School of Architecture, Planning & Landscape
Global Urban Research Unit
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Electronic Working Paper No 29

A 'GREEN ROOM IN THE EUROPEAN HOUSE': CONVERGING DISCOURSES IN EUROPEAN & DANISH SPATIAL PLANNING

Contact: kim.mccartney@ncl.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this working-paper is to contribute to the understanding of the plans and visions for the urban space within the European Union. The main questions are, what is the rationale behind these plans? How are they related to national spatial planning, and finally how do these plans address the connection between identity & place? The institutionalisation and the central documents of the European discourse of urban space are analysed. These are related to Danish national spatial planning, in order to examine whether there is a convergence between these discourses or not.

Key words: Spatial Planning, European Union, Urban Space

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This working-paper represent a stage in the work on a PhD-thesis concerning spatial planning at national and European levels. It is thus an expression of a 'work in progress', and therefore also more or less preliminary. Admitting to such a status, is also to welcome critical comments, and thereby invite the reader to engage in an interactive process of exchanging viewpoints.

The paper is the one half of the work made during a stay as visiting research fellow at Centre for Research in European Urban Environments (CREUE), Department of Town & Country Planning, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, from March to May 1997. It contains the empirical analysis, based on the theoretical framework displayed in the CREUE working-paper: *Discourse Analysis & Socio-Spatial Transformation Processes: A Theoretical Framework for analysing Spatial Planning.* For practical reasons, it has been chosen to split the two papers up, but it should be stressed that the one is the precondition of the other.

The author would like to thank the following persons for useful comments on this paper: professor Patsy Healey, senior lecturer R. H. Williams, lecturer Geoff Vigar all from Centre for Research in European Urban Environments (CREUE) at the Department of Town & Country Planning, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, to which I am also grateful for making time and space for this work. Also thanks to associate professor Ib Jørgensen, Department of Development & Planning, Aalborg University and a 'kindred spirit', research fellow Arne M. Christensen, Department of Geography, Roskilde University for discussions and advice. Any faults or omissions are due to the author alone.

1. INTRODUCTION

> To remain stationary in these times of change, when all the world is on the move, would be a crime
> > Thomas Cook, 1854

> All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind
> > K. Marx & F. Engels, The Communist Manifesto

> A feeling of tension, expectation and unresolved insistence runs through modernity, in particular as it seems, through its most recent stage - as if the main event, the definitive one, the actual meaning and the central point of life and things were yet to come
> > Georg Simmel, Money in Modern Culture

The cities of Europe are going through radical changes. The break-up of the industrial mode of production towards flexible production, expanding service economies, the process of globalization and the rise of an information society is the background for new economic, cultural and social life forms in the cities. With 80 pct. of the population living in the cities, Europe is the most urbanised area in the world (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a). It is a common assumption that the economic growth potentials are to be localised in the cities, as well as they are the power and knowledge centres (Kunzmann 1996). The 'fight of the cities' or what has been termed inter-urban competition, is one expression of the new power distribution among cities. The city is seen as the dynamic power centre of a particular region, as well as a participant in a world wide globalizing economic competition (Lash & Urry 1994). The nation state is given a new meaning, as the national borders are changing their significance, and localities and regions are gaining new importance. This means that cities, as well as regions, are seen as new objets and fields for co-operation, competition and planning. In this context the EU and its spatial planning and policy formulation for the cities and regions are of major importance. The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), initiated by the European Commission, is of particular interest (CSD 1997). In the principles for this work, concepts such as 'a polycentric urban system', 'sustainable development', 'economic and social cohesion' and 'economic growth' are indicators of a difficult and somewhat contradictory notion of the European urban space.

The policies and planning visions for the European urban space indicates that there are new intentions with the space. So the purpose of this working-paper is to analyse what sort of rationale is behind these policies and plans? By articulating the urban space in a new way, different actors are bidding in on a non-neutral power game, which could result in a new hegemony of socially constructed spaces. This means that different institutions as well as actors must be taken into consideration. The question is, how these EU-plans relate to Danish national spatial planning? And how this theme of Spatial Planning is related to the wider discussions of place, identity and politics? The hypothesis is that plans concerning the European territory, will have to address other than mere economic and policy oriented questions. Thus discourses of space and place will have to consider questions of how identification within specific socio-spatial frames are made to come about? And also, what sort of 'spatial imaginary' that needs to be 'triggered' if the citizens living in these places are going to support the plans? So the question of democracy, also needs to be addressed: Who are gaining from these discourses, and in what way are these discourses articulated? In short: What is happening to 'our space'?

The European discourse of urban space is analysed on the basis of the various documents published by the European Commission. The rationale behind these are then compared to one specific case of national spatial planning (the Danish case), in order to see whether there is a convergence or not between these discourses.

A final word of caution is, that this work mainly concentrates on the discourse of urban space even though many other themes are present within these EU-documents (transport, infrastructure, nature and heritage

etc.). The best way to put it is, that the analysis is based on a focused and 'selective reading' of the documents. Thus the term 'urban space' covers the relational socio-spatial configuration of cities and urban agglomerations within a given territory, and not questions of aesthetics and design in a 'micro-spatial' context.

2. A SUMMARY OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework for this analysis of the European discourse of urban space, and its relation to a case of national spatial planning has been developed in the CREUE working-paper *Discourse Analysis & Socio-Spatial Transformation Processes: A Theoretical Framework for analysing Spatial Planning.* In order to bring the reader up to date with the basic rationale of the preceding work, the main points are summarised below.

2.1 Key-points when analysing discourses

✎ Discourses are more or less coherent and repeatable linguistic and material practices, that results in specific power and rationality configurations

✎ The world is only consciously meaningful for us in a linguistically mediated context, thus any discourse analysis is a hermeneutic and interpretative practice

✎ Discourses has both a structural capacity to work 'behind the back' of the agents, as well as they are the (enabling) outcome of agents conscious actions

✎ Discourses are the beset of 'truth', the 'power of naming' and hegemony

✎ Discourses are 'framed' by institutions, with rules and positions for the agents

✎ Access to discourses is governed by criteria referring to linguistic, juridical, economic and cultural competences and 'capital'

✎ The meaning of any given discourse cannot be deduced a priori as either consensus or conflict

✎ Any discourse analysis should consider both linguistic and non-linguistic, as well as material and non-material 'facts'

2.2 Key-points when analysing the socio-spatial transformation processes

✎ Global capitalistic competition is transforming the socio-spatial relations in a dynamic process of interaction between the local and the global. Concrete spatiality is a competitive arena for social struggles, thus space is political

✎ Space and place are vital factors in the socio-spatial transformation processes of identity construction. Thus people attach emotionally and politically to space and place through symbolic constructions of the meaning and identity of places and spaces

✎ Global socio-spatial transformation processes are characterised by space-time compression; multinational competitive capitalism; local-global dialectics; reflexive accumulation based on new forms of aesthetic and cognitive codes and various forms of post-Fordist production processes

✎ The role of the nation state is changing in a world of increasing global and local significant practices, and it is under pressure from the global economy; international regulation and powerful city-states and regions. However, a hollowing out of the nation state is not a withering away of the nation state, but a re-positioning of the nation state

✎ Global-local dialectics are not a priori guarantees of a de-territorialisation of politics, which for example is seen by the fact that there is a social difference in the way agents relates to the globalized space of flows: 'elites are cosmopolitan, people are local'

✎ The meaning of place is the result of processes of social spatialisation, often by means of place-images and place-myths

✎ Processes of territorialisation and regionalisation reflects vital ongoing changes of the European territory. The concept of region is partly a normative element in a performative socio-spatial political discourse of the 'Europe of Regions', and partly a topological and analytical concept. Thus regions are found as functional; administrative or cultural/ethnic/identity regions

✎ By the term 'urban space' is understood the relational socio-spatial configuration of cities and urban agglomerations within a given territory, and not questions of aesthetic and design in a 'micro-spatial' context. The structure of the urban space of Europe is defined by a hierarchy of competing cities within the

framework of a global economy. The cities are economic, social and cultural nodes with a specific configuration of production, consumption and circulation of goods and services

3. FROM SCHUMANN TO MAASTRICHT - 'PROJECT EUROPE'

> For business purposes ... the boundaries that separate one nation from another are no more real than the equator. They are merely convenient demarcations of ethnic, linguistic and cultural entities. They do not define business requirements or consumer needs
> IBM

> One may well interpret European union building as a large-scale attempt to establish a new way of architecture where the closed rooms of the traditional territorial states are broken down and their contents apportioned in new ways, functionally as well as spatially
> Lindström et.al., Regional Policy and Territorial Supremacy

> A day will come when you France, you Russia, you Italy, you England, you Germany all you nations of the continent, without loosing your distinct qualities shall dissolve in a higher unity and constitute the European brotherhood ... A day will come when people will see ... the United States of Europe
> Victor Hugo, 1847 speech

In this analysis, the basic elements of the discourse of European urban space will be outlined. According to the theoretical framework, this amounts to identify and analyse the rationale of the relevant agents, institutions and documents. Furthermore the relation of this discourse to the level of national planning by the means of the Danish case shall be analysed, in order to see whether there exists a convergence or not between these two discourses.

The historical background of 'Project Europe' goes back to the Schumann deceleration of May 9, 1950:

> 'The French Government proposes to take action immediately on one limited but decisive point ... to place Franco-German production of coal and steel under a common High Authority, within the framework of an organization open to the participation of the other countries of Europe ... The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible' (in Williams 1996b:12, emphasis added)

So the ideal of peace in the aftermath of World War II, was the most explicit and evocative of ideals for the future of 'Project Europe' (Weiler 1995:2).

As a part of a rather unique form of supranational government, the formal EU institutions are of major importance (Williams 1996b:30-54). The main ones are the European Commission, the Council of Ministers, the European Council, the Council of Permanent Representatives, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Court of Justice. The Commission can be seen as the executive part of the government, or its civil service. It is established under Article 155, and its 20 members (commissioners) are appointed by the member states. It has a five year term of office, and technically its members must be approved by the European Parliament. The Commission is divided into 24 general directorates and a number of specialist services (its staff is estimated to be around 15.000 civil servants). Of special interest to spatial planning themes is the DG VII of Transport, the DG XI of Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection and the DG XVI of Regional Policy and Cohesion, the latter more important than the first two. The Council of Ministers is the supreme legislative authority of the EU, and it consists of one member from each member state, with the actual membership depending on the specific subject on the agenda. The General Council consists of the ministers of foreign affairs, and at

present there is no spatial policy council which is why the meetings between the ministers responsible of spatial planning and development have the status of being 'informal'. Normally the Council act only on basis of proposals from the Commission, and it cannot initiate proposals itself. In practice, the Article 152 of the Maastricht Treaty, enables the Councils to request the Commission to undertake any study and submit to it appropriate proposals. So the relation between the Commission and the Council is encapsulated in the saying that: 'The Commission proposes, and the Council disposes'. The voting procedures are rather complex, but can roughly be described as unanimity, simple majority voting and qualified majority voting. The Presidency of the Council of Ministers are held on a six-month rotation between the member states. The European Council is the term applied to the EU's summit meetings, which are attended by the heads of governments and foreign ministers. The Council of Permanent Representatives (CORPER), is the permanent representation held by the member states in Brussels. The European Parliament is the only directly elected and democratic body of the EU (direct elections since 1979). Elections are held at five year intervals, the next one coming up in 1999. The seat of the Parliament is in Strasbourg, and its secretariat is located in Luxembourg. The political work of the Members (MEP), is done in cross-country party groupings. Under the Parliament, there are a total of 20 standing committees, the most interesting in this context being the Committee on Regional Policy.

Two other important institutions are the Economic and Social Committee that provides institutional representation for the 'social partners' of employers and employees, and the newly organised Committee of the Regions (CoR). The latter is a body of representatives of the sub national level and is expected to have a major impact of any future explicit urban policy of the Community. The CoR has 8 commissions, where the Commission 2 (spatial planning), Commission 4 (urban policies) and Commission 5 (land-use planing) is of particular importance in this context. The European law is enforced by the European Court of Justice, which formally has the authority over the national courts, even though not all national courts have been equally keen to accept this fact. Especially the German Court has expressed its opposition (Weiler, Haltern & Mayer 1995:8). In the second article of the Treaty of The European Union, called the 'Maastricht Treaty', we find the core rationale of the European Project:

> 'The Community shall have as its task ... to promote <u>a harmonious and balanced development of economic activities, sustainable and non-inflationary growth</u> respecting the environment, a high degree of convergence of economic performance, a high level of employment and of social protection, the raising of the standard of living and quality of life, and <u>economic and social cohesion</u> and solidarity among member states' (EC Council 1992, emphasis added)

When the 'European project' is considered over the time scale from the 1950's to today, the early stages of the construction processes was nationally oriented regarding spatial policies. Even though the regional policy had its institutional foundation in 1975 (the European Regional Development Found (ERDF), it was not until the early 1980's that the regional policy gained momentum. Especially with the reform of the ERDF in 1984 the spatial dimension got a global orientation with the introduction of two types of areas; the less developed regions and the industrial areas in decline (Giannakourou 1996:599). The next important point in time regarding the spatial dimension of EU politics was with the Single European Act of 1986. The Internal Marked was of course an important factor shaping the socio-spatial relation but also the treaty's theme of the 'social and economic cohesion' was important. Thus the internal contradiction of an equal spatial development combined with economic growth under sustainable conditions. At the end of the day it is a question of liberalism versus state interventionism that is the underlying ideological dilemma of the whole European discourse (Giannakourou 1996:602). The discourse of European urban space is thus embedded in a rather unique spatial strategy:

> 'The emerging European spatial strategy is 'concerted' (its options resulting from consensus among member-states and through a 'bottom-up' approach), 'selective' (dealing only with territorial issues which have to talked at the European level), 'flexible' (designed for different contexts and depending on the voluntarism of the public or private sector for its implementation), and 'consistent' (promoting the symbiosis of the various Community policies instead of a strict discrimination). <u>The central idea underpinning the new European planning rhetoric is that of a more general reorientation of the traditional spatial fairness concept in the new context provided by the competition principles of a</u>

<u>spatial integration process that is market-oriented'</u> (Giannakourou 1996:603, emphasis added)

In this analysis of the European spatial discourse Giannakourou pinpoints three driving referentials of the discourse of 'justice'. Firstly the concept of 'competitive spatial justice', promising the levelling of spatial imbalances through redistribution of competitiveness among European areas. Secondly, a concept of 'diversified spatial justice' tolerating discriminations of goals, instruments and actors for the handling of divergent problems. Finally a concept of 'pluralist spatial justice' appealing both to public and private stakeholders to contribute to the redistribution of spatial prosperity (Giannakourou 1996:603). Together these three theoretical pillars are an expression of a specific notion of 'spatial fairness' that involves the paradox of invoking a welfare principle in order to ensure global competitiveness (Giannakourou 1996:604). Thus Giannakourou finds a break with the traditional universal and legally formal approach of spatial justice (i.e. the right to equal treatment of all territories) towards a novel rationale of the diverse and unequal as a result of a more complex and unpredictable world. In other words a:

> 'Transition from a unitary and substantive rationale of fairness towards a pluralist and procedural one' (Giannakourou 1996:605)[1]

A corresponding transition can be found in the institutional context of government decision. Thus essential and formal legislation is replaced by non-binding recommendations, declarations annexed to treaties and various forms of interpretative communications, all encapsulated by the term 'soft law' (Giannakourou 1996:606). Such 'soft law' practice corresponds with the design of the emerging European spatial planning policy. This seems to be shaped by two trends:

> 'The first is the replacement of the traditional hierarchical, vertical and centralised form of state spatial action by a voluntary, co-operative and horizontal model of co-ordinated European or transnational spatial options. The second is the replacement of substantive rules by procedural, prospective and general frames of reference and action expressive of information, proposed standards of good practice and recommendations rather than legally enforceable objectives and means of action' (Giannakourou 1996:606-7)

Now this amounts to say that the decision-making process is moving away from 'positive' co-ordination, relying on hierarchical and homogeneous national spatial standards towards a 'negative' action co-ordination based on information exchange, non-binding principles and encouragement of voluntary and decentralised spatial planning (Giannakourou 1996:607). This is part of a general trend of Western democracies undergoing a dialectics of 'explosion and implosion of politics' (Pedersen (ed.) 1994). Explosion in the way that politics has moved out and away from the traditional representative institutions and into various new institutional settings of corporate bodies and semi-private organisations. This movement has in a way meant an ephemeralization of political responsibility making the democratic control of these new institutional settings even harder than before. Thus the 'implosion' of politics since the political spheres are closing themselves or imploding in their various forms.

The institutional system of the EU has in its current shape properties of a 'state-like politico-administrative system', which has a rather unique constitutional set-up (Wessels 1996:20-1). Opposed to traditional international organisations, the EU has (with the Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of justice) an institutional setting where policies to a large degree are made independent of national governments. This implies that sovereign states have to deal with political actors which are outside their immediate control (Wessels 1996:21). Such an institutional set-up makes it very difficult to identify the decision-maker of the system. A problem that has been accentuated by the increasing number of majority votes of the Council. The constitutional model of EU is changing as a part of the ongoing integration process. At least three models can be identified in order to frame the discussion of EU integration: the intergovernmental model, the federal model of the 'United States of Europe and the co-operative federal model of a 'merged Europe'. The intergovernmental model is characterised by national sovereignty of member states and a 'pooling of sovereignties' (Wessels 1996:23). The federal model of the 'United States of Europe' would imply a rearrangement of the present institutional framework. Nevertheless, it seems to be the ideal of many Eurocrats and politicians in the current debate. In such a model the Commission would have the status of government and the historical European nation state would be substituted to the 'European

Federation'. This model would probably be more efficient when it comes to making fast decisions. Finally the co-operative model of a 'merged Europe' would be based on the concept of dual legitimacy, i.e. that of the member state and the Commission. In such a model the areas of competence would be less clear since national and Community areas of competence would be mixed. The current situation can be described as a 'fusion model' of European institutionalisation (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:360). This means that the institutional processes of European integration are neither federal nor intergovernmental:

> 'Thus the development towards a 'federal system' seems to be unlikely; nor can we observe a turning back to an 'intergovernmental model'; more likely seems to be a further degree of institutional fusion and a higher procedural complexity in the upcoming future from which there is no easy way out. However an institutional 'de-Europeanization' will not take place; there are no signs of a withdrawal from the system but more of an institutional learning and re-equilibrium' (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:365)

Such a development will most likely be of 'advantage' to the increasing professional bureaucracy within the institutionalisation processes of European integration policy. This tendency combined with an increasing 'atomisation' of the decision-making process in the EU, makes it impossible to control the internal co-ordination process through a central body (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:332). Thus the 'explosion and implosion' of politics (Pedersen (ed.) 1994), and a growing 'intransparency' (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:360). Seen alone the politico-administrative system is certainly not a static system. There can be observed an extensive growth of the decisions by the Council and the Commission. And despite the much debate of the principle of subsidiarity we are facing a situation where:

> 'Competences for operating public policies have increasingly been <u>transferred upwards</u> to the level of the European Union by new treaties, treaty reforms such as the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty on European Union, incremental adaptions using Art. 235 EEC and legal 'mutations' by ECJ ... We are confronted with a <u>'messy' and ambiguous vertical fusion of national and EU competences</u> and even more with a highly differentiated 'mixture' of public instruments located on several levels' (Wessels 1996:34, emphasis added)

Thus concluding on the current development trends within EU institutionalisation processes, so much can be said:

> '... the main observation at this point is that in all member states there is, within certain limits, a common trend towards deparliamentarization, sectorization and regionalisation which goes in the direction of Europeanization and convergence: no member state seems to move towards divergence and nationalization' (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:358)

3.1 Institutionalising spatial policy & planning

The Treaty on the European Union has three explicit territorial dimensions with the themes of economic and social cohesion (Title XIV, Articles 130a to 130e), Trans European Networks (Title XII, Articles 129b to 129d) and the environment (Title XVI, Articles 130r and 130t) (Informal Council of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning Ministers 1994:37). The agents and institutions, of prime concern to the understanding of the discourse of European urban space are the European Commission, the Committee of the Regions and the Committee on Spatial Development (CSD). Since 1989, the ministers responsible for the spatial development and planning has met at informal meetings.

The European Commission

The organisational structure of the European Commission illustrate very clearly what interests and which powers one has to consider in the analysis of the discourse. So there is more than twenty general directorates that promotes economic growth and try to make Europe competitive in the global arena. Only one of them (DGXVI) 'takes care of the losers', understood as the regions that cannot keep up with the accelerating pace of economic competition (Masser et. al. 1992:107). The DGXVI is interesting since it is from this forum that the important documents of the discourse are send out.

The Committee of the Regions (CoR)

The diversity of regional and local authorities within the CoR makes this particular institutional setting a field of various (and sometimes divergent) interests. Wiehler & Stumm concludes that the CoR has resulted in the political upgrading of the regions at European level (1995:247). This may conform to the European parliament's demands first of all, but cannot conceal that most of the regions represented in the CoR are said to lack a democratically legitimised substructure (Wiehler & Stumm 1995:247).

The Committee on Spatial Development (CSD)

The CSD is a relatively new body under the European Commission. It has only existed since 1991, and is not a formally part of the Maastricht Treaty (Williams 1996b:48). CSD is an intergovernmental forum of senior officials from the resort ministries responsible for spatial planning. In the Danish case, the Danish Ministry of Energy & Environment's national spatial planning agency. The CSD has the responsibility for the preparation of the ESDP, as well as it is implementing the Co-operation Network of Spatial Research Institutes. Bourdieu (1994a) reminds us, that any agent is placed within a social field where rules governs both the actions of the agents as well as the institutional settings. So if the institution is able to draw on a solid power base, the agents of this institution can be said to have the 'power of naming'. So the CSD is capable to name its 'object', that is the European territory as it is seen from the professional viewpoint of spatial planners and the political viewpoint of the Commission. Now this means that the CSD is one of the most central EU bodies, when it comes to the articulation of the European discourse of urban space:

> 'Although not able to adopt EU legislation as a formal council could, they [CSD] have proved to be a significant driving force in the formulation of EU spatial policy' (Williams 1996b:87)

Other agents close to the development of the urban space in Europe must be said to be the ones that works with the regional theme in one way or another. These are the Consultative Committee of Local and Regional Authorities, The Assembly of European Regions (AER), the Council of European Municipalities (CEMR), the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR), the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities (CLRA) (Veggeland 1996, Williams 1996b).

ERDF, ESF & EAGGF - money to back up action

The structural funds of the Community plays a major part in the regional development policy, and has also some importance for the urban areas. Many of the regional subsidies that has been handed out from the EU in this period of the structural funds (1994-9), has in one way or another been to the benefit of projects in urban areas. There are three so-called 'structural funds': the European Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF). Both the ERDF and the ESF has funded quite a lot of urban projects. The INTERREG programme was originally developed in order to break down the barriers made by the nation states to community actions at a regional level (Veggeland 1996:74). The first program, the INTERREG I was targeted at border regional co-operation. The INTERREG II was then expanded towards cross border cooperations between regions without common borders. The philosophy behind the INTERREG is articulated by the DG XVI like this:

> 'The initiative lies at the heart of unity in Europe. It aims to establish closer co-operation between regions that are separated by national boundaries but share common economic interests. These areas often suffer further isolation through being far from the centres of economic activity and political decision-making (Community Initiatives, CEC, DG XVI 1994, in Veggeland 1996:75-76)

What should be noticed first, is that it is the economic interests that are the central ones in these corporations. Next this formulation implicit acknowledge a core-periphery image of the European space. Since the cross-border activity is stressed even more in the INTERREG II programme this could be seen as strengthening of the 'region-building' by the means of a stronger institutionalised cross-border co-operation (Veggeland 1996:78). The programme of INTERREG IIC must therefore be considered as one of the central institutional

frameworks for regional and urban spatial development in Europe. The link between the *ESDP* and the INTERREG IIC programme is very clear in the minds of the CSD:

> 'Basically, the objective of the ESDP is not to make new policies for the Union. It is rather to make a catalogue of supplementary policy ideas and proposals as seen from a spatial development point of view. Implementation of these policies will have to take place at different levels: national, transnational, Community and Europe-wide ... INTERREG IIC has to do with the transnational level, and there is a very strong connection between INTERREG IIC and the ESDP' (Interview with Derek Martin, member of the CSD and Co-ordinator of International Affairs at the Duch National Spatial Planning Agency, Den Haag 25. September 1996, in Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996b:21, emphasis added)

This assessment corresponds with the thoughts of the Principal Administrator at the DG XVI, unit A3, Henriette Bastrup-Birk. She underlined that the INTERREG IIC initiative should constitute the test-bed for practical measures relating directly to the objectives and approaches anchored in the *ESDP* (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996a:18). The same point of view can be found in the CoR, when it says:

> 'The INTERREG IIC initiative should maintain where desirable from the viewpoint of local and regional authorities parallels with the development of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), which will be finalised during the course of 1997. In this context, the INTERREG IIC initiative should, the CoR believes, provide a vision for the territorial areas within which the actions of the initiative can be strategically implemented. Local and regional authorities must have a strong role in creating such a vision and helping to bring fore their priorities for spatial development. An important role for the European Commission must therefore be the creation of a synergy between the top-down and bottom-up perspectives' (CoR 1997:3-4)

In other words, the European discourse of urban space is getting its first institutional and economic backing from the regional policy of the European Union[2].

4. CENTRAL COMMISSION DOCUMENTS

The central documents of the European discourse of urban space are the ones that are published officially from the European Commission as well as the reports and papers from the CSD and the informal meetings of the ministers responsible for spatial planning in the member countries. That is *Europe 2000, Europe 2000+*, The *Leipzig Principles* and the *ESDP*, and some of the regional studies from the Commission[3].

4.1 Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of the Community's Territory

This is the first major official document from the Commission seeking to address the question of regional planning at European level. It is the first time a spatial dimension is introduced in the Community's attempt to secure economic growth and at the same time secure that the poorer regions gets their share of this growth (Engelstoft 1994:144). The document has two main themes (Williams 1993). One is the centralisation into the 'blue banana' and decentralisation in more attractive and less congested locations. The other is the growth of the second pole of development, from southern Germany and northern Italy to Spain.

The framework is one of post-industrialism and flexibility, as the localisation of service facilities are considered to be of major importance. *Europe 2000* uses as a vocabulary of 'decentralised, local entrepreneurialism' that has been identified as a part of a broader supply-side discourse (Amin & Tomaney 1995:178). An important assumption concerning localisational behaviour is made, when it is said that:

> 'Localisation behaviour has become more influenced by factors relating to quality of life, and less resource-driven than before' (Commission 1991:15)

This is especially held to be the case of knowledge-intensive, high-tech activities with a highly educated workforce. Such rationales are in accordance with the economic theories of competitive advantages (Porter 1990), and urban management theories. The economic activity of the Community must be set in terms of 'sustainable growth' (Commission 1991:18). Apart from mentioning the locational attractiveness of non-congested places, there is however not much for clarification of this concept. It is also rather contradictory to the wishes/forecasts that is introduced some few pages further on:

> 'Both within the Community and in the world beyond it, the flows of trade, capital and people across traditional national borders are now increasing substantially ... These flows seem certain to increase further with the <u>renewal of economic growth in the world economies during the 1990's'</u> (Commission 1991:26, emphasis added)

The analysis points to the double movement of the return of economic activity to the inner cities and a trend towards a more balanced urban system (Commission 1991:20). This has been a development to the benefit of other cities than the traditional growth centres. Nevertheless, the cities display increasing differences between the rich and the poor, not at least due to migration pressure form third countries. The socio-spatial development is thus both characterised as one of competition and co-operation, since:

> 'The completion of the single market will intensify competition between cities and lead to some <u>adjustments</u> in the European hierarchy of cities ... there is already evidence that cities and regions are establishing new networks and other of co-operation to reap the benefit of economies of scale, technology transfers and increased efficiency through joint-ventures' (Commission 1991:21-22, emphasis added)

Although it is undoubtedly true that there is an increase in networking within the cities and regions (Williams 1996a & 1996b), the seriousness of the matter is grossly underplayed by the use of the euphemistic and technical term 'adjustments'. What hides behind this metaphor, is an economic reality of unemployment and social depravation in the cities that gets 'adjusted' in the downward direction of the urban hierarchy. It is thus recognised, that one of the dangers to a more even territorial development lies in what has been termed 'wasteful competition' where complementarity would have been more appropriate than competition (Commission 1991:25). How such 'wasteful competition' should be excluded from the market economy is not said explicitly, but this will only be possible by regulation of the market forces. Because of the uneven social and economic geography of the European territory, the means of spatial planning at Community level is seen as a prerequisite for a 'harmonious development' of the Community (Commission 1991:30). Thus the fourth level of planning is seen as a 'natural' consequence of the European integration process, and the national planning reports that reflects this development is high-lighted for their European mode of thought (i.e. the Dutch, Danish, French and Portuguese plans) (Commission 1991:32).

The financial basis for the European regional policy that is recommended in *Europe 2000* are made up of the structural founds (NordREFO 1992:3:10). So *Europe 2000* can be said to be a strategic document with links to a strong resource-base and politically prioritised part of the centralised and integrated European co-operation (NordREFO 1992:3:12). The main orientation of regional policy within *Europe 2000* is a continuing reliance of the large and central city-regions. This notion of the importance of the large cities is tantamount to the whole of EC thinking when it comes to matters of regional policy (NordREFO 1992:3:26). The rationale seems to be that a massive investment in the infrastructure of the peripheral regions will make more equal conditions of competition within the whole of EC territory (NordREFO 1992:3:28). In an analysis of how the existing regional policy of the Nordic countries matches the regional policy of *Europe 2000*, it is concluded that the European combination of supra-state centralisation and state de-centralisation mixes rather badly with the established regional policy in the Nordic countries. This is based on three pillars: a strong public sector, a state centred and controlled system of territorial resource-transfers and a strong nation state control over the territory (NordREFO 1992:3:15). It is recognised that major cities with 'European aspirations' must cooperate on various actions and joint-marketing programmes (Commission 1991:32). This as a necessary consequence of the global competition with Japan and USA. In this context of footloose economies it is said that all regions have the potential to attract mobile investments (Commission 1991:63). An important factor is that of place-making through 'professional, informed promotion', that might have as great influence as financial incentives in attracting investment (Commission 1991:63).

The report states that:

> 'It has become increasingly clear that <u>economic growth and environmental protection need not to be contradictory objectives</u>' (Commission 1991:111, emphasis added)

This postulate indeed needs substantiation, which neither this report or others have been able to provide. The urban system is directly addressed in this publication, and the development trends of sub urbanisation, concentration of environmental and social problems and immigration are demanding new measures. Thus it is stated that:

> 'The problems of the urban areas call for more wide-ranging efforts in the 1990's. There is considerable scope for co-operation between cities to exchange information and know-how as part of the effort to raise standards overall' (Commission 1991:133)

This is imagined to come about through the help of 'appropriate policies' that also has as their goal to reinforce the smaller and medium-sized cities. The urban re-generation processes that often result in the involuntary movement of the original inhabitants (because of gentrification and rise in property prizes), is considered rather positively as part of the turn of the urban population decline from the 1970's (Commission 1991:136). The urban system is now characterised by the emergence of a more decentralised system. Following this trend, the traditional view of a dominant core and a weak periphery has to be changed:

> 'Thus although location and size remain important, the functions cities perform and their ability to change appear to be more significant determinants of development potential' (Commission 1991:139)

This can be interpreted as a more voluntaristic view of the cities' possibilities and potential for changing their own situation[4]. The trademark of functional urban planning is now seen as a major part of the problem. Thus sub urbanisation and growth in traffic is partly caused by the functionalistic dictum of separating working and living places (Kjærsdam 1995). The policy to meet these challenges are messures to change peoples traffic habits as well as 'better general spatial co-ordination of workplaces and residences' (Commission 1991:140). The latter is very important and at the same time only feasible by means of strong regulation and planning tools. The future of the urban system, and the success criteria for cities within it is a matter of specialisation and competitive advantages:

> 'Each city is in competition with others in their areas of economic interest. Such <u>competition is likely to increase rather than diminish</u> although there may be scope for cities to develop complementary relations' (Commission 1991:141, emphasis added)

The single urban hierarchy of earlier times is expected to disappear in favour of a number of overlapping hierarchies. Nevertheless, it will probably be the urban areas of peripheral Europe that will be hit hardest by the increased competition created by the Single Market (Commission 1991:142). The large metropolitan centres are expected to retain their dominance in the global economy as well as the major European conurbations will continue to be the 'magnets' for international companies (Commission 1991:142), which is a metaphor of inevitability used to described the socio-spatial transformation processes.

The strategies suggested at local level, are concerning the creation of facilities and businesses in order to engage the local population, and are thus strategies with weight on the creation of institutions (Amin & Thrift 1995). Thus the general approach suggested is one of strategic planning and public-private partnerships in new institutional collaborations:

> 'Resolving the problems of Europe's cities in the coming decade will require a degree of strategic vision in order to <u>establish a city identity, to upgrade image and to market services</u>' (Commission 1991:148, emphasis added)

The question is, of course, who's image and who's conceptions of place-identity? There is the risk that these strategies will be the result of collaborations and strategic thinking at the level of influential 'stakeholders' in

institutional settings without democratic control. The key-elements in a successful strategy are: ability to adapt the economic base to new demands of specialisation; efficient transport infrastructure and communication links; a skilled work-force; quality of life; local institutional capacity and an open attitude towards establishing networks with other cities and regions (Commission 1991:148). Under the heading of strategic responses, the theme of 'image' is given a special treat. The importance of a city's image is stressed as significant to economic prospects:

> 'Image does not remain constant and can be coloured by particular events. For example, riots can quickly tarnish a city's reputation. Equally, prestigious international events can provide a boost such as for Barcelona and Seville in 1992 and Italian cities during the 1990 World Cup' (Commission 1991:148, emphasis added)

Thus the place-making activities of strategic collaborative alliances between influential stakeholders (Healey 1997a, 1997b), are the underlying strategic rationale of the Commission's vision of urban policy. This is especially seen as an opportunity through the increasing inter-urban networking activities and strategic alliances (Commission 1991:149).

At the end of the day, the whole exercise of making this first major document on EU spatial planning leads to the conclusion, that the lack of territorial cohesion and rational resource allocation must be met by a common and coherent view of the Community's territory at large (Commission 1991:197). Again, it is said, that planning of spatial development on this level should not be a substitute for national, regional and local planning. However, the Commission has since the making of this document, put pressure on the Community to adopt the theme of spatial development and planning in the Treaty. This has not happened, but when it does, it is hard to imagine that the question of sovereignty and subsidiarity will not be re-actualised, since such a move eventually will need the necessary institutional backing of some sort of planning system which has the primacy over national and lover levels. A vital initial step in this direction, is taken with the recommendation of the establishment of a Committee on Spatial Development - the CSD (Commission 1991:199).

The whole 'tone' of this particular document can be said to be very optimistic. Thus it is stressed that 'new location factors' will help the opening up of economic opportunities for peripheral regions and that the 'flexible production systems' are making firms more footloose and finally that their locational decisions in much higher degree will be influenced by qualitative lifestyle factors (Commission 1991). This scenario is build on a notion of 'competitive advantage' and 'balanced distribution of economic activity' (Commission 1991:191), that seems to neglect that the competition between regions in the EU not a priori will guarantee equal spatial development. Thus it has been said of *Europe 2000* that:

> 'this 'up beat' conclusion underplays the continuing, and indeed sharpening, difficulties faced by peripheral economies in times of economic depression when the 'core' and 'periphery' generally diverge' (Anderson & Goodman 1995:615)

4.2 Europe 2000+: Co-operation for European Territorial Development

Europe 2000+ is the indicator of the 'third stage' of supranational planning studies, putting spatial planning on the Commission's agenda (Williams 1996b:104). It is also the most authoritative of the planning documents so far (Zonneveld & Faludi 1996:43), that is prior to the *ESDP*. Of obvious changes since the presentation of the *Europe 2000* study, is the institutionalisation of the European Union (1993) as well as the further development of the enlargement process (i.e. the association agreements with the East European countries). The overall assessment is, that the territorial organisation of the Community is characterised by a trend towards greater 'complexity and diversity' (Commission 1994a:15). Thus changes in the configuration of territorial disparities are said to have led to 'new centres of gravity and new areas of common interest' (Commission 1994a:15). So the picture of the territorial development is drawn up by the means of the 'mosaic' metaphor:

> 'The result within the Union, in particular, is a mosaic in which areas of modernity and prosperity exists side by side with areas of depression' (Commission 1994a:15, emphasis added)

Even though the problem of deprivation is addressed, it is naturalised by means of the 'mosaic' metaphor that connotes difference, but not at the level of fragmentation or worse. Apart from the euphemistic character of the mosaic metaphor, it is also clear that the deprived areas are looked upon as the 'Other' of 'areas of modernity'. As in the other documents, the major reason for the interest in the deprived areas, is derived from the threat to economic and social cohesion of the Union. This of course coincides with the main objective of the Union (economic co-operation), but is certainly also a reflection of the underlying rationale of integration. So the integration rationale of the discourse draws upon the post-war 'Schumann philosophy' of political integration through the means of economic co-operation.

The basic assumptions of *Europe 2000+* is made on the background of the 'new model of sustainable development' that was launched in the White Paper on *Grotwh, Competitiveness and Employment. The Challenges and ways forward into the 21st century* (Commission 1993). The important thing here, is the assumption of 'decentralised competition' (Commission 1994a:16), which is a notion of economic development that matches the spatial model of 'polycentricity'. The attention to the problem of 'global competitiveness', is addressed through a concern for the risk of an increase in the imbalances in the Union which are arising 'autonomously' (Commission 1994a:16). Which of course is a naturalising view of the market mechanisms, but also an indication of the need for regulation and planning in order to address the 'excessive costs of conurbation' (Commission 1994a:16). Veggeland finds that the economic rationale behind the *Europe 2000+* is the theories of post-fordism, focusing on a development from 'economy of scale' to 'economy of scope' (Veggeland 1996:88-89). The policy goal is then to:

> 'Promote the development of intermediate sized cities and networks of small and medium-sized towns as regional centres of organisation and service' (Commission 1994a:17)

The ecological question is primarily addressed through the rationale of competitive economics. Thus, it is said that the environment plays an increasing role in the 'attractiveness of territories'. And further, an appeal is made to 'solidarity over environmental issues' (Commission 1994a:17). The quest for a more social and economic equal, spatial development (Article 130A), is in the urban field to be achieved by means of 'real integrated metropolitan systems' and joint actions between large conurbations (Commission 1994a:19). Thus a renewal of large urban centres should be combined with strong efforts to 'combat urbanisation of rural areas' (Commission 1994a:21).

The much discussed principle of subsidiarity, has to be applicated on any spatial organisation and policy within the Community (Commission 1994a:23). This is the only possibly way of getting legitimity behind the Commission's visions of a common spatial planning policy within the EU. However, this is also to run the risk of not being able to institutionalise and support a future spatial planning at EU level, thus the Commission moves in dangerous terrain. *Europe 2000+* can be seen as an attempt to consolidate the Commission's role in urban and regional policy. Due to divergent opinions and tensions between the EU member states, the process of making this document was deliberately closed (Newman & Thornley 1996:21). Likewise the policy making of the *Europe 2000+*, is seen as closed and decisions on funding restricted to a few knowledgeable partners (Newman & Thornley 1996:23)

The focus on making circulation of goods more easy must be seen as a way of satisfying the spreading principle of 'just-in-time' production. Accordingly the plans are trying to minimise the boundaries for circulation of goods so that less capital will be fixed. This is a very explicit attempt to acknowledge multinational capitalism's demand for smoother 'capital accumulation' (Harvey 1992). During this process, the time-geography of European territory is changing, since:

> 'Physical accessibility is measured increasingly in terms of costs and time rather than distance' (Commission 1994a:64)

The problem with this 'shrinking' Europe is, of course, that the pressure on the environment increases from the growing intensity of activities.

As in the preceding document, *Europe 2000*, this analysis also addresses the urban system separately. Again a 'more balanced urban system' is the goal. The idea of a 'polycentric urban system' is closely connected to the notion of cohesion and sustainability, since the development of such an urban system is in demand from a post-Fordistic economy (Veggeland 1996:92).The cities in a global capitalistic system are therefore seen as representatives of functional specialisation rather than individual 'nodes' within a horizontally spatial organization (Veggeland 1996:92). The polycentric urban system is needed for a number of reasons, among others because of the growth of metropolitan areas with its economic and environmental costs. The polycentric urban system can be said to operate on a level of horizontal integration where specialisation is being spread out on a number of urban centres. So the European discourse of urban space can be seen as founded on principles of functional and regional differentiation (Veggeland 1996:93). However, within the CSD, that there is no beating about the bush. The 'vocabulary of polycentrism' is not to be taken too seriously:

> 'This idea, to promote a 'polycentric urban structure', I have always regarded that as silly. To promote a balanced urban structure I find very sensible. But you can't promote a polycentric structure. I mean Paris is the centre and you can do as you want, but you can't force 6 million people to move out of Paris ... and therefore I find the term a little silly. (Interview with Derek Martin, member of the CSD and Co-ordinator of International Affairs at the Duch National Spatial Planning Agency, Den Haag 25. September 1996, in Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996b:21, emphasis added)

Historically the changes and movements within the European urban system has been profound, but nevertheless also of great historic continuity. Thus the urban landscape of the Union is characterised by:

> 'A close network of urban areas, marked by the location of a large number of important towns or cities relatively near to one another ... London and Paris are the only giant cities in the Union ... (Commission 1994a:95)

The development trend since the 1980's has been one of increasing urbanisation, relatively increased growth in cities with more than 500.000 inhabitants and what is termed 'decentralised concentration'. The future is estimated to be one of increasing growth in the large cities, due to various factors. Firstly, the economic development has increased the attraction of being located in or near a large city[5]. Secondly, the increasing internationalisation, the competition and development of more sophisticated and flexible production systems, are seen to be in favour of the large conurbations. So will the higher development level of infrastructure and telecommunications (Commission 1994a:97).

The problem of social exclusion is said to be a growing problem for most large cities in Europe. The causes of social exclusion are complex, but nevertheless it is stated that:

> 'Cities have been particularly affected by the structural changes which have resulted from the intensification of global competition and the pace of technological advance' (Commission 1994a:99, emphasis added)

So it is acknowledged by the Commission, that the forces of multinational capital has profound impact on the socio-spatial organisation of the cities. Thus detailed studies shows that:

> 'Social exclusion and spatial segregation threaten to be a growing problem in European cities and one which will not be solved by economic recovery alone' (Commission 1994a:103)

The solution is seen as one of establishing various compensatory programmes such as 'Contract de Ville' (France), 'City Challenge' (UK) as well as actions can be made through the Regional Development Funds of the EU (ERDF).

The need for 'sustainable urban planning' is called for (Commission 1994a:106). As the case of the Danish city of Aalborg shows, this concept is already being launched as a part of the city-promotion of this particular city (City of Aalborg 1996). Part of this strategy is to challenge the core idea of functional

planning, and thus seek to re-locate business and production closer to residential areas (Commission 1994a:106), so notions of the 'compact city' comes into mind.

Having focused on the large cities (more than 500.000 inhabitants), the theme of medium-sized towns and cities comes up. These are cities of 20.000 to 500.000 inhabitants, that plays a significant role in the urban system but which has not always been adequately recognised by policy-makers (Commission 1994a:106). This in undoubtedly correct, but the wide definitorial range (20.000-500.000) seems to result in a comparison of cities with fundamentally different conditions. Nevertheless, this is a part of the rationale behind the European discourse of urban space: When it comes to 'think European' we have to revise and relativise our former spatial scales of thought. Nielsen shows, that in the Danish case, the minimum level of European urban pattern equals what the Danish authorities so far has defined as regional centres (Nielsen 1996:42). The theoretical backcloth for analysing the potential of these cities are (again) one of economic competitiveness:

> 'Small and medium-sized towns and cities face a number of problems in <u>competing</u> <u>effectively with large cities</u> as places for people to live and for business to develop' (Commission 1994a:109, emphasis added)

The problem with the strategies of competitive advantages is, that they implies a specialisation that can lead to benefits as well as to risks. Thus it is concluded on this theme, that the time has come to consider a Europe-wide strategy for the 'balanced development of the urban system' (Commission 1994a:110).

In many ways the border areas is an interesting case when it comes to measuring the ability, possibility and explicit spatial consequences of the socio-spatial transformation processes. So the report sees these regions as nothing less than the 'testbeds' of European integration (Commission 1994a:127 and also Commission 1991:167). As an interesting explication of the rationale behind the ongoing integration processes in the border regions (end eventually in the EU at large), the cross-border cooperations are seen as expressions of the 'readiness to take advantage of opportunities created by economic liberalisation' (Commission 1994a:125). These cooperations can also be seen as the practical examples of what has been discussed as the 'Europe of the Regions'. So these cross-border activities trigger the spatial as well as the political imagination, since they are crossing what in reality is being acknowledged as the arbitrary demarcations of nation states (national borders). The problem is, that many of these initiatives mainly seems to be preoccupied with the economic potentials of expanding markets. Whether such activities are sufficient to lift the project of political, cultural and social integration is not at all clear. What is especially interesting concerning the external border regions, is the potential outcome of possible enlargements of the EU. Thus any enlargement towards the East will in many respects 're-locate' the national territory of Denmark for instance. So it might be possible to see Denmark 'moving' further towards a central position within this relative economic-political spatial configuration of the European Union. This possibility is called the 'continentalisation of Denmark' in the report (Commission 1994a:216). Part of the problem of imagining further integration and actual transnational planning in these areas is due to the different planning systems, cultures and doctrines of the member states (Commission 1994a:133, Faludi & van der Valk 1994). Thus the Commission initiatives concerning the production of further knowledge of planning (the European planning 'observatorium') and the establishment of the 'Planning Compendium' (Williams 1996b). The emergence of a 'new European dimension' can be seen in some of the member state's national spatial planning activities. Thus it is estimated that:

> 'The Fourth Note of the Dutch Government, The Danish national planning strategy, Towards 2018, and the German Raumordnungspolitische Orientierungsrahmen are perhaps the most far-reaching examples [of the European dimension]. The policy documents, all take the European context as a major starting point for the determination of many aspects of national spatial policy' (Commission 1994a:143)

The close and necessary connection between the EU funds and the system of spatial planning is acknowledged (Commission 1994a:144). This is clearly also the case of the latest development of the INTERREG-program with the INTERREG IIC's close connection to the ESDP (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996a, 1996b, 1996c). So the need for an institutional as well as financial foundation of a future

European spatial policy is acknowledged, even though it has to live a 'shadow life' until its adoption in the Treaty.

There is a notion of the Central Capital regions (the 'blue banana') as the 'nerve centre of the Union' (Commission 1994a:173). This area produces 35% of Union value-added, as well as it is responsible for many of the environmental problems (Commission 1994a:175). The dual process of increasing consumption and decreasing production within the urban core areas is identified (Commission 1994a:176). This trend is probably more general than just at the CCC-regional level. Thus it seems to be the general picture of many cities all over Europe today.

Excursus to a translational divergence

An interesting thing occurs when one reads the different translations of *Europe 2000+*. The 'tone' and the connotations are dramatically different in the Danish and the English translations. For example, the word 'solidarity' of the Danish translation is not to be found in the equivalent place in the English text. Instead we find the words 'common interest', which must be said to be a semantic slide towards a less committed and emotional vocabulary (Commission 1994a:15, in both versions). In the Danish text, where the notions of what probably would be termed 'sneaking urbanisation' (p. 21, the Danish version) and 'urban dessert formation' (p. 175, the Danish version) is found, one will search in vain even to find some milder expressions of these phenomena in the English version. Now, the problem of language has been addressed before in connection to European spatial planning (Williams 1996b:55-62), but not to this extent. A very tentative and preliminary conclusion from reading the Danish and the English versions of *Europe 2000+*, is that the Danish translation is more associative and colourful in its vocabulary. What the reason for this divergence might be, is harder to tell. One possibility is, that it is a case of mere translational coincidence. Another, is that there is a link to the national attitude towards European spatial planning. The Danish version corresponds to its pro-EU spatial planning attitude and the opposite in the English case. If such an, admittedly wild, hypothesis should be verified, one should find the same 'tone and colour' in the German and Dutch versions as in the Danish. However, it is puzzling why it is only the case with this document and not with its predecessor *Europe 2000*? However, this divergence creates a hermeneutical problem in interpreting and analysing the documents. Not only for academics, but certainly also for politicians and planners that tries to relate to the European discourse of urban space. Thus further research into these matters seems to be rather important.

4.3 The Regional Development Studies

The European Commission has also sponsored several regional studies. These studies are launched under the DGXVI, with the important clause that they do not reflect the official position of the Commission. Thus their status within the European discourse of urban space is in a way peripheral to the core discourse. Nevertheless they reflect important, and sometimes overlapping, view points. The most fruitful way of perceiving these documents is perhaps to consider them being on the outskirts of the central corpus of documents that characterise the European discourse of urban space.

The 1992 study *Urbanisation and the functions of cities in the European Community*, can be seen as an example of the Commission's interest in putting the urban theme on the agenda (Commission 1992:12). However, the subsidiarity principle, implies that national and urban governments will play the major, and the Commission a more limited role in responding to urban problems (Commission 1992:209). The basic assumption is a rejection of a single urban hierarchy, in favour of a model of 'overlapping hierarchies' within the 'old core', the 'new core' and the 'periphery' of the Community's territory. Thus the centre-periphery model is dismissed in favour of a model of more heterogeneous development (Commission 1992:46-7). The vocabulary is one of post-industrialism, stressing the processes of 'economic globalization' and the importance of the service sector, as well as focusing on new 'entrepreneurial urban decision-makers' in public-private partnerships with a 'strategic awareness of playing in Europe' (Commission 1992:14, 21, 23). The study identifies a 'cycle of urban change' from urbanisation, sub-urbanisation, de-urbanisation to re-urbanisation. In the world's oldest industrial regions in North-West Europe, the urbanisation process is ending (Commission 1992:61). The medium sized and smaller cities have grown during the last three decades, leading to a more balanced urban system. But from the late 1980's there has been a demographic and economic renaissance in many of the larger cities in Europe (Commission 1992:17). The increasing competition between the cities is seen as an important way of strengthening the European economy, but this

development must be accompanied by a urban dimension of the regional policy (Commission 1992:24). So the notion is one of competitiveness, but with an underlying awareness of the uneven result of such processes, at least for some types of cities:

> 'However, the majority of citizens in Europe still live in small or medium-sized cities. These smaller and medium-sized cities are in danger of being <u>relative 'losers' in the international competition between cities</u>, unless they are situated in the immediate hinterland of the metropoles to which they are increasingly functionally linked' (Commission 1992:65, emphasis added)

Two distinct, and reverse, processes has characterised the urban development. One has been decentralisation from the established metropolitan areas in some sectors (back office functions and high-tech industry), and the other has been a re concentration within metropolitan centres and their suburbs (high-level business services, prestigious arts and cultural industries) (Commission 1992:49). The increasing tendency to networking between cities, are seen as important processes of knowledge transfer, economic co-operation and mechanisms for lobbying (Commission 1992:97). European cities are the major environmental offenders (Commission 1992:153), and this is not at least due to the development in traffic:

> 'Average traffic speeds in London, Paris and other European cities have already fallen to a mere 10 m.p.h.' (Commission 1992:146)

The response to the urban problems comes from a more 'activist and entrepreneurial' type of European city leadership (Commission 1992:163). So we are facing the 'rise of the entrepreneurial European city' due to multiple interrelated causes:

> 'The emergence of <u>the entrepreneurial city</u> in Europe during the 1980s was driven by many factors: the impact of economic restructuring; political and administrative decentralisation; the limitations of national regional policies; the renaissance of interest in urban living and the awareness of increasing economic competition between cities after the creation of the single market in 1992' (Commission 1992:163, emphasis added)

Interestingly, this notion of creativity and entrepreneurial cities draws on a Schumpeterian idea of capitalism as an expression of 'creative destruction' and competition, as well as neo-liberal and neo-classical economic rationales. Metaphors as these, are an indication of market-led competition rather than state-led planning. A case study of Rotterdam shows clearly, that these new economic 'miracles' have their prize. Thus Rotterdam's economic revival coexisted with an unemployment rate of 20% (Commission 1992:172).

In the 1995 study *The Nordic countries - what impact on planning and development in the Union?* (Commission 1995b), the capital cities are identified as central nodes in a settlement system which includes the European border region cities in the South and the South-west (Commission 1995:11). As a result of the new political and economic situation in the East Europe, a 'third European core area' might be in the making in Norden (Commission 1995:15)[6]. This study sees the potentiality for the Nordic countries as partly a result of this new situation, and partly as the result of the increasing congestion and environmental problems in the European 'banana' areas (Commission 1995:15). Three major transregions are in the making in this part of Europe: the Greater Baltic Region, the Greater Barents Region and the North Sea Region. Within the Greater Baltic Region the core-agglomeration will presumably be the 'twin-city hub' of Copenhagen/Malmö which boasts a combined population of 2.5 million (Commission 1995:16).

The theoretical backcloth of this study is one of hierarchical settlement structures and functional regions. The vertically integrated, functional regions are assessed on the basis of presence or absence of economically dynamic urban agglomerations (Commission 1995:115). But the wisdom of the classic central place theories are running into difficulties, as the large conurbations today are faced with serious problems with congestion and environmental degradation. So the apparent advantages of 'flexible production specialisation systems and technological advanced service communications and transport infrastructure' are diminishing (Commission 1995:117). This makes a stronger case for a regional 'mosaic development', away from centralisation tendencies. But there is a limit to the mosaic model:

'Yet, to all intents and purposes, it has to be admitted that the spatial organisation in Europe and Norden resembles the hierarchical settlement pattern perceived by Christaller, caused by predominantly vertical functional forces: the little village settlement or farming community on the European periphery at the bottom of the hierarchical scale, and the large information capitals and industrial conurbations of European core at the top' (Commission 1995:117)

So much for the mosaic model! The problem is of course, the immense complexity of the contemporary socio-spatial transformation processes. The new thing that this study capture, is the trend of a new form of region building. Thus the vertical functional hierarchy of the 'traditional' urban system is now being supplemented by horizontally functional regions. This process is especially important in the less populated areas where this kind of region building is partly compensating for the lack of larger urban agglomerations (Commission 1995:18).

The 1996 study *Prospects for the development of the central and capital cities and regions* (Commission 1996), is concentrating on the CCC-regions, that is the Central and Capital Cities and regions and thus the traditional heart of economic growth as we know it under the label 'the Blue Banana'. The methodology of SWOT-analysis and Delphi rounds are indications of the increasing impact of business concepts within planning discourses (Healey 1996:3). The object of the study, the CCC-regions, are considered to be the 'main gateways to the world economy' and 'centres of gravity of Europe' (Commission 1996:25, 37), which implies that an 'us-them' exclusion from the 'good company' only can be overcome by sailing up-stream through these gateways to world-economic growth. The movement towards 'polynuclaer metropolises' is interpreted as leading to a less clear urban hierarchy. But in spite of seeing the socio-spatial development trends through the lens of economic competitiveness, the study explicitly points at an interesting problem:

'There is a particular problem for the polycentric metropolitan systems in this respect, where not only the core/suburbs but separate centres within the system tends to exist in a state of <u>unconstructive competition</u> with each other' (Commission 1996:28, emphasis added)

Now this is an interesting observation made within the paradigm and framework of a growth and competitive oriented economic discourse, and is (at least) and indicator of the complexity of notions of economic growth and its consequences. The CCC-regions are at the same time seen as the 'motors of European economy' holding a 'spearhead position', and as being under strong external pressure. So the difficulty of creating enough new jobs, the increasing immigration and the external competition illustrates that the CCC is in a relative rather than an absolute successful position. The definition of what should be considered urban and thus also how an urban system can be conceptualised, is addressed in this study:

'An urban system can be defined as an international, national or regional set of urban areas which are interdependent in such a way (demonstrated by their linkages) that any significant change in the economic activities, occupational structure, total income or population of one member urban area will directly or indirectly bring about some modification in the economic activities, occupational structure, total income or population of one or more other members of the set' (Commission 1996:155-6)

Obviously this implies a notion of 'interdependency' that any system-theory must address in some way, but the most striking thing about this definition is its economistic understanding of the urban phenomenon. This reduction of the city to be mainly a field of economic activity is a general condition of the status of the city within the European discourse of urban space.

The idea of measuring the relative positions within an urban hierarchy is not new, and this study does also address this problem. The Reclus and the RPD measures are lined up, and it is concluded that whatever the criteria used, the six metropolitan systems tend to head the European hierarchies (Commission 1996:166) - the persistence of the 'blue banana'. This is an economic reduction of the urban space within the discourse, as well as the idea of measuring the relative positions on a quantitative scale clearly can be contested as not very reliable (Harding 1995, 1996).

The study is also an expression of the potentialities of the 'new de-industrialised economy' and 'footloose production', in which the CCC is considered to have good opportunities and where the most important inter-urban relations are those which link capital, control and decision functions of the metropolitan system (Commission 1996:168). Thus the notion of an economy of 'flows' is articulated (Castells 1996, Lash & Urry 1994). The cities that makes the skeleton of the European urban system, has a long history and the most important European areas created in the period 1500-1800 remain the backbone of today's urban network (Commission 1996:170). Within this system the study points to trends of spatial polarisation and competition rather than co-operation:

> 'Despite the growing internationalisation of society as a whole, the general trend is that the CCC metropolitan systems, although they try to secure their future by strengthening their international position, do not give much proof of inter metropolitan co-operation. Thus the <u>metropolises are rather more competitors than complementary systems</u> ... At this moment the trends do not allow much optimism as far as the inter metropolitan cohesion is concerned' (Commission 1996:170, emphasis added).

The current situation is considered to be rather problematic, because of the 'ever-changing challenges' from the US, Japan or the new economic powers in Asia (the rest of the 'Triad'). Here we find a recourse to the 'traditional' European identity-discourse. Not only are there some internal problems, but 'our' position is threatened by the 'Others' that will never stop their hunt for market shares. The core of this economic discourse of competitiveness can be said to be founded on a notion of exclusion of the 'Other'. The new interesting thing is, that the 'identity-work' of the various economic oriented Euro-discourses are returning to the enemy-pictures of earlier times - the 'West-and-the-rest' Emperial discourses.

Addressing the problems of the urban areas outside the CCC system, this study acknowledges the increasing growth in smaller and medium-sized cities, but with a clear notion that 'European economic integration is likely to be of greatest benefit to the most central cities' (Commission 1996:194). Thus the large and medium-sized cities outside the metropolitan areas can be seen fulfilling a service-centre role for their own hinterlands and thereby position themselves within a functional hierarchy of national and international urban space. The idea of 'functional specialisation' combined with geograpical position and good infrastructure are found to be the determinants of the potential of urban areas (Commission 1996:195). Here the use of 'image building' is acknowledged as an important 'discipline' when it comes to position one self within the competitive urban space of Europe (Commission 1996:197). The processes of social spatialisation, as they appear in place-myths and social constructions of places (Shields 1992b), are seen as important supplements to 'hard' economic strategies of place making. At the end of this study, the growth strategies of international capitalism, are supplemented by introduction of the dimensions of ecology and social equity. Thus is it stated that 'growth should be well managed' as well as 'equity and social justice' should be addressed by the Community's urban strategies in order to 'move to a better future' (Commission 1996:205, 249). Thus the real dilemmas for the European discourse of urban space are addressed on the last two pages, without much more than kind words and noble aspirations.

The Green Book on Urban Environment

This document underlines the need for an urban policy in Europe (Commission 1990). The green book never became 'white', that is binding in terms of its proposals (Mantouvalou et. al. 1995:191). This document has been characterised as an example of the affinity between the current societal planning doctrines and post-modernism. Accordingly the neo-rationalistic urban theories of Leon Krier is seen as the ideal of the Green Book's visions of urban space and planning (Nylund 1993:16). The Green Book can also be seen as a part of turn of planning towards processes and form. Some theorists see this as a post-modern re-constitution of space with focus on form and environmentalist values (Healey 1995:255). The document in it self does not seem to have had 'official' influence on the discourse of European urban space. Thus Williams says, that the 'green book' proved to be something of a false dawn for EU urban policy (Williams 1996b:86). However, the ideas of this document should not be totally dismissed since they might resurface in another form or in a different context. As well as it might have helped push the environmental agenda forward.

The White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment

The document the Commission send out in 1993 called the White Paper on *Growth, Competitiveness and Employment. The Challenges and ways forward into the 21st century* is also an important part of the rationale behind the discourse of urban space. On the background of 17 million unemployed people in the Community (1993), this document announced a 'new growth strategy'. There is a 'heroic tone' and rhetoric style in this document, as for instance in the slogan-like assessment of the information society: 'Tomorrow's world is already with us'. But more substantially is the contradictory signals when it comes to assessing the conditions for growth and competitiveness. At the one hand it is said that the market economy has decentralising effects, and:

> 'Hence the growing importance of the local level at which all the ingredients of political action blend together most successfully and partnership networks are developing' (Commission 1993:8)

And some pages later the market economy is described like this:

> 'The market ... spontaneously promotes concentration, thereby creating inequality between the regions and the towns. Awareness of these insufficiencies has led our countries to develop <u>collective solidarity mechanisms</u> (Commission 1993:11, emphasis in the original)

This evaluation of the market economy is swinging from being a localising decentraliser with partnership-effect to a concentrating mechanism with diversifying effects. The document draws heavily on the vocabulary of competitiveness and globalisation:

> 'We must increasingly think in terms of competitive rather than comparative advantages. Comparative advantages traditionally relate to endowment in factors such as netural resources and are therefore fairly rigid. Competitive advantages are based on more qualitative factors and can thus be influenced to a large degree by corporate strategies and by public policies' (Commission 1993:60)

This policy must stimulate a development of 'clusters' of competitive activities that draws on the regional diversity of the Community, as well as it must 'facilitate a revival in consumption'. So in order to keep up with the two others in the 'Triad' (United States and Japan), the Community must put its efforts behind a strategy that is based on a mix between a knowledge-based economy, a sustainable development of industry and a reduction in the time-lag between demand and supply. So again we find the contradictory notion of growth and sustainability within the Community's strategy. The document ends with a vision of a new 'sustainable development model' that must be invented if the dual problem of to little labour and to much use of nature resources shall be solved. It is characteristic that this problem is formulated in the vocabulary of equilibrium and thus draws on neo-classical economic theory. This is most obvious when the dual problem is described as an 'under-use of labour force' combined with an 'over-use of natural and environmental resources' (Commission 1993:178-179). Apart from various policies concerning the internalisation of external environmental costs (the US model), one of the basic problems of competitiveness is that of Europe's relatively high labour costs. Thus in order to improve the competitive standard one must either increase the productivity or face a de-crease in labour costs (wages). Needless to say, it is the former of these strategies that the Commission wants to pursue.

4.4 From Leipzig to Noordwijk - the various CSD-documents

The process that leads to the *European Spatial Development Perspective* (ESDP) is a rather complex history of the institutionalisation and 'making' of the object of the European discourse of urban space. Any genealogical analysis of institutional history will have to take its start somewhere. This narrative shall take the year 1989 as its beginning, but also note that the object of the discourse has been in the making for longer than since 1989. Thus the works of CEMAT since 1970 has had some influence, as well as the *Gendebien Report* of 1983 and the *Torremolinos Charter* of 1984 (Williams 1996b: 77-80). Nevertheless, this 'story' starts with the first informal meeting between the ministers responsible for spatial planning and development in Nantes 1989. Here began the long row of meetings that since were held in Turin 1990, The Hauge 1991, Lisbon 1992, Liège 1993, Corfu June 1994, Leipzig September 1994, Strasbourg 1995, Madrid 1995 and Venice 1996. At all meetings the ministers of spatial planning and development gathered with their senior civil servants to discuss the territorial development of the Community. It is characteristic that these meetings are informal and that there is not any official publications from the meetings of this forum. Nevertheless the documents can be provided, with a little ingenuity and help from, for example the Danish National Spatial Planning Agency.

The Liege-meeting of 1993 states that there is a need for the development of a 'pan-European approach to development', as well as the making of the *Europe 2000* report and the frequent meetings of the CSD is praised. It was at this meeting, that it was formally decided to draw up the *ESDP*. In the rather lengthy document from the 1994 Corfu meeting, the coming *ESDP* is praised in high terms:

> 'In preparing the European Spatial Development Perspective, all Member States can be enriched economically, environmentally and culturally' (Informal Council of Regional and Spatial Planning Ministers 1994:37)

The 'Leipzig principles'

The so-called 'Leipzig principles' from the informal minister meeting of 21.-22. September 1994 deserves a little more attention, since it is here that the basic rationale of the European discourse of urban space is constituted (CSD 1994). This document is an 'internal' CSD-document where the basic principles of the CSD work is to be found. The Leipzig principle evolve around 'cohesion' as a driving referential. In the document it is said that:

> 'spatial development can contribute in a decisive way to the achievement of the goal of economic and social cohesion' (CSD 1994:2)

The thing to notice here is that the more neutral term 'spatial development' is being introduced and used by the CSD (Zonneveld & Faludi 1996:48). The document can be seen as a mixture of allegations, declarations of intent and political restrictions (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996a:16). The Principles for a European Spatial Policy are synthesised as follows (CSD 1994:1):

> ✎ spatial development can contribute in a decisive way of the achievement of the goal of economic and social cohesion
> ✎ the existing competences of the responsible institutions for Community policies remain unchanged; the ESDP may contribute to the implementation of Community policies which have an territorial impact, but without constraining the responsible institutions in exercising their responsibilities
> ✎ the central aim will be to achieve sustainable and balanced development
> ✎ it will be prepared respecting existing institutions and will be non-binding on Member States
> ✎ it will respect the principle of subsidiarity
> ✎ each country will take it forward according to the extent it wishes to take account of European spatial aspects in its national policies (CSD 1994:1)

So on this basis the *ESDP* should integrate three components:

✎ a polycentric urban system, as balanced as possible, discouraging excessive concentration around some and the marginalisation of peripheral areas
✎ a network of environmentally acceptable and efficient infrastructure, strengthening the cohesion of the Community territory
✎ a European network of open spaces for the protection of natural resources, with protection areas classified according to their different functions (CSD 1994:4)

The policies of non-binding recommendations and declarations are encapsulated by the term 'soft law' (Giannakourou 1996:606). This is an indication of a move from 'positive' co-ordination towards 'negative' co-ordination, based on non-binding principles, voluntary and decentralised spatial planning (Giannakourou 1996:607). So this is a part of the 'new institutionalisation' of EU policies, with its diminishing public and democratic control. It should be noticed, that even though the 'Leipzig principles' are the basis of the *ESDP*, they are not considered 'eternal and holy' principles by the CSD (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996b:21).

As with most of the other documents of this discourse, the intellectual backcloth is theories of globalisation and international competitiveness. Thus the globalisation of the economy and the information society are mentioned as important factors that the *ESDP* must take into account (CSD 1994:3). Because of these new trends in the socio-spatial development processes, the old vocabulary of spatial planning is found insufficient. What is needed is new concepts that can face the challenges confronting the European Union (CSD 1994:5). So the search for a new spatial imaginary is launched. The so-called 'cohesion principle' implies the need for a relatively 'balanced poly-centric urban pattern' (CSD 1994:6). This is needed since the urban structure of Europe reflects a hierarchical organisation, because of the urban areas' functional specialisation within a frame of global competition. The major cities within the urban space is decribed by the 'motor metaphor'.

The next meeting in the series of informal meeting was the Strasburg meeting i March 1995. Here the development of three trend scenarios led to the formulation of three questions, that the *ESDP* must address. Firstly, how can a balanced and sustainable development of the European territory be ensured? Secondly, how can long term profitability of this territory be guaranteed in development projects? And thirdly, how can all of the sectoral actions be integrated in a holistic approach? At the Madrid meeting in 1995, the 'Leipzig principles' of urban systems, infra- & infostructure and natural & cultural heritage, was supplemented by a fourth theme of the 'socio-economic system' (Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning 1995a:3). The Spanish presidency also advocated, that the level of analysis was raised from the national level to an overall vision of the European territory. An analytical framework was made in order to address the 'European territorial phenomena' (Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning 1995a:3). At this stage of the process, the 'construction of the object' through scientific expertice must be said to be very explicit. The Madrid-framework suggests a reference of the 'different realities of European territory' to the following criterias:

✎ the relative geographical position within the European Union
✎ the level of integration into the European competitive model
✎ the level of intensity of internal and external territorial inter-linking within the European Union
✎ the potential for sustainable development (Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning 1995a:3)

Within these catagories, the questions of centrality versus peripherality, high versus low economic integration, strong versus weak in territorial inter-linking and development versus natural constraints on the goal of sustainability was addressed. In rather sharp formulations, the underlying dilemma of growth versus sustainability and equity is explictly pronounced, as well as there is expressed concern for certain territories where the two-fold objective of re-balanced and sustainable development might not be within reach. Much of the point of this exercise of tracking down and identifying the problems, is to show how divergent they are perceived due to differences in location, integration and economic development. So the Madrid document stresses that any further study of these matters, must be conducted within the 'spirit of consensus' (Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning 1995a:11). It is concluded, that the lines of action established in Leipzig for the elaboration of the *ESDP* must be supplemented by the following four fundamental criteria:

✎ the geograpichal position (central/preipheral)
✎ the level of economic integration
✎ the intensity of territorial inter-linking
✎ the potential for sustainable development (Informal Council of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning Ministers 1995a:12)

The processes of the elaboration of the *ESDP* is said to be 'open, participative and consensual' in character, which might deserve the label of wishful thinking rather than an acurate empirical description of the reality.

4.5 The European Spatial Development Perspective - first official draft

The first official draft of the *European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP)*, (CSD 1997), was published at the Noordwijk meeting of the spatial planning ministers, on 9.-10. June 1997 under the Duch presidency. Various expectations has been expressed from researchers, politicians and civil servants conserning this document. Some has been fairly quick to dismiss it as a 'paper tiger' while others believe that it will be of major importance for European spatial planning and development in the future. Part of the reason for interpreting the *ESDP* as a superficial and merely political statement without real importance, is the many reservations when it comes to the legal binding forces of this document. On the other hand, the rather long gestation process combined with the huge efforts of planning ministers and high-ranking national civil servants over many years, indicates a high level of political realism (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996a:16). Generally speaking, this first official version of the ESDP (CSD 1997) is a more streamlined document than its preceeding draft versions (CSD 1996d, 1996e, 1996f). This is only to be expected, since the official document is the direct result of the negotiation between the member states. However, there are points from the informal draft versions that needs to be remembered, even though they are not in the official document. These thoughts are nevertheless part of the discourse, as it was shaped and articulated at that given time and will thus be drawn upon when ever relevant.

The 'Leipzig principles' are acknowledged as the foundation of the new spatial approach at the European level. Thus the three fundamental goals are:

✎ Economic and social cohesion
✎ Sustaianble development
✎ Balanced competitiveness of the European territory (CSD 1997:1)

The rationale, or the raison d'être of the *ESDP* is to interveen in the development of competing regions, cities and territories, in order to secure a better balance between competition and co-operation. This should be done in order to reach the 'optimum level of competitiveness' of the European territory at large (CSD 1997:2). The *ESDP* is thus an expression of a new planning scale as well as it is seen as a 'shared vision' of the European territory. The concensus dimension and the non-binding character are still mandatory. The goal of the *ESDP* is thus twofold, since the increasing diversity within the territory is addressed, as well as the external competitiveness of the EU. The delicate balance between a strategy of equity and competitiveness is a build-in problem of the *ESDP*-rationale. In the light of future development (i.e. the enlargement), the *ESDP* should be understood as a process rather than a finished product (CSD 1997:4). The introduction of this 'spatial approach at the European level' ends with the rather bold words:

'Territory becomes a common denominator, the subject for a new type of social contract'
(CSD 1997:7, emphasis added)

The status of this document is one of continuiation of the planning process that started in 1989 with the first informal minister meeting. So the goals of the Corfu meeting (Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning 1994), are still the guiding principles. Thus the *ESDP* should become a 'concerted, selective, progressive, on-going, flexible and transparent process' (CSD 1997:4)[7]. The principle of selectivity results in a selection of a limited number of activities that the *ESDP* addresses. These were laid down in the 'Leipzig principles' as:

✎ a balanced and polycentric urban system

    ✎ parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge
    ✎ prudent management and development of the natural and cultural heritage (CSD 1997:5)

This exact division of goals is similary to the 1997 Danish National Planning Report (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997) . Given the initial reserach questions, the focus here will mainly be on the first of these principles (though they can not be seperated in practice). The methodological tools includes the use of SWOT analysis, in order to identitfy the strengths and weaknesses as well as the opportunities and threats. Thus we find the methodological influence of the business discourse on planning (Healey 1996:3), and an indication of inspiration from a planning theoretical school often labeled 'strategic planning' (Kaufman & Jacobs 1996:325).

In identifying the spatial issues of this new European dimension, the *ESDP* stands on the 'shoulders' of the Commssion's earlier documents, particulary the *Europe 2000+* (CSD 1997:9).
The basic geographical caracteristics of Europe is said to give rise to an inherent centre-periphery dichotomy. As in the earlier studies of the European spatial development, the demographic trends are analysed and the main ones are said to be the relatively low rate of population growth, an increase in the average age of the population and growing migration (CSD 1997:11). On the background of these trends, it is concluded that:

> 'The result of these trends is to reinforce already dominant urbanisation patterns in the
> near future' (CSD 1997:12)

The economic factors that are seen to influence the spatial development are: globalisation, new technological trends, the increasing intangible character of the economy, and the impact of agreements reached in the context of, for example, the World Trade Organisation (CSD 1997:13). These factors result in four important trends: the distribution of larger, medium and small enterprises, the internationalisation of trade within Europe, the potential impact of the EMU and further economic liberalisation and the new communication technologies. All these economic development trends have the potential for increasing the imbalance of the European territory (CSD 1997:14). Finally the environmental trends of waste reduction and management, climate change, loss of biodiversity, acidification and pesticides, freshwather management and forest degradation should be considered (CSD 1997:15-16).

After analysing these generel trends of importance for the socio-spatial development, the focus is turned on more specific topics. One of these is the changes in urban structures. Again the uniqueness of the European urban system is acknowledged, as its strong urban structure with few global metropolises and a large number of cities and towns relatively close to eash other is highlighted (CSD 1997:16). The dynamic socio-spatial changes of technological, political, social and economic character are said to be changing the orientation of the hierarchical functional relationships of the urban system, so:

> 'Cities and towns are having to adapt to their new relative locations and to their new
> positions in the European urban hierarchy' (CSD 1997:16)

The emergence of new networks of towns and cities are seen as one of the ways of enhancing the 'global competitiveness' of Europe. So the urban areas are seen to have different economic opportunities depending on their characteristics and spatial level of action. The analysis operates with the international, national and regional levels. Urban areas at the international level, will accumulate international and other functions and is divided into 'global cities', 'metropolitan regions' and 'capital cities' (CSD 1997:17-18). The cities and towns at the national level defines a more diverse category, and within this the analysis operates with 'peripheral cities with a weaker urban function' and 'older industrial cities' (CSD 1997:18). These types of cities might face major difficulties, depending on their ability to develop 'new economies'. Finally the cities and towns at regional level are divided into three catagories: 'regional level cities in the core area', 'regional cities outside the core area' and 'medium-sized cities in predominantly rural regions' (CSD 1997:18). At this level, the economic performance is seen to depend a lot on the city location. It is concluded that:

> 'Although these generalisations give a broad picture of the changing opportunities, almost
> every individual town and city will have to assess its own potential and adapt its

development strategy in the light of its own territorial circumstances' (CSD 1997:18, emphasis added)

In this increasing inter-urban competition it is acknowledged, that the European territory is not a 'level playing field'. Thus a number of negative development trends characterise the socio-spatial development of the urban space. Urban sprawl is continuing in accordance with an increasing 'need' of space. So villages, towns and cities continue to expand in an often relatievly uncontrolled manner. This development trend is fundamentally against the concept of the sustainable city (CSD 1997:19), and is actualising the discussion about the 'compact city'. Social segregation in the cities are increasing along side with the high rate of long-term unemployment in many cities. The quality of the urban environment is not improving, and is causing problems with noise, air pollution, water pollution, traffic congestation and waste production (CSD 1997:19). The future of the rural areas is becoming increasingly dependent on their urban settlements, due to the continuing urbanisation that creates a pressure from the cities on their rural hinterlands. At the same time, the cities benefits economically and socially from the rural hinterland's attractiveness (CSD 1997:20). Then the SWOT analysis of the urban structures is outlined (CSD 1997:22, emphasis added) (see table):

The SWOT analysis of the *ESDP* does not try to estimate whether the development of strengths overrides the development of weaknesses, which is very sensible considering the qualitative nature of these trends and factors.

The next theme of the analysis is the access to infrastructure and knowledge. To sum up from the SWOT analysis, one could say that the infrastructure theme is divided between a positive trend of strong spatial coherence, improvement of accessibility and efficiency versus a negative trend of concentration, increasing aggravation and pollution (CSD 1997:33). The case of access to knowledge is divided between knowledge intensive and innovative milieus versus uneven geographical diffusion of the 'Information Society'. The continuing pressure on Europe's natural and cultural heritage is the next analytical theme. Again the SWOT analysis summs up the situation. The natural heritage concerns a dilemma between increased collective awareness of the need of prudent management versus the problems of areas with increased pollution and degradation. The cultural heritage is divided by trends of increasing creativity, innovation and conservation versus uniformisation, standardisation and over-conservation (CSD 1997:37).

After these analysis, the impact of Community policies on the European territory is addressed. The preliminary conclusion is, that there is a need for a more balanced geograpichal distribution of productive activities, a more sustainable land use and a greater responsiveness to specific spatial needs (CSD 1997:45). The *ESDP* is seen as the potential 'great unifier' of Community policies:

> 'As with all the other Community policies, those with a clear spatial impact are pursuing specific objectives within a relatively focused perspective. These policies are discussed and adopted in specialised forums. There is therefore a significant risk of decisions with diverging rationales being made, the ourcomes of which may turn out to be conflicting. This situation, in the longer term, may weaken the effectiveness of the different policies and jeopardise the optimal use of available public resourses. The potential for the ESDP to promote greater consistency of Community Policies should therefore be put at the very heart of the debate on European spatial planning' (CSD 1997:45-46, emphasis added)

(III)	Strength/Opportunities	Weakness/Threats
A1	Emergence of urban clusters in regions with <u>high spatial coherence</u> Emergence of <u>networks</u> of cities at the continental, transnational or regional levels (but at an embryonic stage, limited to exchanges of experience and without any real strategic dimension) Regions with <u>a relatively balanced urban system</u>	In sparsely populated regions and/or regions with lower spatial coherence, difficulty of establishing the urban clusters/urban networks necessary to obtain <u>a critical mass of facilities and investments</u>. In certain border areas, towns are 'turning their becks on each other' <u>Strong competition between cities</u>, with the risk of over provision of infrastructure and of waste of resources <u>Imbalances in the system</u> of cities in certain regions: cases of polarisation around a very influential metropolis, cases of 'coastalisation' process at the expence of the hinterland
A2	World-wide influence of <u>competitive global cities</u>, such as London and Paris Development of <u>mobile investment in certain attractive peripheral regions</u> (but need to ensure diffusion of the benefits in the neighbouring regions) Links of 'gateway-cities' with certain parts of the world, <u>contributing to the international influence of the Union</u> and to a re-balancing of its metropolitan functions + similar phenomenon: privileged links between cities of the Union and neighbouring non-member countries	<u>Cities with old manufacturing industries</u>, facing major problems: need for economic reconversion/ diversification, lack of social cohesion Other cities depending on <u>a too narrow economic base</u> (port or tourism industry, public administrations etc.) <u>Difficulty in ensuring the economic dynamism of certain rural towns</u>
A3	<u>Attractiveness of urban districts for certain categories of households</u> (single-parent households, elderly people etc.) which could favour the repopulating of inner city areas In certain regions, successful <u>'compact city' policies</u> Pilot schemes of <u>integrated, multisectoral strategic planning</u> in urban regions integrating the economic, social and environmental dimensions New methods for <u>closing cycles</u> (waste, water, energy) <u>of urban eco-systems</u> <u>New location and mobility policies</u> in certain urban regions	<u>Scattered urban sprawl</u> in many regions <u>Social segregation</u>, urban neighbourhoods in crisis. Industrial and other urban derelict lands. Insufficient mixing of functions (housing, economic activity, green spaces) in certain neighbourhoods. Problems generated by land and real estate speculation <u>Urban waste production</u> + energy/water consumption are often excessive <u>Increased urban nuisances</u> (noise, pollution, congestion of traffic)

As a continuation of the analytical work, the need for more knowledge should be met by agreeing on a number of spatially relevant criteria and indicators. Seven themes needs to be addressed in the future making of EU spatial policies (CSD 1997:47-48):

    1) Geographical position (accessibility, central/peripheral, climate)
    2) Economic strenght (economic output, unemployment, trade relations)
    3) Social integration (level of interaction between different groups in society)
    4) Spatial integration (opportunities and level of interaction within and between areas)
    5) Land use pressure (probability for conflict, over- and under demand)
    6) Natural assets (characteristics of ecosystems)
    7) Cultural assets (landscapes, buildings, tourist opportunities)

These seven areas should be seen as an attempt to set the agenda for further work on European spatial planning, and are thus subject to changes during such a process. Moreover, it is suggested that alternative long term scenarios up to the year 2015 needs to be made in order to qualify the planning (CSD 1997:49).

The third part of the *ESDP* contains the policy aims and options for the European territory. Again the three goals of the 'Leipzig principles' are seen as the basic framework of the analysis, but the theme of a balanced and polycentric urban system has been added the topic of a 'new urban-rural relationship' (CSD 1997:52). As it will be seen in the analysis of the Danish national discourse of urban space, this theme is re-emerging on the national agendas as well. This means that the urban areas are explicitly defined by their relation to the rural areas. On the basis of the development trends that was analysed in the SWOT analysis, it is stated that:

'Cohesion cannot be achieved simply by taking account of the inter-regional dimension; the inter-urban dimension is equally important. A spatial concept considering only a single urbanised center and 'the remainder of the territory' is unacceptable. What is required is rather the development of new prospects offered to the periphery, which could thereby favour a more polycentric organisation of the territory. At the transnational and regional levels, imbalances of the same kind call for policies that assist cities to complement each other in order to ensure that each remains competitive. The environmental and social well being of cities is a parameter for their economic validity. Only sustainable cities will be competitive' (CSD 1997:53, emphasis added)

A certain amount of equal spatial development is imagined to co-exists with an increased competitive position on sustainable conditions - an exercise that seems to be contradictory. But the earlier work of the CSD indicates, that all three themes is expected to come together in EU spatial policy and planning[8]. The sustainability goal grows out of a inter-textual linkage to the ecology discourse of documents such as the 'Brundtland report', the papers of the conference in Rio 1992 and the Agenda 21 plans. The fact that the Brundtland definition goes beyond mere material factors and includes democracy and socal equity, makes the CSD to reason that the objective of economic and social cohesion links up with such a policy. This is, however, not necessarily the case if the way to economic and social cohesion goes through further growth and pressure on the environment[9].

The inter-urban relation is hoped to move from one of competition towards one of 'complementarity and co-operation between towns and cities', and the *ESDP* even speaks of 'natural links' between cities (CSD 1997:53). The goal is to 'optimise' the role of the cities as the economic driving force of regional development. Thus four policy options are made:

(a) Promotion of integrated spatial development strategies for clusters of towns, especially at the cross-border areas
(b) Co-operation within networks of towns and cities at the transnational and European levels, and of smaller towns in sparsely populated rural areas and in a number of economically lagging regions
(c) Improvement of connections between national / international networks on the one hand and regional / local networks on the other
(d) Strenghtening co-operation at the regional and local levels with cities and towns of eastern and central Europe and the Mediterranean countries (CSD 1997:55)

These policies relates to the way the urban space is seen in economic terms. Thus it is stated, that only regions where cities and towns are 'motors of economic growth' can become competitive. And such competition takes place within a globalised and liberalised economy, that can lead to a polarisation between successful cities and less successful ones (CSD 1997:55). The cities do undoubtfully play a central role in the economy, but the question is whether the economic development have not already produced 'winners and losers' in the inter-urban competition. Nevertheless, this discription is very valid in order to argue for a planned development of the urban space. The problem is, that the high priority of economic growth within the European discouse of urban space seems to work against this goal. Again four policy options are developed:

> (a) Development of the European strategic role of the global cities and of 'gateway cities' with a particular attention to outer parts of the European territory
> (b) Improvement of the attrachtiveness of towns and cities for mobile investment, in particular in less favoured areas
> (c) Diversification of the economic base of towns and cities that are excessively dependent on one particular sector
> (d) Reinforcement of the economy of small towns in rural areas where a solid urban development base is difficult to establish (CSD 1997:56)

The overall goal of sustainability is also articulated in relation to the cities, but again under the restriction of a economic rationale. Thus it is stated, that the 'physical and social well-being' of towns and cities are a vital factor in economic development. Sustainable urban development is said to provide the opportunities to 'think globally, and act locally' (CSD 1997:56). However, it is not said how such a strategy corresponds with the increased global competition between expanding economies. Under the theme of sustainable cities, five policy options are outlined:

> (a) Exhange of experience on, and provide support to, effective methods to reduce urban sprawl; alleviate excessive urban pressure in certain costal areas
> (b) Improve the business, environmental and social service infrastructure of cities located in the less favoured areas, including basic needs functions
> (c) Promotion of comprehensive urban planning strategies aimed at achieving social and functional diversity notably with a view to combating social exclusion, and including the re-use of previously developed land
> (d) Promotion of a prudent management of the urban ecosystem, including the protection and development of urban open spaces and green belts
> (e) Promotion of sustainable accessibility in urban areas through appropriate location and land-use planning policies (CSD 1997:57-58).

After these specific policy formulations conserning the urban space, considerations on the urba-rural relation, the access to infrastructure and knowledge and the natural and cultural heritage follows. One of the problems that needs to be addressed is the bluring of the distinction between the urban and the rural lifestyle - the phenomenon of 'ruralisation'. The strategies to avoid such development could be understood as local self reliance strategies. However, these are still to be localised within a global economy, so the potential of such strategies could be disputed. The infrastructure strategy must deal with concentration and overload effects through more balanced infrastructure policies (CSD 1997:61). The cultural heritage is seen as partly a question of regional identity, and partly as an economic asset (CSD 1997:68).

This overall analysis results in a framework for integrated spatial policy, that should be considered as a proposal subject to discussion. It operates at three different spatial levels: Europe-wide, transnational and regional/local level (CSD 1997:70). But the transnational level is considered the 'pivot' level for a full integration of spatial policy options (CSD 1997:71). The main elements of the new 'integrated spatial development policy agenda' at the European level could be (CSD 1997:71-73):

> ✍ A better spatial balance / economic and social cohesion
> ✍ A balanced urban and regional competitiveness
> ✍ A better accessibility

✎ Reinforcing EU border regions and their cities
✎ The development of Euro-corridors
✎ Sustain and develop Europe's biodiversity

At the transnational level, the INTERREG IIC programme and the possibilities under Article 10 of the ERDF are of notable importance. Since this level is going to play the 'pivotal' role in a EU spatial planning strategy, the content is not fixed in this document. It is said, that it is the actual issues and policy orientations, that will finally decide the demarcation of a transnational area. These can only be decided at national and regional authorities (CSD 1997:74).

At the regional and local level, the importance of local administrations is acknowledged as key actors in the field of European spatial planning. At this level the main elements of the new agenda is:

✎ Cross-border co-operation
✎ Inter-regional co-operation (CSD 1997:77)

Concluding on the analysis of this 'new' agenda for spatial planning, the *ESDP* expresses a system-view as the approach. It is a system, where the transnational level is seen as the most suitable integration level (CSD 1997:76). At this level, the various actors are brought together and translates the *ESDP's* guidelines, aims and options:

> 'The implementation of the integrated policy agenda at the European level, transnational strategies and the priorities of the regions and local administrations requires both <u>vertical</u> policy co-ordination between the different administrative levels as well as <u>horizontal</u> policy co-ordination between spatial and sector policies. Vertical co-ordination, above all, is an essential part of the ESDP's strategy of policy development and implementation. Only with adequate co-ordination, will the spatial approach gegerate sufficient powers of persuasion to influence sector policies at all levels' (CSD 1997:76, emphasis in the original)

Here it is very clear, that the new spatial policy agenda needs to 'fight' for its survival and legitimacy compared to the well established, sectorial policies of the Community. Further, this shows that the *ESDP* is based on the rationale of spatial planning as a means of integration within the European Union.

As a final part of the *ESDP*, a chapter on the implementation is included. Here it is discussed, how to carry out the *ESDP* in a field of real politics and planning. The point of departure, is the non-binding nature of the *ESDP* combined with the demand to bring about tangible results (CSD 1997:79). As mentioned, the *ESDP* is seen more as a process than a finished product. Thus the important task of transforming the 'first official draft of the *ESDP'* (CSD 1997) into a revised and 'democratically validated' version of a 'first official *ESDP*' is said to depend on three factors:

✎ A wide political debate
✎ Innovative and experimental actions
✎ The establishment of a solid technical support (CSD 1997:79)

The next step in this process, is that the Member States and the Commission defines a working programme, clarifying the steps they intend to take. In this process, it is stressed that experimental action can be taken within the Member States, between the Member States and with non-member countries. It is said that, some Member States are already in a position to draw on the draft of the *ESDP*. This is, as will be shown later in this paper, very much the case of the Danish national spatial planning. The French, Duch and German levels of activity within this process, might indicate that a similar situation exsists in these Member States. The Community already have instruments for staring this process. Thus at the Community level, the INTERREG IIC is mentioned as an explicitly supporting transnational programmes geared to spatial planning (CSD 1997:80, Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996b:21). Other relevant instruments are the Article 10 of the ERDF and the PHARE, TACIS, MEDA and URBAN progammes, allthough these do not explicitly mention spatial planning.

In order to establish the technical support, a special 'Observatory network' is suggested. This idea goes back to the Leipzig meeting (CSD 1994). The thought is, that the European Observatory should concentrate on the 'technical and scientific aspects' of the drawing-up of the periodic updating of the *ESDP* (CSD 1997:81). Thus the Observatory is going to monitor the socio-spatial development within the European territory, as a means of supporting the spatial planning. Organizationally, it is stressed that there is no need for at heavey bureaucratic body. Instead a model of 'fifteen national focal points' is suggested, each with clear mandates from the CSD (CSD 1997:81).

The 'hard case', that is the democratization and organization of a wide political debate, is saved to the end. It is said, that the political debate should concentrate on two questions:

> ✎ To what extent do the actors concerned agree with the analysis and policy options set out in Prats II and II respectively?
> ✎ How do these actors see the options translated into practice, especially within their own political agendas? (CSD 1997:82)

The idea of submitting the *ESDP* to a wide debate was suggested at the Leipzig meeting (CSD 1994). It is of course a matter of definition whether the gestation process of the *ESDP* is seen as one of widely public debate or not. If the goal was a discussion at high civil service and minister levels, some Member Countries can be said to have engaged in a wide debate. The Danish National Planning Report of 1997 has tried to communicate elements of the European discourse of urban space to a broader public discussion (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997). But to call these discussions democratic in a participatory sense would be a gross overstatement. Rather, the majority of the European populations has no knowledge, what so ever, of the European discourse of urban space. The recommandation from the CSD meeting at Venice in 1996 for the Member States to engage in a broad political debate with 'all actors concerned' (CSD 1997:82), illustrates this problem. Here planning is seen as the organization of decision processes between relevant 'stakeholders' (Healey 1997a, 1997b). But the answer to who this might be is more problematic. So the *ESDP* addresses the question of 'who should be involved?' very explicitly. It is said that apart form the partners that regularly meet within the CSD, it should involve (CSD 1997:82, emphasis added):

> ✎ Within each Member State: relevant authorities, private stakeholders and <u>citizens</u>
> ✎ In the framework of co-operation programmes: partners involved in cross-border, interregional or transnational co-operation
> ✎ At the European level: the European Parliament, the relevant Counsil of Ministers, the Commission (i.e. DGXVI), the Committee of the Regions, the Economic and Social Committee
> ✎ Outside the Union: non-member states, international organizations (i.e. the OECD and the Council of Europe)

The citizens of Europe is rightly mentioned, but unless some more radical measures are taken to bring these actors into the debate, they will hardly stand many chances of speaking up to the 'professional stakeholders'.

The time table laid out for the discussion process, estimates the process to last for 12 to 18 month. In this context, it is said that the 'wide political debate' from mid 1997 to late 1998, is expected to profit from the innovative and experimental co-operation programmes and the first elements of information gathered from the Observatory. An agenda that operates with three levels is suggested (CSD 1997:84). Firstly, issues relating to horizontal co-ordination such as how spatial policy makers work together with the various relevant sectors at national, transnational and Community level? Secondly, the issues concerning vertical co-ordination such as how to achieve better complementarity between bottom-up and top-down processes, how regional and local actors can implement the *ESDP* policy options and, importantly, how to encourage other public and private actors to contribute to the implementation of the *ESDP*, are addressed. Thirdly, issues relating to geographical integration, such as how to transcend the border effects of various administrative boundaries, are addressed.

Institutionally the future role of the Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning and the CSD needs to be considered. A discussion of the legal and financial instruments is also put on the agenda, and here the critical issue is:

'What are the feelings about an explicit mention of spatial planning in the context of
further development of the EU Treaty?' (CSD 1997:85)

In a footnote to this question, it is stressed that the European Parliament, the Committee of the Regions and
the Economic and Social Committee already have taken a positive view in this respect. This is a very clear
sign, that the CSD has much more 'institutional backing' on this issue of getting spatial planning formally
accepted in the Treaty, than was the case some years ago when the theme was mentioned in the various
reference papers such as the *Europe 2000+* (Commission 1994a). Thus the arena for an 'institutional fight'
between the Community institions and actors are set up.

The much discussed maps are placed as the final part of this first official draft of the *ESDP*, but the four
maps in this version will hardly cause any heated or controversial discussions. The first theme is Rural-urban
relations, where the measure is the expected land-use pressure. The second theme is acessibility,
infrastructure and transport. The third is the natural assets and water management. And finally, as the fourth
theme, is a very intersting map of diversity, complementarity and co-operation within the Union. Here the
various potential cross-border co-operations are sketched, and the map shows where the CSD finds potential
development zones of future co-operation.

The meaning of the ESDP?

Various assessments of the meaning of the *ESDP* can be made. Some researchers expect a 'casade of plans'
as a result of the perspective (Morphet 1997:13). Of central importance seems to be the non-binding
character of the *ESDP* that has been articulated during the whole gestation process. This can of course be
interpreted at face value, and thus seen as the practical consequence of the principle of subsidiarity. But one
could as easily interpret the rather excessive insistence on this document as 'non-binding', as the necessary
strategic manouvre in a social field that has not yet been finally prepared for a Euro-wide spatial planning
policy. The intentions of getting spatial planning on the formal EU agenda (that is in the new Treaty), has not
succeeded. One of the more modest, but perhaps realistic interpretations of the *ESDP* goes like this:

'But at the very least the ESDP could be the basis for co-ordinating the Commission's
own activities and achieving a greater degree of consistensy between its various policies
and programmes in their spatial interactions' (Davies 1996:220)

Veggeland refers to the *ESDP* as a 'vision' or a 'political frame of reference for possible spatial development
in EU' and also notes that it will have no legal authority (Veggeland 1996:83). The basic rationale of the
ESDP is one of economic growth as the fundation for sustainability (Veggeland 1996:86). This is a some
what contradictory way of reasoning, and is certainly one of the places where the European discourse of
urban space seems to be on thin ice. Veggeland notes further that the development of the *ESDP* with its
grounding on economic and social cohesion and sustainability, might all in all leed to the development of
'pan European regional planning' (Veggeland 1996:85). Other researchers stress that there is a certain
rationale for the participants in the making of the *ESDP*, to see it as a framework for a new role of non-
sovereign political territory and a reforming of the nationstate-relation of politics and territory:

'Instead of seeing the ESDP as an attack on national sovergeinty, the ministers of
planning might view it as an opportunity for coming to grips with the internationalisation
of the economy that has made national borders less and less relevant' (Jensen, Jørgensen
& Nielsen 1996a:19)

The question is, however, how the citizens are gaining from these policies and plans? Thus the question of
democracy, transperency and public participation in the process of societal regulation   of socio-spatial
processes must be raised. Uptil now, the public accessible information about these plans and policies has not
been overwhelming. One thing seems to be plausible, and that is that the *ESDP* will have a some effect:

'Although the ESDP could seem to be rather bland and imprecise at first glance, its long
term ompact could be considereable. Not only does its text need to be considered but also
its usbtext need to be understood within a much longer time horizon' (Morphet 1997:15)

The metaphors of the discourse

Much of the European discourse of urban space has a spatial imaginary and conceptualisations that are evolving around geometric, organic, mechanical, functional and spatial metaphors. Thus a catalouge of the most frequent used urban metaphors would imply that cities are seen as: 'gateways', 'motors', 'central nerve systems', 'spearheads', 'points' and 'hearts'. It is thus characteristic that many of the metaphors of this spatial imaginary are drawing on organic analogies. It is further the case, that many also implies an underlying notion of functionality. Without going into the epistemological problems of functional theories and explanations, it can be stated that such notions often implies a 'natural equilibrium' and forces at work that reduces the model's elements to functional entities that serves a 'higher purpose'. Further on this subject, it can be said that the language of official Euro-culture is significant: it is the language of 'cohesion', 'community', 'unity', 'integration' and 'security'. European identity is imagined in forms of an idealized wholeness and plentitude (Morley & Robins 1995:23), signalling that 'Europe' connotates 'order', and the 'Other' or the 'rest' connotates 'chaos'. Thus the planning discourse of the European Community as it gets articulated through the various documents can be summerized like this:

> 'If one reads the regional policy documents of the European Community, one gets the
> feeling that the Commission still thinks that it is possible to have both, economic growth
> and reduction of disparities between the regions' (Masser et. al. 1992:107)

The interesting thing is of course, whether the European discourse has any impact on spatial planning at national and local levels?

5. TALES FROM DIFFERENT CITIES - STRATEGIC PLANNING IN EUROPE

In a major case study of 10 different European cities, researchers found that there is an increasing influence of business concepts in the vocabulary of the plan-makers. Thus the 'vocabulary of SWOT techniques and visions' (Healey 1996:3), is identified as an influential frame of reference. Exactly the same is found in the regional studies, framing the European discourse as it is articulated by the European Commission (Commission 1996). When summarized, 7 of the 10 cities of the case study are engaged in articulating spatial planning discourses constructed around specific metaphors and referentials with explicit reference to the European space of competitive markets. The findings are summarized in the schemata on the next page, based on the researchers interpretations of the individual plans (Healey 1996):

It is interesting to note that in most cases the metaphor of 'Europe' is installed in the discourse as the prime legitimating factor of making new efforts to change the local socio-spatial relations. Thus these discourses obviously refer to the international competition within a European and global capitalistic economy. In this realm the main argument seems to be one of competitiveness (Porter 1990). But there are competing discourses as well. So we find cases where the local space is framed by contradictory discourses of capitalistic growth versus ecological sustainability. This is, according to the above analysis of the EU documents, also one of the most important internal contradictions in the European discourse of urban space as articulated by the Commission (Commission 1993).

Case	Metaphor/driving referential
Lyon	'European Metropolis/Eurocity'
Lisbon	'The Atlantic Capital of Europe'
Bergen	'Bergen as a Motor'
Lancashire	'A Landbridge to Europe/Greening the red rose county'

Zurich	'The Swiss City'
The Ørestad/Copenhagen	'We in Europe'
Marks municipality	'A knowledge society and a green society'

Another point of contradiction is the one concerning democratic participation. Especially in the Danish and Norwegian cases, strong antagonistic views are articulated in the social space of the given locality, as well as the Danish case seems to imply that the very statuary foundation of the planning system has been sidetracked. Discourses get them selves in an 'operational mode' by creating oppositional codes of a binary order. For example we see the widespread inclusion-exclusion mechanism that lies in the 'us-them distinction'. This is also in a mode of operation in several of these cases, where the 'trick' (seen from the pro-European point of view) is to turn a negative situation of peripheriality (being on the margin as excluded from 'them') into a positive situation of centrality (being one of 'us'). Defining the 'Other' equals defining your 'self'. Put in another vein, defining one self as the 'Atlantic Capital of Europe', means at the same time that some 'Other' location cannot take this position. And such a notion also connotates centrality of geographical position and economic and cultural importance. Thus one of the central conclusions is, that the strategy-makers have been very consious of Europe as an economic territory. But, there are no consensus behind these discourses, which should come as no surprise since the way 'Europe' is used as a socio-spatial metaphor reflects the different conceptions of the political and economic geography within which the region is located (Healey 1996:12, 24). Another reason is the various interpretations of the 'European metaphor' (Piezerat 1997). Thus it presents itself with multiple faces in the discourses; some places as a threat other places as a node for building internal cohesion and assets, and yet other places as case for founding (Healey 1996:26):

> 'In one and the same territory, 'Europe' can be experienced as a threat ... an opportunity
> ... and a defining space ...' (Healey 1996:15)

This is excactly the findings of Shields (1992) when he speaks of 'social spatialisation' as a process of investing symbolic meaning and material practices in a place. Thus one of the conclusions are, that the strategy-makers are aware of the power of the 'European metaphor', but the meanings they invest herein are divergent and often antagonistic (Healey 1996:13). So it is:

> '... a clear analytical conclusion, that the meaning of 'Europe' in any policy discourse
> cannot be taken for granted' (Healey 1996:15)

Which indicates two important points. One, that further empirical research therefore must be conducted in order to come to grasp with the 'meaning of Europe' in terms of spatial planning. The other is, that such an endeavour implies 'a piece of hermeneutics' or put in another way; an interpretative method.

6. A 'GREEN ROOM IN THE EUROPEAN HOUSE' - THE CASE OF DENMARK

The convergence between the European discourse of urban space and Danish national planning is evident. Thus the Danish government's National Planning Reports has imported the very logic of argument that one finds in all the central CSD and Commission documents. The planning document that initiated Danish orientation towards European spatial planning, was the *Denmark towards the year 2018: The Spatial Structuring of Denmark in the Future Europe* (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1992). This document also suffers from the internal contradiction of wanting both increased transit traffic and a better environment, and it is the first in the trend of 'new' international orientation in Danish national planning (Kristiansen 1995):

> '... the report 'Denmark towards the year 2018' ... illustrates the trend towards marketing
> Denmark in the European context' (Newman & Thornley 1996:64)

The report *Denmark towards the year 2018* holds, that if the new possibilities provided by increasing international economic competition are going to be exploited, then the spatial development of Denmark must be seen in an international perspective (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1992). The cities and the urban system, must compete to acquire a prominent place on the future map of Europe. The report has the same rationale of subsidiarity as the EU documents, so it is stated that the report is a frame of reference for the authorities on a lover level counties and municipalities that eventually will be the ones to decide for actions (Larsen & Nielsen 1992:9).

6.1 From equality to appropriateness - the story of Danish planning

Even though Denmark often is characterized as a centralised state (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:343), it has a fairly decentralised system for public administration with relatively good means for public participation[10]. Since the social reforms of the 1930's there has been a spatial dimension at the core of the Danish welfare state. The welfare dimension was also explicit in the Planning Act of 1974 as that of 'ensuring a more geographically even development of the country' (quoted in Jørgensen & Tonboe 1993:381). There are three levels of administration and planning: state, county and municipality, with 14 counties and 275 municipalities. In resent debates the EU is often thought of as 'the fourth level' of administration (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a). The Danish planning system consists of a framework where the plans at lower levels must not be in conflict with the plans at higher levels. The National Planning documents from the planning agency of the Ministry of Energy & Environment, is the place where the Danish Government's plans, visions and policies concerning spatial development are linked to the European discourse of spatial and urban planning. Thus in the planning document on *The Role of Copenhagen in the Öresund Region* (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1995) it is said that:

> 'When the national borders are decreasing in importance, local and regional strength
> positions will gain relatively greater importance than national strength positions. Hereby
> the development will put the knife at the throat of the North European metropoles that
> whishes to play a role in the European and international division of labour' (Ministry of
> Energy & Environment 1995:9, authors translation & emphasis added)

The Danish discussion of the urban system has changed considerably over the last fifty years. Especially the debate from the period of 1960-75 is interesting in this context. This period was the period of economic growth, and thus also the biggest time for regional policy in Denmark (Gaardmand 1988:75). In these years, with the structural change of the entire country from agricultural production towards industrial production, Denmark has been characterised as being one of the most 'business-friendly' environments in the whole of Europe (Gaardmand 1988:76). As in most other Western countries, the economic growth was considered to be the engine of this new societal form of organisation. Thus it was the dream, that the growing cities would create social prosperity, cultural activity and human happiness. The 1960's debate of urban growth-centres show these aspirations very clearly. The Danish urban planning engineer, Erik Kaufmann was the first to introduce the thought of a self-generating 'natural' urban growth process in Denmark. In no. 63 of the Danish urban planning periodical BYPLAN (1959), Kaufmann launched his 'country plan hypothesis' with a matching 'star-city sketch'. The hypothesis was in short this:

'In the next decades still increasing parts of the population, business and culture life will gather in a few places within the country. If we neglect or counteract this development, we will waste both efforts and money. If we follow it, it can be influenced and the whole country benefit from it' (Kaufmann quoted in Gaardmand 1988:76, authors translation)

So Kaufmann envisioned a hierarchy of cities that could be regionally planned according to goals set for production, service and education. Needless to say, many of the respondents on Kaufmanns ideas found this plan far to de-centralised and thus opposing the general planning philosophy that would favour cities and regions within close distance of the major infra structural systems (Gaardmand 1988:80). Of other discussions from the 1960's of importance can be mentioned the 'Triangle City', the 'Big H' (referring to the motorway system in Denmark) and the 'Örestad', plans that all has been implemented. Another of the period's main themes was the 'skewed Denmark' discussion, referring to the uneven development between West and East Denmark. The next interesting phase in the plans for the urban system can be said to be the 1975-85 period, where spatial planning (Town & Country planning) is coupled to the national policies for regional development. This was also the years after the great 1970-reform that in general had the effect of empowering the local and regional levels of government. From the 1973 Planning Act the goal of 'equal territorial development' is articulated, a goal that was kept until the 1992 reform. In the National Planning Report of 1975, the goal of stopping, or decreasing the growth of the urban fabric in the major cities is articulated (Gaardmand 1988:87). Today this is one of the common features of the Community's spatial policy and the Danish Government's policy, even though the Danish planning policy seems more committed to this aim than the Community's, and thus has rather strict regulations concerning urban sprawl. This policy has been developed in order to confront the increasing blurring of the borders between the urban and the rural, toward the so called 'rurban' areas (Masser et. al. 1992:119). In the same plan of 1975, it is said that planning should provide a net of cities big enough to contain a certain amount of working places and services, within 'fair' travel distances. This was the forerunner for what since became the idea of certain 'regional centres' based on major cities across the country. During these years, the debate of the urban system continued, and the urban system was used as the 'skeleton' upon which questions of regional development, education, localisation etc. was hanged (Gaardmand 1988:88). Finally the Danish membership of the European Community in 1972 also had some influence on the regional planning and the urban system.

In the last 30 years two major things happened that are of importance for this 'story'. First of all the existing three political and administrative levels are the result of a major reform in 1970, as well as they represent the 'Danish notion of subsidiarity':

'One might say that the principle of subsidiarity - as it has come to be discussed after the Danish 'no' to Maastricht in June 1992 - owes its origin to the Nordic model whereby regions control both planning and resources and have their own revenue base' (Commission 1995:12)

The second major change was the 1992 reform of the Danish Planning Act. This was a radical break with the spatial planning traditions within the welfare state so far. In Denmark the new Planning Act of 1992 (Ministry of Environment & Energy 1992), indicates this by focusing on 'appropriate' spatial development in contrast to the former focus on 'equal' spatial development. This shift matches the trend of competitive global capitalism, with its growing numbers of city cooperations, city marketing and inter-urban competition that we have seen breaking through since the 1980's (Healey, Cameron & Davoudi (eds.) 1995). Among the many implications this shift seems to have, the most important one is probably that the welfare state is put in question (Jørgensen & Tonboe 1993). This can either be interpreted as being a dynamic situation where new alliances between the different stakeholders in urban and regional development and planning makes an opportunity for communicative negotiations and democratic planning. Or it can be interpreted as being a fragmented and atomized plan-political arena where the real opportunities for state led spatial planning is limited:

'This change in the planning law together with the message of 'Denmark Towards the Year 2018' amounts to a significant statement that Denmark is prepared to a more polycentric and market-oriented spatial planning within a larger European context. We see this as a tendential break with the former primarily politically dominated welfare

orientation of the Danish territory. <u>The space is gradually being transformed into a space of economics</u>' (Jensen, Jørgensen & Nielsen 1996a:14, emphasis added)

Why the Planning Act was changed is an important question. At the time of the reform there was very little public debate. This owes probably its explanation to the massive de-regulation and 'slimming' of the public sector that characterised Danish government policy in the 1980's. It has also to do with the interpretation of the socio-spatial transformation processes. Thus the National Planning Agency stated in their National Planning Report of 1989 that:

> 'In the opinion of the government the previous objective of equalisation through national planning has been made obsolete by the resent development' (in Jørgensen & Tonboe 1993:390)

This statement shows two important things. Firstly, that the equality dimension has been omitted. Secondly, this statement also draws on the underlying assumption of the 'development' as an anonymous agent. From this point in time, the competitive strategy within an urban hierarchy becomes an important factor in the national planning rationale. So in the National Planning Report of 1990, it is stated that:

> 'In the future the Capital city will be competing with city-regions of the same size an with the same distinctive character in business and culture ... Cities as Århus, Odense, Aalborg must, with each of their distinctive character, make their mark in relation to comparable city-areas in Europe' (Ministry of Energy & Environment, quoted in Kristiansen 1995:151, authors translation)

The reference to the international and competitive situation of global capitalism also reflects one of the major themes of regional policy in Denmark: the 'east-west divide'. Thus some saw this 'new' international planning orientation as a contribution to the old discussion of the 'skewed Denmark' with its underlying theme of rural-urban antagonisms.

In their analysis of the different planning 'families' of Europe, Newman & Thornley concludes that:

> 'The Scandinavian family has probably gone the furthest in decentralisation with planning at the national level reduced to a minimum and regional planning only weakly represented' (Newman & Thornley 1996:72)

So Denmark is seen as one of the European 'families' that responds to the increasing competition by preparing national spatial plans as marketing tools (Newman & Thornley 1996:73). This is seen in the case of the plans for the Öresund-region, where the building of a bridge between Denmark and Sweden combined with massive office facilities should help position Copenhagen within the European space as a post-industrial knowledge and business city. The City Director of Planning indicates that this is clearly a part of Copenhagen's marketing exercise:

> 'The bridge is needed more as a symbol than for speeding up transportation flows' (quoted in Newman & Thornley 1996:238)

6.2 Danish planning practice

The impact of the European discourse of urban space is perceptible at the level of the local Danish authorities. Asked to comment on the current planning situation in Denmark, two regional planners from the County of Vejle saw it this way:

> 'With the new planning act of 1992 and its shift of objective from equal to appropriate development <u>it can be questioned whether the regional plan can reach all corners of the county</u> ... With the new planning objective, appropriate development, it has become legitimate to <u>let development come about naturally wherever possible</u>, since this is supposed to be of the benefit to the weaker areas as well ... This might have the effect that

the regional plan, instead of being a programme for action is developing more in the direction of <u>a catalogue of visions of long-term goals'</u> (Danish County Planner in Fossgaard & Jørgensen 1996:11-13, emphasis added)

The keyword is 'naturally'. What is this 'natural development', and how is it made to come about? This is an expression of a 'naturalized' element of discourse, based on the rationality-mix of neo-classic economics, 'pipe-dream planning' (Jørgensen, Kjærsdam & Nielsen 1994) and neo-liberal beliefs in the market as political and economical superior. It indicates a development that is bound to create problems for the basic democratic planning intention. Thus encapsulated in this planners' statement:

'This development has legitimized that some decisions are being prepared and/or made between <u>groups not under direct democratic control</u> and with the participation of various interests groups in society who have announced their opinion beforehand .... There seems to be <u>a tendency towards less openness</u> as soon as industrial policies are involved because of <u>the factor of competition</u>' (Danish County Planner in Fossgaard & Jørgensen 1996:13, emphasis added)

Planners from another Danish County, Viborg County evaluate the situation similarly, but with a stress on the direct impact on the urban system:

'The change in the planning act of 1992 from equal to appropriate development will most likely lead to <u>a modification of our urban pattern</u>. But already in our latest regional plan of 1993 we changed our main objective, interpreting the new objective of appropriate development in the direction of positive discrimination of the municipal centres of the weaker areas instead of equal development ... <u>Positive discrimination</u> as we practice it now is rather unequal development ... But with the advent of EU <u>a fourth level</u> has been introduced and now regional policy is not only about relating to the kingdom at large, but now we must take into consideration the development trends which can be envisaged in our corner of <u>the overarching totality</u> which is Europe' (Danish County Planner in Fossgaard & Jørgensen 1996:15, emphasis added)

Changes in actual planning practice among the Danish regional authorities are documented here, but also a shift of mind and attitude that one could call the 'think European' mode of thought. This mode of thought is what scholars as well as planners, politicians and entrepreneurs all over Europe switch into these days (Williams 1996b:265). Attending the meeting of *the North of England Assembly of Local Authorities* (NEA) on 5th March 1997 in Sunderland concerning the INTERREG IIC North Sea Programme, illustrated that it is fairly the same motives and rationales that drives the local authorities in Europe towards this new mode of thinking. The whole exercise was about how to 'tune in' on the programme by fitting the project description to the goals and intentions of the INTERREG IIC. To put it boldly one could say that the main motive is encapsulated in this comment from the Association of County Councils in Denmark on the Danish proposal for the 1996 National Planning Report:

'A common planning policy in the EU will also serve as a basis for channelling money from the Funds to the regions of Europe' (ACC 1996, authors translation)

At the NEA meeting this was expressed in terms of what one participator called 'using the right EU buzz words'. As far as this very meeting was concerned, there was consensus about making an application that stressed 'empowerment, sustainability and social & economic cohesion'. The feeling was, that this was the necessary vocabulary to use in order to come in consideration for any funding. This is a part of the trend where many cities and regional authorities are engaged in making their own 'foreign policy' (Williams 1996b:250). It is also in accordance with the general 'bypassing the capital' trend that seems to be sweeping European local authorities (Wessels & Rometsch 1996:343-6). And finally it is a part of constructing agreed 'storylines', marketable to external audience such as the EU (Healey 1995:267).

The changes in the socio-spatial relations has made the Danish National Spatial Planning Agency change its map. During the heydays of the welfare state, the map was split into regions, but today it is the cities that are important (Christoffersen 1994:104-5). The cities had their place in the national planning during the welfare

state, but not isolated. They were a part of an 'urban system' that was planned with accordance to equal geograpichal access to public services. Today, in the reality of inter-urban competition, the notion of an urban system has destabilized (Christoffersen 1994:105). The Danish discourse of urban space is currently structured around three spatial strategies (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a). The city-networks, the national centres and the Öresund-region are the three basic points about which the spatial discourse is articulated (Fossgaard & Jørgensen 1996:6).

6.3 Denmark and European Planning Policy - the 1997 National Planning Report

As mentioned, the 'European orientation' of Danish national planning started with the *Denmark towards the year 2018: The Spatial Structuring of Denmark in the Future Europe* (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1992). But the case of the Danish National Planning Report of 1997 is even more illustrative on these matters. Not only is it the first time, that a national planning report has been submitted to a public hearing phase, it is also the national planning document that lies closest to the EU documents in rationale and style. Due to the phase of public hearings, the report exists in three versions (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a, 1996b, 1997). The title signals the European orientation very clearly, and will in its translated form be *Denmark and European Planning Policy - National Planning Report 1997*. The first draft version of the report was laid out for public debate during 8. January to 18. March 1996, and the Ministry received no less than 160 comments from various private and public organisations, lobby groups and other stakeholders. The first draft (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a), almost triggered a political conflict in parliament, since the Conservative and the Liberal parties made a parliamentary enquiry into the subject of the status of small towns and villages in the proposed report. The revised proposal (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b), has basically the same structure and themes as the first one, with an additional chapter on the villages and small towns and two future scenarios. These scenarios has then been removed from the final report (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997), since they are said to have fulfilled their role as basis for the discussion. The differences between these documents will not be discussed further, since it will be the final and official version that will be discussed here.

The *Denmark and European Planning Policy - National Planning Report 1997* (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997), is divided into a first chapter on the 'challenges' to Danish planning within a territorially changing Europe. The second part contains the development trends within the 'points' (cities), the 'lines' (infrastructure) and the 'planes' (landscape). Then the national planning policy that is proposed in order to deal with these trends is outlined. This is done under the pitoresque heading 'a green room in the European house'. Finally a chapter on environmental assessment is presented. The document continue the trend of the *Denmark towards year 2018* report, with its very widespread use of maps and colourful illustrations. Some of these is quite clarifying others tend to obscure the underlying points. Thus one commentator said of the 1996 proposal for the National Planning Report, that it was an expression of 'metaphysical national planning' (Johansen 1996).

The overall national planning goals of the Danish Ministry of Energy & Environment are the three goals that were identified within the European discourse of urban space: balance in the urban system, environmentally acceptable accessibility and the protection of nature & cultural heritage (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:5). The socio-spatial transformation processes are acknowledged as the background of a new orientation in the national planning policy. Thus spatial planning is seen as having a role to play in the wider integration process, and this closely connected to the ecological and environmental problems. So all spatial planning must be considered under the constrains of an 'ecological free scope' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:7). This is the discretionary space for action that is 'left' when the future generation's access to natural resources are secured. But at the same time, the goal will be to secure an interplay between cities, infrastructure and landscape that will work as a 'velfunctioning mechanism'(Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:7). The territorial changes of Europe is seen as an expression of a move from a Europe of centre and peripheries, to a Europe of 'complex mosaics' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:9). Again the so-called 'frame conditions' of the local business is identified to be connected to global processes of competitive capitalism. The Danish National Planning Report is shown to have its place within a larger frame of reference, made up by the various EU institutionalisation processes that seek to make spatial planning a legitimate area of the Community's activities.

Considering the European urban system, the lack of one dominant centre combined with a foreseeable future growth in cities and their activities, is the point of departure (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:17). Seen within the development trends of a European urban system of urban sprawl, social problems and commuting, the Danish situation is described as one of even geographical distribution of urban development possibilities. It is thus said, that there is no reason to believe that the country will be polarised into powerful growth centres and depopulated rural areas (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:19). The traditional powerful and centralised welfare state planning, with its centres at different spatial levels, has led to a situation where the political geography of the country is double sided:

> 'The Danish urban system is at once hierarchical and decentralised' (Ministry of Energy
> & Environment 1997:20, authors translation)

Even though this is seen as a strength by the ministry, it is acknowledged that parts of the societal development is skewed. This is especially the case in the rural areas and in the small villages. There is a tendency toward emptying the small rural areas of their business functions, leaving them merely as living places in the best cases (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:21). There also seems to be a development trend towards an ageing of the populations in the declining rural areas. Since 1993, the government has experimented with a new policy of business and service development projects in the rural areas and the small villages, as well as there has been submitted two government committees on the problems concerning economy and transport in rural areas. Whether these initiatives will result in any real change, is to early to say anything about. But they have certainly been addressed explicitly in the report as a consequence of the public debate of this issue. The impact of large malls and shopping centres led the Minister of Energy & Environment to issue a stop for all further building of large shopping centres. A committee working under the ministry, concludes that if the smaller cities are to keep some of their service facilities and businesses, a planning policy must be drawn up to prevent the cities with more than 25.000 inhabitants to absorb all investment and employment (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:24).

The internationalisation of the economy is making it self visible in various fields as tourism, the university cities and inter-urban co-operation networks. Many of these networks between cities and municipalities are also trying to get the Ministry's permission to be officially acknowledgeded as regional centres. But the Ministry is reluctant to grant these permissions, which is very obvious if the European discourse of urban space is considered. Many of the cities that wants status of regional centre, are not even thought of on the maps of the future urban system in Europe. Thus the 'problem of scale' returns to the discussion, and it is highly lightly that such a theme will actualise itself even more when countries which has undergone very different socio-spatial transformation processes are going to make real and concrete plans and policies for the spatial development of the European territory.

Under the heading of trends in accessibility, the fundamental dilemma of the Community's policies pops up:

> 'Thus there is a dilemma between, on the one side, the society's organisation and our
> habits and life styles, that builds on the possibility of travelling fast, flexible and
> individually, and on the other side, the need to lower the transport quantity due to
> environmental considerations' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:27, authors
> translation)

The increase in transport is resulting in a 'crowding of the continent', and the many maps suggests that in order to keep the competitive edge of globalized economy, the flows must not be hindered. In this context, Denmark is said to have a fairly high accessibility to the other countries in the European context (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:31). It is also said, that Denmark has a well developed infrastructure and communication between cities. But attempts to lower the level of private car use by the means of collective transportation have not been very successful. Denmark makes its contribution to the pollution of the Community as well as the other countries.

Thus all the development trends come together in the section on National Planning Policy with the title of 'a green room in a European house' (a metaphorical analysis of this concept follows later in this paper). The foundation of the National Planning Policy, is thus one of 'sustainability and balance' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:49). It is stated, that sustainability is not solely an environmental concept, but also of

social acceptability and economic feasibility. The notion of an 'ecological free scope' is of central importance, since previously released reports from the Danish government, suggests that the socio-spatial development must be in accordance with such a concept. It is then said, that:

> 'If an ecological free scope is to be secured, then especially us in the industrialised countries, must change our consumption- and production patterns, since the development tendencies in society indicates a large draw on resources and environment' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:49, authors translation)

A conscious notion of this fact is said to be the necessary point of departure for political actions. So it seems as the goal of ecological and environmental sustainability, is one of the founding principles in Danish spatial planning. But at the same time, it is said that economic development (growth) is fundamental for the stability and future of Europe (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:50)[11]. The rationale of competitive economics is thus also a central part of the Ministry's discourse of urban space:

> 'Absolute equality and homogeneity is a utopia with ghastly perspectives and at the same time an impossibility, when the special local potential is the driving force behind the development' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a:16, authors translation)

To be fair, this statement is not in the second and revised or the final version of the National Planning Report. Nevertheless such an 'institutional slip of the tongue' is still very indicative of how the national planning agency and the Danish government reasons. The only way to discover the 'special local potential', is by taking part in the international and global competition. In this context, the *ESDP* is mentioned as one of the tools of integration and planning. So the Danish government wishes to have a long sighted view of possibilities and problems seen in an international perspective. To this end, the new spatial policy of the EU, should serve two purposes. One is the 'optimization' of the European space, so that activities are spread in a sustainable way. The other, is for the Danish government to contribute to a new life style, that unites modern industrial production and welfare, with ecological responsibility (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:51). In order to move towards these goals, the Ministry sees the growing European co-operation on spatial planning as an important means to these ends. The informal co-operation must therefore, according to the Ministry, contain a 'common vision for the arrangement of the European house'. And after referring to this metaphor of the house of commonality, the *ESDP* goals are repeated in the report as the overall goals.

As a continuation of the previous National Planning Report, *Denmark towards the year 2018*, this report states its political goals for the urban system. It is stated, that all Danish cities has potentiality on the international markets, and that the multiplicity of various specialisations should be considered to be an advantage in an age of increasing inter-urban competition. A balanced urban system can be obtained by means of a five-string strategy, focusing of the following themes (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:55-58):

1. Development of city-networks between regional centres and municipality centres
2. Regional centres with increased European orientation
3. The Öresund-region as an international urban region
4. Development in the small towns and rural areas
5. Plan co-operation across borders

The fourth string of the strategy has been inserted as the result of the public debate, where many 'stakeholders' from the lobby organisations that represents the small villages and rural areas accused the first version of the National Planning Report (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996a), to be 'hostile' towards the small communities. Thus the relation between the cities and the country is not considered to be a zero-sum game. The government will rather look upon this theme through the prism of a 'mosaic' and the possibility of obtaining 'the plural and multiple life forms' of the rural areas (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:57). The strategy results in a number of actions to be taken internationally as well as nationally. At the European level, the government will secure the Öresund-region's status as a European metropole, work for a spread of knowledge of the international strength positions held by Danish regional centres and city-networks, strengthen the focus on the threatened rural areas of Europe, increase Danish participation in the trans-regional plan co-operation in the North Sea and the Baltic Sea regions, continue the

co-operation of Visions and Strategies Around the Baltic Sea 2010 and finally continue the border-regional co-operations with Sweden and Germany (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:58). On a national level the government will, among other things, support the development of city-networks through planning and collection of knowledge, increase the marketing of Danish cities within the Nordic and Baltic regions, analyse the international potentials of Danish cities, the experiences of planning and city-networks, the relation between the urban structure and the use of energy, analyse the conditions of the rural areas and make further regulation on retail business (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:59).

The two other goals, infrastructure and natural areas, are also addressed with concrete policy formulations. Here the interest in being a part of the European transportation networks collides with the strong measures that the government says it will take in order to reduce traffic. And characteristically, the protection of nature and environment can also be legitimated through the economic benefits that clean localities represent:

> 'Quality demands on the nature, culture and environmental areas can be used internationally in business contexts, for marketing the Danish products on a still more environmentally consciousness world market' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:65, authors translation)

The scenarios that entered the debate - and vanished again!

An interesting new thing about the second revised version of the National Planning Report (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b), was the making of two alternative future scenarios. These scenarios has not been included in the final version of the National Planning Report that was published in March 1997. According to the Minister of Energy & Environment, they have served their purpose as catalysts for the debate (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1997:5). It is nevertheless illustrative of the level of discussion as well as the notions of urban space, to analyse these two scenarios even though they are absent in the final and official version of the report.

The scenarios were called a 'decentral urban pattern in regional networks' versus 'large cities in European integration' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b:84-101). The reason for the adaption of these scenarios are said to be the wish of the members of parliament, that needed some tantigble spatial imaginary under the above mentioned parliamentary inquiry. This point is interesting, since it suggests that the whole exercise of imagining Europe spatially, might be much more demanding than many of the EU planners and politicians think. Imagining the 'fourth level'of space (and planning), is at least not a regular exercise among Danish members of the national parliament. In the National Planning Report it is stressed, that the visions within the scenarios should not be considered to be the visions of the government. Rather they will serve to stimulate the debate (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b:5). The two scenarios have the same preconditions, but different goals. Thus the internationalisation of economic relations with its importance for production patterns and societal functions, is said to be the point of departure for both alternatives (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b:85). The scenarios are not quantitative prognoses, but rather qualitative political visions of the future development of the urban system.

The scenario of a 'decentral urban pattern in regional networks' is focusing on a re-direction of our present life style in the direction of a more environmentally conscious production- and consumption behaviour. The rich countries have a special obligation to reduce their excessive use of resources, and the overall goal is increased local self-sufficiency. The principle of subsidiarity is central, since all solutions must be searched for as close to the individual as possible. A more balanced relation between the urban and the rural areas should be strived for, and as a consequence of this, an urban agglomeration as Copenhagen should be restrained from further growth. The urban growth of the coming years should thus be directed towards the smaller cities, and the 'compact city' philosophy of close locations of work places and living places should be followed. The public sector must stimulate local production patterns by channelling its investments and purchase policies in this direction. The service functions in the rural areas are to be strengthened, and a substantial fall in both imports and exports are foreseen. The network of motorways of today will be adequate to reach long time into the future, and public transport should be stimulated also in the more remote areas. In the bigger cities, the collective traffic solutions should also be stimulated. The agricultural production must be re-directed in the direction of 'ecological production methods' as soon as possible. Sustainable energy sources such as sun and wind energy must be prioritised, and any form of urban sprawl

must be hindered by condensing the settlement pattern within the existing urban areas. Now, all these (and more) policies are then evaluated according to their political consequences. Thus it is said that:

> 'The political alternative of a 'decentral urban pattern in regional networks' demand <u>changes, as well in the organisation of society, including the grounding principles of the market economy, as in the life style of the individual citizen</u> ... The alternative presume profoundly changed perceptions of the road to economic development and growth, which will have a major impact on the character and extent of the EU-cooperation, seen in relation to the international agreements that Denmark today is obliged to' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b:93-94, authors translation & emphasis added)

The realisation of this scenario will thus also mean a strengthening of the state as a juridic-political framework and profound restrictions on the movements of the capitalistic market forces.

The scenario of 'large cities in European integration' is made on the assumption that the individual states and regions, are incompetent of creating the optimal frames for development themselves. Economic 'development' is the precondition of reducing the environmental problems, in a ever more internationalised world. The metropoles and urban agglomerations are seen as central elements in the international competition. A common European development perspective should be able to coordinate the overall spatial development in the Community. Within the Danish territory, the 'road forward in an internationalised age', will be made by stimulating a more concentrated urban pattern, that is build upon big urban poles and a urban hierarchy based on specialisation and internationalisation. Big urban regions and the large cities with international potentials, will be the foundation of the urban hierarchy. Within this, the cities must in higher degree than earlier be active in relation to the international competition. Copenhagen, will be of central importance since it already has international potentials. These must be stimulated further. The development of common functional urban agglomerations must be stimulated in other parts of the country, and the urban development will concentrate in 'bands' that makes efficient traffic solutions between the 'nodes' possible. The urban growth should be concentrated, because the urban agglomerations are the 'motors' of the economy. The big cities should promote their image by the means of urban marketing based upon good public service and a concerted cultural policy. The small cities and villages should perceive themselves as the hinterlands of the urban agglomerations, and realistically it must be acknowledged that the growth in population and investments, primarily will benefit the bigger cities and not the rural areas. The infrastructure policy must support all plans for increased international connections, and there will be a major quantitative increase in transport activities. Sustainable energy sources as well as ecological production forms should be advocated, and the urban sprawl should be hindered by concentrated growth within existing urban areas. Again the scenario is evaluated according to its political consequences. It is said, that:

> 'The political alternative 'large cities in European integration', demands that the efforts made on political major issues in a very high degree is fought on the international arena, by means of which political decisions in the international field must be devoted increased interest. The alternative especially presuppose an powerful effort made within the framework of the EU' (Ministry of Energy & Environment 1996b:100, authors translation)

Comparing the two scenarios, it will be crucial how the relative weight is between different means of the solutions. Thus the decentralised strategy could lead to even more traffic, if the working areas and living areas are not connected by an efficient system of collective traffic. Similarly, will the integration strategy easily lead to an increase in traffic with big environmental consequences, if not it is succeeded to re-locate the transportation to more ecological solutions. So the two scenarios are not free of problems, but they served as a prism for the public debate of how politicians would like to see the development of the Danish territory. It could be argued, that the decentralisation strategy were described as very radical, and thus more of a freigthening picture than an alternative. On the other hand, it seems like any solution that will be able to break with the internal contradictions of the European discourse of urban space, must be radical. However, the Minister seems to think that this discussion is over since the two scenarios has been omitted from the final version of the report.

6.4 The use of associative planning metaphors

There has developed a tradition within Danish national planning, to adopt the metaphors, associations and connotations derived from the colourful vocabulary of marketing language. Thus the national planning reports belong to the same genre as the local marketing documents that is used in the city-marketing campaigns. It also seems, as if there are national variations in the way that more or less colourful and persuasive metaphors are used. This might also be a part of the explanation of the above mentioned divergence between the Danish and the English translation of the *Europe 2000+* document. A preliminary investigation into some of the central metaphors and driving referentials of this discourse, will be an indicator of the underlying rationale of the discourse. This can be exemplified by a brief examination of some of the metaphors used in the 1997 National Planning Report. The metaphor of *'a green room in the European house'*, is a mixed and multifaced notion of the Danish location within a larger space. So first of all it is a metaphor of 'inclusionary identity' (Denmark in a larger context). But it is also an expression of 'exclusionary identity', since the word 'green', gives the connotation and self-perception of Denmark as the most seriously environmentally concerned member state (Denmark 'greener than the rest'). Thus it is a metaphor of identity construction, since this is a positional location of Denmark that devalues many of the other member states as 'not quite so environmentally concerned as us'. However it is not a simple exclusionary metaphor, since the word 'house' connotates the Community, and thus also the notion of European integration (a room is a part of a house). But that the word 'room' is chosen also shows, that the territorial integrity of the nation state is still intact, and this is thus also a metaphor of the Danish nation state as the locus of a strong sense of place (rooms have walls). Finally, one could interpret the metaphorical relation between the words 'house' and 'room' as an implicit notion of a socio-spatial hierarchy. However, it is not mentioned whether the Danish government think they inhabit a large penthouse flat, overlooking the rest of the territory, or whether they occupy the basement flat. So the interpretation of this specific metaphor might not be driven further without entering the realm of over-interpretations.

The metaphor of the urban system as a 'well-functioning mechanism', obvious belongs to the vocabulary of a mechanical imaginary. Thus by implying that the goals is a well-functioning mechanism, an analogy to the machine is made. The machine metaphor, partly connotates that man is in control (unless there is reason to make a techno-dystopian interpretation, which is not the case), and partly that cities are cogwheels in the big machine. So if there is such a big machine, there should also be a superintending engineer, which very well could happen to be the EU. Finally, the metaphor of the urban system as a 'complex mosaics', indicates that in the Danish discourse of urban space there is not one, coherent metaphor or perception of cities and urban systems. Thus this metaphor is in a way pointing in another direction than the machine metaphor. This is so, not only for the 'complex' part, but also by means of the 'mosaic' metaphor. The word 'mosaic' thus both connotates the centre-less and de-centralised, as well as it appeals to associations from the realm of the art world (i.e. a glass mosaic). Thus a mosaic, is a meticulous and detailed combination of elements. What this amounts to in this context, is that the socio-spatial transformation processes that shapes the European space, is leading to a de-centralised and polycentric urban structure.

The 1997 National Planning Report could seem, at the rhetorical level, to orient it self in the direction of the former Planning Act and its goal of 'equal spatial development'. But if the plans are analysed a bit more closely, it is obvious that the vocabulary of polycentricity and competitiveness rather is focused on international economic competition, than on equal social distribution of goods and resources.

6.5 Holistic Urban Replanning - a local phenomena?

A recent example of the impact of this competitive and economic oriented planning rationale at a local level in Denmark, is the City of Aalborg's concept of 'Holistic Urban Replanning'. In a publication named nothing less than 'The Road to Sustainability', the planners of the City draws the beginning contours of a new planning era. The plan is that the suburb of Aalborg East, a typical 15.000 inhabitants result of the 1960's building boom, will change through a new mix of 'ecology-democracy-commerce'. This area has, as many similarly areas all over Europe, had more than its fair share of social problems and is now due to undergo a comprehensive process of renewal. What the City-planners actually intends to do is not totally clear, but One get a good impression of what is under its way when the following intentions with 'Holistic Urban Replanning' are considered:

> 'With ecology as a driving force, the dissolution of planning restrictions as an instrument
> and the reorganization of citizen democracy, we expect a liberalization which can provide

> a rich soil for the growth of new enterprises, cultural activities, the improvement of housing and green areas. The running of it is being left to the residents, with the municipal administration as consultant (City of Aalborg 1996:30, emphasis added)

Not that it is at all clear how ecology and the dismantling of the planning regulations should be able to do this trick, but it is a fine example of its genre: the new orientation of urban planning towards economic growth and competitiveness, added a few doses of local participatory democracy with a touch of sustainable ecology. This type of 're(de)planning' can be seen to be in accordance with the discourse of European urban space.

Concluding on these matters, it is of course crucial that the links between the national idiosyncrasies of Danish planning and the European discourse are considered. It is the change of the Danish planning law, and the following re-orientation of planning rationale a part of the European discourse of urban space? The evidence of this being the case, lies in all these convergent rationales and concepts that have been described above. In other words, there is a strong convergence between the European discourse of urban space and the national and regional plans for Danish urban space. So the change of planning rationale has obviously a connection to the broader planning discourse of Europe, as well as to the changes in the socio-spatial relations that characterize global capitalism in the 1990's.

7. ECOLOGY, GROWTH & EQUITY - CONCLUDING REMARKS

> The Europe of Maastricht suffers from a crisis of ideals
> J. H. H. Weiler, Europe after Maastricht

> European integration requires not only new governmental structures and physical infrastructure links but also new mental maps and removal of Cartesian inhibitions
> R. H. Willams, European Union - Spatial Policy & Planning

> Critical of the disasters of utopian planning, we are in danger of forgetting that the unplanned city still is planned, equally undemocratically, by big business and the multinational corporation
> E. Wilson, The Sphinx in the City

The European discourse of urban space is a spatial narrative that is in the process of 'naming' and institutionalising its object. It is thus a discourse where strong intertextual links are constructed between a vocabulary of competitive economics and sustainable ecology. The spatial imaginary is based on the practical exercise of a discursive process of re-imagining European space. Within this discursive process of social spatialisation, competing values and strategies are articulated. Thus the driving rationale of the European discourse of urban space, is that economic growth is the precondition for a sustainable and equal re-distribution of the material wealth. This can be illustrated by the 'equity-growth-ecology triangle' (figure inspired of Masser et. Al. 1992):

GROWTH

EQUITY   **ECOLOGY**

Any spatial planning policy will have to address these themes and try to work for an amalgam of them, if the interest of the 'public good'[12] is to be seriously considered. The assessments of the present, generel situation are obviously very divergent, but even the more moderate analysts seems to be sceptical, thus:

> 'The hope embodied in the concept of *sustainable development* that environmental considerations and economic development priorities could co-exist to mutual benefit, looks increasingly unlikely, as policies reach operational specification' (Healey 1997a:190, emphasis in original)

Two more radical researchers, Hägerstrand and Høyer (in Kristiansen 1995), points to the fact, that if we are to take the ecological challenges seriously, we will have to change the institutions and lifestyles of our societies in a fundamental way. By this critique is blown life into some of the 'old' suggestions of the 1960's 'counter-planning' movement. This includes strategies for regional self-support and an abolition of the economic competitetiveness of multinational capitalism. At the present moment in time this analysis and conclusion does not seem to carry much weight, although it might be the most sensible one in the long run. The underlying contradictions of the discourse of European urban space is not only articulated around the axis of growth versus sustainability. The question of equity tend to make the policy making even more complex. Thus a radical policy of equity might result in a non-sustainable development. As well as any attempt to stop the growth in the name of sustainability, might increase the uneven development trends.

The main point to remember from this exercise is that space is a contested terrain. Not only theoretically, but also because of its social and political dimensions. It is therefore also important that one consider the different and plural ways that social space is conceived, as well as manipulated. In the European discourse of urban space, cities are reduced to economic and functional units within a complex and fluctuating global capitalism. This is a very specific way of seeing, a narrow perspective on a distinct part of reality. But it is not the only perspective, and it is not necessarily the perspective that will lead to the goals the EU has set for the spatial and territorial development. As opposed to an overall growth scenario, a broad panel of planners would like to see an equity/environment scenario with a (Masser et. al. 1992:195-202):

> ✎ Change of values, from competition to solidarity
> ✎ A more radical European Government promotion of sustainable development
> ✎ Europe as leader in environment-conscious policy making
> ✎ Decentralisation programmes and strict land-use control in urban areas
> ✎ Disincentives for location in large cities
> ✎ Restriction and taxation of road freight transport
> ✎ Car use constrained and renaissance of public transport
> ✎ Decentralized systems of autonomous regions
> ✎ Promote small and peripheral cities
> ✎ Permit controlled permanent immigration from non-EC countries

These themes can be elaborated with some essential questions that Jacobs poses at the end of his *Fractured Cities* (Jacobs 1992:263). Thus he asks:

> ✎ Will it be possible to develop more non-waste industrial products?
> ✎ Will is be possible to achieve an equal distribution of scarce resources given the quest for expansion and economic development in a market economy?
> ✎ Can planners ever achieve effective environmental management?
> ✎ Are we prepared to sacrifice certain lifestyle choices in order to save the environment and redistribute resources to those most in need?

So the primacy of politics over market-led rationality, the welfare (equity) dimension of spatial planning and more sincerely prioritization of sustainability, and thus possible acceptance of a non-growth strategy, is on the agenda. Otherwise, the existing socio-spatial change from a space of politics to a 'space of economics' (Jensen, Jørensen & Nielsen 1996a:14), will be inevitable, and the potential for a democratic planning towards spatial equality very uncertain. The question of planning as a means of institutionalising democracy, is actualised by the investigation of the discourse. In this context, the discourse of European urban space is certainly not crystal clear and participatory in its substance:

> 'But one thing is clear: and that is the need for a greater transparency in European planning if it is to be effective and democratic' (Davies 1996:221)

The relation between the European discourse of urban space and the Danish national spatial planning discourse is one of convergence. Thus, the underling rationale of the Danish national planning strategy for the urban system, is in accordance with the European plans as they are articulated from the European Commission. In other words, there exists a commonality of linguistic and material practices, that results in a specific configuration of power and rationality. This is seen in a 'new' and common notion of the European urban space. This is a notion of *a plural and polycentric urban space*. This notion is part of the discourse of European urban space as it is articulated by the EU, entrepreneurs, planners and politicians all over Europe today. This notion of urban space is grounded on the rationality of *a market- & and competition oriented spatial policy*. In the Danish context this means, a shift from equality oriented spatial policies towards a new rationality of spatial policy and planning. The driving force of this rationality is the primacy of the market forces over pure public sector plans and policies for the urban space. However, one might conclude that the Danish discourse of urban space is slightly more progressive in its sustaianability-aspirations than the European discourse of urban space. The Danish discourse is at least more explicit about the contradictions and internal problems than the European discourse.

The chances of articulating a socio-spatial strategy for the European territory at large, and for the inter-urban relations in particular seems to rely on the success of installing a new spatial imaginary in the minds of the European citizens. Such a spatial imaginary, is not likely to come about unless the complex relations between places and identity are re-considered. The question is, how far the EU can go in its attempt to make its citizens identify with a new socio-spatial frame of reference? So far, it is safe to say, that the driving referential of economic competitiveness will not do the trick alone. Neither will a continuing strategy of non-public planning be able to provide the needed legitimacy and public support for such a socio-spatial re-thinking. Any strong identification with a 'territorial project' will only come about if the strategy includes the local spatial identification processes and their relation to global processes of social spatialisation, as well as the spatial imaginary has to be capable of transcending a mere rationality of economic competitiveness. And further more, such strategies also needs the citizen's participation in order to secure the necessary legitimacy.

European integrated spatial planning could, ideally, be thought of as a framework for a more equal and sustainable spatial development. However, the insistence on economic growth, the lack of public awareness and participation in the making of these plans and the unresolved questions of place and identity seems to be major hurdles to a democratic plan process. There is a need for a common spatial imagination and planning. But so far the European discourse of urban space has not seriously addressed the basic dimensions of the problems, with its one-dimensional articulation within a paradigm of competitive economics. If the serious problems of the socio-spatial development are to be solved, we are in need of a new spatial imaginary and a new vocabulary. It will not be pretended that this analysis have found the solution to these complex matters. But it will be suggested, that the European discourse of urban space needs to confront these issues in a more direct and open way. So there is a number of themes and internal contradictions in the European discourse of urban space that needs to be further addressed, and these ought to be part of the future agenda on European socio-spatial transformation:

- ✏ Economic growth versus sustainability
- ✏ Inter-urban competition versus equal spatial development
- ✏ Top-down centralisation versus democracy (subsidiarity)
- ✏ The primacy of economics versus politics
- ✏ The market versus the welfare state
- ✏ The relation between place, identity and politics

As these above findings still are on a preliminary state, further research needs to be done. This is the case for (at least) three reasons. Firstly there is little knowledge about this new European level of spatial planning. And second, there is a need for a more open public debate about what is going to happen to our cities in Europe in the future. And finally the theoretical conceptualisation of the link between planning, power and rationality needs to be further developed.

REFERENCES

ACC (1996): Letter to the Ministry of Environment & Energy, May 21., ref. ARF j.nr. 6100-3/96, Amtsrådsforeningen i Danmark (Association of County Councils in Denmark)

Amin, A. & N. Thrift (1995): Globalization, Institutional "Thickness" and the Local Economy, in P. Healey, S. Cameron & S. Davoudi (eds.): Managing Cities, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, p. 91-108.

Amin, A. & J. Tomaney (1995): The Regional Dilemma in a Neo-liberal Europe, European Urban & regional Studies, vol. 2 no. 2, p. 171-188.

Castells, M. (1996): The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Christofferesen, H. (1994): Europæisk integration, offentlig sektor og regional udvikling i Danmark, NordREFO 1994:5, p. 93-116.

City of Aalborg (1996): The Road to Sustainability, Aalborg: City of Aalborg Information Office.

Commission (European) (1990): Green Book on the Urban Environment, (Com (90) 218), Brussels.

Commission (European) (1991): Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of the Community's Territory, DG XVI, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1992): Urbanization and the functions of cities in the European Community. Regional development Studies, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1993): White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment. The Challenges and ways forward into the 21st Century, (Com (93) 700), Brussels.

Commission (European) (1994a): Europe 2000+: Co-operation for European Territorial Development, DG XVI, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1994b): Competitiveness and Cohesion. Trends in the regions. Fifth Periodic Report on the Social and economic Situation and development of the Regions in the Community, DG XVI, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1995a): Innovative Actions for the regional Development, DG XVI, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1995b): The Nordic Countries - what impact on planning and development in the Union?, regional development studies, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1996): Prospects for the development of the central and capital cities and regions. Regional development studies, Brussels.

Commission (European) (1997): Towards an urban agenda in the European Union, Com (97) 197, Brussels.

CoR (1997): Draft Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on INTERREG IIC Community initiative and the potential role for local and regional authorities, Brussels, CdR 108/97.

CSD (1994): Principles for a European Spatial Development Policy, Committee on Spatial Development, Leipzig October 4., in BMBau 1994, p. 2-20.

CSD (1995a): Results of the CSD meeting on May 12. 1995.

CSD (1995b): Committee on Spatial Development meeting of October 26. 1995

CSD (1996a): ESDP - note on methodology prepared by the Troika, Brussels.

CSD (1996b): Summary record - Committee on Spatial Development Meeting of April 2. 1996.

CSD (1996c): Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Spatial Development held on July 2. 1996.

CSD (1996d): European Spatial Delevopment Perspective. First official outline. Draft Part I.

CSD (1996e): ESDP- Part II - Existing Situation and trends (General Framework).

CSD (1996f): ESDP - Part III: Policy orientations.

CSD (1997): European Spatial Development Perspective - First official draft. Presented at the informal meeting of ministers responsible for Spatial Planning of the member states of the European Union, Noordwijk June 10. 1997.

Davies, L. (1996): Plans sans frontiers?, Town and Country Planning, July/august 1996, p. 218-221.

Engelstoft, S. (1994): Regionalisering og subsidiaritet i Europa, i J. C. Tonboe (red.): Territorialitet - rumlige, historiske og kulturelle perspektiver, Odense Universitetsforlag, Odense, p. 141-159.

Europakommissionen [European Commission] (1992): Europa 2000. Fremtidsudsigterne for udviklingen af fællesskabets område, Luxembourg: Kontoret for de Europæiske Fællesskabers Officielle publikationer.

Europakommissionen [European Commission] (1994): Europa 2000+. Samarbejde med henblik på udvikling af Fællesskabets område, Luxembourg: Kontoret for de Europæiske Fællesskabers Officielle publikationer.

Faludi, A. & A. van der Valk (1994): Rule and order: Duch planning doctrine in the twentieth century, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fosgaard, M. & I. Jørgensen (1996): Recent Tropisms of Regionalisation - as observed in Denmark, Paper for European Urban and regional Studies Conference. A Changing Europe in a Changing World: Urban and regional Issues, Exeter 11.-14. April.

Gaardmand, A. (1988): Jobbet til manden eller manden til jobbet? Om dansk regionalpolitik fra 1945 til 1985, in NordREFO: Om Regionalpolitikken som politikområde, Helsinki: NordREFO, p. 62-108.

Giannakourou, G. (1996): Towards a European Spatial Planning Policy: Theoretical Dilemmas and Institutional Implications, European Planning Studies vol. 4, no. 5, p. 595-613.

Harley, J. B. (1996): Deconstructing the map, in Agnew, J., D. N. Livingstone & A. Rogers (eds.) (1996): Human geography. An essential reader, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p. 422-443.

Harvey, D. (1992): The Urban Experience, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Healey, P. (1995): Discourses of Integration: Making Frameworks for Democratic Urban Planning, in Healey, Cameron & Davoudi (eds.) (1995): Managing Cities: The New urban Context, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, p. 251-272.

Healey, P. (1996): The place of "Europe" in contemporary spatial strategy-making, Paper given at the conference "A changing Europe in a changing world: urban and regional issues", Exeter 11. - 14. April 1996.

Healey, P. (1997a): Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies, London: Macmillian.

Healey, P. (1997b): An 'institutionalist' approach to planning and its implications for 'capacity building' within the planning community, Paper for AESOP Congress, Nijmegen May 1997.

Healey, P., S. Cameron & S. Davoudi (eds.) (1995): Managing Cities. The New Urban Context, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Jacobs, B. D. (1992): Fractured Cities. Capitalism, Community and Empowerment in Britan and America, London: Routledge.

Jensen, O. B., J. Nielsen & I. Jørgensen (1996a): INTERREG IIC - A Loophole for Transnational Planning, Nordrevy, no. 5/6, December 1996, p. 13-19.

Jensen, O. B., J. Nielsen & I. Jørgensen (1996b): The ESDP Ready by February - interview with Derek Martin, Nordrevy, no. 5/6, December 1996, p. 21.

Jensen, O. B., J. Nielsen & I. Jørgensen (1996c): Progress of INTERREG IIC, Nordrevy, no. 5/6, December 1996, p. 20-22.

Johansen, J. (1996): Metafysisk Landsplanlægning, Byplan nr. 2, 1996, p. 90-91.

Jørgensen, I. & J. C. Tonboe (1993): Space & Welfare: The EC and the Eclipse of the Scandinavian Model, in T. P. Boje & S. E. O. Hort (eds.): Scandinavia in a New Europe, Oslo: Scandinavia University Press, p. 365-400.

Jørgensen, I., F. Kjærsdam & J. Nielsen (1994): The state of development plan-making in Denmark, in Healey, P. (ed.) (1994): Trends in development plan-making in European planning systems, Newcastle: Department of Town & Country Planning, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Working Paper no. 42, p. 66-80.

Kaufman, J. L. & H. M. Jacobs (1996): A Public Planning Perspective on Strategic Planning, in Fainstein & Campell (eds.) (1996): Readings in Planning Theory, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 323-343.

Kjærsdam, F. (1995): Byplanlægningens historie, Aalborg: Aalborg Universitets Forlag.

Kristiansen, J. (1995): Transportinfrastrukturens Regionale Udviklingseffekter, Aalborg: Institut for Samfundsudvikling & Planlægning, Skriftserie nr. 165, p. 129-185.

Kunzmann, K. R. (1996): Euro-megalopolis or Theme park Europe? Scenarios for European Spatial Development, International Planning Studies vol. 1, no. 2, p. 143-163.

Larsen, H. & B. Nielsen (1992): Dansk landsplanlægning ser ud over grænserne, Nordrevy nr. 2, 1992.

Lash, S. & J. Urry (1994): Economies of Signs and Space, London: Sage Publications.

Mantouvalou, M. Et. al. (1995): Processes of Social integration and Urban Development in Greece: Southern Challenges to European Unification, European Planning Studies vol. 3, no.2 1995, p. 189-204.

Masser, I. et. al. (1992): The Geography of Europeɔs Futures, Belhaven Press, London.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1991): Lov on planlægning. Lov nr. 388 af 6. juni 1991.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1992a): Danmarks byregioner - et atlas on danske byers internationale muligheder, København.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1992b): Danmark på vej mod år 2018 - analyse og vision, landsplanredegørelse bd. I & II, København.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1995): Københavns rolle i Øresundsregionen, København.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1996a): Forslag til landsplanredegørelse - Danmark og europæisk planpolitik, København.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1996b): Danmark og Europæisk Planpolitik. Revideret forslag til Landsplanredegørelse, København.

Miljø- & Energiministeriet [Ministry of Energy & Environment] (1997): Danmark og Europæisk Planpolitik. Landsplanredegørelse fra Miljø- & Energiministeren, København.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1994): Informal Council of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning Ministers - Conclusion of the Presidency and documents, the Corfu-meeting at June 3. - 4. 1994.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1995a): Interim document for the elaboration of ESDP, Madrid November 30. & December 1. 1995.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1995b): Conclusions of the Spanish Presidency, Madrid 30. November - 1. December 1995.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1996a): Ministerial Meeting on Regional Policy and Spatial Planning - Conclusion by the Italian Presidency, Venice May 3. & 4. 1996.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1996b): Ministerial Meeting on Regional Policy and Spatial Planning - Basic document for the discussion presented by the Italian presidency for the Committee on Spatial Development, Venice May 3. & 4. 1996.

Ministers Responsible of Regional Policy and Spatial Planning (1997): Presidency conclusions, Noordwijk 10. June 1997.

Morphet, J. (1997): European Update, AESOP News, Summer 1997, p. 13-15.

Newman, P. & A. Thornley (1996): Urban Planning in Europe. International Competition, national systems and planning projects, London: Routledge.

Nielsen, J. (1996): "Europa +2000" - Regionernes Europa. Nye tendenser i international planlægning, Byplan 1/96.

Nielsen, J. & O. B. Jensen (1996): Europa og dansk planpolitik, Byplan nr. 5/6, 1996, p. 240-248.

NordREFO (1992:3): Europaintegrationen och den Nordiska Regionalpolitikken, København: Nordisk Institut for Regionalpolitisk Forskning.

Nylund, K. (1993): Ideologierna och samhällsplaneringen - från modernism till postmodernism och dekonstruktivism, Nordisk Arkitekturforskning 1993:4, p. 7-18.

Pedersen, O. K (ed.) (1994): Demokratiets lette tilstand - syv beslutningstagere on Danmark og fremtid, København: Spektrum.

Peizerat, C. (1997): An Interpretation of Europe in planning and property development based on Discourse Analysis: The example of Business Sites, International Planning Studies, vol. No. 1 1997, p. 27-44.

Porter, M. (1990): The Competitive Advantage of Nations, New York: The Free Press.

Shields, R. (1992): Places on the Margin. Alternative Geographies of Modernity, London: Routledge.

Veggeland, N. (1996): Regionens Europa. Innføring i teori og praksis, Oslo: Spartacus Forlag AS.

Weiler, J. H. H. (1995): Europe after Maastricht - do the new clothes have an Emperor?, Harvard: Jean Monet Working Paper No. 12/95.

Weiler, J. H. H., V. Haltern & F. Mayer (1995): European Democracy and its critics - Five uneasy Pieces, Harvard: Jean Monet Working Paper No. 1/95.

Wessels, W. (1996): Institutions of the EU-system: Models of explanation, in Rometsch, D. & K. Wessels (eds.) (1996): The European Union and member states. Towards institutional Fusion?, Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 20-36.

Wessels, W. & D. Rometsch (1996): Conclusion: European Union and National institutions, in Rometsch, D. & K. Wessels (eds.) (1996): The European Union and member states. Towards institutional Fusion?, Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 328-365.

Wiehler, F. & T. Stumm (1995): The Powers of Regional and Local Authorities and their Role in the European Union, European Planning Studies, vol. 3, no. 2 1995, p. 227-250.

Williams, R. H. (1993): Blue Bananas, Grapes and Golden Triangles: Spatial planning for an integrated Europe, Newcastle: Department of Town & Country Planning, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Working Paper no. 19.

Williams, R. H. (1996a): Networks and Networks in European Space, Paper for the 50th Anniversary Conference: Shaping Places. Conceptions and Directions for Spatial Planning, Department of Town and Country Planning, University of Newcastle 25.-27. October 1996.

Williams, R. H. (1996b): European Union, Spatial Policy and Planning, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Zonnenveld, W. & A. Faludi (1996): Cohesion versus Competitive Position: A New Direction for European Spatial Planning, Paper presented at the ACSP-AESOP Joint International Congress, Toronto 24-28 July, 1996.

NOTES

---

[1]. A distinction that has its affinity with the latest 'theoretical swing' of German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. In his *Faktität und Geltung* (1992), the juridical procedural rationality is seen as the mediator between the life world and system, and thus giving primacy to the democratic normativity that lies in decisions made in a democratic procedure over individual's substantial motives.

[2]. This theme has recently (March 1997) been subject to a questionnaire from the Socialist Peoples Party (SPP) to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Denmark. Initiated by the 1999 restructuring of the Structure Funds, the SPP holds out that a successful enlargement of the EU depends on a restructuring of the agriculture and regional policies. Thus in the opinion of the SPP, the regional inequality problems of Europe can only be solved if the well of regions are prepared to renounce on their previous share of EU founded regional support.

[3]. One of the things that is distinct for most of these official publications, is their use of highly stylized maps, scenarios and visionary presentations. It is of course complex matters that these documents try to present, and even though many readers have been opposing this 'fancy' style of presentation, others seems to find that it has its advantages. Kunzmann finds that *Europe 2000*, *Europe 2000+* and the Commission's Periodical reports actually could be seen as contributing to cross-cultural understanding, better problem communication, reduction of complexity by the use of symbols and images and finally that dissatisfaction with such concepts triggers new research (Kunzmann 1996:144). Whether one agrees with Kunzmann or not, there is a point in stating that these documents is a part of a particular 'genre'. Just as when one is to analyse a poem, a newspaper article or a play one must consider what social field that one is engaging with. This is the question of genre, understood as the basic social norms and forms of a given field of communication. Maps in general must be 'de-constructed' if the silences and contradtictions that challange the apparent honesty of the image are to be discovered (Harley 1996:426). Thus if this radical strategy was nessecary in order to 'break the code' of the cartograpich tradition of Enlightenment, it is even more appropriate when we face the European urban discourse and its graphical representations. This is a genre where the realism of representation has been given up upon since it is a matter of communicating various specific qualities or visions conserning the topic in question (i.e. the urban hierarchy, infrastructural flows and nodes). Thus these maps are not supposed to correspond to the physichal environment but to various sets of 'spatial imaginary'. So the map is part of a discoursive field connecting various agents and institutions (with their interests and rationality) to networks of power and knowledge. The conflicts concerning what must be represented and not, are numberless. Resently a medium sized city in Denmark was not on an official map made from a Central Administration authority. The example was media covered, and it was interesting to see a whole community fighting for the right to be re-presentated and against cartograpich oblivience. Interestingly the mapping has been one of the explicit fields of conflicts in the process of making the *ESDP*. So in the slip stream of the multicoloured maps of *Europe 2000* and *Europe 2000+*, there has been a fight over the 're-presentation of reality' between various nations in the EU.

[4]. The national differences in planning systems and philosophies are not themes that this report addresses exlplicitly. Nevertheless, it is mentioned that the South European urban problems are connected to 'lack of planning' which has led to 'unplanned urban sprawl' (Commission 1991:140).

[5]. In the regional study *The Nordic countries - what impact on planning and development in the Union?* (Commission 1995b), it is stipulated that this trend of growing attraction of the large cities might be reversed in favour of smaller cities since the large cities will be overburdened with growth problems.

[6]. 'Norden' includes Norway, Sweden, Iceland and Finland in this study (Commission 1995:10).

[7]. In an earlier draft version of the *ESDP*, these notions are elaborated:
✎ **concerted**: its options emerge from consensus and favour a 'bottom-up' approach; is seeks to harmonise strategies, not to impose an extra, higher level of planning;
✎ **selective**: it deals only with territorial issues of cross-border, transnational or continental relevance; in other words, it complies with the principle of subsidiarity;
✎ **progressive**: it concentrates initially on matters regarded as priorities and then deals with the remainder while deepening its approach to the first ones;
✎ **ongoing**: its options will be periodically assessed and updated;
✎ **flexible**: it is designed for different contexts; the joint strategy proposed should not be confused with universal recipes;

✎ **transperent**: it is submitted to a wide-ranging public debate and is a source of information for all the citizens of the Union (CSD 1996d:3).

[8]. So it is said in the earlier draft version of the *ESDP* that: *'though sometimes supposed to clash with one another, these three goals [economic and social cohesion, sustainable development and the competitiveness of the European territory] are <u>far from being mutually exclusive</u>. On the contary, they can and should be reconciled in a comprehensive strategy, the territorial implications of which still have to be defined. This is the specific role the ESDP, by its very nature, has to play'* (CSD 1996d:6, emphasis added).

[9]. In the earlier draft version of the ESDP, it is said that *'Sustainability is not just a strictly environmental concept, it concerns all human activities. In this approach, <u>economy and ecology becomes 'two sides of the same coin'</u>. Though conflicts may remain between then for the time being, <u>in the long term environmental quality will increasingly become a prequisite of economic development</u>. Morover, it is already an important <u>location-factor for investors</u>. Therefore, a sustainable spatial structure is an increasingly decisive <u>asset for competitiveness</u>, and to stimulate employment and social welfare'* (CSD 1996d:6-7, emphasis added). This is very explicitly a reasoning done within the paradigm of an economic theory of competition. Thus the environment is seen as an 'asset' and a 'location-factor', which corresponds with the theories of economic internalisation of environmental costs that we have seen gain weight in the USA. The rationale is, that market prices should internalise the external costs and this can of cource only be done by subsuming the environment under a quantitative, monetary value. Nedless to say, such solutions might not lead to optimality if the pricing of the environment only operates with the 'market value'. Such reasoning cannot deal with questions such as: what is the use-value of a place, for us and for the generations to come?

[10]. For a more thorough review see Jørgensen, Kjærsdam & Nielsen (1994) and Jørgensen & Tonboe (1993).

[11]. This is said with an explicit reference to the White Paper on *Growth, Competitiveness and Employment. The Challenges and ways forward into the 21st century* (Commission 1993).

[12]. By 'public good' should be understood that planning must have as its goal to address solutions to societal problems, that are broadly acceptable by its citizens. Such acceptance is made to come about, not be means of refereeing to some abstract, essential or universal reason, but by means of open democratic process, where planning must mediate the antagonistic interests into concrete solutions, that not necessarily are expressions of total consensus or absence of hegemony. Planning is a political endeavour, but such an activity must nevertheless seek to 'serve' the broad societal interests rather than the exotic interests of a few powerful stakeholders.