

decrease in cohesion policy support. However, the total allocation for all CEECs, is still impressive – 172,7 billion euro in 2018 prices.

The Commission's proposal is not revolutionary. Most of the novelties in the package are linked to the simplification of implementation rules which is generally in line with CEECs' interests. The objectives of the policy are focused on smarter, greener, more connected, more social Europe which is closer to citizens. More emphasis will be put on innovation and climate objectives as well as ESF+ rather than traditional transport and environment sectors. This is not warmly welcomed by all CEECs who strive for more flexibility in programming, also in order to better capture the challenges for their metropolises and peripheries. Still long before the end of the programming process, my presentation will shed some light into the negotiation processes described above.

CHALLENGING CORE-PERIPHERY-RELATIONS FROM A CEE PERSPECTIVE

Thilo Lang, Leibniz-Institute For Regional Geography, Germany

In the past years, Central and Eastern Europe has been characterised by increasing socio-spatial polarisation at regional level. Empirical observations based on classic GDP and population data demonstrate pertinent North-South, East-West and Core-periphery disparities within the European Union with national level convergence of the CEE countries with the old member states. This “catching-up process” has been to the expense of furthering regional polarisation, however. The enduring de-coupling of a rising number of non-metropolitan regions in CEE (and beyond) has recently raised concerns that the European Union is unable to distribute wealth to all regions and turns into an elitist project unable to reach the majority of European residents. In this presentation, I suggest to understand the current shape of regional development in Central and Eastern Europe as the result of three interrelated processes: a strong core-periphery discourse favouring the large agglomerations and the ‘West’ over the ‘East’, a political over-emphasis on economic development particularly pushing metropolitan regions to global competitiveness, and the materiality of core-periphery dependencies furthering the peripheralisation of areas outside of the major agglomerations. The presentation concludes with some suggestions for alternative regional policies.

GOVERNANCE TURN AND TERRITORIAL POLARISATION IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Ilona Pálné Kovács, Centre for Regional Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary

It is widely agreed opinion that the quality of governance has crucial impact on the efficiency of development policy. Consequently it is not an accident that the EU cohesion reports are investigating the governance quality of the member states both at central and regional level. Unfortunately the CEE countries belong to the group of member states where the governance quality is far below the average and there are only few regional governments which were able to contribute to the catching up by better policy performance. Although the methodology of measuring governance quality requires likely further adjustments but we could accept the recognition that the governance performance is still one of the unexploited reserves of better cohesion policy.

The presentation deals with the institutional arrangement and actor relations of government systems in some CEE countries trying to provide evidence for the assumption that decentralised and open kind of territorial governance performs better and that the lack of political will and ability to share the power with the local and „horizontal” partners have led among other facts to the centralizing governance turn in the region. The author concludes that the new neo-

Weberian, centralised and populist regimes emerged in the region jeopardise the continuation of EU cohesion policy in the former manner or the two speed, asymmetric solutions will be used in the cohesion policy as well.

WHY DO INVESTORS CHOOSE CERTAIN CITIES AS INVESTMENT LOCATIONS ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE EU? EXAMPLE OF LUBLIN.

Mariusz Sagan, Lublin City Council, Poland

Lublin is one of the emerging metropolises on the outskirts of the European Union, often called the capital of Eastern Poland and its main economic, intellectual, academic and cultural centre. Despite its peripheral location close to the cut-off EU border of Ukraine, poor transport accessibility, being the centre of a backward region and the baggage of very strong, post-transformation turbulence, the city effectively attracts Polish and foreign investors. The aim of the paper is, on the one hand, to present the motives behind the business decision to invest in this part of Europe, along with the presentation of the stage process of selection of potential investment locations. On the other hand, the activities of the Lublin self-government will be indicated as part of the implementation of the local development policy, the aim of which is to attract investors. On this basis, conclusions will be drawn, based on the example of Lublin, to what extent location processes in peripheral areas are conditioned by natural processes (cost arbitration, communication accessibility, quality of business environment, pool of talents), and to what extent by strong involvement and determination of local government in acquiring new companies. To sum up, the city of Lublin, very affected by the transformation, located peripherally with limited transport accessibility, managed to break through the classical location barriers, mainly thanks to a wise and contextual economic policy, supported by creative bureaucracy and maximum use of network endogenous resources.

REGIONAL DYNAMICS AND STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Maciej Smetkowski, Centre for European Regional and Local Studies (EUROREG), University of Warsaw, Poland

Grzegorz Gorzelak, EUROREG, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Poland

Owing to their robust economic development during the decade preceding the financial crisis of 2008–09 (out of which only Poland emerged without an open recession) the CEEs have significantly closed the gap to the ‘old’ Member States (EU15). On the one hand, this was a result of a good global economic climate until the financial crisis of 2008, and on the other, a direct and indirect consequence of their accession to the EU. This trend was halted by the global economic crisis of 2008, which invites questions concerning the reactions of the regional structures of the analysed countries and the spatial effects of economic growth during the time of economic prosperity preceding the crisis.

The aim of this paper is to analyse the regional dynamics of the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries – EU(10). The chapter seeks answers to the following research questions: (a) Has the regional development of CEE countries been in line with J. Williamson’s hypothesis, which suggests that the relationship between the level of national development and the magnitude of regional differences resembles an inverted letter U? (b) What have been the main factors responsible for the changes in their spatial pattern? (c) How has the economic crisis affected the growth dynamics of these regions? Empirical studies focused on regional development patterns versus national income level change. The present growth processes were