

**Regions between imposed structure and internally developed response. Experiences with twin track regionalisation in post-socialist Eastern Germany**

**Tassilo Herrschel**

School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages, University of Westminster

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Geoforum. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Geoforum, 38 (3). pp. 469-484, May 2007. DOI 10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.11.003

---

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

---

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch:  
(<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail  
[repository@westminster.ac.uk](mailto:repository@westminster.ac.uk)

**Regions between imposed structure and internally developed response.  
Experiences with Twin Track Regionalisation in post-socialist Eastern  
Germany.**

**Tassilo Herrschel**

Paper published in: In: *Geoforum*, vol 38, no 3, May 2007, pp 469-484

**Abstract:**

This paper investigates the dual nature of regionalisation between imposed institutionalised territoriality and self-made 'ad hoc' collaborative regional arrangements between localities. This involves, as the paper sets out to show, different, but *concurrent* imaginings of 'regions' to two audiences - within and without a defined region, and applied to the same territory, albeit with different images and sets of actors for internal (local) and external (national/international) consumption. These developments are examined within the context of the 'new regionalism' debate, in particular the notion of a replacement of 'old' through 'new' regionalism as a sequence. This duality of region making challenges the frequently somewhat simplistic presumption of regions forming as one complete entity, 'out there' to compete on a global market. They also have to fight for their recognition internally, but with different arguments, rationales and policies. This means that the possibility of overlapping single purpose ad-hoc formed regions, as postulated under the new regionalism, needs to take into account the likelihood of several meanings of one and the same territory. The examples demonstrate that the two possibilities overlap - multi-territoriality and multi-meanings of (new) regionalism.

The paper uses the example of post-unification eastern Germany, where in 1990 a completely new set of traditional regions was established, implementing a 1960s-derived western German model. Since this common starting point, strong economic, cultural and geographic differences have emerged, leading not only to policy adjustments, but also changes to the understanding of regionalisation and regional policy, and the actors involved.

**Key Words:** New regionalism, regionalisation, eastern Germany, post-socialism, territoriality,

**Introduction: The region as a multi-scalar construct of a territory**

There is currently a lively academic debate on 'regionalism' (Siegel 1999, MacLeod 1999,

Keating 1998), frequently with the attribute 'new' (Söderbaum and Shaw, eds 2003, MacLeod 2001, Belin and Richard 2000, Mansfield and Milner, eds 1999). The implication is that there is an 'old regionalism' which has been, or is in the process of being, surpassed and replaced. This notion, however, seems overtly simplistic and is not supported by evidence 'on the ground'. Indeed, as discussed in this paper, new and old forms of regionalisation seem to require each other for producing an effective form of regionalisation and therefore occur concurrently, rather than sequentially. Furthermore, there is clear evidence that new regionalism is not just revolving around the issue of territoriality *per se* - or the lack of it - as its main 'new' feature, but also involving a target audience-determined multiple meaning and representation of one and the same territory, whether real or 'virtual'. In other words, depending on who is to be convinced by a region's qualities, different images and qualities are being portrayed and emphasised that region's main actors.

Nor should 'new' be read as having just been invented. Some twenty years ago, Cashin (1985) explored the nature of 'new regionalism' as an answer to the recognition of "the political futility of seeking consolidated regional government" (p 2027). With a clear focus on local-regional relationships in metropolitan areas in North America, she argues for a non institutional-technocratic approach, in the mold of 'governance', instead. Local self interest is considered the main factor in building 'new' regions as part of a bottom-up approach which contrasts with the conventional state centred, top-down view of regions as integral elements of a state-institutional structure. Territoriality in its scale, legitimation, definition and functional rationale takes a central position in this debate which questions spatiality as a necessarily prescriptive, compulsory element, setting the conditions for policy making and governance. Instead, the territorial delimitation of regions is viewed more as a consequence, rather than determinant of locally based interests. In other words, territoriality follows policy objective, transcending conventionally understood space and its boundaries. In Cashin's (1985) early interpretation, "the New Regionalist agenda seeks to create new regional governance structures that wield powers over policy areas that transcend local borders....while leaving local governments a reduced but meaningful sphere of local authority. It does not seek consolidated metropolitan government" (p 2034). Regions are thus effectively composed by a group of localities as building blocks, which cooperate but are not institutionally and/or governmentally connected. While the emerging notion of regional 'governance' was initially clearly on 'government' - this broadened later in the 1980s and early 1990s - including a growing number of other agencies as actors. At the same time, 'regions' are becoming understood as policy-defined areas rather than territories *per se*. This implies a certain degree of vagueness as to what constitutes a region, as it is seen as a temporal, repeatedly changing construct, contrasting with the conventional understanding of a fixed, continuous and predictable feature. A change of policies would logically result in a change of the relevant areas, i.e. regions. Such changes will not need to take account of statutory boundaries, as the 'new' regions will be 'virtual' rather than institutionalised and statutorily established. They can therefore easily transcend formalised boundaries through cooperative policies. Such 'policy regions' (see also Herrschel, 2000) are the result of democratic processes leading to the building of coalitions between statutory (local) bodies and individual representations of interest around common policy agendas based on the pursuit of perceived opportunities. It is this policy-based 'virtual territorialisation' that is at the centre of the new regionalism concept.

#### **Indigenous and exogenous determinants.... see Hettne.....**

These issues have gained particular relevance and timeliness with the eastward expansion of the European Union, where conventional concepts of regionalisation have been imposed

on the new member states, with little concern for the appropriateness of these 'old regionalist' instruments for tackling the particular, very difficult processes of societal-economic transformation. A decade of expected (by the 'West') unquestioning 'adjustment' by the former socialist states to the western paradigm of societal-economic governance has more recently raised critical views about the efficacy of 'automatically' adopting these practices (Sokol 2001). The particular legacies in structures, policy making and dealings with bureaucracy in government and administration are beginning to generate some 'feed-back' to the western understanding of regionalisation, and what constitutes 'best practice' in its implementation. Certainly, the much slower and vastly more expensive process of integrating western and eastern Germany than was expected has highlighted the complex and anything but one-way process of transition (Herrschel 2000), and this pushed the western models of addressing uneven regional development to its limits. The result was a new impetus and urgency to the discussion of 'new regionalism' in its many incarnations. This includes its dual nature not only in terms of scalar relationships, referred to by Theret (1999) as supra- and infra [*sic*]-national dimension and by Hettne (2003) as endogenous and exogenous factors, but also, as argued here, in terms of the main audiences of projecting and imagineering (see also Herrschel 2000) a region. On the one hand, discussions, mainly (but not exclusively) from within regional studies, focus on the nature of regions *within* a nation state and thus its position in the scalar hierarchy of government in political and territorial terms (e.g. Siegel 1999, Orfield 1998, Peirce 1995, Keating and Loughlin eds 1998, Brenner 2002). At times, these take a specifically state legal perspective (e.g. Frug 2002, Cashin 1985) or a perspective on cooperative government in metropolitan areas (Rusk 1995, Olberding 2002, Herrschel and Newman 2002). On the other hand, coming mainly from discussions within international political economy, regions are debated as collaborative (mainly economic) arrangements *between* nation states (e.g. Söderbaum and Shaw (eds) 2003, Ponagariya 1999, Ethier 1998, Mansfield and Milner 1999, Breslin and Higgot 2000). According to these, 'new regionalism' means the formation of 'global regions' in response to global economic and political processes. Similarly, Ethier (1998) observes a "new global wave of regional integration" (p 1214) which, although being labelled as 'new regionalism'....., is very much rooted in global capitalism and economic competition. Fishlow and Haggard (1992) make the distinction between 'regionalisation' as economic process and 'regionalism' as the political process, thus distinguishing between the two main forces facilitating regions. Here, the distinction will be made with a slightly different emphasis, with 'regionalisation' referring to the *process* of shaping and operating regions, whether politically or economically driven, while 'regionalism' is viewed more as the conceptual-theoretical underpinnings of the *role and nature* of a region.

Global economic and political processes are thus seen as the main drivers of such, primarily defensive, region building. Globally focused competitiveness is thus presented as a key driver of new regionalism. Responses may vary in their political, economic or societal focus, but what they have in common is the lesser fixation with territories as fixed, firmly bounded, containers of policy. Instead, the realisation of shared interests and subsequent joint initiatives across borders are seen as the main drivers of collaborative regionalisation. In fact, it seems, territory follows policy objectives. But any such development is seen as between autonomous territories and their governments. There is no necessary pooling of sovereignty. It is the perceived advantages from 'going it together' vis-a-vis a perceived common challenge through global processes, that encourage pragmatic collaborative arrangements, or a "relational set of institutional forms - functionally and territorially" (MacLeod 2001). The common agenda is thus the projection of a regional agenda to audiences outside such a regional construct. The effect of these new political-economic and societal agendas on the participating territories themselves, such as their identity or political processes, has been of lesser interest in this context.

This is of greater concern at the other end of the regionalisation spectrum, that at the local-regional interface within nation states. Such a relationship may be statutorily-administratively regulated or based on voluntary, cooperative arrangements. In any case, the region here takes a much more inward looking perspective, representing its legitimacy *vis-a-vis* local constituencies, and thus needing to justify its existence and policies. They need to be seen to clearly benefit the interests of its constituent members and not just those of an imaginary 'whole' of a region. Inward looking and externally directed perspectives and interests thus sit side by side in the regionalisation process. But rather than creating, and referring to, different territorial constructs, as usually implied, these two sets of interests coexist and may both refer to the *same* space, projecting a selected (and potentially different) set of characteristics to the respective audiences - inside and outside the region

Inside regions, local areas thus emerge as the main building blocks both in terms of policy definition and, via their statutory powers, policy implementation. It is not through new statutory regional bodies, responsible for fixed territories, that 'new' regional policy responses are defined and introduced. Conventional structures are, however, as the case studies demonstrate, the instrumental backbone necessary for the actual, territorial implementation of the policy aims and strategies devised under the 'new' approach with its 'virtual regionalisation'. This means that competition between localities, parochial thinking and localist interests continue to underpin regionalisation. The less formal arrangements under new regionalism, however, make engaging in a regional agenda appear less threatening to localities' own interests. Much of the difference between 'old' and 'new' regionalism lies in the ways in which varying policy goals and local interests are projected onto the formation of regional policy responses. Having no fixed structures and territoriality, the region may be projected and interpreted differently for different audiences and policy objectives. The main difference here lies with the distinction between intra- and extra-regional audiences. The main function of 'new regionalism' is to bring the two together in an effective manner.

Region building in eastern Germany illustrates the two 'cultures of regionalisation', the older, territorially driven, technocratic and prescriptive 'old' understanding, and the more recent, issue-based, often *ad hoc*, 'new' approach. Here, territoriality is more of an incidental outcome of identified common policy objectives, rather than the beginning of regionalisation attempts *per se*. Leading on from that, sub-nationally derived and 'assembled' interests and objectives circumscribe 'regions' rather than nationally defined policy objectives. This allows, and places greater emphasis on, variations in institutional arrangements and policy-making practices than under the 'old' system with its standardised structures. At the same time, regions, if locally based, need to 'fit in' with established structures of government and policy implementation, to avoid competitive government. If conceptual, rather than institutionally fixed, regions are less 'threatening' for participating actors, as there remains a 'way out', if local interests seem no longer adequately served. Such regions thus need to deliver on expectations to justify their continued support and existence as an inter-locally agreed strategy. They may thus need to define more than one set of regional narratives and characteristics, including territoriality, each aiming at a different target audience - within and without a region. This may include addressing on the one hand any concerns of *local* constituencies about a possible threat to their policy-making autonomy, and, on the other, projecting a coherent and integrated regional image to an *extra-regional* audience to portray competence and credibility in economic policy making.

The examples presented here provide a broad range of different developmental contexts of regions and thus address some of the criticism levelled by MacLeod (2001) and Lovering (1999) at the obsession of 'new regionalism' with success stories in regionalisation, such as

Emilia Romagna. The changing role of regions in the context of globalisation and the subsequently increased sense of competition between spaces seems to require more than a mere change in good practice in regional governance rolled out universally on the basis of successes of a few. Much of the 'new regionalism' debate has ignored peripheral and non-urban areas, focusing instead on economic cores (i.e. mainly urban regions) as its main arena. The inevitable outcome is an incomplete, perhaps even distorted, picture of the actual processes and outcomes of new regionalism. For instance, what are the responses and recipes for those areas outside the grip (or just interest) of the outward stretching urban cores (see also Wallis 1994, MacLeod 2001), whose interests are more inwardly focused and defensive? A broader approach, as offered by the analysis of all the regions across eastern Germany, may allow for different 'paths' of development and regionalisation to emerge (Amin 1999). This study includes the different contexts of, and experiences by, the more than twenty conventional formal planning regions in eastern Germany, which were established by order at the beginning of the 1990s. Their experiences with, or view of, the need to balance between responses to 'external' factors of competitiveness through marketing initiatives, and to 'internal' factors revolving around creating a sense of common regional purpose among localities, will be at the centre of this study.

The two main issues are: (1) evidence of specific targeting of regionalisation through imagineering 'up' and 'down' the spatial scale, and (2) evidence of a general shift from 'old' (territorial) to 'new' style (policy focused) initiatives. Is there evidence of a 'new regionalism' emerging out of the initially imposed conventional 'old' regional structures? Can one observe a changing role of territoriality, advocated as a central plank of 'new regionalism' within a more general re-configuration of political economic spaces as suggested by *inter alia* Swyngedouw (2000) and Brenner (1999)? Is there a qualitative re-organisation of the state as argued by MacLeod (2001) in general? The answer to the latter is, not surprisingly, rather less clear cut. While there are clear signs of changing practices of government, moving towards multi-actor governance, there are few indications of changes to the state organisation. Institutions remain intact, just their way of interacting and negotiating has changed. Newly emerging collaborations may or may not involve the state apparatus and its representatives, thus questioning the implicit state-centred perspective of much of the 'new regionalist' debate, where the state is largely viewed in the lead role of developing and implementing 'new' good practice of regionalisation. The second set of questions, revolving around the scalar differences in target audiences of regionalisation policies, will look at evidence of internally and externally directed strategies, and their relationship to, and representation of, one and the same region. The emergence of 'regional management' is a useful indication of such dually focused initiatives, seeking to bring together various local actors, while also actively engaging in area marketing. The picture of regionalisation painted here derives from a combination of a more general survey of all formally established conventional regions, and a more in-depth 'dipstick' approach for a selection of these regions to examine the background to, and experiences of, these areas from a policy maker's point of view. The eastern German case with its perhaps surprisingly by and large accepted western driven transformation process is of particular interest at this time, as it may provide some important policy lessons for the integration of the former communist countries of central Europe into the European Union.

### **Regions as a two-audience construct**

Much of the regionalism discussion has taken a distinct economy centred view, driven by the debate on globalisation (Hutton and Giddens, eds 2000) and the associated competitiveness between territories, and the impact especially on cities (Sassen 2001, Scott, ed 2002, Marcuse and van Kempen, eds 2000). Territory, scale and regulative structures have taken

much of the centre ground of the regionalism debate ( Brenner 2000, Storper 1997, Storper and Salais 1997, Hudson 2001). Business interests and investment have thus somewhat marginalised other factors, such as social and political and institutional particularities which are seen merely as subservient to the goal of maximised competitiveness (Scott 1998, Cooke and Morgan 1998, Barnes and Ledebur 1997). But this view is somewhat one sided (see MacLeod 2001, Lovering 1999), as it presumes a standard form of 'good practice' response, driven by institutional-territorial parameters. It thus seems effectively not much different in its implied universal applicability from the understanding of conventional regionalism. The *external*, i.e. national and, especially, international re-/presentation of regions has thus emerged as the 'natural' prime issue of interest, implying that it is solely this concern of a region that matters. Governance structures and the utility of regions are judged by their effectiveness in maneuvering a territory successfully into the view of presumed footloose capital (MacLeod 1999, 2000, Swyngedouw 2000). 'New regionalism' is thus closely associated with an outwardly (supra-nationally) focused perspective. Regions are usually seen as complete, clearly defined, static entities, visibly represented by their territoriality. A region's *external* 'face' is, however, just one side of the coin. In reality, as the cases here illustrate, regions are much less clear cut in their nature and are increasingly constructed from 'within' with varying considerations of, and coordination with, established formal conventional regional structures. Regionalism thus draws increasingly also on locally based, opportunity driven interests, where cooperation may promise better prospects for the achievement of (local) policy goals. And this is what the case studies highlighted.

Region building is thus essentially a two-faced affair, *simultaneously* directed at different spatial scales, that is at audiences both inside and outside a region. Both need to be convinced of a region's advantages for the relevant actors' diverse policy goals to be achieved. Bringing them together 'under one roof' is a particular challenge, but also opportunity, for the 'new regionalism'. Policy makers representing a region may seek to engage with just one of the two 'target groups', or with both, as seems opportune for their specific interests at a particular time. In addition, in eastern Germany, as in the other formerly state socialist countries, there are specific systemic legacies that affect the ways in which actors engage in territorial governance, utilise institutions and identify priorities in policy making, and interact with each other, whether concerned with intra- or extra-regional interests.

Following from the above, there are two main sets of determinants which circumscribe and shape the ways in which regionalisation - 'new' and 'old' - operates (Figure 1). Firstly, the different directions of policies with their respective audiences, pointing *upwards* or *downwards* on the spatial scale, that is extra-regional or intra-regional respectively, each with their particular institutional-administrative implementation. Audiences for one and the same region may thus stretch from global capitalist organisations to locally based groups. Secondly, there are the operational parameters, i.e. (national) institutional frameworks for regionalisation and specific legacies, both shaping attitudes towards the scope, utility and desirability of regions as territories of governance. Also contained in these parameters are preferences for certain ways of doing things and making policies, drawing on a particular selection of 'old' and 'new' regional initiatives. The choice may reach from local concerns with local-regional government relations and the protection of local autonomy, to 'selling' a regional image to outside capital markets to attract (urgently) needed inward investment. In both cases, functional utility is key to this kind of regionalisation. While local government may favour clearly and formally defined responsibilities as a safeguard, especially when there are different 'rights' at different levels, such as under German federalism, business oriented organisations (quangos) tend to favour more responsive, non-formalised and *ad hoc* 'new regionalist' policies (see table 1), albeit, most importantly, with an ability to 'deliver'.

The latter may well require to engage with conventional regional policy instruments and administrative structures, because strategic objectives need to translate into tangible projects on the ground to give credibility to the whole strategy. The relative importance of intra-regional and extra-regional interests to facilitate economic development, will tilt the balance in favour of one or the other regionalisation approach. The result is a specific mix of adopting 'old' and 'new' forms of regionalisation with intra- and extra-regional policy targets. And this mix may differ not just between regions, but also within each of them, and over time, requiring continuous negotiations between policy makers to accommodate the diverse objectives, such as balancing localist attempts at maintaining autonomy, and seeking to project *one* region as a coherent economic and policy territory to the outside world. Institutional arrangements will mirror this diversity of actors.

Figure 1 near here

### **Regions and regionalisation in eastern Germany: Concurrent duality of 'old' and 'new' regionalism**

The case of eastern Germany provides an interesting backdrop to the study of the role of 'internal' (local political and societal) and 'external' (national and supra-national institutional and economic) factors in the process of regionalisation. The socialist legacy and subsequent western German-led wholesale 'adjusting' transformation provide a particular, common historic experience and societal-governmental factor, from where individual regional responses may emerge. The combination of system and process provided the unique opportunity to study the newly established 'western' system's ability to learn from, and address, the stark economic challenges of territorial competitiveness - and (often) survival, across an inherited diverse economic geography and newly created locally-focused administrative structure. A range of modifications to the initial arrangements for regionalisation during the 1990s suggest such a learning process. Questions of interest include: How important are specific regional factors *vis-a-vis* the homogenising pressures of globalisation proclaimed elsewhere? How did the political actors within the regions operate the established regional structures? Have there been inter-regional differences in this process, which could be interpreted as regional individualisation in policy responses (and thus 'new regionalist' trends)? Or are these modifications part of a new common process? And what is the evidence of separate responses emerging for internal, i.e. local and intra-regional, and external, i.e. supra-regional corporate, consumption?

The study uses results of a questionnaire survey of all Planning Regions in eastern Germany carried out in 1999, which set out to establish their views of the process of regionalisation and their roles within it. All but three questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire addressed four main topics: 1) background to the delimitation of the region (state or locally driven), 2) the operationalisation of the region, including local-regional functional relationships and the appropriateness of planning instruments, 3) the use and purpose of regional plans *vis-a-vis* economic processes and the interests of the relevant local authorities (need to 'learn'?), and 4) collaboration with the relevant *Land* government and its policies, including the role of the *Land* in regional planning matters (scope for institutional adjustments). In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with at least two planning regions in each of the five Länder as 'dipstick probes' to gain more



detailed information on underlying issues and processes. In general, the answers were detailed, at times even elaborate. In addition, each of the planning regions' websites were accessed in 2002 to look for evidence of changes in policy emphasis, territorial references or range of actors involved.

### Regionalisation in eastern Germany - establishing the 'old'

In Germany, regions as sub-national entities have historically had a strong position *vis-a-vis* a younger nation-state. Nevertheless, concept and meaning of 'regions' are somewhat fuzzy, associated with differing scales, meanings and roles between the local and national levels (Wollmann and Lund 1998). Traditionally, regions have been considered part of the formalised administrative structure with fixed territories and clearly defined responsibilities within the federal multi-scalar government structure, and a distinct technocratic outlook. The 'meso level' between local and national essentially includes two types of regions, the strong *Länder* as the main constitutional components of the federation and effective central governments, and the smaller planning regions as mere administrative-technocratic creations within each *Land*, whose role it is *to* to provide a supra-local spatial development planning framework. The planning regions are part of a more detailed, domestically focused sphere with strong links to the local scale of governance and development planning. The upper tier of local government, the *Kreise* (counties), for instance, reaches into the regional scale and, as a group, their joint territories define the space covered by a planning region. There are four to five planning regions within each of the five new *Länder*. They possess no governmental powers and are an integral part of the hierarchical planning system. Their legitimisation is primarily externally (state) derived, rather than based on intra-regional (local) views, and it is thus not surprising to find them being contested in their meanings, purpose and utility (Herrschel/Newman, 2002).

Regions have thus become increasingly more than the traditionally fixed and institutionalised territories, and this adds to the already existing 'fuzziness' of the understanding of 'regions' (Keating 1997) **(and Regional Studies special issue 2004)**, "since they reflect different conceptions of their political character and potential." (Keating, 1998, p 17). This contrasts with the general understanding behind creating those planning regions. For regions to be 'real', their boundaries need to be less administratively than functionality and purpose driven. As it is, the planning regions are not part of a statutory set-up, but rather an expression of state (*Land*) policies and technocracy, and municipalities have thus tended to view them more of a challenge to their independence than a useful framework for achieving their development goals. Although the remit of the planning regions has been confined to making regional development plans, planning control is a central plank of local autonomy and takes an important place in economic policy making. Furthermore, the effectiveness of these planning regions was in doubt almost from the outset. Being outside the institutionalised planning hierarchy, many local planners consider the regional plans as little more than paper exercises and of little practical relevance for their own remit (interview with Neuruppin planning dept, July 1999). There was thus little obvious benefit from engaging with the form of regionalisation on offer, and local policy makers thus began looking to seemingly more relevant and helpful alternatives when dealing with issues stretching into the regional scale.

These are defined by localities cooperating in certain policies for a specified period of time, rather than fixed territories handed down by the state. They are thus the outcome of utilitarian rather than institutionally prescribed collaboration. The more the implicit territories of this self-help regionalisation differed from the planning regions' set boundedness, the less relevant the latter appeared. This process of regionalisation in parallel to existing formal

arrangements is something quite new in Germany, as in many other countries, as the author's current research on regionalisation strategies in Europe and North America shows (ESRC seminar series on 'clusters and regionalisation'). In eastern Germany, pressures for change have been quite extraordinary, challenging in many ways established practices of western Germany, which had simply been transferred to the east.

### The common socialist legacy

Historic legacies affect political processes and territorial identities, both important ingredients of region building. For a more general debate of territorial identity see *inter alia* Konold (2003) for a regional perspective, Batt and Wolczuk (eds 2002) for national-regional identity in central and eastern Europe, and Schöpflin (2002) and Jenkins and Sofos (eds 1996) for the relationship between nation and identity. The legacies of the socialist state have had particularly strong and lasting effects on the shaping of territorial government, including regionalisation. The legacies included a technocratic, hierarchical understanding of public administration, including planning and a conditioning to top-down policy implementation as part of the state apparatus. These legacies become evident, for instance when dealing with *planners* compared with *economic development policy makers* or, indeed, the emerging new breed of *regional managers*. Having been conditioned by hierarchical, technocratic approaches to regionalisation, many of the regional planners at the RPAs have thus not much challenged the nature of the established system, including its top-down implementation. Another important legacy has been the conscious attempt at 'westernising', i.e. leaving 'easternness' and its symbols behind, to accelerate unification under an initially at least unchallenged western paradigm. Only now, *Ostalgia* (nostalgic view of East German legacies) is emerging, indicating an attempt at eastern German emancipation within the new Germany. Prior to that, in the early 1990s, when the planning regions were established, considerable efforts were made, to 'airbrush' out of history any territorial references to the former 'socialist' control function of regions as the 'long arm' of the government and socialist party in Berlin. Instead, bridges to earlier historic regions were sought, although this turned out to involve much more than simple name changes (Pickvance 1997). The name of regions thus gained an important symbolic role in breaking with the communist times. Later on, localist competitiveness and rivalries among the newly empowered local authorities added to the perceived importance of a region's name. The two main factors shaping regionalisation in post-Iron Curtain eastern Germany were thus firstly the wholesale top-down introduction of the western German model of spatial planning and governance across eastern Germany without much consideration for the particular situation there and the likely scale and speed of (economic) change. Secondly, there was the widespread attempt to overwrite the socialist past. Both concerns involved distinctly inward looking, intra-regional agendas which, particularly in the early years following unification, appear to have overruled any other consideration. Externally targeted region marketing to attract badly needed corporate inward investment seemed beyond the horizon, as many of the chosen bland names illustrate. They are of little use in international place competition, where a recognizable image and regional identity are of crucial importance (e.g. Porter 2001, Williams 1998). Avoiding the names of the larger cities in a region's name, for instance was driven by the new battle between the urban centres and the rural hinterlands. Having gained constitutional local autonomy, the non-urban municipalities now felt it was time to challenge the traditional hegemony of the cities. These concerns of often seemed to outweigh every other regional agenda. In the early 1990s, regionalisation was evidently understood primarily as a local, domestic affair, addressing inward looking interests and priorities in the wake of the end of socialism. This was partly due to an unawareness by the largely inexperienced, newly empowered local and regional administrations of the need to participate in global

competition for economic development (something not needed under socialism), and partly due to petty, historically driven localist competitiveness 'set free' as part of post-communist liberation. Not surprisingly, therefore, as more recent developments have shown, alternative self-help solutions aimed at dealing with the fall-out of economic restructuring have emerged in those regions where policy makers grasped the wider situation more quickly, overcame the period of post-socialist emancipation faster and adopted an outside perspective more rapidly. They thus effectively developed a new strand of regionalisation parallel to the formal planning regions. As part of that process, *region* slowly began to mean more than first and foremost '*planning region*'. However, territorial changes to match the identified new larger scale policy concerns and necessary institutional capacity were considered politically too contentious in a country where people felt already disoriented by the extent and speed of past and ongoing changes. In addition, a renewed focus on formal territoriality entailed the danger of triggering apprehension among the relevant local authorities about challenges to their policy making autonomy, especially if regional territories were (again) established 'top down'.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the varying methods of delimiting the planning regions in the five new Länder in the early 1990s, and looks at evidence of *a posteriori* changes to these boundaries as a sign of 'fine tuning' in response to perceived policy needs. The approach to territorialisation indicates the degree to which internal and external considerations were taken into account, and bottom-up pressures seek to 'get around' the top-down imposed structures.

*Figure 2 near here*

In many instances, the imposed planning regions remained largely 'alien' technocratic entities for planning purposes with little 'real life' visibility and relevance. In some cases, as in the Dresden region, such 'artificial' regionalisation separated the central city from its surrounding hinterland, effectively cutting the cities off from their hinterlands. This divisive nature of boundaries with at times little apparent regard to functional territorial reality, was quoted in several instances as a problem with the *status quo*, such as in eastern Brandenburg (Lausitz-Spreewald) (see Table 2). Here, vast open-cast lignite mines and the associated huge challenges of redevelopment are seen as the dominant and true region-defining concerns, which transcend individual planning regions. Furthermore, the strong territorial identities among the mining communities have been largely ignored and *de facto* overwritten by the technocratic creation of the planning regions. Similarly, established geographical identities, e.g. specific landscapes, also seem insufficiently reflected in the new planning regions, something complained about by some of the relevant planners (quest. survey 1999). They view the perceived artificiality of these regions as encouraging disengagement or lack of interest among local communities. This applies in particular to the big cities which are seen as seeking to pursue their own interests with little concern for the fate of the remaining (rural) parts of the region. They are aware of their leading roles within the regions and are thus unwilling to be squeezed into an artificial and seemingly unresponsive straightjacket. This may lead to localist urban egoism at the expense of wider regional interests and concerns. In those regions with no obvious dominant urban centres, like Oberes Elbtal in Saxony (outer Dresden area), the *counties (Kreise)* at the sub-regional scale emerged as the *de facto* foci of regional identities instead of the created planning regions. The counties seemed more 'real' and relevant to people's interests and concerns. A simple administrative implementation of territorial structures 'from above', following an outside assessment of regional boundedness, by contrast, may lead to them being perceived as little more than alien containers of national or *Land* political will with no (or few) regionally relevant qualities. They may thus have to compete with 'alternative' policies and

actors who are perceived as more in tune with regionally derived interests.

Having been established from above, albeit with an *a posteriori* indirect involvement of local government through delegated councillors to the regions' planning offices, the regional planning associations, there has been limited evidence of the produced work being adopted within the regions a key element of development planning and policy. Quite the contrary. There are growing signs that alternative forms of regionalisation and related policy are emerging from outside the formal (planning) framework. There is less emphasis on formalism and bureaucracy, and more on informal linkages be they within government or including other actors, and a new, more explicit interest is evident in extra-regional concerns and policy objectives. The emergence of the many different regional agencies and inter-local co-operations, especially during the later 1990s, attest to that. Figure 3 provides an illustration of the diverse types of regionally operating organisations and their links and purposes within the regions. While there is strong indication of 'institutional thickness' (Amin and Thrift 1994) developing or, perhaps more accurately, 'institutional substitution' through *ad hoc* agencies, it has also become obvious that the planning regions act as a kind of common, official territorial reference point for the emerging policy based agencies and their initiatives.

Here: Figure 3: list of regional organisations/actors in planning regions

Emerging 'new regionalism' and 'extrovert' regional policies: challenging imposed formalised territoriality and intra-regional perspectives.

Since its creation in the early 1990s, the initial pattern of regionalisation has increasingly faced two main challenges: (1) fundamental changes in the economic geography with a widening gap in the developmental fortunes between urban and rural areas (Herrschel 2000, Herfert 1998, Maretzke 1998), and (2) the (related) necessity for a more visible external representation of regions in the competition for new investment. The result has been a growing number of regional initiatives that go beyond the purpose and operation of the formal system of developing regional translations of *Land* planning in a rather technocratic way. New players and policy approaches emerged as part of a clear shift towards a system of governance rather than mere state driven government. Nevertheless, inter-local, localist rivalries continue to focus regional discussions on internal rather than external factors and target audiences. The result has been two main types of answers: Firstly, leaving the territorial status quo and seeking to work within that framework through collaborative alliances between these territorial entities, thus creating 'virtual regions'. Or, secondly, creating new territorial structures through reorganisation of the status quo, thus working within 'old regionalist' parameters. Between those two alternatives, combinations are possible, drawing on 'old' and 'new' forms of regional responses.

Developments in the state of Saxony-Anhalt illustrate the second type of response, that is re-organising the territoriality in response to locally based spatial affinities. The initial, 1993 'first round' of *Land*-led regionalisation had created four planning regions centred on the state's main cities as 'natural' economic and administrative centres. Increasingly, however, during the subsequent years, this territorial structures was challenged in two ways: through rivalries between the designated regional centres and their surrounding hinterlands with a further group of cities (interview with Dessau EDU, 4 July 2000), and through acute economic worries among the municipalities in the more peripheral northern part of the state,

which seemed inadequately responded to under the existing territorial arrangement.

The first challenge led to name changes to the regions to accommodate lingering inter-city animosities based on historic rivalries, as well as urban-rural animosities. While these differences were battled out, little obvious concern was given to the effect of these discussions on an outside audience. The new name of the regions is bland and nondescript, trying to avoid any reference to the name of the respective largest cities. Engaged in these internal squabbles, there was little evident concern with further reaching extra-regional interests. Effectively, the regions' competitive situation, rather than being enhanced by more 'responsive' region-based policies, has been made more difficult by inward looking. Internal, localist rivalries, such as between Dessau and Wittenberg, has eclipsed the competitive economic challenges for the region as a whole. In effect, the two cities' local interests have been imposed on the region and now shape its future prospects. This is the opposite effect of what arguments in favour of more bottom-up regionalisation and governance advocate, presuming that there is a common externally directed, competitiveness focused, view among localities. But this may not be the case. The relative importance of city and hinterland matter considerably for the scope of effective region building and policy making. It is this form of inter-local competition that regional planning was set up to overcome. That this did not happen illustrates the rather limited impact of the formal planning regions. The number of players matters in the regionalisation process, and it requires a clear policy objective, or project, which facilitates inter-local collaboration for effective region-based policy. This, in turn, may produce a regional identity, even if merely for opportunistic reasons.

The second challenge, through the creation of new territories, is illustrated by the creation of a new, fourth region in the north of the *Land* of Saxony-Anhalt in 2000. The new 'Altmark' region consists of just two counties (*Kreise*) around two medium-sized towns, both with established historical roots in the region. Potential rivalry for investment was overruled by the realisation of the benefits of cooperation to boost urgently needed economic development. Starting from a joint regional development concept in 1996, which *inter alia* sought to draw together indigenous development potential and promote an identity as 'Altmark region' both to intra- and extra-regional audiences. The Altmark is an old established historical region and enjoys recognition within eastern Germany, a fact that helped to convince an at times skeptical audience within the region itself of its 'realness'. The informal approach adopted, outside the official planning structures managed to mobilise considerable public support as an identity-shaping process and focal point for rallying around while developing a 'fight-back' mentality to replace the previous resignation into the economic problems (interview with Stendal county economic development unit, July 2000). A sense of joint fate may have been the main driving force, aimed more at the region itself to shore up morale, rather than imaginary outside capital. From that point of view it makes perfect sense to use the Altmark name. Outside the region, however, 'Altmark' does not have much resonance. With its emphasis on tradition and indigenous innovative potential, the informal region through inter-local collaboration was formally institutionalised by the *Land* government as the fourth formal planning region in 2001, reflecting a realisation at state level that the initially established three regions had too little correspondence with the actual functional geography.

As the two contrasting experiences exemplify, however, this devolution of the regional building process to the local level has not always been easy, as latent localist instincts broke into the open. This undermined the wider purpose of the regional approach, especially developing a common strategy to target outside business investors. The limited,

technocratic, merely planning focused, brief of the planning regions makes them ill equipped to meet those wider, strategic challenges. Not surprisingly, therefore, responses by the planning regions (questionnaire survey) on the usefulness of the available instruments for regional planning have been mixed. While those with a technocratic understanding of 'region' seemed happy enough with the available instrumentarium, those with a more policy oriented view were less so, although this did not amount to an outright criticism of the western driven regionalisation process *per se*.

Emerging 'new regionalism' and 'extrovert' regional policies: challenging imposed territoriality and 'introvert' perspectives.

Formal arrangements for regions have been the traditional means of establishing and operationalising regional development policy and planning. The competitive challenges of globalisation, however, have increasingly brought to the fore the limitations of this approach, as discussed above.. While much of the debate proposes a shift from one to the other 'stage' or 'phase', evidence from developments in eastern Germany suggests that such an understanding is too simplistic. The proposed shift is not only varied, but also operates a dual, concurrent approach of formal and informal, or 'old' and 'new' regionalisation. This includes, so the examples point out, a varied representation of the same territory, with different policy objectives attached. These include attempts at external marketing to attract investors' attention on the one hand, and local(ist) concerns, on the other. Slowly, the latter includes an awareness among *local* policy makers that they need to adopt a more outward-looking perspective to improve their economic prospects, and this includes transcending administrative and institutional, and also psychological, boundaries. As a result, two types of policy objectives and rationales have developed and are operating together, albeit pegged at different scales and aimed at different target audiences: The formal, planning based and hierarchically organised concerns deal with intra-regional development issues, and the less formal, outward looking policies and linkages aim at connecting the region with outside political and capital processes, and these may include neighbouring regions. Regional issues are thus portrayed and prioritised differently for the same territory, in response to identified 'internal' and 'external' interests and priorities respectively. The dual track, dual audience approach uses both instruments of regionalisation, formal and informal, whereby the perceived usefulness of the former will affect the efficacy of the latter. The process is thus much more complex than the usually portrayed 'one region - one territory' picture, irrespective of 'real' (territorially bounded) or 'virtual' (conceptual). These alternatives reflect many of the characteristics claimed for 'new regionalism', in particular, flexibility, network based nature and territorially flexible multi-actor arrangements for specific purposes and thus often a limited time frame. They encompass a growing number of non-governmental actors, including regional marketing organisations, inter-local alliances and business focused regional advice organisations. The multitude of organisations varies between regions (Figure 3), as the websites of the regional planning associations reveal. The result is the emergence of four main types of regionalisation based on the interaction between its representation and audience targeting (internal/external), and its implementation (formal versus informal) (see Figure 1). The first ten years of post-socialist regionalisation in eastern Germany have thus brought about changes in two directions: scalar orientation and type of policy, both in response to the perceived competitive pressures under liberalised market conditions.

Figure 3 illustrates the types of institutional actors operating in planning regions, and their institutional backdrop, in addition to the 'standard' Regional Planning Associations (RPAs).

Also shown are the main policy aims pursued within the regions as stated in documents, emerging during interviews with the RPAs, and outlined in a questionnaire survey in 1999 and on the RPAs' and linked agencies' websites. For reasons of clarity, not all planning regions have been shown, but instead two of each of the five *Länder*. The resulting number of ten is just under half of the total number. It becomes obvious from the list that the formal planning arrangements, including the RPAs, were generally in place by the end of 1992. Since then, policies and practices have been reviewed, albeit to varying degree and with differing outcomes, suggesting a growing individualisation of regional experiences and responsiveness. The evident differences between the *Länder* reflect established attitudes to regions as either effectively mere containers of *Land*-devised policies, e.g. in Thuringia and, to some degree, Brandenburg, or 'actual' areas of regional economic competitiveness, policy definition and implementation, as now in Saxony-Anhalt.

Changes in regionalisation occurred in two ways - for once in the form of new actors entering the stage, and, for the other, through the emergence of more marketing oriented, less technocratic and formalised policies. Given their identified two main audiences, they are marked in Figure 3 with INT (internal) or EXT (external) respectively. Generally, a growing number of actors and types of initiatives can be observed. Thus, by the late 1990s, it is no longer development planning and land-use distribution that are the by far main concern, but rather seeking to respond to the early experience of rapid marketisation through closer contacts with the business world, including business development agencies. The implications for the once established formal planning regions have varied between the five states of eastern Germany, reflecting different attitudes to, and expectations from, regionalisation at both local and state levels.

Thus, in the *Land* of Saxony, the four planning regions established in the early 1990s have remained unchanged, focusing on the three main cities Leipzig, Dresden and Chemnitz, and a cluster of medium-sized cities respectively. Nevertheless, multi-track regionalisation and regional policy can be observed among the four regions, with a growing number of actors outside the planning regime, and addressing intra- and extra regional audiences, if to a varying degree. Their Initiatives seem designed to overcome perceived shortcoming by the formalised planning regions as main bearers of regionalisation, when it comes to economic development. This includes responding to the emerging new economic geography. For instance, difficult economic realities encouraged two city regions, situated in neighbouring planning regions, to market their combined economic capacity to the outside world. The Initiative Southwest Saxony promotes sustainable economic development by raising the combined regions' profile and visibility in an international framework. The topic, rather than a different territoriality, are the main difference to the planning region's 'standard' agenda. There is thus good evidence of voluntary cooperation between local authorities outside the formal planning-hierarchical framework, aimed at coordinating and advertising indigenous development potential to an outside, national and international audience. The two leading cities in this project, Chemnitz and Zwickau, rather than competing head-on for localist benefits within their respective planning regions (see Figure 4), serve as beacons to raise the combined, imagined region's visibility from further afield. Similarly, on Saxony's border with Poland and the Czech Republic, there are clear indications of a move towards 'governance' as part of its "regional management" concept. This emphasises collaboration between economy, society and politics in the interest of better targeted, more relevant policies, thus effectively following the model advocated by Paasi (2001). Policies now target both the players inside a region, but specifically also those outside. Among the Regional Planning Association's key aims is: 'building a regional consensus as the basis of effective internal and external marketing' ([www.home.t-online.de/home/rpv.ol-ns](http://www.home.t-online.de/home/rpv.ol-ns), accessed 7/10/02). The new multi-agency governance arrangement is held together by a Regional Manager

whose main task is to foster indigenous potential by achieving a regional consensus on policy aims and 'official' regional identity and interests, which are then promoted externally. The role of 'regional management', also mentioned explicitly also on several other planning regions' websites, is a bid to portray a more pro-active, less staid and formulaic role.

Elsewhere, some planning regions have even gained their *Land* government's formal approval as examples of 'good practice in regionalisation'. For example, in 1998, the Northern Thuringia (Nordthüringen) planning region was granted the label 'Region of the Future' by the *Land* and thus officially sanctioned, following its seemingly successful innovative regionalisation strategies. Three years earlier, the five main towns in that region had decided to cooperate in the shape of a loose form of city association (Städteverbund) to identify and pursue consensual, common economic policy, focusing on tourism and thus and outside audience. For the tourism part, a private sector style economic development company (ESK) was set up by local actors, including the local authorities and the Chamber of Commerce, to market the sub-region of the southern Harz mountains (Südharz-Kyffhäuser) separately from the rest of the planning region, because of its greater tourism potential than found elsewhere in the region. Such 'separatism' reflects the pragmatic, opportunity driven approach under a 'new' regionalist agenda.

The shift towards 'alternative', 'self-help' regions becomes also evident in the remaining two northern states of eastern Germany, Brandenburg and Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania), despite their continued rather traditional approach to regionalisation. Formally, there have been very few changes to the territorial arrangements established in the early 1990s. The focus is thus clearly on intra-*Land* focused planning. The inevitable void between the two targets, understanding regions as mere planning areas and more independent policy making entities respectively, is now being filled by non-state development organisations, some of which, like ZEIT, having their own regional structure. (Figures 2, 4). Likewise, in Mecklenburg, little has changed over the last 15 or so years in terms of regionalisation. The planning regions' names continue to refer to their main cities, albeit always in conjunction with the geographic region's name, e.g. 'Mecklenburg-Schwerin'. There has thus been no 'fashionable' egalitarianism between rural communities and the urban centres. Economic development is, rightfully, presumed to be generally concentrated in the main cities. Given their limited indigenous capacity to generate economic development, and thus the need to attract such capacity from the outside, there seems to be a less localist-introvert focus than found elsewhere among eastern Germany's planning regions. The Mecklenburg-Schwerin region, for instance, established (in 1999) a regional marketing organisation which sails under the slogan 'Tackle the Future in Mecklenburg-Schwerin' (see website [www.m-vp.de/regionalmarketing-meck-sn](http://www.m-vp.de/regionalmarketing-meck-sn), accessed 7/10/02). The regional planning association makes it quite explicit that marketing the area to audiences both within and without the region, is among its main aims. The need for parallel strategies has been acknowledged, although both tracks are seen as part of the same undertaking. Raising confidence and identity within the region is considered a crucial part of externally directed policy and planning, because they help to facilitate indigenous development potential and a sense of regionness, and thus raise the region's credibility and competitiveness.

Such examples are, however, not the rule in regionalisation in eastern Germany, and it is only since the late 1990s that greater concern has been given to the need for a more pro-active, outward looking *policy* approach which goes beyond traditional technocratically defined physical *planning* within set territories. The legacies of past socialist administrative structures, together with a lack in confidence in local development potential and thus a suspicion of each other, fuelled by an initial distrust of formal regional arrangements as



potential threat to local powers, all have contributed to strong intra-regional perspectives and initiatives aimed at easing local-regional competition. Against this backdrop, technocratic procedures are considered the much safer option than less clearly defined and circumscribed 'risky' and 'chaotic' policies. Only recently has there been an increasingly acute awareness of the essential commonality of economic problems and challenges. These go well beyond the regional, *Land* or national horizon. This has begun to somewhat challenge localist outlooks and policies that had taken a foothold in the early 1990s. The result is the emergence of a dual track approach to regionalisation, one introspective, one extrospective, driven by the concurrent challenges of localist protectionism and international economic competition.

### **Bridging the old and the new: Twin track, variably scaled and multi-layered regionalisation in Eastern Germany - Some Conclusions**

As elsewhere, globalisation and subsequent structural economic and political factors have created a range of differing approaches to regionalisation in the five new German *Länder*, not only in terms of establishing boundaries but also territorial scales, institutional arrangements and policy foci. The challenges questioned the newly established post-unification technocratic and planning-oriented regionalisation vis-a-vis the growing pressures of globalisation, while under the impact of the specific historic and political-institutional legacies of post-socialism. In particular, they showed the dual, 'layered' nature of the developing new regionalisation, advancing two regional images and qualities at the same time, while referring to the same territory: one aimed at mainly locally rooted groups within the region to alleviate concerns about interference with their rights and responsibilities, and one aimed at an outside audience, projecting a successful image of the region in a wider (inter-/national) economic context. The formalised system of conventional hierarchical spatial planning and development policy established in eastern Germany 'from above', clearly favoured the planning-focused tradition and *modus operandi* developed in western Germany since the 1960s. Intra-regional concerns, especially negotiating between competing localities' ambitions, were the main task. Since then, economic and political realities have raised the awareness within regions that larger scale issues beyond immediate local-regional considerations need to be addressed to facilitate economic development. It is a reflection of the growing recognition and expectation, that regions need to be more than spatial containers for managerial development planning. They have become the new central platform in territorial marketing and competition in an internationalising or globalising economy. This shift was made possible to some extent by the growing familiarisation of the new institutions and policy makers with the post-unification state structures and political economic framework, particularly among the newly empowered municipalities. Territoriality and thus boundedness circumscribe a region's credibility, as it "will determine whether the inhabitants [and policy makers] recognise the regions and their centres as appropriate entities of communal life or distinct cultural spaces. This, in turn, may influence their level of engagement in matters of regional self-government" (Suraszka et al, 1996, p 459). It was thus the result of a learning process during which the need became apparent for attracting inward investment through direct marketing of the regions in a competitive national and international environment. Localities increasingly seem to realise the need collaborate with each other and 'go regional' to gain a more reasonable chance of attracting attention and competing successfully. The limitations of the regional system established shortly after unification made few provisions for such a new role, thus encouraging alternative, more policy-focused forms of opportunity-driven regional collaboration between like-minded localities. The result is that this 'new' regionalism is complex, not only as part of a system of

a multi-scalar (Brenner 2002), and implicitly hierarchical, form of regulation, but also multi-scaled in the perception and imaging of one and the same region. It is this that emerged as the particular feature of new regionalisation between local and international concerns and aspirations. Multi-scalar does not just refer to the existence of specific territories for different policy agendas, overlapping if necessary as, for instance suggested by Brenner (2002), Hettner (2003) or Söderbaum (2003). Rather, it also means a multi-layered (re)presentation of one and the same territory, with each layer aimed at a particular audience and its expectations of what makes a useful, attractive region. This, as the examples have demonstrated, may produce several layers of policy driven regions, each with their own sets of actors and derived boundedness. The main challenge is localist ambitions that undermine regional engagement. The picture is thus much more complex than general discussions on 'new' regionalism frequently suggest, with a need to *simultaneously* address different audiences through these 'new regions'. It is not an *either - or* situation as suggested by much of the scale focused 'new regionalism' debate. There is no one 'right' form of regional scale of governance, with a matching 'best fit' (variably sized) territory for each policy objective negotiated between local actors, including across local boundaries. While this is one side of the story of new regionalism, drawing on examples of cluster building and collaborative arrangements between neighbouring municipalities in the pursuit of a shared objective (see also Herrschel 2005), the other side is that of a multi-scalar projection of the same territory, with a scale-dependent variation of its highlighted qualitative attributes. It is a scalar variability of a territory's imagineering, leading to a layer of different such imagineerings. In contrast to the multi-scalar variably *sized* territorialisation, where territories are of different sizes and shapes, depending on the participating localities, the layering of multi-scalar representations of a region are essentially congruent. There are clear boundaries, albeit with seemingly different qualitative contents.

Both these understandings exist concurrently, and regional actors may use them according to their objectives and perceived opportunities or policy requirements. This makes the 'new regionalism' much more complex in its diversity of territoriality and meaning, and thus certainly transcending conventional models and practices of regionalisation through fixed territories and associated administrative structures. This reflects the nature of regions as 'value-laden' constructs (Paasi 2001) both in terms of territory and representation (meaning). Both are connected, of course, although the emphasis on one or the other dimension of 'scalar variability' depends on policy objectives, the range and nature of actors involved, and past practices and experiences. Economic pressures from globalisation appear to be an important stimulus for the development of the 'new' meanings and forms of operationalising regions between local and international interests, processes and expectations, and these are circumscribed by past experiences with local governing autonomy, ways of making policy and also personalities in the policy-making process. Their particular and varying combination shapes the balance between the measures associated with 'new' and 'old' regionalism, and thus between territorially, opportunity or audience-driven regionalisation.

## **Bibliography**

Amin, A (1999): An Institutional Perspective on Regional Economic Development. In: *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, vol 23, no 2, pp 365-378

Amin, A and Thrift, N (1994): Living in the Global. In: Amin, A and N Thrift (eds):

Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Barnes, W.R. and Ledebur, L.C. (1997): *The New Regional Economies*. London: Sage.

Batt, J and Wolczuk, K (eds 2002): *Region, State and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe*. London: Frank Cass

Brenner, N (1999): Globalisation as Re-territorialisation: the Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union. In: *Urban Studies* , vol 36, pp 431-451

Brenner, N (2000): The Urban Question as a Scale Question: Reflections on Henri Levebvre, Urban Theory and the Politics of Scale. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 24, no 2, pp 361-378

Brenner, N (2002): Decoding the newest 'metropolitan regionalism' in the USA: A Critical Overview. In: *Cities*, vol 19, no 1, pp 3-21

Breslin, S and Higgot, R (2000): Studying Regions: Learning from the Old, Constructing the New. In: *Political Economy*, vol 5, no 3, pp 333-352

Cashin, S D (1985): Localism, Self Interest, and the Tyranny of the Favored Quarter.: Addressing the Barriers to the New Regionalism. In: *The Georgetown Law Journal*, vol 88, pp 1986-2048

Cooke, P and Morgan, K (1994): Growth Regions under Duress. Regional Strategies in Baden-Württemberg and Emilia-Romagna. In: A. Amin and N. Thrift (eds): *Globalization, Institutions and Regional Development in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 91-117

Elander I (1997): Between Centralism and localism: On the Development of Local Self-Government in Postsocialist Europe. In: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* vol 15 pp 143-159

Ethier, W (1998): Regionalism in a Multilateral World. In: *Journal of Political Economy*, vol 106, no 6, pp 1214-1245

Fishlow, A and Haggard, A (1992): *The United States and the Regionalisation of the World Economy*. Paris: OECD.

Frug, G E (2002): Beyond Regional Government. In: *Harvard Law Review*, vol 115, no 7, pp 1766-1836

Herfert, G (1998): Stadt-Umland Wanderungen in den 90er Jahren. Quantitative und qualitative Strukturen in den alten und neuen Ländern. In: *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, no 11/12, pp 763-777

Herrschel, T (2005): 'Creative Regionalization': Making Regions for 'Upscale' and 'Downscale' Consumption - Experiences from post-socialist eastern Germany. In: *GeoJournal* , vol 62, no 1, pp 59-70

- Herrschel, T (2000): Regions and Regionalisation in the Five New *Länder* in Eastern Germany. In: *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol 7, no 1, pp 63-68
- Herrschel T and Newman P (2002): *Governance of Europe's City Regions*. London: Routledge
- Hettne, B (2003): The New Regionalism Revisited. In: Söderbaum and Shaw (eds), pp 22-42
- Hudson, R (2001): *Producing Places*. London: Guilford Press
- Hutton, W and Giddens, A (eds, 2000): *Global Capitalism*. New York: The New York Press
- Jenkins, B and Sofos, S (eds 1996): *Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe*. London: Routledge
- Keating, M and Loughlin, J (eds 1998): *The Political Economy of Regionalism*. London: Frank Cass
- Keating, M (1998): Political Economy of Regionalism. In: M Keating and J Loughlin (eds), pp 17-41
- Keating, M (1997): The Invention of Regions: Political Restructuring and Territorial Government in Western Europe. In: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol 15, no 4, pp 383-399
- Konold, W (2003): Identität, Wandel und Wahrnehmung der Kulturlandschaft. Das Beispile westliches Bodenseegebiet. In: A Dornheim and S Greifenhagen (eds): *Identität und politische Kultur (Identity and Culture of Politics)*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Land Sachsen-Anhalt (1999): *Landesentwicklungsplan für das Land Sachsen-Anhalt 1999*. Ministerium für Raumordnung und Umwelt: unpublished
- Le Galès, P and Lequesne, C (eds 1998): *Regions in Europe*. London. Routledge
- Lovering, J (1999): Theory Led by Policy: The Inadequacies of 'New Regionalism' (Illustrated from the Case of Wales). In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 23, pp 379-395
- MacLeod, G (2001): New Regionalism Reconsidered. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 25, no 4, pp 804-829.
- MacLeod, G (2000): The Learning Region in an Age of Austerity: Capitalising on Knowledge, Entrepreneurialism and Reflexive Capitalism. In: *Geoforum*, vol 31, pp 219-236
- MacLeod, G (1999): Place, Politics and Place Dependence. In: *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol 6, no 3, pp 231-253
- Mansfield, E and Milner, H (1999): The Wave of New Regionalism. In: *International Organization*, vol 53, no 3, pp 589-627.
- Marcuse, P and van Kempen, R (eds, 2000): *Globalizing Cities: A New Spatial Order?* Oxford: Blackwell

- Mouffe, C (1998): Post-Marxism: Democracy and Identity. In: *Environment and Planning D: Government and Space*, vol 13, pp 259-265
- Olberding, J (2002): Does Regionalism beget Regionalism? The Relationship between Norms and Regional Partnerships for Economic Development. In: *Public Administration Review*, vol 62, no 4, pp 48-491
- Orfield, M (1998): *Metropolitics. A regional Agenda for Community and Stability*. Revised ed., Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press,
- Paasi, A (2001): Europe as a Social Process and Discourse: Considerations of Place. Boundaries and Identities. In: *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol 8, no 1, pp 7-28
- Peirce, N (1993): *Citistates. How Urban America Can Prosper in a Competitive World*. Washington D.C: Seven Locks Press
- Pickvance, C G (1997): Decentralization and Democracy in Eastern Europe: A Sceptical Approach. In: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* vol 15 pp 129-142
- Ponagariya, A (1999): The Regionalism Debate: An Overview. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 23, pp 477-511
- Porter, M E (2002): Regions and the New Economics of Competition. In: A J Scott (ed): *Global City-Regions. Trends, Theory, Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Rusk, D (1995): *Cities Without Suburbs*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Sassen, S (2001): *The Global City*. Oxford: Princeton University Press
- Schöpflin, G (2002): *Nation, Identity, Power. The Politics of Europe*. 2<sup>nd</sup> impr., London: Hurst & Company.
- Scott, A.J. (1998): *Regions and the World Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, A J (ed 2002): *Global City-Regions. Theory, Trends, Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Siegel, F (1999): Is Regional Government the Answer? In: *Urban Illusions (II), The Public Interest*, no 137, pp 85-98
- Söderbaum, F (2003): Introduction: Theories of New Regionalism. In: Söderbaum and Shaw (eds), pp 1-21
- Söderbaum, F and Shaw, T (eds 2003): *Theories of the New Regionalism*. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan
- Storper, M and Salais, R (1997): *Worlds of Production*. London: Harvard University Press
- Storper, M (1997): *The Regional World*. London: The Guilford Press

- Suraszka et al (1996): Towards Regional Government in Central Europe: Territorial Restructuring of Post-communist Regimes. In: *Environment & Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol 15, no. 4, pp 437-480
- Sokol, M (2001): Central and Eastern Europe a Decade After the Fall of State-socialism: Regional Dimensions of Transition Processes. In: *Regional Studies*, vol 35, no 7, pp 645-655
- Swyngedouw, E. (2000): Authoritarian Governance, Power and the Politics of Rescaling. In: *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol 18. No 63-76
- Theret, B (1999): Regionalism and Federalism: A Comparative Analysis of the Regulation of Economic Tensions Between Regions by Canadian and American Federal Intergovernmental Transfer Programmes. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 23, no 3, pp 479-512
- Wallis, A D (1994): Inventing Regionalism: A Two-Phase Approach. In: *National Civic Review*, vol 83, no 4, pp 447-469
- Williams, C (1998): Territory, Identity and Language. In: M Keating and J Loughlin (eds), pp 112-139
- Wollmann, H and Lund, S (1998): European Integration and the Local Authorities in Germany: Impacts and Perceptions. In: M. Goldsmith and K. Klausen (eds): *European Integration and Local Government*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 57-74

**Figure 1: Determinants of Regionalisation: Multi-scalar Representation and Differences in Operationalization of Regions**

		<b>MEANS OF OPERATIONALISATION</b>	
		<b>'old regionalism'</b>	<b>'new regionalism'</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- formal</li> <li>- institutionalised,</li> <li>- technocratic</li> <li>- physical planning focused</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- informal</li> <li>- purpose-specific,</li> <li>- opportunity driven</li> <li>- strategic policy focused</li> </ul>
<b>Targeting of RE- PRESENT- ATION</b>	extrovert (EXT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- emphasis on upscale 'defence' of regional interests</li> <li>- following fixed, formal channels of communication,</li> <li>- territory as base of power and responsibility</li> <li>- operating as spatial 'container' for higher tier policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- area marketing to outside (corporate) audience,</li> <li>- seeking pragmatic alliances with other regions,</li> <li>- using marketing organisations (regional development agencies)</li> <li>- projecting an 'all regional' image</li> <li>- emphasis on business opportunities, competitive advantage</li> </ul>
	introvert (INT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- exercising statutory downscale control of local government within government hierarchy</li> <li>- emphasis on planning and 'control'</li> <li>- no need to justify policies and existence to other policy makers</li> <li>- government-focused (rather than governance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lobbying for local co-operation</li> <li>- service provision through single purpose bodies</li> <li>- competing with localities for policy responsibility and resources</li> <li>- seeking legitimacy and support through 'successful' initiatives</li> </ul>

**Figure 2: Overview of Delimitation of the Planning Regions in the Five New Länder, as seen by the heads of the Regional Planning Associations**

Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	Brandenburg	Saxony	Saxony-Anhalt	Thuringia
<p><b>Early 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Land</i> defined regions 'top down', recognized separateness of Pomerania in NE of Land after intense lobbying</li> <li>● use of functional hinterlands of main cities (as defined by GDR)</li> <li>● consideration of cultural-historic regional entities</li> </ul> <p><b>Late 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● no major review of regionalization until now</li> <li>● <i>Land</i> continues to control regional planning as state task</li> </ul>	<p><b>Early 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Land</i> defined regions as vehicles of Keynesian-style development aims (policy container)</li> <li>● regions function as 'functionally interdependent social and economic sectors'</li> </ul> <p><b>Late 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● continued strong state-centred regionalization</li> <li>● 'alternative' informal regionalization (based) as local 'self-help' measures</li> <li>● no review until now</li> </ul>	<p><b>Early 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● initially state-driven regionalization</li> <li>● regions established as policy containers: economically relevant?</li> <li>● regions to follow functional links between localities</li> </ul> <p><b>Late 1990s</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● now in process of localizing regional planning: local authorities (<i>Kreise</i>) to find regional partners</li> </ul>	<p><b>Early 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● strong state-driven 'top-down' regionalization</li> <li>● planning regions identical with <i>Land</i> Government Office areas</li> <li>● planning regions focus on three main cities</li> <li>● based on social and economic 'relative homogeneity'</li> </ul> <p><b>Late 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● now in process of re-regionalization in response to economic areas</li> <li>● responsibility for regional planning transferred to local level (<i>Kommunalsierte Regionalplanung</i>)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Early 1990s</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● state-driven 'top-down' regionalization</li> <li>● planning regions focus on main cities</li> <li>● planning regions cut to obscure old GDR administrative regions (<i>Bezirke</i>)</li> <li>● regions based on functional catchment areas of cities</li> </ul> <p><b>Late 1990s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● discussing possible localization of regional planning (locally-defined areas)</li> </ul>

source: Questionnaire survey of all planning regions (Regional Planning Associations) in eastern Germany, autumn 1999



**Figure 3: Statal and Para-Statal Institutions of Regional Governance in Planning Regions**

<b>Planning Region</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Nature and Aim of Institution</b>
<b>Mecklenburg-Schwerin</b>	'Regional Marketing Mecklenb.-Schwerin Ltd.' (est 1999), created by RPA  RPA	externally focused: ' <i>Make the Future in Mecklenburg-Schwerin</i> ', improve competitiveness planning and 'organising' regional development
<b>Mecklenburg-Seenplatte</b>	RPA (1992)  Regional Management 'Die Region Vorpommern' (est 1999)  Regional Conference since 1995, supported by fed govt	- trad. regional planning instruments deemed insufficient for developing ecological concept for region - need for more cooperation (build themed sub-region) - need for developing strong marketing company
<b>Mecklenburg-Rostock</b>	RPA Regional Forum (2000), shaped through RPA  Region Rostock-Güstrow-Bad Doberan Marketing Initiative e.V.  regional management	formal planning reference to 'Rostock region', develop regional marketing 3-city collaborative 'club' to promote Baltic coast in planning region to outside  as support of promotional tasks (outside and inside region)
<b>Thuringia all four planning regions have same formal admin. structure as managed by the Land</b>	RPA  SEHN (1995): network of three small counties  Südharz-Kyffhäuser Development Agency (ESK ltd) in Nord Thüringen region	formal planning (development control, Regional Plans) regional information system on development sites etc  intra-regional cooperation for sub-region, slogan: North Thuringia - a region with future, serves for investors

<b>Saxony-Anhalt: Anhalt-Wittenberg</b>	RPA  Economic Development Agency Anhalt Ltd.	formal planning  Inter-municipal collaboration for joint marketing. Effectiveness challenged by member L.A.s which seek more local benefits, externally directed
<b>West Sachsen</b>	RPA	- formal planning  - reference to the diversity of Saxony's landscape
<b>Oberlausitz</b>	RPA  Regional management  Oberlausitz-Lower Silesia Marketing Agency (www.oberlausitz.com)	- formal planning  - foster cross border cooperation with PL and CZ p develop regional consensus to market region to inside and outside groups
<b>Altmark (Saxony-Anhalt)</b>	RPA  Altmark Regional Conference (both Kreise engaged)  Regional Management (supported by RDA)  Anhalt Economic Development Agency Ltd.	formal development  prepare Regional Development Concept, intra regionally directed  promote network building, enhance role of counties (localisation?) to be merged with Tourist Board,
<b>Meissen County</b>	Meissen County Regional Management  WRM (West Saxony Regional Management, www.wrm-gmbh.de)	coordination of actor network (governance)  Investor and partnership network aimed at business support (mainly indigenous)
<b>Brandenburg</b>	RPAs  Future Agency Brandenburg	formal planning  centrally run, for all Brandenburg, divided into six subregions, service provider for business

NOTE: RPA = Regional Planning Association