

Scale, 'Virtual Regions' and Structures in City Regional Governance - A North American - European Perspective

Tassilo Herrschel and Peter Newman, Centre for Urban and Regional Governance, University of Westminster, London W1B 2UW, UK.

e-mail: t.a.herrschel@wmin.ac.uk, newmanp@wmin.ac.uk

Paper prepared for the 'City Futures' Conference, Chicago 2004

Draft, please do not quote without the authors' permission

Introduction: Virtual Regions' and the New and Old Regionalism in Reconstructing Regions

This paper represents our working draft of a framework for comparing innovation in regional governance in Europe and North America. We sketch out the conceptual debate and make a first attempt to locate our study cities and regions in a simple framework that reflects key elements of this debate. The two intersecting factors in this framework are firstly, the strength of formal institutions at the regional level, and, secondly, evidence of the emergence of 'virtual regions'. These, this paper argues, are at the centre of 'new regionalism', questioning the advocated leading importance of scale and territoriality. But they do not mean a substitution of 'old regionalism' *per se*, rather an amendment to it.

The 'new regionalism' has enjoyed a good run in academic debate on both sides of the Atlantic. In this debate there are nagging doubts that the 'old regionalism' has been surpassed and replaced, if indeed it ever existed. The debates about regionalism in Europe and North America, particularly the U.S., have been very different, and whilst we shared a label of 'new regionalism' (Mansfield and Milner 1999, MacLeod 2001), there were different issues at stake. In the U.S., arguments have been about local economic regions (Barnes and Ledebur 1997, Rusk 1995), metropolitan cooperation (Savitch and Vogel 1996, Olberding 2002), and one or two beacon cities (Marshall 2002, Siegel 1999). In addition, a handful of academic advocates (Swanstrom, 1996, Katz, 2000) spelled out the new regionalism message. The main driving force behind this new 'regional turn' in North America has been the problems caused by urban sprawl (Daniels 1999, Benfield et al 2001) and the perceived need to reinforce international competitiveness. Regionalism had long seemed a good idea but with almost no examples of regional or metropolitan government, the new regionalism needed to find new persuasive arguments.

In Europe, there has been a different story. The regional scale was encouraged by expanding European Union policy (, by the creation of institutions to represent regions (see also Benz and Eberlein 1999), a strong tradition of regions as territories of identity, and in some countries also by nation states themselves. Devolution from national to sub-national scales has been a strong theme. Some regionalist, or nationalist, political identities also

enjoyed a revival and offered further examples of a Europe of Regions (Keating, 1998). By the 1990s, a new regional economic orthodoxy had emerged, derived from the 'motor regions' of the 1980s and offering a model for economic revival but that seemed to be more rhetoric than reality (Lovering 1999). The idea of developing and following a successful model, such as the Third Italy (Cooke and Morgan 1994) or Barcelona, has turned out to be unrealistic and unfeasible in the light of the many differences between, especially, city regions as the advocated centres of economic development. The reality of a 'new regionalism' is contested in both Europe and the US (Lovering 1998, MacLeod 2001, and see Journal of Urban Affairs 2001) but there are very different strands to the debates, encompassing city regions, trans-border (international) regions, innovation regions, etc. .

New Regionalism and the 'Virtual Region'

In this paper we want to take out what seems a common strand. Some twenty years ago Cashin (1985) explored the nature of a 'new regionalism' as a response to the "political futility of seeking consolidated regional government" (p 2027). Local self interest is considered the main factor in building 'new' regions. In Cashin's 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" (2034). In the absence of formal institutions, something new was needed but, so Cashin reassures an American audience, that does not at all have to mean that a new tier of government is needed. The notion of the 'policy region', contrasting with jurisdictional regions, also appears in analysis of new European institutions (Herrschel, 2000). It is this idea of regions as policy areas that we focus on in this paper. Taking regions as policy areas implies a degree of vagueness of what constitutes a region. The region can be seen as a temporal, repeatedly changing construct, contrasting with the idea of a region as a fixed, continuous and predictable, bounded territory. A change of policy effects changes to the selection of relevant areas. We can take this further and say that new regions will be *virtual* rather than institutionalised and fixed in space. Such policy regions are the result of negotiated processes, leading to the building of coalitions between formal institutions and other interests around a common policy agenda. Agenda and coalition are prime concerns in contemporary urban studies (Stone, 2004). Scale, for all the attention given to it (Brenner 1999, 2000, Jones and MacLeod 1999), emerges a dependent variable.

We have argued elsewhere (Herrschel and Newman, 2000) that 'informal regional institutions' pursuing policy agendas inevitably interact with the formal institutions of government. How that interaction works out shapes the dynamics of regionalism. In Europe, the 'old regional' institutions often hold the budgets and other resources. 'Old regionalism' - territories defined by states, or elected regional governments, has thus not disappeared, but rather gained a new quality. In some places, the old and the new interact, and it is

the quality of this interaction that circumscribes the effectiveness and policy efficacy of the resulting 'integrated regionalism'. In the US, city governments, some city-region-wide bodies and, of course, States have profound impacts on the development of 'new regionalism' by encouraging or discouraging cross-border working among municipalities. But this is in essence old style regionalism with more or less strongly developed visibility and more or less effective institutions.

Old and new exist alongside each other. There may be an interdependent co-existence, albeit of varying quality, of 'old' and 'new' regionalism, with the former providing the instrumental, technocratic attributes and the latter the more imaginative and responsive elements of policy making. The efficacy of policy may depend on how the old and the new interact. In different circumstances old or new may be the more effective, even varying between policy fields. For example, in Portland, formal (elected) regional government has repeatedly been hailed as an example of best practice in city regional governance and, by implication, for economic competitiveness. Views from within the region, however, suggest differently. Here, as expressed by the 'edge city' of Beaverton, a formal, planning-focused regional approach is considered of little help in economic development. There is support for an informal, 'virtual' regionalism based on interest based alliances and emerging opportunities and policy requirements at any one time (REF). Similar views were expressed in Vancouver, B.C., Aarhus in Denmark and Hamburg in Germany. In all of these cases a distinct difference between 'old' and 'new' views on the meaning of regionalisation was expressed. Conventional planning bodies tend to favour the former, while a 'new breed' of project-focused, business-linked and marketing-directed policy makers favour the latter. One of the main differences rests in the interaction with businesses. While 'old' views are still very much tied in with a supply-side approach to policy, 'new' regionalism favours a more (business) demand-led perspective.

Depending on local circumstances, such factors as institutional legacies, personalities or economic development pressures, a stronger or weaker form of old regionalism may exist alongside more or fewer new regional institutions, or even a complete absence of the latter. In our view, 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. 'New' does not mean an altogether new version of regionalism, including institutions and territoriality, but rather a recognition of the dual nature of regionalisation consisting of a technocratic, territorially fixed and bureaucratic understanding of region on the one hand, and the policy focused more strategic and opportunity driven approach on the other. How the territorially bounded and the virtual come together will be the outcome of internal factors, as they define the ability and capability of key local actors to engage in such reconstructive forms of regionalism.

We are contrasting regionalism based on territory with regionalism based around policy goals and initiatives. Locally based, opportunity driven interests may see cooperation as offering better prospects for achieving goals than localities 'going it alone'. Territory based regionalism, by contrast, will

inherently be concerned with boundaries, separateness and allocation of powers and responsibilities. It is thus more defensive than new 'virtual regionalism' which seems much more to promise a win-win opportunity, as no 'real' powers and responsibilities are at stake. Practitioners in Vancouver, Aarhus and Hamburg suggested the term *virtual region*. The virtual region is policy oriented and time limited by the interests of its members. Territory and boundaries follow the agenda. Of course, other (territorially bounded) regional institutions have to be negotiated with, but there is less anxiety and defensiveness, as the virtual region doesn't threaten old regionalist powers. In our examples, the virtual region is very much concerned with economic development as its main driving force, and much less with technocratic planning. This is considered as a necessary backup for policy implementation, but nothing more.

This new, virtual type of regionalism tends to be outward looking, that is concerned with image, identity and investment. Global competitiveness has become a strong driver of economic development policy and given much credence within all levels of government. Regions may be created for an external audience. But there are also internal constituencies, and a need to sustain the legitimacy of institutions at the local and regional level. Policy objectives may thus need to define more than one set of regional narratives and characteristics, including territoriality, each addressing a different target audience within and without the region. Region-building needs to appeal simultaneously to audiences both inside and outside the region, and it is here that the 'virtual region' is in a much better position to accommodate such varying requirements. This is much more difficult, if not impossible, for conventional old style, jurisdictional territories. Regionalism may thus on the one hand need to address any impression that it may represent a threat to local autonomy and the advancement of local interests, while on the other also projecting a coherent and integrated image of the region to external actors. Common interests within a region need to 'imagineer' a clear regional image, which then is put into practice through 'drafting in' old regional actors with their institutionalised powers and policy implementation tools. This picture of temporary, policy driven alliances between like-minded actors within and outside government, actively shaping images of a region contrasts with the widespread notion of a region as a mere territorial container for policies and government structures. This includes the advocated installation of a new tier of regional government as solution to the problem of an absent regional approach to tackling development issues. Much of this discussion focuses on city regions as the most dynamic economic foci and thus centres of experimenting with old and new forms of regionalisation.

The Analytical Framework

The following two diagrams illustrate the conceptual arguments brought forward in this paper. Figure 1 shows the intersection of the two main variables identified as circumscribing the nature of regionalisation – the provision with formal structures for the administration of regions, and the degree to which there is evidence of region building either in conventional,

territory based form or, in the shape of ‘new’, virtual regions. Depending on the quality of these two variables, four main types of combinations can be distinguished. These are then related to the case studies (Figure 2). In the first quadrant (Q1) we find cities with a high degree of formalisation, usually as part of a hierarchical structure of territorial government, combined with evidence of strong regionalisation, usually of the ‘old’, territorially based format. Possible evidence of informal ‘virtual regions’ suggests a shift towards ‘new’ regionalism. But, in any case, the notion of ‘region’ is firmly embedded in metropolitan governance. The second quadrant (Q2) includes metropolitan areas where a clear governmental structure exists, usually in the form of provisions for a planning hierarchy. There are few signs of ‘new regionalism’ in the form of emerging ‘virtual regions’, and even conventionally defined metropolitan regions may not exist. The third (Q3) and fourth (Q4) quadrant are both characterised by metropolitan areas with a relatively weak provision for formal regionalisation. Here, local government is strong and competitive, while any regional matters are usually confined to very narrow functional necessities, such as the provision of public transportation or basic physical infrastructure. The difference between the two groups rests in the degree to which informal, virtual regions have been developed to address identified regional issues, such as area marketing. Such arrangements tend to be of the ‘new’, ad hoc variety, as they preserve local independence, and they reflect a different awareness and recognition of a need for thinking regionally.

Figure 1: Regionalisation at the intersection of the two variables of institutionalisation and evidence of ‘new’ (virtual) region building:

		Variable 2: Evidence of region building through ‘new’ regionalism (shift towards ‘virtual regions’?)	
		High	Low
Variable 1: Degree of Institutionalisation of regions	High	(Q1) High degree of formalisation of regional government (hierarchy), combined with good evidence of ‘new’ regions	(Q2) High degree of formalisation of regional govt., combined with limited evidence of ‘virtual’, new regions
	Low	(Q3) limited formal provisions for regions, yet still strong regionalisation, incl. ‘new’ virtual regions	(Q4) Few signs of formal provisions for regions and little evidence of new, virtual regionalisation

Note: Q1-4 = Quadrant 1-4

The four quadrants of different provisions for regions and implementation of virtual regionalisation may be associated with the exemplary case studies examined across Europe and North America. They are shown in Table 2. Their location in one of the four quadrants is based on the strength of provisions for formal regions, e.g. regional government or agencies, often clearly focused on planning, and signs of emerging virtual regions within metropolitan areas. Some of the groupings may appear somewhat surprising, such as London and Pittsburgh together in Quadrant 3. But the objective of this grouping is not about structural or other similarities of the city regions *per se*, but rather the comparability of administrative structure in terms of recognising regions, and the evidence of 'virtual regions'. Economic structures, histories and functional capacities are of lesser importance in this context.

Hamburg, Munich, Portland and Paris share the same quadrant in Figure 2, because all four possess a well established regional government with important policy-making capacities and responsibilities. Planning across municipal boundaries has been an important driving force in this shaping these structures, either to address the problems of sprawl (Portland), commuter traffic and provision of business land (Hamburg and Portland), or the management of a rapidly growing large metropolitan area exceeding local capacities (Paris – Île de France). Increasingly, the concern with international competitiveness has also increased the importance of collaboration (Munich), at times involving several tiers of government with contractual formal arrangements (Hamburg), bringing in the state as a key driving force in building metropolitan regions (France), or establishing an elected regional government as a novel development.

The main challenge in all cities has been to assure established institutional actors of their continued roles, while using the regional powers to drive a metropolitan cross-border development agenda. Nevertheless, while hailed as examples of effective cross-border metropolitan governance, there are signs of a distinct divergence between planning based and policy focused actors. Thus, for instance, one economic development policy maker in the Portland area remarked that the Portland Regional Council was much too technocratically, planning focused to be of help for attracting businesses. Instead, a network based, flexible 'virtual' regional policy was advocated. Similar comments were made in Hamburg, where at the Hamburg Organisation for Economic Development [promotion] it was commented with reference to the formal, territory defined *Metropolregion*, that civil service-led governments are too much focused on structures, and not enough on strategies and processes.

Table 2: Regionalisation Characteristics of Case Studies

Variable 1: Formal Institutionalisation		Variable 2: Evidence of 'new' (virtual) regions emerging (discussed) in metropolitan area	
		Rel. Strong	Rel. Weak
Provision for formal, institutionalised (city-) regional government	Relatively strong	Q1: Hamburg, Portland, Paris, Munich	Q2: Turin, Genoa, Berlin, Prague
	Relatively weak	Q3: Pittsburgh, Lyon, London, Copenhagen (Øresund), Aarhus, Vancouver	Q4: Seattle, Leeds, Philadelphia, Atlanta

Note: Q1-4 = Quadrant 1-4

In Munich, there is a strong hierarchical planning system, including the regional level (Regionaler Planungsverband München– regional planning association for the Munich region), which is based on the counties and maintains good links to the Bavarian state government), and there is a distinction between the city of Munich and the rest. But this region can operate only through the counties' statutory powers when it comes to implementing planning strategies. Inevitable, this strengthens a more county-based rather than wider regional perspective. This technocratically shaped regional approach is now supplemented by the MAI Munich Marketing Agency, a public-private body financed through corporate membership and acting independently, seeks to promote a Greater Munich identity. It is the attachment to the Munich name that provides interest in membership. This organisations, however, is politically rather weak and works entirely through networking businesses and public sector bodies. But this arrangement is much less influential than in Hamburg, where such marketing concerns have moved more into the formal administration strand. In this respect, Munich sits somewhere between Prague and the Italian cities on the one side, and Hamburg, on the other.

The second quadrant in Figure 2 (strong institutionalisation and little evidence of virtual regionalisation) includes such varied cities as Prague, Berlin, Turin and Genoa. Interestingly, both Italian cities find themselves in the same category, reflecting a more Italian rather than local issue. All

three cities share their strong presence of a formal arrangement for dealing with issues at the regional scale, first and foremost planning concerns as part of a hierarchical arrangement for infrastructure and strategic land-use planning. In Prague, similar to Munich, the city is separated from its hinterland in terms of planning responsibility, suggesting a 'doughnut' situation. In Prague, for instance, the Central Bohemia region shows no interest at all what is happening in Prague city, and its relevant map merely shows a white spot in the middle. This view contrasts with that of the distinctly business and area marketing oriented Regional Development Agency of Central Bohemia, which uses Prague as a pawn in its advertising efforts. Here, it was stated that 'writing a (planning) strategy is all very well, it is *doing* it that matters.' Similar statement could be applied to Berlin which is in a similar 'doughnut' situation. Separated by state boundaries from its hinterland, cooperation across border is limited and difficult, and attempts at cross-border regionalisation are little more than projected ambitions with few implementational powers. Nevertheless, there are at least consultations and communication links between city and hinterland, something still amiss in the Prague area.

Turin and Genoa share the historically based strong focus of Italian regional thinking on cities, and view regions essentially as extended spheres of urban influence. This is reflected in the strictly hierarchically organised planning system: cities – province – region. The underlying ethics is very much shaped by hierarchical technocratic thinking within a public sector ethos. There are few signs externally oriented marketing activities in a new regionalist mould. In Genoa, it is its status as European Capital of Culture 2004 that has added a bit of international activity. In Turin, a forward-thinking mayor from the business community introduced wider strategic discussions. The 'Torino Internazionale' project outlined new strategic projects including a marketing region and regional collaboration across boundaries, but a new, more technocratically minded mayor has stepped back from pursuing 'unrealistic' initiatives. Nevertheless, the Italian government, like its French counterpart, has realised the importance of promoting the main cities as economic growth centres, but other than a vague directive to 'do something', no implementation strategy or directive has come forward. This differs from France. Much of such a regionalisation approach seems to depend on the respective administrative region's ability and willingness to facilitate city regional cooperation.

The third quadrant brings together six cities which share relatively weak formal structures to support a city-regional approach, albeit with variations. These are generally national conditions, such as the rather limited regional capacities in Denmark, dealing solely with transport, hospital and school planning, but with no economic development brief. There is a strong dichotomy between relatively strong local government and a strong national centre. Economic development concerns have thus spurned a number of informal, 'virtual' regions, some even international, such as the Øresund region, facilitated by the new bridge across the sea between Denmark and Sweden. Emphasising cluster based economic specialisms

has become an important means of city (regional) marketing, e.g. Investment Location marketing Aarhus. There is thus a growing duality between formal, planning focused regions and newly emerging policy-based territories around business clusters as crystallisation points of the projected virtual regions.

In Pittsburgh, virtual regionalisation has gained in visibility and importance. The just completed re-organisation of various regionally operating agencies, including the Chamber of Commerce and the meanwhile well established Pittsburgh Regional Alliance under a new roof organisation, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development And Affiliates, shows an ongoing re-adjustment of the non-governmental regional bodies to respond to political and economic opportunities and necessities. It also suggests a growing confidence and political standing of these organisations vis-à-vis local and state government and the business community. Lyon, vying with Marseille for second city status in France, followed state directives and established the city-regional organisation of Grande Lyon to cover the city and its neighbouring municipalities. Evolved from providing basic municipal services, like street cleaning, it has now moved decisively into place marketing, advertising Lyon's new International City development projects. But the organisation sits outside formal governmental structures and thus does not possess many executive powers to implement 'actual' projects on the ground.

Vancouver possesses at first sight a formal city region, the Greater Vancouver Regional District, but that is essentially a very conventional platform of rather technocratic regional planning. It suffers from political haggles between the municipalities which belong to the Council, and economic development is not part of its remit. This is where municipalities try to out-compete each other directly. Yet there are early signs of informal regionalisation, such as the Vancouver Economic Development Commission. Its development is still in its early days, but the ethos is distinctly 'virtual region' based to overcome the separateness between business and public administration, and between public administration actors.

Lastly, quadrant 4 groups cities with very limited region-wide responses, either formal-institutional or virtual. In the absence of formal structures covering the whole city region, collaborative arrangements need to be found. In all four cities here such collaboration has been suffering from different interests in the core city and the surrounding region. In Leeds, an economically lagging region with an old industrial image is viewed as an obstacle to the ambitious, largely successful re-imaging of the city as 'trendy' commercial centre rather than old industrial city. Parochial interests thus dominate. In Atlanta and Philadelphia, city-regional difference and separateness have economic but also ethnic origins, projecting a 'black' city against a 'white' suburban region. In both cities, despite recent attempts at overcoming divisions also in the political field, city-regional government is still somewhat out of sight. The personalities of the mayors play an important role either to facilitate cross-border

communication, as in now in Atlanta, or undermine it, as still in Philadelphia. Still, some informal arrangements have emerged, largely led by the business community, to overcome the operational costs (e.g. traffic congestion) of a divided region. But there are also differences in the degree to which these organisations take a genuinely regional perspective. In Philadelphia, despite the name Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, the 'greater' refers to the city only. The legacy of the Olympics in Atlanta has been a more outward looking perspective, even though this is entirely business focused. Still, organisations like the Atlanta Regional Committee are beginning to serve as a cross-border and inter-institutional platform for the discussion of city-regional issues, albeit in a very politicised environment.

Some early conclusions:

This paper presented some of the initial results and ideas developed as part of an ongoing international comparative study of city regional governance and the evidence of 'new regionalism'. Initial results suggest a much more complex picture than that frequently portrayed by advocates of 'new regionalism'. In particular, question marks appear over the notion of a wholesale shift from a notional 'old' to a 'new' form of regionalism and associated 'good practice' in policy making. The issue of territoriality and, by implication, 'right' forms of governance, seems to be much less important than the recognition among city-regional policy makers that collaboration at the regional level is beneficial to them and their constituencies. Policy opportunities, developmental challenges, or leading policy makers' insight are all important trigger points of such developments. Resulting associations, networks and opportunity driven collaborations define *virtual regions* as policy regions. But they require the continued involvement of 'old' conventional regionalism as the basis of policy implementation and instrumentation. Virtual regions circumscribe the group of collaborating 'conventional' actors and their respective jurisdictions, but do not displace them. Thus, 'new' regionalism does not appear to be so much about 'new' in the sense of 'replacing old', but rather adding a new component to an existing and continuing operational system of regionalism. This raises its strategic policy making profile with more emphasis on visions for the future and thus broadens the conventional, more technocratically, land-use planning focused approach to regionalisation.

References:

- Barnes, W R and Ledebur, L C (1997): *The New Regional Economies*. London: Sage.
- Benfield K, Terris J and Vorsanger, N (2001): *Solving Sprawl*. New York: Natural Resources Defense Council.
- 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
- Daniels, T (1999): *When City and Country Collide*. Washington: Island Press
- 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
- Gilham, O (2002): *The Limitless City*. Washington: Island Press
- 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 (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
- Katz, B (2000): *Reflections on Regionalism*. Washington, DC: Brookings
- Keating, M (1998): Political Economy of Regionalism. In: M Keating and J Loughlin (eds): *The Political Economy of Regionalism*. London: Frank Cass, 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
- 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.
- Marshall, A (2002): *How Cities Work*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- 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): *Metropolitica. 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
- Rusk, D (1995): *Cities Without Suburbs*. 2nd ed, Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Savitch H, Vogel R (1996): *Regional Politics*. London: Sage
- Swanstrom, T (1996): Ideas Matter: Reflections on the New Regionalism. *Cityscape*, 2(2), 5-21.
- 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