

PAPERS 44 INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND TERRITORY. THE MEDITERRANEAN ARC

PRESENTATION

The exploration of the relationship between infrastructures and territory in one the axis that articulates the Spanish and European territory, the Mediterranean Arc, was the objective of the course organised by the CUIIMPB (*La planificación de las infraestructuras y el territorio. El arco mediterráneo*, November 2005), coordinated by Carme Miralles-Guasch, director of the IERMB, and Ángel Aparicio, director of the CEDEX. The underlying thesis of three days of sessions was the change of paradigm that has been occurring in recent years in relation to the challenge of providing infrastructures with a territorial dimension from a dialectic perspective, with more emphasis on synergy and interrelations, and through the inclusion not only of physical and economic variables, but also of social and environmental ones. And although territorial dynamics are processes that in their genesis, development and implantation imply long-term time arcs, they cannot ignore the need to relate territorial scales of variable geometry. An example of this is, unquestionably, the Mediterranean Arc.

This was the origin and the conceptual framework that was the inspiration for issue 44 of *Papers* magazine on the Mediterranean Arc, understood to be a spatial axis in which different territorial scales are interrelated and in which there are some infrastructures (constructed or planned) that differ greatly from what could be defined as a multilevel network. In its analysis of this European space, the magazine features the collaboration of several specialists from a variety of origins, namely Turin, Marseille, Valencia and Barcelona, and different disciplines.

The first article, by Francesc Carbonell and Josep Báguena, analyses the process of constructing the Mediterranean Arc as a counterbalance of the influence of northern territories in Europe; this is a bidirectional process because it stems both from the European Commission and from the Mediterranean regions, the objective being to reach a consensus in terms of key policies on supraregional scales. One of these policies is undoubtedly that of transport and infrastructures, a matter that appears in all of the articles in this issue of *Papers*.

Francesca Governa explores the vision of infrastructures as being trans-scale territorial projects that should not only be conceived in relation to the geographic/geoeconomic/geopolitical scale that justifies their construction, but also through

lesser and multiple hierarchical scales. She bases her analysis of the relationship between infrastructures and territory on the concepts of *territorial congruence* and *multilevel government* to guarantee that planning is carried out by all of the agents in the territory. Along similar lines of argument, Joaquín Farinós, in relation to the accessibility requirements of infrastructures in all of the territories of the EU, promotes the need for planning activities to be coherent and to consider inter-modal integration as a guarantee of local development and territorial cohesion. He analyses the Mediterranean Arc as an example of the specialisation of territories in polycentric Europe and underlines three key aspects for the success of the project: technical capacity, the mobilisation of agents and political leadership.

In his article, Josep Vicent Boira analyses how, despite the cohesion of the Mediterranean Arc and its strong business and social relations, there has been a loss of political interest in its physical materialisation. He presents several reasons for this (the limited interest of the EU, the lack of permanent institutional organisation in the region) that, combined with the system of assigning projects in the EU, in which national interests are rewarded ahead of criteria on a European scale, have prevented the axis from being consolidated. Meanwhile, the concept of a radial Spain has not benefited the development of the north-south axes that structure the peninsula.

Jean-Claude Turret emphasises in the fifth article the importance of consolidating a common transport network in order for the Mediterranean Arc itself to be more internally coherent. However, he is aware of the existing dysfunctions in the network of infrastructures located along the Western Mediterranean coast, especially concerning railways, and the political difficulties of the unitary conception of infrastructures beyond the state level.

THE PROCESS OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ARC: A TWO-WAY STREET

Francesc Carbonell
Josep Báguena

Introduction

Over recent decades, Europe has been interpreted from various spatial

points of view, which have ranged from representations based on the predominant centre-periphery differentiations of the 70s, to others based on the identification of axes, arcs and “bananas” which cover extensive regions of the continent to, finally, those which are based on a system of network relationships. The representation of a networked Europe, which is necessary to understand the growing degree of complexity in which the territorial relationships are played out on the continent, should not lead us to forget, however, the existence of articulating axes, especially appropriate in the design and provision of transport and communication infrastructure.

In this sense, many of the EU initiatives aimed at favouring an increase in territorial competitiveness and a reduction of imbalances (European Territorial Strategy), the design and prioritization of trans-European transport (TEN-T), as well as those arising from the territories themselves in the form of the constitution of supra-regional areas (Euroregions, Working Communities) are focussed on addressing functional realities that cross state borders. On some occasions, these realities are recognised and organised in the form of Euroregions. On other occasions the simply form strongly integrated axes which contribute to articulate the set of European territories from a functional point of view.

The Europe of axes and Euroregions becomes, therefore, a necessary reality both in order to have territories with sufficient critical mass to develop a system of relationships which require larger scales to articulate the European space. In this context, the Mediterranean Arc becomes, due to its population size, economic activity and its strategic situation between the continent and the Mediterranean, a key element that has to be interpreted as a unit and provided with the infrastructure which will guarantee it functions as such. In order to understand what the Mediterranean Arc means today, we need to determine and understand the process of definition and, moreover, focus on the elements which have acted as catalysers for its opportunities and potential as an articulating space for the European continent.

To address this question, we will review, first, the origins of the formulation of the idea of macro regions in Europe and, in particular, the determining role played by EU policies, both those directly responsible (perspectives of territorial planning on a continental scale, new criteria for regional

policies and for the allocation of structural funds, etc.), and those which accompanied or recognised *bottom-up* initiatives (in particular the INTERREG programmes). These policies have, in some cases, operated in tandem with processes of political and administrative decentralization and reorganization of the member States.

Second, we will analyse the possible answers, from regional and local scales to new options for territorial development policies produced in answer to EU instructions; answers which propose acting on the adoption of the paradigms of the new "regional" regionalization, a conceptual and practical approximation to the construction of new geographies of cooperation.

The conclusions will recommend to the territorial agents in the Mediterranean Arc, the application of new paradigms and the development of new opportunities offered by the interaction of these two processes (*top-down* and *bottom-up*) to construct a macro regional space, in order to overcome the current state of affairs, still embryonic and little articulated, but in which there have already appeared a series of initiatives which will be briefly described in the appendix.

1. The formulation of the Mediterranean Arc: a double process¹

The concept of an Arc understood as an axis of development was first formulated in 1973 with the birth of the "Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions" which brought together 65 European regions with the common aim of drawing up strategies to exercise a counterweight to the great human and economic concentrations of central Europe². From this declaration of intentions, it is not until 1992³ that we find a specification of the Mediterranean Arc in the documents of the European Commission prior to the elaboration of the European Spatial Development Perspective (Potsdam, 1999) in answer to the demand for a counterweight to the central European urban and economic spine and to define new potential spaces. Nevertheless, the initiative in the formulation of this new space does not respond exclusively to a strategic design on the part of the European Commission in terms of territorial rebalance. Studies carried out in the 80s analysed the dynamics of the development of the European urban system and highlighted the birth of new axes of alternative development to the north-south axis of the central European megalopolis, among which was the Mediterranean spine⁴. According to those studies, the Mediterranean Arc should have a role as protagonist in Europe⁵.

In the historical process of the materialization of the Mediterranean Arc we can see, in synthesis, two processes and two parallel realities:

1. On the one hand, the express wish of various European regions, and later the European Commission, itself to create alternative development pools to the centre (*top-down*);

2. On the other hand, the cooperation of a range of regions and cities around the western Mediterranean with clear potential for economic development (*bottom-up*).

It seems therefore pertinent to ask ourselves, apart from the observation of the realities and existences, what the mechanisms have been for the consolidation of transnational and cross border potential in this two-way construction.

1.1. European construction, a key factor

In terms of the *top-down* dynamics, the answer is very clear. When Spain, Portugal and Greece joined the European Community in the 80s the processes of integration underwent a notable acceleration. The perspective of a single market radically changed the vision of borders. From the idea of the border as an expression of national limits, outside which no territorial development policy was envisaged, to the border as a space for the articulation and genesis of transnational realities⁶.

From this first step and by means of mechanisms which encouraged territorial cooperation, the European Union decisively set the path for the emergence of the Mediterranean Arc. Among the decisions ratified by the Union and by the respective ministers of the Member States, the adoption of some guiding principles was particularly relevant as this formed part of a new "informal" territorial planning policy in Europe. Principles which have progressively given rise to new spatial configurations, to new geographic and economic spatial images, the discussion of which has been in itself an exercise in European cooperation and construction. Let us look briefly at the process followed.

The reports *Europe 2000* and *Europe 2000+*, produced by the DG XVI of the European Commission, respectively in 1992 and 1994, were a first exercise in thinking about the construction of European territory on a different scale. As an example, in the first of these documents they anticipated that "the creation of a Europe without borders will accelerate the transformation of regional economic systems and will intensify the relationships between regions belonging to different states. A process which should be anticipated by the creation of networks of cooperation and setting territorial planning (of the States) in a wider geographical framework". Additionally, they especially recommended a new emphasis on this cooperation at an interregional level, although they still did not propose nor delimit in advance fixed regional groupings, but promoted as a first step, the setting

up of "visions" of territorial development *bottom-up*, which were not restricted by national borders.

This batch of transnational territorial perspectives, out of which the Mediterranean Arc was to be a "natural" product, managed to generate a body of innovative thinking on what, in practice, European integration should mean and how, in an everyday way, the regional and local levels could participate. The second document, *Europe 2000+*, advanced proposals in two ways: on the one hand by intensifying the interrelations between the different territories in the Union and on the other, by beginning to define the criteria of cooperation with a future enlarged Europe on the basis of a spatial vision of the continent considered as a whole.

This itinerary of elaboration and discussion of framework-documents on European territorial planning led, finally to the adoption in summer 1999 in Potsdam of the *European Spatial Development Perspective* (ESDP), also known as *European Territorial Strategy* (ETE). The report more clearly established a series of processes to be followed in order to produce these new territorial visions of Europe by means of the constitution of great macro regional associations. The ESDP proposals were based on three guiding principles, which as we have mentioned, would be decisive in guiding "informal" European territorial planning policies: economic and social cohesion, sustainable development and balanced competition. Three principles which in the latest EU documentation have been summarised in one, territorial cohesion, and the specific application of which is carried out through the following *policy options*:

- Strengthening a large area of economic integration in the European Union, equipped with high quality global services and functions, including the peripheral areas by means of strategies of transnational spatial development;
- Strengthening a more balanced and poly-centric system of metropolitan city-regions, *city clusters* and networks of cities by means of cooperation between structural and political policies of transeuropean networks and the improvement of links between international-state and regional-local transport networks;
- Promoting integrated strategies of spatial development for the *city clusters*, within a system of transnational and cross border cooperation, including the corresponding rural areas and small towns;
- Driving cooperation on specific topics in the field of spatial development through transnational and cross border networks;
- Promoting cooperation on a regional, transnational and cross border scale,

between cities and towns in the northern, central and eastern European countries and the Mediterranean region, driving north-south relationships in Central and Eastern Europe and the east-west relationships in the North of Europe.

This innovative position on territorial cooperation proposed by ESDP modified and encouraged people to think in terms of new functional geographies of European space and the construction of a vision of the Mediterranean Arc took shape. It was by means of the articulation of these great economic macro regions that it was possible to make up, piece-by-piece, the territorial puzzle of the European economy.

Hence the Mediterranean Arc, or the alpine Arc or central Mediterranean became cross-border territories in process of gestation, new possible territories based on geographical solidarities which had to be encouraged to consolidate⁷. In short, then, we can see that Europe has played a fundamental role in the emergence of the Mediterranean Arc both as a reference (Single Market, ESDP) and as an institutional agent (Directorate General of Regional Policy of the European Commission). We will now see how, following the principle of action-reaction, the rules of the game formulated "top down" have been or may be reformulated "bottom up" by means of renewed initiatives undertaken by regional or local political or economic bodies. This is a process we have called new "regionalization".

1.2. The new "regionalization" of Europe

As Josep V. Boira (2002) explains, the concept of "regionalization" may vary depending on the definition of "region" used. To understand the new European territorial dynamics he proposes we work with "economic" regions, that is, those which are set up by the reality of flows and relationships. According to Dematteis (2002) these new economic territorial units are, mainly, "intentional constructions". In other words, the areas of macro regional cooperation are an answer to a claim on the part of the territories to enlarge their critical mass and the opportunities of interaction in a globalised economy; they are the authentic territorial entities of the future for decision-making, the new active subjects of political public and economic life.

In the voluntarist creation of these new areas, the opportunities for interaction of the regional-local scale with the global one are more possible and direct than ever. Regions, local groupings, businessmen, universities, schools and economic sectors can participate and in fact do so in the game of international political, economic, thinking and market relationships, without having to pass to the next administrative scale in the hierarchy.

This new approach to territorial relationships, which means a new way of thinking

and acting, implies having previously gone through a series of new paradigm and opportunities:

- The territories, their governments and their agents increasingly have the possibility of organizing themselves horizontally or in networks. To respond to the new challenges of globalisation and the resulting economic restructuring, the system of relationships between cities and regions is reorganized with more direct connexions, of a non "pyramidal" type, between the various elements.
- The new organization in networks is based fundamentally on the potential of regional and local players, in endogenous development.
- It is necessary, as has already been said in other words, to manage the interdependencies between territories, their projects and common strategies, and their complexities. In the area of the Mediterranean Arc we have, for example, to overcome attitudes which are too passive or merely "descriptive" and to advance towards other more proactive and propositive attitudes.
- We need to look in depth at the new possibilities of regional and local cooperation in all areas of European public, social and economic life and integrate *lobbying* as a way of defending, at one and the same time, the particular and general interests of the macro region of the Mediterranean Arc.

Thus, continues J.V. Boira, and according to the premises of this new "intentional" regionalization, the idea of the Mediterranean Arc, "the model of this new immediate, active and geopolitical territory", should not lie exclusively in "processes of classical territorial formation –in short in processes of national construction–, but rather in more functionalist formulations which, in part, have already been attempted in Europe over recent years" (Boira, 2002). The problem arises, however, when the agents who supposedly are to contribute to the construction and strengthening of the relationships in this new area, do not know what is happening in Europe "in terms of regional cooperation, economic and business association, and common territorial planning" (Boira, 2002). They ignore, for example, that the "new spaces" which are being configured in Europe on different scales, the new cartographic and economic design of the territory, is based on, as we have said above, the interaction between the rules of a European spatial approach "from above" and the response from economic cooperation on a regional and local scale which is born "from below". They also ignore, have forgotten or, simply, have chosen to ignore, the need for this double "creative effort in territorial issues". On the one hand, there has not been the least sign of adopting common points of view in terms of territorial

planning and, on the other, as they have not achieved an effective materialization of these new spaces, there has been no new form of cooperation nor government in this enlarged geography either. Once again in Boira's words: there has not arisen the need for a new "regional" (euro)regionalism.

The appearance of this concept is linked with the role of the regional territories as units of economic analysis, of decision-making and of application of territorial planning and development principles. Boira uses the definition proposed by Mace and Thérien (1996), where "regionalism" is understood as "a process which happens in a geographical region given that various types of players (states, regional institutions, social organizations) share and pool fundamental values. These players also participate in a networked growth of economic, cultural, scientific, and diplomatic interactions [...]. Although the progression may not be automatic and the speed may vary depending on the sector which is affected, the combination of growing interactions and shared values does not necessarily produce a new political unit, but rather a stronger and more diversified capacity of management and decision making on regional issues." The elements that characterize this new meaning of "regionalism" would be:

1. that we are dealing with a process
2. that it involves many players from different backgrounds, not only institutions or governmental bodies
3. that working in networks is given priority over hierarchical relationships
4. that it combines the most fundamental or economic interactions with shared values
5. that it admits different speeds for different sectors of the economy or social life
6. that it aims to, above all, increase and organize the capacity to face regional and international problems rather than just creating a new superimposed legal and governmental reality.

Therefore, after the "regionalism" at a state scale which formed the EEC in the 50s or the EU in the 90s, and the more or less intense processes of *devolution* within each member state, we find a third stage of new "regional" regionalism, which started as trans-state and cross border expression, articulating "semi administrative" areas, but which could continue within each State.

The materialization of this construction of new areas of decision-making and cooperation were channelled through the adoption of a real regional agenda. This regional agenda understood not as a sum of declarations, meetings and summits –which is what to a great extent the activity of associations such as the

Working Community of the Pyrenees, The Euroregion of the Mediterranean Pyrenees or the Latin Arc had centred on, to give three examples of territorial areas and diverse institutional representations–, but as an effective expression of multilateral visions of the economy, social life, politics and the planning of a new territory to be constructed.

Possible topics on the new regional agenda of the Mediterranean Arc –some of which as would be expected, already formed part of the established working groups, for example, in the Latin Arc or of the Inter-Mediterranean Commission of the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions (CRPM)–, should be:

- Management of the coast, a shared physiographic characteristic, which should be treated in coordination with policies on tourism, the conservation of the environment, fisheries and natural resources, ports and maritime transport
- Water, as a strategic factor in the Mediterranean basin.
- Communication and transport networks, due to their importance in the quality of life and economic competitiveness of territories.
- Shared economic structure, both a set of purely economic elements, as well as territorial and cultural ones.
- The construction of a new geopolitical space where the relationships of the member states which make up the Mediterranean Arc and Europe can be reconsidered.
- Territorial planning, the planning of uses and the preservation of natural spaces from a supraregional perspective.

In addition to a great number of other questions, while not as important, depend on the affected territory, such as: the network of cities, immigration, the labour market, support for the internationalisation of companies, shared industrial sectors, the model of trade, the constitution of a common ports and airports policy, the pressure of tourism, agricultural policy, and cultural cooperation, etc.

Boira, inspired by the concept of “*spatial suicide*” coined by Calthorpe and Fulton (2001) – a concept which the authors use to refer to those North American metropolitan areas which have opted not to adhere to the need to create an economic macro region–, leads them to predict serious problems in the medium to long term caused by the absence of a shared vision of the Mediterranean Arc, specifically in the economic and material fields (infrastructure, territorial planning, etc.). To complete the description of the paradigm of “regionalization” and to be able to judge better the convenience, need or urgency of economic and material

cooperation between the various territories that make up the Mediterranean Arc let us look at which aspects, according to the same authors, we should consider:

1. The external effects of decisions taken by neighbouring territories. The growing political and economic integration of territories leads to an increase in the dependence and interference of the economic and social dynamics of territories on others.
2. The convenience of constructing infrastructures in a networked form. Accessibility is, as has been said, a key factor in improving the competitiveness of territory. It is, as a right, a constitutive part of what the OECD calls “territorial capital”. And in the case of small territorial units such as those which make up the mosaic of the Mediterranean Arc, accessibility almost always depends on the “others”, which makes the adoption of a policy of cooperation even more essential.
3. The need to avoid unfair competition with neighbouring territories by means of cooperation. This means doing what some authors have called *co-opetition*, which means, for small territories, reserving competition only for those areas where we have “win-win” situations and cooperating, on the other hand, in aspects such as large communication infrastructure, which are high cost in the case of duplication and may lead to financial resources running out and not being available for other needs, or in certain economic sectors such as tourism, in which savage competition can have a negative impact on the environment and even putting at risk a resource which is necessary for one’s own success and the viability of the futures of the companies involved.
4. Increases deriving from economic efficiency based on cooperation. The example of economic synergies coming from the establishment of a European single market being the best example.
5. The ability to exert pressure (*lobbying*). The coordination of policies and the cooperation of public action and private sectors allows for increased influence when faced with state and supra-state power.

1.3. European regional policy: the meeting of *top-down* processes and *bottom-up* initiatives

The Directorate General of Regional Policy of the European Commission offers official recognition and an organizational framework for an associative dynamic which drives initiatives of territorial recognition outside regional and national borders with a bottom-up logic. This recognition is shown in the Community Initiative Programme INTERREG⁹. The main aim of INTERREG is not so much to foster

the development of cross border regions, but to accompany symbolically, and to a certain extent financially, initiatives for the recognition of common interests⁹.

The example of the initiative INTERREG or other programmes funded by European Regional Development Funds (FEDER) allows us to claim that the two process involved in the formation of the Mediterranean Arc mentioned above –on the one hand a progressive recognition on the part of the European Union of transnational realities and, on the other an articulation of territories with the potential for cross border development which we have called “new regionalization”– have been converging to create formal mechanisms.

2. In conclusion

The aim of this article has been to show, on the one hand, the historical process of the drafting of guiding principles by the EU for a territorial articulation of the European continent and, on the other, the possible ways of addressing, at regional and local scales, the challenges raised by community bodies. Answers which adopt new paradigms for the construction of geographies of cooperation which we have called “new regionalization”.

On the part of the territorial players within the Mediterranean Arc, the development of new opportunities offered by the interaction between these two processes is still embryonic or is simply unknown. To a large extent this is due to a lack of a long tradition in cooperation between neighbours such as that which holds for example, in the cities and regions of the Baltic.

Nevertheless, the conceptual bases for the construction of these new territories have already been defined. There are also, as we have mentioned, good practices of cooperation to which we can turn in reference. Furthermore, there has been a whole range of initiatives (see the Appendix)¹⁰ which have been developed, although so far not greatly articulated. Therefore, it seems that we have arrived at the moment to make a virtue of necessity and apply the advice of “new regionalization” to build the macro regional reality of the Mediterranean Arc, and to construct the new critical mass required by both the processes of European integration and the processes of economic internationalisation.

1 In this work we have considered those initiatives or contributions to the definition of the Mediterranean Arc based on a logic of European and transnational intervention. We have not considered, therefore, other contributions, Spanish or French, which define axes of development of their respective Mediterranean regions.

2 Cabodi, 1998

3 Europe 2000 and later, Europe 2000+

4 Among these studies we should highlight those by R. Brunet, G. Dematteis, A. Bagnasco, N. Cattani, or A. Vanolo.

- 5 Juan, 1994
 6 Balme, 1995
 7 Báguena, 2001
 8 INTERREG is a programme within the framework of the Structural Funds of the European Union aimed at fostering cross border, transnational and interregional cooperation.
 9 Rivière, 2004
 10 As an appendix to the article, we include a brief description of the most significant experiences that, from a Catalan point of view, have fed the process of construction of the Mediterranean Arc.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES CONCEIVED AS TERRITORIAL WORKS. The demands and strategies of territorialisation

Francesca Governa

Introduction

Infrastructure projects create varied and profound changes in territory, which must be planned, programmed and managed. However, the need to plan, programme and manage the territorial changes arising from infrastructure projects is faced with considerable difficulties, in both theoretical and practical terms. These difficulties are mainly linked to the difficult and often troubled relationship between sectorial logic and supralocal interests, in response to which infrastructure interventions take place, and the territorial logic and local interests in the places where these interventions are going to take place. Some recent cases, such as the Susa Valley "protest" in Italy against the high speed / high capacity railway line which should cross the valley to link Turin with Lyons as part of corridor V joining Kiev with Lisbon, show the difficulties involved in working in order to resolve these conflicts. Similarly, they show the urgent need to deal with them within a government system of territorial dynamics that is increasingly open and fragmented. As a consequence, the problem does not so much lie in the European or national high-speed railway project or macro-corridors on a continental scale, but instead in the significance taken on by the location of these projects in certain regional and local contexts (Albrechts and Coppens, 2003; Priemus and Zonneveld, 2003).

In any event, in order to pursue this objective it is essential to refine the analysis and interpretation methodologies which enable a view of transport infrastructure as interventions of a purely technical nature or relating to transport to be overcome, in favour of an interpretation of them as territorial works not only in relation to the geographical scale which justifies them being carried out, but also in terms of the structuring action that the work itself may have on hierarchically lower scales. Changing the way that transport infrastructure is interpreted also requires a new view of the relationship between infrastructures and territory in terms of

more consolidated interpretations, in which infrastructure is considered as a purely technical intervention related to transport, and territories as a "neutral" screen on which these interventions are projected. On the contrary, infrastructural intervention could be interpreted as an opportunity for transformation by the various territorial levels (Banister and Berechman, 2001).

Apart from that, the hypothesis of conceiving of infrastructural interventions not as a need with which the local or regional territories hosting them must live with on a more or less positive basis, minimising damage and maximising advantages, but rather as potentialities for reclassification and development even on a local and regional scale, even it is necessary to consider their theoretical and practical implications in greater depth, is beginning to gain acceptance in numerous European countries. This acceptance is linked to the role played by the common transport policy in Europe, which has introduced "new" keywords such as integration, co-ordination and interoperability into the public policy lexicon (EC, 2001). Likewise, the wideranging international debate on the subject of governance (ESPON, 2006), in which the change in the types and means of collective action in the urban and territorial field is highlighted, also identifies some directions for change in terms of infrastructure and transport policies¹. Overcoming the traditional approach to planning and consolidation - including in practice - of models of society and ways of co-operation between institutions, does indeed seem to prefigure the move towards negotiated processes in which by opening up decision-making forums, a large number of subjects appear, which belong to various levels of territorial hierarchy (from the most strictly local level to the EU) and a plurality of interests.

Our aim with this article, which discusses the central issues of this debate, is to present and discuss a possible interpretation as the basis for carrying out a re-interpretation of the relationship between infrastructure and territory which overcomes the logics, which are frequently reductionist and determinist, involved in the study of the territorial impact and/or effects of works. The central thesis of the article may be summarised as follows: transport infrastructures are normally seen as purely technical interventions related to transport, defined by a sectorial rationality (the fact of connecting). However, this way of looking at transport infrastructures creates numerous problems of both a theoretical and practical nature. In order to deal with them, it is necessary to change perspective, i.e. to see infrastructures also as an opportunity at both local and regional levels, and an opportunity for reconsidering sectorial policies - and policies relating to transport infrastructures in particular - as integrated policies, and to programme paths to local development. In other words, the questions for which we will try to provide an answer can be

summarised as follows. Can infrastructural interventions, despite being in response to sectorial logics and supralocal interests, become opportunities for the local/regional territories where these interventions are going to be located? How can we reconsider the relationship between infrastructures and territory to overcome a conception of infrastructure as a purely technical intervention related to transport, imposed by the supralocal level on the local level, on the environment, on citizens, on development strategies for places, and achieve the territorialisation of infrastructures? What action needs to be taken for this to occur? That is to say, what type of policies should be adopted? In the following paragraphs, we attempt to provide an initial answer to these questions.

1. The cross-scale territoriality of transport infrastructures

Let us start with the way infrastructures are considered and in particular, by asking ourselves what considering transport infrastructures as territorial works means. The first step in this direction consists of leaving behind a purely functional logic related to transport with its roots in the conception of transport infrastructures, and instead interpreting the territories that they cross or which they affect as a key variable in infrastructural interventions. However, this raises another question. What is the scale or the level of territory in which the territorial nature of infrastructure is defined? Indeed, infrastructure is a territorial work not only on the geographic scale which justifies it being carried out, which is in general supralocal (for example, the European Union for the TEN - Trans European Networks), but also at regional and more strictly local levels. In fact, infrastructural work does not only infrastructure territory at its own level, but also establishes relationships at lower territorial levels. It is enough to consider the places "crossed" by the High Speed/High Capacity railway network or those where the nodes of this network are located.

This apparently commonplace aspect has been neglected for a long time. Indeed, according to the hierarchical-functional rationality which covers the relationships between territories on a different scale (from the European Union to the neighbourhood), each infrastructural work has its own territorial level, which justifies its existence and its spatial structure in terms of its predominant territorial function. As a result, for example, the trans-European transport networks belong to the territorial level of the EU, while the relationship between these networks and the other territorial levels involved in their completion is neglected.

Normally, infrastructure works are therefore considered as territorial works in terms of the level at which they are decided, as they are a result of functional, geoeconomic and geopolitical reasons which make sense at