![imajINE logo] Integrative Mechanisms for Addressing Spatial Justice and Territorial Inequalities in Europe

Integrative Mechanisms for Addressing Spatial Justice and Territorial Inequalities in Europe

D1.1 Conceptual review of the Scientific Literature

Version 1.2

Authors: Mikko Weckroth, Juho Luukkonen, and Sami Moisio (HU), Frank Meyer and Judith Miggelbrink (IfL), Apostolos G. Papadopoulos, Loukia – Maria Fratsea, and George Mavrommatis (HUA).

Grant Agreement No.: 726950

Programme call: H2020-SC6-REV-INEQUAL-2016-2017

Type of action: RIA – Research & Innovation Action

Project Start Date: 01-01-2017

Duration: 60 months

Deliverable Lead Beneficiary: HU

Dissemination Level: PU

Contact of responsible author: mikko.weckroth@helsinki.fi

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 726950.

Disclaimer:

This document reflects only the author's view. The Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Dissemination level:

• PU = Public

Table of Contents

Introduction: In search of a spatial form for a European social model

Issues of justice and inequality are a pressing political concern in Europe and in the context of contemporary European integration. This report elaborates upon some of the ways in which spatial justice has been conceptualized and researched in general and in the context of European integration in particular. In so doing, the report offers a review of scholarly work which examines issues of justice and inequality in a spatial framework.

Indeed, the search for a European social model has already for some time touched upon the spatial dimensions of justice and inequality. From this angle, it is notable that developing a European social model was included in the Lisbon 'competitiveness treaty' in 2000. The goals of the treaty included stabilizing national economies, raising the level of employment, strengthening educational systems, and re-working the systems of social security in the Member States.

From the 1990s, the development of the policies of the European social model have proceeded in tandem with the explicit territorial policies of the EU, such as the emergence of European spatial planning agendas and practices. These territorial policies have involved explicit articulation of the EU's territorial cohesion and related ideas on socially inclusive growth and a place-based approach. This all demonstrates that in the context of the EU, economic and social issues have been increasingly presented in a territorial framework since the late 1990s.

The idea of social Europe was re-worked in 2005 after the EU enlargement and the related growing disparities and increasing institutional diversity within the EU. In this context, the territorial cohesion of the EU emerged as an important policy idea and appeared in academic discourse. The territorial expansion of the EU in 2005 thus not only raised the issue of increased tension between policies on growth, productivity, competitiveness and employment, and policies on solidarity and redistribution, and the environment, but also prompted a discussion on the territorial disparities and inequalities in Europe. Addressing territorial inequalities within the EU framework has grown in importance since the 2008 economic crisis and the notable wave of immigration from outside the EU since 2016.

Numerous developments position European places and regions differently on the political-economic landscape. For instance, it is important to re-think the means through which spatial justice can be engendered through public policies in the age of austerity politics and to reconsider the ways in which EU policies are constrained by the current form of knowledge-based economization. The Lisbon Strategy (2000) and the associated "knowledge-based economy talk" still dominate the so-called territorial cohesion policies of the EU (Moisio 2018). This agenda, together with the recent proxy agenda of "smart specialization" (highlighting "smart growth" and "endogenous growth"), fundamentally structures and constrains how spatial policies can be imagined and practised in the European countryside and in small and medium-sized cities and regions.

Broadly speaking, territorial cohesion is a European Union policy field that simultaneously attempts to achieve a number of different goals and even slightly contradictory objectives. Following from this, territorial cohesion has been named as a highly ambiguous and contested term with many different layers of meaning (see for instance Mirwaldt, McMaster and Bachter 2008, Servillo 2010, Atkinson and Zimmerman 2016). At the same time, it has also been declared that territorial cohesion might

mean different things to different member-states and actors as the concept seems to get appropriated to fulfill various policy demands (Faludi 2015). In this sense, territorial cohesion remains an elusive and complex concept, open to many different and varied interpretations; a flexible European normative policy goal that can be 'manipulated' in order to promote specific priorities in different national/ regional contexts. Nevertheless, apart from its elusive character, territorial cohesion has been mostly defined in relation to a number of different dimensions/ aspects. Among them, the most dominant ones are linked to the promotion of polycentricity, balanced development (reduction of socio-spatial disparities), policy co-ordination and governance and, last but not least, environmental sustainability (see for instance Mirwaldt, McMaster and Bachter 2008, Bohme et al 2011, Dabinett 2011, Medeiros 2016). In short, these specific dimensions although not necessarily compatible appear to dominate the meaning of territorial cohesion's goals.

In this report, we present the results of our critical review of scholarly contributions addressing the concepts of 'spatial justice' and 'territorial cohesion'. The review is divided into seven main sections. After this introduction, we present our rationale for defining these concepts as the main focus of this report. Then in the third section, we elaborate upon the conceptual history of spatial justice in the academic fields of geography, spatial planning, and political science in section three. In the fourth section, we scrutinize the academic discussions that have revolved around the policy concept of territorial cohesion over the past fifteen years. The aim of the section is to conduct a critical review of scholarly contributions on territorial cohesion in the fields of geography, spatial planning, and political science as well as to analyse the ways in which the concepts of territorial inequality, spatial justice, and social cohesion have been discussed in academic works on the EU's territorial cohesion. In the fifth section, we focus on such scholarly contributions which have contributed to the development of models and techniques for measuring and operationalizing territorial cohesion and the related policy goals. In the final section we review the literature which addresses the links between territorial cohesion/spatial justice and "mobility". We in particular discuss the ways in which mobility is being understood as a factor in the context of spatial justice and territorial cohesion. In the final section, we present a summary and conclusions on our conceptual review on the academic literature of 'territorial cohesion' and 'spatial justice'.

Defining the key concepts

A scholar interested in scrutinizing the spatial nature of concepts such as economy or justice becomes entangled in a web of overlapping, undefined, and contested concepts. As questions of economy, justice, and space are quite often discussed within different disciplines, perspectives, and research traditions, a highly complex web of linkages and tensions exists between concepts such as 'territorial cohesion', 'spatial justice', and 'regional (economic) disparities' or a number of other variations and combination of words. In order to navigate through this jungle of concepts and meanings, one can try to quantify and categorize academic contributions regarding their choice of words and concepts. The results of such an procedure are shown in Table 1, where the geographical concepts of 'territorial', 'regional', and 'spatial' are cross-referenced with the concepts of 'cohesion', 'inequality/-ies', and 'justice'.

Table 1. Results of the Google Scholar search with key concepts[1]

Concept	"in the title of the article"	"anywhere in the article"	Typical journals
"Territorial cohesion"	579	15 200	*Regional Studies, Planning, Practice & Research, European Planning Studies,*
"Territorial inequality/-ies	92	2 905	*Regional Studies, Population, Space and Place, Economic Geography*
"Territorial disparities"	80	2 870	*Journal of Urban and Regional Analysis, Regional Science Policy & Practice, Intereconomics*
"Territorial justice"	76	1 840	*Political Geography Quarterly, Spatial Justice, Journal of Social Policy*
"Regional cohesion"	170	8 620	*European Economic Review, European Plannig Studies, Research Policy*
"Regional inequality/-ies"	1 913	52 700	*Journal of comparative economics, papers in regional science, regional science and urban economics*
"Regional disparities"	2 820	75 400	*Journal of comparative economics, economic geography, journal of economic geography*
"Regional justice"	34	1 120	*Space and Polity, American Journal of Public Health, Population*
"Spatial cohesion"	42	2 890	*Landscape Ecology, Biological Conservation, Journal of Applied Ecology*
"Spatial inequality/-ies"	832	25 000	*Urban Studies, Social Science & Medicine, Comparative Sociology*
"Spatial disparities"	314	10 400	*Journal of Economic Geography, Regional Studies, European Urban and Regional Studies*
"Spatial justice"	362	6 030	*Environment and Planning A, Justice spatiale/Spatial justice, City, Urban Studies, Antipode*

Table 1 reveals that in terms of pure volume, the most commonly used concepts are regional inequality/ies and regional disparities, with close to 5000 hits as the title of the article. However, when looking at the journals where these analyses have been published, it seems to be that these concepts are favoured in journals of economic geography and regional science. A similar trend can be read in territorial concepts and to some extent in spatial inequality/-ies and disparities.

Based on this pattern, one could thus argue that the concepts of inequality/ies and disparities have been used rather in a descriptive and neutral manner in order to describe and analyse the geographical heterogeneity of certain variables or societal dimensions. Moreover, this dimension has been approached from an economic perspective, and these analyses have focused on either a mechanical description of spatial terms or the geographical heterogeneity of economic production.

After this vast literature on the spatial heterogeneity of the economy, the most prominent concept has been territorial cohesion. This most obviously is related to the attention it has been given in EU policies and related analyses in an attempt to capture its meaning and use in the planning and governance of the EU territory.

Regarding the appearance of the concept of spatial justice, the exact number of search engine hits seems surprisingly low. However, when looking at the journals where these analyses have been published, it seems clear that this concept is of central importance as it addresses the normative and moral issues which are absent in the somewhat mechanical description of territorial or regional inequalities. One might thus argue that the issue of spatial justice is mostly discussed implicitly in scholarly analyses on the economic analyses of regional development and related regional disparities, and it receives its meaning through a set of other concepts.

Based on the interpretations made in this brief review, in this report we focus on the concepts of 'spatial justice' and 'territorial cohesion'. These concepts have established themselves as a focus of analytic studies regarding their meaning and use, whereas regional (economic) disparities or inequalities have not stabilized as a concept as such. As a consequence, it is necessary to understanding the shifting meanings and historical development of these terms. We begin this literary review with a conceptual history of social and spatial justice.

---

[1] The search was conducted in August 9th 2017 covering a period from 1990 until the present.

(A short) conceptual history of social and spatial justice

Spatial justice serves as a "boundary concept" (Chilvers & Evans 2009, 358) as it oscillates between – and, thus, potentially confronts – scientific analysis, ethical concerns, political programmes, and activist standpoints. Therefore, it might be fundamentally misleading to discuss spatial justice as a universal concept beyond its practical embeddedness – despite the necessity to reflect on the universal validity of the concept of 'justice'. A further necessity is to differentiate the concept of spatial justice alongside its intricate relation to perspectives outside the realm of research results from the comparative approach of the IMAJINE project. Hence, at least as a working hypothesis one could assume that the way spatial justice is scientifically addressed in a specific social, cultural, and political context – for example, the nation-state – depends on certain social, cultural, and political legacies and traditions expressed in (and performed) through law, class relation, collective experiences, geographical imaginaries, etc. This is partly due to the fact that spatial justice as a political issue and idea was effectively 'nationalized' and 'statized' during the Keynesian welfare state construction of post WW2 Europe. Irrespective of some similarities, spatial justice was thus discussed and played out differently in different parts of Europe.

In the following, we will briefly sketch out some philosophical fundamentals of social justice and the subsequent – specifically human geographic – works that have attempted to adapt it to struggles over space and inequalities between different places. However, the debate on justice – either social, spatial, or without a referent – has a long history, which is why we will not be able to provide a comprehensive summary. Instead, we will specifically focus on those works that have proven to be important for the geographical debate. Furthermore, the strands we follow are not covered by the same intensity of research. We will, however, provide hints as to whether other approaches may exist.

Fundamentals

One of our key assumptions is that (social, spatial, territorial, etc.) justice has to be understood as an under-defined term. Throughout its history of usage, it has had many different meanings assigned to it in different parts of the world, in different strands of science, by different scholars within these strands, and in the course of different political projects. Its meanings are thus historically contingent: its content and key aspects have changed or, as well, have been left unspecified. With regard to 'justice', Pirie (1983, 468) claims that "the meaning of the term is usually taken for granted and not in the least mysterious".

However, numerous scholars have attempted to conceptualize its under-defined nature. Most prominently – with regard to its impact on the geographic debate – John Rawls, philosopher at Harvard University, introduced in 1971 in "A Theory of Justice". He utilizes a hypothetical and ahistorical default concept of society named the "original position" in which – as he assumes – people, irrespective of their own characteristics, decide in non-biased ways on the principles of justice (Rawls 1971/2009, 10ff.). Based on this thought experiment, he derives two principles of justice that would emerge from that hypothetical state. Firstly, he assumes that justice is constituted by each person having "an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties"

(ibid., 266). Secondly, "social and economic inequalities are to be arranged (…) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged", and "offices and positions" shall be open to all (ibid.).

However universal these principles may seem, Rawls (1999) later disputed whether they "could be applied beyond the nation state", as he located the subject of justice in those institutions of society "which sustain deep and pervasive inequalities – what he called 'the basic structure of society'" (Barnett 2011, 250). Hence, Rawls (1971/2009, 6) attributed justice to social institutions. This triggered numerous attempts by subsequent scholars to identify a global basic structure in the face of global social issues (ibid.). Criticism has been levelled as Rawls was seen to presuppose a rather homogeneous public from which he derives the possibility to conceptualize a single notion of rationally justifiable justice (Dikec 2001, 1878). In his later work, he incorporated a more nuanced notion of the public (see Rawls 1993), while still maintaining a consensus-oriented perspective on the process of social negotiation (ibid.). Despite the fact that Rawls' conceptualizations have been frequently criticized, sometimes ferociously (see Hayek 1976), his work has proven to be of particular importance for geographic debates on spatial justice.

Spatial justice

Not only have there been a number of concepts and notions that overlap with spatial justice, such as environmental justice, socioenvironmental justice, a just city, and a just landscape (see e.g. Swyngedouw and Heynen 2003), but the spatial itself is all too easily taken for granted despite its polysemic nature. Whereas some scholars have questioned the need for it in general (see Pirie 1983), some avidly defend its relevance in the context of a "new spatial consciousness" (see Soja 2010).

However, an implicit reference to the notion that spatial justice manifests itself specifically in the urban space has been omnipresent. Notwithstanding, there is no logical reason to confine the notion of spatial justice to the urban space. Furthermore, there has been literature on spatial and geographic unevenness. This critical literature by Marxist and radical geographers (e.g. Smith 1984) explicitly touches upon questions of

uneven distributions of and access to societal resources and markets, socio-spatial marginalization and peripheralization, the exploitation of spatially uneven conditions of capitalist production, and profit-making.

However, the terminology used is heterogeneous. These bodies of literature (such as PoSCoPP 2015) do not always actively develop a specifically geographical conception of justice but refer to a/the role of space and spatiality in the production of disadvantaging, exploitive, marginalized, colonial, and precarious social conditions. Even though they might not explicitly talk about spatial justice or positively offer a definition, they are highly relevant for addressing spatial justice.[2]

The first popular entry for the concept of spatial justice that uses a spatial referent is usually attributed to Davies (1968). She, however, as Dikec (2001, 1786) comments, focuses on assessing "the distribution of local services with respect to the needs of designated service areas". In contrast,

---

[2] However, given the richness of this debate, in the following, we will mainly concentrate on debates about "spatial justice" specifically.

David Harvey's book "Social Justice and the City" (1973), while introducing the term "territorial social justice", yet still in the sense of "distributive", specifically highlights questions of justice in urban contexts. His work draws, among others (including John Rawls), on Henri Lefebvre's "Le Droit à la ville" (1968; The Right to the City) in which Lefebvre claims that justice cannot be reduced to access to resources but – as social and spatial processes converge – has to involve the right to take part in urban transformation processes. Justice, in that regard, implies that "active participation in the political life, management, and the administration of the city" would be achieved (Dikec 2001, 1790). In such a view,

spatial justice refers to the 'right to something'.

In his book "La Révolution Urbaine" (1970; The Urban Revolution), Lefebvre conceptualizes the fundamental political and social changes needed. As will be shown later in this section, the more recent "right to the city" debate specifically draws on Lefebvre's work.

By stressing the issue of "right to …" (rather than just "distribution of …"), Lefebvre's definition of justice fundamentally relies on his notion of social transformation. Harvey, in contrast, is critical of the hypothesis that the urban would not only serve as the culmination of the spatial injustice that follows the capitalist mode of production but may be the starting point of its abolishment as "the reality of urbanism modifies the relations of production without being sufficient to transform them" (Harvey 1973, 306). With regard to the concept of social justice and "geographical situations" (ibid., 107f.), he summarises that regional investment, in order to meet requirements of justice, should be elaborated on the basis of "socially just methods" to measure needs, and should subsequently fulfil the needs of the population. Secondly, multiplier and spill-over effects are to be created.[3] And thirdly, "deviations in the pattern of territorial investment may be tolerated if they are designed to overcome specific environmental difficulties" (ibid.). With regard to his concept of territorial justice,

"the geographical problem is to design a form of spatial organization which maximizes the prospects of the least fortunate region" (Harvey 1973, 306).

However, in the context of his overall oeuvre, Harvey has predominantly moved away from statements about distributional principles *in concreto* and rather remained to voice his critique on neoliberal processes that shape contemporary society as he "was more interested in the structural dynamics of the capitalist society" (Dikec 2001, 1786).

Despite the increasing popularity of the term spatial justice, Pirie (1983), for instance, questioned the necessity of introducing a spatial reference: "To assert that a person's living at x is unjust because of the remoteness of x, for example, is merely to beg the question why remoteness in general or in particular is unjust" (Pirie 1983, 471). As a scholar having published on the public sphere and issues of marginalization, Don Mitchell, for instance and in contrast, stresses that this may point at certain

---

[3] Yet Harvey remains unclear exactly who has to create such conditions.

complex entwinements. He emphasizes the need to reflect spatial justice against the background of access:

> That, in turn, and as I already suggested, requires us to think critically about power and control: about social and spatial structures, about those solidified social relations that are the landscapes and institutions within which we live (and against which we might struggle). (see Brown et al. 2007:9)

On a more elaborated level, Dikec (2001, 1793) conceptualizes the relation between space and justice as fundamentally bound to stable structures. In his works on French urban policy, Dikec for instance, mentions that "institutional structures and practices that privilege competition, efficiency, and economic success" play a role in establishing the conditions under which neoliberalism may thrive (Dikec 2006, 64). For him, spatial (in)justice cannot be attributed to specific acts but is the product of systematic exclusion and dominance (Dikec 2001). Such structures are complex and, given that Dikec bases his understanding on Lefebvre, are the outcome of dialectical processes in that injustice and spatiality coexist entwined (ibid.).

Similar approaches have emerged that centre on the social structures that may further or hinder unjust conditions. Most prominently, Iris Marion Young has worked extensively on "structural injustice", which she claims to exist "when social processes put large groups of persons under systematic threat of domination or deprivation of the means to develop and exercise their capacities, at the same time that these processes enable others to dominate or to have a wide range of opportunities for developing and exercising capacities available to them" (Young 2011, 52).

With regard to scholars working on matters of (social) justice, Merrifield and Swyngedouw (1997, 3) criticize an often prevailing static nature of the concept that does not take into account spatial and temporal differences. To Israel and Frenkel (2017), this comes as no surprise as for example in the case of scale, it is "perceived as socially produced (…), thus complicating normative selections needed to define a metric by which justice will be measured" (Israel and Frenkel 2017, 4). However complicating this notion may be, it is in line with contemporary claims that "the social and the spatial are dialectically intertwined, mutually (and often problematically) formulative and consequential" (Soja 2010, 18). For Soja, hence, (in)justice cannot be reduced to social processes themselves but must be understood by taking into account how social and spatial processes are interwoven, something he demonstrates using the example of Los Angeles (ibid., 111ff.).

He claims that "justice and injustice are infused into the multiscalar geographies in which we live, from the intimacies of the household to the uneven development of the global economy", affecting our lives and able to be changed by "social and political action" (ibid., 20). Soja (2010), traces injustice on the basis of the exogenous processes of the "imposition of political power, cultural domination and social control over individuals and groups" (ibid., 32). Furthermore, he identifies "endogenous processes of locational decision making and the aggregate distributional effects that arise from them" (ibid., 47). Spatial (in)justice, as a consequence, is understood by Soja as "the

outcome of countless decisions made about emplacement" (ibid.). In sum, a key aspect of Soja´s use of spatial justice is to highlight how geographical inequalities are created and reproduced by policy[4].

Soja's book "Seeking Spatial Justice" (2010) marks one of the milestones in the rejuvenated "right to the city" debate, which gained momentum after the turn of the millennium as "we live, after all, in a world in which the rights of private property and the profit rate trump all other notions of rights" (Harvey 2008, 23). With processes such as dispossession, gentrification, and further polarization in a global context, Harvey concludes that urbanization came hand in hand with the "burgeoning processes of creative destruction that have dispossessed the masses of any right to the city whatsoever" (ibid., 37) and that are symptoms and products of increasing injustice. However ubiquitous such setbacks may seem, the Right to The City movement surfaced in many countries across the globe. As Iveson (2011, 255) points out, proponents such as Marcuse (e.g. 2005) have stressed that a growing number of movements are not only locally bound but attempt to network using larger events such as Social Forums.

However, criticism has been levelled against a certain usage of the concept of spatial justice due to the interpretative, qualitative, and general nature of such accounts. For instance, Israel and Frenkel (2017) have recently contributed their attempt to introduce a metric of social justice in order to be able to assess current conditions. They specifically use

> "a person's capabilities and his liberties to be and to do (opportunities or life chances), according to the terminology discussed by Amartya Sen. The extent to which these capabilities are equally distributed in space will define whether a given spatial arrangement is (un)just". (Israel &Frenkel 2017, 2)

This approach attempts to introduce a metric on the basis for the notion that

no single definitive measure exists for justice, but, in contrast, it can be assessed on the basis of individual opportunities in a given context.

As Sen (2009) argues, it seems much more sensible to not presuppose a notion of a perfectly just situation against which reality is to be measured. In that regard, a more choice-centred understanding of what is fair and may create wellbeing comes into play (see Sen 1993). However, Sen does set certain universal goals such as

> "freedom and liberty; the ability to live our lives and be happy; and development of our capabilities. Of course, different individuals, groups and territories might fill in the detail on these goals in rather different ways". (Storper 2011, 19).

Drawing on these notions one could however suggest that 'justice' is regarded as a more qualitative assessment of whether or not something is perceived as 'fair', whereas 'inequality' is considered more quantitative concept and thus more suitable for objective measuring[5]. However, it needs to be

---

[4] Soja discusses the ´spatial justice` and policy relations specifically with regard to 'the city' scale, but it can also be considered relevant at a larger geographical scales, e.g. whether EU policy has (unintentionally) contributed to the perpetuation of regional inequalities within Europe.
[5] This interpretations connects also to discussion on defining the key concepts in page 5.

mentioned that this interpretation is based on the history of usage of the concepts as they – per sé – do not possess these contents or connotations.

Using Sen's work, Israel and Frenkel (2017) incorporate the aspect of spatiality into their appropriation of Sen's works by considering, first, the living environment and, second, social space and internalized habits: "Spatiality is produced in the interaction between these two structures" (ibid., 8). Both aspects, according to the authors, are relevant in shaping one's capabilities and abilities to execute certain actions. Justice, in that regard, is not used in a distributive manner of quantitative or qualitative aspects of life. Instead, by referring to Sen (1993), this notion focuses on the "range of options, and one's ability to choose and actualize them" as it "creates conditions for relevant agency, from which, in turn, well-being, happiness, and health may result" (Israel & Frenkel 2017, 12). From that point of view,

spatial justice emerges from citizens with a specific set of capabilities against the backdrop of the physical and social environment (Israel & Frenkel 2017, 12).

Other approaches and applications related to spatial justice

Although their contribution has just recently been published, other scholars have contributed approaches to the debate before, for example, from a planning perspective. For instance, Fainstein (2010) argued in her book "The Just City", again inspired by Rawls (1971), for the consideration of at least three components of a "just city". She mentions, first, the distributive aspect when stressing that material equality is essential. Second, she proclaims that diversity should characterize urban social life. In order to navigate potential conflicts, democracy has to be the third core concept guiding urban planners (see Fainstein 2009). Her conceptualization, of course, is focused on application rather than on theoretical elaboration.

Whereas the urban and the city both have been proclaimed as the space, place, and scale in which social heterogeneity clashes and creates specific conditions, questions of spatial justice have also been addressed on supra-national scales. For instance, Böhme et al. (2004) have explicitly criticized the lack of research that interrogates EU policy-making in planning areas against the backdrop of the notion of spatial justice "by looking beyond their formal territorial domain, or area of influence" and by revealing how inequalities and injustices are reproduced (ibid., 1179). This corresponds with Dabinett's (2011) claim that an analysis should consider "complex relations between values and diversity", whereas a conception of space as a container with spatial justice being "shorthand for social justice in space" (Dabinett 2011, 2391) should be avoided. In tension with this notion, yet in line with a more global approach to spatial justice, Storper (2011) introduces an approach to, what he calls, "inter-territorial distributions of resources" (ibid., 19), based on the assumption that

spatial-economic justice can only be achieved by means of the redistribution of resources.

Such a notions on ´spatial justice` have gained popularity in the course of the post-2008 era in Europe, characterized by the financial crisis, debt crises, austerity policies and subsequent debates about European solidarity (see Hadjimichalis 2011 for the case of Greece and Mahon 2014 for the case of Ireland).

Another approach to spatial justice draws on the concept of landscape. Based on the notion that landscape is a product of processes of appropriation of the physical environment that reflects "the political landscape" (Mitchell 2003, 788), injustice can further be understood as a social condition that leaves physical traces. To Mitchell as to Olwig, Henderson, and others to whom Mitchell extensively refers, landscape does not just mirror social processes nor is landscape an enigmatic "palimpsest" (Sahr 2003, 21), a "spoor" (Mitchell 2003, 790), or even the "detritus" (ibid.) of social life. Going beyond a framing of landscape as a mere representation, the conceptualization of landscape that comes to the fore in this approach refers to the (constant) appropriation of the physical environment for which the law, politics of property, community formation, and regimes of productivity are central (and for which, in turn, landscape has also become formative). As Olwig (1996, 630f.) puts after more than twenty years:

> Landscape, I will argue, need not to be understood as being either territory or scenery; it can also be conceived as a nexus of community, justice, nature and environmental equity, a contested territory that is as pertinent today as it was when the term entered the modern English language at the end of the sixteenth century.

Moreover, Olwig argues that – in northern Europe – law and justice are deeply embedded in the historical development of country and landscape (ibid., 643), the latter not as the space or the object of law (and justice) but merely its medium. Against this background, a notion of landscape could be derived that focuses more generally on the role of landscape in shaping social relations. However, such a notion of landscape as a medium does include its capacity to mediate exploitation, identity politics, and subjugation (Mitchell 2003, 791).

A last strand of research on justice that we would like to briefly mention has drawn connections between spatial justice and mobility. From this perspective, the uneven mobility of capital is a crucial aspect in the processes of capitalist globalization and urbanization (Sheller 2014, 797f.) and, thus, has fundamental implications for how spatial justice manifests itself spatially.

Such issues become specifically relevant in the context of the "Right to The City" debate and concern the individual's ability to make certain choices on whether "to be mobile and to reside in a place" (ibid.).[6]

As we have shown, (in)justice can be conceptualized in different ways. Some scholars trace it according to the distribution of certain resources (early works of Harvey); some identify it on the basis of an individual's ability to exercise his or her wishes (Young, Sen). Some scholars may attribute it to concrete actions, some assign it to social institutions (Rawls), whereas others see it as the outcome of structural processes (Young). And while many publications seem to rely on a large-scale analysis (e.g. Soja), an increasing amount of literature seems to question whether an analytic and empirical approach could be used to measure spatial (in)justice (Israel and Frenkel) and design the respective responses to it (e.g. Fainstein).

---

[6] The relationship between mobility and spatial justice will be more thoroughly discussed in section 5.

As a summary of what has been said above, one may recognize a strong urban focus in the literature on spatial justice. In the ensuing sections, we inquire into the ways in which spatial justice has been discussed in the context of European integration as territorial cohesion. We argue that territorial cohesion is indeed one of the few policy concepts and ideas in the context of the EU where the issue of spatial justice has been explicitly discussed and related to other issues such as territorial inequality and spatial unevenness.

Review of the academic literature on the policy concept of territorial cohesion

Rather than taking an urban focus, territorial cohesion in the context of European integration is treated as a regional issue that can be tackled through EU-driven regional policies. As mentioned earlier, academic literature on territorial cohesion is extensive. According to Faludi (2004), territorial cohesion has its roots in the decades-old French regional political idea of *aménagement du territoire*. However, in the context of EU policies, it made its first appearance only in 1997 in the Amsterdam Treaty. A quick Google Scholar search for the topic reveals that the number of academic works on territorial cohesion has grown together with the emergence of the political agenda of territorial cohesion. Until the publication of the Amsterdam Treaty, "territorial cohesion" gives around 150 search engine hits, while the search for the period from 1997 to 2002 – the following year after the publication of the Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (CEC, 2001), which devoted a separate section to territorial cohesion – gives around 250 hits.

The search for the next five-year period (2003–2008) indicates a booming era for academic industry on territorial cohesion (over 2100 hits). This is not a big surprise given that the framed period involves such remarkable milestones in the EU's spatial policies as the publication of the Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (CEC, 2004), the publication of the preliminary results of the politically influential ESPON programme (ESPON, 2004), the publication of the proposal for the EU constitution (European Union 2004), and the launching of the Territorial Agenda of the EU, whose final version was published in 2007 (Territorial Agenda 2007). In all these documents, territorial cohesion is brought to the fore as a significant political agenda both for the EU and for the individual Member States (cf. Davoudi 2005).

Since 2009, the number of academic publications referring to territorial cohesion has grown even more remarkably. The almost 12 000 hits with Google Scholar indicate that the concept has not only been consolidated in the policy vocabulary of the EU (in the EC's Directorate General on Regional Policy in particular), but also that it is no longer addressed only within a small cadre of European planners and planning scholars. Instead, it has been grasped across disciplinary boundaries by a wide range of scholars interested in issues of spatial policies and development within and beyond Europe.

As is often the case with politically fashionable concepts and ideas, the concept of territorial cohesion has in many cases been taken for granted without critically reflecting on its contents and varying political meanings. Many studies have used it in a descriptive manner – with pre-defined meanings of territorial cohesion, territory, and cohesion – to describe and compare certain economic and social conditions in and between particular geographical contexts. However, a large number of publications have critically examined the political interests and dimensions revolving around the

meanings of the term territorial cohesion (e.g. Davoudi 2005; Vanolo 2010; Faludi 2013; Van Well 2012). For instance, planning scholars have been eminently industrious in investigating the concept.

One reason for the growing interest towards territorial cohesion has been the view that adding territorial cohesion to the EU's strategies and treaties has provided new opportunities for rethinking and promoting the idea of European spatial planning, which was considered to be in the doldrums after the fading of the political appeal of the *European Spatial Development Perspective* document (cf. Faludi 2010a). Many of the contributions coming from the field of European spatial planning have either concentrated on the meta-level discussion on whether territorial cohesion ought to be defined more clearly for policy purposes (e.g. Abrahams 2014) or on the genealogy of the concept, in other words, tracing the origins of the concept and its evolvement in EU-orchestrated policy processes (e.g. Faludi 2010b).

Conducting a comprehensive overview on the scientific literature on territorial cohesion is a challenging task. This is not only due to the vast amount of scholarly contributions on the issue but because of varying understandings and usages of the concept. Many scholars have noted how territorial cohesion has become a new buzzword of spatial policies, whose actual meaning still has little consensus (Schön 2005; Evers 2008).[7] From such a perspective, territorial cohesion is a somewhat elusive spatial imaginary that can be referred to in policy-making in a number of ways. This applies also to academic debates, where it is not always even clear

> *whether the concept refers to a policy objective which is pursued through a particular policy means or whether territorial cohesion is the policy tool or technology itself for obtaining certain policy goals.*

The literature review is made even more complicated by the fact that the terms 'territory' and 'cohesion' bear varying conceptual meanings and weights in different disciplines and research traditions. The term territory, for instance, has traditionally been problematized and examined more thoroughly in geographical debates than in the debates on European spatial planning. Accordingly, in geographical debates territorial cohesion has been associated more with the politics of space and scale and the shifting geographies of power relations within the EU polity, whereas planning scholars have only recently started to pick up these themes (e.g. Faludi 2013).

While political contributions to defining the meaning and content of territorial cohesion have been scrutinized and categorized abundantly (e.g. Waterhout 2007; Luukkonen 2010), academic contributions on the concept have not been reviewed very often. This may arise from the "practice-oriented" tradition of the spatial planning discipline in which the focus of academic planning research has been rather on policy problems and the practical application of research resources than on systematic self-reflection on how planning scholars have themselves contributed to the emergence and (re-)formulation of the concept (cf. Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2008). Indicatively, when scholarly literature reviews and summaries of the different meanings of the concept of territorial cohesion have been made, they have quite often involved both political and academic contributions (see e.g. Van Well 2012).

---

[7] In some contributions, "fuzziness" has been considered a characteristic of policy concepts or even a strategic choice to avoid strong tensions or resistance between the involved parties (e.g. Zaucha 2015).

Below, academic literature on territorial cohesion has been classified into four broader thematic categories (see Table 2). The identified categories are not clearly distinct, and studies in different categories overlap in many cases. Studies which fall into the category of governance studies, for instance, examine understandably often also the roots of the concept in different European policy traditions.

Thematic categories of academic studies on territorial cohesion	Key dimensions within the themes
Genealogy of the concept	French tradition of *l'amenagement du territoire* German tradition of the integrated comprehensive approach Evolution of the concept in the EU's policy processes Successor to European spatial planning Links to the European model of society
Territorial cohesion as a mode of governing	Integrated approach Open method of coordination Multilevel governance Evidence-based policy Territorial dimension
Territorial cohesion as a normative policy objective	Balanced development/Equality Competitiveness Territorial capital Sustainable development Solidarity Spatial justice
Territorial cohesion as a spatial framework	Polycentrism Place-based development EU territory as a whole Functional Europe Spatial division of labour

Table 2. Four main categories of academic literature on territorial cohesion.

The first category of scientific literature consists of studies which seek to trace the origins of the concept. The category involves studies that examine the processes of the emergence and evolution of the concept in the context of European integration. In such "follow-the-policy" studies, scholars have examined and mapped the travelling of the concept/policy along with individual policy actors, as well as between different institutions and sites in which it has been formulated and debated.

According to several scholars, territorial cohesion has its roots in the French tradition of *aménagement du territoire*, a sort of spatial planning or regional policy which is directed at maintaining territorial (national) unity by decentralizing powers and mobilizing regional and local actors around national territorial policies (e.g. Davoudi 2005; Faludi 2004a). However, it is also noted that territorial cohesion derives partially from the German tradition of regional policies called a comprehensive integrated approach. Compared to the French tradition, which is sometimes seen as

a regional economic approach to spatial planning, the German tradition conceptualizes space and spatial policies somewhat differently. As Faludi (2004) notes,

from the French perspective territorial cohesion is seen as ensuring balanced economic development and the establishment of solidarity between regions, whereas the German tradition directs towards the broader perspective of sustainable development.

In many of the studies in this category, territorial cohesion is also considered an extension of the principles of the European model of society – that is, objectives of reducing disparities, inequalities and injustices – from individuals to places and territories (Davoudi 2007, 84; see also Davoudi 2005, Faludi 2007). Thus, according to this understanding, territorial cohesion is not a novel invention nor has it been imported outside of the EU polity but is an inherent part of the ideational European model of society.

The second category consists of studies which examine territorial cohesion from the perspective of shifts in governance of the EU's spatial policies. In these studies, territorial cohesion is understood as providing new opportunities or frameworks for governing the EU's and national spatial policies. In such a view,

territorial cohesion enables and empowers regional and institutional actors within the EU to use particular "cohesion resources" to introduce new and innovative scales of governance in Europe.

The governance perspective on territorial cohesion and development considers territorial cohesion policy as a way for creating new forms and scales of governance (Holder & Layard 2011, 2). While the idea of multilevel governance is well known in the context of the EU and among EU scholars, territorial cohesion is seen as providing entirely new possibilities for cross-sectoral and cross-border cooperation governance.

The issue of competence, or of whether the EU ought to have any formal power in European-wide planning issues or not, is at the core of the governance discussions on territorial cohesion. The debate originates from the view that the inclusion of the term territorial cohesion in the EU's official documents has created new opportunities for the EU to intervene in a field which has traditionally been seen as a matter of domestic policy-making. Many of the studies in this category also associate territorial cohesion with the German idea of a comprehensive integrated approach, which pays attention to both horizontal and vertical coordination and the cooperation of policies with spatial impacts (e.g. Schön 2005; see also Janin Rivolin 2005). In addition to these approaches, some scholars have examined the possibilities for applying the open method of coordination (OMC) in the context of territorial cohesion (e.g. Davoudi 2005; Faludi 2004b). The OMC is a sort of a soft mode of governing based on policy learning and adaptation through voluntary cooperation, deliberation, benchmarking, and information exchange (Moisio & Luukkonen 2015). According to some scholars, the OMC approach would be better suited than the hierarchical Community method in policy fields such as spatial planning and development in which the competence boundaries between actors remain fuzzy (cf. Davoudi 2005). Finally, according to some scholars, territorial cohesion implies better cognizance of the spatial impacts of policy-making as well as a better evidence base for policy decisions rather than a clearly defined objective of reducing regional disparities (Schön 2009, 14). In such a reading, territorial cohesion is considered as part of a more general "territorial turn" and the

rise of evidence-based policy-making, which denotes a closer relationship between policy-making and relevant centres of calculation that produce knowledge resources for the support of spatial policy debates and decisions (e.g. Gualini 2008; Adams et al. 2011; Schön 2009).

The third category involves studies that approach territorial cohesion as a policy objective. The majority of studies in this category revolve around the tensions between the policy objectives of balanced development and competitiveness. In some of the contributions, territorial cohesion is seen as a way to combine these objectives. Schön (2005), for instance, argues that pursuing territorial cohesion contributes to both of the objectives by putting in practice integrated and holistic spatial development approaches. According to this politically popular reasoning,

territorial cohesion policy would both reduce disparities and strengthen competitiveness by enabling regions to exploit their endogenous potentials (see Faludi & Waterhout 2005; Evers 2008).

However, several studies have also expressed criticism towards this view and claimed that the goals are contradictory (e.g. Lawton-Smith et al. 2003). Furthermore, some studies define territorial cohesion as an objective for unleashing the untapped "territorial potential" or "territorial capital" of European regions (e.g. Finka 2007). These studies highlight the need to take into account the regional diversity and context-specific needs and assets of European regions not only in solving problems but also in utilizing the rich diversity of European regions as a competitiveness asset.

The third category includes studies which link territorial cohesion with the idea of the European model of society overlapping with the first category. In such a reading, territorial cohesion is a spatial extension of the principles of the European model of society – objectives of reducing disparities, inequalities and injustices – from individuals to places and territories (Davoudi 2007, 84; see also Davoudi 2005, Faludi 2007). Occasionally,

territorial cohesion is also understood as the territorial dimension of sustainability (e.g. Camagni 2007; Holder & Layard 2011) or as an expression of solidarity and justice among regions and places (e.g. Doucet 2006).

The fourth category in the scientific literature on territorial cohesion consists of studies which have linked the concept to different kinds of spatial frameworks or configurations which might promote or indicate territorial cohesion. In some of the studies in this category, territorial cohesion is considered to give new stimulus to the ESDP's agenda of promoting a polycentric spatial pattern in Europe which would ultimately lead to balanced and sustainable development (Faludi 2005).

Another spatial concept to which territorial cohesion is often attached is the idea of place-based development.

Deriving from the Barca report (2009), place-based development refers to the idea that public policies ought to be context-sensitive in a way that enables the specific needs, characteristics, and potentials of places and regions to be taken better into account. This idea resonates well with the view that territorial cohesion is about paying attention to the territorial dimension of policies and about the better utilization of the potentials of European regions (cf. Zonneveld & Waterhout 2010; see also Mendez 2013).

However, it can also be argued that place-based development might be in tension with territorial cohesion as if development initiatives are bottom-up and tailored to place-specific needs and contexts it might be assumed that there will be greater convergence across a territory such as the EU rather than coherence. This kind of reasoning draws from Marxist critiques of localism arguing that allowing spatial variations militated against the social justice of everyone being treated equally within a state and that a strong central state is required to redistribute resources equitably across space.

Moreover, according to Holder and Layard (2011), territorial cohesion replaces the idea of a "Europe of flows" with the idea of a "Europe of places". In this politically appealing reasoning, Europeans are considered less nomadic than, say Americans, and more strongly attached to the region in which they were born. To complement the growing liberalization of the EU economy, some kind of policy should be in place to safeguard quality of life in places where the market cannot provide it. This policy would be

a territorial cohesion policy which, in this case, contributes to the safeguarding of services in the least accessible or peripheral regions (cf. Waterhout 2007, 42).

Some of the studies falling in this category understand territorial cohesion as a way to approach the EU territory as an integrated whole (cf. Faludi 2007; see also Bialasiewicz et al. 2005). Such an interpretation involves the implicit idea that Europe constitutes – or can be turned into with the help of European-wide planning policies – a functionally coherent spatial entity with an internal division of labour.

Spatial justice and territorial cohesion

The EU's cohesion policy is considered an expression of solidarity between the EU Member States and regions (Molle 2007; Ahner 2009). In the context of the EU's cohesion policies,

solidarity is considered primarily an economic question as it has been associated with the redistribution of resources or compensation payments to disadvantaged regions.

According to Allen (2005, 238), for instance, the logic behind cohesion policy "assumes that economic convergence among countries and among regions will deliver cohesion, which in turn will deliver growth, competitiveness, employment, and sustainable development."

In the context of academic debates on territorial cohesion, solidarity has been discussed as a spatial or territorial idea. For some scholars, territorial solidarity involves meanings that go beyond purely economistic rationales. Faludi (2007b), for instance, has noted that territorial cohesion thinking is animated by the conviction that there are values beyond growth, indicating that territorial cohesion represents certain "decommodified" values that cannot be left "at the mercy of market forces" only (Faludi 2007b, 580). For others, territorial cohesion and the associated idea of territorial solidarity are still dominated by an economic agenda. Holder and Layard (2010), for instance, have remarked that the use of economic methodologies and terminologies as well as the values expressed indicate that

> *territorial cohesion and territorial solidarity are primarily concerned with the balanced distribution of economic opportunities in space and equal opportunities to participate in economic activities (Holder & Layard 2010, 283−284).*

In seeking to broaden the understanding of territorial cohesion beyond purely economistic interpretations of solidarity, scholars have positioned territorial cohesion within a wider debate about the European model of society (e.g. Faludi 2007; Davoudi 2005). While the idea of a European model of society is highly disputed (e.g. Gualini 2008), several scholars share the understanding that certain values and objectives can be considered to characterize a distinctive European way of organizing and governing societal life (see e.g. Faludi 2007). In this context and as noted earlier

> *territorial cohesion is seen as extending the principles of a European social model from individuals and social groups to places and territories (Davoudi 2007, 83).*

Together with the goals of economic and social cohesion, territorial cohesion puts an emphasis on such policy goals as reducing disparities, inequalities, and injustices which, according to Davoudi (2007, 84), are "arguably embedded in the European social model". In the debates on the European social model and on territorial cohesion as a way of spatializing it, the concept of territorial cohesion derives its meaning from the broader idea of spatial justice (e.g. Doucet 2006; Davoudi 2007; Faludi 2007; Dabinett 2011; Holder & Layard 2011). Unlike the economically oriented definitions deriving from the discussions on the EU's cohesion policy and regional development policies,

> *territorial cohesion is understood in these debates in ways which resonate with Soja's understanding of spatial justice as the "fair and equitable distribution in space of socially valued resources and opportunities to use them" (Soja 2009, 2; cf. also Storper 2011).*

On a more concrete level, the fair distribution of opportunities in European space is expressed, for instance, as equal access to services, facilities, and knowledge as well as equal chances of employment, mobility, income, health, expressions of identity and culture, participation, and representation, regardless of where European citizens tend to live and work (Dabinett 2011, 2; Malý 2016; see also Giannakourou 1996). However, Holder and Layard (2010) remind us that

> *spatial justice or fairness is not only about the fair distribution of "goods" but also about the fair distribution of "bads",*

in other words, that territorial cohesion should be concerned with the fair distribution of environmental harms and other potential disadvantages that may result from the realization of the EU's policies seeking to enhance regions' economic competitiveness and development (Holder & Layard 2010, 283).

Territorial cohesion and European spatial planning

As the discussions referred to clearly indicate, territorial cohesion is above all a socio-spatial matter. Its central themes and ideas revolve around questions of how European integration and the associated EU policies should be organized and governed spatially and what would be the desired spatial structure of the alleged common territory of the Union. The first question involves issues such as what the proper scale is for governing and inspecting territorial development and the associated (im-)balances (e.g. Davoudi 2005; Hall 2005), how many public sector interventions in terms of spatial development ought to happen, and who the main actors are in regulating and conducting

spatial development policies in different geographical contexts (cf. Servillo 2010). The latter question, in turn, involves issues such as what the appropriate spatial structure is of the EU territory for promoting spatial justice (e.g. Dabinett 2011) and what kind of spatial configuration best secures the balance between the EU's core objectives of cohesion and competitiveness (e.g. Cattan 2007).

The notion of territorial cohesion has reactivated the politics geared around the governing and regulating of European spaces and Europe as a politically and economically cohesive spatial entity which, since the fading away of the political momentum generated by the publication of the ESDP document in 1999, has not been in the limelight of European politics. In that light, it is not surprising that the notion of territorial cohesion has been warmly welcomed in European planning policy communities and that planning scholars have contributed actively to the discussions on territorial cohesion (cf. Dühr et al. 2010).

In seeking solutions for advancing territorial cohesion and the underlying objectives of spatial justice, equity, and competitiveness, planning scholars have provided several contributions in which they outline the appropriate ways of organizing European spatial structures and configurations. One of the key ideas promoted by planning scholars is polycentrism (e.g. Dabinett 2011; Fabbro & Mesolella 2010; Camagni 2002). However,

while in some interpretations polycentrism is seen as contributing widely to the main aspects of territorial cohesion, that is, to spatial justice, sustainable development, balanced development, and the better use of territorial capital (Camagni 2002), suspicions have also been expressed about its ability to promote cohesion and sustainability (see Maier 2011, 268).

Another significant aspect that has been discussed in planners' contributions is the idea of place-based development. If polycentrism has been linked to the role of city-regions and wider network-regions as key spaces of wealth production and dissemination, the idea of place-based development has been slightly more associated with balanced development and inclusive growth generated through paying attention to context-specific local development conditions in regions also beyond the urban cores of Europe (e.g. Dabinett 2011).

Altogether, territorial cohesion has opened spaces of governance in which it is possible to speak and act upon the EU territory as a whole as a cohesive spatial entity and policy object which can be governed and regulated through spatial planning and development policies. In that light it is important to bear in mind that territorial cohesion is not only something that occurs or is governed in a pre-existing EU space. Instead, it is a significant assemblage of governmental techniques and political discourses in the "territory work" through which the EU seeks to diminish the dispute over the varying understandings of Europe and promotes the idea of Europe as a coherent spatial entity, and which also leads different political authorities and experts to speak and act in the name of the EU as a territorial object (Moisio & Luukkonen 2017).

Measuring 'spatial justice' and 'territorial cohesion'

Besides the fact that the concept of 'territorial cohesion' has been constantly debated and redefined in the literature of (critical) political geography, few attempts have been made to measure it empirically (ESPON, 2013; Farrugia & Gallina, 2008; Medeiros, 2016). Despite the fact that these

attempts have not resulted in commonly agreed indicator(s) for territorial cohesion, the attempts to operationalize the concept are fruitful to study as they involve confining descriptions on the nature of the phenomenon. As noted by Hamez (2005, p. 401), besides the abundance of definitions in policy documents given to territorial cohesion, it is also defined through the methodologies and metrics devised to measure its nature and development. This means that the process of operationalizing the concept, transferring it into a measurable format, can be studied in order to elucidate its definition and meaning.

Thereby, this section reviews the attempts at trying to transform the concepts of 'territorial cohesion' and 'spatial justice' into a quantifiable and measurable format. While there are different considerations on what broader dimensions and components territorial cohesion should cover (Camagani, 2005; Camagani, 2009; Medeiros, 2016; Mirwaldt, McMaster, & Bachtler, 2008; Zaucha, 2015), few attempts have tried to actually measure the level of territorial cohesion on different geographical scales and contexts through relevant indicators (ESPON, 2013; Farrugia & Gallina, 2008; Medeiros, 2016). This rather limited literature is analysed here through asking

1) what dimensions have been selected to define territorial cohesion,
2) whether some dimensions are emphasized or favoured over others, and
3) on whose needs and interests these operationalizations are made.

The operationalization of spatial justice and territorial cohesion

First, while analyses exist on the operationalization of both spatial justice and territorial cohesion, they seem to have different motivations and disciplinary bases. Operationalizations of territorial cohesion are more frequently done within the literatures of political science and planning studies as the concept is much more closely related to policy-making and governance. This relates to the close policy orientation of the concept, since policy-makers at EU and national levels are interested in having access to measures on which explicit policies such as territorial cohesion can be evaluated.

The literature on the operationalization of spatial justice, however, approaches mainly from the perspective and methods in the sub-discipline of spatial analysis. In general, it appears that empirical measurements as well as theoretical foundations of spatial justice have been driven more by academic interest, whereas the discussion over the definition and operationalization of territorial cohesion have been initiated and driven by the interests of policy-makers. Thematically, analyses on spatial justice have focused on measures of accessibility and mobility, and have operated in the urban scale and context. For example, Talen and Anselin (1998) conducted an assessment of spatial justice through an evaluation of measures of accessibility to public playgrounds. Another branch of literature has approached spatial justice through environmental justice, as for example in Bowen, Salling, Haynes, and Cyran (1995), who analysed the spatial distribution of toxic industrial pollution and demographic groups in the US context[8].

Regarding the territorial cohesion that serves as the main focus of this section, one of the first attempts to measure the concept was by Farrugia and Gallina (2008), who made an ambitious attempt to develop one single indicator for territorial cohesion. In the first place, they defined a wide list of dimensions the indicator should cover, including a measure for a polycentric territorial and urban system. However, they soon acknowledged the lack of data regarding various key dimensions (Zaucha, 2015 p. 30). Thereby, in the end territorial cohesion was defined by Farrugia and Gallina

---

[8] Theoretically, this would refer to fair distribution of "bads" as discussed by Holder and Layard (2010).

(2008; p. 39) rather loosely as the "ability to access services of general economic interest"[9]. In order to measure this ability, they were restricted to focusing only on a national level because no subnational indicators were available from the World Development Indicators of the World Bank, which was used for the analysis.

After calculating the index on the availability of services such as transport, energy, communications, education, and health care, Farrugia and Gallina (2008) looked at country-level correlations between the territorial cohesion index and the GDP and HDI.

Although this exercise by Farrugia and Gallina (2008) can be considered interesting and valuable for understanding the relationship between the national level of development and service availability, it is clear that it offers a rather limited contribution to policy-making, even less so at the subnational scale.

Consequently, a few years later Medeiros (2011) aimed to make a comprehensive empirical evaluation on the level of territorial cohesion on the regional scale for the EU territory as a whole that would better serve the needs of regional policy-making. In this operationalization he relied on a "Star model" of territorial cohesion (Medeiros, 2006), which suggested

environmental sustainability, polycentrism, social and economic cohesion, and cooperation/governance as the main components for the concept.

Medeiros also succeeded in defining a single composite index for territorial cohesion, but soon ran into a lack of comparable regional data on the whole EU scale. Thus in the end Medeiros was able to calculate the index of territorial cohesion only for NUTS 2 and 3 regions in the Iberian and Scandinavian contexts[10].

From the EU perspective one of the most comprehensive and relevant attempts to measure territorial cohesion was the INTERCO programme by ESPON (European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion, earlier European Spatial Planning Observation Network) in 2013. INTERCO was a part of the Territorial Indicators and Indices Project included in the ESPON 2013 programme and aimed to develop a set of indicators and indices that could be used to support policy-makers of the Commission and EU Member States in measuring and monitoring territorial cohesion related to European territorial development.

While selecting the indicators for measuring territorial cohesion, INTERCO identified in the first stage 600 potential indicators, but after filtering and prioritization, finally chose 32 top indicators organized into six territorial objectives. These six policy-oriented territorial objectives were

- *strong local economies ensuring global competitiveness*

- *innovative territories*

- *fair access to services, market and jobs*

- *inclusion and quality of life*

---

[9] Referring specifically to spatial or territorial accessibility.
[10] For the most recent contribution on measuring territorial cohesion and impacts see Medeiros (2017)

- ***attractive regions of high ecologic values and strong territorial capital***

- ***integrated polycentric territorial development.***

The selection of the final set of indicators was based on the final report of INTERCO, which itself was based on "the interaction of stakeholders – by means of workshop participation in ESPON events". The final report of INTERCO made it clear that as the project was initially aimed to respond to the needs of policy-makers, thereby "stakeholders" were listened to carefully in a process described during the participatory process (ESPON, 2013). This obviously affected the results, and the selection of indicators reflects the conceptualization of the territorial cohesion of EU officials as well as the sector-specific needs of different departments rather than the academic foundation of the researchers.

Despite these obvious shortcomings in the operationalization of territorial cohesions, some conclusions based on these attempts can be drawn. First, based on these three examples on the operationalization of territorial cohesion, it seems clear that

the process first and foremost reflects the ambiguousness of the concepts as well as the variety of different stakeholders and perspectives in defining it.

Further, in the end these analyses do not address the quintessential question of how territorial cohesion should be measured, but only consider more pragmatically with what existing variables or combinations thereof this measurement should be performed (Hanell, 2015).

In general, these problems described in these three cases of the operationalization of the concept territorial cohesion cannot be considered a surprise, and the concept has been noted to be impossible to define (Böhme, 2011, p. 2). In fact, the authors of the INTERCO defined the political and contradictory nature of the concept as well as the extreme divergence of the requests of policy-makers as the main result of the INTERCO (ESPON, 2013. p. 11). This divergence in interests and the ambiguousness of the conceptual framework made it extremely difficult to define the key indicators for the concept as well as caused the authors to abandon the plan to develop one single composite indicator, originally one of the main goals of the project.

Correspondingly, another conclusion based on these operationalization attempts is that when they have been initiated mainly out of academic interest, they have resulted in a single composite indicator. However, the usability of this single indicator is limited due to the limited availability of data which would enable a comparative analysis at the regional level and because different stakeholders and sectoral policymakers have disregarded any composite indicator that does not suit the measurement of their sectors. These problems regarding the usefulness of composite indicators was also noted by Hamez (2005), who wrote that indicators for territorial cohesion need to be a compromise between scientific rigour and usefulness to policymakers.

Third, the availability of other than economic data on a regional level seems to steer the analysis into an economic dimension. Especially when the operationalization is executed by an EU-based foundation such as ESPON, the emphasis is placed on economic production instead of possible indicators of distributive economic prosperity. Furthermore, the selection of indicators (and the emphasis on the first two, which were strong local economies ensuring global competitiveness and innovative territories) in the INTERCO project reflects the agenda and imaginary of the "European knowledge-based economy", emphasizing "the centrality of knowledge as an economic asset aimed

to strengthening the position of Europe in the face of 'global competition'" (Luukkonen & Moisio, 2016, p. 17).

Other scholars have also noted that even though economic and social issues have often been treated as equivalent in EU agendas, when put into practice, the economic side tends to suffuse the social dimensions (Keating, 2017). In line with these arguments, Hamez (2005) has also expressed concerns that

there is a danger that while developing the indicators for territorial cohesion, given the shortage of data on other dimensions, focus will be placed on economic cohesion instead of territorial cohesion.

Faludi (2004) has also noted that as the original focus of territorial cohesion as a concept has been on economic development, this dictates the categories through which it is approached.

However, even after agreeing with the importance of the "economy", it is important to note that macroeconomic development does not necessarily converge with development that takes place at an individual or household level. In other words, there can be a significant difference between the economic measurement on the macro (GDP or GVA) or micro (individual or household) level. As a recent study from EUROFOUND reveals, certain national contexts (e.g. Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, or Ireland) have significant divergence between the macroeconomic indicator of the Gross Domestic Product and corresponding changes in household-level incomes (Eurofound, 2017). This emphasizes the importance of multidimensional monitoring of economic wellbeing by using both aggregate economic indicators such as the GDP and a range of indicators providing a more direct estimate of household disposable income.

Thereby, one could argue that from the perspective of individuals and households, the disposable income is more a relevant measure for perceived territorial or social cohesion than a macroeconomic measure of economic production. In general, the limitations of the GDP as a comprehensive measure of wellbeing and development are well known, and the assessment of the wellbeing of individuals and societies needs to acknowledge a number of distinct areas of human life (Stiglitz, Sen, & Fitoussi, 2009).

Territorial Cohesion and mobility: From connectivity to human movement

This section focuses on the linkages between territorial cohesion, human mobility, and the EU concepts of polycentricity and place-based development and policies. We start the inquiry on the interrelations between territorial cohesion and mobility with a notion that territorial cohesion has its roots in the prior efforts to develop a European spatial planning philosophy. Following such lines, the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), which was created in 1999, laid down the foundations of a common European Spatial Agenda. Allegedly, and always according to the ESDP's central way of thinking, the main problem of EU territory was the concentration of population, activities and economic prosperity into a few specific metropolitan areas. More particularly, this concentration of people and economic activity primarily took place within the metropolitan (and

broader regional) areas of London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg; the infamous European 'Pentagon'. Furthermore, this concentration was seen as a major spatial problem that created congestion problems, increased cost of living in these areas (inflation in land-values), and in a way, created obstacles to the further development of other areas/ regions. As the main aim of ESDP was the 'balanced and sustainable development' of all EU territories, a number of policy priorities came to the forth. More particularly, polycentric development, parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge (irrespectively to where one lives) and the wise management of natural and cultural heritage became articulated as a policy panacea to the troubles of European Union's urbanism. In short, as we have already seen, these policy priorities would become the foundations upon where territorial cohesion's dimensions would be built upon.

Within the ESDP thinking, a certain relationship became constructed between polycentric development and mobility that would be further on inherited to territorial cohesion policy as well. More to the point, polycentricity and mobility would become the central themes that would dominate this emerging European spatial planning philosophy (Richardson and Jensen 2000). Furthermore, within this line of thinking, it was implied that polycentricity was feeding on mobility as a European polycentric urban system depended on an efficient transport infrastructure along with enhanced physical and interactive connectivity. At the same time, polycentricity and mobility became also linked with economic competitiveness in a globalized competitive market. But let us examine in more detail this alleged relationship between polycentricity and mobility.

As argued above, the ESDP puts a lot of emphasis on polycentric development as, allegedly, the creation of a European polycentric system can foster economic competitiveness and growth through the creation of more significant urban economic nodes highly active in contemporary processes of globalization. Following such lines, a Europe of flows instead of a Europe of places appears to break into the narrative fore (see for instance for instance see Dabinett 2011, Holder and Layard 2011, Bohme and Gloersen 2011). Furthermore, mobility within such a spatial imagination of a Europe of flows does not actually relate to the movement of people (different categories: citizens, European citizens, third-country nationals), but to connections and links between spaces as parts of broader economic networks. Accordingly, mobility is not about human geographies of movement, but instead, transport infrastructure and physical and interactive connections between established and emerging spatial nodes. From such a perspective, mobility becomes conceptualized as an enhanced transport infrastructure and connectivity between the spatial nodes of a European polycentric system. More concretely, this relationship between polycentric development and mobility becomes linked to two major aspects: transport accessibility to the center(s) for peripheral regions and efficiency of transport in core areas in order for congestion problems to be eased out. From all the above, it becomes apparent that the relationship between polycentricity and mobility, at least according to the ESDP, becomes articulated through a spatial planning perspective that does not take into account, or better put emphasis, on human movement, but instead, on the organization of infrastructure and transport that can promote connectivity and bring closer together the spatial nodes of the European polycentric system. Such a spatial imagination goes along with a conceptualization of a Europe of flows in the age of a 'network society', intensified economic flows and the rise of informational cities (see for instance Castels 2004).

By all accounts, territorial cohesion policy appears to have inherited this ESDP's alleged close link between polycentric development and mobility as connectivity (real and digital). However, other

takes on mobility seem to appear within the territorial cohesion policy discourse, too. For instance, in the *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion* (EC 2008), it is made clear that the main objective of 'a more balanced and harmonious development' relates to enhancing connections between territories (overcoming distances through enhanced physical and interactive connections), but also, reducing concentration (overcoming differences in density) too. Accordingly, some writers have argued that mobility, and more particularly human mobility, gets inserted into the territorial cohesion policy discourse through the ways that urban areas/functional areas/ regions gain or lose populations (Atkinson 2017).   Thus, in the case that the major European urban centers continue to attract populations and experience positive demographic change then the goals of polycentric development are not really met. On the other hand, when there is a dispersion of populations from major urban centers to lesser ones then the aforementioned objectives of polycentricity are coming closer to realization. This is another the way that mobility, this time not as connectivity but as human movement, becomes linked to polycentricity and thus territorial cohesion. In this way, mobility within territorial cohesion's policy discourse is not only about connections between urban nodes/regions/spaces. Instead, it is also about human movement and people's location and relocation within and between regions/cities/spaces as connectivity gets supplemented with human movement.

To continue, within this take on mobility, the *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion* (EC 2008), goes on to represent international migration as a possible threat to territorial cohesion's aims, especially to the Southern and Eastern EU border regions. Accordingly, it is argued that "*External border regions lag further behind in economic development and GDP per head [to the rest of EU]. The EU, however, is surrounded to the South and East by regions with still lower levels of GDP per head, combined with higher population growth, creating strong pressure for migration*" (EC 2008:8). Following such lines, the mobility of international migrants (third-country nationals) is viewed in a precautious manner as it can possibly jeopardized the already low-levels of territorial cohesion (as economic inequality) that are evident in many EU border areas. In this sense, international migration or the mobility of third-county nationals to Southern or Eastern EU border regions can further intensify already existent patterns of economic disparities in EU space. Thus, mobility is not always a good thing for territorial cohesion.

On the other hand, an important territorial cohesion policy document, the Barca Report (Barca 2009), goes on to shed more light on this relationship between territorial cohesion and human mobility. More particularly, it refers to intra-European migration and international migration as well. As the Barca Report clearly promotes a place-based approach to territorial cohesion, any solutions to possible tensions arising from migration are based on local development initiatives. Accordingly, it is stated that: "*A strong case is also made for including migration among the priority issues [of Territorial Cohesion]. Given the scale of migration, a large number of people in Europe are involved: the people moving to work in some areas of the EU, the people living in the areas where migration inflows take place, and the people, experiencing (inside and outside of Europe) the outflows from the areas where they live. For each of these categories new opportunities go together with new risks. The final balance of advantages and disadvantages depends on how communities adjust and it is affected by the way public goods and services (urban planning, education, public transport, healthcare, social services) are adapted to the change involved. Some places might fail to adjust, as it is already apparent from existing tensions, and here place-based interventions are needed to avoid new problems of social exclusion*" (Barca 2009). Accordingly, in this narrative of territorial cohesion and

human mobility it is argued that the movement of EU citizens, but also, third-country nationals to specific regions and places can create problems not only to the new areas of settlement, but to the places of origin as well. However, the end result of such movements depends on how places/ communities adjust to such inflows or outflows and how the provision of general economic interest services become modified to cater to these newly emerging needs. Accordingly, the movement of people within and towards EU space is not necessarily constructed as a clear-cut threat to territorial cohesion as some opportunities appear to go hand in hand with new (and many) challenges. Nevertheless, possible tensions might arise from such movements and the only according to the report policy solution is its much proclaimed panacea: place-based initiatives. In short, the movement of people within and towards EU can be both a negative and a positive thing as the aims of territorial cohesion might definitely experience challenges, but some opportunities too; the main challenges relate to social exclusion that clearly jeopardize the aims and goals of territorial cohesion. In this way, a mixed picture between territorial cohesion and human mobility is brought to the narrative fore.

Last but not least, the Barca Report (2009) goes on to make clearer this relationship between territorial cohesion and human movement by creating a strong link between intra-European mobility of EU nationals, social inclusion and economic competitiveness. Following such a policy narrative, the mobility of EU nationals within the country or within EU space is not contradictory to the aims of a place-based development approach as the movement of citizens and EU citizens is allegedly related to social inclusion, but also, economic competitiveness. As a result, EU citizens by having the freedom to decide, either to leave or to stay, are extending their human capabilities by broadening their life-chances. Allegedly, this broadening of life-chances succeeds in both promoting social inclusion across EU, but also, extending economic competitiveness through the free movement of people and human skills. But let us hear the Barca Report arguing its case: "*According to another misconception, place based development policies restrict mobility by encouraging people not to move out of places. If this was the case the policies would be against efficiency and social inclusion, since the option of mobility is an important aspect of both. In fact, it is not the case, since these policies [Territorial Cohesion policies] aim at broadening the opportunity of people and giving them more substantial freedom to choose whether to move or not*" (Barca 2009:xiv). In short, this is an interesting policy narrative in relation to human mobility and territorial cohesion as the movement of EU citizens across national and supranational space appears to enhance their life-chances and thus promoting social inclusion while at the same time promoting economic efficiency and competitiveness. In this narrative, the mobility of EU citizens across regions and countries can only be a good thing as it supposedly promotes the dual goals of economic competitiveness and social inclusion that are the two dominant logics of territorial cohesion (Van Well 2012).

Conclusions

This report set out to conceptually review the scientific literature regarding the spatial or geographical dimension of concepts such as justice, economy, and inequality. First, while defining the key concept for this report, a Google Scholar search revealed that the concepts (or moreover a combination of words) 'regional inequality' and 'regional disparities' are in terms of pure volume the most commonly used. However, these "concepts" are usually used merely as mechanical descriptions of spatially uneven economic production. Thereby, the report has focused on concepts of territorial cohesion and spatial justice that are more theoretically loaded and have a stronger policy relevance

and relation. The former political concept established its presence in academic literature though its appearance in EU policies and documents, whereas the latter is more academically driven involving more explicit normative claims and moral judgements.

The review on the conceptual history of the social and spatial started with the remark that justice (either social or spatial) remains a context-dependent and under-defined term. However, philosopher John Rawls (1971) aimed at a universal and theoretical definition of the concept, and later on, early authors on spatial justice drawing on Rawls, such as Harvey (1973), steered the focus to the urban scale (without any specific or explicitly argued reason) and understood justice mainly as the redistribution of resources. Alternatively, Lefevre and other "Right to The City" scholars related spatial justice more as "a right to/or access to" something. In a more recent contribution, Israel and Frankel attributed spatial justice to a "person's capabilities and liberties", drawing from the capabilities approach of Sen (1993; 2009). In a broad sense, spatial justice has been conceptualized either as a spatially even distribution of resources (Harvey) or as capabilities, functioning, and freedom (e.g. Sen, Young, and Israel and Frankel).

The review of the academic literature on the policy concept of territorial cohesion noted that the roots of the concepts stretch to the tradition of French regional political planning (Faludi, 2004). In the EU policy context, the concept first appeared in 1997 in the Amsterdam Treaty, but the booming era as an academic interest started after 2005. Since then, territorial cohesion has become a buzzword of spatial policies and planning, even though there is still little consensus on its actual meaning (Schön 2005; Evers 2008). In sum, territorial cohesion is an elusive spatial imaginary that can be referred to in policy-making in a number of ways. In this report this evasive literature is categorized in four broader thematic categories.

The first category contains those studies that focus on the genealogy of the concept and seek to trace the origins of territorial cohesion as a concept. Within this category, some scholars trace the roots of the concept to the French tradition of *aménagement du territoire*, a sort of spatial planning or regional policy directed at maintaining territorial (national) unity by decentralizing powers and mobilizing regional and local actors around national territorial policies (e.g. Davoudi 2005; Faludi 2004a), whereas others have noted that territorial cohesion derives at least partially also from the German tradition of regional policies called a comprehensive integrated approach.

The second category consists of studies which examine territorial cohesion from the perspective of shifts in governance of the EU's spatial policies. In these studies, territorial cohesion is understood as providing new opportunities or frameworks for governing EU and national spatial policies. The governance perspective on territorial cohesion and development highlights the term territorial cohesion and the associated funding as constituting a 'fourth tier' of governance within the EU (Holder & Layard 2011, 2). In this perspective, the idea and the concept of 'multilevel governance' is seen as a way of providing new possibilities for cross-sectoral and cross-border cooperation between different forms and levels of governance.

The third category involves studies that approach territorial cohesion as an explicit policy objective. Studies in this category revolve around the tensions between the policy objectives of balanced development and competitiveness, and in some of the contributions, territorial cohesion is seen as a way to combine these objectives. Schön (2005), for instance, argues that pursuing territorial cohesion contributes to both of the objectives by putting in practice integrated and holistic spatial

28

development approaches. According to this politically popular reasoning, territorial cohesion policy would both reduce disparities and strengthen competitiveness by enabling regions to exploit their endogenous potentials (see Faludi & Waterhout 2005; Evers 2008).

The fourth category in the scientific literature on territorial cohesion consists of studies which have linked the concept to different kinds of spatial frameworks or configurations which might promote or indicate territorial cohesion. In some of the studies, territorial cohesion is considered to give new stimulus to the ESDP's agenda of promoting a polycentric spatial pattern in Europe, which would ultimately lead to balanced and sustainable development (Faludi 2005).

Besides polycentricity, another concept to which territorial cohesion is often attached as a form of spatial framework is the idea of place-based development. Deriving from the Barca report (2009), place-based development refers to the idea that public policies ought to be context sensitive in a way that better takes into account the specific needs, characteristics, and potentials of places and regions.

This report also argues that besides analysing the ways in which territorial cohesion has been constantly debated and redefined in the literature of (critical) political geography, the process of operationalizing the concept, or of transferring it into a measurable format, can be studied in order to elucidate its definition and meaning. This analysis reveals that since the very meaning of territorial cohesion has remained undefined and ambiguous in policy documents as shown in the previous sections, it is no surprise that also the operationalization of the concept has not resulted in coherent and commonly shared measures. Instead, the operationalization of these rather ambiguous concepts has so far proven rather difficult or even impossible (Böhme, 2005), and thus no commonly shared measure has evolved.

Thereby, this report suggests that in future, those engaging in the operationalization of territorial inequalities or spatial justice should acknowledge whether they are approaching the task from an academic interest and motivation or if the task is to fulfil the needs of policymakers. In those attempts that aim to compromise between scientific rigour and usefulness to policymakers, it is important that the operationalization process remains transparent (Hamez 2005).

It is also argued that the strong emphasis on the economic dimension in the operationalization of territorial cohesion in the context of European integration should be further discussed and scrutinized. The literature on territorial inequalities and spatial justice highlights a set of issues that go beyond the narrow economic perspective. Currently, the emphasis on macroeconomic production (GDP) instead of household- or individual-level consumption in the operationalizations of territorial cohesion reflects more the interest in an economically competitive EU territory than in spatially balanced economic prosperity. In general, it should more explicitly acknowledged that concepts of spatial justice and territorial cohesion hold many more multidimensional questions than those of uneven economic development measured by indicators and macroeconomic productivity. The future operationalizations could consider shifting the focus from macroeconomic indicators towards dimensions that have more direct relevance to the everyday life of populations.

The moral and ethical foundations in the normative suggestions for territorial inequalities and spatial justice should be more explicitly discussed and considered. Spatial justice demands that research has normative as well as analytical goals, meaning that instead of mechanically describing the trends and patterns in territorial inequalities, they need to be evaluated normatively according to values of

justice and fairness. This converges with the notions of Böhme (2004), who called for more value-driven analyses of territorial inequalities. For such analyses, recent contributions from Storper (2011) and Israel and Frenkel (2017) provide important theoretical foundations and groundwork. More specifically, the question of geographical scale (and spatial rescaling) when examining territorial cohesion, territorial inequality, or spatial justice is never merely a mechanical exercise, but instead always evokes a division between "us" and "them" which involves both socio-psychological processes and philosophical foundations (see e.g. Storper, 2011; pp. 5-6).

In sum, future operationalization of the concepts of spatial justice and territorial cohesion could benefit from including subjective expressions on the individuals themselves. Here, survey data on subjective wellbeing or the "functioning" of the population in the EU territory such as the European Social Survey could be utilized.[11] This converges with the claims expressed by Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi (2009) over the definitions and measures of wellbeing and development. The divergence between the macro-economic dimension and the experienced and subjective reality of the population lies at the centre of different crises the EU is facing (e.g. Brexit as well as the emergence and success of different populist movements). Acknowledgement of this issue can be considered of central importance to the operationalization of spatial justice, territorial inequalities, and cohesion.

Finally, as territorial cohesion has remained as a highly ambiguous and contested term with many different layers of meaning also the relationship between territorial cohesion and notions on mobility takes equivocal meanings. First, and within the ESDP framework, this relationship becomes constructed through the integration of polycentric development and mobility. Within this line of thinking, it is implied that polycentricity feeds on mobility as a European polycentric urban system depends on an efficient transport infrastructure along with enhanced physical and interactive connectivity. Thus, territorial cohesion policy appears to have inherited ESDP's alleged close link between polycentric development and mobility as connectivity (physical and digital). Additionally, some writers have argued that mobility, and more particularly human mobility, gets inserted into the territorial cohesion policy discourse through the ways that urban areas or regions gain or lose populations (Atkinson 2017).

Furthermore, Barca Report (Barca, 2009), sheds more light on the relationship between territorial cohesion and human mobility referring to intra-European and international migration. As Barca Report promotes a place-based approach to territorial cohesion, solutions to possible tensions arising from migration are based on local development initiatives. Besides bringing to the fore the mixed picture between territorial cohesion and human mobility the Barca Report also discloses the relationship between territorial cohesion and human movement by creating a link between intra-European mobility of EU nationals, social inclusion and economic competitiveness. More especially, as the movement of EU citizens across national and supranational space enhance their life-chances and thus promoting social inclusion it also contributes promoting economic efficiency and competitiveness. Thereby, the mobility of EU citizens across regions and countries can only considered as a favorable process as it promotes the dual goals of economic competitiveness and social inclusion; the two dominant logics of territorial cohesion (Van Well 2012).

---

[11] For an example, see Weckroth, Kemppainen, Sorensen (2016)

References

Adams, N., Cotella, G. & Nunes, R. (eds) (2011): Territorial Development, Cohesion and Spatial Planning. Knowledge and policy development in an enlarged EU. London, Routledge.

Ahner, D. (2009): What do you really know about European cohesion policy? http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/ecp_rational_and_objectives.pdf?pdf=ok. Accessed 14.08.2017

Allen, D. (2005): Cohesion and the Structural Funds: Competing Pressures for Reform? In Wallace, H., Wallace, W., Pollack, M. A. (eds): Policy-Making in the European Union. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 213–241.

Atkinson R. (2017) "Policies for small and medium-sized towns: European, National and Local Approaches", *Tijdschrist voor Economiche en Sociale Geographie*, doi:10.1111/tesg.12253.

Atkinson R. and Zimmerman K. (2016) "Cohesion policy and cities: an ambivalent relation", in Piattoni S. (ed.) *Handbook on Cohesion Policy in the EU*, Elgar Publishing, Elgar online.

Barca, F. (2009): An Agenda for A Reformed Cohesion Policy: A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations. Independent Report, Prepared at the Request of the European Commissioner for Regional Policy, Danuta Hübner. Brussels, European Commission.

Barnett, C. (2011): Geography and ethics: Justice unbound. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(2), pp. 246–255.

Bialasiewicz, L., Elden, S., Painter, J. (2005): The Constitution of EU Territory. Comparative European Politics 3(3), 333–363.

Bohme K, Doucet P., Komornicki T., Zaucha J., Swiatek D. (2011) How to strengthen the territorial dimension of Europe 2020 and the EU Cohesion policy, EU, European Regional Development Fund, prepared at the request of the Polish Presidency of the Council of the EU.

Bohme K. and Gloersen E. (2011) "Territorial Cohesion storylines: Understanding a policy concept", *Spatial Foresight Brief*, 1, www.spatialforesight.eu

Bowen, W. M., Salling, M. J., Haynes, K. E., & Cyran, E. J. (1995): Toward environmental justice: Spatial equity in Ohio and Cleveland. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 85(4), 641–663.

Brassett, J., Croft, S. & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2013): Introduction: An Agenda for Resilience Research in Politics and International Relations. *Politics*, 33(4), 221–228.

Brown, N., Griffis, R., Hamilton, K., Irish, S., and Kanouse, S. (2007): What Makes Justice Spatial? What Makes Spaces Just? Three Interviews on the Concept of Spatial Justice. *Critical Planning: A Journal of the UCLA Department of Urban Planning / Spatial Justice*, 14, 7–29.

Camagni, R. (2002): On the concept of territorial competitiveness: sound or misleading? *Urban Studies*, 39(13), 2395–2412.

Camagani, R. (2005): The rationale for territorial cohesion: Issues and possible policy strategies. In Boscaino, P. (ed): *Present and future of the European spatial development perspective*. Florence, Ministero delle Infrastutture e dei Transporti, pp. 121–138.

Camagni, R. (2007): Territorial Development Policies in the European Model of Society. In Faludi, A. (ed): *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 129–144.

Camagani, R. (2009): Territorial impact assesment for EU regions: A methodological proposal and an application for EU transport policy. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 32(4), 342-350.

Castells, M. (2004) "An Introduction to the Information Age", Frank Webster, Raimo Blom, Erkki Karvonen, Harri Melin, Kaarle Nordenstreng, and Ensio Puoskari, (eds) in *The Information Society Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, pp 138–49.

Cattan, N. (2007): Cities and networks in Europe. A critical approach of polycentrism. Montrouge, John Libbey Eurotext.

CEC (Commission of the European Communities). (2001): Unity, Solidarity, Diversity for Europe, Its People and Its Territory: Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC. (2004): A New Partnership for Cohesion: Convergence, Competitiveness and Cooperation: Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Chilvers, J. & Evans, J. (2009): Understanding networks at the science–policy interface (Editorial). *Geoforum*, 40(3), 355–362.

Dabinett, G. (2010): Spatial Justice and the Translation of European Strategic Planning Ideas in the Urban Sub-region of South Yorkshire. *Urban Studies*, 47(11), 2389–2408.

Dabinett, G. (2011): Promoting Territorial Cohesion and Understandings of Spatial Justice. Paper for the DG Regio, Regional Studies and Slovenia Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy Conference: What future for Cohesion Policy? An academic and policy debate. Sava Hoteli Bled, Slovenia, 16–18 March 2011.

Davies, B. (1968): Social Needs and Resources in Local Services: A Study of Variations in Provision of Social Services between Local Authority Areas. London, Joseph Rowntree.

Davoudi, S. (2005): Understanding territorial cohesion. *Planning Practice and Research*, 20(4), 433–441.

Davoudi, S. (2007): Territorial Cohesion, the European Social Model, and Spatial Policy Research. In Faludi, A. (ed): *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 81–103.

Dikeç, M. (2001): Justice and the spatial imagination. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(10), 1785–1805.

Dikeç, M. (2006): Two Decades of French Urban Policy: From Social Development of Neighbourhoods to the Republican Penal State. *Antipode*, 38(1), 59–81.

Doucet, P. (2006): Territorial Cohesion of Tomorrow: A Path to Cooperation or Competition? *European Planning Studies*, 14(10), 1473–1485.

Dühr, S., Colomb, C. & Nadin, V. (2010): European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation. London, Routledge.

EC (2008) Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning territorial diversity into strength, Com (208), 616 final, Brussels.

ESPON (European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion). (2004): ESPON in progress: Preliminary results by autumn 2003. Luxembourg, ESPON.

ESPON. (2013): INTERCO indicators of territorial cohesion - final report. (No. 3/2). Luxembourg, ESPON & University of Geneva.

Eurofound. (2017): Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the great recession. Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.

European Union. (2004): Treaty establishing a constitution for Europe. *Official Journal of the European Union,* C 310.

Evers, D. (2008): Reflections on territorial cohesion and European spatial planning. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99(3), 303–315.

Fabbro, S. & Mesolella, A. (2010): Multilevel Spatial Visions and Territorial Cohesion: Italian Regional Planning between the TEN-T corridors, ESDP polycentrism and Governmental 'Strategic Platforms'. *Planning Practice & Research*, 25(1), 25–48.

Fainstein, S. S. (2009): Spatial Justice and Planning. *Justice spatiale – spatial justice*, 1/2009.

Fainstein, S. S. (2010): The Just City. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Faludi, A. (2004a): Territorial Cohesion: Old (French) Wine in New Bottles? *Urban Studies*, 41(7), 1349–1365.

Faludi, A. (2004b): The Open Method of Co-ordination and 'Post-regulatory' Territorial Cohesion Policy. *European Planning Studies*, 12(7), 1019–1033.

Faludi, A. (2005): Polycentric territorial cohesion policy. *Town Planning Review*, 76(1), 107–118.

Faludi, A. & Waterhout, B. (2005): The usual suspects: The Rotterdam informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(3), 338–342.

Faludi, A. (2007a): The European Model of Society. In Faludi, A. (ed) *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 1–22.

Faludi, A. (2007b): Territorial Cohesion Policy and the European Model of Society. *European Planning Studies*, 15(4), 567–583.

Faludi, A. (2010a): Cohesion, Coherence, Cooperation: European Spatial Planning Coming of Age? London, Routledge.

Faludi, A. (2010b): The Process Architecture of EU Territorial Cohesion Policy. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 39, 1–18.

Faludi, A. (2013): Territorial cohesion, territorialism, territoriality, and soft planning: a critical review. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(6), 1302–1317.

Faludi A. (2015) "Territorial Cohesion under the looking glass", EU publications, www.ec.europe.eu/regional_policy/archive/consultation/terco/pdf/lookingglass.pdf

Farrugia, N., & Gallina, A. (2008): Developing indicators for territorial cohesion. (No. Research Report 1/2008). Roskilde, Caffe Centre, Department of Society and Globalization, Roskilde University.

Finka, M. (2007): Territorial Cohesion — Between Expectations, Disparities and Contradictions. In Scholich D. (ed): *Territorial Cohesion. German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy*. Berlin, Springer, pp. 23–39.

Giannakourou, G. (1996): Towards a European Spatial Planning Policy: Theoretical Dilemmas and Institutional Implications. *European Planning Studies*, 4(5), 595–613.

Gualini, E. (2008): 'Territorial cohesion' as a category of agency: the missing dimension in the EU spatial policy debate. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 28, 1–22.

Hadjimichalis, Costas (2011): Uneven geographical development and socio-spatial justice and solidarity: European regions after the 2009 financial crisis. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 18(3), 254-274

Hall, P. (2005): Fundamental question for the ESDP. *Town and Country Planning*, November, 330 – 331.

Hamez, G. (2005): Territorial cohesion: How to operationalize and measure the concept? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 6(3), 400–402.

Hanell, T. (2015): Measuring territorial cohesion: A macro-regional approach. In Lang, T., Henn, S., Sgibnev, W. & Ehrlich, K. (eds): *Understanding geographies of polarization and peripheralization*. UK, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 235–251.

Harvey, D. (1973): Social Justice and the City. Athens, University of Georgia Press.

Harvey, D. (2008): The Right to the City. New Left Review, 53(9/10), 23–40.

Hayek, F. A. (1976): Law, Legislation and Liberty. Volume 2: The Mirage of Social Justice. London, Routledge.

Holder, J. & Layard, A. (2010): Relating Territorial Cohesion, Solidarity, and Spatial Justice. In Malcolm, R. & Borgmann-Prebil, Y. (eds): *Promoting Solidarity in the European Union*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 262–287.

Holder, J. & Layard, A. (2011): Drawing out the Elements of Territorial Cohesion: Re-scaling EU Spatial Governance. *Yearbook of European Law*, 30(1), 358–380.

Israel, E. & Frenkel, A. (2017): Social justice and spatial inequality: Toward a conceptual framework. *Progress in Human Geography*, Online First, https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517702969.

Iveson, K. (2011): Social or spatial justice? Marcuse and Soja on the right to the city. *City,* 15(2), 251–259.

Keating, M. (2017): Contesting European regions. *Regional Studies*, 51(1), 9–18. doi:10.1080/00343404.2016.1227777

Lefebvre, H. (1968): Le Droit à la ville. Paris, Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. (1970): La Révolution Urbaine. Paris, Gallimard.

Lawton-Smith, H., Tracey, P. & Clark, G. L. (2003): European policy and the regions: A review and analysis of tensions. *European Planning Studies*, 11(7), 859–873.

Luukkonen, J. (2010): Territorial cohesion policy in the light of peripherality. *Town Planning Review*, 81(4), 445–466.

Mahon, Marie (2014): Planning gain in a time of crisis. In: Kearns, G.; Meredith, D.; Morrissey, J. (eds.): Spatial Justice and the Irish Crisis. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, pp. 78-89.

Mahony, M. (2013): Boundary spaces: Science, politics and the epistemic geographies of climate change in Copenhagen, 2009. *Geoforum*, 49, 29–39.

Maier, K. (2011): The pursuit of balanced territorial development: The realities and complexities of the cohesion agenda. In Adams, N., Cotella, G. & Nunes, R. (eds): *Territorial Development, Cohesion and Spatial Planning. Knowledge and policy development in an enlarged EU*. London, Routledge, pp. 265–290

Malý, J. (2016): Territorial cohesion discourse: key concepts from a geographical perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Masaryk University, Faculty of Science, Department of Geography.

Marcuse, P. (2005): Are social forums the future of social movements? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(2), 417–424.

Medeiros, E. (2016): Territorial cohesion - an EU concept. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 60, 1–30.

Medeiros, E. (2017): European Union Cohesion Policy and Spain: a territorial impact assessment. *Regional Studies*, 51(8), 1259-1269.

Mendez, C. (2013): The post-2013 reform of EU cohesion policy and the place-based narrative. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(5), 639–659.

Merrifield, A. & Swyngedouw, E. (1997): Social justice and the urban experience: an introduction. In Merrifield, A. & Syngedouw, E. (eds): *The Urbanization of Injustice*. New York, NYU Press, pp. 1–17.

Mirwaldt, K., McMaster, I., & Bachtler, J. (2009): Reconsidering cohesion policy: The contested debate on territorial cohesion. Working paper. Glasgow, University of Strathclyde.

Mitchell, D. (2003): Cultural landscapes: just landscapes or landscapes of justice? *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(6), 787–796.

Molle, W. (2007): European Cohesion Policy. London, Routledge.

Moisio, S. (forthcoming 2018): Geopolitics of the knowledge-based economy. London, Routledge.

Moisio, S. & Luukkonen, J. (2015): European spatial planning as governmentality: An inquiry into rationalities, techniques and manifestations. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 33(4), 828–845.

Moisio, S. & Luukkonen J. (2017): Notes on spatial transformation in post-Cold War Europe and the territory work of the European Union. In Vihalemm, P., Masso, A., Opermann, S. (eds): *The Routledge International Handbook of European Social Transformation*. London, Routledge, pp. x–x.

Olwig, K. R. (1996): Recovering the substantive nature of landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 86(4), 630–653.

Phelps, N. A., & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2008): If geography is anything, maybe it's planning's alter ego? Reflections on policy relevance in two disciplines concerned with place and space. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33(4), 566–584.

Pirie, G. H. (1983): On spatial justice. *Environment and Planning A*, 15, 465–473.

PoSCoPP (Research Group Production of Space in the Context of Polarization and Peripheralization). (2015): Understanding New Geographies of Central and Eastern Europe. In Lang, T., Henn, S., Sgibnev, W. & Ehrlich, K. (eds): *Understanding Geographies of Polarization and Peripheralization*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–21.

Rawls, J. (1971/2009): A Theory of Justice. Revised Edition. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1993): Political Liberalism. New York, Columbia University Press.

Richardson T. and Jensen O. B. (2000) "Discourses of mobility and polycentric development: A contested view of European spatial planning", *European Planning Studies,* 8:4, pp. 503-520.

Sahr, W.-D. (2003): Zeichen und RaumWELTEN. Zur Geographie des Kulturellen. *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen*, 147, 18–27.

Schön, P. (2005): Territorial Cohesion in Europe? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 6(3), 389–400.

Schön, K. P. (2009): Territorial Cohesion – Current Views of the Commission and the Member States of the European Union. In Kilper H. (ed): *German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy 2009: New Disparities in Spatial Development in Europe*. Berlin Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag, pp. 7–17.

Sen, A. (1993): Capability and well-being. In Sen, A. & Nussbaum, M. (eds): *The Quality of Life*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 30–53.

Sen, A. (2009): The Idea of Justice. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Servillo, L. (2010): Territorial Cohesion Discourses: Hegemonic Strategic Concepts in European Spatial Planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 11(3), 397–416.

Smith, D. M. (2000): Social justice revisited. *Environment and Planning A*, 32(7), 1149–1162.

Smith, N. (1984): Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space. Oxford, Blackwell.

Soja, E. (2009): The city and spatial justice. Paper prepared for presentation at the conference Spatial Justice, Nanterre, Paris, March 12-14, 2008.

Soja, E. (2010): Seeking Spatial Justice. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. (2009): Mismeasuring our lives: Why GDP doesn't add up. New York, New Press.

Storper, M. (2011): Justice, efficiency and economic geography: should places help one another to develop? *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 18(1), 3–21.

Swyngedouw, E. A. & Heynen, N. C. (2003): Urban political ecology, justice and the politics of scale. *Antipode*, 35(5), 898–998.

Talen, E., & Anselin, L. (1998): Assessing spatial equity: An evaluation of measures of accessibility to public playgrounds. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(4), 595–613.

Territorial Agenda (2007). Territorial agenda of the European Union: Towards a more competitive and sustainable Europe of diverse regions—Agreed at the occasion of the informal ministerial meeting on urban development and territorial cohesion on 24/25 May 2007. http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_1005295/Territorial-Agenda-of-the-European-Union-Agreed-on-25-May-2007-accessible.pdf. Accessed 14.08.2017

Vanolo, A. (2010): European Spatial Planning Between Competitiveness and Territorial Cohesion: Shadows of Neo-Liberalism. *European Planning Studies*, 18(8), 1301–1315.

Waterhout, B. (2007): Territorial Cohesion: the Underlying Discourses. In Faludi, A. (ed): *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 37–59.

Weckroth, M, Kemppainen, T, & Sørensen, J.F.L (2015): Predicting the gross domestic product (GDP) of 289 NUTS regions in Europe with subjective indicators for human and social capital. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 2(1), 311-330.

Van Well, L. (2012): Conceptualizing the Logics of Territorial Cohesion. *European Planning Studies*, 20(9), 1549–1567.

Young, I. M. (2006): Taking the basic structure seriously. Perspectives on Politics, 4(1), 91–97.

Young, I. M. (2011): Responsibility for Justice. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Zaucha, J. (2015): Key dimensions of territorial cohesion. A review of the existing sources of information on territorial cohesion. Institute for Development, Working Papers no. 008/2015.

Zonneveld, W. & Waterhout B. (2010): Implications of territorial cohesion: An essay. Paper prepared for the Regional Studies Association Annual International Conference 2010 'Regional Responses and Global Shifts: Actors, Institutions and Organisations' Monday 24th - Wednesday 26th May, Pécs, Hungary. https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:0ec15123-28f9-41a8-a0db-2632b26fcb9e?collection=research Accessed 14.08.2017