



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The place where streams seek ground. Towards a new territorial governmentality: the meaning and usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Union

Hissink Muller, B.M.

Publication date
2013

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hissink Muller, B. M. (2013). *The place where streams seek ground. Towards a new territorial governmentality: the meaning and usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Union.*

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

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)^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-*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

^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.

IGCs Schema 1

General stories and stories on the concept of territorial cohesion itself in the IGCs usage area

| Year/Stories | General | Territorial cohesion itself |
|--|---|---|
| 1993 | | -include TC in Treaty |
| 1995 -SF Reform | resolve competency issue | |
| 1999 -ESDP | | TC important -TC related to CAP -TC related to intermodal freight transport -support TC to slacken drift SF to poorer regions of CEECs |
| 2001 | | |
| 2002 -Convention discussions | allocation of powers major issue | TC should be recognised as EU priority task -add TC to Constitutional Treaty Article I-16 |
| 2003 -Draft Constitutional Treaty | -more integrated Europe cannot be exclusively economic | -do/not include TC/rural development in Constitutional Treaty Article I-3/I-16 concerning TC area of democratic legitimacy requires regulation principles of subsidiarity and proportionality dictate shared responsibility for TC TC must express itself through practices -TC used to weaken liberalisation by EU In 2003 TC seems to become an issue debated in itself |
| 2004 -EU Enlargement -Rotterdam meeting | -Constitutional Treaty will be ratified | TC accepted Member States and EU are responsible for articulating TC -strategic and integrated territorial affairs can be discussed at Community level with TC in ratified Constitutional Treaty |
| 2005 -Non-ratification Constitutional Treaty -Guellec Report -Agenda 2007 | all actors should strive to find common ground at EU level while respecting national differences -reject Constitutional Treaty -there is distance between European people(s) and European institutions Europe has urban specificity and identity | -islands regions involved in getting TC in Constitutional Treaty -pro/contra TC reinforce dialogue on TC between EC and Member States -possible to implement TC policies without referring to TC role EC in TC is conception of infrastructural structures TC represents acceptance of Community competence in guidance of national and local policies -DG Regio-DG Employment and Social Affairs and Member States-EC shape TC |
| 2006 -SF Reform | -Constitutional Treaty only future prospect territorial crosscutting issues less important for policy than other crosscutting concepts | -Constitutional Treaty gives TC policy competency TC in Treaty unimportant -pro/contra (shared) TC competency subsidiarity related to (shared) TC-competence -TC in Constitutional Treaty gives more activity herein -no/lack of legal grounding for TC -many main discussions held under/in relation with TC shared responsibility for TC in new Intergovernmental Treaty |

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.¹ This is not surprising for stories in Treaty debates and (since 2001) Convention discussions, because treaties set out the tasks for the European Union. A more nuanced and implicit competency story can since 2004 be related to the general stories on the need for a Constitutional Treaty. The latter namely developed from a certainty that the Constitutional Treaty will be ratified, to a counterstory about the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty, to finally seeing this Treaty as only a future prospect.² It then is in the year of the Constitutional Treaty's non-ratification that a competency story which does not explicitly treat competencies posed that all actors should strive to find common ground at the Community level while respecting national differences.³ From 2005 on also general stories emerged on the un/importance of the spatial/territorial, thereby paradoxically informing us about both Europe's urban identity and the unimportance of territorial crosscutting issues for policy.⁴ 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).⁵ Additionally, such relationships hint at the corroboration of this appendix' second general 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ Yet, after the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification, decision-making stories on territorial cohesion itself disappeared.¹² 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

| Year/Meta-narrative | Cohesion Objective | SP/TC competence | SG(EI) | Territorial specificities | Coordination | Territorial dimension |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1995 | | | | -promote TC by researching territorial impacts of European policies | | |
| 1996 | -include TC in Treaty related to economic and social cohesion | -TC related to spatial planning | -include TC in Treaty related to SGEI | -include TC in Treaty related to specific territories | | |
| 1997 -Treaty of Amsterdam | -Amsterdam Treaty Article 16 legal base of | | -regional and cohesion policies as territorial policies | -SGEI promote social and territorial cohesion | | -TC related to territorial dimension of sectoral policies |
| 1998 | | -draft ESDP lacks analysis of SGEI promoting social and territorial cohesion | | | | |
| 1999 -ESDP | -TC is component of economic and social cohesion -IGCs must underline TC importance by introducing clearer reference to spatial planning under economic and social cohesion | | | -territorial effects of European policies show importance TC | -define partnership and coordination parameters with TC | -TC way of taking decision on European geographical area |
| 2000 -Charter of Fundamental Human Rights | | | -SGEI important TC dimension -SG(EI) promote TC and social cohesion/competitiveness and economic and social cohesion -SGEI automatically result in TC | -TC is territory with geographic, economic, cultural or social cohesion | -TC is territorial framework for mobilising public and private players in administrative unit | |
| 2001 | | | | -TC related to sub-state territorial units for cohesion reality | -TC in Treaty necessary for horizontal and vertical coordination | -TC related to territorial dimension of sectoral policies |
| 2002 -Convention discussions | -complete economic and social cohesion with TC -enforce cohesion policy with TC in Constitutional Treaty -realise TC because of intensified disparities -TC is third cohesion pillar/related to territorial dimension of cohesion | -TC related to spatial planning -empowerment EU to organise territory as far as growth centres related to TC -reference to TC is absent in Amsterdam Treaty because responsibility for spatial development falls under Member States' competence | -support inclusion of SGI without TC in Constitutional Treaty -SGI contribute to competitiveness and economic, social and territorial cohesion -TC in relation to SGI resists against complete market liberalisation | -TC related to SGI resists against complete market liberalisation | -TC gives greater coherence to Constitutional Treaty | |
| 2003 -Draft Constitutional Treaty | -TC on a par with economic and social cohesion/operationalise cohesion of territory -TC is useful for reducing disparities within/between nations and regions | -TC reduces development disparities between regions by reorganising Community territory to enable polycentric harmonious balanced sustainable development -TC requires regulation for impact European spatial development policy on regional policy -TC is not spatial planning -TC requires regulation for spatial (development) policy -achieve TC by polycentric reorganisation Community territory -spatial planning competence debate held under TC | -SGI are/not related to TC in Constitutional Treaty Article I-3 -SGI also strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion -TC related to role of local and regional government for SGI -TC related to government instead of market for SGI | -use TC for legal basis acknowledging that territorial differences must not risk discriminatory situations -TC linked to territorial divers reality -TC linked to territorial impacts of Community policies | -Member States must conduct and coordinate economic policies to attain TC -TC needs institutional framework for good territorial governance -TC related to subsidiarity and self-administration | -use TC to strengthen territorial dimension in EU -TC used to strengthen territorial dimension of EU policies -TC is sectoral field |
| 2004 -EU Enlargement -Rotterdam meeting | -TC on a par with economic and social cohesion -TC (already) integral part of economic and social cohesion policy -TC establishes principle of equity amongst European citizens wherever they live -TC translates balanced sustainable development -TC included in Constitutional Treaty Article I-3 for cohesion policy | -reshuffling terminology overcomes lack of EU competency in spatial planning -TC in Constitutional Treaty gives additional underpinning to European spatial development policy call | -promote TC with SG(EI) -SGEI will automatically result in TC -TC ensures equitable SG(EI) access conditions | -TC used for geographically handicapped areas/island regions/territories under constraints -TC incentive to take geographic and demographic diversity into account for promoting competitiveness/sustainable development of all territories | -articulating TC calls for more coordination, coherence, and cooperation -to make it easier for Member States and EU to set different priorities -TC should be in Treaty | -addition of territorial dimension with TC seals political acceptance -TC used to include territorial dimension in Constitutional Treaty -with TC in Constitutional Treaty EC could strengthen territorial dimension in all policies |
| 2005 -Non-ratification Constitutional Treaty -Agenda 2007 | -TC enriches economic and social cohesion by giving transversal dimension applicable to whole territory and all policies -TC provides reason d'être for regional development policies -TC based on principle of equity between citizens wherever they live -TC connected with sustainable development -TC needs balanced development vision on Member State level -TC in Constitutional Treaty is reshuffling of cohesion policy competences | -not use TC as spatial planning -synonym -relate TC to spatial development -TC is not related to spatial planning -TC entails spatial planning on lower levels -Agenda 2007 only way forward for TC policy | -discuss territorial structure for SGI in relation to TC -SG(EI) are/not related to TC -SGEI will automatically result in TC -TC ensures appropriate SG(EI) accessibility | -TC related to all kinds of territories/specificities of regions/areas with geographical and demographical constraints/cities -TC related to territorial impacts of globalisation -role EC in TC is identification of specific territories -TC in Constitutional Treaty Articles I-3 and III-220 for stronger union between territories with respect for their diversity | -steer TC by placing more coordination within integrated territorial strategy -TC does not establish Treaty base for (spatially) coordinating sectoral policies -TC connected with governance, cooperation, and transnational development | -TC related to territorial dimension of development -not sure how TC in Constitutional Treaty will translate into territorial dimension |
| 2006 | -use TC as justification for regional cohesion policy -pro Community TC competence if TC is giving regions chance -regional policy with goal of economic and social cohesion implies TC -Barrier pushed TC in 1999, 2004 for regional policy for all regions -Barrier incorporated TC in Constitutional Treaty to combat territorial disparities -TC in Constitutional Treaty implies that cohesion policy is more than financial redistribution -Amsterdam Treaty Article 2 related to TC | -TC is not spatial planning -pro/contra Community TC competence if TC is spatial planning -TC policies entails usage of spatial planning on lower levels -Barrier incorporated TC in Constitutional Treaty for balanced spatial pattern of economic development | -SG(EI) are/not related to TC -SG(EI) first TC issue for territories creating own competitiveness | -Community competence for territorial cohesion policy might extend Impact Assessment's to TIA -founding fathers used TC for specific territories | -Community TC competence useful for lower level coordination -Barrier incorporated TC in Constitutional Treaty for EC's coordination of development policies | -lobby for territorial dimension related to TC failed |

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,^a 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).¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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-3^b of the Constitutional Treaty might not hold as long as this Treaty is not ratified.¹⁷ 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*.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.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.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. *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.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)?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).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 *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.

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 *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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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^a lacks an explicit reference to the objective of territorial cohesion.²⁸ 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’.^b 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.²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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;³¹ 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

^a ‘In order to promote its overall harmonious development, the Community shall develop and pursue its actions leading to the strengthening of its economic and social cohesion[.] In particular, the Community shall aim at reducing disparities between the levels of development of the various regions and the backwardness of the least favoured regions or islands, including rural areas’ (OJEC, 2002).

^b ‘Spatial ‘planning’ or spatial ‘policy’? Jensen&Richardson (2003) argue: ‘We will refer to this broad field of policy making as European ‘spatial policy’, even though it often goes under the self-proclaimed label of European spatial ‘planning’. Our principal reason for this is that the idea of planning is itself a contested one – partly since the EU has no formal competency in this area, and key documents such as the European Spatial Development Perspective are clearly not labelled as ‘plans’. Indeed, the very question of the possibility of planning at the level of the EU is at the heart of our inquiry[.] The idea of policy also helps to emphasise the diffuse and politicised nature of this complex field of activity.’ Whereby comes that even spatial planning can be seen as part of a policy, and therefore ‘spatial planning’ possibly fits into the broader ‘spatial policy.’

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.³² 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 im-/explicitly (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.^{a33} Still, such a successful introduction seems to have not been enough, because the lobbying continued.³⁴ What more was wanted did not become clear though, because the development of this territorial cohesion

^a 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.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.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.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,^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).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.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).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.

^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).

C.2.5 Territorial specificities metanarrative

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.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ 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 were 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.⁵¹ 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.⁵² 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.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶ 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).⁵⁷ 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).⁵⁸ 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, undefined, 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,⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹ 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.⁶² 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.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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 the 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.

IGCs Schema 3
Narratives in the IGCs usage area with an own dynamic

| Year/ Narrative | Power Allocation | Regional/Cohesion Policy | European Spatial Planning | SG(E)I |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1986 -SEA | | | | liberalise public services |
| 1989 -ESDP process | | | -pro/contra EU competence in policy coordination | |
| 1991 | | | -pro Community spatial planning | |
| 1992 -Treaty of Maastricht | | -give attention to economic and social disparities -social and economic cohesion subordinated to building open market | -pro/contra Community planning competence? | |
| 1993 | | | -empower EC to produce spatial scheme under Article 10 ERDF regulations | |
| 1995 -SF Reform | | -examine policies with territorial impact by encouraging coherence and co-ordination | -objective of strengthening economic and social cohesion basis of European spatial planning dimension | -pro/contra Community spatial planning -EU spatial planning competencies already/do not exist |
| 1996 | -no legal basis to distort competition in spatial cohesion | | -spatial policy coherence needs enforceable EC direction | have targeted strategic approach for regions with specific weaknesses and handicaps by provision of SGEI and sectoral policy coordination |
| 1997 -Treaty of Amsterdam | | -Member States should conduct and coordinate economic policies for economic and social cohesion | -Community has competencies for strategic spatial planning | focus on territories with specific weaknesses and handicaps in SGEI |
| 1998 | -include regional planning in Community sphere -EC should improve complementarity of Community policies | -EC should establish internal mechanisms for departmental co-ordination and incorporate regional impact assessment | -pro Community spatial development competency intergovernmental ESDP way not good/possible incorporate ESDP principles in EU programming | supplying services is economic activity |
| 1999 -ESDP | | -pro regional policy for all regions | -what to do with CSD? | |
| 2000 -Charter of Fundamental Human Rights | | -pro regional policy for all regions | -EP supports European Planning ESDP contributes to SGI support | supplying services is economic activity -SGI are Community concern -SGEI key elements of EMS -provide SGI according to national schemes de services collectives based on long-term assessments of need |
| 2001 | | -pro regional policy for all regions | -ESDP leads to formal European spatial planning | SGI used to resist complete market liberalisation |
| 2002 -Convention discussions | -distributive regional and territorial development policies should be Community competency | -not restrict appraisal of cohesion to economic and social dimensions territorial dimension of cohesion policy can only be inferred from Treaty of Amsterdam Article 158 | -pro Community planning competence -pro/contra Community spatial development competency -EU has no traditional spatial land-use powers -Will EU have spatial policy? -Maastricht Treaty introduced subsidiarity principle to address ESDP issues -ESDP generated capacity for voluntary European spatial planning | |
| 2003 -Draft Constitutional Treaty | -include many policy areas in EU -pro subnational powers | -pro regional policy for all regions -regional policy most important policy for cohesion -spatial cohesion used to promote overall harmonious development | -ESDP combines reinforcing economic and social cohesion with balanced and sustainable development | -support SGI in Constitutional Treaty -government instead of market for SGI -local and regional government responsible for SGI -SGEI are shared EU value/spatial equity form |
| 2004 -EU Enlargement -Rotterdam meeting | | -pro regional policy for all regions | -pro/contra Community spatial policy -regional level should participate in ESDP process/determines ESDP success -EU has no spatial planning means -European laws may affect town and country planning and land use | |
| 2005 -Non-ratification Constitutional Treaty -Agenda 2007 | -EU has no competence for coordinating European sector policies -Constitutional Treaty Article 159 supposes reinforced cooperation within EC | -take European action to maintain equivalent living standard in all regions integration of territorial dimension into economic and social cohesion complementary -Amsterdam Treaty Article 158 formed basis for regional policy | -pro Community planning competence -no/need formalisation of European spatial development -regional development is co-incident outcome of EU sectoral policies -EU policies malfunction from territorial perspective -around 1999 EC wanted right of intervention in spatial planning -subsidiarity principle played into Community planning opponents hands | -pro/contra liberalisation of services (market) -outermost regions have special SGEI needs |
| 2006 | -drop all territorial issues -pro/contra top-down planning | territorial dimension of cohesion presupposes increasing focus on territorial logic behind SF investments in regions -Amsterdam Treaty Article 158 formed basis for regional policy | organisation of space on Community level to achieve spatial planning for networks and services -Community level spatial planning necessary -pro/contra Community spatial coordination -EC will not dictate spatial policies -Constitutional Treaty Article III-221 refers to spatial development | supplying services is economic activity |

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.⁷² 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.⁷² This debate relates to the ‘European spatial planning’ narrative, which has as main quest a European spatial planning competency (see Appendix D),⁷³ 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

⁷² 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),⁷⁴ 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,^a but also to the less known call for the special needs of specific territories herein,⁷⁵ 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,⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ 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 2006.⁷⁸ 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 2005.⁷⁹ 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/without the concept as “spearhead” (e.g. see the ‘SG(E)I’ narrative).⁸⁰ 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.

^a [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.

¹ Faludi&Waterhout, 2002.

² EU Council, 2005b; Husar, 2006: 2, 83; representative of Brussels Capital Region, Personal interview in Brussels, 23rd of February 2006.

³ Van Gestel&Faludi, in Faludi, 2005a: 90-91.

⁴ Nordregio, 2006a: 78; Camagni, in Faludi, 2007.

⁵ Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

⁶ Husson, 2002: 13; Tatzberger, 2003; Faludi, 2004b: 9; Peyrony, 2005: 3; Husar, 2006: 16.

⁷ OJEC, 1997, effective 1999; EP, 1999a: 91, Conclusion, Point 2; Leygues, in DCRGA, 2004: 29; EP, 2005c: 8; Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 94; Husar, 2006: 77; Nordregio, 2006a: 27, 28; Personal interviews in Brussels 2006: administrator from the CoR, 2nd of February; representative of Brussels Capital Region, 23rd of February; representative of the Permanent Dutch Representation in Brussels, 27th of February; officer of DG Regio, 2nd of March; officer of DG Environment, 17th of March; officer from DG Enterprise and Industry, 23rd of March; officer of DG Regio, 23rd of March; officer of the East of England's Brussels Office, 28th of March.

⁸ Europese Gemeenschappen, 2003.

⁹ OJEC, 2004.

¹⁰ CPMR, 2003; European Countryside Movement, 2003: 1; Faludi, 2003a; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; Olofsson, in DCRGA, 2004: 66, 68; BMVW, 2005: 5-7, 26; Faludi, 2005c: 21; Zonneveld&Waterhout, in Faludi, 2005a: 17n3; Husar, 2006: 22-23, 30, 93; Nordregio, 2006b: 166; Personal interview in Brussels 2006: officer from the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, 16th of February; representative of Brussels Capital Region, 23rd of February; officer of the CEMR, 14th of March; official of Nordrhein Westfalen, 16th of March; officer of DG Environment, 17th of March; officer from DG Agriculture, 19th of March; officer of the East of England's Brussels Office, 28th of March; officer of the CPMR, Personal interview by telephone, 13th of April 2006; Camagni, in Faludi, 2007; Drevet, in Faludi, 2007; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

¹¹ ARL, 2003; CEMR, 2003; European Countryside Movement, 2003: 2; DG Regio, unpublished, undated; Leygues, in DCRGA, 2004: 29; DG Regio&DG Employment, 2005; EP, 2005c: 3-4; Faludi&Waterhout, 2005; Ministers for Spatial Development&CEC, 2005; Camagni, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

¹² But stories on decision-making concerning territorial cohesion do still exist in 2006, as, for instance, coming from a member of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio) (Personal interview in Brussels, 7th of February 2006).

¹³ ARL, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Robert, in Faludi, 2007.

¹⁴ OJEC, 1997, effective 1999; Robert, in Faludi, 2007.

¹⁵ Husson, 1999; Tatzberger, 2003.

¹⁶ CoR, 2002a; BBR, 2003a; DATAR, quoted in Faludi, 2003a: 16; Faludi, 2003a; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Ó Cuiv, in DCRGA, 2004: 24; OJEC 2004: 11, Art. I-3 83, Art. I-14 82, Art. II-96, Art. III-220; EP, 2005c: 12; Zonneveld&Waterhout, in Faludi, 2005a: 17; Husar, 2006: 17, 31; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated.

¹⁷ Faludi, 2003a; Waterhout, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003.

¹⁸ Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; EP, 2005c: 7; officer of DG Regio, Personal interview in Brussels, 23rd of March 2006.

¹⁹ Ó Cuiv, in DCRGA, 2004: 24; official of DG Regio, Personal interview in Brussels, 18th of January 2006.

²⁰ CEC, 2004a; administrator of the CoR, Personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of February 2006.

²¹ Davoudi, 2004: 2; EP, 2005c: 12; administrator of the CoR, Personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of February 2006; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

²² Officer of DG Agriculture, Personal interview in Brussels, 29th of March 2006.

²³ CoR, 2003b: 4; CPMR, 2003; CPMR&CoR, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

²⁴ Tatzberger, 2003; CEC, 2004: 28; Schout&Waterhout&Jordan, 2006: 12; member of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), Personal interview in Brussels, 7th of February 2006.

²⁵ AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated; Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; EP, 2005c: 12; official of DG Regio, Personal interview in Brussels, 18th of January 2006.

²⁶ Tatzberger, 2003; EP, 2005c: 10; Faludi, 2005c: 20; Husar, 2006: 2; Nordregio, 2006a: 133.

²⁷ Faludi, 2005c: 11-12.

²⁸ CoR, 1997; OJEC, 1997, effective 1999; André&Moreira, 2002; CoR, 2002a; ARL, 2003; CPMR, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

²⁹ CoR, 2002a; ARL, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; ARL, 2004: 16; Davoudi, 2004: 2; Dutch Presidency, 2004; EU informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion, 2004a; Faludi, 2004b: 16f; BMVW, 2005: 5; Drevet, in Faludi, 2007; Dh&Nadin, 2005; Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 94, 102; Schön, in Campbell, 2005: 391-392; Van Gestel&Faludi, in Faludi, 2005a: 90-91; Zonneveld&Waterhout, in Faludi, 2005a: 17; Husar, 2006: 2, 17-18, 22-23, 92; Nordregio, 2006: 28; Personal interviews in Brussels in 2006: official of DG Regio, 18th of January; officer from the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, 1st of February; Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), 7th of February; officer from DG Regio, 2nd of March; officer of DG Regio, 23rd of March; officer of the CPMR, Personal interview by telephone, 13th of April 2006; Camagni, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

³⁰ Camagni, in Faludi, 2007.

³¹ CoR, 2002a; CoR, 2003b: 4; CEC, 2004: 28; Schout&Waterhout&Jordan, 2006: 12; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

³² Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 94; officer from DG Regio, Personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of March 2006; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

³³ OJEC, 1997, effective in 1999; Husson, 2002: 13; ARL, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Faludi, 2004b: 9; Husar, 2006: 16.

³⁴ Husson, 2002: 13; Faludi, 2004b: 9; Husar, 2006: 16.

³⁵ Husson, 2002: 13; Faludi, 2004b: 9; Husar, 2006: 16.

³⁶ CEC, 2000c; 2001c; 2001d; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Husson, 2002: 13; CEMR, 2003b; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; CEC, 2004b; Commission staff 2004; Faludi, 2004b: 9; OJEC, 2004; CoR 2005a; EcoSoc, 2005; EP 2005c: AM 13; Faludi, 2005c: 7; Husar, 2006: 16, 83; officer from the CPMR, Personal interview by telephone, 13th of April 2006; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated.

³⁷ Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; EP 2005c: AM 13; Husar, 2006: 83.

³⁸ Pezzini, 2000; CoR, 2002a; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Husson, 2002; CEMR, 2003b; Faludi, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; Faludi, 2005c: 7; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

³⁹ Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; EP 2005c: 10, No. 35, 36; Husar, 2006: 79, 92; officer from DG Agriculture in 2006, Personal interview in Brussels, 29th of March 2006; Personal e-mails 2006: officer from DG Transport and Energy, 27th of March 2006; officer from DG Transport and Energy, 5th of April; Zonneveld, in Faludi, 2007.

⁴⁰ CEC, 2001a; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Waterhout, 2002; 2003.

⁴¹ AER, 1995; Tatzberger, 2003.

⁴² Husson, 1999; Tatzberger, 2003; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated.

⁴³ Two members of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), Personal interview in Brussels, 7th of February 2006.

⁴⁴ Alvergne&Musso, 2000; DATAR, 2000; Husson, 2000; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; BBR, 2003a; CoR&CPMR, 2003; European Countryside Movement, 2003: 1; Tatzberger, 2003; Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; OJEC, 2004; BBR, 2005a: 57; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁴⁵ Alvergne&Musso, 2000; DATAR, 2000; Husson, 2000; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Tatzberger, 2003.

⁴⁶ European Countryside Movement, 2003: 1; Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; OJEC, 2004; BBR, 2005a: 57; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁴⁷ ARL, 2003; Van Gestel&Faludi, in Faludi, 2005a: 90-91.

⁴⁸ Officer from DG Regio, personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of March 2006.

⁴⁹ OJEC, 1997; Husson, 2002; European Countryside Movement, 2003: 1-2; Faludi, 2003; OJEC 2002: 103; Tatzberger, 2003; Almkvist, in DCRGA, 2004: 50; Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; OJEC, 2004; Olofsson, in DCRGA, 2004: 66, 68; Husar, 2006: 11, 31; Camagni, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout (in Faludi, 2007); DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁵⁰ Hache, in DCRGA, 2004: 53; AEM&CPMR Islands Commission&EUROMONTANA, undated.

⁵¹ Schout&Waterhout&Jordan, 2006: 12.

⁵² Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 52.

⁵³ EP, 1999a: 91, Conclusion, Point 2; CPMR, 2002a; DATAR, quoted in Faludi, 2003a: 16; Europese Gemeenschappen, 2003; Almkvist, in DCRGA, 2004: 50; ARL, 2004: 16; Leygues, in DCRGA, 2004: 29; OJEC, 2004; Husar, 2006: 17, 31, 77, 92; Nordregio, 2006b: 166; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; two members of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), Personal interview in Brussels, 7th of February 2006; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁵⁴ Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 52.

⁵⁵ Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Van Gestel&Faludi, in Faludi, 2005a: 90-91.

⁵⁶ ARL, 2003; CEMR, 2003b; Tatzberger, 2003; EP, 2005c: 3, 4; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁵⁷ Alvergne&Musso, 2000; DATAR, 2000; Husson, 2000; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; CoR, 2003b.

⁵⁸ Husar, 2006: 2; Robert, in Faludi, 2007.

⁵⁹ EP, 1999a: 91, Conclusion, Point 2.

⁶⁰ André&Moreira, 2002.

⁶¹ CoR, 2002a; Tatzberger, 2003; Olofsson, in DCRGA, 2004: 66, 68; Husar, 2006: 17; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁶² CPMR, 2003a.

⁶³ Nordregio, 2006b: 166.

⁶⁴ BBR, 2003a; 2003b; CEMR, 2003a; Europese Gemeenschappen, 2003; officer of the CEMR, Personal interview in Brussels, 14th of March 2006.

⁶⁵ Leygues, in DCRGA, 2004: 29; OJEC, 2004; Olofsson, in DCRGA, 2004: 66, 68; Robert, in Faludi, 2007.

⁶⁶ Tedwr-Jones&Morais Mourato, in Faludi, 2005a: 70-71.

⁶⁷ Tatzberger, 2003; officer from the CPMR, Personal interview by telephone, 13th of April 2006.

⁶⁸ Schön, 2005: 391-392; Husar, 2006: 11.

⁶⁹ EESC, 1998.

⁷⁰ EP, 1999a: 91, Conclusion, Point 2; Husar, 2006: 77.

⁷¹ ARL, 2003; CoR, 2003b: 4.

⁷² Giannakourou, 1996; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; ARL, 2003; CEMR, 2003b; CoR, 2003a; DATAR, quoted in Faludi, 2003a: 16; Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 52; Husar, 2006: 17; Personal interview in Brussels 2006: MEP of the Committee of Regional policy, 22nd of February; representative of the Permanent Dutch Representation in Brussels, 15th of March; officer from DG Regio, 2nd of March; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁷³ Wulf-Mathies, 1995; Williams, 1996; Bastrup-Birk&Doucet, 1997; CEC, 1997a; EESC, 1998: section 2.3, 3.1, 3.5; Tampere Ministerial, 1999; Noetzel, 2000; Tedwr-Jones&Williams, 2001; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Husson, 2002; ARL, 2003; BBR, 2003b; Europese Gemeenschappen, 2003; Faludi, 2003a; Jensen&Richardson, 2003; Waterhout&Zonneveld, 2003; Faludi 2004b: 20; OJEC, 2004; Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 97, 102; 2005c: 11-12; Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 43; Schön, in Campbell, 2005: 391-392; Husar, 2006: 15, 17-18, 32, 70; Nordregio, 2006a: 133; 2006b: 28; Personal interviews in Brussels 2006: administrator from the CoR, 2nd of February; MEP of the Committee of Regional policy, 22nd of February; Drevet, in Faludi, 2007; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁷⁴ Giannakourou, 1996; OJEC, 1997; CoR, 2002a; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; ARL, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Faludi, in Faludi, 2005a: 2; BMVW, 2005: 28; Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 93; Peyrony, 2005: 3; Husar, 2006: 11, 26, 31; Nordregio, 2006b: 83; officer of DG Agriculture, Personal interview in Brussels, 29th of March 2006; Robert, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁷⁵ OJEC, 1997; ECR, 1998: 3851; Alvergne&Musso, 2000; CEC, 2000c; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Prodi, 2002; CEMR, 2003b; Prodi, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; Waterhout, 2003; Davoudi, 2005a: 347-348; EP 2005e: 10, No. 35, 36; Schön 2005: 391-392; CEC, 2006; Husar, 2006: 11, 79; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.

⁷⁶ Wulf-Mathies, 1995; Williams, 1996; OJEC, 1997; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; Janin Rivolin, in Faludi, 2005a: 93; Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 43, 52; Schön, 2005: 391-392; Husar, 2006: 11, 15; Personal interviews in Brussels 2006: administrator from the CoR, 2nd of February; MEP of the Committee of Regional policy, 22nd of February; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁷⁷ OJEC, 1997; CoR, 2002a; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; ARL, 2003; EP 2005e: 10, No. 35, 36; Husar, 2006: 11; Nordregio, 2006b: 83; officer from DG Regio, Personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of March 2006; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007; DG Regio, unpublished, undated.

⁷⁸ Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; ARL, 2003; Janin Rivolin, 2005a: 19; officer from DG Transport and Energy, Personal e-mail, 27th of March 2006.

⁷⁹ CEC, 2000c; Faludi&Waterhout, 2002; EP, 2005c: 7.

⁸⁰ Williams, 1996; Faludi&Waterhout; Husson, 2002; BBR, 2003b; Faludi, 2003a; Jensen&Richardson, 2003; Tatzberger, 2003; EU Council, 2005a; Schäfer, in Faludi, 2005a: 53; administrator of the CoR, Personal interview in Brussels, 2nd of February 2006; Waterhout, in Faludi, 2007.