

EAAE

European Association for Architectural Education
Association européenne pour l'enseignement de l'architecture

AEEA

News Sheet
November 1986 **18**

51 Rue de la Concorde,
Brussels 1050, Belgium.

REPORT NAPLES:

Manuel Ribas and Adrien Cools respectively reviews Workshop 12: "Activités des architectes – nouvelles perspectives / New perspectives for Architects," held in Naples in March.

Sous ce titre-là on voulait analyser la situation croissante du chômage professionnel parmi les architectes qu'on constate dans la majorité des pays européens; et en même temps, on voulait faire face aux mesures récemment envisagées dans plusieurs pays et qu'on ne juge pas favorables à la qualité de la formation des futurs architectes. Le cadre des séances était Villa Pignatelli, aujourd'hui transformée en musée, et qui est située en face de la Riviera di Chiaia, dans la côte immédiatement au Nord du Port et de la ville médiévale de Naples. Maintenant elle se trouve au centre de la ville baroque et moderne. Ce furent la diligence et le travail du Prof. Camillo Gubitosi (du Département des Projets Urbains à la Faculté d'Architecture) les facteurs qui ont réussi à avoir ce très beau cadre pour le Colloque, ainsi que la bonne marche du Colloque dans son ensemble.

L'après-midi du Jeudi 20 mars eut lieu la séance d'ouverture. C. Gubitosi dû excuser l'absence du Prof. Siola, Doyen de la Faculté d'Architecture. Il fut suivi par les paroles de l'architecte Zoleo, au nom des architectes napolitains, qui traça le cadre de la situation des 38.000 architectes et 60.000 étudiants italiens, parmi lesquels seulement le 10% des architectes se trouve dans la pratique professionnelle bien que seulement le 9% des étudiants arrivera à la consécration du Diplôme d'Architecte. A la fin de son intervention le Prof. Jockusch comme Président de l'Association exposa les buts du Colloque:

- s'opposer avec des arguments valables à la politique de fermer certaines Facultés et Ecoles,
- s'assurer pour que la qualité de l'enseignement architectural ne soit pas méprisée,
- lutter avec toutes les forces disponibles contre les politiques d'enseignement qui ne suivent que la loi de la demande pour l'architecture.

P. Jockusch avait demandé précédemment de se borner autant que possible à une liste de neuf questions. En conséquence M. Gubitosi demanda à ceux qui allaient participer au Colloque de préparer un résumé avec la situation de chaque pays à l'égard du thème annoncé. La délégation de l'Ecole de Copenhague, ainsi que M. Roger Tillotson de l'Ecole de Newcastle University avaient déjà rédigé leur document. Les délégations des cinq Ecoles espagnoles ont profité du temps libre à Naples pour en finir le sien.

Avec des invitations pour que tous les assis-

tants puissent exposer la situation dans leurs respectifs pays, et sous l'appel de M. le Président pour que le débat soit amplifié aux Directives C.E.E. pour les architectes des pays communautaires, on finit la première séance. Le soir, on s'est rassemblé pour dîner dans un Hôtel de la ville, invités par les organisateurs.

Le lendemain, vendredi 21 mars, on a commencé en plein air dans le jardin de Villa Pignatelli, pour nommer Birgit Cold, de l'Ecole de Trondheim en Norvège, comme Directrice des débats. C'est elle qui après la première part du débat du matin, a résumé les positions les plus répétées:

- 1er, la discussion pour ou contre, que les architectes soient généralistes ou spécialistes;
 - 2ème, les problèmes d'adaptation des architectes face aux besoins de la Société;
 - 3ème, l'utilité des confrontations, des données statistiques dans les divers pays en ce qui concerne les architectes;
 - 4ème, la position de M. Roland Schweitzer pour tâcher de créer le besoin d'Architecture parmi nos Sociétés nationales.
- (Voilà ses paroles: "auparavant il n'y avait pas des architectes mais il y avait de l'Architecture, maintenant nous avons des architectes mais pas beaucoup d'Architecture.") Ce fut surtout la discussion généralistes – spécialistes qui nous occupa entièrement jusqu'à la fin du matin.

L'après-midi après le déjeuner offert au Circolo della Stampa, on est revenu au débat avec des détails pour préciser comment la spécialisation se faisait dans le curricula de plusieurs Ecoles ou Facultés.

La pluie nous a obligé à revenir au portique de Villa Pignatelli, et c'est là qu'on a suivi la discussion avec des extensions vers la Science de la Communication ainsi que sur le thème de Moralité et Pouvoir.

A cinq heures on a dû finir pour que ceux qui venaient comme représentants de leurs respectives Ecoles puissent se réunir en Assemblée Générale.

Le soir, accompagnés par C. Gubitosi, on a visité le très restreint Circolo del l'Unione, dans le grand bâtiment du Théâtre San Carlo où on a eu un dîner formel avec des collègues napolitains.

Le lendemain, samedi 22 mars, c'était le dernier jour du Colloque. Dans le salon de Villa Pignatelli on continua le débat annoncé les jours précédents. Ce fut Jean Barthélemy qui avec sa capacité de synthèse formula – un résumé pour les trois jours, tel que j'ose résumer à continuation:

- 1er, Le problème du chômage chez les architectes n'est pas un problème général, mais il est bien différent dans chaque pays.
- 2ème, Le problème est complexe, parce-qu'il y a des facteurs à court et à long délai qui jouent ensemble.

3ème, Il faut lutter jour à jour. C'est pour cela qu'il est nécessaire une divulgation de solutions particulières pour que chacun connaisse les stratégies possibles.

4ème, A demi-terme, deux groupes de conditions s'avèrent: Celles qui dépendent des architectes et celles qui concernent la Société.

5ème, On a abandonné (dans l'Enseignement général primaire) la formation pour la sensibilité qui conduit à exiger une qualité, de l'espace et à l'environnement. Cela créerait une demande qui serait à la base des nouveaux emplois pour les architectes.

6ème, Dans un horizon plus lointain, il faut penser que nous sommes au commencement de l'époque post-industrielle. On doit pousser la Construction jusqu'au niveau des nouvelles connaissances (télématique – robotique, par exemple). Mais si on veut éviter la formation dicotonique d'une élite dirigeante sur une masse aliénée, incapable d'exiger la qualité de son environnement, il faut harmoniser la civilisation post-industrielle avec celle pré-industrielle. C'est à dire mêler le progrès avec l'artisanat (Arts and Crafts). Cela on ne pouvait pas le dire auparavant, lorsque le mythe de la productivité était à tout prix protégé comme indiscutable.

Avec une intervention finale de M. Y. Allegret pour faire la réclame de la réunion d'Octobre à Paris (maintenant le 14ème Colloque A.E.E.A.) c'est Jockusch qui faisait le rappel final des actions immédiates à prendre pour réaliser les propos du Colloque.

L'après-midi, pour ceux qui sont restés à Naples, on est allé visiter les temples doriques de Paestum, dans une ambiance extraordinaire. Le lendemain, l'organisation du Prof. Gubitosi avait annoncé une excursion à Pompei, mais puisque la majorité des participants connaissaient déjà les ruines et personne ne connaissait Caserta, on a changé l'itinéraire du car pour aller visiter le Palais Royal et le Parc des Bourbons Rois de Naples au XVIIIe siècle. Après la visite, plusieurs



Paestum, March '86. Drawing by Birgit Cold.

d'entre nous ont allés directement à l'aéroport de Capodichino pour la rentrée.

Le Colloque de Naples qui était posé sur le défi du chômage professionnel des architectes, avait montré où étaient les origines du problème: d'une part la mauvaise adaptation de la formation architecturale face aux besoins modernes; mais aussi, d'autre part, faire sentir la nécessité moderne d'une grande qualité dans l'aménagement de l'espace et de l'environnement bâti.

Manuel Ribas, Barcelone, août 1986.

NEW PERSPECTIVES FOR ARCHITECTS:

The EAAE organised a workshop at Naples which was exceptional both for its subject: 'New perspectives for architects', and for the setting of the meeting: Villa Pignatelli on the banks of the Riva de Chiaia in a botanical garden.

Under the presidency of Professor Peter Jockusch of the University of Kassel, twenty eight lecturers in architecture, coming from West Germany, Belgium, Spain, France, Great Britain, Denmark, Israel, Italy and Norway, were able to exchange information and points of view on a fundamental theme.

They deserve a lot of praise for adhering to the timetable of the work sessions chaired by Birgit Cold of Trondheim, considering the temptations provided by the warm welcome of Professor Camillo Gubitosi of the University of Naples: excursions to Paestum and to Caserta, evening meals at the Theatre of San Carlo or in the romantic quarter of Santa Lucia.

The major conclusion was that new perspectives for architects do actually exist and that these perspectives are simultaneously diverse, numerous and fascinating. However, it is an essential condition that architects need to be able and willing to meet the needs of present day architecture.

The objective of architecture is not to provide work for architects, not least because the image of the latter is seriously challenged by many.

Critics of the profession observe indeed that the quality of architecture has continually decreased ever since architects have secured for themselves the monopoly of production; architects seemed to be incapable of mastering the phenomenon of intensive urbanisation inherited from the Industrial Revolution. Focusing too much on a past-orientated vision of things, they have neglected the particularly dynamic socio-economic environment of today; the solutions they have proposed to meet the expectations of people for a new way of living have almost always led to a dead-end.

These criticisms are doubtless exaggerated. Professor Barthélemy of the University of Mons recalled that the weaknesses and errors of architects mirror the chaotic evolution of a society in search of a new balance known as *post industrial*. That perhaps, on the contrary, we should be thankful to architects for having been willing, in a subjective and irrational way, to work for continuity rather than in the dynamic of the ephemeral.

Technological developments have overturned the traditional rules of architectural production, but this is only one feature of a situation as instable as it is complex, mass-production and the consumer society.

This new situation which is based on the standardisation of production within a precise framework has long been considered as an ideal, but is perceived today as an intolerable constraint.

Industrial production is neither desirable nor possible when it is concerned with a large mass, when heavy, difficult to manipulate and

directly influenced by a specific environment, i.e. when the subject is architectural. Architects are aware of this because of the Arts and Crafts and Bauhaus movements. Far from belonging to history, these carry on through a renaissance of craft skills and the success of organisations such as 'Les Compagnons du Devoir' in France.

If the future is not recorded anywhere, it is still possible to "place" it by means of a very small number of extremely probable hypotheses the validity of which will depend upon the choice of society which we adopt.

The chief challenge of our time is most certainly to decide on our common future.

Two main theories are being put forward at present.

The first imagines our world organised in terms of efficiency and productivity. Such a world will value light, mobile, autonomous and easily reproduced objects: TV receivers, cars, videos.

Society will be structured in two categories of people: a small, active and very productive elite of highly specialized technicians in control of information and robotics and a mass of unoccupied, aided and passive consumers.

In this theory medium and long term projects are excluded, only the immediate and the ephemeral count. There is no more construction; the interest in the environment, the built fabric and in architecture is marginalised.

This disturbing model can already be seen in many European towns. Naples, where this EAAE workshop took place, is made up of a centre of dilapidated buildings, its suburbs are the scene of anarchy and of the provisional. Rubbish piles up around municipal containers, cars are parked on the pavement of the main streets and obstruct access to side streets, graffiti disfigure façades, fountains in the parks are transformed into smelly mud-pits presided over by tragic statues in mutilated marble. The only new equipment consists of metal shutters and grilles changing buildings into ridiculous fortresses.

A second theory favours utility and quality i.e. demand rather than supply. In this world the will to develop man exists, a development only possible in an environment conceived in terms of quality.

Here architecture is considered as an essential need even if its productivity is low and if investment in it is not directly accountable.

Social organisation rests upon the distinction between those who are useful and those who are not, the nature of this utility varying according to the needs expressed.

If this latter theory is accepted then, "the architects' mission becomes essential once more, if we reckon that they would have to remodel the shape of towns to meet the forecasts for the coming century to modernise existing agglomerations, to create new ones and to organise the renewal of all our architectural heritage." (Zhang Zugang, Head of Jlanz hu Xuebao, Peking)

This is based on the assumption that architects will be "open" to this kind of mission, and that their training will allow them to fulfil it satisfactorily.

According to Professor Allegret of Paris - Villemin, young architects are willing to be useful; the economic crisis is not a catastrophe for architecture, it is a salutary reappraisal and the sign of change. The young have started this change under the pressure of a very malthusian profession threatened with extinction by the excessive protection with which it has surrounded itself. They have rediscovered that the field of their competence is "design", drawing as well as projects, a field that their elders have arbitrarily restricted to the single application of planning buildings.

However worthy their efforts may be, they come up against the negative image of the architect in society. We are far from being identified with that of Brunelleschi who urbanised Florence, gave the city efficient war machines, lodged its princes in luxury, built a dome for all time, created a new architectural style and also fought for the improvement of working conditions for building workers.

The survival of the architectural profession, especially in Britain, is, according to Roger Tillotson of the University of Newcastle, a cause for serious concern.

Town Planners, Urban Designers, Interior Designers, Landscape Architects, Quantity Surveyors and Environmental Engineers have been growing in stature for several years now. They constitute at present a collection of well-structured professions, separate from that of the architect, but nevertheless in direct competition with him. Their success is encouraged by the same architects who cherish the illusion that they are the irreplaceable leaders of the modern building team. It is a profound error, because increasing numbers of clients, private as well as public, are placing their confidence in Project Management by these new specialists.

Quantity Surveyors, for example, are seen as "good guys", capable of controlling the cost and economy of a scheme, especially in renovation projects or before profiting from special refurbishments.

The result, in 1982 the Chartered and Quantity Surveyors reached 60,000, i.e. three times as many as the professional architects. By 1985 their number had grown to 65,000 and they officially enlarged their sphere of operation to include Project Management. Among them are many who employ architects, but for how much longer?

These acting "managers" are confirming in effect that the conceptualization of modern real estate comes less and less from architects who are not capable of mastering the equipment and the organization (of services) which today represents more than 60% of the total cost of building.

Architects experience great difficulties in convincing potential clients and the public in general that a good architectural scheme is necessarily the product of their initiative.

At the same time Interior Designers succeed very well to convince the same clients and the same public of the usefulness of their intervention in all that concern the planning of the interior spaces of a building.

Sir Terence Conran, in creating his Habitat stores, has not only been successful in selling fashionable furniture and household furnishings, but he has also created a new lifestyle which directly affect architectural thinking. The decorators have conquered High Street and they have replaced architects in the domain of "how to do?" and of fashion.

Roger Tillotson's conclusion is clear: "In these circumstances, it is unrealistic to expect that the formal architectural education can continue to produce a graduate with the broad skills and knowledge required to control every part of the building process from conception to realisation, when at the same time these superhuman attributes are neither acknowledged by society nor recognized in level of earnings. This situation will not attract the brightest pupils to the profession in the first place, and the failing reputation of the architect will become even worse."

With variations, this situation is to be found everywhere in Europe except in Norway.

Naples Report continues on page 5.



EEC 85/384-6 : RESPONSES TO THE EEC COUNCIL DIRECTIVE ON

FRANCE:

La réduction de 6 à 5 années d'études d'architecture est appliquée en France depuis Octobre 1985. L'approbation de la Directive, issue du Traité de Rome, visant la libre circulation des Architectes est datée de Juin 1985.

Le corps enseignant français, dans son ensemble, n'aura pu faire le rapprochement entre ces deux événements concomitants qu'il aura découvert, l'un "in extremis", l'autre "à posteriori". La Sous-Direction de l'Enseignement de l'Architecture en France, sous estime, en effet, tout à la fois l'importance de l'information et la concertation avec les enseignants, considérés comme des sous-fifres en matière de prospective sur l'enseignement.

Les fonctionnaires de la Communauté ont fait de même. Ils n'ont ni recherché une information fiable sur les études et les Ecoles, ni une réelle concertation avec les enseignants européens pour bâtir leur texte.

La Directive, décision politique communautaire, pourrait être une solution positive pour l'Europe. L'exploitation pratique que le gouvernement français en a tiré, en diminuant la durée des études pour réduire le budget de l'enseignement, est une résultante négative.

Réduire la période d'acquisition des connaissances et l'éducation architecturale, alors que le contenu de l'enseignement doit s'élargir, c'est réduire délibérément la maturité et la compétence de l'étudiant rentrant en possession de son droit d'exercer la profession.

Inciter à survoler les problèmes au lieu de les approfondir c'est faire peu de cas de la qualité architecturale, c'est aussi mal gérer l'intérêt public.

Il y a pire.

La principale faiblesse de la formation des architectes en France vient de ses lacunes en matière de pratique professionnelle.

Antérieurement à la réforme, la présence de l'étudiant à mi-temps à l'Ecole, en 5ème et 6ème années, lui permettait de "faire la place". Il pouvait y apprendre la pratique du métier.

La Gouvernment aurait pu renforcer cet enseignement professionnel déficient, mais s'appuyant sur l'article 23.2 de la Directive qui "reconnait comme preuve suffisante une attestation du pays d'origine ou de provenance selon laquelle une expérience pratique appropriée (!) a été acquise dans le pays d'origine . . .", il a cru pouvoir ignorer ses responsabilités.

La réforme force, littéralement, le stage de formation pratique dans le cycle de 3 ans conduisant au diplôme national. Elle l'insère à l'intérieur d'un certificat sans lui accorder de délai supplémentaire. Le droit à l'exercice s'obtient donc au terme des 2 + 3 années comprenant deux mois de stage, période juste suffisante pour mettre un casque de chantier aux mesures d'une tête à moitié pleine, ou à moitié vide.

En conclusion, l'inquiétude naît de ce que l'on se dirige à pas résolu vers la primarisation d'un enseignement appelé supérieur qui va se compléter d'une réduction du nombre d'Ecoles.

L'affaiblissement de la profession d'architecte décidée au niveau politique, sera ainsi réalisé au détriment de l'environnement bâti et de l'intérêt public.

Certains diront que notre analyse est caricaturale et qu'elle dramatise une situation

comparable à celle des autres Etats Membres de la communauté. On ne peut quand même pas prétendre que la contraction de la période de formation conduise une à meilleure compétence ceux qui auront à la subir. Sans préparation préalable, au cours de l'enseignement secondaire, sans sélection au départ, sans encadrement suffisant, sans équipement adapté à un enseignement supérieur et contemporain, sans étapes sereines de formation, l'étudiant en architecture est voué à grossir, un an plus tôt, le bataillon des sous-éduqués sans emploi.

Les Ecoles, leurs corps enseignant, les organismes représentatifs de la profession issus de la législation française, n'ont cessé de stigmatiser une évolution qui ne peut être que néfaste pour l'avenir de l'Architecture.

Mais l'Etat, et particulièrement le Ministère des Finances, conserve ses pouvoirs discrétionnaires puisque les considérations financières priment sur l'intérêt public.

Au terme de ce rapide survol sur les effets de la Directive en France, pouvons-nous nous poser quelques questions?

Le rôle des Etats de la Communauté pourrait-il être réduit pour le plus grand bien de l'Enseignement Supérieur, corrélativement pourrait-il y avoir des droits au dessus et au dessous des Etats?

Les Ecoles pourraient-elles mener des négociations, directement entre elles, ou avec des tiers, passer des accords, traiter des contrats pour améliorer le service qu'elles ont à assurer?

Pourraient-elles engager des actions devant la Haute Cour, pour défendre l'intérêt supérieur de l'Enseignement contre des Etats Membres qui adopteraient des mesures qui lui seraient néfastes?

Pourraient-elles devenir un "lobby" pour la valorisation des besoins de la Société Européenne?

Pourraient-elles entreprendre de concert la création d'un Institut Européen d'Architecture, centre d'échanges d'information, de concertation et de formation?

Pourraient-elles éviter les grands mouvements d'alternance, répondre aux défis des technologies en constante évolution tout en appartenant à une Communauté économique mais aussi culturelle?

Construire l'Europe de demain est une nécessité; la construire sur des fondations insuffisantes serait s'exposer à constater, trop tard, que, sur les ruines de la culture européenne, les architectes d'Europe ont perdu leur place dans la compétition internationale et leur rôle dans la Société.

Gerard Benoit, Paris.

ITALY:

One's first impression is that the EEC proposal does not substantially intervene with the organisation and routine procedure of Italian architectural education. However, a major intervention can be registered in other areas: on an educational level, in the engineering faculty; on the managerial level of the profession, in the two professional orders, those of the engineers and architects respectively. The engineering faculty, in particular, appears to be affected. This faculty now confers a generalized "right to project" which would be heavily reduced by the EEC regulation (Chapter III). Article 3 of Chapter II would cause, furthermore, the restructuring, at least of the degree course in civil engineering and the introduction of teaching material belonging to non-engineering sectors, which is not

coherent with the logic that currently sustains the organisation of engineering studies.

At the moment in Italy, private or autonomous schools that confer the title of architect, do not exist. Such a title is exclusively a university title, gained at the architecture faculties (the difference between these and the higher institutes is purely nominal) at the end of a course of studies lasting 5 years. The individual faculties have marginal autonomy in the organisation of their own studies, but are governed by statutory guidelines related to a national regulation. The students have some autonomy in the compilation of their studies, but the margins of this are limited and controlled, the educational areas being established on a national level (regional and urban planning, history, criticism, conservation, landscaping, technology, physics, mathematics, the science and technology of construction, social economics, presentation). The fundamental disciplines are obligatory on a national level, the individual choices of each faculty worthy of the organisation of study programmes and of single course programmes, widely guarantee the education described in Article 3 Chapter II.

It should be understood (something that isn't specified in the directive), in which ways, and by which parameters the EEC intends to confront the planned format, described in the 11 points of the article cited. Instead, the relevant problems are another matter and can only be mentioned here. Would not the model, as outlined in the directive, weigh negatively against the definition and the development of the social role of the architect, his opportunities for effective work, already reduced; the utilisation of his real competences?

Qualifications which enrich and make complex the traditional, professional figure, that supposes new planning subjects, appear more and more necessary. Point 3 of Article 3 speaks also of "fine arts", while the concept of art, of artistic production, is subject to fundamental changes which resulted in a concept of aesthetics as interpretation (hermeneutics). One speaks, generally, of the learning of the human sciences, of the relationship between the architect, the people and the environment, of requirements and of human scale, but all the specific authorities necessary for the comprehension, preservation and evaluation of the historic-architectural, environmental, natural patrimony, of energy resources . . . are omitted.

The larger dimensions of some problems are not mentioned, the transformation which occurs, the tension which passes through society and learning. The architect seems to be an operator on a small scale, a "translator" of objects and images already expected, a "restorer" not of an enormous heritage that has been handed down, but of an anachronistic idea of the city, and of architecture as "reconciled" places.

Moreover, which criteria are to be used for the periodic revision of this list of qualifications? Also if the list is reduced, it evidently would seem to refer to a specific cultural situation. This situation cannot be considered immobile; there are some indications that it is already obsolete. Some points may later lose importance, other scientific or experimental sectors, not considered, can emerge and assert themselves. The architect, already a weak figure in the working environment, must recuperate the capacity to adjust the conditions of learning above all, to possible as well as yet untried project demands.

Maria Grazia Dapra Conti, Torino.

COMMENTARY

P. Jockusch, President of the EAAE, reflects on the findings of EAAE Workshop 12 in Naples:

The workshop title, "New perspectives for architects" was only the more optimistic version of stating the problem on which the Naples workshop focussed; "Architectural education for unemployment" would have been the pessimistic version.

Indeed, the market for building is shrinking, the role of the architect in society diminishes, competing professionals from outside our profession are taking over some of our duties. At the same time, the architectural profession is no longer capable of absorbing young graduates, due to the fact that the average age of the architects in the profession has decreased significantly over the last couple of years, and also because there is now much less work available for people whose productivity has increased through rationalization, information processing aids and various modes of specialization.

On top of this, architectural schools are now facing a rise in student population because of the increased birth rate. Surprisingly, for school leavers applying for enrolment in higher education, architecture is still much in demand as a subject of study.

The workshop has shown that redundancy of young graduating architects is not an equally salient problem in all our member countries. The geography of unemployment shows that in some Nordic countries no unemployment can be perceived at all. That is also the case in countries with selected entry and with the capacity of architectural education geared to the needs of society for architectural services. Other countries with a more liberal entry for university and/or a "social demand" approach to architectural teaching have disconnected the learning and job markets, and thus they educate young people for professions knowing that they will not have much of a chance to get jobs.

In other disciplines like teacher training, civil engineering, town planning, economics, these problems are very similar, but one can perceive a liberal self-regulating system in that the knowledge of fewer chances on the labour market discourages applicants from applying for those academic disciplines. In architecture this is mostly not the case. Students apply despite their knowledge of the few opportunities for employment.

Our Workshop had to discuss why that is the case. In the first place architecture as a profession is apparently still conceived of as being prestigious. Applicants may hope to be among the privileged few who can still earn their living in that profession.

Secondly, young people may themselves disconnect their academic subject from the professional domain in which they will earn their living so that academic studies become an introduction into social life as such.

Thirdly, and to follow up the second argument, there may be a new sense of architecture as a generalist problem-solving discipline with which one hopefully will be capable also of dealing with architectural problems.

Fourthly, there is a deep concern among young people about our survival in the man-made environment and therefore architecture and the environmental sciences are seen as offering an ecological chance for survival.

Our member schools can count themselves lucky for such an enormous demand for places and for governments who are still paying for staff and facilities in institutions which produce partly redundant specialists. Some of our member schools report severe cuts both in budget and staff as well as growing

pressure for greater efficiency and reduced length of courses. The EEC Directive seems to signal to schools of architecture that either they reduce the length of studies or they are to face more cuts.

It is therefore not only deep concern about the future of our students, but it is also the worries about the future existence of our schools which led us to hold this conference in Naples.

Naples is the biggest member school but not yet the biggest school in Europe which happens to be Rome with 20,000 architectural students. We deliberately went to one of the biggest schools, because we assumed that the problems described above will be more crucial there. We learned that there is an Italian way of coping with these problems.

The reduction of numbers of students in architecture and the closing down or trimming of schools of architecture is not merely a quantitative problem. The EAAE feels deeply concerned about maintaining the diversity and differences among schools, also the regional specificity of individual schools. Reducing the size of schools seems even preferable to closing them down altogether. In fact, in some of the Nordic countries it appears to be beneficial to keep schools of architecture relatively small, that is, somewhere between 80 and say 500 students. And it seems an advantage of the smaller schools that they show a very lively social quality, as well as being able to attract big names. Moreover, the smaller school is by no means uneconomical as compared to the very big ones.

Maintaining a network of many high calibre schools in Europe can only add to the quality of the architecture of the future, for we are well aware that the quality of architectural education today will determine the quality of the architecture twenty years ahead.

The EAAE, with conferences like the one in Naples and with other political action, attempts to help European architectural schools to survive, and to adopt their increasingly difficult job of educating for the changing needs of society and its expectations of a social service provided by architects. It was with this in mind that the Naples workshop produced suggestions for both short- and long-term strategies which might help schools under threat with arguments and with ideas for action.

Among the many proposals for *short-term* action I can only highlight the following:

- *Solidarity* among schools despite the growing competition. This solidarity is needed to fight jointly for independence from both ministerial and professional pressure.
- *Specialization* of schools above a basic and general level of architectural education.
- *Integration* of related course structures namely between architects, landscape designers, town planners, industrial designers, ecologists and building technologists while offering a common knowledge base and professional ethos. Students need the opportunity for both a more generalist broadening of their future professional activities and for specialization in certain domains where they are the true experts.
- *Diversification*: Opening career structures between the established disciplines, especially in the direction of the social sciences, community work, medical studies, journalism, ecological, pedagogical and information sciences etc.
- *Feedback*: Some schools have invited their graduates back five years later to a conference at the school to discuss how they were getting on, in order to establish what ecological niches they have found and the extent to which their creative talents have survived the current crisis.

- *Market research*: Schools should organise links with the employment offices and establish a job information system as well as asking their students to start looking for work long before they leave school.
- *Practical experience*: Practical phases within the general theoretical course appear to be very successful in establishing links with practice. Not only do students learn better, but they also get acquainted with architectural offices so that there might be a better chance for employment after they receive their diplomas.
- *Publicity*: Schools of architecture already under threat of closure should use the chance to make the general public aware of their performance and their service to society. For example, British Columbia University School of Architecture has run a one-week-long publicity campaign and got such a good response that they now seem to be safeguarded from closure.

This brings us to some more *long-term* perspectives. It was felt during the conference that we should also analyse the reasons for the decreasing demand of society for the services offered by architects.

Unlike doctors, lawyers, and other learned professions, architects have seriously lost their reputation as specialists for the design and production of buildings. Since the architect, even in a generalistic sense needs the help of other specialists and building firms before a building can be made ready for use, many other professionals apart from the architect offer their service so as to make the architect redundant in the design and building process. Therefore the profession of the architect is as much under threat as the schools of architecture.

Publicity is needed to inform the general public of the reasons why architecture is necessary and about what architects can do for our society.

Secondary school education should include basic courses in architecture for non-architects.

Also, politicians ought to be better informed about architecture.

Of course, the domain in which architects can and will work in future will change, and many architectural schools already take notice of this by diversifying their course content, looking for new careers in the wider field of building, for example, in building maintenance, building facilities management, building rehabilitation etc.

Architectural studies enable people to survive with their skills and even the head of the municipal tube and many of the captains of fire brigades in Barcelona are architects by training.

Architectural schools and professional representatives should monitor the development of society and the technological environment in order to help develop concepts of the future in which the post-industrial modes of production are reconciled with the re-discovered pre-industrial crafts of building - where new concepts for the environment will be related to new concepts for society and lead on to new concepts of the role of architects in society. Specialized generalists with multi-disciplinary basic knowledge may be the most likely outcome, and the hope is to regain respectability and competence by making the general public aware of the necessity of the architect's role and his specialization and guidance within the team of those who are responsible for shaping the built environment.

The concept of architecture which exists among the general public, and the necessity of architecture for our society is to be made a topic for one of our future EAAE forums.

P. Jockusch, Kassel, W. Germany.

Having seen on the one hand the drastic reduction in the areas of activity open to the architect and on the other hand the enormous success experienced by a series of rival professions in the field of spatial and formal organisation of the environment, in other words, architecture understood in the broader sense, the great majority of participants agreed that it was necessary to organise a training programme for architects which would be both more general and more specialized.

For several speakers, Professor Thau of Haifa, Lawrence Gage of Canterbury and Francesco Segui de la Riva of Barcelona-Vallés, specialization cannot be avoided. If the proficiency of the architect is the general and detailed conception of a project, he will only be able to recover control of the totality of the missions which are linked to this project by specializing in one or several fields such as 'management', refurbishment, interior architecture, landscaping or urban design.

The debate then moved to consider the appropriate time to start this specialization.

Two trends appeared: one in favour of rapid specialization during the second part of the course, the other preferring a single generalist training followed by a 'post graduate' specialization which would facilitate permanent specialization and redeployment during one's career.

Rapid specialization, however, offers important advantages: it limits study to a reasonable length of 5 or 6 years; it enables the redeployment of the students towards other careers during their studies; the course is concerned with the qualities required by specialization (knowledge and skill).

I had the opportunity to present the plans of the Faculty of Architecture and of the Environment which could be created at the U.L.B. (Université Libre, Bruxelles)

In this programme three stages can be distinguished:

- the first, for beginners, would be common and directed towards the acquisition of basic knowledge, specific techniques of expression and methods of global perception of the environment;
- the second, first degree (*licence*), would differentiate objectives at the same time as preserving a significant area of common teaching structured into *certificats*;
- the third is a master's degree specializing in one of the three fields at present under consideration: architecture, landscaping and urbanism.

In each of the specialized master's degrees options can be envisaged; in architecture for example the 'third world', 'art and history', 'management', 'expertise'.

Lastly, the participants underlined that the demand for architecture in industrialised countries was very different from that of the Third World. Demand in the latter does not depend on a free choice, it corresponds to an absolute necessity: survival. Needs are mainly quantitative. The intervention of the European or European-trained architect takes place at the level of technology, control of urban development, services more than the precise planning of buildings which are largely carried out by local users. The architect, however, can usefully contribute in the choice of models and references.

It is difficult to summarize three days of discussion and reflection. For the participants in the workshop, it appeared that the new perspectives for architects are directly related to the demand for architecture. This demand is very broad and diversified even within the limits of the fundamental competence of the architect: formalization and organization of space occupied by man.

This competence covers several aspects

which, in order to be mastered, demand specialization. This must, however, be accompanied or preceded by a basic training at the highest level.

The more general the training, the broader the professional fields will be, provided that the competence and skill required are possessed.

The public, and to a certain extent architects themselves, are badly informed of the tasks which relate to the training of the architect.

Professor Garcia Miguel Lison of Barcelona, after having stressed this last point, reported that the director of the Barcelona metro is an architect and that most Spanish fire officers have received an architectural training. But this is what the architects of the Académie have always argued.

Adrien Cools, Brussels
(Translated from French by M. Cowan)



Hentie Louw reviews Workshop 13: "Learning & Teaching", held in Trondheim, Norway in May.

Although not the furthest north of our member schools (that distinction belongs to Oulu, Finland), Trondheim is very much on the edge of the EAAE's catchment area. It therefore says a lot for the preparatory work by the organiser, Birgit Cold, and the intrinsic interest of the subject matter that so many people could be persuaded to travel the long distances to this beautiful Norwegian city. In all 30 teachers, representing 21 schools of architecture attended the meeting, i.e. excluding the Norwegian contingent which numbered 20. Also worth noting was the unusually high number of female colleagues (almost one third of the total).

I arrived late on the Thursday, and by the time I had registered the introductory session, at which the various seminar group leaders outlined their respective topics for discussion, was nearly over. Fortunately, due to Birgit's excellent workshop primer (cf. News Sheet 17), we all had the opportunity to study the various themes beforehand, so I had a chance to look at the exhibition of student work (from Trondheim and Berlin) in the *Skiboli*, our workshop base on the campus of the Norwegian Technical University.

This little building – the name literally means "wall house" – is an adapted version of a live project ran by the Department of Architecture in conjunction with the Foundation for Scientific and Industrial Research (SINTEF) for a building exhibition in 1981. (Those who attended the Stuttgart Workshop in 1984 will remember Birgit Cold's account of this venture.)

The first day's proceedings were rounded off with a reception by the Dean of NTH, Professor Dag Kavlie, in the council chamber of the old main building – an imposing stone structure in Romanesque style dating back to the foundation of the institution (1910) – offering a superb view across the old city, the cathedral and harbour to the fjord and mountain ranges beyond. This was followed by an excellent meal of traditional Norwegian dishes at the *Skiboli*.

The second day was devoted to seminar discussions. Originally seven themes had been identified,* but after people had expressed

their preferences it seemed practical to combine Aase Eriksen's two groups and to proceed with six: three groups in the morning and three in the afternoon, which gave each person the opportunity to attend two different sessions.

This made the groups just about the optimum size for a meaningful seminar, although most groups found that a disproportionate amount of the discussion time was taken up by the process of getting acquainted with each other and the many different interpretations of the issue at hand arising from the different cultural perspectives. Consequently, what on paper appeared a fairly generous allocation of time to each topic in the end proved inadequate to progress the debate much beyond the initial statements by the group leaders.

For those of us who missed the Thursday afternoon session, that afternoon brought an unexpected bonus in the form of a video presentation by two teachers from the Hochschule der Künste in Berlin, Lothar Eckhardt and Ingo Schneider. Originally scheduled to form part of Jan Brockmann's introduction to his seminar on the influence of the Bauhaus, but postponed because their car broke down on the way from Berlin, this demonstration centred on the work of first and second year students at the Hochschule der Künste. Particularly impressive was the "play" in which students artistically reconstructed man's progressive settlement of the earth.

It was a timely reminder of the enthusiasm which projects like these can generate as well as of the standards of achievement which dedicated teachers working with talented students can reach. Some aspects of this German school's work proved quite controversial and it would have provided a valuable focus to Brockmann's seminar. Instead it set the scene for a lively debate during the final plenary session the following day.

That evening we were graciously received by the Lord Mayor of Trondheim at the old Archbishop's Palace before departing by ferry boat for the island of Munkholmen on the Trondheim fjord. Here dinner – a delicious traditional fish barbecue – was served in a restaurant located in the now disused historic fort/prison.

The guided tour of the inner city of Trondheim, led by the architect, Dag Nielsen, on Saturday morning unfortunately turned out to be a rather wet affair, which was a great pity because this erstwhile capital city of Norway offers the visitor a fascinating blend of old and new. Especially interesting is the large number of traditional wooden buildings, commercial as well as domestic, which have survived the many fires, and the modern atrium developments, another example of which we saw that afternoon at the University Centre at Dragvoll.

The latter building – where we held our final plenary session with seminar reports – is only the first phase of a much larger complex. It was completed in 1979 after the designs of Henning Larsen and consists of a 3-storeyed glazed mall or "street" along which the various university departments are grouped. As we discovered, this is an eminently sensible arrangement for the Norwegian climate (it was raining again), and provided the perfect setting for our closing ceremony.

Most participants stayed on for the post-conference tour on the Sunday. Anne Grete Hestnes took us on an excursion which

* 1. Aase Eriksen: *The Relationship between Form and Content*
2. *Built Environment Education and Learning by Doing*
3. Inge Mette Kirkeby: *Project Work – Aims, Organisation and Evaluation*
4. Kirsten Birch: *The Male and Female Approaches to the Design Process*
5. Jan Brockmann: *The Artistic Approach to Learning with reference to the Bauhaus School*
6. Harald Høyen: *Innovation, Creativity in Teaching and Lifelong Learning (or, the Survival of the Teacher)*
7. Robert Esdaile: *Reflections on the Teaching of Architecture*

included another joint project between SINTEF and the Trondheim Division of Architecture and Building Technology: a group of experimental solar houses at Heimdal; a modern wooden house designed by a member of the architectural department for himself and, finally, the Trondelag Folk Museum on the outskirts of Trondheim. This time the weather played along and we spent a most enjoyable afternoon in the open-air museum admiring examples of the Norwegian timber building tradition, dating from the Middle Ages to the 19th Century, before departing for our respective destinations.

In conclusion something must be said about the debates themselves. The theme, "Learning & Teaching", lends itself to different interpretations. The order, "learning" before "teaching" is significant, for as Birgit Cold stressed in her introduction to the Workshop in News Sheet 17, there is still a lot we as architectural teachers have to learn about the discipline of teaching itself.

EAAE Workshop 13 was set up with this in mind – not so much as an attempt to impart facts and information as an invitation to take part in a "voyage of discovery". If you like, the difference between a lecture and a seminar. If, therefore, we ask ourselves the obvious question, "What have we learned about the teaching of architecture at Workshop 13?", it is from this perspective that the answers should be sought.

As with a seminar proper, atmosphere is of great importance and it struck me that Birgit and her colleagues have succeeded very well in establishing the appropriate ambience for a discussion of the topic. A great deal of effort has gone into laying the groundwork: the group leaders prepared excellent summary statements and these were circulated well in advance in News Sheet 17, so participants should have arrived well "primed" for the debates.

The organisation on the day also cannot be faulted; everything over which Birgit had control went as smoothly as could be hoped. As a result we had a very enjoyable time; we saw many interesting things, made many new friends and had lots of congenial opportunities for "talking shop".

The one disappointment for me personally, was that we did not seem able to advance the debate on this crucially important subject as much as one would have expected from a group of seasoned teachers of architecture. Because it is a perennial problem at EAAE meetings I would like to use this opportunity to try and analyse why this should be the case.

The following appear to have been the major factors limiting progress on this particular occasion:

1. **Communication:** Difficulties arose from two separate but related issues: cultural and language differences. The first is unavoidable, but although it leads to misunderstandings it adds spice to our debates and, moreover, is the reason for our existence as an organisation. The second problem is both avoidable and more negative. At Trondheim, although one of the seminars, that of Kirsten Birch, was conducted in French those participants who could only speak French were seriously disadvantaged. Having been at the receiving end myself in the past at predominantly French speaking meetings I could sympathize, but seeing that the EAAE do not have the resources for simultaneous translation the only viable long term solution for the problem is that all of us acquire at least a working knowledge of both languages. In the final analysis the onus must remain on the individual members to acquire these basic skills for communication.

2. **Preparation:** Seminars by their very nature depend for their success on an equal input from the leader(s) and participants. In my

view (and I do not exclude myself from this), too few delegates come to EAAE meetings properly prepared either to contribute significantly to the discussions or to benefit from them. I am convinced that the seminar-mode is the appropriate one for our workshops but, if we want to raise the level of our debates above that of the anecdotal and "off the cuff" type of response, then we had better do our "homework". Birgit, her colleagues and group leaders did; have the rest of us lived up to their standards in Trondheim?

3. **Structure:** It speaks for itself that a workshop should be structured so as continuously to focus attention on the principal theme, whatever that may be. In this respect Trondheim succeeded better than most. However, there is a point of criticism. The discussion group topics fell broadly into three classes: those which dealt essentially with a) pedagogical issues (Eriksen, Kirkeby), b) philosophical parameters (Birch, Brockmann), c) practical experience (Høyem, Esdaile). All three categories are obviously of importance to the theme, and one accepts that a seminar cannot be inclusive. Nonetheless, if the aim at Trondheim was to give every participant a holistic experience they should have been given the opportunity to attend three rather than two sessions out of six (one from each category). Conversely, if the aim was in-depth debate the time available permitted only one subject, given the practical constraints.

FUTURE EVENTS: PROCHAINES ACTIVITÉS:

WORKSHOP 15: BRIGHTON, ENGLAND, JULY 1987

Theme: "Shelter and Cities: Confronting Today's Students with Tomorrow's Realities" David Robson, organiser of this event writes:

The Association proposes to hold its XVth Workshop in Brighton at the School of Architecture and Interior Design, Brighton Polytechnic, from Thursday July 9th to Saturday July 11th 1987. The Workshop will coincide with the opening three days of the UIA/UNESCO sponsored International Project for Students of Architecture (IPSA) which is being run in Brighton from July 9th to July 18th, and will immediately precede the XVIth Congress of the International Union of Architects (UIA) which takes place in Brighton from July 13th to July 17th.

The theme of the UIA Congress is "Shelter and Cities – Building Tomorrow's World". More than 5,000 delegates from every corner of the globe are expected to attend. The IPSA event is being organised entirely by students for students as a parallel event to UIA. Its theme is "Communicating Dreams – Building Realities" and it will enable students who have been corresponding through IPSA for more than a year to come together and participate in joint workshops. Both events have been planned in response to the fact that 1987 has been designated by the UN as International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH). The XVth EAAE Workshop will attempt to create a bridge between UIA and IPSA, and will be a meeting point for teachers of architecture who find themselves drawn to Brighton by one or other of these events. Whilst EAAE is an association of European schools of Architecture, it is proposed that the XVth Workshop will be open to delegates from schools in every part of the world. It has been timed deliberately to enable teachers who are in Brighton to meet before the main Congress and to discuss the specific educational issues which lie behind its theme. Indeed one aim of the Workshop might be to draw up a communique for submission to the Congress. However, the Workshop is also open to delegates who, while not intending to inscribe for the main Congress, wish to take part in "fringe" events, or to observe the IPSA

4. **Scope:** The Trondheim Workshop adopted the traditional pattern of EAAE Workshops, which allows about one day out of two and a half (excluding the final tour) for a structured debate ($\pm 9\frac{1}{2}$ hours in this case). We seem to believe in mixing business with pleasure, and there is nothing wrong with it as long as we are not over-ambitious in our choice of subject matter relative to the time available for discussion. Each of the seminar topics at Trondheim could easily sustain a full workshop on its own, and perhaps, we should start thinking in those terms if we want our workshops to advance knowledge in the field.

I raised these few points because it appears to me as if the EAAE has reached a turning point in its development. As the only European mouthpiece for architectural education our potential role in the current economic/political climate could be a significant one. We have already accepted (News Sheet 16) that in the future the EAAE may have to take a higher profile in the politics of architectural education in Europe. I am arguing here that this move should be paralleled by an equally determined effort to raise the "critical temperature" of our deliberations. Political credibility in our case can only be enhanced by academic credibility. Birgit Cold and her colleagues in Trondheim have opened an exciting new vein for us to explore at future meetings. Let us not dissipate its potential riches!

Hentie Louw, Newcastle upon Tyne.

workshops, or simply to meet with other teaching colleagues.

The implication of the theme adopted by the UIA Congress is that the nature and the scale of the shelter crisis, both in the developing countries and in the so-called developed countries, demand that architects develop and take on new professional roles for themselves. This is already happening: witness the "Barefoot Architects" of Latin America or the "Community Architecture Movement" in Britain. What are the implications of these new professional roles for teachers of architecture? How shall we prepare today's students to face tomorrow's realities?

For further information contact:

David Robson

School of Architecture and Interior Design, Brighton Polytechnic, Mithras House, Brighton BN2 4AT, United Kingdom. (tel 0273 556229)

AGA 1987: LONDON:

The Council proposes to hold the next Annual General Assembly in London about the middle of March 1987 in order to discuss urgent administrative matters. The agenda will be circulated to members in the near future. In addition, there will be a special presentation by David Coupe and Hans Haenlein on the topic of a Peripatetic School of Architecture in Europe.

10TH INTERNATIONAL FORUM 1987: ZÜRICH

The next EAAE/AEEA International Forum will be held at the ETH Zürich, Switzerland early in November. The Theme will be: "Architectural Education and the Information Explosion", and it will be a joint EAAE/ECAADE event.

1ST EUROPEAN FULL-SCALE MODEL WORKSHOP COPENHAGEN 15 JANUARY 1987:

This one-day event, organised by the Laboratory for Housing, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, will coincide with the International Building Fair: "Building for Billions 87", to be held at the Bella Center, Copenhagen (10–18 January). Theme: "Housing in the 1990s." For further information contact: Karen Zahle, Laboratory of Housing, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, 1 Kongens Nytorv, DK 1050, Copenhagen, Denmark (Tel. 01-126860).