

# Introduction

---

Since the turn of the millennium, the debate in the field of transport policy has been increasingly shaped by the guiding principle of an integrated approach to transport policy. This new strategy in transport policy is now being pursued by social actors from business, academia and society in equal measure, so that it is possible to speak of a broad social consensus regarding the guiding principle of an integrated approach to transport policy.

Whereas previously debates concerning the ‘turnaround in transport’ (*Verkehrswende*) were dominated by the strategy of ‘avoiding traffic’ or avoiding growth in traffic volume, today the unanimously favoured integration strategy is focused on the goal of increasing the efficiency of the transportation system. While the strategy of traffic avoidance, with demands that stood in opposition to widespread mobility behaviour, inevitably triggered conflicts of interest, the guiding principle of an integrated approach to transport policy relies on the harmonious reconciliation of the interests of all participants, with the overall goal of sustainable transport development. There are five interlocking approaches to integration: first, social integration is meant to be ensured through the participation of the social actors affected by transport policy measures; second, technical integration is sought through the linking of the different modes of transport; third, political integration is to be achieved through inter-ministerial cooperation, for example between the portfolios of urban and transport planning; fourth, ecological integration aims to achieve the systematic consideration of environmental impacts; fifth, and lastly, the pursuit of economic integration, brokered

by the market. The bundling of all five integration strategies is intended to contribute to a holistic and thus more effective transport policy. The goal is a transportation system that ensures economically efficient, socially acceptable, environmentally friendly and thus sustainable transport development (cf. BMVBW 2000: 11).

The real transport development, however, stands in peculiar contrast to an integrated transport policy that has been pursued for more than ten years. The social actors, the individual modes of transportation, and not least of all the relevant ministries still seem to be far removed from a practice directed at integration and, for the most part, continue to follow their own individual, organisational or systemic logic. It is therefore hardly surprising that the goal of sustainable transport development pursued by integrated transport policy has not been achieved to date. Thus, the shift from so-called motorised individual transport (MIV) to public transport (ÖV), which has been demanded for decades, has not taken place. Instead, the number of registrations of private vehicles continues to increase, with cars also becoming larger, heavier and thus more energy-intensive (cf. DIW 2014). Accordingly, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions also continue to rise (cf. UBA 2017). In view of the discrepancy between the aspirations and the reality of transport policy, the question arises as to the reasons for this unsatisfactory situation. How is it that a guiding principle that is socially widely accepted remains so ineffective?

In order to approach these questions, the *first* chapter begins with a political-economic contextualisation of transport, examining the significance of transport within the framework of capitalist socialisation.

The *second* chapter begins by discussing the function of social discourses and models. It is shown that they possess an independent significance alongside traditional explanatory variables such as political interests and social institutions. Following that, the establishment of the hegemonic discourse of integrated transport policy is retraced. On the one hand, it becomes clear that the guiding principle of integrated transport policy is by no means as new as it is often portrayed. Rather, it is part of a long historical tradition in the course of which the model has experienced a repeated renaissance without ever being implemented. Against the background of this “genealogy of failure”, and in view of the current

discourse, the even more pressing question arises concerning the underlying causes. Furthermore, the strategic reorientation in the transport sector since the 1980s, from avoiding traffic to an integrative approach reveals a general paradigm shift in the discourse of sustainability. Whereas in the past the natural “limits to growth” were taken as a given, today the aim is a productive “growth of limits”. The original sustainability strategy with the goal of reduced economic growth for the purpose of conserving natural resources has been replaced by the conviction that sustainability can be achieved through economic growth. Lastly, we show that the hegemonic discourse is in itself by no means coherent. Rather, it reveals a struggle for control over the power of social interpretation.

Following the discourse analysis, the *third* chapter presents an actor-centred analysis of the field of transport policy. Using the practical implementation of the Federal Transport Infrastructure Plan as an example, the statements on the objectives of integrated transport policy are first contrasted with actual developments. This reveals structural blockades which today continue to hinder even innovative concepts. Following this insight, we turn our attention to the institutionalised interests in the transport sector. Within the framework of a policy analysis, the actors in the field of transport policy are divided into five types. Measured against the guiding principle of integrated transport policy, one can distinguish a social, a technical, a political, an ecological and an economic integration strategy. These five ideal-typical strategies for action constitute central lines of conflict in the field of transport policy, although the field is dominated by the economic strategy of market integration. The results of the analysis are then recapitulated and the social function of the model of integrated transport policy is defined in more detail. Two levels can be distinguished: on the one hand, there is the formal level of the fuzzy model, which can be used by everyone due to its fundamental openness and indeterminacy, which explains its particular attractiveness. On the other hand, there is a substantial level of the guiding principle, where actors articulate their specific interests without reference to those of other actors. By bundling divergent interests in this way and aligning them with a supposedly common strategy, the guiding princi-

ple of integrated transport policy conceals conflicting interests and thus shuts down the necessary political debate about the appropriate strategy in transport policy. The discrepancy between the claims and reality of the model of an integrated transport policy is thus explained by its ideological function.

In the *fourth* chapter, using selected examples, the social consequences of German transport policy outlined above are presented in the context of the multi-tiered political system. To this end, to begin with, the national development of freight transport is examined, using the example of Deutsche Post AG. On the level of the Federal states, the results of joint regional planning in Berlin-Brandenburg are examined. At the local level, the projects financed by the Federal government within the framework of the research initiative “Mobility in Urban Areas” are examined with regard to their effects on transport. In each of these cases, an integrated transport policy with the goal of sustainable transport development was invoked at the outset. The contrast between aspiration and reality provides clues as to what causes the programmatic concepts to repeatedly fail the test of reality. A general problem seems to be that the existing, sometimes serious conflicts of interest are no longer thematised in the context of an integrated, consensus-oriented transport policy, which prevents a public debate about the different objectives. Behind the publicly staged consensus, however, the more powerful representatives of the different interests assert themselves. In light of this, the reality-aptitude of consensus-oriented transport policy has to be scrutinised. Lastly, European transport policy is discussed at the supranational level, which is becoming increasingly important for national transport policy. After an overview of the period from 1990 to the present day, the development of European freight transport, which has become a particularly pressing problem in recent years, especially due to the enlargement of the EU, is retraced by way of example.

The concluding *fifth* chapter follows on from the first and explores the question of how sustainable transport development can be shaped politically under the conditions of capitalist socialisation.