Europeanisation and The Built Environment:
The Re-scaling Of the Border City Goerlitz-Zgorzelec

Siarhei Liubimau

This article starts with a brief outline of the conceptual assumptions which are treated here as the predecessors of, and supplements to, theories of the social production of geographical scales. This outline is intended to show that the social production of geographical space (concrete spatial configurations and the relations between them) and the social production of geographical scale are two indispensably interconnected research foci. In this perspective, basing the argument on a range of existing literature, the coordination of the term 'socio-spatial transformation' with the term 're-scaling' is presented as particularly helpful in the case of the social analyses of cities (both as bounded spatial units and in terms of the social meaning of their literal built environment) located in proximity to European state borders and, hence, lying in the core of the re-composition of hierarchies of socio-geographical scales. With regard to the present case study, this coordination helps to deal with the complex scalar position of urban units located in the vicinity of internal EU borders and encountering significant socio-spatial transformations due to EU enlargement and hence a change of regime of border functioning. Further on, this article refers to the results of qualitative field research in Goerlitz-Zgorzelec and argues that firstly, the practical meaning of built environments in trans-border urban space is related to the transformation of the EU border regime, which configures socially and spatially grounded asymmetries and opens variable possibilities of gaining surplus from trans-border conditions for agents and agendas of different levels. Secondly, the built environment and its uses are central to the scalar changes brought about by the Europeanisation process. Thirdly, it introduces the category of the 'architecture of Europeanisation' in two distinct respects.

Theoretical Framework

One of the outcomes of the growing critical sensitivity of social researchers to the term 'space' is the notion of geographical scales (from the European perspective these are urban, national, regional, EU and global) as relatively bounded geographical units that are socially produced (Brenner 2000b, Brenner 2004). This notion implies criticism of the traditional way of reading different socio-geographical units as bounded within some conflict-free primordial structure and on the contrary emphasises their processual nature (Brenner 2001, 592). In the most general perspective, it opens a new way for the analytical coordination of social processes and their spatial background. Neighbourhoods, cities, metropolitan areas, regions, nation-states, territorial blocks and the global scene are no more regarded as immutable elements of an immutable hierarchy. On the contrary, more and more researchers' attention is given to the very process of establishing this hierarchy and its driving forces. In this respect, it is possible to talk about three rough conceptual assumptions which were negotiated within this new current of scholarship in the social sciences and which have also become influential clichés in public discourse. First, is the assumption of the crisis or, rather the mutation, of the territorial nation-state (Appadurai 1996). Second, is the assumption that it is precisely urban centres and metropolitan areas, as specific types of social and geographical organisation, that become the main strategic loci of production and decision making (Sassen 2002, Scott

2005). Third, is the assumption that globalisation is a process that presupposes new ways of conceiving of and living spatiality on both micro- and macro- levels (Harvey 1990, Tsing 2000). At this stage, it would be valid to emphasise that all these assumptions can be coordinated precisely around a critical stance towards geographical scale as a pre-given container of social transformation. To put it differently, certain localities, neighbourhoods, cities, sovereign states and multi-nation blocks such as the EU are seen here as processes constituting semi-autonomous and constantly reconfigured entities, whose growing complexity and connectivity makes the procedure of singling them out more and more problematic, and thus reveals their character as constructed by the flows and unevenly disposed localisations of capital, political decisions and struggles, and cultural production and repertoires.

On the one hand, it could appear sensible to locate this new perspective on geographical scale within the epistemological shift conventionally called the 'spatial turn', a research agenda to make space visible in theories of society, culture and politics and thus replace the 'view from nowhere' (Friedland and Boden 1994, 5). As Edward Soja boldly puts it, the aim of this epistemological arrangement is to 'spatialise the historical narrative' and to look at it as if it were a geographical map (1989, 1). In many respects the initial goal of this position is to re-examine and criticise the domination of time and history as the major framework of knowledge in the social sciences. For Soja, challenging the temporal master-narrative – or making it clear that in order to make history you have to construct human geography – is the condition of possibility for a more coherent variant of critical social theory (1989, 11). The prerequisite of this innovative theoretical angle can be found in the understanding that space and time are socially grounded and can be given to social actors only contextually, whereas the context, which makes temporal rhythms and spatial configurations available to them, is always constituted by specific modes of capital accumulation, horizons and frameworks of political action and cultural forms. It involves the conceptual position that space and time are not totally divided as is assumed within Newtonian physics and its related commonsense worldview. On the contrary, it is agreed that both space and time can be conceived only in tension and are always interrelated (although we can definitely distinguish them) (Massey 1993, 141). Yet, while different concepts of history have for a long time been used by social scientists for a more nuanced analysis of society, space and geography have been rather neglected as an inevitable dimension of social relations. In this vein, both the set of theories subsumed by the label the 'spatial turn', and the critical perceptions of this label, are to reveal the ways in which the spatio-temporal structuring of social life can be used analytically for the concretisation and materialisation of social relations.

On the other hand, the issue of the social production of geographical scales cannot be limited exclusively to changing modes of knowledge in academia. This new epistemology adopted by social scientists is systematically related to the material referent of the current research agenda. It would be reasonable to say that, in the most general terms, this material referent is the increasing interrelations between the global and the local. As Anna Tsing argues with particular regard to the state of affairs in the field of anthropology, currently globalisation and globalism are the most significant horizons of social research to be dealt with. To locate this claim historically, she refers to the issue of modernisation and modernism as a similar challenge and horizon for post-Second World War scholarship. Nowadays, the global framework, crystallised from manifold connections, circulations, their channels, and the resulting landscape elements which rework global flows, makes it possible for us to focus on the 'making and remaking of geographical and historical agents and the forms of their

agency in relation to movement, interaction, and shifting, competing claims about community, culture, and scale' (Tsing 2000, 330). Various spatial configurations persist as the key variables for many theories precisely because global circulation, its logic and the mutations it causes, can be grasped by a social scientist as specific geographically organised projects, i.e. 'relatively coherent bundles of ideas and practices as realised in particular times and places' (Tsing 2000, 347). Besides, various spatial configurations, such as business districts, bridges, slums, border checkpoints or underused plazas, and their social meaning, persist as a source of metaphors for inventing new categories because they can serve as analogies necessary to unlock the complex and dynamic interconnections between the global and the local, intensively experienced in everyday life and made routine by commonsense knowledge.

The idea that certain political and social reconfigurations also imply mutations in the functioning of scalar hierarchies, or, to put it differently, a re-scaling process, involved the emergence and use of the term 'politics of scale'. This concept derives from the understanding that in the situation of the connectivity and interdependence of the different socio-geographical building blocks of cities, regions and states, the very process of scaling becomes a matter of political activities and struggles. Neil Brenner, who summarises the debates on this issue, writes about two aspects of this notion. Firstly, he sees it as the production and transformation of socio-spatial arrangements at different levels which can be easily distinguished from each other, such as the local, the urban, the regional, the national, etc. Secondly, the focus lies on the very process of scaling, or, alternatively, on the way the *relations* between diverse smaller and larger spatial units are set up, reproduced, reconfigured and contested (Brenner 2001, 599-601). In the context of this article, these notions of scale and scaling have two useful implications. They make possible a more refined analysis of urban units (or, more broadly, areas) located in proximity to state borders, which are often called laboratories of internationalisation, globalisation or, closer to the context of this paper, Europeanisation (Balibar 2003, Donnan and Wilson 1999, Wilson and Donnan 2005). They are locations where new socio-spatial configurations are crystallised. Furthermore, these notions open up a new angle on the phenomenon of the state border itself by serving as a structure for the analysis of its dynamic, uneven and selective nature (Berg and Ehin 2006), and for making conceptually visible and recognisable certain projects which emerge due to changing regimes of border functioning and produce new kinds of spaces and spatial relations.

As suggested already, it is now often noted that the urban scale should be prioritised as the locus of broader social transformations which shows the trajectories of globally induced 'projects', as understood by Anna Tsing (2000), in the most evident way. Michael Peter Smith, who chooses to use the term 'transnational urbanism' for unpacking today's conditions, does so for two reasons. Firstly, transnational social actors are connected to the cultural, political and socioeconomic domains characteristic of the urban milieu. Secondly, these actors sustain their transnational condition by practising means of communication and travel usually associated with the culture of cities. In this sense, for him 'transnational urbanism' is 'a cultural rather than a strictly geographic metaphor' (Smith 2001, 5). Moreover, if the aim of this article is to analyse the place-specific reworking of the general regime of relations between different social landscapes and their elements (Pred and Watts 1992) in the broader perspective of the enlarged and re-scaled EU, then cities as concentrations of political, economic and cultural power on the one hand (Harvey 1990, Scott 2005), and as major nodes of circulation where transnational relations are firmly established

on the other (Sassen 2002), should be the initial research focus. This intention was significantly influenced by the philosopher Henri Lefebvre, who has shown that capitalism has remained sustainable because political and economic actors under capitalism managed to turn spatiality into a set of exchange values, as well as the main medium for capital accumulation. Furthermore, it was urban centres that were the central point in this process of the social production of space (Lefebvre 1991). This insight, in many respects, makes it possible to theorize a situation where urban governance has gained more say in relation to the territorial nation-state as a result of the growing capitalisation of city space and the declining possibilities of central government to rationally and evenly plan the development of its territory (Harvey 1989). As such, the growing entrepreneurial functions of municipalities might be interpreted as further evidence of the much mooted crisis of the nation-state and modern, or nation-state centred political agency lagging behind post-modern or trans-national economic agency (Kobrin 1997). However, here it would be equally reasonable to refer to Brenner who comments on this interpretation and shows that the nation-state is still crucial, but operates (regulating and governing) more on the urban and regional than on the national scale, and applies particular policies in order to enhance the 'place-specific competitive advantage' of its most important urban centres (2000a, 2001). Besides, to shift the emphasis from the issue of governance to the issue of different kinds of movement and different kinds of trans-border conditions, it would be legitimate to say that the nation-state and trans-national practices are not mutually exclusive, but rather are constitutive of each other (Smith 2001).

Case Study

The case study of the revitalisation of the Neisse suburb on the Polish side of the German-Polish border city, Goerlitz-Zgorzelec briefly presented in this article has been conducted with a dual aim. First, it is intended to show that the discussed research optic of the social production of geographical space as the social production of geographical scales can be a fruitful conceptual framework for endeavours to study dynamic trans-border spaces. In other words, it strives to argue that any given border regime is an indispensable attribute of scale-making, and vice-versa, any scalar formation (such as the enlarged EU in this case) is made possible by particular border regimes. Second, based on this case study, this article attempts to show that a concrete built environment and its practical meaning is the key presupposition, channel and outcome of the scalar shifts and struggles taking place in the border conditions as part of broader scalar change (in this instance, EU enlargement presupposing turning the German-Polish border into an internal EU and Schengen border). As such, the particular trans-border social meaning of a built environment encountering changes due to a mutating regime of border functioning and, hence, due to the establishment of the new scalar formation is an articulation both empowered by and empowering this new scalar formation.

  As Marek Furmankiewicz writes, 'in cross-border co-operation, especially in euroregions, spatial connections and physical resources (border rivers, nature regions), which give scope for common work, are very important' (Furmankiewicz 2007, 350). For Goerlitz-Zgorzelec, which formed a single town before 1945 when the German-Polish border was re-established, both the built and natural environments play this crucial role. The River Neisse, as the synthesis of the natural and built environment (bridges, the infrastructure of the riverbanks, the infrastructure for

border control, etc.), became one of the most important scenes of the local reworking of macro-trends. It was saturated by the social meaning of closure when the Oder-Neisse Line was established and served as a rather closed border between Poland and East Germany. After 1989, on the other hand, it has become one of the most important elements of European integration. The growth of trans-national connections between different localities and the growth of the autonomy of local self-government, which, as is conventionally agreed, are the major trends of Europeanisation in the context of global socio-spatial change (Perkmann 2003), both caused and were reconfirmed by a radical re-tooling of the Neisse in relation to its Western and Eastern sides. Transnational German-Polish environmental, infrastructural and cultural projects were very much concerned with how to make this river a means of connection, not a means of separation, while the euroregion launched in this area was called the *euroregion Neisse-Nisa-Nysa* in German, Czech and Polish.

Such changes in the regime of the uses of concrete spatial configurations appear to stem from mutations in the regime of border functioning, which, to retain the angle of the concepts introduced above, in its turn can be understood as establishing a new scalar organisation. Eiki Berg and Perit Ehin use the term 'border regime' as a system of control that regulates behaviour at borders. The authors write about three main features to be analysed: first, the *functions* attributed to the border, second, the *mode of governance* and third, the *degree of openness* (Berg and Ehin 2006, 55). Although they focus on external Schengen borders, where the function of control remains the most important, it would be reasonable to argue that any European border as an institution is at least a two-way road and cannot be analysed in terms of the command of control only (Bauer and Darley 2007). The EU, as the formation of a new scale – and its growing importance in the structuring of space and movements – presupposes a new kind of relation between different socio-geographical units both within its limits and beyond its borders. Here urban agglomerations adjacent to internal EU borders are the most radically re-scaled, while the entire situation of European Integration and the growing role of urban centres in relation to the territories of nation-states provoke the question: what is the urban scale as opposed to the national and EU scales? Or, how can we position such urban units within the prevailing scalar hierarchies? If we understand urbanisation as a presupposition and an outcome of historically grounded modes of capital accumulation (Harvey 1989, Harvey 2006), then it would be appropriate to place analytically regimes of border functioning in the very centre of this spatially dispersed and bounded accumulation process. Besides, if within the analysis we juxtapose socio-spatial practice and the practical meaning of spatial forms with prevailing scalar hierarchies, then it would be fruitful to coordinate the issue of the re-tooling of the framework for spatially grounded social action with the historical variations of the institutions of borders, involving different degrees of openness and closedness with regard to different modes of accumulation through movement and exchange. In this light, the focus on regimes of border functioning empowers researchers to trace how the uneven development between the two sides of the border – and in a broader context of changing scalar configurations – is continually structured and re-structured or, bounded and re-bounded, by those who use borders and border conditions for gaining different kinds of surplus.

This analysis of the socio-geographical meaning of the revitalisation of the Neisse suburb in Goerlitz-Zgorzelec aims to show how concrete *spatial typologies* on the *urban scale*, or concrete pieces of the *built environment* and their uses by social actors of different levels, are embedded into the new scalar hierarchy caused by EU enlargement. In this instance, the concept of the 'built environment' is used instead of

the concept of 'architecture,' since it gives more opportunities to analyse the relations between human agency on the one hand and spatial configurations on the other. The Neisse suburb in Zgorzelec is the only piece of the built environment on the Polish side of the river that can be historically and symbolically associated with the old city core of Goerlitz. Remarkably, in contrast to the German side, where the old city centre became the main target of both state and private investments in infrastructure immediately after the fall of the GDR, on the Polish side this historical part of the city was totally neglected. Moreover, Daszynskiego Street in Zgorzelec, where most of the old nineteenth century buildings of the Neisse suburb are located, was perceived for a long time as one of the city's most dangerous areas, inhabited by 'pathological' families, forgotten and not integrated into the rest of the city. Here, it is reasonable to argue that in the context of the shortage economy in 1990s Poland, there were not enough institutional and market instruments for the commodification of the houses, which were ill-equipped with utilities yet had important historical meaning. The same situation could be observed in the 1970s-80s on the other side of the Neisse in Goerlitz, where people preferred to settle in the better equipped socialist pre-fabricated block-housing on the outskirts of the city, while the historical core was the location of social problems. There was even a plan to blow up some part of Goerlitz city centre and to build modern houses instead, but the 1989 transformation made it impossible for this plan to be realised.

The perception of, and plans concerning, the Neisse suburb in Zgorzelec rapidly changed at the beginning of the 2000s and, as will be argued below, were connected to a broad socio-spatial transformation, which is here conceptually constructed as re-scaling. The key moment for this change was the EU funded opening, or rather re-opening, in September 2004 of the Old Town Bridge, which connects the Neisse suburb on the eastern side of the river with the historical centre of Goerlitz on the western side. This project was not only a highly symbolic gesture in the course of Poland's accession to the EU and the growing intensiveness of trans-border cooperation in a town which had been divided, and sustained as divided, by the destruction of all the bridges during the Second World War. In addition, it would also not be enough to talk about it as a straight effect of the EU policy of planning balanced development across its territory. From the angle of the spatial change caused by the EU enlargement and the emergent new German-Polish border regime, the re-opening of the bridge can be considered as a local 'project' or a reworking of the broader trend of the mutations of state territoriality or of the mutations of the regime of border functioning. This mutation was supplemented by EU specific funds and institutional programmes on the one hand, and by the local peculiarity of the built environment with its social uses, symbolic meaning and trajectories of the commodification of space on the other. The most striking result of the reconstruction of the Old Town Bridge became the massive reconstruction of the Neisse suburb with the dominant goal of its revitalisation in both an architectural and social sense.

As the data gathered on both the German and Polish sides of the Neisse River indicates, in many respects the revitalisation project was the way to smooth over the clash between the well-restored historical core of Goerlitz and the poor Neisse suburb in Zgorzelec. As argued by the Zgorzelec architect C.A., who started to work on the revitalisation project in 2004, when certain plans for the restructuring of this area were already elaborated:

> I would say that the main impulse to launch the program of the revitalisation
> of the Neisse suburb was the perspective of or, in general, the construction or

re-construction of the Old Town Bridge. To put it briefly: from the moment of the opening of the Old Town Bridge, passing across the Old Town Bridge from Goerlitz one fell into a wilderness. In Goerlitz, of course, the old city in the 1990s changed totally […] After the re-unification of Germany, a lot of funds were made available for the revalorization of the old city of Goerlitz. In connection with its character, meaning and potential. And of course in Zgorzelec for a long time nothing was done in this respect and in the end I would say that common sense prevailed. Because, I would say, if this work [revitalisation – S.L.] would not start, today one would cross the Old Town Bridge [...] I would say, in Goerlitz it looks really like a fairy tale, this architecture has such character [...] it is even 'sugary' in some places, because it was restored and got back its old magnificence. And on our side there would be just bushes, there would be, I don't know [...] Well, it would be a serious clash after crossing the Old Town Bridge.

For all that, however, it is necessary to emphasise that it was precisely the built form of the Old Town Bridge that made this clash real, as it created a framework for the further asymmetrical interplay between the actors on the both sides of the Neisse. This concrete bridge, as an injection into the existing built environment, further altered the uses of other spatial configurations on the urban scale. These mutations primarily involve the capitalisation of the space of the district and its appropriation by the practices of urban entrepreneurs, where the growing density of restaurants, bars, and cultural attractions, such as museums, and shops for tourists, is its evident outcome and constitutive force. As several of my informants from Zgorzelec said, 'Euros are flowing across this bridge to Zgorzelec' or, sometimes, 'to Poland'. Such an attitude towards the transformation analysed here can be found not only in the case of the inhabitants of Zgorzelec, but also in the case of expert knowledge, which also deals with the newly established configuration of scales grasped in the most immediate way as the recently established border regime.

  For instance, the programme for the revitalisation of this area, prepared for approval by the Zgorzelec city administration in 2004, stresses that the Neisse suburb in Zgorzelec is de-capitalised and should be revitalised in order to make it compatible with the previously rejuvenated historical centre of Goerlitz. The assumptions of this programme fit well with the data gathered through interviews with local experts and informal talks with Zgorzelec inhabitants in the sense that they all show that before 2004 the Neisse suburb served, both practically and discursively, as the intensification of different sorts of problems, thus hindering its development as an organic part of the city's body. Within the programme of revitalisation, the district's problems are divided into spatial (an old communication infrastructure), social (uncertain property relations) and economic examples (a still not established structure for trade and services). In this vein, such a combination of potential problems is presented as requiring a specific formula of rehabilitation. Furthermore, the aims are a modernisation of the technical infrastructure which would attract investors and encourage the overall economic development in this area; the establishment of adequate property rights for both houses and land (i.e. the privatisation of communal and state-owned buildings); a proper solution for transport (building car-parks on the one hand and the limitation of car mobility on the other); the creation of attractive configurations of trade and services which would have a 'centre-making character'; and the liquidation of social problems to make the area safer. According to a 2004 survey, thirty-six percent of buildings required a profound renovation, while the strategy for this renovation in the broader stream of the revitalisation project was

supposed to be a private-public partnership together with the utilisation of EU funds. In the overall context, the important role of investments and privatisation was assumed (not only the activities of the municipal authorities), as was the availability of loans for dwellers who want to renovate their houses independently.

More important here is that, already in this programme, the Neisse suburb was imagined as a spatial succession of trade, tourism and recreation that would connect the city centre of Zgorzelec with the Old Town Bridge. In this context the term the 'showcase of Zgorzelec' referred to the Neisse suburb and, in the course of the field research I conducted in Goerlitz and Zgorzelec in May-July 2008, it was reproduced by most of the Polish experts I interviewed. It should be pointed out that most of the programmatic aims within the revitalisation project discussed above were realised by summer 2008, while interviews showed that these aims are still regarded as the reference points for the urban development of Zgorzelec's. The term 'showcase' can be interpreted as something serving as a city's currency within its efforts at self-promotion. However, the very usage of this term and the socio-spatial conditions of the possibility of its use suggest the problematic meaning of the built environment constituting the Neisse suburb and of both its social and spatial character in the trans-border conditions of Goerlitz-Zgorzelec. When dismantled, this problematic meaning can help reveal the fabricated nature of various spatial units and of their interrelations, both of which are involved in the projection of the Neisse suburb, while the area's broader scalar context turns out to be an adequate explanatory framework of its current vision and functions. In other words, the processes constituting the current constellation of the Neisse suburb can be turned into a research problem when viewed as dependent on its scalar background. Two major aspects of the problematic meaning are the projected (and contested) centre-making potential of the Neisse suburb, and the aim of privatisation of this area, which is expected to result in its commodification through the establishment of a structure for unique trade and services designed largely for tourists. These two aspects are closely interconnected, while it is precisely the change in the scalar order, spatially grounded in the construction of the Old Town Bridge in 2004, which determines this specific interconnection.

Goerlitz is an uncharacteristic case of a former GDR town of such a size (around 60,000 inhabitants) since its economy is in many respects based on the tourist industry. The preserved architectural heritage and low cost of living (in relation to the standard of the apartments in the revalorised old city core) made it a popular destination for elderly tourists from all over Germany, with the main currency of the self-promotion of Goerlitz as a tourist destination being its historical centre. In this vein, the revitalisation of Daszynskiego Street in Zgorzelec can be read as an attempt to include this part of the Polish side of the Neisse River into an already existing and architecturally grounded mode of capital accumulation. The public-private venture to bind this formerly abandoned part of Zgorzelec to the more developed and better invested in spatial configurations on the other side of the river through architectural style, colour and design details, also presupposes the new trajectories of capitalisation in this part of the city and its built environment pursued by entrepreneurs and the state. In this context, the very practical meaning of the built environment (i.e. the projections and uses of the built environment in a broader social and geographical configuration) of the Neisse suburb acquires a new, trans-national dimension. Talking about the revitalisation project and his own role and place within it, my interviewee Zgorzelec architect C.A. emphasises that Goerlitz-Zgorzelec is an artificially and politically divided urban unit with an almost 1000 year common history, and, therefore, each side should be consciously tied to its counterpart.

From here stem all my analyses, strivings and decisions. As I said, I managed to change some things [in relation to previous projects of revitalisation – S.L.], to quickly rework the colouristics of those buildings. Because there were already investors who had already bought the buildings and wanted to carry out renovation and my idea was to beat them to it. Before, everything happened in a way which, according to me, is not the right proper one because a planner made a colouristics project ignoring history. Here, in Zgorzelec, in the Neisse district practically everything was also happening in isolation from history, from what had been shaped historically. Nonetheless, I managed in some sense to bring it about such that everything that happens in Zgorzelec, primarily in the Neisse district, is tied to [...] to Goerlitz. That means, my plan was to make the two towns closer to each other, to give them an identical character in the sense of colouristics, to just carry over this image of the city in order that Zgorzelec would not develop independently from Goerlitz and Goerlitz from Zgorzelec. [...] Because it was one city and I perceive this city as one city. I am talking as an architect. [...] Both cities, and the objects situated on the different sides, do not differ in the sense of certain decisions with regard to architectural detail. If they appeared in the same historical period, one can find a lot of similarities in the buildings, which appeared in Zgorzelec and in Goerlitz, because they appeared in the same city, one which had administrative limits including both today's Zgorzelec and today's Goerlitz. My plan was to come back to this, to plan the development of Zgorzelec as tied to the development of Goerlitz, to make it a certain continuation, a certain reference. From here come all the Old Town lamps, which are in the Neisse district because of me, of course. Because there also existed a totally different project, a different decision, different lamps. But I manage to bring it about such that today the lamps are basically identical with those in Goerlitz.

This passage from an interview reveals how changing scalar configurations, manifested primarily in Poland's accession to the EU and in the Europeanisation-centred projects, give a new scalar frame of reference for spatial planning practice and for the socio-historical dynamics of the extant built environment. Particular street lamps or the colours of buildings that ten years ago were still totally abandoned acquire a new social sense when they shift within a prevailing constellation of socio-geographical scales. In the same way as the River Neisse and its banks are invested in differently, socially, on various stages or circuits of socio-geographical structuring, lamps and facades become the localisations of negotiations concerning certain scale-specific projects. Moreover, the very purpose and rationality of the architect's practice is crystallised and justified in connection to the changing spatial and social relations between Polish and German towns, or, in other words, in connection to the limits and possibilities that newly emerging scalar formations constitute for social actors. In this vein, the practical stances of Goerlitz architects – who acknowledge that culture as consumption, and tourist consumption in particular, forms the main instrument for the city's place-promotion – in relation to the discussed revitalisation project also have a clear scalar background. As K.F., an architect from Goerlitz, says:

Up till now the touristic and also somehow the cultural focus lay on the old city [of Goerlitz – S.L.]. Let us say more or less only on the old city. Now it is in one direction expanding to the Wilheminian district of Goerlitz and on the other side to the Neisse Ufer Bereich [the Neisse riverside area – S.L.], which includes of course the Polish side. […] And this is of course of

meaning for both sides, not only for the German or the Polish side. And it is an expanding area for tourists, for the touristic centres of the inner city of Goerlitz, of course. […] As you surely know there is the term of *Waterfront development*, which is normally associated with big building developments, like docklands or whatever. One can also call these future developments on both sides of the Neisse 'waterfront development', but not in terms of big buildings, rather with more recreational, let's say soft tourism, et cetera.

It is thus evident in these discussions, that the scalar background is dynamic and open for both discursive and practical (both aspects are taken here in the narrow perspective of architects' professional stances) re-tooling and competition. On the western side of the Neisse, the old Goerlitz city centre is still prioritised as the centre of the trans-border tourist area, despite the symbolic affirmation of the bridges themselves or the border itself as the new centre of a united European city. However, on the eastern side, the argument concerning how materially and stylistically the Neisse suburb should be revitalised, or fastened to the historical core of Goerlitz, is the most prevalent aspect of scalar re-tooling. As Z.B., a cultural manager who is involved in the organisation of certain cultural events in the Neisse suburb says:

> Zgorzelec is kind of a poorer offshoot of Goerlitz. It would be good if it could be broader [Daszynskiego Street – S.L.]. Ha-ha. And they left this old city to us, as we have no old market, nothing. And I am very happy that Daszynskiego Sreet acquires such an appeal. […] Unfortunately, there are still plastic windows, unfortunately our laws are not so restrictive as laws in Germany. Unfortunately, old paving stones were removed, even though the old ones could have been revitalised. But I am still happy that this street *emerged*, that step by step it really looks better.

The fact that Z.B. talks about Daszynskiego Street as only a recently emerged one should mean that it re-emerged both socially and architecturally due to the formation of a new scalar constellation, thus enabling this part of Zgorzelec to become socially and architecturally interchangeable with its Western counterpart.

Figure 5.1. Goerlitz [photo taken by the author, Siarhei Liubimau, in 2008].

Figure 5.2. The Neisse Suburb in Zgorzelec [photo taken by the author, Siarhei Liubimau, in 2008].

The transformations of the Neisse district in Zgorzelec can be roughly described as gentrification, or as the rehabilitation of old social and spatial structures (usually ones

referring to the industrial labour class) by post-industrial middle-class property owners, developers and trendy services (Smith 1982). However, in the case of the Goerlitz-Zgorzelec gentrification, or revitalisation (a term which gives a more positive shade to the analysed processes) is remarkable since it becomes possible due to the obvious change of scalar hierarchies. More precisely, the rehabilitation of Daszynskiego Street is not only an important aspect of the local trajectory of Europeanisation and the strategic use of a certain scalar lens which gives priority to the urban scale and not to the scale of the territorial nation-state. It is also an outcome and a presupposition of changing socio-geographical modes of capital accumulation. The fact that some part of Zgorzelec is revitalised cannot be addressed without the coordination of its urban scale with the urban scale of Goerlitz, the scale of the German and Polish nation-states and the EU scale. Thus, it cannot be theorised properly without a deliberate placing of the twin-town's scale within the broader scalar constellation. Here, it is possible to say that the re-scaling of the Neisse district is possible due to an asymmetry in development (geographically uneven development). Thus unevenness made possible the idea of this bridge as the way to make these two cities closer to each other. Yet the result was the intensification of unevenness (or, the 'clash' between the two sides of the river), which caused another attempt to move both parts closer to each other by arranging injections into the urban fabric. Apparently, the border (or, its changing regime of functioning) understood as a medium of exchange makes the spatial configuration adjacent to it the site of intensified socially and geographically grounded asymmetries and, therefore, turns them into localisations of an intensified 'politics of scale'.

The 'politics of scale' as a) the production and reconfiguration of relatively bounded units of socio-spatial organisation and b) the process of the creation of mutually embedded and positioned spatial units (Brenner 2001), becomes an especially useful notion. In this exact context I would find it fruitful to talk about the 'architecture of Europeanisation', which signifies the socio-spatial typologies present in border zones in the clearest way. The 'architecture of Europeanisation' is the realisation of EU political and economic goals by planning a certain built environment, like bridges, roads, surveillance equipment, recreation zones etc., which socio-spatially adjusts trans-border relations and thus adjusts and reconfirms a distinct scalar hierarchy. In this vein, from the perspective of such programs as INTERREG, border areas are seen not as closures, but rather as loci of intensified international cooperation, while borders themselves are consciously turned into instruments of European integration. Moreover, another more complex meaning suggests that the 'architecture of Europeanisation' is the built environment that merges with place-specific trans-border projects. Through this it becomes the locus of scalar shifts and struggles emerging from the changing border regime that challenges or complicates the existent scalar order. If borders are treated as institutions that make possible the scalar order of Europe, then the 'architecture of Europeanisation', as introduced here, indicates how Europe is socio-spatially negotiated and constructed on the urban scale.

Conclusion

The analysis of both the social meaning of the Old Town Bridge and the restructuring of the Neisse district in Zgorzelec shows that, in the case of the dynamic dispositions of border cities in the mosaic of socio-geographical scales, more theoretical attention should be paid to built environments as loci of the 'politics of scale' and scenes of the changing character of political borders. This perspective is to a significant extent

based on the understanding of the social production of space as the social production of geographical scales. As was argued with reference to the empirical material gathered as a result of qualitative interviews with actors involved in spatial planning and trans-border cooperation projects and fieldwork conducted in Goerlitz-Zgorzelec, built environments on internal EU borders, which significantly change their appearance and social meaning due to changing regimes of border functioning, can be conceptually constructed as the 'architecture of Europeanisation'. In a first sense, the 'architecture of Europeanisation' is the realisation of the economic and political goals of the EU by means of projecting a particular built environment. In a second sense, the 'architecture of Europeanisation' is the built environment, which becomes the locus of scalar shifts and struggles caused by the process of Europeanisation as a reshuffling of socio-geographic structuring in the stream of EU enlargement.

Works Cited

Appadurai, A. 1996. "Sovereignty without Territoriality: Notes for a Postnational Geography." In *The Geography of Identity,* edited by P. Yaeger, 40-58. Michigan.

Balibar, E. 2003. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton.

Bauer, P., and M. Darley, eds. 2007. *Borders of the European Union: Strategies of Crossing and Resistance*. Prague.

Berg, E., and P. Ehin. 2006. "What Kind of Border Regime is in the Making? Towards a Differentiated and Uneven Border Strategy." *Cooperation and Conflict* 4: 53-71.

Brenner, N. 2000a. "Building 'Euro-Regions': Locational Politics and the Political Geography of Neoliberalism in Post-Unification Germany." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 7, no. 4: 319-45.

———. 2000b. "The Urban Question as a Scale Question: Reflections on Henri Lefebvre, Urban Theory and the Politics of Scale." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24/2: 361-78.

———. 2001. "The Limits to Scale? Methodological Reflections on Scalar Structuration." *Progress in Human Geography* 25 no. 4: 591-614.

———. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford.

Donnan, H., and T. Wilson. 1999. *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State*. Oxford.

Friedland, R., and D. Boden. 1994. "An Introduction to Space, Time and Modernity." In *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity,* edited by R. Friedland and D. Boden, 1-60. Los Angeles.

Furmankiewicz, M. 2007. "International Co-operation of Polish Municipalities: Directions and Effects." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 98, no. 3: 349-59.

Harvey, D. 1989. "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism." *Human Geography* 71, no. 1: 3-17.

———. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change.* London.

———. 2006. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. Cambridge.

Kobrin, S. J. 1997. "The Architecture of Globalisation: State Sovereignty in a Networked Global Economy." In *Governments, Globalisation, and International Business*, edited by J. H. Dunning, 146-173. Oxford.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford.

Massey, D. 1993. "Politics and Space/Time." In *Place and the Politics of Identity,* edited by M. Keith and S. Pile, 141-161. London.

Perkmann, M. 2003. "Cross-Border Regions in Europe: Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Co-Operation." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10: 153-71.

Pred, A., and M. J. Watts. 1992. *Reworking Modernity: Capitalisms and Symbolic Discontent.* New Brunswick.

Sassen, S., ed. 2002. *Global Networks, Linked Cities*. New York.

Scott, A. J. 2005. *Regions and the World Economy: The Coming Shape of Global Production, Competition and Political Order*. Oxford.

Smith, M. P. 2001. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalisation*. Oxford.

Smith, N. 1982. "Gentrification and Uneven Development." *Economic Geography* 58, no. 2: 139-55.

Soja, E. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London.

Tsing, A. 2000. "The Global Situation." *Cultural Anthropology* 15, no. 3: 327-60.

Wilson, M. T., and D. Hastings, eds. 2005. *Culture and Power at the Edges of the State*. Münster.