Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Policy Debates

Construction of New Territorial Scales: A Framework and Case Study of the EUREGIO Cross-border Region

MARKUS PERKMANN

Wolfson School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK.
E-mail: m.perkmann@lboro.ac.uk

PERKMANN M. (2006) Construction of new territorial scales: a framework and case study of the EUREGIO cross-border region, *Regional Studies* **40**, 1–15. This paper proposes a framework for analysing re-scaling processes and applies it to a case study of the Dutch–German EUREGIO cross-border region. While much of the scale debate focuses on the causes and consequences of re-scaling, this paper addresses the conditions and circumstances in which new territorial scales emerge and suggests a framework of necessary components of re-scaling processes. Informed by neo-Gramscian thinking, the scales debate and recent analyses of regionalization, these are formulated as: political mobilization, governance building and strategic unification. The case study locates the EUREGIO case with respect to these dimensions. The paper concludes that this framework can be used for studying and comparing other re-scaling cases and presents an initial typology for classifying cross-border regions.

Scale   Re-scaling   Cross-border region   Cross-border cooperation   Europe   Territory

PERKMANN M. (2006) La construction d'une nouvelle délimitation régionale: un cadre et une étude de cas de la région transfrontalière EUREGIO, *Regional Studies* **40**, 1–15. L'article avance un cadre pour l'analyse des démarches à suivre quant à une nouvelle délimitation régionale et l'applique à une étude de cas de la région transfrontalière hollandaise–allemande EUREGIO. Alors qu'une partie non-négligeable du débat porte sur les causes et les conséquences d'une nouvelle délimitation, cet article aborde les conditions et les circonstances nécessaires à une nouvelle délimitation territoriale et avance un cadre des éléments essentiels aux processus de délimitation. Fondés sur la pensée néo-gramscienne, le débat sur la délimitation et de récentes analyses de la régionalisation, ces éléments sont élaborés comme la mobilisation politique, le développement de la gouvernance et l'unification stratégique. L'étude de cas situe l'EUREGIO par rapport à ces éléments. L'article conclut que ce cadre pourrait servir de moyen d'étudier et de comparer d'autres exemples d'une nouvelle délimitation régionale et présente une première typologie du classement des régions transfrontalières.

Délimitation   Nouvelle délimitation   Région transfrontalière   Coopération transfrontalière   Europe   Territoire

PERKMANN M. (2006) Die Konstruktion neuer Maßstäbe; ein begriffliches konzept und Fallstudie der Euregio, einer grenzüberschreitenden Region, *Regional Studies* **40**, 1–15. Dieser Aufsatz schlägt eine Grundstruktur zur Analyse der Schaffung neuer Größenordnungen vor, und wendet sie auf eine Fallstudie der Euregio, einer deutsch- niederländischen, grenzüberschreitenden Region an. Obschon ein Großteil der Größenordnungsdebatte sich auf die Ursachen und Folgen der neuen Größenordnung konzentriert, beschäftigt sich dieser Aufsatz mit den Bedingungen und Umständen, unter denen sich neue territoriale Größenordnungen ergeben, und schlägt eine grundlegende Struktur notwendiger Komponenten bei Verfahren zur Einführung neuer Größenordnungen vor. Auf neo-Gramscische Gedankengänge, die Größenordnungsdebatte und kürzlich durchgeführte Analysen der Regionalisierung zurückgreifend, werden diese auf folgende Weise analysiert: als politische Mobilmachung, als Aufbau eines Regierungsapparates,und als strategische Vereinheitlichung. Die Fallstudie ordnet den Fall Euregio im Hinblick auf diese Größenordnungen hin ein. Der Aufsatz kommt zu dem Schluß, daß die grundlegende Struktur zur Untersuchung und zum Vergleich anderer, neu einzuordnender Fälle geeignet ist und legt eine vorläufige Typologie zur Klassifizierung grenzüberschreitender Regionen vor.

Größenordnung   Neufestlegung von Größenordnungen   Grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit in Europa   Gebiet

PERKMANN M. (2006) Construcción de nuevas escalas: marco de trabajo con el ejemplo de la región transnacional EUREGIO, *Regional Studies* **40**, 1–15. En este artículo se expone un marco de trabajo para analizar los procesos de reescalamiento aplicándolo a un caso práctico en la región transfronteriza Euregio de Holanda a Alemania. Aunque el debate de la escala se centra en las causas y las consecuencias del reescalamiento, en este artículo se analiza en qué condiciones y circunstancias surgen las nuevas escalas de territorios. Se sugiere también un marco de trabajo para los componentes que son necesarios en los procesos de reescalamiento. Con datos del pensamiento neogramsciano, del debate sobre las escalas y los recientes análisis de regionalización, estos componentes se definen del siguiente modo: movilización política, construcción de la gobernanza y unificación estratégica. El caso estudiado se sitúa en la zona Euregio con respecto a estos factores. Termino el artículo exponiendo que esta estructura puede servir para estudiar y comparar otros casos de reescalamiento y presento una tipología inicial para clasificar las regiones transfronterizas.

Escala   Reescalamiento   Región transfronteriza   Cooperación transnacional en Europa   Territorio

INTRODUCTION

Transformations of the geographic scale and governance modes of public agency have recently attracted much interest by observers (BRENNER, 2003; GUALINI, 2004; JESSOP, 2002; PECK, 2002; SWYNGEDOUW, 2004; WARD and JONAS, 2004). The 're-scaling' debate has highlighted the implications of shifting scales for social forces and populations, and investigated the impact of scales on the role of localities, regions and other socio-geographic formations involved in the wider processes of global production and consumption.

The emergence of cross-border regions (CBRs) provides a paradigmatic case for re-scaling processes. A CBR is a territorial unit that comprises contiguous sub-national units from two or more nation states (PERKMANN and SUM, 2002). Since borders were hermetic barriers only on rare occasions in the history of nation states, the existence of integrated cross-border spaces is no novelty as such. What is new is that the construction of CBRs has become a more or less explicit strategic objective pursued by social forces within and beyond border regions. JESSOP (2002) comments on the significance of CBRs within the broader context of state restructuring and identifies a variety of different processes and strategies underlying and informing their emergence and consolidation.

Empirically speaking, CBRs are very different in terms of their set-up, roles and social bases, depending on the institutional context in which they are embedded. In Europe, CBRs tend to be groupings of local or regional authorities integrated into or attached to the multilevel policy implementation networks constituted by European Union (EU) regional policy (PERKMANN, 2003; ANDERSON et al., 2003). In North America, the building of CBRs is more closely associated with particularist and issue-driven interests, and they appear more loosely organized with a variety of private and public actors involved (BLATTER, 2004; SPARKE, 2002). In East Asia, CBRs tend to underpin the so-called growth triangles that, often in association with Special Economic Zones, exploit locational complementarities between territories with different factor prices and competency levels (SUM, 2002; SPARKE et al., 2004).

So far, the empirical study of CBRs and the theoretical debate on re-scaling have not been explicitly linked. The present paper intends to address this lacuna by focusing on an aspect of re-scaling processes that has failed to gain attention in the debate. Most contributions to the scale debate focus on two aspects: the *forces* that drive processes of re-scaling, and the *consequences* of re-scaling. In terms of the driving forces, much attention is paid to the underlying contradictions and functional imperatives of global capitalism, and re-scaling is often read as part of experimental strategies to restructure the spatial scaffolding of global capitalism (BRENNER, 1998) and provide new configurations of structured coherence (HARVEY, 1982). In terms of the consequences, authors have pointed to the role of re-scaled arrangements within strategies of neo-liberal restructuring and deregulation, sometimes at the expense of incumbent local communities (e.g. SWYNGEDOUW, 1996).

Less attention has been paid to how re-scaling actually occurs. What are the general circumstances in which new scales are constructed or transformed? What are the necessary ingredients of successful scale construction? This paper proposes a framework that can serve to answer these questions as well as to analyse and compare concrete cases. While the framework categories are informed by the wider debate on state-theory and regionalization, they are put to the test with a case study on the EUREGIO, a CBR between Germany and the Netherlands. The choice of the EUREGIO is pertinent insofar as it is a relatively advanced case of cross-border cooperation (CBC), and at the same time there is evidence that its model is followed widely by other similar initiatives across Europe (PERKMANN, 2003).

The objective is to create an analytical template that can inform further case studies and comparative work aimed at identifying different types of re-scaling strategies and scenarios. Demonstrating and uncovering empirical variation across cases might help address the implicitly functionalist bias in much of the current debate on scales and re-scaling, suggesting that the emergence of new scales is invariably driven by the

pressures of the global capitalist system. Not dissimilarly, neo-liberal approaches view the emergence of new scales, such as 'natural economic zones' and CBRs, as the de-facto manifestation of the economic imperatives of a globalized economy (OHMAE, 1995).

To achieve this objective, the paper proceeds as follows. After a brief summary of the scale debate, an argument is made in favour of a *territorial* concept of scale in order to clarify the ambiguities associated with the concept. Inspired by Neo-Gramscian state theory as well as recent work on concrete re-scaling processes, such as 'regionalization', a framework is presented that encapsulates the main dimensions of re-scaling processes: political mobilization, governance building and strategic unification. The framework is then applied to an in-depth study of the emergence of the EUREGIO, whereby the presentation of the data is integrated with the discussion and analysis. Concluding, a number of observations are presented as to how this framework can be used for studying further cases of re-scaling and a typology of re-scaling processes is proposed.

The empirical work in this paper is based on information obtained from two sources: interviews and policy documentation. Twenty interviews were carried out with individuals involved in the EUREGIO, the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR) and the European Commission. They included EUREGIO officials, civil servants at member municipalities, municipal associations and districts (*Bezirksregierungen* in Germany and *regios* in the Netherlands) on both sides of the border, as well as the Dutch central government and the German *Land* governments of North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) and Lower Saxony. Interviews were face to face, lasted 1.5 h on average and were semi-structured; they were all taped and transcribed. References to interview evidence are coded according to the format 'i1', 'i2', etc.; a list is provided in the Appendix. An equally important body of evidence was provided by printed and electronic documentation, in particular policy strategy and planning documents, policy evaluations and public communication materials produced by the EUREGIO, its member authorities, the European Commission, the AEBR and other organizations such as research institutes and consultancies commissioned to evaluate policy measures.

SCALES AND THE POLITICS OF SCALE

Commonly, 'geographic scale' can be referred to as:

> usually a nested hierarchy of bounded spaces of differing size, such as the local, regional, national and supranational . . . .
> (DELANEY and LEITNER, 1997, p. 93)

In the recent literature, there has been a lively debate about the 'politics of scale', a notion originally coined by SMITH (1992), which reflects the assumption that geographic scales are socially constituted in historically

specific ways and can, hence, become a stake in political struggles. This can be read against the background of the 1970s 'locality debate' when a substantivist view of scale postulated intrinsic characteristics of the 'local' (COOKE, 1989; COX and MAIR, 1989; DUNCAN and SAVAGE, 1989). More recently, authors moved towards a *relational* conception of scale, emphasizing the fact that geographic scales are socially constructed and that their precise manifestation cannot be derived a priori (cf. HOWITT, 1993).

BRENNER (2001) has made an important contribution to clarifying the concept of the politics of scale. He argues against the semantic broadening of the scale concept that he observes in much of the literature, notably MARSDEN (2000). He proposes a 'plural' meaning of scale, implying that the 'politics of scale' refers to a reconfiguration of particular orderings or hierarchies *among* geographic scales and not *within* a geographic scale. In other words, the politics of scale refers to the changing relationships between geographic scales, and the implications of such interscalar transformation for each of those scales in organizational, discursive and governance-related terms (BRENNER, 2001).

SWYNGEDOUW's (1996) contributions have elucidated the twin dimensions of scales as sites of regulation and arenas for social formations and struggles. On the first point, the fact that scales produce scalar *effects* can be seen as the very reason they become stakes in political struggles aimed at their transformation or maintenance; this is illustrated by Swyngedouw with the case of the restructuring of the Belgian mines (cf. also WILLIAMS, 1999). At the same time, he argues that 'scale' is underpinned by a temporary social compromise' (SWYNGEDOUW, 1996, p. 146). Hence, scale solidifies existing power relationships, regulates forms of cooperation, and defines power strategies. On the regional level, this process has been described by LIPIETZ (1994) as the creation of 'regional armatures', involving the establishment of a 'space-for-itself' endowed with the capacity to intervene on the part of a particular hegemonic bloc. From such a social-integrative perspective, scale becomes relevant both as a site for control and domination and as an arena for conflicts and cooperation: The 'continuous reshuffling and re-organisation of spatial scales is an integral part of social strategies and struggles for control and empowerment' (LIPIETZ, 1994, p. 141).

While these authors emphasize the socially constructed nature of scales *qua* institutions, other authors have pointed out that scales also play an important role as (constructed) discursive referents in political life. Scale discourses, as 'representational tropes' (JONES, 1998) can be deployed in political action to provide rationales for specific political projects (KELLY, 1997). As SMITH (1992) argues:

> by setting boundaries, scale can be constructed as a means of constraint and exclusion, a means of imposing identity,

but a politics of scale can also become a weapon of expansion and inclusion, a means of enlarging identities. Scale offers guideposts in the recovery of space from annihilation.

<div align="right">(p. 14)</div>

This short overview has highlighted the regulatory, social-integrative and discursive dimensions of scale. The next section explores the relationship between re-scaling and *territorial* restructuring.

RE-SCALING AS RECONFIGURATION OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE

The re-scaling debate has highlighted the role of scales – and implicitly their governance effects – as stakes in political struggles. Brenner's critique of the overextensive use of the scale concept and his plea to focus on its 'plural meaning' have done much to provide better analytical focus. There is still considerable ambiguity, however, about what the concept of scale effectively means. On the one hand, 'scale' often appears to refer to the *bounded spaces* constituted by the territorial set-up of states, regions or localities that are arenas and objects of public governance. On the other hand, scale also appears to refer to the extension of *processes*, such as commodity chains, firm collaboration or capitalist accumulation in general. While the latter is an important aspect of tendencies such as globalization, as pointed out by JESSOP (1999) and implicit in CASTELLS's (1996) 'spaces of flows', it is distinct from the creation and modification of scales understood as arenas and objects of public governance.

The difference between the two meanings of 'scale' is spelled out by DICKEN (1998, p. 13), who notes that, for instance, industrial commodity chains operate as 'vertical' processes across increasingly extensive geographic *scales* and '[c]utting across these vertical structures are the territorially defined political–economic systems which … are manifested at different geographical scales'. In other words, *vertical* processes such as the manufacturing of industrial products, or the provision of financial services increasingly crisscross *horizontally* constituted local, regional, national or supranational territories. A similar difference underlies COX and MAIR's (1991) distinction between 'spaces of dependence' and 'spaces of engagement'; here, 'spaces of dependence' refer to the exposure of local communities to processes of various spatial extension, while 'spaces of engagement' emerge when localities constitute themselves as an 'agent', i.e. engage in territorial action.

In the interest of analytical clarity, there is a strong argument for limiting the meaning of 'scales' to their 'horizontal' meaning, i.e. understood as spatially bounded units and objects of public governance.

These units exist as socially constructed, but real social entities that are organized according to a specific social relation: territoriality (SACK, 1986; BADIE, 1995). It is due to collective governance institutions, e.g. governments, that these scales are de facto constituted as objects of governance and targeted by specific policies.

Territorial re-scaling then involves the establishment of governance functions at a scale that is different from where they were previously situated. In turn, these governance functions are performed by institutions associated with each scale, i.e. relatively stabilized and legitimate patterns of social regulation. Each re-scaling process, therefore, can be said to involve the institutionalization of governance institutions at a new scalar level. A new scale can only be efficacious if it gains a sufficient degree of institutional thickness (JESSOP, 2002, p. 29), and can hence become an object for manipulation and contestation.

A precondition for this is that social support is mobilized to provide resources and legitimacy for such territorial strategies; such support might be indirect, as in the case of formal jurisdictions where it is provided via institutions of representative democracy. The mobilization of social support is likely to go hand in hand with the construction of narratives and discourses interwoven with the material (inter)dependencies involved in rearranging and constructing scales (MACLEOD, 1999). In particular, in order to be a 'space of engagement', i.e. a territory with a *capacity to act*, it must always be discursively constituted as such. In this way, the locality (or region) can develop a 'political capacity' (RITAINE, 1998) to engage, for instance in a territorial project of competitiveness. These ensuing agents are *territorial* actors who act, as it were, 'on behalf' of a territory and whose constitutive legitimacy lies in their capacity to exert relative control over a spatially bounded area.

Such arrangements rely on various articulations of territoriality. In this respect, SACK's (1986, p. 19) rather voluntarist definition of territoriality as 'the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area' or COX's (1991, p. 57) understanding that territories are 'bounded areas or arenas in which conflict occurs' cover only specific aspects of territory.

More comprehensively, territoriality is a social relation that organizes social subjects based on a set of rules linked to a bounded geographic space. As COLLINGE (1999) notes, territoriality refers to the 'socially mediated spatiality of political relations, producing formations which are interpellated as units such as "nations", "regions" and "localities"'.

As with any social relation, 'territoriality' is an abstract principle for creating and reproducing social order, but at the same time it has to be regarded as historically constructed and historically evolving.

Badie (1995) shows how 'modern territoriality' emerged as a counter-movement to other modes of socio-spatial organization such as the empire, the feudal system or the city-state at the end of the Middle Ages. He observes that at the transition from feudal territory to modern territoriality, the creation of boundaries became the instrument of choice for these new strategies of domination (via modern territoriality) (Badie, 1995, p. 33). The institution of boundaries went hand in hand with the establishment of (the idea of) a single *sovereign* authority equipped with exclusive power over a homogenous territory, as opposed to the entangled and multiple patchwork instituted by feudal domination over land and populations.

The way in which territories are defined, and how they relate to each other – both between and within states – constitutes an important moment for defining the relative positions of various social actors. In the process of territorialization, 'politics' can be seen as the strategic and political actions underlying the formation of territory (Steinberg, 1994, p. 3). It follows that each actual instantiation of territory must be regarded as the product of social struggles, in other words as socially but not necessarily intentionally constructed.

Concluding, for the sake of this present investigation into the issue of scale, territories can be characterized as specific institutionalized forms of social representation and domination based upon bounded geographic spaces and/or their populations. Importantly, territories are also sites of governance as their institutional set-up will generate effects that will be structurally selective vis-à-vis specific social forces on different scales. Thus, they provide institutionalized power positions for social actors for whom (the control of) territory becomes a resource. From such a perspective, the question of scale, and particularly of re-scaling, becomes relevant because shifting spatial boundaries and the government functions associated with them reconfigure the social and productive bases of territorial entities and thereby modify the resource position of territorial actors, and, of course, of the territorial communities as a whole. It is clear that the strategies underlying such re-scaling processes will therefore be subject to social contestation as they can be expected to affect significantly the power, resource appropriation and life chances of social groups organized at different levels. Narratives and discourses constructing scales as spatial communities as well as, more instrumentally, objects of intervention will play an important role in these processes of social contestation and governance realignment.

In view of these considerations, a territorial notion of scale sheds light on three interconnected aspects of scales: their nature as social formations, their function as sites of governance, and their construction via narratives and discourses. These aspects will be addressed comprehensively below.

ANALYSING RE-SCALING PROCESSES

As previously discussed, most contributions to the scale debate focus on two aspects: the forces that drive processes of re-scaling, and the consequences of re-scaling. However, less attention has been paid to how re-scaling actually occurs. What are the circumstances in which new scales are constructed or transformed? What are the necessary ingredients of successful scale construction? In the following analysis a framework is proposed that serves to analyse concrete cases of re-scaling. The framework lays out key dimensions of re-scaling processes that are illustrated with the example of a specific case study. While beyond the scope of this paper, future comparative case study work might explore degrees of empirical variation across each of the dimensions of the framework and establish different types of newly emerging scales and the circumstances in which they emerge.

The dimensions presented below are derived from several theoretical sources. First, the scaling debate has pointed to several core aspects relevant within re-scaling processes, largely informed by thinking based on the strategic–relational approach and regulation theory (Jessop, 2001). Generally speaking, such approaches postulate the existence of historically specific social formations, representing solidified yet unstable compromises among social forces, and institutionally constituted via modes of calculation and regulatory institutional forms producing specific effects for wider economic and social processes (e.g. MacLeod, 1999). In line with such thinking, for instance, is Swyngedouw's (1996) distinction between scales as regulatory forms and arenas for social formations and struggles.

A further conceptual impetus comes from existing accounts of re-scaling processes, notably 'regionalization' (Balme, 1996). Keating (1997) has provided a useful template for analysing a specific type of re-scaling process, regionalization, by distinguishing between the aspects of *political mobilization* for processes of region-building, *institutional restructuring* resulting in new governance structures, and *functional needs* providing rationales for the actors involved in the construction of new scales. Similarly, Gualini (2004) distinguishes between changes in substantive rationales, procedural rationales and interactional–relational rationales affecting the creation of new territorial scales in a scenario of 'experimental regionalism'.

In light of the scale debate as well as the regionalization literature, the following dimensions appear to be at the core of re-scaling processes; they can be characterized as social, procedural and substantial respectively:

- Political mobilization, i.e. the formation of a social basis underpinning the creation or transformation of a scale. If scales, as noted by Swyngedouw, solidify existing power relationships within a temporary hegemonic space, then they are underpinned and reproduced by specific coalitions of social forces.

Political mobilization then refers to the process through which these coalitions are built and maintained over time.

- Governance building, referring to emerging arrangements for channelling political and other interests and coordinating decision-making. Governance is used here in its broad sense, including exchange, hierarchy and heterarchy (JESSOP, 1998), but empirically it is most likely that new scales will rely more narrowly on complex configurations of heterarchic arrangements such as networks (e.g. BALME and JOUVE, 1996).
- Strategic unification, referring to the construction of a new scale as a unit and object for politico-territorial intervention, constituting a link between strategic intervention and the (intended) effects to be achieved on economic and social processes affecting the territorial scale. Effectively, this aspect refers to the substantive, 'project' dimension infusing social formations with shared visions and cognitive guidelines for action and intervention (COLOMY, 1998).

These three dimensions relate to the core processes involved in the emergence of new scales. Having defined this framework, it is now put to the test via a specific case of re-scaling: the EUREGIO CBR.

CASE STUDY: THE EUREGIO CROSS-BORDER REGION

General context

The EUREGIO is a Dutch–German CBR in the area of Enschede, the Netherlands, and Münster, Germany, involving approximately 140 local authorities with a total population of 3.2 million.[1] Founded in 1958, it is among the oldest CBRs in Europe and has established itself as a legitimate and competent agency responsible for cross-border matters in this specific geographic area.[2] The EUREGIO is governed by a set of formal bodies, most notably an executive board composed by the key member authorities, and a cross-border 'parliament', the EUREGIO Council. A single secretariat with approximately 30 staff functions as the executive branch of the EUREGIO and covers a variety of local policy areas ranging from spatial planning and economic policy to social and cultural matters.

It has a diversified stream of income of approximately €5.7 million (as of 2005), partly from a voluntary membership fee drawn from member authorities. Most of its income, however, is derived from its role as a programme manager for the local implementation of Interreg, the EU's support programme for CBC (PERKMANN, 1999). Interreg is part of EU regional policy and provides financial support for local public-sector collaboration across Member State borders resulting in structural economic benefits to border areas. Total Interreg funding amounts to approximately 2.3% of the EU's Cohesion policy budget.[3]

The allocation of Interreg funds is governed by Steering Committees responsible for small-scale border areas, composed by local actors and central or *Land* authorities from the participating countries. The EUREGIO is an active member of the Steering Committee responsible for the Dutch–German border area, but across Europe local CBR organizations are not always involved in the formal decision-making process. This means the EUREGIO is effectively also a policy implementation partner of the EU Commission for these regional policy measures in the Dutch–German border areas.

In the following, the three core dimensions of the EUREGIO as a newly emerging scale are reported and discussed in detail.

Political mobilization

The EUREGIO dates back to the 1950s when municipal associations on both sides of the border organized the first cross-border conference. It was established as a joint body of three inter-municipal associations, which themselves had been founded with the objective of pursuing regional collaboration to solve the structural problems of the border areas.[4] The initial period was characterized by a process of coalition-building across a number of municipalities on both sides of the border that were initially organized within groupings separately for each side of the border.

Their primary interest was to create a platform for the improvement of the local and regional infrastructures which in the eyes of the local elites were neglected on the part of the *Land* (North Rhine Westphalia) and central governments. The situation was critical on the German side where high unemployment and structural problems persisted (COUNCIL OF EUROPE (CoE), 1972). The area was among the poorest in Germany, and suffered from restructuring processes in the textiles sector which accounted for more than 50% of the industrial labour force in the 1960s with local unemployment rates of up to 80% (GOINGA, 1995, p. 20). In addition, 20% of the labour force still worked in agriculture.

While the municipal groupings were initially unilateral, they soon recognized that linking up with their counterparts on the other side of the border would enhance the legitimacy of their claims. Each area had similar socio-economic structures – partly inherited from a pre-nation-state past – and the local actors realized that their constituencies suffered from various border effects due to the marginalization within their respective national economies. Cooperation also appeared promising in addressing the day-to-day border problems, related to commuter flows, business relationships and social contacts.

Although European integration was at an embryonic level, the existence of a genuine cross-border platform enabled the EUREGIO actors to attach greater legitimacy

to their claims vis-à-vis their higher level authorities. Very early, the EUREGIO actors attempted to lobby supra-local actors, such as their national central or *Land* authorities as well as later the Council of Europe and the European Commission, in relation to regional policy measures. The cross-border coalition was successful, for instance, in influencing transport infrastructure decisions, such as the building of motorways connecting the area to the main German networks or the preservation of railway lines (cf. RAICH, 1995, p. 155; i5, i6).

This political mobilization was clearly driven by bureaucratic interests and remained restricted to the realm of public administration without involving a broader popular mobilization. From early on, however, the municipal groupings, and in turn their member municipalities, sought a degree of broader-based legitimacy for their cross-border strategies as the attention shifted towards building governance structures for the newly emerging cross-border space. CBC was positioned both as a way of seeking reconciliation after the brutalities of the Second World War and a contribution to the ongoing process of European integration (SCHACK, 1998). In fact, the initial concrete activities of the EUREGIO focused on cultural matters and 'know your neighbour' initiatives which were benevolently regarded by the central governments. This meant that both national and supranational authorities could be successfully approached. An illustrative example is the establishment of the 'Mozer Commission' in 1971, a primarily ceremonial body that still exists today and involves a large number of members, including higher-level authorities, sponsors, guests and advisors. Furthermore, as CBC became part of standard activity repertoire of the local authorities, they sought to emulate a regional democracy by establishing the 'EUREGIO Council' in 1978. The Council is a para-parliamentary body constituted by 64 elected politicians appointed by the member authorities; however, it has no formal legislative competencies although it is the most authoritative among the EUREGIO bodies.

In summary, it is clear that political mobilization in the EUREGIO was driven by administrative and policy-oriented considerations emerging within the local authorities and their umbrella associations. While the initial impetus resulted from the desire for resources from higher-level authorities, such as the *Land*, national governments and later, supranational authorities such as the European Commission, subsequent political support moved to include the building of governance structures for a cross-border space as a whole. This was still informed in part, however, by interest in resources available particularly from the European Commission. As will become clear from the discussion below, the building of cross-border policy coordination structures enabled the local actors to draw upon funding provided by Interreg, the European Commission's programme to support cross-border integration. Both initial political mobilization and ongoing support for EUREGIO CBC can, therefore, still be regarded as primarily driven by administrative rationales.

Governance building

CBRs represent a specific challenge within public governance due their atypical, non-nested territorial set-up: as their constituent parts − municipalities, districts and other subnational jurisdictions − belong to different nation states, they do not operate in a conventional context of public administration defined by legal competencies and decision-making mechanisms rooted in public law. CBRs do not have 'governments' but rely on voluntary cooperation within a context of pragmatically defined and mutually recognized set of rules. For a long time they even operated outside public law and resorted to civil law arrangements (BEYERLIN, 1998). They can therefore be seen as exemplary for a type of public agency that has been described as 'governance' by authors from a variety of backgrounds in regional and urban studies, political science and organizational studies (JESSOP, 1998; LE GALÈS, 1998; AMIN and HAUSNER, 1997; KOOIMAN, 1993). In various forms, the principle of gover*nance* − often contrasted to govern*ment* − has been widely connected to the operation of networks among parties willing to cooperate in the absence of a hierarchical instance (MESSNER, 1997; HANF and O'TOOLE, 1992; MARIN and MAYNTZ, 1991).

In light of these challenges, the main question is how a system of networked relationships can be effective in producing a 'scale'. The considerations below provide an example for such a working arrangement for the specific case of the EUREGIO. Empirically speaking, in the EUREGIO, networked governance is instituted on three levels: (1) the EUREGIO secretariat, acting as skilful and knowledgeable network broker; (2) a horizontal border-crossing network of local authorities; and (3) a vertical, 'multilevel' network of authorities including local, regional, *Land*, central state and EU actors.

EUREGIO as organization. From an organizational viewpoint, the nodal point of the EUREGIO is its secretariat, which over the last 40 years has developed into an organization with a high degree of specialist competence. The secretariat has no constitutionally instituted competencies nor does it have any guaranteed income streams. At the same time, its mandate is relatively undefined. This enables it to act in an entrepreneurial fashion as long as it has the backing of the member authorities. This relative discretion in defining and expanding its tasks has been widely used by the EUREGIO secretariat. This is reflected in its ability to generate a stable resource flow to maintain its operations. The EUREGIO commands considerable income from sources not related to Interreg, notably from the

membership fee charged to the member authorities, approximately €0.30 per inhabitant in 2005.

The proceeds from the membership fee enable the EUREGIO to pay the overheads out of its own budget. The secretariat proved successful in raising project-related funding long before Interreg was launched. In most cases, local funds were complemented by contributions from NRW and the European Commission. More recently, the secretariat successfully bid for pilot-projects from various other Directorates-General (DGs) of the European Commission. As a result, the secretariat today operates a range of activities that strengthen its profile as a cross-border regional advice and citizens' service centre.

Unlike other Euro-regions, the secretariat always sought to avoid over-dependence on the mostly temporary resources provided by non-local authorities. Although Interreg constituted a major boost in terms of financial revenues and organizational growth, the secretariat has managed to diversify its revenues and secure stable funding from local sources.

The EUREGIO organization has established itself as a highly regarded regional development agency in the Dutch−German border area. Based on its expertise and local connectedness, the secretariat exerts considerable informal influence upon EU programme implementation, for several reasons. First, by acting as a project animator, it ensures that all available funds are effectively allocated (i2, i5, i18). Second, it has made itself indispensable as a network broker. For genuine cross-border projects, project applicants need partners on the other side of the border; the relevant contacts are usually established by the secretariat (i7). Third, the secretariat uses its administrative expertise to turn initial ideas into project applications ready for submission to the Interreg Steering Committee.

The development of a strong organizational basis − enabled by a steadily increasing resource flow − was crucial for providing the local actors with access to Interreg implementation. In the 1980s, the member municipalities agreed to increase their financial contribution in the expectation that this would help to secure a substantial local impact on the allocation of future European funding. The EUREGIO grasped a strategic opportunity when it was still undecided whether a large-scale CBC support programme would be launched.

The result was that when Interreg was finally launched, the EUREGIO secretariat, with 15 staff members, was the natural candidate for programme management.[5] It had positioned itself as the strategy unit responsible for a range of tasks no other organization could deal with, becoming the undisputed agency for 'mobilising the region' (i5).

In conclusion, the secretariat doubles both as a network broker, securing ongoing cooperation among the members of the network, and a policy entrepreneur, continuously seeking to introduce policy innovations to widen the role and impact of the EUREGIO (MINTROM, 1997; ROBERTS and KING, 1996). It developed the EUREGIO from a loose network into a regional policy agency that has assumed the self-defined mandate of transforming the CBR into a 'central location in North-western Europe' with 20 million consumers within 150 km (GABBE, 1985, p. 95). The secretariat has assumed the role of a 'functional government' (BECK, 1997) not on the basis of a strong formal mandate, but through a skilful moderation and solidification of the horizontal and vertical policy network structures in which the EUREGIO is embedded. They are discussed below.

Local network. As a non-mandatory body, the EUREGIO depends on voluntary cooperation among local authorities although common rules and obligations have been defined via formalized agreements. The member authorities are linked via a set of networks that tend to have visible, formalized front-ends as formal bodies. The most important among these is the so-called 'Working Group' that acts as a supervisory board and involves senior civil servants and political office-bearers from the most powerful and active member authorities on both sides of the border. In addition, there are a number of 'Working Circles' specializing in single policy areas and involving expert civil servants from local and supra-local authorities and interest groups. They deal with project-oriented work in various policy fields, such as economic policy, social matters, or 'daily border problems'.

The most important feature of these relationships is their *technocratic* nature as the main workload rests with expert civil servants. Such technocratic networks are usually more stable than purely 'topocratic' networks composed of politicians and tend to be committed to problem-solving as opposed to pure bargaining (RHODES, 1990; BENZ, 1995). This is despite the fact that strategic EUREGIO matters are usually dealt with personally by the top officials who act more like political generalists, and hence 'topocrats' representing their constituency.

Decision-making and coordination even in technocratic networks can be notoriously difficult, especially when it comes to issues of distribution or balanced redistribution (BECK, 1997). For instance, conflicts arise over the geographic distribution of project funding or decisions favouring larger authorities over smaller ones, or urban municipalities over rural ones.

The EUREGIO has developed a variety of mechanisms to reduce the conflictuality and complexity of decision-making within the local cross-border networks. With the secretariat playing an active part as a network broker, the EUREGIO generated a set of norms that maintain a usually productive problem-solving climate, for instance a commitment to the 'long-term' and a sense of distributional fairness. A

balanced distribution of project funding over time (to mitigate limited resources) and across space (to secure commitment) is seen as crucial for unifying particularist interests behind a common objective (i5). There is no explicit or implicit formula for distributing Interreg support between the two countries or between different constituencies (i1, i7, i11). The secretariat enjoys an uncontested reputation for allocating funds even-handedly. This is why decision-making on projects is usually non-conflictual and smaller municipalities are discouraged from defecting. A further factor in reducing the complexity of decision-making in networks is the relatively small number of participants (MESSNER, 1997). In this respect, the municipal associations in the EUREGIO network play a key role by restricting the number of (relevant) participants, while representing the smaller members. At the same time, they are important in securing the commitment of the participating municipalities, even by sometimes paying for their membership (i2).

Vertical network.   In addition to the local network, the EUREGIO is also part of a vertical, multilevel network involving regional, national and European policy agencies, essentially constituting an EU cohesion policy implementation network (HEINELT and SMITH, 1996). These supra-local network linkages provide significant resources, complementing the local resources which can be seen as complementary at best. These relationships were established long before the EUREGIO was given its mandate in Interreg implementation. Its early successes all crucially depended on the support of non-local authorities, in particular the *Land* NRW, the Dutch government and the European Commission.

The Dutch central government and NRW have traditionally adopted a 'CBC-friendly' attitude towards their border municipalities. On the German side, special measures for border areas in spatial planning and economic policy have been deployed since the 1960s. NRW has also experimented with a variety of innovative regional policy schemes. Initiatives such as 'regional conferences' sought to delegate regional policy to municipalities and districts by involving them into the design and implementation of structural measures in problem areas (VOELZKOW, 1995). Evidently, the regional mobilization, brokered by Euroregions in border areas, is similar to these regional conferences.

Even before the launch of Interreg, the European Commission joined the vertical network as an important catalyst and player. Long before Interreg was launched, the EUREGIO had been lobbying the European Commission for CBC support. In 1972, the European Commission helped to fund a first cross-border development plan for the EUREGIO. A similar solution was found for the 1987 action programme before the EUREGIO succeeded in attracting

a substantial amount of European funding under Art. 10 ERDF for a series of 'innovative' pilot projects.

In the 1990s, the loose network relationships were sedimented into a more formal arrangement, the Interreg Steering Committee, involving the economics ministries of the Netherlands, NRW and Lower Saxony, the Dutch provinces and the German district authorities.

Within the confines of its area, therefore, the EUREGIO has de facto become an important implementation partner for the European Commission. Due to its expertise and authority in the local context, it enjoys a status that goes far beyond its relatively weak formal position in the vertical network. The EUREGIO is a full member of the Steering Committee and is entitled to propose its chairman.

Formally, the Steering Committee is the ultimate instance in the decision-making process on the allocation of Interreg funds. Practically speaking, however, decisions are rarely imposed on the EUREGIO actors, effectively valuing the professionalism of the secretariat. The interview evidence points to high-trust relationships across the vertical networks (i10, i11, i14), often constituted by long-term working relationships among individuals and high ideological commitment to the CBC cause.

Apart from such motives created by the social embeddedness of network contacts, for the Dutch and NRW authorities there is also an administrative rationale for cooperating with the EUREGIO actors. A senior NRW official observed: 'you can't pull projects like a rabbit out of a hat' (i11). As the need to secure the cross-border character of Interreg projects is taken seriously, the EUREGIO has a crucial role as a project 'animator' to secure the successful allocation of Interreg funds. The reliance on the EUREGIO is reflected by the fact that the NRW and Dutch ministries do not in general coordinate their positions on specific projects before Steering Committee (SC) meetings (i11).

The involvement of the EUREGIO in this vertical network mirrors the general networked set-up of policy implementation in EU regional policy described as multilevel governance (HOOGHE, 1996; BENZ and EBERLEIN, 1999). Given the importance of Interreg, it is also relevant for maintaining the stability of the local network described above. In fact, the local EUREGIO network operates in the 'shadow of hierarchy' cast by the Steering Committee.[6] To avoid rejection of project proposals by the *Land* or central government, the EUREGIO makes sure that projects have the structural economic impact required by the structural funds regulations. The relatively clear criteria for evaluating project proposals simplify the decision-making process by providing rules to be routinely followed. In case of doubt, the uncertainty reducing function of these rules is complemented by the 'shadow' of authority exerted by the Dutch and NRW governments as well as the European Commission that is channelled through the secretariat and can

be used to discipline the members of the local network. Hence, the EUREGIO secretariat performs an interface function by mediating between the network of EUREGIO members and the supranational network crystallized in the Steering Committee. On one hand, the supranational authorities trust in the secretariat's administrative expertise and its ability to prioritize the 'objective' quality of projects over the particularist interests of project applicants. On the other, the local authorities perceive the secretariat as their agent and representative vis-à-vis the higher-level authorities. It follows from the high level of interdependence between the local network and the vertical network relationships that, as a newly emerging scale, the EUREGIO is highly dependent on its integration into the supranational policy framework provided by the EU.

Strategic unification

Strategic unification refers to the construction of a scale as an object of intervention. Early in its history, the EUREGIO actors began to underpin their institution-building strategies by referring to the cross-border space as a unified object to be shaped and constructed (CoE, 1972, p. 111). The ambition of turning the EUREGIO into a 'functional unit in all spheres of life ... by superseding intra-regional locational competition via developing a specialization for the unit as a whole' originated in the late sixties, if not earlier (CoE, 1972, p. 111). The EUREGIO was to be transformed from a separate set of marginalized border economies into an integrated economic space. This strategy was formalized as the 'region principle' (GABBE, 1985, p. 94) and aims to create a 'centrally located area in North-western Europe' able to cater for 20 million consumers within a radius of 150 km (GABBE, 1985, p. 95). The creation of *cross-border development concepts* played a major role in this construction of the EUREGIO as a cross-border territorial object of intervention. Such conceptual guidelines defining the intervention space, the objectives to be pursued and the measures to be taken were a precondition for being able to attract funding from higher level authorities and to develop the EUREGIO from a loose network into a regional policy agency.

In 1971, a first EUREGIO 'structural analysis' was carried out with EU and national support (MALCHUS, 1986, p. 36). The study proposed a bundle of objectives and some general guidelines for a possible regional programme (CoE, 1972). A further step was the completion of the 1987 'action programme', which contained a long-term development perspective as well as more detailed measures for a multi-annual period. The latter part constituted the blueprint for the Interreg Operational Programmes that were later submitted to the European Commission. The development programmes were produced on the basis of expert input provided by an NRW research institute, and presented scientific rationales for *local* CBC as an efficient strategy for overcoming the structural problems of border areas.

The development programmes were relevant both as planning mechanisms and as social-integrative devices. As a multi-annual bundle of project fields and project ideas, distributed evenly in both geographic and policy area terms, they offered the EUREGIO members an expected probability for gaining access to funding opportunities in the future. By opening up a time horizon associated with a stream of resources to be distributed among a relatively large number of actors, they created incentives to cooperate and to expend resources for a secretariat.

The idea of designing *locally managed*, integrated, multi-sectoral programmes for border areas was conceptually aligned with the emerging regional policy of the European Community from the mid-1970s onwards. The 'programme approach' to regional policy propagated by the European Commission (TÖMMEL, 1994) was rapidly translated into a major catalyst for the mobilization of border areas by providing a cognitive reference for a new object of governance: a 'cross-border region' (CBR).

The rather technical construction of the CBR as an integrated region was complemented by a set of more ceremonial discourses that in turn helped mobilize political support both on the local and supra-local levels. The central discourse is constituted around the concept of the *European* border. In the context of an integrating Europe, the 'border' assumes the quality of a special symbolic marker that was mobilized very effectively by the EUREGIO. By transcending national borders, the EUREGIO claimed to be contributing to European integration 'on the small scale'. Thus, the EUREGIO was perceived as the realization of an integrated Europe that is close to the citizens, unbureaucratic and local. Similar views are shared by the European Commission and some academic observers. For the European Commission, and EU-friendly national governments, CBRs function as 'test beds for the construction of Europe' (SCHULZ, 1998, p. 15, cf. also TRÄNHARDT, 1993). 'Europe' offers itself as the most obvious referent to be invoked as a common identity among nationally distinct border communities; in addition, it also constitutes an effective symbolic resource vis-à-vis the higher-level actors, i.e. the *Land* and province authorities, the central governments and the European Commission.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This paper proposes a framework for analysing processes of re-scaling and illustrated the framework with a case study of the EUREGIO. Applied to this specific case, for each of the proposed categories, the following conclusions can be drawn.

First, political mobilization occurred by establishing collective action among local authorities on both sides of the Dutch–German border area. The initial interest was to create a platform that could leverage the combined political power of the border authorities vis-à-vis higher-level authorities in the attempt to attract attention and resources to the area. With the advent of new regional policy models that assigned local actors a stronger role in policy design and implementation – particularly promoted by the European Commission (TÖMMEL, 1994) – political support was mobilized for creating and maintaining cross-border governance structures addressing the cross-border space as a new unit of intervention. For both aspects, administrative considerations were primary, and in fact the actors supporting the CBR were almost exclusively local authorities. There was little involvement or interest on the part of other types of collective actors in the EUREGIO.

Second, governance building in the EUREGIO focused on the intersection of a local policy network involving local authorities and a vertical policy network involving higher-level authorities, i.e. central governments and the European Commission. An entrepreneurially acting agency, the secretariat, plays an active role as network broker, project animator and carrier of expertise. The two networks are highly interdependent. On the hand, participation in the local cross-border network would lose much of its attraction without a constant resource flow being secured through funding provided by higher-level authorities. On the other, the vertical network relies on the motivational role and decentralized intelligence of the local network for the inception and orderly execution of funded cross-border projects. The governance aspect of the EUREGIO highlights the 'inter-scalar' dimension of re-scaling strategies. The newly emerging territorial unit was established interdependently with higher-level scales, in particular the EU as a supra-regional policy-maker. Hence, this process involved not only 'scaling down' the level at which cross-border development measures are coordinated, but also a change in the logic of coordination, or mode of governance, as observed in other cases of shifting scales. In this specific case, instead of highly bureaucratic decision-making within so-called 'inter-state commissions' (AYKAÇ, 1994) operating on a national level, the EUREGIO instituted a 'grass-roots' agency operating in a constitutional grey space to achieve a far higher degree of mobilization and policy commitment to cross-border regional measures on the part of local actors.

Third, strategic unification in the EUREGIO was inspired by a shared vision around building a 'functional unit' serving as object of intervention for unified cross-border policy measures in 'all spheres of life'. The CBR was constructed as an object for intervention via a series of 'development concepts' that were informed by scientific–bureaucratic regional policy rationales. These documents served as cognitive and social-integrative devices ensuring the mobilization of the involved networks around a constant and stable 'theme of interaction'; this has been recognized as an important factor for the stability of networks (HÉRITIER, 1993). Simultaneously, this bureaucratic vision was underpinned by a more symbolic discourse centred around the 'European' dimension of the CBR.

The aim of the present paper was not to present the EUREGIO as the only possible model for the construction of new scales. In fact, the features exhibited by this case can be expected to differ strongly from other cases although there might be a certain degree of isomorphism in relation to other cases of European CBRs. Nevertheless, the dimensions of the proposed framework can be used for creating variation across different cases of scale construction. An initial typology, outlining both the features specific to the EUREGIO and potential variations, is presented in Table 1. Accordingly, for instance, the type of political mobilization in the EUREGIO can be described as 'administrative', but in other cases the type of actors and coalitions might be different. By contrast, in the Austro-Italian border area, the building of CBC was informed by popular mobilization driven by party politics (LUVERÀ, 1996), or in the case of Cascadia, by a coalition of 'boosterist' private-sector interests and think-tanks (SPARKE, 2002).

Similarly, governance building in the EUREGIO was shaped by a self-appointed agency and network broker that, as a successful policy entrepreneur, established a productive degree of interdependence between the local network of municipalities and the policies of a supranational actor: the EU. By contrast, other cases of scale-building rely to a stronger degree on inter-agency coordination on the national level, as

Table 1. *Logics of scale construction within cross-border regions*

	EUREGIO	Variations
Political mobilization	Administrative	Boosterist local economic interests (Cascadia) Ethno-linguistic, popular (Tyrol)
Governance building	Policy entrepreneurship in multilevel network	Inter-state coordination (Indonesia–Malaysia–Singapore Triangle) Loosely coupled public–private networks (Greater China)
Strategic unification	Cross-border economic space	Exploitation of complementarities (Asian growth triangles) Addressing externalities (USA/Mexico)

in the Indonesia–Malaysia–Singapore Triangle (GRUNDY-WARR *et al.*, 1999). Growth triangles such as Greater China, in turn, are constituted by a complex web of loosely coupled networks of actors spanning the boundaries between private entrepreneurship and public agency (SUM, 2002).

Strategic unification, finally, was provided by an image of a homogenous cross-border economic space overcoming the disadvantages associated with marginal border location. In cases such as regional cooperation arrangements on the US–Mexican border it is rather the attempt to mitigate negative social and environmental externalities that come to be the unifying discourse and strategic impetus for CBC (SCOTT, 1999). The exploitation of complementarities, expected to induce major boosts of investment and growth, are at the centre of unification discourses in the South East Asian growth triangles (SPARKE *et al.*, 2004).

Having proposed a framework for analysing re-scaling processes and sketched a typology, a few concluding comments are in order in view of further research. It is beyond the scope of this paper to present a comprehensive typology of scale construction that includes not only CBRs, but also potentially other processes involving the creation of new or modified scales as different as macro-regional collaboration or special economic zones. However, it has been shown that re-scaling processes vary widely in terms of political mobilization, governance building and strategic unification. This indicates that it is not appropriate to hold single causal factors responsible for re-scaling processes *tout-court*, and that there is indeed a variety of logics at work, possibly stemming from the wider institutional contexts in which they occur. This is in fact an important theme for future research. A related open question is whether the features of re-scaling processes 'cluster' into specific configurations in the sense that particular modes of political mobilization tend to go hand in hand with specific modes of governance and specific discourses of unification.

APPENDIX: INTERVIEW CODES

i1	Provincie Overijssel, Zwolle, the Netherlands
i2	Landkreis Grafschaft Bentheim, Nordhorn, Germany
i3	Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Regio Oost, Arnhem, the Netherlands
i4	Bezirkregierung Weser-Ems, Oldenburg, Germany
i5	EUREGIO, Gronau, Germany (group interview)
i6	Bezirkregierung, Abteilung Regionalplanung und Wirtschaft, Münster, Germany
i7	Beleidsmedewerker Economische Zaken en Grensoverschrijdende Samenwerking, Regio Acherhoek, the Netherlands
i8	EUREGIO, Gronau, Germany
i9	Landkreis Steinfurt, Steinfurt, Germany
i10	Investitionsbank Nordrhein-Westfalen, Düsseldorf, Germany
i11	Ministerium für Wirtschaft und Mittelstand, Technologie und Verkehr des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Düsseldorf, Germany
i12	Kreis Borken, Stabstelle, Bocholt, Germany
i13	European Commission, DG16, INTERREG II/c (spatial planning), Brussels, Belgium
i14	European Commission, DG16, INTERREG II, Brussels, Belgium
i15	European Commission, DG12, Brussels, Belgium
i16	European Commission, DG16, Internal inter-regional cooperation (art. 10), Brussels, Belgium
i17	European Commission, DG16, art. 10 innovative actions for telematics and the information society, Brussels, Belgium
i18	LACE-TAP office, Brussels, Belgium
i19	European Commission, DG1, Brussels, Belgium
i20	European Commission, DG16, Brussels, Belgium

NOTES

1. See http://www.euregio.de
2. For additional details on the EUREGIO, cf. SCHACK (1998), AYKAÇ (1994), DENTERS *et al.* (1998), MURPHY (1993), and GOINGA (1995).
3. See http://europa.eu.int
4. The informal Interessensgemeinschaft ('community of interest') Rhein-Ems (1954) was replaced by the more formal Kommunalgemeinschaft Weser-Ems (1962) on the German side; and by the Belangengemeemschap Twente-Gelderland and the Samenwerkningsverband Oost-Gelderland (today Regio Achterhoek) on the Dutch side.
5. 'The EUREGIO was already there, it was obvious that they were going to do the programme management' (i1).
6. On coordination in the 'shadow of hierarchy', cf. SCHARPF (1996).

REFERENCES

AMIN A. and HAUSNER J. (1997) Interactive governance and social complexity, in AMIN A. and HAUSNER J. (Eds) *Beyond Market and Hierarchy: Interactive Governance and Social Complexity*. Edward Elgar, pp. 1–31, Cheltenham.

ANDERSON J., O'DOWD L. and WILSON T. M. (2003) *New Borders for a Changing Europe: Cross-border Cooperation and Governance*. Frank Cass, London.

AYKAÇ A. (1994) *Transborder Regionalisation: An Analysis of Transborder Cooperation Structures in Western Europe within the Context of European Integration and Decentralisation Towards Regional and Local Governments*. Libertas, Sindelfingen.

BADIE B. (1995) *La fin des territoires: essai sur le désordre international et sur l'utilité sociale du respect*. Fayard, Paris.

BALME R. (Ed.) (1996) *Les politiques du néo-régionalisme. Action collective régionale et globalisation.* Economica, Paris.

BALME R. and JOUVE B. (1996) Building the regional state: Europe and territorial organization in France, in HOOGHE L. (Ed.) *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-level Governance*, pp. 219–255. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

BECK J. (1997) *Netzwerke in der transnationalen Regionalpolitik: Rahmenbedingungen, Funktionsweise, Folgen.* Nomos, Baden-Baden.

BENZ A. (1995) Politiknetzwerke in der horizontalen Politikverflechtung, in JANSEN D. and SCHUBERT K. (Eds) *Netzwerke und Politikproduktion: Konzepte, Methoden, Perspektiven*, pp. 185–204. Schüren, Marburg.

BENZ A. and EBERLEIN B. (1999) The Europeanization of regional policies: patterns of multi-level governance, *Journal of European Public Policy* **6**, 329–348.

BEYERLIN U. (1998) Neue rechtliche Entwicklungen der regionalen und lokalen grenzüberschreitenden Zusammenarbeit, in BRUNN G. and SCHMITT-EGNER P. (Eds) *Grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit in Europa: Theorie – Empirie – Praxis*, pp. 118–134. Nomos, Baden-Baden.

BLATTER J. (2004) 'From spaces of place' to 'spaces of flows'? Territorial and functional governance in cross-border regions in Europe and North America, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **28**, 530.

BRENNER N. (1998) Between fixity and motion: accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales, *Environment and Planning D – Society and Space* **16**, 459–481.

BRENNER N. (2001) The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration, *Progress in Human Geography* **25**, 591–614.

BRENNER N. (2003) The formation of the global city and the re-scaling of the State's space in post-Fordist Western Europe, *Eure-Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano Regionales* **29**, 5–35.

CASTELLS M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society.* Blackwell, Cambridge MA.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (CoE) (1972) *1. Europäisches Symposium der Grenzregionen. Die Zusammenarbeit europäischer Grenzgebiete. Basisbericht, ausgearbeitet von V. Frhr. von Malchus.* CoE, Strasbourg.

COLLINGE C. (1999) Self-organisation of society by scale: a spatial reworking of regulation theory, *Environment and Planning D – Society and Space* **17**, 557–574.

COLOMY P. (1998) Neofunctionalism and neoinstitutionalism: human agency and interest in institutional change, *Sociological Forum* **13**, 265–300.

COOKE P. (1989) *Localities: The Changing Face of Urban Britain.* Unwin Hyman, London.

COX K. R. (1991) Comment – redefining 'territory', *Political Geography Quarterly* **10**, 57–62.

COX K. R. and MAIR A. (1989) Levels of abstraction in locality studies, *Antipode* **21**, 121–132.

COX K. R. and MAIR A. (1991) From localised social structures to localities as agents, *Environment and Planning A* **23**, 197–213.

DELANEY D. and LEITNER H. (1997) The political construction of scale, *Political Geography* **16**, 93–97.

DENTERS B., SCHOBBEN R. and VAN DER VEEN A. (1998) Governance of European border regions, in BRUNN G. and SCHMITT-EGNER P. (Eds) *Grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit in Europa. Theorie – Empirie – Praxis*, pp. 135–161. Nomos, Baden-Baden.

DICKEN P. (1998) *Global Shift.* Paul Chapman, London.

DUNCAN S. and SAVAGE M. (1989) Space, scale and locality, *Antipode* **21**, 179–206.

GABBE J. (1985) EUREGIO: regionale grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit auf kommunaler Ebene, in: *Staatsgrenzen überschreitende Zusammenarbeit des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*, pp. 90–98. ILS, Dortmund.

GOINGA K. (1995) *Das alltägliche Leben in der Praxis.* EUREGIO, Gronau.

GRUNDY-WARR C., PEACHEY K. and PERRY M. (1999) Fragmented integration in the Singapore–Indonesian border zone: Southeast Asia's 'Growth Triangle' against the global economy, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **23**, 304.

GUALINI E. (2004) Regionalization as 'experimental regionalism': the rescaling of territorial policy-making in Germany, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **28**, 329–353.

HANF K. and O'TOOLE L. (1992) Revisiting old friends: networks, implementation structures and the management of inter-organizational relations, *European Journal of Political Research* **21**, 163–180.

HARVEY D. (1982) *The Limits to Capital.* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

HEINELT H. and SMITH R. (Eds) (1996) *Policy Networks and European Structural Funds.* Avebury, Aldershot.

HÉRITIER A. (Ed.) (1993) *Policy-Analyse.* Westdeutscher, Opladen.

HOOGHE L. (Ed.) (1996) *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-level Governance.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

HOWITT R. (1993) A world in a grain of sand: toward a reconceptualisation of geographical scale, *Australian Geographer* **24**, 33–44.

JESSOP B. (1998) The rise of governance and the risks of failure: the case of economic development, *International Social Science Journal* **50**, 29–44.

JESSOP B. (1999) Some critical reflections on globalization and its illogic(s), in OLDS K., DICKEN P., KELLY P. K., KONG L. and YEUNG H. W.-C. (Eds) *Globalization and the Asia Pacific: Contested Territories*, pp. 19–38. Routledge, London.

JESSOP B. (2001) Institutional (re)turns and the strategic-relational approach, *Environment and Planning A* **33**, 1213–1235.

JESSOP B. (2002) The political economy of scale, in PERKMANN M. AND SUM N.-L. (Eds) *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-border Regions*, pp. 25–49. Palgrave, Houndsmills, NY.

JONES K. T. (1998) Scale as epistemology, *Political Geography* **17**, 25–28.

KEATING M. (1997) The invention of regions: political restructuring and territorial government in Western Europe, *Environment and Planning C* **15**, 383–398.

KELLY P. F. (1997) Globalization, power and the politics of scale in the Philippines, *Geoforum* **28**, 151–171.

KOOIMAN J. (Ed.) (1993) *Modern governance. New Government–Society Interactions.* Sage, London.

LE GALÈS P. (1998) Regulation and governance of European cities, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **22**, 482–506.

LIPIETZ A. (1994) The national and the regional: their autonomy vis-à-vis the capitalist world crisis, in PALAN R. and GILLS B. (Eds) *Transcending the State–Global Divide: A Neo-Structuralist Agenda in International Relations*, pp. 23–43. Lynne Reimer, London.

Luverà B. (1996) *Oltre il confine. Regionalismo europeo e nuovi nazionalismi in Trentino-Alto Adige.* Il Mulino, Bologna.

MacLeod G. (1999) Place, politics and 'scale dependence': exploring the structuration of Euro-regionalism, *European Urban and Regional Studies* **6**, 231–253.

Malchus V. F. V. (1986) Bilanz und Perspektiven der institutionellen Entwicklung grenzüberschreitender Zusammenarbeit in Europa, in Institut für Landes- und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (Ed.) *3. Europäische Konferenz der Grenzregionen*, pp. 23–68. ILS, Dortmund.

Marin B. and Mayntz R. (Eds) (1991) *Policy Networks. Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations.* Campus, Frankfurt am Main, and Westview, Boulder CO.

Marsden S. (2000) The social construction of scale, *Progress in Human Geography* **24**, 219–242.

Messner D. (1997) *The Network Society: Economic Development and International Competitiveness as Problems of Social Governance.* Frank Cass, London, and German Development Institute, Berlin.

Mintrom M. (1997) Policy entrepreneurs and the diffusion of innovation, *American Journal of Political Science* **41**, 738–770.

Murphy A. (1993) Emerging regional linkages within the European Community: challenging the dominance of the state, *Tijdschrift voor Econ. en Soc. Geografie* **84**, 103–118.

Ohmae K. (1995) *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies.* Free Press, New York, NY.

Peck J. (2002) Political economics of scale: fast policy, interscalar relations, and neoliberal workfare, *Economic Geography* **78**, 331–360.

Perkmann M. (1999) Building governance institutions across European borders, *Regional Studies* **33**, 657–667.

Perkmann M. (2003) Cross-border regions in Europe. Significance and drivers of cross-border co-operation, *European Urban and Regional Studies* **10**, 153–171.

Perkmann M. and Sum N.-L. (2002) Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions: scales, discourses and governance, in Perkmann M. and Sum N.-L. (Eds) *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-border Regions*, pp. 3–21. Palgrave, Houndsmills, NY.

Raich S. (1995) *Grenzüberschreitende und interregionale Zusammenarbeit in einem 'Europa der Regionen'. Dargestellt anhand der Fallbeispiele Großregion Saar-Lor-Lux, EUREGIO und 'Vier Motoren für Europa'.* Nomos, Baden-Baden.

Rhodes R. A. W. (1990) Policy networks: a British perspective, *Journal of Theoretical Politics* **2**, 293–317.

Ritaine E. (1998) The political capacity of southern European regions, in Le Galès P. and Lequesne C. (Eds) *Regions in Europe*, pp. 67–88. Routledge, London.

Roberts N. C. and King P. J. (1996) *Transforming Public Policy: Dynamics of Policy Entrepreneurship and Innovation.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Sack R. D. (1986) *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schack M. (1998) *Grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit an der deutsch-niederländischen Grenze.* Institut for Grænseregionsforskning, Aabenra.

Scharpf F. W. (1996) Positive und negative Koordination in Verhandlungssystemen, in Kenis P. and Schneider V. (Eds) *Organisation und Netzwerk. Institutionelle Steuerung in Wirtschaft und Politik*, pp. 497–534. Campus, Frankfurt am Main.

Schulz C. (1998) *Interkommunale Zusammenarbeit im Saar-Lor-Lux-Raum. Staatsübergreifende lokale Integrationsprozesse.* Saarbrücken, Selbstverlag Geographie, Universität des Saarlandes.

Scott J. W. (1999) European and North American contexts for cross-border regionalism, *Regional Studies* **33**, 605–618.

Smith N. (1992) Geography, difference and the politics of scale, in Doherty J., Graham E. and Malek M. (Eds) *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences*, pp. 57–79. St Martin's, New York, NY.

Sparke M. (2002) Not a state, but a state of mind: cascading Cascadias and the geo-economics of cross-border regionalism, in Perkmann M. and Sum N.-L. (Eds) *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-border Regions*, pp. 212–238. Palgrave, Houndsmills, NY.

Sparke M., Sidaway J. D., Bunnell T. and Grundy-Warr C. (2004) Triangulating the borderless world: geographies of power in the Indonesia–Malaysia–Singapore growth triangle, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **29**, 485–498.

Steinberg P. (1994) Territory, territoriality and the new industrial geography, *Political Geography* **13**, 3–5.

Sum N.-L. (2002) Globalization, regionalization and cross-border modes of growth in East Asia: the (re-)constitution of 'Time–Space Governance', in Perkmann M. and Sum N.-L. (Eds) *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-border Regions*, pp. 151–175. Palgrave, Houndsmills, NY.

Swyngedouw E. (1996) Reconstructing citizenship, the re-scaling of the state and the new authoritarianism: closing the Belgian mines, *Urban Studies* **33**, 1499–1521.

Swyngedouw E. (2004) Globalisation or 'glocalisation'? Networks, territories and rescaling, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* **17**, 25–48.

Tömmel I. (1994) *Staatliche Regulierung und europäische Integration: Die Regionalpolitik der EG und ihre Implementation in Italien.* Nomos, Baden-Baden.

Tränhardt D. (1993) Die Kommunen und die Europäische Gemeinschaft, in Roth R. and Wollmann B. (Eds) *Kommunalpolitik. Politisches Handeln in den Gemeinden*, pp. 66–80. Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, Bonn.

Voelzkow H. (1995) Die Regionalisierung der Strukturpolitik und neue Formen einer intermediären Interessensvermittlung, in Kilper H. (Ed.) *Steuerungseffekte und Legitimation regionaler Netzwerke*, pp. 7–40. Institut Arbeit und Technik, Gelsenkirchen.

Ward K. and Jonas A. E. G. (2004) Competitive city-regionalism as a politics of space: a critical reinterpretation of the new regionalism, *Environment and Planning A* **36**, 2119–2139.

Williams R. W. (1999) Environmental justice in America and its politics of scale, *Political Geography* **18**, 49–73.