The campus or back to the city? City-university spatial relationships

Pierre Merlin

Université de Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne)
and École Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées

Introduction

The university has not always been urban. In ancient Athens, it was divided between the Academy of Plato, the Lyceum of Aristotle and the Garden of Epicurus, all three of which were located outside the city centre.[1] Etymologically speaking, the university is the community (*universitas*) of masters and pupils. Initially it did not have its own premises. The term university gradually developed from its designation of this community of masters and pupils to signify the institution itself and its premises.

From the very beginning of its history, and continuing up to the present time, the university has provided:

- complete training, not limited to the learning of wisdom but which includes a critical dimension and teaching with professional ends that involves the passing on of institutionalised knowledge;
- centres in which knowledge is extended as it is taught, and others where it is only taught;
- teaching that overlaps with the city, in which training is not only in the hands of the masters, but also stems from dealing with the city, taking part in social matters and an education that is physically distanced, in which the masters impart certain rules for life and of behaviour as well as knowledge;
- centres of learning in the city in which the scholar divides his time between his place of study and life within that society, which are fully integrated with the needs of the time, as well as other enclosed places, at a distance from the city, in which the scholar obeys certain norms and is isolated from the outside world.

These four dimensions are not independent, although they should not be confused. The campuses of the great American universities, for example, propose research at the same time as teaching, but are distanced from the city and function as closed

---

1. Genestier, Philippe. "L'université et la cité", pp. 1-45 in Merlin, Pierre *et alii*, *L'habitat des étudiants en France*, Marne-la-Vallée, Institut Français d'Urbanisme, Laboratoire Théorie des mutations urbaines, 1991, 427 p. See also: Genestier Philippe. "L'université et la cité", pp. 22-46 in *Espaces et sociétés*, n° 80-81 (Villes et universités), 1996.

centres. The British *college*, whose campus model was inspired in the ancient model, enjoyed greater integration within the city –the Mediaeval university often was the city— although it had its own rules, which converted it into a closed universe. The majority of European university campuses (in particular those in France and Spain) are distanced from the city, although in these cases the institution does not provide any kind of education that is complementary to training and constitutes a closed universe without rules of any kind, and without the student finding therein a self-sustaining way of life: few students actually live-in this type of institution, and all escape the place as soon as they have fulfilled their obligations.

Society cannot ignore the repercussions of the training systems that it adopts, and it cannot neglect the fact that these depend to a great extent on the places where such training takes place and how such places are equipped. Reconsidered in this way, urbanism is not merely limited to certain technical options, but has consequences which, in turn, have significant repercussions on social organisation.

In an age in which higher education has become available to the masses, which in the developed countries of today implies the majority of young people, it is necessary to begin by reflecting on the objectives that must be assigned to these higher education establishments, the place that they occupy in them, and the different infrastructures that will allow them to fulfil their purpose.

Three models for establishing universities

Although it is not exhaustive, we can propose an outline of the relationships between the city and the university based on the three models, implicitly referred to above: the Mediaeval university, the American campus and the European campus.[2]

The Medieval University

The Medieval universities followed on from the ecclesiastical or monastic schools which had, in turn, replaced the great libraries of the Hellenistic and Roman ages (such as Alexandria). The proposal of the first universities (Bologna, Paris, Oxford) was to bring together centres of wisdom and training, making them independent of the bishops, although under the prestigious, if distant, power of the Pope (Medieval universities were founded by Papal Bull or pontifical dispensation). These universities, as underlined by Georges Duby, were true professional associations, sworn corporations of masters and students, which gathered together hundreds, or even thousands, of students in various, although limited, centres. These associations were inter-linked

---

2. Merlin, Pierre. *L'urbanisme universitaire en France et à l'étranger*. Paris: Presses de l'ENPC, 1995.- 416 pages.

throughout Europe, exercising a true *de facto* cultural monopoly and spreading wisdom, with an ideological undertone, which in turn had an influence on the political world. Although they asserted the independence of the masters and their wisdom, these universities were in fact protected by pontifical authority and were founded on the initiative of bishops and princes (or in some cases by the cities themselves). In the two cases in which they were established within the city, in the second they were less concentrated than in the first, and were considered as a means of reconstituting the elite classes of civil society, as opposed to the first case, in which they shared the intention of setting themselves up as local centres.[3]

Once granted charters or statutes of constitution, Medieval universities proclaimed their own autonomy. This meant that they were self-governing and that the power lay with their professors (as in Paris) or, on occasions, with the students (as in Bologna). Their pedagogic autonomy led to the awarding of diplomas after examinations had been sat (*licencia docendi* or doctorate). Legal autonomy established the university franchises, which went so far as to subject professors and students, even in relation to actions perpetrated outside the university, to their own internal justice. Such particularities inevitably led to frequent conflicts with the local population and municipal authorities. In the case of very violent confrontations, universities were occasionally obliged to withdraw to other locations (as was the case, in 1316, of the University of Orleans, which moved to Nevers). The most extreme case of independence was that of the University of Bologna, the oldest university of all, which was founded in 1205 in a free city. The premises (library, amphitheatres, laboratories, observatory, etc.), were regrouped to the north-west of the fortified city, little by little forming a true university quarter, although lacking any kind of planned structure.

At Oxford, following the partial withdrawal to Cambridge, it was the autonomous colleges (the university was nothing more than a federation of such colleges), that took root and established themselves in the city, fully integrating themselves in the existing urban fabric. The same thing happened at Salamanca, and later at Alcalá de Henares, Leuven, Uppsala, etc. where universities were founded in previously existing towns or small cities, in which their presence would make a profound impression.

Despite being very proud of its independence or its franchises, and regardless of how compacted it appeared to be within the city, the Medieval university had few teaching centres. In Paris, the Latin quarter –i.e. the area where Latin and not Medieval French was spoken– was on the threshold of the city itself, and at some distance from the centre and the cathedral. It had, however, been built up without any cohesive plan, with the somewhat haphazard construction of one building after another. The main colleges were built alongside the teaching centres, in which some of the students found lodging. Unlike at the colleges at Oxford (and later at other

---

3.   GENESTIER, Philippe. "L'université et la cité". *Op. cit.*

British Medieval universities), an education was not in any way guaranteed. Most of the students, however, lived in the hostels or found lodgings with one of the local parishioners. Despite the generally poor quality of the residences this situation represented an important source of income for the local population, even though the risks of conflict were multiplied. Teaching took part in a variety of locations, often in the lodgings themselves. The first colleges for which grants were awarded were associated with a certain type of patronage. In Paris around fifty cases of this kind were known, the most famous being the one founded by Robert de Sorbonne in 1257 which took in students of humble origins. In the 14ᵗʰ century, the number of residences multiplied, with masters taking in up to twenty students and the convents taking others. In the opinion of Serge Vassal, "student accommodation was the first urban development problem that the universities had to resolve".[4] The students were grouped together into "nations", depending on their province or country of origin (this system still exists today at the University of Uppsala).

In the 13ᵗʰ century, the Holy See strictly controlled the number of universities. Their proliferation in the 14ᵗʰ and 15ᵗʰ centuries, particularly in the south of France —a region that was loyal to the Avignon papacy— came about through the need for training required by princes (for their collaborators), by bishops (for the clergy) and even by merchants (for their children). The autonomy of the universities, in particular in the judicial field, was to a great extent surrendered in exchange for royal protection. In short the universities became popularised and underwent a conservative transformation, when they were absorbed by the powers that be and the aristocratic oligarchy.

Today some universities with Medieval origins, in particular those in the United Kingdom, have conserved a great deal of their original characteristics. Founded –with the exception of La Sorbonne- in towns or small cities they have shaped their environment and constitute one of the most important aspects of the town or city itself. Nevertheless this has not prevented such towns from developing of their own accord: Oxford is a centre of the automobile industry and Cambridge is the home of scientific estates (many of which are related to the colleges), etc.

The American campus

The term campus comes from the Latin and means "field" or "wide extension of land". A campus can be defined as the land on which the buildings of a university are built. Today the term has a specifically university connotation, to such a point that it is considered almost a redundancy to talk of university campuses, even when it can be applied to land reserved for other purposes such as, for example, medical activities.

---

    4. Vassal, Serge. *L'Europe des universités* (thèse). Caen: Editec, 1988, 627 pages.

The notion of the campus has, for a long time, been closely linked to American urbanism; since the 19th century, or even the end of the 18th (Princeton, Chapel Hill). At that time, the model that inspired the founders of American universities was the British college, with its combination of education and training and residential accommodation, whose buildings and green spaces formed a community in its own right, where educational value came not only from the teaching, but also from the way of life enjoyed there and the aptitude that such open spaces tended to favour.

It was according to this logic that the first campuses were established in the United States, after its independence, when the country was no longer prepared to make do with colonial high schools (some of which were converted into the universities that formed the famous *Ivy League*). As we have already mentioned, these colleges were designed following the British model. At the time a debate arose between those who were in favour of intra-urban sites and those who preferred to locate campuses outside cities. The second option, strongly defended at that time, resulted in the construction of university residences (dormitories) alongside the university centres. The American anti-urban tradition determined this preference for rural sites, given that it was assumed that this would transmit beneficial effects through contact with nature, while also avoiding the pernicious effects of the promiscuity and debauchery found in the cities.

The *Morrill Act* of 1862, providing federal land away from the city centres for the creation of high schools and State Universities, was the starting point for the development of the university of the masses, almost a century before this occurred in Europe. It also made the campus the predominant model for American universities. These were the so-called *land grant universities*. University planning was placed in the hands of F. L. Olmsted (who took charge of some twenty or more projects, including the campus at Berkeley) and the followers of the Paris School of Fine Arts (the mass planning method). The figure of the *campus planner* first emerged at the end of the Second World War. The predominant idea of the time was that the university, established on its own campus, would constitute its own city, an idea that is certainly open to question.

It must not be forgotten, however, that since their first appearance, the surroundings of a great many campuses have undergone considerable change and development. Many of those initially set up on the outskirts of cities, or even in the country, have since been restructured and absorbed by urban expansion (as is the case of Berkeley). As a result, it is now difficult to distinguish the urban campuses from those that were not originally planned as such. Furthermore, American campuses have not always been the result of planning. In the 1950s, at the start of a period of rapid growth (between 1953 and 1980 demand grew five-fold) the majority of campuses were not based on a development plan of any kind. This did not happen until the 1970s, firstly from the perspective of expansion (the creation of new campuses and the extension of those already in existence) and later due to internal rehabilitation (after

1980, approximately) and changes of image. The promoters were private companies or, as in the case of public universities, the State and they could directly take charge of construction work or provide grants to companies for this purpose. Whatever the case, from that time on most of the universities could count on both planning and construction services. Henceforth the role of Federal Government was reduced and limited to the awarding of grants for projects of particular interest.

The European campus

The American notion of a campus was exported to Europe after the Second World War, when rapid expansion —in the case of some universities— made it necessary to acquire land, which was only available on the urban periphery, in order to set up badly needed scientific departments. Thus the notion of campus came to be associated with sites outside, but connected to, the city, on land that allowed buildings to be spread out. The French projects from this period of rapid expansion were specifically inspired by the American model, although they did not manage to reproduce such a particular style of life, the *"raison d'être"* of the American campus, as had occurred with the British colleges.

In the majority of western European countries the 1960s was a period of rapid proliferation in terms of student intake. The number of university centres in France alone multiplied fivefold between 1954 and 1974. In these two decades the State made a colossal financial investment in higher education. Senior (literary, legal and scientific) colleges were added to the sixteen 19th century universities. In contrast to the original projects, these colleges took on functions of second level training and were later brought together to form new universities in small cities and large towns. New centres were also founded in the Paris area and on the outskirts of the city, while the old university in the city centre was divided, in the wake of the events of 1968 and the introduction of the new law, into seven separate universities. The specialised schools and, above all, the University Institutes of Technology, were subsequently spread out even more and covered the whole region. This dispersion, together with the delay in the construction of student residences, favoured locally based student enrolment, particularly in recently created centres.

The university expansion of those years was associated with a type of campus that was dubbed "*à la françese*". There were various reasons for this: on the one hand, due to influences from the United States and to a lesser extent from the United Kingdom; and on the other, due to the influence of a preponderance of Modern Movement theories and in particular the "Athens letter". Apart from these implicit influences the debate was also fuelled by more mundane arguments. The following considerations all provided arguments in favour of the external campus location:

a) the need to provide scientific laboratories which required a lot of space;

b) the multiplication of student numbers, which could no longer be covered by the construction of a few buildings integrated within the city centre, nor by those found in the inner periphery of the city;

c) the availability of suburban land that could, in the case of urgent need, be quickly bought into use and was also much cheaper than trying to acquire similar land in the city centre where the process could easily have taken several years;

d) the possibility of bringing all of the buildings together on a large site on the outskirts of town, and at a site that was not in demand, in urbanistic terms. Likewise, funds could be set aside with a view to further expansion and, in particular, it was possible to build on campus, thus providing facilities in close proximity to and including: teaching centres, university residences, restaurants, sports facilities and any other types of facilities that it was difficult, or often impossible, to imagine in the city centre;

e) a virgin site which allowed the university centre to draw up a rational plan: the surrounding area could be integrally planned within an urban setting on the basis of the university's needs. This virgin setting would also provide a greater level of quality than anything that could be achieved in the city centre;

f) the isolation of a semi-rural setting was more favourable in terms of providing good working conditions than the hurly-burly of a densely populated city centre;

g) accessibility, particularly by car, would be greatly improved.

The arguments against such campuses were:

a) it was possible to take advantage of a great many buildings in the city centre that had been abandoned by their previous owners who had already moved out to the periphery;

b) in overall terms, campus unity was a myth, as relationships between the components of a university are often very inconsistent and bringing them together on a unified campus would not change this reality;

c) working conditions would be more favourable in city centres as students would be closer to cultural facilities such as city centre libraries;

d) the environment of the historic centre was seen as, at least, as pleasant and much more prestigious than that of semi-rural and often abandoned areas;

e) the more the university was immersed in its urban context the more influence it would have on its environment.

However the arguments in favour of separation won hands down, although certain distinctions must be made:

a) certain campuses were planned in, or close to, city centres, as had been the case at the end of the 19th century in the majority of the UK's *civic universities*;

b) some campuses were designed to be integrated into new neighbourhoods then under construction: this was the case with the Toulouse-Le Mirail (Candilis, Josic,

Woods) and the Villetaneuse university project (which was never carried out) and also with the two campuses at d'Annappes and Flers, around which the Lille-Est new town was later built (which was subsequently known as Villeneuve d'Ascq);

c) the majority of the campuses of the period were built on the outskirts of the city and have since remained isolated either because urban integration failed (Orléans-La Source) or because, in most cases, it was not even considered (the campuses of Grenoble-Saint Martin d'Hères, Bordeaux-Talence, Dijon-Montmuzard, d'Angers-Belle Beille, Amiens-Salouël-Saleux, Rennes-Beaulieu, etc).

d) certain of the scientific campuses are worthy of special mention: the best received, generally speaking, were the high schools such as the Polytechnic School of Palaiseau (166 hectares), although it must be admitted that in these cases sufficient means were made available to ensure quality architecture, offering good facilities (in particular for sports) and creating a pleasant, initially flat, rural environment;

e) and finally, we cannot ignore the fact that the towns and cities in which the old universities chose the campus solutions have also conserved their central buildings (often for humanities, human sciences and economics and law faculties).

Thus, by way of a double transposition, the Medieval British university was transformed into the "*campus à la française*", despite the fact the two concepts appear to have little in common. In this case, it is possible observe the negative effects of the desire to transpose and assimilate models whose cultural foundations are often very different and therefore difficult to combine.

Some other European countries have undergone a similar evolution. In the United Kingdom, the Medieval universities (Oxford, Cambridge and three Scottish universities), were complemented in the 19th century by the *civic universities* (established in cities such as Durham, London and Manchester), which and also known as *redbrick universities* because of the dominance of this building material. Of the other British universities, some (29 out of 49) were founded after the Second World War and the others were built in the 1960s. The latter were called *greenfield universities*, a reference to their setting, as they were mostly located on campuses on the outskirts of towns and small cities. Most of these formed part of the 1963 Robbins Plan. This defended the principle of a large scale expansion of higher education and its diversification (including the creation of *polytechnics*, which were later converted into universities in 1992). We must, however, underline an important difference in French policy in this area: most of these new universities were sited on the outskirts of average sized towns and local student recruitment was not a significant aim. The provision of university residences was therefore significantly developed and their role went significantly beyond simply providing for lodging requirements: they also had to play a role in integrating students into the university community. This integration, which tended to take place through the halls of residence and the associated sporting and cultural facilities in the British case, was often left in the hands of the *Student*

Union. In the UK, it was also part of the process of leaving the family home that university life was intended to contribute to: in the UK it was supposed to justify the tradition of students enrolling with higher educational establishments located outside of their native cities and away from their family homes. This tradition was, however, lost to a large extent with the establishment of the *polytechnics*.

In the Netherlands, the most recently established universities have also been built on campuses on the outskirts of the main cities (for example, the University of Brabant in Tilburg) or even as urban campuses (the Erasmus University in Rotterdam), while the older universities have set up their own campuses on the outskirts of cities (as in the case of the De Uithof campus of the University of Utrecht).

In Belgium, various universities moved to new campus locations: this was the case in Liege (with the new location being on a hill overlooking the city) and with the Free University of Brussels (located in the town of Nivelles, 30 km. south of the capital). Nevertheless, the University of Louvain-la-Neuve, which was created at the same time and as a result of the obligatory transfer of teaching in French from the Catholic university of Leuven, formed part of a new town: it formed the nucleus and *"raison d'être"* of the new town and constitutes an exception of great interest.[5]

Recent universities established in Sweden have also been built on campuses on the outskirts of cities (at Karlstad and Lulea). The older universities chose to expand further away from historic centres. This was the case of the urban campus of the University of Stockholm, at Frescati, to the north of the city and also that of the University of Uppsala, which was located on a privileged axis on the outskirts of the city. The Technical University of Delft, in the Netherlands, also followed similar locational criteria.

In Spain, the majority of recent projects have also been built away from city centres. This can be seen above all in the case of Madrid, where the beautiful Moncloa campus, which was originally planned in 1927, is now the home to the majority of the Complutense University (which also occupies the Somosaguas campus, further to the west) and also to both the Polytechnic University of Madrid and the National Open University. Likewise, the campus of the Autonomous University of Madrid was established some 15 km to the north of the city (at Cantoblanco) when it was founded in 1968. Rehabilitation operations have also taken place in Spanish universities located in historic centres (as in the case of military buildings on Las Ramblas in Barcelona and a former tobacco factory in Seville, etc.) or on the outskirts of cities (as occurred with the Carlos III University and the rehabilitation of former bunkers in Getafe and Leganés).

_____

5. WOITRIN Michel. *Louvain-la-Neuve, Louvain-en-Woluwe, le grand dessein*. Gembloux (Belgique): Duculot, 1987.

During the period of most extensive university growth, mainly in the 1960s and 1970s, the majority of developed countries adopted the campus solution, with the American model being either implicit or explicit. However, the model itself has also evolved over time, as there are notable differences between the campuses of the great and most prestigious universities, such as Princeton, Stanford and the MIT, and those of the state universities. The key to this change appears to be associated with the site chosen for the student halls of residence. In the first cases, campuses appeared and developed in a systematic way and life on campus took on an educational dimension which, as with the colleges of British Medieval universities, went beyond merely training functions and the imparting of wisdom. In the second case, in which halls of residence are less frequent, this traditional aspect of the university mission appears to have been relegated to a secondary role. Likewise, there are profound differences between the different campuses of the European universities. The majority of French universities are pale caricatures of the American model. Even in those cases in which student halls of residence have been installed on campus along with sporting and cultural facilities, collective life is almost non-existent and the students do not really take over the space and make it truly their own. Through the protagonism of the student halls of residence, British *greenfield universities* have, however, attempted to conserve at least part of the tradition inherited from the Medieval universities.

Significant differences can also be observed within a single country, as clearly seen in Spain. If we take Madrid as our example, we find that the Moncloa campus (mainly on account of its siting at a prestigious location close to the palace of the same name, but also because it is easily accessible by metro) possesses many of the virtues of the great American universities, while Cantoblanco is more reminiscent of French campuses, and Getafe and Leganés have found it difficult to integrate themselves into the system on account of their rather unattractive urban environments.

WHAT KIND OF URBANISM IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE "UNIVERSITY OF THE MASSES"?

The university has now entered a phase that could be defined as the "university of the masses."[6] In the United States this happened some time ago, while in western Europe it is about to happen now. Can the modes of integration that were used at the time of the elitist university still be maintained? What can the universities contribute to this process, having been converted into an activity, or even life, frame for such a wide age band, and having become impregnated with the physical appearance and the soul of the cities in which they are found? What conclusions can be drawn from this in terms of university urbanism?

_____

6. MERLIN, Pierre. "L'université de masse et la ville", pp. 47-71 in *Espaces et sociétés*, n° 80-81 (Villes et universités), 1996.

Changing to the "university of the masses"

The "university of the masses" is already a reality in the United States. It is generally held to have been so since the *Morrill Act* of 1862, which led to the development of the public universities and senior schools (created by the federal states). However, it was not until much later on that the real explosion in enrolment took place. In 1950 there were 2 million students who by the early 1990s had grown to 15 million. This figure is equal to 6% of the total population (a percentage that approximately doubles that found in Western Europe) and covers 4 different age groups. Nevertheless, these figures must be examined more closely: almost half of these students (43% in 1992) were only studying part time; over 40% (42% in 1992) had enrolled for diploma courses (two year higher educational courses), which in most European countries are considered separately from full degree, or higher level, courses. The proportion of students committed to long term courses on a full time basis (at least at *bachelor* level) only represent 42% of the population or approximately 7 million people (2.5% of the total population, covering 1.75 different age groups, a rate that is lower than that found in north-west Europe. Even so, the American university system offers much more diversified centres than the majority of European countries. There is also a clearly defined hierarchy, which has at the top the 60 leading research universities of the *Association of American Universities* and extends down to the *junior colleges* and *community colleges*, which only teach short courses lasting up to two years. It also includes the *comprehensive universities and colleges* (which prepare students for *bachelor* and *masters* degrees), as well as the professional schools and *liberal art colleges* (which also prepare students for *bachelor* degrees).

Neither is it easy to come up with a simple definition of students in France. The total number of students in pre-university education is 2.1 million, of which 1.5 million are at universities (including the University Institutes of Technology). These statistics have remained more or less the same over the last few years (partly due to the lower birth rate amongst the latest generation of students). Likewise, in the early 1960s, enrolments were lower than 300,000. These students represent 3.5% of the total population, with an age group range of almost 2.5.

This generalisation of higher education is less evident in the United Kingdom, a country with less than 1.5 million university students (including those at the old *polytechnics* and colleges of higher education), a figure that represents less than 2.5% of the population and spans 2 distinct age groups.

In the Netherlands, university students (a total of around 500,000) represent almost 3% of the total population and span over 2.5 different age groups.

In Sweden there are almost 250,000 students (including those who have already started a professional career), a figure that represents almost 2.5% of the population and covers 2 distinct age groups.

Finally, in Spain there are almost 1.4 million students, representing 2.5% of the population and again spanning approximately 2 different age groups.

The "university of the masses" is undoubtedly a step towards the democratisation of higher education. It would, however, be an error to believe that this represents any real equality of opportunity. All countries, including those in which the equality of official diplomas is openly proclaimed, as is the case in France, conserve an elitist sector. In the United States this is represented by the wealthiest, most prestigious and most selective universities, which enrol students from the whole country and also from abroad. In the United Kingdom it is associated with the Medieval universities and some of the *civic universities* (London, Bristol, Durham, etc.). In Sweden the two oldest universities (Uppsala and Lund) as well as certain highly specialised colleges (the Stockholm Royal Institute of Technology, The Chalmers Institute of Technology, in Gothenburg, the Stockholm School of Economics, The Karolinska Institute of Medicine, in Stockholm) have this status. In the Netherlands, the inequality of the different universities is less evident, although for Leiden for Humanities, Amsterdam for Human Sciences, Rotterdam for Economy and Delft for Technology are recognised as being the most prestigious. There is also a clear difference, evident from secondary education level onwards, between the universities and the professional higher educational colleges. In Spain, as in France, all universities are officially at the same level, despite the fact that the oldest, such as the Complutense in Madrid, the technical universities of Madrid and Catalonia, and the autonomous universities of Madrid and Barcelona, have the best reputations and most prestige. In France, apart from the extremely hierarchical organisation of the higher educational colleges, which are equipped with resources that are far superior to those of other universities, some centres have widely acknowledged doctoral teams and research laboratories and prepare far more theses than the rest in certain specialities. This is the case with Sciences at Paris XI (Orsay), Strasbourg I, Grenoble I, and Paris VI and with Humanities at Paris IV. It also applies to studies of Human Sciences at Paris I and Paris X; Law, at Paris I and II; and Economics at Paris I and XI (there is evident domination by the Parisian universities in all specialist areas except for perhaps the Sciences).

Conversely, the arrival of the "university of the masses" has rarely been accompanied by the multiplication of the number of shorter courses. Likewise, the "university of the masses" has not, except in France, led to free access to the chosen university and subject. Selection and guidance systems are common, although they are applied with varying degrees of severity/permissibility. In the United States, where the hierarchy of the different centres is openly accepted, everyone has a place available to them at the end of the candidate and selection process. This is not the case in Germany, however, where candidates often have to wait several years before being able to enrol for the most popular courses. Even in France, some course subjects (public health for example) have introduced a system of limited (*clauses*) numbers. The higher education colleges are very selective, including the UIT's (University Institutes of Technology), although in a rather more modest way. Some universities have also introduced, clandestine selection processes. This generalised opening to a wider sector

of society also depends on the existing system of grants. Only the Netherlands and Sweden offer grants to all students without means testing. In the United States there are various grant systems.

To summarise, the "university of the masses" is far from being even-handed. It is closer to being a mere "inflation" of the existing university system, rather than the development of a new concept of the university as such.

Planning and the "university of the masses"

The "university of the masses" is quickly becoming a local and regional challenge. In their recruitment systems, companies are keen to have local universities and they know that it is a significant advantage for the selection of technical and executive personnel. Effectively, over half of the population is, has been or will be parents of students. Thus, the great majority of small cities and large towns either has a university of its own or actively pressurises the competent authorities to provide it with a university centre. In France, this was the case of Le Havre and of the towns along the northern coast (Dunkerque, Calais and Boulogne) and also of Artois (Arras and the mining belt), Lorient and La Rochelle, all towns that managed to found universities in the 1990s. In the 1980s, there was even a tendency for a multiplication of the annexes of the universities located in larger towns or cities in smaller neighbouring towns.

In Spain, as in France, universities are mainly found in cities and large towns and serve a more or less defined catchment area. Student accommodation is relatively scarce in either of these countries and most students tend to enrol at the nearest centre. This policy has not, however, been followed everywhere. In the Netherlands, the Hague, which is the country's third biggest city as well its administrative capital, has no university of its own. In Rotterdam, the second largest city, the Erasmus University only teaches Economics and Health. The increase in student numbers has mainly come through enrolments at professional higher education colleges. Even after the Robbins Report, the United Kingdom reserved *polytechnics* and senior colleges the task of covering the needs of higher professional education at the local level. Universities are, of course, present in the larger cities, while *civic universities* have often been established in smaller towns (as was the case of the Medieval universities and the *greenfield universities*). The fact that the *polytechnics* were turned into universities in 1992 has not eliminated the distance that exists between them and the traditional universities, which enjoy modern research facilities that the former still often lack. In the UK, students choose their university on the basis of the specific subject and the attraction of the centre and town or city in which it is located. This contrasts with the Dutch technical colleges, the old British *polytechnics* and higher educational colleges, which rely on local enrolment. Sweden went from having only two universities to six (plus two specialised university centres). Only the oldest universities (Uppsala

and Lund) and, to a lesser extent, the centres in Stockholm, have catchment areas that effectively cover the country as a whole. In the United Kingdom, the traditional tendency for the university itself to offer student accommodation has been reaffirmed, but no such policy exists in either the Netherlands or Sweden.

The key role of student accommodation

Among the three examples of universities that we originally gave, and also within each of the three models, student accommodation conditions are shown to be very different.

In the model of the Medieval university, with Oxbridge being the modern archetype, the key element is their organisation of the university into *colleges* with halls of residence where the students lodge and where they establish their relations with their peers and professors, also within the *college* environment. The purpose of the lecturers and the *college* is not limited to the imparting of wisdom, as this is also done by the university through its main courses. The *colleges* also offer seminars and tutorials, and these tutorials, and in a wider sense the *college* itself, are not just concerned with producing future graduates, but also with forming people, in the most complete sense of the word, and creating rounded and responsible citizens.

In the beginning, the first American colleges were inspired by the Medieval university. Two centuries ago, the first campuses also imitated this model. Even today, many of the great universities –those of the *Ivy League* and also more recent ones, such as Stanford– are characterised by the relationships that exist between their different departments; teaching, research and accommodation (*dormitories*): these residences offer limited comfort, with a room shared by two students continuing to be the standard model. Until the 1960s, half of the buildings on an American campus were dedicated to residential uses. It was even possible to provide accommodation for married students, as well as professors and other staff. However, the significant increase in enrolment led to this tradition becoming increasingly discarded. The most recently built campuses have been sited in order to allow the easiest possible access, precisely because they can only offer accommodation to a minority of students. This move has been mainly conditioned by financial arguments and considerations, as student accommodation has become increasingly economically unviable. Despite this, the private universities, which –although the minority– tend to also be the wealthiest, have continued with the tradition of campus accommodation. The combined result of all of this has been that for most centres, enrolment has become increasingly more local than it was with the old universities; today, five out of every six new students enrol in the state in which they live. The proliferation of colleges offering shorter courses (with local enrolment), the increase in the number of students who live as couples, and of mature students, including those who are already working (and increasingly numerous), the scarcity of resources at the disposal of many universities (above all

the public universities) to build new halls of residence, and the generalised use of the car, which simplifies accessibility, have all resulted in a reduction of the number of students living on campus. Thus, the model of the American campus, which was originally inspired by the British Medieval *college*, has ceased to be a reality in the majority of cases. The result is that the ideal of offering an education extending beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge has, to a great extent, disappeared. The exceptions can only be found at the private universities that still insist on offering campus accommodation at least for *freshmen* (first year students who are starting university and have an immediate need to become integrated within the university community). Some of the most prestigious public universities (such as Berkeley and other campuses of the University of California) have also tried to follow this lead, but in most other centres, the arrival of the "university of the masses" has made it very difficult to maintain this reality.

In this sense the European campus is more diverse. In the United Kingdom, the tradition of seeking a change of location (enrolling at a university in a different region) is still frequent, even in the case of *greenfield universities*. The *civic universities* offer numerous halls of residence, although these are not always found on campus and are often on the outskirts of the town or city in question. The *greenfield universities*, which are often sited on a campus, provide accommodation for the majority of first year students, for the same reasons as in the United States. On the other hand, the old *polytechnics* and technical colleges, which have always concentrated on more local enrolment, only provide accommodation for a small minority of their students. They do not have either the land or the financial means of the traditional universities and perhaps there is no demand for them to try to imitate them in this respect.

Louvain-la-Neuve again provides a rather particular, though interesting, case in this respect. This university can provide accommodation for over 10,000 of the 15,000 students attending university in this new town. This accommodation was built at the same time as the university itself (and there are another 5,000 students studying at the health faculty at Woluwe-Saint-Lambert, on the outskirts of Brussels). The centre even introduced an interesting system of "kots". This aimed to bring together groups of 8 to 10 students within common (social, philanthropic, artistic, animation, etc.) projects that had been accepted by a mixed commission of students, local inhabitants and members of the university, and could take advantage of reduced rents. In fact, the very idea behind the town of Louvain-la-Neuve favours the integration of students in a way of life which, as in the British Medieval university (Louvain-la-Neuve is in fact the heir to a university originally founded in 1425), seeks to favour the establishment of a community.

This is not, however, the case in the majority of other European countries. Despite providing all of their students with grants, the Netherlands and Sweden do not consider accommodation to be a priority issue. The Dutch universities, which previously offered student accommodation areas within the city, were later forced to

put them up for sale: the authorities considered that there was no reason to offer students accommodation facilities that were any different from those already available to other young people. In Sweden, local organisations and student unions manage rather small residential areas for students. Nevertheless, the case of Uppsala, where the Medieval university tradition persists, seems to constitute an exception, with the existence of the "nations" (old colleges that grouped students together on the basis of their region or country of origin) and their own lodgings. In Spain, on the other hand, there is no tradition of student accommodation at all, with only a very small minority relying on institutional accommodation. In France, with the exception of the important case of the international university city of Paris, student halls of residence accommodate only perhaps one tenth of all students. The majority of these halls of residence were built in the 1960s (with studio flats built as a result of the accommodation operation plan which was financed by social contracting).

Student accommodation has become the keystone of university policies and the relationship between the university and the city. Wherever the tradition of the educational university has been preserved, and the university's relocating function has been maintained, student accommodation continues to be a priority issue in university policies (examples include the United Kingdom, the great private American universities, Louvain-la-Neuve, and Uppsala). On the other hand, wherever the concept of the "university of the masses" has taken hold (France, Spain, etc.), this has been relegated to a secondary, or even superfluous, position and under no circumstances is considered a priority.

The university in the city

The relationships between the university and the city in which it is located are multiple.

In extreme cases situations of mutual dependence arise. This was the case with the Medieval universities, which increased the prestige of their respective towns and cities, even in those cases in which the town or city in question already existed, as with Oxford and Cambridge, Louvain, and Uppsala. We can also add cases of new towns that have come into being because of their university, such as Louvain-la-Neuve or Villeneuve d'Ascq. In these towns and cities the relationship with the university is complex and not always amenable. In Uppsala, it has historically been bad: as early as the Middle Ages, the local inhabitants were complaining about how noisy the students were and about the fact that they had their own jurisdiction. Until very recently, the municipal authorities of Cambridge, a city in which none of the students officially lived, complained that the students lived in a state within the state. Even when the university has been founded by the town or city itself, after a certain time has elapsed, the latter tends to lose interest in the former and to fail to meet the university's needs, to the point at which the State is forced to

take over (as happened with Amsterdam and Stockholm). The university usually has few arms at its disposal with which to put pressure on the city and threatening to leave would hardly be credible, apart from the fact that the students rarely form a significant part of the local electorate.

Furthermore, with regard to questions of urbanism, the university needs to have the consent of its local town or city to support its spatial development, unless there has been a prior declaration of public utility, which is not always possible. Universities are often subject to the laborious task of negotiating for building permits. In Cambridge, the city and the university are caught up in almost permanent litigation involving this question. In the United States, this has become a general issue for the private universities: Harvard can no longer use the plots of land that it originally acquired as residential areas in areas where it is now the main property owner. Although the public universities cannot oppose local urban planning decisions, conflicts still arise. The acquisition of accommodation, in the area surrounding the campus, by the University of California at Berkeley, is a constant source of conflict with the local community. Similar cases abound, with student accommodation as the main source of conflict. Complaints are made about student behaviour and they are blamed for increasing local rents and the deterioration of real estate, etc. In order to resolve this situation, over the last twenty years many American universities have become actively involved in joint planning procedures with municipal authorities (Berkeley), or even with some local associations (University of Pittsburgh). This has resulted in self-imposed limits being put on university development in terms of spatial expansion and the acquisition of accommodation.

Another significant option, in terms of spatial development, concerns university services and parking policies. This is an important issue when it comes to choosing sites for university centres. In the United States, the tradition of having campuses on the outskirts of the city and the massive use of cars have led to the choice of isolated sites that are adapted to the age of the car. This has also contributed to a reduction in the number of students living on campus. In the 1960s, there was a recommendation to set aside a parking space for each student. This recommendation has never been fully introduced anywhere, although some universities have reached a ratio of 0.6, or even higher, as at the University of California in Los Angeles and San Diego. Public transport systems have rarely been considered a determining factor. However, from the 1980s onwards habits and attitudes started to change and university centres were obliged to introduce parking charges. Some centres, such as Harvard, that are well-communicated by public transport, have tried to limit the use of cars. On the other hand, in Europe, public transport services are often considered essential. Many centres impose strict limits on parking, which in some cases represents a considerable problem for municipal authorities who have to deal with a parking problem beyond their control, as is the case with Oxford and Cambridge.

Facilities –and in particular cultural and sports facilities– could, on the other hand, constitute a basis for co-operation between the university and the city, although in reality this is rarely the case. Apart from the different mentalities and bureaucratic routines that act as a brake to such potential sources of collaboration, the needs of one and the other are rarely complementary: in the case of libraries, for example, what would be considered an appropriate use of funds for students would probably be very different from that for the local population as a whole. The most frequent area of co-operation tends to be found in hospitals (with university teaching hospitals or the use of municipal medical centres by medical students).

The economic impact of the university has hardly ever been the object of specific studies. This has often been limited to superficial evaluations of the specific weight of the university in terms of local employment or spending, which is far less than the real impact or, on the contrary, could be overestimated due to the use of multiplying coefficients which camouflage double employment. This impact evidently has an importance that is inversely proportional to the density of the city. With respect to the impact of universities on companies within their respective cities, they are affected, and above all by technological universities, but apart from exceptional cases (such as MIT in Cambridge, Stanford University in Palo Alto or the universities of Cambridge and Lund) this impact should not be exaggerated.

Many of the cities that play host to universities suffer another negative impact in the form of local taxation and rates bills. Generally speaking, universities do not pay local taxes or rates, and when they do, they normally pay preferential prices for the services provided by the municipality. In the specific case of the United States, universities are seen as a charge which must be subsidised by the municipality; in other words, by local taxpayers. Some universities, as is the case of the MIT, may even pay significant voluntary contributions in order to improve their relationships with the municipality (1 million dollars a year in the case of MIT). However, the MIT and Harvard are the third and fourth most important contributors in Cambridge, Massachusetts (with the first two both being public service companies).

Social relationships are, likewise, almost always a challenge. Universities often fear a "hot" environment, as is the cases of Amsterdam and many American universities. The city complains that the students "raise hell". In the specific case of American universities, attempts have often been made to provide local populations with social services, such as cultural activities, advice for young people, and/or social assistance, etc. in order to offset some of these perceived negative factors.

As we can clearly see, numerous problems are created by the interaction between cities and universities and many of these are frankly bad, above all in the United States. The municipalities often accept the economic or cultural perks and the derived prestige as their due, while at the same time placing undue emphasis on the disadvantages and impositions that the existence of the university also implies.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, in the majority of cases the campus solution is chosen when it comes to the creation of new universities or extension of existing ones. This is the case in the United States, Europe and other developed countries. It is unusual for them to establish in city centres either through the rehabilitation of old buildings or the construction of new ones. There are, however, certain well designed exceptions where this as happened, such as the rehabilitation of the tobacco factory in Lyon and, in particular, the example of Seville. In a more modest sense, mention should also be made of the conversion of former barracks at Uppsala, Getafe, Leganés, and of other cases which have also found interesting solutions. However, cases of new university cities, such as Avignon, that have systematically taken over old buildings in the city centre (inside the walls of the Papal city, in the case of Avignon) –or even put up new ones in the vicinity, as is the case of the Santa Marta hospital– are rare. Faced with the threat of impoverished city centres, as a result of a tendency towards "peripheral urbanisation" –or even "rural urbanisation"– these cities considered the arrival of students, who would make up almost one tenth of their populations, a distinct opportunity and advantage.

The arrival of the "university of the masses", which is a concept that now encounters little resistance, has favoured the option of establishing a campus and has effectively converted it into the ideal solution. These campuses should be designed in such a way as to offer a true sense of community life and to allow contact to be, once more, established with one the original objectives of the university. However, except on rare occasions, this has not been the case. Cities that adopt this solution effectively take a decision to exclude a wide cross-section of young people and to assume the risk of seeing how the city centre slides into tediousness, with the consequent abandonment of numerous activities (shops, nightlife, etc.). Undoubtedly, the presence of the university alone would not be enough in itself to prevent this from happening, yet it could make a considerable contribution to palliating the decline of city centres, a phenomenon that has been so evident in the United States, and even in the north of Europe. In the same way, the presence of the university could also contribute to the policy of the "compact city", which has been promoted by London, Stockholm and several Dutch cities, among others. In this sense we have seen that student accommodation can have a decisive importance in the city centre or also on the campus - wherever the former location has been rejected - as it ensures that universities are something more than mere knowledge supermarkets and helps to transform urban sites into places with a life of their own.

We must ensure this (partial) return of the university to the city centre and this reconciliation between university and city. To this end, it will be necessary, whenever possible, to favour the establishment of real student areas, rather than the student ghettos of the campuses, with areas in which university infrastructure and student

accommodation are numerous and attract the creation of cultural centres, libraries, and other associated facilities. Transforming university campuses into such areas, and allowing the city to permeate them, is undoubtedly a difficult trick to pull off. Nevertheless a successful university facility is one in which the local inhabitants play an active role, rather than merely surrounding acting as neighbours and spectators. Efforts must also be made to ensure that university buildings are attractive and that both students and local inhabitants can take pride in them. They should be located on main thoroughfares and contribute to an understanding of what the city is. In a single word they should be "monuments".[7] We must not forget that the university buildings are destined to be the most important civil construction projects of the early 21st century, as they were, if not always with the required architectural quality, towards the end of the 20th century.

---

7. MERLIN, Pierre. "L'aménagement universitaire", pp. 87-103 in *Universités 2.000, Quelle université pour demain? (Assises nationales de l'enseignement supérieur, Sorbonne, 26-29 juin 1990)*. Paris: La Documentation française, 1991, 334 pages.