



Impression of the new Central Station The Hague

# PART 3

# Singapore: a model for the Deltametropolis?

The Deltametropolis is the western and central area of the Netherlands which most people call the Randstad. This is where the estuaries of the Rhine and the Maas flow into the North Sea and form a delta which, over the centuries, has become the heart of the Netherlands. Around 6.5 million people (40% of the total population of the Netherlands) live in an area covering 4,900 km<sup>2</sup>. In European terms, this is a densely populated area. However, if we compare the Deltametropolis with Singapore (where 4.3 million people live on an island with an area of only 637 km<sup>2</sup>), we see that Singapore is five times as densely populated.

41

The Deltametropolis includes – in part or in whole – four provinces and 180 municipalities, the largest of which are Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. These average-sized cities (population between 250,000 and 800,000) are located at some distance from each other. Administrative fragmentation is a key feature in the Netherlands. Together with the widespread consultative culture in the Netherlands and the many appeal procedures against government decisions, decision-making can become a lengthy process at all administrative levels. A great deal of patience is required for the implementation of major projects. The political culture in the Netherlands is characterised by the desire to achieve consensus among as many parties as possible (even small ones). Compromise is therefore a high priority in this country. The sober culture of the Dutch is also reflected in their critical attitude to big projects. A good price-quality ratio is something to be proud of; over-indulgence is something to avoid. In the Netherlands you will never find buildings like the National Library or the Opera in Paris. Plans for skyscrapers and other forms of high-rise living are difficult to put into practice. This is partly due to the fact that the luxury flats with a wide range of facilities, which are common in large cities elsewhere, are very rare here. The result is that the Deltametropolis is becoming an urban park city, with limited support for fast and frequent public transport due to the relatively low population density (at least

for a metropolis). There is only a limited underground rail service in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, and plans for a circle line in the Deltametropolis fail to get off the drawing board. The development of a metropolis therefore becomes a lengthy process, during which municipalities and provinces fight tooth and nail to defend their authority. Many people hate the idea of administrative reorganisation.

## COMPARED TO SINGAPORE

The Fifth Policy Document on Spatial Planning (the Netherlands has a planning tradition) will be rewritten by a new cabinet, which will be chosen in January 2003. The Deltametropolis will continue to be part of the plans, although no-one yet knows in what form. Most projects which are vital for the development of a metropolis, such as the circle line linking the major cities, have all been scrapped. In 2006, the HST line, which will run from Amsterdam to Paris, will be the only modern high speed line in the Netherlands. By contrast with Singapore, more investments will be made in automobility in the coming years.

It may be concluded that there are few similarities between the Deltametropolis and Singapore, as is shown in the following comparison.

	Deltametropolis	Singapore
Area	4900 km <sup>2</sup>	637 km <sup>2</sup>
Population	6.5 million	4.3 million
Population growth	0.6%	3.5%
	Growth due to migration and ageing	Growth due to natural increase in population Balanced population profile
Characteristic	Collection of cities and provinces	City state
Average annual economic growth	2%	6%
Economy	Knowledge economy and trade	Growing knowledge economy but strong emphasis on trade and industry

## WHAT DOES A 'DELTAMETROPOLIS' MEAN IN DUTCH TERMS?

If the Netherlands wishes to remain competitive in an international context and particularly at the European level, an integral approach towards urbanisation and the development of the metropolis for the western area of the Netherlands is essential. In addition, the current prognosis is that the Dutch population will increase by around 2 million people by 2030, and it is clear that half of these will have to be housed in the Randstad conurbation. This means that, in the future, the population of the Deltametropolis will rise to around 7.5 million.

Administrative reorganisation will be essential and a number of committees have

already looked at this challenge. At the same time there is a general feeling that the government must remain in touch with the people and that increases in scale are not desirable. In this respect, the discussion about the merger of the provinces of North and South Holland has gone furthest.

Assuming a daily urban system, the most obvious solution might be a division of the Deltametropolis into four departments: a northern department (Haarlem-Amsterdam-Almere), an eastern department (Utrecht-Hilversum-Amersfoort), a southern department (Rotterdam-Dordrecht-Gouda) and a western department (The Hague-Leiden-Zoetermeer-Delft). In the most western part of the Deltametropolis, this would involve the merging of Haaglanden and the region around Leiden. A cohesive policy at department level could be implemented for the population of approximately 1.5 million, covering the areas of the economy, infrastructure, living, restructuring, welfare, education, culture and the environment. In order to ensure fast public transport on the scale of the Randstad, it will probably be desirable to set up a separate transport authority. As yet, there is no support for this proposal and there is every chance (certainly in the short term) that such support will not be obtained. However, it is interesting to note that, in October 2001, the Council of the Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and Environment (VROM-raad) had already made some recommendations in this direction and international developments (European integration, globalisation) are also creating the conditions for reform.

In all the discussions about administrative reform, democratic legitimacy remains a priority. On the road to a Deltametropolis, politicians as well as citizens and the civic society will all have to participate actively. This is also the approach taken by the Deltametropolis Association. Better administrative collaboration is planned with the Joint Scheme for Randstad Collaboration (Gemeenschappelijke Regeling Randstad-samenwerking) approved in September 2002, in which the twelve Randstad authorities participate. It is to be hoped that these two different organisations will help the Deltametropolis to overcome the impasse. Because the need is great.



# Copy-cat confusion

Suppose we were not in the business of urban planning and development. And we were confronted with the question “what might the Singapore experience mean for the Randstad, the urban conglomeration of the Western Netherlands?”

Like any self-respecting person with modern information facilities, we would access the World Wide Web and “google” – or use some other kind of advanced search engine – to find some clues to an answer.

## THE RANDSTAD ON THE WORLD-WIDE-WEB

And sure enough, after Singapore Airlines, the second and third hit leads us to Singapore’s Online Government Portal and Singapore’s Infomap: the national website. The second of the two is particularly impressive, providing an abundance of information on the city: its global position, its climate and country profile, its inhabitants, business, economy and traffic, its social life, government structure, strategies and so on, all with nice pictures, video clips and informative written documentation. Singapore presents itself as a genuine global player: well designed, well maintained and efficiently run. Like a business on the national scale.

By contrast, it would seem that the Randstad does not exist! It took me 25 hits to find something on “Keep the northern part of the Randstad accessible” (in Dutch), some 36 to find a site on urbanisation in the Randstad (with only very general information) and some 40 to find a site on “Mastering the city”, where the Randstad figures alongside Berlin, Paris and the Ruhr Area. There is no site which officially presents the Randstad on the Web.

Of course, one could carry on “googling”, but that is where I stopped. The Randstad, as we are discussing it, is not really present on the World Wide Web! For the majority of ordinary people, the term seems to refer to a Dutch employment agency. For others, it may be a school, a diving or hockey club or a database for motorcars. Only a few will make the link with urbanisation issues or megalopolitan developments. And the

few that do will in all probability belong to that rather small world of planners, urban analysts and politicians with an interest in the field.

Cross-checks – New York, Los Angeles, Paris, Berlin, Delhi, Mumbai, Tokyo, Shanghai, Mexico City – all resulted in first hits or hits within the top 10. Cross-checking for Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht had the same result! But, again, the Randstad does not seem to exist. These cities – which policy sees as the most important constituent nodes of the Randstad – apparently do not see any advantage in explicitly presenting themselves as part of that overarching urban conglomeration of medium-sized and small cities we call the Randstad, or in genuinely building on the advantages of such a position.

## **POLYCENTRICISM**

And that is strange. Planners and politicians have been talking about the Randstad ever since the 1940s, when the term was first used to refer to the cities of Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht as part of an ‘urban rim’ around a ‘green heart’. That combination of Randstad and Green Heart has figured in policy documents and policy debate ever since. As early as the 1960s, for example in the Policy Document on Spatial Planning (1966), there was talk of an ‘E-level’ of urbanisation – the level of world cities – which was presented as a possible future for that network of cities. And when, in our globalised economy, the discussion focuses on the different benefits of locations in European metropolitan areas for multi-national business, the Randstad as an entity figures directly next to, and is compared with, London, Paris, Berlin, and Milan. Only recently, at the European level of policy development, when the European Spatial Development Perspective was on the agenda, the Randstad was presented as one of the carriers of ‘the pentagon’, the term coined by Germany to designate the core area of European spatial-economic development. That same Randstad has also been described as one of the best examples of polycentric urban development in network-like conglomerations of medium-sized cities and that same ‘polycentricism’ is now accepted as the ‘best’ overall European urbanisation strategy by the vast majority of European planners and politicians. This is not surprising, of course, since this model of polycentrism fits in quite well with the historical development of urban settlement in Europe (e.g. northern Italy, central and north-western Europe). In addition, Europe under the auspices of the EU has to mediate between core economic area developments and safeguard the even – some would say ‘egalitarian’ – and more or less equal economic development of its member states (including compensation for uneven development).

But perhaps, on second thoughts, it is not so strange that the Randstad is not prominently present on the World Wide Web – precisely because of its polycentric urban network structure. The backbone of this model is the idea of the complementarity of, in principle, independent cities. The contribution of each of these cities to the network as a whole is based on the specific characteristics and qualities of each. Typically, polycentric urban networks are examples of co- and multi-level governance. The overall course of development is therefore the sum total of the activities of each of the cities involved, whether or not these result from some kind of common strategy (preferably, of course, they should!). No single partner is in overall control and there is no fixed hierarchy in terms of power relations, even if the formal governmental hierarchy is present in the background. Governing urban networks is a matter of developing mutual inter-

dependences, a matter of creating and maintaining a negotiated order, creating as many win-win situations for those involved as possible, public and private partners alike. Urban networks then – and therefore the Randstad as well – exist by virtue of a shared network identity and accepted complementarity as a general frame of reference, by virtue of the individual developments in each of the constituent parts and by virtue of some loose kind of coordination with respect to the overall strategy. Faludi, in trying to coin this combination of “virtues”, speaks of the existence of a planning doctrine.

## **THE RANDSTAD: A GLOBAL PLAYER?**

It is for this reason that – in all our research, our statistical ‘evidence’ and policies – we can still refer to the Randstad as the conceptualisation of that western part of the Netherlands where most of our economic activities take place, where most Dutch people live and which, on a global and European scale, can be presented as a coherent network and a competitor to other metropolitan areas in the spatial-economic sense. And all this without any strict top-down, overall, integrated and hierarchical strategy or detailed forward planning. These kinds of planning do of course exist for specific fields of policy such as housing, infrastructure and the like, but the co- and multi-level governance setting means that they are more often than not challenged and subject to all kinds of negotiations and adaptations.

However tempting and impressive the Singapore case might be for planners and politicians who want to promote the Randstad as a global player, this Singapore case has therefore only minor significance for the future development of the Randstad. A copy-cat approach can only lead to disaster. That does not necessarily apply to specific elements of the Singapore strategy, whether relating to traffic control, environmental issues, housing or to the range of social programmes, public-private partnerships, linkages or urban design. Studying these elements can be very worthwhile. They are all of interest in themselves! We can learn from them and perhaps work out under what conditions and with what kind of adaptations these would be applicable to the Dutch case.

47

But it is not these specific strategy components that make the Singapore case so impressive. In varying degrees, they can be found in other parts of the world. What makes the Singapore case so impressive is the combination of all those components in a single, coherent, overall strategy, backed by a strong central government, with enough power even to control final implementation and maintain its strategy over a longer period of time. Central control, centralised power and continuity are its strengths. And these are absent from in the Dutch case and, indeed, they would not be appropriate for the Dutch situation (or many other situations in this part of the world). All past attempts to develop something more than a loosely-organised kind of coordination on the level of the Randstad, a kind of co- and multi-level governance, have failed. In the present political circumstances, they will undoubtedly continue to fail. They are not appropriate for the European democracies or the European approach to urban development. As soon as Google produces a first hit or a top-10 hit for the Randstad, presented as an urban entity, a metropolis and a global player on its own merit, and explicit references to that metropolis and all its advantages on the sites of Amsterdam, Rotterdam or any other city in this urban network, it will be time to return to the issue. But for now, a copy-cat approach can only lead to confusion.



48



# How desirable is a fully planned metropolitan system?

Anybody in Europe who wants to copy the success of Singapore must realise that Singapore itself is a copy of the London metropolis of the nineteenth century. Its 'creator', Mister Lee Kwan Yew, was imbued with Victorian ideas and principles from his Oxford study years. He transposed these values to an Asian society which, after 1965, had to be built up rapidly and under high social pressure. Singapore is Victorian in its cult of moral values, its obsession with cleanliness, its abhorrence of the undeserving poor, its belief in education and in the natural superiority of the highly educated. The twist added by Lee Kwan Yew was only a high-tech one.

In fact, Singapore became the Asian variant of the British welfare state, centred around public housing and social services. The State is exceptionally powerful, with systematic state intervention in the economy through a well-trained, well-paid, usually clean, state technocracy. That State power is also manifest in the physical sphere and, here also, there are clear parallels with the British situation. The emphasis on public transport, the phenomenon of the public housing estates and the successful introduction of new towns are all British ideas which found their way easily to the island on the Malayan coast. The fact that the model migrated so smoothly can be explained by referring to Singapore's need for a solution to major ethnic tensions and, of course, the pressure on the small island to use its restricted space as efficiently as possible for an increasing population. Social engineering on British lines helped to keep these tensions under control and to deal successfully with the space problem. At the same time, the basis was established for the remarkable period of economic growth in which Singapore acted in Asia for a long time as a safe haven in a troubled world.

However, Singapore differs fundamentally from the British Empire in the absence of a

civil society. Even after forty years of building, there is still no middle class which has managed to bend the state planning machine to its will. As a result, the city state continues to work smoothly in a fully planned metropolitan system. The question is how exemplary this situation is, in the sense that we, as Dutch planners, should allow ourselves to be guided by it.

## **SOCIAL ENGINEERING**

This question is directly related to a Dutch debate about power and the significance of the planning apparatus in our country. That apparatus dates from a period in the past when our country had to be rebuilt after a tragic war. Government planning was intended to contribute to a rapid, forced, process of industrialisation. The Netherlands also acquired a welfare state on British lines, with the emphasis on public housing, social services and public transport. Planning as a new discipline was a state-oriented form of social engineering, intended to bind the 'atomised individual' into new social structures. This form of social engineering was the background to large-scale structures establishing the 'Randstad' (the cities of western Holland) as a fully planned metropolitan system. At present, the situation has changed completely. In industrial terms, our country, outside the Eindhoven and Twente regions, has never reached maturity. The housing programme has been dismantled, the public transport companies have been privatised and the social security system is increasingly giving way to private arrangements. The government is withdrawing from major areas of society. Insofar as this ever was the case, there is virtually no more discussion about a Randstad – now referred to as the 'Deltametropolis'. In recent years, planning has advertised itself as a tool for maintaining spatial quality.

50

However, the main change which has occurred is the formation of a broad-based stratum of assertive, well-educated ordinary citizens who demand their rights and who are prepared to throw sand into the once-efficient planning machine if it fails to serve their interests adequately. This formation of a broad-based upper class in the Netherlands in recent decades is striking. However, it is the result, not of an increasing sense of responsibility, but rather of egoism. That has made planning awkward and it also interferes with the establishment of a civil society as a source of welfare, prosperity and happiness. The main question is therefore what should be done. Should planning become tighter, stricter and rigid in a response to the decline in public solidarity? Should there be concrete investment programmes to give the state's numerous plans and policy documents an air of feasibility? Can the plans for 'the Delta Metropolis' be saved by cutting out the upper social class? This is the debate about power and the significance of the Dutch planning apparatus.

There is a lot of tough talk – a firm call for order – and the case of Singapore includes, in that sense, attractive components which may be a cause for jealousy: over there, the city state still has the power to decide on and build systematically on a metropolitan scale.

## **RATHER CREATIVE THAN FULLY PLANNED**

Personally, I think that it would make more sense to work first on establishing a civil society. That civil society will lead to a new relationship between the individual and the community, between freedom and order. In 'The Great Disruption', Francis

Fukuyama describes the germination of the first seeds of a new, post-industrial civil society. He believes that its structure will be completely different than in the industrial age. Neither the State nor the existing institutions will be the cornerstones of the new social capital. Rather, ordinary citizens themselves will shape that capital 'bottom up' in their mutual relationships. Ultimately, the creation of this post-industrial civil society will determine whether and how we establish our Dutch metropolis. One thing is clear: this metropolis will not be fully planned, as is the case in Singapore. A creative city like London is a better example.

#### References

- Manuel Castells, End of Millennium.  
The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume III, 1998, p. 243-287.
- Francis Fukuyama, The Great Disruption.  
Human Nature and the Reconstruction of Social Order. New York 1999.
- Paul Scheffer, Alles van waarde moet zich verweren. In: NRC Handelsblad 21 September 2002, p. 6.
- Cor Wagenaar, Drie maal Nederland. Voorstudie Vijfde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening no. 18, July 2000.



# Singapore's mission: a world-class land transport system

Looking at the traffic situation in Singapore with a professional Dutch eye, the conclusion has to be that Singapore must, now and in the future, be confronted with mobility problems that are virtually unmanageable. This island state is the size of the Dutch province of Utrecht, has more than 3 million inhabitants, a high standard of living, a global harbour and airport, and a territory which is only partly suited for construction purposes. All these things justify the supposition about mobility problems. Nevertheless, mobility is not a difficulty. On the contrary.

Despite the difficult conditions, Singapore is on the way to becoming one of the most effective land transport networks in the world. Singapore's mission is to provide its people in the next 10 to 15 years with a world-class transport system, with the aim of establishing a fully-integrated cost-effective land transport. A network that must meet the requirements of the Singaporeans, with their different budgets, by providing a wide range of choice and also supporting Singapore's economic and environmental objectives.

How can Singapore do this? What is the operating philosophy in the short and long terms? In view of the serious mobility problems in the Netherlands, we have to study this approach and monitor it closely while, of course, taking into account the differences between the two countries (for example, geography, initial situation and administration). The paper from Liu Thai-Ker for the Megacities lecture is a perfect example of this, especially since urban planning and the transportation of people and goods are inextricably linked.

## AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

The main elements in the package of policy measures in Singapore are, in brief, as follows:

- fully-integrated town and transport planning to reduce the need for movements;
- selective expansion of the road network in order to improve the functioning of the road network as a whole;
- where possible, the use of smart transport management systems to increase the capacity of the existing networks;
- the coordinated management of vehicle ownership and usage for managing mobility (demand management);
- improving and regulating public transport for the purposes of establishing a competitive transport mode;
- improving road safety and air quality by means of permanent arrangements;
- a finance framework based on covering costs and partnerships.

## LESSONS TO BE LEARNT

As a professional, I am convinced that effective mobility policy for complex situations such as those in Singapore and the Netherlands has to be based on the consistent implementation of a coherent innovative package of measures which take into account the specific conditions in each country. And on maintaining a policy of this kind over a long period of time. Singapore provides us with an example of consistent implementation of this kind in their specific situation. Striking elements which can be learnt from are, in brief:

- a professional approach to establishing a picture of expected developments;
- a challenging mission which is implemented in concrete terms in a coherent and effective package of measures for both the short term and the long term;
- extensive integration of urban planning and transport;
- an operationalised price mechanism based on managing the demand for car ownership and the number of vehicles using the roads<sup>1</sup>;
- the full and repeated deployment of new innovative technologies and the granting of high priority to the development of expertise in this area;
- an organisation which is adequate for the purposes of implementation;
- the inclusion of flexibility based on permanent evaluation.

*1 At present, two demand management tools are in operation:*

- *the Vehicle Quota System introduced in 1990 to manage increasing car ownership by means of registration and competitive bidding for vehicles;*
- *the Electronic Road Pricing system introduced in 1998 for managing vehicle use.*



# CURRI- CULUM VITAE



## CURRICULUM VITAE

### Liu Thai-Ker

Liu Thai-Ker is director of RSP Architects Planners & Engineers Pte Ltd. in Singapore, with oversees branches in Malaysia, India, Dubai and London.

In 1962, Liu obtained his Bachelor of Architecture with First Class Honours and University Medal from the University of New South Wales. In 1965 he became Master in City Planning with Parson's Memorial Medal from Yale University. He was conferred Doctor of Science honoris causa by the University of New South Wales in 1995.

Besides a renowned architect-planner, Liu is also the chairman of the National Arts Council, the Adjunct Professor of the School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, as well as a member of several governmental bodies in Singapore. He has also been appointed the planning advisor to Shandong Province and a dozen major cities in China.

Liu has received several awards, which include the Public Administration Medal (Gold) in 1976 and the Meritorious Service Medal in 1985 from the Singapore Government. In 1993, he was bestowed the second Asean Achievement Award for Outstanding Contributions to Architecture. In 2001 he became the second Gold Medallist of the Singapore Institute of Architects.

### Professional memberships

Fellow, Singapore Institute of Architects

Fellow, Singapore Institute of Planners

Corporate Member, Royal Institute of British Architects

Fellow, Royal Australian Institute of Architects

Member, Institute of Real Estate Management, United States of America

Certified Property Manager, United States of America

### Awards

1976	National Day Award – Public Administration Medal (Gold)
1985	National day Award - Meritorious Service Medal
1991	University of New South Wales Alumni Award for Achievement
1993	Second Asean Achievement Award for Outstanding Contributions to Architecture
1994	Honory Citizen of Fuzhou Award, People's Republic of China
2001	Singapore Institute of Architects Gold Medal



## **Current appointments**

### *Professional:*

From 1992 Director, RSP Architects Planners & Engineers Pte Ltd  
From 1992 Director, RSP Consultants Ltd, Hong Kong  
From 1996 Director, Squire Mech Pte Ltd

### *Government:*

From 1996 Chairman, National Arts Council  
From 2000 Chairman, Singapore Tyler Print Institute

### *Academic:*

From 1987 Advisor Professor, Tongji University  
From 2000 Adjunct Professor and Chairman Advisory Committee, School of Design & Environment, National University of Singapore

### *Directorship:*

From 1993 China-Singapore International Pte Ltd  
From 1994 Singapore Offshore Petroleum Services Pte Ltd  
From 1995 RSP Aviation Pte Ltd  
From 1999 China Homes Ltd  
From 2000 Metro-City Development Pte Ltd

### *Institutions:*

From 1995 Honory Secretary, Chinese heritage Centre  
From 2000 Member the Hokien Foundation  
From 2000 Member Advisory Council, Nature Society Singapore

### *Committees:*

From 2000 Member Tourism 21 Status Review Steering Committee  
From 2000 Chairperson Arts, Culture & Recreation Working Group, of  
Enhancing Human capital Sub-Committee, under Economic Review  
Committee

### *Advisor to Companies:*

From 2001 Advisor to Keppel Land Ltd on China Pr

### *Planning advisor:*

Peoples Republic of China: Beijing, 1987, Fuzhou 1988, Ningbo, 1993, Yantai, 1993, Longkou, 1993, Xiamen, 1993, Wuxi, 1993, Penglai, 1994, Tianjin, 1994, Jinan, 1995, Shandong Province, 1996  
Taiwan: I-Lan County, 1995

## CURRICULUM VITAE

### Dirk Frieling

Dirk Frieling (1937) studied architecture at the Technical University Delft and graduated in 1965. He is married and has three children –a painter, a lawyer and a linguist–.

Currently he works as professor in urban and regional planning in the faculty of architecture of this same university and as codirector in a consultant firm in the field of housing and planning. He is engaged as ‘agent’ by twelve cities in the densely populated western part of the Netherlands who have formed an alliance to develop this part of the country into a deltametropolis.



### Professional engagements

1965	J.L. Sert, Cambridge, Mass.
1965–1967	Military service R.A.F.
1967–1972	Amsterdam, dept. director municipal housing department
1972–1989	Specific projects: urban renewal (Spaarndammerbuurt) and urban expansion (Bijlmermeer)
1989–1991	Lelystad, IJsselmeerpolders Development Agency
1991–present	Specific projects: new town development (Almere, started in 1976, currently 140.000 inhabitants) and landreclamation (Markerwaardpolder, 400 sqkm, not implemented)
1991–1993	The Hague, Ministry of Public Works
1993–1998	Delft, professor of urban and regional planning at Technical University Delft
1998–present	Amsterdam, chairman steering group Renewal Bijlmermeer Amsterdam, advisor on urban strategy of Burgomaster and Aldermen Delft, agent of Deltametropolis (a multi-city alliance in Holland)

### Special projects

1984 – 1989	The Netherlands Now as Design This privately organised research project aimed at visualising the Netherlands as it would look in 2050 according to the political programs of social-democrats, liberals, christian-democrats and ongoing technological development. The results were presented in public expositions of four varieties of the Netherlands: Critical (soc.dem), Dynamic (lib.), Careful (chr.dem) and Relaxed (technocr.) in 1987, and published in several books (in Dutch) and widely discussed in the press.
-------------	---

1996 –present The Metropolitan Debate

This privately organised research project aims at improving the decisionmaking process on physical planning in the Netherlands ('quicker and better'). This project can be considered as a follow up of The Netherlands Now As Design. The foundation The Metropolitan Debate organised in 1997 and 1998 seven debates on the subject, five of which were commissioned by government departments. A book on the method (in Dutch) was published in 1998.