (i.e. actual and empirical), also to interpret the possible usages (i.e. potential). The research shown in each of these appendixes started with the conventional definitions of territorial cohesion stories (i.e. mostly just premises) that have a family resemblance due to their contextual appearance. The focus thereby lays on the opposing expert viewpoints, this to identify the concept’s systematic uncertainty.

In each of them also the same kinds of schemes of coded problem statements display a part of the territorial cohesion usage field that plays a role for the points around which the concept’s positions aggregate. Each scheme thereby sets stories against the social events that happen through time (i.e. in years)\textsuperscript{a} to reveal developments in battles fought (i.e. contradicting stories), inertnesses (i.e. often heard stories), and explorations of new possibilities (i.e. marginal stories).

The first scheme (i.e. Schema 1) always lays out the general stories, which frame all the other stories in a usage area, and the structuring stories, which form the meta-construction of parts of it (e.g. by being on territorial cohesion itself).

The second scheme (i.e. Schema 2) always lays out the small-\textit{m} territorial cohesion metanarratives (often simply ‘metanarratives’). As each metanarrative embraces major opposed assumptions in the concept’s usage (i.e. a dominant story and counter- or non-story), the columns of this scheme form a “bundle of territorial cohesion strings”. Stories that link these topics therefore arrange the formation of this bundle (what often separates Schema 2 in 2a and 2b for the separate and connected metanarratives).

The third scheme (i.e. Schema 3) always lays out the narratives with an own dynamic (often simply ‘narratives’). These are on similar and same topics as the metanarratives, and as the concept’s context therefore reveal hidden territorial cohesion mission statements, disclose possibilities, and give topics their weight. Stories that link these topics again arrange this formation (and separate Schema 3 in 3a and 3b). This allows for a comparison between the two formations that leads to deductions about the concept as having own and/or a bricolage of power practices.

Appendix D then treats the (post-)ESDP process usage area, Appendix E the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area, and Appendix F the European Funds usage area. Before that though, the rest of this appendix treats the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area.

Introduction of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area

The analytical quadrangle made above (see the Introduction of Part II in Book II) points out that the Intergovernmental Conferences (IGCs) could form the official usage of the concept of territorial cohesion. The juridical or even constituting make-up of the IGCs usage area then leads to a general hypothesis that guides the reader through this appendix: the Treaty debates

\textsuperscript{a} Because years are a common but, as every way, also a pretty arbitrary way to divide time in pieces, the deduction of these developments from stories takes, when possible, the timing of the appearance of texts into account. A story at the end of 2004 is therefore interpreted in almost the same way as one in the beginning of 2005, and interpretations based on timing are always very cautious. Moreover, it more often is about periods than exact timing.
decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground. However, these debates of course point to other concerns besides territorial cohesion too. Another general hypothesis can then be: the whole territorial cohesion usage field is not independent, but strongly related to other areas of action (see Chapter 6). One could for instance think of the allocation of power on its own merits, Cohesion policy, et cetera. Yet, from this research’s departure-point of European spatial planning (see Chapter 3) comes the main interest, formulated as leading question in this appendix: ‘How is the concept of territorial cohesion used in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area for a competency for European spatial planning?”.

To treat these hypotheses and question, the stories on territorial cohesion in this usage area fan out below. Firstly, by treating the general stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself (§C.1), followed by the territorial cohesion metanarratives of cohesion objective, spatial planning or territorial cohesion competence, Services of General (Economic) Interest, territorial specificities, coordination, and the territorial dimension (§C.2). Thereafter, schema’s ordering these stories will be related to narratives with an own dynamic that show areas of action in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area which are related to the concept of territorial cohesion (§C.3). From these ordered stories conclusions can be drawn on the strategic positions in the usage of the concept (see Chapter 11).

C.1 The general stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area

C.1.1 The usage area’s general stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself

The stories that frame and structure other stories in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area can be ordered in a schema on the ‘General stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself in the IGCs usage area’. This Schema 1 below shows that there are three kinds of general stories in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area that frame all other ones. These are, in order of importance, stories on the existence of government levels which should have competencies (e.g. the European Union), the need for a Constitutional Treaty, and on the un/importance of the territorial/spatial. They are respectively coloured pink, green, and blue in Schema 1. Also the stories on the concept of territorial cohesion itself that structure the territorial cohesion stories in this usage area can be divided into three kinds. These namely refer to the importance of the concept, the placing of the concept in Treaties, and on decision making when it concerns territorial cohesion. These are respectively coloured red, yellow, and green in Schema 1.
Besides that Schema 1 expresses that each kind of general stories has another subject matter, their own though related developments through time can be followed as well. These general stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself will be further described below.

C.1.2 The stories framing this usage area

Since 1995, starting with the general stories on the existence of government levels, there seemed to be a general consensus that the competency issue should be resolved and that the allocation of powers is a major issue. This is not surprising for stories in Treaty debates and seemed to be a general consensus that the competency issue should be resolved and that the Constitutional Treaty only future prospect in the IGCs.
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The continued informal process of the Ministers responsible for spatial development (i.e. Agenda 2007) and its weakness in the European Union parallel these paradoxical statements respectively (see Chapter 3 on the (post-)ESDP process). Additionally, such relationships hint at the corroborated hypothesis: the whole territorial cohesion usage field is not independent, but related to the allocation of power and European spatial planning.
C.1.3 The stories structuring this usage area
The stories on the concept of territorial cohesion itself are framed by the three kinds of general stories. While the structuring stories on the importance of the concept did not appear in the year after the introduction of ‘cohesion’ into the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 just yet, those on territorial cohesion’s placing in Treaties already did, and this as “a foot in the door” by demanding the concept’s inclusion in the Treaty. Although the Treaty of Amsterdam from 1997 included territorial cohesion in Article 16 (added as Art. 7D), the concept’s status was unsure: the stories on the importance of the concept evolved between 1999 and 2006 from calling for territorial cohesion’s importance and acceptance to others stressing the un/importance of the concept in the (Constitutional) Treaty. Hereby the eventual inclusion of territorial cohesion in the Draft Constitutional Treaty and its non-ratification signify this evolution: the concept’s status increased but this did not become official. Moreover, since this inclusion territorial cohesion appeared on the agenda, because from 2003 on not only stories on the concept itself were told, but territorial cohesion itself seems to be debated upon for the first time.

Notwithstanding that the structuring stories posed territorial cohesion as unimportant, the key placing of the concept in the Constitutional Treaty appears to be contested. That is to say, since the concept itself was debated upon for the first time, there were not only stories for and against the concept and on whether the Community should be active in territorial cohesion matters, but also discussions on the place of territorial cohesion in the Constitutional Treaty: in Article I-16 with a marginal role concerning coordinating or complementary action or in Article I-3 relating to central cohesion issues and a shared competency. Since the drafting of the Constitutional Treaty with the concept in it, structuring stories on decision-making related to this came to the fore that dispute who will decide on territorial cohesion matters. Framed by the general stories on the existence of government levels these decision-making stories show various levels of de/centralisation: from practices and subsidiarity, through sharing and dialogue, to a Community competence, and they are later more on centralised decision making. Yet, after the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification, decision-making stories on territorial cohesion itself disappeared. This at least suggests some need for this Treaty as official ground to decide on the concept. Hence, while territorial cohesion was included in Article I-3 (and also I-14) of the Constitutional Treaty, both the general stories on this Treaty and those on the placing of territorial cohesion inside it show continued contrapositions.

C.1.4 The Intergovernmental Conferences usage area is framed and structured by fundamental disputes
The general stories and stories on the concept itself frame and structure territorial cohesion stories in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area with fundamental disputes which remain even though official (e.g. constitutional) documents take sides. Obviously, this situation and/or the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification clearly refutes this appendix’ first general hypothesis: the Treaty debates do not decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground, not in the sense of a final decision where to officially base usages of the concept of territorial cohesion on at least. The hereby framed and structured territorial cohesion stories can then be ordered by the topics that seem to be assumed as those to be discussed under this concept, that is, its metanarratives.
C.2 Territorial cohesion metanarratives in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area

C.2.1 Introducing the six metanarratives

In the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area most territorial cohesion stories evolve around a single metanarrative, of which there are six. One metanarrative openly aligns to stories on territorial cohesion itself when it concerns the placing of the concept in Treaties. This because an assumption shown in stories of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area is that a competency for territorial cohesion has to do with Cohesion Policy. With Cohesion Policy forming the main formal policy area for the concept’s usage (see the next chapters), the label for this metanarrative becomes ‘cohesion objective’. The key issue of this usage area also relates to stories on territorial cohesion itself when it concerns the placing of the concept in Treaties. This is the debate on whether giving a Community competency for territorial cohesion (partly) entails giving one for spatial planning, making ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ another territorial cohesion metanarrative. Still, a juridical fact is that the concept has from the official start in the Treaty of Amsterdam the official grounding of Services of General (Economic) Interest, what is thus the name for another territorial cohesion metanarrative in this usage area.

The order of metanarratives does not stop with the three abovementioned territorial cohesion metanarratives though: ‘territorial specificities’, ‘coordination’, and ‘territorial dimension’ can be added. The concept of territorial cohesion is namely also used in stories which point to territorial realities (mostly at lower levels) and, although also debates on coordination exist without any use made of the concept, coordination (e.g. of policies) is inside the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area almost only mentioned when related to territorial cohesion (e.g. in Article I-16 of the Constitutional Treaty). Moreover, another use made of the concept of territorial cohesion is to further the territorial dimension more abstractly, in itself, and (mostly) on the Community level. Both the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘territorial dimension’ metanarratives are thereby framed by the general stories on the un/importance of the spatial/territorial, because the assumption shown by these topics is that territorial cohesion has to do herewith. The appearance and development of the stories per metanarrative can then be ordered in Schema 2 on the ‘Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the IGCs usage area’.

IGCs Schema 2
Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the IGCs usage area
Below the developments of these six metanarratives in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area will be described one by one by identifying and relating their main discussions.

C.2.2 Cohesion objective metanarrative

The importance of the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative can also be deduced by that there are no stories denying the relationship between territorial cohesion and Cohesion Policy. A working hypothesis for this territorial cohesion metanarrative could therefore be: the official place of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy is unproblematic. The three different kinds of territorial cohesion stories which test this hypothesis are on the relation of territorial cohesion
to economic and social cohesion, regional and cohesion policy, and to the issue of disparities/equity. These are respectively coloured orange, red, and green in Schema 2. Most of them emerged only since the Convention discussions in 2002, a time where the usage of the concept might have been extended beyond Services of General (Economic) Interest (SG(E)I) only as laid down by Article 16 of the Treaty of Amsterdam (see §C.2.4). The late blossoming of this metanarrative then hints at a less unproblematic placing of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy. This because when this place would be unproblematic for the concept, what reason could there be that it did not blossom earlier? Exceptions on the late timing of this emergence of stories of the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative are a few earlier ones on the relation of territorial cohesion to economic and social cohesion. This type of stories stayed the most prominent until the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification. They are therefore treated first before the other two types below.

The inclusion of territorial cohesion in relation to economic and social cohesion in the Treaty of Amsterdam was wished for in 1996, but this Treaty relates the concept to social cohesion only. Moreover, a difference appears in how (mostly descriptive) stories fitted the concept into the legal basis of economic and social cohesion existing since the Treaty of Maastricht. That is to say, notwithstanding the Treaty of Amsterdam, territorial cohesion was also mentioned as component of economic and social cohesion before the Convention discussions. Since these discussions, there seems to be an ambiguity in the call of completing economic and social cohesion with territorial cohesion. This due to descriptions of the concept as third cohesion objective equal to economic and social cohesion on the one hand and as a territorial/transversal dimension of these two cohesion objectives on the other. Hence, even if territorial cohesion’s placing in Cohesion Policy is officially certain, the stories on the relation of territorial cohesion to economic and social cohesion show that this neither holds for which place this will be nor for how it will work out.

Yet, a characteristic of the metanarrative’s contraposition concerning the relation of territorial cohesion with economic and/or social cohesion, is that there appear switching dominances, or no dominant story, and no weaker counterstory as a consequence. Even the possible ending of this doubt by the inclusion of territorial cohesion on a par with economic and social cohesion in the important Article I-3b of the Constitutional Treaty might not hold as long as this Treaty is not ratified. The development of the counter/stories of the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative after the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty therefore seems to follow the same line as before the Convention discussion. This because it resulted in the legal basis for territorial cohesion being the Treaty of Amsterdam again – i.e. Article I-3 not coming into force might mean a role en marge. Yet, stories in 2004 as well as 2006 leaned the other way by holding that (regional) economic and social cohesion policy already implies territorial cohesion. It might thus not even to be clear whether the uncertainty around the place of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy will go away. The other two kinds of territorial cohesion stories in this metanarrative explain it further.

Besides the call in 2002 to enforce Cohesion Policy with territorial cohesion in the Constitutional Treaty and the observation in 2004 that for this policy the concept was included in Article I-3, it is only after the drafting of this Treaty that stories relating territorial cohesion to regional and cohesion policy really came forward since 2005, of which many are backward looking. Despite the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification, the stories on territorial cohesion as (usable) reason for regional/cohesion policy showed no development, nor did the backward looking stories on changes in competences of Cohesion Policy due to the inclusion of territorial cohesion in the Constitutional Treaty – while both are stuck in the abovementioned ambiguity of the stories on the relationship between territorial cohesion and

---

a See chapter 4 on the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area for the for territorial cohesion ir/relevant distinction between regional policy and cohesion policy.
b The Union ‘shall promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, and solidarity among Member States’ (OJEC, 2004).
economic and social cohesion.\textsuperscript{21} What is more, a backward looking story from 2006 hinted at the possibility that a position on the relationship of territorial cohesion to regional policy existed before the emergence of explicit stories to show for it. This by stating that from 1999 to 2004 the Commissioner of DG Regio (i.e. Barnier) pushed the concept of territorial cohesion for a regional policy for all regions.\textsuperscript{22} The stories on the relation of territorial cohesion to regional and cohesion policy thus show that the relative silence on the place of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy and the late explicit appearances of (smoke) trails thereof might brace the idea that it is a problematical issue beneath the surface.

The third kind of territorial cohesion stories in this metanarrative then seems to relate to both treated above. \textit{Qua} timing to begin with: just as when the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative points to the relationship of territorial cohesion to regional and cohesion policy, stories on disparities/equity emerge at the time of the Convention discussions. First these are on the use of territorial cohesion for disparities.\textsuperscript{23} Besides that the upcoming European Enlargement of 2004 increased disparities, a backward looking story from 2006 might also explain this relation of territorial cohesion by stating that Barnier incorporated the concept in the Constitutional Treaty to combat territorial disparities – while this statement might at the same time point to discordances in these stories: which territorial disparities (e.g. within/between nations/regions)?\textsuperscript{24} Then, in the year of Enlargement, most stories on territorial disparities seem to change from this discussion into being on the principle of equity of citizens wherever they may live, whereby territorial cohesion would both be based on as establish this principle (see next chapters).\textsuperscript{25} Hence, the territorial cohesion stories on disparities/equity show that there also seem to arise substantive problems for territorial cohesion’s place in Cohesion Policy.

The official place of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy seems thus far from unproblematic as this section’s working hypothesis posed. The concept’s place herein \textit{an sich}, its placing on a par to or as dimension of economic and/or social cohesion, and substantive concerns are namely disputed without conclusion or explicit statements on such developments. What is more, although this exemplifies the appendix’ second general hypothesis (i.e. the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action), it weakens the first one (i.e. the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground). This with Cohesion Policy as an area of action related to the whole territorial cohesion usage field and a specification of the unclarities of the concept’s official ground given by Treaties respectively.

\subsection*{C.2.3 Spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence metanarrative}

As the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative shows, the placing of concept of territorial cohesion in Cohesion Policy is far from unproblematic. For this appendix’ leading question (i.e. how is the concept used in this usage area for a competency for European spatial planning) one then wonders: would an affiliation of the concept with spatial planning therefore be either more or less workable? Cohesion Policy is namely not the same as spatial planning and \textit{qua} words ‘territorial cohesion’ differs more from ‘spatial planning’ than from ‘cohesion policy’. The working hypothesis for the ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ metanarrative might thus pose: a European Union competence for territorial cohesion gives no formal ground for one for European spatial planning. Against this hypothesis goes that this territorial cohesion metanarrative does harbour a debate wherein almost all stories explicitly show (mostly descriptive) positions on whether a competency for territorial cohesion (partly) entails one for spatial planning. Still, two other kinds of territorial cohesion stories seem to question this debate on formal competencies, this by implicitly relating the concept to tasks which could fall under a European spatial planning competency or by pointing to an informal relationship between them. These three kinds of stories that
characterise the ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competency’ metanarrative are respectively coloured yellow, pink, and blue in Schema 2. Together they hint at a justification of its existence: although territorial cohesion possibly will have to do with spatial planning, it is not clear whether and, if so, how this involves European Union competencies.

The main debate of this metanarrative on whether a competency for territorial cohesion (partly) entails one for European spatial planning can be traced through an apparently self-evident relatedness of the concept and spatial planning. That is to say, there were before and after 2005 stories strongly relating the (post-)ESDP process to territorial cohesion. However, it was in this year of the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification, and formally seen en marge role of the concept as a possible consequence, that an even stronger statement was made: the informal Agenda 2007 would be the only way for territorial cohesion policy. This forward looking statement should be seen in light of the many ways in which territorial cohesion stories represent a promotion of the formal relationship or even total overlapping of territorial cohesion and spatial planning. After the proposal to include a reference to ‘spatial cohesion’ appeared in the discussion about an European Union competence for spatial planning in 1995, the development in the competency debate on territorial cohesion/spatial planning namely really kicked off in 1997 when territorial cohesion was related to spatial planning; this while the concept was officially seen only related to SG(E)I and a backward looking story in 2002 holds that the responsibility for spatial development strictly falls under Member States’ competence because the Treaty of Amsterdam’s Article 158 lacks an explicit reference to the objective of territorial cohesion.

From 2002 onwards many similar stories were told, in which the label ‘spatial planning’ also changes to ‘strategic spatial planning’, ‘spatial development’, and ‘spatial policy’. Since the drafting of the Constitutional Treaty in 2002 until its non-ratification these stories not only related territorial cohesion to spatial planning, some even posed or disputed the identification of both as the same. Such identification of course always implies that giving the European Union a competency for territorial cohesion equals the giving of a competency for spatial planning. So from 2002 stories on this were added to stories on their relation, and only in 2005 the relation of territorial cohesion to spatial planning appears to be contradicted. That it are the Member States which are responsible for spatial development thus supports the working hypothesis that a European Union competence for territorial cohesion does not give an official ground for one for European spatial planning. Nonetheless, the debate shown by the metanarrative’s territorial cohesion stories points to possible changes herein.

Albeit that an on-going territorial cohesion debate can even offer a formal ground for an European Union competence for spatial planning, there are also more stealthy ways for relating both activities, as shown in the other two kinds of territorial cohesion stories. Signs hereof include stories which might implicitly relate the concept to spatial planning by not referring to ‘spatial planning’ in the shadow of the drafting of the Constitutional Treaty. Firstly by timing, because in 2002 and 2003 they showed the relationship of territorial cohesion to organising the European territory, secondly by after its non-ratification stating that Barnier incorporated the concept in this Treaty for a balanced spatial pattern of economic development; the assumption here is of course that organising the territory and a spatial pattern are spatial planning issues. This side-debate therefore shows that the metanarrative’s main debate which discusses the relationship between competencies for territorial cohesion
and spatial planning could be less important than it first seemed (i.e. not crucial). Besides, although stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning mostly show the dispute on their (implicit) formal relationship or (total) overlap, a connection of a formal territorial cohesion to an informal European spatial planning such as Agenda 2007 (blue in Schema 2) or in/formal spatial planning at lower levels (blank in Schema 2) is also possible. Safe to say though, that just as with the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative’s stories on the relation of territorial cohesion to economic and social cohesion, the (explicit) stories of the ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ metanarrative continue in contradictions without there clearly being a dominant story and weaker counterstory (yet).

Although the territorial cohesion stories thus clearly indicate that (European) spatial planning and territorial cohesion are related, they do not really answer this appendix’ leading question of how the concept is used for a competency for the former. What namely is important for the working hypothesis of the ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ metanarrative, which states that an European Union competence for territorial cohesion gives no formal ground for one for European spatial planning, is that it is not clear how and why they are related. That is to say, in which ways do competences for spatial planning or territorial cohesion differ or such tasks overlap implicitly (see the next chapters)? Hence, again a territorial cohesion metanarrative exemplifies the appendix’ second general hypothesis (i.e. the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action), but now with (European) spatial planning as an in/formal area of action related to the whole territorial cohesion usage field. What is more, it also weakens the first general hypothesis (i.e. the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground) due to the unclarities of the concept’s official ground given by Treaties, the more so as it complexes the specification with (European) spatial planning besides Cohesion Policy.

C.2.4 Services of General (Economic) Interest metanarrative

As already mentioned above a number of times, Services of General (Economic) Interest (SG(E)I) are linked to territorial cohesion, even officially so with the Treaty of Amsterdam. A working hypothesis for this section on the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative can thus quickly ensue: the official ground of the concept of territorial cohesion given by SG(E)I is unquestionable. The ambiguous label of ‘SG(E)I’ hereby denotes the important difference between Services of General Interest (SGI) and Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI) (see section 2.3), which the concept of territorial cohesion, however, not accounts for. To be precise, although in this metanarrative the territorial cohesion stories almost always spoke of either SGI or SGEI, they did not explicitly treat the consequential difference. The metanarrative does harbour two other debates though. The main stories of the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative can, namely, be divided into stories on the existence of a relationship between territorial cohesion and SG(E)I and on the causal direction thereof. These are respectively coloured pink and green in Schema 2. Both kinds of stories thereby show a stable development of the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative that points towards its decreasing importance. A development, therefore, which would question the use of SG(E)I as official ground for the concept of territorial cohesion.

The introduction of the relationship between territorial cohesion and SG(E)I appeared successful. In the lobbying for the Treaty of Amsterdam this relationship was namely made for the first time. Quite effectively so, since a year later this Treaty gave a shared competence for promoting social and territorial cohesion by providing SGEI. Still, such a successful introduction seems to have not been enough, because the lobbying continued. What more was wanted did not become clear though, because the development of this territorial cohesion

---

*Without prejudice to Articles 77, 90 and 92, and given the place occupied by services of general economic interest in the shared values of the Union as well as their role in promoting social and territorial cohesion, the Community and the Member States, each within their respective powers and within the scope of application of this Treaty, shall take care that such services operate on the basis of principles and conditions which enable them to fulfil their missions’ (OJEC, 1997).
metanarrative became less univocal.\textsuperscript{35} To be exact, the juridical fact that the provision of SG(E)I promote social and territorial cohesion remains, but from 2000 on stories concerning this promotion of SG(E)I are for economic cohesion and/or competitiveness as well.\textsuperscript{36} Besides this variation another debate developed as well: after the drafting of the Constitutional Treaty and the more important place of the concept in Article I-3, it was also stated that it is territorial cohesion that ensures conditions of access to SG(E)I, thereby turning the causal relationship between them around.\textsuperscript{37} Notwithstanding the increasing variation of territorial cohesion stories in the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative through time, the official ground remains stable, as both kinds of stories hereby assume that the juridical relationship between territorial cohesion and SG(E)I exists.

Even though territorial cohesion’s official ground of SG(E)I seems pretty stable, this does not make it a necessary base. Although the juridical fact establishing the existence of the relationship between territorial cohesion and SG(E)I itself can also be found in Article 36 of the European Council’s Charter of Fundamental Human Rights from 2000,\textsuperscript{a} the proposals for the inclusion of SGI in the Constitutional Treaty were, for instance, also made without relating these services to territorial cohesion, and vice versa as mentioned in Article I-3 (see section 2.2.2).\textsuperscript{38} What is more, disagreement on territorial cohesion’s only official ground rose: notwithstanding the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty and SG(E)I as sole official basis again, territorial cohesion stories after 2004 disregarded or even contradicted the juridical fact that SG(E)I and territorial cohesion are related – shown in extreme by counterstories which explicitly separated SG(E)I and territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{39} A possible explanation for this divergence might be the existence of territorial cohesion stories outside the IGCs usage area which show more concern for reducing regional disparities by striving for polycentric development than for the issue of SG(E)I (see the Chapter on the (post-)ESDP process).\textsuperscript{40} That is to say, the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative might decrease in importance in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area due to a competition between territorial cohesion metanarratives in other and between related usage areas (see next appendices).

Also in the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area there thus appears to be a developing contradiction, both concerning the existence of a relationship between territorial cohesion and SG(E)I and the causal direction of it. The variation of territorial cohesion stories that developed hereby does not question the official ground given by SG(E)I for a usage of the concept. What does undermine the unquestionability of SG(E)I as the official ground of territorial cohesion, as this section’s working hypothesis holds, is that both the concept as SG(E)I were also posed without the other and that the metanarrative’s territorial cohesion stories even started to explicitly contradict the juridical fact of their relationship. Hence, however paradoxically it might be, even this territorial cohesion metanarrative on the only already existing official ground for the usage of the concept appears weakens the first general hypothesis (i.e. the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground) by challenging decisions made in Treaty debates. What is more, for the second general hypothesis (i.e. the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action) the ‘SG(E)I’ metanarrative seems to go beyond accordance with the ‘cohesion objective’ and ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ metanarratives. It namely not only points to SG(E)I as an area of action related to the whole territorial cohesion usage field, but also suggests that the territorial cohesion usage areas influence each other, and therefore that the areas of action related to the whole field may interconnect as well.

\textsuperscript{a} ‘The Union recognises and respects access to services of general economic interest as provided for in national laws and practices, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, in order to promote the social and territorial cohesion of the Union’ (OJEC, 2000).
The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative appears as a stable and unquestioned territorial cohesion metanarrative in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area. Through the years its territorial cohesion stories show almost no changes and, just as with the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative, none explicitly deny the relationship of territorial cohesion to territorial specificities. Moreover, since a story in the ‘cohesion objective’ metanarrative stated that Barnier (as Commissioner of DG Regio) incorporated territorial cohesion in the Constitutional Treaty to combat territorial disparities, it might be this territorial cohesion metanarrative that clarifies which kind of territorial disparities this are. That is to say, the working hypothesis for this section on territorial specificities might well be: it is clear with which territorial specificities the concept of territorial cohesion is concerned.

However, the structure of this metanarrative immediately complicates the matter, as its territorial cohesion stories can be divided into two groups: those on territorial impacts and those on territories. These are respectively coloured purple and yellow in Schema 2. The former can be characterised by having a top-down perspective, as they are concerned with how something from above (e.g. policy) affects the ground territorially wise. Such a characterisation can also be applied to the stories on territories after they are subdivided into stories on actual territorial realities and those on the needed focus on specific territories. Here, the former have a bottom-up perspective, as the most tangible realities exist on the lowest level (e.g. as knowledge), and the latter link bottom-up and top-down perspectives, as focussing on specificities implies a selective sight from above upon lower actual specificities. Even though the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative thus harbours three different kinds of territorial cohesion stories, these kinds do belong together, and not only because they are all on territorial specificities. They also belong together because, although distinct, the substance of these different kinds of stories can come together – e.g. due to negative territorial impacts of European policies on specific territories due to their “deviating” territorial realities. Still, there are many ways in which the concept of territorial cohesion can be concerned with territorial specificities

The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative is the oldest one of the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area. Its territorial cohesion stories namely began in 1995, this with the promotion of the concept in the call for research on the territorial impacts of European policies seen by the regions. Since then this top-down kind of territorial cohesion stories form a constant factor. To be precise, besides a minor deviation in 2005 by a story on the territorial impacts of globalisation, stories which relate territorial cohesion to the territorial impacts of European policies are told regularly. Moreover, these stories appear so stable (e.g. by talking about policy), that it could even be posed that a statement from 2006 fully echoes the “origin” of researching territorial impacts at the regional level, were it not that the levels differ. That is, a Community competence for territorial cohesion policy – a competency whereon the structuring stories on territorial cohesion itself contradict – might lead to Territorial Impact Assessments (TIA) at the Community level. What therefore becomes clear from these territorial cohesion stories on territorial impacts is that their perspective cannot be top-down only (as held above), simply because they relate to territorial realities. Wherein the similarity of these territorial cohesion stories on territorial impacts does lie, is that they are concerned with bottom-up knowledge on top-down impacts. One territorial cohesion perspective on territorial realities is thus clear, but still leaves open which realities to look at/for. It therefore does not clarify with which territorial specificities territorial cohesion is concerned, and thus at least does not bare this working hypothesis.

The metanarrative’s stories on territorial realities have one thing in common: in their bottom-up perspective that relates territorial cohesion to actual territorial realities, they always seem to agree on the importance of territorial diversity. Also these territorial
cohesion stories thus seem to have a clear perspective on territorial specificities. However, the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative also hints at a major change in the way of looking at territorial reality through this perspective. That is, before the Constitutional Treaty was drafted the metanarrative’s stories on territorial realities refer to lower territorial units to describe territorial cohesion, but afterwards they appear to be on the usage of these units as well.45 Disagreement remains on for what to use these units though: for objectives of stronger union between them, not risking discriminatory situations because of their differences, or to promote their competitiveness and/or sustainable development.46 This change from describing territorial units to uniting them in a single cause at the top could fit the general stories in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area. This because the general stories around that time could have framed descriptions of territorial reality by stating that a more integrated Europe cannot be exclusively economic and that all actors should strive to find a common ground at the European level while respecting (national) differences.47 Also territorial cohesion stories describing territorial realities should thereby thus have to deal with uniting territorial differences in this way. Then again, the territorial cohesion stories on territorial realities do not only disagree on the common goal set for territorial units, but also do not clarify which territorial realities the concept is concerned with. Hence, is that even when they are on territorial realities, this metanarrative’s stories do not clarify with which territorial specificities the concept is concerned, what thus strongly runs against this section’s working hypothesis. What is more, describing diversity with territorial cohesion can also decrease instead of increase clarity, as it could lead to many different descriptions of territorial reality. And this while the need to be clear about this might become higher due to the search for a (non-economical) ground to unite territorial diversity through a common goal on the European level.

Stories on bottom-up descriptions of territorial units could partly fit into those on the needed top-down focus on specific territories. To know which territories are specific, they namely need to be described. However, hereby not all territories need to be described when a focus is chosen beforehand. A backward looking story in 2006 might thereby indicate something which could be called an “original focus”. It namely claimed that the “founding fathers” of the concept of territorial cohesion used it (in a lobby) for autonomous and peripheral territories as specific territories.48 Although this claim could be questioned due to the absence of territorial cohesion stories hereon in the metanarrative’s emergence (see Chapter 4 on the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area though), after this the variation of specific territories certainly increased. To be precise, it was after the concept became more important in the Constitutional Treaty (Article I-3), and the specification of territories herein less general (Article III -220), that other territories were mentioned as well (e.g. geographically handicapped areas, islands, territories under constraint, cities, or simply all kinds of territories); thereby also showing tensions with the general story that Europe has an urban specificity (e.g. should the specificity of a territory be different from Europe’s specificity?).49 Because of this, the concept of territorial cohesion might lose its focus when it concerns specific territories: the “original” idea would get generalised through the various applications of it. A backward looking story in the IGCs usage area on territorial cohesion itself from 2004 gives an example of this by stating that the island regions where involved in getting the concept in the Constitutional Treaty.50 What the territorial cohesion stories on specific territories thus seem to disagree about is: on which specific territories to focus? Hence, the metanarrative’s stories focussing on specific territories do not back this section’s working hypothesis, at least they develop that way, as neither they clarify with which territorial specificities the concept of territorial cohesion is concerned.

Although this section’s working hypothesis posed that it is clear with which territorial specificities the concept of territorial cohesion is concerned, especially the ‘territorial
specificities’ metanarrative shows this is far from obvious. This by leaving open about which territorial realities to have bottom-up knowledge on top-down impacts, incorporating the tension of bottom-up descriptions of territorial diversity and the quest for a common ground, and losing the concept’s top-down territorial focus by adding more and more specific territories. Hence, again the first general hypothesis is weakened (i.e. the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground): not even the metanarrative on territorial specificities lays down with what territorial specificities territorial cohesion is concerned, and stably so.

C.2.6 Coordination metanarrative

Also the ‘coordination’ metanarrative appears as an unquestioned territorial cohesion metanarrative in the Intergovernmental Conferences usage area. Just once the linkage between territorial cohesion and coordination seems to be contradicted explicitly. Moreover, this metanarrative fits firmly into its usage area, as it can be linked with two kinds of stories on the concept of territorial cohesion itself: i) those on the place of the concept in Constitutional Treaty Article I-3, leading to a shared competency, or rather in Article I-16, leading to coordinating action of the Community, and ii) those showing a need for decision making, especially if they mention sharing and dialogue. Following the working hypotheses of the previous sections, this section’s working hypothesis would then pose that the official relation between territorial cohesion and coordination is unproblematic. Yet, the falsifications above suggest that no such self-evidence exists with this concept. Here we will therefore hold as working hypothesis that this relationship is problematic. Whether this is the case then mostly depends on the main stories of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. These are on the coordination of and cooperation for policies and on the need of an institutional framework as more robust base for coordination; in Schema 2 these have the colour blue and brown respectively. As only the latter stories develop, also this metanarrative is rather stable.

Although starting a little bit later than other territorial cohesion metanarratives, territorial cohesion stories on substantive horizontal and vertical coordination and processual cooperation between actors return almost every year since 1999. Certainly after the Convention discussions began, more of these stories are told. This could be explained by a backward looking story from 2006, which states that Barnier incorporated the concept in the Constitutional Treaty for the European Commission’s coordination of development policies. It is only in 2005, then, that a counterstory holds that it is not established from which Treaty regulation the coordination of sectoral policies derives. Also, the ways in which the concept is positively related to coordination vary (e.g. coordination parameters, economic policies, integrated territorial strategy, spatial coordination, transnational development) and, in a similar way as with the direction in the relationship between SG(E)I and territorial cohesion, there are both stories on territorial cohesion leading to as well as needing coordination. No trends are visible within these variations though. Together with that counterstory they thus seem to support that the official relationship between territorial cohesion and coordination is problematic because it is both contested and undefined.

Stories of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative on the need of an institutional framework might relate to the possible uncertainty of which Treaty regulation establishes a legal basis for coordinating policies. Moreover, both of them can fit in the trend towards less explicit treatment of competencies as shown in the general story on the need for government levels with competencies told in the IGCs usage area. That is to say, if the stories on which level has the competency to do what are less clear, then the call for an institutional base framing coordination of policies and cooperation between actors might become stronger. Perhaps stories of this metanarrative promoting subnational authorities, self-administration, and the principle of subsidiarity touch upon this uncertainty about the allocation of power as well.
This by showing attempts to grasp this moment from decentral positions. Such a
development would of course further increase the problematic of the official relationship
between territorial cohesion and coordination.

Yet, some territorial cohesion stories seem to denote a boundary of the IGCs usage
area. They namely hint at less formal ways of doing compared to those discussed in Treaty
debates. These stories are that territorial cohesion is a (territorial) framework for mobilising
public and private players, no administrative unit (both from 2000), and that it needs an
institutional framework for good territorial governance (from 2003). Since then territorial
cohesion stories on coordination are told, but not those relating territorial cohesion to a more
robust institutional framework. This can partly be explained by the uncertain situation around
the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty and by the general stories on the distance between
European institutions and people(s). That is, as a consequence the promotion of these
interests for a coordination framework might have moved into (for outsiders) less visible and
more informal areas of action, leading to such stories in other usage areas (see the next
chapters). The ‘coordination’ metanarrative therefore shows that the concept of territorial
cohesion is frequently used for coordination of and cooperation for policies, but that stories
on a formal institutional framework for coordination disappear from this usage area. Whether
the official relationship between territorial cohesion and coordination is problematic thus
does not only depend on the nature of the relationship, but also on its relevance.

When you assess the ‘coordination’ metanarrative’s stories with this section’s
working hypothesis, an ambiguity appears. A counterstory goes against the official
relationship between territorial cohesion and coordination, and that the ways in which they
relate is left undefined also backs up that this relationship is problematic. However, that
territorial cohesion stories on a formal institutional framework for coordination disappears
from the IGCs usage area, suggest that the formality of such a relationship might be
irrelevant. When this metanarrative shows that this official relationship is contested,
defined, but also unimportant, this has similar implications for both general hypotheses.

For the first, which poses that the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official
ground, it gives rise to a questioning of how this official ground does matter. For the second,
which poses that the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action, it
generalises this questioning, by pointing to the possibility that the relationship between the
concept’s whole usage field and official areas of action is weak.

C.2.7 Territorial dimension metanarrative
The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative shows territorial cohesion stories on bottom-up
and top-down movements and the ‘coordination’ metanarrative also on the need for a
territorial framework. However, the ‘territorial dimension’ in itself can be treated separately
as territorial cohesion metanarrative too due to the more abstract features and focus on the
Community level which distinguish it from these other two metanarratives. A division which
can be made in the territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension is between those
promoting the territorial dimension of policies, and those promoting it more in general. These
are respectively coloured purple and blue in Schema 2. One story which does not fit into this
division of often-told stories appears only once (in 1999), but might nevertheless be worth to
mention. It namely points to a heated issue: using the concept to decide on the European
geographical area, thereby showing territorial cohesion can have to do with this, but hardly
is so in practice. Yet, as territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension are related to
this, the working hypothesis for this section might be that this debate will blossom.

In 1997, while territorial cohesion is officially only related to SG(E)I, the story starts
that the concept is related to the territorial dimension of sectoral policies. This story
develops again from the Convention discussions until the non-ratification of the
Constitutional Treaty by promoting territorial cohesion to strengthen the territorial dimension of (all) European Union policies. Moreover, the only counterstory seems to be the statement that territorial cohesion is a sector field itself, and, as a consequence, no territorial dimension of other policies. While this (weak) counterstory points to a debate, these stories fade away after that non-ratification. What thus falsifies this section’s working hypothesis, is that territorial cohesion stories that link to the heated issue of the European geographical area do not blossom at all.

A similar development can be described for the stories relating territorial cohesion to the territorial dimension more in general. At the time the concept of territorial cohesion officially increased in importance due to Article I-3 of the Draft Constitutional Treaty, the story on using the concept to strengthen the territorial dimension in the European Union arose. Although in the two years after this the same is told and no counterstory emerges, also these stories of the ‘territorial dimension’ metanarrative disappear later on, though more slowly. That is to say, in 2005 it was held that it is even not sure how the inclusion of territorial cohesion in the Constitutional Treaty will translate into a territorial dimension. Moreover, a backward looking from 2006 story says that the promotion of the territorial dimension (also) in relation to territorial cohesion did not have the desired impact. This development might also account for the disappearance of stories relating the concept to the territorial dimension of policies. In the IGCs usage area the development of the ‘territorial dimension’ metanarrative thus seems to arrive at a dead end.

The ‘territorial dimension’ metanarrative shows that this issue might disappear from the IGCs usage area. This falsifies this section’s working hypothesis that something so close to the heated debate on the European geographical area will blossom. However, while the territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension of European Union policies shows some debate through a counterstory, they disappear from the scene later on, just as those on the territorial dimension more in general do. Both developments thereby go against the first general hypothesis (i.e. the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground), as a territorial dimension issue is taken off the official “radar”. Yet, as the ‘coordination’ metanarrative suggested, perhaps such formality is irrelevant.

C.2.8 Territorial cohesion stories relating metanarratives

Schema 2 does more than summarise the developments of the territorial cohesion metanarratives separately as described in §2.2 though. It also shows how some stories connect these metanarratives. These are made visible in the dark blue boxes in-between the metanarrative-columns. The usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the IGCs usage area can then not only be characterised by its metanarratives, but also by the ways in which the connections between them form a bundle of metanarratives.

These relating stories suggest for instance that SG(E)I and Cohesion Policy relate with territorial cohesion. The ‘SG(E)I’ and ‘cohesion objective’ metanarratives are namely linked in 1997 – but not thereafter. This by the story that Article 16 on SG(E)I of the Treaty that year is the legal basis of regional and cohesion policies as territorial policies; whereby this linkage can relate to the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘territorial dimension’ metanarratives as well. The same might not hold for SG(E)I and spatial planning. This because the only story relating the ‘spatial planning or territorial cohesion competence’ and ‘SG(E)I’ metanarratives mentions in 1998 that the draft ESDP lacks an analysis of SGEI promoting social and territorial cohesion. Albeit that officially seen only SG(E)I legally ground the usage of territorial cohesion, the SG(E)I metanarrative is thus both not often linked to other metanarratives and mostly to the ‘cohesion objective’ one. This peculiarity of the concept in the IGCs usage area points to the importance of an analysis of territorial
cohesion stories that denote its informal usage. The official ones namely suggest that territorial cohesion has to do with far more than for which there is a legal ground.

A sign of this is that a stronger linkage is made between territorial cohesion metanarratives in the year the ESDP was published. The ‘cohesion objective’ and ‘spatial planning or territorial cohesion competence’ metanarratives are namely related via the call to underline the importance of the concept in IGCs by introducing a clearer reference to spatial planning under the objectives of economic and social cohesion. While territorial cohesion was included in the Draft Constitutional Treaty but the clearer reference to spatial planning was not, this relation continues to be made. This explicitly in notes that territorial cohesion requires regulation for the impact of European spatial development policy on regional policy, and implicitly in statements that territorial cohesion reduces development disparities between regions by reorganising Community territory to enable polycentric harmonious balanced and sustainable development. The relation between these metanarratives might therefore denote a possible overlap of territorial cohesion stories in debates on cohesion policy and spatial planning competencies when the concept is used. However, it might thereby more depend on how they overlap in policy practice than officially seen.

The few stories relating metanarratives in the IGCs usage area thus show that they do not form a firm bundle. The only ties made are between SG(E)I and Cohesion Policy and SG(E)I and spatial planning, whereby the former is less weak than he latter. second general hypothesis. As this shows an absence of strong official ties between territorial cohesion topics, this might have implications for the second general hypothesis (i.e. the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action). That is to say, although the whole usage field might be strongly related to others areas of action, it seems as if officially seen it is not even strongly integrate itself. Moreover, even if the metanarratives would have shown that the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground (i.e. the second general hypothesis), the relating stories surely point towards more informal usages of the concept (e.g. in policy practice).

C.3 Narratives with an own dynamic in the IGCs usage area

To complete the picture of the IGCs usage area, we should deal with its narratives on the areas of action related to the whole territorial cohesion usage field (i.e. power allocation, Regional/Cohesion Policy, European spatial planning, SG(E)I). Although the metanarratives bring a part of this whole usage field to the fore, there are similar narratives that do not speak of ‘territorial cohesion’ and have their own dynamic. This of course again shows that the whole usage field is strongly related to other areas of action (i.e. the second general hypothesis). Yet, the stories of the metanarratives might therefore also belong less to only territorial cohesion than Schema 2 portrays. That is, this might decrease the importance of the stories on territorial cohesion itself and make their relations to the metanarratives less self-evident. These narratives are shown in the schema of ‘narratives in the IGCs usage area with an own dynamic’ (Schema 3); note that the general stories shown in Schema 1 also frame these narratives.
Schema 3 shows that the narratives with an own dynamic in the IGCs usage area, especially those of the ‘SG(E)I’ and ‘European spatial planning’ narratives, are older than both the stories on territorial cohesion itself and its metanarratives. As can be seen in Schema 2, metanarratives that demarcate the territorial cohesion field in the IGCs usage area almost all start in the wake of the Treaty of Amsterdam in which the concept was made official for the first time.\(^a\) The presence of these narratives before territorial cohesion was mentioned could then suggest that this concept is not so much used for itself, as Schema 1 and 2 might make you believe, but more as a conceptual tool for (positions in) the debates shown in Schema 3.

These narratives with an own dynamic can be characterised by describing the main debates as told by their stories. The main debate of the ‘power allocation’ narrative, coloured purple in Schema 3, is on giving the European Union (and regions) more or less competencies.\(^b\) This debate relates to the ‘European spatial planning’ narrative, which has as main quest a European spatial planning competency (see Appendix D),\(^c\) coloured yellow in Schema 3. In the ‘Regional/Cohesion Policy’ narrative, regional policy for all regions is mostly promoted and the territorial dimension of cohesion policy discussed (see next

---

\(^a\) Only the ‘coordination’ metanarrative starts later, that is, after stories extend the concept of territorial cohesion beyond SG(E)I, but notwithstanding that stories on coordination are also told in the narratives with an own dynamic.
appendices), coloured red and orange in Schema 3 respectively. The ‘SG(E)I’ narrative points to a heated public debate with the related issues of the liberalisation of public services, providing SGI or SGEI, and whether providing services (always) constitutes an economic activity, but also to the less known call for the special needs of specific territories herein, coloured green and pink in Schema 3 respectively. A “territorial cohesion topic” that can be found in all narratives is the need for coordination, which is most apparent in the ‘European spatial planning’ narrative, coloured pastel pink in Schema 3. Also stories on the territorial dimension mostly return in the ‘Regional/Cohesion Policy’, but not in the ‘SG(E)I’ narrative. To end these characterisations: stories on territorial specificities are divided in those on territorial impacts, which seem to belong to the ‘Regional/Cohesion Policy’ and ‘European spatial planning’ narratives, and stories on specific territories, visible in the ‘SG(E)I’ narrative. As the territorial cohesion metanarratives in Schema 2 also try to show: all these debates of the narratives with an own dynamic are reflected in the usage of the concept of territorial cohesion to promote, for instance, regional policy for all regions, the coordination of policies, and/or the needs of specific territories.

Although the connections between metanarratives under the concept might characterise the bundle of territorial cohesion stories, also their bundling might not be a quality typical for only the concept of territorial cohesion. For instance, already since 1993 also stories of these narratives with an own dynamic ex-/implicitly relate ‘European spatial planning’ and ‘Regional/Cohesion Policy’ and contradict the relation between ‘SG(E)I’ and ‘European spatial planning’ in 2006. Besides showing stories that do not use the concept, but are similar to the ones explicitly relating territorial cohesion metanarratives, there are also stories in Schema 3 that make relations between the narratives without there being a similar explicit linkage of territorial cohesion metanarratives. Some stories namely positively relate ‘European spatial planning’ and ‘SG(E)I’ in 2000 and 2005, and those two to ‘Regional/Cohesion Policy’ in 2005. What is more, Schema 3 might also show (hidden) possibilities inside the IGCs area. This by relating territorial cohesion metanarratives without the (explicit) usage of the concept. That is, through implicitly linking stories told in territorial cohesion metanarratives via similar stories of narratives with an own dynamic. Examples of this might be those from the informal European spatial planning area that link formal stories and the promotion of territorial specificities with/out the concept as “spearhead” (e.g. see the ‘SG(E)I’ narrative). These narratives with an own dynamic thus do more than merely further supporting the second general hypothesis. When similar issues are spoken of with as without the concept, there are less reasons for why the IGCs usage area’s metanarratives can show how the Treaty debates decide on territorial cohesion’s official ground (i.e. as the first general hypothesis poses).

Together the three Schema’s try to give an ordered picture of the stories told in the IGCs usage area. These stories seem to allow the deduction that almost every official usage of the concept of territorial cohesion is contested or not essential for it – no matter whether we speak about the importance of the concept itself, the belonging of metanarratives to the concept, the exclusiveness of stories for the usage of the concept, or the usage of the concept when a story or metanarrative does belong to the concept. A reason for these contradicting stories could then be that they mostly reflect one thing: contrapositions.

---

* [W]hen it comes to services of an economic nature, the compatibility of their organisational arrangements with other areas of Community law must be ensured [in particular freedom to provide services and freedom of establishment, and competition law]. In the field of competition law, the Court has established that any activity consisting of supplying goods and services in a given market by an undertaking constitutes an economic activity, regardless of the legal status of the undertaking and the way in which it is financed [(see: cf. C-35/96, Commission v. Italy, ECR, 1998, p. 3851 and ECJ judgment of 12.9.2000 in joined cases C-180/98-184/98, Pavlov.)]. With regard to the freedom to provide services and freedom of establishment, the Court has ruled that services provided generally for payment must be considered as economic activities within the meaning of the Treaty. However, the Treaty does not require the service to be paid for directly by those benefiting from it. It therefore follows that almost all services offered in the social field can be considered “economic activities” within the meaning of Articles 43 and 49 of the EC Treaty (CEC, 2006). Hence, if the provision of a service is labelled ‘economic’ (e.g. SGEI), the chance that the EU competition rules have to be followed would, arguably, increase. 51
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Appendix D  The order of the (post-)ESDP process usage area

Introduction

The analytical quadrangle made above (see the Introduction of Part II in Book II) points out that not only the Intergovernmental Conferences but also the (post-)ESDP process could form the usage of the concept of territorial cohesion. That is to say, not so much its official but informal usage. The IGCs usage area then leads to a general hypothesis that guides the reader through this appendix: as it portrays a threefold contested usage of the concept for European spatial planning (see Chapter 12), you can expect that its usage in European spatial planning is problematic too. The (post-)ESDP process usage area’s in-depth content and concerns with policy and knowledge hint at another general hypothesis: while the stories of the IGCs usage area are mostly straightforward and general, you can expect those in the (post-)ESDP process one to be just as multi-shaded and specific. When one then considers the combination of this contested usage and nitty-gritty of stories from the departure-point of European spatial planning (see Chapter 3), a question that formulates the main interest comes to mind: ‘How does the usage of the concept of territorial cohesion substantively influence European spatial (planning) policy?’ This concern therefore leads the reading of this appendix.

To treat these hypotheses and question, the presentation of the (post-)ESDP process usage area below untangles a tightly structured bundle of different stories on territorial cohesion. It starts doing so with the stories that frame and structure the other stories in this usage area: the general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself (§D.1). A treatment of the six territorial cohesion metanarratives of spatial/territorial structure, economy/society/environment, accessibility, spatial/territorial specificities, coordination, and the spatial/territorial dimension follows (§D.2), and a discussion on the many stories relating these metanarratives is added to this (§D.3). To thereafter show issues related to territorial cohesion in the (post-)ESDP process usage area, both the as metanarratives schematised stories and those relating these metanarratives will be compared to both the narratives with an own dynamic (§D.4) and the connections between them (§D.5). From these ordered and compared stories conclusions can be drawn on the strategic positions in the concept’s usage (see Chapter 12).

D.1 (Post-)ESDP process’ framing and structuring stories

D.1.1 The usage area’s general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves

Also the stories that frame and structure other stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area can be ordered in a schema, here one on the ‘General stories and stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself in the (post-)ESDP process usage area’. This Schema 1 below shows that the (post-)ESDP process usage area has many general stories which together form a patchwork. In this multifaceted framework six more processual and four more substantive general stories can be distinguished; some combinations of such general stories appear as well. In order of importance the six processual ones are – with between brackets their colour in Schema 1 – for using governance techniques (red), on the lack or need of substantive coordination (light green), the need to cooperate with each other (dark green), (the social structure for) dividing roles between political levels (pink), the epistemic base for political action (blue), and the existence of the main institutional framework such as the State and its tasks or the global (purple). The four substantive ones, also in order of importance – and their colour in Schema 1 –, give economic causes (yellow), make moral
calls (grey), show the importance of the region (dark yellow), and name Cohesion Policy (teal). It is also of importance to note that a general story which does not that much frame this usage area is concerned with services. SGEI are namely at least during the research period the sole official base for using territorial cohesion (see the previous appendix on the IGCs usage area).

The stories that structure other territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area have a simpler image. There are only three: on territorial cohesion itself, spatial planning itself, and their connections. They are respectively coloured blue, brown, and orange in Schema 1. These three story types are exactly those which showed a threefold contested usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the IGCs usage area (i.e. pro/contra territorial cohesion, spatial planning, their overlap/relation; see Chapter 11). The argument to put these structuring stories next to each other here comes forth out of the leading question of this appendix, which asks about substantive influences. In this way, just the structuring stories can be addressed before we go deeper into the more specific stories on spatial planning that are in/directly related to territorial cohesion in the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic (see next paragraphs).

(post-)ESDP process Schema 1
General stories and stories on the concept of territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself in the (post-)ESDP process usage area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Stories</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715-18th century</td>
<td>French Revolution - Jacobins victorious over Girondins - de/centralise public authorities - society comparable to human body</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>French Republican model links social and political - oppose feudal - military system - found rational religion - promote industry - universally associate men as brothers</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>State is ruling power</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>WWII reinforced social policies as nationa identity part - National Reconstruction - Aménagement du territoire attends to spatial imbalances - political compromise needed - have equitable and humane society</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>implement vigorous policy</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Trade barriers in EEC countries lowered - DATAR exists - integrate policies</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Intergovernmental ESDP process - EC approves 'Europe 2000' - DATAR and ARL communicate</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Berlin wall open - European economy regains momentum - ESDP process - EC studies spatial policy - Expert planning community debates TC - Community ensures coherence - Community no superinstitution</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>first CSD - Sustainable development related to spatial planning - National spatial research institutions meet - EMU</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>CSD has pioneering role in promoting economic, social and territorial cohesion</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Intergovernmental ESDP process - Intergovernmental - ESDP process</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Intergovernmental ESDP process</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Intergovernmental ESDP process</td>
<td>territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again this Schema 1 does not only express that each kind of general stories has another subject matter, but also that their developments and those of the stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves can be followed through time, as will be done below.

D.1.2 The stories framing this usage area
While the more processual en substantive general stories treat a wide array of issues, their patchwork with various entanglements sets the scene of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Untangling them in a concise way is difficult, perhaps impossible. Yet, an attempt is made below, thereby starting with the earlier processual and substantive stories before the later processual and substantive ones are treated. The earlier general stories namely root this usage area even further in history than the later ones do.
The history of some general stories is traced back through the 19th and 20th centuries as far as in 17/18th century France. After the centralising efforts of French Kings the French Revolution would have expressed general stories on the division of roles between political levels: those for decentralisation and those for centralisation of public authorities (i.e. the Girondins and the victorious Jacobins respectively). This debate is refashioned in and for the European Union when the ESDP process starts in 1989 and is made intergovernmental in 1991. Hereby decentralisation is favoured mostly (e.g. subsidiarity), and in 2005 even described as happening. Less development is shown in the general stories on the structure in which these roles should be divided; this while one could even argue that the development of nation-states and the coming into existence of the European Union meanwhile re-ordered the political structures. That is to say, since the opposition to the feudal-military social system in the 19th century with a change towards a French Republican model linking the social and political – a linkage reinforced by the two World Wars –, the current socio-political structure is merely defended or taken as given and to be used. From 2002 on though, the need to change or even create a new institutional framework within this social structure is voiced, as is some criticism on the short-sightedness of the political system. The epistemic base for political action relates to these structures and roles. General stories on this base can only be found in the 17/18th and 19th century and in 2003 and 2005. These do show some differences between the latter and former centuries, as they reflect on science instead of comparing society to the human body and discuss the political nature of observation instead of calling for a rational religion. Still, the other early processual stories that frame the (post-)ESDP usage area show a rather stable picture: there is a long-standing dispute about political de/centralisation and a late push toward political innovation, but always within the current socio-political structure.

The substantive general stories on economics and morality are the ones which can be found regularly through the last centuries as well. In the new social system coming from the 19th century, industry and universal human association are namely promoted. To begin with the former: since the National Reconstructions after the Second World War, the lowering of trade barriers in countries of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1964, and the non-existence of an economic crisis after 1983, the economic general stories name the importance of diversity for trade and the closer economic integration since the European Monetary Union (EMU) in 1992. While the European economy got back its momentum around 1989, there is also explicitly called for more growth since 2003. Around the same time the moral general stories are mostly on solidarity between citizens and the form this should take (e.g. equal outcomes or opportunities); hereby the question of national and/or European solidarity is left untouched; although this is an important topic, especially since the Enlargement of the European Union in 2004. Moreover, in 1991 a moral general story, which was retold in 2005, shows a possible place where moral stories can be linked to economic ones. This because it separates civic (i.e. moral) and industrial (i.e. economic) values as based on equity and efficiency respectively. The general stories on economic and morality thus do not bring up disputes, but a tension between the two in, again, the current social system. Hence, no matter whether the early general stories are more processual or substantive, they tell the (post-)ESDP process usage area is based on continuities that last for several centuries now instead of only on the European Union.

The later general stories also root this usage area in the time before the European Union. A disagreement thereby appears since the two World Wars. The processual stories on the existence of the main institutional framework namely seem to divide: in 1927 the State as main institutional framework is seen as the ruling power, but there is also stated that it should be considered as a working group. Thereafter the State itself is only mentioned in 2003 – by rooting its legitimacy in the maintenance of the social contract and stating the historical
linkage of the French Republic with the marginal issue of providing public services – and in the repetition of this story in 2005. Yet, in 2005 the European Council revived the in 2000 adopted Lisbon Strategy to, amongst others, make the most competitive economy in the world. The story telling about the State’s existence might therefore have to compete with the one on global competition on every scale as the most important institutional framework. That is, also the story of “from the State as ruling power to the State as one of many in global competition” frames this usage area.

What is more, one could understand seeing the State as a working group as foreshadowing the most important general story since the year the ESDP was published and could be applied: using governance techniques. These stories emerge with broad statements on the need to use proactive, long-term, marketing, and/or holistic techniques. The rise of them from 1999 on can be related to the development of stories on the main institutional framework (i.e. from the State to globalisation) and on the social structure for dividing roles between political levels (i.e. a new institutional framework within the existing social structure) in new attempts to govern society. After the White Paper on European Governance in 2001, these general stories on governance namely develop towards a blossoming of them in 2005: this through the additional call in 2003 to make policies less generic and the statement that vague goals are useful (in the policy arena), and a year later through both the call to use multi-level models and stories on the existence of multi-level and multi-sectoral European Union governance. These general stories on using governance techniques thus blossomed after the Ministers responsible for spatial development came together at the Rotterdam Conference in 2004 and at the time of the consecutive Luxembourg Conference, whereby they became more precise too. Besides the continued call to create (multi-level) governance and to further work at a strategic level, now a facilitating of the European Union with an incentive-based approach is proposed against the story that its policies should be based on uniform principles. Yet, there are also general stories on governance techniques that paradoxically describe the strong influence of the governance agenda and that there is no change in European Union governance. In 2006, the central claim that (sub)national governmental bodies need to set their own agenda in accordance to European Union priorities is added to this, as is a contrastatement on vague goals: now they would be politically weak. The late blossoming of governance stories thus frames the (post-)ESDP process usage area with several detailed processual puzzles.

The general stories on the lack or need of substantive coordination are the processual stories that appear the most often. With the associated ones on the need to cooperate with each other, they can be seen as fitting for the puzzling general stories on using governance techniques (e.g. how to fit pieces together). However, both general stories are also told without an explicit mention of ‘governance’, making an implicit placement of them in those on using governance techniques always possible.

Nonetheless, if considered in themselves, the general stories on substantive coordination show a stable and dominant appearance from its emergence in 1964 on: Community policies are incoherent and they should be coordinated. Strangely enough, those on the unimportance of coordination are only voiced after the European Commission study of ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and the Costs of Non-Coordination’ in 2001. Then the general stories pro coordination also change. They namely become more specific, as they (sharper) distinguish vertical from horizontal policy incoherence, contradict each other whether approaches become generally speaking more or less sectoral, and they point to the Community Institutions when it concerns coordination. While the European Council revived the Lisbon Strategy in 2005, linkages of coordination to this strategy are added, as is the possible objection that Community policies should be coordinated with national policies (as well) – what implies the question of national policies and this strategy
align. Notwithstanding the descriptions of the increasing integration of Community policies already noted in 1999 and stories on the existence of mechanisms to cope with this, something changes towards 2006. Then the stable appearance of the general stories on coordination is also questioned. This by general stories labelling ‘integration’ as a bureaucratic politics concept and those on the problems with responsibility for this (i.e. who should coordinate); note that at that time a strategic agenda-setting between the various Councils of the European Union does not exist. This usage area is thus not only framed by puzzling processual stories, but also by hardly questioned and just as detailed ones for coordination.

General stories on the need to cooperate with each other are as stable as those on coordination. Since 1948, but mostly after 1999, compromise and involvement of actors are called for. Differences only exist about the kind of entities these are and the manner in which it should happen. Since 2000, the year the structures of the ESDP process were dismantled, the general stories on cooperation namely first call for involvement of all relevant administrative bodies; after public and private actors in 2002, this becomes key actors or territorial levels (e.g. Member States and Community Institutions) in 2005. The manner to cooperate then changes: from political compromise during the National Reconstructions to cooperation networks after the Committee on Spatial Development (CSD) was in 2001 replaced by the working group on Spatial and Urban Development (SUD) (which has less status and autonomy). Two years later, it was about flexible cooperation, concerted activities, and reciprocity at all levels. Hence, even though the importance of coordination is hesitantly questioned eventually, the need to cooperate is not. However, although the general stories on cooperation stably frame this usage area, they do not say what the collective activities and common goals for cooperation are in it.

The two later substantive general stories neither tell what the collective activities and common goals are in the (post-)ESDP process usage area, but they do frame the stories which do tell this (see the next paragraphs). These general stories do not appear very often, but might be influential nevertheless, as they are on the importance of the region and Cohesion Policy. To begin with the latter on that formal European Union policy: at the time of the Enlargement of the European Union, it is told that all (old) Member States share the concern for post-enlargement Cohesion Policy, something echoed in 2006. The general stories on the importance of the region describe a regionalisation of Europe in 1998 and add the promotion of the region to this in 2005. Only deviant look forward is made in 2003 qua subject matter. This by the statements that regions will become the locus of rurality; something that does not return in this usage area. Moreover, both kinds of general stories are related in that year too, as Cohesion Policy would be aimed at regions (see next appendix).

The general story on the importance of the region can also be found in combination to other general stories since 2002 (e.g. those on decentralisation or growth potential). With the formal importance of Cohesion policy in the European Union, the importance of the region stiched into the general stories, and their combination, both thus frame the (post-)ESDP process usage area.

Other combinations of general stories mostly appear since 2004 (e.g. the year of the Galway Conference on Territorial Cohesion), thereby showing above already related processual general stories. The general stories therefore seem to image this post-ESDP process usage area as an entangled construction. Besides the frames this patchwork of general stories gives, a main characteristic of them is that the year 2005 sticks out. This is not so much because of the contract approach which can be filtered out of the processual general stories; an approach in which decentralisation is emphasised and the central level and vertical
agreements assure coordination. This year of both the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty and the start of the Agenda 2007 – in the process of the Ministers responsible for spatial development concerned with the territorial state and perspectives of the European Union – sticks out due to other reasons. That is, all the distinguished general stories are debated extensively then (except for the one on Cohesion Policy). The year 2005 thus clearly shows the cluttered framework made by the general stories and might give the rather constant call for coordination, cooperation, and the usage of governance techniques a deeper dimension.

The (post-)ESDP process usage is therefore not so much framed by continued contrapositions as the IGCs one is, but by a multi-shaded patchwork of alignments. Both the more processual and more substantive general stories thereby root this usage area in continuities from (far) before the European Union. They give a stable picture of the current social system in which political de/centralisation is disputed and the economic and moral stand in a tension. Yet, besides the stiched-in importance of the region and Cohesion Policy, lately a push towards political innovation within this frame appears, and this accompanied by a blossoming of governance stories. Especially in 2005 a cluttered framework comes forward from the general stories in which detailed processual puzzles meet barely questioned calls for coordination and cooperation. The general stories of this usage area thus already start to support the second general hypothesis that poses that its stories are multi-shaded and specific. That is, even the stories that frame those on the substantive influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) have these characteristics.

D.1.3 The stories structuring this usage area

Because the stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself are debated extensively in 2005, the same holds for them as for the general stories: this year sticks out. In the IGCs usage area, both territorial cohesion, (a formal) European spatial planning, and their bond were contested. Yet, the stories on spatial planning itself in the (post-)ESDP process show the stable and continuous promotion of European spatial planning since their emergence at the time of the Treaty of Amsterdam and the publishing of the ‘EU Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies’ by the European Commission in 1997. The deviant case in this is the statement in 2005 that spatial planning is unimportant, which might more signify the influence spatial planning has outside its own realm.

It is not surprising that the other spatial planning stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are structured thus though, as this usage area exposes the most interests in spatial planning.

A major debate does appear in these structuring stories though. It is about whether European spatial planning should stay informal (e.g. mostly conducted by the Member States’ Ministers responsible for spatial development) or be made formal (e.g. as a genuine Community policy with its accompanying European Union policy making process). Related to the in/formality of European spatial planning are descriptive stories on who wants to hold sway over its functioning: autonomous planners or the European Commission. While autonomous planners are only mentioned in 1997, such a role of the European Commission could have been ventilated earlier on. That is to say, a backward looking story from 2005 holds that the European Commission started the study of ‘Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of the Community’s Territory’ for a formal European spatial planning in 1991 – what happens to be the year the informal and intergovernmental ESDP process of the Member States started as well. Nevertheless, at least superficially seen, there seems to be no development in this matter: the European Commission was, amongst others, involved in the ESDP process, made a working document on spatial planning when the ESDP was published in 1999, adopted the in 1999 launched European Spatial Planning Observatory
Network (ESPON) in 2002 after supporting the Study Programme on European Spatial Planning (SPESP) as ESPON’s precursor in 1998, is mentioned as wanting to have a spatial planning closer to its merits in 2003, but is (again) merely involved in Agenda 2007 as well. Notwithstanding these differences on the in/formality and driver of it, the stories on spatial planning itself are thus clearly pro European spatial planning.

The stories on territorial cohesion itself that structure other territorial cohesion stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area emerged two years after the inclusion of the concept in the Treaty of Amsterdam. Since then they show the stable and continuous promotion of territorial cohesion, just as the stories on spatial planning itself do for European spatial planning. Only the discussion on the un/importance of territorial cohesion in general could weaken this promotion. However, its stories only indicate the unimportance of the concept in 2003 (i.e. when it was included in the Constitutional Treaty) and in 2005 (i.e. the year of the non-ratification of this Treaty). Safe to say, therefore, that other territorial cohesion stories in this usage area are just as structured for the concept as the spatial planning stories are for spatial planning. In both the (post-)ESDP process usage area thus differs from how contested they are in the IGCs usage area (again, see Chapter 11).

In this territorial cohesion promotion the two main debates can be separated along the same lines as the general stories: a processual one on who should steer territorial cohesion and a substantive one on its scope. In 2003 the latter debate appeared and shows dominant stories for a broad scope (e.g. beyond spatial planning) countered by those for the concept as focal point. As this discussion fades away through the years, territorial cohesion is not only seen as a self-directed policy, as the concept is also seen as (merely) adding to the Lisbon and Gothenburg Strategies since the Ministers’ (re-)booted their intergovernmental process in 2004 (i.e. the Rotterdam Conference). The processual debate in the promotion of the concept might remind us of those structuring stories on who wants to hold sway over the functioning of European spatial planning. From the publication of the ESDP on they namely pose and describe the European Union (mostly the European Commission) or the Member States as up to this task when it concerns territorial cohesion. Some stories on territorial cohesion itself which do not appear clearly in either one of these debates might also be important to mention, because they are directly framed by processual general stories. In 2005 a (far) backward looking story is namely that the historic roots of territorial cohesion lay in the centralising efforts of the French kings (before the French Revolution); this would thus place the concept in long-lasting continuities. In 2005 and 2006 a related descriptive note is that the governance agenda (i.e. processes) strongly influences the concept; an influence also reflected in the most important general stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area: those on using governance techniques. Hence, notwithstanding the debates on the scope and steering of territorial cohesion (policy), this usage area thus not only shows the promotion of European spatial planning, but also the well-framed promotion of territorial cohesion.

What is more, before stories promoted spatial planning or territorial cohesion itself, their bond was made. That is, the pioneering role of the Committee on Spatial Development (CSD) in promoting, amongst others, territorial cohesion was described at the time of the first CSD in 1992, shortly after the Délegation à l’Aménagement du Territoire et à l’Action Régionale (DATAR) merged spatial planning and regional policy. Ever since, this bond is promoted, implied, often made in the year the Constitutional Treaty was drafted and thereafter, and only refuted in 2005 and cut in 2006. The other spatial planning and territorial cohesion stories in this usage area are thus not only structured by the separate promotion of both, but by there linkage as well. The (post-)ESDP process usage area is thus completely framed along one side in the threefold contested promotion of territorial cohesion for European spatial planning shown in the IGCs usage area.
Since 2002 two additional stories emerge on this bond besides explicit assertions of it: i) the relation sometimes collides into an identification of both as the same and ii) how they relate or should relate is mostly discussed. The latter can be subdivided roughly in those on a) the intergovernmental ESDP and Rotterdam processes, b) ESPON, and c) for territorial cohesion needed changes in spatial planning. Especially the latter is interesting for this appendix’ leading question (i.e. on the substantive influence the concept has on European spatial policy), but we will deal with them in the order of above.

The discussion on how the ESDP relates to territorial cohesion mostly consists of descriptive backward looking stories. It seems through the years to revolve between the extremes of that the ESDP already harboured the concept or that it is the ESDP which is debated in terms of territorial cohesion instead. Moreover, in the year the Constitutional Treaty was drafted the European Commission would begin to prefer territorial cohesion over the ESDP; this while also the Ministers in the Rotterdam process seem to commence their claiming of the concept after the non-ratification of this Treaty.

Stories on ESPON are more univocal and appear to have a linear development: already in the year it was launched ESPON is called to give a definition of territorial cohesion and after it did so in the first substantive structuration of the concept – which is described as having a broad standpoint (coming from the ESDP) – the deliverance of evidence for (operationalisation of) territorial cohesion policy is stated to be the task of ESPON (or its successor). However, just as with the differences in viewpoints concerning the ESDP as source for territorial cohesion, there are also some paradoxical statements in 2005 concerning ESPON. These show some of the context in which changes in spatial planning for territorial cohesion are called for. Here with the tension of ESPON working on (either) spatial planning or territorial cohesion.

Although changes in European spatial planning might of course occur implicitly, the need to change spatial planning for territorial cohesion is expressed in 2001, and thereafter there is explicitly call for directing spatial planning (as policy tool) for territorial cohesion concerns. Other developments related to the changes in spatial planning for territorial cohesion might be the increasing diversity in labels – adding those of ‘development’ and ‘policy’ to ‘planning’ – and the discussion since 2004 on the roots of territorial cohesion in various planning traditions or just one (i.e. aménagement du territoire). The statement in 2006 that the ESDP and territorial cohesion are concerned with governance, showing the general story on using governance techniques once more, seems to be important in this; as both planning traditions and governance are concerned with ways of doing. All in all the substantive influence of the usage of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) seems at least to depend on the identification of territorial cohesion and spatial planning as the same or discussions on how they (should) relate (i.e. the ESDP and Rotterdam processes, ESPON, changes in spatial planning). Either way, because the structuring stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area promote spatial planning, territorial cohesion, and their bond, they seem to weaken the first general hypothesis. Why would the usage of the concept in European spatial planning be problematic in their promotion?

D.1.4 The (post-)ESDP process usage area is framed and structured by puzzling promotions

Notwithstanding these stories on spatial planning itself, territorial cohesion itself, and those linking them, as long as it is not clear what they promote, the comparison between them remains superficial. The same holds for the finding that the usage of the concept in European spatial planning is not problematic. The multi-shaded and specific patwork of general stories that frame the (post-)ESDP process usage area suggest it is far more complex. It might for instance be puzzling enough to determine what is actually promoted. To be thorough, the
territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories that are framed by these general stories and structured by these stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves can then be ordered. This again by the topics which seem to be assumed as those as to be discussed under the territorial cohesion (i.e. its metanarratives) and as part of the concept’s European spatial planning context (i.e. the narratives with an own dynamic). The similarities and differences between (the order of) the stories of the territorial cohesion metanarratives and narratives in this usage area can thereby point to answers to this appendix’ leading question too. That is, below we can find out what the substantive influence of the concept is on European spatial (planning) policy.

D.2 Territorial cohesion metanarratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area

D.2.1 Introducing the six metanarratives

In the (post-)ESDP process usage area many territorial cohesion stories evolve around a single metanarrative, of which there are (again) six. In the relation between territorial cohesion and spatial planning, an important differentiation hereby is between ‘spatial’ and ‘territorial’ stories. A development from spatial to territorial stories might namely denote an influence of the concept of territorial cohesion on spatial planning (and thereby answer this appendix’ leading question). Such a development can be visible in stories which are different in this aspect but similar in what makes them a metanarrative; what happens three times here.

In this usage area territorial cohesion is for instance steadily used in (mostly descriptive) stories that tell about spatial or territorial structures, making ‘spatial/territorial structure’ a territorial cohesion metanarrative. Spatial and territorial structures can be grasped with the use of different perspectives coming from viewpoints that can (mainly) stand on their own as well. Examples of this come forward in the usage of territorial cohesion in relation to economic, social and environmental policy objectives as (other) possible common goals to cooperate for. This makes ‘economy/society/environment’ another territorial cohesion metanarrative. As framed by its general stories (see §D.1.1), the concept is seldom used for the issues of services or infrastructure in this usage area. Yet, due to the juridical fact that Services of General Economic Interest are the sole official basis of territorial cohesion, those few stories are important nonetheless. Also infrastructure – especially the Trans-European Networks (TENs) since the Treaty of Maastricht had a title on them – is in itself an important issue in the European Union and influential in European spatial planning too. If taken together, services and infrastructure can be caught under the more general category of ‘accessibility’ (e.g. of services, via networks); as done in a story in this usage area as well. Hence, although there are only a few territorial cohesion stories on services and/or infrastructure in the (post-)ESDP process usage area, the importance of both of them and their possible grouping makes ‘accessibility’ a territorial cohesion metanarrative.

Just as in the IGCs usage area, here the order of metanarratives does not stop with the three abovementioned territorial cohesion metanarratives either. Moreover, the three other metanarratives have almost the same labels as three of that usage area: ‘spatial/territorial specificities’, ‘coordination’, and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ (see Appendix C). Yet, the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative does not so much point to territorial realities (of lower levels) as in the IGCs usage area, but to similar spatial and territorial realities in a somewhat different way. The ‘coordination’ metanarrative also resembles the one of the IGCs usage area in (see Appendix C). However, here the informal boundary is regarded from the other side, that is, from less formal ways of doing, as the (post-)ESDP process is largely conducted informally. Framed by the most often appearing general stories on the lack or need of substantive coordination, it is hereby not surprising that coordination (e.g. territorial governance) is the most debated metanarrative. The up until now introduced metanarratives
that treat the spatial or territorial dimension all do so in a different way. Because also in this usage area some territorial cohesion stories further the spatial or territorial dimension in itself on the Community level, they form a separate metanarrative. The appearance and development of the stories per metanarrative can then be summarised schematically as shown below in Schema 2a ‘Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the (post-)ESDP process usage area (without relating stories)’.

(post-)ESDP process Schema 2a
Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the (post-)ESDP process usage area (without relating stories)
The territorial cohesion metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic (see §D.4 and D.5) characterising this usage area have one general similarity: there seem to be no contradicting stories. For instance, no stories tell that something does not have to do with territorial cohesion. Hence, no metanarrative is refuted as such explicitly, nor consisting of a dominant story opposed by its counterstory. However, the intensity in which the metanarratives are debated differs and the way in which they should be expressed seems to be discussed as well. As their labels already suggest, especially the ‘spatial/territorial structure, ‘spatial/territorial specificities’, and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarratives might then show a development from spatial to territorial stories. For the influence of territorial cohesion on spatial planning these appearances and developments will thus be scrutinised. Below the developments of these six metanarratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area will therefore be described one by one by identifying and relating their main discussions.

D.2.2 Spatial/Territorial structure metanarrative

Although a territorial cohesion metanarrative is labelled ‘spatial/territorial structure’, only some of its stories are explicitly on spatial structure. Besides some on a geographic rationale for organising Europe, most are on one specific spatial or territorial structure instead, a possible common though vague goal to cooperate for, that is: polycentrism. These three territorial cohesion stories are coloured green, gray, and pink in Schema 2a respectively. Because polycentrism can be considered as something spatial or territorial, an influence of territorial cohesion on European spatial policy could be difficult to detect here. The working hypothesis for this metanarrative therefore reads: spatial/territorial structure issues play no role when territorial cohesion influences European spatial policy. Before we treat the metanarrative’s dominant stories to test this though, the less important stories can give a lead.

In 2003 it is suggested that the concept can be used for making spatial structures in political agreement; this of course aligns with the general stories on the need to cooperate. This was after the ESDP’s processual structures were dismantled, the working group on Spatial and Urban Development (SUD) substituted the CSD, and territorial cohesion was promoted to prevent concentration. That is, possibly at a time ripe for coordination and/or political structures when it concerns European spatial planning and territorial cohesion. ESPON was simultaneously clarifying and structuring the content of territorial cohesion, even though a general story on the epistemic base for political action suggests that political concepts are not operationalisable (also see §D.2.5). However, no stories of the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative appear in 2004, just as there were no stories on spatial planning itself then; this even tough DG Regio published the Interim Territorial Cohesion Report and the Ministers responsible for spatial development met informally at Rotterdam. A year later, around the time the Rotterdam process started (with Agenda 2007), the attention to spatial structure is stressed just once again to prioritise spaces and places, while now territorial cohesion is not a means to do this – as before – but the goal of this. Moreover, each of the metanarrative’s stories appears that year (i.e. on spatial structure, geographic rationale, polycentrism). Thereby it is the only year in which territorial cohesion is posed to be the European context framing a country or even the rationale for organising European space; a rationale with which ESPON would have been set up as well. This blossoming could thus demonstrate the expansion of the metanarrative. Then again, these stories on spatial structure and geographic rationale seldom appear and they show almost no development of the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative. That is to say, these territorial cohesion stories do not start to speak in ‘territorial’ instead of ‘spatial’ terms.

Territorial cohesion stories on polycentrism do not only dominate this metanarrative by number and continuity, but by being the earliest stories in this metanarrative as well. They namely emerge since 2001, which is two years after the publication of the ESDP in which the
concept of polycentrism played a major role. None of them dispute their relation, and in 2003 it is even stated that territorial cohesion must link with polycentrism. Discussions mainly appear to be on the way in which they relate and also on who will approve a way of doing that relates them. Besides descriptions hinting at possible approvals by the French or peripheral countries – due to, respectively, similarities in European Union and French ways of doing or their nature –, the disagreement on who will approve appears to be on whether polycentrism will be pursued by a revamped ESDP process under a territorial cohesion policy or that territorial cohesion would be more helpful to convince political (policy) actors than the concept of polycentrism. The laborious discussion on how these two concepts relate as conducted since the year of the Second Cohesion Report might signify the importance of polycentrism for other uses though (e.g. veiled, scientific). Notwithstanding ESPON’s structuration of territorial cohesion in 2003 and its Synthesis Report in 2005, the poles in this continuous discussion explain that polycentrism leads to territorial cohesion or vice versa, but no explanation becomes dominant in this. Hence, also the metanarrative’s main discussion on how polycentrism and territorial cohesion (should) relate hardly shows any development: again these territorial cohesion stories do not change from ‘spatial’ to ‘territorial’.

At first sight spatial/territorial structure issues thus seem to play no role when territorial cohesion influences European spatial policy, just as this section’s working hypothesis posed. Besides that differences between spatial or territorial structure are hard to detect, the territorial cohesion stories on these structures, an organising geographic rationale, and polycentrism show no development. However, an influence of territorial cohesion on European spatial policy does not necessarily have to show itself in the change from ‘spatial’ towards ‘territorial’ stories for spatial/territorial structure issues to play a role. A territorial cohesion story on polycentrism for instance suggests a questioning of the importance of the entire ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative: if the concept of territorial cohesion is more useful than the concept of polycentrism, less usage of the latter might be an influence of the former. Issues of spatial/territorial structure then have a negative role to play. Such speculations relate to the two general hypotheses too. Their details namely support that the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis), and a focus on territorial cohesion instead of polycentrism that, when the latter is essential for European spatial planning, a usage of the former is problematic (i.e. the first general hypothesis). Especially this change in focus could give an answer to this appendix’ leading question. That is, a way in which the usage of the concept of territorial cohesion could substantively influence European spatial (planning) policy is by throwing polycentrism off its agenda.

D.2.3 Economy/Society/Environment metanarrative

Economic stories in the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative are mostly concerned with competitiveness, those on society with balance, and the environmental stories with sustainability. These are coloured yellow, red, and green in Schema 2a respectively. Similar to the main discussions on spatial/territorial structure and polycentrism is that the causal direction in the relation between territorial cohesion and the economic, social, or environmental policy objectives is debated. A characteristic that gives the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative its coherence produces more complexity though. Since their emergence in 2000, these territorial cohesion stories namely combine two or all three policy objectives as well. With such a multi-shaded and specified make-up, this metanarrative aligns to the patchwork of general stories. It might therefore help to solve the puzzle of the territorial cohesion and spatial planning promotions that structure this usage.

* Note that ‘sustainability’ can also designate social or economic sustainability and that, likewise, there can be spoken of balanced competitiveness and social competition as well.
area (see §D.1.4). This section’s working hypothesis could then be: the economic, social, and environmental policy objectives clarify what territorial cohesion is aimed at. Although the early emergence of the relevant territorial cohesion stories makes this metanarrative the oldest one of the (post-)ESDP process usage area, its stories only appear uninterrupted since 2003; which is the eventful year of the Constitutional Treaty, the first substantive structuration of the concept by ESPON, and the first year the structuring stories often made the linkage between territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves.\(^71\) The ways in which they appear will be treated below per policy objective before their combinations are.

More social stories on territorial cohesion posing to (instrumentally) relate the concept to reducing disparities (and, as said above, *vice versa*) can be seen than descriptions explaining that territorial cohesion leads to balanced development (again, also *vice versa*); these territorial cohesion stories are also framed by the general stories on Cohesion Policy and the importance of regions, as they touch upon both.\(^72\) As mentioned above, 2004 was the year of the Enlargement of the European Union, the European Commission’s Third Cohesion Report, and the Ministers’ Rotterdam Conference. Concurrent with these events is a strong statement that goes beyond the utilitarian relationships between territorial cohesion and balance: territorial cohesion would be a principle of equity amongst European citizens (wherever they live).\(^73\) This would pick a side in the frame delivered by the usage area’s general stories on morality, that is, pick European over national solidarity. Nevertheless, the regular appearance of these social stories decreases through the years. This could denote a weakening of the relation between social policy objectives and territorial cohesion stories. Then territorial cohesion would aim less at balanced development.

In 2004 something befits the framing from the economic general stories that call for more growth since 2003. From then on territorial cohesion is not only said to be a social principle, but starts to be persistently related to only economic stories on competitiveness as well.\(^74\) Since the European Council revived the Lisbon Strategy the year after (which is concerned with both growth and competitiveness), the stories relating territorial cohesion to economics also seem to fall within the development of the general stories on the major institutional framework towards global competition on every scale. This because they become more varied, add global and balanced competitiveness, and, above all, become dominant.\(^75\) A backward looking story in 2006 that says that the concept increased in importance for DG Enterprise and Industry (e.g. microeconomic redevelopment) might also reflect the developing dominance of economic stories on territorial cohesion.\(^76\) This suggests that territorial cohesion will aim more at competitiveness.

After the European Council adopted the Gothenburg Strategy for sustainable development in 2001 and since the inclusion of the concept in the Constitutional Treaty, also environmental stories on territorial cohesion appear.\(^77\) Eventually, the stories develop from relating the concept to sustainable development more in general to the addition of more specific stories on sustainable communities in 2006.\(^78\) Furthermore, in this year territorial cohesion is increasingly related to the environment in comparison to both the other years and the social and economic stories; but perhaps this merely foreshadows the increasing political emphasis on sustainability the years after instead of a strengthening of its relation to territorial cohesion, as the same year there are also stories holding that actors concerned with sustainable development do not use the concept at all.\(^79\) Whether territorial cohesion aims at sustainability thus is a question.

Of importance for the metanarrative is, then, that its territorial cohesion stories just as steadily relate the concept to combinations of economic, social, and environmental policy objectives as that it treats them separately. Moreover, combined stories often precede separate ones. An example of this comes forward in the year the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy and the Council of Europe’s Guiding Principles of the European Conference of
Ministers responsible for Regional Planning of the Member States (CEMAT) promoted the concept. Then the call is made to promote territorial cohesion through more balanced social and economic development of regions and improved competitiveness. Moreover, notwithstanding that once the story emerged that territorial cohesion adds no value to economic and social cohesion, since 2003 the combination of economic and social policy objectives with the concept appears most continuously; this, strangely enough, with hardly touching upon the importance of regions as the social stories of this metanarrative do. While the economic-environmental connection seldom appears – with hereby ‘sustainability’ always representing the environment –, the relation between social and environmental policy objectives never does; only if also combined with an economic policy objective (see below). The continuity and dominance of the combination of economic and social policy objectives in this territorial cohesion metanarrative might reflect the general stories. These namely also frame the metanarratives by connecting economic and moral stories, this with industrial and civic values based on efficiency and equity respectively, including their tension. Although this makes it more complex, territorial cohesion could then mostly aim at uniting social balance and economic competitiveness.

The two territorial cohesion stories relating each of the policy objectives almost contradict each other on whether balance, competitiveness, and sustainability (of Europe) are complementary. While the stories that harmoniously combine different policy objectives are dominant, as reflected when all three are joined in 2004, a year earlier a story goes far away from this dominance by stating that balance is not enough for competitiveness and sustainability. Another issue appears around the same time too. That is, although there is called for a broader application of territorial cohesion than cohesion policies (e.g. in European spatial planning), a story in 2006 might point to a characteristic of this complementarity between objectives, as it holds that the concept is not used for general economic or social issues. The territorial cohesion stories might therefore point to a broad application of the combination of economic, social, and environmental policy objectives, but this by neither following an environmental way as promoters of sustainable development see it, nor a general socio-economic path.

The ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative thus mainly hints at an implicit disagreement about which policy objective relates to territorial cohesion. The usage of the concept in relation to them seems to show a dominance of competitiveness, a weakening when it concerns balanced development, and perhaps a disputed strengthening when it concerns sustainability. If in European spatial (planning) policy the same happens, this could be territorial cohesion’s substantive influence (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). It of course also falsifies the working hypothesis, because the economic, social, and environmental policy objectives do not clarify what territorial cohesion is aimed at. Quite the opposite – and the more so when you consider that the debates are also about whether territorial cohesion aims at such an objective or vice versa. The territorial cohesion stories on how these policy objectives (should) relate are clearer, as they signify less development and a dominance of harmonising socio-economic combinations. However, these unifications are so specific that they support the second general hypothesis (i.e. the stories of this usage area are multi-shaded and specific) instead of this section’s working hypothesis. This metanarrative thus does not help to solve the puzzle of the spatial planning and territorial cohesion promotions. It therefore supports the first general hypothesis, as this unsolved puzzle could make the usage of territorial cohesion in European spatial planning problematic indeed.

D.2.4 Accessibility metanarrative
The importance of services and infrastructure and their mutual concern for accessibility forms a metanarrative from the territorial cohesion stories about them. Their stories are respectively
coloured green and blue in Schema 2a. The official linkage of territorial cohesion and services and the substantive one of spatial planning and the infrastructure then directly leads to this section’s working hypothesis: territorial cohesion influences European spatial planning by redefining infrastructural issues in terms of services. However, that it might not be that simple is suggested by that this organisation of the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative is not harmonic. A main discussion that develops in it namely has to do with the ways in which services, infrastructure networks, and accessibility are or should be related.

It was six years after the inclusion of territorial cohesion in the Treaty of Amsterdam, which related to Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI), that a backward looking story holds that this gave spatial development a new commitment. After the Constitutional Treaty was drafted, the Ministers started the Rotterdam process, and ESPON had a broad standpoint on the concept in 2005, however, the subsequent territorial cohesion stories on services classify public services as networks and state that the concept is (also) broader than SGEI; note that in the IGCs usage area ‘SG(E)I’ is not the only territorial cohesion metanarrative either, and the concept thus also broader there. What is more, no territorial cohesion story is concerned with services only after this (not to mention its relation to rural and peripheral areas described in 2003). An implicit question seems thus to arise: are services networks or is infrastructure a service? In 2004, for instance, it is said that territorial cohesion policies (should) promote key internal and external linkages (in the transnational and interregional). This could relate to services as networks, but can be classified as territorial cohesion story on infrastructure too, that is, one contradicting the 2005 statement that transportation improvements have negative effects on territorial cohesion. A year later though, not so much this implicit question but an open dispute between infrastructural stories seems to appear: territorial cohesion would not or only be used for TENs. Hence, it is safe to say that territorial cohesion stories on services could develop into a (wanted) broader usage of the concept for (also) infrastructural concerns. This of course goes right against this section’s working hypothesis. Then territorial cohesion would not influence European spatial planning by putting infrastructural issues under the aegis of services, but would the latter be on a par.

The inclusion of territorial cohesion in the Treaty of Amsterdam might have given spatial development a new commitment. This commitment could have less to do with its relation to services than to the concept itself though – and perhaps also with its potential link to infrastructural issues. Yet, in 2006 it is held that it is via TENs and accessibility that the concept is linked to Services of General Interest (SGI). This would even go further than putting infrastructural issues and services on a par, as the former then becomes a gatekeeper. That is, to talk about about territorial cohesion and services, one must then mention infrastructure. This ostensible switch in importance in the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative from services to infrastructure might thus not so much involves a total replacement within these territorial cohesion stories, but a possible reorganisation of them.

Either way, this metanarrative hardly supports that territorial cohesion influences European spatial planning by redefining infrastructural issues in terms of services (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). It more points to the opposite: European spatial planning influencing territorial cohesion by redefining service issues in terms of infrastructure. Whether this usage of territorial cohesion is problematic in European spatial planning (i.e. the first general hypothesis) then depends on what is more problematic: not following the official linkage between services and territorial cohesion or not discussing services in common infrastructural terms. Again, either way this supports that the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis). With the addition of these topics, at least the organisation of them cannot rely on general terms due to the increased complexity. Hence, up until now the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative only shows a
D.2.5 Spatial/Territorial specificities metanarrative

The territorial cohesion stories of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative can be divided into groups just as in the similar metanarrative of the IGCs usage area (see §C.2.5). Most of these stories are on territories, subdivided in stories on observation and a certain focus, and others on impacts of European Union policies. Territorial cohesion stories on territorial capital are added as a third group here. These three territorial cohesion stories are respectively coloured yellow, violet, and pink in Schema 2a. Contrary to the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative, an influence of territorial cohesion on European spatial policy could be easy to detect in these stories. This metanarrative namely deals with both spatial and territorial specificities. This section’s working hypothesis therefore is: the spatial specificities change into territorial specificities due to the influence of territorial cohesion. What also seems to point in this direction is that the observation stories on territories show a development and that the stories on impacts and territorial capital are consecutively added to them, which are developments in themselves. Below they are treated in this order.

In 2002 the European Commission adopted ESPON, which should substantively clarify territorial cohesion. While ESPON structured the concept with a broad standpoint a year later, a backward looking story holds that the unexploredness of territorial cohesion favoured some political consensus. However, even though since the territorial cohesion stories on observation emerged in 2003 it is stated that political and scientific approaches to the concept are partly similar, the main development of them is concerned with exploring actual spatial/territorial realities; this is in line with the stories on spatial planning and territorial cohesion themselves that bring the linear development of ESPON forward: from clarifying the concept to delivering evidence for territorial cohesion policy. That is, these stories are successively on: i) observation (later on naming the use of local authorities in this) and measurement, ii) adding analysis and a continuing lack of information to this in 2004 (while ESPON worked on an integrated territorial cohesion indicator), iii) identifying priority fields in 2005 (the year of the ESPON Synthesis Report), and on iv) providing territorial cohesion knowledge and techniques for policies in 2006 (when ESPON ended). This development does not go from the observation of spatial to territorial specificities, obviously, as it did not start with spatial specificities. One could nonetheless argue that it clearly shows an influence of territorial cohesion because its development definitively heads towards observing territorial specificities in relation to the concept.

Two territorial cohesion stories question this development though. One deviating story in 2005 mentions an observable trend towards territorial cohesion in – not actual spatial/territorial realities, but – sector policies. In 2003, another seems to run counter to an increasing clarification of the concept (by ESPON), as it says that the information to measure the potential for territorial cohesion is already available. General stories on the epistemic base for political action from 2003 and 2005 can be added to this, as they respectively state: science simultaneously measures and defines something and observation has a political nature. An inference from these general stories and this metanarrative’s stories on observation may then not so much picture the measurement of territorial cohesion. Instead, one could see a structuration of already available or soon to be produced information in the, and thereby as the, territorial cohesion perspective as determined politics and science. Hence, territorial cohesion observations might mainly be produced from bottom-up descriptions of territories and with a top-down focus. When this is done with already available information, the influence of territorial cohesion might be the transformation of
spatial into territorial information. This of course only holds when you presume that the information that was moulded in the territorial cohesion perspective was more spatial than territorial. Yet, even when this is not the case, a possible influence of territorial cohesion is clear: the concept could restructure information.

With the possible importance of a perspective for these stories on observation the other group of territorial cohesion stories on territories comes to the fore, that is, those about a certain focus. The top-down focus for the (to be) produced information could hereby not be determined at the top at all. An expressed focus in 2004 namely is the (natural) role of islands in territorial cohesion, and a year later the taking into account of territorial diversity in general or just cities for territorial cohesion and the revived Lisbon (and Gothenburg) Strategy; while reducing negative effects of geographical handicaps is called for in territorial cohesion policies as well. As mentioned above, the stories on observation seem to develop steadily and in 2005 hereby the statement is made that it is possible to identify key priority fields for strengthening territorial cohesion. However, as can be seen in the stories on a focus, the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative harbours no agreement on the territories and priorities to focus on in and after such observation. Although such an increasing polyphony of voices might be called a development, it surely does not reflect a change from spatial to territorial specificities due to territorial cohesion.

The territorial cohesion stories on the impacts of European Union policies do not seem to show a similar development as those on territories (i.e. the linear development of ESPON); this notwithstanding that bottom-up information on top-down impacts of European Union policies relates to territories. They start a year later, in 2004, which is three years after the European Commission’s report ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-coordination’ and two years after ex ante impact assessments became obligatory for all Community policies. The promotion of a systematic consideration of impacts is dominant thereby and shows almost no development, while it is asserted that this (also) points to a broader usage of territorial cohesion too. Still, a variation in these stories on the impacts of European Union policies appears which is now familiar for us: should impacts on territorial cohesion be assessed (e.g. that the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has adverse impacts) or should the concept be used to assess impacts. A story in 2006 might point to a certain relation between the stories on impacts and territories despite their difference in development; and it thereby partly aligns with the general stories on the importance of regions. This because the story promotes territorial cohesion to take a structural account of both impacts and the needs of local and regional levels. Hence, even if territorial cohesion clearly influences this development towards accounting for territorial specificities, it does not even suggest a change from spatial specificities towards this outcome.

In the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative the stories on territorial capital are the youngest. Those on impacts of European Union policies might always implicitly refer to spatial impacts and those on territories could at times do as well, even though if they only refer to territorial realities explicitly. The stories on territorial capital however, they relate to both spatial and territorial development or neither. They thereby show even less development from spatial to territorial stories. Since their emergence in 2005, which is the year of – not only the revived Lisbon Strategy and the start of Agenda 2007 as mentioned above, but also – the policy analysis conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), stories on territorial capital show a dominance of the territorial by presenting an (economic) usage of (regional) potential – a potential probably identified in actual territorial realities. A difference in these stories lies (again) in the direction of the relationship: territorial capital is central/in favour of territorial cohesion or territorial cohesion allows the right usage of territorial capital. The new development that territorial cohesion
stories on territorial capital appear thus in no way influences a change from spatial to territorial specificities, as both can be implied.

The first story in the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative, which stated in 2002 that territorial cohesion helps to meet citizens’ demand for transparency (i.e. a specific territorial knowledge), is not repeated and seems to fit in none of the three story groups. A reason for this might be the distinctive dominance in this metanarrative of stories on top-down foci and bottom-up information instead of bottom-up views and observations of the top; note though, that there is a polyphony of voices concerning on what territories to focus in this. Within this dominance, spatial specificities do not seem to change into territorial specificities, and this therefore does not happen, as this section’s working hypothesis posed, due to the influence of territorial cohesion either. Yet, influences of the concept can be deduced nonetheless: developments towards observing territorial specificities, restructuring information on territories in a territorial cohesion perspective, accounting for impacts of European Union policies, and promoting territorial capital. As such a full territorial cohesion agenda could become confusing, also the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative both supports that the concept’s usage in European spatial planning is problematic (i.e. the first general hypothesis) and that stories in the (post-)ESDP process are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis). Moreover, insofar European spatial (planning) policy takes these issues on board it shows a clear substantive influence of territorial cohesion’s usage.

D.2.6 Coordination metanarrative
The most often appearing general stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area are on coordination. Those appearing the second most are on the need to cooperate with each other, and this is often related to the need or lack of coordination. Both thus frame the stories of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative, starting with that it is the most debated one. Territorial cohesion stories on cooperation thereby form a subgroup of those on coordination (i.e. as processual coordination). The main stories of this most debated metanarrative are namely on the coordination of policies, subdivided in those on vertical but mostly horizontal policy coherence, cooperation, and visions, and those on territorial governance, of which most are on governance and some on frameworks. In Schema 2a their stories respectively have a blue and brown colour. Yet, in themselves they do not say for what this coordination is of course.

This metanarrative nonetheless gives a possible processual reason for coordination that could emphasise the importance of it. That is to say, a minor though recurring territorial cohesion story of this metanarrative is on making (European Union) policy or the Structural Funds (see Appendix F) more effective. This does more than only give us some grip in such a purely processual matter, as it also directs us to something striking. That is, if this usage area is concerned with an informal process such as the one of the ESDP, how could its territorial cohesion stories then be on making a formal European Union process more effective through coordination? If you assume that coordination is an issue of European spatial planning, a working hypothesis for this section then follows: territorial cohesion formalises the part of European spatial planning concerned with coordination.

Treaties might indeed be crucial in this respect (see Appendix C). However, that only the territorial governance stories show some development could point to the relative unimportance of the formality of Treaties for the (post-)ESDP process usage area (i.e. Treaties change, stories do not); the more so because the 2002 story that territorial cohesion helps to meet the citizens’ demand for legibility is never repeated. Some events around the emergence of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative in 2002 do point to developments though: the French government invited the pays (i.e. towns with their surrounding hinterlands) to formulate a Schéma du cohérence territoriale as new-style structure plans three years earlier.
(see Schema 1) and the already mentioned report ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-coordination’ and the SUD substituted the CSD one year earlier. Too find out whether territorial cohesion influences European spatial planning in this matter, this metanarrative’s stories on coordination (i.e. policy coherence, cooperation, visions) and territorial governance (i.e. governance and frameworks) are treated in this order below.

After 2001 general stories on the unimportance of coordination are voiced and in 2006 coordination is thereby even substantively questioned. The concept does not seem to be used in such a way though, as no territorial cohesion story criticises coordination of policies. Instead, if it concerns horizontal policy coherence (most of them), differences in this constant promotion are on the direction of the relationship (again) and the scope. That is, does territorial cohesion need coordination or is it for the coordination of policies and should spatial policies, (spatially relevant) sectoral policies, or all policies be coordinated. While the former difference does not appear to lean to either side, in the latter the coordination of sectoral policies appears to be dominant (e.g. with an emphasis on a territorial coherence or integrated spatial approach). This non-development and dominance of course shows no formalisation of coordination whatsoever. Yet, they do underline that the territorial cohesion stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area only shed a positive light on the issue, thereby opening the door for a formalisation of it as European spatial planning concern through territorial cohesion.

Just as the territorial cohesion stories on the coordination of policies, those on cooperation do not develop either and show even less variety. In 2005 they namely name both the current shared responsibility of the Member States and European Union and the importance of stakeholder involvement for territorial cohesion and situate relations between public and private actors at the heart of the concept in 2004. A linkage between the stories on policy coherence and cooperation, and the minor story on effectiveness, is made in the statement that this shared responsibility needs an effective and coherent application of the Member States’ and European Union’s instruments. Again, although these stories on cooperation show no development, they do clarify an important point: cooperation for territorial cohesion might already be institutionalised even though it is not clear whether this is purely formal or informal (e.g. a shared responsibility, private actors). Then a formalisation of coordination as European spatial planning concern through territorial cohesion might already have processual footing.

The smallest group of these stories on coordination of policies, those on visions, might always link policy coherence and cooperation, because visions can simultaneously foster coordination and cooperation. A clear example of this comes from when stories on visions first appeared in 2002: a largely shared vision would be needed to meet future challenges (i.e. content) demanding actions (i.e. process) for territorial cohesion. In 2005 it is then held that visions contribute to specifying the concept, instead of taking the concept as departure point for action. This could again merely point to the absence of development in all these territorial cohesion stories on the coordination of policies. That is, the discussion is on how coordination and territorial cohesion relate, not about their combined promotion. They only give one hint about territorial cohesion’s formalisation of European spatial planning’s coordination though. This is that visions, as combination of substantive and processual coordination, are only offered and might therefore, either formally or informally, not be institutionalised at the moment.

The ‘coordination’ metanarrative of the IGCs usage area shows that after 2003 the promotion of a coordination framework related to territorial cohesion might have moved into less visible and more informal areas of action (see §C.2.6). In lieu of this is that after the informal structures which lead to the ESDP were dismantled in 2000 but before the informal Rotterdam process started in 2004, it then is a backward looking statement in 2003 that marks
the beginning of the stories on governance in the ‘coordination’ metanarrative of the (post-
)ESDP process usage area. It even states that the concern of territorial cohesion with
territorial governance originated in the ESDP. The promotion of governance might thus
have moved back into informality.

The important general stories on using governance techniques frame many of these
territorial cohesion stories on territorial governance (e.g. using holistic techniques, creating
multi-sectoral and multi-level governance, accordance of priorities, territorial cohesion as
vague goal). These territorial cohesion stories show the development of a possible dispute
hereby; a dispute of which general stories and stories on territorial cohesion itself notify the
importance around that time by describing the strong influence of the governance agenda on
(also) the concept. They namely accentuate that territorial cohesion needs territorial
governance in 2004 and 2005 and propose the usage of the concept for policies dealing with
cross-cutting governance issues a year later.117 That is, also a dispute on the direction of the
relationship between territorial cohesion and governance appears. Either way though, an
instalment of coordination stories relates to this, because a backward looking story of 2003
says that the concept’s concern with making European Union policy more efficient through
policy coherence also roots in the ESDP. Likewise, a territorial governance story from
2005 is similar to a story on coordination of policies. It namely poses that a key challenge for
territorial governance is that territorial cohesion needs an effective and coherent application
of European Union and national instruments.119 Hence, these governance stories show a
slight development that deepens the metanarrative. Then again, a more important deduction
for now might be that the various territorial cohesion stories on coordination are hereby the
more complexly intertwined. This could imply that both the territorial cohesion concerns with
governance and coordination originate in European spatial planning, making this informal
room besides their formal leeways the more familiar for both. Territorial cohesion could thus
formalise this part of European spatial planning, but it might not be necessary.

A general story in 2006 could frame the complexity of territorial cohesion stories on
coordination as pictured above, because it states that coordination demands a stable
framework. Although the territorial cohesion stories on frameworks only appear in 2004 –
the year DATAR launched administrative meetings on territorial cohesion for spatial
development policy –, they might nevertheless hint at some institutional framework as robust
base for coordination (e.g. with territorial coherence or an integrated spatial approach).121
While these territorial governance stories are partly framed by the general stories on the
State, and that this major institutional framework should ensure cooperation between local
authorities, they do not necessarily talk about a formal base for coordination. Moreover, they
never state that territorial cohesion provides a framework (see Appendix C), but that it needs
one, and the frameworks mentioned are always spatial development frameworks.122
Territorial cohesion stories relating the coordination of policies and frameworks, which also
only appear in 2004, do not change the features of these territorial governance stories. They
merely add a call for collaborative governance for territorial cohesion for instance.123 Hence,
insofar it concerns frameworks, territorial governance stories more seem to imply a strong
influence of spatial planning on territorial cohesion than vice versa. A formal status of these
practices might thus be the only thing that territorial cohesion adds to them.

Some territorial cohesion stories on territorial governance from 2005 stress this point
so clearly they should be brought forward openly. They namely hold that the European
Union’s territorial governance as context for the implementation of territorial cohesion needs
an institutional definition of European spatial planning and the institutional relation between
this territorial governance and national planning systems is stressed with the Constitutional
recognition of the concept in mind.124 That is to say, while this territorial cohesion issue
would come from and even remain (European) spatial planning, territorial cohesion formalises it. A question then becomes whether the concept really does so.

Much in the (post-)ESDP process namely pays attention to informalities instead. For instance: i) the general stories on dividing roles between political levels call for an interdisciplinary policy framework, ii) the contract approach as possible filtrate of the general stories in 2005 mentions the importance of the central level and vertical agreements for policy cohesion, and iii) the uninterrupted stories tell that territorial cohesion needs better multi-level governance. All of this does not call for formality. Yet, three other “stories” point in the opposite direction. They are more or less related to the Constitutional Treaty: i) at the time this Treaty was drafted territorial cohesion was said to require a transfer of competencies to the regional level, ii) in 2004 a backward looking story describes that the integration principle was hoped to be formalised in it as part of the territorial cohesion agenda, and iii) the silence on frameworks with its non-ratification (this is not a story, but the absence of one). That is, the formality of Treaties could have some weight for the territorial governance stories on frameworks in this territorial cohesion metanarrative nonetheless. This again supports that territorial cohesion could formalise the European spatial planning concern with coordination, but whether it does so hangs in the balance.

Although the ‘coordination’ metanarrative partly supports this section’s working hypothesis that territorial cohesion formalises the part of European spatial planning concerned with coordination, it partly undermines it as well. The support lays in the frequently noted possibilities for this formalisation when it concerns policy coherence, cooperation, especially when already in/formally institutionalised, and visions. The developing promotion of territorial governance complexes the matter though. This does more than supporting the second general hypothesis in that the territorial cohesion stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are specific. Here territorial governance is namely not only interwoven with (mostly) coordination and cooperation, but also shows possibilities for that territorial cohesion takes on European spatial planning’s informal coordination. Governance and coordination as territorial cohesion concerns then have both informal and formal leeways that are familiar, and spatial planning to influence territorial cohesion so much more with frameworks than vice versa that the abovementioned formalisation is the only thing territorial cohesion would add.

That this formalisation hangs in the balance is logical, as this is the usage area concerned with the informal (post-)ESDP process, not with whether something is an official competency. Moreover, the IGCs usage area doing this shows that a usage of territorial cohesion that formally opens the relationship between European policies and spatial planning is disputed in threefold (see Chapter 11). Now it becomes clear though that the overlap or relation between territorial cohesion and spatial planning appears, at least amongst others, to focus on coordination. Especially when this territorial cohesion issue indeed derives from spatial planning, then this usage of the concept would not be problematic in European spatial planning at all (i.e. going against the first general hypothesis). However, as could be expected with a more processual metanarrative, this does not clarify the ways in which such usage substantively influences European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question).

D.2.7 Spatial/Territorial dimension metanarrative
In the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative a division can be made between territorial cohesion stories promoting the spatial/territorial dimension of policies and those on space and territory, thereby implicitly pointing into the direction of the heated issue of deciding on the European geographical area. These stories are coloured purple and orange in Schema 2a respectively. In this last metanarrative one could expect to see a development from spatial to
territorial stories due to an influence of territorial cohesion on spatial planning. However, in both the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarratives we could not find such development notwithstanding their ‘spatial/territorial’ label. The working hypothesis of this section therefore is: territorial cohesion does not influence whether the spatial or territorial dimension is promoted. Before we look at the stories on the spatial/territorial dimension of policies, which appear more often, the ones on spaces and territory are treated.

The territorial cohesion stories on space and territory are mostly on the latter, only appear in 2005 and therefore show no development. Still, this is after the European Enlargement and Rotterdam Conference and while the Constitutional Treaty was up for ratification. These stories could thus both show the importance of these events for the development that they appear in 2005 and the reluctance of discussing space and territory themselves and in relation to demarcating the European territory. That is, without touching on this heated issue, perhaps some in/formal insights into the European Union’s political-geography might be ventilated for formal times to come. Yet, besides the description that the territorial cohesion agenda draws on French and German conceptions of space, the stories on territory simply vary in the same way most stories of the metanarratives of the (post-)ESDP process usage area do: in the direction of their relationship. Although the territory is promoted as base for policy-making to attain territorial cohesion, the dominance appears to be the other way around, because the concept is mostly described as usable for affecting the territory (e.g. for its modernisation, opening it up, as traversal dimension applicable to the whole of it). Territorial cohesion stories on space and territory thus not only appear sparsely, the hesitation of relating territorial cohesion and political-geographical issues does not show an influence of the concept either.

After the ESDP structures were dismantled, the promotion of the spatial dimension of policies starts with the call in 2001 to integrate spatial concerns in policies for territorial cohesion. This promotion continues the year after with an almost inverted statement, that territorial cohesion accentuates the consideration of the spatial dimension by sectoral policies, and dusks in 2005, with the description of the addition of a spatial justice dimension through the concept to the focus of European spatial policy. Since then a development from spatial to territorial stories appears. That is, since the Constitutional Treaty was drafted the territorial cohesion stories promoting the territorial dimension in European Union policies dominate, appearing continuously. Only one backward looking story deviates from this promotion by tracing the territorial dimension of the concept (in the ESDP, Lisbon and Gothenburg Strategies and CEMAT), and this after ESPON clarified territorial cohesion in 2002. This would suggest much of the territorial dimension roots in European spatial planning, just as much of the spatial dimension might. What is more, in 2006 something is added to this development, and this during the years in which the linkages between stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves increase in an extensively developing debate. This addition is seeing territorial cohesion – not as a concept to promote the territorial dimension in European Union policies, but – as part of a new territorial way of doing in the European Union. That territorial cohesion stories change from promoting the spatial to the territorial dimension might thus denote an influence of the concept.

Hence, in the (post-)ESDP process usage area only the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative shows a development from spatial to territorial stories. That this ‘spatial/territorial’ difference might matter first supports that the stories in this usage area are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis). On this crossroads territorial cohesion would then go away from spatial concerns towards only promoting the territorial dimension of European Union policies, becoming a part of a more wide-ranging territorial way of doing, and perhaps even playing a role in discussing the European territory in general.
This seems to falsify this section’s working hypothesis, as territorial cohesion could influence this change towards territorial concerns. In this way the usage of the concept could thus substantively influence European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). Whether this usage is problematic in European spatial planning (i.e. the first general hypothesis) then hinges on whether territorial concerns are more problematic for it than spatial concerns.

D.2.8 The overall picture of the separate metanarratives

There are some general conclusions that can be drawn from the metanarratives treated above. To begin with, each of the metanarratives supports the second general hypothesis that the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are multi-shaded and specific. Besides that this holds even more so when you consider the details of all their topics at once, the ‘economy/society/environment’ and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarratives stick out. This because they harbour an implicit disagreement about which policy objective relates to territorial cohesion and many foci on territories. Yet, these many specificities do pile up answers to this appendix’ leading question.

The metanarratives suggest many possibilities for substantive influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy. The ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative for instance shows that the concept could throw polycentrism of the agenda, the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative that the concept could place services on it, and the ‘coordination’ metanarrative that the concept could formalise European spatial planning’s coordination through territorial governance. The ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative then is the only one that seems to demonstrate the concept’s influence with the development from spatial to territorial concerns, especially for the territorial dimension of European Union policies. The ‘economy/society/environment’ and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarratives on the other hand appear to do so in other ways. That is, when European spatial (planning) policy would display a dominance of competitiveness issues and harmonious socio-economic treatments, while concerns for balanced development weaken and those for sustainability are disputed, this could be affected by territorial cohesion. The same holds for a dominance of top-down foci and bottom-up information in observing territorial specificities, restructuring the information in a territorial cohesion perspective, accounting for impacts of European Union policies, and promoting territorial capital. These possibilities however give a too one-sided view.

For an overall picture of the separate metanarratives one should also note the possible influences European spatial planning might have on territorial cohesion. An example of this comes forward in the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative: a redefinition of service issues in terms of infrastructure. The ‘coordination’ metanarrative is more important here though, as the overlap or relation between territorial cohesion and spatial planning appears to focus on coordination. The formalisation of it mentioned above would namely be the only performance of the concept, while especially the frameworks for it can come from spatial planning. What is more, notwithstanding the leeways the issues of policy coherence, cooperation, and visions give for this formalisation, it hangs in the balance. However, as informal coordination is common in the (post-)ESDP process, this does not make the usage of the concept problematic in European spatial planning. Many other points might though: i) focussing on territorial cohesion instead of polycentrism, ii) discussing services in the official or infrastructural way, iii) promoting territorial instead of spatial concerns, iv) the puzzle of territorial cohesion objectives, and v) the full territorial information agenda. All of this seems to support the first general hypothesis: the usage of territorial cohesion in European spatial planning seems to be problematic indeed.
Then again, one could wonder why this usage of the concept would be so problematic in European spatial planning when it already appears as on-going practice. One could also wonder whether the possibilities for substantive influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy coming from the separate metanarratives is representative for the (post-)ESDP process usage area. That is to say, this ordering of territorial cohesion stories is not only simplifying but the more misleading. A main characteristic of this usage area lies namely in the frequently made and large variety of connections between these territorial cohesion metanarratives, giving this usage area its high density.

D.3 Stories relating territorial cohesion metanarratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area

D.3.1 Territorial cohesion stories connecting metanarratives

The separate territorial cohesion metanarratives partly portray the order of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. The relations made between them further draw their bundling in a dense nitty-gritty structure. To give a short overview, the general development of them is sketched first. The territorial cohesion stories that relate two or more metanarratives emerge slowly in 2002, which is two years after a metanarrative first appeared and while ESPON clarified the concept, this with two stories having the mention of polycentrism in common. The year after, in which the draft Constitutional Treaty included territorial cohesion and ESPON made the first substantive structuration of the concept (with a broad standpoint), an eruption of relating stories ensues. This suits well with the stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves, which are often linked that year, and the metanarratives, which have all emerged separately by then. Notwithstanding the Galway Conference on Territorial Cohesion and the start of the Rotterdam process in 2004, far less of them are told that year. This might, again, accord with the simultaneous absence of both stories on spatial planning itself and territorial cohesion stories from the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative after the informal intergovernmental process of European spatial planning recommenced. Furthermore, in this year that territorial cohesion stories in the ‘coordination’ metanarrative link the coordination of policies and territorial governance, almost all of the relating stories revolve around the ‘coordination’ metanarrative, emphasising the metanarrative’s importance (including this connection made within it). Just as with the extensive debates on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves and the territorial metanarratives in 2005, the territorial cohesion metanarratives are connected most frequently at this moment the Constitutional Treaty was up for ratification, the Agenda 2007 started, and the ESPON Synthesis Report was published. Even though in 2006 few more relating territorial cohesion stories appear, they all in all constantly add connections between metanarratives and underline previously made ones through the years.

Also the connections made between territorial cohesion metanarratives can then be ordered in a schema, as shown below in Schema 2b ‘Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the (post-)ESDP process usage area’.
In this schema a characteristic of the separate metanarratives seems to prevail: the direction within the relationships of the concept to the various issues switches regularly. In addition, the ways in which these connections between metanarratives are made show a narrow scope, since the issues of the connected metanarratives are mostly just named besides each other or that one needs or inhabits the other. That is, none are for instance bound in essence, excluding other possible connections. Another feature of these territorial cohesion stories is
that there seems to be no trend in which certain metanarratives become linked instead of others. Moreover, during the years all metanaratives are connected to all other metanarratives and no such relation is made by a story disputing that a connection (e.g. polycentric development has nothing to do with competitiveness).

Together with the second general hypothesis (i.e. the stories of this usage area are mostly multi-shaded and specific) this nitty-grittyness leads to the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives: the territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives only further complex them. On the other hand, within this firm fabric the (post-)ESDP process usage area, some connections between metanarratives seem to be stronger than others. Two ways to typify the relevant territorial cohesion stories are then looking at strong or weak links – the latter can namely show isolated parts. A third way to typify them is by looking at the possible importance of what they tell rather than the frequency of their appearances. Below these ways are treated in this order.

D.3.2 Frequently connected territorial cohesion metanarratives

Metanarratives that are frequently connected by territorial cohesion stories mostly revolve around the ‘economy/society/environment’ and ‘coordination’ metanarratives. The link that connects the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarratives then also appears to be strong. Similar to when the territorial cohesion metanarratives began to be related in 2002, most of these stories are for polycentrism, which is the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ part of the relation. In this connection the stories in 2005 show an even linkage to social, economic, and environmental policy objectives independently seen and no dominance of the competitiveness issue as in the separate ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative. It therefore gives no closure on the common goal to cooperate for with territorial cohesion.

Yet, that polycentrism is linked to different perspectives might mostly reflect the importance of its own promotion (i.e. as long it is promoted, it is okay). Moreover, when such stories relate these policy objectives, polycentrism and territorial cohesion can be seen in their usage as ‘bridging concepts’ that harmonise economic, social, and environmental policy objectives. The concepts are thereby mentioned besides each other and also with polycentrism as helpful for territorial cohesion. This mostly instrumental connection through the years thus shows that the substantive connection of territorial cohesion stories for spatial/territorial structures for economic, social, and environmental policy objectives appears to be dominant in this usage area. One could thus pose that this harmonious indecision about policy objectives further complexes the metanarratives. Then again, if it only is about polycentrism in whatever way, the picture becomes less complex instead.

Another often made connection, especially around the time of Agenda 2007, concerns a similar harmonisation of economic, social, and environmental policy objectives, but now with the ‘coordination’ instead of the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative. Although here both these metanarratives blossom after 2004, the year in which most connections revolve around the ‘coordination’ metanarrative, a shift in balance seems to occur. The addition of substantive policy coordination might namely involve a restructuring of this usage area, as no stories on this coordination connect it to the issue of spatial or territorial structure. Coordinating visions are under the concept for instance never related to polycentrism (e.g. in polycentric visions). This shift from spatial/territorial structure to coordination, however, does not give any closure on the issue of which policies to coordinate either, and merely adds rural and infrastructural policies into the equation. Qua coordination the metanarratives could therefore become a bit more complex, intertwining it with the content of various policies.
During Agenda 2007 many stories underlining the connection between the ‘coordination’ metanarrative and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ or ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative add more complexity to this intertwinement of coordination.\textsuperscript{147} They also show a clear emphasis nonetheless, because they connect the territorial to the coordination of policies by, respectively, telling about territorial policies or a territorial strategy or by stressing the coordination of policies with territorial impacts.\textsuperscript{148} Hence, under the concept of territorial cohesion there is a development whereby coordination, of which the lack and need for is so often mention in the general stories, is often substantively linked to the promotion of various policy objectives as well as to territorial impacts and the territorial dimension of policies. Whether these connections make the metanarratives more or less complex then depends on whether you get more entangled between the coordination and territorial parts or are more directed by their focus on coordination through territorial courses of action or of policies with territorial impacts.

The strong links between metanarratives thus both support and go against the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives which poses that the territorial cohesion stories connecting them only lead to more complexity. These stories namely potray that polycentrism is indecisive about policy objectives, these objectives are also intertwined with the issue of coordination, which, in its turn, is entangled with several territorial issues. They on the other hand also point to a stronger focus on polycentrism and territorial coordination. Either way, it again becomes clear that the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis), what could make territorial cohesion’s usage in European spatial planning problematic (i.e. the first general hypothesis), as does the indecisiveness. Mainly the stronger focus on polycentrism and territorial coordination then touch on a substantive influence of the concept on European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). The latter supports that territorial cohesion could formalise European spatial planning’s coordination through territorial governance (see §D.2.8). The former, however, might point towards a build up of tension: the risk that the concept might throw polycentrism off the agenda of European spatial (planning) policy (again, see §D.2.8) increases when this issue is more important.

D.3.3 Weakly related territorial cohesion metanarratives
Territorial cohesion stories infrequently connect metanarratives when it concerns services and the spatial/territorial and will be treated below in this order. A surprising finding from the separate metanarratives thus returns here. Even though the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative harbours important issues under the concept, just as it consists of few stories compared to the other metanarratives, few territorial cohesion stories connect it to other ones.\textsuperscript{149} This notwithstanding that in 2002, while ESPON clarified the concept, the connecting stories even emergenced by connecting the ‘accessibility’ and ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarratives. After polycentric development and accessibility were hereby stated to be conditions for territorial cohesion, this connection was never repeated though.\textsuperscript{150} This is thus a clear instance in which the metanarratives are not made more complex.

In 2003 it is said that the stressing of the territorial dimension of European Union policies already started in 1997 with the Treaty of Amsterdam (i.e. with services), thereby linking the ‘accessibility’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarratives.\textsuperscript{151} Yet, the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative is linked to the one of ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ only once (in 2003), but never in the sense of promoting services for geographically handicapped regions (see the next appendices).\textsuperscript{152} For the other way around something similar holds: the stories that come closest to the concern with geographical handicaps are that territorial cohesion needs horizontal and vertical coordination of policies with territorial impacts for particular regions and territories (in 2004) and that a basic element of territorial cohesion is
the support for weak, lagging or handicapped regions to narrow inequalities and disparities between different parts of the European territory (in 2005).\footnote{153} What is more, the development in the few connections of the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative resembles the increasing weakness of stories on services in the separate metanarrative. This because other metanarratives link only to the issue of services in the year the Constitutional Treaty was drafted and thereafter only to infrastructure.\footnote{154} Hence, the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative, and also the concern with geographical handicaps, seems to be knitted loosely in the territorial cohesion stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area.

Remarkably, other seldom made connections are those between the metanarratives that have ‘spatial/territorial’ stories in common: the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’, ‘spatial/territorial structure’, and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarratives. Rare instances are, for instance, a statement in 2003, after ESPON clarified the concept, that connects the first and third of these metanarratives. This with that territorial cohesion would need cohesion indicators set in harmonious economic development terms with a geographic dimension;\footnote{155} thereby linking to the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative as well. A statement in the time of the ESPON Synthesis Report of 2005 then connects these second and third metanarratives with that territorial goals can be subsumed under territorial cohesion and polycentrism.\footnote{156} The peculiarity is thus that the spatial/territorial metanarratives show threesome-wise a rather unconnected grouping that explicitly relates spatial/territorial issues of structure and specificities with the spatial/territorial dimension more in general.\footnote{157} This notwithstanding that territorial cohesion stories often appear within these metanarratives separately seen, these metanarratives are well-connected to the other three too, and connections between the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarratives appear less rarely. A partial explanation might that when this common reference is promoted in relation to other issues, the spatial/territorial trait is not the primary focus or concealed. Either way, this shows that territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives can also further complex them by seldomly appearing. An implicit promotion of the spatial/territorial dimension is namely less clear than an explicit promotion of it.

Also the weak links between metanarratives thus both support and go against the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives which poses that the territorial cohesion stories connecting them only lead to more complexity. That is, while an implicit promotion of the spatial/territorial dimension would do so, the isolation of accessibility issues, especially when combined with geographical handicaps, makes them clearer instead. Yet, both support the second general hypothesis, because both this implicitness and isolation only come forward through this nitty-gritty of the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area. That the services issue seems to be knitted loosely in this fabric might then point to that it is a rather new topic on the European spatial planning agenda (see §D.2.4) which did not take root in it (yet). The possible problematics involved in such a usage of territorial cohesion for European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. discussing services in the official or infrastructural way; see §D.2.8) might thus just be new risks. Then again, that services are isolated in this usage area suggests that, if it is a substantive influence of territorial cohesion on the European spatial planning agenda, it is a rather weak influence.

D.3.4 Possibly important territorial cohesion stories relating metanarratives

The territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives and stick out due to the importance of what they tell are, as treated below respectively, on the usage of spatial planning and several issues related by their more or less implicit promotion of the territorial (i.e. territory, territorial cohesion information, coordination, a framework, territorial capital). Various stories that connect metanarratives, mostly the frequent ‘economy/society/environment’ or ‘coordination’ ones, then place the concept more in
Cohesion Policy or European spatial planning (e.g. by describing the ESDP as origin, bringing it beyond the ESDP towards fundamental European Union goals, emphasising cohesion).\(^{158}\) A statement from 2003 – which is when the ‘spatial planning/territorial cohesion competence’ metanarrative in the IGCs usage area showed an implicit relation of the concept in the Constitutional Treaty to spatial planning (see §C.2.3) – relates to this. Territorial cohesion would namely set the objective of reducing development disparities and physical and economic dislocation by means of spatial planning and other public policies with a territorial impact.\(^{159}\) The stories bonding territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves promote, amongst others, the direction of spatial planning for territorial cohesion concerns, but this is something different. That is, the territorial cohesion stories connecting metanarratives might thus – besides relating the concept more to Cohesion Policy (see Appendix E) – show the promotion of the usage of spatial planning for a (economic) policy objective via the concept. Because this would go against the grain of the stories structuring the (post-)ESDP process usage area (i.e. promoting territorial cohesion for spatial planning or vice versa; see §D.1.3), it is quite fundamental.

Territory is a clear territorial issue of course. In the separate metanarratives territorial cohesion stories on it only appear in 2005. When they connect the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ with the ‘coordination’ and/or ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarratives though, the territory already appears earlier, that is, since ESPON structured the concept and the Constitutional Treaty was drafted in 2003.\(^{160}\) Then the territory is not debated in itself. It namely appears in stories on territorial cohesion that: make policies related to the same territory compatible, provide a foundation for European Union cooperation for a coherent approach to the (sustainable) development of the European territory, or are closely linked to a vision harmonising economic, social, and environmental policy objectives for the European territory.\(^{161}\) In this usage area, territorial cohesion could thus without discussion nonetheless touch upon this heated issue (see §D.2.7).

ESPON’s work on territorial indicators and an integrated territorial cohesion indicator more implicitly promotes the territorial. The general stories on the epistemic base for political action thereby frame connections of the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ with the ‘economy/society/environment’ and/or ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarratives. This by showing the promotion of indicators for spatial structure (e.g. polycentrism) and economic or social policy objectives (i.e. the environment is not mentioned).\(^{162}\) A related difficulty in the observation to approach territorial cohesion is then signalised in 2003: gaps in information on cultural heritage, governance, and SG(E)I are mentioned (i.e. as to be filled).\(^{163}\) While ESPON has a broad standpoint on the concept, this would add coordination and accessibility issues to the wanted territorial cohesion information. The polyphony concerning the focus in and after observation – which is already mentioned in the separate ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative (see §D.2.5) – could therefore be made more diverse and become more entangled if it is also related to these issues. Yet, it would also brand more issues into territorial ones.

This entangled polyphony of foci is framed by the non-existence of a strategic agenda-setting that looks at other European Union Councils (see §D.1.2). Both form the context in which a connection between the ‘coordination’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarratives in 2006 reinforces the general call for coordination in a top-down manner.\(^{164}\) Moreover, the territorial cohesion story doing this also links the latter metanarrative’s stories on territory and on the territorial dimension of European Union policies. Territorial policy integration would namely be the effort to integrate the territorial dimension into European Union policies to achieve a coherent approach to the development of the European Union territory on the basis of territorial cohesion.\(^{165}\) This could thus link coordination not only to the territorial, but to the heated issue of territory as well.
Then again, at the time of the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty, the general stories on the importance of the State as institutional framework frame what seems to be a statement against this line of a European Union territory. That is to say, a territorial story that connects the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarratives calls to conceive territorial cohesion in States with their own territorial reality and position in European space.\textsuperscript{166} With territorial cohesion, it is thus not automatically about the European Union and its territory. Moreover, earlier, during the start of the Rotterdam process in 2004, from a story that connects the ‘economy/society/environment’, ‘coordination’, and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarratives we can hear that both an emphasis on the European Union or (Member) States can be expanded under territorial cohesion. The promotion of a sustainability of growth within the multi-level governance of territorial cohesion policy would namely imply an ensuring of the compatibility of territorial policy formulated at the national level with development policies pursued in regions and cities.\textsuperscript{167} Furthermore, in 2005 the contract approach as frame from the general stories (i.e. another way to divide roles between political levels; see §D.2.6) seems to be described as no panacea either. This because only using tri-partite contracts and territorial impact assessments would reduce the scope for an integrated territorial cohesion policy.\textsuperscript{168} Consequently, the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives leave the promotion of a territorial dimension of European Union policies, wide-ranging territorial way of doing, and/or territories with the concept open, just as the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative did. What is more, they increase the complexity by adding the concern for multiple levels.

Connections of metanarratives that describe a similar entangled knot the same year, but in a bottom-up manner, mention territorial capital. While the Agenda 2007 started and the Lisbon Strategy was revived in 2005, territorial cohesion stories connect the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative’s issue of territorial capital to those of other metanarratives. That is, to polycentrism from the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ metanarrative, the economic policy objective from the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative, and substantive and processual coordination and governance from the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. This with the call to develop territorial capital through European territorial cooperation by implementing territorial cohesion and polycentrism and with the statement – \textit{qua} relationship between territorial capital and territorial cohesion \textit{vice versa} – that the key challenge for territorial cohesion in governance terms is to enable the effective exploitation of Europe’s territorial capital by ensuring that the European Union sectoral and economic and national territorial development policies structurally reinforce each other.\textsuperscript{169} Although these stories might be confusing, here it is enough to understand that, albeit in a top-down or bottom-up manner, the complexity of the (post-)ESDP process usage area increases thus. That is, the territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives depict a need to coordinate processes and policy substance, while promoting various related territorial ways in which this could be done (e.g. frame policy coherence, make knowledge, use capital).

The remarkable territorial cohesion stories in the links between metanarratives thus fully support that the stories making these connections only further complex the metanarratives (i.e. the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives). This because they add issues, link to the one of territory, entangle already specific stories, and deviate from this usage area’s structure; this of course also supports the second general hypothesis (i.e. stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are multi-shaded and specific). They add the issue of multiple levels in the irresolute promotion of the territorial, and both add and entangle issues and foci for territorial observation. Besides also entangling coordination and territorial issues in top-down and bottom-up processes and substances, they thereby touch upon the heated issue of the European Union’s territory without discussing it. This increased complexity and risk could make the usage of territorial cohesion in European spatial planning...
more problematic (i.e. support the first general hypothesis). All these remarkable stories leave the concept’s substantive influence on European spatial (planning) policy open though (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). Yet, one of them goes against this question by deviating from the usage area’s structure of promoting territorial cohesion for spatial planning or vice versa. It alludes to the usage of spatial planning for a (economic) policy objective via territorial cohesion, that is, to the instrumentality of both territorial cohesion and spatial planning.

D.3.5 Findings from the connected metanarratives

The connections between the metanarratives further characterise the picture of them drawn above (see §2.3) by presenting a firm fabric of instead separated territorial cohesion stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Much thereby supports the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives which poses that these connections only further complex them. This is especially shown in the inconclusiveness about with which policy objectives polycentrism links, the intertwinement of such objectives with coordination issues, and also the intertwinement of the latter with a diversity of foci. These territorial cohesion stories namely link observation, policy coherence, and the territory. This while the last issue is vehement but not discussed, the territorial is implicitly and irresolutely promoted, and coordination and territorial issues entangled in top-down and bottom-up processes and substances. However, this does not mean that the working hypothesis holds.

Although all of these connecting stories demonstrate that the stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis), they do not turn them into a chaos of shades. They also clarify through emphasis, as some connections between metanarratives appear to be dominant. These are the substantive ones of spatial/territorial structures for economic, social, environmental policy objectives, those of coordination to the promotion of various policy objectives, and the territorial impacts and dimension of policies. Inversely, the concerns of accessibility are dimly voiced in a rather disconnected manner. The focus on polycentrism and territorial coordination is thereby just as strong as the isolation of services (and geographic handicaps). The connections between metanarratives thus not only further complex them.

Nonetheless, the increased specificity, complexity, and indecisiveness the connected metanarratives portray could make the usage of territorial cohesion more problematic in European spatial planning (i.e. the first general hypothesis). The same holds for the increased risk due to the concern with the territory (i.e. a heated issue) and the focus on polycentrism (i.e. could be thrown off the agenda of European spatial planning). Although also the same could hold for the new topic of services (i.e. discuss it in the official or infrastructural way), its isolation in this usage area weakens the possible substantive influence it can have on European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). For such an influence the connecting stories only bring territorial coordination forward, as this supports territorial cohesion’s formalisation European spatial planning’s coordination through territorial governance. More remarkable though, might be the prove they give for that territorial cohesion and spatial planning perhaps do not so much influence each other, but something else influences both.

D.4 Narratives with an own dynamic in the (post-)ESDP process usage area

D.4.1 Narratives as scene for territorial cohesion stories

As in the IGCs usage area, also the stories of the (connected) territorial cohesion metanarratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area belong less to the concept than Schema’s 2a and 2b portray. This because similar stories are told in narratives that do not
bring up the concept and have an own dynamic. Their stories show a fuller picture of this usage area as they form the spatial planning context of territorial cohesion stories. These narratives can point to substantive influences of the concept on European spatial (planning) policy when we look for differences in their stories since the ones on territorial cohesion itself and its metanarratives appeared in 1992 and 2000 respectively; these eight years could signify that in this usage area it took a while to figure out how to fill-in the concept more specifically or that the need for this arose. To look for such influences though, we first lay out their order, general development, summarising schema, and main debates.

The orders of stories from the earlier narratives and later metanarratives partly overlap and intersect. With eight narratives the crowded multi-shadedness of this usage area returns in full adorn. There are four substantive narratives, adding a more general one on ‘spatial/territorial development’ to the same order as shown by the metanarratives (i.e. ‘spatial/territorial structure’, ‘economy/society/environment’, ‘accessibility’ narratives). Other narratives are processual by being on ‘surveillance’ and ‘process’, thereby intersecting the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ and ‘coordination’ metanarratives, or structural by adding the narrative of ‘planning traditions’ to the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ one, which resembles the metanarratives’ order again. The stories of these narratives are of course framed by the general stories and structured by the stories on – not territorial cohesion, but – spatial planning itself.

To give a short overview, the general development of these narratives can be sketched. What then denotes the maturity of most is that they do not appear very late compared to the general stories as the metanarratives do. Besides the promotion of communication networks to circulate ideas and wealth for the industrial system in the 19th century, as shown in the ‘accessibility’ narrative, most narratives start during the national reconstructions in 1948; this with a French flavour, exemplified in the planning tradition story that aménagement du territoire, which would attend to spatial imbalances, is aménagement of our society. Moreover, their appearance precedes the explicit promotion of spatial planning itself – while the narratives of course implicitly promote it due to their content. This might indicate that such a promotion was explicitly carried out outside the (post-)ESDP process usage area, that is, without being related to territorial cohesion in any way.

Almost all the narratives have emerged 40 years later since the expert planning community debated territorial cohesion and a European spatial framework was on the agenda. This with the addition of stories from the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘surveillance’ narratives on, respectively, the antagonism between a small European core and large periphery and the improvement of the European Union’s spatial policy evidence base. When the intergovernmental ESDP process started in 1991 the ‘process’ narrative emerged at last. Stories on the coordination of Member States and the need for a strategic spatial framework for ongoing Community stories were thereby added to territorial cohesion’s context in this usage area, because the most frequent general stories on the lack or need for coordination emerge later, at least in this usage area the spatial planning concern with coordination seems to be generalised instead of that a general coordination concern is specified for spatial planning.

Still, only since 1999, the year the ESDP was published and the first general story promoting territorial cohesion itself emerged, stories appear regularly in all narratives instead of being scattered over them through the years. These traits of occurrence might denote the inbuilt connection between the metanarratives that emerge one year later and the narratives as context of this. That is to say, the narratives already show their dynamics independently before stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves appear, and well before the territorial cohesion metanarratives do so. These timings make conceptual usages of
territorial cohesion for (all) narratives and (positions in) debates within these narratives possible.

Compared to the many territorial cohesion stories told in this usage area, there are even more that form their context. The appearance and development of all the narratives’ stories is summarised schematically below in Schema 3a ‘Narratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)’.

(post-)ESDP process Schema 3a
Narratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)
### Table: Spatial Impacts of Community Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event/Decision/Action</th>
<th>Impact/Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>EC approves Europe 2000+ -致力于建立欧洲2000+计划</td>
<td>ESDP (European Spatial Development Policy) structures dismantled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SF feature: -L'Occidentale</td>
<td>Observations and suggestions on spatial development shape future policy at European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>TC in Treaties of Amsterdam (1997) - Agreement on Community Cohesion, Spatial Planning, Societies and Policies</td>
<td>ESDP Committee underlines importance of better assess territorial management than co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>EC supports one-year SPDEP - Special Programme for Spatial Planning, Societies and Policies (SF) Committee underlines territorial impacts</td>
<td>ESDP helps with new policy frameworks for spatial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>GSP - Green Spatial Policy - SF in cohesion - SF working document on SF in cohesion - Schéma de cohésion territoriale</td>
<td>Emerging spatial policies less important than desired spatial structure in contemporary Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>European Council adopts SF strategy - Green Paper on Spatial Development - European Spatial Development</td>
<td>SF reflects local and territorial specificities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>European Council adopts SF strategy - Green Paper on Spatial Development - Spatial Impacts of Community Cohesion and Cost of Non-Cooperation - GSP achieves SF</td>
<td>SF reflects local and territorial specificities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>- SF is a policy - SF is about territorial cohesion - SF is about territorial cohesion and policy intervention</td>
<td>SF helps with new policy frameworks for spatial development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram: Spatial Impacts of Community Cohesion

- Technical and scientific foundations are essential for spatial development
- ESDP supports new policy frameworks for spatial development
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In the year 2005, all of them show extensive debates; this is in line with meetings on territorial cohesion for spatial development in 2004. Another main trait of the 'economy/society/environment' narrative, while ESPON Schema 3a shows that through the years dominance switches between the narratives. Pronounced ones are hereby the ‘economy/society/environment’ narrative, while ESPON structured the concept of territorial cohesion in 2003, and the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative, at the time the Rotterdam process started and DATAR launched administrative meetings on territorial cohesion for spatial development in 2004. Another main trait of the narratives is the year 2005, in which all of them show extensive debates; this is in line with
all the kinds of stories shown and events mentioned in the previous paragraphs. In this year that also the ESPON Synthesis Report was published, especially the dominance of the ‘surveillance’ narrative catches the eye. However, the huge amount of stories seems mostly to denote that the context of territorial cohesion as formed by spatial planning stories relates many issues to the concept in a jumbled way.

A typical detail of these spatial planning stories is that they only mention the Gothenburg Strategy if accompanied by the Lisbon Strategy. More generally though, the stories of these narratives with an own dynamic can be divided per issue, what allows, just as with the territorial cohesion metanarratives, the characterisation of them through their main debates (including the colouring, but now in Schema 3a). The ‘spatial/territorial structure’ narrative then shows an antagonism between the European core and periphery and whether polycentrism benefits both (pink), and a debate on the usefulness of (thinking in) spatial structures (of cities) (mint green). In the ‘economy/society/environment’ narrative these different policy objectives are promoted separately (yellow, red, green) and the possibility of their reconciliation is discussed. While the stories of all the narratives clearly though falteringly grow in number through the years, those of the ‘accessibility’ narrative hardly do. Instead, they constantly tell about the uneven effects of infrastructure networks (blue) and the importance and scope of services (e.g. as locational factors) (green). The in this usage area substantively wise most general narrative is the ‘spatial/territorial development’ one, which shows political and mostly entrepreneurial debates on territorial development (of regions) (brown) and the focus of and reason for a (new) European spatial development perspective (blue).

Both the processual narratives discuss related issues. The ‘surveillance’ narrative promotes the need for a spatial policy evidence base and discusses the status of it (yellow), debates the creation and conduct of one European observation of the territorial state (mostly in the form of ESPON) (blue), and states that it is important to take spatial/territorial impacts (purple) as well as territorial diversity into account (with territorial indicators) (orange). The ‘process’ narrative then shows stories on forms of territorial cooperation to be promoted (e.g. between cities or the Ministers responsible for spatial planning) (brown) and a dispute on policy coherence with spatial planning (azure). Furthermore, discussions also inhabiting this narrative are on safeguarding the ESDP process and, after the Rotterdam process started, on how to carry out an informal though influential European spatial planning (pale turquoise). More structurally, traits of a possible European planning way of doing (e.g. innovative, shaping minds, no plans) and the institutionalisation of it (brown) are debated in the ‘planning traditions’ narrative, just as the different influences of North-western spatial planning traditions on this (green) and the manifestation of a common territorial governance (orange) are. Although the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative refers to policies (purple) and the territory (orange) just as the metanarrative does, the territorial approach appears to be an independent issue here (grey). Now that the main debates in the developed order of narratives with an own dynamic order are sketched, the question becomes how to look for influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy in their Schema 3a.

D.4.2 Looking for influences between the narratives and metanarratives

Influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy come forward when you compare the territorial cohesion metanarratives (Schema 2a) and narratives with an own dynamic (Schema 3a). Such a comparison, however, also brings forward that all the narratives are reflected in the usage of the concept to promote, for instance, polycentrism, competitiveness, territorial observation, or the coordination or territorial dimension of policies. That is, there probably is an influence of European spatial (planning) policy on
An influence that mostly lies in an in-filling of the concept with spatial planning content through the promotion of the territorial cohesion metanarratives – i.e. at least as far as they are reflected by the narratives with their own dynamic in the (post-)ESDP process usage area. This might hold even more for similar traits of and developments in both (e.g. a dominance of polycentrism, the economic, the territorial dimension of policies, and a weakening of the social and strengthening of the environmental) and stories appearing in narratives before they eventually emerge into already present metanarratives (e.g. on spatial structure, territorial capital, territorial impacts of policies, the territory). Yet, the (post-)ESDP process usage area also shows an influence of territorial cohesion on European (spatial) planning.

What is more, in the promotion of European spatial (planning) policy issues via the concept the former might have undergone substantive changes too; this possibly in accordance with the in 2001 called for bond between territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself: a reinvention of spatial (development) policy to apply territorial cohesion. Such an influence could for instance appear in redirections of the narratives’ own dynamics. Another route influences between territorial cohesion and European spatial (planning) policy might take is through different arrangements of metanarratives and narratives, thereby (re)structuring them by affecting stories. Compared to the narratives’ stories that are reflected in the similarly organised metanarratives, stories from the narratives into the divergently arranged metanarratives do not show overlaps of course. They could intersect the metanarratives by pervading their territorial cohesion stories with spatial planning concerns though. There are therefore various ways in which the influences between territorial cohesion and European spatial (planning) policy can be detected.

The leading question of this appendix asks for the influence of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy. However, as noted above, the narratives with their own dynamic predate the territorial cohesion metanarratives. The working hypothesis for this section therefore poses: European spatial (planning) policy more influences territorial cohesion than vice versa. We conclude on this after consecutively testing it the overlapping and intersecting narratives and metanarratives.

D.4.3 Influences between overlapping narratives and metanarratives

In the overlapping narratives and metanarratives many stories show possible influences between European spatial (planning) policy and territorial cohesion. To list the issues involved: a reorganisation of territories, territorial approach, polycentrism, triangle of sustainability, and the territorial dimension of policies. Plenty of examples can be given of course in which an influence might be expected, but none can be found. The ‘accessibility’ narrative for instance differs from the metanarrative in that, even though it were TENs which found their way into the ESDP, it shows no switch in importance from services to infrastructure. Still, no influence between metanarratives and narratives seems to be indicated here (i.e. the stories do not change at least). The listed issues above can then be divided between, in the order followed below, those of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy and vice versa.

Stories on ‘spatial/territorial structure’ then show a possible influence, because the metanarrative might have added the reorganisation of territories (instead of spaces) to the narrative since 2003. This fits the stories on territorial cohesion as rationale for organising European space nicely. If there is any influence of the concept on the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative to show for, then it developed in tandem with the promotion of the territorial approach since territorial cohesion was structured by ESPON and included in the Constitutional Treaty. However, the territorial approach could come from outside the territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories too. This because territorial cohesion is only
in 2006 explicitly said to be part of a territorial way of doing and in the narrative the
territorial approach is since early on linked to the European Union’s rural policies, an in this
usage area rarely presented kind of stories.190 Another influence coming from the
metanarratives is the replacement of polycentrism with territorial cohesion (see §3.2.2). Yet,
a statement in 2006, while ESPON ended, might have to with this. That the usage of
territorial cohesion is _qua_ concept more helpful in convincing actors than polycentrism,
might namely have to do with the account of polycentrism itself as not for policy makers –
this notwithstanding the dominant campaign for it.191 Moreover, already before that,
polycentrism itself is, also since its promotion _via_ territorial cohesion, disputed for its
infeasibility and internal contradictions.192 With polycentrism the influences between
territorial cohesion and European spatial (planning) policy might thus go in both directions. A
clear influence of the former on the latter, however, only comes forward when it concerns the
emergence of the reorganisation for territories as an issue – and this would only be a possible
influence.

Compared to the fading of polycentrism, the stories on different policy objectives
seem to show a mirror wise movement after the ‘triangle of sustainability’ – with its focus on
a complementary balance of economy-society-environment – would have permeated from
spatial planning into the territorial cohesion stories on sustainability.193 That is to say, just as
the territorial cohesion metanarrative never does, since the Rotterdam process the
‘economy/society/environment’ narrative hardly contradicts the harmoniousness of the
relations between these policy objectives.194 As said above, the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’
narrative partly follows the order of the territorial cohesion metanarratives. However, it does
not seem to be substantively influenced by the metanarrative’s discussion away from spatial
concerns and towards territorial ways of doing – i.e. as hinted at in the previous paragraphs.
That is to say, independently seen the narrative does not discuss the spatial but the territorial
dimension of policies from the start.195 This would more support an influence _vice versa_.
Hence, possible influences of European spatial (planning) policy on territorial cohesion are
clear: permeation with the triangle of sustainability and promotion of the territorial dimension
of policies.

D.4.3 Influences between intersecting narratives and metanarratives
Also the stories from the intersecting narratives and metanarratives that show influences
between territorial cohesion and European spatial (planning) policy can be divided according
to the direction of influence. Some characterising illustrations can namely be found of
territorial cohesion stories that appear to affect the narratives with an own dynamic through
intersection. One could thereby think of spatial justice as an issue that clearly shows an
influence of territorial cohesion. Yet, although in 2005 it is stated in the ‘spatial/territorial
dimension’ metanarrative that territorial cohesion added a spatial justice dimension to
European spatial policy, this addition is in the narratives difficult to retrieve (i.e. beyond the
‘spatial/territorial dimension’ one).196 That the mention of territorial cohesion as transversal
dimension from the same metanarrative does not return in the narratives either, then leaves
the possible pervasion of territorial cohesion concerns in spatial planning stories more
open.197 When the content is transversal, it could namely lead to a return in various
narratives. Issues in which such influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial
(planning) policy through intersection can be detected are: the role of local authorities in
surveillance, spatial development as coordination, and territorial and planning ways of doing.
These are treated before many on the other way around are, that is, issues of: territorial
capital, the ESDP, coordination, environmental and economic policy objectives, observing
the territorial state, coordination in spatial development, and territorial policies.
The, compared to the narratives, differently arranged metanarratives could point to a possible influence on European spatial (planning) policy where, instead of merely reflecting the narratives as the similarly arranged ones do, territorial cohesion stories differ in substance. A minor story in the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative, which in 2005 describes that the increasing role of local authorities in the implementing and monitoring phases of sector-specific European Union policies contributes to territorial cohesion, might for instance show some effect. This because in the ‘surveillance’ narrative the year after it is stated that (policy) integration works if the capacities of administrations to incorporate territorial effects at the micro level are looked at. Then again, also the ‘surveillance’ narrative dominantly stresses observation from the European level – mostly by ESPON, but also including a weak call for an Observatory for rural areas, in addition to national research. Narratives that possibly point to a more restructuring development are the ones on planning traditions and surveillance, especially in 2005. They namely show calls for, respectively, common principles for European Union territorial governance and, more farfetched, a research framework (e.g. for after ESPON would end in 2006). Yet, only the territorial cohesion trait of an increasing role of local authorities in observing the territory seems to have an influence on spatial planning stories, but only a little – not to mention the restructuring of narratives.

General discussions on spatial and territorial development could also be influenced by the particular issues promoted with territorial cohesion. This influence appears to only hold for issues of policy coherence though – e.g. not for those of territorial capital and territorial governance. The year after the territorial cohesion stories on coordination of and through spatial (development) policies appeared in 2004, spatial development is namely in the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative stated to serve the promotion of a better use of financial assistance. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the early statement in 1991 that a strategic spatial framework for ongoing Community policies is wanted, the ‘process’ narrative – which, again, aligns with the frequent general stories that Community policies should be coordinated – does not show an influence of the territorial cohesion stories on spatial frameworks from 2004. Also the territorial cohesion trait of seeing spatial development as a way to coordinate then seems to have a minor influence on spatial planning stories.

The stories that since the Rotterdam process link territorial cohesion to both territorial governance and spatial/territorial development in the ‘coordination’ metanarrative and to territorial policies in the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative could influence the related discussions in the ‘planning traditions’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives. After the call for a common European wide response to challenges of the European Union’s territory in 2004, these narratives namely move closer to territorial policy. This because: i) the discussion on a European planning way of doing also widens to spatial policies, ii) the discussion on territorial governance itself is taken up again with more stress, and iii) the ESDP is seen as solid basis for the commitment to an effective planning of Europe’s territory (also see §D.5). However, that in 2002 it is said that the White Paper on European Governance from a year earlier is pro spatial planning might suggest something else. That is, this possible influence of the concept could come from outside both the territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories, and instead from, for instance, the increasing influence of general stories on using governance techniques. Nonetheless, in this mixture of territorial and planning ways of doing (e.g. towards territorial policy), territorial cohesion could have a major influence on European spatial (planning) policy.

The influences of territorial cohesion on European spatial (planning) policy that are detectable through the intersections of narratives and metanarratives thus take no definite form. A major influence, with a mixture of territorial and planning ways of doing, is not only...
uncertain but fuzzy too, and other possible influences, of an increasing role of local authorities in observing the territory and seeing spatial development as a way to coordinate, appear to be small. We therefore turn to detecting possible influences in the other direction.

Stories from the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative appear through almost all the territorial cohesion metanarratives. The stories on territorial capital were, for instance, infused in the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative at the time of the revived Lisbon Strategy. This by the statement that territorial capital with spatial/territorial development policies is central to territorial cohesion. Other important examples of such timings are the return of spatial development in: i) territorial cohesion stories in 2003 that see the ESDP as source for the territorial dimension of the concept, ii) both the territorial governance and policy coherence parts of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative often mention spatial development, and iii) the environmental and economic elements of the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative do too. The ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative, and thus this organisation of stories, therefore seems to implant spatial/territorial development twists into the metanarratives’ territorial cohesion stories when it concerns territorial capital, the ESDP, coordination, and environmental and economic policy objectives.

The ‘surveillance’ narrative’s debates about a spatial policy evidence base and one European observation of the territorial state return in the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative. The later territorial cohesion stories namely tell about a continuous observation (for evidence) and top-down focus (from one point) while not so much taking specific territories into account but the territory in general (as territorial state). This seems to go right against the territorial cohesion stories on increasing the role of local authorities in this matter. Although this will not so much restructure the organisation of metanarratives, it could nonetheless redirect the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative more towards surveillance.

Territorial cohesion stories that combine parts of the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and more processual narratives appear to be in line with these twisting influences of the discussion on spatial and territorial development. Most of the time the ‘coordination’ metanarrative namely also mentions the coordination of or through spatial (development) policies, including the need for leading visions, thereby underlining this processual concern with the concept (also see §D.5). Furthermore, in the territorial cohesion stories on territorial governance the issue of spatial/territorial development (as focus) returns pressingly since the Rotterdam process too (see §D.2.6). In the narratives, however, territorial governance is grouped under the heading of ‘planning traditions’. Stories on territorial cohesion itself discuss in which planning tradition the concept roots. In spite of that, national planning traditions and a potential European one seem, besides their own discussion dynamic (i.e. mostly on aménagement du territoire again), to be covered up in the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. They are only implied when it concerns the interaction between territorial governance and national planning systems and an institutional definition of European spatial planning in 2005. If spatial planning stories do have this influence, it is thus not overt.

The same holds for a related way in which metanarratives could extract content from narratives: in the overlap and intersection of the more structural ‘planning traditions’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives within the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative in 2005. That is, stories on territorial policies are with the concept not discussed as they are in older stories on territorial management and planning without the concept, but merely touched upon by relating territorial cohesion to territorial strategies and policies. Hence, this influence of the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and processual narratives on territorial cohesion stories clearly comes forward the concept’s linkage of
spatial (development) policies and coordination. However, what this might entail for planning traditions and territorial management is not explicitly discussed.

There are thus many influences of European spatial (planning) policy on territorial cohesion detectable through the intersections of narratives and metanarratives. This mostly due to spatial/territorial development twists from the so-named narrative, putting, amongst others, territorial capital, the ESDP, and environmental and economic policy objectives in the territorial cohesion stories. Besides a possible redirection of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative towards debates from the ‘surveillance’ narrative, another and major influence concerns the linkage of spatial/territorial development and coordination. Although it is also implanted from the narratives, related ways of doing represented in the more processual and structural narratives seem to be left behind.

D.4.4 The main influences between narratives and metanarratives

The multiplicity of narratives with an own dynamic set up beforehand as scene for territorial cohesion stories in the (post-)ESDP process usage area depicts many spatial planning stories that (literally) fill their content into the concept. The narratives thus surely support that in the (post-)ESDP process the stories are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis that poses).

Especially where the metanarratives duplicate the narratives’ order, the territorial cohesion stories replicate the issues of polycentrism, competitiveness, and the territorial dimension of policies. When they intersect, there appear some twists in the concept’s discussions, as the ESDP is posed as the major substantive source and the observation of the territory in general and territorial capital are focused on in relation to spatial/territorial development. The moulding of more processual and structural territorial cohesion stories by the narratives’ dynamics might have led the ‘coordination’ metanarrative to also harbour territorial cohesion stories on the coordination of or through spatial (development) policies. The contact made between the ‘planning traditions’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives in the metanarratives could, in its turn, have helped to set an emphasis on a new wide-ranging territorial way of doing with/in the concept – although the latter is hardly explicated.

Influences from the metanarratives on the narratives appear subtler. This supports the working hypothesis that European spatial (planning) policy more influences territorial cohesion than vice versa. Yet, all of them thereby also answer this appendix leading question (i.e. how does the usage of the concept of territorial cohesion substantively influence European spatial (planning) policy?). The concept’s usage could for instance redirect the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ narrative, perhaps tremendously (i.e. away from polycentrism), but clearly towards the reorganisation of territories. What is more, the influences of the concept itself on European spatial (planning) policy might only increase the emphasis on surveillance with a more general territorial approach and nearly boomerang the harmoniousness of policy objectives back as an obligation. Most striking though, is that territorial cohesion could also influence spatial planning stories on spatial/territorial development. Although the former influenced the concept with its inclusion of the coordination of or through spatial (development) policies (i.e. a way in which this issue came onto the territorial cohesion agenda), also this might boomerang back into spatial planning stories, but now by perceiving spatial/territorial development merely as an instrument for coordination.

These influences of the concept on European spatial (planning) policy might give problems for its usage in European spatial planning (i.e. the first general hypothesis). However, besides that they appear to be subtle, they mostly seem to reinforce the narratives’ own dynamics (e.g. away from polycentrism, towards a harmoniousness of policy
objectives). It is different when it concerns seeing spatial/territorial development merely as instrument though. The concept could thereby namely restructure the ‘spatial/territorial development’, ‘planning traditions’, and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives. This could then at the same time: i) recycle spatial development as an instrument and ii) install planning traditions into common territorial governance principles through the ‘coordination’ metanarrative and iii) base the planning of the European territory through the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative. That is, a simultaneous limiting of function, widening of focus, and refurbishing of megalomanic aspirations. Although this is mostly speculative, especially the former could be very problematic indeed.

D.5 Connections between the narratives with an own dynamic in the (post-)ESDP process usage area

D.5.1 Situating the connections between narratives in the context of territorial cohesion

The general stories gave the (post-)ESDP process usage area the image of an entangled construction. The firmness of the bundle formed by the connections between metanarratives might therefore, just as their issues coming from the narratives with an own dynamic, neither be a quality typical for territorial cohesion only. What is more, the narratives are even denser connected. That is, compared to the connected metanarratives, the narratives show more connections per year, whereby more stories form a connection and regularly connect over three narratives. While the territorial cohesion metanarratives are connected from 2002 on, but mainly since the Constitutional Treaty was drafted and ESPON structured the concept the year after, spatial planning stories that connect narratives emerge already when most of the narratives began after the Second World War. Hence, the connections between metanarratives could derive from the connected narratives. As working hypothesis we already pose it thus.

Still, the territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories also have something in common, as both the connections between metanarratives and between narratives considerably increase when territorial cohesion and spatial planning itself were often linked in 2003. More such common features could thus falsify the working hypothesis, as they show that when the metanarratives have something in common with the narratives, this does not need to derive from the latter. The picture of this usage area should therefore be finished by drawing the concept’s context that is formed by the connected narratives. The connected narratives and how they change the up until now drawn picture of this usage area come forward in various ways. Their general development and schematisation (both §D.5.2), comparisons between them and the connected metanarratives led by the separate metanarratives (§D.5.3) and narratives (§D.5.4), and how they structure a debate on territorial governance (§D.5.5) are treated below to arrive at territorial cohesion’s own features as shown by the full picture of this usage area (§D.5.6).

D.5.2 The general developments and schematisation of the connected narratives

Qua substance, the stories that connect the narratives are very consistent with the stories within them. Besides a dominance of the ‘surveillance’ narrative from the start – which with stories on watching the Community territory mostly relates to the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative –, also the connections of narratives appear in line with the separate narratives: haphazardly until the ESDP was published in 1999. Since then, the connections seem to develop differently than the separate narratives do. The dominance of the separate ‘economy/society/environment’ narrative in 2003 (see Schema 3a) is for instance not underlined here. That year there appears to be no dominance in the connections between narratives and, what is more, the dominance of the ‘surveillance’ narrative seems to be
overturned by others thereafter, especially since 2005. 213 Another major development might just lack synchronisation. That is, although the stories in 2004, the year of the Rotterdam Conference, could give the impression that the dominance of the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative is only stressed with the strong connection to the ‘process’ narrative, after the start of Agenda 2007 in 2005 the connections simply revolve around the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative – and thereby amongst others with a strong linkage to the ‘process’ narrative again. 214 These general developments thus stress the importance of the issues of surveillance and, later on, spatial/territorial development in the context of territorial cohesion.

The stories that connect the narratives are schematised below in Schema 3b ‘Stories relating narratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area with an own dynamic’. Schema 3b thereby mostly shows that the rich context of the concept as formed by spatial planning stories is since long an even more entangled mash than the densely connected territorial cohesion metanarratives.

(post-)ESDP process Schema 3b
Stories relating narratives in the (post-)ESDP process usage area with an own dynamic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>events</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>European Council adopts Schéma du cohérence territoriale</td>
<td>SUD substitutes CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>ESPON clarifies TC</td>
<td>EC adopts ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lisbon Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>balanced development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram illustrates the spatial planning and its impact on regions across Europe. The information is used to support sustainable development, ensuring regional and local cohesion.

The European Commission promotes the use of coordinated and balanced strategies and interventions in regions, aiming to improve territorial development and achieve wider social cohesion objectives. This is achieved through the reform of SF, which is expected to enhance the potential of all EU regions.

The diagram shows the need for analysis of territorial developments and the importance of regional and local equality in achieving these objectives. The diagram also highlights the role of ESPON in producing useful information and ensuring territorial development.

The European Commission emphasizes the importance of coherent with ESDP, promoting the use of infrastructure, and transfer processes. The Commission supports the use of regional and local cohesion strategies and interventions in larger regions and individuals.

The Commission also stresses the importance of coherent spatial visions for Europe and aims to form part of coherent EU transport strategies and interventions with territorial impact. The Commission highlights the need for permanent research and development in support of this vision.

The Commission supports permanent research and development in regions and individuals, as well as the implementation of research and development policies with territorial impact. The Commission also promotes the use of EU programmes and research centres to gather data needed for spatial and social developments.

The Commission aims to form part of coherent EU transport strategies and interventions with territorial impact, as well as the implementation of research and development policies with territorial impact.
Again, in line of the previous findings, the year 2005 sticks out, this time also because all narratives are in one or more ways connected to all others that year.\textsuperscript{215} The only though important exceptions in this are the ‘accessibility’ and ‘planning traditions’ narratives. These only connect in 2003 when it concerns a common vision – in combination with the claim that SG(E)I are centrally placed in the planning tradition of \textit{aménagement du territoire}, which is often mentioned in relation to territorial cohesion, this might hint at a promotion of this linkage outside the (post-)ESDP process usage area (see the next Appendices).\textsuperscript{216} Still, the narratives clearly appear to have influenced the territorial cohesion metanarratives by giving them the characteristic of a mutual connectedness (hence, the working hypothesis above).

What is more, before the metanarratives did, also the narratives appear to persistently underline and add connections without a trend in which certain ones become linked instead of others. A sketchy way to situate the connections between narratives within the usage area is then to compare the yearly profiles of these connections to those within the bundle of territorial cohesion metanarratives. Some findings then go against the working hypothesis for the connected narratives (i.e. the connections between metanarratives derive from the connected narratives) and some support it, as shown below respectively.

Although the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘economy/society/environment’ narratives are often connected, they do not portray the dominance of territorial cohesion stories in which through the years polycentrism is substantively connected to economic, social, and environmental policy objectives.\textsuperscript{217} What seems to be reminiscent of the metanarratives though, is that the ‘accessibility’ narrative is knitted loosely within the narratives. Yet, connections do appear. These are not that much concerned with geographical handicaps (also see §D.3.3) for instance, but narrow the services part of the connection (i.e. SG(E)I) mostly down to urban-rural relationships.\textsuperscript{218} While urban-rural relations are in the separate ‘spatial/territorial structure’ narrative only discussed in 2005, a year earlier the narratives and metanarratives potentially make fitting connections in this. Territorial cohesion would namely require coherent spatial frameworks that acknowledge the changing nature of rural-urban interdependencies and strategic spatial planning would provide a powerful tool for integrating rural and urban domains.\textsuperscript{219} Accessibility does fit into the substance of this usage area’s dense territorial cohesion context more generally too. This because after the ESDP included TENs, the narrative is regularly connected, especially in the year the Constitutional Treaty with its article on SGEI was up for ratification.\textsuperscript{220} The metanarratives thus link the ‘accessibility’ metanarrative even looser to other metanarratives looser than the ‘accessibility’ narratives does to other narratives. Hence, what in the (post-)ESDP process usage area does not derive from the territorial cohesion context is that the concept stresses the connection between polycentrism and policy objectives, but hardly connects accessibility to other issues.

The connections between the metanarratives do reflect the connection between narratives though. The emphasis of connections with the ‘process’ narrative in 2004 is for instance reflected in the metanarratives that revolve around the ‘coordination’ metanarrative that year, and two years later the accent that the ‘planning traditions’ narrative lays on integration returns in the stress of the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative on territorial policy integration.\textsuperscript{221} Note hereby though, that just as the bundled territorial cohesion metanarratives, the connected narratives do not show a strong threesome-wise promotion of the issues of spatial/territorial structures, specificities, and dimension.\textsuperscript{222} Also, when the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative connects to others, the European territory is not discussed in itself either. Even more so than in the separate narrative, the territory is mostly the object of observation in general and useable in more specific ways instead (e.g. to develop it, make a vision for this).\textsuperscript{223} In addition, the polyphony concerning the focus in and after observation as expressed by territorial cohesion stories appears even more diverse and
entangled in the connected narratives. This due to the connections of the ‘surveillance’ narrative with others, mostly the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative. The connections between metanarratives thus in many ways derive from the connected narratives: besides that both miss a joint promotion of spatial/territorial issues or discussion on territory, the emphasis on coordination in the connected metanarratives seems to come from the emphasis on process and integration from the accent planning traditions give it.

However, the coordination issue has more complexities. When Agenda 2007 took off in 2005, coordination was in territorial cohesion stories namely often substantively linked to the promotion of various policy objectives as well as to territorial impacts and the territorial dimension of policies. The narratives do not show the former connection, but could lead to the same nevertheless. If coordination in relation with spatial or territorial development entails the weighting of policy objectives that is. The combination of the strong connections between the ‘process’, ‘spatial/development’, and ‘economy/society/environment’ narratives is namely a trait of that year. In a similar interplay, the issue of territorial governance from the ‘planning traditions’ narrative might relate concerns with coordination from the ‘process’ narrative to the one on the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’. Only the linkage of coordination to the territorial impact of policies then seems to be a characteristic of territorial cohesion. The concept thus appears to not only extent the tentacles of the coordination issue, but to add an own trait to this as well.

D.5.3 A comparison between the connected metanarratives and narratives led by the separate metanarratives

With such a huge amount of schematised spatial planning stories that relate narratives through the years, cherry-picking seems to be a suited procedure to further complete the image of this territorial cohesion usage area beyond the sketch above. That is, a selection of stories that in this web follow or go against the leads provided by the earlier findings on metanarratives, narratives, and the influences between them. This section then compares the connected metanarratives and narratives following these leads from the separate metanarratives and the next paragraph those from the separate narratives.

A lead from the territorial cohesion metanarratives is the question of what the importance of the one on spatial/territorial structure is. A story connecting the ‘spatial/territorial structure’ and ‘surveillance’ narratives in 2006 might answer this as follows: if the main discussion on polycentrism will stay, then only inside the ESPON community. This would of course mostly limit the metanarrative to a usage in research. The redirection of the separate narrative away from polycentrism is then reflected in its connection with the ‘spatial/territorial development’ narrative since Agenda 2007, whereby it turns around whether to promote territorial capital instead or with polycentrism. Such banishment of polycentrism to research in the context of territorial cohesion might thus help its disappearance off the concept’s agenda. However, this would not be an influence on the connections between metanarratives.

Related to this, is that the stories connecting the ‘surveillance’ narrative to others do not precisely state where the information consists of that will function as spatial evidence base for, for instance, a European spatial policy. Especially so, because disputes were on polycentricity as a research focus already since ESPON followed upon the Study Programme on European Spatial Planning (SPESP). In the general promotion of observation since the European Parliament’s Gendebien Report on a European regional planning scheme in 1983 and the emphasis on spatial/territorial impacts of policies from 1999 onwards, the only constant thereby seems to be a focus on economics – of which the analysis is in 1948 said to

---
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enlighten political compromise. However, even after the call from 2001 to set up a network of research centres to gather data needed for spatial planning on the Community level, it remains indefinite what this focus will be. The similar lack of focus and dominance of economics when it concerns the observation of territories in the connections between metanarratives (see §D.2.5 and §D.3.3) could thus derive from the connected narratives.

The dominance of (again) economic policy objectives does not develop in the connected narratives as it did in the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative. It always appeared already there; this might have helped them to dominate in the territorial cohesion metanarrative of course. Since 1992 the social policy objectives are added to them and do not seem to weaken through the years. However, before the ESDP also emphasised cohesion in 1999, this addition was only in relation to economic policy objectives, and thereafter this socio-economic relationship continues to be mentioned often. When connected to other narratives and policy objectives, the social thus appears constantly. Similarly, since the Leipzig Principles in 1994 – which for ‘sustainable development’ referred to the United Nations’ Brundtland Report from 1987 –, but especially shortly prior to the Gothenburg Strategy, environmental policy objectives regularly appear in connection with other narratives, thereby often related to economic and social policy objectives. These connecting spatial planning stories could have helped the issue of sustainability to emerge in the territorial cohesion metanarrative. The stories connecting narratives thus suggest that the dominance of the economic and emergence of the environmental policy objectives in the territorial cohesion metanarrative comes from the concept’s context. Still, besides that the fading of the social policy objectives in the metanarrative appears a territorial cohesion feature, also these influences would not be on the connections between metanarratives.

The ‘accessibility’ metanarrative showed a switch in importance from services to infrastructure. The connections of the ‘accessibility’ narrative to others on the other hand do not, this even more clearly than the separate narrative. The more so, because a relevant territorial cohesion story from 2003, telling that the Treaty of Amsterdam would have given spatial development a new commitment (i.e. services), merely has one robust connection between narratives to show for it: a discussion on services as infrastructure that in 2005 connects the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and ‘accessibility’ narratives. This switch in the metanarrative could therefore be another trait characterising territorial cohesion in the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Then again, this would not be an influence on the connections between metanarratives.

From 2004 onwards the ‘coordination’ metanarrative is concerned with cooperation for territorial cohesion. However, already in 1999 the ESDP and the European Commission’s working document on spatial planning were seen as helpful for the concern with horizontal cooperation itself; thereby linking the ‘process’ narrative to, respectively, the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and ‘planning traditions’ narratives. Moreover, in 2003, a year before these territorial cohesion stories, vertical relations are added in the former linkage between narratives, as being promoted by territorial development policies, and European rural policy is called upon to illustrate subsidiarity and shared governance. That is, it does not matter which cooperation, it appeared in the concept’s context before it did as territorial cohesion issue. Although neither this is an influence on the connections between metanarratives, the territorial cohesion issue of cooperation seems to derive from the connected narratives.

Another concern that emerges in territorial cohesion stories later on is related to this. Three years before territorial cohesion dealt with territorial governance, stories already

---

*For instance, in 2005 many issues to gather data on are pointed out: infrastructure, accessibility, territorial structure, unemployment rate, diversification level of production, research, innovation, education and training activity level, decentralisation, territorial potential for sustainable economic growth, competitiveness, inequalities between individuals, regional development gaps.*
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connected the ‘process’ and ‘planning traditions’ narratives in 2001, at the time of the White Paper on European Governance and the study of ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’. They were on an informal institutional framework for coordination (i.e. with a spatial vision). These three narratives are connected again in 2004, the year of the Rotterdam Conference. This in support of institutional structures for spatial policies and planning frameworks to facilitate horizontal and vertical coordination within new governance models, now to frame spatial development as well. While the Rotterdam process proceeded, these connections increase in strength. The trans- and subnational level are thereby added, and both the concerns with cooperation and an informal institutional framework seem to filter into the debate on territorial governance in the ‘planning traditions’ narrative (this through its connections with the ‘process’ one). Nonetheless, in 2006 territorial policy integration is still named as a multi-actor and multi-level challenge for European Union policy making, this while the networks of territorial policy officials and politicians would not do the tasks such integration requires. That is, there is much talk about these ways of doing, also about the lack of action in this. This spatial planning talk seems to spill into territorial cohesion stories. Hence, since the Rotterdam Conference rebooted the intergovernmental process that led to the ESDP, the spatial planning stories that connect narratives align to the territorial cohesion story that the concern with policy coherence in territorial governance comes from the ESDP. Also here, however, an influence from the connected narratives on the connections between metanarratives thus does not appear.

The leads from the separate metanarratives thus point to many territorial cohesion features that seem to derive from the connected narratives: a lacking focus and dominance of economics in the observation of territories, the dominance of economic and emergence of environmental policy objectives, and much about ways of doing such as cooperation. However, only the former would influence the connections between metanarratives. What is more, those leads also appear to bring some traits forward that belong to territorial cohesion: the fading of the social policy objectives, the switch in importance from the issue of services to the one of infrastructure, and the disappearance of polycentrism. Although the latter might be reinforced by the banishment of polycentrism to research in the concept’s context, these own traits of course neither affect the connections between metanarratives.

D.5.4 A comparison between the connected metanarratives and narratives led by the separate narratives

Leads from the separate narratives show some influences the metanarratives might have had on the narratives. Most, however, are concerned with the influences the narratives might have had by intersecting the metanarratives, and these are touched upon first. A spatial/territorial development twist implanted in a territorial cohesion metanarrative appears, for instance, through the connection between the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and ‘surveillance’ narratives since the Rotterdam process began in 2005; a connection which, in its turn, might have been moulded in accordance with the ‘spatial/territorial specificities’ metanarrative. That is, spatial planning stories stating that observations focussing on development potentials are needed, and a year later that territorial capital will become the cornerstone of the second ESPON programme, might have flavoured the territorial cohesion story from 2005 that it is the identification of territorial capital which is central to the concept. This of course does not show how a connection between metanarratives derives from the connected narratives. It does point to an influence of the latter on a metanarrative though: eventually, territorial cohesion, which is itself said to lead a second ESPON programme, might take up the task of identifying territorial capital as well.
Another twist comes from the connections between the ‘spatial/territorial development’, ‘process’, and ‘planning traditions’ narratives into the ‘coordination’ metanarrative of 2004. The processual concern in territorial cohesion stories on coordination of or through spatial (development) policies might namely be inscribed by a certain endorsement of coordination since the European Commission’s working document on spatial planning from 1999. Although there develops a discussion on whether territorial integration comes from the (French) regional economic or (German) comprehensive integrated tradition, ever since, and especially in 2005, a coordinative approach always solidly joins with spatial planning. When territorial cohesion thus deals with coordination in this context, it almost automatically touches upon spatial planning. Then again, while it is said in 2005 that the Ministers tried to use existing European Union policy processes to achieve a coherent approach and a year later that territorial policy integration is the most promising area in territorial development policy, the ‘coordination’ metanarrative does not appear to reflect the brightening connection between the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and ‘process’ narratives any longer. Even if it would, this would of course not be an influence from the connections between narratives on a metanarrative instead of on the connected metanarratives. Yet, not linking coordination with spatial development could thus develop into a territorial cohesion trait that distinguishes the concept from its context in this usage area.

Something more structural might be happening in this though. The connections between the ‘planning traditions’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives might twist territorial cohesion stories on territorial governance in the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. Nota bene, this might happen through the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ metanarrative, and thus point to an influence of the connected narratives on the connections between metanarratives; the more so because these stories are strongly supplemented by the ‘spatial/territorial development’ and ‘process’ narratives. That is, when the Constitutional Treaty was drafted, the (then) post-ESDP process is said to determine the territorial dimension of cohesion; this with the promotion of a coherent vision of the Community’s territory since the first CSD in 1992. Thereafter, however, the narratives’ discussion on territorial governance picks parts of both statements.

It namely seems to revolve around the question of how to relate a coherent approach for the development of the European Union territory to an integration of the territorial dimension into European Union policies (on multiple levels). Yet, stories on a general territorial approach for this are neither firmly connected in the metanarratives nor narratives (yet); they merely come from ensuring coherence between European Union regional and rural policies in 2003 and a generalised European Union version of this in 2004. Both threads might then come together in 2005 with the story that a reflection based on an overall picture in line with the ESDP’s vision of territorial development is helpful for the coordination of sectoral policies into an integrated territorial approach. Likewise, a year later another statement – i.e. inverted and more relevant for territorial cohesion – follows: a territorial or space-based approach and territorial coordination through information and dialogue help to translate territorial concepts into policies. In time, territorial cohesion seems thus once again to be disconnected from the concern to coordinate for or through spatial (development) policies, but this while taking up the chance for more wide-ranging coordinative territorial governance, through the spatial/territorial dimension of policies that is. This would therefore neither be an influence of the connected narratives on the connections between metanarratives, as it does not derive from them, but another trait of territorial cohesion itself.

---

*a ‘Coordinative approach’ is a label for a variety of similar issues. Through the years they sequentially appear as: integrated and multi-sectoral, coherent, cross-fertilising or space-based approach.

*b ‘spatial planning’ is a label for a variety of similar issues here. Through the years these sequentially appear as: regional development, spatial development, spatial policy, territorial development.
Yet, the separate ‘planning traditions’ narrative shows no influence of the territorial cohesion stories that since the Rotterdam process take up the concern for spatial frameworks. The connections of this narrative with others show the similarity between such stories even more clearly. As early as DATAR merged spatial planning and regional policy in 1991, the Europen Regional Development Fund (ERDF) regulations included on DATAR’s insistence are for instance said to give the European Commission the power for a schéma de développement de l’espace communautaire. Ten years later, at the time of the European Commission’s White Paper on European Governance and study on ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’, this is echoed. Albeit that it is merely said that a policy framework with a spatial vision resolves the lack of vertical and horizontal coherence, in 2003 the ESDP process and French way of doing would converge in the interpretation of DG Regio (see Appendix E). That territorial cohesion stories just took up the discussion on spatial frameworks from the concept’s context could thus be seen as part of the debate on common principles of territorial governance (see the next section). For now though, this does not clarify in how far this is an influence of the connected narratives on the connections between metanarratives.

The leads from the separate narratives that point to the influences the metanarratives might have had on the narratives are treated below due to their relevance. Although they probably will not show what in the connections between metanarratives derives from the connected narratives, they correct the previously drawn picture of this usage area. Spatial justice as shown within territorial cohesion stories, for instance, might have a slightly larger influence on the content of the narratives connected to the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ than described above. Spatial justice is namely retrievable when connected with in themselves disputed issues of social policy objectives and polycentrism. That is, in 2001 there is called to limit regional inequalities in the European Union with a concern for social and spatial justice and four years later polycentrism is said to be increasingly explained in terms of cohesion, equity and spatial justice; especially the latter statement can be disagreed with, as shown in 2003 and 2005 when polycentrism is said to inform a shift away from regional redistribution. Hence, although territorial cohesion stories on spatial justice are hard to find, they could have had a slight influence on the narratives, and therefore on European spatial (planning) policy.

The connections of the ‘economy/society/environment’ narrative to others show that it might not be territorial cohesion that almost obliges these policy objectives to harmonise (within the ‘triangle of sustainability’). The only stories in tension with this obligation are namely from after the emergence of the metanarratives. At the time of ESPON’s broad standpoint in 2003, these minor deviant stories pose that territorial policies change from spatial redistribution to regional competitiveness; for this perhaps informed by polycentrism. At the time of Agenda 2007 and the ESPON Synthesis Report in 2005, more such arguments come up: i) the hegemony of economic integration and liberalisation would have led to economic data and indicators at the cost of social ones, ii) the competition orientation of the draft ESDP would have been at the expense of sustainability, and iii) the final ESDP would not aid to go against an economic development ethos of the European Union. It would be strange though to – because of this timing – hold that this questioning of harmonic policy objectives in spatial planning stories is an influence of territorial cohesion. Safe to say though, that the obligation to harmonise policy objectives seems to come from the (connected) narratives themselves instead of returning to them via territorial cohesion.

Hence, also the leads from the separate narratives point to territorial cohesion features that seem to derive from the connected narratives: the task of identifying territorial capital and the discussion on spatial frameworks. Besides that only the latter would influence the
connections between metanarratives, it could be a part of a larger debate on territorial governance too. Just as convincingly those leads appear to bring forward traits that belong to territorial cohesion: not linking coordination with spatial development and the chance for more wide-ranging coordinative territorial governance. What is more, they suggest a slight influence the other way around: the issue of spatial justice would arrive from the metanarratives into the narratives. However, the connected narratives also deny that the obligation to harmonise policy objectives comes from territorial cohesion, as it appears in the concept’s context all along. Obviously, neither these own traits of territorial cohesion nor this influence of the concept affect the connections between metanarratives.

D.5.5 A territorial governance debate structured by connected narratives

Above there is referred to a complex debate on territorial governance. It appears in the (connected) narratives since 2000 and full-blown five years later. As territorial governance is a trait of territorial cohesion and the concept links to this debate in its context, also via the issue of spatial frameworks, we pay extra attention to it. Besides that the increasingly important general stories on using governance techniques hereby frame the debate, the connected narratives could namely further structure it.

The connections between the ‘process’ and ‘planning traditions’ narratives are an example of this. In a start that joins both, coordination is thereby seen as aménagement intégré du territoire and also as territorial governance. Between this start and 2005, the concern for coordination was linked to various others and the minor discussion on a new European planning way of doing to several. Meanwhile, stories that bond territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves began to call for the (re)direction of spatial planning (as policy tool) for territorial cohesion concerns; which in their turn were, just as the general stories on coordination, linked to the Lisbon Strategy since the Rotterdam process (see Schema 1). This could have triggered an explicit debate on these issues. However, the territorial cohesion stories swap from treating coordination of and through spatial/territorial development and spatial frameworks in 2004 to predominantly discussing territorial governance in 2005, thereby only treating planning traditions implicitly (see Schema’s 2a and 2b). A question then is what it means that territorial cohesion discussions not only almost merely imply planning traditions, an issue regularly appearing in the concept’s context, but that these discussions also swap towards territorial governance (also see §D.3.3).

An answer comes from the connected narratives. Stories that connect the ‘planning traditions’ and ‘process’ narratives in 2005, just as the territorial cohesion stories, hardly mention aménagement du territoire and mainly discuss territorial governance. Although hereby subsidiarity is said to lead to the articulation of a framework of territorial governance principles shared by all European planning systems, spatial planning is that year in the various connections of the same narratives mostly considered inversingly, that is, as a coordination apparatus. The creation of new strategic concepts by visioning seems to show one aspect of this; thereby in line with the general stories on using governance techniques that discuss the usage of vague goals (e.g. territorial cohesion). Although attached to many spatial planning issues, the concept’s context thus opens up the possibility of using spatial planning for coordination.

However, since 2005 also declarations appear that state that the coordinating effect of spatial development (e.g. the ESDP) remains minute beyond spatial planning circles; this in addition to the atypically explicit story that a European Union competence for coordination does not harbour a material responsibility for European spatial development or spatial

---

* Chronologically seen: increasing territorial imbalances, territorial dimension of policies, territorial approach, regional development, territorial integration, spatial impact, development of European Union territory, and substantive policy objectives, European Union spatial development, territorial analysis, and all residents of urban and rural areas.

* Chronologically seen: a holistic understanding, common vision, bottom-up policies, and strategic planning.
Moreover, while European spatial planning is said to be embedded in a multi-level governance system and spatial planning stories promote the territorial dimension of policies, a description in the connections of the ‘process’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives also points out that the governance of Community policies does not favour to take the territorial dimension into account. This would make it less surprising that after the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification territorial governance is not mentioned in the narratives anymore (i.e. no further competence for territorial cohesion, no promotion of the territorial dimension, such as territorial governance, by spatial planning). This would thus end the debate on territorial governance in the concept’s concept, while it remains a territorial cohesion issue.

Nevertheless, one year later territorial policy integration is deemed to be both the most promising area in territorial development and based on territorial cohesion as well, which is highlighted by the statement that both the ESDP process and territorial cohesion are concerned with governance. The disappearance of spatial planning stories on territorial governance while the ones on territorial cohesion explicitly maintain this concern might signify a possible singling out of the coordination apparatus and/or framework of governance principles isolated from the discussion on spatial development and planning traditions. An answer to the question posed above then becomes: that territorial cohesion merely implies planning traditions and swap towards territorial governance could mean that for territorial cohesion processual structures for spatial planning are reduced to one of the many useful territorial ways of doing.

Then again, the spatial planning and territorial cohesion stories on territorial governance in this usage area might above all have forecasted well-built ambitions. How useful would this territorial way of doing for instance be? Note thereby that the general stories on the importance of the region continuously saturate the narratives. Furthermore, these general stories are in 2003 also linked to the one on Cohesion Policy. Perhaps it is this linkage that frames a story on spatial planning itself which further opened up this exterior the same year: the European Commission would want a spatial policy closer to its merits. A reduction of processual structures for spatial planning towards a useful territorial way of doing could thus also entail a selection.

A story connecting the ‘economy/society/environment’ and ‘planning traditions’ narratives in 2005 then points to the possibilities in this passage. This because it calls to open an intergovernmental discussion on European Union territorial governance that links the European Union’s cohesion strategy with the functioning of national planning systems. Moreover, national and regional territorial development is offered as integrated and space-based framework for development that adds value to the European Union’s Cohesion Policy and Lisbon Strategy as well. Although territorial cohesion metanarratives also encompasses the concern with regions, they show more affiliation with cohesion; especially the territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘economy/society/environment’ metanarrative to those placing the concept more in Cohesion Policy than European spatial planning do.

That these stories might thereby promote to use spatial planning \textit{via} territorial cohesion for a (economic) policy objective (see §3.3.4) and/or closer relate to Cohesion Policy might therefore become the more acute. Hence, the debate on territorial governance in the (post-)ESDP process usage area also points outward to the Region/Cohesion policy usage area (see Appendix E).

D.5.6 Some territorial cohesion features shown by the full picture of this usage area

The treatment of the connections between the narratives with an own dynamic above finished the picture of the (post-)ESDP process usage area with a myriad of spatial planning stories that form the package of narratives. Besides that this context for the bundle of metanarratives
supports that the stories in this usage area are multi-shaded and specific (i.e. the second general hypothesis), this comparison brings forward how the concept of territorial cohesion is affected by its context, it differs from it, and it affects its context.

The profile of the connected metanarratives reflects the way in which the narratives are packed. The connected narratives might thus have furnished the metanarratives’ mutual connectedness and added spatial/territorial development twists. The connected narratives might thereby have influenced the connections between the metanarratives when it concerns their discussion on spatial frameworks and lacking focus and dominance of economics in the observation of territories. This therefore supports the working hypothesis for the connected narratives somewhat (i.e. the connections between the metanarratives derive from connected narratives). Still, they mostly influence the metanarratives instead of their connections. The connected narratives appear to show that the focus for surveillance is as economic as indefinite and that the context of territorial cohesion assisted the concept in taking up the task of identifying territorial capital in a developing dominance of the economic and emergence of the environmental. Moreover, the spatial planning stories, in cross-fertilisation with the ones on territorial cohesion, might have restored the weight the concept lays on territorial governance, either in relation to policy coherence and frameworks or not.

Then again, compared to the connected narratives, the territorial cohesion stories also point to some own traits. That is, the concept hardly connects accessibility to other issues, stresses the connection between polycentrism and policy objectives (e.g. within the ‘triangle of sustainability’), extents the tentacles of the coordination issue, especially towards policies with a territorial impact, and all of this with a restrain on spatial and territorial development issues later on. These own traits of course go against the working hypothesis for the connected narratives, as these connections between the metanarratives do not derive from them. In addition, the connected narratives also point to two traits of territorial cohesion per metanarrative. The concept’s context neither assists in the fading of the social with territorial cohesion nor the concept’s switch from services to infrastructure. Insofar these differences between territorial cohesion and spatial planning stories lead to frictions, they could make the concept’s usage in European spatial planning problematic (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

The connected narratives also point towards substantive influences that the usage of territorial cohesion might have on European spatial (planning) policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question), this mostly through disagreements with the earlier findings. The territorial cohesion issue of spatial justice could for instance have spread into the concept’s context nonetheless. Inversely, the obligation to harmonise policy objectives does not appear to come from the concept, but to reside in the (connected) narratives themselves. Yet, the most important findings in this section appear to be that the discussion on polycentrism might only be restricted to research, instead of vanishing altogether, and that the processual structures for spatial planning could for territorial cohesion be reduced to a useful territorial way of doing.

4 Musso, 1999; Boltanski&Thévenot, 1999; Guigou, 2000; Faludi, 2003a; Dutch Presidency, 2004: 2, 10; Peyrony, in Faludi, 2007.
7 Peyrony in Faludi, 2007.
Appendix E  The order of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area

Introduction
Regional/Cohesion policy could form the formal usage of the concept of territorial cohesion. For this reason the analytical quadrangle made above (see the Introduction of Part II in Book II) places this area between the Intergovernmental Conferences and the (post-)ESDP process. The former namely draws the official limits in which territorial cohesion may be used, limits which Regional/Cohesion policy must abide by, while the latter shows an informal demarcation of the concept’s substantive space, a room to which Regional/Cohesion policy could substantively relate.

This place of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area then leads to three general hypotheses that guide the reader through this appendix: this usage area cherry-picks substances from the (post-)ESDP process usage area (to incorporate contents for indigenous concerns); roams the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines as frontier (to partly follow, use, and transgress borders); and combines these activities to expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action (to blend picked contents and rules with and for established practices). As such, the usage of territorial cohesion could thus affect Regional/Cohesion policy in general. Therefore the question that leads the reading of this appendix is: ‘How does the concept of territorial cohesion change the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy?’ Although this is our main interest, from the departure-point of this research (see Chapter 3), we are of course also concerned with – not only the second general hypothesis, but also – the effects such changes might have on European spatial planning.

To treat these hypotheses and question, the presentation of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area below starts with the stories that frame and structure the other stories in this usage area: the general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and regional and cohesion policy themselves (§E.1). After this the four territorial cohesion metanarratives of cohesion objective or territorial dimension, balance, economy, or environment, coordination, and territories and accessibility are elaborated upon (§E.2). A discussion on the ways stories relate these metanarratives follows (§E.3). Also to show the context of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area, both the as metanarratives schematised stories and those relating them then will be compared to both the narratives with an own dynamic (§E.4) and the connections between them (§E.5). Also from these ordered and compared stories conclusions can be drawn on the strategic positions in the concept’s usage (see Chapter 13).

E.1 Regional/Cohesion policy’s framing and structuring stories

E.1.1 The usage area’s general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves

Again, also the stories that frame and structure other stories in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area can be ordered in a schema, here one on the ‘General stories and stories on territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy itself in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area’. This Schema 1 below shows that the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area has, compared to the (post-)ESDP process one, “only” five general stories that frame all other stories. In this neat framework two more substantive and three more processual general stories can be distinguished. In order of importance these are – with between brackets their colour in Schema 1 – on public objectives (blue), institutional arrangements (red), the Lisbon Strategy (olive), society constructions (grey), and processual and substantive coherence
All these general stories are interrelated, especially the substantive ones on public objectives and the Lisbon Strategy on the one hand and the other three more processual ones on the other hand. Besides that 2001 stands out, in which more than one kind of general stories appears for the first time, the years 2004 and 2005 do so too, because all general stories are debated in those years, extensively so in the latter; in these years the European Commission respectively published the Second and Third Cohesion Report and drafted the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG) for Cohesion Policy. One surprise hereby is that the general stories are just once solely concerned with services (i.e. in 2006). This is not just surprising because Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI) are (during the research period) the sole official base for territorial cohesion, as shown in the IGCs usage area, but the more so because, albeit that the (territorial cohesion) stories in this usage area attend to this issue, they are thus hardly framed.

The ambiguous label of this usage area (i.e. the regional/cohesion part) can be defended by that regional policy and cohesion policy are in the European Union often used interchangeably and Directorate-General (DG) Regio’s mission is to strengthen cohesion. Nonetheless, as done below, they can be separated, at least because cohesion policy also aims at Member States and regional policy is not bound by cohesion objectives only. Contrary to the (post-)ESDP process usage area, on first sight the stories that structure territorial cohesion and regional and cohesion policy stories in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area therefore do not have a simpler image than those that frame them. There namely are seven. Structuring stories on (and in Schema 1 having the colour): territorial cohesion itself (yellow), regional policy itself (blue), cohesion policy itself (red), and their connections, that is, between regional and cohesion policy (purple), territorial cohesion and cohesion policy (orange), territorial cohesion and regional policy (green), and all three (black). Still, just as for the (post-)ESDP process usage area, the argument to put these structuring stories next to each other here comes forth out of this appendix’ leading question, now on the influence of the concept on regional/cohesion policy. This treatment namely lays down the structure of this usage area before we test the general hypotheses in the next paragraphs on the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic. A main trait of this structure then is that, just as with the general stories, the years of 2004 and 2005 stick out, but now because first the concept and cohesion policy themselves start to be debated extensively and the year later all three are. This timing of structuring stories on regional policy suggests we should not take the interchangeability of regional policy and cohesion policy for granted when it concerns territorial cohesion.

Regional/Cohesion Policy Schema 1
General stories and stories on the concept of territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy itself in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area
Also this Schema 1 does not only express that each kind of general stories has another subject matter, but also that their developments and those of the stories on territorial cohesion and spatial planning themselves can be followed through time, as will be done below.

E.1.2 The stories framing this usage area

Although the framework of general stories is neat, four of the five kinds harbour an abundant enough variety to subdivide them (shown in darker and lighter shades of the general stories’ colour in Schema 1). This makes this scene of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area less neat, but it remains a clear framework due to the clarity (and comparability) of these subdivisions. As shown below in the treatments of framing stories on, respectively, public objectives, the Lisbon Strategy, institutional arrangements, society constructions, and processual and substantive coherence.

The general stories on public objectives can be separated in those on economic and, later on, social balance (darker blue), economic growth (lighter blue) and the environment (lightest blue). The public objective of insuring harmonious development came into the Treaty of Rome which established the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957; this is thus the oldest objective of the three. The other public objectives emerged just after the message of 1999 that the least prosperous Member States caught up, that is, it took a long time since the Single European Act (SEA), which created the Single European Market (SEM) in 1986 and further promoted harmonious development, for this usage area to be framed with other public objectives. Although the plea against disparities remains – this while activities remain concentrated in the central European regions and differences on the regional level increased –, more purely economic growth concerns start to be expressed progressively from the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000 on (see below), especially in pursuits for competitiveness – e.g. in 2005 it is both conveyed that the Second Cohesion Report was barely interested in competitiveness and that the Sapir Report from 2003 aims to counteract the declining European Union growth and competitiveness. The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area is thus substantively framed by a long promotion of economic and/or social balance and recently emerging concern with economic growth.

Notwithstanding the importance of European Union Enlargement in 2004, and the related endorsement of solidarity with the new (Eastern) Member States, already from their recent start a tension between the public objectives of balance and growth comes to the fore; the environmental objective only appears since 2004 and seldom as an independent factor (e.g. sustainability as a to be incorporated agenda). This tension is mostly implicit in rallies for, through the years, stabilisation or speeding up, targeting equity or efficiency, focusing on competitiveness or reducing disparities, and for strengthening the social or modernising economically. When explicitly mentioned in 2005, the disagreement is on whether these objectives go together in the long run as efficiency and equity or, the other extreme, that the market economy generates injustices; what is also telling, is a backward looking story from 2006 that describes a tension inside the European Commission (after the Sapir Report) between the DG’s Enterprise and Industry, Research and Development and Transport and Energy versus DG Regio. Thus, while a backward looking story in 2005 notes that their interplay fluctuated over time, the general stories on public objectives seem to show a developing disagreement: not anymore the traditional support for economic balance only, but a recent combination of balance and growth (and the environment to a lesser degree).

The general stories on economic growth, which amongst others state that the European Union should be the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy, were boosted in the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy by the European Council in 2000. The general stories on this strategy which emerge in four years since its adoption always promote it. There nevertheless appear some differences in interpretation. In 2004 there is for
instance stated that there is aimed for Europe to be the most competitive, but that this strategy would also aim at making Member States and regions competitive in a globalised economy (i.e. most competitive on which level). The addition of the environment to the Lisbon Strategy as a third strand during the European Council in Gothenburg in 2001 (i.e. incorporating the sustainability agenda) increases the amount of such minor differences; as shown in 2005 by a combination with the public objective of the environment, which now declares that the Lisbon strategy wants to turn Europe into the most competitive area of sustainable growth. Strangely enough, this year after the Enlargement and the ensuing larger disparities between Member States – making the message of 1999 that the least prosperous Member States have caught up less momentous –, the European Council revived the Lisbon Strategy that focuses on growth and jobs in the whole Community instead of in its poorer parts. The general stories on the Lisbon Strategy thus frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area along one side of the developing disagreement on public objectives (i.e. the economic growth side).

Notwithstanding these expressed Lisbon Strategy concerns, a backward looking story holds that its actual progress disappoints; two others from 2006 might give two explanations for this: i) the old Lisbon Strategy would mostly be about goodwill (i.e. less about real actions) and ii) the decision-making on this strategy would have showed a top-down approach (i.e. deciding on the Community level what national governments should do). Even though the (revived) Lisbon Strategy is still labelled as merely “window-dressing” that year, it seems to have become paramount in the European Union and the whole European Commission, with a major role for DG Enterprise and Industry as a consequence, and national policy too. In relating this dominance to public objectives, the dispute is whether it made economic considerations weigh heavier than (traditional) social ones – not to mention the environment – or if this was already the case before its adoption. Either way, the (revived) Lisbon Strategy might at least clearly denote a shift from support for economic balance towards supporting (balanced) growth.

The general stories on institutional arrangements can be divided disproportionately in mostly stories on political institutions (darker red), some on the market (lighter red), which are all related to political institutions again, and few on people (lightest red). To start with the latter, the story from 2006 which states that it are people that make the difference (in collective decision-making) is the only time they are given a role. General stories on political institutions, on the other hand, often frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. This is for instance shown after the European Council of Milan in 1986 (on the way to the SEA), which agreed upon additional areas of competence and institutional changes for the European Union and called for the first IGC. What is more, during the change from the absence of a direct relation between Brussels and the regions since the establishment of DG Regio by the European Commission in 1967 towards local responsibility as a basic principle of the European Commission’s 2001 White Paper on European Governance, as pictured by backward looking stories in 2005, subnational institutional bodies (i.e. mainly regions) are favoured persistently. Even in 2002 the alternatives mentioned are vague “different actors and mechanisms” or state that it is impossible to reach a common European solution due to the divers and important national systems (note that both these alternatives do not go against the subnational); the latter is also echoed when, at the time the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty, intergovernmental bargains as base for Community policy were castigated. Nevertheless, from 2004 on the scenery does change due to the strong calls for European Union involvement and a combination of forces from various governmental levels (e.g. networking), as illustrated by the Committee of the Region’s Territorial Dialogue between the European Commission and regional/local governments in 2006. This usage
area is thus processually seen similarly framed as substantively: by traditional support for European Union institutions and a recent combination of them with (mostly) regional ones.

During this change, general stories on the market emerge; this thus almost two decades after the European Council of Milan also agreed upon the completion of the internal market. They are always linked to the state in this, albeit for a greater role of local public and private actors in 2002, implicitly in a call to weaken European Union liberalisation activities, or by encouraging European Union and state intervention in the market in 2004 and 2005 respectively. One of the abovementioned differences in interpretation of the Lisbon Strategy might fit here (i.e. most competitive on which level), as it is concerned with political institutions and the market. This because this strategy is said to be paramount at both the European Union and national level and in its making to have been decided in a top-down manner for private actors as well. Moreover, in 2005 there seems to be a quarrel on whether regions are the level to realise Lisbon or whether its realisation (e.g. concerning innovation and business environment) lies in the hands of the Member States. Other important additions to these general stories in 2006 might show a contextual fragment of them. That is to say, they critically describe that the European Union cannot and does not define its interest, the existing power structures of its institutions provide an uneven field, and that there is public failure in the delivery mechanisms. Hence, the general stories on institutional arrangements that frame the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area show (en)trenched disputes on favouring different political bodies to intervene in (mainly) the market. The Lisbon Strategy might then indicate a surpassing of both, as it spreads through all government levels and their relation to markets.

General stories on society constructions can be considered as arranging the ones on the three kinds of institutional arrangements. Although also those on society constructions can be divided into political (darker grey), economic (lighter grey), and social ones (lightest grey) – whereby here the social is strongly present –, mostly combinations appear – which is not surprising when it is considered that it entails a discussion on the whole system harbouring the three spheres. Their emergence in 1914 also shows a trait of these discussions. That is to say, they are concerned with ideal types that capture complex social phenomena (e.g. in 2004 and 2005 it is posed that social models conceptualise the ways in which different types of societies construct social interdependence). Early on, the dispute on the harmonisation of social regulations as precondition for industrial market integration resulted in the political decoupling of economic integration and social-protection on the European level in 1953; thereby probably laying the ground for the determination to complete the internal market as ventilated during the Council of Milan. In 2002 and 2005 European integration is still characterised as being decoupled, whereby the later characterisation holds that this asymmetricality led to an increasing demand for recreating a level playing field and a recoupling of social-protection and economic integration issues on the Community level. Although it is only since the Enlargement that general stories call for the ESM (e.g. reducing disparities) besides economic and monetary union, backward looking stories around that time hold that centuries-old contested debates lay in the social models, those on a European Social Model (ESM) emerged after the SEA, and “the French” injected the European Model of Society (EMS) into integration debates (e.g. in 2006 Delors is pointed out). The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area might thus be framed by disputes that are even deeper (en)trenched than those on institutional arrangements.

The explosion of these stories on society constructions took place in 2005, that is, when the Constitutional Treaty’s was not ratified and the Lisbon Strategy reinstated; a backward looking story from 2006 thereby gives some structural reasons for the latter: a globalising market in the course of international integration, liberalisation, rapid technological development, an enlarged job market and pressing problems with
unemployment all over the European Union. Three different systematic discussions then come to the fore in this explosion: i) on the relations between the State, the market and civic society, ii) the State as provider and interventionist or facilitator and enabler, and iii) on individual liberty and social responsibility. It is also posed that the ‘EMS’ might merely be a rhetorical device in these discussions (e.g. justifying subsidies for services) or represent a real conflict between (British and Franco-German) ways of constructing social interdependence. This frame of fundamental discussions in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area might thus be used opportunistically besides that it shows deep (en)trenched disputes.

Furthermore, the report that the 20th century welfare-state model of public action is in crises seems to fit in these disputes nicely, and also to relate to the expressed ambiguity about whether the economic emphasis in the ESM is old or if it erodes it. Yet, in 2006 this flurry quietened, even though the EMS is purported to gain prominence in the debate about the direction of European integration; whereby the liberal school of thought, with competitiveness as key concept, is alleged of challenging the distribution and convergence philosophy. Hence, structural tensions seem to gather under the exclusive political wishes to secure community existence in 1993 and the calls for the best results and against a “double speed” European Union in 2005 and 2006 – e.g. in 2006 a forward looking story holds that conflicts over resource distribution in the ESM will increase in the future.

With the complication of three kinds of general stories (i.e. those presenting three public objectives, disagreements on institutional arrangements, and disputed society constructions), what might be astonishing, is that the ones on processual (darker green) and substantive coherence (lighter green) are less elaborate. That is, there is much involvement between these stories, but the need put the parts they talk about in one piece is hardly expressed. General stories on coherence silently start to appear at the time of a by the European Commission sponsored study on ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’. This with a statement that combines processual and substantive coherence: partnerships would, amongst others, facilitate a coordinated approach. These general stories strengthen a little bit since the Sapir Report added force to these concerns, as shown in the extra call to integrate European Union priorities and the linkage of cooperation (e.g. of stakeholders) to networking for political institutions as told by the then emerging general stories. The need or promotion of ways to coordinate activities thus did not so much frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area (as was the case for the (post-)ESDP process usage area).

Later a question on coherence and its responds seem to appear. However, the questioned sector-specific nature of Community policy as depicted in 2005 is not really answered the year later, as an allocation of tasks is proposed in which each level should matter and the Community level concern itself with the coherence of policy and investments (i.e. from various sectors) – the more so because the European Union is held to struggle in defining strategies that tackle future challenges in a forward looking, coherent, and integrative way. Nonetheless, two ways come forward: i) the Lisbon Strategy is in 2006 said to be a way of coordinating policies, which would increase its efficacy (and how much general stories on it frame this usage area), and ii) a business approach can be filtered out of the general stories since 2002, which is supposed to be part of the since the 1970’s burgeoning new development paradigm (i.e. an approach that focusses on the supply side, money for value, endogenous growth, entrepreneurship, is solution-oriented, and sees culture as growing industry). Recently, the concern with processual and substantive coherence therefore does frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area, but only weakly so and without clear answers.
The main characteristic of all these general stories that frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area is that they outline essential discordances without highlighting consensus though cooperation or coordination. This both holds in the developing disagreement after the recent substantive shift and the processual frictions through the alignments of politics, economy and society. Instead of merely supporting economic balance as before, the usage area namely has to deal with balance and/or growth, whereby the Lisbon Strategy aligns to the latter. When it concerns society constructions and (its) institutional arrangements, deeply (en)trrenched disputes between different political bodies for market intervention (i.e. European, national, regional institutions) then point to growing structural tensions between securing community existence and best results.

E.1.3 The stories structuring this usage area

As mentioned above, the structuring stories on territorial cohesion and cohesion and regional policy appear to be more complex than the framing ones. Although the subdivisions of the general stories already showed that the framework of this usage area is more complex than it seemed (making the structuring stories relatively “less” complex), we could still use a working hypothesis to guide the reader through the lay out of the structuring stories. Adding their timing (i.e. together territorial cohesion and regional policy only start to be debated later on) to the same word of two (i.e. cohesion) then leads to the following working hypothesis: territorial cohesion is stronger related to cohesion policy than to regional policy. The observant reader of course already noted that in the structuring stories there appear fewer connections between regional policy and territorial cohesion than between cohesion policy and territorial cohesion. This working hypothesis goes beyond such counting though, and includes what these stories tell too. Before noting their relationships, and thus support for or falsification of this section’s working hypothesis, however, they are discussed one by one.

After the Treaty of Rome instated to reduce regional disparities in 1957 and the European Commission established DG Regional Policy ten years later, stories on regional policy itself emerged with calls for its formalisation at the time of the 1986 European Council of Milan, something the SEA established a year later. Since then, the outlines, basis, and aim of regional policy are mostly discussed – and treated in this order below. That is, all promote regional policy; it is only relativised when compared to other State activities in 2002 and just once, in 2005, challenges to this European intervention are touched upon. For instance, a backward looking story in 2005 reminisces that the old regional policy aimed to equalise Member States’ budget contributions – an origin in 2006 related to the unequal benefits of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) – and its support for national regional economic policies in the early 1990’s is noted. Either way, the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area is structured by the promotion and formalisation of regional policy.

Although regional policy might have become more self-directed since the SEA, the promotion to interpret its outlines wider remains. This also after the discussions on the Structural reforms from the mid-1980s until the late-1990s towards the Council of Berlin, which gave regional policy for the 2000-2006 period two regionally restricted objectives (i.e. for regions whose development is lagging behind and those undergoing structural conversion) and a horizontal applicable one (i.e. for education, training, employment). The promotion for a wider interpretation is for instance shown by the call for a regional policy covering all regions, which would increase its geographical scope. A push towards a wider geographical interpretation of regional policy therefore also clearly structures this usage area.

In the middle of the period 2000-2006 – which, a backward story in 2005 mentions, aimed to develop the European Union to facilitate its Enlargement – and after the Sapir Report, the then described basis for especially regional policy is evaluated as wrong: intergovernmental bargains. Stories on regional policy itself, on the other hand, more align
with the disputed general ones on political institutions when they favour regions. Two of their processual statements might add to this by indirectly illustrating a disapproval of intergovernmental bargains. That is, in 2005 it is remarked that the European Commission introduced decentralisation for the effectiveness of regional policy – even though the empowerment of regions is not marked as an original regional policy aspiration – and there is called for a regional policy that with the principle of subsidiarity avoids both a duplication of Member States’ actions and contradictions between intervention levels.\textsuperscript{51} Calls to get regional policy out of the Member States’s hands – and into those of the European Union and regions – thus structure the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area too.

Another proposed reform of regional aid guidelines for a new regional policy framework in 2004 substantively relates to these influences. It would namely direct regional policy towards the Lisbon Strategy (probably still with the regional interpretation from the general stories) and thereby, as stated in 2006, risk its traditional focus on the Structural Funds (SF) – \textit{nota bene} less emphasis on poorer regions, even after Enlargement.\textsuperscript{52} Furthermore, stories in 2005 and 2006 respectively state that DG Regio itself is not interested in competitiveness and the emerging focus on this, as shown by the general stories on public objectives, and is even assessed (by itself) as threatening its existence.\textsuperscript{53} Hence, the stories on regional policy itself present various trail of disputes that structure the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. These first direct the formalised regional policy out of the control of the Member States, then for an increase in its geographical scope, and finally towards the (revived) Lisbon Strategy, what could perhaps lead to DG Regio’s demise.

Since the SEA included cohesion policy – as is recollected in 1996 and 2006: for southern and peripheral Member States – it is supported constantly as well; whereby it is noted in 2002 that the popularity of the term ‘cohesion’ increases (i.e. this support might have effects).\textsuperscript{54} The development of stories on the aims of cohesion policy thereby reflects the move of general stories on public objectives from balance only to growth too, especially with the ones on the Lisbon Strategy. As stated in 2006: cohesion policy was a countermeasure against the SEM and largely based on the distribution and convergence philosophy.\textsuperscript{55} Moreover, since 2001 cohesion policy is related to general stories on society constructions, as statements read that it is an action for public authorities in a European model which redistributes and empowers for participation in the economy.\textsuperscript{56} In 2005 there is added that the decoupling of European economic integration and social-protection issues created an inherent and persistent tension between the European Union’s economic competitiveness and cohesion policies.\textsuperscript{57} With its traditional support for cohesion as balance, the constant promotion of cohesion policy thus structures the essential discordances between both balance and growth and securing community existence and best results that frame the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.

However, following the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000, cohesion policy is positively linked to competitiveness too. At the time of the European Commission’s Third Cohesion Report in 2004, there is even a movement of changing cohesion policy towards the Lisbon Strategy and letting it cover the whole European Union of 25 Member States (i.e. not only the “poor ones”).\textsuperscript{58} Although in 2006 a backward looking story says that the European Commission concentrated on its traditional cohesion policy after the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification (e.g. convergence), in 2005 the European Council reduced the funding for it – making the Lisbon-oriented focus of DG Regio and DG Employment’s non-paper ‘Cohesion Policy in Support for Growth and Jobs’ the more important (i.e. less money, more selective spending), with clear consequences for the European Commission’s draft CSG for Cohesion Policy.\textsuperscript{59} No wonder, thus, that the recent support for cohesion for growth also structures this usage area when it concerns those essential discordances that frame it.
The need for an effective cohesion policy, which is expressed since the Sapir Report, might also increase in importance because of such a reduction of Cohesion policy for the Lisbon Strategy (e.g. with an emphasis on value for money as in the business approach mentioned above). Whether it has effect is then gauged against growth goals. It was within these huge changes that the Cohesion policy regulations for the 2007-2013 funding period were negotiated in 2006 (see Appendix F); they thereby reflect the general stories on institutional arrangements by not being intergovernmental and including supra- and subnational public and private actors. All in all, stories on cohesion policy itself thus parallel those on regional policy itself, but then without a focus on regions and with a stronger emphasis on competitiveness.

Also all stories on territorial cohesion itself are for the concept, although it is only once, in 2006, explicitly mentioned as important. While the concept emerged in the early 1990s, these stories began when DG Regio’s Commissioner Barnier invoked it in 1999, whereby territorial cohesion is immediately labelled as a European Union policy; something which can be seen as illustrative for the aggressive pushing of the concept by the European Commission noted in 2006. Obviously, this promotion of territorial cohesion structures the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.

Through the years, a major dispute ensues on the role of territorial cohesion vis-à-vis European Union policy (also see Appendix C on the IGCs usage area). The statements thereby go through three stages: from i) territorial cohesion being a European Union policy until in 2003 the Committee of the Regions even institutionalises the concept in a commission (COTER), via ii) European Union policy just embracing aspects of territorial cohesion when the concept starts to be debated extensively at the time of the Galway Conference and DG Regio’s Interim Report on it in 2004, to iii) thereafter additional statements on European Union intervention being questionable in this (e.g. the European Union cannot use the concept) and that its institutions do use it while there is no legislative process underway addressing territorial cohesion per se. In 2006 some backward looking stories demonstrate this uncertainty around the usage of territorial cohesion in European Union institutions. They namely pose that the 2005 Guellec Report was to make the European Parliament the first European Union institution that makes the concept a political objective, this while the European Commission would have turned its back to it after the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty. Nonetheless, the same year the European Commission related the concept to the making of a White Paper on territorial cohesion, something the Guellec Report proposed. This dispute about whether territorial cohesion is European Union policy and the ensuing uncertainty structure this usage area in a very fundamental way of course.

Besides this vagueness whether territorial cohesion will be a European Union policy, another (perhaps premature) discussion is about who is responsible for a (possible) territorial cohesion policy. Suggestions since 2003 mostly point towards a direction in line with the concurrent general stories on political institutions and cooperation, that is, a shared responsibility. While administrative capacity for territorial cohesion policy on the Community level would for instance be problematic around 2005, it is proposed that Member States do this work. Two years later a possible tension between substance and process might even point to a more territorial cohesion way to resolve these responsibility issues. Territorial cohesion is namely not only described as a substantive principle but as a method as well (e.g. a European Union Territorial Cohesion Strategy). This discussion away from a sole responsibility for territorial cohesion policy thus structures this usage area by adding more detail to the dispute of whether this is a policy of the European Union.

For territorial cohesion as substantive principle one should then note that the concept is practically from the start mainly related to general stories on economic growth (and also to...
environmental objectives). This is well before this was the case with regional and cohesion policy themselves, what could thus mean that these concerns come from, or at least with, the concept. Substantively, this includes debates such as those on cohesion policy itself: is the concept for solidarity or competitiveness, thereby adding whether territorial cohesion is a basis for these public objectives (e.g. the Lisbon Strategy) or vice versa. Similarly, in 2005, the year most general stories on society constructions appear, the concept is said to be rooted in the European Model and bring the political tensions of the ESM to the fore. Hence, the stories on territorial cohesion itself show that the concept was always supported, also when it included competitiveness concerns, but that this does not self-evidently lead to a territorial cohesion policy of the European Union.

Stories on regional policy, cohesion policy, and territorial cohesion themselves also relate these three. What allows us to test this section’s working hypothesis (i.e. territorial cohesion is stronger related to cohesion policy than to regional policy). Since 1996 the policies are strongly linked (e.g. regional policy as core of cohesion policy). In 2004, at the time the European Parliament’s Committee on Regional Policy (REGI) requested studies on the future of Cohesion Policy, voices even rose for an obligation of this linkage on the Member States. After this, the regional-cohesion policy-combination mirrors their separate developments towards a growth orientation. The old style regional and cohesion policies are for instance pictured as incapable for the present challenges because they are only moved by equity considerations. Cohesion policy is also said to aim at improving the competitiveness of regions and a new regional policy hybrid would link cohesion policy and the Lisbon Strategy. When framed by the general stories on the Lisbon Strategy, especially these latter structuring stories might show that, due to the “competitiveness mantra” as existential threat, DG Regio tried to explain cohesion policy as an important tool, or even as laying the ground, for this strategy as observed in 2006 (e.g. cohesion policy for all regions). Hence, the strong relation between regional and cohesion policy themselves and their increasing orientation towards growth structure this usage area. This strength and similarity of development goes against a stronger relationship between territorial cohesion and cohesion policy than between regional policy and the concept, as it seems difficult to separate these policies.

Whether territorial cohesion is stronger related to cohesion policy than regional policy should be answered after their separate relationships to the concept are treated though. Together they are related to it since 2003, when the Committee of the Regions passed a resolution on territorial cohesion. The concept was hereby first posed to be fundamental and at the heart of the debate about the future of both policies, while they are fused later on, when territorial cohesion is considered as justification for regional cohesion policy. Moreover, regional and cohesion policy are only somewhat distinguished in these threefold connections twice. In 2006 the concept would denote that cohesion policy is more than a regional policy of only convergence and financial distribution – a development argued for in the general stories on public objectives and those on regional and cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves separately – and the Lisbon Strategy and cohesion policy would be different from territorial cohesion and regional policy – which would also entail a realignment of the general story on the Lisbon Strategy away from the concept and regional policy. If regional policy, cohesion policy, and territorial cohesion themselves are all three taken together, they thus indicate that the concept could also be stronger related to regional policy than to cohesion policy. Moreover, this threefold bond does not only structure the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area, but also points to its cohesiveness.

Yet, surprisingly enough, without cohesion policy, regional policy and territorial cohesion themselves only relate since 2005; that is: two years after COTER was established and one year after DG Regio published its Interim Territorial Cohesion Report. The main
discussion here is on whether territorial cohesion should and does depart from existing policies of DG Regio towards, for instance, leading its policies to be more than redistribution only (e.g. the Lisbon Strategy) or acting less centralised, whereby the former might strengthen the third general hypothesis on expanding the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action. Although this discussion might be caused by territorial cohesion’s vagueness, as it is no explicit aim of DG Regio, backward looking stories nonetheless state that DG Regio used the concept from 2001 on (e.g. until 2004 DG Regio would even have done this as the driving force, but in 2006 just a part of this DG would have). Meanwhile, the REGI Committee of the European Parliament surely did use the concept, as its abovementioned Guellec Report on the Role of Territorial Cohesion in Regional Development testifies. More in extreme though, territorial cohesion is noticed as playing a legitimating role for DG Regio and being the raison d’être for regional development policy; although this is tempered by the statement that the response of regional policy to the concept depends on its future geographical scope, objectives, and implementation approach (see above). Hence, stories relating regional policy and territorial cohesion themselves structure this usage area with discussions that might open up leeways for regional policy to expand. Although these relations appear late, they do connect both in firm ways (e.g. to redirect regional policy).

Stories that relate cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves appear to be organised around the European Commission’s cohesion reports, and positively so; only once they are related negatively: when DG Environment is in 2006 said to not use the concept for cohesion policy. They begin three years after the First Cohesion Report from 1996 did not mention the concept, this with the proposal to include territorial cohesion in the future Cohesion Reports. What follows in 2001, is that in that years’ Second Cohesion Report the concept would have been started to be used descriptively; this report namely has a chapter on it, something later described as the first time in the European policy context that territorial cohesion has been given some substance. The Third Cohesion Report from 2004 then is the central and exemplary document for the relationship between cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves, as it elaborates on the concept; according to a backward looking story from 2006, the European Commission supported the concept with this report. This report’s treatment of the concept could accord with the general stories on public objectives and the Lisbon Strategy, as it would be in development and competitiveness terms. More important though, is that this treatment is in 2005 also characterised as soft-pedalled for tactical reasons. As mentioned above, disputes on whether territorial cohesion will be a European Union policy and who is responsible structure this usage area (e.g. also see Appendix C for the Constitutional Treaty). Still, the year after the Third Cohesion Report these reports are mentioned as the place for an analysis of the concept or the contribution of Community policies to territorial cohesion. Moreover, the European Commission relates territorial cohesion to a Fourth Cohesion Report that year, which is in 2006 looked forward to as the document in which the concept will be used mostly. Notwithstanding uncertainty about whether and how territorial cohesion will be included in European Union policy structures this usage area, the relationship between the concept and cohesion policy themselves does so by increasingly opening the door for this.

It is only since the Third Cohesion Report though that the relationship between the concept, which is by then extensively debated, and cohesion policy themselves becomes denser. The main debate here is similar to the one on the relationship between territorial cohesion and regional policy themselves – which linked just one year later. That is, should and does territorial cohesion depart from existing cohesion policy? Even though the concept is supported in its own right under it, there is a disagreement on whether territorial cohesion is new in cohesion policy (e.g. as a dimension). In 2005 the concept is for instance described as emphasising aspects of cohesion policy but also that it calls for an inflection
thereof. Paradoxically enough, it are the organisations which were always closely involved in cohesion policy that are said to support a broad usage of the concept of territorial cohesion (e.g. more than cohesion policy in a narrow sense). Stories relating cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves thus also structure this usage area with discussions that might open up leeways for (now) cohesion policy to expand.

Other debates on the relationship between cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves are on responsibility and the Lisbon Strategy; these are also shown by stories on territorial cohesion and those of regional and cohesion policy themselves respectively. The responsibility issue is here touched upon by that European Union intervention in territorial cohesion is deemed as questionable because the main actors in cohesion policy would remain the Member States. However, simultaneously it is posed that post-2006 cohesion policy proposals offer stronger and broader instruments for territorial cohesion too (e.g. a European Union Cohesion Strategy addressing territorial cohesion). Hence, because the relationship between cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves matches the discussion away from a sole responsibility for territorial cohesion policy (i.e. the one that adds more detail to the dispute of whether this is a policy of the European Union), how this discussion structures the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area is reinforced.

The issue of the Lisbon Strategy might for the concept point to the, compared to regional policy, stronger emphasis of cohesion policy on competitiveness. It is namely noted that the development in which cohesion policy supports the Lisbon Strategy also affects territorial cohesion. DG Regio and DG Employment’s non-paper orienting cohesion policy in support of the Lisbon Strategy, which has a chapter on territorial cohesion, seems to go further in this than the Third Cohesion Report’s emphasis on competitiveness for the concept. That stories on cohesion policy itself structure this usage area by adding more detail to the framing stories on the Lisbon Strategy (one side of the general stories on public objectives) thus returns in the relationship of this policy with territorial cohesion.

Yet, in 2006 a statement problematises the linkage made between cohesion policy and the Lisbon Strategy while relating to the issue of responsibility. It namely remarks that with the concept the discrepancies between the Lisbon Strategy and cohesion policy can be tuned locally; this is in line with the development of the general stories on political institutions beyond the European Union ones and the orientation of regional policy towards acting less centralised for territorial cohesion. It is thus safe to say that the debates in relationship between cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves evolve around the questions of whether the concept is new in this policy, who has responsibility for it, and how does the Lisbon Strategy comes into play here. Although this is similar to how the relationship between regional policy and territorial cohesion themselves structure this usage area (i.e. firm), the relationship between territorial cohesion and cohesion policy themselves appears to be more developed (e.g. the cohesion reports), what gives more room for both an expansion of this policy and the inclusion of the concept in European policy in general (e.g. regional policy too).

The main characteristic of all these stories that structure the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area by being on regional and cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves, is that they lay out some lines of basic disagreement. For regional policy itself these are concerned with less national control, a wider geographical scope, and an alignment to the Lisbon Strategy. The latter two also hold for cohesion policy, with its heavier emphasis on competitiveness, and only the latter is shared by the stories on territorial cohesion itself. The working hypothesis of this section is, however, concerned with their relationships to see whether territorial cohesion is stronger related to cohesion policy than to regional policy. Summatting the above mentioned findings on this gives more points against than for it: i) the relationship between regional and cohesion policy themselves seems to be very strong, ii)
they have very similar developments when they are both concerned in itself and iii) if related to the concept, iv) in threefold connections a possibility for the antithesis of this section’s working hypothesis is shown, and v) later on also a firm connection is made between regional policy and territorial cohesion. Only one such finding speaks for the working hypothesis: the relationship between cohesion policy and the concept themselves seems to be debated into robustness. If a difference exists between the strength of the relationship between regional and cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves, a conclusion of what these structuring stories say might then go against the counting of the findings above. That is to say, they point to the relationship between regional policy and the concept as one that is mainly tried to be linked strongly (somewhat out of the blue even), while they point to the one between cohesion policy and the concept as often linked already (before an attempt is made to make it stronger).

Then again, the differences between regional and cohesion policy, besides their relative emphasis on regions and competitiveness respectively, seem not to matter much for territorial cohesion statements; this might further legitimate the ambiguous label of this usage area. What is more, either way these supports do not necessarily lead to a formal European Union territorial cohesion policy. In the relations of the concept to regional and especially cohesion policy themselves, the main debates on whether it changes these policies (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) namely emerge just when the statement that territorial cohesion is already European Union policy starts to be disputed. This attempt to expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action with the concept thereby acknowledges the third general hypothesis (i.e. the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area combines a cherry-picking of substances from the (post-)ESDP process usage area and a roaming of the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines to expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action). What is perhaps more important though, is that no story that relates the concept to either one of these policies sees the Lisbon Strategy as a threat. Hence, regional and cohesion policy and territorial cohesion seem to mutually support each other for themselves when they establish a formal usage of the concept in these official policy areas, use the concept to increase regional and cohesion policy’s official area of influence, and/or link these policies to the Lisbon Strategy for their continued existence.

E.1.4 The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area is framed and structured by discordant promotions (with spatial planning)

For the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area holds the same as for the (post-)ESDP process usage area: the comparison between these stories on regional policy itself, cohesion policy itself, territorial cohesion itself, and those linking them remains superficial as long as it is not clarified what they promote. Here the same holds for the two main findings for this usage area’s structure: i) although both policies and the concept are promoted in themselves, this does not have to lead to a European territorial cohesion policy and ii) the usage of the concept appears to relate more to cohesion than to regional policy. What does this actually mean for how territorial cohesion affects regional/cohesion policy? The more so, as the clear-cut divisions portrayed in the general stories that frame this usage area suggest some essential choices are or have to be made. Do these promotions for instance favour balance or growth and prefer one political institution over another to intervene in the market?

Another issue which is not mentioned yet, although it is portrayed by the stories on regional and cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves, is spatial planning – which is of importance, as the first general hypothesis of this appendix holds that this usage area cherry-picks substances from the one of the (post-)ESDP process. Although not much is said about spatial planning, some very indicative statements do appear. These start in 2001 when, besides “the French” activity in European regional policy and interest in spatial
planning and cohesion policy four years earlier, the German Planning Advisory Council also related cohesion policy and spatial development.\textsuperscript{103} That is, in that year of the Second Cohesion Report it is said that the descriptive usage of territorial cohesion draws on the ESDP and both are mentioned by the European Parliament’s resolution on this report the year later; note that this is the one and only time spatial planning is mentioned when the concept and regional/cohesion policy themselves are related.\textsuperscript{104} Even more fundamental is that at the time territorial cohesion is claimed as already being European Union policy, the European Commission is described as using the concept to reformulate spatial planning as a Community competency.\textsuperscript{105} Although such statements seldom appear, they do point to influences between regional/cohesion policy and spatial planning through the concept of territorial cohesion, that is, to relations between the Regional/Cohesion policy and (post-)ESDP process usage areas. This are influences that could overlap with or form how territorial cohesion affects regional/cohesion policy.

However, when regional/cohesion policy and territorial cohesion start to be debated extensively in 2005, something important is noted for spatial planning as well. An intensification of the relationship between European Union policies and spatial planning policies, within the Member States for a European Union Strategy on territorial cohesion, and in multi-level governance, would namely be feasible, but difficult as well (e.g. the European Union has no competency for spatial planning).\textsuperscript{106} Notwithstanding this absence of a European Union competency (see Appendix C), spatial planning is regarded as possible justification for cohesion policy in 2006.\textsuperscript{107} What would fit such a formation as well, is that DG Regio is characterised as not to be called DG Spatial Policy due to sensitivities, but that it wants to lead the Rotterdam process more in line with cohesion policy (see Appendix D).\textsuperscript{108} A deeper more detailed look at what a possible formal European Union territorial cohesion policy would entail is thus needed for both the leading question on the changes of regional/cohesion policy with the concept and the first general hypothesis that states that substances are cherry-picked from the (post-)ESDP process.

Hence, to again be thorough, the territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy stories that are framed by the general stories and structured by the stories on territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy themselves can be ordered in more fine-grain. Also here by the topics that seem to be assumed as those as to be discussed under territorial cohesion (i.e. its metanarratives) and as part of the concept’s regional/cohesion policy context (i.e. the narratives with an own dynamic). The similarities and differences between (the order of) the stories of the territorial cohesion metanarratives and narratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area can then point to answers to the leading question of this appendix too. That is, below we can find out what the influence of the concept is on the direction of European Regional/Cohesion policy.

E.2 Territorial cohesion metanarratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area

E.2.1 Introducing the four metanarratives

Also in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area most territorial cohesion stories evolve around a single metanarrative, of which there are four. The most consequential metanarrative for the concept’s usage here rests upon the premise that something cannot be an objective and dimension at the same time. It namely makes a difference whether territorial cohesion is used as a relative independent objective to which (cohesion) policy is oriented or as a territorial dimension going through policies aiming at economic and social cohesion. Therefore, as foreshadowed by the stories on territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy themselves, the relation of the concept to the older and formally established objectives of economic and
social cohesion is a main discussion in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. The label for this metanarrative then is ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’, and it is in this usage area one of the two main pillars around which territorial cohesion stories gather.

With the possibility that territorial cohesion becomes a part of regional/cohesion policy, a prominent question might be: what does regional/cohesion policy actually promote with the concept: balance, economic objectives, and environmental ones. ‘Balance/Economy/Environment’ is therefore the label of the metanarrative which gathers the relevant stories. Another metanarrative which is not a pillar either is labelled ‘coordination’. That not that many territorial cohesion stories appear on this issue is not that surprising. This because the Regional/Cohesion usage area’s general stories on processual and substantive coherence are not elaborate and silently appear in a combined start since the European Commission sponsored study on ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’. Yet, the European Union is, amongst others, also held to struggle in defining strategies that tackle future challenges in a coherent and integrative way; the Lisbon Strategy and a business approach might be up for this task though. In this context territorial cohesion stories promote both processual and substantive coordination.

The other metanarrative which can be considered as a pillar harbours the most territorial cohesion stories, compared to the other metanarratives, and the ones that are formally based too. These are respectively concerned with specific territories and accessibility. Although only some are on the latter issue, they are important because they express the official base of the concept in the Treaty of Amsterdam’s Article 16 on services (see Appendix C). The same Treaty then posed in its Article 158 to reduce the backwardness of the least favoured regions or islands, including rural areas as well, but this without mentioning territorial cohesion. Yet, with the concept these issues of territories and accessibility are combined, what makes this combination of the most numerous with the formally based territorial cohesion stories a metanarrative labelled ‘territories and accessibility’. The appearance and development of the stories per metanarrative can then be summarised schematically as shown below in Schema 2a ‘Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area (without relating stories)’.

Regional/Cohesion Policy Schema 2a
Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area (without relating stories)
These metanarratives give a basic order of the territorial cohesion stories in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. A common characteristic of the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic in the (post-)ESDP process usage area then returns here: there seem to be no contradicting stories. Although one could argue that stories that depict territorial cohesion as territorial dimension go against those depicting it as cohesion objective (or vice versa), they do not do so explicitly (i.e. no stories tell that something does not have to do with territorial cohesion). Hence, also in this usage area no metanarrative is refuted, nor does one consist of a dominant story opposed by its counterstory. However, besides that the
intensity in which the metanarratives are debated thus differs (i.e. the two pillar metanarratives with a higher intensity), also here the way in which they should be expressed seems to be discussed. As this matters for the influence the concept could have on European Regional/Cohesion policy, also these appearances and developments will thus be scrutinised. Below the developments of the four metanarratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area will therefore be described one by one by identifying and relating their main discussions.

E.2.2 Cohesion objective/Territorial dimension metanarrative

The ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative is the oldest metanarrative of this usage area, as it already emerged when the concept itself did in 1991. The question that organises the metanarrative thus is whether territorial cohesion is either a cohesion objective or (territorial) dimension of cohesion objectives. In Schema 2a the stories that form the debate of whether territorial cohesion is either the one or the other are coloured green. The working hypothesis for this metanarrative then might be derived from two general hypotheses. Those that together pose that this usage area roam the by the IGCs drawn confines and expands the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action namely lead to the following: the concept is only used as territorial dimension of economic and social cohesion to open the door for an on a par placement of territorial cohesion. However, before this primary debate of the metanarrative is portrayed, the separate stances are treated: first territorial cohesion as territorial dimension (coloured purple in Schema 2a), then as cohesion objective (pink).

At the time Barnier invoked the concept in 1999, the first statement that denotes the territorial dimension with it held that territorial cohesion has a territorial dimension. It took five years before this basic beginning was picked up and elaborated, this with the main issues of territorial balance and the European Model of Society (EMS); this was structured by the then emerging discussion on the relationship of territorial cohesion to regional/cohesion policy themselves. The concept is for instance disputed to address territorial imbalances; this also in accordance with the stories that relate the concept and regional/cohesion policy themselves insofar they do not see the Lisbon Strategy as a threat (as territorial disparities are considered a territorial cohesion problem if they affect the overall competitiveness of the European Union economy). When concerned with the European Social Model (ESM), the concept only appears as territorial dimension in 2005 though; this is in line with an implicit discussion shown by the intersections of the general stories on society constructions and those on cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves. That is to say, while “the French” are said to have introduced territorial cohesion as the EMS’s spatial component into the European debate, it seems to remain unresolved whether the concept’s spatialisation of this model’s social-protection concerns can go together with territorial cohesion also giving a spatial dimension to the political tensions embedded in the EMS. Still, these main issues of territorial balance and the EMS have no major developments.

Nota bene, this absence of development in the increasingly discussed territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension seems to be stamped at the time the European Parliament’s REGI Committee supports a European Union Territorial Cohesion Strategy. That is, in 2006 no other issues are treated beyond generally mentioning the increasing attention on spatial issues within regional policy due to the concept and that a transversal territorial cohesion potentially changes sectoral thinking at all spatial levels. Hence, when territorial cohesion would be used as territorial dimension for an on a par placement later on, the filling-in of this dimension starts rather late.

Even though territorial cohesion as objective already regularly appeared since the Second Cohesion Report devoted a chapter to the concept, neither this stance develops and is even less elaborated than the territorial dimension one. The main issues are that territorial
cohesion leans towards social cohesion (as in the Treaty of Amsterdam) and/or competitiveness. What is in line with the general stories on the Lisbon Strategy, is that, from this beginning on, it is also held that the usage of the concept is linked to combining competitiveness and social cohesion – once competitiveness is hereby even posed as key cohesion axis. Two other issues treated in 2005 are then framed by the general stories on society constructions and public objectives (thereby linking to the environmental objective of incorporating the sustainability agenda). This with an imperative, if territorial cohesion has to add to the content of economic and social cohesion then it must link with sustainability, and an explanation, the social and territorial cohesion in Member States would largely exist due to national redistributive welfare-state policies. Hence, safe to say that territorial cohesion as objective appears earlier and more regularly than territorial cohesion as territorial dimension. Then again, developments in these stories that back this emergence in the official policy area are even more absent. This might partly be explained by that in 2006 there is still no legislative process underway that addresses territorial cohesion per se. Notwithstanding the appearances that show the possibilities of both stances, the question remains: is territorial cohesion a cohesion objective or territorial dimension? Almost a decade before the stances in this are shown independently, territorial cohesion is mentioned as possible complementary to social and economic cohesion, and this starts the metanarrative. The debate on how the concept should add to these two cohesion objectives, however, begins much later: just after the structuring dispute on the role of territorial cohesion itself vis-à-vis European Union policy succeeded the claim that it is European Union policy. Hereby territorial cohesion is first promoted as new third cohesion dimension (i.e. besides the economic and social cohesion objectives), but simultaneously described as reflecting a growing emphasis on the spatial dimension in European Union policy (i.e. as territorial dimension not even confined to cohesion policy). Through the years, only once a statement dissents, this with the 2006 story that DG Employment and Social Affairs does not discuss the territorial dimension of cohesion with the concept, while the rest fills the continuum between these two poles. On this continuum territorial cohesion is posed as implicit in economic and social cohesion, their precondition, extending beyond them, territorial dimension of cohesion policy, and a new territorial way of doing in general. In 2005 a possible order is made in this. A statement namely goes that the doubt about the added value of territorial cohesion compared to economic and social cohesion makes sense if its territorial approach is assimilated to a sectoral approach with territorial reference units, but if ‘territorial’ is understood in a broad way, then the territorial qualifier applied to cohesion opens wider perspectives. However, after the continuum is carved up in fine slices, in 2006 still no decision cuts the knot that ties this line together. An explanation for this could be the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty as formal policy-making base and the problematic administrative capacity for territorial cohesion policy on the European Union level as practical side to this. The main debate of this territorial cohesion metanarrative therefore does not affirm its working hypothesis, because from the beginning on the concept is both used as cohesion objective and as territorial dimension and no final decision on this is made (yet).

Hence, the concept is not only used as territorial dimension of economic and social cohesion to open the door for an on a par placement of territorial cohesion. While this goes against this section’s working hypothesis, the metanarrative does clearly keep up that the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area roams the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines as frontier (i.e. the second general hypothesis). The on a par placement of territorial cohesion namely did not need an opening of a door, as it already appeared inside – just as territorial cohesion itself was claimed as European Union policy early on. Only after territorial cohesion was not self-evidently considered to be a European Union policy anymore, the concept...
became debated as both cohesion objective and territorial dimension (e.g. using territorial cohesion as territorial dimension for a step back instead of forward). Although territorial cohesion as cohesion objective could entail an additional segment for the regional/cohesion policy area, as the territorial dimension of it the concept can still lead to the area’s enlargement, that is, in depth instead of span.

What is more, when territorial cohesion is used for the territorial dimension of policies in general, then it might not so much expand the regional/cohesion policy area, but increase the potential influence of it on other policy areas. The possibility of overarching territorial strategies in line with the ESDP, as shown in this metanarrative in 2004, could hereby affirm the third general hypothesis. The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area namely seems to combine the transgressing of the formal limits drawn by the IGCs (i.e. for territorial strategies) with selecting parts of the (post-)ESDP process (i.e. the strategies in line with the ESDP) to expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action. Stories in the metanarrative’s main debate put it even stronger in 2003: the territorial cohesion focus in the Second Cohesion Report would be an extension of the appraisal of the territorial dimension beyond the spatial planning sphere while bringing it closer to economic and social cohesion. Although this fits the 2001 description of the European Commission, which would relate territorial cohesion as new third cohesion dimension to the ESDP, a tension surfaces when a note from 2006 is accounted for, that is, those saying that the concept is more than the in economic and social cohesion implied territorial cohesion are spatial planners would (i.e. what turf belongs to whom?). Hence, it seems as if the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative clearly indicates a substantive cherry-picking of the territorial dimension for economic and social cohesion (i.e. the first general hypothesis), this with the possibility of going beyond these objectives.

E.2.3 Balance/Economy/Environment metanarrative

To see which substantive objectives regional/cohesion policy actually promotes with the concept, we only have to look at the three kinds of objectives, because only those for balance, economy, and the environment come forward in territorial cohesion stories. These are respectively coloured red, yellow, and green in Schema 2a when it concerns the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative. To then come up with a working hypothesis for this metanarrative, we can build forth upon the general stories on public objectives and the Lisbon Strategy and those on territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy themselves. These namely also lead to the finding that stories on territorial cohesion itself argued about issues of economic growth and environmental objectives well before those on regional and cohesion policy themselves did. This section’s working hypothesis then is: territorial cohesion promotes the combination of balance, economic competitiveness, and the environment from the start. Below the chronological appearance of the objectives of balance, economy and their pairing, and environment and their combinations are therefore treated.

Indeed, territorial cohesion is in 2000 first only identified with balanced development; this after the general stories on public objectives told that the least prosperous Member States caught up. Although this identification does alter (e.g. the concept being a means instead of the same) and is partly disputed in 2005, it is this issue of balance that dominates the metanarrative; this even while the Lisbon Strategy was already adopted the whole time. Yet, that the combination of balance, economic competitiveness, and the environment does not dominate does not mean that it does not appear.

While there is a concentration of activities in the central European regions, in 2002 economic issues are for instance voiced, but this in an opposing manner, as territorial cohesion is mentioned as blocking free economic competition. Moreover, a year later the concept does not only promote a reduction of the differences between regions (which were
increasing), but pairs this with a promotion of the competitiveness of them; in 2006 a side
discussion in this appears on promoting balanced development within regions or between
territories (also see §E.2.5). Still, the year of the Enlargement is most surprising in light of
the working hypothesis. That is to say, much frames and structures territorial cohesion stories
on economic objectives in 2004: the Third Cohesion Report’s treatment of the concept is
characterised as being in development and competitiveness terms, stories on cohesion policy
itself begin to align with the then emerging general ones on the Lisbon Strategy, and those
relating regional/cohesion policy and territorial cohesion themselves show a disagreement on
connecting them to this. Yet, no promotion of economic objectives appears in this
metanarrative; employment is prioritised though, which can be about balance as well as
economics, as it was a year before the revived Lisbon Strategy concerned itself with growth
and jobs. Hence, even when paired with competitiveness, the objective of balance seems to
dominate.

Such a pairing of balance and economy is not yet the combination meant by this
section’s working hypothesis though. This comes into view with the concept’s promotion of
the environment too, although this was only since 2004 and in the start just strongly on its
own (e.g. by being concerned with natural risks and sustainable development). That is,
even though a 2006 backward looking story tells that the Interim Territorial Cohesion Report
holds that the concept is reflected in the Treaty’s Article 2 (which promotes sustainable and
balanced development), this reflection is substance matted in 2005. It became more
confusing when the 2007-2013 funding period regulations for Cohesion Policy were
negotiated a year later though. Then the metanarrative signifies a disagreement on whether
territorial cohesion goes beyond the reduction of imbalances or not, while simultaneously
quarrels emerge about what extras this would bring (e.g. sustainable and balanced
development or a balance between economy, society, and environment in relation to the
Lisbon Strategy). Hence, although disputed and confused, territorial cohesion promotes the
combination of balance, economic competitiveness, and the environment.

Then again, this promotion of three objectives together is not enough to support this
section’s working hypothesis on its own. First only balance appeared to dominate the whole
time, then competitiveness was added and paired, followed by the environment. That is, as
the concept’s promotion of the combination of these three objectives only appeared in the last
instance, it is safe to say that territorial cohesion does not promote such a combination from
the start.

However, this territorial cohesion metanarrative does align with the structuring
disagreements on what territorial cohesion would add to regional/cohesion policy itself.
While the concept itself is in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area related to
competitiveness and the Lisbon Strategy, the (further substantive) filling-in of this connection
(e.g. combined with the older objective of balanced development) namely does not crystallise
in the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative either. The quarrels of this territorial
metanarrative nevertheless support two general hypotheses. They namely point to a possible
cherry-picking from the (post-)ESDP process usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis) in
the form of a balancing between economic, social, and environmental concerns; this might
even restructure the usage area substantively, as economy and society intersect economic and
social balance and economic growth. They also point to an exploitation of the official limits
(i.e. the second general hypothesis) by an argued stretching of a Treaty Article on sustainable
and balanced development. However, these possibilities seem to remain indecisive (again) on
how such a usage of the concept expands the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action (i.e. the
third general hypothesis).

---

This is the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community signed in 1957.
E.2.4 Coordination metanarrative

In 2000 the ‘coordination’ metanarrative started when it was held that the concept can offer a practical framework for cohesion policy.\textsuperscript{139} Although this is a year before the general stories and processual and substantive coherence started, they do frame this metanarrative. In Schema 2a processual and substantive coordination are then coloured darker and lighter blue respectively. The many discussions in the general stories on institutional arrangements and society constructions also frame this metanarrative. These general stories namely show (en)trenched disputes on favouring different political bodies and systematic discussions on the relations between the State, the market, and civic society. These disputes and discussions then lead to the following working hypothesis: the usage of territorial cohesion for coordination is problematic. When there are disputes between political bodies and discussions on their relation with actors from the market and society, coordination could be difficult. This would also affect the discussion on who is responsible for a (possible) territorial cohesion policy in stories on territorial cohesion itself, as they mostly point to a shared responsibility, and thus to the need to cooperate.

After 2000, processual and substantive coordination are above all treated separately, but only so since 2004, that is, around the time the general stories on political institutions castigated intergovernmental bargains as basis of regional policy (i.e. show some need for other ways of doing); a backward looking story from 2005 holds that in 2003 DG Regio already mentioned territorial cohesion as bringing forward development opportunities for cooperation and networking though.\textsuperscript{140} Besides this initial separation into process and substance, neither territorial cohesion stories show any significant development. This might be explained by the short time-span this territorial cohesion metanarrative appeared thus; what befits the general stories on political institutions, whose dispute only then developed towards the promotion of combining forces from various governmental levels (i.e. imply some need for coordination). To test whether these territorial cohesion stories show that coordination is problematic, we still need to treat them though. Below substantive coordination follows processual coordination.

Processual coordination in terms of cooperation, networking, and dialogue is in this territorial cohesion metanarrative more discussed than substantive coordination. This discussion can be characterised by that: territorial cohesion is held as presupposing or encouraging cooperation, when governmental levels are specified transnational cooperation comes to the fore, and that it is not clear who (should) cooperate (e.g. which levels and actors).\textsuperscript{141} This last point falls in the systematic discussions on the relations between the State, the market and civic society in the general stories on society constructions and might further increase in importance. That is to say, on the one hand the informal cooperation between governmental levels is not always related to the concept and on the other hand there is called to go beyond networking for territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{142} The Committee of the Regions’s Territorial Dialogue between the European Commission and the regional/local governments in 2006 could, for instance, harbour development prospects of territorial cohesion stories on processual coordination.\textsuperscript{143} The question of who should be involved could hereby also depend on the topic with which such processual coordination is concerned (see below). Hence, the only way in which the usage of the concept for coordination is shown to be problematic here, is the imprecision of stories on processual coordination.

The question of with which topic a processual coordination is concerned does not only echo the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative. It namely also resonates the critical general stories on political institutions which tell that the European Union cannot and does not define its interest (i.e. no common goal to focus coordination) and the ones on society constructions which characterise European integration as decoupled (i.e. the balancing of concerns might need the re-coupling of economic integration and social-
protection issues). Of importance hereby is then, that the main characteristic of the territorial cohesion stories on substantive coordination is that they differ in integrated and coherent policies: all policies, just regional/cohesion policy with others, or only with competition policy. That is to say, the topic might define who cooperate, but it is not clear what the coordinated topic (then) is.

Above and beyond this main substantive coordination issue, two other extremes appear. These show that an integrated approach is also not related to the concept, but that the even more fixed ‘territorial coherence’ strangely enough is. Albeit that these discussions could signify the challenge that the concept’s usage for coordination entails, when it is used thus, it is so in an unproblematical manner. Moreover, these stories might start to develop in 2006, since it is a time at which DG Regio already monitors other European Union policies and the European Parliament’s REGI Committee supports a Territorial Cohesion Strategy of the European Union. The only way in which the usage of the concept for coordination is shown to be problematic here, is the lacking decision on what to coordinate substantively.

While all the stories that frame and structure the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area portray essential discordances without highlighting consensus, territorial cohesion thus seems to be the eye of the tornado. The concept namely promotes processual and substantive coordination, and rather unproblematically so – this tension with its context could also be a reason for this metanarrative’s late emergence. The metanarrative therefore goes against that the concept’s usage for coordination is problematic (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis).

Although the transnational level is emphasised processually in the concept’s promotion of coordination, such a pursuit might be the more concealing when some general stories on political institutions are considered. That is, the existing power structures of the European Union institutions would provide an uneven field. When they coordinate together in an uneven field, they could accept the existing power asymmetries (e.g. equal partnership under the shadow of hierarchy). Note though, that the IGCs usage area harboured a dispute on this leeway (see Appendix C). The dispute was on the placing of the concept in the Constitutional Treaty: in Article I-3 (i.e. leading to a shared competency) or Article I-16 (i.e. leading to coordinating action of the Community). The promotion of coordination appears therefore to be disputed in itself. The IGCs usage area also demarcated less formal ways of doing with its ‘coordination’ metanarrative, ways depicted endlessly in the (post-)ESDP process usage area too. The late emergence of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area then, in its turn, still leaves it open whether – and when: how – the puzzle of cherry-picking an informal balancing of substantive concerns from the (post-)ESDP process usage area would be matched with the difficulties of formal cooperation (e.g. for a territorial cohesion policy).

E.2.5 Territories and accessibility metanarrative
As relatively seen the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative harbours the most territorial cohesion stories, it comes as no surprise that it also has the largest variety of issues. Territorial cohesion stories on territories and accessibility are then subdivided in six groups (and in Schema 2a coloured): those on specific territories (yellow), territorial specificities (purple), and territorial capital (pink), on services (green) and infrastructure (blue), and those that combine such territorial and accessibility issues (orange). That this metanarrative thereby expresses the official base of the concept (i.e. services) does more than merely give the other reason for why this metanarrative can be seen as a pillar. It might namely also affirm that this usage area roam the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines as frontier (i.e. the second general hypothesis), as it could reuse Articles 16 (on services) and 158 (that names territories). When you consider this weight of the metanarrative, the working hypothesis for it might well pose: the combined issues of territories and accessibility become the focal point in
the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. Before this combination of issues is treated though, the developments of the separate issues are, starting with accessibility (i.e. first services, then infrastructure) before territories (i.e. first specific territories, then territorial specificities, territorial capital last).

The ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative begins by relating territorial cohesion to Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI), at the time of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997 – and the relevant Article 16 is seven years later labelled as important. A communication of the European Commission from 2000 increased the weight of this official base for the concept, as it identified Services of General Interest (SGI) as key element of the European Model of Society (EMS); which is in line of the general stories on society constructions. The only main developments in these territorial cohesion stories on services start two years later. This with the suggestion that the concept implies SG(E)I with an universal character, which is not echoed afterwards, and, a year later, that the debate on territorial cohesion is broader than these services. Hence, the territorial cohesion stories on services make a combination of the issues of territories and accessibility easier, as they develop towards the promotion of SG(E)I for everyone and explicitly widen the concept beyond services.

The other accessibility stories, those on infrastructure, are both less important and frequent. While the European Parliament’s REGI Committee merged with the one on transport in 1999, it is only at the end of this term of the European Parliament that stories on infrastructure appear in 2004. This with calls to develop infrastructural networks (e.g. energy, transport) and nodes (e.g. ports) for territorial cohesion. However, the development of this issue does not go beyond more or less bringing up the concept when it concerns im/material connectivity and that territorial cohesion is more than just transport functions. What holds for the territorial cohesion stories on services therefore seems to hold for those on accessibility in general: also by explicitly widening the concept beyond transport they make a combination of the issues of territories and accessibility easier.

This metanarrative’s stories on territories start with the most discussed ones: specific territories emerge in 1999 with the call to strengthen territorial cohesion for Objective 1 regions’ laggard economic development (see Appendix F), peripheral regions, or polycentric development and are highlighted since. Later on other territories are mentioned as well; the only defiant story comes from 2006 and holds that the concept is not used for the question of territory at all. To give a selection of the plethora of emphasised territories in random order: wealthier central zones of the European Union, islands, cities, polycentrism, clusters of competitive and innovate activities, peripheral, mountain, cross-border, transnational, poorer, or handicapped regions, regions with low population density, rural, very remote, or natural disadvantaged areas, Cohesion countries, East or West, or North and South Europe. Moreover, in 2006 it is held that territorial cohesion finds favour with everyone if there are no regional interests excluded. It therefore comes as no surprise that the concept also starts to refer to the whole European Union territory since 2005; something the stories on cohesion policy itself link to the Lisbon Strategy. The territorial cohesion stories on specific territories thus seem to become self-defeating: when you want to promote certain territories, you cannot promote every one of them.

Still, if it would be difficult to reach territorial cohesion on various levels simultaneously, this promotion of specific territories does point to a focus. It namely seems as if the regional level is predominantly promoted – e.g. the preference for the Community level is only weakly voiced once (in 2006) –, and this in a way that would increase the geographical scope of regional policy. A complexity only mentioned to the side above then appears: although territorial cohesion is mostly seen as a matter between territories, territorial cohesion within a region is constantly brought forward as well. Nonetheless, more
important though, also in light of the stories on regional/cohesion policy itself, is that if the combination of the issues of territories and accessibility would become a focal point with territorial cohesion, a key question then follows almost automatically: which territories to emphasise?

Besides that the concept is used with the sole cause of emphasising certain territories, related concerns are promoted as well. An expression from 2002 represents the strongest of such points until 2003: territorial cohesion relates to the positive discrimination of places, activities, and social groups.160 This falls within the attempts to counter the existing concentration of activities in the central European regions and the increasing differences on the regional level (e.g. by regional state aid).161 In line with the framing and structuring stories things change around 2004 though. While territorial cohesion is still argued to imply that people should not be disadvantaged by wherever they live and work, which is in 2005 even considered as base of territorial cohesion in providing the raison d’être for regional development policy – this specifies the stories that relate territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy themselves –, the recognition of naturally disadvantaged areas is explicitly mentioned as not being the core focus of the concept too.162 A disagreement thus seems to develop about which geographical disadvantages territorial cohesion attempts to counter.

Moreover, since 2004 territorial cohesion stories on specific territories also assert competitiveness concerns, thereby mostly emphasising urban areas and polycentric development – with (again) the derived discussion on whether the competitiveness of regions and/or the whole European Union is at stake; this follows the lines of the general stories on the Lisbon Strategy.163 Notwithstanding the promotion of competitiveness and urban areas, the peripheral regions and Cohesion Countries are in 2006 still said to use the concept as justification for a regional cohesion policy.164 The squaring of balance and growth thus returns here; thereby framed by the general stories on public objectives and structured by those on regional/cohesion and territorial cohesion policy themselves. Yet, compared to for instance the reflection of this squaring in the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative, balance and growth are in the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative displayed geographically: from only assisting (naturally) disadvantaged areas to assisting (all) others as well (e.g. cities for competitiveness). A positive discrimination of many places (i.e. the development shown above) could also imply less attention to countering the existing concentration of activities (i.e. attention to more regions leads to a decreasing focus on some non-central regions). The question for the combination of territories and accessibility then becomes: how to have it as focal point in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area without a clear geographical focus?

When it concerns territories, this metanarrative also harbours territorial cohesion stories on territorial specificities. Although territorial specificities are thereby clearly related to the assertion of specific territories (e.g. by referring to their specificities), they are more on their actual realities and appear far less often.165 These stories on territorial specificities emerged in 2003, with the mention of geographical constraints and the diversity of territories, and appear more in general later on.166 The next year the treatment of impacts of policies is added to such specificities, something which took three years since the European Commission sponsored the study ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’.167 For the relationship between the variety of territories emphasised in territorial cohesion stories and the through the years promoted issues hereby, it is remarkable that the once mentioned geographical constraints suggest a possible hybrid between the earlier mentioned different concerns (i.e. focus for balance versus all regions for growth). That is to say, while in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area the impacts of policies are with the concept considered for balance, geographical constraints are considered for an
association of territorial cohesion policy with competition policy (i.e. focus for growth). This of course adds possible answers to the question on a geographical focus above, but also shows an openness to new combinations.

Also the territorial cohesion stories on territorial capital are related to specific territories, as this type of capital is held to be specific for a territory. Compared to the stories on territorial specificities, the treatment of territorial capital is less spread out over the years though, and it shows even less development. First potentials of territories come up, and in 2005 territorial capital is mentioned explicitly (besides different labels for territorial potencies), and this always to support the Lisbon Strategy or competitiveness; which is in line with the general stories on this strategy and those rallying for growth. However, often territorial capital appears in territorial cohesion stories that combine the divided ones on territories (i.e. specific territories and territorial specificities) and is thereby also concerned with balance and less-favoured areas. Although neither the territorial cohesion stories on territorial specificities nor those on territorial capital make a choice for certain territories or concerns, they thus seem just as set for a combination with accessibility issues as the territorial cohesion stories on specific territories.

While the separate stances on services and infrastructure on the one hand and specific territories, territorial specificities and territorial capital on the other give hints for the working hypothesis, of course only the territorial cohesion stories combining the issues of territories and accessibility can test whether this combination becomes the focal point. It took a while before the combination emerged though, as it did so in 2004, seven years after the Treaty of Amsterdam. It directly started with the main stories that link services and specific territories: territorial cohesion was promoted for an equal access to services wherever the users have their activities; in 2006 it is told that the Interim Territorial Cohesion Report claimed that the Treaty’s Article 16 already posed this. Besides differences in users (e.g. individuals, economic operators) and activities (i.e. work, but mostly living) and the dispute whether the concept should be endorsed for this cause or if this cause conditions territorial cohesion, these main stories are elaborated a bit by different additions to services (e.g. providing basic facilities, knowledge). More important though, is that a familiar quarrel comes up in 2005. Various specific territories are stressed for this provision (e.g. rural areas, geographically handicapped or cross-border territories), that is, the European Parliament’s resolution on the concept would for instance present a narrow territorial cohesion policy agenda that is confined to the least accessible regions. The question of which territories are concerned thus returns here. Still, the combination of the territories and accessibility issues thus seems to revolve around the service level in territories. As such it could become the focal point of usage area.

Some minor stories emerge in the combination between territories and accessibility as well. In 2006 not services but infrastructure is for instance combined with specific territories. TENs would namely contribute to territorial cohesion by connecting countries, regions and areas overseas. These minor stories mostly emphasise the importance of the main stories of this combination though. Moreover, only once the combination does not focus on specific territories. This is when in 2005 the key challenge for strengthening territorial cohesion in light of the Lisbon Strategy is said to be the enhancement of territorial capital and potentials of all regions and the promotion of territorial integration (as a form of accessibility). Yet, this main concern for an equal provision of services everywhere does not develop strongly. This might be explained by the dispute between balance and growth from the structuring stories which this metanarrative displays geographically. That is, if a universal provision of services leads to only assisting particular territories in this, it would favour these disadvantaged areas; thereby not even touching upon the framing debates on the relations between the State, the market and civic society and the intervention of different political
bodies. The promotion of specific territories, however, develops to assisting – not only these, but – many more territories. The unclear geographical focus of territorial cohesion – which accords with the shift of the framing and structuring stories into a tension since 2004 – seems thus to work against the combination of the issues of territories and accessibility.

The combination of the territories and accessibility issues thus might not become the focal point in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). This even though separately seen the issues of services and infrastructure widen the concept beyond both and develop towards a promotion of universal SG(E)I and those of territorial specificities and territorial capital are similarly set for such a combination. The widening of territorial cohesion’s geographical focus could namely contaminate with the combination’s main concern with an equal provision of services everywhere. Although this might sound paradoxical, is could be harder to raise the service level of regions where this is low without a clear geographical focus.

This metanarrative thus clearly shows the roaming of the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines (i.e. the second general hypothesis) with its connecting usage of Treaty Articles 16 and 158. However, territorial cohesion did not develop in this with or towards a steady geographical focus. In the widening of the concept beyond accessibility issues the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative seems therefore to follow the steps of the framing and structuring stories in a geographical manner: a debate evolves on whether to assist some particular territories or all (e.g. in providing services). Still, that the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area appears to expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action with the concept’s combination of providing services for specific territories also supports the third general hypothesis – i.e. as failed attempt.

Alternative ways that come to the fore support the first general hypothesis on cherry-picking the (post-)ESDP process usage area and might even, for the time being, put the issue of accessibility on the back burner (e.g. as infrastructure). Information on territories is namely said to have come from ESPON (e.g. indicators of imbalances and effects of European Union assistance through sectoral policies, regional policy, and the Structural Funds), the post-ESDP process to focus on territorial cohesion to support the Lisbon Strategy by better exploiting Europe’s divers potentials, and polycentric development is recognised as the responsible Ministers’ advocacy of concept; the latter is in 2006 with economic growth even related to peripheral regions and Cohesion Countries. Then again, an expansion of the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action with territorial cohesion that leans more towards the (post-)ESDP process than on the IGCs would modify the Region/Cohesion policy usage area – e.g. the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative could fade away.

E.2.6 The overall picture of the separate metanarratives
The leading question of this appendix is concerned with the disagreement on whether territorial cohesion is new in regional/cohesion policy as shown by the framing and structuring stories, but then asks about future directions. It namely asks how territorial cohesion changes the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy. In those stories the concept is more and less centrally posed in the debate about the future of regional/cohesion policy and whether territorial cohesion inflects this policy towards, for instance, being more than redistribution only (e.g. the Lisbon Strategy) or, touching upon responsibility matters, acting less centralised. Obviously, when the concept is successfully used to increase the European Regional/Cohesion policy’s official field of action (i.e. the third general hypothesis), it would significantly change this policy’s future direction, because this would add issues from the metanarratives portrayed above as territorial cohesion policy.

However, the discussions on the expansion of the regional/cohesion policy’s area of influence with these territorial cohesion concerns are rather indecisive. The ‘cohesion
objective/territorial dimension’ and ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarratives show this in particular. That is, it is still neither clear whether territorial cohesion adds an objective to regional/cohesion policy or forms the territorial dimension nor does it crystallise what the concept promotes substantively.

The metanarratives do give an overall picture of this usage area though. They namely clarify some options, which can be mentioned in the order of the three general hypotheses. The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area might then cherry-pick five substances from the (post-)ESDP process usage area: i) a balancing between economic, social, and environmental concerns, ii) ways to coordinate (see Appendix D), iii) territorial information, iv) the exploitation of territorial potential, and perhaps even v) polycentrism. Related to this, is that this usage area also seems to roam the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines as frontier. This in four ways: a) by placing territorial cohesion on a par with economic and social cohesion, b) stretching a Treaty Article on sustainable and balanced development and c) those concerned with coordination, and d) connecting Treaty Articles on services and specific territories; ways b) and c) thereby relate to points i) and ii) respectively. The first way could then be successful in expanding the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action by adding a task, just as territorial strategies in line with the ESDP (i.e. the third way) might be by increasing its influence on other policies.

Yet, these metanarratives alone only present a part of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. Although the four metanarratives consists of a clear-cut bundle, especially when compared to those of the (post-)ESDP process usage area, also here some extra findings can be drawn together by touching upon the ways in which they connect. These might for instance reveal whether a possible expansion of regional/cohesion policy’s span with territorial cohesion as objective would mean a refuge for a perhaps fading ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative or whether a deepening of this policy with the concept as territorial dimension would increase the role for the ‘coordination metanarrative’.

E.3 Stories relating territorial cohesion metanarratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area

E.3.1 Territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives

In this usage area the connections between the territorial cohesion metanarratives are not as abundant as those shown by the more nuanced territorial cohesion stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Yet, also the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area appears interwoven. It took almost ten years after the separate emergence of the primary ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative though that, around the time that all of them emerged separately, they start to be connected. Hereby the first two years show a slow start with the territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘coordination’ and ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarratives and the latter with the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ one. This respectively with statements that territorial cohesion is essential for a competitive and sustainable Europe because it can offer a practical framework for a cohesion policy and that the value of the concept is that it puts the spatial dimensions of economic, social, and environmental development in the core European Union agenda of economic and social cohesion. Nonetheless, the metanarratives are increasingly connected through the years. The timing thereby runs against the order of the structuring and framing stories and separate metanarratives: the year of the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports does not stand out (i.e. 2004), but the year after the connections appear full-blown. The denser connectedness of the metanarratives is thus a rather new feature of the order of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.
The connections made between territorial cohesion metanarratives can be ordered in a schema, as shown below in Schema 2b ‘Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area’. With Schema 2b a pretty evenly woven fabric is portrayed, as there develops no dominant pairing of metanarratives. Still, there are some differences in this. These denote the degree in which the metanarratives are more or less strongly knit into the fabric of the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area of which they are an ordering part.

### Regional/Cohesion Policy Schema 2b

*Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Metanarrative</th>
<th>Cohesion objective/Territorial dimension</th>
<th>Reliance/Economy Coordination</th>
<th>Territories/Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>European Council adapted EEC’s enlargement decisions</td>
<td>Balanced regional development</td>
<td>Strengthening territorial dimension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>General Cohesion Report sets European Council’s priorities and decisions</td>
<td>Territorial cohesion and growth</td>
<td>Strategic frameworks and operational arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cohesion Policy: Territorial Cohesion in Europe</td>
<td>Economic and social cohesion</td>
<td>Strengthening territorial dimension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>DG’s Territorial Cohesion &amp; Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>EU Enlargement – Territorial Cohesion &amp; Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Pan-European Consensus Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Interim Territorial Cohesion Report on EU and Cohesion (DG) at 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- TC is another cohesion type because it is connected to economic and social cohesion in relation to economic and social cohesion.
- The connections made between territorial cohesion metanarratives can be ordered in a schema, as shown below in Schema 2b ‘Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area’. With Schema 2b a pretty evenly woven fabric is portrayed, as there develops no dominant pairing of metanarratives. Still, there are some differences in this. These denote the degree in which the metanarratives are more or less strongly knit into the fabric of the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area of which they are an ordering part.
It is visible that since 2004 even three territorial cohesion metanarratives are connected frequently, especially when the ‘coordination’ metanarrative is one of them. The working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives therefore is: the ‘coordination’ metanarrative plays a more important role in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area than the separate metanarratives portray. A particular story might denote that such an importance of coordination is essential for territorial cohesion, as it connects all four metanarratives in 2003. This with the statement that the concept mediates between the political purposes of weakening the by the European Union caused liberalisation, ensuring equal access to SGEI, strengthening the territorial dimension of European Union policies, receiving balanced and sustainable development by taking territorial effects of sectoral policies on different levels into consideration, and steering European regional policy after 2006. However, it could be the more regularly appearing characteristics of the territorial cohesion stories connecting metanarratives that put the working hypothesis in a perspective.

E.3.2 Comparing the separate and connected metanarratives

To compare the separate and connected metanarratives, we can simply follow the order in which the separate ones were treated above: from the connections of the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative, via the ones of the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative and ‘coordination’ metanarrative, to the connections of the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative to others.

In the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives, the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ one appears just as important as when considered separately. However, the concept is hereby never really treated explicitly as an independent cohesion objective – even when seen as a part of the main discussion of the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative, territorial cohesion primarily appears here as some sort of territorial dimension. Moreover, that the connecting stories mostly state that the concept adds to economic and social cohesion in this aligns with a concern ascribed to spatial planners above, that is, that the concept is more than the in economic and social cohesion implied territorial cohesion. These connections therefore do not seem to indicate a shelter for the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative by adding territorial cohesion as objective to regional/cohesion policy. This again suggests a substantive cherry-picking from the (post-)ESDP process usage area in the promotion of the territorial dimension for economic and social cohesion with the possibility of going beyond these objectives. The usage of the concept as territorial dimension is thus strengthened by the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives.

When territorial cohesion stories connect the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative to others, the issue of balanced development does not dominate as in the separate metanarrative. Moreover, economic and even environmental concerns appear prior and at least as frequent this time – albeit often in combinations, particularly if it concerns sustainable development (e.g. sustainable economic growth). The combination of balance, economy, and the environment is thereby disputed. Yet, this again shows the possibility of cherry-picking it from the (post-)ESDP usage area, and that the working hypothesis for that metanarrative, which states that the concept promotes the combination of these concerns from the start, is stronger than it appeared above.

A striking finding from the connected metanarratives can then also add force to the previous ones. That is to say, the Lisbon Strategy is never mentioned. The (further substantive) filling-in of the connection of the concept itself with competitiveness and the Lisbon Strategy since 2004 thus does not crystallise here in combination with other objectives either. Although this strategy might shape all issues since 2004, it therefore has no (direct) role in ordering the connections between the territorial cohesion metanarratives.
Furthermore, that in 2004 economic growth, which is an important part of the strategy, is said
to not achieve the desired results if not matched by coherent social and territorial cohesion
policies, does not say how they should be matched; something for which in the following
year merely a territorial cohesion addition might have come up: the translation of the
fundamental European Union goals of balanced competitiveness and sustainable development
in a territorial setting. 188 Both these statements thus do (indirectly) point to the significance of
the connections made with the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. It does not matter whether it
concerns a matching of policies for economic growth and social and territorial cohesion or a
territorial setting for objectives, as both could need coordination.

Contrary to the order of the separate metanarratives is that the ‘coordination’ one
appears abundantly in the connections between them. 189 What is more, where in the separate
metanarratives the issue of processual coordination had more weight than the substantive one,
when connected, the substantive coordination clearly dominates. That is to say, before 2005
processual coordination does not even appear. Its role only increases while the 2007-2013
funding period regulations for Cohesion policy are negotiated and there is the Territorial
Dialogue between the European Commission and regional/local governments – e.g. with the
disputed statement that territorial cohesion only stands above economic and social cohesion
as territorial cooperation. 190 Both discrepancies (i.e. more on coordination and its substantive
form) could be explained by that connecting issues, and thus possibly connecting
metanarratives, inheres in coordination. In spite of this, the ‘balance/economy/environment’
and ‘coordination’ metanarratives are scarcely connected in the Regional/Cohesion policy
usage area, even though some stories that do this point to the significance of linking to the
‘coordination’ metanarrative. 191

Another development with the ‘coordination’ metanarrative is that it took three y ears
since the European Commission sponsored study ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies
and Costs of Non-Coordination’ before the coordination of policies with territorial impacts
became significant in the connections between the ‘coordination’ and ‘territories and
accessibility’ metanarratives. 192 This emergence in 2004 does not only have its timing in
common with the one of the stories on territorial impacts in the separate ‘territories and
accessibility’ metanarrative. Also the quarrel on whether territorial cohesion leads to or needs
this coordination, as shown in the separate ‘coordination’ metanarrative, returns here. That
since 2005 coordination starts to be connected with the territorial dimension from the
‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative more explicitly as well is more
important though (e.g. issuing a territorial strategy, territorial approach), as this hints at a
possible deepening of regional/cohesion policy with coordination through territorial
cohesion. 193 Nevertheless, this is not as strong as the possibility of coordination through the
transversality of territorial cohesion as territorial dimension would suggest (e.g. translating
concerns in a territorial setting); something the connected metanarratives strengthen. 194

That territorial cohesion as such a territorial dimension might merely suggest
cordative strength can come forward as follows. In 2005 the emergence is described of a
stable set of policies around the concept that build on the classic distributive regional policy
of European Union and add the pursuit of competitiveness, endogenous development,
sustainability, and good governance. 195 Although this could suggest clarity about
coordination, all these referred to connections of the ‘coordination’ metanarrative include this
metanarrative’s dispute about deciding on the policies to coordinate. That is, when it is not
clear what policies to coordinate, they cannot form a stable set.

Moreover, an issue for this good governance might then be the question that rises in
the separate metanarratives: how to match the cherry-picking of an informal balancing of
substantive concerns from the (post-)ESDP process usage area with formal cooperation? The
first connecting story on a practical framework for a cohesion policy finds little resonance
though: when the concept is considered as basis for this match in 2004, territorial cohesion is related to the informal way of doing of the Ministers responsible for spatial development, and during the little development of the connecting stories on processual cooperation, a 2006 call for an interdepartmental task force mentions the concept hand in hand with balanced development (i.e. no balancing of issues). This would mean that processual coordination through territorial cohesion is either involved in informal spatial development or formal balanced development. Besides, even when the issue of processual coordination is not connected to the multi-objective ‘balance/economy/environment’ but to the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative, this indecision remains. Coordination of DGs is namely constricted to those active in the urban dimension field and the call for cooperation and increased interaction between stakeholders lacks a substantive criterion for officially selecting the topics concerned. The territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘coordination’ metanarrative to the others thus do not clarify either who (should) cooperate. This even though they mostly, and with an enforced zeal, unproblematically promote substantive coordination, something which could clarify the topic that demarcates who works together (see §E.2.4).

The most discussed ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative seems to be relatively independent in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. This because it is far less prominent in the connected than separate metanarratives, especially when it concerns services and specific territories, not to mention when these issues are combined. The metanarrative’s main stories (i.e. equal access to services everywhere) just return once for instance. Territorial cohesion is in 2002 namely considered as blocking free economic competition because it is related to the positive discrimination of places, social groups, and activities and implies the rendering of SG(E)I with a permanent and universal character. The connectedness of the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative in this usage area should thus come from other issues than its main stories that combine those of territories and accessibility.

However, also separately seen the issue of specific territories is rarely connected in this usage area, not even with the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative, which also has to do with the territorial; and when this issue is connected, then polycentric development and the whole European Union territory mostly come to the fore. A noticeable exception in this is a backward looking story in 2005. It refers to the Interim Territorial Cohesion Report for three things: i) as relating the territorial dimension of cohesion to the distribution of competitiveness factors (regarding Research and Innovation capacity), ii) as achieving accessibility conditions through the European Union by physical transportation, and iii) to the overcoming of territorial imbalances between the European Union’s centre, periphery, and geographic handicapped regions. This report also relates to the potential readiness apparent in the stories on territorial specificities and territorial capital to combine these with accessibility issues. Yet, albeit that the ability of these issues to combine with accessibility is shown in some connections to other issues, the just mentioned story is the only one relating to it in the form of territorial capital and infrastructure (i.e. a loose accompanying). The only well-connected territorial cohesion stories of the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative therefore seem to be those on territorial specificities – i.e. mainly those concerned with territorial impacts that connect with the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. The metanarrative’s minor stories therefore also do not connect it firmly in this usage area.

The unconnectedness of the territories and accessibility combination can thus be added to the unclear geographical focus of territorial cohesion, which already came to the fore in the separate ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative. Both namely counter that the combined issues of territories and accessibility become the focal point in the
Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. The connected metanarratives however do push the ‘coordination’ metanarrative more forward than the separate ones. Many of the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives mention coordination issues or the need for it, some even strengthen this call by posing the transversality of territorial cohesion as territorial dimension. This could thus portray a more important role for the ‘coordination’ metanarrative in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area (i.e. the working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives). Yet, this promotion is neither clear in what policies nor who to coordinate.

E.3.3 Additional findings from the connected metanarratives

The stories connecting the metanarratives draw the finishing touches of their above portrayed territorial cohesion order in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area by adding some accents. These can (again) be mentioned in the order of the three general hypotheses. The connected metanarratives then only hold against the cherry-picking of substances from the (post-)ESDP process usage area that these connections appear two years before those between the ones of the (post-)ESDP process usage area do (see Appendix D). That is, how to pick cherries without cherry bushes? However, these connections emerge concurrently with the separate metanarratives of the (post-)ESDP process. Moreover, it might still be the connectedness that characterises the metanarratives of the (post-)ESDP process usage area, especially the higher densities, which returns in the territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives of the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area. If so, then the differences in stories from this usage area’s separated and connected metanarratives might denote that the (related) substances from the (post-)ESDP process usage area alter the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area a bit. The connected ones are namely more concerned with the territorial dimension than with cohesion objectives, more with competitiveness and sustainable development than with balanced development only, and more with the coordination of policies with territorial impacts than equal accessibility to services wherever the activities of their users. This last shift would even go beyond a mere filling-in of an order with substances, as it restructures the metanarratives’ order (i.e. no ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative).

Even though they seldom roam the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area, the connecting stories also deliver some extra findings on this. They are namely hardly on sustainable and balanced development only (i.e. stretching Article 2; see §E.2.3) and just once combined on specific territories and services (i.e. stretching Articles 16 and 158; see §E.2.5). Moreover, the single time Article 158 is mentioned (i.e. about reducing the backwardness of the least favoured areas), the claim that the concept returns in this explicitly states that this article is on economic and social cohesion (i.e. not even also on territorial cohesion).\(^{203}\) However, a larger role for the ‘coordination’ metanarrative, especially when connected to policies with territorial impacts, does highlight the dispute in the IGCs usage area on the Constitutional Treaty’s Article I-16 concerned with coordinating action of the Community (see Appendix C).

Still, certainly for the connections between metanarratives that could restructure it, the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area leans more towards the (post-)ESDP process than on the IGCs (e.g. informal ways due to the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification). Besides the key question of which policies (with territorial impacts) to coordinate, two ways are hereby possible: i) balancing one concern (e.g. balance, cohesion) with others inside regional/cohesion policy, which might weaken the concern’s individual promotion, or ii) balancing this concern with others outside regional/cohesion policy, which might increase the influence of this policy and its concern. A weak story that connects the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ and ‘coordination’ metanarratives in 2005 illustrates the latter possibility. The better placing of sectoral policies in an integrated territorial strategy by territorial cohesion would be about not giving birth to any contradictory effects in pursuit
of the primary cohesion policy objectives. This cherry-picking of coordination from the (post-)ESDP process usage area might transgress the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area though. Moreover, this coordination might do more than only expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action, as it could be a technique that (re)structures regional/cohesion policy even when it is used for concerns indigenous to it.

Then again, it is not clear what the primary objectives of this regional/cohesion policy would be after an influence of territorial cohesion. Although the possible shifts in the usage area are disputed, the concept could play a role in this beyond just expanding the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action. The effects of territorial cohesion on its context, which is formed by the narratives with an own dynamic, might thus show more ways in which the concept can change the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question).

E.4 Narratives with an own dynamic in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area

E.4.1 Narratives as scene for territorial cohesion stories
The order made in the territorial cohesion stories depicted above in the (connected) metanarratives attempts to elucidate the usage of the concept in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area. However, just as in the IGCs and (post-)ESDP process usage areas, also here the stories of the metanarratives belong less to the concept than Schema’s 2a and 2b portray. In this usage area even exactly the same stories are told in narratives with an own dynamic that do not mention the concept. It is thus not self-evident that the issues shown in the metanarratives would as territorial cohesion policy actually change the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy (i.e. this appendix’ leading question), as it might not be the concept that expands this policy.

Then again, these narratives can point to the ways in which the concept could help in this. When differences in these narratives’ stories are for instance sought since the ones on territorial cohesion itself in 1999 and its metanarratives appeared eight years earlier. Such sameness and difference in timing then already leads to a composite working hypothesis for the narratives with an own dynamic: the concept was first used for other concerns before it was discussed on itself and thereafter it was, or its constituent concerns were, pressed without calling it ‘territorial cohesion’. In light of a roaming of the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area (i.e. the second general hypothesis), the later option could be seen as a transgression of the official borders after the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification (see Appendix C). Before we test the working hypothesis though, we first lay out the order of the narratives, their summarising schema, and the main threads through their debates.

Albeit it that in the narratives similar issues appear as in the metanarratives, the more numerous regional/cohesion policy stories which form the concept’s context are ordered differently. None of the six narratives thereby totally overlaps with a metanarrative. Yet, some order and similarities can be discerned. Four narratives are namely more substantive: the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’, ‘accessibility’, ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’, and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives. The first one corresponds to the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative, and the second and fourth both resemble a part of the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative. The two other narratives are respectively more processual and structural: the ‘organisation’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives. The former is similar to the ‘coordination’ metanarrative, and the later resembles parts of the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ and ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarratives. The appearance and developments of these narratives is then
summarised below in Schema 3a ‘Narratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohesion/structural Development</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Spatial/developmental Development</th>
<th>Cultural specificities</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Spatial/territorial contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above provides a detailed overview of the narratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories). Each row represents a specific year, and the columns indicate different perspectives and aspects of the policy, such as cohesion/structural development, accountability, spatial/developmental development, cultural specificities, organisation, and spatial/territorial contexts.
Cohesion Policy in Support of ESDP process

- EC drafts funding for Cohesion Policy
- European Council revives EC relates TC to Fourth Paper
- ES...
These narratives have the following order of importance: the ‘territorial specificities’, ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’, ‘spatial/territorial dimension’, ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’, ‘organisation’, and ‘accessibility’ narrative. When you look at Schema 3a, you can think that these decreasing weights solely derive from the decreasing amount of regional/cohesion policy stories per narrative. Some other factors for this order are also accounted for by treating the main threads which run through these narratives. The importance of these presented dynamics then lies in that the narratives could set the scene for a restructuring influence of the concept due to the earlier appearance of their regional/cohesion policy stories.

E.4.2 The main threads through the narratives with an own dynamic

The appearance and developments of the narratives will be sketched by following their order of importance. That is, first the main threads of the two most debated and oldest ones, then
those of the three which are increasingly debated, to finish with the threads of the surprisingly least debated narrative. What immediately becomes visible in Schema 3a, is that the issue of specific territories (coloured light yellow in Schema 3a) is also in the narratives with an own dynamic the most debated, now in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative and especially in the year of the Third Cohesion Report (2004); just once, in 2006, this debate is disagreed with: in the United Kingdom it would not be about territories but about people. Central in this debate are particular (geographically) less favoured areas, although in general too. In the first twenty years of DG Regional Policy’s existence, old industrial areas in decline, rural areas, and peripheral regions are put forward, thereafter more are added and the quarrel on which areas are most disadvantaged is incessant. ‘Polycentrism’ can only be heard weakly in this, including a forecast in 2005 that maintains that polycentrism will be invoked in cohesion policy. Perhaps a story from 2006 could hereby be generalised to all European Union Institutions: the European Parliament gains new spheres of influence with every extension of cohesion policy to geographical areas. This would offer an explanation for the plethora of territories put forward.

Another development in the regional/cohesion policy stories on specific territories appears in 2002, two years after the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy. Since then also the development of – not disadvantaged, but – stronger parts is proposed (e.g. for competitiveness), but then mostly in the less favoured areas or cities. However, the two key questions which seem to come to the fore are: i) how to square the equal treatment of with the particular attention to territories and ii) should attention go to the areas which are worst off or to the ones where interventions have the largest effect (the latter reminisces the view from the general stories on the business approach to attend more to value for money)? This development thus points to some essential geographical choices that shimmer on the territorial cohesion’s background in regional/cohesion policy.

Besides the main debate on specific territories, the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative also harbours stories on territorial specificities (coloured violet), this after the ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Coordination’ study was published, and on more detailed territorial affairs (pink), this almost only in 2005. Territorial specificities mainly come to the fore by issuing for the assessment of the spatial/territorial effects of sectoral policies and expressing opinions on how the divers territories are and should be accounted for in policy making (e.g. via indicators, maps, by the Member States and regions). The more detailed territorial affairs are particularly concerned with cities. The namely touch upon issues as diverse as urban sprawl, town planning, architecture, crime prevention, and education policies. For a cherry-picking from the (post-)ESDP process usage area a 2005 statement from this narrative could then be important. That is, the European Commission would draw more on ESPON than to the Member States (i.e. also without using the concept of territorial cohesion). Hence, this narrative could lead to some interesting findings for the first general hypothesis.

This most discussed ‘territorial specificities’ narrative is seconded by the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ one, which of the narratives shows the most overlap with a metanarrative. It namely harbours seemingly nested discussions on economic (coloured goldenrod in Schema 3a) and social cohesion (coloured dark red) since the Single European Act (SEA) of 1987, and beneath these two (preceding) objectives the three of distribution (red), growth, (yellow), and environment (green) – these three are thus much in line with the general stories on public objectives (i.e. balance and growth). In this narrative there is for the most part discussed whether economic and social cohesion can exist in one simultaneous situation or if economic and social policies work against each other and

*Hereby physical determinism surfaces as well (e.g. to plan out crime).*
whether cohesion is for solidarity, equal opportunities, or targeting.\textsuperscript{215} The questioning of the effectiveness and sufficiency of the current policies in this develops from 2002 on, the year before the Sapir Report which aims to counteract the declining European Union growth and competitiveness is in line with the stories on regional/cohesion policy itself.\textsuperscript{216} Hence, safe to say that several discussions loom behind the term ‘cohesion’.

The other three objectives are first only on distribution. The dispute lines set by the general stories on political institutions and those on regional/cohesion policy itself seem hereby through the years to be followed one-sidedly against the intergovernmental bargains and in favour of regional institutional bodies, as the regional level is emphasised instead of the macroeconomic imbalances between states.\textsuperscript{217} What also fits the framing and structuring stories is that growth concerns are increasingly uttered since the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000 too. Although on their own they occasionally bring up the problems caused by the (changing) economy, far more often economic development is supported, and later on these regional/cohesion policy stories even express full competitiveness concerns.\textsuperscript{218} What again reflects the general stories on public objectives is that environmental matters are hardly spoken of and seldom go beyond a general care for sustainability (i.e. since 2000, a year before the Gothenburg Strategy, the pair of balanced and sustainable development is frequently aimed at); the single time an environmental point does appear on its own shows environmental quality as long-term investment.\textsuperscript{219} The traditional concern for distribution only thus would then in regional/cohesion policy be challenged by growth only.

Then again, a characteristic of this narrative is that these five objectives are constantly related. When nested, the key debate on their relationship appears after the Lisbon Strategy’s adoption and is on whether cohesion and competitiveness go together.\textsuperscript{220} For instance, does competitiveness fall under (economic) cohesion or justifies competitiveness cohesion?\textsuperscript{221} Furthermore, when cohesion and balance are not equated (e.g. when cohesion is related to competitiveness, this is implicitly the case), there are surprisingly few stories that state how cohesion and balanced development relate – not to mention the lone argument in 2006 on whether environmental concerns are attended to horizontally in cohesion policy or only weakly so.\textsuperscript{222} The relation between balance and cohesion would then remain open to dispute. When the distribution, growth, and environmental objectives are related they do seem to accord with the framing and structuring stories though. Since the Third Cohesion Report the regional/cohesion policy stories namely both oppose and join balanced development and growth (e.g. equal opportunities are in 2004 put forward as instrumental for economic potential).\textsuperscript{223} All these appearances and developments of this narrative are thus very similar to the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative. However, besides the slightly different formulations, the main difference is that the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ narrative – is not on territorial cohesion, but – involves economic and social cohesion.

The above two narratives with an own dynamic are also the oldest ones, as they emerge at the time of the Treaty of Rome (1957). However, three other narratives are increasingly debated as well. In the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative the issue of preserving the European territory (coloured orange in Schema 3a) picks up its development (e.g. by posing to reorganise this territory, be against internal borders) after twenty years of silence since this was pleaded for in 1983 (i.e. at the time of the European Parliament’s Gendebien Report on a European regional planning scheme).\textsuperscript{224} In a similar fashion, though only in 2005, a concern with ‘space’ is expressed and just once, in 2006, these regional/cohesion policy stories on the territory slip with the statement that the word ‘regional’ is used for the question of territory.\textsuperscript{225} The issue of territory might thus also appear on the regional/cohesion policy agenda.

Moreover, since the ESDP was published in 1999, also the territorial dimension is promoted in the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative (coloured purple). Although this is
sometimes problematised, the main disagreement in this promotion is whether the territorial
dimension is for all policies or only for regional/cohesion policy; around the time that the
European Parliament report on the urban dimension from 2005 mentions the (post-)ESDP
process, also detailed territorial relations are treated in this (plum), which are mostly aimed at
reducing territorial imbalances. Another progressively discussed topic is the territorial
approach (grey). Strangely enough, in 2004 this topic begins agriculturally, thereby referring
to the Leader programme (see Appendix F), instead of – at this time of the Third Cohesion
Report – a beginning concerned with regional/cohesion policy; something which is reinforced
since by the relatively many descriptions of hesitations to impose a new overarching principle
in this policy. Still, this discussion keeps on going against the sector-specific nature of
Community policies, even though thereby also different geo-economic ways of doing clash
(i.e. reducing imbalances versus growth poles). More territorial issues besides the territory
are thus steadily rooted for in more or less disagreement.

The ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’ narrative is the youngest narrative. It is
another increasingly debated narrative after it emerged in 2001, two years after the European
Commission and European Parliament supported the parts of the ESDP that are on a
regionally more balanced development of cities and regions. Central in its initial – but later
on sporadic – discussion on spatial development is the strength of the relationship between
the ESDP process and regional/cohesion policy (coloured alice blue in Schema 3a) – e.g. the
ESDP would be instrumental (e.g. ideas), but inconsequential in practice. The core
discussions of this narrative are however on territorial and regional development (coloured
brown) and territorial capital (fuchsia). The former shows a shift through the years in step
with the framing and structuring stories. This by going from distributive to development
policies, thereby touching upon various issues (e.g. state aid, and, reminiscent of the business
approach out of the general stories: knowledge workers, entrepreneurship, innovation,
strategies); this again with a pervading emphasis on the regional level from the general stories
on political institutions and those on regional/cohesion policy itself in particular. Thus, although only since recently, also territorial and regional
development concerns form the context of territorial cohesion in this usage area. As these
relate to the ESDP process, also this narrative might lead to interesting findings on a cherry-
picking of the Regional/Cohesion policy from the (post-)ESDP process usage area.

The third increasingly debated narrative is the ‘organisation’ one, the one similar to
the ‘coordination’ metanarrative. Also this narrative entails a discussion on substantial
coordination (coloured azure in Schema 3a); something which is in 2006 said to have
increased in importance as policy objective since the early 1990s. While regional/cohesion
policy is hereby always central in the discussion (e.g. for its effectiveness), the disagreement
is on whether this policy should be coherent in itself, be coordinated with other policies
(contributing to it), or be consistent with competition policies. Although in 2004 cohesion
policy is described as having vertical and horizontal partnership as cornerstone since 1988, it
is in this usage area only 3 years later, since the White Paper on European Governance, that
processual coordination (coloured navy) is added to substantive coordination; vertical
cooperation is thereby above all promoted between governmental levels, also with an
emphasis on decentralisation, as is horizontal cooperation between regions (e.g. transnational
cooperation). However, it lasted three years before the issue of governance (chartreuse)
emerged in 2004; what accords with the changing general stories on political institutions.
Governance is hereby only addressed in the call for a strategic approach in the
implementation of policies (e.g. for and of regions). Nevertheless, it is this discussion on
governance that substantively extends the narrative beyond the ‘coordination’ metanarrative.
The Regional/Cohesion policy usage area seems therefore to treat this issue, but not with the usage of territorial cohesion, something the (post-)ESDP process usage area did do.

Sketched last here is the least discussed ‘accessibility’ narrative. This one emerged in 1997, at the time of the Treaty of Amsterdam, and consists of discussions on services (coloured lime in Schema 3a) and infrastructure (coloured cyan). First it only claims that citizens should have access to services, but since the European Council revived the Lisbon Strategy in 2005 a discussion ensues on the (minimal) level of provision as well (in which ICT and health services also come to the fore since the Third Cohesion Report). During this development infrastructure increasingly comes to the fore too. This mostly by claiming basic infrastructure for citizens, but since the Third Cohesion Report (again) also by adding more transport issues (e.g. multimodality, transport networks and corridors); the year of 2006 might suggest that the attention slides away from transport towards technical infrastructure and applied research though. Hence, it is surprising that although the only official base for using territorial cohesion is an Article on SGEI (see Appendix C), services seem to play a minor role in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area, this both for the concept’s usage and context. Then again, that for the concept services only play a minor role in this usage area might be caused by its older regional/cohesion policy context. More in general though, now that the main threads in the developed order of narratives with an own dynamic order are sketched, the question becomes how to look for influences between territorial cohesion and European Regional/Cohesion policy.

E.4.3 Looking for influences between the narratives and metanarratives

The narratives with an own dynamic painted with a thick brush above touch upon issues which are very familiar to the ones in the metanarratives. Yet the narratives’ order differs, as shown in Schema 3a, and they have their own dynamics too, as demonstrated by their main threads. The effects territorial cohesion has on its context, which is formed by these ordered regional/cohesion policy stories, might then indicate the role the concept plays in the changes of direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy beyond an associated expansion of its area of action (e.g. a restructuring effect). The request for studies on the future of Cohesion policy by the European Parliament’s REGI Committee in 2004 might thereby denote the urgency of these changes.

However, as the second part of this section’s working hypothesis conveys (i.e. after territorial cohesion was discussed in itself its concerns were pressed without mentioning the concept), the supports between regional/cohesion policy and the concept do not necessarily have to lead to a formal European Union territorial cohesion policy. The future response of regional/cohesion policy to territorial cohesion is for instance also said to depend on its future geographical scope, objectives, and implementation approach. Although the concept could affect such points, they themselves might be more important than the question on whether to call (a part of) them ‘territorial cohesion policy’.

After ordering the narratives, schematising them, and writing down their main threads, we thus have to find out (again) where territorial cohesion influenced its context and vice versa. This can be done by carefully comparing the metanarratives (Schemas 2a and 2b) with the narratives (Schema 3a) with this section’s working hypothesis in mind. Similarities between emerging territorial cohesion stories and older regional/cohesion policy stories then suggest the usage of the concept for other concerns, and changes in regional/cohesion policy stories after territorial cohesion stories the implicit promotion of the concept’s concerns.

E.4.4 Territorial cohesion concerns in the narratives and metanarratives

Through the above noted comparison, two other concerns for which territorial cohesion could have been used come up, as do two possible implicit promotions of territorial cohesion and an
almost perfect fit between both. Below these are treated respectively before some extra findings about deceptive traces and spatial planning.

Territorial cohesion might have been used for concerns while the concept was not discussed in itself and, arguably, therefore not promoted for itself (i.e. the first part of this section’s working hypothesis). What confirms this in the concept’s regional/cohesion policy context is that the most discussed and oldest narratives of ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ harbour concerns which might have used the banner of ‘territorial cohesion’ for their own cause. The concern with specific territories can namely be thought of as fed from the older ‘territorial specificities’ narrative into the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative, and territorial cohesion as cohesion objective could have been used for this cause as shown by the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative. This because – not synchronically, but still – roughly similar territories are emphasised in the narratives and metanarratives early on, and in the start regional/cohesion policy stories are first only on distribution. Hence, the concept could have been just another way to promote these territories, the more so with territorial cohesion as cohesion objective, because then it only disadvantaged ones were put forward and the relationship between cohesion and balance was still undisputed. However, both the concerns with specific territories and distribution are challenged later on by other regional/cohesion policy objectives and the constant addition of specific territories.

Also the promotion of providing services might have used the concept for its own cause. This issue namely simultaneously enters the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative and ‘accessibility’ narrative; in both it seems to play a minor role though. Although services thus did not appear later with the concept than in its context, it was already an issue since the Treaty of Amsterdam. Hence, if territorial cohesion was used for other concerns instead of for itself, it was for balanced development, emphasising specific territories, and the provision of services, which all were disputed during the development of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.

In the development of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area there might be rallied for territorial cohesion concerns without referring to the concept. Traces of territorial cohesion stories in the narratives might signify this activity, especially the cherry’s from the (post-)ESDP process usage area which are picked via the concept. An example of this is the territorial dimension. Since the statement that the European Union’s regional policy did not account for the territorial dimension when the ESDP was published in 1999, the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative paradoxically starts to live up to its name. This timing is conspicuous for two reasons: i) at the same time stories on the concept itself show that territorial cohesion was considered European Union policy by then (see §E.1.3) and ii) the substantive cherry-picking of the territorial dimension from the (post-)ESDP process usage area emerged in the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative with the statement that the concept also has a territorial dimension. Likewise, the regional/cohesion policy stories on a territorial approach – which are less debated, but increasingly so – came into the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative in the year the same metanarrative points to an expansion of the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action with the possibility of overarching territorial strategies in line with the ESDP. The promotion of the territorial dimension, or even a territorial approach (e.g. for the implementation of policies), might therefore implicitly rally for territorial cohesion concerns.

Another way in which territorial cohesion could be influencing European Regional/Cohesion policy is by helping with the addition of growth and sustainability concerns to the established distributive ones such as balanced development. In 2000 the issue of competitiveness namely emerges both in the connections of the ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative and in the
‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ narrative. Just as with the territorial dimension, the promotion of competitiveness could thus be a trace of territorial cohesion. One could wonder though whether the then adopted Lisbon Strategy needs any help (e.g. from territorial cohesion) to invade regional/cohesion policy stories while it becomes more dominant. Moreover, the upcoming issue of sustainability is also without the usage of the concept related to both the distribution and growth objectives (mostly in accordance with Treaty Article 2). Notwithstanding this change of regional/cohesion policy stories after territorial cohesion stories, it is more a question whether than a suggestion that this entails the implicit promotion of the concept’s concerns.

Furthermore, if the concept would help Regional/Cohesion policy to restructure the treatment of its objectives after the additions of growth and environment, then threefold combinations should be detectable. The metanarrative namely points to the possibility of cherry-picking such a balancing between them from the (post-)ESDP process usage area. However, this restructuring seems to hinge on the usage of the concept, as these threefold combinations hardly appear in the narrative; those few times that they do since 2004, when the Third Cohesion Report referred to the ESDP, it is not so much a balancing but harnessing of social and environmental concerns for economic growth. The question that came up in the main threads of the narratives thus remains unanswered: how does this balancing of three concerns relate to the differently structured pair of economic and social cohesion? Hence, although the objectives in the concept’s context partly fit its concerns, it seems unlikely that territorial cohesion is thereby implicitly promoted.

Besides such seemingly one-way influences between territorial cohesion and its regional/cohesion policy context, a more complex way comes up as well. In the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ narrative the effectiveness and sufficiency of the current policies is namely questioned. This might point to a demand to which territorial cohesion responds with substantive coordination and informal ways of doing, which are concerns that dominate the connected metanarratives. That is, although the dynamic of the ‘organisation’ narrative already in itself more revolves around substantial than processual coordination since the Gendebien Report of 1983, the concept might have helped to reboot this debate; something in which the Sapir Report could have had a larger role though, as it also recommends coordination. This would merely suggest another influence of the concept on its context.

Then again, even though DG Regio monitors European Union policies in 2006, this does not really seem to lead to a balancing of concerns with substantive coordination. The contextual regional/cohesion policy stories nevertheless appear to present some missing pieces for a puzzle displayed in the metanarratives. That is, the matching of cherry-picking an informal balancing of substantive concerns from the (post-)ESDP process usage area with the difficulties of formal cooperation. The ‘organisation’ narrative namely puts forth ways of new horizontal cooperation on the regional governmental level (e.g. transnational cooperation) and governance as a strategic approach for the implementation of policies (e.g. for and of regions). When these are formalised, such cooperation is not difficult anymore. This almost perfect fit between the metanarratives’ substantive coordination and informal ways of doing and the narrative’s processual coordination and governance therefore suggests a usage of the concept without the mention of ‘territorial cohesion’. If so, then this might direct the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy for its implementation approach more towards the (post-)ESDP process.

You might expect that the important ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative has a large influence on the separate narratives’ regional/cohesion policy stories. However, and extra finding here is that this is not the case; something what also underlines the metanarrative’s relative independence. The task of exploiting territorial potentials, for
instance, emerges in the ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’ narrative, but this well before it came up in this metanarrative as territorial cohesion focus of the post-ESDP process.\textsuperscript{252} Although exploiting territorial potentials might be considered as a territorial cohesion focus, it thus seems a deceptive trace of the concept.

Other such deceptive traces turn up in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative. The change in the metanarrative from only assisting (naturally) disadvantaged areas to assisting (all) others as well (e.g. cities for competitiveness) is not really followed in this narrative, as even its proposals to develop stronger parts emphasise less favoured areas or cities; cities in general do return in detailed territorial affairs later on though, and albeit that for this issue the concept is not used, the discussion on emphasising specific territories under territorial cohesion might have helped this attention somewhat.\textsuperscript{253} More of such traces are that: i) although polycentric development is recognised as the advocacy of concept by the Minsters responsible for spatial development, it is only weakly mentioned without the (explicit) usage of the concept, ii) opinions on accounting for the diverse territories in policy making are expressed before the metanarrative did, and iii) without referring to the concept the European Commission is said to draw on ESPON too.\textsuperscript{254} Although there are many deceptive territorial cohesion traces, these are remarkable. They namely expose that the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative not only appears independent from other metanarratives, but also from the concept’s context. Territorial cohesion might therefore at most have assisted the transportation or strengthening of urban, polycentrism, and ESPON concerns into the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy.

The narratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area thus portray an initial usage of territorial cohesion for the regional/cohesion policy concerns of balanced development, specific territories, and service provision. They also suggest that the concept helped to change the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy towards a promotion of the territorial dimension or territorial approach, ESPON for information, and towards the (post-)ESDP process for the implementation of its policies and an attention to cities and sometimes even polycentrism. However, even if these traces in the concept’s context are from territorial cohesion, they show that these concerns, contrary to for instance a balancing of economic, social, and environmental objectives, can be pressed without the concept as well.

E.4.5 Using territorial cohesion for the narratives’ dynamics?

The narratives with an own dynamic thus both confirm that the concept was first used for some other concerns before it was discussed on itself and that it was, or its constituent concerns were, thereafter pressed without calling it ‘territorial cohesion’. A familiar picture thereby appears of the cherries that the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area might pick from the (post-)ESDP process usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis): the territorial dimension, territorial information, an implementation of policies, attention to cities, and perhaps polycentrism (see §E.2.6 and E.3.3). A less familiar picture appears for the roaming of the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area (i.e. the second general hypothesis). That is, although the exposed processual coordination and governance could push for more formalisation in the concept’s context too, territorial cohesion is first used for services in line with the Treaties and no Treaty Articles are stretched for objectives without the mention of territorial cohesion. However, these narratives more question the use of the concept.

What is the added value of territorial cohesion in the attempts to expand the European Regional/Cohesion policy area of action (i.e. the third general hypothesis) or change it in another way? Perhaps that with a broader official base for the concept’s usage (i.e. broader than laid down in the IGCs usage area) the formal policy substance could be expanded less cautiously. Yet, if territorial cohesion is foremost seen as a label under which various
concerns gather, as noted above, then the usage of the concept without referring to ‘territorial cohesion’ could also be detectable through the connections made between these concerns. The connections between narratives should thus be compared to the (connected) metanarratives for similarities before we can draw conclusions on this question.

E.5 Stories relating the narratives with an own dynamic in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area

E.5.1 General features of the connected narratives

What appeared to confirm the third general hypothesis is that a successful usage of territorial cohesion might expand the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action by (in)formally adding the issues shown in the (connected) metanarratives. However, when the narratives with an own dynamic are inspected for how territorial cohesion changes the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy, an alternative conclusion appears. They namely show that the concept might just have been used as a way to support concerns for redirections, as these are in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area also pressed for without the mention of ‘territorial cohesion’. This situation might make us wonder whether these concerns are actually concealed territorial cohesion concerns or if there is more to the claim (in the early stories on the concept itself) that territorial cohesion already is European Union policy (also see the IGCs usage area’s debate on a Community competency for territorial cohesion). Nonetheless, if the concept involves a typical connectedness, the regional/cohesion policy stories that connect the narratives could deliver some extra findings to answer such questions. A working hypothesis which could lead this search is: the connections between the narratives with an own dynamic do not resemble the (connected) metanarratives.

The metanarratives and narratives differ in how similar issues are distributed among them, as presented in the differently ordered territorial cohesion and regional/cohesion policy stories with Schema 2a and 3a respectively. With the exception of the ‘balance/economy/environment’ and ‘coordination’ metanarratives, the metanarratives thereby intersect the narratives. The connections made between the narratives could thus also reveal more ways in which regional/cohesion policy stories are similar to territorial cohesion stories (i.e. similarities that fall between the stiches, e.g. issues that belong to one metanarrative but several narratives and vice versa). For additional findings to come forward from the connected narratives, their schema and general features will be treated before the way in which they are compared with the connected metanarratives and separate narratives and their comparison is.

The stories that connect the narratives are then schematised below in Schema 3b ‘Stories relating narratives in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area with an own dynamic’.

---

**Regional/Cohesion Policy Schema 3b**

**Stories relating narratives in the Regional/Cohesion Policy usage area with an own dynamic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Narrative</th>
<th>Cohesion/Cohesion Growth Environment</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Spatial/Territorial (Regional Development)</th>
<th>Territorial Specificities</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Spatial/Territorial dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As shown in Schema 3b, a general feature of the connected narratives is that since 1993 regional/cohesion policy stories begin to connect them with each other and these connections, after a pretty smooth development, erupt at the time of the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports, hereby forming connections that solidify thereafter.\textsuperscript{255} Compared to the connected metanarratives the year of 2004 thus does stand out in the connected narratives. A denser connectedness is nevertheless also a rather new feature of the order of the regional/cohesion policy stories as (shaping) context of the concept in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.\textsuperscript{256}

Notwithstanding the variance in the narratives’ connectedness, another general feature is that through the years specific territories stably appears as the prominent topic, followed by the one on cohesion objectives, and both are strengthened through their often connected narratives.\textsuperscript{257} The third column in the joined appearances is the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative, what highlights the issue of the European Union territory as well as the territorial (and urban) dimension of policies and developments.\textsuperscript{258} The importance of the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative could thus have affected the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives through intersection, as territorial cohesion as cohesion objective (i.e. one part of the metanarrative) resembles other cohesion objectives (i.e. two parts of a narrative) and territorial cohesion as territorial dimension (i.e. the other part of the metanarrative) the territorial dimension without the concept’s mention (i.e. a part of another narrative). A noticeable story from these three mainstays aligns with the geographical squaring of balance and growth while connecting the ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives in 2006. It namely suggests that the question on cohesion or competitiveness could become a question on which spatial level differences between cities (or regions) can be emphasised (e.g. competitive regions could imply cohesive cities and backward hinterlands).\textsuperscript{259} Such stories thus increase our understanding of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area.

Another general feature of the narratives is that the new denser connectedness of them is similar to the metanarratives \textit{qua} timing. That is to say, where it took the metanaratives until 2003 to connect more than two of them, this is already the case in the narratives from 1999 onward, and regularly so.\textsuperscript{260} Hence, when gauged against the comparison of territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives with those that fit within them, also the context of the concept formed by the regional/cohesion policy stories shows an interwoven order of narratives. Besides these mainstays, timing, and interweaving, where then to look for when we compare them and how?
E.5.2 Restricting the search for new findings in the connected narratives

The search for new findings in the regional/cohesion policy stories that construct the connectedness of the concept’s context can be restricted in a simple manner. We are namely interested in findings which would radically change the sketch of the narratives with an own dynamic made above, even more so when these reveal territorial cohesion trails.

The separate narratives then portrayed two core developments: i) first the usage of the concept for balanced development, emphasising specific territories, and the provision of services and ii) later for the assistance of changing the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy with a territorial dimension, ESPON for information, an increase in the attention paid to cities and polycentrism, and towards the (post-)ESDP process for the implementation of its policies. Another territorial cohesion trail from the connected metanarratives can be added to the discussed issues in the separate metanarratives. That is, the metanarratives appear to become less concerned with equal accessibility to services wherever the activities of their users – even though this combined issue emerged late in the separate ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative – and more with the coordination of policies with territorial impacts. We thus direct our searchlights on territorial cohesion trails for findings that change or add to these three core developments.

E.5.3 Territorial cohesion trails in the connected narratives

The connected narratives however do not change the sketched first development of the separate ones. They namely neither support nor undermine that the initial usage of territorial cohesion might have been for the regional/cohesion policy concern of balanced development and even strengthen the findings on specific territories and service provision. The same holds for any new finding about the subsequent development in the separate narratives insofar it concerns changes towards the informal ways of doing of the (post-)ESDP process for the implementation of policies. There thus do not appear that many essential changes to the three core developments. Some important additions to these do though. These findings revolve around three points which are in order of appearance: a cherry-picking of territorial ways of doing from the (post-)ESDP process usage area, a roaming of the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area by linking territories and accessibility, and the additions of overarching objectives and several ways to coordinate.

A regional/cohesion policy story that connects the ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ narratives in 2003 might then be important for the first point. It namely poses that the post-ESDP process shows progress in characterising the territorial dimension of cohesion; a dimension which is a year later by the connected narratives also considered as having become equal to economic and social cohesion. This could mean that the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area does not only cherry-pick from the (post-)ESDP process usage area, but that it can also select when to do this or even store cherries somewhere else (e.g. until the territorial dimension of cohesion is characterised enough).

A related new finding from the connected narratives is that the territorial approach does not so much have an agricultural beginning as the separate spatial/territorial dimension’ narrative suggested. That is, even though in 2004 a territorial approach is mentioned as guiding the coherence between European Union regional and rural policies, a year earlier it is already considered as countering the ineffectiveness of cohesion policy to reduce disparities between regions; this in connection with the ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ narrative. Still, also the connected narratives thus show with the often appearing ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ one that territorial cohesion might help to develop European Regional/Cohesion policy to become more territorial, but that the concept’s usage is not necessary for this.
In a similar but more substantive vein, an attention to both the issues of polycentrism and cities seems to fit perfectly (i.e. with cities as polycentrism’s centres). In the connected narratives these are divided though, as polycentrism hardly appears while cities do so prominently.\textsuperscript{265} Note hereby that stories on polycentrism lead the ‘spatial/territorial structures’ metanarrative of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Where an attention to polycentrism in the regional/cohesion policy stories could therefore indicate an influence of territorial cohesion and/or the (post-)ESDP process, those on cities do not.

The connected narratives’ sole story on ESPON (in 2006) might, with its connection of the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘organisation’ narratives, indicate a price to be paid by European Regional/Cohesion policy for its new found source though.\textsuperscript{266} Leaning towards ESPON for information could namely empower this organisation into the communication and dialogue phase with policy makers on its conclusions and their consequences for cohesion policy.\textsuperscript{267} If a cherry-picking from the (post-)ESDP process leads to an expansion of the European Regional/Cohesion policy area of action, this therefore does not automatically give the concerns indigenous to the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area free rein over these gains.

The connected narratives thus at least adjust the pictured developments in the separate ones somewhat. That is, in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area the territorial approach might have a combined agricultural and regional/cohesion policy descent, in the concept’s context the appearance of polycentrism and not the attention to cities seems a territorial cohesion trail, and a redirection towards the (post-)ESDP process usage area (e.g. for the territorial dimension of cohesion) could entail the entrance of more organisations (e.g. ESPON) onto the stage of European Regional/Cohesion policy.

The strength of the connections between the various narratives which knit the interlaced order of regional/cohesion policy stories into firmness is in accordance with their separate weights. That is, all narratives are consistently connected to all others, except the ‘accessibility’ narrative, which is the least connected one.\textsuperscript{268} Only at the time of the Third Cohesion Report in 2004 this narrative is also strongly connected to others besides the one on ‘territorial specificities’.\textsuperscript{269} In spite of this, in general the connecting regional/cohesion policy stories are instigated by those on the issues of proximity/peripherality from the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative and first transport costs in 1993 and later access to services from the ‘accessibility’ narrative – a setup which grows stronger through the years.\textsuperscript{270} Since 2002 this chief connection for the ‘accessibility’ narrative revolves around specific territories and services, something which reminisces the roaming of the confines drawn by the IGCs usage area as shown by the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative (see §E.2.5). The main discussion of both this metanarrative and this significant connection of the ‘accessibility’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives thus clearly represents an intersection between the metanarrative and narratives. Here it is the loosely connected metanarrative which reflects the paired concerns of the narratives though, as these emerge earlier.

With the ‘spatial/territorial/regional development’ narrative a lone combination is thereby made in 2005. If territorial cohesion would have been used in this, it could have opened up an opportunity to maintain the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative by modification. SGEI would namely be regarded as a basic precondition to use territorial capital in an even distribution of economic activities over the European Union territory.\textsuperscript{271} To some degree this connection marks an intersection of the narratives by the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative, as it shows an affiliation of issues that belong to the same metanarrative (i.e. territorial capital and accessibility). The modification then lies in a shift in focus from specific territories to territorial capital. Although this pairing has less official footing, it could offer an alternative route.
Furthermore, although territorial cohesion might become out of use for the combination of concerns for services and specific territories, this does not seem to influence the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action. A fading of this metanarrative (again, see §E.2.5) could thus denote a temporary usage of the concept for the pairing of these issues. In light of roaming the by the IGCs usage area drawn confines as frontier, this would mean the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area goes beyond only partly following and using the only official base of the concept’s usage. It would namely go towards simply transgressing these borders with territorial cohesion as provision of services in specific territories and leaving this pairing behind in the concept’s regional/cohesion policy context.

The ‘cohesion/distribution/growth/environment’ narrative and ‘balance/economy/environment’ metanarrative largely overlap. They seem to differ in a major way in their connections though: in contradistinction with the non-treatment of territorial cohesion as explicitly issued objective in the connected metanarratives, the economic and social cohesion objectives are frequently discussed in the connected narratives. If the connected metanarratives therefore show that territorial cohesion consists in gathering concerns in a typical manner, this (consequentially) might not fit with the concept being an objective itself (substantively seen). Moreover, in the concept’s context as formed by regional/cohesion policy stories, economic and social cohesion do relate to other issues, but this without losing their appearance as objective. This suggests that it is not typical for them to gather various concerns as territorial cohesion seems to do. The concept thus might not infect the regional/cohesion policy stories with the gathering of concerns under a cohesion objective, even though they do strongly connect these objectives to other issues. Hence, only the knitting of territorial cohesion in the official Regional/Cohesion policy area of action might add this overarching feature to it. This expansion with the concept would change the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy and is related to the issue of substantive and processual coordination.

The organisation narrative with its coordination and governance issues is well-connected. Nonetheless, it does not manifest itself disproportionately in this as the ‘coordination’ metanarrative did, neither compared to other narratives nor in its separate significance. This can support the finding that, to boot the gathering of issues, the concern with coordination characterises territorial cohesion too. A similarity to the ‘coordination’ metanarrative could point to a territorial cohesion trail nonetheless. That is, the remarkably modest appearance of the connected ‘organisation’ narrative more often puts overall policy coherence forward, as argued for with territorial cohesion, than that it focuses on regional/cohesion policy as the separate narrative does. Later on the narrative is also connected to others with an emphasis on the substantive coordination between subnational institutional bodies. A more varied array of subnational associations for horizontal cooperation (e.g. between towns and cities or urban centres, rural areas, and peripheral regions) is thereby put forward than the separate ‘organisation’ narrative does with its focus on regions. This processually accompanies the emphasis in substantive coordination on overall policy coherence.

The more elaborate concern with subnational institutional bodies aligns with the framing and structuring stories that promote the region or decentralisation in general. During this promotion a particular look forward in 2005 might show the mobilisation of them with the Territorial Dialogue (i.e. between the European Commission and subnational governments, organised by the Committee of Regions). Hereby the Lisbon Strategy would namely be realised through cohesion policy. This sets the connected narratives apart from the connected metanarratives, because in the latter this strategy as alternative way for coordination has no part. Hence, merely making a case for the coordination of all policies does not seem to distinguish territorial cohesion from its regional/cohesion policy context, as
the connected ‘organisation’ narrative discusses this as well. However, this narrative does so by stressing subnational institutional bodies in both substantive as processual coordination and including the Lisbon Strategy as a possible guiding concern. This dynamic of its own therefore distinguishes the concept’s context from territorial cohesion, and thus *vice versa* as well.

The concept does appear to play a major role in European Regional/Cohesion policy however if it is for the promotion of the coordination of policies when these have a territorial impact. Although also regional/cohesion policy stories on this appear often and already since the European Commission sponsored study of ‘Spatial Impacts of Community Policies and Costs of Non-Co-ordination’ (from 2001), after the Third Cohesion Report (from 2004) this concern does not seem to be pressed hard for anymore. Yet, to be more precise, in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative the discussion on territorial impacts starts a year before the connected metanarratives do in 2003, and in the connected narratives it already comes to the fore when the ESDP was published in 1999, one year earlier than in the ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative. This first (regional/cohesion policy) story on coordinating policies with territorial impacts even connects almost all narratives (i.e. except for the ‘accessibility’ and ‘spatial/territorial dimension’ ones). It namely poses that without a reciprocal fine-tuning process spatial effects of Community policies can aggravate disparities in regional development if these policies are exclusively geared to a sectoral objective. Even though the coordination of policies with a territorial impact is not pressed hard for in regional/cohesion policy stories, the issue regularly appears. The question thus is why the concept plays a major role for it.

The promotion of the coordination of policies with a territorial impact in the concept’s context could still be seen as allied to territorial cohesion. This namely happens during a time when the concept, eight years after it emerged in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area, was still claimed as being European Union policy already. The concept might therefore have annexed the concern of coordinating policies with a territorial impact or *vice versa*. This connection between issues, which is first pressed for in the context of territorial cohesion formed by this usage area, might have become characteristic for the concept nonetheless. The coordination of policies with a territorial impact could therefore be a way in which the concept changes the direction of the future of European Regional/Cohesion policy (e.g. by expanding it with this concern).

**E.5.4 Additional findings from the connected narratives for the overall picture of this usage area**

The treatment of the connected narratives with an own dynamic does not lead to radical changes to the above pictured order of the territorial cohesion context in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. However, after the substantive similarities which are found in the separate narratives lead to a questioning of the use of the concept for a cherry-picking from the (post-)ESDP process usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis), we searched for resemblances between the connections of the metanarratives and narratives. This to find out whether the concept’s typical connectedness represents territorial cohesion concerns. Where in general also the regional/cohesion policy stories appear interweaved, a first finding which confirms that they do not resemble (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis), is that the connected narratives show the metanarrative the way to become firmly connected (i.e. they connect earlier).

The most important issues through the connected narratives are thereby those of specific territories, cohesion objectives, and also the territory and territorial dimension. These might partly mirror the separate metanarratives, as, albeit that the ‘cohesion objective/territorial dimension’ metanarrative returns divided in the narratives’ order, its
importance does seem to resound in the connected narratives. Yet, the connected narratives do not change the suggestion that their concerns for balanced development, specific territories, and services used the concept early on. They however do slightly adjust the subsequent development by showing how the issue of polycentrism and not cities can be a territorial cohesion trace.

A major finding from the connected narratives then comes forward through another intersection. The most discussed ‘territories and accessibility’ metanarrative namely intersects the narratives in two ways: by the affiliation of the issues of territorial capital and accessibility and, more prominent, the association of the concerns to provide services and emphasising specific territories. The latter is reminiscent of a usage of the concept with which the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area roams the by the IGs usage area drawn confines as frontier (i.e. the second general hypothesis), and the former offers an alternative route. These findings run against the apparent fading of the pairing of service provision and specific territories in the metanarratives. It namely remains, but in the regional/cohesion policy stories which form the concept’s context.

Another major difference is that the connected narratives seem far less concerned with coordination than the connected metanarratives. Where territorial cohesion is not really discussed as objective in the connected metanarratives, economic and social cohesion are in the connected narratives and frequently so. This insinuates that overarching considerations are typical for the concept. Still, even the concern with overall policy coherence is stressed without the concept’s usage as well; also guided by the Lisbon Strategy in this. In support of the findings from the connected metanarratives is then that the distinction of territorial cohesion again appears to lie in the promotion of the coordination of policies with a territorial impact. Hence, if the concept expands the Regional/Cohesion policy area of action (i.e. the third general hypothesis), this probably is not done by using official rules for the provision of services to specific territories. Instead, this would be done with the coordination of policies with a territorial impact which could need an informal way of doing as shown by the (post-)ESPD process usage area.
Appendix F  The order of the European Funds usage area

Introduction
The European funds could form the most concrete usage of the concept of territorial cohesion. It is therefore placed at the bottom of the analytical quadrangle made above (see the Introduction of Part II in Book II). The European Funds usage area shown in this appendix then does not only complete the represented demarcation of the concept’s practices by being treated as the last issue in itself, but also by resonating the other three usage areas.

It could for instance be argued that the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty made territorial cohesion such a weak and therefore useless concept in the European funds, that this usage area does not transgress the by the earlier Intergovernmental Conferences drawn confines. The first general hypothesis that guides the reader through this appendix could therefore be: there is no formal usage of the concept in the European Funds usage area at all. Still, not all stories told in and on European funding have to be formal and various ones could plea for giving territorial cohesion a role in it nonetheless. The second general hypothesis then arises when the European funds are seen as wanting to fund as much as possible and many different concerns are assumed to self-interestingly use the concept to get (more) funding: the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions. These masses could then reflect both the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas (e.g. their policy positions, but now for funding). When a formal usage of the concept is questionable and territorial cohesion might play an informal role, one could wonder what the actual hassle is all about. The question that leads the reading of this appendix therefore is: ‘How does the concept of territorial cohesion channel European funds?’ Although this is our main interest, from the departure-point of this research (see Chapter 3) we are of course also concerned with the influences between European spatial planning and the European funds in this (e.g. how European spatial planning positions in this usage area affect and are affected by the European funds).

To treat these hypotheses and question, this appendix shows the attempt made to roughly order the wide-ranging masses of stories in the European Funds usage area. Also this appendix starts its presentation of this with the stories that frame and structure the other stories in this usage area: the general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves (§F.1). Yet, the outcomes of the main events are outlined before that, because these are fundamental to understand the European Funds usage area. After these events and framing and structuring stories, the three territorial cohesion metanarratives of substantive objectives, territorial specificities, and governal organisation of the territory are treated (§F.2). A discussion on the ways stories relate these metanarratives follows (§F.3). Also to show the context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area, both the as metanarratives schematised stories and those connecting them then will be compared to the narratives with an own dynamic (§F.4) and the connections between them (§F.5). Also from these ordered and compared stories conclusions can be on the strategic positions in the concept’s usage, now also foror the closure of the whole territorial cohesion usage field (see Chapter 14).
F.1 European Funds’ events and framing and structuring stories

F.1.1 Financial events as fundamen of the European Funds usage area

What characterises the European Funds usage area is that factors which lay outside even territorial cohesion’s contextual stories largely form it; a feature that, arguably, already hints at the minor role territorial cohesion plays in the debates on the European funds at large. That is, background events actually set the budget of the European Union and the allocations of funds. A better grasp of the concept’s usage and its context in the European funds is therefore in need of a preliminary view. We should first have a rough sketch of the development of the path-depend though unpredictable outcomes of the financial dealings of Member States and European Institutions. Below these developments are sketched along three tracks: the funding for agriculture, the increasing role for the Structural Funds, and the Community Initiative of Interreg.

A year after the Treaty of Rome established the European Economic Community, the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) was created in 1958 to finance the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP).1 For long the CAP accounted for the majority of the “European Union budget”, of which, weakly put, not too much went to the poorest Member States and Regions.2 The Fund’s Guarantee Section stabilised prices by financing price support measures and export refunds – while in 1972 there were national quota’s for sugar, cotton, and tobacco, it still took the largest share of the budget in 1986 – and the Guidance Section was added in 1964 for other agricultural expenditures (e.g. modernisation of farming).3 Relatively seen though, the role of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund decreased through the years – e.g. the Common Agricultural Policy and Rural Development Programmes accounted for “only” half the budget in 2004 (90% of which went to market support measures).4 Finally it was even replaced by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural development (EAFRD), to which the publication of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development in 2006 points.5 Hence, although the part of the budget reserved for agricultural issues decreased, it remains to have – perhaps not the largest, but – a huge financial weight in the European funds.

The Structural Funds are more important for territorial cohesion though, especially their European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) – i.e. financially assisting development projects in poorer regions and employment schemes respectively.6 Although the Structural Funds originated around the same time as the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, it took a while before their financial role gained cloud; something what might have to do with the establishment of the European Regional Development Fund, and linked to this Directorate-General (DG) Regional Policy, when the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Ireland joined the Community some fifteen years later.7 The role of the Structural Funds started to grow when they were reformed in the end of the 1980s; this also lead the majority of their increased funding, just 13% of the total budget though, to go to NUTS-areas8 with a GDP/capita of less than 75% of the European Union average.8 This development continued when the Edinburgh European Council of 1993 made Regional/Cohesion policy funding one third of the European Union budget; this included the addition of the lighter Cohesion Fund established by the Treaty of Maastricht, which funds
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1 Of course, most of the time this was not the ‘EU budget’ but the budget of the European Economic Community, as it was only in 1993 that the Treaty of Maastricht established the European Union.
2 The combination of price guarantees and financing the modernisation of farming could have played a role in the production of “butter mountains” and “wine lakes”.
3 The other two are the Financial Instrument of Fisheries Guidance and the Guidance Section of the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund (the latter shows the fluid boundary between Agricultural funds and the Structural Funds).
4 The more so when it is considered that the Guidance section of the European Guidance and Guarantee Fund is a part of the Structural Funds and also the European Social Fund was created in those times as well.
5 NUTS: nomenclature d’unités territoriales statistiques (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics), denoting subnational areas such as regions and provinces.
6 Gross Domestic Product per capita (here adjusted for purchasing power): the total market values of goods and services produced in a country in a year.
environment and transport infrastructure in Member States with a GNI/capita\(^a\) below 90% of the European Union average.\(^9\) The early developments of the Structural Funds which are relevant for the usage of territorial cohesion thus only show that their (financial) weight increased.

Then again, out of the planning process for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period, which was already going on in the late 1990s, came that this new period started with a reduction of them (i.e. 195 billion euro’s for the Structural Funds and 18 for the Cohesion Fund as outcome); this even though the European Enlargement was coming up, which would lower the European average capita/income due to the new Eastern Member States in 2004.\(^10\) Still, a third of the Community budget went to less prosperous regions and social groups.\(^11\) The first objective, which was for regions whose development lags behind, took 70% of the Structural Funds, and a bit more than 10% went to the other two objectives each, which were for economic and social conversion in areas experiencing structural difficulties and modernisation of training systems and creation of employment outside regions covered by the former respectively.\(^12\) Although the Structural Funds decreased in weight, they thus maintained their amplified role.

Then, at the time of the Enlargement the European Commission brought forward a proposal to change the objectives and allocations again for the new 2007-2013 funding period.\(^13\) It took much debate, mutually between the Member States and between the European Institutions, until, at last, an inter-institutional agreement was reached on the new financial perspectives in 2006.\(^14\) Meanwhile five things happened: i) the three objectives changed into those of convergence, (regional) competitiveness and employment, and territorial cooperation (see below); ii) the Member States (in the European Council) cut down the initially proposed increase in the budget; iii) the relative increase in funding for the first objective in expense of the other two masked a real decrease;\(^b\) iv) the European Parliament rejected the fought-over European Council’s agreement; and, strangely enough, v) during this bickering about who gets how much money, the final Community Strategic Guidelines (i.e. on how to spend it) were made after a public consultation process on its draft version.\(^15\) The development which increased the role of the Structural Funds through the years thus by its outcomes already shows several aspects. The Structural Funds were formed with their total budget being inflated under pressure, with changing allocations for different objectives, and av simultaneous but other process for the details on how to spend them.

For territorial cohesion, one initiative funded through the Structural Funds is worthwhile to sketch in further detail: the one for cooperation between regions, Interreg. The first initiatives for transnational cooperation arose in the 1950s and cross-border cooperation in spatial development started around 1972, this in the context of the intergovernmental initiatives for spatial policy (see Appendix D on the (post-)ESDP process).\(^16\) However, these types of cooperation only came into the European funds at the time of the 1988 Structural Funds reform, as then cross-border cooperation was mentioned among the activities eligible for intervention under the European Regional Development Fund.\(^17\) A year later Interreg began as a Community Initiative\(^c\) to stimulate regional cooperation.\(^18\)

While Member States already participated in transnational groupings, the European Commission started to fund such cooperation’s as well by in 1995 adding transnational to cross-border cooperation to the larger Interreg programme.\(^19\) This development of Interreg continued. For the 2000-2006 period a bit more than 5% of the one third of the Community budget meant for less prosperous regions and social groups went to the Community Initiatives, whereby the share going to Interreg, which now also included interregional co-
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\(^a\) Gross National Income: Gross Domestic Product of a country plus its negative/positive balance with other countries.

\(^b\) That is: the piece of the pie gets relatively bigger, but the pie gets absolutely seen smaller.

\(^c\) The Community Initiatives are pilot interventions of the EC and if others then ‘Interreg’ appear in this usage area then these mostly are ‘Leader’ since the early 1990’s and ‘URBAN’ later on, which focus on urban and rural areas respectively.
operation, increased.\textsuperscript{20} With the Enlargement the Interreg guidelines from 2000 were updated and the eligible areas changed. What was more important though, is that the European Commission then also proposed Territorial Cooperation as new third Structural Funds objective, which, being similar to Interreg, would imply a mainstreaming of it for the new funding period.\textsuperscript{21} Hence, as noted above, on top of the overall decrease of the Structural Funds for the 2007-2012 period, the new Territorial Cooperation objective, which already was the smallest, also suffered the most relatively seen.\textsuperscript{22} Yet, it is safe to say that the Community Initiative Interreg increased in prestige and financial weight by developing into the mainstream.

The financial events fundamental for the European Funds usage area thus demonstrate reshufflings of funding. Agriculture became less important in this, although it still remained very important, and the role of the Structural Funds and also its Interreg Community Initiative became larger, but they are still debated upon.

F.1.2 The usage area’s general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and European funds themselves

The general stories and the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves float on the above described forming currents which determine European funding through the three tracks of agriculture, Structural Funds, and Interreg. Since the Treaty of Rome these stories then respectively frame and structure other stories in the European Funds usage area. Also these can be ordered in a schema, here one on the ‘General stories and stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in the European Funds usage area’. Note that also the abovementioned events return in this Schema; relevant events also returned in the three other Schema’s I (see Appendix C, D, and E), but those of this usage area form it more than the other events form the other usage areas.

Schema 1 shows that the European Funds policy usage area has six general stories. This amount suggest that this usage area is more complexly framed than the one of Regional/Cohesion policy, which has five general stories, but is not as much a patchwork as the (post-)ESDP process usage area is with its ten general stories. The general stories of the European Funds usage area are then in order of importance – with between brackets their colour in Schema 1 – on money (orange), the political organisation (red), implementation (pink), the official policy directions (deep sky blue), the European Union as a business (cyan), and European spatial planning (olive). These are all debated in 2005 and 2006, extensively so in the former. Of course all of them can be related when it concerns funds, including those that do not fall in these general stories,\textsuperscript{23} but in this usage area especially those on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions appear more linked – i.e. those on the topic, how to decide on it, and for which use respectively. The general stories on European spatial planning are instead the odd ones.

The stories that structure other territorial cohesion and European funds stories in the European Funds usage area have an image that resembles the structuring stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Here these three are simply on: territorial cohesion itself, the European funds themselves, and their connection. They are respectively coloured yellow, blue, and bright green in Schema 1. Just as for the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas, the argument to put these structuring stories next to each other comes forth out of this appendix’ leading question, now on the influence of the concept on the European funds. That is, in this way the structuring stories can be addressed before we go deeper into the more specific stories on the European funds that are in/directly

\textsuperscript{21} The Leader Community Initiative would also be mainstreamed in 2006, but thereby financed through rural development programmes instead of the Structural Funds.
related to territorial cohesion in the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic (see next paragraphs).
Just as the other three Schema’s 1, this one does not only express that each kind of general stories has another subject matter, but also that their developments and those of the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves can be followed through time, as will be done below.
F.1.3 The stories framing this usage area

The fundamental developments that also form the six general stories portray financial disputes. The working hypothesis for this section on these stories could therefore be: the general stories of the European Funds usage area show the contours of sharp debates. To test this we first treat the three general stories that are more linked than the others: those on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions. After that we follow the other three according to what is left from the abovementioned order of importance by treating the general stories on implementation before those on seeing the European Union as a business and the odd ones on European spatial planning.

Separately seen the general stories on money are primarily for the Single European Market (SEM) – since the Single European Act (SEA) established it in 1986 that is. These are about the single currency, the market’s disadvantages, and also for preserving something which can be seen as a “counterweight” to the SEM: the European Social Model (ESM).24 When the Structural Funds were reduced in 2000, the political aspect of finance was first added to this with a one-way street: financial problems can become political, but do not demand political solutions from intergovernmental finances.25 Thereafter the promulgation of the proverb of (States) “getting as much as possible” emphasised the importance of money; while paradoxically these general stories also signalled a tendency to reduce public spending at the time that the new financial perspectives were under negotiation.26 Although these developments do not explicitly form a debate, especially the politicisation and importance of finance offer room for this.

The general stories on the political organisation commenced later than those on money: with the 2000-2006 period.27 Typical for this usage area is then, that these stories pose that technical and political choices intricately connect and that the ones on the political organisation are all for the European Union.28 That is, although these general stories do point to the existing diversity in the political organisation now and then (e.g. by noting the importance of inter-institutional agreement or how members of the European Parliament more represent their own (regional) constituencies than their (European) political party), the promotion of European integration and a smooth running of the European Union, both also with Enlargement in mind, is stronger than the indication of diversity.29 This promotion furthermore appeared indirectly in assertions for European Union intervention and, though less so and later on, the decentralisation of its tasks when the European Commission proposed new Structural Fund regulations.30 An additional concern hereby is the role of knowledge in these politico-financial processes. This comes forth out of the description of lobbies and placing of (facilitative) experts, but also by calling for transparent policy planning – nota bene at the end of the public consultation on the Community Strategic Guidelines.31 Hence, if the general stories on money also offer room for debates with a politicisation of finances, those on the political organisation do not seem to take it, as they mostly unpoltically promote the European Union in this.

In 2006 the general stories on money again underline the general financial concern by affirming that it is about what will be paid for. However, this also points to the general stories on the official policy directions (i.e. money is important, but for what will it be used).32 All such general stories thereby uniformly disregard their initial concern with agriculture.33 Instead, the Lisbon Strategy seems to rise as a main official policy direction, but this only since 2003, three years after the European Council adopted it.34 Although the other way, that is: Regional/Cohesion policy, appears well before this strategy, it took until 2004 that those two were related here; which seems to be explained later on by that then the Lisbon Strategy needed to be taken into account, possibly pressed by the European Council which revived it
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in 2005. Perhaps, with all the financial negotiations under way, a contemporaneous look forward has hereby to do with a tension hinted at the year after. It namely observes that many decisions on the future regional policy have yet to be taken, this while Western Member States would be positioned behind the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy is noted as useful too. That is, the question remains to which direction European Union funding should go. The general stories on official policy directions therefore also offer room for sharp debates.

Moreover, what becomes the more noteworthy is that in 2006 impressions are uttered that the Member States attach much importance to financial issues but their policy priorities vary greatly. Hence, the general stories on money and the political organisation mainly promote the SEM and European integration, but give no (further) unambiguous official policy direction. Yet, although a tension between the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy might count for something, these outlines themselves do not seem to show the sharp debates that could be expected of the general stories of the European Funds usage area.

Still, it would be more important if it is true that there is a discrepancy between what is told and what actually is. With a look backward a general story on the official policy directions from 2005 already points towards one way in which this can come forward: a gap between policy and reality at the end of the 1980s. What’s more, the combined general stories, which earlier touched upon these issues, made a financially oriented claim that brings forward another way. In this early period they namely accuse the Community’s regional and social policy of tokenism if compared to the aspirations of the Treaty of Rome. The backing up of aspirations by funding appears to remain a concern. The echo of the “tokenism accusation” in 2006 suggests this and, vice versa, the relative silence on agriculture too.

Even though the SEA granted the promotion of a formal regional policy of the European Union and the increasing importance of the Structural Funds is taken into account, there might thus remain discrepancies between the general stories and the actual financial developments. The general stories then might not show contours of sharp debates because they do not represent the existing tensions.

Another explanation could hold as well though. The linked general stories on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions show this with a similar problem concerning the political organisation and the Lisbon Strategy. They namely both state that this strategy needs European Union intervention and that it leads to decentralisation. Under these paradoxical statements could then lay unrevealed tensions (i.e. decentralisation entails less intervention of higher governmental levels). Grossly seen though, these linked general stories seldom deviate from unproblematised promotion; a (double) exception comes from 2006 with the forecast that the Lisbon Strategy will not be successful because there is no real SEM. The essential conclusion then remains that although the amounts of funding change, the general stories on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions hardly do. However, perhaps the general stories do not give the contours of sharp debates because they are (partly) incongruous with the larger disputes about the European funds. That is, they do not represent the existing tensions, as they, and thus this usage area, does not deal with these but with other issues.

In spite of the larger importance of the general stories on implementation compared to those on the official policy directions, the former do not have a main topic, only a minor one, plus two other issues. The latter two only appear when the Community Strategic Guidelines were drafted in 2005: one makes a case for the exchange of best practices – also with the criterion that this should be on common issues and the addition that there should be an European framework programme for it –, the other cares for the effectiveness of Community policy implementation (e.g. to have no conflicting actions on the ground). Alongside these two issues, the only more structural topic of the general stories on implementation appears to be on principles. These started at the time of the Structural Funds reform in 1988 with the call
to base the implementation of Cohesion policy on national and regional multiannual programmes. Yet, it does not seem to matter whether it concerns principles for implementation or best practices or effectiveness of it, these general stories more appear to lay out than discuss the implementation of European funds.

This implementation appears to develop into a complex though. This starts with a division of labour (e.g. the European Commission approves the programmes that the Member States draw) and differentiation in programmes (e.g. larger ones need Community Support Frameworks and Operational Programmes). It was since ten years after these general stories started that principles also restructured this complexity. In 1999 a European Union regulation which laid down general provisions for the Structural Funds defined the principles of programming, partnership, additionally, and concentration. While the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament wanted to concentrate funding in areas most in need, the parliament also supported the European Commission’s proposal to stronger apply the partnership principle. The general stories reflect this the same year with an emphasis on local and regional authorities and the representatives of the social partners. The complexity does not end here though, as implementation becomes the more complicated when the different practices under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) are accounted for. That is to say, DG Regio and DG Employment and Social Affairs are in 2006 indicated as having different ways of doing – and the same holds for if, as asked for that year as well, the diversity of Europe’s local actors would be recognised. Insofar the general stories on implementation frame the sharp debates of the European Funds usage area (if they exist), then the complexity these stories portray might more blur than clearly define the contours of these debates.

These implementation complexities might stand in a tension with the wished for effectiveness (i.e. more complexity leads to less effectiveness). The general stories on implementation about complexity and effectiveness could in combination nevertheless be given as a reason to organise politically. That is to say, giving local actors strategic impulses from the European Union (e.g. the Lisbon Strategy) with an effective implementation of sectoral Community policies is for instance said to require European intervention. However, crucial to remember hereby is thus that the general stories on implementation are important in the European Funds usage area but do not show a clear formation and entail a bunch of interrelated topics and issues – to not even mention the myriad in practice. Save to say therefore that the general stories on implementation do not resonate the disputes which are shown in the developing currents of events.

The least important – but not unimportant – general stories are on the European Union as a business and on European spatial planning. The former grew with the Lisbon Strategy, especially its revival in 2005, and a concurrent European Parliament co-decision report on the regulations of the ERDF. They are not so much concerned with one or more topics, but with a central idea expressed in various forms; this is reminiscent of the business approach filtered out of the general stories in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. That is to say, seeing the European Union as a business presupposes a definite goal to work to with a single rationality for a supposedly homogeneous all in an as clear-cut assumed reality – as with profitability and the economical reality for private corporations. This central idea is expressed in demands to let the European Union promote such things as its (regional) innovation, growth, entrepreneurship, and quality. Because oppositional goals, plural rationalities, a
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4 Community Support Frameworks outline the strategic objectives of the funding.
5 Operational Programmes are specific for a sector or region and describe the detailed measures and delivery arrangements of interventions.
6 The programming principle entails the making of multiannual development programmes. The partnership principle is concerned with partnerships between the European Commission and other government levels (and non-governmental actors) during the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes. The principle of additionality means that Community financial assistance supplements national spending rather than replacing it. The principle of concentration means that resources should be focussed on an area, community, or sector.
heterogenous whole do not fit the European Union as a business, general stories seeing it thus could close the door for debates.

Yet, the idea of seeing the European Union as a single business – whereby it merely is about the management of measures – becomes clearer if contrasted with two statements that go against it – which thereby belong to these general stories on the European Union as business nonetheless. These statements appeared while the business idea got stronger in 2005 and are: the judgement of effects depends on the perspective of different actors on the development of an area (i.e. going against a single reason and homogeneity) and European society consists of national societies (i.e. going against the European whole and assumed economic reality). Although the idea of the European Union as business seems to gain ground, these general stories therefore also cover those going against it. Hence, this shows some debate in the general stories of the European Funds usage area, but not explicitly enough to be called sharp.

The general stories on European spatial planning are the odd ones, as it is no formal European policy (see the previous appendices) and almost negligible in the European funds in general. They are nonetheless influential in this usage area and appeared, all pro European Spatial Planning, since the European Commission’s working document on Community Policies and Spatial Planning in 1998. A related event for the European Funds usage area the year after, is that the guidelines of the Structural Funds for the 2000-2006 period and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund already mentioned the then published ESDP. Moreover, in line of the initial relation of spatial development with cross-border cooperation, the European Commission’s guidelines for Interreg III for the same period did even more than just refer to the ESDP. That is, proposals for Interreg IIIB funding had to take it into account; here a particular noteworthy Interreg III programme is ESPON, which analysed Structural Funds programmes. Although European spatial planning is marginal in the European funds, these general stories on it frame the European Funds usage area and this by its promotion.

What surprises hereby, is that after the first general stories on European spatial planning, it was indirectly more promoted by discussions on the influence between European and national spatial planning than with the ESDP. Very consequential for this might be, as posed in 2006, European spatial planning is of the Member States instead of the European Union; this would also make it easier to understand why the Rotterdam Conference of the Ministers responsible for spatial development in 2004 did not have the purpose of discussing the Structural Funds’ financial allocations. Then again, the general stories on European spatial planning which seem to fall outside these discussions appear to characterise them the most. That is, after Interreg incorporated the ESDP, it was stated that a change of spatial planning in the European Union occurs whereby it might loose its name, and that a second ESDP (which appeared at the horizon in 2006) should be more practical to be influential. While European spatial planning thus seems to have its foot in the door of the European Funds (e.g. in the form of the ESDP), the general stories on this show – some discussion, but – no sharp debate at all. This makes them less odd in the general stories though.

Hence, however awkward, where the events so fundamental for the European Funds usage area already point to debates, a characteristic of its general stories is that they show no sharp debates at all. On the contrary, they run counter to this section’s working hypothesis by merely portraying promotions. That is, promotions of the SEM, European integration, Cohesion policy, European spatial planning, the complexities of implementation which are more or less guided by principles, and the simultaneous growth of the Lisbon Strategy and the idea of seeing the European Union as a business. The only explicit tension that comes
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* Interreg IIIB is concerned with transnational cooperation.
forward is between the Lisbon Strategy and/or Cohesion policy as official policy directions, and some contentions seem to go against the idea of the European Union as a business. How then to explain that the general stories show no sharp debates? Do they not represent the related financial reality? Do they point to a calm spot amidst heavy weather? Are the currents of the underlying developments so large and/or slow that the discussions that frame this usage area cannot come to the fore sharply? This appendix will further treat these issues below.

F.1.4 The stories structuring this usage area

The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves further structure all the stories in the European Funds usage area that are framed by the general ones. The events that form the general stories are thus also fundamental here. As these events show debates but the general stories almost none, the working hypothesis for this section on the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds in themselves separately and in their connections could be guided further by the first general hypothesis of this appendix. That is, if it is held that there is no formal usage of territorial cohesion in this usage area and its structuring stories are framed by almost no debates, then they might not debate the concept at all. However, before the stories on territorial cohesion itself and its connections to those on the European funds themselves are treated, the latter are separately.

F.1.5 The stories on the European funds themselves in two phases

The stories on the European funds themselves can be divided into two phases: from 1996 until 2004 and when they are treated extensively thereafter in 2005 and 2006. Hereby these structuring stories further build upon the usage area’s disregard for agricultural concerns as framed by the general stories, as they are mostly on the Structural Funds. The only ones on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in the first phase appeared in 2004 (i.e. when 45% of the budget went to market support measures). They thereby asserted that the fundamental justification for the CAP was (and remains) a more effective exploitation of comparative advantage. Thereafter only notice was taken of its large financial weight and the origin of its fund labelled as first structural funding instrument. When territorial cohesion relates to the European funds, it will thus probably be the Structural Funds, as shown below for the first before the second phase.

Early on the structuring stories on the Structural Funds rendered these funds as merely being the financial means for “higher purposes”. Such as a smooth running of the European Union – nota bene claimed while they were reduced in 2000 – and, with hindsight from 2005, as a balancing of the books of the Member States until the end of the 1980s. Yet, the Structural Funds were in the first phase also considered for their own cause. The structuring stories thereby eventually often show views for and against their reform. New rules were namely appreciated at the time principles re/structured the above mentioned implementation complexities and the Guidelines for the Structural Funds and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period were published. When territorial cohesion relates to the Structural Funds, one should thus keep in mind that these funds are debated and changed themselves too.

Just before such debates on the next period were going to break loose, some friction then emerged: the funding for Cohesion policy would be insufficient to reach the proposed objectives of this policy, but major reform was resisted as well. Hereby the problems of tokenism and a permanent gap between policy and reality (as noted in the general stories) are related to the framework from the end 1980s. This framework is namely said to require continuous policy adaptations and regular changes at the (so complex) implementation level; something which is exemplified by the possibility to propose, if necessary, adjustments that are linked to new Community policy initiatives in the Community Strategic Guidelines.
Another topic is on the Structural Funds’ principles being too generic. This is a related topic, because generic principles in combination with a complex reality could lead to mismatches; moreover, that generic principles are re/evaluated is less surprising when you consider the complexities shown by the general stories on implementation. Notwithstanding that this smaller topic was not really argued over, it could still be posed that the stories on the European funds themselves appear to show debates on the framework and principles of the Structural Funds.

Another trait of the stories on the European funds themselves seems to be that they support European spatial planning at the outset instead of debating it; which is of significance for the first general hypothesis about the absence of any formal usage of the concept too, and thus this section’s working hypothesis, as it could show how in/formalities structure this usage area. This with the following three statements for instance: i) the Structural Funds were for European spatial planning identified as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, ii) DATAR was said to have heavily influenced Cohesion policy in the structure of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and iii) the political conclusions of the ESDP would have been encouraged to be applied in implementing action that is financed through the Structural Funds and noticed in the 2000-2006 funding guidelines later on. The structuring stories thus appear to reinforce European spatial planning’s foot in the door of the European Funds as framed by the general stories.

However, these structuring stories also depict a hesitation of European spatial planning to march into the Structural Funds. This for instance comes forward in stories reminiscent of something mentioned above: the informal meeting in Rotterdam (i.e. of the Ministers responsible for spatial development) was simply not meant for the contemporaneous debates on the Structural Funds reform for the 2007-2013 funding period. A year before the ESDP’s publication in 1999 there was namely called to not mix the debate on this document with the institutional procedures which are related to the previous funds reform. The minor discussion on the Community Initiatives in the stories on the European funds themselves could nevertheless be crucial here, because Interreg incorporated the ESDP. Simply put, these initiatives were supported at first, but at the end their cancellation in the 2007-2013 funding period was called for. It is save to say though that the line of in/formality might be a fuzzy one in the European Funds usage area when it concerns European spatial planning. A mark that becomes the more important the stronger territorial cohesion relates to European spatial planning (here). As a consequence it becomes the more difficult to in a clear-cut way determine whether the concept is used formally (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

From 1996 to 2004 the stories on the European funds themselves thus seem to point to debates, at least when it concerns the Structural Funds (i.e. its reforms and principles), and a fuzzy in/formality, as they at the outset deal with European spatial planning. This phase and the later one of 2005 and 2006 then have the promotion of one fund per area/programme as (another) principle in common – once a European Commission proposal for the 2007-2013 Structural Fund was, along the lines of the general stories on the political organisation and implementation, even linked to bringing up the concerns with decentralisation and concentration. Yet, a more important question could be: how did the stories on the Structural Funds themselves develop in the later phase? That is to say, in the years of extensive debates and many events. After the Enlargement the extensive debates on the European funds namely display the negotiations on the financial perspectives for the 2007-2013 funding period; the intensity of the funding debates would have been severe, but its
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As mentioned in the chapter on the (post-)ESDP process, the Délegation à l'Aménagement du Territoire et à l’Action Régionale (DATAR) is part of the French spatial planning way of doing that influences (the ways of doing in) the European Union.

Single Pot funding might reflect a more British way of doing, what perhaps stands in a tension with the way of doing promulgated by DATAR.
agreement easily reached, both politically and diplomatically (i.e. split 50/50% by the old and new Member States). Moreover, also these funds’ Community Strategic Guidelines were debated. This probably in a more intricate fashion though, as DG Regio and DG Employment were reported as submitting the first draft to the Member States in 2005 and the last version as to be provided by the European Commission to the Council after both the 2007-2013 financial perspectives and regulations of the Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund are agreed upon. These developments offer reasons for the stories on the European Funds themselves to differ in phase two.

The second phase differs from the first phase by mostly discussing another reform of the Structural Funds, but not explicitly so. Here major debates are concerned with the European Union budget in three ways: i) deciding on it; ii) expanding but now also reducing the funding for Cohesion policy; and iii) effectively using what is left. This also comes forward by respectively: i) labelling the European Parliament as more assertive, due to its rejection of the European Council’s budget agreement, and, at least its Committee for Regional Policy, as an alley of the European Commission; ii) by even voicing a renationalisation of the Structural Funds; and iii) for instance adding strategic and/or evidence-based targeting, new utilisation forms, and more indirect measures to the ways already referred to; note that these debates presume that the European Union cares whether its funds are well spent, something denied just once. The general and structuring stories thus show parallels with the last reform. That is, while the general stories on money, how to decide on it, and for which use appear linked, the structuring stories had an overlapping debate on the essentials of how to decide on the European funds and how much goes to Cohesion policy – another debate was framed by the general stories on implementation and on how to spent these funds. Moreover, in line of the financial events is that the allocations over the three Cohesion policy objectives were discussed as well (i.e. convergence, (regional) competitiveness and employment, and territorial cooperation); perhaps these structuring stories thereby only partially expose the leeway, as they merely differ marginally. Also in the second phase debates about the Structural Funds appear clearly, of which the debates on how much funding goes to Cohesion policy and the allocation of this over the three objectives might be of special interest for territorial cohesion.

Yet, the debate on how much funding goes to Cohesion policy (objectives) is not the only way in which the general stories on the official policy directions are further structured. Two other (and double related) topics also shape the usage area in this: a disagreement on struggles between the DGs and a quarrel on how the Lisbon Strategy fits into the Structural Funds. Although for the former the stories on the European funds themselves held that there is no competition for funding, they on the other hand regarded Anglo-Saxon tools as a way out of a one-year struggle. Because in this struggle those DGs aligned to the Lisbon Strategy were roughly set against the ones which are better equipped by the European funds (which mostly finance agricultural and regional policy), what clearly relates to this is that the Lisbon Strategy is alleged to both counter national Structural Funds strategies and guide the principles for the Community Strategic Guidelines. The tools as way out of the argued struggle between DGs then appears to point to the official policy direction of the Lisbon Strategy, as these included loans instead of grants and introduced these guidelines; in passing, the latter were also held as not compulsory for all regions and therefore responded in the minor issue of the Structural Funds’ principles being too generic. After the stories on the European funds themselves show entangled debates on the Structural Funds in the first phase, these debates thus change from for and against their reform to how to decide and spent them, the Cohesion policy allocation(s), and the Lisbon Strategy.

Note that the value and purpose of the Structural and Cohesion Funds are seldom questioned in the second phase. Regardless of these interrelated issues of the debate on this
latest reform, what they have in common is that they neither mention higher purposes nor the
Enlargement as major political event. A story from these entangled debates on the European
funds themselves can then perhaps characterise their differences in opinion best: a common
financing is needed which backs up aspirations, but political processes make the policy-
making and implementation of the Structural Funds’ distribution more difficult.87 That is, it
seems if the tension of the one-way street between finances and politics and the involved
tokenism exposed by the general stories is trailed, as not much seems to remain to be
discussed for the European funds themselves, as much became political, except for complexly
interrelated issues about difficult implementations.

During this second phase another trait of the stories on the European funds themselves
appears to develop in a main way too: European spatial planning does not seem to keep away
from the Structural Funds anymore.88 These structuring stories namely do not only tell about
the Structural Funds as means to implement Cohesion policy, but the ESDP as well.89
Furthermore, the Ministers responsible for spatial development were urged to provide input
for the Community Strategic Guidelines; this probably in line with the official policy
direction in this pointed at above, because these Ministers were marked supporters of a shift
towards the Lisbon Strategy.90 However, the other side of the coin is the even as heavy
indicated influence vice versa. This is described with the Structural Funds regime that would
largely handicap the European spatial policy field.91 Observations on the informal Councils
of Ministers responsible for spatial planning fit this picture, as they would lack influence
when the intergovernmental conferences already set the framework and/or the Community
Strategic Guidelines for the National Strategic Reference Frameworks (NSRFs) would be
adopted by the European Council.92 With the mainstreaming of Interreg into the Cohesion
policy objective of territorial cooperation, the role of the fuzzy line of in/formality in the
European Funds usage area increases, also in complexity; the more so when the stories on the
European funds themselves leave it open which of the spheres of actions and innovative
measures the mainstreaming technique incorporates from the Community Initiatives into the
objectives and priorities of the operational programmes.93 What might be clear though, is that
the stories on the European funds themselves do not only show changes in entangled debates
on the Structural Funds, but also the in/formal promotion of European spatial planning.

F.1.6 The stories on territorial cohesion itself in two phases
In this usage area the stories on territorial cohesion itself can be divided in the same two
phases as those on the European funds themselves (i.e. until 2004 and thereafter). However,
before also they are treated extensively in 2005 and 2006, the concept appears later than
stories on the European funds themselves do. That is, they appear since the 2000-2006
funding period, and habitually so; which could be explained by the remark from 2006 that
Barnier (i.e. the Commissioner of DG Regio from 1999 to 2004) pushed the concept.94 While
at its emergence territorial cohesion was claimed to be a European Union principle, the
stories on territorial cohesion itself also held that the concept requires a political consensus,
such as the acceptance of a common project among different regions.95 As the general stories
frame those on territorial cohesion itself, the need for a common project would open up room
for debate.

As the general stories on the official policy directions (i.e. Cohesion policy and/or the
Lisbon Strategy) and those on European spatial planning are ambiguous, it is not surprising
that the concept was linked to all three. This in the first phase by: endorsing territorial
cohesion in its own right under Cohesion policy, letting the Lisbon Strategy or the ESDP give
a hypothetical territorial cohesion index, and observing that in trans- and infranational
practice territorial cohesion is more promoted than spatial planning.96 This last observation
aligns to the one in the general stories that tells about a change of spatial planning whereby it
might loose its name. The practices which are designated namely seem to be those fostered by the Interreg IIIIB programmes that need to take the ESDP into account. The practices which are designated namely seem to be those fostered by the Interreg IIIIB programmes that need to take the ESDP into account. Still, even though territorial cohesion might need a common project, there thus seems to ensue no debate on or between these three directions.

Two issues from the general stories on the European Union as business and implementation also return in the early stories on territorial cohesion itself. Especially the linkage of innovation to the concept falls straight into the general stories. It is hereby remarkable that cases were made for measures that strengthen territorial cohesion and an effective territorial cohesion policy before the general stories on implementation are concerned with effectiveness. Albeit that many topics thus come to the fore which place the concept in the European funds, perhaps effectiveness therefore is a preoccupation of the concept. Yet again, until 2004 the stories on territorial cohesion itself mostly seem to adhere to the general stories of this usage area. That is, they affirm that there appears no debate on the concept.

In the second phase of 2005 and 2006 many relevant events happened: the draft Community Strategic Guidelines described territorial cohesion, an informal Ministerial meeting on regional policy and territorial cohesion was held in Luxembourg, and the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development mentioned the concept. It therefore is not surprising that stories on territorial cohesion itself appeared more often in the European Funds usage area after the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports treated the concept in 2004. Thus could also increase the changes for a debate on the concept.

The second phase also differs from the first one in that one major and one minor debate are added and two debates are restructured. The major debate revolves around a question of direct importance for whether there is a formal usage of the concept in this usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis): does the usage of the concept in the funds need the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty or not (see the Appendix C on the IGCs usage area)? The stories on territorial cohesion itself hereby denote a range from fully in favour to indifference. That is, they describe the European Union as holding territorial cohesion as a guiding principle and observed that the concept found its way into in/formal policy documents, also in anticipation of its inclusion in the Constitutional Treaty, but also that the European Commission adopted a subtle approach to the concept after the Treaty’s non-ratification; the latter relates to a side-debate which can be exemplary: to draw a White Paper on territorial cohesion or not? This debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for the concept’s usage could have great consequences. It might namely create a situation in which the first general hypothesis is affirmed (i.e. no formal usage), but the effects of this are circumvented (i.e. usage still). However, the indifference shown by the statement that a territorial cohesion competency would change little could lead to a re-evaluation of this; the more so when the territorial cohesion aspects dealt with in national strategies (on European funding) depend on the preferences of the Member States, that is, when the complexities which were already brought forward by the general stories on implementation return here. The stories on territorial cohesion itself thus structure this usage area with a major and influential debate about the need for an official ratification of the concept.

One might pose that this debate on the concept’s ratification already negates that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all. The minor new debate of the stories on territorial cohesion itself in 2005 and 2006 then adds to this, as it shows a disagreement on to
what extent territorial cohesion exists. The differences here come forth out of the details – which relate to the above-mentioned complexity of implementation levels. That is, in 2005 these stories stated that since 1999 trends and policy development slightly contributed to territorial cohesion, but descriptions on whether it in- or decreases differ depending on the level in question (e.g. it lacks on the national level).\textsuperscript{104} There thus appears a debate around territorial cohesion’s existence besides the concept’s ratification. However there is neither a structuring story against the concept nor a debate on whether it actually can exist or not. The working hypothesis that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all then thus still stands.

The two restructured debates of the stories on territorial cohesion itself in this second phase are concerned with the concept’s focus. The therefore restructure the debates on the concept’s political consensus and when it concerns the three official policy directions. While with the emergence of the concept the requirement of such a common ground aired, here these structuring stories even call to broaden the fields dealt with by territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{105} However, more specifically, the discussion is whether territorial cohesion is an ‘undefined political objective’ or not (i.e. what its ground is); whereby these stories substantively define territorial cohesion as, for example, (unchallengeable) equity, the regional aspect, the diversity of Member States, and spatial development.\textsuperscript{106} These structuring stories thereby also define the concept as a method, or better: as related to processes. Territorial cohesion would for instance need a comprehensive strategy that sets the framework for specific objectives and actions to be successful (i.e. \textit{vice versa}).\textsuperscript{107} But again, such debates on the concept’s (lack of) focus do not debate the concept itself though.

The other restructured debate is on how the concept links to the general stories of the official policy directions and European spatial planning. While in the first phase merely links appear, here they are more structured. A structure that is build then sees spatial development as a part of territorial cohesion and the concept as a part of Cohesion policy as well as the Lisbon Strategy, or more specific: connected to ways in which Cohesion policy can contribute to the Lisbon Strategy.\textsuperscript{108} Only Cohesion policy seems to be questioned hereby (e.g. as such a “midfield”). That is to say, even though the stories on territorial cohesion itself said that the new Cohesion policy framework provides unprecedented opportunities for the integration of the concept, they observe that no actions or measures in this policy are designated to exclusive pursue territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{109} Thus also when the links of territorial cohesion to three official policy directions are structured, no debate on the concept appears.

Hence, in the stories on territorial cohesion itself the concept seems only to be promoted and not so much debated in itself. That is, territorial cohesion is merely promoted with debates about it (i.e. its in/formality, existence, and focus). This bolsters that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). Perhaps hereby the concept tries to be used formally in various ways, because no (explicit) argument is made against it – although there is no outcome on this yet, what is also suggested by the scarcity of financial territorial cohesion events. This situation again points to the fuzzy line of in/formality. One might then ask how strong the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves relate to European spatial planning.

F.1.7 The stories connecting territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in two phases

Stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves have, not surprisingly, the same two phases as both have separately. None thereby demote territorial cohesion, what is in common with the stories on the concept itself. A basic difference, however, is that after the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports were published the degree of coverage increased much more greatly. This could be shocking when
combined with their late emergence (i.e. a shock-wave like appearance); also this late emergence on itself surprises when you consider the backward looking story from 2005 which holds that a general awareness of territorial cohesion already began with the planning process of the 2000-2006 Structural Funds programmes in the end of the 1990s (i.e. where are the stories that account for an earlier general awareness). Below this quick development of the just lately emerging stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are again treated per phase.

The concept and European funds themselves were connected at the time of the European Parliament’s resolution on the management of Regional policy and the Structural Funds of 2002. However, this immediately as a foregone conclusion with the claim that territorial cohesion is an objective of the Structural Funds measures. Two years later though, the connection weakened through the account that territorial cohesion has in cases only been inferred as policy objective of Structural Funds programmes; to not even mention the concurrent message that the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was not set with territorial cohesion in mind. Although the concept itself is again not debated, this usage area is structured by a debate on whether the territorial cohesion is already (explicitly) taken up by the Structural Funds.

During this debate these stories meanwhile brought some other aspects forward as well. That is, the concept could play an important role in the fundamental discussion about the revision of the Structural Funds (e.g. it does not yet), even without an official reference, and, more extreme, it could reorient these funds towards territorial cohesion (also with the help of the principle of concentration). Note that they do not mention European spatial planning at all in this phase. Yet, a more important distinction for this usage area deals with the non-/existence of a formal usage (i.e. the first general hypothesis) and the non-/existence of debate (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis) respectively. We can namely separate the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in the ones that discuss whether the concept is in/formally used in the European funds and those that suggest the possibility to do so.

In 2005 and 2006 the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves continued further and more thoroughly. A basic question thereby was whether the concept changes the funds; this relates to how it channels them (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). For instance, although they insisted that the term ‘cohesion’ assures the continuity with the traditional approach to the European funds, the concept would also add measures to the proposals of the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG). A more humble observation was that substantive concepts such as territorial cohesion are put aside when Intergovernmental Conferences have set the framework and national Ministers of finance distributed the money; this is similar to the story on the European funds themselves about the influence the informal Councils of Ministers responsible for spatial planning lack. Besides debates on whether territorial cohesion is already taken up by the Structural Funds, and if formally so, these stories also structure this usage area with consequences of the concept for the European funds.

Still, besides the basic question whether the concept changes the funds, the placing of the concept lingered as well. Apart from the agricultural funds the concept was, confusingly, issued as (to be) used in each and all of the thus far mentioned European funds and Structural Funds objectives (e.g. in a cross-cutting manner); this also with arguments such as: if the European Union has a competency for territorial cohesion then it is related to the Structural Funds – what increases the importance of the debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for the concept’s usage – and if the concept relates to the Lisbon Strategy then it is wider than the Structural Funds – what increases the role of the general stories on the official policy directions. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds
themselves therefore appear to affirm that territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). That is to say, those that connect them even describe a situation in which policy and political actors pragmatically use the concept in substantively different Structural Funds objectives to suit their own ends.\textsuperscript{119} This then leads to a variety of usages. Hence, as these stories note themselves: the undefinedness of territorial cohesion affects the policy targeting through the future Structural Funds.\textsuperscript{120} This would then mean a simple answer to this appendix’ leading question of how the concept channels European funds: not at all.

Other stories in the second phase that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are more on how the concept deals with the complexities of implementation. They are concerned with its place in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the contribution of the Structural Funds to territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{121} The former are ambiguous though. This because they on the one hand describe these guidelines as including territorial cohesion as purpose for which the funds may intervene, or even that the funds will implicitly include an European Territorial Cohesion Strategy; the Member States are in that case also given a role, as a side-discussion is on whether its inclusion would affect the National Strategic Reference Frameworks (e.g. it depends on the financial resources available to Cohesion policy in each Member State).\textsuperscript{122} The concept’s undefinedness thereby remains unsolved. What is more, although these guidelines would (partially) reflect previous reports which revealed the European Commission’s position on territorial cohesion, a clearer definition was demanded as a necessity.\textsuperscript{123} However, on the other hand these stories also hint at the omission of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines. They namely point to a “backdoor possibility” which is shown in the stories on the European funds themselves: to make adjustments in these guidelines linked to new Community policy initiatives as way to include territorial cohesion nonetheless.\textsuperscript{124} While the stories on territorial cohesion itself disagree on the existing territorial cohesion, the stories that connect the concept to the European funds themselves thus debate its inclusion in the Community Strategic Guidelines.

In the debate on the contribution of the Structural Funds to territorial cohesion, one argument is that their past programmes have been conducive to territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{125} However, that more attention is paid to whether these funds could contribute to territorial cohesion seems to stand in a tension with this (i.e. when the question is whether, then it is not yet the case), especially the arrayed factors this would depend on (e.g. the outcomes of the negotiations between the Member States and European Commission prior to the approval of the legislative proposals, the leverage over the national spending of funds).\textsuperscript{126} Moreover, although the 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform, which is strongly debated in the stories on the European funds themselves, was reported to take the concept on board, a warning hereby is that the newly proposed approach actually presents threats to delivering territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{127} Hence, although debates appear about the place of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the contribution of the Structural Funds to it, the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves also seem to harbour an all-out questioning of these implementation oriented debates. They namely ask, in line with the one-way street that appears in the general stories on money (i.e. not demand political solutions from finances), whether European Union programmes are suitable to conduct a thorough political debate on the long-term stakes in the field of territorial cohesion.\textsuperscript{128}

One can argue that for such a thorough political debate the concept has to be used formally. Yet, informal possibilities could appear too, with European spatial planning for instance. Then again, something that is striking in the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in both the first and second phase, is that European spatial planning only plays a minor role. Separately seen the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds support it. Yet, in connection they in the last years merely put
forward: that a European Union competency for territorial cohesion would link the concept to the Structural Funds and result in spatial planning related regulations and that the territorial cohesion definition of the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group (CPG)\(^9\) also holds for the distribution of the Structural Funds.\(^{129}\) Perhaps this minor role has to do with the in these connections hardly mentioned debates on the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification.\(^{130}\) The fuzzy line of in/formality might there fore lie – not central, but – at the border of the European Funds usage area, whereby European spatial planning forms the informal side.

This minor role for European spatial planning thus points to the importance of the question whether the concept is formally used in this usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis). Clearly, rather important for an absence of any such formal usage is just this connection between territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. With an absent formal usage of the concept, a fruitful way to characterise the stories on this is to show what they did not do. They then never state that territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are not connected and/or cannot be. However, none were, for instance, on the budget, Cohesion policy allocation(s), or how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds. Hence, although they are not contradicted, the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves appear to be not involved in any major European funds debate (yet).

F.1.8 The main characteristic of the structuring stories

The main characteristic of all these stories that structure the European Funds usage area by being on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves is that they do not really put them into question but outline their debates and discussions. Hereby those on the European funds themselves showed entangled debates on how to decide on and spent the European funds, the Structural Funds’ cause, its reforms, the Cohesion policy allocation(s) and the Lisbon Strategy. Those on the territorial cohesion itself point to debates around the concept: its un/definedness, existence, and in/formality with related policy directions. The stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves relate them by discussing the existence or possibility of this connection and consequential changes for the funds. These stories also debated the place of the concept within the funds and Community Strategic Guidelines (leading to more confusion) and their contribution to territorial cohesion. The concept is in itself thus not debated, what affirms this section’s working hypothesis.

What might be more important though, is that none of the structuring stories debate major funding issues. As the European funds lead to much debate, this underlines that the European Funds usage area is not involved in such main issues. This might be due to its informality related to European spatial planning. However, although the general stories frame a support European spatial planning, the separate stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves appear to back it in/formally as well, when these structuring stories are connected they do not. A strange situation thus appears, as all these structuring stories together also do suggest that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area (yet) (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

4.1.9 The European Funds usage area is framed and structured by entangled minor debates

The plain message here is that although the financial events that are fundamental for the European Funds usage area reshuffle funds, the general stories do not appear to frame the territorial cohesion and European funds stories in this with sharp debates. Instead, they mainly frame them with the promotion of European finances, economics, politics, and in/formal policies. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves then
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\(^{9}\) The CPG is a group in the (post-)ESDP process (more on this process in Appendix D) that consists of the immediate past, current and next Presidencies and the European Commission.
further structure this usage area. This with debates that draw a fuzzy line of in/formality as border, a distinction between existing and possible usages of the concept, and an absence of voices that go against territorial cohesion. Hence, in line with this section’s working hypothesis, the concept is not debated. However, without touching upon major debates of European funds, it could seek an active formal usage in this, which until now did not exists; this situation largely defends that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

The territorial cohesion and European funds stories which are framed by these general stories and structured by those on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves can be ordered by the topics which seem to be assumed as those as to be discussed under the concept of territorial cohesion (i.e. its metanarratives) and as part of its European funds context (i.e. the narratives with an own dynamic). Hereby they might portray the various ways in which the concept tries to fit into the European Funds usage area. These stories thus become the testing ground for the second general hypothesis which poses that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions.

F.2 Territorial cohesion metanarratives in the European Funds usage area

F.2.1 Introducing the three metanarratives

Just as in the IGCs and Regional/Cohesion usage area, also in the European Funds usage area most territorial cohesion stories evolve around a single metanarrative. The ordering of territorial cohesion stories in this usage area thereby lays bare a bundle of three wide metanarratives. These signify that the usages of the concept go all over the place within these metanarratives. The three metanarratives seem thus already to confirm that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis).

The concept for instance appears with a variety of substantive objectives. However, a stringent splitting up of territorial cohesion stories according to kinds of substantive objectives (as in the other usage areas) would rest upon shaky grounds. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves namely also strongly structure them with a debate on the substantive focus of the concept; thereby framed by the debates on the official policy directions and European spatial planning. The result is therefore a single metanarrative that harbours the whole group of substantive objectives. This metanarrative, simply called ‘substantive objectives’, has the least weight though.

When the European Funds usage area portrays the most concrete usage of the concept, then territorial cohesion might not get any more tangible than with the territorial reality which is told of. Territorial cohesion stories bring many specificities to the fore for this, what forms the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative. This metanarrative is the largest of the three, even huge in 2005. The role of knowledge (e.g. lobbies, experts) and the gap between policy and reality could thus become more significant, as the general stories on, respectively, the political organisation and official policy directions frame these spoken of territorial realities.

Territorial cohesion also appears in this usage area with organisational issues. These range from purely territorial to purely processual, due to which they form the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative. The governal organisation of the territory comes close to the activity of a State, which is formal and territorial per definition. For this metanarrative the European Funds usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality is therefore essential. The appearance and development of the stories per territorial cohesion metanarrative can then be summarised schematically as shown below in Schema 2a
‘Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area (without relating stories)’. 

These wide metanarratives give a very basal order of the territorial cohesion stories in the European Funds usage area. A main characteristic of all these territorial cohesion stories might thereby already give a glimpse of their picture sketched below. That is, there seldom appear counterstories in these metanarratives. Just as in the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas, also in this usage area no metanarrative is refuted, nor
does one consist of a dominant story opposed by its counterstory. However, this could imply something else for the European Funds usage area. As this usage are lies besides main funding debates, this absence of counterstories could signalise that the points that are brought forward by the territorial cohesion stories are not (yet) discussed, that is: there is hardly paid attention to them. Yet, because the metanarratives are so wide, also here the way in which they should be expressed appears to be discussed. Here this matters for the influence the concept could have on the European funds, which to its possible irrelevance could be a minor influence or only later on, or, perhaps more probable, *vice versa*. Because of this, also the appearances and developments of these three metanarratives need to be scrutinised. Below this will be done one by one by identifying and relating their main discussions.

F.2.2 Substantive objectives metanarrative

The ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative is the youngest metanarrative, as it only appears since 2004 (i.e. only for three years). It are then the substantive objectives of balance, competitiveness, the environment, economic cohesion, social cohesion, infrastructure, services, and polycentrism which appear persistently from the proposals for the debated 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform on (i.e. four years after new substantive objectives arrived in 2000). Albeit that the financial events reshuffle allocations and not each of these objectives appears regularly in this metanarrative, developments are hard to detect in it. What is clear, is that the metanarrative follows the structuring stories with an absence of a specifically agricultural objective despite the weight of agricultural funding in general.

Nonetheless, the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative could already begin to test whether the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). We are thereby guided by a description from the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves: actors use the concept pragmatically in substantively different Structural Funds objectives. In combination with the up until now largely affirmed first general hypothesis, which poses that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all, the working hypothesis for this section then becomes: the substantive objectives that are related to territorial cohesion represent an ungathered mass of informal usages. To see whether this is the case, below the substantive objectives are treated in the following order: polycentrism, three pairs of infrastructure and services, economic and social cohesion, and balance and competitiveness, and the environment.

Although Interreg III (also see §F.2.4) took onboard ESDP policy recommendations such as polycentric development, when territorial cohesion relates to polycentrism in this usage area this relationship is not furthered specified – with the stubborn exception of seeing polycentric patterns as the best precondition for territorial cohesion. An explanation for this could be that the Structural Funds Guidelines and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period mentioned the ESDP but not polycentrism. Another explanation could be that the territorial cohesion stories on polycentrism refer more to the by the general stories promoted European spatial planning than to the official policy direction of Cohesion policy (e.g. by seeing territorial cohesion and polycentrism as spatial policy aims). As a result polycentrism appears on the fuzzy line of in/formality that comes from the stories on the concept and the European funds themselves.

Furthermore, also in accordance with these structuring stories is that here only indirect links to the Structural Funds were made: their programmes would contribute to territorial cohesion and polycentric development (depending on the national policies and again the geographical level concerned) and the implicit Territorial Cohesion Strategy in the Community Strategic Guidelines would embrace polycentrism. That the territorial cohesion stories on polycentrism thus point to both an existing relationship and the possibility
of it could imply that this substantive objective portrays a usage of the concept without a well-established formality (i.e. formally only possible, but existing informally).

Territorial cohesion also relates to infrastructure and services. Yet, in both cases it is not clear if the stories describe an existing relationship or a thought of possibility. These substantive objectives were thereby often paired and mainly seen as parts of territorial cohesion; this at least as the once noted contribution of (also) the Structural Funds programmes’ infrastructural measures to territorial cohesion. What is then typical for this usage area, is that the general stories do not frame these issues, those on territorial cohesion and the European Funds themselves do not (strongly) structure them, and that this metanarrative only weakly puts them forward. Although the territorial cohesion stories on services follow the formal limits set for the concept’s usage (see Appendix C on the IGCs), the substantive objectives of infrastructure and services thus seem to play a minor role in the European Funds usage area.

Economic and social cohesion is another pair in the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative, one that is framed by Cohesion policy as official policy direction. With arguments for the un/importance of the terms of social and territorial cohesion in politics the concept thereby sides a little bit more to the social than to the economic. Mostly these territorial cohesion stories discuss the existence and form of the relationship of territorial with economic and social cohesion though; thereby structured by the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. For its existence they plea to refer to territorial cohesion when the other two are mentioned in the new Structural Funds period – while the in 2004 proposed Community Strategic Guidelines would eschew just this. For the form of the relationship they extend the concept beyond economic and social cohesion while the Structural Funds (and Cohesion Fund) programmes paradoxically would (intuitionally) contribute to territorial cohesion with just these socio-economic measures. These territorial cohesion stories on economic and social cohesion thus appear to describe usages of the concept, but mostly ask to formalise them, either by adding territorial to economic and social cohesion or via the implication of the former with the latter.

The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves obviously structure the territorial cohesion stories on balance and competitiveness, especially those that with the latest Structural Funds reform debate the allocations between the convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment objectives and those that place the concept in each and all Structural Funds objectives. The fundamental financial events thereby gave the convergence objective the most financial weight. The concept then appears to relate to the substantive objective of balance (e.g. the convergence objective, territorial balance), whereby the objectives of Structural Funds programmes would even often mention territorial cohesion and balance. However, the counterstory emerged in 2006. It tells that few people in DG Regio see this connection, or more clear-cut: that this DG only works with the concept for the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. This does not only mean that territorial cohesion stories on balance are questionable, but also that those on competitiveness form an alternative.

Then again, in 2006 also this story about territorial cohesion and (regional) competitiveness and employment was countered. Notwithstanding that from the start the concept was often related to competitiveness, thereby even with the call to base it on territorial cohesion, an explicit dispute appears on the existence of a relation between territorial cohesion and the objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. Perhaps the question of how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds, a question which the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves quarrelled about and left unresolved, structures the latter counterstory. The concerned territorial cohesion stories namely also linked the substantive objective of competitiveness to the Lisbon
Strategy, which was around that time revived by the European Council. Together these counterstories of course dispute any relation of the concept with either the substantive objective of balance or competitiveness. Yet, both were in 2006 also considered to coexist in the European Commission’s approach to territorial cohesion. An approach which was questioned earlier as threatening the potential of the future Structural Funds to deliver territorial cohesion, because it would not resolve how to simultaneously pursue both; it thereby thus does not show how the Lisbon Strategy and Structural Funds fit either. Hence, this metanarrative reveals that there does exist some debate on territorial cohesion: counterstories dispute existing and/or possible in/formal usages of the concept with the substantive objectives of balance and competitiveness.

The environment as the here last-mentioned substantive objective appears mainly in territorial cohesion stories on sustainability; thereby once forming the linkage between the concept and the (regional) competitiveness and employment objective. The debate on the concept’s place in the Community Strategic Guidelines structures these stories. Especially because in 2005, the year of the Bristol informal Ministerial meeting on Sustainable communities in Europe, the observation that the term of sustainable communities crept into these guidelines’ definition of territorial cohesion after the ‘Bristol Accord’ seems to explain why the issue of sustainability often arises thus in this metanarrative. The substantive objective of the environment could therefore show how an informal usage of the concept can enter (marginal) formality.

The question then is whether this listing of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative represents an ungathered mass of informal usages in the European Funds usage area (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). The number of different substantive objectives noted above could be evaluated as many. Moreover, except for the regular pairing of infrastructure and services, balance and competitiveness, and economic and social cohesion, they seldom link and only appear as a group by being substantive objectives. This metanarrative thus starts to affirm that territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions in the European funds’ area of action (i.e. the second general hypothesis), as they not give a clear picture of what territorial cohesion aims for.

However, this does not imply that all these usages are informal (i.e. the first general hypothesis). With economic and social cohesion the concept appears to ask to formalise usages, while the substantive objective of the environment could show how an informal usage can become formal (i.e. via a territorial cohesion definition in guidelines). Then again, even a formal usage of the concept with a substantive objective does not automatically bring about an acknowledged and/or major role. The the counterstories of the in/formal usage of the concept for balance and competitiveness show this, as does the lack of a well-established formality for polycentrism and the minor role for the formal usage of territorial cohesion with services. Hence, the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative portrays a loose group that fiddles with the fuzzy line of in/formality and might lead to an expansion of the European funds’ area of action.

F.2.3 Territorial specificities metanarrative

The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative appears earlier than the above-portrayed ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative, since 2001, what is still rather late. It thereby mostly harbours descriptions of territorial reality and debates on territories, but also promotions of territorial capital, references to Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA), and links between all these issues. The multi-purposive attention of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative made it difficult to depict a channelling of European funds as meant in the appendix’ leading question. Yet, while territorial cohesion might not do so substantively, the concept could do this territorially wise. The working hypothesis for this section therefore is: the concept
defines where European funds go territorially. This working hypothesis is therefore tested when it concerns, in the order of appearance below, territorial reality (directly or via indicators or an index), territories (Member States, regions, and urban or rural areas), territorial capital, TIA, the links between these issues, and this metanarrative’s nonstory. It should be noted though, that this could mostly be hypothetical. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves namely structure the metanarratives by not being involved in any major European funds debate.

The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative began to directly relate territorial cohesion to descriptions of territorial reality since ESPON analysed Structural Funds programmes in 2001; thereby possibly reducing the gap between policy and reality as framed by the general stories. In 2004 the concept was then believed to deal with something signalised as a general problem: the geographical level of the collected statistical data upon which European Union policies rest (i.e. NUTS II). However, also another problem of selectivity was addressed with more demand from the start. Territorial cohesion would namely relate to both the territorial model of a region and to, more specific, the structuring of the regional economic system, just as contrasting geographical concentrations (e.g. of deprivation, unemployment) would support territorial cohesion. The concept thus does not seem to select one territorial reality to describe. One could then wonder whether a clear picture of this reality is needed to territorially define where European funds go.

What does not select the territorial reality to describe either (whatever the geographical level), is that more similar issues swarmed to the concept while ESPON researched territorial structures in 2005. These went from, for instance, simply measuring territorial cohesion’s status quo to the objective measurement of specificities for regional development, from territorial cohesion and polycentrism as morphological aspects to specificities which fit the general stories on the European Union as a business (e.g. research, innovation, training activity, diversification of productivity), and from the geography of the spending of the Structural Funds to the ‘territorial’ as new context to identify imbalances which deserve European support. Needless to say, the concept thus appears with increasingly more descriptions of territorial reality. What the metanarrative notes for the draft Community Strategic Guidelines, which could be seen as the entrance way towards the formality of the concept’s usage, tells a lot though. The guidelines’ definition of the concept, whose focus and place in these guidelines the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves debate, would namely differ from the one in the Third Cohesion Report: it does not mention imbalances anymore. That is to say, although all these territorial reality issues would of course imply a choice to expand the role of experts in and concerns of the European funds, what of this reality is defined as territorial cohesion changes. This could thus both clutter a tightening of the gap between policy and reality and obscure a territorial definition of where European funds go.

Around the time of the latest Structural Funds reform the discussions on indicators and an index surpassed the ones that directly and, arguably, less constructively describe territorial reality in the territorial cohesion stories. They are thereby framed by the general stories on the role of knowledge in the political organisation and structured by the stories on the European Funds themselves when these debate evidence-based targeting as a way to effectively use the funds left. Although the metanarrative’s discussions relate territorial cohesion to the old indicator of GDP, there is mainly pleaded for new indicators for territorial cohesion. Of importance for evidence-based targeting is then, that the here observed emphasis lies on easy to comprehend territorial cohesion indicators because all the by ESPON researchers generated information must go through one official of the European Commission. The discussion on indicators could thus more clearly point out how territorial
cohesion might territorially define where European funds go, as an indicator (GDP or an other) simplifies the many territorial realities that clutter the gap between policy and reality.

Nonetheless, a problem of complexity did crop up. That is, in the last two years of the reform debate backward looking stories reveal that it was impossible (for ESPON research) to complete territorial cohesion indicators. Technically seen there would have been too much territorial diversity and politically seen too little time. It is therefore no surprise that the following was stated to be a territorial research challenge: the identification of territorial cohesion indicators related to the adoption of territorial balance as reference for the allocation of funds; note that by linking to territorial balance this research would also go against the above-mentioned definition of the concept in the draft Community Strategic Guidelines. The brought up territorial cohesion indicator then orders territorial reality with several dimensions. However, this does not really resolve the complexity problem either, as these several dimensions can relate in many ways, what could make a such a definition of where European funds go territorially seen not only complex but uncertain too.

Despite all this complexity and uncertainty, the forward looking stories which were added in 2006 pose that the concept will mostly be used in relation to territorial indicators. A condition they hereby give is that the objective of territorial cohesion adds measures to the proposals of the Community Strategic Guidelines by accentuating the programming once new territorial indicators allow for a better targeting; this aligns with the framing and structuring stories on an effective implementation and might expand the European funds. Then again, to resonate the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves: also when it is evidence-based, probably the undefinedness of territorial cohesion principally affects policy targeting (i.e. towards a lack of it).

Territorial cohesion indicators could, especially through ESPON, fill the relative silence on European spatial planning though; a silence structured by the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. Moreover, a backward looking story from 2006 gives additional information for this. The ESPON research on territorial cohesion indicators would have decided to focus on the available data that is useable for the development of a composite index which accounts for the ESDP’s economic, social, and sustainable dimensions and the definition of territorial cohesion; an account which places the structuring debate on the focus of the concept in the heart of such an index. The complexity and uncertainty that surrounds territorial cohesion indicators could thus also offer possibilities for European spatial planning

The territorial cohesion stories on the European Territorial Cohesion Index (ECTI), of which all are for the development of it, give some extra information hereby. That is, while such a single index could be useful in a context which prefers easy comprehension (e.g. one lone European Commission official), a friction came up between the making of it (e.g. the gap between policy and reality) and its utilisation (e.g. the role of knowledge). These territorial cohesion stories namely posed that scientists should not substitute for policy makers but make the procedure and methods of the index transparent; they are thus framed by the general stories on the political organisation insofar they are concerned with the role of knowledge. Yet, on the other hand they stated that the European Territorial Cohesion Index cannot be a neutral tool. If the European Territorial Cohesion Index presents a possible usage of the concept that territorially defines where European funds go, this might lead to political and technical tensions.

The territorial cohesion stories touch upon these tensions. Besides that the available data is said to constrain the index’ development (e.g. by focusing on economic instead of
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a That is, the territorial dimension with various spatial levels and components of the territorial state (e.g. accessibility to services), the multisectoral dimensions of the economic, social and environmental, and the temporal dimension (also see the hyper-cube intension in Chapter 10).

b An account which also might reveal a reason for the multisectoral dimension of the above-mentioned territorial cohesion indicator (i.e. economy, society, environment).
territorial cohesion), a look forward holds that the ongoing discussion in ESPON on the European Territorial Cohesion Index can place the concept on the European Union agenda and provide a space to articulate the connections between technical and political choices. Hence, the European funds’ area of action could expand with such a space; a space framed by the general stories on the political organisation which intricately interconnected these choices. What hints here at the role of knowledge in the political organisation for the European Funds usage area though, is that while territorial cohesion indicators or an European Territorial Cohesion Index might implicitly define where European funds go with the concept (e.g. through better targeting, a bad index score), the metanarrative’s descriptions of territorial reality strangely enough do not touch upon such matters. That is, knowledge might not only to play a subservient but also minor role in this.

Since its emergence the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative also promotes specific territories; this probably according to the proverb “get as much as possible” from the general stories on money applied to territories. With the Enlargement coming up, the concept thereby (technically) supported a distribution of funds to the old Member States (e.g. instead of to Central and Eastern European Countries). However, later these stories reported on some of these Member States that they hardly ever use the concept during intergovernmental negotiations. The distinction between possible and existing usages of the concept, which comes from the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves, could structure this paradox (i.e. possible as support, but not really used). It could likewise structure the statements that with the Lisbon Strategy as hypothetical territorial cohesion index the European funds would be concentrated in the new Member States (i.e. a possible usage) and that these Member States do not care for such concepts as long as they get richer through the European Union (i.e. an existing “usage”). What is more, another direction to fund Member States appears too. That is, with the other discussed hypothetical territorial cohesion index, that is, the one exposed by the stories on a European Territorial Cohesion Index: the ESDP, the funds would shift to (regions in) the Southern Mediterranean. Put simply, the various possible and existing usages of the concept maximally differ in to which Member States European funds should go.

Two examples from this metanarrative might hereby denote that political and technical choices perhaps do not intricately interconnect with the concept (e.g. contradict). First you have the throughout the framing and structuring stories unsolved question of how to place the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds. Where the general stories on the official policy directions politically position Western Member States behind this strategy, this technically appears to benefit the new ones with territorial cohesion. Besides this the stories on the European funds themselves paradoxically pose that the intergovernmental negotiations were severe and that political agreement was easy. The territorial cohesion stories are stable on the other hand, because they at least technically totally disagree on to which Member States the European funds flow with the concept. These two examples therefore lead to the conclusion that the filling-in of territorial cohesion with the diversity of Member States in the structuring debate on the focus of the concept already might have suggested. That is, the European Funds usage area seems to harbour all political disagreements of the intergovernmental negotiations on European Union funding, with territorial cohesion also technically so.

Regions already appear in the disagreement on to which Member States the European funds flow with the concept. The types of region form an issue in the metanarrative despite this as well: those classified by wealth (e.g. the GDP indicator) and the ones with specificities. Also here territorial cohesion appeared since 2001 to support regions that are not poor (and vice versa). Against this train of thought runs, just since 2005, the argument that the lack of territorial cohesion on the national level (as mentioned in the stories on the
concept itself) results from that the advanced regions benefit most from the Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund; although the statement that there are strategies of Structural Funds programmes for lagging regions in line with territorial cohesion disagrees with this, it comes from the same vain (i.e. territorial cohesion relates to poor regions). What is more, a reading of the Community Strategy Guidelines that year claimed an existing and formal usage of the concept for poor regions. It namely held that these guidelines account for the territorial cohesion angle between the convergence regions and others. Yet, the debate that relates the concept to not/poor regions continued, because the stories also critiqued these guidelines for not accounting for the territorial cohesion angle between non-convergence regions; and with its inclusion territorial cohesion was (again) said to still depend on the domestic policy priorities. These territorial cohesion stories thus develop from discussing not poor to also poor regions. Just as for the Member States, the various possible and existing usages of the concept thus also seem to differ maximally in to which regions the European funds should go.

During the Structural Funds reform debates the metanarrative adds specific region types that overlap with the ones that are classified by wealth. First with the call in 2004 to apply the principle of concentration (which is mentioned in the framing and structuring stories) to tackle territorial cohesion problems that are associated with geographically handicapped regions. Notwithstanding the overtaking supplication a year later to with the concept go beyond both regions with economic weaknesses and those with specific handicaps, the specificity just increased. For starters, the backward looking stories identified the Committee for Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR) as since long supporting the concept (e.g. with lobbying). A discussion then develops when they also hold that the awareness of territorial cohesion became evident in the 1997-1999 Structural Funds programmes for regions that are affected by industrial decline and describe the alike 2000-2006 ones for regions that experience structural difficulties as in line with territorial cohesion too. Moreover, in 2006 the metanarrative added remote areas and those with low or high densities – this well after the European Union was concerned with them (see §F.4.3) –, for these would relate to territorial cohesion in the European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) just as the peripheral regions. Hence, this ungathered mass of usages surely confirms the second general hypothesis, as it does not territorially define the regions where the funds go to with the concept. That is to say, these territorial cohesion stories merely add a polyphony of specific regions to the discussion on poor or not poor regions. What could shed some light on this, is that while the structuring stories held that the Community Strategic Guidelines are not compulsory for all regions, the pushing of the concept by Barnier, as mentioned by the stories on territorial cohesion itself, is said to be for a Cohesion policy for all regions (i.e. on the side of the debate against only poor regions).

What is more, during the latest debates on the Structural Funds reform two other types join this already polyphonous discussion on territories through a duet of soloists, that is: urban and rural areas. Also these overlap with the above-mentioned (not) poor and specific territories, as regions can be wholly urban or rural or consist in both urban and rural parts. Since four years after the Community Initiative URBAN continued from 2000 on, the metanarrative then strongly relates territorial cohesion to urban areas (e.g. with URBAN, the urban dimension in general, to apply the principle of concentration to urban centres); whereby the Structural Funds are also judged as not serving territorial cohesion optimally within them. However, immediately the metanarrative expressed the concern of ensuring the economic integration of rural areas with Structural Funds programming too. Stronger put, the years after this these territorial cohesion stories claim a formally existing usage of the

---

*It should come as no surprise that the URBAN Community Initiative was for urban areas (e.g. to regenerate depressed urban areas, increase job opportunities, diminish segregation).*
concept. With rural areas the Community Strategic Guidelines would namely deal with the territorial cohesion angle within a region. Moreover, these stories even go against the relative absence of a concern with agricultural funding in the framing and structuring stories by describing DG Agriculture as using the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development. The concept might therefore experience a rupture through a reorganisation in European funds, as from 2006 on the agricultural Community Initiative Leader will for instance be financed through mainstream rural development programmes instead of the Structural Funds.

Such a rupture becomes deeper in 2005 when a dissolution of this tension between urban and rural areas within the concept is accepted. That is to say, on the meso level the rural-urban dimension would be at stake when discussing territorial cohesion. Hence, besides that the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative neither territorially defines to which Member States European funding goes with the concept, nor chooses for particular regions according to wealth or specificity, it focuses the Structural Funds on both urban as rural areas. Later on this latter usage might even overstretch the concept by engaging in the heavy agricultural funding.

As mentioned above, after the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy the stories on territorial cohesion itself fell straight into the general stories that see the European Union as a business. Already three years before that though, a way in which territorial specificities can be assumed as clear-cut reality for the European Union as business came up with the emergence of this metanarrative: territorial capital. These stories do not appear to develop and have as their main disagreement the strength and direction of the relation between territorial capital and territorial cohesion. For instance, for its strength they just mentioned the concept when it concerned a mobilisation of territorial capital to ensure an equitable repartition of competitiveness factors, but more urged to understand the contribution to territorial cohesion as maximally using territorial capital (of regions/Europe); at times the general stories on the official policy directions explicitly frame the latter stronger relationship through the Lisbon Strategy. Where in the here assumed territorial reality territorial capital would apparently lead to territorial cohesion, qua usage of the concept it can be vice versa. It was namely held that territorial cohesion would add an emphasis on territorial capital in the Community Strategic Guidelines. Furthermore, facilitating territorial capital could thereby be another more indirect Structural Funds measure (e.g. one that the stories on the European funds themselves debate to effectively use the fund left), also because in their emergence these territorial cohesion stories coupled the concept with institutional cohesion. With territorial capital this metanarrative might thus promote a possible usage of the concept which can expand the European funds’ area of action, even though their relation is not clear. What is clear is that territorial capital does not directly define where European funds go territorially wise with territorial cohesion, but merely what they should fund wherever they go, or define this indirectly by for instance pointing to where there is not enough territorial capital.

When territorial cohesion does not get any more tangible than in this ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative, then its references to Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) become the more important for knowing the concept’s real financial punching power. The tangible effects of the concept could namely be at stake here. Befittingly, the European Union’s Subcommittee on Spatial and Urban Development already studied Territorial Impact Assessment in 2001 and the year after ex ante impact assessment became obligatory for all Community proposals. However, it took the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative a while...
before it engaged in this topic: they only did so since the debates on the Structural Funds reform – strangely enough thereby relating territorial cohesion to another type of evaluation of policies as well: *ex post.*\(^{197}\) Moreover, after this late emergence of Territorial Impact Assessment as a topic in the metanarrative, it appears to have no development, notwithstanding that ESPON researches territorial impacts a bit later.\(^{198}\) The territorial cohesion stories on territorial impacts which did turn up since then are merely less specific about the kind of assessment. They namely state that the European Commission should establish a system to check the impacts of various Community policies on territorial cohesion – whereby on the meso level the strongest effects would be indirect – and that the concept will mostly be used in relation to Territorial Impact Assessment – what surprises when you keep the minor role the issue of experts seems to have here in mind.\(^{199}\) The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative is therefore via Territorial Impact Assessment concerned with where the European funds went. This of course does not territorially define where they go.

Separately seen the debates and discussions on territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, and Territorial Impact Assessment do not appear to define where European funds go territorially with territorial cohesion. However, their links might show this.\(^{200}\) Characteristically, the metanarrative hereby links two concerns hardly spoken of: islands and the less demanding problem of selectivity in directly describing territorial reality. Albeit that the structuring stories also fill-in the debated focus of the concept with the regional aspect, here the argument goes that the richer main land encompasses some islands because they are too small for the NUTS II level, therefore complementary data should be used to assess them separately for an effective territorial cohesion policy.\(^{201}\) This is characteristic of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative, because for the rest the links between the different issues (all since 2005) highlight the other side in the debate about to which territories European funds go with the concept (i.e. not only weak ones).\(^{202}\) These stories see territorial cohesion, for instance, as justifying a distribution of funds to regions of the old Member States without the income/capita criterion and call for territorial cohesion indicators (e.g. of ESPON) to go beyond those regions with economic weaknesses or specific handicaps as mentioned in the draft Constitutional Treaty.\(^{203}\) Moreover, they place territorial capital as a territorial component in the represented territorial cohesion indicator and link it both to all regions and to cities (i.e. not only to poor territories).\(^{204}\) The links between the metanarrative’s concerns therefore neither territorially define where European funds go with the concept. Yet, implicitly they might do so when territorial cohesion is loosely linked to its indicator and/or territorial capital, that is: funding then (also) goes to other then poor territories.

Nonetheless, what might best mark this metanarrative is its nonstory. A lone argument namely relates the concept to the territorial criteria for Member States to allocate resources to regional programmes.\(^{205}\) What negatively anchors the nonstory is that ESPON researchers would not have intended to propose criteria for future Structural Funds allocations when it concerns the European Territorial Cohesion Index.\(^{206}\) The linkage of territorial cohesion to territorial criteria for the allocation of funds thus appears to be the nonstory of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative in the European Funds usage area. The concept therefore seems to refuse to explicitly define where European funds go territorially wise.

Hence, the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative does not appear to define where European funds go with the concept (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). Its territorial cohesion stories namely totally disagree on Member States, harbour an abundance of region types, and focus on both urban and rural areas. What is more, they do not expose the issue when they point out territorial capital, a territorial cohesion indicator, European Territorial Cohesion Index, or Territorial Impact Assessment (although the first two link to other than poor territories) and only the metanarrative’s nonstory is concerned with allocation criteria.
Besides, territorial cohesion could play no role in a major European funds debate, because the only formal usage that chooses between these specific territories crops up in the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development (i.e. for rural areas). This could then overstretch the concept by aberrantly engaging in agricultural funding as well.

Then again, this situation does give the European funds’ area of action leeways to expand with every type of territory introduced, just as the concept’s promotion of territorial capital and descriptions of territorial reality do for the funds concerns. Moreover, ESPON’s discussion on the European Territorial Cohesion Index could even add a space in this usage area to connect technical and political choices. However, although such hypothetical expansions and Territorial Impact Assessment might increase the role of knowledge, the many discussions and different descriptions of territorial reality in the metanarrative thereby merely seem to clutter the uttered gap between policy and reality – e.g. leading to difficulties for evidence-based targeting. Thus, although inconceivably it seems, the metanarrative that harbours the most tangible issues shows the most ungathered mass of different positions for possible expansions of the European funds’ area of action.

F.2.4 Governal organisation of the territory metanarrative
The ‘goveral organisation of the territory’ metanarrative is the oldest one in this usage area. Its organisational issues range from purely territorial to purely processual: the European territory, the territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, and, as a crown, territorial cooperation. Although the concept does not often merge these interrelated issues, when for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period the allocation for Interreg and transnational co-operation increased and they incorporated the ESDP in 2000, this metanarrative dawned by linking territorial cooperation and the territorial dimension. We should therefore also treat the links between these issues. The metanarrative really rose during the debates on the 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform though, whereby, save for the issue of governing and the first linked two, these issues emerged statically in 2005. Below the issues of are therefore treated separately before their links are, this by following the order from purely territorial to purely processual. Also these issues can thereby be checked with a working hypothesis.

Leads for this come from this usage area’s informal side, even though the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves hardly refer to European spatial planning and this side therefore does not appear to be crucial. Yet, Interreg may be the focal point for a formal usage of the concept here, since Interreg’s placing of the ESDP in the European funds could guide the way. The mainstreaming of Interreg is thus fundamental for this metanarrative. Moreover, the framing and structuring stories did back up European spatial planning and the latter left open which of the Community Initiatives’ spheres of actions and innovative measures the mainstreaming technique incorporates. Hence, this territorial cohesion metanarrative has much to do with parts of the after 2004 restructured debates on the focus of the concept itself: these did not work out how European spatial planning relates to Cohesion policy in the European funds and saw territorial cohesion both as a method and as needing a comprehensive strategy that sets the framework. A working hypothesis for this section could thus be: territorial cohesion crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the European funds. Obviously, an affirmation of this would fill the silence on European spatial planning, which is structured through the connections of the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves, and drop the first general hypothesis, which poses that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all, by putting forward such a formal usage.

What is characteristic for this metanarrative is that the issue that could set the territorial scene in this plays a minor role. Only once its territorial cohesion stories
positively discuss the European territory as a whole. This with the statement that territorial cohesion implies an overarching idea for the territory’s fair and equal treatment; something which follows an in-filling of the debate on the concept’s focus in the stories on territorial cohesion itself. Straight against such a whole runs a debate in which the concept indicates a complex and “un-State-like” territorial organisation. Territorial cohesion would namely be on the divisions that cut up the European territory and the national borders in it by attending to cross-border activities and the jumble of their overlapping fields of action. However, these territorial cohesion stories also explicitly deny the usage of the concept for Cohesion policy if it concerns activities across borders. The way in which this metanarrative treats the European territory thus points to an informal organisation of the territory. Framed by the general stories, it thereby definitively leaves this path open for the Lisbon Strategy as official policy direction and for European spatial planning. The latter is thus not so much located formally in the European funds.

Then the issuing of the territorial dimension, which is not strictly territorial compared to the European territory, as it is a dimension of something else. Besides, this issue just once presupposed a State-like organisation of the territory here. This with a lone assertion in 2004: (regional) State aid should act as a territorial cohesion factor. What these territorial cohesion stories did discuss though, is the incorporation of the territorial dimension in the European funds via the concept, already so since the metanarrative’s dawn. They discuss this with the view of territorial cohesion as goal to enhance territorial policies on the supranational level for territorial cooperation (also see below). Clearly, territorial cohesion could thus cross they fuzzy line of in/formality with the territorial dimension.

However, even while these territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension appear to follow the distinction the between the existing and possible usages of the concept (a distinction made by the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves), they thereby do take the concept’s role in this issue for granted without an agreement on what this territorial dimension entails. For instance, the observation that the intuitional integration of territorial cohesion in regional policy is without an apparent understanding of the territorial implications still claims an existing usage of the concept to begin with. A putting forward of possible usages of the concept seems, in its turn, to mix structuring stories which see spatial development as part of territorial cohesion, the concept as part of both Cohesion policy and the Lisbon Strategy, and the openings the new Cohesion policy framework give for the concept’s integration. This came to the fore in the presentation of the concept for the joint informal Ministerial meeting in Luxembourg on regional policy and territorial cohesion. That is to say, as an opportunity to link the debate on the European Commission proposals for the Community Strategic Guidelines to the consideration of territorial challenges and/or to stimulate debate in the Member States on the territorial development dimension of the proposed National Strategic References Frameworks (NSRFs) and Lisbon action plans. It is here thus not clear what the territorial dimension implies for territorial cohesion. Hence, even though these territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension claim an existing usage of the concept in the Structural Funds which does not deal with territorial implications, they with the spotlight of the concept do show possible paths to locate territorial development or territorial challenges within these funds.

With territorial cohesion, the substance which is coordinated could at least indirectly and/or partly be territorial. Substantive coordination therefore lies between the purely territorial and processual issues of the metanarrative. Especially during the emergence of this issue in 2005 territorial cohesion stories much debated it, mostly the horizontal kind. The above-mentioned debate on the processual focus of the concept in the stories on territorial cohesion itself structures the central disagreement here, as it is on the form of the relationship: substantial coordination is implied by or leads to territorial cohesion. Territorial
cohesion would for instance already be shown as coherence in Structural Funds programme strategies.222 Then again, these funds would also contribute to territorial cohesion with regional policy’s adoption and promotion of a more strategic and integrated cross-sectoral approach to economic development.223 As so often, there is thus a central disagreement about the form of the relationship between substantive coordination and territorial cohesion.

Besides this disagreement lies another unresolved question: which policies to coordinate? While these territorial cohesion stories did specify the Structural Funds (e.g. they do not mention agriculture funding), they disagree on coordinating (for) Cohesion/Regional policy or (spatially relevant) sectoral policies in general.224 A single position that chooses sides in both these disagreements is then that at the heart of the concept lies the one fund per programme principle which strengthens the integrated approach of Cohesion policy (i.e. territorial cohesion coordinates, only Cohesion policy);225 this of course framed by the stories on the European funds themselves that put this principle forward. The central disagreement on which policies to coordinate thus relates to the one on the form of the relationship between substantive coordination and territorial cohesion.

Also when the metanarrative discusses vertical substantive integration, which it seldom does, it strictly follows the framing and structuring stories, now on the role of Member States in implementation.226 That is, its stories hold that the translation of the Community Strategic Guidelines into policy priorities and their coherence with the goal of territorial cohesion depends on the content of and alignment with domestic regional development policies.227 This metanarrative thus covers a twofold disagreement on horizontal substantive coordination and accounts for the vertical kind. No wonder therefore, that when it combines these issues, it questions the appropriateness of the 25 distinct National Strategic References Frameworks to (at the Community level) represent the Member States’ perspectives on spatial development and territorial cohesion via their perspectives on cohesion.228 Hence, when territorial cohesion would cross the fuzzy line of in/formality with substantive coordination the role of European spatial planning seems questionable.

Still, one could also ask why there is even referred to spatial development when it concerns coordination and what this entails for the structured line of in/formality. For instance, although the Structural Funds guidelines and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period from 1999 mentioned the ESDP, they did not take vertical or horizontal integration on board, and their revision in 2003, which mentioned ‘regional cohesion’, did not do so either. The statement that a more integrated approach is the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group’s definition of territorial cohesion might thus shed some light on the metanarrative’s reference to spatial development in this.229 However, it also exposes an informal concern with substantive coordination through the concept’s usage. Hence, territorial cohesion could therefore with substantive coordination place European spatial planning in the European funds when the concept crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality even though the role European spatial planning is questionable.

The structuring stories then claim that the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group’s definition also holds for the Structural Funds distribution. Moreover, in line with this the metanarrative simultaneously reported this issue as the only kind of formal usage of the concept too: the Community Strategic Guidelines would only explicitly mention territorial cohesion with the integrated approach as measure.230 Something what these disagreements and the in/formal usages of the concept then have in common is that they intersect the distinction between existing and possible usages of the concept. In the above, only existing usages come to the fore. However, the territorial cohesion stories likewise state possible usages. The development model underlying many of such holistic Structural Funds strategies would for instance ideally place these funds in line with the comprehensive concept and the integration part of its agenda would play a role in the evaluation of regional policy in 2007
and the financial framework after the 2007-2013 period (i.e. both do not yet exist). Hence, disagreements on the relationship between territorial cohesion and the horizontal kind of substantive coordination predominate (i.e. on how they relate, policies to coordinate, a possible or existing usage). Nevertheless, it remains the case that the concept might cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds insofar it concerns substantive coordination.

In this metanarrative the issue of governing does not appear as purely processual. A reason for this, is that it partly though explicitly acknowledges State conduct, which is territorial, for the governal organisation of the territory. For starters, these territorial cohesion stories slightly favour decentralisation within the frame of the general stories on the political organisation. They for instance demand that the control over territorial cohesion with the Structural Funds should be regional or even pose that aspects of empowerment of regional and local levels of governance contribute to it. However, the concept does not only regard the regional level, far from it. Initially these stories even stated that Member States should be responsible for ensuring social and territorial cohesion and that only they are financially able to do so; this would go against the foregone conclusion of territorial cohesion as European Union guiding principle and in extremis align to the renationalisation of the Structural Funds as expressed in the structuring stories. Territorial cohesion thus does not cross the fuzzy line of in/formality here, because only with formal governing is dealt with.

These earlier stances on governing remain while the debate on all the metanarrative’s issues starts in 2005. Yet, the issue develops into another direction due to, amongst others, the demand to broaden the circle of participants beyond the Member States for territorial cohesion policy. This makes it easier to understand the critical challenge put forward for territorial cohesion – apparently with a European Union viewpoint. That is, to face both the national and regional authorities responsible for the Structural Funds allocation. The governing issue could thus explain the relative silence on vertical substantive coordination above: it is even undecided whether Member States should (together) deal with territorial cohesion. On top of this, these territorial cohesion stories found that the flexibility sought by the Member States with respect to the proposed Community Strategic Guidelines suggests that they do not share the conceptual approach underlying the concept. Reasons for this could be that a part of this conceptual approach might accord with the general stories on implementation, whereby indirect measures come to the fore, and the idea of the European Union as a business, which gains ground and differently acknowledges State activities, as both can give the State a smaller role. This would both imply that territorial cohesion can also with governing issues cross the fuzzy line of in/formality and that this goes against the formal side.

However, as with the issue of territorial capital, while the described processes would here contribute to territorial cohesion, qua usage of the concept it can be vice versa again. That is, where the observed transition to formulate strategic frameworks, which are shaped by the new development model, within regional policy on both the national and European level was related to the concept, Structural Funds programmes would even contribute to territorial cohesion by supporting a new governance and method for policy making and implementation. Conversely, the territorial cohesion stories held that the concept would add measures to the proposals for the Community Strategic Guidelines by potentially contributing to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial levels. Either way, and indirect or business-like, these territorial cohesion stories neither show a formal nor existing usage of the concept.

One argument nevertheless downgrades this new governing way of doing with territorial cohesion (i.e. less State-like), whether it leads to it or is it. It thereby also
reminiscences the indifferent side of the structured debate on whether the concept needs the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty: a European Union competency for territorial cohesion would namely change little because the ESDP process is owned by the Member States.241 Hence, these territorial cohesion stories embody essential debates that are concerned with the governmental levels in the more formal State-like way of doing. They are polarised in this between the European and national levels and slightly for decentralisation to the regional level, and support a change towards a different way of doing. Both directions do not show an existing usage of the concept though. Important hereby is that, concordant with the undetermined spheres of actions and innovative measures for mainstreaming, informal ways of doing should not be equated with European spatial planning. With the issue of governing territorial cohesion namely seems to handle both sides of the fuzzy line of in/formality by affecting the formal conduct of the Structural Funds, but the concept does not locate European spatial planning in this.

The only purely processual issue in this territorial cohesion metanarrative is processual coordination.242 Like most of the other issues it emerged in 2005, here with a statement that immediately locates European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds: the draft Community Strategic Guidelines would account for the policy views expressed at the Rotterdam informal ministerial meeting with a chapter dedicated to territorial cohesion and cooperation.243 However, although with processual coordination the concept thus clearly points towards a crossing of the fuzzy line of in/formality, the territorial cohesion stories give nothing more on this issue itself; that is, besides relating the concept to the partnership principle and the exchange of best practices for which some general stories on implementation want an European framework programme.244 The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative thus hardly expresses purely processual concerns – combined with the territorial though, the issue of cooperation forms the crown of it.

The issue of territorial cooperation is the firmest one in this territorial cohesion metanarrative, as only in 2005 territorial cooperation is not the most debated issue.245 This crown of the metanarrative presents a clear debate on the relation of the concept to territorial cooperation, whether it be the Community Initiative Interreg or the mainstreamed Structural Funds objective (of the European Regional Development Funds), and a derivative side-debate on which kind to support hereby. The former ranges from the observation that the concept is used in Interreg programmes, via the consideration that territorial cooperation is a part of territorial cohesion (e.g. as instrument or key component of a strategy for it), to going so far as the statement that territorial cohesion is this new Structural Funds objective.246 What is more, these territorial cohesion stories said that the Third Cohesion Report sees territorial cohesion as this new Structural Funds objective and called to rename it ‘European grouping of territorial cohesion’, as the 2004 European Parliament’s Olbrycht Report on territorial cooperation suggested.247 This would clearly have great consequences for the concept’s usage (e.g. formalisation and influence).248 Then again, the sole development in this metanarrative runs against the reports in 2006 that most people in DG Regio – or broader: the European Union Institutions – relate the concept to territorial cooperation.249 The only counterstory namely disputes this and suggests that an emphasis on territorial cooperation is different from the concept.250 The eventual name of this Structural Funds objective follows this, as it does not include the concept. When territorial cohesion crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality into full formality it thus concerns possible usages of the concept in the European funds.

Obviously, the side-debate on territorial cooperation not only disagrees on the type of territorial cooperation, but also with the counterstory, as it overlaps with the territorial cohesion stories that support the issue.251 The stories of this side-debate thereby often referred to all three (former) Interreg tracks.252 When they did specify territorial cooperation, however, cross-border cooperation never gets a special treatment – cross-border activities are
accounted for with the issue of the territory though – and their disagreement is on whether territorial cohesion does relate to inter-regional cooperation. What could be more important for European spatial planning in this though, is that when these territorial cohesion stories bent to a territorial cooperation kind, then it is to the one with a European spatial planning origin and largest role for the Member States: transnational cooperation. This does not surprise when it is put in mind that the transnational kind of territorial cooperation appeared in the metanarrative’s emergence in 2000, the year the allocation for Interreg and its transnational track increased for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period and the guidelines for these programmes incorporated the ESDP. That is, at least qua timing the concept and the increasing financial importance of transnational cooperation and the role of European spatial planning in this are tied up. These events and territorial cohesion stories might thus clearly pose European spatial planning in the middle of the European funds, but again, this merely as a possibility.

Moreover, the framing stories which tell about a change of spatial planning whereby it loses its name are structured by the stories on the concept itself which observe that in trans- and infranational practice territorial cohesion is more promoted than spatial planning. When these events and stories do not pose spatial planning but territorial cohesion in the middle of the European funds, this would again concord with the undetermined spheres of actions and innovative measures for mainstreaming (i.e. what is included). That is, territorial cohesion could cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating other actions in the European funds. In spite of the large amount of territorial cohesion stories on territorial cooperation, they thus seem to suffer from the same trait as the general stories which stay the same while the amounts of funding change. To be exact, the update of Interreg guidelines, a change in eligible areas from 2004, and especially the almost halving of the initial funding for the territorial cooperation objective a year later could be of direct consequence for the European Funds usage area, and thus for the concept’s real punching power. This metanarrative merely reflects these events once though, as it is for the concept considered that the Structural Funds objective of territorial cooperation is proposed in principle but not in finances – i.e. territorial cooperation does not form the centre of the European funds. Still, territorial cooperation as crown of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative thus leaves the fuzzy line of in/formality open for territorial cohesion (with three ways). Moreover, it shows that the concept does not have to locate European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds to cross this line; such an activity might form a part of it at these fringes though (e.g. through transnational cooperation).

While the territorial cohesion stories on the territory, the territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, and processual coordination hardly merge in this metanarrative, when they do they seem to follow the crown issue of territorial cooperation. That is to say, the territorial dimension and processual issues are mostly linked. An example of this is then of importance for a crossing of the fuzzy line of in/formality by the concept with European spatial planning. It namely argues that the European Commission loses a part of the ownership of the process where the Community Strategic Guidelines make a strong reference to territorial aspects. To be exact, the Constitution which gives a base for activity in this area was lost and the Ministers responsible for spatial development would have taken over the initiative with their document that deals with territorial cohesion. This could imply a dissolving of the already fuzzy line of in/formality through the concept, because it locates European spatial planning both outside and within the European funds.

However, the concept seems to form a counterweight to such a movement too. This when it links the more processual issues, because then it refers to already existing and/or formal activities instead of (other) territorial aspects. Such “ballast” appears in the territorial cohesion stories by way of the implementation principles for the management of
the Structural Funds: ‘additionality’ as substantive coordination and ‘partnership’ between economic and social actors as processual coordination that are involved in the new policy implementation method (e.g. going beyond the State organisation). Hereby the line of in/formality would thus remain, as the formal side is clearly defined, and therefore the crossing of it by the concept as well.

The rest of the links then hang between this argument on the informal ownership of the process on territorial aspects and its counterweight. They namely do link the territorial dimension and processual issues but do not seem to dissolve this fuzzy line, or at least do not mention European spatial planning or the Community Strategic Guidelines. A part of their suspending thereby is the route via which the concept crosses the line of in/formality. With the spatial focus directing substantive coordination for territorial cohesion the inward route comes across. These territorial cohesion stories namely related a European Commission which continues to integrate territorial policy integration into the Structural Funds after their guidelines of 1999 did not mention spatial integration, as neither the revised version of 2003 nor their coordination with the Cohesion Fund 2000-2006 did. Conversely, another statement appeared outwards aligned to the issue of governing. The Structural Funds would namely contribute to territorial cohesion with the support of regional policy for a model of territorial governance (i.e. away from State government). Territorial cooperation could form a two-way street in this (i.e. in- and outwards), because when the territorial cohesion stories treat it separately they, as mentioned above, leave the fuzzy line of in/formality open for the concept (in threefold) – perhaps no less can be expected from a crown issue in the margin of the European funds mainstream.

This makes it less shocking that when territorial cooperation links to more processual ones, the territorial cohesion stories went beyond territorial cooperation as scene of new strategic ways. They namely posed that the development of a territorial cohesion strategy depends on territorial cooperation because an exchange of best practices and networking are conducted within this framework. In the few links of the interrelated issues of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative the concept thus appears to form a crossing on the border of in/formality. However, as the concept also goes against the weight of the existing and/or formal implementation principles and locates European spatial planning both in- as outside the Structural Funds, territorial cohesion could even turn up in the dissolving of this fuzzy line.

All in all, in the European Funds usage area as portrayed by the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative, territorial cohesion appears to cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the European funds. The isolated though perfect exemplification of this confirmation of this section’s working hypothesis is when the Structural Funds are concerned with territorial cohesion and cooperation. However, two nuances weaken it. Firstly, just as when both territorial cohesion and European spatial planning are narrowed down to substantive integration: both do not appear in the middle of the European funds, but at their margin. What is more, an extreme though initial stance on the governing issue even placed the quest for territorial cohesion in the hands of national finances.

Most issues combine this side-line feature with the other nuance though: the concept might not need European spatial planning for this crossing. The concept’s concern with governing namely does not locate European spatial planning in its handling of the in/formal conduct of the Structural Funds. Moreover, the opening of this fuzzy line with territorial cooperation at the margin for territorial cohesion merely gives room for this. Hereby the concept’s border-path towards an informal organisation of the territory might merely be free for European spatial planning, amongst others, while for the territorial dimension the concept only spotlights possible ways to locate territorial development and challenges inside the
Structural Funds. Furthermore, when illustrated by the metanarrative’s links between these organisational issues the crossing on the border of in/formality appears to dissolve when the concept locates European spatial planning on it. This metanarrative thus fills the structured silence on European spatial planning by often presenting its framed hesitation to march into the Structural Funds via the concept.

A question then is whether these crossings refute that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all (i.e. the first general hypothesis) or merely put forward possible formal usages of territorial cohesion. Notwithstanding that this metanarrative constantly crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality by flirting with both sides, its only counterstory dissents precisely with the crowning usage of the concept, which would due to events imply formality, that is: territorial cooperation as mainstream Structural Funds objective. Save to say though, the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative could not so much put forward a formal usage of territorial cohesion, but definitely a disputed formal room for a debate on the concept.

F.2.5 The overall picture of the separate metanarratives

The European Funds usage area is roughly ordered in the ‘substantive objectives’, ‘territorial specificities’, and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives. Their wide-ranging concerns much resonate those from the other usage areas (see previous appendices). Yet, they also add the indigenous ones of a territorial cohesion indicator, European Territorial Cohesion Index, Territorial Impact Assessment and territorial cooperation. The answer to how the concept channels funds (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) then signifies the financial punching power of the whole territorial cohesion usage field.

A channelling of European funds through the concept encounters two key difficulties though: in each metanarrative there appears a disagreement on the formality of the existing or even possible usage of the concept and a collection of many positions. This largely affirms that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all (i.e. the first general hypothesis) and appears to be in line with that the expansion of European funds with the concept shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis) respectively. Hence, even if there would be a formal usage of the concept in this usage area, then it is not clear how territorial cohesion channels European funds, neither substantively, territorially, nor organisationally. Something the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative’s nonstory on territorial criteria for the allocation of funds seems to seal as a refusal.

The European funds’ area of action can nonetheless expand over the fuzzy line of in/formality which is drawn through the metanarratives by linking territorial cohesion to substantive objectives, territorial concerns, and/or various territories. That promotions of the concept with substantive concerns are, arguably, more difficult to side as in/formal than organisational ones increases this fuzziness. The same substantive concerns are namely ventilated in both informal and formal areas while organisational concerns themselves deal with the organisation of in/formality. For substantive concerns this is especially the case when they do not relate to informal European spatial planning (e.g. ESPON results), something which would at least indicate their informality.

The formal ground to build such an extension upon for the European Funds’ area of action via the concept then only appears to offer the through the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative marginalised issue of services. Even worse, this formal ground offers a risk detected with the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative: overstretch by an engagement with agricultural funding instead of the nearer Structural Funds. Most starting points lie thus on the fuzzy line of in/formality, some even plainly so. The counterstories of the concept’s promotion of balance, competitiveness, and territorial cooperation might stand for these, as
they signify disputes instead of mere indifference (i.e. openly in/formal position take more notice).

These difficulties are of course structured by the undecided debate on the focus of territorial cohesion itself. Yet, in the face of this the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative develops a disputed formal room for debate on the concept, a room crowned by territorial cooperation. What is more, the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative also presents a space for this, one cluttered with usable knowledge of territorial reality. The connections that are made between the metanarratives could then show whether the relationships between these concerns do channel European funds with territorial cohesion, offer a solidifying formal usage of the concept, and/or (further) order the many positions collected by the metanarratives.

F.3 Stories relating territorial cohesion metanarratives in the European Funds usage area

F.3.1 Territorial cohesion stories connecting metanarratives

In the European Funds usage area the metanarratives often connect. Yet, despite the masses in them separately, they do not do so as persistent as the metanarratives of the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas. While the separate metanarratives dawned, the first two territorial cohesion stories thereby came up that together connected all three metanarratives. These two stories exemplify that the connections of metanarratives show even less extreme viewpoints than the separate ones. They namely appear to follow the structuring stories and ignore the polarised tension which at the moment also leaned to that the Member States should ensure territorial cohesion and are the only ones financially able to. First the observation appears that the European Union takes care for territorial cohesion financially seen while ESPON analysed Structural Funds programmes in 2001. That is, the Objective 1 programmes at that time would already target social and territorial cohesion. A year later the proposition appears to let the European Union and Member States take care of it together through vertical and horizontal substantive substantive coordination. That is, national economic policies and the European Union’s various common policy areas should be coordinated so that they are mutually supportive to strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion. These connections between the metanarratives thus seem to stay on the middle of the road.

What is awkward these first two years is that the territorial cohesion stories of these middle-of-the-road connections did not connect the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives even though they both had already emerged separately. Yet, in line with all stories noted thus far, this was the silence before the storm. During the debates on the latest Structural Funds reform there namely follow many territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives, also by relating the organisational territorial cohesion issues and territorial specificities. This development thus resembles thunder from a clear sky.

In this sudden blossom of grouping movements it is difficult to detect developments such as a dominant pairing of metanarratives. The territorial cohesion that connect metanarratives can be ordered in a schema though, as shown below in Schema 2b ‘Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area’.
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*Note though, that the metanarratives of the European Funds usage area are wider than those of the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas. Because of this, territorial cohesion stories that relate various issues (e.g. the substantive objectives of balance and services or organisational concerns of the territorial dimension and substantive coordination) more often appear inside one metanarrative than connecting two or more.*
This Schema 2b comprises all connections between the three metanarratives, of which none are disputed, whereby all three more or less evenly dealt with. The separate metanarratives differ in this, as the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative dominates them. The connected metanarratives therefore increase the weight of the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives. The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative remains dominant in the European Funds usage area though.

However, just as this dominant metanarrative does not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds territorially, the other two do not do so substantively and the even show a dispute on a formal room to debate territorial cohesion (e.g. to decide the concept’s place). A straightforward working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives might therefore be: the connections between the metanarratives do not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds. Besides that this needs a formal usage, the involved territorial cohesion stories would only line out a clear-cut decision to pursue a certain channelling of funds if they pin-point a particular usage of the concept by specifying a strong relationship between different territorial cohesion issues. The inclusiveness of the connections suggests that this does not take place: they cannot focus on certain issues without excluding others.

F.3.2 Comparing the separate and connected metanarratives
The channelling of European funds which the separate territorial cohesion metanarratives do not bring forward can surface by comparing them with the connected ones since the debates
on the latest Structural Funds reform. Besides presenting extra noteworthy information hereby (e.g. important additions, possible explanations), the focus lays on the territorial cohesion stories which correct the thus far drawn picture of the European Funds usage area. Below this comparison then follows the three connections for some fundamental characteristics, thereby lifts the issue of State aid, and relates the formal ground to build an extension for the concept’s usage upon.

F.3.3 Characteristics of all the connected metanarratives

In the connections between the metanarratives a new issue of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative just breaks the surface. It explicitly combines the concept’s organisational concerns with governing and the territorial dimension, that is: the spatial approach.272 The spatial approach would guarantee a better economic performance of European Union programmes by concentrating financial means on strategic sectoral and national axes.273 Such an approach can, arguably, be useful in general. However, when these stories see the spatial approach as a result of a strategic shift in regional policy and territorial cohesion, they specify it territorially and financially with Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) and the Cohesion Fund.274 This is not general of course. Such a generally applicable way of doing might therefore with the concept always rest in an un gathered mass of discussed topics, as the spatial approach does with topics of specific territories and the place of the concept in the European funds. In the current state this would lead the spatial approach to stick territorial cohesion to a channeling the Cohesion Fund to new Member States.

To increase this mass of topics the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives even add specific territories to the ones that come up in the separate metanarratives. Besides these territories though (e.g. mountainous ones), when these stories bound all three metanarratives in 2004, this un gathered mass returns too: a proposal for the promotion of sustainable economic growth on the basis of territorial cohesion came up with a broad unorganised focus.275 It namely seems to be the case that the National Strategic References Frameworks (NSRFs) and Operational Programmes (OPs) simply have to account for almost all issues that are depicted in the metanarratives, except for, amongst others, balance, substantive integration, and territorial cooperation.276 What is then illustrative of this discussion is that a year later the same connection between metanarratives puts another broad focus forward. Now in a possible formal usage of the concept in the linkage of the European Funds and Intergovernmental Conferences. The appeal to have a vision in the Community Strategic Guidelines which is more in line with draft Constitutional Treaty Article III-220 for instance does include balance as substantive objective (see Appendix C on the IGCs usage area).277 An un gathered mass of topics could thus hamper a channeling of European funds with the concept (e.g. funding for what).

Although a formal room to debate the concept might thus be much needed (e.g. for the relations between its concerns), territorial cooperation, which as the crown issue of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative could grant such room, appears less often in the connected metanarratives. This formal room is thus not only disputed, but also not (yet) well-stitched in the entire European Funds usage area. These characteristics through all connected metanarratives seem thus to be in line with that the connections between the metanarratives do not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds. They namely even supplement the un gathered masses of the concept’s usages – or at least leave them unorganised due to the different broad foci which do not weigh the various issues – and give less attention to a formal room to debate these territorial cohesion concerns.

Besides an un gathered mass of topics, also the formality of the concept’s usage plays a role for a channeling of European funds. The larger ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal
organisation of the territory’ metanarratives then separately both play with the fuzzy line of in/formality at the fringes of the mainstream European Funds – e.g. by giving possibilities for European spatial planning (such as ESPON). Yet, some shapes in the picture of this alter when these metanarratives connect with commonalities.276 A minor addition here presents a path for the specific territories (seen from the Community level) to become territorial actors in the more formal State-like way of doing for example. These territorial cohesion stories namely filled-in the call to broaden the circle of participants for territorial cohesion policy beyond the Member States with cross-border regions.279 Besides that such participants would be representative for the European Union’s complex un-State-like territorial organisation, if this formalises territorial cohesion, it is merely a possible usage of the concept. That is, it is not even how this can indirectly channel European funds.

Another link between organisational issues and the debate on specific territories could be more essential for the concept though, as it might change the crown issue of the organisational metanarrative. It namely holds that the new Structural Funds objective of territorial cooperation would not only group the Interreg legacy but the one of the URBAN Community Initiative as well.280 Such an incorporation of spheres of actions and innovative measures with the mainstreaming technique gives territorial cooperation a bias. This bias could, depending on the weight this crown issue has, lead territorial cohesion to channel European funds to urban instead of rural areas.

However, the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives do not only give territorial cooperation less attention, here they also dispute its weight for territorial cohesion. That the concept would not strongly relate to territorial cooperation as Structural Funds objective due to the low importance accredited to territorial grouping thereby even practically emphasises the counterstory of territorial cooperation as territorial cohesion issue.281 Although territorial cohesion could with territorial cooperation have a bias to channel European funds to urban areas, this channel is thus disputed in itself.

Besides this disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion (e.g. for the space to relate technical and political choices which the concept can add), this connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives also clarifies the role of experts in the frame of the general stories. Although an advice was that during the work on a European Territorial Cohesion Index engagement should be sought with policy makers in a constructive dialogue, the clarification comes with that the latter were also described as the ones that decide over the content of the index.282 That is, not experts but policy makers may have the role of sieving the cluttered descriptions of territorial reality. Insofar a territorial cohesion channels European funds through such descriptions, the question becomes which from the ungathered mass topics do policy makers select for this.

These territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives thus point out an urban bias in the disputed formal room to debate the concept and that when a European Territorial Cohesion Index channels European funds it can select a territorial view of policy makers. Yet, they do not pin-point a particular usage of the concept by specifying a strong relationship between different issues. Moreover, when the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives did specify a strong relationship between different issues, it did not give a clear-cut decision to pursue a certain channelling of European funds. That is to say, by seeing territorial cohesion as the substantive coordination of sectoral policies with spatial impacts in 2005 – a year later labelled as a way of thought the Dutch wanted to claim in 2004 – this connection merely specify a focus.283 In this way the connected metanarratives therefore do not come any closer to channelling European funds than basing the decision to coordinate certain policies on where already spend funds went.
F.3.4 State aid in the European Funds usage area

A concern worthy of special mention is State aid. Although it is of little significance in the separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative, State aid is a major issue in public debate. When this metanarrative is conencted to others though, it plays a large role for territorial cohesion. While State aid is not directly a part of the European funds, the European Union does decide on the rules for this kind of financial aid. The general stories on money and implementation then frame the argument these territorial cohesion stories on State aid make by presenting a tension between the support for the Single European Market (e.g. reduce State aid) and the minor issue of the funding principles being too generic. They namely first go against a too uniform application of the State aid provisions. This by relating State aid to specific territories in the 2004 connection of metanarratives treated above (e.g. State aid for poor or functional urban regions), which implies different ways of doing for different territories. In the connection with the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative (see below for more on this connection) State aid shows up a year later to reduce regional disparities, this without (directly) specifying territories. While the usage of the concept in the debate on State aid does not channel European funds, it could therefore play a role in an effort to change the formal rules that solidify for financial aid in the European Union (e.g. for some territories).

F.3.5 The formal grounds of territorial cohesion to channel European funds

Neither the separate ‘substantive objectives’ nor ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative defines how territorial cohesion channels European funds, this both due to the ungathered masses of substantive and territorial concerns expressed with territorial cohesion and the concept’s uncertain formal grounds. More indications for this come from the connected metanarratives when they are concerned with territorial indicators, Cohesion policy for all regions, territorial cooperation, sustainability, the territorial dimension, services, and agricultural funding. These issues are treated in this order below.

One of the territorial cohesion stories which connects the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ metanarratives gives a partial reason for why they do not define a channeling of the European funds. That is to say, it simply remarks that no attempt was made to adopt territorial balance as reference for the allocation of funds in 2004 because it was impossible to identify territorial cohesion indicators. Hereby the aforementioned problems with territorial cohesion indicators (see §F.2.3) could form a basis for the appearance of the territorial cohesion counterstory of balance (i.e. the concept does not have to do with balance because territorial cohesion indicators are lacking). They could likewise form the basis for the noted absence of the term of imbalances in the concept’s definition in the Community Strategic Guidelines. When the concept’s ungathered masses of concerns lead to the lack of territorial cohesion indicators, they could thus also indirectly affect the channelling of European Funds (i.e. not for balance).

If the metanarratives’ connection explains instead of changes this situation, it thereby at least corrects the thus far drawn picture of the European Funds usage area. The 2000-2006 Structural Funds objectives were namely – unlike those of the 2007-2013 funding period discussed in the separate metanarratives – explicitly territorially specified. The Objective 1 programmes which were mentioned above because they appear in the emergence of the connections between metanarratives (see §F.1.1) then supported economic and social conversion in areas that experience structural difficulties. This shows that substantive concerns were earlier expressed with territorial cohesion than the separate ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative portrays (i.e. just not by themselves, but linked to certain territories). The European funds of course still link substance and territories with the objectives for the 2007-2013 funding period. Yet, only these connected metanarratives show
the obvious pairing of, for instance, promoting balance and supporting poor regions. This difference in Structural Funds objectives might therefore at once illustrate how the events fundamentally affected the order of the metanarratives (i.e. substantive instead of substantive and territorial objectives leads to a ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative) and indicate the minor influence vice versa (i.e. of the concept in the European funds on the whole, or at least the concern with specific territories and objectives). This begs the question whether territorial cohesion channels these funds or that these channels structure the concept.

However, a territorial cohesion story that connects these metanarratives appears to go against the latter suggestion. While passing both balance and lagging regions and their obvious relationship, it poses that the concept did have a significant influence in the European funds for the 2007-2013 funding period. Barnier’s pushing of territorial cohesion for a Cohesion policy for all regions would namely be visible in the European Regional Development Funds’ (ERDF) objective of (regional) competitiveness. This might thus add the pair of competitiveness and not poor regions to the one of balance and poor regions for a channeling of European funds with territorial cohesion.

These ties between substantive objectives and territories are more complex though. The debate on whether with territorial cohesion balance aims at peripheral regions or (also with competitiveness) implies the Urban Agenda is namely also included. This debate then weakens the assumed bond between not poor regions and competitiveness insofar the Urban Agenda does not entail a Cohesion policy for all regions (and can thus also link competitiveness to poor regions) and peripheral regions do not overlap with poor ones (not only competitiveness links to not poor regions). Moreover, with the observation that the pre-accession funds provided to Central and Eastern European Countries seldom explicitly addressed territorial cohesion, balanced spatial competitiveness and spatial integration objectives, the disagreement on the concept’s usage for Member States steps in too – i.e. the New Member States might not use the concept due to their habits developed for European Funds. These discussions on how the ungathered masses of territorial cohesion concerns interlink of course do not make it clearer how the concept can channel European funds.

Hence, it seems that such connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ metanarratives do not show how territoritorial cohesion channels European funds either. They namely do not order the ungathered masses within the metanarratives, but increases the complexity by interweaving the discussions in numerous ways. Moreover, these connections of metanarratives show that the events of the European funds more affected the order of the concept than the separate metanarratives portray, while their discussions are merely on the increase of influence that is needed to channel European Funds with territorial cohesion.

The connected metanarratives pay less attention to territorial cooperation and the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ ones even hints at an emphasis on its counterstory in practice (i.e. territorial cooperation is different from territorial cohesion; see §F.3.4). The territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives however still appear to redraw the importance of this crown issue. They showed, for starters, possibilities to expand the formal room for debate on territorial cohesion, which is given with territorial cooperation as mainstreamed objective, through the other two Structural Funds objectives. This due to the concept’s horizontal approach or its relation to the sustainable development aspect of the objective of (regional) competitiveness for instance. Furthermore, the (expanded) formal room to debate territorial cohesion is here thus due to these Structural Funds objectives located in Cohesion policy, while territorial cooperation also opens the backdoor for European spatial planning to cross the fuzzy line of in/formality. Either way, when the concept is in/formally used for territorial cooperation through these
Structural Funds objectives, the question is in how the concept the concept could influence how these objectives channel European funds.

The connecting story concerned with this issue also further specified the structure of the general stories’ official policy directions and informal activity build in the stories on territorial cohesion itself. That is to say, it saw this opening for European spatial planning through territorial cooperation as an opportunity. Then trans-European spatial development cooperation could be strengthened in the context of an enlarged European Union, hereby issues should be maintained in the eligible cooperation priorities that are most likely to contribute to territorial cohesion and growth-oriented territorial development for the Lisbon Strategy. These connected metanarratives might thus reset the importance of territorial cooperation for a formal room to debate territorial cohesion and discuss eligible priorities. However, this does not depict a channelling of funds with the concept.

Yet, a possible channelling of funds does appear here in another way. With territorial cohesion it would for the European Union be possible to in the application of policy endow with a limited integration of the territorial dimension in coherence with sustainable balanced development. Then again, besides that the metanarratives do not represent an existing channelling of funds with the concept, such presented possibilities connect issues that are in the separate metanarratives discussed or even disputed (i.e. the territorial dimension and balance respectively). This leaves little to firmly root an influential usage of the concept upon: the minor issue of sustainability. Yet, one could nonetheless track the alike possibilities that are offered by the separate metanarratives through the issue of sustainability and even the territorial dimension. These are namely a way for the concept’s informal usage to enter marginal formality and possible paths to locate territorial development and territorial challenges (e.g. growth-oriented) within the European funds with the spotlight of territorial cohesion respectively. Moreover, together the issues of sustainability and the territorial dimension can broaden the path, perhaps towards a formal usage of the concept that does channel European funds. Hence, the connection between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives seems to restore territorial cooperation as crown issue through other objectives (e.g. competitiveness and/or sustainability). What is more, a single territorial cohesion story hereby deeply changes the picture of the European Funds usage area, as it could turn the other metanarrative’s nonstory on territorial criteria into a rumour. That is to say, although the separate metanarratives do not show it, the discussions on territorial cohesion might place the concept as a channel in the European funds, particularly when related to sustainability (again) and the territorial dimension.

Notwithstanding, or especially with, the possible channelling of European funds through the concept as portrayed in the connected metanarratives, the formal grounds to build an extension for the concept’s usage upon remain important. The issues of services and agricultural funding should therefore be treated. However, the territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative only mentioned the objective of services twice, and even further marginalise the concern with this than pictured in the separate metanarrative. Also the usage of the concept for agricultural funding appears in such a way. When the connections with the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative appeared to begin to picture this formal usage of the concept by linking rural areas and issues of other metanarratives, they ended quickly and gave territorial cohesion a double edged place. That is, where agricultural funding is structured as marginal in the usage area – which entails the risk of overstrechting the concept with this formal usage —, these funds even hardly mention territorial cohesion to the side. It is not clear how the concept can channel European funds from such a marginal place in both this usage area and agricultural funding.

The two times the concept did come to the fore within agricultural funding were without surprise though. Both saw the concept as a goal, thereby relating familiar issues
which would contribute to territorial cohesion (e.g. the environment, the spatial distribution of economic activity and indirectly via land management and forestry as well). These territorial cohesion stories might hereby nonetheless have changed the concept’s usage in the European funds in major ways. They namely go against the territorial cohesion counterstories of competitiveness and balance by demonstrating that the concept’s concerns with both competitiveness and territorial balance became formal. However, they are thereby narrowed down to agricultural funding, as all these issues are; or even tighter, to the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development’s axis of improving the environment and the countryside. Such a usage of the concept in agricultural funding can thus be viewed as parallel to the possible channelling of European funds which is discussed in the connected metanarratives when territorial cohesion relates balance, the environment, and the territorial dimension. The solid fit on this formal ground might paradoxically increase the risk of overstretching the concept though. This well-connected extension would namely be supported by an aberrant and heavy agricultural funding all the same. Yet, for now the concept’s formal usage for agricultural funding, despite its narrowed down set of territorial cohesion concerns, does not appear to channel these funds due to its too marginal place – to not even speak of the concept’s minor role for services in the European funds.

F.3.6 Additional findings from the connected metanarratives

The territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives do not only complete the sketch of the concept’s usage in the European Funds usage area, but also change its image a bit. The connected metanarratives namely seem to supplement the ungathered masses of the concept’s usages (e.g. by adding the spatial approach) and to leave them unorganised due to the different broad foci which do not weigh the various discussed topics, that is, if these connections do not increase the complexity through interweaving issues of different metanarratives in numerous ways. They also appear to reset the importance of the disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion concerns. Hereby territorial cooperation could open up ways to expand this room through the other two Structural Funds objectives despite that these connections do not fasten this crown issue of the concept tighter in the usage area (e.g. by emphasising its counterstory practically).

Beyond additions though, the connected metanarratives illustrate how the events more affected the order of territorial cohesion than the separate ones portray: the connecting stories show ways in which the concept’s usage for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds objectives did not yet divide substantive and territorial concerns. These concerns namely appear separated in the metanarratives since they are more focused on the next funding period whose policy does not territorially specify its substantive objectives. However, there also pops up a disputed influence of territorial cohesion on the European Funds, which passes the also for the 2007-2013 funding period related lagging regions and objective of balance. That is, a pushing of the concept for a Cohesion policy for all regions would be visible in the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness. Related to the other two new objectives of these funds, is that the territorial cohesion stories point towards an urban bias of territorial cooperation and base the debate on the concept’s relationship with the objective of balance on the problems with territorial cohesion indicators.

Yet, one could ask whether also the connected metanarratives do not channel European funds (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). The connected metanarratives surely change the picture of the European Funds usage area by suggesting that such a channelling actually is debated. This would turn the nonstory on territorial criteria into a debate. Still, the
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territorial cohesion stories just come up with the coordination of certain policies based on whether already spend funds had territorial impacts. What comes closest to a possibility for the concept to channel European funds roots it on the minor territorial cohesion issue of sustainability.

The issue of sustainability also represents an undisputed path towards the concept’s formality, one which its concern with the territorial dimension could broaden. The connecting stories namely marginalise the formal usage of the concept which follows the Intergovernmental Conferences (i.e. for services) and the one which does not follow these official limits gives territorial cohesion a double edged place: to the side in the aberrant agricultural funding. The latter thereby formally demonstrates territorial cohesion’s concern with competitiveness and territorial balance and narrows the role of the concept down to improving the environment and the countryside. Yet, the marginality of this place appears to inhibit a channelling of European funds nonetheless. Many things remain undecided; and when the discussions on a European Territorial Cohesion Index will give a space to relate technical and political choices hereby (e.g. make the index usable to channel funds), it could be the policy makers in the role of selecting the descriptions of territorial reality. That these connected metanarratives expose a usage of the concept in the better known debate on State aid is perhaps more important. Territorial cohesion could namely gain more weight hereby without directly channelling European funds. This by playing a role for a change of the European Union’s financial aid rules against the development of the Single European Market (e.g. to lessen the uniform application of State aid provisions for some territories).

The metanarratives thus do not represent an existing channelling of European funds, as no clear-cut decision on this appears through a strong relationship of issues. They therefore do not bring the ungathered masses of the metanarratives together in a neat order, but (further) snarl them like a messy ball of wool. They also do not offer one solidifying formal usage of the concept, but twofold marginal ones that do not explicitly endow. Still, possibilities for the concept to formally channel these funds surface, since territorial cohesion relates the issues of balance, the environment, and the territorial dimension on both the concept’s fuzzy line of in/formality and topical formal side.

However, crossing this expanse might overextend the concept, because it situates territorial cohesion on the divergent currents of the agricultural funding and Structural Funds mainstreams. A firm fit of possible in/formal usages of the concept and its existing formal grounds can paradoxically increase this risk. That is, if the metanarratives underpin a channelling of European funds thus, it is on a watershed. Even so, to know whether it is territorial cohesion that channels European funds, it is necessary to compare the metanarratives with the narratives with an own dynamic. If the latter would namely portray the same picture as the former, such a channelling would not really stream via territorial cohesion, as it might not even need the concept for this.

F.4 Narratives with an own dynamic in European Funds usage area

F.4.1 To sort wide-spread European funds stories in the usage area’ order

The metanarratives above offer an overview of the concept’s usage in the European Funds usage area as they order territorial cohesion stories. Also here, just as in the other usage areas, these stories might belong less to the concept than Schema’s 2a and 2b portray though. Again narratives with an own dynamic might harbour exactly the same stories for instance. If in this usage area the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic show similar debates, this can reveal both the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action (e.g. by putting many issues on the agenda) and the ungathered mass of different positions independent from the concept (e.g. this drive demonstrates this mass). In so doing, they would bring the many
possibilities to light for concerns to use the concept instrumentally as well. Furthermore, this would reinforce the present negative answer to the appendix’ leading question: the concept does not channel European funds as the same channelling appears without the mention of territorial cohesion.

Where the metanarratives do differ from the narratives, they point to the concept’s own features in the European funds, whether these are formal or not; the concept’s formality therefore plays only a minor role in this section. However, so far territorial cohesion appears without any outstanding characteristic that channels European funds. The working hypothesis of this section might therefore combine both preliminary deductions: the concept does not channel European funds because the narratives with an own dynamic portray the same picture of an ungathered mass of different issues.

The numerous European funds stories which form the concept’s context already confirm the working hypothesis in the way they are arraigned: the order of the narratives with an own dynamic is the same as the one of the metanarratives. They for instance also treat a range of regularly interrelating substantive objectives. It thereby are the same objectives as in the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative which also form same pairs. Economic and social cohesion, balance and competitiveness, the environment, polycentrism, and infrastructure and services are thus not exclusive features of territorial cohesion. Besides this ‘substantive objectives’ narrative, ‘territorial specificities is another. This because almost all this kind of issues which are debated with territorial cohesion return without mentioning the concept (i.e. territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, Territorial Impact Assessment). This also holds for issues that deal with the governal organisation of the territory (i.e. the European territory, territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, territorial cooperation), which is thus a narrative too.

On the other hand, the sizes of these same groups of similar issues differ, since now the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative relatively increases in weight at the expense of the one of ‘territorial specificities’. However, before the working hypothesis for the separate narratives is considered, Schema 3a ‘Narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)’ will summarise their appearance and development.

---

**European Funds Schema 3a**
Narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Analyse Community proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Develop technical tool for evaluation of scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Recognise key role of Atlantic Arc regions in achieving Lisbon targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Support cross-border and transnational cooperation in a scale during current funding period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reinforce institutional capacity of national and regional authorities with reinforced partnership with local and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Coordinate between national and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ensure cohesion for transport/research/safety/defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Develop technical tool for evaluation of scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Assign 23% of SF for territorial projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Support cross-border and transnational cooperation in a scale during current funding period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Reinforce institutional capacity of national and regional authorities with reinforced partnership with local and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Coordinate between national and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ensure cohesion for transport/research/safety/defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Develop technical tool for evaluation of scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Recognise key role of Atlantic Arc regions in achieving Lisbon targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support cross-border and transnational cooperation in a scale during current funding period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Reinforce institutional capacity of national and regional authorities with reinforced partnership with local and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Coordinate between national and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Ensure cohesion for transport/research/safety/defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Develop technical tool for evaluation of scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Assign 23% of SF for territorial projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Support cross-border and transnational cooperation in a scale during current funding period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Reinforce institutional capacity of national and regional authorities with reinforced partnership with local and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Coordinate between national and regional authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Ensure cohesion for transport/research/safety/defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Develop technical tool for evaluation of scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Recognise key role of Atlantic Arc regions in achieving Lisbon targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Support cross-border and transnational cooperation in a scale during current funding period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schema 3a shows many debates on European Funds issues, already so from the Single European Act (SEA) from the late 80’s on and mostly around their reforms, particularly the last one; 307 this is in step with the events fundamental for this usage area and its framing, structuring, and territorial cohesion stories. At first view, the narratives thereby appear to affirm a part of the working hypothesis, as they do not only portray many issues, but even more than the ungathered masses of the metanarratives. However, the European funds stories need to be at least roughly sketched to confirm that part and, moreover, check whether the narratives’ debates are any different from the ordered territorial cohesion stories.

Before the many European funds discussions will be treated below per narrative, a lead which could be significant for the first general hypothesis can be followed. That is, even though in this part of the usage area no in/formal usage of territorial cohesion comes forward by principle, as only the stories on the European funds themselves structure them, later on the
narratives hint here at by simply appearing in 2003.\textsuperscript{308} Strangely enough that year the concept was namely related to the European funds by the structuring stories, and the funding issues continued to be expressed towards the debates on the new Structural Funds reform. The stories on territorial cohesion itself and all the metanarratives, however, suddenly fell silent. An explanation of this might line up with the structuring stories’ debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for a formal usage of the concept, as territorial cohesion was that year extensively discussed during the drafting of it (see Appendix C on the IGCs usage area). Perhaps the fuzziness of the European Funds usage area’s line of in/formality and nearly absent formal usage of the concept then result from the anticipation on the Treaty’s ratification, its non-ratification two years later, and the ensuing uncertainty since. The channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion depends on more than this line of in/formality though. As will be shown below per narrative to redraw the territorial cohesion channels.

F.4.2 Substantive objectives in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The ‘substantive objectives’ narratives thus harbours issues that are similar to the like-named metanarrative (i.e. economic and social cohesion, balance and competitiveness, infrastructure and services). What also characterises the European Funds usage area in this is that the narrative rigorously follows the general stories on the official policy directions with its sole statement on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). It would not be aimed at cohesion (between regions), not even to the extent it takes environmental and socio-cultural concerns on board.\textsuperscript{309} Such a characteristic makes that the extension of territorial cohesion in agricultural funding for its formal usage would have to deal with more than just passing the official limits set for it in the IGCs usage area. Such a formal usage would also be more isolated than shown above in the stories on territorial cohesion itself and the metanarratives, as it might not have the possibility to lean upon its context in the European Funds usage area for this. This is the opposite of the three most debated substantive objectives, which will be treated below first. Thereafter the first traces of a major debate on economic and social cohesion are drawn and the less important debates on infrastructure and services and polycentrism touched upon.

Through the years the most often debated substantive objectives are balance, competitiveness, and the environment.\textsuperscript{310} Just after the Edinburgh European Council made Regional/Cohesion policy funding one third of the European Union budget and the Cohesion Fund funded environment and transport infrastructure these substantive objectives emerged immediately and the first two paired.\textsuperscript{311} This link developed from initially using terms of workers and their adaptation to industrial changes in 1994 to those of employment and competitiveness and the relative weighting of balanced development and growth hereby ten years later (e.g. by describing Member States that are concerned with growth instead of internal disparities or by reporting that 60% of the programmes for the new convergence objective may be linked to the Lisbon Strategy).\textsuperscript{312} This thus seems to be the same as the tension between balance and growth of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative.

Yet, it is striking that although balance was in 1999 even linked to polycentrism, this objective did not appear independently in the context of territorial cohesion before 2003.\textsuperscript{313} Furthermore, the year thereafter balance just played a part similar to its initial concern with work in the second Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment that was proposed for the 2007-2013 funding period.\textsuperscript{314} Only when the debates on this latest reform broke loose the issue of balance was really discussed in itself. This with European funds stories against regional disparities or on the first objective of convergence in the same proposal for instance.\textsuperscript{315} The stories on the European funds themselves structure a
fundamental question in this by debating the expansion/reduction of funding for Cohesion policy. That is, should the European Union finance regional development (i.e. with the first two new Structural Funds objectives) besides its support for convergence between Member States (e.g. with the Cohesion Fund)? The substantive objective of balance is thus disputed as belonging to territorial cohesion and whether it should be a European funds objective.

To answer the question above, the Member States and European Commission would especially have much debated the second new Structural Funds objective. The narrative seems in line with this debate between the Member States and the European Commission, as the substantive objective of competitiveness appears to be its main issue, and this even more pronounced than in the metanarrative, through the frequent promotion of growth the general stories on seeing the European Union as a business frame this substantive objective as well. For starters, after its initial pairing with balance, the substantive objective of competitiveness did appear independently before 2003, even a year before the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. The European funds stories thereafter explicitly link competitiveness to this strategy. This for instance by reporting the obligation for 75% of the programmes of the second new Structural Funds objective to do this; an objective they label as less or even non-redistributive, but that the European Commission held that it uses money for European Union policy goals (i.e. a political justification). What is more, a forward look in 2006 sees that the Structural and Cohesion Funds could even bent to this narrow economic agenda. This would partly answer the structuring stories’ question of how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds (i.e. with an all pervasive competitiveness objective). Yet, that competitiveness is a much debated issue in the context territorial cohesion of course does not decide upon the relationship it to the concept (e.g. for/against the metanarrative’s counterstory). Hence, with balance and competitiveness the same channels for European funding appear with and without territorial cohesion, but with their own dynamics.

Perhaps it are the European funds stories themselves that explain why the substantive objective of the environment only appeared independently since 2004 (e.g. without the issue of infrastructure). The namely give a hint a year later: the starting-point for DG Environment concerning Cohesion policy would be the integration of the environment into Structural Funds programmes and financial means for the implementation of environmental policy. That is, possibly such an integration of the environment first entails an attempt to relate it to established objectives, which is often shown – and this is not done in the way the territorial cohesion stories do: only once and to the issue of competitiveness, but also to balance and later on even to services (i.e. the innovative use of renewable energy resources). The narrative thus treats the substantive objective of the environment differently than the territorial cohesion stories do: it covers more than sustainability (e.g. the environmental balance, natural heritage) and might therefore hardly use the concept to promote the environment in the European funds.

Either way, this promotion of the environment seems to be unsuccessful, as these stories held in 2005 that sustainable development as policy statement is not followed through with clear guidelines and targets. Hence, also when territorial cohesion links to the substantive objective of the environment, then its context in the European Funds usage area largely reflects such a usage of the concept. Both do not seem to channel European funds though. The concept’s context thereby does suggest a rather one-sided relationship in the promotion of the environment and territorial cohesion though. When the environment only returns in the concept with sustainability, then environmental concerns might attend to the concept far less than the latter towards sustainability.

Traces of the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative’s first major debate emerge when the Single European Act included economic and social cohesion. The debate namely does not
derive its importance from its size but the weight of these substantive objectives. However, notwithstanding their early appearance, the European funds stories that promote these substantive objectives just developed into a debate from the 2000-2006 funding period on. Since then the Structural Funds were described in line with the structuring stories on their “higher purposes”: as having more to do with budgetary redistributions than real economic cohesion or the eradication of regional disparities. The substantive objectives would then change easily. The link of economic cohesion to the substantive objective of balance instead of social cohesion is telling here: during this funding period the classification of cohesion into economic and social cohesion seems to disappear from the context of territorial cohesion, social cohesion even completely. This is strange, doubly so, because the territorial cohesion stories continued to discuss economic and social cohesion and bended a bit more to the latter. Here the narratives thus differ from the metanarratives.

Moreover, when this narrative did mention economic and social cohesion since the new Structural Funds objectives were proposed in the debates on these funds’ latest reform, the low levels of compatibility between economic cohesion and convergence came up and the relationship of competitiveness to cohesion in general was questioned. In the European funds the mention of territorial cohesion with economic and social cohesion thus seems to disappear without as with territorial cohesion. Yet, this difference could also mean that economic and social cohesion channelled European funds, but territorial cohesion will not do so due to their disappearance.

Even though the substantive objective of infrastructure already surfaced in 1989 (i.e. even before the Cohesion Fund funded transport infrastructure), it appears as a minor issue, mostly to promote European networks, and it does not to develop in this narrative. Yet, this does indicate something. The European funds stories on infrastructure might namely indicate a debate, but one that relatively decreases in importance (i.e. in the context of territorial cohesion) due to the growth of the stories on the European Funds themselves and other issues of this narrative. Although the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative does not pair the issue of infrastructure and the ten years later emerging issue of services as strongly as the metanarrative does, also the latter substantive objective seems to have a minor role here. That is, while these European funds stories held in 2006 that services were on the agenda in 2004, the narrative strangely enough does not show this. Services thus do not seem to figure prominently on the European Funds’ agenda, or at least not when it concerns the context of territorial cohesion (see Appendix E on Regional/Cohesion policy though). The ‘substantive objectives’ narrative is thus reflected by the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative when it concerns infrastructure and services: both substantive objectives are debated, but weakly so. Although infrastructure channels European funds, this does not appear in this usage area.

The other less important debate is on the substantive objective of polycentrism. It only appeared since the ESDP’s publication and mention of this document in the Structural Funds Guidelines for the 2000-2006 period and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund, which is logical (see Appendix D on the (post-)ESDP process). The debate that develops in this narrative is then about polycentrism’s importance. It is mostly promoted with, for instance, statements which hold that the European Parliament always supported polycentrism and even that it met universal approval. However, a contrary assertion is that with the Structural Funds no direct polycentric development is needed on measure or priority level.
shows the side in this debate that seems to prevail – when the accounts that the theme of polycentric development is not so apparent in the strategies of 2000-2006 Structural Funds programmes and the Community Strategic Guidelines do not include it are correct that is. Polycentrism might thus to play a larger role for territorial cohesion than in its context of the European funds; this can be explained by that both polycentrism and territorial cohesion relate to the informal activity of European spatial planning (again, see Appendix D). Due to this difference, it could be a way in which the concept channels European funds.

F.4.3 Territorial specificities in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The narrative concerned with territorial specificities appeared regularly since the 1988 Structural Funds reform, which is while the European Comission’s budget just increased two years earlier, and each of its issues blossomed during the debates on the latest reform. Besides the weight territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, and Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) concerns, their development differs from the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative – this could be due to their earlier emergence, as sometimes the difference is just that they develop (through time). The differences and additional significant information in territorial specificities are then treated below: first the here most discussed specific territories and the in European funds stories less similar territorial reality before the more notable Territorial Impact Assessment and even less important issue of territorial capital.

The development of the specific territories in the narrative seems to differ from the metanarrative. That is, even though the narrative also first mostly spoke of regions according to wealth (i.e. those lagging behind) and since 2005 many specific regions appear, some specific ones turn up near the beginning too: regions affected by industrial decline and regions with extremely low population density; just as a later backward looking story explains the first development as a compensation for the United Kingdom and others with low benefits from the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), the creation of a Structural Funds objective for the second type of regions might relate to Austria, Finland, and Sweden joining the European Union. The context of territorial cohesion thus did not discuss a specific territory later than the territorial cohesion stories did, and even more come up within it (e.g. are lobbied for). The hereby formed leeway for the European funds’ area of action to expand could point out that specific territories do not so much use the concept in this but vice versa.

Regardless of such usages, this leeway appears to be disputed later on. The European funds stories namely both report that the Structural Funds regulations account for specific territories and that the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG) do not focus certain strategic activities on them. Even despite the stories on the European funds themselves that hold that these guidelines are not compulsory for all regions, whether specific territories are actually dealt with is disputed.

With another line of debate specific territories do more clearly come to the fore. This in the track of agricultural funding: the expenditure of the Common Agricultural Policy would be concentrated in the wealthier and more densely populated areas. Such a concentration would go against the Structural Funds (i.e. both qua lagging regions and regions with a low density). Yet, these two streams of funding did link, even if only superficially, as a backward looking story noted in 2004 that after the 1990s the Agricultural Funds’ Guidance Section was considered alongside the Regional and Social Funds as part of the regional and national Operational Programmes (OPs) in Objective regions. This link of agricultural funding and Structural Funds did not subsist for the 2007-2013 funding period, and the latter seem to take the urban side in this line of debate; one European funds story even went beyond the often mentioned urban dimension by stating that cities are central to
Cohesion Policy. The ‘territorial specificities’ narrative thus further portrays the watershed on which the concept situates itself with its formal usage for agricultural funding and the more nearby and, arguably, urban Structural Funds – i.e. the void between the two streams widens.

Still, the actual spending much depends on the Member States. This comes to the fore with the urban dimension. The reflection of urban development would vary because urban development policies vary across Member States. This comes stronger to the fore with the financial problems in the broader context of the concept though. That is, while territorial cohesion stories remain undecided between specific territories, also in the case of Member States, the European funds stories depict the high stakes in the debates on the latest Structural Funds reform: the Eastern ones want the priority because they suffer the most acute problems, the Southern ones enough to tackle unresolved problems, and the Western Member States refuse to pay for both. Again, territorial cohesion thus seems to play no role in major reshufflings in European funds.

Hence, the ways in which the European funds stories on specific territories differ from how they are treated with the concept seem to show that each of them came forward without a concern for territorial cohesion too (e.g. for a leeway to expand the European funds’ area of action). This makes it questionable whether the concept channels European funding thus. Moreover, the watershed of agricultural funding and Structural Funds on which territorial cohesion situates itself appears to widen in line with the debate on, respectively, rural and urban areas in the concept’s context. This increases the risks for when it would channel European funding. However, territorial cohesion plays no major role in reshufflings of these European funds, nor within them. Still, the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative does not bring forward a Cohesion policy for all regions. Such a (financial) non-/decision which expands the European funds’ area of action might therefore not only be a territorial cohesion concern, but a concern pushed solely by it (or one far out of the concept’s context). This is thus a way in which the concept could channel European funding.

There appear more descriptions of territorial reality in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative than in the territorial cohesion metanarrative. The tightening of the gap between policy and reality, as framed by the general stories on the official policy directions, might thus be more cluttered in this usage area than the metanarrative portrays. In spite of their amount, some direct descriptions do not come up, such as the geographical concentrations of deprivation and the territorial model of a region. What is more, this narrative says nothing on polycentrism, which could indicate that insofar territorial specificities are concerned, the concept might be used as a passageway to get European spatial planning concerns in the European funds – and less so with polycentrism as substantive objective, as shown above. Such direct descriptions of territorial reality (e.g. territorial model of a region, polycentrism) could thus be territorial cohesion features.

Also in the narrative’s indirect descriptions of territorial reality the context of territorial cohesion differs from the concept. These descriptions developed since the start of the narrative by debating many different indicators. First voices rose that criticise the statistical straightjacket created by the European Council in which, for instance, the Structural Funds regime expresses regions in the statistical representation of NUTS II as dominant unit of analysis. From 2004 on these European funds stories did more than only promoting or criticising the indicator of GDP/capita though. They also endorsed (other) indicators for territorial imbalance. Territorial cohesion could hereby further open up this debate. This because the situation described in 2006 was that the European Parliament demanded new territorial indicators but that the European Commission just held options open while awaiting the faith of the Constitutional Treaty. And this Treaty did not include any other new particularly territorial element related to indicators except for territorial cohesion. The debate
about territorial indicators thus did not only develop both with territorial cohesion and in the concept’s financial context, but might also fit both together.

This debate thereby fell straight into the frame of the general stories on the European Union as a business. By mentioning earmarking in relation with (measuring) how the Structural Funds contribute to the Lisbon Strategy and by often making the relationship between benchmarking and spatial development (e.g. as undertaken by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)); earmarking is hereby just stated as not a finalised process in this without dealing with the question from the framing and structuring stories how these funds and strategy relate.\textsuperscript{352} Nota bene, these financial developments of the European funds and the possibility to further open the debate on territorial criteria with territorial cohesion become the more important, as the narrative, unlike the metanarrative, does touch upon the relationship between territorial reality and the activity of defining where funds go. Besides relating indicators to the identification of regional specificities and their acknowledgment through higher funding allowances, the European funds stories namely state that ESPON outcomes are considered as usable to develop more sophisticated criteria for the Structural Funds and that territorial criteria would be contemplated for Member States to allocate resources to regional programmes.\textsuperscript{353} This electrifies the concept’s context as a circuit into which territorial cohesion can be plugged.

Of course, neither territorial cohesion indicators nor a European Territorial Cohesion Index (ETCI) appeared in the electrification of the concept’s context; ESPON would have recommended EUROSTAT\textsuperscript{a} to elaborate target indices of social cohesion though.\textsuperscript{354} Moreover, the narrative does not appear to discuss a space to interconnect political and technical choices as the metanarrative does with its index, but merely mentions some relations between these activities.\textsuperscript{355} Another caveat for this is that these European funds stories often align with the general stories on the political organisation which frame the role for experts. That is to say, the European Commission would not want to leave the formulation of the criteria for allocating funds to analysts and ESPON could play a role in, for example, providing territorial analyses for European Union policy making. Although the context of territorial cohesion might help the concept to channel European funding, this is therefore far from a closed deal.

A possible expansion of the European funds’ area of action with the addition of territorial reality concerns might thus (again) more provide many ways to promote territorial cohesion than vice versa. Still, the concept could do more than further opening the debate on indicators which developed in its context. It could namely with its European Territorial Cohesion Index bring a focus into the clutter of the uttered gap between policy and reality, even though it may thereby add some own features (e.g. polycentrism). Hence, instead of providing difficulties for evidence-based targeting as mentioned in the metanarrative, the concept could be a (small) step towards such a chanelling of European funding.

Territorial Impact Assessment appears to play a larger role in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative than in the territorial cohesion metanarrative. Albeit that the issue emerged in 1998 – which is before the EC’s Spatial and urban development subcommittee (SUD) studied it and well-before ex ante impact assessment became obligatory for all Community policies – and discussion on this grew, the concern with it did not change.\textsuperscript{356} That is, the narrative mostly promotes Territorial Impact Assessment. This for instance by linking it to the principle of concentration to insure that the Structural Funds are not geographically or thematically spread too thinly.\textsuperscript{357} These European fund stories hereby also added to the electrified context of territorial cohesion (i.e. electrified by the territorial criteria for the allocation of funds; see above) by linking with the issue of specific territories. Funds

\textsuperscript{a} EUROSTAT is as a general service the EC’s Directorate-General for statistics.
could namely be invested where they have the greatest impact;\textsuperscript{358} perhaps this relates to the obligatory \textit{ex ante} impact assessment. THUS

However, through the years some statements undercut this support for Territorial Impact Assessment in various ways. To begin with, these European funds stories described some assessment fatigue in the Directorates-General (DGs) and that ESPON keeps Territorial Impact Assessment alive in a less technical manner.\textsuperscript{359} They also debated the impact that comes forth from the distribution of the financial resources from the European Union budget instead of (indirectly) other European Union interventions.\textsuperscript{360} These stories, moreover, downgraded the abovementioned larger role for Territorial Impact Assessment in the context of territorial cohesion. That is, in 2004 spatial impacts would not even have been talked about.\textsuperscript{361} More essentially though, while an account was that not all Member States have a tradition in Territorial Impact Assessment, its application is said to depend on the priorities set by the authorities.\textsuperscript{362} Even its origin was not free of criticism insofar it does not lay in Environmental Impact Assessment but in European spatial planning. It namely would, at least then, only be for large transnational projects.\textsuperscript{363} Hence, if the concept will mostly be used for Territorial Impact Assessment as the territorial cohesion stories declare, then it has a context in the European funds usage area already filled with arguments for and against it. The relationship of the concept to its context remains an unknown in the territorial cohesion stories though, as it could for instance matter that territorial cohesion more appears with the \textit{ex post} than \textit{ex ante} evaluation of policies.

In which the metanarrative’s stories might be more accurate than the ones of the narrative is that the inclusion of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines would add an emphasis on territorial capital. To be precise, since territorial capital appeared statically in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative, it did not only do this in 2002, a year later than the metanarrative, but also similarly and less so.\textsuperscript{364} Again, the general stories on the European Union as a business might for a clear-cut reality frame stories on territorial capital. This thus more so for the concept’s usage than for its context in the European Funds usage area; just as those on European spatial planning seem to do for direct descriptions of territorial reality. Even though the issue of territorial capital does not appear as a feature of the concept, an emphasis on this issue might therefore be a feature of territorial cohesion nonetheless. The ‘territorial specificities’ narrative thus indirectly reveals territorial cohesion’s emphasis on territorial capital for the European funds and directly reveals a promotion of Territorial Impact Assessment in the concept’s context – weakened from all sides though – in which the usage of it would fit.

F.4.4 The governal organisation of the territory in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The order of the narratives with an own dynamic differs from the one of the territorial cohesion metanarratives in that relatively more European funds stories treat organisational issues. Although most issues in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative (i.e. the European territory, spatial approach, territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, territorial cooperation) are the same as in the metanarrative, they seem to have slightly different weights as well: all issues that side to the territorial, save for territorial cooperation, are less important (i.e. the territory, spatial approach, and territorial dimension).\textsuperscript{365} The emphasis on the processual appears thus more pronounced here, something which is not surprising without the mention of territorial cohesion which makes the stories less ‘territorial’ to begin with.\textsuperscript{366} Just as with the other narratives, the concept lands in long ongoing debates, here since 1987.\textsuperscript{367} Territorial cohesion’s organisational context is complex too, because these organisational issues far more often interrelate in this part of the usage area than in the territorial cohesion stories.\textsuperscript{368}
To treat this complex context of the concept, the line from more territorial to processual issues listed above will be followed below and thus be completed by the exemplary territorial cooperation.

The European funds stories discussed the territory well-before the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative did, even almost since the start of the similar narrative; whereby it first only related to spatial planning. A debate on territorial divisions emerged in the issue of the territory during the latest Structural Funds reform. Although the European funds stories thereby also considered the European Union without internal borders for the Structural Funds, the NUTS – which in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative come forward as dominant unit of analysis – are discussed as scientifically seen the best but politically wise unwelcome territorial divisions; this might give the facilitating role of experts, as framed by the general stories on the political organisation, more cachet. Either way, the “un-State-like” organisation of the territory which is noted in the territorial cohesion stories thus clearly returns in their context. It thereby points towards the new third Structural Funds objective as promoting a stronger integration of the European Union territory in all its dimensions (see for territorial cooperation below). Hence, the organisational narrative’s territorial issue of the territory shows a way in which territorial cohesion could fit in the contextual debates of the European Funds usage area: suiting “un-State-like” territorial divisions which could include an important role for experts.

In the narrative also the spatial approach appears as a minor issue again, just as in the metanarrative. In the narrative it did even regularly so since 2004 (e.g. as territorial approach). The European funds stories thereby mostly debated whether this approach is successful in the Structural Funds. Yet, they also harbour a statement that is significant for territorial cohesion. That is, a territorial or space-based approach and territorial coordination through information and dialogue can help to translate territorial concepts into policies of the European Union and Member States with, for instance, the Community Strategic Guidelines in Cohesion policy and sectoral policies. Such a statement also shows how the spatial approach and substantive coordination can relate. Still, it does not envisage a great role for territorial cohesion due to the small role of the spatial approach in the context of this concept. Hence, the organisational narrative’s territorial issue of the spatial approach shows how territorial cohesion could not fit the contextual debates in the European Funds usage area so well. The spatial approach’s relative insignificance could namely drag the concept along.

A more discussed territorial issue in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative is the territorial dimension, whose emergence stutters since in 1995 the European fund stories posed the problem that the national level is too small and the Community level too big. Almost ten years later the territorial dimension namely re-emerged at the time of the European Parliament’s resolution on the management of Regional policy and the Structural Funds. This with the call to embody a stronger spatial and sectoral targeting of resources and by shortly discussing the un/importance of State aid for Member States; the latter appears as in the territorial cohesion stories: scarcely. Only during (again) the latest reform of the Structural Funds the territorial dimension issue developed into a debate. Thereby it was promoted and its existence was questioned (e.g. in the Community Strategic Guidelines, the Structural Funds programmes, the investments in regions). Yet, the European fund stories also point out that the concept’s context could for the most part to be formed by different concerns. The European funds stories namely hold that many of the policies and funds that the metanarratives speak of are not primarily territorial but regional-economic if not sectoral (i.e. the Structural Funds, rural development and environmental directions, transport and energy networks, Leader and URBAN). Thus insofar it concerns the territorial dimension similar issues do appear in the context of territorial cohesion as with the concept, but in an essentially different way, that is, much less self-evident.
Another significant point for territorial cohesion comes to the fore here as well, as the narrative’s stories reveal that the promotion of the territorial dimension might not be a political affair. That is to say, various approaches to introduce the territorial dimension into European Union policies would be proposed through mechanical and technical processes. Disagreeing examples of such approaches are: the broader axis of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development might give a resting-place for the formal usage of territorial cohesion – if this axis affirms the report that it is completely territorial – and in the 2007-2013 funding period territorial cooperation would become the only territorial instrument (see below). Note that such processes that are not part of politics proper could rule out a space to interconnect political and technical choices as put forward with the European Territorial Cohesion Index. Hence, territorial cohesion could still offer possible paths to locate the territorial dimension within its primarily non-territorial context of the European funds (e.g. territorial development and challenges related to the informal Ministerial meeting in Luxembourg on regional policy and territorial cohesion). However, as the territorial dimension already appears in this context, the concept might for the incorporation it in the European Funds the concept merely be needed to interconnect political and technical choices instead of introducing the issue.

The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative did not immediately treat the issue of substantive coordination as the territorial cohesion stories did, since at the beginning, when the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period commenced, it related to the Community Initiatives (mostly Interreg). Thereafter, however, these European funds stories slowly started and later, during (yet again) the debates on the funds for the next period, their promotion of substantive coordination was amplified more in general, also indirectly when they picture a current situation of uncoordinatedess. What is particularly interesting for territorial cohesion is that some stories thereby attended to the watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds. That is to say, there was neither a debate on whether an alignment of agricultural and regional policy objectives is a challenge nor on whether this should be done – e.g. their (by ESPON shown) inconsistencies qua financial allocations were even seen as logical consequence of their aims. Differences just appeared about how to do this. Although the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development are claimed to help out in providing consistency with other policies, other more territorial directions might better suit territorial cohesion than this agricultural base of its formal usage in the European funds. For instance, (informal) territorial development and the seldom issued territorial approach were put forward as well. This to, respectively, guide the political and strategic development of various agricultural policy measures and allow for coherence between rural and regional development policies (see below for a territorial management of funds). Clearly, European funds stories are concerned with substantive coordination, apparently with their own reasons, such as the now even wider portrayed watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds.

However, in this narrative both the direct and indirect way of promoting substantive coordination appeared in a wider variation of informal policies, funds, and/or guidelines than around the watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds. The financial gains thereby became especially clear in two European funds stories. One argued for horizontal substantive coordination that trade-off effects and inconsistencies between European Union sectoral policies would lead to an inefficient allocation of European Union resources and a reduction of policy effectiveness. The other expressed a concern of vertical substantive coordination with European Union policies to mobilise the largest amount of resources, hereby framed by the general story on money of “getting as much as possible”. When it concerns substantive coordination, it is thus hard to notice differences between territorial cohesion and its context.
The metanarratives showed that insofar territorial cohesion is concerned with substantive coordination it might have crossed the fuzzy line of in/formality (i.e. by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds). Now we can see that this situation could have a strange consequence. The integrated approach as a territorial cohesion definition might namely be so well-matched for its context in this usage area, that the concept could be difficult to recognise due to isomorphism – a form which could cohere with the French practice mentioned with *le Fonds national d’aménagement et de développement du territoire* (again, see below).

The oldest concern in this narrative is with governing, and it took almost ten years since 1987 for other concerns to also appear independently. The European funds stories hereby get increasingly more detailed on the management of the funds within the frame of the general stories on implementation (e.g. how to deal with the various levels). Perhaps the since 2004 voiced need of flexibility in following the rules (e.g. criteria and/or regulations) is thus not so much, as a territorial cohesion story posed, sought by the Member States in disagreement with the territorial cohesion approach. Instead, together with the asked for simplification of the delivery system, it just shows a (counter)movement in the management of European funds (e.g. against strict rules). What more, the implementation principles which are noted in the general stories (i.e. programming, partnership, additionality, concentration) are here even stated to refer more to a management and implementation model of the Structural Funds than to a specific vision of territorial prospects. This thus underlines the regional-economic and sectoral character of the context of territorial cohesion in the European funds. It would also imply a major a redrawing of the picture of the concept’s usage, as concept could even be less important than portrayed above.

Notwithstanding the regional-economic and sectoral character of the concept’s context, it does show a debate on the degree in which the management of the Structural Funds is territorial. The narrative for example disclosed that in 1991 the regulations of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) included on DATAR’s insistence gave the European Commission the power to produce a *schéma de développement de l'espace communautaire*. This is not strange at all when you consider that the narrative exposes a more general relationship of *aménagement du territoire* to these funds – according to a backward story in 2006 already so since the end of the 1980s; thereby filling-in the stories on the European funds themselves which hold that DATAR heavily influenced these funds. The uttered search for new utilisation forms of the funds by according a special status to the financial and geographical lever effects of regional policy could likewise give a possible answer to the call of frequently improving the delivery mechanism. A territorial form of management (e.g. *aménagement du territoire*) might namely stack related problems. These are a lack of strategic and implementation capacity where needed (i.e. notice an absence of it on territorial levels) and, arguably, of keeping it simple while the mechanisms constantly change slightly (i.e. frame change through the territorial). When the context of territorial cohesion is more territorial than stories on its regional-economic and sectoral character tell, it would therefore differ less from the concept and be more open to it. Yet, this is thus debated for the management of European funds.

Albeit that the narrative debates the details and territorial character of the management of European funds, it hardly deals with the decision-making over them or formal State-like ways of doing in this; the narrative therefore appears more framed by the general stories on implementation than the ones on the political organisation. Even when its European funds stories for the 2007-2013 funding period discuss a renationalisation of the Structural Funds or a clear reflection of the overall European Union policy objectives in the allocation of resources instead, then they do this, unlike the metanarrative, indirectly via the new delivery or planning system. Perhaps the ways to (formally) decide on funds were already
established for the context of territorial cohesion (but not for the concept). Those few European funds stories that do touch upon these more political matters then regularly favour decentralisation. This for instance by remarking that the regions have no part in the definition of national strategies for European funds or that the support for the modernisation of regional development strategies is a main area of European Union intervention. Hence, through its own dynamic the governing issue seems to offer a fertile context to cultivate territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area insofar it harbours (French) territorial ways of managing funds. However, the governing issue also distances the concept from deciding were European funds go, as it does not often link to these matters. Moreover, it further reduces the role of territorial cohesion in this as well by supporting decentralisation, as lower levels have less to say in these matters, and by uncovering the implementation approach for which the Member States seek flexibility without mentioning the concept.

Although the balance in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative might veer away from the more territorial issues, this context of territorial cohesion does not tip over to the purely processual side either. The European funds stories namely did not often deal with processual coordination. Moreover, when they did, this issue came solely forward with the partnership principle besides a few mentions of European spatial planning; hereby also affiliated to aménagement du territoire again with contrats de plan Etat-Région which mix the general stories on implementation and European spatial planning by aligning to both. For instance, during the debates on the new Structural Funds period, it was in 2004 observed that since 1988 significant and uneven progress has been made in strengthening the application of the partnership principle in the governance of the Structural Funds programmes. However, since then the treatment of the issue of processual coordination, and even the partnership principle, dimmed in this narrative. A simultaneous statement is though, that tripartite negotiations are a main area of European Union intervention for the European Union funding policy delivery mechanism. This thus seems to insinuate that the development in which concerns for processual coordination dimm might not hold for European funds, but only for the context of territorial cohesion within them. Hence, it could still be save to say that the concept does not so much have a purely processual but a territorially tainted organisational context.

The best example of this territorially tainted organisational context of the territorial cohesion could be the promotion of territorial cooperation. The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative began with issuing the transnational cooperation when the European Commission added it to cross-border co-operation in 1995 – first this was predominately about Interreg of course. The European funds stories then mostly back up this key issue, but also convey observations of the 2007-2013 Structural Funds debates that some Member States did not support territorial cooperation and that the financial commitments did not match the stress of both the European Commission and other Member States on it (see section 5.1.1). Because territorial cooperation is less undisputed in the context of territorial cohesion than with the concept, it also exemplifies that this context is less territorially tainted than the concept.

Then again, criticism on territorial cooperation paradoxically underlines support for it as well. This first happened with the statement that the formulation and execution of Interreg programmes was closed on all territorial levels. Later on this also happens more in detail by discussing the improvement of the coherence of zoning and limits for the amount of partners for territorial cooperation. More essential though, the regulations and Community Strategic Guidelines would not solve the typical restraints that hindered the effectiveness of territorial cooperation in the 2000-2006 funding period: the difficulty to qualify and quantify value for money and the intangible nature of outcomes. The narrative thereby also portrays how the development of the general stories on the European Union as a business frames this
organisation of territorial cooperation. Those regulations and guidelines would namely stress it linked to innovation, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), and entrepreneurship – these European funds stories even come up with something called ‘entrepreneurship territorial pact’. However, seeing territorial cooperation as a part of the European Union business (e.g. as a way to manage measures) does not suggest how to change its uttered intangible nature and value for money, nor how to organise its demarcations (e.g. not closed ones). Still, debates about territorial cooperation do not dispute it, but their support of territorial cooperation make this context of territorial cohesion more familiar to the concept.

Notwithstanding the difficulties of territorial cooperation, the strategic projects of this new third Structural Funds objective were put forward to link with governing issues. This as a site to improve European territorial governance in absentia by developing common approaches, networks, and integrated developments; perhaps the development of the European Union as a business partially fills the void here, also because it was noticed that DG Regio sees territorial cooperation as relating the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy. While the European funds stories never gave more weight to one of the territorial cooperation types (i.e. crossborder, interregional, transnational), it is still according to them the trans-European dimension which plays a key role in promoting better territorial governance in the European Union (e.g. away from formal State-like ways of doing). Territorial cooperation might thus in various ways play a pivotal role when (French) territorial ways of managing funds provide a fertile context to cultivate territorial cohesion.

The transnational kind of territorial cooperation is not only mentioned more often through the years and related to the improvement of territorial governance, but it also seems to have a privileged relationship with European spatial planning. This relationship thus appears without the mention of territorial cohesion. Just as territorial cohesion does not have to locate European spatial planning within the Structural Funds to cross the usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality, European spatial planning therefore does not need the concept to form an activity at the fringes of the European funds either. In the narrative a debate on such a role for European spatial planning comes forward too. It is namely claimed that the Ministers responsible for spatial development will play a key role in applying territorial cooperation, but also that the new third Structural Funds objective does not refer to spatial planning and that the application of the ESDP through its Interreg predecessor was mixed. Hence, in the own dynamic of the narrative a possibility opens up whereby European spatial planning might indeed disappear in trans- and infranational practice as the framing and structuring stories suggest.

However, when European spatial planning dissappears thus territorial cohesion does not necessarily take its place as argued in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative. This could be even more probable for the inter-regional than transnational cooperation type territorial cooperation. The territorial cohesion stories namely disagree on whether inter-regional cooperation relates to the concept; the more so if a European funds story is correct in that it’s more thematic (e.g. instead of geographical). The own dynamic of territorial cooperation, the crown issue of territorial cohesion, thus does not so much put itself into question but discusses its form in various ways, such as the difficulties with its intangible nature and value for money and the adjustments for its demarcations. Also possibilities to improve territorial governance come to the fore with ways of doing for the European funds that are in accordance with the European Union as a business and European spatial planning and perhaps both in combination on the transnational level. Then again, European spatial planning could also disappear from the concept’s context formed by territorial cooperation, and this without a territorial cohesion sneak route. This would thus essentially change the picture of in the European Funds usage area.
F.4.5 Redrawing territorial cohesion channels with the narratives

The narratives with an own dynamic change the picture the metanarratives drew of the European Funds usage area. The narratives namely clarify that the ungathered masses of different positions in the metanarratives are surrounded by the even greater masses of the likewise ordered European funds stories. Metaphorically speaking, the general stories of the European Funds usage area thereby might not so much point to territorial cohesion as a calm spot amidst heavy weather (see §F.1.3), but frame the concept as a sheet floating above the large forming currents of financial events. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves thereby structure how funding might go through the tangent plane. The metanarratives and narratives then bring the details of this to the fore. As shown below by the ways in which the concept’s context gives opportunities and obstacles for the promotion of it, points to instrumental usages of territorial cohesion and its own features, how ungathered masses can expand the European funds’ area of action, and what the consequences of this are for how the concept channels European funds.

The narratives thereby portray the same kind of picture of an ungathered mass of different issues as the metanarratives do. Both by looking alike and by differing slightly, the concept’s context in the European Funds usage area then gives some opportunities for the promotion of territorial cohesion. The narratives for instance present contextual opportunities for territorial cohesion with their territorially tainted organisational issues. This because they thereby offer a warm welcome for the concept with similar “un-State-like” territorial divisions and a suiting display of (French) territorial ways of managing funds. Territorial cooperation could lend a hand in this too due to its additional role of improving territorial governance. Moreover, the concept might also enter the lively debate on Territorial Impact Assessment and get familiar with some difficulties for territorial cooperation.

However, the narrative mostly presents obstacles for the promotion of territorial cohesion. The substantive objective of the environment for instance seems to provide less opportunities then the metanarratives picture. It namely appears to be more occupied with other concerns than the one which attracts territorial cohesion to become formal (i.e. sustainability). An obstacle that comes from the narratives more clearly, is that they appear to situate the concerns with economic and social cohesion outside this usage area while these are more important for formalisation. They also mirror the concept’s own out of place formal status with their relative silence on services. Obstacles also rise due to reasons that are not related to formalisation. The role of territorial cohesion could for instance diminish when it would depend on the spatial approach to translate the concept in the European funds, as this approach is rather insignificance. The same holds for the dependence of territorial cohesion on its relationship to both agricultural funding and the Structural Funds, as the differences between, respectively, supporting rural or more urban areas are widening. All in all the context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area thus does not appear very receptive for the concept.

The narratives do bring possibilities to light for concerns to use territorial cohesion instrumentally. That is to say, the many debates in the concept’s context that are similar to it reveal both the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action and the ungathered masses of different positions independently from the concept. Then again, in this large overlap most issues seem rather to signify territorial cohesion for their reinforcement within the in/formally established European funds’ area of action instead of signifying an expansion of it. The concept is for instance not so much used to make specific territories beneficiaries of the European funds, but to let them retain their funding. Nonetheless, issues that would certainly represent courses to expand the European funds’ area of action come up where the narratives indirectly point to own features of territorial cohesion, as these are not (yet) part of this area of action.
However, these own features of territorial cohesion appear to be scarce, as the territorial cohesion stories merely lay more emphasis on some concerns than the European funds stories do. That is, more emphasis on: i) supporting all regions in the promotions of specific territories, ii) polycentrism as direct description of territorial reality and substantive objective (an emphasis that is framed by the general stories on European spatial planning), and iii) territorial capital as clear-cut assumed reality that fits the idea of the European Union as a business. Moreover, that the territorial cohesion stories more discuss economic and social cohesion than their European funds context could mean that the concept does not expand this area of action thus; what becomes the more probable when these substantive objectives have disputed relationships to the new Structural Funds objectives of convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment. Only one expansion route of the European funds’ area of action appears via the promotion of territorial cohesion. This is through the further opening of the debate on indirect descriptions of territorial reality with a territorial cohesion indicator and through a focus in this gap between policy and reality with a European Territorial Cohesion Index (e.g. for evidence-based targeting). Hence, not only do most issues that appear with territorial cohesion also appear in its context, but this also mostly in the same way.

The narratives’ stories thus do not portray the same but a largely similar picture of ungathered masses of different issues when compared to the metanarrative. It therefore comes as no surprise that they largely uphold that the concept does not channel European funds because this (i.e. the narratives’ working hypothesis). That mostly the same issues appear, and more and since longer promoted and discussed, namely mostly entails that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an unagathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). The only recognisable order when you relate these two unagathered masses seems to be this unagatheredness itself. That is, for the appearance of territorial cohesion no place would be surprising.

With such complicated and large overlaps and slight differences of the metanarratives and narratives, the question becomes what the consequences of this are for how the concept channels European funds (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) – or rather, following the structured undefinedness of territorial cohesion and the similar narratives, how it does not. The three situations to distinguish in this are when: i) the concept and its context are the same, ii) the concept differs from its context by not treating an issue, iii) the concept differs from its context by treating an issue. Territorial cohesion merely underlines a channelling of funds when it is the same as its context when it for instance concerns funds for competitiveness, polycentrism, a specific territory, territorial cooperation, focussing substantive objectives with horizontal substantive coordination. This can even hold if a channelling would have appeared in the metanarratives before the narratives – which indicates possible influences of territorial cohesion on its context. To give a negative example of this: by depicting multifocality similar to the one in the metanarratives, the narratives neither substantively clarify the European funds’ aims. The concept could namely have done the digging here, but the channel that channels funds might also remain there without the mention of territorial cohesion.

Where the concept and its context overlap the narratives also cut down ways in which territorial cohesion could channel funds. The narratives for instance increase the risk that the
only formal usage of territorial cohesion that chooses between specific territories
overstratches the concept. Besides that the narratives show a wider watershed between
agricultural funding and the (urban) Structural Funds, they namely also list specificities of
rural areas directly from territorial reality as an isolated resting-place for an extension of alike
(combined) territorial cohesion concerns (e.g. with farming systems and landscape, mountain
pastures, agricultural and forestry products). Another overlapping situation appears with the
own dynamic of the issue of territorial cooperation. That is to say, territorial cooperation does
not clearly cut down this possible way through which the concept could channel funds, but
merely discusses its form. Yet, these discussions do voice a disappearance of European
spatial planning without territorial cohesion as a replacement too. This would cut off this
route for the concept’s influence in twofold (i.e. neither directly nor indirectly via European
spatial planning). The overlaps between the narratives and metanarratives thus in many ways
show how the concept does not channel European funds.

Dissimilarities between the metanarratives and narratives might, in their turn, show
how territorial cohesion could channel funds. In many instances the concept does not treat an
issue of its larger European funds context. Yet, this implies a choice in concerns but not
directly in a channelling of funds; at most an absence of possibilities to do so, or even a way
in which not the concept but its context channels funds. Territorial cohesion could channel
European funds due to the concept’s own features of a territorial cohesion indicator and
European Territorial Cohesion Index though. However, that the concept can thereby easily
channel European funds when it would link in its near options for this in the usage area
depends more on its context then on the concept. This context namely actually debates
territorial criteria while the concept merely links a territorial cohesion indicator and index to
not poor territories. Another possibility for territorial cohesion to channel European funds
comes up with investing where funds have the greatest impact (e.g. an evidence-based
targeting). Against this runs that territorial cohesion mostly appears with ex post evaluations
of policies and that in its context Territorial Impact Assessment is weakened from all sides.
Hence, the narratives mostly cut down ways in which territorial cohesion could channel
European funds.

The only possibility for the substantively and territorially vacillating concept to
channel European funds appears through its substantively multifocal context: via territorial
criteria and, if related to this, territorial cooperation. Nonetheless, the narratives indirectly
underline the importance of the Constitutional Treaty as basis for formal usages of the
concept to channel funds. They namely also increase territorial cohesion’s risk of
oversretching by channelling agricultural funds with the concept’s major existing formal
usage. Perhaps the direction to which a structuring story points might thus be followed here:
question all these implementation oriented debates because a political debate on territorial
cohesion needs other ways.

The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative is then extra significant for the
comparison between metanarratives and narratives. Not only because it is relatively more
important than the alike metanarrative, but also because its own dynamic in the European
funds could come closest to a revelation of how the concept relates to spheres of political
debate. However, what is telling for this usage area, is that the issues discussed distance the
concept even further from decision-making. They could be indicative in spite of this, but not
by giving a glimpse of proper political debates though, as the defining where funds go hardly
comes forward through them. The narrative’s support for decentralisation and exposure of the
Member States that seek flexibility for a general rather than territorial cohesion
implementation approach can for instance cut down the role for the concept. This narrative’s
issues could instead show how to channel funds more downstream where funding passes
through the machinery of implementation. The narrative namely follows the general stories
on the European Union as business more than the metanarrative does and this could guide the leeway for territorial cohesion to channel European funds. That is to say, the less directed the funding comes from the top (i.e. with multiple foci), the more influence the downstream drainage area can have.

For such an influence downstream the European funds it should then become clear whether the concept can contribute to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial levels (e.g. with broad facultative guidelines and an undefined concept). Moreover, it should also became clear whether territorial cohesion can be significant insofar this changed attitude overlaps with seeing the European Union as a business. The links between such concerns and those issues that do channel European funds thus become important. Therefore the need arises to clarify how the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects with the other ones and thereby gives room for territorial cohesion to influence the streams of funds (e.g. through transnational European spatial planning or the concept’s urban bias in territorial cooperation).

F.5 Stories relating the narratives with an own dynamic in the European Funds usage area

F.5.1 Connected narratives as messier ball of old wool

Also in the European Funds usage area the separate narratives make clear that the debates shoved under territorial cohesion have their own dynamics without the concept as well. This strengthens the largely negative answer to this appendix’ leading question of how the concept channels European funds: it does not and probably will not. The narratives nonetheless affirmatively nuance that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an un gathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). They namely portray larger un gathered masses of different positions and how the drive to expand might instrumentally use the concept in this. Moreover, this un gatheredness might order such an expansion with the concept. The treatment of the European funds stories that connect the narratives adds to this picture.

Where the connected narratives of course correct some lines that are drawn above, as shown below if needed. The connections between the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative and the others are namely mostly treated to trace the tracks of possibilities for the concept to influence the channelling of the largely multidirectional – or even directionless – European funds more downstream. However, with a concept that hitherto appears so insignificant for the funds as territorial cohesion, a working hypothesis could better be: the connected narratives with an own dynamic show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream.

Just as the orders of the metanarratives and narratives in which, respectively, the territorial cohesion and European funds stories differ and overlap are the same (as shown in Schema 2a and 3a), the same order holds for the ways in which both form bundles through connections too.418 The ones between the narratives thereby amplify the larger role for territorial organisational issues in the concept’s context. Their only development namely was that the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives started to dominate since the debates on the new Structural Funds period in 2004.419 Perhaps this development has something to do with the possibilities for territorial cohesion to influence the European funding downstream as shown in the concept’s context. Yet, whether this is the case, and whether the connected narratives hamper such a channelling more in general, does not depend on their order but on the discussions in the European funds stories that connect the narratives. These stories are schematised below in Schema 3b ‘Stories relating narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic’.
After Schema 3a above showed the emergence of ungathered masses of European funds stories since the Single European Act (SEA) in 1986, it comes as no surprise that many of them connect the narratives. Even though European funds stories only connected narratives since almost ten years after the narratives emerged, this is from early on when you compare this to the emergence of the territorial cohesion stories. The concept’s context in the European Funds usage area thus seems to reveal an even messier ball of wool than the connected metanarratives. In combination with the situation in which the orders of territorial cohesion and its context are similar, this opens up the room for many differences in the substantive details.

The differences that are already found in the separate narratives could be a starting-point to search for details that are essential for how territorial cohesion could channel European funds. This because the connections between the narratives seem to compare to the connected metanarratives as the separate ones do (e.g. there are more European funds stories and they are older). Below the connected narratives are therefore compared to the connected metanarratives before a first glance, road towards formality, and relevant ways of doing come from the comparison between the separate and connected narratives. This to finally finish the picture of the European Funds usage area with these additional findings from the connected narratives.

F.5.2 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the connected metanarratives

Here it is not about the detailed information which the European funds stories that connect the narratives add to the separate ones (i.e. much). Instead, it is about the differences that matter because they correct the already drawn picture of the European Funds usage area and/or show how the concept’s context hampers or gives possibilities for a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream. The above-made comparison between the narratives and metanarratives could be a good point to start the search for such essential substantial differences in the connected narratives.

However, this might be a step too fast, especially when organisational concerns link with substantive or territorial priorities. That is to say, also the connections between the narratives can correct the depiction of the connections that bundle the metanarratives. The connected narratives can therefore also correct the findings on how the concept channels European funds and thus the starting-point to search for essential substantial differences in the connected narratives. This should be clear before the ways in which the connected narratives could hamper or give possibilities to the concept’s channelling can be traced with a focus which is derived from the separate narratives.

Compared to both the separate narratives and (connected) metanarratives, all the relevant trails in the connected narratives emerged during the debates on the new Structural Funds period (unless explicitly stated otherwise below). While hereby all the mentioned European funds stories signify what could be posed, none are the only one standing and substantively seen all can be varied with (e.g. some are even contradicted). Thus, the picture that is drawn of the bundle of metanarratives will thus be corrected by its well-connected context, this when it concerns a Cohesion policy for all regions, State aid, and territorial cooperation as shown below respectively.
The connected narratives can correct the portrayal of the connected metanarratives just as with the comparison of the separate ones: by showing the ways in which features that are presented as belonging to the concept also appear without the mention of territorial cohesion. A way in which European funds stories connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives follows this path, as it discusses a with territorial cohesion disputed broadening of funding streams by a Cohesion policy for all regions. Moreover, the descriptions of an all-region approach were mostly national instead of European. They for instance emphasise the contribution of all regions to national development and growth and that countries where regional disparities are perceived as negligible would shift to this approach, or, if not so perceived, that countries do so due to the negative economic cycle around 2005 and the difficulties to maintain sustainable economic growth in even the wealthiest and economic strongest regions. When it concerns a Cohesion policy for all regions, the similarity between territorial cohesion and European funds stories thus suggests that such an all-region approach is not a feature of the concept.

Despite the correction of this territorial cohesion feature, something is in accordance with the posed effect of the concept qua channelling of funds. This is that the all-region approach seems to manifest itself in the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment, that is, the objective for which these European funds stories mentioned all regions or those that do not qualify for the convergence objective as eligible. Still, besides that the all-region approach is a disputed territorial cohesion concern, it is questionable whether it actually is the concept that influences the usage of an all-region approach for competitiveness in Cohesion policy as suggested by the metanarratives. The connected narratives more portray the concern as a wave for territorial cohesion to ride on than a characterising trait of the concept. It might be save to say though, that an all-region approach more presents an opportunity for territorial cohesion to channel European funding than that it shows how the concept’s context hampers this.

When it concerns State aid, the connected narratives do appear to clearly correct the options that are mentioned for territorial cohesion instead of merely questioning the concept’s influence; this even though they, just as the territorial cohesion stories do, expose debates on regional State aid and the concerned European Funds stories go against the uniform application of the provisions for some territories (here peripheral or least developed regions). The connections made between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives namely decrease the financial importance of regional State aid in this usage area. The connecting stories do this by both stating that regional State aid is a small part of the overall national spending in regions and by for the Community level promoting the reduction of it in eligible areas. That not that many European funds stories are on State aid places the debates on this mostly outside the European Funds usage area too, what further decreases the probability that the concept will channel funds thus. Hence, territorial cohesion might more downstream not only not channel funds indirectly through (regional) State aid, but have a hard time gaining weight through this better known debate as well. However, the by the connected narratives presented lessening of the importance of State aid for territorial cohesion thereby does not exemplify how its context hampers a channelling of European funds through the concept, merely how it could remove a possibility.

With the issue of territorial cooperation the connected narratives even go beyond offering an opportunity for territorial cohesion to channel funds. This in a paradoxical way, as the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives underline that features belong to the concept by showing how they also appear without territorial cohesion. The concerned European funds stories namely gave territorial cooperation an urban bias, but a bias to other territories or combinations of them as well (e.g. differentiated according to wealth). The concept’s context therefore both
emphasises that only having an urban bias in territorial cooperation is a territorial cohesion feature and replicates it.

In a similar fashion the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives support the concept’s linkage of territorial cooperation with the other two Structural Funds objectives. Also here this linkage appears in the European funds stories (with an emphasis on interregional cooperation), what indicates that it is not solely a feature of territorial cohesion, but that the concept’s context can also make this linkage firmer. Moreover, hereby not only balance and competitiveness come up, as the European funds stories express all substantive objectives in this linkage – except for the one of polycentrism that is (which scarcely plays a role in the connected narratives). An expansion of the disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion concerns in territorial cooperation through the other two new Structural Funds objectives could therefore lean on the part of the concept’s context that gives this leeway.

All in all, with territorial cooperation the connected narratives do not show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion. Quite the contrary, it forms favourable circumstances. This by replicating also the urban bias in territorial cooperation and by backing how territorial cooperation links to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives. In both ways European funding can then be channelled more downstream to debate territorial cohesion. Insofar the connected narratives are compared to the connected metanarratives they thus do not show that the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). This context namely at most removes a possibility for this with State aid, if it does not support or gives opportunities instead with an all-region approach, urban bias of territorial cooperation, and by linking territorial cooperation to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives.

F.5.3 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the separate ones: first glance

Perhaps by comparing the connected narratives to the separate narratives some ways come to the fore in which the concept’s context does hamper a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion more downstream. Yet, not every time a connecting European funds story corrects the findings from the separate narratives a channelling of European funding through territorial cohesion needs to be hampered (or supported). After infrastructure and partnership are touched upon as examples of corrections that do not influence such a channeling of European funding, Territorial Impact Assessment and territorial criteria are treated as instances that do point to such an influence.

The findings on the substantive objective of infrastructure and the organisational issue of partnership which come from the separate narratives call for some correction. Although infrastructure does not have a prominent place in the separate or connected narratives, it was nonetheless regularly mentioned, mostly for specific territories or as one of many on a list of concerns. Partnership might, on the contrary, be less important in the European Funds usage area than portrayed in the separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative, since before 2004 this concern hardly came forward in the connections. This suggests that the issue of partnership could not only dim in the concept’s context, but also that it is not well-knit into the usage area’s fabric (e.g. making the dimming easier). The picture of infrastructure and partnership in this usage area should thus be changed slightly. Yet, these changes would have no influence on a possible channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion, as both seem to play a minor role for the concept.

Also the lively debate on Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) which is shown by the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative does not appear to be tightly knit into the European
Funds usage area, as it hardly relates to issues of the other narratives. Although this holds for the issue of Territorial Impact Assessment just as for the one of partnership, those few times that Territorial Impact Assessment does relate to these other concerns in the concept’s context might still be noteworthy nonetheless. This because independently seen the debate could already be important enough for territorial cohesion due to the alternatives it can offer for a channelling of European funds with the concept (e.g. evidence-based targeting by investing where funds have the greatest impact). The question then is how an issue that is loosely knit into this usage area could open up funding channels for territorial cohesion.

A backward looking European funds story that connects the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives appears to go against possibilities for territorial cohesion to channeling European funding with Territorial Impact Assessment. The ESDP would namely have proposed that Member States further develop national regulations and instruments related to Territorial Impact Assessment for large infrastructure or water management projects or in transborder situations; this parallels the critique in the debate of the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative, which posed that it involves large transnational projects. When territorial cohesion would be concerned with Territorial Impact Assessment, it therefore might not deal with these “large projects”, because the connecting stories in the concept’s context hardly mentioned these assessments – and when they did, they suggest “an outside” of the European Funds usage area which does deal with this. In so doing the concept’s context could thus be said to hamper a channelling of funds through territorial cohesion.

However, it are the separate narratives (i.e. the same context) that gives territorial cohesion the possibility to channel European funding with Territorial Impact Assessment in the first place. Moreover, the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives even present an alternative route by explaining how to focus funding channels. That is to say, they state that proposals or applications for the approval of European Union programme delivery that are based on ex ante evaluations, which contain qualitative data and the analysis of support measures relating to investment willingness and readiness among public authorities and private beneficiaries, would compel European Commission services to develop truly integrated administrative and financial programming measures. This is a clear opening for territorial cohesion to channel European funds with Territorial Impact Assessment. Hence, the connected narratives do not so much show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion with this issue. The connections only narrow down the possibilities the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative gives with Territorial Impact Assessment as badly attached issue. Because they do not treat “large projects”, there is only room left for mundane but perhaps more plentiful “small projects”.

While the separate narratives mostly cut down the ways in which territorial cohesion could channel European funding, another possibility they give is via territorial criteria for the European funds. However, the European funds stories that connect the narratives reduce the scope of this, because they do not often discuss territorial criteria. Those times they do, which is in the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives, they are concerned with the new Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. If the concept will channel European funding with its own features of territorial cohesion indicators and/or index by linking to the discussion on territorial criteria in its context, such a usage of the concept might therefore be confined to competitiveness and substantive objectives that relate to this.

A consequence of this substantive focus appears when a side-discussion is taken into account which is scarcely hinted at in the connected narratives. That is, the apparent role of policy makers to select the descriptions of territorial reality when it concerns a European
Territorial Cohesion Index, an index which could give a space to relate technical and political choices. In the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives, European funds stories namely put Member States forward to identify the best indicators for a territorial allocation of funds and/or also regions to choose the appropriate mix of investment according to their assessed strengths and weaknesses. Although both statements assert decentralisation, they leave open whether Member States and/or regions assess their territorial reality through own (more or less direct) descriptive categories or through ones that come from the European Union. When territorial cohesion channels European funding through territorial criteria, this setting of the criteria to assess territories of course influences such a channeling greatly.

In the European Funds usage area, a self-assessment of Member States with descriptive criteria from the European Union seems to be more probable. The European funds story that connects all narratives illustrates this: the thematic eligibility for the appointment of various European objectives would allow States and regions to validate their territories (to reinforce their accessibility). A European funds story then makes an interesting claim when it connects the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives. That is to say, the Structural Funds would have facilitated a bottom-up policy design with descriptions from those in the affected territories. However, these descriptions might not be defined bottom-up, but only be filled-in at lower levels. The question therefore is how bottom-up a policy design is if it uses “building blocks” that are made at the European Union level. In the case of a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion more downstream with territorial criteria, the focus in descriptions of territorial reality might then lay on competitiveness and related substantive objectives. Still, such conditions do not hamper the possible channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion, they merely narrow down the funding streams. That territorial criteria are less discussed in the concept’s context than appeared in the separate narratives does hamper such a channelling though.

F.5.4 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the separate ones: road towards formality

A condition for territorial cohesion to channel European Funds, besides the need for possibilities to appear for it in the concept’s usage, is the formality of such of the concept. It would be surprising if the connected narratives treat a channelling of European funds more downstream though (e.g. to hamper it). The concept’s paths to formality in the European funds namely consider the substantive objectives of the environment, economic and social cohesion, and services instead of the relevant organisational issues. Still, the connected narratives correct how territorial cohesion can be used with these substantive objectives, which are therefore treated before the formal usage of the concept for agricultural funding is corrected.

Even though it does not have to do with organisational concern, an increase in weight of the sustainability issue due to the connected narratives could benefit the formalisation of territorial cohesion nonetheless. That is to say, the concept’s context does not so much focus on environmental concerns other than this issue. A European funds story that connects all narratives for instance claims that Cohesion policy has strong indirect territorial impacts with ‘sustainable development’ as a governance concept which is introduced and/or promoted by the European Union; hereby a manner to channel funds more downstream of particular importance for territorial cohesion comes to the fore as well: with governance concepts. Moreover, although the connecting stories never link sustainability to the organisational concern of the territorial dimension as the territorial cohesion stories do, its context does not hamper a channelling of funds with this linkage either. Although a linkage of sustainability and the territorial dimension seems a feature of the concept, here these two concerns thus
regularly appear separately.\textsuperscript{438} The connected narratives therefore appear to support the environment as a path to formalise territorial cohesion, and consequentially show a way in which the concept’s context provides a possibility to channel European funding with it.

The connected narratives reflect a way in which the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion as shown in the separate narratives as well. This is by hardly discussing economic and social cohesion.\textsuperscript{439} What is more, here the stories even point out how important this outside of the European Funds usage area is in which the connecting stories of the concept’s context put these twin cohesion concerns, and thus how insignificant territorial cohesion is for the European funds. That is to say, a report which connects the ‘substantive objective’ and ‘governal organisation of territory’ narratives held that the Community Strategic Guidelines deal with the territorial dimension in passing while economic and social cohesion are central.\textsuperscript{440} The connected narratives thus appear to remove economic and social cohesion as a path to formalise territorial cohesion, and therefore reflect a way in which the concept’s context can hamper a channelling of European funds with it.

The connected narratives do not only support and remove paths towards the formalisation of territorial cohesion, they also point to an awkward situation. Services namely came up pretty regularly in the European funds stories that connect the narratives.\textsuperscript{441} Although this does not make the issue dominate the debate, it does correct the picture drawn by the separate narratives: the formal status of services for a usage of territorial cohesion is not out of place in the European funds at all. The awkwardness of the situation then lies in that the concept does not focus on services in the European Funds usage area. Moreover, even though services often appear as one of the many concerns when all narratives connect (as with infrastructure as substantive objective), it was also often about the provision of services in (e.g. peripheral, rural, urban) or between (i.e. urban and rural) certain territories; this in the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and territorial specificities’ narratives.\textsuperscript{442} This doubles the awkwardness of the situation, because such a linkage coheres with a ‘territories/accessibility’ metanarrative of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. The presented possibilities to use the appropriate formal status of services are thus not used by territorial cohesion to channel of European funding.

Hence, the connected narratives do not by themselves show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion by blocking its paths to formality. However, they do reflect the separate narratives by showing how the relevant issues of economic and social cohesion are discussed outside the European Funds usage area. They also display how, despite this, the context might nevertheless support the concept’s path to formality \textit{via} the issue of sustainability. This even even relates to governance concepts as a way to channel funds more downstream. Yet, most strange here is that territorial cohesion does not take the path to formality of services, not even when related to specific territories.

Just as for the possibilities for a formal usage of territorial cohesion in the European funds, the connected narratives also correct the picture of the concept’s existing formal usage, that is, for agricultural funding. Where the separate narratives portray such a usage as isolated, it rather appears to have an own separate part in the connected narratives, especially so since the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development were published in 2006.\textsuperscript{443} The European funds stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives characterise this part. This by seldom combining the issues of the concept’s minor but official (i.e. services) and main formal usage (i.e. agricultural funding), but often relating rural areas to the environment (already in 1999), economic diversification, and territorial balance.\textsuperscript{444} Perhaps the role of territorial cohesion therefore would not diminish as the separate narratives portray, but schism in the European funds instead. The consequences of this of course increase when a channeling of European funds through the
concept depends on the relationship it has with agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds. In its context the concept can namely strongly lean on both kinds of funds while they are differing further.

With such schisming, it could become more relevant how still to relate these kinds of funding. It therefore is no surprise that the European funds stories which connect the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governa organization of the territory’ narratives stress the inconsistence between the financial allocations of Agricultural and Cohesion policies and debate horizontal substantive coordination (e.g. as un/solvable); the only deviation hereby was that the introduction of direct payments and the allocation of a larger share of resources to rural development would have had improved their coordination. The schisming between agricultural and Structural funding therefore appears to be well noted in the context of territorial cohesion.

What could complex matters for territorial cohesion even beyond such a tense coordination, is that there is clearly pointed to the situation more downstream. That is to say, not only the territorial impacts of European agricultural funding are labelled as strong, but the completely territorial axis of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development are put forward as meant to be decentral per Member State – this while different approaches to rural areas in the European Union are acknowledged as well. The possibilities to channel agricultural funds with territorial cohesion which hereby open up more downstream therefore leave much room for variation.

An approach that could be suiting for a schmising, complex, and possibly varying situation is often mentioned in these connecting stories: the Leader approach. The Leader approach was thereby asserted as being bottom-up, integrated, innovative, and concerned with local governance. When it is considered that the Leader Community Initiative will be financed through the mainstream rural development programmes, something of the connected narratives becomes the more telling for an extension of the concept between Agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds. That is, the connecting stories even cater for both the horizontal substantive coordination and the opening up of the complexity more downstream by regularly bringing forward the issue of urban-rural relationships. When the Structural Funds are more urban, agricultural funding more rural, and this difference lower levels could have the task of coordination them, a focus on urban-rural relationships thereby seems sensible indeed. A development in this focus is that until 2004 urban-rural relationships were fittingly concerned with balanced (territorial) development, in territorial cooperation for instance (e.g. as a spatial development strategy), but since then they are mostly seen as to be managed or coordinated. Insofar territorial cohesion also channels agricultural funding downstrems, the concept’s context thus offers the Leader approach, urban-rural relationships, and their management to fill in the room for varying coordination.

Hence, the connected narratives do not show how the context of territorial cohesion hampers a channelling of agricultural funding through the formal usage of the concept. Still, by supporting such a channeling of European funds they do turn the risk of overstretching the concept into the risks of schisming and complexing instead. The connected narratives namely portray an own separate agricultural funding part for territorial cohesion to lean on. This part of the concept’s context might also emphasise a tense substantive horizontal coordination between different financial allocations, open up of many choices to be made more downstream (e.g. with the Leader approach), and develop towards a managing of urban-rural relationships. All and each of these features could be useful in the complex and schismmed context of territorial cohesion.
F.5.5 Trailing territorial cohesion’s channelling of funds by comparing ways of doing in the separate and connected narratives

The warm welcome for territorial cohesion pictured by the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative returns somewhat in the European funds stories that connect this narrative to the others. However, here the territorially tainted organisational issues do not so much present French ways of doing, but debate similar “un-State-like” territorial divisions and suitability of territorial ways of managing funds. To add the findings hereon below we touch upon several issues, that is, consecutively: territorial divisions, territorial and substantive ways, more and less business ways of doing, and European spatial planning.

Territorially wise the connection with the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative includes the debate on creating new territorial divisions. Various arguments were put forward in this against the existing borders of States and linguistic, legal or cultural barriers. The connecting stories instead wanted to base territorial divisions on economic and social reality, or more specific: the development of cross-border conurbations, and posed that regional development requires strategic alliances across administrative boundaries or that an understanding of transnational synergies is needed. The trans-European dimension was also given a role in the strengthening of the structure of the European territory, what signifies the importance of this debate. However, even if it is important, how this debate in the context of territorial cohesion would change how the concept channels European funding is not clear.

A well-known issue shows a possibility for this, that is, the effect of changing territorial divisions on statistic and cartographic results (i.e. as base for the re/presented territorial reality). These results can have effects on the channelling of the European Funds and vice versa, as it is even said that the Structural Funds regime led to reconfigurations of the administrative boundaries in some key beneficiaries (e.g. different statistics lead to different allocations). Again the connected narratives thus do not show how the context of territorial cohesion hampers a channelling of European funds through the concept. Instead, here they show a room for choices to be made on territorial divisions more downstream.

A territorial way of doing might be needed to choose between territorial divisions. When the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects to the other ones there appears a contradiction between more substantive and more territorial ways of managing funds though. On the one hand the connections with the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative demonstrate that downstream (i.e. mostly nationally) European Union programmes might not be receptive to territorial ways of doing as a part of territorial cohesion. This because the connecting European funds stories explicitly mention that these programmes, including integrated ones for better economic performance, do not have territorial space as main frame of reference or even lack a spatial focus; this lack was indirectly indicated as increasing due to the reduction of resources for non-convergence programmes, which would thus be more territorially oriented (e.g. with an all-region approach). In the connections with the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative on the other hand, such territorial ways of doing do come up. Once even with a given territory and field of action as ground for this, as same Interreg cooperation areas could base new alliances in the European Parliament. This extreme thus clearly alludes to the abovementioned debate on territorial divisions. Still, the question is which ways for territorial ways of doing come forward, other than via territorial divisions that is, that could influence a channeling of European funds with territorial cohesion.

Besides territorial ways, also substantive ways of doing return in the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives. They namely appear to outline the range between these polies more organisationally wise and downstream too. Nonetheless, although the relevant connecting stories thereby often mention the management of natural and cultural resources or heritage (e.g. with territorial
cooperation), most were less substantive and concerned with the tensions of vertical substantive coordination. The processual scope thereby goes from side to side. On one side you have the statement that the top-down stream of European funds to the regions creates and needs room for management activities on the national level (e.g. horizontal substantive coordination); often the partnership with cities came forward for this, what goes well with the observation that the approach adopted for urban development in the Structural Funds is often a function of domestic policies. The other side is that the regions are said to come up with own priorities in the management of European funds (e.g. in cooperation). For a more or less territorial way of doing the discussion on who has to do what in the manegement of funds thus adds to the debate on the demarcation of these actors (i.e. territorial divisions). Yet, the question on how this channels European funding with territorial cohesion remains.

One way in which the concept’s context touches upon this question, is that Cohesion policy would have strong indirect impacts on the selection of priorities and with governance concepts promoted by the European Union. When Cohesion policy can impact the priorities for European funding with governance concepts, a territorial way of doing with territorial cohesion can do too. While such an impact might be top-down, what has impact as governance concepts in this too, are the implementation principles – shown in the general stories on implementation – which more accord with decentralisation. The tension framed by the general stories on the political organisation comes to the fore here, that is, the one between European intervention and decentralisation. Besides that this tension similarly returns in the territorial cohesion stories, it could for a usage of this European Union concept thus even indicate its possible influence more downstream.

Hence, a picture of the concept’s context appears in which not only the multi-level management structure of European funding is discussed, but where the reorganisations of this work through these same structures that run counter to it (e.g. top-down supporting decentralisation). A territorial way of doing might therefore not only be needed for the abovementioned room more downstream to make choices on territorial divisions, but also for the management structure within the set territorial entities and levels. The only way for territorial cohesion to channel European funding which appears thereby is if it is understood as a governance concept that impacts the selection of priorities. How this would happen remains unclear though.

In any case, such a territorial way of doing might not totally follow the frames that are set by the general stories on the European Union as business. This because in these connecting stories the entrepreneurship territorial pact, here mentioned for actual business practices on the regional level, merely played a minor role. The separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative does fit these general stories, as it shows that the idea of the European Union as a business mostly frames leeways for territorial cohesion in its context instead of the concept itself. Yet, when this narrative connects to the others, a situation appears that might not so much hamper this way in which the concept could channel European funds. That is to say, the connecting stories emphasise the business-like way way of doing by often discussing management, but do not follow this course all the way. The context of territorial cohesion thus calls for manoeuvres for the concept to channel European funding with ways of doing, because it emphasises business-like ways of doing that the concept might have to link with territorial ways of doing.

Then again, perhaps territorial cohesion could channel funds more downstream with a less business-like alternative of managing for the way of doing. A specific and – if not all-then – much-encompassing example of a contextual possibility for this comes up in a European funds story that connects all narratives. It namely poses that the to the Structural Funds related regulations that account for the specificity of territories with natural handicaps and urban and rural areas would have meant to promote a more integrated approach. This
traversally through the reinforcement of the strategic dimension that prevails in the design of the programme documents, which thereby become the place of synthesis between the Communitarian priorities shown in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the national development objective that respects territorial balance. This story’s possibility refers to many issues that are also found in the (connected) metanarratives and separate narratives (e.g. specific territories, an integrated approach, the above noted tensions and room for management activities). Yet, for territorial ways of doing with territorial cohesion it more gives a territorial objective to act for (i.e. territorial balance) instead of a territorial ground to act on. This thus does not clarify how territorial cohesion would channel European funding with a way of doing.

Hence, when the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects to the other narratives, it somewhat shows how the context of the concept can hamper – not the channelling through territorial cohesion itself, but – the ways in which territorial cohesion could channel European funds insofar it entails a territorial way of doing. This because these connections harbour a contradiction between more substantive and, more suiting for territorial cohesion, more territorial ways of doing, a contradiction which in extreme ranges from the lack of a spatial focus to a given territory as ground for action. Also a way in which this context of the concept does not hamper such a channelling but might nonetheless give rise to some complications appears. For the management of funds it namely links the leeways that see the European Union as a business to a channelling of funds without totally following this course. What is more, these connected narratives also give possibilities for how territorial cohesion can channel funds. This by outlining a range of possible territorial ways of doing more downstream that deal with the tension of vertical substantive coordination. Once there is thereby even referred to trails of influence on lower levels from other European Union concepts. Therefore the discussions on the ways of doing in the European funds in the context of territorial cohesion which is formed by the connected narratives give no clarity on a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion.

The connect narratives appear to give both no closure and many undefined in-between or even hybrid possibilities for a channeling of European funds. What makes it even more multifaceted is that their stories add European spatial planning in the mix. Explicit chances that European spatial planning could give here for territorial cohesion to channel European funds otherwise than through ways of doing seem negligible though, just as the information coming from the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives in these connections. Hence, if the connected narratives do give such chances, it is through ways of doing.

It was since the European Commission’s Interreg guidelines incorporated the ESDP in 2000 that ways of doing for territorial cohesion appear with European spatial planning on the usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality – thereby not only noting the Community level (e.g. such as the (post-)ESDP process), but processual issues more downstream as well. Not surprisingly, European spatial planning especially comes forward in the connected narratives with transnational territorial cooperation, as both are linked from the start. More specific was the coordinating role given in the European funds for (trans)national spatial planning (e.g. even as land use policy) and, more planning-minded, that this (instrumental) link between spatial planning and funds appeared vice versa as well. That is to say, some of these European funds stories describe European spatial planning as grabbing territorial cooperation to play a key role in this or as its practical evidence base. These European spatial planning options thus keep in/formal ways of doing, especially transnational ones, open in the European funds’ context of territorial cohesion.

Yet, notwithstanding this room to postpone decisions on informality or formality, the support for European spatial planning seems to be low in this usage area (high in the (post-
This because the stories that connect the narratives do not often mention it, and in those few times they do, they even report a lack of financial support (e.g. from the national governments). Moreover, the development in the connecting stories even goes against spatial planning more downstream at the time of the debates on the new Structural Funds period. They namely did not only vary, but for territorial cooperation also noticed a decreasing focus on spatial planning in interregional practices and that in transnational practices the cohesion of Europe and territorial cohesion are more talk about than spatial planning; the latter development is in line with the framing and structuring stories. Hence, European spatial planning might play a role as an informal way of doing more downstream in the European funds’ context of territorial cohesion through (trans)national coordination for funds or transnational territorial cooperation. However, here none of these possibilities appeared as being backed up by finances and they seem to fade away too.

F.5.6 Additional findings from the connected narratives

The treatment of the connected narratives above leads to consequential adjustments to the before depicted context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area. Some of these are major, such as a changing of the risk of overstretching the concept with an extension to agricultural funding towards one of schisming and complexing instead. Most are minor though, such as the difficulties for channelling European funds through territorial cohesion with Territorial Impact Assessment or territorial criteria. Perhaps this is characteristic for such a detailed and well-connect context. The connect narratives would then show that the concept’s context hampers n/or supports such a channelling more downstream. Still, some opportunities and obstacles for this do arise.

These of course come to the for by comparing the connected narratives to the connected metanarratives. The connected narratives also do this by correcting the by the separate narratives described context of territorial cohesion. Yet, such corrections do not necessarily relate to the concept’s (possible) channelling of European funds, because issues can have a negligible role in the usage of the concept. The concern with partnership for example appears to be less important, as it is not well-knit into the usage area, and infrastructure more important, as it has a regular role. Corrections are relevant, for instance, when the context of territorial cohesion would plainly hamper a channelling of funds by blocking roads to formality. The connected narratives do not so much appear to block but merely to cross the concept’s usage in this though. Another way in which corrections are relevant is when the connected narratives retouch the pictured usage area with a main finding. The connections between the narratives for instance increase the role for territorial organisational issues. This highlighting the possibilities for territorial cohesion to influence the ways in which the multidirectional funds will be channelled. First the opportunities and then the obstacles that come from the connected narratives for this are then treated below insofar they respectively come forth from comparisons with the metanarratives and separate narratives and deal with in/formality and ways of doing.

Just as the comparison of the separate narratives and metanarratives cut down the own features of the concept, the comparison of the connected ones shows that the own dynamics of all the connected issues more dug (potential) funding channels than territorial cohesion did. Yet, three opportunities for the concept to channel European funding do come forward through: i) the portrayal of an all-region approach as a wave on national and European levels for territorial cohesion to ride on (to channel funds for competitiveness) instead of a disputed trait of the concept, ii) the support for the ways in which European funds can be channelled more downstream to debate territorial cohesion with the backing up of how territorial cooperation links to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives, and ii) the
replication of also the urban bias in territorial cooperation. As the concept’s context the connecting stories thus also present opportunities for territorial cohesion to channel funds.

Other opportunities for a channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion come forward when it concerns possible formal usages of the concept. While correcting the separate ‘substantive objectives’ narrative, the connected narratives namely offer concerns with services (related to specific territories) as official opportunities. However, these are strangely enough not (yet) used by the concept. What is more, even though the connected narratives expose that the linkage of sustainability and the territorial dimension is typical for territorial cohesion, they basically back the sustainability issue for territorial cohesion’s formal usage in the European funds as well. By offering these opportunities (towards formality), the connected narratives thus refute that the concept’s context simply hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis).

Many obstacles for territorial cohesion to channel European funding appear in the concept’s context though. The connect narratives for instance remove a path for this by unfolding that if territorial cohesion would indirectly channel funds through (regional) State aid more downstream this has minor financial weight. The also take away opportunities that are presented by the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative. For Territorial Impact Assessment they namely place the discussed larger projects outside this context. Moreover, these connections narrow down possibilities for territorial criteria to channel funds (more downstream) due to their focus on competitiveness and related substantive objectives in descriptions of territorial reality. By hardly discussing a targeting of funds the connected narratives therefore also corroborate that the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). This could signify that such a feature of the concept would not fall that good in the European funds.

Also other obstacles for a channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion come forward when it concerns possible formal usage of the concept. The connected narratives for instance place the discussion on economic and social cohesion largely outside the European Funds usage area, what decreasing the possibility for the concept to relate to their formal discussion. Moreover, as mentioned above, the connected narratives turn the previously presented risk of overstretched the concept’s existing formal usage in agricultural funding into ones of schisming and complexing. They namely show that the support for a channelling of these funds through territorial cohesion goes beyond just offering opportunities towards an own separate agricultural field for the concept to lean on. These risks increase by that these connecting stories come up with the management of urban-rural relationships. For this they also emphasise the tense substantive horizontal coordination involved and revealed the opening up of many choices to be made more downstream (e.g. with the Leader approach). The risks then increase due to this management, because it could be useful enough for territorial cohesion to depend on it when the concept is both used in agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds.

Hence, insofar the connected narratives correct the picture the separate narratives draw of the context of territorial cohesion they both show how it constructs support for (i.e. services, sustainability, agricultural funding) and hampering (i.e. territorial criteria) of a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion. Yet, the mostly show how neither opportunities nor obstacles are fully constructed in this usage area (i.e. partnership, infrastructure, Territorial Impact Assessment, territorial criteria, economic and social cohesion).

Although the role for territorial organisational issues increases in the European Funds usage area with the mass of connections of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’
narrative to the others, ways of doing hereby for territorial cohesion hardly link to the issues which can channel European funds. For this the connected narratives only reveal the concept’s emphasis on the urban bias of territorial cooperation and the link of territorial cooperation to convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment. However, there mostly appear various ways of doing that could be part of how territorial cohesion might channel European funds without it being clear which ones will actually be used.

Simply seen the connected narrative indicate an obvious path for territorial cohesion for the ways in which the multidirectional funding streams can be channelled: (governance) concepts of the European Union (such as sustainable development) would influence a channelling of funds on lower levels. However, the concept’s context merely complicates for territorial cohesion. The connected narratives for instance harbour a contradiction between substantive and territorial ways of doing, which range from lacking a spatial focus to a given territory as ground for action, and do not totally follow the outlet of business-like ways of doing. Still, the connected narratives do line out plenty of possible territorial ways of doing more downstream. These deal with the tension of vertical substantive coordination and, notwithstanding the mentioned lack of financial backing for it, European spatial planning as in/formal way of doing through (trans)national coordination for funds or transnational territorial cooperation. The overall deduction in this therefore is that there is no closure on in/formal and more or less territorial and/or business-like ways of doing in the context of territorial cohesion. Instead, there appear many undefined in-between or even hybrid possibilities, with, for instance, implicit overlaps as a consequence.

This mixing mash could both support and hamper how the concept could channel funding streams. This depends on what territorial cohesion’s way and its context’s ways of doing are; to complex this: the way of doing of territorial cohesion could develop as an amalgam of the ways of doing that exist in its context. Hence, it is neither clear if nor how the concept would contribute to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial levels. The relevant choices appear not yet made and the connected narratives seem to suggest that these unsolved tensions transfer downstream. In this transfer of tensions to lower levels the connected narratives do not only show how the concept’s context opens up choices to be made more downstream on agricultural funding, but they show such choices on territorial divisions in a channelling for other funding through territorial cohesion as well (e.g. in the management of urban-rural relationships).

The connect narratives with their additions to and corrections of the connected metanarratives and separate narratives thus finish the picture of the European Funds usage area. This by showing that although it mainly are the own dynamics of the many connections between different kinds of issues in the intricate context of territorial cohesion that (potentially) channel European funding streams, they thereby also leave many suitable ways open in which territorial cohesion might do this.
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