

Knieling, Jörg

Conference Paper

Cooperation of metropolitan areas - case study metropolis cooperation Berlin - Hamburg

42nd Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "From Industry to Advanced Services - Perspectives of European Metropolitan Regions", August 27th - 31st, 2002, Dortmund, Germany

Provided in Cooperation with:

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

Suggested Citation: Knieling, Jörg (2002) : Cooperation of metropolitan areas - case study metropolis cooperation Berlin - Hamburg, 42nd Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "From Industry to Advanced Services - Perspectives of European Metropolitan Regions", August 27th - 31st, 2002, Dortmund, Germany, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/115763>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Cooperation between Metropolitan Areas – Case Study Metropolis Cooperation Berlin – Hamburg

Dr.-Ing. Jörg Knieling M..A.
The Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg
Office of the Senate - Planning Unit
Poststraße 11
20354 Hamburg
Fon ++49 (0) 40 / 428 31 – 2210
Fax ++49 (0) 40 / 428 31 – 2460
eMail joerg.knieling@sk.hamburg.de

1. The Metropolis Cooperation Berlin – Hamburg

Berlin and Hamburg are the two shaping centers in north and northeast Germany and as such in an increasingly sharper European and world-wide location competition. As city-states with metropolitan functions Berlin and Hamburg represent similar interests in numerous politics and are in charge for comparable tasks. Against this background there already has been a cooperation within different fields for years in the interest of both cities. Examples are tourism industry, handicraft or administrative modernization.

This cooperation is to be expanded and intensified in the coming years on additional action fields. The senates of Berlin and the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg agreed in a first common senate conference in May 2001 to develop cooperation between both cities in form of a metropolis cooperation. This objective corresponds with programmatic and conceptual considerations on German and on European level to attach a specific importance to metropolitan areas as well as metropolis cooperation (see MURL o.J.; EEC 1999; Goeddecke-Stellmann et al 2001; Mehlbye 2001).

The available paper describes general theoretical basics and success factors of metropolis cooperation on the one hand, and it designates the concrete goals, the or-



ganization and the topics of the metropolis cooperation between Berlin and Hamburg on the other hand. In thesis form it is outlined, which scopes appear for a cooperation between neighboring metropolises and metropolitan areas.

2. Theoretical basics and success factors for metropolis co-operation

In a survey made on behalf of the Office of the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg "Cooperation between Metropolitan Areas - Starting points for the intensified cooperation of Hamburg and Berlin on the basis of the experiences of international and national city co-operation" Heeg/ Klagge/ Oßenbrügge (2000) confirm that the cooperation between Berlin and Hamburg can offer an increase in value for both metropolises. Regional-scientific considerations as well as experiences of city-cooperation in Germany and Europe¹ underlie this estimate.

Cooperations get attractive as patterns of action, when all participants involved in the cooperation expect a surplus (win-win-situation). While regional or inter-local cooperation offer numerous advantages by spatial proximity and the integration of the participants, these advantages are not clearly evident for partners, who are spatially apart as well as independent, little connected and linked to each other. The following theoretical aspects can carry on the explanation of metropolis cooperations (see Heeg/ Klagge/ Oßenbrügge 2000: 35 ff; Konvitz 2000; Sternberg 1999):

- explanation samples of the „new geography of economy“, within whose framework the regional-economical development is particularly explained by advantages of agglomeration and specialization (Krugman 1998);
- aspects of the evolutionary and institutional economical and social sciences, which refer to the importance of regional development paths, the institutional embedding and open samples of the adjustment (Storper 1997);
- considerations to spatial network formations as exchange and mobility samples (Castells 1995; Fürst/Schubert 1998; Esser/Schamp 2001);
- discussions about new spatial formations, which attribute a special function to metropolitan areas in the globalized society (Cappelin 1991; Sassen 1996);

¹ The cooperation MAI (Munich-Augsburg-Ingolstadt), the "Business Region South Bavaria" and the "Region of Cooperation" Frankfurt, Rhine Main, Wiesbaden as well as on European level the co-operations Oeresund-Region (Malmö Copenhagen), Union of Baltic Cities and Baltic Pallete, Randstad Holland, Le Diamond Alpin (Geneva, Lyon, Turin), Lyon-Marseille as well as Vienna-Bratislava-Prague-Budapest-Munich served as case examples.



- new forms of governmental guidance, which fall under the term governance and - apart from a current discourse regarding the European institutions - are discussed both on urban and on city-regional level (Fürst 2001).

Against the background of these theoretical considerations as well as empirical analyses a metropolis cooperation can be promoted by the following success factors (Heeg/ Klagge/ Oßenbrügge 2000: 31 ff.):

- Motivations and goals: the partners should exchange their mutual motives and specify goals, visions and strategies together at the beginning of the process to develop a successful metropolis cooperation;
- Topic fields, projects and instruments: metropolis cooperation needs specific contents, so that it can show cooperation successes. A condition is to specify topic fields, that are suitable for cooperation as well as projects and instruments, that contribute to the implementation of the topic fields.

Within the topic fields three types can be differentiated: a) cooperation in regionally and largely independent fields, for example town planning, traffic, environmental protection, administrative modernization, security or district development; b) cooperation within the range of supraregional person-oriented services, e.g. education and science, art and culture or tourism, as well as c) cooperation within the range of business-oriented services and in the knowledge-based production. The latter aim in particular at the economic development and thus at topic fields such as media, trade and logistics or bio- and medical technology.

- Participants and actor constellations: A successful cooperation of the metropolises is based on confidence and openness for participants involved. The cooperation aims at the fact that learning processes take place, which refer both to solutions in individual topic fields and to the advantages of cooperation. For the implementation of the goals and projects the integration of further social participants apart from politics and administration can become important.
- Institution-building: For a long-term success cooperations require to be formally institutionalised. The institution-building creates a common basis and working procedures and by this way the obligation to exchange experiences in regular intervals. Thus co-operation is strengthened and can also fill in phases of lesser intensity.



3. Targets of metropolis cooperation

With the metropolis cooperation Berlin and Hamburg pursue four target areas, by which they aim to draw an increase in value from the cooperation (FHH/Berlin 2001a und b):

- Profit from each other / location marketing: Berlin and Hamburg want to profit from each other by the promotion of exchanging goods and services among themselves, e.g. in the fields of logistics, media and communication as well as tourism industry. Both cities as well as the northern German area stand on national and European level in competition with other large population centers and metropolitan areas. In order to secure their competitiveness and to work as cores for the development and revaluation of the northern German area, Berlin and Hamburg are to complement each other by coordinating processes with their respective aimed special functions, appear together outward and in this way open new markets, e.g. in Eastern Europe.
- Common protection of interests: As city states Berlin and Hamburg represent in some politics, e.g. in the financial adjustment between the German Länder, the same or similar demands opposite third interests. Cooperation is to coordinate these positions even better and thus to increase the effectiveness of common demands, e.g. in relation to the European Union.
- Common problem solving / exchange of experience and knowledge: As city states Berlin and Hamburg face similar problems in numerous fields of action, e.g. green belt migration of the population, unequal load distribution between city and surrounding countryside or immigration and integration of foreigners. An exchange and a transfer of „best practices“ - successful measures and proceedings as well as innovative solution methods - is to contribute better solutions and save costs at the same time.
- Fair competition: Since there still remain further fields, within which the relationship of both cities is shaped by competition, both partners commit themselves to keep the rules of fair competition. In particular the city governments and their economic development units will refrain of addressing and poaching enterprises of the other location purposefully.

In a survey made on behalf of the Office of the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg "cooperation between metropolitan areas - starting points for the intensified cooperation of Hamburg and Berlin on the basis of the experiences of interna-



tional and national city cooperation" the University of Hamburg confirms the necessity of a cooperation between both metropolises (Heeg/ Klagge/ Ossenbruegge 2000).

4. Organizational structure

For the organization of the cooperation specific work structures were created, which are slim and decentralized organized: Common senate conferences, a coordination circle, variable work forms for the treatment of specialized topics and a report obligation.

Common senate conference Berlin - Hamburg

The first common senate conference took place the 15th May 2001 in Hamburg. Further common conferences are to take place alternating in Berlin and Hamburg and usually are set annually if required the senates seize appropriate resolutions in separate meetings, in order to keep organization efforts as small as possible.

Coordination circle

The coordination circle consists of leading employees of the administrative units, which take part in the cooperation. Its tasks comprise the supervision of the cooperation projects and if necessary the preparation of essential resolutions of the two senates. The leadership is with the Offices of the Senate.

Variable work forms for the processing of topics

The treatment of the specialized topics takes place in different work forms, which are specified by the respective responsible field in agreement. During treatment further administrations as well as the respective economical and social participants are to be taken part if required.

Report obligation

The administrations submit reports on results of the cooperation to the senates regularly and when required (FHH 2002a).



5. Topics of the metropolis cooperation

For the first stage of cooperation the topics specified in the table below were agreed upon. The overview refers to the targets specified above and shows, which kind of cooperation in the respective topic area is aimed at.

Table: Topic areas of metropolis cooperation Berlin - Hamburg

| Politics field | Cooperation topic | Type of cooperation | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------|---|
| | | profit from each other / location marketing | common protection of Interests | common problem solution / exchange of experiences |
| Traffic | Long distance passenger traffic | | X | X |
| | Freight traffic | | X | X |
| | Public transport urban transport organization | | X | X |
| Federal fiscal transfer system | Reorganization of Federal fiscal transfer system | | X | X |
| Media and communication industry | Improvement of common location development | X | | X |
| Tourism industry | Development of common marketing activities | X | | X |
| Handicraft | Promotion of the handicraft | | X | X |
| | Qualification | X | | X |
| Eastern Europe cooperation | Extension process | | X | X |
| | Market exploitation | | X | X |
| Science and research | Development of strategic science fields | X | | X |
| | University marketing | X | | |
| Job market and employment policy | Organization of the structural change / common projects (EU-Structural Funds) | | | X |
| | Challenges in metropolitan areas | | X | |
| | Integration of immigrants | | | X |
| City development | Urban regional development | | | X |
| | Urban redevelopment, social quarter development | | | X |
| | Development measures concerning town construction | | | |



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| | City monitoring | | | X |
| | Soil economics | | | X |
| Monument protection and monument maintains | Protection of industry and technique monuments | | | X |
| | Historic monuments of the rail-bound urban traffic | | | X |
| Environmental protection | Job market and climatic protection | | | X |
| | Waste industry, quarter care | | | X |
| Health service | Development perspectives in metropolitan areas | | X | X |
| | Applications of telematics | | | X |
| Security | Police presence in the public area | | | X |
| | Security in drug consumption areas | | | X |
| Integration politics | Integration problems | | | X |
| | Ghetto formation | | | X |
| Administrative modernization | Information and communication technique | | | X |
| | Budget modernization | | | X |
| | Administrative reform a.o. | | | X |

6. Metropolis cooperation German wide

Since summer 2001 Berlin and Hamburg further on cooperate with Frankfurt, Hannover, Munich, Rhine Ruhr, the Saxonia Triangle and Stuttgart in an initiative group "Metropolitan areas in Germany". The group developed from a model project in urban and regional planning called "Regions of the Future" by the German Ministry of Traffic, Construction and Housing and receives financial support for the organization of the cooperation process on the part of the Ministry until the end of 2002. Project management lies in the hands of the Technical University of Berlin.

A target of the German wide metropolis cooperation is to determine the position and common requirements of the metropolitan areas in view of the German and the European level and derive an action catalog from it. It is e.g. aimed at identifying common action fields and priority strategies of the metropolitan areas as well as improving the presence and protection of interests of the metropolitan areas at the European Union. In order to achieve these goals, the metropolitan areas involved agreed on the following work procedures:



- preparation of a manual regarding the strategies and instruments of the protection of interests of the German metropolitan areas in the national and European context,
- clarifying the functions of the metropolitan areas for a lasting development on German and European level,
- formulation of the requirements and expectations of the German metropolitan areas to the German and European regional development.

7. Theses for cooperation between neighboring metropolitan areas

The following theses for metropolis cooperation are based on the experiences of the metropolis cooperation Berlin - Hamburg and aim at generalizing statements. It is to be considered that on one hand the cooperation of Berlin and Hamburg so far is concentrated on executive participants from government and administration. On the other hand the cooperation deals with the cities, so that regional aspects are only brought up for discussion in individual fields, in which they are directly necessary for the task fulfillment, e.g. in traffic and settlement development.

Neighboring metropolises between cooperation and competition

With the action fields for metropolitan cooperation it appears appropriate to differentiate regarding their internal and external orientation. In internal-oriented co-operation the exchange of experience, the search for common solutions and innovation transfer for comparable tasks are the center of attention. The administrations and specialized authorities give themselves in this way mutual impulses for a successful treatment of their tasks and for a modernization of administrative action. This way internal-oriented co-operation can contribute to the optimization of the local services and products by a kind of mutual benchmarking. Topic areas of this internal-oriented co-operation are for example urban development, job market promotion, environmental protection, integration politics, internal security and administrative modernization.

The activities of external orientation aim primarily at common interests during the location shaping. At the same time both metropolitan areas however remain in competition with one another. Therefore win-win-situations can result in particular if action fields are identified, by which both cooperating partners profit so that competition steps into the background or the expected cooperation advantage is larger than it would be with competitive acting. Topics of external orientation are e.g. city tourism (in particular for selected target groups, at which both profit from a coordinated mar-



keting) and common large-scale infrastructure projects like the development of the rail-bound long-distance (ICE-) traffic connection between Berlin and Hamburg.

The two metropolises Berlin and Hamburg are in the international standard, compared with Paris, London, New York or Tokyo, but also with the Randstad or the Ruhr district, relatively small (Blotevogel 1998). Related to the European level this situation is intensified additionally by the planned extension to the east, since the cities suffer a relative meaning loss by this scale enlargement of the European Union. Therefore metropolis cooperation produces a win win-situation for Berlin and Hamburg possible, by obtaining more importance by the common occurrence and thus by the obtained size advantage. Such a revaluation one metropolis can only reach together with the other, if Berlin and Hamburg position themselves as a pair of metropolises or both even together with Copenhagen as north European metropolis triangle.

Specialization of metropolitan areas

Given the limited possibilities of public budgets of metropolitan areas and to reproach a competitive infrastructure, it appears obvious, that the metropolitan areas, especially with reference to cost-intensive infrastructure (e.g. ports, airports, universities), aim at a specialization based on division of labor. However at the same time the metropolitan areas stand in hard competition among themselves to receive conveyances, which are connected with these investment decisions.

The more closely a cooperation specializes on division of labor, the more positive the development of competences in one metropolis can affect the other one too. By a possible joint use of the public as well as private spectrum both metropolises can profit from each other and at the same time revalue opposite third in the location competition. This would be obvious e.g. in the development of specialized competences of universities, hospitals or airports. For this cooperation advantage the distance between the metropolises and its accessibility however is a limiting factor. Therefore in the case of Berlin and Hamburg the acceleration of the rail-bound long-distance traffic connection plays an important role.

In addition the specialization based on division of labor can come into a stress ratio to the political logic, since division of labor also means renouncement. One metropolis must put back with certain development options consciously in favor of the other and favor a in this sense long-term and trustful cooperation of both partners with each other (which applies in the reversal conclusion with other options likewise to the other metropolis). The political logic favors in contrast rather short term and locally presentable successes. In addition the location competition leads to the fact that a



high expectation pressure exists opposite the policy, that the respective metropolis uses all offering development options in the competition for its own advantage.

Promoters for cooperation

Who can contribute to a metropolis cooperation or takes over the role of a promoter, so that the cooperation can be introduced and operated successfully? - For the success of the metropolis cooperation the authentication by the governments involved has a special meaning. It has signal function for the population, the economy, for social partners and for the administration. The resolutions seized between Berlin and Hamburg in the common senate conference have the function of task orders in relation to the specialized administrations. In the favorable case there are individual power based promoters, who plead expressly for cooperation on the government level and who particularly support conversion process thereby. Cooperation on the government level is at the same time a substantial condition for the fact that between the metropolises the necessary confidence develops, which is basis for a long-term cooperation.

Besides promoters on specialized level are - possibly for each action field - necessary to achieve the goals of cooperation. Supporting promoters of economical and social partners can support the cooperation by motivating the participants from administration and government by their commitment and their interest additionally.

Organization of cooperation

For the organization of metropolis cooperation the criteria of flexibility and decentralization should be centered. Metropolis cooperation covers different action fields, so that respective specific organization forms are necessary (working groups, workshops, project-related cooperation etc.). Therefore the competence for the execution of the cooperation should be answered locally to a large extent in the different action fields and remain with the specialized administrations.

So that cooperation from the view of the departments involved is noticed as a common achievement, a general platform appears appropriate beyond that. This can represent an incentive for the individual units to get particularly involved, if it makes successes of the efforts of cooperation transparent. Conducive in addition is the above mentioned authentication on the part of the government that provides the cooperation with a high value. Beyond that the platform offers a framework, which allows a continuous information exchange and the coordination of concepts and proceedings between the different action fields or departments.



Politics for metropolitan areas on national and European Union level

In the central-place-system metropolitan areas can be arranged as outliers, which form a new hierarchic level above the upper centers. Therefore the question, which effects this might have on the city system and the associated regional development policy, arises on the one hand. On the other hand there is an interest, which requirements result from the view of metropolis cooperation.

Germany possesses a comparatively decentralized urban-regional system, that - in contrary to the centralized structure of France - applies as the strength of the country wide regional structure. The multiplicity of comparable cities and regions is basis for a spatial planning policy, which aims at equivalent living conditions in all parts of Germany. But at the same time this policy promotes competition and innovation between the comparable cities and regions. This also applies to the new hierarchic level of the metropolitan areas. They distribute themselves over the entire federal territory and create thereby the conditions for development, at the same time they stand in competition with one another, which releases innovations. The national and European Union level could give further purposeful incentives, e.g. regional competitions and regional advancement programs (as already happened by "Regions of the Future", "BioRegio", "mobilist", "InnoRegio", "Learning region" etc.), to support the development of metropolitan areas.

Related to the metropolis cooperation (in the sense of the regional planning law) the development of the infrastructure for connecting the metropolitan areas appears an urgent task. The infrastructure, traffic facilities in the context of the trans-european nets or networking of information and communication technologies, seem to be a substantial basis for functional cooperation.

On the European and the national level it appears appropriate, if initiatives and incentive instruments of different departments were bundled to general metropolis politics or at least were coordinated purposefully. One target should be a coordination of the specialized policies, which exhaust possible synergies of the available budgets to a large extent.

Relationship of metropolitan areas to other regions in the spatial context

It has already been mentioned that metropolitan areas have to be seen in relationship to other regions in the spatial context. In the course of the regional development of Germany the metropolises and metropolitan areas should understand themselves as outriders for innovation and development impulses. Thus trickle down-effects can be effective for other regions, intensive communicative entwinements of the different



region types among themselves appear to be necessary. An example of such an innovation transfer is the country wide network “Regions of the future”, similar effects obtain other model projects of regional planning or city networking, as they are operated by different intermediate actors (EuroCities, METREX, KGST, Bertelsmann Foundation etc.).

Financial assistance on the national level and by the European Union should be made available therefore both for the promotion of innovation within the metropolitan areas and for the innovation transfer between the regions.

Literature

Blotevogel, H. H. 1998: Europäische Metropolregion Rhein-Ruhr, Theoretische, empirische und politische Perspektiven eines neuen raumordnungspolitischen Konzepts, Schriften des ILS NRW, No 135, Dortmund.

Blotevogel, H. H. 2002: Vernetzung von Metropolregion, in: Kujath, H. J.; Schlippenbach, U.v., Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Conference Documentation, IRS, p. 35-37, Erkner.

BMVBW (Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bauen und Wohnungswesen) 2000: Raumordnungsbericht 2000, Berlin.

Cappelin, R. 1991: International networks of cities, in: Camagni, R. (Hg.), Innovation networks: spatial perspective, p. 230-244, London: Belhaven Press.

Castells, M. 1996: The rise of the network society, Oxford.

Esser, J.; Schamp, E. W. (Hg.) 2001: Metropolitane Region in der Vernetzung. Der Fall Frankfurt/Rhein-Main, Campus Forschung, Bd. 836, Frankfurt / New York.

EG (Europäische Gemeinschaften, Hg.) 1999: EUREK – Europäisches Raumentwicklungskonzept. Auf dem Weg zu einer räumlich ausgewogenen und nachhaltigen Entwicklung der Europäischen Union, Luxemburg.

FHH (Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg) 2002a: Metropolen-Kooperation Berlin - Hamburg, Arbeitsbericht 04/2002, unveröff. Bericht des Planungsstabs der Senatskanzlei, Hamburg.



FHH 2002b: Leitbild: Metropole Hamburg – Wachsende Stadt, internal document of the Senate (draft), Hamburg.

FHH / Berlin (Bundeshauptstadt Berlin) 2001a: Metropolen-Kooperation Berlin - Hamburg, Drucksache für die gemeinsame Sitzung der Senate Berlins und der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg am 15.05.2001, internal document of the Senate, Berlin / Hamburg.

FHH / Berlin 2001b: Metropolen-Kooperation Berlin - Hamburg, Protokoll der gemeinsamen Sitzung der Senate Berlins und der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg am 15.05.2001, internal document, Berlin / Hamburg.

Fürst, D. 2001: Regional governance – ein neues Paradigma der Regionalwissenschaften? Raumforschung und Raumordnung 59, p. 370-380.

Fürst, D.; Schubert, H. 1998: Regionale Akteursnetzwerke. Zur Rolle der Netzwerke, Raumforschung und Raumordnung 56, p. 352-361.

Göddecke-Stellmann, J; Müller, André; Strade, Andreas 2000: Konkurrenz und Kooperation. Europas Metropolregionen vor neuen Herausforderungen, IzR, No. 11/12, p. 645-656.

Heeg, S.; Klagge, B.; Oßenbrügge, J. 2000: Kooperation zwischen Metropolregionen - Ansatzpunkte für die verstärkte Zusammenarbeit von Hamburg und Berlin auf der Basis der Erfahrungen internationaler und nationaler Städtekooperationen, unveröff. expertise by the University of Hamburg, Economical Geography, Hamburg.

Krugman, P. 1998: What's new about the new economic geography? Oxford Review of Economic Policy 14, p. 7-17.

Kujath, H. J.; Dybe, G., Fichter, H. 2001: Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Raumstruktur des Bundesgebietes, Untersuchung im Auftrag des BMVBW, unveröff. Forschungsbericht, Erkner.

Kujath, H. J.; Schlippenbach, U.v. 2002: Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht, Erkner.

Mehlbye, P. 2000: Global Integration Zones – Neighbouring Metropolitan Regions in Metropolitan Clusters, IzR, No. 11/12, p. 755-762.



MURL (Ministerium für Umwelt, Raumordnung und Landwirtschaft) o.J.: European Metropolitan areas in Germany / Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland, Beschluss der MKRO vom 03.06.1997, Düsseldorf.

Sassen, S. 1996: Metropolen des Weltmarkts. Die neue Rolle der Global Cities, Frankfurt: Campus.

Sternberg, R. 1999: Innovative Netzwerke und Regionalentwicklung, in: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hg.), Europäische Einflüsse auf die Raum- und Regionalentwicklung am Beispiel des Naturschutzes, der Agenda 2000 und des regionalen Milieus, Working Material of ARL, No. 257, p. 78-104.

Storper, M. 1997: The Regional World. Territorial Development in a Global Economy, New York: Guilford.