DUTCH PLANNING EDUCATION: WHERE IT IS NOW, HOW IT GOT THERE, WHERE IT MUST GO NEXT

Barrie Needham

This paper was prepared for the founding conference of the Association of European Schools of Planning, held in Amsterdam, November 1987. It was to treat 'Dutch planning education: where it is now and how it got there'. Considering the current precarious state of Dutch planning education and the national review of it which is being made, a section was added 'Where it must go next'. Although that section is aimed at a Dutch audience it will also be interesting to others, as it poses questions relevant to planning education everywhere. The link between the first two sections and the last is provided by the section 'The vulnerability of Dutch planning education'.

1. Where it is now

a. The courses at present

In the Netherlands at the present time you can study planning as a self-contained full-time 4-year course at two universities - Nijmegen and the University of Amsterdam (not the same as the Free University of Amsterdam). The term self-contained refers to the fact that the course on its own leads to a university degree - you can start the course straight after school: the '4-years' refers to the shortest time within which the course can be completed, but most students take considerably longer.

At the University of Groningen you can study planning as a specialization during the last two years of a four-year course in human geography; at the University of Utrecht, planning can be studied as a specialization within human geography and as a minor subject for all faculties, but especially the faculties of law, social sciences and geography. At both universities, planning can also be followed as a subsidiary subject (several hundred hours of study).

A more technical, urban design, approach to planning can be studied at the technical universities of Delft and Eindhoven. At Delft, there are three specializations possible within building - architecture, urban design, housing: within urban design there is a more planning-oriented option. Students of civil engineering may also follow a course in planning. At Eindhoven, a short course in planning can be followed by students of architecture and 'urbanism'.

At the Agricultural University of Wageningen, students of landscape architecture and of agricultural sciences can, after their first year, follow courses in planning, but focussed on rural areas.

Finally, there should be mentioned the technical training offered by a few occupational training colleges (HBO's), in particular the 4-year full-time course at the Higher Technical College Utrecht and the more urban design-oriented course (likewise 4-years full-time) in Tilburg (Nationale Verkeers-akademie). At other HBO's and Schools of Building (Akademie van Bouw-kunst) you can study urban design from a technical, architectural, point of view.

We know how difficult it is to decide which 'planning-related' courses should be included in such a survey: there is no need to apologize, therefore, for saying that the above survey includes all the most important planning courses, but not all the courses that have something to do with planning.

b. The courses a few years ago (1980)

Dutch university education was re-organized recently and the full-time self-contained courses in planning have only been possible since 1982. Before then, a 'complete' course in planning could be taken as a sort of masters course (with a minimum length of 2½ years) following a 3-year course begun straight after school in human geography, sociology, political science, or psychology. Such a course was not self-contained but it built upon other courses. It was offered by two universities only, Nijmegen and the University of Amsterdam. It will be seen that those two 'masters' courses have been transformed into the only two self-contained courses.

The courses at the Technical University of Delft and at the Agricultural University of Wageningen were more or less the same as they are now.

The urban design course at the Technical University of Eindhoven was bigger a few years ago and there were more resources for giving it (the department - 'urbanism' - has now been closed).

At the Free University of Amsterdam, students of human geography and of sociology could follow a substantial specialization in planning: but that is no longer possible, the department and the chair having been abolished.

At the University of Brabant (Tilburg), students of sociology could follow a specialization in spatial planning: but there also the department and the chair have been removed, taking the course with them.

At the University of Groningen there was a department of planning and demography with its own chair, offering a substantial course in planning as a 'subsidiary subject'. The chair and department now have a slightly different task (planning and urban geography instead of planning and demography), but the course in planning has been maintained, even expanded.

At the University of Utrecht, there was a department of planning offering a two-year course in planning for students of geography and of social sciences. The department has been closed. The chair remains and has been included in a department of urban studies. The course has been reduced and is now mainly used as a specialization within geography.

It will be seen that most of the recent changes in Dutch planning education have been reductions, caused by the cutbacks in university-level education in general.

c. Student numbers

The number of courses on offer does not say everything about the extent of planning education. We want to know also how many students follow those courses. There is, however, little point in telling how many students take the subsidiary courses or the 'specializations' we shall restrict ourselves to the two "complete" courses, at Nijmegen and Amsterdam.

These two courses are about the same size. Nijmegen has tended to have a few more first-year students but rather fewer students in total. Recently, the two courses together have been attracting about 110 first years. Nijmegen has about 180 students on the "new" (i.e. self-contained) course plus another 60 not yet graduated from the "old" course; the corresponding numbers for Amsterdam are 240 and 90.

Comparison with the numbers on the "old" courses a few years ago would not say very much. It is more interesting to know that in the 25 years of its existence Nijmegen has "produced" more that 400 planning graduates, Amsterdam (equally old) more than 300.

The scale, nationally, is small.

d. The content of the courses

The courses can be divided, on the basis of their content, into four types:

- Those which teach "planology" (which term we shall translate provisionally as "spatial planning (broad)"; a fuller explanation follows shortly). In this category fall the social-science based courses (as they are usually called, to distinguish them from the technical, urban-design based, courses) at Nijmegen, Amsterdam, Groningen and Utrecht. Obviously the latter two, giving a subsidiary subject only, can go into far less depth than Nijmegen and Amsterdam.
- Those which teach urban design ("stedebouwkunde"). The two courses offered at the technical universities of Delft and Eindhoven fall into this category.
- The course in rural planning at the Agricultural University of Wageningen. Although this course is clearly specialist, its approach is nearer to the "planology" courses than to design courses.
- The technical courses at the occupational training colleges.

The rest of this paper will concentrate on the education in spatial planning (broad) i.e. planology, partly because this includes more staff and students than the education in urban design, partly because any contribution - nationally and internationally - to theory, practice and training in planning will have to come mainly from the spatial planning courses (broad).

A related point: we shall speak no more of "planning" unqualified. In Dutch this word refers always to the generic activity (e.g. the University of Nijmegen has a "planning department" for planning its education, research, administration, etc.). If the Dutch want to refer to "planning" with the meaning town and country planning, physical planning, environmental planning, etc., they use the term "ruimtelijke planning en ordening" to which they give a fairly precise meaning. It is this term which we translate as "spatial planning (broad)": other translations of the same term are "physical planning" and "environmental planning": most important is to know what the term refers to, and this will be explained below. (We do not apologize for this excursion into definitions and translations, as we cannot assume that the meaning given to 'planning' in 'planning education' is the same in all countries).

e. "Planology" and related concepts

In order to describe Dutch planning education in any but a superficial way it is necessary to explain what the Dutch mean by planology. Moreover, this and related concepts are interesting in themselves for they represent, in my opinion, a contribution of international interest to the theory of spatial planning (for a fuller account see Needham, 1988).

We begin with the idea of the spatial order, or lay-out, or configuration **de ruimtelijke orde.** This term contains three ideas:

- that of a material and a social component, influencing each other;
- that of pattern and structure brought about by regularities in the social component;
- that of the spatial configuration existing and changing independently of action by public authorities.

Now the term **ruimtelijke ordening** - the direct influencing by public authorities of the spatial order. What is involved is the preparation of regulations or ordinances and the taking of measures based on them, by which the public authorities have an immediate, or a direct, influence on the shaping of the spatial configuration: examples would include the imposing of building lines, prohibiting the building on certain types of land, preventing "bad neighbours" locating next to each other. Those regulations do not have the form of a spatial **plan:** that latter implies regulations specifically designed for certain geographical areas, also coherence between all the regulations for any one location within that area, also that the relationships between the regulations to be applied to one location and those to be applied to another have been thought out. There can be spatial ordering without a spatial plan.

There are different ways by which the spatial configuration can be regulated, that is by influencing directly:

- the design of individual buildings;
- the form of groups of building and spaces;
- the use of specific buildings or spaces;
- the generalized location of activities apart from spaces.

The term spatial ordering is applied to the third way ("land-use regulation"), sometimes to the fourth ("steering the location of activities") also.

The next term to be explained is **ruimtelijke planning** - spatial planning (narrow). Experience with the making and application of regulations which directly influence the spatial configuration led to the realization that such measures needed to be better prepared, so that the various measures applied to the same location would be consistent and mutually re-inforcing, also that the relations between the measures applied to different locations be better thought out. A spatial plan was needed to guide the taking of direct measures. Spatial planning (narrow) is then the systematic preparation for spatial ordering.

And so we come to the term which started this exposition - **planologie.** This is "scientific and methodological reflection on spatial ordering and planning, forming - on the basis of empirical research - descriptive, explanatory and normative theories" (SPAR 1972). The Dutch, it will be noted, are bolder that most other nationalities when it comes to spatial planning (broad): they claim to have a theory of it! It is planology which is taught in that part of Dutch planning education on which this paper concentrates.

One final point about the use of terms. It will be seen that the Dutch make a distinction between **ordering** and **planning,** whereby the latter refers to making plan or programmes of preparations to guide the ordering. In English, the term **planning** is used more broadly, to mean both sorts of activities. But as we want to maintain the distinction we introduce the following (admittedly cumbersome) terms (taking the idea from Kreukels - 1980, 54-7). Planning in the Dutch sense (to do with the making of plans) we call **planning (narrow):** planning in the English sense (= planning-narrow + ordering) we call **planning (broad).** When talking about Dutch planning education we refer always to spatial planning (broad). It should be added that the Dutch often use their term **planologie** in a looser sense than described above,

including within it not only the science but also the activities of planning (narrow) and ordering.

f. The division of labour

Although we are concentrating mainly on the planology-education, we have seen that it is one part only of Dutch planning education. And there has arisen a division of labour in the practice of spatial ordering and planning in which a place is accorded to "planologists" - but also to the graduates from other types of planning education.

The division of labour used to be as follows. People with an education in planology did the research necessary for preparing policy. When this policy took the form of a spatial plan, that latter was prepared not by "planologists" but by designers, either urban designers or landspace architects. The policy (in the form of a spatial plan or some other statement) had to be transformed into regulations by which the policy could be implemented (ordinance for the spatial ordering): this was the task of "policy officers", officials in what can be thought of as being the equivalent of the Town Clerk's Department, who then advised the politicians about making and taking regulations. And the actual implementation of the regulations (granting building licences etc.) was done by technicians.

The planologists were educated in planology (or in another social science with planology as a subsidiary subject or specialization) at a university, the designers were educated at a technical or agricultural university, the policy officers were educated (often in law) at a university or had an administrative qualification, the technicians received a vocational training at a college.

Van der Cammen (1979, 52-61) describes that phasing of work and division of responsibilities as research - design - policy (and we have added - implementation). He argues that the rise of process-planning has made the traditional division of responsibilities much less sharp. Nevertheless, the current provision of and philosophy behind education and training still bears deeply the imprint of those ideas.

2. How it got there

a. Planology is 25 years old

At the beginning of September 1962 the first professor of planology was appointed in the Netherlands, at the University of Amsterdam. That was just over 25 years ago (an anniversary which is not unconnected with the fact that the international conference for which this paper was prepared was held in Amsterdam!). Two months later, the second chair was created, in Nijmegen. Steigenga filled the post in Amsterdam until his death in 1974, and he was succeeded in 1977 by Faludi, who is still there. Wissink filled the post in Nijmegen, and fills it still. There are other professors who have been, and still are, connected with these courses, but it is to those three people whom we must look for an understanding of the development of planology over the last 25 years: the reason is that it belongs to the Dutch academic tradition that the "head professor" is responsible for the development of his or her discipline, and because these two universities have offered the only "complete" courses in that discipline of planology. (One unfortunate consequence is that it is difficult to be critical of planology in the Netherlands without implying criticism of those three people).

The developments leading up to 1962 we have not time to consider here, although they continue even today to exert a strong influence on education and practice (see the paper by Faludi in this issue). For a description

and analysis see de Ruijter and Gortworst (1981), de Ruijter (1983) and - in English - Faludi and de Ruijter (1985).

b. Continuity - or stagnation?

Two things struck me when I, who came to the Netherlands from England nearly 10 years ago, began to study what the Dutch meant by those terms "ruimtelijke orde", "ruimtelijke ordening", "ruimtelijke planning", "planologie".

One reaction was amazement and admiration. For I thought, and still think, that those concepts provide some of the building blocks for a theory of physical of spatial planning (broad): while I thought, and still think, that no-one else has created a satisfactory theory of that subject. The second reaction was amazement and disappointment. For in the last 25 years, hardly anything has been done with those concepts. Today they are used with almost the same meaning as 25 years ago. And I have found only one extended attempt to combine them into a theory - that was by Steigenga, see especially his book from 1964 - a theory which has led nowhere, has been quietly dropped, but not replaced. Those two reactions led me to write in 1982 (p. 133) "Planology is a meagre science". Fortunately, it has put on a little weight since then. Shortly we shall see how.

There have been two changes which could have stimulated the science of planology: but the effect of which so far has been small.

The first was the introduction, in 1982, of the self-contained courses in planology. Faludi (1982) had high hopes for this. But I see the changes which have come about with the transformation from a $2\frac{1}{2}$-year course (which built upon 3-years of study of another subject) to a 4-year self-contained course as "more of the same". The educational model for the two courses at Nijmegen and Amsterdam is: the students are taught the components, but they must put them together themselves. The components are grouped into three: object ("theories in planning", including planning for different sorts of sectors, such as housing, services, employment); theory ("theories of planning"); methods and techniques. The students integrate those in a fourth type of component - project work. The new courses are longer than the old ones, so more components are taught (in Nijmegen, project work has been expanded greatly). There must be no misunderstanding: we offer a good solid training in spatial planning (broad): the components are good and the whole is more than the sum of its parts. But the thread that should bind the components together, the common denominator of all the different types of spatial planning (broad) which are taught - the science of spatial planning (broad), no less - gets little explicit treatment.

The second change that must be mentioned is the occupation of the chair in Amsterdam by Faludi. His contribution to the methodology of planning (the decision-centred approach, attention to procedures, etc.) are known worldwide, and deservedly so. But until recently they have done little to advance the science of planology. The reason is that his work has been mainly on the generic activity of planning (narrow): it should be applicable to spatial planning and ordering, but equally applicable to educational policy, economic policy, social welfare policy, housing policy, etc. However, his latest publication (1987) has been directed to **environmental** planning specifically: and that changes the picture considerably.

c. Recent development in theory

Recently there have been some movements in that rather stagnant situation, movements which could fulfill the promise - inherent in the creation all

those years ago of the concepts spatial ordering, spatial planning (narrow), planology - of a theory of spatial planning (broad). And here the debt to Faludi and others for introducing ideas from public administration must be acknowledged: the recent developments of which we are talking use certain aspects of the decision-centred approach, integrating them with aspects of "object" theories, about how the spatial order comes about and changes.

We will mention two developments, one based largely in Nijmegen, the other around Faludi. They have in common the starting points:

- public planning is about public agencies taking and enacting decisions;
- two kinds of public decisions can be distinguished. One set of decisions interacts directly with private decision-making, so as to change the environment outside the public agency: the other sets the framework which the public agency needs for its interventionist measures. In the Dutch terminology, the first set of decisions relates to "ordering", the second to "planning" (narrow).

Interestingly, the two recent developments in theory about which we are talking complement each other, in that we in Nijmegen start from the "ordering"-side of planning (broad), Faludi on the "planning"-side of planning (broad).

In Nijmegen we are concentrating on what has been called the "action-oriented approach" (Wissink, 1986) and this focusses on the process by which:

- a public authority;
- aware of its entrepreneurial position in the market of decisions;
- aware also of how private decisions bring about the spatial order;
- knowing the instruments it has for influencing those private decisions and how those instruments work;
- trying to achieve a particular configuration of land uses and activities (a given spatial order) or particular changes in that;
- searches for and chooses the best measure or set of measures which;
- when implemented under the given circumstances;
- will act directly on those private decisions which give rise directly to the spatial order.

In Nijmegen we are interested primarily, it will be seen, in the **intervention**-end of spatial planning (broad) - in how public bodies can change, by direct actions, the physical environment (more broadly - the spatial configuration).

Faludi, in his latest book (1987, 140), makes very clearly the distinction between environmental **planning** (he means in the "narrow" sense) and environmental **intervention** ("ordering", in the Dutch sense): his interest is primarily in environmental planning (narrow) but - realizing correctly that this must be based on measures for environmental intervention - he devotes a chapter (chap. 10) to "Public environmental measures". Important for our argument here is that the book applies Faludi's ideas about a generic theory of planning (narrow) to the physical environment.

These two developments in theory we see as promising. Because they share some starting points, it might be possible to combine them to form one "unified theory" of spatial planning (broad). That would not be easy: but it should be a much more fruitful exercize than debating the presumed points of contact between "object theories" (about the physical environment) and theories of planning in general. We see the possibility of putting flesh on the bones of the "meagre science" of planology, after all those years. Let us hope that we are not too late, in view of the current precarious state of Dutch planning education.

3. The vulnerability of Dutch planning education

a. The crisis in Nijmegen

For four years now, the Minister of Education and Science has been trying to close down the planology course in Nijmegen. The course continues, but only conditionally and the number of "permanent" members of staff is being reduced by about a third. On top of that, the Faculty of Geography and Planning is being combined with the departments of Policy and Administrative Science and of Political Science to form a new faculty called Policy Sciences. The Department of Planology will not be able to offer all the components of a 4-year full-time course in planology: it will not have the capacity, and it is being required that courses be shared between departments with, for example, all students in the faculty taking the same (or versions of the same) first year. The crucial question for us in Nijmegen is: how, under those conditions, do we offer a course in planology in which the identity of that subject is emphasized and which provides a good training for practice?

b. The threat to Dutch planning education

The situation in Nijmegen should concern more than those working and studying there. Three of its wider implications will be mentioned:

- the planning course in Amsterdam is bigger and stronger than the one in Nijmegen: but if that latter disappears then Amsterdam will become more vulnerable;
- if the planning department in Nijmegen can lose a lot of its independence by being taken into in faculty of which it is but a small part, then the same can be done to the department in Amsterdam too. There in particular the question could easily be raised: should not planology be reabsorbed into its "mother discipline" of human geography?
- the problem with which we are faced in Nijmegen (how to offer a course in planology under much reduced circumstances) "concentrates the mind wonderfully". Some of the fruits of that concentrated mental effort we offer at the end of this paper, as being of more general interest and possibly applicable to planning education in other countries too.

There is no doubt that Dutch planning education is in a precarious situation nowadays. Faludi and de Ruijter (1985, 47) talk about the "incompleteness of the institutionalization of planning" in the Netherlands, one aspect of which concerns education and professional training. Neither of the terms "planoloog" and "stedebouwkundige" are registered professional titles: anyone who wishes may claim them (although a Bill has been drafted to register the latter title). Partly as a result, there is little correspondence between the training followed and the nature of the subsequent employment: graduates of planology take work in a wide variety of fields besides spatial planning (broad); work in spatial planning (broad) is done by a wide variety of people besides graduates of planology. And, obviously, the strength of education in planology to lay an exclusive claim to a particular sort of work is weakened whenever specifically planning education is reduced in size.

This precarious situation has led The Netherlands Association for Physical Planning and Housing (NIROV) to start an investigation into the "supply and demand with respect to education for spatial planning". We must welcome this initiative; but must at the same time warn against a numerical exercize, trying to balance supply and demand on the labour market (the type of manpower planning that was so misused in government policy for planning education in Britain). As explained above, the link between planning

education and employment in planning is too loose for such an exercize. More fruitful would be an investigation into the **type of skills** required in spatial planning and how the planning courses could train in those skills: we come back to this point later.

c. The contradictions in Dutch planning education

A university education in planning can have three functions:
- a very general contribution to culture and knowledge;
- it helps students in their general intellectual development;
- it contributes to better spatial planning (broad).

Here we restrict ourselves to this last function.

The next question is: what is the function of spatial planning (broad)? To this there can be only one answer: it must contribute, directly or indirectly, to a better "spatial configuration" (which includes, remember, not only the physical environment but also the spatial distribution of activities).

From the above we can deduce:

education in spatial planning (broad)

v

better spatial planning (broad)

v

better spatial configuration

And now the contradiction. We would defend against all-comers the statement that the spatial configuration in the Netherlands is excellent. The residential environment, most town and city centres, the villages, lines of communication - all these function well, provide a humane setting for daily life, and access to them is available fairly evenly to all people. Certainly in most international comparisons, the Netherlands wins in this respect. Second, we would defend also the statement that the quality of this spatial configuration is the direct result of public involvement - of spatial "ordering". With respect to the large-scale engineering works (water engineering, polders, etc.) this is immediately obvious: with respect to new housing areas, urban renewal schemes etc. it requires but a little empirical research to discover the crucial and constructive role of public agencies in the content and realization of such schemes.

The contradiction is then between:
- the spatial planning (broad) is so good;
- the education in spatial planning (broad) is socially so weak.

An explanation of this contradiction is to be found in the idea of the "incompleteness of the institutionalization of planning" (see above). What interests us here is the response of planning education to this situation.

d. The failure of Dutch planning education

One response could be: we will try to strengthen the **institutional** position of planning education within the field of spatial planning (broad). That would require recognition of the professional titles "planoloog" and "stedebouwkundige" and that certain functions could - legally - be performed only by those professionals. Dutch planning education has not tried to achieve that - and

wisely too, for that attempt would have received no support from other institutional aspects of spatial planning (broad) in the Netherlands, such as the absence of a planning department in many small municipalities, the strength of the social housing sector, the importance of the water engineers.

Another response could be: we will develop a body of planning thought (broad) and, based upon that, education in spatial planning (broad), of such a quality and relevance that we are willingly **granted** social recognition. Our graduates will be able to demand the key jobs in spatial planning (broad) because experience will show that our education equips them so well for those jobs that they can perform them better than graduates of human geography, or regional economics, or political science, or sociology, or anthropology, or civil engineering - that is, better than the graduates who now compete with planology-graduates for work in spatial planning (broad). (Obviously it is of interest to planning educators in other countries too that their courses be so good that their graduates can secure the key positions in spatial planning (broad). So the attempt in the last section of this paper to sketch out how Dutch planning education could be improved with that aim should interest a wider audience).

It is a failure of Dutch planning education that it has not responded in that second way. The theoretical work necessary to build up the coherent body of planning thought (broad) has been inadequate in the last 25 years (see the section "Continuity - or stagnation?"). And the interest in planning education itself has been weak, even among the teaching staff. Gortworst and de Ruijter (1981, 13) say, "Neither students nor staff (staff even less than students) developed an explicit vision of education and the relationship between education and practice".

In other words, Dutch planning education - in spite of having excellent building blocks for theoretical development, and in spite of the undisputed social importance accorded to spatial planning (broad) - has not been able to prove itself to society, to earn for itself a recognized and indispensable position in the huge and continuing operation of spatial planning (broad) in this country.

4. Where must it go next?

a. The requirements

At present the Netherlands has a "no-nonsense" government which finances the universities accordingly. A course has to prove its worth socially (measured by, among other things, a low unemployment rate for its graduates) if it is to be allowed to continue. So, education in spatial planning (broad) must make a claim to be able to make a specific and unique contribution to the practice of spatial planning (broad), a contribution moreover for which there is a market demand: and it must be able to make good that claim!

We have also a university tradition which lays great emphasis on academic standards and on the difference between an academic education and a professional training. So education in spatial planning (broad), if it is to continue within the university sector, must be based on a sound theory of spatial planning (narrow) and spatial "ordering" and on the relationship between the two.

These are the requirements. Neither is met adequately at present, we have argued. Both must be satisfied in any response which is chosen to meet the current threat to Dutch planning education.

For completeness, the question must be asked: must there be a response? What is the point of trying to save planning education from this

threat? Our answer is in line with the previous argument that the (main) function of education in spatial planning (broad) is to improve the practice of spatial planning (broad): we argue that a better planning education would lead to an (even) better spatial planning (broad). There must, therefore, be a positive response to the present situation. What should it be?

b. A separate science/theory of spatial planning

First there must be developed, and taught, a science/theory of spatial planning (broad) which is separate and has its own identity, in the sense that it is a distinct body of knowledge.

This theory must be more than human geography, or other disciplines which describe and analyse the physical environment and how it is used. If the theory of spatial planning (broad) goes no further than that, then education in spatial planning (broad) will - under pressure of the cuts in university funding - be absorbed into some larger department, probably human geography whence it came 25 years ago.

Equally, the theory must be more than administrative or policy science. If planning education should move in that direction, then the result would be, again, absorption. For example, if we in Nijmegen had put the stress on administrative or policy science then, with the formation of a new Faculty of Policy Science, there would have been no point in incorporating into it the existing Department of Planology: the existing administrative and policy scientists would have claimed the course - and, thus, the students and associated finances.

And the theory must be more than a non-commital combination of "object" theories and theories of planning in general. It must be, in chemical terms, a **compound**, not a **mixture**. There must be an explicit fusion which produces a theory which could not have been deduced from the separate parts.

c. "Mould" and "core" models for planning education

Earlier we described the existing courses in Nijmegen and Amsterdam as consisting of "components" which the students must follow and the integration of which is largely left to the students themselves. Let us call this the "mould model" for a course. The students are provided with the components and the requirement to study for so many hundred hours (the mould): when the components are poured into the mould, you discover that a new object (a trained "planoloog") has been produced.

Our criticisms of this mould model are:

- it does not require a separate theory of spatial planning (broad), so the development of one is not stimulated;
- it is largely left to the student him/herself to discover what there is in common between the courses he/she follows on - e.g. -regional planning, housing policy, urban renewal, planning for commercial services, rural planning, etc.;
- when somebody applies for a job in - say - urban renewal it is not apparent to the employer if there is any difference between the graduate who has studied human geography with urban renewal as a subsidiary subject and the graduate who has studied planology via courses in urban renewal plus housing plus regional planning plus etc. It might not even be apparent to the graduates themselves;
- very practically, such a model would be impossible (or counter-productive) in Nijmegen, when we have to make good our claim to be able to provide an education in spatial planning (broad): with a staff of 8.6

people we cannot provide all the components to pour into the mould. And if we ask other departments to provide some of them, are those other departments going to want to determine the shape of the mould also? They will, in any case, want to know how we see the relationship between the components we provide and the components they provide.

It is for those reasons that we argue for a "core model" for planning education. This would have the following characteristics:

- the starting point is an activity which we have call **spatial planning (broad).** The claim is made that this activity is common to all the separate activities whereby public agencies try to shape and change the "spatial configuration" of society - such as urban renewal, shopping policy, housing policy, etc. - and that it is that which distinguishes all of them from other activities;
- the claim is made further that it is possible to develop a separate theory of spatial planning (broad), in the sense used above, and to teach it, and to apply it in practice. One corollary is that someone practising - say - urban renewal would do that better for having studied the theory of spatial planning (broad) than someone who did not have that knowledge;
- a course in the theory of spatial planning (broad) would be the core of education in spatial planning (planology). All students would have to follow that core. They would in addition have to follow other courses which would gain significance by being explicitly related to the theory of spatial planning (broad). There could be choice between those subsidiary subjects;
- insofar as the education in spatial planning (broad) is partly provided by other departments than "planology", that latter department would have sole responsibility for the core course.

d. The content of the core

Finally, in order to make this proposal more concrete, let us sketch out what should be taught in this core:

- the theory of spatial planning (broad) "sec". It will be apparent, from what we have said above, that this theory would include (and combine) both theories of spatial planning (narrow) and theories of spatial "intervention";
- a critical description of the legislation and institutions for spatial planning (broad) in The Netherlands ("statutory town and country planning"), with some attention paid to the situation in one or two other countries (to put the Dutch situation in perspective, also to emphasize that the theory of spatial planning (broad) should be applicable to more than the one country);
- a critical analysis of many examples of planning practice, in order to study the thinking behind the plans (why were those measures chosen in order to tackle those problems?) and the use that was made of the institutions and legislation;
- planning history. We would include in this very few slides of ancient Greek settlements, medieval town centres and British colonial settlements in North America! Rather students would study why public authorities have wanted to intervene in the "spatial configuration", what means were created to enable them to do this, the thinking that lay behind the choice of measures for intervention, and how the experience with all that was evaluated and led to changes in thinking, in practice, and in institutions.

Finally, all students following the core course would be required to do one or

two projects in which the theory and knowledge specified above would be applied to a real situation and where the student would have to make specific and concrete proposals for public action, including the relevant legislation and the institutional aspects. We would, however, make no fetish of project work, and we suggest that most of the core could best be learned by a combination of lectures, reading, and writing.

References

Cammen, H. van der (1979)
De binnenkant van de planologie, Coutinho, Muiderberg.

Faludi, A., P. de Ruijter (1985)
No match for the present crisis, in **Public planning in the Netherlands,** ed. A.K. Dutt, F.J. Costa, O.U.P., New York.

Faludi, A. (1987)
A decision-centred view of environmental planning, Pergamon, Oxford.

Gortworst H., P. de Ruijter (1981)
Onderwijs voor ruimtelijke planning in Nederland, werkstuk 41, het P.D.I., U.v.A., Amsterdam.

Kreukels, A.M.J. (1980)
Planning en planningsproces, Vuga, 's-Gravenhage.

Needham, B. (1982)
Choosing the right policy instruments, Gower, Aldershot.

Needham, B. (1988)
Continuity and change in Dutch planning theory, **Netherlands Journal of Housing and Environmental Research,** 3-1.

Ruijter, P. de (1983)
Stedebouw-onderwijs 1900-1945, werkgroep PSVA, het N.I.R.O.V., 's-Gravenhage.

SPAR (Sectie Planologie en Stedebouwkunde i.o.) (1977)
Advies inzake de taakverdeling bij het wetenschappelijk onderwijs in de planologie.

Steigenga W. (1964)
Moderne planologie, Aula-boeken, Utrecht.

Wissink, G.A. (1986)
Handelen en ruimte: een beschouwing over de kern van de planologie, **Stedebouw en Volkshuisvesting,** 67-5, 192-4.