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ABSTRACT

The terms ‘gateway’ and ‘corridor’ which originated in traditional geographical location and systems theory have long been regarded as valuable conceptual tools, especially in understanding the development of ‘New World’ urban systems and regional economies. But more recently, the terms have begun to be applied in new ways and in new situations. It seems that almost any major city anywhere can now be called a ‘global gateway’. A ‘transportation corridor’ can be a ‘gateway’ and an ‘urban corridor’ simultaneously, or the terms may refer simply to ICT infrastructures (see for example Van der Linden, 2005). So what are the conditions leading to changing interpretations of these once taken for granted terminologies and what are the implications for policy? This paper examines how the gateway and corridor concepts are currently being reinterpreted in the context of contemporary processes of globalization and the extent to which new theorisation is informing spatial policy in North West Europe.

INTRODUCTION: URBAN SYSTEMS, GATEWAYS AND CORRIDORS

Globalization, its implications for economic development and the policy challenges it poses have become major academic and political preoccupations at the start of the twenty first century. Although the terms gateway and corridor were introduced as specific theoretical concepts to describe the systematic ordering of urban places in the nineteenth century pre-globalization era, there has been a surprising recent resurgence in their use to inform present day post-industrial urban spatial formations. Both Massey (Massey et al, 1999) and Short (Short et al, 2000) have argued that there are many ways in which cities should be considered conduits of globalization. Short deliberately uses the term gateway in preference to that of ‘world city’ or ‘global city’, to shift attention away from the notion of cities as dominating to how cities are affected by globalization. The range of new interpretations indicates that close examination of the revived gateway city concept in recent academic debate, is needed.

The origin of the gateway concept in traditional urban location and systems theory is well documented. Burghardt (1971) for example explained how gateway cities have traditionally been seen in the literature as quite distinct from Christallerian ‘central places’, or ‘hubs’ due to their unique positional and
morphological characteristics, “an entrance into (and necessarily an exit out of some area)” ... “The entrance tends to be narrow and will probably be used by anyone wishing to enter or leave the tributary area “behind” [thus] the city is in charge of the connections between the tributary area and the outside world” (p.269). The economic power of older cities remains commonly associated with their historical siting at so-called ‘natural gateways’, harbours, fording points of rivers and so on, and the ability this has afforded them to control the movement of goods into and out of regional or national ‘hinterland’ markets.

Similarly, the movement of people and commodities along ‘natural trade routes’, or the corridors between gateways, has been seen to give pairs or chains of cities a unique locational advantage with respect to transport and wholesale functions and the power to regulate physical trade flows between them. Whebell’s (1969) thinking on the role of corridors in urban systems theory defined the term as a historically persistent “linear system of urban places together with the linking surface transport media” (p.1). In other words, a corridor is more than a bundle of transportation infrastructures; it is an urban economic phenomenon, which has relevance for regional policy.

Like the gateway concept, the corridor has been particularly associated with New World ‘frontier’ urban systems. In transport planning especially, the relationship between gateways and corridors has become a key focus of attention with the intensification of freight and passenger traffic flows in the latter half of the twentieth century. The proliferation of transport infrastructures and terminals requires long-term planning, major investment and the co-ordination of inter-modal transfers, essential to support urban and regional economic development.

But while the body of theory that gave rise to the gateway and corridor concepts prioritised locational factors, specificity of site and situation, as key determinants of trade relations and differential regional development, modern theorisations have emerged in response to the greater complexity of development processes associated with post-industrial urbanisation. Burghardt himself did not see the gateway model as static. His theorisation was intended as an explanation of a historical evolutionary development process and not an end point. The question therefore arises, how should these concepts inform policy and planning in the new globalization era?

UNDERSTANDING GLOBALIZATION: WORLD CITY NETWORK ANALYSIS

Predating the gateway and corridor literatures, Christaller’s ‘Central Place Theory’ of 1933, illustrates two features of urban theorisation that have continued to inform policy to the present day - a focus on local and hierarchical, urban-hinterland relations. But the development of a ‘world economy’ involving new forms of commercial production and trade - the shift from manufacturing to advanced knowledge-intensive services - has been accompanied by a major shift in urban theory. Amongst the many contributors to new broad ranging theoretical perspectives, Sassen’s (1991) ‘global city’ and Castells’ (1996) ‘network society’ hypotheses have been outstandingly influential.

Building on Friedmann’s (1986) notion of a ‘world city’ hierarchy in which London, New York and Tokyo are ‘global financial articulations’, followed by ‘multi-
national’ and ‘important national articulations’, Sassen (1991, 2001) first identified the importance of ‘advanced producer services' (APS) - or business service providers to other businesses such as financial services - in the creation of cities of global status with important ‘command and control’ functions. Their production has dispersed world-wide geographically to service multi-national companies (MNCS), while at the same time concentrating in key world trading centres defined as global cities.

Linking the major developments in information and communication technologies (ICTs) at the end of the twentieth century to network theory, Castells (1996, 2000) saw the rise of the ‘network organisation’ and the ‘informationalisation’ of the economy in globalization, as fundamentally changing the notion of the global city (Castells, 2000, pp.163-215). For Castells, commercial activity and trade in the ‘new economy’ take place in a ‘space of flows’ (p.429) that is detached from, and dominates, the territorial ‘space of places’ (pp.453-459).

Crucially, Castells’ work emphasises the importance of the external relations of cities (Allen, 1999, pp.109-202; Taylor, 2001a, b). But in spite of this major development in conceptual thinking, empirical data on inter-city relationships or spaces of flows, was absent until the Globalization and World Cities (GaWC) Study Group at Loughborough University pioneered the development of quantitative and qualitative methods to fill the void. Since 1997, under the direction of founder Peter J. Taylor the group has specialised in studying the relations between cities in globalization.

Unlike conventional urban studies that use comparative attribute data derived from official place-specific statistics, GaWC analysis focuses on the space of flows in inter-city networks by using primary relational data (Taylor, 1997, 2001a). The GaWC subjects of study are the world-wide organisational geographies of knowledge-intensive APS firms - banking / finance, law, management consultancy, insurance and so on - which construct complex relations between cities through the synonymous processes of world-wide dispersal and concentration identified by Sassen (Beaverstock et al, 2000). Analysis of large-scale data on firms' servicing strategies across the three dominant contemporary world economic regions of North America, Western Europe and Pacific Asia (Friedmann, 1986) allows the business ‘connectivity’ of individual cities to a ‘world city network' of service centres to be measured.

Informational flows and knowledge transfer between the city-based offices of transnational service firms construct invisible ‘interlinkages’ between cities in the post-industrial era. The presence of multiple such offices in any one city increases its nodal connectivity, and thus its interlinkages, to the world city network. Plotting the number of offices, their size, functions and importance within global service networks in GaWC analysis therefore reveals the highs and lows in the connectivity and linkages of any one city to all others and to sources of knowledge and innovation worldwide.

While a number of studies have attempted to capture information about inter-city flows such as air traffic and telecommunications, these do not inform our understanding of the service network relations that now increasingly define city economies, nor the processes giving rise to flows of people, skills, knowledge transfer and innovation between cities (Pain and Hall, 2008). For example, a recent large-scale study of multi-national enterprises (MNEs) by Alderson and Beckfield
(2004) focuses on the power that headquarter (HQ) functions confer on ‘world cities’ but does not tell us anything about the complex inter-city flows that are associated with knowledge-intensive APS networks (Taylor, 2004). Of particular relevance for the consideration of gateways and corridors, GaWC methodologies uniquely inform policy on the new geographies of globalization in which Christaller’s traditional urban ‘hinterlands’ that demarcate local economic relations, become what Taylor (2001a, 2004) has described as ‘hinterworlds’, as their economic zones of influence extend and overlap world-wide through borderless but invisible, knowledge-based trading (Taylor 1997, 2001b, Taylor and Walker, 2004).

Figure 1 depicts the inter-relations between the 123 cities of the world that are most connected globally through 100 advanced service networks that use them (18 in accountancy, 15 in advertising, 23 in banking/finance, 11 in insurance, 16 in law and 17 in management consultancy (Taylor and Walker 2004). All these cities have at least one fifth of ‘First global city’ London’s network connectivity. Toronto (0.50 - 0.59) is Canada’s most highly connected city, followed by Montreal (0.35 - 0.49), Calgary and Vancouver (0.20 - 0.34).

Figure 1 Global Connectivity (Source: Taylor et al. 2002)
The interlinkages between each of these four cities, and their interlinkages with the other 120 cities worldwide, could be computed using a GaWC analysis to map the new economy hinterworlds of the Canadian Gateway and Corridor, including their transnational and transcontinental linkages with major cities close by such as Hong Kong, Shanghai, New York and Washington. Figures 2 and 3 show the hinterworlds of London and the UK's second service city Manchester respectively, using 2004 data.

**Figure 2: London's Hinterworld** (Source: Taylor and Walker, 2004)
Manchester's hinterworld (Figure 3) shows the levels of service network provision it has for doing business in each of the other 122 world service cities. Of interest for new theorisation of Canada’s gateway and corridor relations, Manchester’s hinterworld reveals strong service linkages with Canadian as well as Australian cities, especially with Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver and also with Calgary, which may reflect their historic Commonwealth trading relationships (Taylor and Walker, 2004). In contrast, London appears under-linked to Canadian and Australian cities relative to Manchester (Figure 2), suggesting that similar historical links have now been overtaken by London’s recent development of strong world-wide service linkages.

**Figure 3: Manchester’s Hinterworld** (Source: Taylor and Walker, 2004)

For city codes, see Figure 1.

Interview analysis would shed light on the reasons behind the development of these different patterns of linkages. While quantitative analysis allows the world-wide connectivities produced by multi-nodal office network concentrations to be mapped schematically, the reasons underlying evolving urban hinterworld relations can only be known by undertaking qualitative research. GaWC face-to-face interview studies with the senior decision-makers of global APS firms and their industrial and professional organisations, investigate the organisational processes that underpin inter-office and inter-city relations. They reveal the complex
interrelationships within and between service networks and within and between the cities they operate in. Such in-depth investigation is vital to understand the emerging roles and functions of different cities in knowledge production, innovation and trading in world-wide service networks.

NETWORKS, FLOWS AND HIERARCHIES - SPATIAL PARADOXES

While new urban hinterworld relations seem at first sight to endorse nineteen eighties and nineties ‘end of geography' predictions (for example, Ohmae, 1991; Cairncross, 1995, 1997a, b) in that finance, skills and functions are mobile within networks, GaWC studies suggest that this understanding of contemporary spatial change is over-simplistic.

To an extent, location is becoming less important as individual cities can be by-passed through increasing network use of new communication technologies (Hoyler and Pain, 2002); labour and transport costs are also shown to have less relevance as business location determinants (Pain, 2007a). Nation state boundaries and systems of governance are thus apparently losing significance and being replaced by more diffuse territorial relations. Unsurprisingly, these changes are a cause of concern for countries and cities, which see themselves as economically threatened by shifting world geo-political relationships. But complementary quantitative and qualitative analyses of inter-city network relations indicate that their spatial outcomes are more complicated than a hierarchical zero-sum game.

Two basic spatial paradoxes can be identified from the application of GaWC analytical methods in recent empirical research, both of which have significant implications for policy.

Spaces of Flows and the Location of Production

First, there is substantial evidence that urban gateway hinterland-hinterworld relations are becoming more much more geographically complex with increasing connectivity of cities to worldwide advanced service networks. As cities increase their global connectivity, paradoxically, inter-urban economic interdependencies are found to be extending and intensifying whilst, at the same time, global functions are clustering and centralising. This confirms the co-existence of processes of concentration and dispersal of production as postulated by Sassen, but importantly, recent evidence suggests that these apparently contradictory processes now apply at multiple geographical scales (Pain, 2007a; 2008). Adding to Rodrigue et al’s (2006) observation that “the concentration of services in world cities is following a spatial trend which appears to be the opposite of production”, network concentration with extension seems to define the multi-scale geography of new (service) production. The traditional notion of a competitive hierarchy of urban centres (a feature also of Burghardt’s 1971, gateway model) thus becomes less relevant as globalization proceeds - business flows in networks create inter-city functional synergies and complementarities, depicted in the mapping of city hinterworlds, that can be exploited through policy.
Spaces of Flows and Infrastructures

A second paradox in the new geography of inter-city networks and flows is that there is evidence of established gateway and corridor roles becoming at once more detached from, and yet increasingly dependent on, physical infrastructures (the space of places) (Pain and Hall, 2006). This finding extends understanding of what Castells has identified as “a structural schizophrenia” between “two spatial logics” - of flows, and of places. Castells warns that “the dominant tendency is toward a horizon of networked, ahistorical space of flows, aiming at imposing its logic over scattered segmented places” (Castells, 2000, p.459). But recent research shows that as conduits of trade flows are dematerialising with informationalisation / virtualisation, physical flow infrastructures (transport hubs/gateways and corridors) are in fact also becoming more important. In competitive globalising markets, inter-city network flows are highly dynamic, thus flexibility and openness, both to virtual and material (physical) flows, is crucial. This has implications for transportation, regulation and cross-border co-operation, (as opposed to territorial competition), in policy.

As Taylor first claimed when reporting the results of his landmark (2001) GaWC world city network analysis, “The conclusion is that globalization does not herald the end of geography, it marks the development of exciting new geographies.” (Taylor, 2001b, p.51). These emergent new geographies, and their implications for spatial planning, are considered further with reference to recent empirical evidence from North West Europe by Pain (2007; 2008) but here we turn to consider to what extent the two aforementioned paradoxes that define spatial relations in globalization have been recognised in European policy.

APPLICATION OF THE GATEWAY AND CORRIDOR CONCEPTS IN EUROPEAN POLICY

Although the gateway and corridor concepts have been most strongly associated with New World urban systems, they have had a significant influence on current European Union (EU) policy which has actively promoted their use in strategic planning.

The goals of the EU spatial policy framework, the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) (EC, 1999), concern the three dimensions of ‘sustainable development’ - economic, social and environmental (see Blowers and Pain, 1999 for a full discussion of the concept of sustainable development in city planning). Strategy aims to promote economic competitiveness, social cohesion and environmental sustainability - key priorities of the EU ‘Lisbon’ and ‘Gothenburg’ Agendas (EC, 2000; 2001) - through the pursuit of spatial ‘polycentricity’ or the balanced spread of urban development. It is held that polycentricity at metropolitan and regional scales, within and between regions, across the EU territory, will support all three aims in unison. Demographic and economic concentration in EU national capitals and in the highly urbanised European ‘core’ or ‘Pentagon’ area (defined by the cities of London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg) is thus actively discouraged and the growth of alternative dynamic ‘global economic integration zones’ in ‘peripheral areas’ is boosted.
Gateways and corridors constitute key delivery vehicles to achieve this major spatial rebalancing.

The ESDP is a non-binding document but its use of the gateway and corridor concepts in support of polycentricity has a critical influence on regional development across the EU territory, which is supported by Structural Funds allocation. European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) also support cross-border cooperation to promote ESDP spatial priorities through a wide range of research (ESPON), ‘action’ and ‘investment projects’ (INTERREG). These have a strong emphasis on the ability of transportation infrastructures to promote morphologically balanced spatial development reflecting planning approaches that predate recent spatial theorisation. The gateway and corridor concepts feature strongly as spatial policy tools, but they lack theoretical definition and are less directly considered in terms of contemporary trading relations than were their earlier North American counterparts (Burghardt, 1971; Whebell, 1969).

“Gateway cities” are described as “large seaports, international airports, trade fair and exhibition cities and cultural centres” that provide access to the EU territory and also peripheral “metropolitan regions”, with advantages such as low labour costs or links with economic centres outside the EU, which are to be expanded (EC, 1999, pp.22-23). Elsewhere, “global gateways” are described as transportation hubs, specifically seaports and airports, which are to be well distributed, and links with their hinterlands increased, to provide more balanced access to intercontinental transport and service levels (p.27). “Corridors” are generally referred to in terms of transport infrastructures. “Congested corridors” are seen as reducing functional effectiveness within the EU core area. “Eurocorridors” with multimodal infrastructure (p.36), transnational cross border “development corridors” or “infrastructure networks” (p.70), and “Trans-European Networks” (TENs) (p.26), are to be promoted.

The companion document to the ESDP, the North West Metropolitan Area ‘Spatial Vision’ (NWMA 2000), sets the operational spatial planning objectives for the North West Europe ‘Central Zone’. Like the ESDP, the NWMA document is non-binding but it has a key influence on member state regional policy and investment strategy (Hall and Pain, 2006).

London and Paris are both referred to as “global cities/gateways” in a hierarchy of European cities (NWMA 2000), (Figure 4). Their global competitiveness is to be maintained, but their physical growth constrained, while their internal and external accessibility are increased. At the same time, development is to be promoted in other locations where “counterweight global gateways” outside the core have the potential to develop global command functions. Transportation infrastructures are prioritised as key delivery vehicles, with “transport axes” serving as “development corridors” (Nadin, 2002, p.34). Flows from London, Paris and the Pentagon to other regions of Europe are to be promoted through TENs (Trans-European Networks). In the UK, the Midlands and North of England are identified as counterweight global gateways (NWMA 2000, pp.30-33) and the Channel Tunnel Rail Link/M2-M20 and West Coast ‘Main Line’/M1-M6 as important “Eurocorridors”. The “corridors/transport axes” connecting Hull and Immingham with Rotterdam and Southampton with Le Havre are to be strengthened (NWMA 2000, pp.30-1) and London-Thames Gateway is identified as an important “bottleneck”. Completion of the high speed train (HST)
network is a priority to provide connections to other parts of Europe (NWMA 2000, p.29).

**Figure 4: The North West Europe Spatial Vision** (Source: European Council, 2000)

These priorities and concepts have been rigorously adopted in the UK Government’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (ODPM 2003a, b, 2004) and in regional policy. In The London Plan (Mayor of London, 2004) for example, London is described as a ‘world gateway city’, the London airports - Gatwick, Stansted and Heathrow and the Channel Tunnel are described as ‘external gateways’. Even the London-Stansted-Cambridge corridor and the Greater South East ‘mega-region’ are described as ‘gateways’ (p.15), (see also Thames Gateway RDA Economic Statement, 22 Nov 2006, p.3).
But the distinctions between corridors, urban areas and gateways are blurred in the two documents. Unlike Burghardt’s gateway definition, in which there is a clear distinction between ‘hub’ and ‘gateway’ cities, in EU spatial policy, ‘nodal’ cities such as London and Paris also have a ‘global gateway’ role. Similarly, there is no clear distinction between corridors and urban areas, yet there is an implicit understanding that urban gateways will not only be linked by new bundles of infrastructures but will be an integral part of proposed major Eurocorridors. Underpinning the lack of conceptual clarity, there is an underlying assumption that the development of new Eurocorridors will stimulate peripheral growth while, at the same time, enhancing Europe’s external competitiveness, however the specific link between economic development and major investment in physical infrastructures is not discussed or demonstrated.

While it is nowhere explicitly stated, and competition between cities and regions is firmly discouraged, the logic behind the ESDP/NWMA use of the gateway and corridor concepts implies a redistributive development scenario designed to combat perceived hierarchical spatial relations, that is supported by EU funding and Member State planning.

The overall schema has been highly influenced by the French EU presidency derived European ‘Social Model’ and the concept of ‘territorial cohesion’ which has a political-institutional as well as a social agenda (Faludi 2004; 2005). While spatial policy intentions to unify fractured development approaches across an expanding jigsaw of member state political boundaries can be seen as laudable - TENs/HST initiatives demonstrate the challenges posed by institutional fragmentation of Europe’s railway systems - there is growing practitioner scepticism about the application of its spatial concepts, polycentricity, gateways and corridors, in implementation. The concept of polycentricity has been criticised as normative (Taylor et al., 2003, p.73; Davoudi 2003 pp.991-995) and the value of applying the gateway and corridor concepts as policy tools is inadequately supported by substantive evidence.

Murtagh (2005) notes that “much of the rhetoric of the ESDP loses its meaning the further down the spatial scale we go” (p1). Citing the National Spatial Strategy for the Republic of Ireland, 2003, that bears “the ESDP imprint” (p.2), as an example, Murtagh refers to the application of the concept of a “linked gateway along a notional economic corridor” as holding,

“An important appeal for local politicians and business interests but it is not clear what is the nature, source and content of the ‘dynamic’ referred to in the NSS [, 2003]. Moreover, it is not obvious how these connections would be made in regional or local planning, through economic development strategies or in structural arrangements to develop cross-border administrative, civic or political cooperation” (pp.2-3).

Similarly Nadin (2002), who has undertaken extensive research on the application of the NWMA Spatial Vision across North West Europe, reports that the notion of the “counterweight global gateway” in particular is regarded by practitioners with “much scepticism” and can be seen as “perhaps a political slogan” (p.34). The findings from recent research, which has specifically investigated the phenomenon of polycentric development in eight major regions of North West Europe, endorse these doubts (Hall and Pain, 2006).
In summary, the conceptualisation of space in current European policy is thus founded on traditional land use planning approaches that seek to manipulate territorial economic, social and environmental relations using physical solutions. Physical solutions are immensely costly, take a long time to implement and run the risk of the rationale behind their development changing before their completion. Gateways and corridors are seen as mechanisms of change, capable of rebalancing existing development patterns in line with politically informed priorities. Although the Lisbon economic growth agenda seeks to improve EU competitiveness in the global knowledge economy, in practice the economic network relations of European cities, with each other, and with other cities world-wide, are not taken into account in the formulation of spatial policy. A (2005) review of the Spatial Vision has simply reiterated the previous (2000) focus on Europe’s hinterland relations (for example Duhr and Nadin 2005, p.49).

Recent research (Hall and Pain, 2006) endorses the importance of material, as well as virtual, flows associated with contemporary globalization in Europe (spatial paradox two), but these must be understood in the context of complex wider changes (see Pain, 2008, in this volume). An understanding of hinterland-hinterworld relations is therefore vital to inform spatial interrelationships between the economy, society, environment and policy for future gateway and corridor development.

GATEWAYS AND CORRIDORS, NEW ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

The interpretation of gateway and corridor roles in North West European spatial policy can be seen as essentially paradoxical. European global gateway cities and their external (international) corridors, are seen positively, as attracting flows into the EU knowledge economy while their specialist global function within Europe is interpreted negatively as reinforcing unequal, internal territorial relationships.

Referring to Andersson and Andersson’s (2000) Gateways to the Global Economy, Rossi and Taylor (2006, p.1) point to the contradictory perspectives on the relationship between gateway cities and uneven development in the recent academic literature. Urban corridors are similarly seen alternatively as promoting balanced development and, according to post-modernists, as self-perpetuating sites of economic power that contribute to uneven development. These opposite views with regard to gateway and corridor roles replicate positive and negative interpretations of the concept of globalization (Cochrane and Pain, 2000), but how accurately do such bi-polar views represent the geographies associated with global change at the start of the twenty first century?

GaWC empirical research demonstrates the significance of the rise of the global network organisation in the contemporary knowledge economy for Castells’ ‘space of places’. The activities of cross border APS networks are constructing multi-scale inter-city linkages which represent synergistic spatial relations (spatial paradox one). Figure 1 shows that the number of network nodes deriving global city connectivity through their linkages in the world city network, is much larger than suggested by earlier urban theorisation. The global role of new gateways which are emerging as a result of these processes, is increasingly constructing urban functional complementarities at sub-national scales.
Taylor et al (2002) identify two types of ‘new gateway’ in the world city network – those that are ‘highly connected’ and those that are ‘gateways to emerging markets’. This distinction is intended to make the point that gateway cities where global firms congregate are not always command and control centres. For example, Hong Kong ranks third in the world for the global connectivity conferred on it by the co-presence of multiple advanced service firms in spite of its lack of headquarter (HQ) functions.

The international culture of cities is a crucial contributor to their success as new economy gateways and Hong Kong has become an important international business cluster because of its enabling function in the world city network, bringing together specialist transnational skills and knowledge with expanding Asian markets (Taylor et al, 2002; Taylor 2005). Compared to other Chinese cities, Hong Kong has been open to foreign investment that has increased its connectivity to external business networks. The city’s dual positionality within a virtual space of network flows and the material space of places, illustrates the possibilities that are open to places apparently at risk of losing historic gateway and corridor roles founded on situational advantages.

In the case of Canada, Toronto is defined as the national ‘high connectivity gateway’ (with 0.50-0.59 of London’s global connectivity, Figure 1) where command and control functions are clustered, but this should not be seen as holding back the development of traditional and new Canadian gateways. Toronto’s global connectivity should facilitate rather than hinder, the development of other Canadian cities as gateways to emerging transnational markets.

As Taylor notes “Diasporic trade ... is a sure sign of city-ness” ... “Creators of net-work, foreign agents, convert initial entrepot (warehouse functions) into vibrant cosmopolitan cities by interlocking [them] into a network” (2005, p.4-5). Whereas Manchester’s hinterworld shows it to be under-linked to Pacific Asia (Figure 3), Canadian city hinterworlds should be strong in this respect, benefiting from their unique combined strong historic trading and cultural links both with the US and with Pacific Asia. As demonstrated by the case of Europe, quantitative and qualitative hinterworld analysis is essential to inform policy, planning and investment for gateway and corridor development in the globalization era.
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