

TERRITORIAL DIMENSION OF GOVERNANCE AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL EFFECT ON THE GEOGRAPHICAL LEVELS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Samet YILMAZ*
Araştırma Makalesi

Abstract

Territorial matters increasingly gain importance in the European Union (EU). The EU considers territory as a variable in specification and implementation of policies. So, the territorial dimension has been added to various policy areas, and governance has also been addressed on a territorial basis. In this framework, as a relatively new concept, territorial governance has entered into the EU's agenda to improve the efficiency of governing processes and ensure territorial development. This study elaborates on the fundamentals of territorial governance. Its main purpose is to discuss the institutional effect of territorial governance on the geographical levels in the EU.

Keywords: European Union, Territory, Governance, Territorial Governance, Institutional Effect.

Avrupa Birliği'nde Yönetişimin Teritoryal Boyutu ve Coğrafi Düzeyler Üzerindeki Kurumsal Etkisi

Öz

Teritoryal meseleler, Avrupa Birliği (AB) içerisinde artan oranda önemli hâle gelmektedir. AB, politikaların belirlenmesinde ve uygulanmasında teritoryayı bir değişken olarak ele almaktadır. Bu bakımdan teritoryal boyut, çeşitli politika alanlarına eklenmiş ve yönetim de teritoryal bir bağlamda ele alınmaya başlanmıştır. Bu çerçevede göreceli olarak yeni bir kavram olan teritoryal yönetim, yönetim süreçlerinin etkinliğinin artırılması ve teritoryal gelişimin sağlanması

* Arş. Gör. Dr., Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, E-posta: sametyilmaz@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5232-5435.
Makalenin Gönderilme Tarihi: 28/04/2020 Kabul Edilme Tarihi: 31/08/2020

amacıyla AB gündemine dâhil edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, teritoryal yönetişimin temel unsurlarını ele almaktadır. Çalışmanın temel amacı, teritoryal yönetişimin AB içerisindeki coğrafi düzeyler üzerindeki kurumsal etkisini tartışmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Avrupa Birliği, Teritorya, Yönetişim, Teritoryal Yönetişim, Kurumsal Etki.*

Introduction

Territory increasingly gains importance in the EU's policies. The Union establishes an ideational and practical approach to territory, considering the geographical effects of policies. It is aimed at construction of a more balanced and harmonious geographical area by adding a territorial dimension to various policy spheres. In particular, with adoption of the ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective), which outlines the framework of the spatial vision of the EU, the effects of policies on places in which people live have begun to be considered more.¹ In the 2000s, the concept of territory, which is identical with the modern state,² was positioned as a policy in the EU. Concepts such as territorial cohesion, territorial development, territorial capital, territorial cooperation and territorial impact assessment have been included in the EU's agenda.³ So, space, territory and place and their relationship to policies and the governing processes are significant parts of the European integration.⁴

With the increasing importance of territory in implementation of EU's policies, the concept of territorial governance has been included in discussions on the governing processes. As a polity⁵ which seeks to establish a space of welfare and freedom,⁶ the EU tries to perform territorial governance to make implementation of policies more efficient, provide full

¹ Mustafa Demirci ve F. Neval Genç, "Planlamanın Avrupa Birliği Boyutu," *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no 19 (2007): 53-74.

² Samet Yılmaz, "Human Territoriality: A Spatial Control Strategy," *Alternatif Politika* 10, no 2 (2018): 131-155. Samet Yılmaz ve Çiğdem Aydın Koyuncu, "Teritoryalite Beşeri ve Siyasal Etkileşimlerin Düzenlenmesinde Neden Hâlâ Önemli?" *International Journal of Social Inquiry* 12, no 1 (2019): 317-343.

³ Eduardo Medeiros, "Is There a Rise of the Territorial Dimension in the EU Cohesion Policy?" *Finisterra, LI*, no 103 (2016): 89-112.

⁴ Julian Clark ve Alun Jones, "The Spatialities of Europeanisation: Territory, Government and Power in 'EUrope'," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33, no 3 (2008): 300-318.

⁵ Simon Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, 2nd Edition, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

⁶ Ole B. Jensen ve Tim Richardson, *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity* (London: Routledge, 2004).

and effective use of territorial capacity and encourage more actors to participate in the governing processes. Moreover, territorial governance is closely related to the spatial development and cohesion policies of the EU.

This study deals with the basic elements of territorial governance in the context of the spatial order desired to be constituted throughout the space of the EU. A conceptual analysis method shall be applied by elaborating on the documents prepared in the EU and the available literature on territorial governance. The main purpose of the study is to discuss the institutional effect of territorial governance on the geographical levels in the EU. In this framework, firstly, the conceptual debates on territory shall be handled to make the concept operational concerning the study. Then, what it means that territory has been added to the EU's policies and governance shall be explained. Lastly, the institutional effect of territorial governance on the geographical levels shall be analyzed.

I. On the Concept of Territory

Territory, like many concepts in the social sciences and humanities, is a controversial concept. Debates on territory mostly revolve around biological and social studies⁷ and the structure of modern states and arguments against this structure.⁸ However, it is mostly addressed in terms of territoriality. To illustrate, Sack describes territoriality as “*the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area.*” Territory is the product of territorial actions, and it differs from other types of geographical areas such as place and space.⁹ Similarly, Delaney defines territory as a bounded and

⁷ Andrea Mubi Brighenti, “On Territorology: Towards a General Science of Territory,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 27, no 1 (2010): 52–72.

⁸ Anssi Paasi, “Bounded Spaces in a ‘Borderless World’: Border Studies, Power and the Anatomy of Territory,” *Journal of Power* 2, no 2 (2009): 213–234. David Storey, *Territory: The Claiming of Space* (Essex: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2001). Joe Painter, “Rethinking Territory,” *Antipode* 42, no 5 (2010): 1090–1118. John Agnew, “The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory,” *Review of International Political Economy* 1, no 1 (1994): 53–80. Marco Antonsich, “Rethinking Territory,” *Progress in Human Geography* 35, no 3 (2010): 422–425. Sami Moisio ve Anssi Paasi, “Beyond State-Centricity: Geopolitics of Changing State Spaces,” *Geopolitics* 18, no 2 (2013): 255–266. Stuart Elden, *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2013).

⁹ Robert D. Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986).

meaningful social space, and the meanings on this space regulate the functioning of social power.¹⁰

It is clear that there is an interconnectedness between territory and territoriality.¹¹ This interconnectedness is notably related to the modern state. In this context, territory is a spatial compartment with neatly defined and continuous boundaries. Though such a definition seems rather simple and functional, it has some difficulties. There have been territories on which territorial actions have been applied but have discontinuous boundaries. Additionally, territory may have various qualifications other than the purpose of bounding. Thus, it should not be positioned as directly the product of territoriality.

Territoriality is a claim of control. A geographical area is bounded to impose control or claim on resources and people on it. Thus, as one of forms of power,¹² territoriality is a prevalent spatial control strategy. The area on which control is to be established and relationship patterns are organizationally institutionalized. The bounded area acquires a territorial function, depending on the feature of boundedness. So, it would be more substantial to view a geographical area on which territorial actions are exercised as *territorial*, not directly as territory. Such an approach shall bring about separation of that geographical area from other ones. In order for a geographical area to be territorial, it is supposed to be a geographical demarcation. Additionally, the bounded area may gain a political character through different forms of authority, apart from sovereignty.¹³ The political dimension of territoriality is related to the intensity of control rather than the existence of any principle. The institutional efficiency of the geographical area is decisive in this sense. If territoriality is organizationally developed, covers a large part of societal life and also provides a spatial identity or belonging to individuals and communities, then, the spatial control is comprehensive and organic. However, if the boundedness and claim of control are partial and intended to fulfil particular aims, rather than providing an identity or belonging, territoriality is functional.¹⁴

¹⁰ David Delaney, "Territory and Territoriality," içinde *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Vol. 11, ed. Rob Kitchin ve Nigel Thrift (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009), 196-208.

¹¹ Yılmaz, "Human Territoriality," 147-149.

¹² John Allen, "Three Spaces of Power: Territory, Networks, Plus a Topological Twist in the Tale of Domination and Authority," *Journal of Power* 2, no 2 (2009): 197-212.

¹³ Antonsich, "Rethinking Territory," 422-425.

¹⁴ Hans Vollaard, "The Logic of Political Territoriality," *Geopolitics* 14, no 4 (2009): 687-706.

It may be proposed that a geographical area, whether it is a place, space or region, acquires a territorial character by being demarcated and bounded in certain respects. It is politically delineated as a governmental and administrative compartment.¹⁵ In this framework, the concept of territorial shall be harnessed to indicate a bounded geographical compartment in this study. So, territory, apart from its other features, shall refer to a governmental and administrative partition.

II. Entry of Territory as a Policy into the EU's Agenda

Territory has recently entered into the EU's agenda. It should be noted that it is difficult to distinguish between the concepts of spatial and territorial in the EU.¹⁶ Although these concepts are stated separately in the EU's documents, they are sometimes interchangeably employed.¹⁷ For instance, spatial impacts may be used with similar meaning to territorial impacts, or spatial planning may have the same connotations as territorial planning.¹⁸ It is clear that space is a more general and comprehensive concept than territory, and there are various approaches on space.¹⁹ Without any discussion about its content, space shall be considered as one of the types of geographical areas that may acquire a territorial character.

Spatial effects of policies, in fact, have been on the agenda since the foundation of the EU.²⁰ However, spatial issues started to be directly discussed in various documents that were prepared by the EU in the 1990s.²¹ The most important one among these is the ESDP that was accepted in 1999. The document which represents the different approaches of the member states to space²² is not binding. However, it is the basic document that

¹⁵ Painter, "Rethinking Territory," 1103.

¹⁶ Juho Luukkonen ve Helka Moilanen, "Territoriality in the Strategies and Practices of the Territorial Cohesion Policy of the European Union: Territorial Challenges in Implementing "Soft Planning"," *European Planning Studies* 20, no 3 (2012): 481-500.

¹⁷ Andreas Faludi, *Territorial Cohesion Under the Looking Glass Synthesis Paper About the History of the Concept and Policy Background to Territorial Cohesion*, (2009), Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/consultation/terco/pdf/lookingglass.pdf

¹⁸ Medeiros, "Is There," 93.

¹⁹ Samet Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği ve Teritoryalite: Birlik Mekânının Teritoryalleşmesi ve İçerisi-Dışarı Ayrımı* (Bursa: Dora, 2020), 27-32.

²⁰ Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği*, 187-188

²¹ Demirci ve Genç, "Planlamanın Avrupa," 56-58.

²² Andreas Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion: Old (French) Wine in New Bottles?" *Urban Studies* 41, no 7 (2004): 1349-1365. Andreas Faludi, "From European Spatial Development to Territorial Cohesion Policy," *Regional Studies* 40, no 6 (2006): 667-678.

reveals the fundamentals of the spatial approach of the EU and has directed the subsequent developments.²³

The ESDP provides a spatial approach at the EU scale and seeks establishment of a single space. It anticipates a spatial development on a geographical and political scale that transcends the member states.²⁴ According to the document, the spatial development policies are aimed at achievement of economic and social cohesion, a balanced competition and sustainable development by conserving resources.²⁵

The ESDP has an ideational approach to the territorial character of the EU.²⁶ It specifies that the cultural variety in a small area is the distinctive territorial feature of the EU. Thus, the spatial development policies should be aimed at improving the living conditions of citizens, rather than homogenizing local and regional identities. They should be specified and implemented, and a balanced development should be ensured throughout the territory of the EU.²⁷

Although territory has entered into the EU's agenda with the ESDP, in fact, it is the cohesion policy that has made territory a political element. The cohesion policy that is based on regional development²⁸ is essentially aimed at achievement of a harmonious societal structure. It has a political will to reduce the socio-economic disparities among societies in the territory of the EU. Cohesion was specified as social and economic cohesion, and then, territorial one was added by the Treaty of Amsterdam. The Treaty of Lisbon, together with social and economic cohesion, has regulated territorial cohesion as one of the competences of the EU. The Union shares competence with the member states in this policy field.²⁹

Territorial cohesion has a societal basis. The EU has adopted a model of society aiming to promote the living conditions of the societies in its space

²³ Demirci ve Genç, "Planlamanın Avrupa" 59.

²⁴ Samet Yılmaz, "Avrupa Birliği'nin Teritoryal Yapısı ve Dış Sınırları: Esnek veya Katı Teritoryalite?" *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 75, no 1 (2020), 37-38.

²⁵ European Commission, *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union* (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1999), Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/pdf/sum_en.pdf

²⁶ Yılmaz, "Avrupa Birliği'nin," 38

²⁷ European Commission, *European Spatial*, 7.

²⁸ Raffaella Y. Nanetti, "EU Cohesion and Territorial Restructuring in the Member States," içinde *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Liesbet Hooghe (Oxford: Oxford University, 1996), 60.

²⁹ Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği*, 220-225.

where welfare and social justice are provided. Additionally, this model includes good governance, sustainable development and competitiveness. Territorial cohesion constitutes the spatial dimension of this model of society.³⁰ It is based on consideration of the spatial effects of policies and encompasses a wide range of policy areas ranging from establishment of multi-level governance (MLG) to protection of natural assets and development of rural areas. So, territorial cohesion is closely related to the daily practices of individuals. It is aimed at ensuring a balanced, harmonious, effective and sustainable territorial structure among cities, regions and macro-regions to advance the territorial condition of the EU.³¹

Both the spatial development and territorial cohesion policies prove that territory has entered into the EU's agenda as a policy element. In fact, these policies are low politics since national governments, though various actors engage, are the main actors in the process. However, introduction of territory as an element to be regulated in the Founding Treaties indicates that territory itself has been adopted as a policy in the EU. This is not a solely linguistic change but also a semantic one signifying the emergence of a new geographical area in the EU.³² Thus, territory has become a variable added to various policy areas and gained a political character as an agent.

III. EU and Territorial Governance

Territorial cohesion seeks revealing the potential of territory to ensure a balanced development. Territory itself needed to be considered as an input or variable in implementation of governance. Thus, depending on the geographical scale, governing should be conducted in accordance with the features of the place in question. So, how may the concept of territorial governance be operationalized? How does territorial governance differ from the plain governance?

³⁰ Andreas Faludi, "The European Model of Society," içinde *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, ed. Andreas Faludi (Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2007), 1-23. Simin Davoudi, "Territorial Cohesion, European Social Model and Spatial Policy Research," içinde *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, ed. Andreas Faludi (Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2007), 81-104.

³¹ Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği*, 226-230.

³² Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği*, 235.

A. Concept of Governance

It is known that the concept of governance is used across various disciplines. However, it may be suggested that it has certain common features. First of all, governance is different from traditional governmental practices. In general, while government displays the use of state or public power through formal bodies established in a hierarchy, governance includes in complex relationships and networks and does not only encompass governmental units, but also non-governmental actors in decision-making procedures. Thus, it is a method aiming to reach binding-decisions. This method, unlike the traditional hierarchical one performed by governmental agencies, is a softer coordination between relevant stakeholders. In other words, it is a multi-actor, multi-level, soft and heterarchical way of governing.³³ So, new relationship patterns are established between governments and citizens. However, this does not mean that the hierarchical method is not existent in governance.³⁴ Governance is composed of all methods related to governing and aimed at reaching collective actions within a governmental structure.

Governance has also been utilized in EU studies which specify that governmental and non-governmental actors at different levels have entered into decision-making processes in a pluralistic manner, and networks have been established at the EU scale. Additionally, this multiplicity of levels in decision-making processes in certain policy fields has extended to explain the political and organizational structure of the EU.³⁵ Thus, governance is not merely a method for governing or creating norms; it is a polity-building process, as well.

Governance is aimed at involving as many actors as possible in the governing processes and increasing efficiency. In fact, the main purpose of governance which has been frequently referenced in documents of the EU is stated this way. The White Paper published in 2001 which establishes a

³³ Mark Bevir, *Governance: A Very Short Introduction* (Hampshire: Oxford University, 2012).

³⁴ Tanja Börzel, "European Governance: Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48, no 2 (2010): 191–219.

³⁵ Ian Bache ve Matthew Flinders, "Themes and Issues in Multi-Level Governance," içinde *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache ve Matthew Flinders (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004), 1-11. Liesbet Hooghe ve Gary Marks, *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001). Liesbet Hooghe ve Gary Marks, "Types of Multi-Level Governance," içinde *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti ve Michael Zürn (Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2010), 17-31. Simona Piattoni, *The Theory of Multi-Level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2010).

general framework concerning governance towards the functioning of the EU in a more effective and democratic way specifies that “[g]overnance’ means rules, processes and behavior that affect the way in which powers are exercised at European level, particularly as regards openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence.” It is also stated in the document that the Commission alone cannot promote European governance, and national, regional and local authorities and civil society should participate in the process.³⁶ Thus, on the basis of horizontal and vertical cooperation, governance is conceived as multi-actor and multi-level by the EU.³⁷

B. Fundamentals of Territorial Governance

Territorial governance is a significant variable to ensure spatial development and cohesion and “can be looked at as an institutional approach to develop integrative planning and development on a regional level in the context of territorial cohesion.”³⁸ It has been on the EU’s agenda since the 2000s. However, territorial cooperation that may be defined as a policy to improve the living conditions of EU citizens through the joint initiatives of local or regional authorities of the member states has been on the EU’s agenda since the 1990s. The main goal of the policy is to provide social and economic cohesion and contribute to the territory-building process of the EU. For this purpose, cross-border cooperation (CBC) initiatives supported by interregional cooperation (INTERREG) programs have been established between authorities at various levels.³⁹ Thus, territorial

³⁶ Commission of the European Communities, *European Governance: A White Paper* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities 2001), 5-6, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/communication-white-paper-governance-com2001428-20010725_en.pdf

³⁷ Committee of the Regions, *The Committee of the Regions’ White Paper on Multilevel Governance* (Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2009), 1, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/cdr89-2009/_cdr89-2009_en.pdf. Kai Böhme et al., *Territorial Governance and Cohesion Policy* (Brussels: European Parliament. Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies, 2015), 15-16, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563382/IPOL_STU%282015%29563382_EN.pdf

³⁸ Axel Stein, “Territorial Cohesion in the Context of Interregional and Transnational Cooperation,” *European Spatial Research and Policy* 17, no 1 (2010): 20.

³⁹ Birte Wassenberg ve Bernard Reitel, *Territorial Cooperation in Europe. A Historical Perspective* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015), Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020,

cooperation promotes territorial cohesion by developing an integrated territorial approach and multi-level spatial development strategies.⁴⁰ These features are similar to those of territorial governance in terms of spatial and territorial actions.

Territorial governance has similar elements to MLG.⁴¹ However, as its name implies, it has a strong territorial reference and tries to govern territorial dynamics and processes.⁴² It is basically concerned with the relationship between governance and territory.⁴³ Adding territory as a policy and a common good to the governing processes for valorization of territorial capital is one of the main variables of territorial governance.⁴⁴ This way, it is aimed at improvement of social, intellectual, political and material capital and establishment of territorial cohesion at various levels.⁴⁵ This situation rests on governance of territories at the local, regional, national and transnational levels in accordance with their own characteristics and requires a holistic approach. Territorial governance is inherently multi-level and multi-actor. However, it evaluates governing processes by adding a territorial outlook. So, it has a place-based approach.⁴⁶ It focuses on territoriality of policies and concerns management of territorial dynamics, assessment of territorial impacts and specification of boundaries to handle various policy issues.⁴⁷

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/information/pdf/brochures/interreg_25years_en.pdf

⁴⁰ Eduardo Medeiros, "Territorial Cohesion: An EU Concept," *European Journal of Spatial Development*, no 60 (2016): 18.

⁴¹ Andreas Faludi, "Multi-Level (Territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms," *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, no 2 (2012): 197-211.

⁴² ESPON TANGO (Territorial Approaches for New Governance), *Territorial Approaches for New Governance* (Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2013), 15, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/applied-research/tango-territorial-approaches-new-governance>

⁴³ Anders Lidström, "Territorial Governance in Transition," *Regional and Federal Studies* 17, no 4 (2007): 499.

⁴⁴ Simin Davoudi et al., "Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practices," *Boletín de la AGEN*, no 46 (2008): 44.

⁴⁵ ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level* (Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2006), 17-18, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/3.ir_2.3.2_final.pdf

⁴⁶ Böhme, et al., *Territorial Governance*, 15.

⁴⁷ Dominic Stead, "The Rise of Territorial Governance in European Policy," *European Planning Studies* 22, no 7 (2014): 1372. Lidström, "Territorial Governance," 499.

Regarding governance as place-based is the distinctive feature of territorial governance. The place-based approach is a method to ensure social development. Considering the features of specific places for establishment of more appropriate policies and effective use of resources, it rests on reducing the inefficiency and social exclusion of people through implementation of external interventions and MLG.⁴⁸ The effective use of resources or territorial capital requires establishing cooperation between various levels of government (MLG, vertical relations), sectoral policies with territorial impact, territories, and governmental and non-governmental organizations and citizens (multi-channel governance, horizontal relations).⁴⁹ Thus, territorial governance is “*a process of the organization and co-ordination of actors to develop territorial capital in a non-destructive way in order to improve territorial cohesion at different levels.*”⁵⁰ In particular, participation of local elites in the governing processes is essential for achievement of territorial cohesion.⁵¹

Specification and implementation of policies in a place-based manner and establishment of vertical and horizontal cooperation between different levels of government are aimed at both integrating policies and providing territorial integration. The place-based approach includes MLG and requires participation of local actors in designing and conducting policies. However, it is not a localist paradigm; rather, it involves supra-local authorities. In this structure, higher authorities determine the general objectives and performance standards. Lower authorities carry out policies through cooperation with relevant units and elites in line with the characteristics of the place in question and the general objectives. Thus, territorial cohesion and integration which aim at enhancement of coordination between functional areas that are existing or created in the territory of the EU to make them more coherent geographical entities and cooperation between different geographical levels may be achieved. This expectation requires developing place-based policies, encompassing the existing but also exceeding administrative boundaries.⁵²

⁴⁸ Fabrizio Barca, *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations* (Brussels: Directorate General for Regional Policy, European Commission, 2009), Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/policy/future/barca_en.htm

⁴⁹ ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of*, 18.

⁵⁰ ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of*, 13.

⁵¹ Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, *Territorial Cohesion in Future EU Cohesion Policy: Final Report for the Research Project “The Territorial Dimension of Future EU Cohesion Policy”* (Berlin: Federal Ministry of Transport, 2012), 46-50, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://d-nb.info/1030281866/34>

⁵² Kai Böhme et al., *How to Strengthen the Territorial Dimension of ‘Europe 2020’ and the EU Cohesion Policy* (Warsaw: Polish Ministry of Regional Development, 2011), 23-27,

Participation of local elites in the governing processes within the framework of the place-based approach and the effective use of territorial capital, in fact, seek to bring about a territorial awareness and loyalty between citizens and levels of government. In other words, the place-based approach is aimed at provision of a territorial identity or sense of place. This goal is basically one of the objectives of the spatial vision of the EU. So, a more efficient spatial integration is expected. It was stated in the final report of ESPON (European Spatial Planning Observation Network) Project 2.3.2. that territorial governance

*“confronts the problem of the representation of interests, thus considering among its objectives the specific social and political dimension of the collective action. It sees the territory not as a static and passive space, but in a dynamic and active context, as an actor itself in the development process, stressing particularly the role of proximity, sense of place and territorial identity to promote the collective action of local coalitions and their capacity to organize relations with other territories.”*⁵³

To sum up, territorial governance is a territorially sensitive way of governing which is based on establishment of horizontal and vertical cooperation between relevant actors, achievement of territorial cohesion, promotion of decision-making procedures at lower levels, integration of policy sectors and adjustment to changing conditions.⁵⁴ It is aimed at improvement of territorial integrity. Thus, it may be claimed that territorial governance is the governing part of the territorial dimension of the European model of society. More importantly, on account of the fact that territorial governance concerns how actions are organized from a territorial point of view, it positions territory itself as an agent, and territory is added to governing processes as a variable.

Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020,
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011_territorial_dimension_eu2020.pdf

⁵³ ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of*, 18.

⁵⁴ Davoudi et al., “Territorial Governance,” 35. Dominic Stead, “Dimensions of Territorial Governance,” *Planning Theory & Practice* 14, no 1 (2013): 142. Lisa van Well ve Peter Schmitt, “Understanding Territorial Governance: Conceptual and Practical Implications,” *Europa Regional*, 21.2013 no 4 (2015): 212.

IV. Geographical Levels in the EU

The geographical levels in the EU are classified in two ways. Firstly, just as the concept of region,⁵⁵ they coincide with the existing administrative boundaries. For instance, the NUTS (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics) classification that subdivides the economic territories of the member states into territorial units in a hierarchy as regions (NUTS), local administrative units and grid cells is based on the administrative boundaries of the member states.⁵⁶ Likewise, territories are mainly classified as local, regional, national and supranational in the documents on spatial development and territorial cohesion.⁵⁷

Classification of territories in reference to administrative boundaries in the EU proves that the geographical levels are politically partitioned in a hierarchy, ranging from local to supranational. Such a structure, in the framework of the types of MLG introduced by Hooghe and Marks,⁵⁸ is similar to a federal system. Vertical cooperation is established between territorial levels which are hierarchically separated from each other, and the EU level becomes a geographical and political scale under which the sub-levels are grouped. However, in the same framework, geographical and political scales may be fuzzy since new scales are constituted and reconstituted to achieve particular aims in the EU.⁵⁹ For instance, while the NUTS classification is mainly hierarchical, and territories are classified at certain levels, it is specified that territorial units may take place at multiple levels, as well. Moreover, new scales of governance are established through CBC at the regional, interregional and trans-regional levels.⁶⁰ Though the

⁵⁵ Mehmet Özel, "Avrupa Birliği'nde Bölge, Bölgeselleşme, Bölge Yönetimleri Kavramları Üzerine," *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 58, no 1 (2003): 97-117.

⁵⁶ European Union, *Consolidated Text: Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the Establishment of a Common Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS)*, 18.01.2018, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:02003R1059-20180118&qid=1519136753473>

⁵⁷ Yılmaz, *Avrupa Birliği*, 231-236.

⁵⁸ Hooghe and Marks established two types on MLG. Type I governance structure is general-purpose and similar to a federal system in which jurisdictions are diffused across limited number of governmental levels. The actors within such units are generally territorial with mutually exclusive memberships. Type II structure is task-specific. It has many overlapping jurisdictional levels. Thus, membership is mostly intersecting. Hooghe ve Marks, "Types of," 17-31.

⁵⁹ Enrico Gualini, "The Rescaling of Governance in Europe: New Spatial and Institutional Rationales," *European Planning Studies* 14, no 7 (2006): 881-904. Michael Keating, *Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2006).

⁶⁰ Joachim Beck, "Cross-Border Cooperation and the Challenge of Transnational Institution-Building—the Example of the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC),"

EU level may be considered as a territorial scale,⁶¹ the sub-levels may be positioned at various scales. Thus, “[European spaces] *can be simultaneously local, national, European and global.*”⁶²

The fact that territories may be at various scales, and new scales of governance emerge is the second way to politically define geographical levels. Territories in the EU are regarded as interconnected or relational, and new levels of governance such as macro-regions that encompass various territories at the transnational scale are forged. Thus, overlapping, fluid and complex authority structures emerge across the territory of the EU.⁶³ In fact, provision of territorial cohesion requires a flexible governance and finding the most appropriate territorial scale. The Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion specifies that “[w]hereas most policies focus on a single administrative geographic level, the pursuit of territorial cohesion implies a more functional and flexible approach.”⁶⁴ This way, it is aimed at establishment of cross-border coordination between territories at different levels and provision of policy coordination and territorial integrity.

RECERC, no 1 Spécial (2017): 1-13, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <http://recerc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/R9beck.pdf>. Luis De Sousa, “Understanding European Cross-Border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis,” *Journal of European Integration* 35, no 6 (2013): 669-687. Luiza Bialasiewicz et al., “Re-Scaling 'EU'rope: EU Macro-Regional Fantasies in the Mediterranean,” *European Urban and Regional Studies* 20, no 1 (2003): 59-76. Markus Perkmann, “Cross-Border Regions in Europe Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Co-Operation,” *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10, no 2 (2003): 153-171. Markus Perkmann, “Construction of New Territorial Scales: A Framework and Case Study of the EUREGIO Cross-Border Region,” *Regional Studies* 41, no 2 (2007): 253-266.

⁶¹ Yılmaz, “Avrupa Birliği'nin,” 31-52.

⁶² Chris Rumford, “Rethinking European Spaces: Territory, Borders, Governance,” *Comparative European Politics* 4, no 2-3 (2006): 137.

⁶³ Andreas Faludi, “Territorial Cohesion, Territorialism, Territoriality, and Soft Planning: A Critical Review,” *Environment and Planning* 45, no 6 (2013): 1302-1317. Andreas Faludi, “The Poverty of Territorialism: Revisiting European Spatial Planning,” *The Planning Review* 52, no 3 (2016): 73-81. Dominic Stead, “European Integration and Spatial Rescaling in the Baltic Region: Soft Spaces, Soft Planning and Soft Security,” *European Planning Studies* 22, no 4 (2014): 680-693. Jussi S. Jauhiainen ve Helka Moilanen, “Towards Fluid Territories in European Spatial Development: Regional Development Zones in Finland,” *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 29, no 4 (2011): 728-744. Ole B. Jensen ve Tim Richardson, “Nested Visions: New Rationalities of Space in European Spatial Planning,” *Regional Studies* 35, no 8 (2001): 703-717.

⁶⁴ European Commission, *Investing in Europe's Future: Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2010), 24, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/cohesion5/pdf/5cr_part1_en.pdf

V. Institutional Effect of Territorial Governance

Territorial governance incorporates regulation of space, and on a place-based foundation, it is directed to the spatial dimension of the European model of society, just like territorial cohesion. Valorization of territorial capital which is composed of intellectual, political, social, material, cultural and geographical elements⁶⁵ and intervention in policies whose spatial dimension is significant such as poverty and social exclusion⁶⁶ are priorities of spatial development, territorial governance and cohesion. In this framework, the spatial and territorial policies of the EU are aimed at protecting the stability of the societal model to be forged initially through distribution of welfare and prosperity in a balanced way. Regional development policies and structural funds have been established for this purpose.⁶⁷ This situation requires intervention in directing resources. Spatial development, territorial governance and cohesion are also geography-centered policies concerning the distribution of welfare and prosperity. Since the member states are the main actors in allocation of resources and implementation of redistributive policies, the spatial and territorial policies of the EU are secondary and complementary in terms of mobilization and allocation of resources. However, policies towards establishment of a balanced and harmonious societal structure prove that “*the EU is more than a ‘just’ regulatory State.*”⁶⁸ In the context of territoriality, the EU seeks to impose control on resources or direct them to territories through the emergence of institutional structures to forge a space of welfare and prosperity.

As it is specified, there are two ways in bounding space in the EU. On the one hand, territorial levels are given, coincided with existing governmental boundaries, and on the other hand, scales may be blurred, and new spaces of governance may emerge. It is known that scales are generally viewed as given. However, they are redefined or rebuilt in a variety of ways. In particular, institutionalization is significant in crystallization of scales.⁶⁹ New spaces and levels of governance are established through CBC in the EU. In general, CBC is a process that creates opportunities and constraints for the actors involved and contains complex networks. This process

⁶⁵ ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of*, 18.

⁶⁶ European Commission, *Investing in*, 184-192.

⁶⁷ Müslüm Basılın, “Avrupa Birliği’nin Bölgesel Ekonomik Kalkınma Politikası,” *Global Journal of Economics and Business Studies* 1, no 1 (2012): 47-66.

⁶⁸ Jane Holder ve Antonia Layard, “Drawing out the Elements of Territorial Cohesion: Rescaling EU Spatial Governance,” *Yearbook of European Law* 30, no 1 (2012): 360.

⁶⁹ Perkmann, “Construction of,” 256-257.

includes vertical and horizontal cooperation and operates in a multi-level manner. Augmentation of structural funds and INTERREG programs have made CBC attractive for local actors to cooperate with the EU.⁷⁰ Many cross-border regions (CBRs) have been established especially since 1990, but lack of an effective common legal framework and a supranational unit to carry out the process hampers establishment of a substantively functioning CBC mechanism.⁷¹ In order to promote the CBC process in Europe, the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC), which has a legal personality, was set up in 2006. As an EU unit, it can sign contracts, establish its own budget, recruit staff and implement projects on behalf of its members in accordance with its mandate. Though the EGTC has not been successful in achievement of political legitimacy, it is a cross-border entity to enhance the capacity to act autonomously on behalf of the member states on CBC.⁷² Furthermore, the EU adopted the macro-regional strategy as a new instrument for transnational cooperation in 2009. The strategy is aimed at providing territorial cooperation and tackling common problems of states in a particular area through promotion of coordination between existing initiatives and institutions.⁷³

It is obvious that CBRs have increased, but the powers and efficiency of emerging institutionalizations are rather weaker than those of national states and domestic units.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, their institutional capability varies. For instance, Metzger and Schmitt claim that the institutionalization of the Baltic Sea Region has a tendency to improve. The region is increasingly solidified through the functioning of the Commission as a spokesperson concerning the interests of the region.⁷⁵ In the same vein, Perkmann suggests that, in the framework of certain variables, adding that CBRs may have different features, the political mobilization in Dutch-German border-regions was

⁷⁰ Markus Perkmann, "Building Governance Institutions Across European Borders," *Regional Studies* 33, no 7 (1999): 657-667.

⁷¹ Andrea Noferini et al., "Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU: Euroregions amid Multilevel Governance and Reterritorialization," *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 35-56. Beck, "Cross-Border Cooperation," 1-13. Perkmann, "Cross-Border Regions," 153-171.

⁷² Estelle Evrard, "The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): Towards a Supraregional Scale of Governance in the Greater Region SaarLorLux?" *Geopolitics* 21, no 3 (2016): 513-537.

⁷³ Stefan Gänzle ve Kristine Kern (ed.), *A 'Macro-Regional' Europe in the Making Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

⁷⁴ Tobias Chilla, Estelle Evrard ve Christian Schulz, "On the Territoriality of Cross-Border Cooperation: "Institutional Mapping" in a Multi-Level Context," *European Planning Studies* 20, no 6 (2012), 977

⁷⁵ Jonathan Metzger ve Peter Schmitt, "When Soft Spaces Harden: The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region," *Environment and Planning A* 44, no 2 (2012): 263-280.

established by local authorities on both sides the border area. Then, with the advent of the new regional policy that granted a stronger role to local actors in designing and implementing policies, the actors at higher levels (national and EU) have also participated in the process, and an interdependence has been set up between the local and higher levels. The higher levels or vertical networks have provided the flow of resources, while the local cross-border networks have kept the cooperation operative and attractive. Political support has been mobilized for establishment and maintenance of cross-border governance by “*addressing the cross-border space as a new unit of intervention.*” Thus, a new territorial scale has become salient.⁷⁶

Addressing governance in a place-based manner promotes the political-territorial feature of the geographical levels in the EU. Territorial governance is aimed at uncovering the endogenous potential of territories. Participation of local elites in the governing processes is notably significant for the political boundedness of scales and promotion of institutionalization. So, territorial governance provides a territorial function to the geographical levels.

Conclusion

This study has analyzed the territorial dimension of governance in the EU. Territorial governance, though its content has been specified in the EU’s documents, is actually an institutional learning process. Implementations bring about redefinition of its content. In this sense, as there are various governance practices in the EU, the meaning of territorial governance may become uncertain. However, establishment of a balanced and coherent societal structure requires achievement of territorial cohesion. With its vertical and horizontal dimensions, territorial cohesion is aimed at sharing European values. Place-based policies and initiatives of the EU institutions towards transferring resources to regions are political actions.⁷⁷ “*Europeanisation, therefore, is inevitably linked to EU territorial governance.*”⁷⁸

Territorial governance, which is based on the combination of the place-based approach and MLG, is a method of governing in consideration of the unique qualities of places. To increase the efficiency of governing and ensure a balanced development across its territory, the EU addresses

⁷⁶ Perkmann, “Construction of,” 253-266.

⁷⁷ Holder ve Layard, “Drawing out,” 380.

⁷⁸ Stein, “Territorial Cohesion,” 6.

governance on a territorial basis. The conduct of governing in a place-based manner is toward strengthening the political and geographical character of the governmental levels. So, territorial governance concretizes the governing processes and seeks to create a sense of place at certain scales by establishing and advancing the institutional capability of demarcated scales.

The effectiveness of new scales of governance which reorganize economic, social and political actions⁷⁹ is particularly significant for achievement of territorial governance. So, the success of the territorial dimension of the governing processes should be assessed by specifically examining the institutionalization level of new scales or CBRs. It is clear that their institutional capacity is not as comprehensive and strong as *sovereignty-bound*⁸⁰ states, and their boundedness or territoriality is mainly functional. However, sovereignty is not a prerequisite for the emergence of boundedness. Rather, whether there is a governmental and administrative boundedness and the effectiveness of institutional capacity in directing resources are significant for the degree of territorial control. Thus, establishing and connecting CBRs to the supranational level, together with allocation of resources and improvement of autonomous action capability, may promote the territory construction process and the boundedness of governmental levels.

It should be noted that though the EU handles governing in a territorial way, the space of the EU has contrasting features since spatial configurations and administrative boundaries intersect each other in most cases.⁸¹ As a result of a functional and flexible approach to territorial cohesion, cooperation is established on multiple scales in the EU. However, the notion of territorial strategies or hard spaces is strong in the spatial development and territorial cohesion policies of the EU.⁸² Thus, bounded, networked and fluid territories may simultaneously be observed throughout the territory of the EU.⁸³

⁷⁹ Gabriel Popescu, "The Conflicting Logics of Cross-Border Reterritorialization: Geopolitics of Euroregions in Eastern Europe," *Political Geography* 27, no 4 (2008): 418-438.

⁸⁰ James Rosenau, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity* (New Jersey: Princeton University 1990).

⁸¹ Faludi, "The Poverty," 78.

⁸² Andreas Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion and Subsidiarity under the European Union Treaties: A Critique of the 'Territorialism' Underlying," *Regional Studies* 47, no 9 (2013): 1594-1606. Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion, Territorialism," 1302-1317.

⁸³ Jauhainen ve Moilanen, "Towards Fluid," 728-744.

References

- Agnew, John. "The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory." *Review of International Political Economy* 1, no 1 (1994): 53-80.
- Allen, John. "Three Spaces of Power: Territory, Networks, Plus a Topological Twist in the Tale of Domination and Authority." *Journal of Power* 2, no 2 (2009): 197-212.
- Antonsich, Marco. "Rethinking Territory." *Progress in Human Geography* 35, no 3 (2010): 422-425.
- Bache, Ian ve Matthew Flinders. "Themes and Issues in Multi-Level Governance." içinde *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache ve Matthew Flinders, 1-11. Oxford: Oxford University, 2004.
- Barca, Fabrizio. *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations*. Brussels: Directorate General for Regional Policy, European Commission, 2009. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/policy/future/barca_en.htm
- Basılğan, Müslüm. "Avrupa Birliği'nin Bölgesel Ekonomik Kalkınma Politikası." *Global Journal of Economics and Business Studies* 1, no 1 (2012): 47-66.
- Beck, Joachim. "Cross-Border Cooperation and the Challenge of Transnational Institution-Building—the Example of the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)." *RECERC*, no 1 Spécial (2017): 1-13, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <http://recerc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/R9beck.pdf>.
- Bevir, Mark. *Governance: A Very Short Introduction*. Hampshire: Oxford University, 2012.
- Bialasiewicz, Luiza, Paolo Giaccaria, Alun Jones ve Claudio Minca. "Re-Scaling 'EU'rope: EU Macro-Regional Fantasies in the Mediterranean." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 20, no 1 (2003): 59-76.
- Böhme, Kai, Sabine Zillmer, Maria Toptsidou ve Frank Holstein. *Territorial Governance and Cohesion Policy*. Brussels: European Parliament. Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies, 2015. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563382/IPOL_STU%282015%29563382_EN.pdf
- Böhme, Kai, Philippe Doucet, Tomasz Komornicki, Jacek Zaucha ve Dariusz Świątek. *How to Strengthen the Territorial Dimension of 'Europe 2020' and the EU Cohesion Policy*. Warsaw: Polish Ministry of Regional Development, 2011. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011_territorial_dimension_eu2020.pdf

- Börzel, Tanja. "European Governance: Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48, no 2 (2010): 191–219.
- Brighenti, Andrea Mubi. "On Territorology: Towards a General Science of Territory." *Theory, Culture & Society* 27, no 1 (2010): 52–72.
- Chilla, Tobias, Estelle Evrard ve Christian Schulz. "On the Territoriality of Cross-Border Cooperation: "Institutional Mapping" in a Multi-Level Context." *European Planning Studies* 20, no 6 (2012), 961-980.
- Clark, Julian ve Alun Jones. "The Spatialities of Europeanisation: Territory, Government and Power in 'EUrope'." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33, no 3 (2008): 300-318.
- Commission of the European Communities. *European Governance: A White Paper*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities 2001. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/communication-white-paper-governance-com2001428-20010725_en.pdf
- Committee of the Regions. *The Committee of the Regions' White Paper on Multilevel Governance*. Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2009. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/cdr89-2009_/cdr89-2009_en.pdf
- Davoudi, Simin, Neil Evans, Francesca Governa ve Marco Santangelo. "Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practices." *Boletín de la AGEN*, no 46 (2008): 33-52.
- Davoudi, Simin. "Territorial Cohesion, European Social Model and Spatial Policy Research." içinde *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, ed. Andreas Faludi, 81-104. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2007.
- De Sousa, Luis. "Understanding European Cross-Border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis." *Journal of European Integration* 35, no 6 (2013): 669-687.
- Delaney, David. "Territory and Territoriality." içinde *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Vol. 11, ed. Rob Kitchin ve Nigel Thrift, 196-208. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009.
- Demirci, Mustafa ve F. Neval Genç. "Planlamanın Avrupa Birliği Boyutu." *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no 19 (2007): 53-74.
- Elden, Stuart. *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2013.
- ESPO Project 2.3.2. *Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level*. Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2006. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/3.ir_2.3.2_final.pdf

- ESPON TANGO (Territorial Approaches for New Governance). *Territorial Approaches for New Governance*. Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2013. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/applied-research/tango-territorial-approaches-new-governance>
- European Commission. *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1999, Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/pdf/sum_en.pdf
- European Commission. *Investing in Europe's Future: Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2010. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/cohesion5/pdf/5cr_part1_en.pdf
- European Union. *Consolidated Text: Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the Establishment of a Common Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS)*. 18.01.2018. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:02003R1059-20180118&qid=1519136753473>
- Evrard, Estelle. "The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): Towards a Supraregional Scale of Governance in the Greater Region SaarLorLux?" *Geopolitics* 21, no 3 (2016): 513-537.
- Faludi, Andreas. "From European Spatial Development to Territorial Cohesion Policy." *Regional Studies* 40, no 6 (2006): 667-678.
- Faludi, Andreas. "Multi-Level (Territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms." *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, no 2 (2012): 197-211.
- Faludi, Andreas. "Territorial Cohesion and Subsidiarity under the European Union Treaties: A Critique of the 'Territorialism' Underlying." *Regional Studies* 47, no 9 (2013): 1594-1606.
- Faludi, Andreas. "Territorial Cohesion, Territorialism, Territoriality, and Soft Planning: A Critical Review." *Environment and Planning* 45, no 6 (2013): 1302-1317.
- Faludi, Andreas. "The European Model of Society." içinde *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, ed. Andreas Faludi, 1-23. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2007.
- Faludi, Andreas. "The Poverty of Territorialism: Revisiting European Spatial Planning." *The Planning Review* 52, no 3 (2016): 73-81.

- Faludi, Andreas. *Territorial Cohesion Under the Looking Glass Synthesis Paper About the History of the Concept and Policy Background to Territorial Cohesion*, (2009), Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/consultation/terco/pdf/lookingglass.pdf
- Faludi, Andreas. "Territorial Cohesion: Old (French) Wine in New Bottles?" *Urban Studies* 41, no 7 (2004): 1349-1365.
- Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs. *Territorial Cohesion in Future EU Cohesion Policy: Final Report for the Research Project "The Territorial Dimension of Future EU Cohesion Policy."* Berlin: Federal Ministry of Transport, 2012. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, <https://dnb.info/1030281866/34>
- Gänzle, Stefan ve Kristine Kern (ed.). *A 'Macro-Regional' Europe in the Making Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Gualini, Enrico. "The Rescaling of Governance in Europe: New Spatial and Institutional Rationales." *European Planning Studies* 14, no 7 (2006): 881-904.
- Hix, Simon. *The Political System of the European Union*. 2nd Edition. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Holder, Jane ve Antonia Layard. "Drawing out the Elements of Territorial Cohesion: Re-scaling EU Spatial Governance." *Yearbook of European Law* 30, no 1 (2012): 358-380.
- Hooghe, Liesbet ve Gary Marks. "Types of Multi-Level Governance." içinde *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti ve Michael Zürn, 17-31. Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2010.
- Hooghe, Liesbet ve Gary Marks. *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.
- Jauhainen, Jussi S. ve Helka Moilanen, "Towards Fluid Territories in European Spatial Development: Regional Development Zones in Finland." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 29, no 4 (2011): 728-744.
- Jensen, Ole B. ve Tim Richardson, "Nested Visions: New Rationalities of Space in European Spatial Planning." *Regional Studies* 35, no 8 (2001): 703-717.
- Jensen, Ole B. ve Tim Richardson. *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Keating, Michael. *Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2006.
- Lidström, Anders. "Territorial Governance in Transition." *Regional and Federal Studies* 17, no 4 (2007): 499-508.

- Luukkonen, Juho ve Helka Moilanen. "Territoriality in the Strategies and Practices of the Territorial Cohesion Policy of the European Union: Territorial Challenges in Implementing "Soft Planning"." *European Planning Studies* 20, no 3 (2012): 481-500.
- Medeiros, Eduardo. "Is There a Rise of the Territorial Dimension in the EU Cohesion Policy?" *Finisterra, LI*, no 103 (2016): 89-112.
- Medeiros, Eduardo. "Territorial Cohesion: An EU Concept." *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 60 (2016): 1-30.
- Metzger, Jonathan ve Peter Schmitt. "When Soft Spaces Harden: The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region." *Environment and Planning A* 44, no 2 (2012): 263-280.
- Moisio, Sami ve Anssi Paasi. "Beyond State-Centricity: Geopolitics of Changing State Spaces." *Geopolitics* 18, no 2 (2013): 255-266.
- Nanetti, Raffaella Y. "EU Cohesion and Territorial Restructuring in the Member States." içinde *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Liesbet Hooghe, 59-88. Oxford: Oxford University, 1996.
- Noferini, Andrea, Matteo Berzi, Francesco Camonita ve Antoni Durà. "Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU: Euroregions amid Multilevel Governance and Reterritorialization." *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 35-56.
- Özel, Mehmet. "Avrupa Birliği'nde Bölge, Bölgeselleşme, Bölge Yönetimleri Kavramları Üzerine." *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 58, no 1 (2003): 97-117.
- Paasi, Anssi. "Bounded Spaces in a 'Borderless World': Border Studies, Power and the Anatomy of Territory." *Journal of Power* 2, no 2 (2009): 213-234.
- Painter, Joe. "Rethinking Territory." *Antipode* 42, no 5 (2010): 1090-1118.
- Perkmann, Markus. "Building Governance Institutions Across European Borders." *Regional Studies* 33, no 7 (1999): 657-667.
- Perkmann, Markus. "Construction of New Territorial Scales: A Framework and Case Study of the EUREGIO Cross-Border Region." *Regional Studies* 41, no 2 (2007): 253-266.
- Perkmann, Markus. "Cross-Border Regions in Europe Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Co-Operation." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10, no 2 (2003): 153-171.
- Piattoni, Simona. *The Theory of Multi-Level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.
- Popescu, Gabriel. "The Conflicting Logics of Cross-Border Reterritorialization: Geopolitics of Euroregions in Eastern Europe." *Political Geography* 27, no 4 (2008): 418

- Rosenau, James. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*. New Jersey: Princeton University 1990.
- Rumford, Chris. "Rethinking European Spaces: Territory, Borders, Governance." *Comparative European Politics* 4, no 2-3 (2006): 127-140.
- Sack, Robert D. *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986.
- Stead, Dominic. "Dimensions of Territorial Governance." *Planning Theory & Practice* 14, no 1 (2013): 142-147.
- Stead, Dominic. "European Integration and Spatial Rescaling in the Baltic Region: Soft Spaces, Soft Planning and Soft Security." *European Planning Studies* 22, no 4 (2014): 680-693.
- Stead, Dominic. "The Rise of Territorial Governance in European Policy." *European Planning Studies* 22, no 7 (2014): 1368-1383.
- Stein, Axel. "Territorial Cohesion in the Context of Interregional and Transnational Cooperation." *European Spatial Research and Policy* 17, no 1 (2010): 5-22.
- Storey, David. *Territory: The Claiming of Space*. Essex: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2001.
- Vollaard, Hans. "The Logic of Political Territoriality." *Geopolitics* 14, no 4 (2009): 687-706.
- Wassenberg, Birte ve Bernard Reitel. *Territorial Cooperation in Europe. A Historical Perspective*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015. Erişim Tarihi: Nisan 04, 2020, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/information/pdf/brochures/interreg_25years_en.pdf
- Well, Lisa van ve Peter Schmitt. "Understanding Territorial Governance: Conceptual and Practical Implications." *Europa Regional*, 21.2013 no 4 (2015): 209-221.
- Yılmaz, Samet ve Çiğdem Aydın Koyuncu. "Teritoryalite Beşeri ve Siyasal Etkileşimlerin Düzenlenmesinde Neden Hâlâ Önemli?" *International Journal of Social Inquiry* 12, no 1 (2019): 317-343.
- Yılmaz, Samet. "Avrupa Birliği'nin Teritoryal Yapısı ve Dış Sınırları: Esnek veya Katı Teritoryalite?" *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 75, no 1 (2020), 31-52.
- Yılmaz, Samet. "Human Territoriality: A Spatial Control Strategy." *Alternatif Politika* 10, no 2 (2018): 131-155.
- Yılmaz, Samet. *Avrupa Birliği ve Teritoryalite: Birlik Mekânının Teritoryalleşmesi ve İçerisi- Dışarıyı Ayrımı*. Bursa: Dora, 2020.