

**Julia Salom Carrasco,  
Joaquín Farinós Dasí, eds.**

# **Identity and Territorial Character**

**Re-Interpreting Local-Spatial Development**





# Identity and Territorial Character

Re-Interpreting Local-  
Spatial Development

Julia Salom Carrasco  
Joaquín Farinós Dasí  
(Eds.)

Colección: Desarrollo Territorial, 13  
Director de la colección: Joan Romero  
Cátedra de Geografía Humana. Universitat de València

Consejo editorial:

Inmaculada Caravaca	Universidad de Sevilla
Josefina Gómez Mendoza	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Oriol Nel·lo	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Andrés Pedreño	Universidad de Alicante
Ricardo Méndez	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
Rafael Mata	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Julia Salom	Universitat de València



Esta obra está bajo una Licencia Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial-SinObraDerivada 4.0 Internacional.

© Del texto: los autores, 2014

Publicacions de la Universitat de València  
puv.uv.es  
publicacions@uv.es

Composición, maquetación y pruebas: JPM Ediciones  
Diseño de la cubierta: Luis Gómez  
Tratamiento gráfico: Celso Hernández de la Figuera

ISBN: 978-84-370-9283-6 (papel)  
ISBN: 978-84-9134-987-7 (PDF)  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7203/PUV-OA-987-7>

Edición digital

# Contents

<b>Authors list</b> .....	7
<b>Introduction</b> .....	9
1. Re-territorializing local development in EU: local-based against globalisation impacts <i>Joaquín Farinós Dasí</i> .....	13
2. Economic crisis and the Southern European regions: towards alternative territorial development policies <i>Mário Vale</i> .....	37
3. Valencia industrial districts facing the economic crisis: is reindustrialization possible? <i>Julia Salom and Juan Miguel Albertos</i> .....	49
4. Location determinants of migrant inflows: the Spanish case <i>Luisa Alamá-Sabater, Maite Alguacil-Mari, Joan Serafí Bernat-Martí</i> .....	81
5. Heritage, image and territorial competitiveness: a new vision of local development? <i>Nicolae Popa</i> .....	99
6. Territorial inheritance as development opportunities in Mediterranean mountains: Morella and the Els Ports region (eastern Spain) <i>Joan F. Mateu Bellés, Joan Serafí Bernat Martí, Rafael Viruela Martínez</i> .....	127

7. Cultural heritage and/or development? Impacts of cultural heritage, tourism and cultural governance on space and society in Bamberg (Germany) and Gjirokastra (Albania) <i>Matthias Bickert and Daniel Göler</i> .....	153
8. The public institution of cultural cooperation: a new form of cooperation in the region's service. Case study: the 'Quai' in Angers <i>Martine Long</i> .....	171

# Authors list

**Alamá-Sabater, Luisa.** Senior Lecturer, Economics Department & IIDL, Jaume I University (Castellón, Spain).

**Albertos Puebla, Juan Miguel.** Human Geography Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography & IIDL, Valencia University (Spain).

**Alguacil-Mari, Maite.** Senior Lecturer, Economics Department & IEI, Jaume I University (Castellón, Spain).

**Bernat-Martí, J. Serafi.** Senior Lecturer, Economics Department & IIDL, Jaume I University (Castellón, Spain).

**Bickert, Matthias.** Lecturer, Department for Geography, University of Tirana (Albania).

**Farinós Dasí, Joaquín.** Full Professor, Department of Geography & IIDL, Valencia University (Spain).

**Göler, Daniel.** Full Professor, Institute of Geography, Otto-Friedrich-University Bamberg (Germany).

**Long, Martine.** Professor in public law at the University in Angers, France (HDR). Co-head of the Master degree 'Public Intervention Law'(Angers).

**Mateu Bellés, Joan F.** Full Professor, Department of Geography, Valencia University (Spain).

**Popa, Nicolae.** Full Professor, Department of Geography, West University of Timișoara (Romania).

**Salom Carrasco, Julia.** Full Professor, Department of Geography & IIDL, Valencia University (Spain).

**Vale, Mário.** Full Professor, Centre for Geographical Studies, Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning, Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)

**Viruela Martínez, Rafael.** Human Geography Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography, Valencia University (Spain).

# Introduction

Despite the multifaceted nature of the territory, understood as a complex system, scant attention has been paid to the objective of policy coherence, one of the five principles of good governance according to the Commission's White paper. There are powerful interests and reasons for that caught up in wanting to perpetuate patterns of growth and power relations established and strongly settled.

In economic crisis times it seems territory "does not matter"; less than never. But nobody ensures that it will appropriately be taken into account after. And what is worse, is an argument that neglects, consciously or not, the possibility of new innovative ways that precisely contribute to promoting, again, development. We understand this as territorial and sustainable development, which combines competitiveness and social dimension while being environmentally sustainable.

While in the EU we can see how the European social model and the so called "Welfare State" is progressively menaced and dismissing, in other parts of the world with more pristine conditions (where States recognize themselves as multi-national States and communities still can co-exist with some traditional respect to territory) they strive to demand and achieve the objective of "good life". It will not be coincidence that the Earth Summit (Rio + 20) returned to the South-American continent; again to Rio. In the case of Europe, where both territory and societies have been heavily transformed and even domesticated, analysis is necessary more complex, and recovery more difficult; but only in appearance. There are important changes taking place forced by the (financial) crisis that is decomposing states, rights and opportunities for welfare and development of places and generations of citizens who live there.

In such context this book presents materials presented to *2H2S European Research Consortium in Human and Social Sciences 11<sup>th</sup> International Seminar entitled "Identity, culture and right government of territory: is it possible to reinterpret the local development?"* held in Valencia and Castellón (Spain) on 16<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2012 in order to move into the possibilities of promoting (at local level and with the objective of development of localities, regions and societies) necessary innovations. Not only socio-institutional ones (according to the consolidated statements of local and regional development of economic geographers and regional and urban economists) but also -and mainly due their added value- socio-territorial innovations. Second ones include first ones, by extending development relation-



ships with territory, economy and society, culture and the environment (in an inter-sectoral and coherent way). For that, territorial governance and decision-making, and renewed strategic planning, became a quality instrument for politics and policy management (in tuning with recent and promising, although it is not exempt of risks, ecosystem based management approach).

Despite clear evidence of failure that have reached the current situation globally, still is difficult to propose (and accept) progresses towards a renewed understanding of local (territorial) development planning; in two senses. First about focus, so far than economic; in which sustainability was not only reduced to measure environmental costs of facilities and services of general interest (costs that were not previously considered, as some time ago was the case of transport costs, leading then to new theories of international trade and imperfect competence models). Second about planning activity itself, each time more contested due rigidities and simplifications of real trends and processes. All this puts territorial development planning at stake.

Governance and culture are considered now as basis vectors. Culture this time is considered not only as heritage (cultural or natural), in a static or passive way, as a resource that can be put in market value to develop clusters of activities. This applies to tourism and leisure activities, anchored to some of these territorial given resources; values in many European countries have their own long history and their own natural and geographical conditions. But pro-active (and this is the fundamental difference) by putting them in value; a final value it is depending on the way they are managed and administrated (not only in a 'prudent' but also creative way). Culture and heritage also refers to intangibles, narrative, "story lines" and traditions; and not just to learn from it but also to reinvent it from. One has several names: know-how "savoir-faire", tradition or industrial endogenous potential...

Let's get practical. Although it is possible that large changes can occur in places, in a world ones want flat and undifferentiated, do not expect great miracles, but the reproduction of old patterns instead, where places and people are faced with an old race between "earning territories" and "lost territories". Way exhausted! We have to look alternative ways, or at least complementary to this old vision. The question then is which chances are for their peculiarities ... and where to find them? If nothing is new at all, at least ones can look for the differential supported by the own culture in order to promote changes or innovations in products, processes and organizations (public as well as private ones). The goal: re-inventing territories and exploring possibilities of these vectors such as identity, culture and new territorial government (governance) practices.

According to these premises this book is organized, from both scale and thematic point of view, in eight chapters following introduction. First one explores possibilities for a renewed local/spatial strategy focusing on territorial cohesion principle, objective and policy within a re-visited EU; itself seen as renewed spatial/economic regionalization project. Second one focuses on the key role and impacts of European Policies ('first pillar' ones, mainly Regional European Policy) for this purpose. Third one put eyes in re-industrialization strategy as way to recover economies in crisis (as is the case of Spain, and more in particular of

Valencian Autonomous Region, after Real Estate crash), through local industrial districts development. Fourth one studies immigration fluxes in the Spanish case; new attracted populations represent an important resource for local development as new job forces, skilled or not, but also with a diverse character that enriches places of destination. Finally four remaining chapters deep inside cultural dimension -cultural heritage and cultural cooperation- as key factor to successful local development strategies; through case studies analysis in some European context as Albania, France, Germany, Romania and Spain.

A cultural and geographical diversity that also is present in the list of authors and their own specialization field. That represents an interesting opportunity to the reader of this book in order to make an alternative approach, and see this strategic topic of local/spatial development from different and suggesting perspectives. Editors hope it can be useful in order to face successfully challenges spaces and places should to manage in current globalized and crisis context.

# 1 Re-territorializing local development in EU: local-based against globalisation impacts

Joaquín Farinós Dasí  
*Professor, Geography Department & IIDL  
Valencia University (Spain)*

## 1. A new old history: (economic) crisis is here again!

Increasing regional differences in EU, financial crisis, non-democratic capitalism, civil society movements and conflicts, crash of the ‘government-governance-governability’ continuum, breaking moment in democratic regeneration (from real meta-governance between State-Market-Civil Society to a more limited State and Market one, and finally to Market dominium). As consequence: political and values’ crisis, leading to civil reactions and movements, looking for guiding and leading own futures and for recomposing real good/right meta-governance relationships between State-Market-Civil Society in a renewed (real) democracy through Civil Society delegation of power in representative hands (under more civic control trying to avoid current democratic deficit).

Trying to say in a simple way, current situation across the whole world is the result of a new stage of capitalism production system –globalization– that represents some important changes regarding to some previous ones (JESSOP, 2002). Among them some combination of factors are specially crucial: loss of citizens’ control about their future; loss of national and even supra-national control over financial international fluxes and its effects; loss of redistributive character of market production model with a progressive concentration of benefits and progressive reduction of middle classes as crucial element for demand and markets (and so for productions and enterprises of the real economy).

In sum, capitalism cannot solve its own problems and its regular crisis but only displace them geographically (HARVEY, 2010); but now also over time: firstly going back to the future (jeopardizing it because the problem of internal –families & business– as well as external debt), and right now going back to the past (social rights reduction/erosion trying to going back to previous stages of the industrial-

zation processes on 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century –with low salaries, more working hours, more flexibility or simply deregulation–). Accordingly, within this new globalized context where not more displacement is possible, except across other unexplored places –seas and space– and along time –as it has been done– it cannot be democratic anymore (STRECK, 2011).

How we became to this new situation can be simply summarized as: the need to reinforce accumulation within the crisis of this model of production in the middle of the 1980s; re-invent itself by the end of the 1990s with strong neo-liberal approaches; and predating and jeopardizing futures in first 2000s, until the current financial global crisis that –as a top that impedes to go so far– it seems oblige necessarily to go back (mainly in social rights) as only possible solution.

But also other alternatives to this provided one can be possible; that is, a model of competitiveness based on specific resources (local, endogenous, own, differentiated) instead common or banal ones; in line with old Jacques Delors' idea of local employment opportunities recently renewed as 'bottom-up development' (Panorama, 2012), supported on cooperation and territorial intelligence for both cohesion and better quality of life from local to EU levels (FARINÓS, 2013).

But in fact national perspectives are predominant, and a Federal EU Project seems to be each time so far, menaced by the opposite/contrary way tending to re-nationalization of policies, funds and programs. In this not so much stimulating way, currently predominant, nor democracy nor social rights nor welfare nor quality of live, nor happiness seems to win, but more traditional and conservative ways to do instead. In this trend liberals are clearly in advantage. Opposite could be the open field for progressive parties, with more clear trans-national and cooperative way from local to EU level, as first step.

If some time ago in EU (several decades after in the case of recent developed countries) local traditional conservative agrarian societies where the origin of local development (BERNABÉ, 1975; HOUSSEL, 1980), right now it seems in this new international context the place-based approach is in stand-by, if not directly missing. However lack of rules and securities in a speculative (instead real/productive) economy, within a non-democratic capitalism era, a re-interpretation of this process is more necessary than never. One should try to go forward (to translate borderlines for the new 21<sup>st</sup> century), more than re-produce a revival of 19<sup>th</sup> century production rules and rights. In such discourse liberals are the king; even though progressive parties could feel comfortable by doing and claim for the same, as until now. For both ideological sides this option is easier and more comfortable than reinvent discourses and translate barriers (about this question, applied to EU, project see MIGONE, 2013).

At this moment one can think the key issue (and dirty tramp) is the problem of States' debt; as a mirage, considered as unsolvable problem in current state of the art. This matter is heavily menacing EU project at least for two important reasons: because there is not at all a clear delimitation and difference between credit and usury (and typify usury as international felony and crime, as in fact it has been done at national level in many cases; however international or EU new law against it is difficult due precedent traditions and facts); and because in this fuzzy situation

of markets tyranny some nation-states win (creditors or stronger ones) and have new advantages from those are losing (those with debt).

## 2. Development in theory and practice: short overview of its evolution and predominant focus

Development relates with ‘progress’ concept; as evolution from basic forms to more complex and elaborated ones that are understood as better than the previous ones (‘modernization’). It relates in turn with other concepts as ‘wealth’, ‘growth’ of ‘domestic product’, which will lead to more satisfactory wealth and ‘quality of life’. However these relationships are not of cause-effect style, nor lineal ones.

Initially based on a lonely economic perspective, development concept evolved to a more trans-disciplinary approach. From a simple understanding, development is economically oriented: as transitional process to a modern, industrial and capitalistic economy (this one in turn with different possible interpretations: Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Karl Marx...), by following and reproducing a model of development advanced countries use before and the new countries in evolution should to imitate and emulate (so the so called ‘Developing Countries’). In this sense development is a progressive, irreversible, long term process following a homogenization pattern.

*Modernization perspective* joints several development strategies and approaches argued by authors as Rostow, Keynes, Perroux, Hirschman, Myrdal... It supports convenience of concentrate efforts on key (industrial) sectors and factors (social as well as institutional and cultural changes) with multiplicative effects and links in order to maximize results. That means to accept the unavoidable unbalanced character of the development process as strategy for action.

From a broader and more interesting understanding (more complex but less dependent and fatalistic), development means increasing quality of life, poverty eradication and better material welfare indicators. Within this new perspective it combines economic together with other social as well as environmental criteria/indicators, such as: covering basic needs, democracy, respect to minorities, protection of territorial assets as well as of local particularities and autonomy. It relates with new approaches and theories as those of ‘Basic Needs’ (Paul Streeten, in 1970s) and ‘Basic Rights’ (Amartya Sen and his ‘Human Development and Capabilities Approach’ in 1990s).

According with the *Basic Needs Theory*, despite economic growth is still considered as basic determinant in order to achieve desired development, it is not enough by itself in order to guarantee satisfaction of citizens’ basic needs. In this case, main goal of development must be to give all people opportunities to live a fulfilling life. Since the 1980s several evaluation reports showed the failure when achieving this objective in many countries. By then they were mainly developing countries, but currently also is the case of old developed ones, right now in crisis (as some EU Member States). That led to a new soft law commitments at international level, as is the case of *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs –eight objectives for human development adopted by 189 NU countries,

fixed in 2000 in order to be achieved in 2015 as deadline, and lastly revisited due failure on its fulfilment).

The Atlantic Chart (1941) –through which a new world order was established (until now)– based peace possibilities on economic and social securities. USA's President Franklin Roosevelt opens the way to a common understanding of development as incremental process following occidental/market pattern. In all cases this process would be under the supervision of supranational institutions as World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF). Initially conceived as control instruments in the post-war international order (in order to correct situations of absence of wealth/richness –a real danger for the global peace objective–), progressively this strategy was heavily criticized (Singer, Prebisch, Harvey, Lacoste...). Not only from the radical *Dependency Theory* (popular in the 1960s and 1970s, as strong reaction and criticism to *Modernization Theory*), but also at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup>.

By now WB and IMF both are considered as clear examples of 'non-democratic' institutions. However they are guiding citizens' lives without their permission or taking into account their opinion; but trying to preserve bastard interests instead, really opposite to those of people. In fact they are running contrary to its original objective, to avoid the final cause of the new social-endogenous conflicts and lack of social peace. As reaction we can see not only recent 'springs' movements but also (this time by accepting rules of global capitalism) new recent geo-political instruments as *BRICS*, the common agreements among the five major emerging national economies (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa).

After criticism to *Modernization Theory* coming mainly from Marxists, and after lessons learned simply and empirically over time, new approaches emerge; as is the case of the *Basic Needs Theory* (proposed by Streeten after the 11<sup>th</sup> International Society for Development World Conference, held in India in 1969). As key pre-requisite for development it asks for the fulfilment of 'vital minimum' for each individual (citizen). This ground, a necessary basis, is the necessary point of departure for any development process. These minimum factors considered are the following: ensuring material consumption needs, essential services for life (health, education, transport...), other factors facilitating own potential development (qualitative factors as participation and other favourable conditions as security).

This *Basic Needs Theory* relates with: the *Maslow's hierarchy of needs* (MASLOW, 1943 –also a USA author, as Streeten was–), as well as with the new "SumakKawsay" ("Buen vivir") principle (included in both current Constitutions, those of Bolivia and Ecuador, in these cases with a more clear environmental sustainable approach); but also with the more recent Amartya Sen's *Basic Freedoms Theory*. In this theory freedom is understood as capacity to choose, as well as capacity to be able to do. Amartya SEN (1999) differentiates five kinds of freedoms:

- political ones: related with participation as basis or real democracy –menaced in the current global financial crisis–,
- economic services availability: one should remind this was a very basic issue in first understandings for Territorial Cohesion idea inside EU in the 1990s,

- social opportunities: again menaced in the current crisis because the diminution of social rights and coverage (eroded/'in coma' Welfare State),
- transparency guarantees: related with basic principles of good governance as openness, transparency and accountability (EC, 2001),
- economic securities: more traditional factor related with new governance requirements/conditions for development according indicators developed for some international –neoliberal oriented– institutions (as is the case of the Economic Global Forum and their *Global Competitiveness Reports* – see EGF, 2013-14–).

Despite these attempts for a broader and more generous understanding of development, it was re-conducted to more economic terms, again, along the 1980s and 1990s. However liberalization, free-market and de-regulation of economies did not give expected results. Contrary developing countries (as well as creditor countries) must face the challenge of external debt reimbursement. The result was the debt restructuring (Brady Plan –1989–) and the so called Washington Consensus promoted for the IMF, the WB and the US Treasury Department. This wrong called 'consensus' consist in a set of 10 relatively specific economic policy prescriptions to be applied along the 1990s by concerned countries (mainly Latin-American ones): prescriptions about macroeconomic stabilization, more clear economic opening for trade and investment, and the expansion of market forces (labour force flexibilization or/and de-regulation at internal level).

Structural Adjustment Programs were the key instruments to apply these main guidelines progressively oriented to liberalization, privatization and de-regulation. Again, development is more than never identified as economic growth. Poverty and social problems were considered as unavoidable compensation accordingly with 'necessary' hard structural adjustments (if debt countries do not want to suffer fiscal discipline measures and punishments). The logic behind of such process seems to look for continuous adaptation of national and regional spaces to globalization exigencies and constraints (restrictions) as the only way for a feasible (real, possible) development (never local, but systemic). Not so surprisingly, twenty years after, same arguments and same measures will be pursued and applied in EU 'developed' countries affected by the current financial crisis. Just when the Latin-American ones refuse these measures and practice opposite ones and seems to be in the right way to development, growth and better quality of life (according with their positive economic indicators and the emergence and development of a new and broader middle class).

Washington Consensus itself represents an innovation, trying to adapt and satisfy needs and exigencies of global capitalism: increasing liberalization of economy, but this time leadership on investments management is going directly to private interest hands. State's role is being reduced exclusively to social and juridical (law, regulative) matters, but any of economic nature. Furthermore, public power will be applied in a *New Public Management* approach (wrongly called so, because it is reductionist while trying to identify and confuse modernization with privatization). That means administrations should be less citizen but more client

oriented instead, in a progressive process of de-centralization/compartmentalization. This way make easiest externalization and privatization of previous public competences and services (new spaces of opportunity for private business and interests), by establishing a new code of relationships and routines of action (meta-governance) between State and Market while avoiding Civil Society.

In this trend only 'participation' refers and takes care for Civil Society rights. Notwithstanding this participation is not always understood nor applied in a very clear, right and useful way (as the desired 'areté' in Aristotelian wording). And this is a very important and crucial difference for new EU countries that are applying these Washington Consensus receipts since the beginning of the 2010s. Defence of traditional national interest (Economic Nationalism), the Social Contract, and past democratic and egalitarian capitalism, all of them are in regression. As well as Social-democracy (on Merkel words "...a party, no longer a movement"), that in current non-democratic capitalism conditions (RODRIK, 2011; STREECK, 2011) is in crisis and presents clear need of revision (MERKEL & OTHER, 2008; ROMERO, 2011; STETEER & OTHER, 2009). If not it is directly in risk to be definitively eroded, changed or deleted; open window neither for a new society of needs and rights but menaces and risks instead (*Human Development* versus of *Risks Society* –BECK, 1992–).

This new situation high and clear claims for a reaction as well as for renewed alternatives and routines of action. One can imagine them more democratic and territorial based; some other can think localism is not enough, and claim for a new system, through revolution... or progressive changes (... to decide!).

### **3. From development to local development; what the local scale adds? Alternatives for a new understanding of 'territorialisation'**

Any initiative trying to overcome limitations and inefficiencies of traditional development theories and receipts (as Washington Consensus –without any good result in countries applying them along the 1990s–) looks to generate new proposals and perspectives strongly related/linked with local/particular territorial/spatial conditions. They try to combine both material (economic, social, political, cultural and environmental components...) with symbolic components (story lines, narratives, values, ownership...); not generic nor indiscriminate ones but indicative, specific, adapted and even iterative ones instead (JOHNSTON, 1991).

In this way the spatial dimension (territorialisation) appears as a new category with a synergic character facilitating such combinations. Since then, one speaks about a new development model based on local potentials (local as the more pertinent level but in relation with other ones –principle of multilevel governance, see ESPON, 2007–). So, new development models become differentiated and adapted to particular territorial features, as well as they should be able to find their accommodation within the global context.

While traditional structural policies for development adopted a functional approach, new perspectives of local development use a territorial focus as frame-



work for all actions. This new (local) development tries to achieve three main objectives: guarantee the global public goods right delivery among population, fight against personal-group-spatial and inter-generational unbalances and asymmetries in the new global context, and guarantee people fundamental rights.

Local Development theories belong to eclectic or multi-factorial theories; that is, local development requires several resources acting simultaneously. In order to achieve long term development processes, geographically based issues are the most important ones (e.g. infrastructures and facilities, quality of services, research and development activities, skilled labour force, talent). In similar way, one can also distinguish between generic and specific resources, being the second ones the most strategic and important. However, as some authors as HAUGHTON & ALLMEIDER (2008, 2013) point out, only territories with a minimum required threshold (level) of development and strategic capabilities can make use of local potentials and global opportunities by integrating internal with external diagnostic (here we use SWOT routines as methodological approach). Those which do not achieve these thresholds should look mainly for national and external support, and for territorial cooperation.

Local features and local strategic actors are crucial (TEWDWR-JONES & OTHER, 2005), but they also depend on political will and policies put in practice at supra-local/national level (finally supra-national one in the case of EU) in order to promote themselves as well as to articulate local potential with new emerging potentials and opportunities (and threats) at global level. Also development of an appropriate planning activity to better organize territory in which economic activities and sectors must be developed in order to promote local development appears as an important pre-condition. Here Spatial/Regional Planning becomes crucial element and key factor.

A lot of opportunities can come from outside, from externalities as well as cooperation initiatives and strategies. It does not mean, either, local development is only related with economic variables (e.g. those of relational nature between actors and institutions, trying to agree a common shared vision and the way to achieve it). Current liberalized free market economy, mainly supported by biggest financial institutions, represents a difficult environment that heavily menace actions and reactions from local levels. In such context, stronger institutionalization, as the return of States and new regionalisms (as is the case of EU and their public policies to be applied both at national as well as supra-local level) can help to face internal vulnerabilities (see AGNEW, 2000; AMIN, 2004; AMIN & THRIFT, 1994; HARRISON, 2006, 2013; MACLEOD & JONES, 2007; STORPER, 1997; SWYNGEDOUW, 1997).

Again multi-level and horizontal coordination and cooperation, and participation (the three dimensions of territorial governance that relates with New Strategic Spatial Planning –see FARINÓS, 2009a–) appear as basic criteria for local territorial development. Spatial development is defined and delimited by present both social and power relationships, and existing negotiation and ‘contractualisation’ processes (seen from a deliberative perspective according with HABERMAS, 1984). Here one should face the challenge of combining spatial with regional planning; economy with territory and demography. An un-structured problem that still has

not had one clear solution but several ones showing diversity of approaches, styles and traditions in spatial development planning practices: from urban to regional, from regional to spatial (as in the case of European Regional Science Association –ERSA–, European Spatial Development Planning Network –ESDP–, European Council of Spatial Planners –ECTP– ...), from space to territory, from single economy to regional economy, to international trade, to culture economy... to New Strategic Spatial Multi-level (from local to transnational) Multi-purpose (from Plan to Project) Planning.

This is the way (Local Territorial Development) to make localism possible – again– by overcoming some typical conflicts/dichotomies:

- winners versus losers (territorial unbalances inside a common space, not necessary hard-well defined –with clear borders–, but also soft spaces – with soft boundaries and variable geometries–),
- urban versus rural,
- ‘personal use’ versus ‘production’ (scale economies, local versus global market),
- growth and wealth versus sustainability and quality of life

Current financial-economic crisis is claiming for the return of:

- a. Sovereignty: in fact shared sovereignties (maybe more correctly we should talk about ‘powers’) from local to EU level, sharing real common projects/ strategies instead re-nationalization practices, by following as servants global financial powers, as well as
- b. Real democracy: as the best way to control State apparatus (accountability principle) and to strongly ask for it in order to defend the vital functions of society.

Both constitute effective and necessary reaction against too exclusive orientation to growth, to international markets, to increasing privatization processes and to progressive reduction of public administrations (current trend to State’s reduction looking for the minimum State). Development, do not forget, is very dependent on how consistent is its unavoidable political dimension; but also on to which extent local shareholders and stakeholders are able to organize themselves and lead their actions with enough degree of autonomy.

Government added value is not only related with the way in which it can deliver services of general interest, but mainly its capacity to promote cooperation among independent organizations that can become inter-dependent and develop new forms of governance (from local to supra-national level). National level is of nuclear importance in this new Network Government style, in which thinking politically space means to analyze and to understand desires, actions and strategies of all territorial actors. Economic growth and territorial integration implies not only the use of different kind of resources, physical and human ones, competitiveness networks... but also other immaterial ones defined only in an iterative way in each territory along time (DEMATTEIS & GOVERNA, 2005); as an *autopoietical social system* (LUHMANN,

1987), a dynamic element result of action-communication dialogue among entities fixed over territories (ALLEN & OTHER, 1998) (in PFEILSTETTER, 2011).

The final goal for them is to achieve territorial cohesion, through exploitation of both endogenous as well as exogenous variables. Also it is, in fact, the main goal for EU project: sustainable, intelligent and balanced spatial/territorial development (at all levels) by rising on value productive differentiation processes in areas of geographical and political co-existence (as the EU is) through territorial cooperation. As officially and institutionally said in CEMAT Lisbon Declaration (2006:3):

Networks, consisting of a number of nodes and their respective direct or indirect relations, are a fundamental element of contemporary societies and a crucial tool to the establishment of new bridges over Europe by supporting an enduring interdependence among different agents and territories.

Every network node detains a limited number of resources and is dependent on the resources detained by other nodes. It is the quality of resources (namely people and organizations) of each node and the quality of interaction and of resources sharing that determines the role and efficiency of a network. (...) Constructing the future of Europe presumes the strengthening of interactions and interchanges at a regional, national and European level as well as with even more global territories having in consideration that dynamic networks requires external links to other networks and systems. It is necessary to devise and build networks as “bridges” for the sustainable spatial and socio-economic development of the European continent. Sustainable development is better achieved by boosting interactions among the different systems and strong networks may help to promote sustainability. (...) Networks are tools for better governance: sharing knowledge and best practices, benchmarking and collective constant learning, engagement, monitoring and accountability are a new way of promoting a competitive adaptation to the challenges of globalization and territorial cohesion.

#### **4. From specific resources to territorial cooperation to achieve global integrated economic zones and for territorial cohesion**

Originally, first attempts for local development were based on the traditional “bassin de vie” French concept, in which people live, produce and consume goods and services, locally produced and locally oriented. The philosopher’s stone for economists (mainly regional economists) is how to overcome limits imposed by this small/detailed scale to achieve scale economies to be more competitive and to get over this gap in order to maintain advantages and revenues over time. As a result small becomes necessarily bigger and bigger, producing tensions between specificities and commodities (production systems are moving between Fordism and Taylorism), also between localism (new regionalism) and globalization. New global financier capitalism clearly asks and guides to the second, but people clearly needs the first one. Citizens are not a fully movable resource, nor can be understood simply in the short term, as immediate benefit that can quickly disappear after.

Despite all attempts the ‘End of History’ (FUKUYAMA, 1992) and ‘World is flat’ (FRIEDMAN, 2007) arguments are not unavoidable targets; mainly due people want to have a project of life for them and for their family, and even for their locality (land, country where to put down roots). If this argument seems kind of romantic, take into account this is the basis of the ‘European Social Model’ –ESM–. EMS is not only a differential element (uniqueness), but also a differential element that European should decidedly export in order to maintain their comparative advantages; for global win-win welfare, instead succumbing to extreme market alternatives proposed by capitalist rules. As Harvey pointed out, crisis is not exceptional but the usual character of capitalism; and in such moments translates its negative effects from old to other new gained territories.

This is the logic behind the Atlantic Chart, Washington Consensus, EU progressive enlargements and international Economic-Commercial Agreements. Simply and short: Chinese people will ask progressively for more social and labour rights (as before other Tigers and Dragons as Korea or Vietnam did). Despite ‘stability’ and ‘certainty’ are possible to achieve thanks to heavy political systems in new economic giants as China and Russia, finally they will have such better conditions and rights. But by now, because of their competition, it means German people (the strongest EU economy) have to reduce their social rights (Welfare State) and their salaries by working more ours for less revenue. If agree with this, follow this line... if not (and here the French –conservative and not– seem to be the most outstanding pupils), it is possible to think about alternative ways (probably “Third Way” is not the more appropriate way to name it due to its final results for progressive parties; GIDDENS & OTHER, 2006).

Which kind? Last CEMAT paragraph reproduced between brackets in the previous heading is very explicit; but as usual only beautiful words without desired results (ALBER & OTHER, 2008; BAUMAN, 2004; BRANDOLINI, 2007; SCHARPE, 2010). Territorial Cooperation, Global Integrated Economic Zones (explicit objective in the ESDP document –EC, 1999–) and Territorial Cohesion are the three vertexes in this new magic triangle (similarly occurs to Economic-Social-Environmental dimensions for Spatial Sustainable Development). For this purpose starting point of departure are spatial own potentials (specific development factors –DEMATTEIS & GOVERNA, 2005–).

Biggest challenge, still at this moment –or even more at this moment–, is just how to find new intelligent and useful ways in which hopefully bridging between local spaces (localities, ‘bassins de vie’, local spaces... with their own landscape character that makes them unique areas) and the supra-national/global scale. Probably at this moment old receipts –as those of 1960s (scale economies, growth poles, industrialization by substituting importations, protectionism and so on)– must be reinterpreted; as well as a new understanding of ‘glocalization’ (ROBERTSON, 1992; SWYNGEDOUW, 1997) is needed.

What it is at stake is if alternative ways for local and general development are possible (within a traditional perspective –capitalism– or outside it), and if it is possible to combine traditional strategies (even though revisited and adapted to the current new context) with very new and different ones. In other words,

if it is possible to be back to localism and to a new interpretation of economic regionalism (feasible and useful), or the only alternative for change is a more radical one (revolutionary changes). Incrementalism and progressive changes, as usual, seems to be easier and more comfortable; taking into account both forces (establishment) as well as fears. We can find examples of this in old as well as in new developing countries (mainly in South-America as said above). In any case, as ALBRECHTS (2010) wrote some years ago for spatial development, “More of the same will be not enough”.

How different and on what? How to re-interpret localism and regionalism in current new situation? We propose three main elements to be taken into account:

- respect to own character and features: differential character, culture economy and ownership, by jointing both material as well as symbolic dimensions of each territory;
- infrastructures and communication networks availability: as necessary condition to put in practice multi-scalarity; not only from theoretical and political-administrative point of view, but also as real condition in living world for citizens and their activities;
- new reinforced strategy for territorial cooperation in order to achieve a new intelligent and useful regionalism: more specially in the EU case, looking for such desired idea, objective and policy as Territorial Cohesion is.

From a local and regional development point of view –as PIKE, RODRÍGUEZ-POSE & TOMANEY (2006; 2007) pointed out– development opportunities coming from inside (bottom-up) can adopt several alternatives and specialization. Those are based not only on strategic/engine sectors but mainly on those on which localities and regions count upon competitive advantages (based both on material and non-material resources). In turn, they are not only referred or oriented to goods production but also, and more interesting, to services delivery; both production and public services (both for competitiveness but also, and mainly, general public interest services –economic and not–).

From a more traditional point of view (goods production and delivery) this book offers along its pages and chapters some interesting examples regarding for instance: tourism assets and values exploitation for local economies, immigration as process improving human capital diversity and knowledge as a way to enrich local assets, socio-institutional networks and regional policies on research and development as key factors for local economic development... Each time all of them are based on more clear participation and human capital involvement; in relation with the so called ‘social innovation’. Notwithstanding the most interesting part of this social innovation refers to new activities, that are alternative to traditional ones but within the current market perspective: social services, social (communitarian, residential, solidarity...) economies. It was probably in this way Delors’ White Paper was focusing on (EC, 1993). However neoliberal approach is quickly gaining positions –also in this field– trying to catch it for the traditional profit-oriented sectors (mainly health and education), as one can see even in EU documents

as EC (2013) and Horizon 2020. This is one of the most important threats social innovation must face to (MOULAERT, 2010); specially when trying to achieve ‘Europe 2020’ strategy objectives.

Some legislative initiatives, both at national as well as EU level, seem to corroborate this argument. Ones relate with local administrations reform, trying to reduce and concentrate number of municipalities and their capabilities, instead following the way proposed in BARCA’s Report (2009) and subsequent ITI for the next Regional European Policy program period (see Mário Vale’s chapter in this book), as well as the Community-Led Local Development approach (CLLD), initially focused to rural –LEADER– but after enlarged to urban areas –URBAN & EQUAL–. As it is the case at this moment in Spain, like three decades ago it was promoted in UK within Margaret Thatcher governments (despite Public Choice Theory born), and done also by other Member States as Greece. These measures are leading to achieve scale economies, power concentration and gaining necessary threshold in order to make easier externalization and privatization of such services. It makes easier to let them in private hands and business according with politics criteria.

Similarly other ones relate with free market and competitiveness inside EU space (the so called Anglo-Saxon idea of Europe, finally predominant after enlargement process), and consequent prohibition for public support for some specific national sectors and activities without European Commission permission (under the umbrella of contested Regional Policy). It is the case of German Lander contestation during Nice Treaty in 2000, but also of France and The Netherlands “No” to the EU Constitution (by then under preparation), even though it was a French (the former President Valery Giscard d’Estaing) who chaired committee leading to such ambition. Clearly it was the EU prohibition to French National Government economic support to social economy initiatives looking for spatial justice and territorial coherence, as well as the so called democratic deficit for EU first pillar policies, and criticized Commitology Committees, the reasons. In the case of the Netherlands there were some traditional policies, as among other social housing (TASAN-KOK & other, 2013), strategic from a national point of view, that would be affected by EU regulation. Too much net-contributing States to the EU budget in each program period want to hear.

Against this situation, that has progressively led to a more inter-governmental method instead the Community one (to more re-nationalization of EU policies and to ‘less Europe’), we can found the strategic and positive idea of Territorial Cooperation for Territorial Cohesion. It applies not only at local or micro-scale level, but also at macro-level. At micro-scale more cooperation and more participation produce more dense networks. These help to increase territorial creativity and more enabling and relational governance, promoting in turn social innovation. According to MOULAERT & OTHER (2005) social innovation refers to re-creation of social relationships among individuals and community social groups, as well as to new governance practices associated to them.

New governance initiatives socially innovative at local level –in order to make feasible its development and progress– need to develop alliances and mul-

ti-scalar networks to join them to non-traditional local initiatives as well as to exogenous forces, in order to achieve desired local changes (MOULAERT & NUSSBAUMER, 2008). This strategic coordination among public and private interests, among actions and strategies of private organizations and State administrations is possible through New Strategic Spatial Planning. Here, and despite steps done, the challenge is still being how to link economic/regional together with spatial development, as said above.

At meso and macro levels, cooperation represents the feasible way to achieve Territorial Cohesion (FALUDI, 2010; FARINÓS 2009b). We argue Territorial Cooperation as better and positive concept than ‘Territorial Integration’; however this is not the only point of view. European territory balanced development seems difficult to be achieved without Spatial Integration, but impossible without Territorial Cohesion. ESDP Noordwijk draft defined “Spatial Integration” as: “Opportunities –not defined which kind; so large range of issues possible– for and level of interaction within and between areas”. Originally and still mainly predominant nowadays it was understood as economic integration (Single Market); afterwards “economic and social cohesion” (Maastricht Treaty); and finally it was enlarged to “social, economic and territorial cohesion” (Lisbon 2007 EU Treaty, entered in force since 2009; but not yet with a clear Territorial Cohesion definition –FARINÓS, 2009b–).

In a common understanding (Wikipedia) Territorial Cohesion “is intended to strengthen the European regions, promote territorial integration and produce coherence of EU policies so as to contribute to the sustainable development and global competitiveness of the EU”. Since some years ago (first half of the 2000s) it seems more clearly EU tries to put in practice spatial development through territorial cohesion. Two are the main possible interpretations (focus) of territorial dimension of cohesion:

- as ‘territorialization’ of social cohesion (then ‘social and territorial cohesion’), trying to translate it from individuals to territories (DAVOUDI, 2007a,b) –in fact a very conflictive argument itself–, in order to reduce unbalances and offer similar departure opportunities to people despite locations;
- as single and individualized third dimension for cohesion (‘territorial’) to be added to the two previous ones (‘economic’ and ‘social’), as separate but related issues oriented to: 1) achieve EU spatial harmonized and integral development (economically competitive, socially just and environmentally sustainable); 2) all this by means of right use of (diverse) territorial local resources, by coordinating efforts among public administrations (at all levels), economic actors and civil society; in other words, by means of new good territorial governance practices (ESPON Project 2.3.2); 3) taking into account Territorial Cooperation is the best way to achieve Territorial Cohesion. Territorial Cooperation allows to maintain both solidarity among territories (Regional Policy) but also arguments for territorial competitiveness avoiding continuous dependence of public funding by following a bottom-up approach (if not possible alone... then looking for associations in order to define and agree common local/spatial development strategies).

Ratification of new Lisbon Treaty 2007 in 2009, including “economic, social and territorial cohesion” as first pillar policy, gives to Territorial Cohesion a regulative character at least in two important senses in order to:

- a. provide goods and services (of general interest) and transfer health between territories and their citizens;
- b. support new local spatial development strategies across Europe (as ITI and macro-regional spatial visions for Baltic and for Danube) by introducing a new perspective of spatial planning. These represent an attempt of coordination among all sectoral policies with territorial impact, instead simply sectoral confronting social (re-distribution) criteria with economic (competitiveness) one. In fact a more complex, comprehensive and integrated approach (FARINÓS, 2008).

DE BOE & OTHER (1999, 7) interestingly underline there are several understandings on integration concept: as coherence, concurrence, coordination of territorial impacts/effects between sectoral policies with territorial impacts and different stakeholders involved in common projects on a given territory; as well as a mean to identifying functional territorial units as efficient space to live and work. Especially the two last enhance spatial dimension of integration, complementing the previous economic predominant one. In this way spatial integration can be understood as crucial aspect for European spatial planning and spatial sustainable development through territorial place-based spatial visions (or sustainable development strategies; from local, place-based, to trans-national level). This interpretation is similar to those given by BÖHME, DOUCET & OTHER (2010: 9) to “Territorial Integration”. In this new idea of territorial integration (related with the more traditional one of functional areas) several processes of territorial grouping of functional or homogeneous areas are included. They can be defined according to several criteria: obliged mobility, voluntary agreements to define common local strategies (cross-border and not)... In all cases they directly link with Territorial Cohesion—through Territorial Cooperation—, polycentrism and urban rural partnerships.

Explicit references to ‘functional regions’ have been made in EU documents and proposed regulations for the next EU financial framework for 2014-2020 period. Document entitled *How to Strengthen the Territorial Dimension of ‘Europe 2020’ and the EU Cohesion Policy* relates functional regions with: enlargement of local job markets, achievement of critical mass through territorial cooperation, accessibility to growth poles and secondary regional centres, public transport connections to regional centres, and compact cities (sustainable cities). In turn, document entitled *Effective Instruments Supporting Territorial Development. Strengthening Urban Dimension and Local Development within Cohesion Policy* (MRD, 2011), closely relates strengthening of urban-rural relationships with: development of the entrepreneurial capacity, enhancement of human and social capital, enhancement of social services, enhancement of linkages with urban areas, the increase of the residential and economical attractiveness of rural areas. In turn, OECD (2011) underlines five fields for urban-rural partnerships: exchanges



of services and public goods (both in urban and rural areas by both urban and rural users); exchanges of goods (also in both senses from rural to urban and vice versa); exchanges of financial resources; infrastructure (transport, facilities, ICT... ) connecting urban and rural areas; mobility (commuting and migrations).

A key issue for territorial integration is to achieve an appropriate balance between spatial/territorial equity and diversity. This issue strongly relates with a crucial question as appropriate balance between enlargement and cooperation with neighbourhood regions and States and internal stronger cohesion inside EU borders is (DUHR & OTHER, 2010). Flows between places are not enough to ensure spatial integration, but also “willingness to co-operate” is required. This cooperation willingness can occur from local (place-based) to trans-national levels, and it opens new perspectives for future European Regional Policy (2014+); as well as for new fuzzy boundaries areas (variable geometries) to which new spatial visions can be developed (ALLMENDINGER & HAUGHTON, 2009; FALUDI, 2010; HAUGHTON & OTHER, 2010).

Soft spaces represent a deliberate attempt to insert new opportunities for creative thinking, particularly in areas where public engagement and cross-sectoral consultation has seen entrenched oppositional forces either slowing down or freezing out most forms of new development. Soft spaces often seem to be defined in ways that are deliberately fluid and fuzzy in a sense that they can be amended and shaped easily to reflect different interests and challenges (HAUGHTON & OTHER, 2010, 52).

In fact, anything new but old challenges revisited: How to adapt space and territory, functional-real versus administrative units (to new variable geometries), vector/fluxes versus surface/plain space, space and place (two each time more nearby concepts), emergence and prevalence of sub-regional/supra-local instead local (LAU2) scale for planning (e.g. re-emergence of metropolitan areas as planning units), etc. How to apply and make effective putting theory in practice seems to be behind this revisited idea of ‘soft spaces’ and ‘soft planning for soft spaces’. In this context new governance routines and new practices are emerging, as well as new pieces of legislation and instruments, more oriented, as it seems, to Strategic Spatial Planning.

This renewed Strategic Spatial Planning can be considered as preliminary manifestation of democratic governance and a socio-territorial innovation for this new soft planning (see ALBRECHTS, 2010; FARINÓS, 2010; PASCUAL, 2011); leading for a renewed smart local spatial development by combining the three dimensions: competitiveness with spatial justice and sustainability. There must be necessarily hierarchical relations between them or it is possible to achieve an intermediate way? If so, in order to secure balanced spatial development one should combine territorial cooperation (through networks and partnerships promotion) together with better coherence among policies with territorial impact (coordination). This option seems to be the natural output of the process of integration of the two objectives (competitiveness and balance) and the two more solid spatial planning traditions: regional economic development (looking for spatial justice) and integrated/comprehensive (looking for bottom-up spatial development in a very well

structured multi-level system). The first one tries to adapt places to policies (closer to globalization view); the second one pays more attention to strengths of each territory and to a better accommodation of instruments of policies to them (closer to localism, place based, focusing more on localization and territories' self-character, singular culture-economy, and local growth-employment-competitiveness).

## 5. Final remarks

What local scale can not to do (alone)? What is not allowed to do (even in cooperation, together with other)? What about real possibilities for a new production system model (if really new, or simply revisited trying to negotiate with establishment)? Should changes be oriented to maintain the same order –as usually–; or face the risk to stay and reproduce again all is already known?

Not local strategies without combining internal with external diagnostic, not without territorial co-operation strategies, not possible without territorial cohesion in mind. Here a new proposed understanding for development: not as simple modernization, but linking it with quality of life and rights, leading to a new understanding of dignity life for each community, re-negotiated according each community consider essential to achieve it.

As said, three elements can give place and open opportunities for progressive modest innovations regarding Welfare State, *SumakKawsay* (living-better), Social Innovation, Social-Residential-Solidary (local) Economies, and new alternative development processes: a) new localism, b) how to link economic/regional with spatial/territorial sustainable development (putting territory/space into the political agenda from local to EU level), and c) smart Territorial Cooperation for Territorial Cohesion as revisited/updated economic Regionalism inside European Union.

At this moment we are fully hidied by the neo-liberal and free market single thought, a situation and trend that decidedly started at the beginning of the 1990s, coincident with the third and final crisis of welfare state and the consequent failure of Social-Democracy parties. Doubts about the so called 'Third Way' as well as situation and alternatives described above in this chapter seem to lead to a final conclusion:

- Politically progressive alternatives should take into account these possibilities of new local development bottom-up, participated and really democratic, but ...
- In order to overcome limitations of such localism and not to stop progress, it is necessary to combine the local with supra-local, more in concrete supra-national, within the EU context; by enforcing Economic Global Zones configuration, based on endogenous character and combining complementary and/or synergic potentials (despite present barriers and menaces –RADALLI, 2000; 2006–).
- Looking to reinforce original European Social Model (FALUDI, 2007) as feasible and desirable model for the rest of the world; instead to erode it losing EU competitive advantages that make it attractive, desired and imitated (because our quality of live); instead progressively losing own condi-

tions and to be obliged to compete through more common advantages (of ‘inferior order’ according with Porter’s terminology) for which other less developed countries (that look to us as desired reference and place to go to live) are in better condition because they can found them easily. Instead look for the EU social model in the EU territory, these other states should develop it at home, contributing in turn in this way to maintain such EU social model not only as reference at international scale, but also allowing it to remain at EU level (contrary to more frequent current menaces in some significant cases as Sweden and the Netherlands).

- Trying to build a common shared idea and objective of a renewed European Union project, making easier to understand and apply European policies across Member States, from national to regional and local levels.
- The assumed hypothesis is: reducing misunderstandings and conflictive interpretations on spatial concepts, trends, menaces and the way to address them in an harmonized way (but with respect to diversity) will improve positive effects of (EU and national) public policies (by relaxing entry barriers –e.g. too NW oriented in view of Southern and other cohesion countries–). In this way one contributes to the main objective of European Territorial Cohesion, as the key point/goal for European Union project.

Two main issues referred to this action of the EU (in relation with regional development and spatial planning perspectives) are: 1) to understand how the EU can became white and clear reference for Member States when they are defining their spatial planning and development policies (e.g. their National Strategic Reference Frameworks or National Plans on Infrastructures, Landscape, Sustainable Development, Spatial Planning...); 2) how member States (diverse and quite different) are doing in order to adapt their own practices towards the European policies.

These issues correspond respectively to two basic questions: 1) to what extend EU has real multi-level capacity to give an orientation to national policies (or even to regional and local ones) in the field of Sustainable Spatial Development and Territorial Cohesion in order to achieve a better development across Europe; and 2) to what extend actors at national or even at infra-national level have taken in their agenda European objectives, criteria and routines, and how do they put them into practice and which kind of changes on governance practices can be observed.

First one tends to emphasize Europeanization of policies with spatial effects and their coordination, looking for coherence as criteria and territorial cohesion as objective. In this sense European institutions –and particularly the European Commission and Community Method– are shaping actors’ minds (FALUDI, 2010). Such actors –at infra-European level– are gradually integrating in their thinking, approaches, policies and way of acting, guidelines produced at European level. Complementary, for the second one, some specialists are interested by the way in which infra-European actors are using these guidelines and are adapting them to their own context (geographic, institutional, social, economic...); even if they are trying to influence the shaping of European Policy in the field of planning according to their own background (HASSENTUEFEL & SUREL, 2000).

Dealing with space and place requires tailor made informal rather than formal approaches, by respecting diversity of stakeholders are living in and make use of such places. New activity patterns overflow traditional spaces, defining new ones that seemingly require new territorial realignments. That represents a new opportunity to look (through cooperation) for more smart and shared/distributed/specialized strategies for territorial cohesion; at all levels: EU, national, regional and local levels. It represents an smart alternative both for competitiveness as well as welfare and quality of life; that is, not only for economics but also for people (citizens) in a sustainable (environmental friendly) way. Sustainability is considered in this case in a broad sense (not only 'green'), as manifestation of main goal of good quality of life, that citizens living in very old and domesticated territories (as EU is) are asking for, claiming for substantive re-generation. If we fail in this purpose alternatives seem really worse: poverty, coercion, dispute and (structural) violence, rights' loss and a progressively more unpleasant world (HABERMAS & OTHER, 2011). What do we prefer? Star Wars and The Lord of Rings' story lines as background; empires against people... again! Looking for a new relationship between Economics and Human Dignity (as well as a new 'globalized age of resistance', SHARZER, 2013) seems a right alternative for the future.

## References

- AGNEW, J. 2000. "From the political economy of regions to regional political economy". *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 101-110.
- ALBER, J., FAHEY, T. & SARACENO, C. 2008. *Hand book of Quality of Life in the Enlarged European Union*. Oxon: Routledge.
- ALBRECHTS, L. 2010. "More of the same is not enough! How could strategic spatial planning be instrumental in dealing with the challenges ahead?". *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 37, 1115-1127.
- ALLEN, J; MASSEY, B. & COCHRANE, A. 1998. *Rethinking the region*. London:Routledge.
- ALLMENDINGER, P. & HAUGHTON, G. 2009. "Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries, and metagovernance: the new spatial planning in the Thames Gateway". *Environment and Planning A*, 41, 617-633.
- AMIN, A. 2004. "Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place", *Geografiska Annaler*, 86B, 33-44.
- AMIN, A. & THRIFT, N. 1994. "Living in the global", in AMIN, A. & THRIFT, N. (Eds.). *Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-22.
- BARCA, F. 2009. *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations*. Independent Report prepared at the request of Danuta Hübner, Commissioner for Regional Policy, 244 pp. <[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/archive/policy/future/pdf/report\\_barca\\_v0306.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/policy/future/pdf/report_barca_v0306.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- BAUMAN, Z. 2004. *Europe: An Unfinished Adventure*. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press, Themes for the 21st Century Series.

- BECK, U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- BERNABÉ MAESTRE, J.M<sup>a</sup>. 1975. *Industria i subdesenvolupament al País Valencià*. Mallorca: Ed. Moll.
- BÖHME, K., DOUCET, P., KOMORNICKI, T., ZAUCHA, J. & SEWIATEK, D. 2011. *How to strengthen the territorial dimension of 'Europe 2020' and the EU Cohesion Policy*. REPORT based on the Territorial Agenda 2020 prepared at the request of the Polish Presidency of the Council of the European Union, 97 pp. <[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011\\_territorial\\_dimension\\_eu2020.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011_territorial_dimension_eu2020.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- BRANDOLINI, D. 2007. "Measurement of Income Distribution in Supranational entities: The Case of the European Union", in MICKLEWRIGHT, J. & JENKINS, S. (Eds.). *Inequality and Poverty Re-examined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CEMAT (2006): *Lisbon Declaration on "Networks for sustainable spatial development of the European continent: Bridges over Europe"*, Document by the Secretariat General prepared by the Spatial Planning and Landscape Division. 14 CEMAT (2006) 14 Final, 6 pp. <[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/polityka\\_rozwoju/Documents/14af8d9d64db488da9e3a95ce280607614CEMAT\\_Declaration\\_en2.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/polityka_rozwoju/Documents/14af8d9d64db488da9e3a95ce280607614CEMAT_Declaration_en2.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- DE BOE, PH.; HANQUET, TH.; & OTHER. 1999. *Study Programme on European Spatial Planning. Strand 1.4. Spatial Integration*. 153 pp.
- DAVOUDI, S. 2007a. "Territorial Cohesion, European social model and spatial policy research", in FALUDI, A. (Ed.). *Territorial cohesion and European model of society*, Cambridge, MA: The Lincoln Institute for Land Policy.
- DAVOUDI, S. (2007b): "Cohesión Territorial: Relaciones con la planificación territorial y la política regional", in FARINÓS, J. & ROMERO, J. (Eds.). *Territorialidad y buen gobierno para el desarrollo sostenible. Nuevos principios y nuevas políticas en el espacio europeo*. Valencia: PUV / IIDL, Colección 'Desarrollo Territorial' n° 2, 67-77.
- DEMATTEIS, G. & GOVERNA, F. 2005. "Territorio y territorialidad en el desarrollo local. La contribución del modelo SLOT". *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, 39, 31-58. <<http://www.boletinage.com/39/02-TERRITORIO.pdf>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- DURH, S.; CLAIRE, C.; VINCENT, N. 2010. *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*. London: Routledge.
- EGF –Economic Global Forum– 2013. *Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014*. <<http://www.weforum.org/issues/global-competitiveness>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION –EC– 2013. Guide to Social Innovation. DG Regional and Urban Policy and DG Employment, Social affairs and Inclusion, 72 pp. <<http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/10157/47822/Guide%20to%20Social%20Innovation.pdf>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- 2008. *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion Turning territorial diversity into strength. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, The Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee*. SEC(2008) 2550. COM(2008) 616 final. 13 pp. + Annex.

- <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0616:FIN:EN:PDF>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- 2001. *European Governance - A White Paper*. COM (2001) 428 final, 25 July, 35 p. <[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001\\_0428en01.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0428en01.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
  - 1999. *European Spatial Development Perspective. Agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, May 1999*. Published by the European Commission; Prepared by the Committee on Spatial Development. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 87 pp. <[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docofic/official/reports/pdf/sum\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docofic/official/reports/pdf/sum_en.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
  - 1993. *Growth, competitiveness, Employment. The challenges and ways forward into the 21st century. White Paper*. COM(93) 700, 5 December 1993, Parts A and B, 143 pp. <[http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/white-papers/pdf/growth\\_wp\\_com\\_93\\_700\\_parts\\_a\\_b.pdf](http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/white-papers/pdf/growth_wp_com_93_700_parts_a_b.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- ESPON 2.3.2 Project. 2007. *Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level*. Final Report, 1328 pp. <[http://www.espon.eu/export/sites/default/Documents/Projects/ESPON2006Projects/PolicyImpactProjects/Governance/fr-2.3.2\\_final\\_feb2007.pdf](http://www.espon.eu/export/sites/default/Documents/Projects/ESPON2006Projects/PolicyImpactProjects/Governance/fr-2.3.2_final_feb2007.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- FALUDI, A. 2010. *Cohesion, Coherence, Cooperation: European Spatial Planning Coming of Age?* London & New York: Routledge/Royal Town Planning Institute, *The RTPI Library Series: Planning/Geography/Urban Studies*, 207 pp.
- FALUDI, A. 2007. "The European Model of Society", in FALUDI, A. (Ed.). *Territorial cohesion and European model of society*. Cambridge, MA: The Lincoln Institute for Land Policy, 1-22.
- FARINÓS, J. (2013): "Territorial Cooperation as a Means of Achieving Territorial Integration? From Local Place-based to European Union Territorial Cohesion", in GORZELAK, G. & ZAWALIŃSKA, K. (Eds.). *European Territories: From Co-operation to Integration*. Warsaw: ESPON & EUROREG - Centre for European Regional and Local Studies, University of Warsaw, 42-53.
- 2010. "Gobernanza para una renovada planificación territorial estratégica: Hacia la innovación socio-territorial", in MARTÍN, A. & MERINERO, R. (coord.). *Planificación Estratégica Territorial: Estudios Metodológicos*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía/U. de Jaén/Radeut, 87-113.
  - 2009a. "Bases, métodos e instrumentos para el desarrollo y la cohesión territoriales. Diagnóstico y propuestas para el debate y la acción", in FARINÓS, J.; ROMERO, J. & SALOM, J. (coord.). *Cohesión e inteligencia territorial. Dinámicas y procesos para una mejor planificación en la toma de decisiones*. Valencia: IIDL/PUV, Colección Desarrollo Territorial, 7, 17-62.
  - 2009b. "Cooperación para la cohesión territorial: Una interpretación multinivel desde el SO Europeo", in BOSQUE, J. & RODRÍGUEZ, V.M. (ed.). *La perspectiva geográfica ante los retos de la sociedad y el medio ambiente en el contexto ibérico*. Madrid: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 117-148.

- 2008. “Gobernanza territorial para el desarrollo sostenible: Estado de la cuestión y agenda”. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, 46, 11-32.
- FRIEDMAN, T.L. 2007. *The World Is Flat 3.0: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Picador, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.
- FUKUYAMA, F. (1992): *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- GIDDENS, A.; DIAMOND, P. AND LIDDLE, R. (Eds.). 2006. *Global Europe, Social Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.
- HABERMAS, J. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston, M.A.: Beacon Press.
- HABERMAS, J. & 18 OTHERS EU INTELLECTUALS. 2011. “The EU needs leadership to tackle this crisis, not repeated doses of austerity. Ad hoc politics has undermined European solidarity and has created confusion and distrust among Europe’s citizens”. *The Guardian*, Wednesday 22 June. <<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/jun/22/eu-leadership-tackle-crisis-austerity>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- HARRISON, J. 2013. “Configuring the New ‘Regional World’: On being Caught between Territory and Networks”. *Regional Studies*, 47(1), 55-74.
- 2006. “Re-Reading the new regionalism: A sympathetic critique”. *Space and Polity*, 10, 21-46.
- HARVEY, D. 2010. *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. London: Profile Books LTD.
- HASSENTUEFEL P. & SUREL Y. 2000. “Des politiques publiques comme les autres? Construction de l’objet et outils d’analyse des politique européenne”. *Politique européenne*, 1, 8-24.
- HAUGHTON, G. & ALLMENDINGER, P. 2013. “Spatial Planning and the New Localism”, in HAUGHTON, G. & ALLMENDINGER, P. (Eds.). *Planning Practice and Research*, Special Issue, 28.1 (Spatial Planning and the New Localism in England), 1-5.
- 2008. “The Soft Spaces of Local Economic Development”. *Local Economy*, 23(2), 138-148.
- HAUGHTON, G., ALLMENDINGER, P., COUNSELL, D. & VIGAR, G. 2010. *The new spatial planning: Territorial management with soft spaces and fuzzy boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- HOUSSEL, J.P. 1980. “Les industries autochtones en milieu rural”. *Revue de Géographie de Lyon*, 4, 305-341.
- JESSOP, B. 2002. *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.
- JOHNSTON, R. 1991. *A Question of Place*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LUHMANN, N. 1987. *Soziale Systeme. Grundrisseiner allgemeinen Theorie*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- MACLEOD, G & JONES, M. 2007. “Territorial, Scalar, Networked, Connected: In what sense a ‘Regional World’?”. *Regional Studies*, 41.9, 1177-1191.
- MASLOW, A. 1943. “A Theory of Human Motivation”. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

- MERKEL, W.; PETRING, A.; HENKES, CH. & EGGLE, CH. 2008. *Social Democracy in Power: The Capacity to Reform*. London & New York: Routledge.
- MIGONE, G.G. 2013. "Bottom up... to Europe". *open Democracy free thinking for the world*, 5 April 2013. <[http://www.opendemocracy.net/gian-giacomo-migone/bottom-up%E2%80%A6-to-europe?utm\\_source=Daily+Newsletter&utm\\_campaign=d7090f466c-DAILY\\_NEWSLETTER\\_MAILCHIMP&utm\\_medium=email](http://www.opendemocracy.net/gian-giacomo-migone/bottom-up%E2%80%A6-to-europe?utm_source=Daily+Newsletter&utm_campaign=d7090f466c-DAILY_NEWSLETTER_MAILCHIMP&utm_medium=email)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- MOULAERT, F. 2010. "Introduction: Challenges for social innovation research", in FRANK MOULAERT, F.; MACCALLUM, D.; MEHMOOD, A. & HAMDOUCH, A. (Eds.). *Social Innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research*. KATARSIS Contract Nr. 029044 (CIT5), WP5 Methodology Development (D5), and Final Report: Towards a Handbook (D6), 7-10. <<http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/124376771EN6.pdf>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- MOULAERT, F.; MARTINELLI, F. & SWYNGEDOUW, E. (2005). "Social Innovation and Local Development". *Urban Studies*, 42.11, Special issue, October.
- MOULAERT, F. & NUSSBAUMER, J. 2008. *La logique sociale du développement territorial*. Québec: Québec, Presses de l'Université du Québec. Collection Géographie contemporaine, 139 p.
- MRD (2011): *Effective instruments supporting territorial development. Strengthening urban dimension and local development within Cohesion Policy*. Issue Paper. October 13 pp. EU Polish Presidency, Ministry of Regional Development. <[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/konferencje/eic2011/eng/Documents/Issue\\_paper\\_EFTD\\_final.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/konferencje/eic2011/eng/Documents/Issue_paper_EFTD_final.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- OECD. 2011. *Partnerships and Rural-Urban Relationships: An OECD Perspective*. Paris: OCDE.
- PANORAMA. 2012. "Interview. Jacques Delors". *Panorama Inforegio*, autumn, 43, 4-7.
- PASCUAL, J.M. 2011. *El papel de la ciudadanía en el auge y decadencia de las ciudades. El fin del gerencialismo o la recuperación de lo público y sus autores*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch.
- PFEILSTETTER, R. 2011. "El territorio como sistema social autopoiético. Pensando en alternativas teóricas al 'espacio administrativo' y a la 'comunidad local'". *perifèria*, 14, 1-17. <<http://ddd.uab.cat/pub/periferia/18858996v14a5.pdf>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- PIKE, A.; RODRÍGUEZ-POSE, A. & TOMANEY, J. 2007. "What Kind of Local and Regional Development and for Whom?". *Regional Studies*, 41.9, 1253-1269.
- 2006. *Local and Regional Development*. London: Routledge.
- RADAELLI C. M. 2006. "Européanisation", in BOUSSAGUET, L.; JACQUOT, S., RAVINET, P. (dir.). *Dictionnaire des politiques publiques*. Paris: Les Presses de Sciences Po, 193-202.
- 2000. "Whither Europeanization? Concept stretching and substantive change". *European Integration online paper (EIoP)*, 4, 8.
- ROBERTSON, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.



- RODRIK, D. 2011. *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*. New York- London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- ROMERO, J. 2011. "Ciudadanía y democracia. El malestar urbano y la izquierda posible hoy en Europa". *Biblio 3W. Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 20 de julio de 2011, vol. XVI, nº 932 (7). <<http://www.ub.es/geocrit/b3w-932/b3w-932-7.htm>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- SEN, A. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHARPF, F.W. 2010. "The asymmetry of European integration, or why the EU cannot be a social market economy". *Socioeconomic Review*, 8,2, 211-250.
- SCHARZER, G. 2013. "Local resistance to global austerity: it will never work". *Open Democracy. free thinking for the world*, January 2013, 3 pp. <<http://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/greg-sharzer/local-resistance-to-global-austerity-it-will-never-work>> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- STETTER, E.; DUFFEK, K. & SKRZYPEK, A. 2009. *Next Left. Renewing Social Democracy contributions to a European-wide debate*. Brussels: The Foundation of European Progressive Studies. <[http://www.astrid-online.it/rassegna/Rassegna-I/23-02-2010/FEPS\\_NextLeft.pdf](http://www.astrid-online.it/rassegna/Rassegna-I/23-02-2010/FEPS_NextLeft.pdf)> [Accessed 29.09.13].
- STORPER, M. 1997. *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*. New York: Guilford.
- STREECK, W. 2011. "The crisis of Democratic Capitalism". *New Left Review*, 71, 5-29.
- SWYNGEDOUW, E. 1997. "Neither global nor local: glocalization and the politics of scale", in COX, K. (Ed.). *Spaces of Globalization*. New York: Guilford Press.
- TASAN-KOK T., GROETELAERS D. A., HAFFNER M. E. A., VAN DER HEIJDEN H. M. H. & KORTHALS ALTES W. K. 2013. "Providing Cheap Land for Social Housing: Breaching the State Aid Regulations of the Single European Market?". *Regional Studies*, 47(4), 628-642.
- TEWDWR-JONES, M.; ALLMENDINGER, P. & MORPHET, J. 2005. "Local Government, Modernization and Community Strategies: The Challenge for Local Planning". *Environment and Planning A*, 38(3), 533-551.

# DESARROLLO TERRITORIAL



In economic crisis times it seems territory «does not matter»... less than never. This argument neglects, consciously or not, the possibility of new innovative ways that precisely contribute to promoting, again, development; this time supported on cooperation and territorial intelligence for both cohesion and better quality of life from local to supra-national (EU) levels. A renewed understanding of local (territorial) development is presented; a new model of competitiveness based on specific resources instead common or banal ones.

If nothing is new at all, at least one can look for the differential supported by the own culture in order to promote innovations in products, processes and organizations. The goal: re-inventing territories and exploring possibilities of vectors such identity, culture and new territorial government/governance practices. Governance and culture are considered this time basic vectors for territorial development, which combines economic competitiveness with social and environmental sustainability.

Any initiative trying to overcome limitations and inefficiencies of traditional development theories and receipts looks to generate new proposals and perspectives strongly related with local territorial conditions. Despite the multifaceted nature of the territory, a complex system, until now scant attention has been paid to the objective of policy coherence, one of the five principles of good governance. In such context, renewed Strategic Spatial Planning became a quality instrument for Politics and Policy management.

