**Aarhus School of Architecture // Design School Kolding // Royal Danish Academy**

**Editorial**

Toft, Anne Elisabeth

[Link to publication](#)

ARKITEKTSKOLEN AARHUS          Designskolen Kolding          Det Kongelige Akademi

# NEWS SHEET 60

June/*Juin* 2001
Bulletin 2/2001

---

**Announcements/***Annonces*

## The EAAE Prize 2001 - Writings in Architectural Education /
## *Le Prix de l'AEEA 2001 - Écrits sur l'Enseignement de l'Architecture*

EAAE Council Member, Ebbe Harder

---

**The EAAE Prize 2001 / *Le Prix de l'AEEA 2001***

---

For some time the EAAE Council has been engaged in securing the **EAAE Prize** a more permanent economic foundation corresponding to its ambitions.

Owing to the sponsorship of the **Velux Company** the efforts have proved successful and it is now possible to endow the prize with a total amount of 25.000 Euros.

The EAAE Prize aims to stimulate original writing on the subject of architectural education. Organised bi-annually, it will focus the attention of the general public on outstanding work in the field selected by an international jury. The prize will reward the efforts of those who seek to improve the quality of the teaching of architecture in Europe.

The subject and the rules of competition will be presented at the **4th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture in Chania, Crete, Greece,** in September 2001. Immediately after the meeting the competition will be announced to all EAAE members.

**The preliminary deadline for submissions is 1st March 2002.**

*Le Conseil de l'AEEA s'est engagé depuis longtemps à mettre sur pied le **Prix de l'AEEA**. Le conseil s'attache à donner à ce prix un cadre permanent et les fondements économiques correspondant à ses ambitions.*

*Grâce au soutien de la société **Velux**, il est maintenant possible de doter le prix d'un montant total de 25.000 Euros.*

*Le prix de l'AEEA a pour but d'encourager la rédaction et la publication de documents originaux consacrés à l'enseignement de l'architecture. Tout les deux ans un jury international sélectionnera les textes les plus marquants qui seront ensuite largement diffusés. Le prix récompensera le travail de toute personne qui par ses écrits aura tenté d'apporter un développement qualitatif à l'enseignement de l'architecture en Europe.*

*Le sujet et les règles du concours seront présentés à la **4ème Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe à Khaniá, en Crète, Grèce,** début septembre 2001. La competition sera présenté à tous les membres de l'AEEA, à la suite de la reunion.*

*La date limite d'inscription est fixée au 1er mars 2002.*

# EAAE

Member Schools of Architecture

## *AEEA*

*Membres Ecoles d'Architecture*

**New members accepted at the General Assembly of 5 September 2000 in Chania.**

University of Prishtina
Faculty of Architecture
Serbia

Reinisch Westfälische Technische
Hochschule Aachen
Fakultät für Architektur
Germany

School of Architecture
Edinburgh College of Art/
Heriot Watt University
Edinburgh, UK

Politecnico di Milano
Facolta di Architettura; Campus Bovisa
Milano, Italy

**Armenian Republic:** Ereven, Institut d'Architecture et de Construction d'Everan • **Austria:** Graz: Technische Universität Graz • Wien: Tehnische Universität Wien • **Belgium:** Antwerpen: Hogeschool Antwerpen • Brussels: Institut Supérieur d'Architecture La Chambre • Brussels: Institut Supérior Saint-Luc • Brussels: Intercommunale d'Enseignement Sup. d'Architecture • Brussels: Vrije Universiteit • Diepenbeek: Provinciaal Hoger Architectuur Instituut • Gent: Hogeschool voor Wetenschap & Kunst • Heverlee: Katholieke Universiteit • Liège: Institut Supériur d'Architecture Saint-Luc • Louvain-La-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain • Mons: Faculté Polytechnique de Mons • Ramegnies: Institut Supériur d'Architecture Saint-Luc • Tournai: Institut Supérieur d'Architecture Saint-Luc • **Bosnia:** Sarajevo: University of Sarajevo • **Bulgaria:** Sofia: University of Architecture • **Czech Republic:** Brno: Faculty of Architecture • Prague: Technical University • **Denmark:** Aarhus: Aarhus School of Architecture • Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts • **Finland:** Espoo: Helsinki University of Technology • Oulu: University of Oulu • Tampere: Tampere University of Technology • **France:** Charenton Le Pont: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris Val De Marne • Darnetal: Ecole d'Architecture de Normandie • Grenoble: Ecole d'Architecture de Grenoble • Marseille Luminy: Ecole d'Architecture de Marseille • Nancy: Ecole d'Architecture de Nancy • Paris: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Belleville • Paris: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-la-Seine • Paris: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-la-Vilette • Paris: Ecole Speciale d'Architecture ESA • Paris: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Villemin • Paris: Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Tolbiac • Saint-Etienne: Ecole d'Architecture de Saint-Etienne • Talence: Ecole d'Architecture de Bordeaux • Vaulx en Velin: Ecole d'Architecture Lyon • Versailles: Ecole d'Architecture de Versailles • Villeneuve d'Ascq: Ecole d'Architecture Lille & Regins Nord • **Germany:** Aachen: Facultät für Architektur • Berlin: Hochschule der Künste • Cottbus: Technische Universität Cottbus • Darmstadt: Fachhochschule Darmstadt • Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden • Essen: Universität-Gesamthochschule • Hamburg: Hochschule für Bildende Künste • Hannover: Universität Hannover • Kaiserlautern: Universität Kaiserlautern • Karlsruhe: Universität Karlsruhe • Kassel: Gesamthochschule Kassel • Stuttgart: Universität Stuttgart • Weimar: Architectur für Architectur und Bauwesen • **Greece:** Athens: National Technical University • Thessaloniki: Aristotle University • **Ireland:** Dublin: University College Dublin • **Italy:** Ascilo Piceno: Facolta di Architettura • Aversa: Facolta di Architettura • Ferrara: Facolta di Architettura • Florence: Dpt. Progettazione dell Achitettura • Genova: Facolta di Architettura • Milan: Politecnico di Milano • Milan: Politecnico di Milano • Reggio Calabria: Universita Degli Studi di Reggio Calabria • Rome: University of Roma • Rome: Facolta di Architettura, Terze Universita • Siracusa: Facolta di Architettura • Turin: Politecnico di Torino • Venice: Instituto Universitario di Architettura • **Lithuanian Republic:** Kaunas: Kaunas Institute of Art • **Macedonia:** Skopje: Universitet Sv. Kiril i Metodij • **Malta:** Masida: University of Malta • **Netherlands:** Amsterdam: Akademie van Bouwkunst • Delft: Technische Universiteit • Eindhoven:Technische Universiteit • Rotterdam: Akademie van Bouwkunst • **Norway:** Oslo: Oslo School of Architecture • Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science • **Poland:** Bialystok: Technical University • Gliwice: Technical University • Szczecin: Technical University • Wroclaw: Technical University • **Portugal:** Lisbon: Universidade Tecnica • Lisbon: Universidade Ludsiada • Porto: Universidade do Porto • Setubal: Universidade Moderna Setubal • **Roumania:** Bucharest: Inst. Architecture Ion Mincu • Cluj-Napoca: Technical University • Iasi: Technical University Iasi • **Russia:** Bashkortostan: Bashkirsky Dom Regional Design School • Jrkutsk: Technical University • Krasnoyarks: Institute of Civl Engineering • Moscow: Architectural Institute Moscow • **Serbia:** Prishtina: University of Prishtina, Faculty of Architecture • **Slovak Republic:** Bratislava: Slovak Technical University • **Spain:** Barcelona: ETSA Universidad Politecnica da Catalunya • El Valles: ETSA del Valles • La Coruna: Universidad de la Coruna • Las Palmas: ETSA Las Palmas • Madrid: ETSA Madrid • Madrid: Universidad Europea de Madrid • Pamplona: ETSA Universidad de Navarra • San Sebastian: ETSA Universidad del Pais Vasco • Sevilla: ETSA Sevilla • Valencia: ETSA de Valencia • Valladolid: ETSA de Valladolid • **Sweden:** Göteborg: Chalmers Technical University • Lund: Lund University • Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology • **Switzerland:** Genève: Ecole d'Ingénieurs de Genève • Genève: Université de Genève • Lausanne: Ecole Polytech. Fédérale de Lausanne • Mendrisio: Academia di Architettura • Windisch: Fachhochschule Aargau • Zürich: ETH Zürich • **Turkey:** Ankara: Middle East Technical University • Kibris: European University of Lefke • Istanbul: Istanbul Technical University • **Ukraine:** Kiev: Graduate School of Architecture • Lviv: Lviv Politechnic State University • **United Kingdom:** Aberdeen: Robert Gordon University • Belfast: Queen's University • Brighton: Brighton's University • Canterbury: Kent Institute of Art and Design • Cardiff: UWIST • Dartford: Greenwich University • Dundee: University of Dundee • Edinburgh: School of Architecture • Glasgow: University of Strathclyde • Glasgow: Machintosh School of Architecture • Hull: Humberside University • Leeds: School of Art, Architecture and Design • Leicester: De Montford University • Liverpool: Liverpool University • Liverpool: John Moore's University • London: University College, Bartlett School • London: Westminster University • London: Southbank University • Manchester: Manchester School of Architecture • Newcastle upon Tyne: Newcastle University • Oxford: Oxford Brooks University • Plymouth: Plymouth University • Portsmouth: Portsmouth University

# Editorial

News Sheet Editor - Anne Elisabeth Toft

Dear Reader

EAAE Council Member Ebbe Harder (Denmark) is now for the first time officially informing about the **EAAE Prize: "Writings in Architectural Education"** (see front-page).

At the same time Ebbe Harder promises the readers of this magazine that the EAAE Prize will be an essential point on the agenda at this year's **General Assembly**. Just as last year the General Assembly will be held in connection with the **Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture, 1-4 September 2001 in Chania, Crete, Greece**.

On pages 13-15 you can read more about the **4th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture**, where the superior theme of discussion will be the directives of the Bologna Declaration for the architectural education in Europe. The development of the profession demands greater flexibility in the architectural education with differentiated possibilities of specialisation, which is also why the structure of the architectural education must now, among other things, be adapted to the structure at the universities with a three-year basic education (bachelor level) and a two-year superstructure (candidate level).

The following Council Members are responsible for the organisation and running of the 4th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture: EAAE Council Member Constantin Spiridonidis (Greece), and EAAE Council Member Maria Voyatzaki (Greece).

As a thematic introduction to the discussions at the above-mentioned meeting you may benefit from reading the article by EAAE President Herman Neuckermans (Belgium), **The Institutional Context of European Architectural Education** (see page 5). Similarly you can in the **"Profile"** of this issue, which this time deals with **Politecnico di Milano, Faculty of Architecture, Campus Bovisa Milano, Italy** among other topics read about the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Professor Antonio Monestiroli's experiences in connection with the change of his school to the 3-2 structure prescribed by the Bologna Declaration (see page 16).

*Cher lecteur*

*Pour la première fois dans le Bulletin de l'AEEA et officiellement, Mr Ebbe Harder, membre du conseil de l'AEEA (Danemark), vous informe du **Prix de l'AEEA 2001 - Écrits sur l'enseignement de l'architecture** (voir première page).*

*Au même temps, Mr Ebbe Harder garantie aux lecteurs du Bulletin que le Prix de l'AEEA 2001 sera un point essentiel inscrit sur l'ordre du jour à **l'Assemblée Générale** de l'AEEA qui, comme l'année dernière, aura lieu à propos de la Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe, Khaniá, Crète, Grèce.*

*Aux pages 13-15, vous trouverez plus d'information sur la **4ème Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe,** dont le thème général sera les directives de la Déclaration de Bologne pour l'enseignement architectural en Europe. Le développement du métier exige une plus grande flexibilité dans l'enseignement architectural avec un éventail de possibilités de spécialisation, ce qui est aussi la raison pour laquelle la construction de l'enseignement architectural devra maintenant, entre autres, être adjusté à la structure des universités avec une formation initiale de 3 ans (niveau license) et une formation supérièure de 2 ans (niveau maîtrise).*

*Les responsables de l'organisation et du déroulement de la **4ème Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe** sont les membres du conseil suivants: Constantin Spiridonidis (Grèce) et Maria Voyatzaki (Grèce).*

*En prélude thèmatique aux discussions qui auront lieu à la conférence mentionnée ci-dessus, vous pouvez lire l'article du Président de l'AEEA, Mr Herman Neuckermans (Belgique): **The Institutional Context of European Architectural Education** (voir p. 5). Parallèlement, dans le **"Profil"** du Bulletin qui cette fois-ci concerne **Polytechnicque de Milan, Faculté d'Architecture, Campus Bovisa Milano, Italie** vous pouvez, entre autres, vous renseigner sur les expériences du recteur de la faculté de l'Architecture, Professeur Antonio Monestiroli, à l'occasion de la restructuration de l'école à la structure ordonnée 3-2 de la Déclaration de Bologne (voir p. 16).*

The international conference **Re-integrating Theory and Design in Architectural Education** was as earlier advertised (see EAAE News Sheet #58, - #59) held in Ankara, Turkey, in the period from 23 to 26 April 2001. The conference was arranged in a cooperation between Gazi University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Ankara, Turkey, and the EAAE. The Organizing Committee had chosen to invite the following keynote speakers to address the audience at the conference:

- **Christopher Alexander** (USA)
- **Olcay Aykut and Isik Aksulu** (Turkey)
- **Aydan Balamir** (Turkey)
- **Ahmet Gülgönen** (Turkey)
- **John Habraken** (The Netherlands)
- **Gülsüm Baaydar Nalbantoglu** (Turkey)
- **P. G. Raman** (Turkey)

Ph.D.-student François Classens from TU Delft, Faculty of Architecture, Delft, The Netherlands, contributes to this issue of the EAAE News Sheet with a **Report** from the conference (see page 21) and on page 23 you can read Augustin Ioan's text: **On the Different Kinds of Looking at the Architectural Theory.**

   Augustin Ioan is an Associate Professor at the Institute of Architecture "Ion Mincu" Bucharest, Dept. of History and Theory, Bucharest, Romania.

Do architects make good leaders - and can we within the architectural education do anything to develop the leadership qualities of future architects?

   This was just two of the questions I sought answered when I interviewed **Richard N. Swett, Architect and US Ambassador to Denmark**. The whole interview with Richard N. Swett can be read in this issue of the EAAE News Sheet (see page 28).

Yours sincerely

Anne Elisabeth Toft

*Comme nous l'avons annoncé, la conférence internationale, **Réintégration de la Théorie et de la Conception dans l'Enseignement Architectural** a été tenue à Ankara, Turquie, du 23 au 26 avril 2001 (voir Bulletin de l'AEEA #58 et - #59). La conférence a été le résultat d'une coopération entre l'AEEA et l'Université de Gazi, Faculté de l'Ingénierie et de l'Architecture, Ankara, Turquie. Le comité d'organisation avait choisi d'inviter les keynote speakers suivants à la conférence:*

- ***Christopher Alexander** (États-Unis)*
- ***Olcay Aykut et Isik Aksulu** (Turquie)*
- ***Aydan Balamir** (Turquie)*
- ***Ahmet Gülgönen** (Turquie)*
- ***John Habraken** (Pays-Bas)*
- ***Gülsüm Baaydar Nalbantoglu** (Turquie)*
- ***P.G. Raman** (Turquie)*

*Dans ce numéro du Bulletin de l'AEEA, François Classens de TU Delft, qui actuellement prépare son Doctorat à la Faculté d'Architecture, Delft, Pays-Bas, a réalisé un **rapport** approfondi de la conférence (voir p. 21) et en page 23, vous pouvez lire le texte d'Augustin Ioan: **On the Different Kinds of Looking at the Architectural Theory.***

   *Augustin Ioan est Professeur Assistant à l'Institut d'Architecture "Ion Mincu" Bucarest, Departement de l'Histoire et de Théorie, Bucarest, Roumanie.*

*Est-ce que les architects seront des bon leaders? Que faire, dans le cadre de l'enseignement architectural pour développer les qualités de leadership des architects futurs?*

   *Cette question est une de celles que j'ai posées à **Richard N. Swett, Architecte et Ambassadeur des États-Unis au Danemark.** Vous trouverez l'interview de Mr Richard N. Swett dans la suite de ce Bulletin (voir p. 28).*

*Sincèrement*

*Anne Elisabeth Toft*

# The Institutional Context of European Architectural Education

EAAE President, Herman Neuckermans
June 2001

Although we are all involved in architectural education, as we are in our schools, in our countries, many of us are unaware of what happens on the European level with respect to architectural education. As the realization of the European Union progresses without delay, a review of the European initiatives seems more than desirable, in preparation for the meeting of Heads of Schools in Chania in September.

## The European Directive for Arcitecture/ The Advisory Committe

The European directive for the sector of Architecture (85/384/CEE) dating from June 10, 1985[1] specifies the education and vocational training in schools of architecture. To this end the European Commission has set up an Advisory Committee on Education and Training in the field of Architecture (85/385/CEE), which has produced a list by country of the schools that grant a diploma giving access to the profession of architect in the 15 European member countries of the Union. This list is updated regularly by the committee.[2]

This Advisory Committee comprises 3 experts per country: 1 representative of the state, 1 member representing education and 1 representative of the profession. It thus counts 45 members **in total**.

Within this committee two working groups were created: a diploma group and an education group.

The *diploma* group, chaired by James Horan, must examine the candidacies of the schools that apply for European approval; it receives the files submitted by the school and convokes the representatives of this school to present their programme. This work is carried out in presence and under the control of 2 or 3 administrative representatives of the European Commission. The diploma group makes a report, meets at the request of the Member States, and proposes this report to the Advisory Committee to vote.

The *education* group, presided by John E. O'Reilly, is a working group comprising 1 expert per country. It is charged to develop reports on specific subjects, for example the vocational training (apprenticeship), research in architecture, the diploma work in the schools… This working group meets 4 to 5 times per year for 2 days. The reports are written in French or English. When the working group agrees on the text, it presents it to the 45 members for discussion and vote. Once voted, the

text is translated into 11 languages and is sent as a report or recommendation to the Prime Ministers of the 15 governments, who forward it to all authorities involved, which in turn gradually integrate it in the national practices. The reports or recommendations of the 45 are not obligatory in the short term, but in the long run the results will become effective simply by comparison.

The committee has made proposals concerning amongst others the duration of the studies, the pedagogical/teaching contents, the training of the teachers, apprenticeship/internship, and access to the profession of architects.

The Architects' Directive describes in Chapter V the provisions intended to facilitate the effective enforcement/implementation of the right to free movement of persons and services in the European Union.

In 1996 the European Commission published a report known as SLIM (Simpler Legislation in its Internal Market) on the mutual recognition of the diplomas[3]. The goal is to arrive at a simplification aiming at re-examining the structure and mechanism of the seven sectorial directives, as they exist for the doctors of medicine, nurses, veterinary surgeons, dentists, midwives, architects and pharmacists. In the days to come, the European Commission will publish a proposal aiming to replace the sectorial directives and its Advisory Committees by only one general directive (a common body) with appendices specific to the sectors, a new mechanism of consultation thus replacing the Advisory Committees, which are bound to become too expensive in the light of a Europe with 27 or 28 Member States[4].

## UNESCO/UIA/ACE

In 1996, UNESCO and the UIA (*Union Internationale des Architectes* – International Union of Architects) have jointly decided to draw up a global charter on the education of architects. They appointed ten experts from around the globe to write out this charter, which was published in 1996 at the international meeting of the UIA in Barcelona[5].

The UIA unites more than 100 international organizations of architects. Two working groups form its core: the Professional Practice Commission (co-chaired by J. A. Scheeler and Zhang Qinnan) and the Education Committee (chaired by J. C. Riguet).

Both the UIA Accord and Guidelines (Beijing, 1999) and this UIA / UNESCO Charter (Barcelona, 1996) incorporate the fundamental requirements for an architect in terms of knowledge, skills and abilities that must be mastered through education and training as listed in the Architects' Directive (85/384/CEE art.3):

● Ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements, and which aim to be environmentally sustainable;

● Adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and related arts, technologies, and human sciences;

● Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design;

● Adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process;

● Understanding of the relationship between people and buildings and between buildings and their environments, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;

● An adequate knowledge of the means of achieving environmentally sustainable design;

● Understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of architects in society, in particular in preparing briefs that account for social factors;

● Understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project;

● Understanding of the structural design, construction, and engineering problems associated with building design;

● Adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against climate;

● Necessary design skills to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations;

● Adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning;

● Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, and cost control.

These two institutions decided to set up a validation committee for the charter by appointing 17 experts throughout the world for a once renewable three-year term (decision taken at the UIA meeting of September 12th in Paris). The mission of this committee of 17 experts, subdivided according to the UIA's five regions (Europe Region 1, Europe Region 2, Asia, the Americas, Oceania), will be to identify the schools that comply with the charter in order to boost the schools' quality and to sensitise the respective authorities on the importance of architectural practice on a socio-cultural level.

The ACE (Architects' Council of Europe – *Conseil des Architectes de l'Europe*) is the European association dealing with the architects and their profession[6]. It consists of four representatives from each of the 15 member states of the EEC: two representatives from the national professional associations and two from the national architects' orders. Although this organisation has no legal authority, it acts as a mouthpiece for the architects throughout Europe. This professional association maintains very good relations with the consultative committee. Nevertheless the 15 professional representatives in the consultative committee are not members of the ACE, with the exception of Juhani Katainen, who is currently the vice-president of the ACE and will become its next president in 2002.

By representing national professional associations, the ACE is *de facto* a member of the UIA[7].

## The European Higher Education Area (Sorbonne, Bologna, Prague)

The joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education, convened in Bologna in June 1999, was the start for the creation -one year after the Sorbonne agreement- of the 'European Higher Education Area' by the year 2010[8]. It aims at promoting mobility of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff in order to benefit from the richness in democratic values in Europe, its diversity of cultures and languages, the diversity of higher education systems.

Six objectives were accepted:

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees

2. Adoption of a system essentially based on 2 main cycles

3. Establishment of a system of credits

4. Promotion of mobility

5. Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance

6. Promotion of the European dimension in higher education.

The keystone of the agreement is the introduction of a similar structure for all higher education in Europe:

'Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of the first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of 3 years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries.'

Some people fear the effect of equalising education all through Europe. However the communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of HE in Prague on May 19 2001 states: 'It is important to note that in many countries bachelor's and master's degrees, or comparable two cycle degrees, can be obtained at universities as well as at other higher education institutions. Programmes leading to a degree may, and indeed should, have different orientations and various profiles in order to accommodate a diversity of individual, academic and labour market needs as concluded at the Helsinki seminar on bachelor level degrees (February 2001)'[9].

Almost all higher education institutions concerned with the education of an architect, the IUA as well as the ACE, advocate at least a 5-year curriculum in architecture for those who have the ambition to practice as an architect. Quote the ACE position paper on the Bologna declaration[10]:

'…However, a study comprising only three years is too short to lead up to an appropriate level of professional qualification for architects.'

And: 'Professionals and University teachers agree that the development of these skills require studies of at least five years supplemented by a training period of not less than two years.

This view is reflected in the report of the Advisory Committee (ACETA) set up under the architects Directive (58/384/EEC) entitled 'Recommendation on the Duration of Architectural Education and Training' ref : III/5244/5/89-EN dated 31.08.90 and in the UIA (Union Internationale des Architectes) Accord on recommended International standards of Professionalism in Architectural Practice (January 2000).'[11]

And: 'Furthermore, the UIA/UNESCO "Charter for Architectural Education and Architectural Practice" (Barcelona 1996) advocates that the education of architects be of no less than five years duration on a full time basis at an institute of higher education supplemented by a period of three years of practical training.'

It has to be clear that these 5 years cannot be the accumulation of a 3-year professional oriented bachelor study, followed by a 2-year master's study. Five years of study in architecture start from the very outset with the fundaments of architecture as a discipline, and not with the 3 years of a draftsman in architecture. Normally these 2 different tracks should address different profiles of students, with other ambitions and other intellectual and creative capabilities.

In case of studies in architecture, the bachelor degree will primarily be the moment where students can easily switch schools all through Europe, rather than a professional degree leading to a job.

According to Vroeijenstijn, a member of the Dutch Quality Assurance Agency (VSNU) these switches will require an appropriate EQA (External Quality Assessment) with international dimension and new quality accents[12]:

• A more standardised assessment all over Europe: all countries will have to deal with an internationally accepted structure of the evaluation. The question is who will set these standards: governments, professional bodies, the academic community?

• The development of quality labels for all degree programmes: is the bachelor/master/doctorate in one country equivalent to those in another country? Here the question of accreditation is getting a new dimension.

• Results of this EQA must be presented in a way that offers insight to all European partners and the labour market.

## Quality Assessment

Since the 1980ies, institutions of Higher Education have been solicited increasingly to demonstrate their quality and assure the quality under the pressure of society asking what is the return for its investment in education. This economy driven evolution follows the mainstream of quality control that has been a tradition in industry for a long time, as expressed full-grown in ISO-9000.

Because the more 'procedure oriented' industry model, as such, appears not to be applicable to the more 'content oriented' higher education, specific instruments have been developed for quality control and assessment in education within the framework of the European Network of Quality Assurance agencies (ENQA) established/committed by the EU.

In general it consists of an **external assessment** by a committee of independently acting peers, who perform an audit of the institution, its educational activities and eventually its research activities, its services to society. The basis for such an evaluation is the **self-analysis report** produced by the institution/faculty/department itself, followed by an audit in situ. The ingredients of the self-evaluation report are:

1. the formulation of the mission statement of the institution, its goals and aims, its expected outcomes. These are the premises on which every quality assessment is based.

2. the inputs or constraints within which the mission statement has to be realised; this implies screening the management of the institution, policy, staff, students, funding, facilities.

3. the analysis of educational activities; Vroeijenstijn proposes the following model:

## Accreditation/Validation/Recognition and Registration

Nowadays accreditation of educational systems is not a widespread practice in Europe. Western Europe is acquainted with the system of evaluation and quality assessment. In the US accreditation by the professional organisations is well known since the 19th century and also Eastern Europe knows the system of accreditation. Programme accreditation means: 'the process that establishes that an educational program meets an established standard of achievement…'[13] and:

'the acceptance of a specific degree or educational programme as giving the graduate sufficient preparation to start or continue on a career as a professional'[14].

Where accreditation is looking at the input to the course, validation looks at the performance of the output/candidate.

In the USA the professional degrees in architecture are accredited by the NAAB (National Architectural Accrediting Board). In this board the

| GOALS & AIMS | Programme | | | Students | Staff | Output | Satisfaction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Content | Organisation | Examinations | Selection | Qualifications | Pass rate | Opinion students |
| | Translation Goals/aims | Didactic concept | Procedures | counselling | Competencies | Drop out | Opinion alumni |
| | Coherence Program | Curriculum design | Organisation | | Co-operations | Average graduation time | Opinion labour market |
| | Contribution each course towards goals and aims | Innovations | Level | | | | |
| | | | Reflection program | | | Achieved standards | Opinion society |

4. if applicable, an assessment of the research activities. Several models for the evaluation of research have been developed. They look at research policy, research programmes, research management, qualifications and competence of staff, the international framework, Ph.D. programmes, they take into account scientific production measured in number of publications, presentations at international conferences, projects, external funding, reports, dissemination of results, etc.

Several countries have instated the practice of having an internal QA every 3 or 4 years alternating with an external QA at a similar pace.

practising profession is represented by the AIA (American Institute of Architects), the universities and educators represented by ACSA (Association of the Collegiate Schools of Architecture), and the state regulatory boards represented by NCARB (National Council of Architectural Registration Boards)[15].

But in Europe, except in the UK where the professional organisation RIBA still is the accrediting body; accreditation is getting more and more a formal quality label based on external assessment. After Bologna this quality label will have national and international consequences. According to Vroeijenstijn this quality label given by the national EQA-agencies will have to be formally

recognised by an independent body by the name of Quality Council, or Accreditation Council or Validation Council or the like.

Today Europe shows a multitude of paths into the profession of architect. In some countries graduates can practise immediately after graduation, in others they are required to do an internship first, ending with a report or with an exam. Evidently this can lead to unfair situations in a Europe with free exchange of people and services. Architects with a diploma tend to be more expensive than mere apprentices. As a consequence the latter might take over the vacancies in countries without mandatory apprenticeship, simply because they constitute a cheaper work force. This should be put on the European Union's agenda.

A quick scan of the actual situation in Europe regarding access to the profession shows the following picture[16]:

**Austria**

- Graduates from universities of technology are Dipl.-Ing. Resp., and from universities of arts (former academies) (Mag. Arch). They are all operating under the Private Engineer Act from 1993 (Ziviltechnikergesetz – ZTG, 1993).

- Diplomas are accredited by the state system; internal and external quality assessment of schools has started this year.

- The private engineer and architect are entitled to do the planning of projects of specific fields, but not to do the site supervision.

- Only the authorized architect (master-builder), however, can do both.

- This authorization is not issued simultaneously with graduation from a department of architecture, but is subject to several years of practical work prior to admittance to the private engineer exam. Following Austria's entry to the European Union the ZTG was adjusted for EU-architects substituting the private engineer-exam by the so-called 'information obligation', i.e. a colloquium to evidence that the applicant is acquainted with the legal regulations governing the specialized field of architecture.

- The title of 'architect' is protected and is only awarded after becoming a member of the Chamber of Architects and Engineers.

**Belgium**

- The title of 'architect' is legally protected.

- Diplomas are recognised by the ministry of education through a mechanism that is different for institutes of higher education and universities; there is no accreditation by the profession.

- Graduates become entitled to practice architecture as autonomous and liable individuals after 2 years of apprenticeship.

**Denmark**

- The title of 'architect' is not protected.

- No accreditation of diplomas; title of the graduates 'candidates in architecture' is guaranteed by the state.

- Students graduate after 5 years of study; graduates can practice immediately after graduation; even without becoming a member of the Danish Academic Association of Architects (MAA); however state subsidized commissions require a proof of professional experience.

- The situation is similar in all Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Finland) with minor variations.

**France**

- The title of 'architect' is protected.

- Graduates have the right to practice immediately after graduation; they are sworn in by the Ordre des Architectes.

- Programmes are accredited per cycle by a committee of teachers, practitioners and university professors.

- The sixth year of study comprises a semester of apprenticeship and a thesis work.

**Germany**

- The diploma is certified by the state for the Technical Universities as well as for the Fachhochschule.

- Graduates get the academic title of Diplom Ingenieur or Ingenieur.

- The title of 'architect' is protected.

● Only after 1 to 2 years apprenticeship with presentation to the *Architektenkammer* they are entitled Architect and admitted to practice.

● The official duration of studies is 5 years at the TU (in reality 6.5 years as an average) and 4 to 4.5 years at the Fachhochschule.

**Greece**

● The diploma is given by the schools without accreditation process.

● After presenting their final year project to a jury of professionals, graduates have access to the profession.

● No apprenticeship is required, although for state subsidized commissions experience has to be proven varying with the 'category' (importance) of the job.

● Engineers and surveyors can also act as architect.

**Italy**

● Graduates, called *dottore archittetto*, have to pass an exam organised by the state (essamo di stato), twice a year in order to access the profession and become a member of the Ordre des Architectes; the examination committee consists of professors and 1 representative of the Ordre des Architectes.

● Apprenticeship is not required.

● Architect-draftsman graduate after 3 years of study; the *dottore* requires officially 5 years of study.

**The Netherlands**

● The diploma gives directly access to the profession.

● The profession is not protected; the title of 'architect' is protected.

● There is no accreditation; quality control of schools is done via external quality assessment every 3 years for education, after another 3 years for research; this procedure has nothing to do with the profession.

● The study programme fulfils the fundamental requirements of an architect as formulated in the UIA accord.

**Portugal**

● Till today graduates from schools of architecture could enter the profession and become a member of the Ordre des Architectes immediately after graduation.

● Now the situation is changing because of the advent of many new private schools of architecture: the Ordre requires 6 to 8 months of apprenticeship before registration with the Ordre.

● Accreditation of schools/certification of the programme by the Ordre des Architectes (the constitution of the committees is still a subject of debate) is in the pipeline; graduates from accredited schools do not have to pass an exam after apprenticeship, the others have to.

**Romania**

● The 4 schools of architecture confer the title of 'architect'; graduates can enter immediately into the profession, but can only take responsibility after 2 years and an exam taken by a committee from the Ordre des Architectures, consisting of academics as well as practitioners.

● By the end of 2001, this will be after 2 years of experience in practice.

● There is a national accreditation board of the programmes.

● The Institute of Architecture Ion Mincu (IAIM) asks quality assessment from RIBA every 4 years.

● IAIM also obtained from the French Ministry of Culture for their graduates the right to become a member of the French Ordre des Architectes, without any other prerequisites.

**Spain**

● The only way to become an architect in Spain is by graduating from a school of architecture, whether at a public (state) or at a recognised private university.

● Graduates can start their professional practice immediately after graduation.

● The title of 'architect' is protected; only the graduates of a school of architecture can call themselves Architect.

**UK**

• Generally the studies of architecture consist of a Bachelor's course of 3 years (pt1), 1 year of practical training (the year out), followed by 2 years for the 'diploma in architecture (pt 2)' and then at least 1 further year of practice. Graduates can then take the final part 3 examination (log book of office experience, case studies, written examination on professional practice and an oral exam), which will then qualify them for admission to the RIBA (the chartered professional body) and registration with ARB (Government). Registration with ARB allows the individual to call him/herself Architect in the UK, i.e. protection of title. There is no protection of function in the UK.

• RIBA and ARB also jointly control the 30 schools of architecture in the UK. Every 5 years schools go through a process of quality assessment by the RIBA/ARB. This 'audit' focuses on the quality of student performance (as well as checking "inputs") and is called validation, as opposed to accreditation. It covers all years of the school but particularly looks at years 3 (pt1), 5 (pt2) and 7 (pt3). The visiting board comprises academics, practitioners, a non-architect, a student and a local representative. The school "audit" is comprehensive and the board interviews the head of the University, Head of School, Teachers, Students, External Examiners and examines the work done via an exhibition and sample portfolios. A report is then made which is sent to the school (for information) and to the RIBA and ARB for approval. Conditions can be made in the report to rectify weaknesses - these can include early revisits.

• The RIBA also carries out validation services internationally and is active in all 5 continents and in 20 countries. A feature and strength of the system is that there is considerable student mobility between schools, even internationally, between pt1 and pt2.

**Questions/Afterthoughts/Remarks**

1. Till today UIA, ACE, the Architects Directive and its advisory committee are completely focused on the architect who conceives buildings. If education in architecture is going to widen its scope and deliver graduates who are specialists in the built environment and who can take many different responsibilities in spatial issues, then this distinction should appear throughout all texts, advises and regulations.

2. Assessment of such a school, including its research activities, includes, but is wider than accreditation for the profession of architect.

3. What is the position of EAAE in the proposed restructuration of the Architects Directive? Is there a role to fulfil by EAAE?

4. For those who are going to practise architecture as a profession, apprenticeship/internship has to be streamlined. Maybe internship can be defined contentwise in terms of achievements instead of in terms of duration.

5. In the process of accreditation of programmes EAAE should play a role, as is the case with ACSA in the USA.

6. Openings have to be made towards a research base for architecture as a discipline. The research community should have a voice in this debate.

7. EAAE has to take position in the debate on the EHEA and bring this as a motion to the forum of the Ministers of Education (like other associations did, as it can be read in the introduction to the Prague meeting minutes).

8. Five is not three plus two. ■

**This article will be published in French in EAAE News Sheet # 61**

## Notes and References

1. 85/384/CEE
   Rue de la Loi, 200
   B-1049 Bruxelles
   Bureau C107 1/8
   tel: ++32/2.2991111

2. ibidem, chapter III

3. Report for the SLIM exercise on the
   mutual recognition of Diplomas
   Rue de la Loi, 200
   B-1049 Bruxelles
   Bureau C107/01/046

4. proposal by European Commission
   Internal Market Directorate General,
   Unit D-4
   Av. De Cortenbergh, 100
   B-1049 Brussels
   e-mail: Market-D4@cec.eu.int

5. U.I.A. Work Programme 'Education'
   UIA/UNESCO Charter for
   Architectural education – june 1996
   51, rue Raynouard
   75016 Paris
   e-mail: uia@uia-architectes.org

6. Architects' Council of Europe
   rue Paul emile Janson, 29
   B-1050 Bruxelles
   e-mail: info@ace-cae.org

7. the previous paragraphs are based to a
   large extent upon an interview with
   professor Roland Schweitzer and with
   professor James Horan

8. The European Higher Education Area
   Joint declaration of the European
   Ministers of Education convened in
   Bologna on 19 June 1999

   http://www.unige.ch/cre/activities/
   Bologna%20Forum/

9. Towards the European Higher
   Education Area

Communiqué of the meeting of
European Ministers in charge of
Higher Education in Prague on
19 May 2001. (4p)

10. ACE Position Paper on the joint
    declaration of the European ministers
    of higher Education convened in
    Bologna on 19 June 1999 - ACE,
    Brussels, 5 May 2001 (2p)

11. Union Internationale des Architectes
    UIA Accord on recommended
    International Standards of
    Professionalism in Architectural
    Practice - January 2000

12. Vroeijenstijn, A. I.:
    Quality Assurance in the schools of
    Architecture (11p)
    Paper presented at the Third Meeting
    of Heads of Schools of Architecture –
    Chania (Crete), September 2000

13. see ref. 11

14. see ref. 12

15. Palermo, G.:
    NAAB in the U.S. System, pp. 19-22
    In: EAAE From Education to Practice:
    accreditation systems comparison
    (proceedings of the Brussels meeting)
    Ed. J.F. Mabardi

16. from personal communication by
    academics in each of the countries
    listed:
    **Austria** (Bob Martens); **Denmark**
    (Peter Kjaer); **France** (Sabine
    Darmaillacq-Chardonnet); **Germany**
    (Heiner Hoffmann); **Greece**
    (Constantin Spiridonidis); **Italy**
    (Andrea Bruno); **The Netherlands**
    (Carl Weeber); **Portugal** (Sergio
    Infante); **Romania** (Emil Popescu);
    **Spain** (Carlos Manuel Muñoz-
    Fontenla); **U. K.** (Maria Voyatzaki and
    Jack Pringle),
    with thanks

**The 4th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture**

Chania, Crete, Greece, 1-4 September 2001

# Speculating the Future of Architectural Education in the Light of the Bologna Declaration

**The Fourth Meeting of Heads of Schools of Architecture** will take place, once again, in the City of Chania, Crete, Greece from **1 to 4 September 2001**. Like last year the **European Cement Association** (**CEMBUREAU**) will kindly sponsor the event. The theme of the Meeting is '**Speculating the Future of Architectural Education in the Light of the Bologna Declaration**'. The Meeting is addressed to those that have the responsibility to decide on issues related to the academic profile of their School (Heads, Rectors, Directors, and/or Academic Program Coordinators).

After the unanimous decision taken by the participants of the Third Meeting of Heads last year, the Fourth Meeting is coming up to confirm Heads' enthusiasm and commitment to fruitful dialogue, exchange of ideas and practices related to the management of academic issues in schools of architecture in Europe. The aim of the Meeting is to contribute to the understanding of the political and academic characteristics of the new higher education space in Europe proposed by the Bologna Declaration, and to speculate the future of architectural education as well as the profile of the architect in this space. It is expected that this Meeting will become an inventory of the trends and dynamics, which are emerging in Schools of Architecture of all European Countries as a consequence of this call for reform. For this reason, the agenda is open-ended and participants are invited to suggest other issues for discussion, which reflect the debate on that subject in their institution or their country. The EAAE Council strongly believes that it becomes more than necessary for schools of architecture in Europe to anticipate their future collectively and to collaborate on the definition of aims and objectives as well as on the strategies for their fulfillment. Active presence and effective representation of all Schools to this meeting is, therefore, of vital importance.

Eminent keynote speakers such as **Stefan Behnisch, William Curtis, Vittorio Gregotti, Neil Leach and Ian Ritchie** have been invited to give lectures related to the above topics. Moreover, at the Meeting, there will be a presentation of the conclusions of the Pan-European Survey on architectural education, which was ran by the EAAE and

CEMBUREAU, and was addressed to all staff members of EAAE member Schools of Architecture.

The participation fees for the Meeting are **520 EURO** for EAAE member Schools and **700 EURO** for non-EAAE member Schools. These include the subscription fee, four-night hotel accommodation, all (seven) meals, coffee breaks and guided tour in the region. An amount of 120 EURO will cover dinners, social events and the excursion for accompanied members.

Those interested in participating are kindly requested to fax immediately the enclosed to this Newssheet registration form to ++**30/31.458660**. Please do not hesitate to contact our secretary for any further information. ■



Venetian Lighthouse, Chania

## The 4th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture

Chania, Crete, Greece, 1-4 September 2001

# Speculating the Future of Architectural Education in the Light of the Bologna Declaration
# Preliminary (and open ended) Agenda

**Association Européenne du Ciment**
**The European Cement Association**
**CEMBUREAU**

Sponsor: EUROPEAN CEMENT ASSOCIATION (CEMBUREAU)

Host: CENTER FOR MEDITERRANEAN ARCHITECTURE

### Session 1:

**State of the Art in Architectural Education in Europe**

Presentation of the Results and Conclusions of the Pan-European Survey ran by EAAE and CEMBUREAU.

*In collaboration and sponsorship of CEMBUREAU, the EAAE is running a survey to all European Schools of Architecture. The aim of the Survey is to record the views of academics in architectural education on issues related to architectural education in general, and the teaching of construction and building materials in particular.*

### Session 2:

**The Education of the Architects in the Framework of the Bologna Declaration. Tendencies, Issues, Criticisms and Responses**

- How compatible is the existing framework of architectural education in Europe with the new higher education space at which the Bologna Declaration aims?
- Which are the most crucial issues that schools will encounter if they are to follow the Bologna Declaration principles?
- Are there any objectives of architectural education subverted by the Declaration?
- How is the freedom of schools to manage their curricula redefined in the cohesive space of higher education indicated by the Declaration?
- How will Schools of Architecture define a set of credible goals in order to anticipate change and avoid its imposition?

### Session 3:

**Bologna Declaration and Architects Employability in the European Labour Market**

- Does the new educational environment, promoted by the Declaration, orient studies in the direction of education or in the direction of training?
- Do schools of architecture have a choice in one or the other direction?
- Which are the consequences of the Declaration on the working environment?

- What is the view held by professional bodies on the consequences of the Declaration?
- What profile of architect emerges from the educational environment prescribed by the Declaration?
- What are the adaptations that schools are invited to make in order to align with the labor market as indicated by the Declaration?

### Session 4:

**The Diversity of Architectural Education in Europe and the Convergence Dictated by the Bologna Declaration**

- How can convergence of architectural education be achieved given the existing diversity in Europe?
- Do the recent implemented reforms ensure a compatible educational environment?
- To what extent are mobility and quality ensured in the implemented reforms in view of the Declaration?
- What system will ensure compatibility of degrees awarded by different schools of architecture in Europe?
- Is it possible for a cohesive European space in architectural education to come true without schools common agreement to form a unanimous framework of values, content and directions?
- What are the procedures, which would allow such frame work to be formed?

### Session 5:

**How will Schools of Architecture proceed in the light of the Bologna Declaration?**
**Proposals for Actions and Strategies**

- How do participants see the role of schools in this new cohesive environment indicated by the Declaration?
- What initiatives have to be taken immediately in order for schools to adopt strategy(ies) which will enable them to move forward?
- Are there visible groupings that would allow schools to become stronger in the process of initiation in the cohesive European environment and more specifically in the forming of the type and the physiognomy of degrees they award?
- Proposal and strategies forward.

**The 4th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture**

Chania, Crete, Greece, 1-4 September 2001

# Speculating the Future of Architectural Education in the Light of the Bologna Declaration
# Preliminary Programme

**Saturday 1 September 2001**

| | |
|---|---|
| 19:30 | Opening Session |
| 20:30 | Refreshment Break |
| 21:00 | Keynote Speech |

**Sunday 2 September 2001**

09:00    C. Spiridonidis, (Thessaloniki, Greece) Introduction to the themes and discussion issues of the meeting

**Session 1 09:30 – 13:30**
**State of the Art in Architectural Education in Europe**

Presentation of the Results and Conclusions of the Pan-European Survey ran by EAAE and CEMBUREAU
*Session Co-organised with CEMBUREAU*

| | |
|---|---|
| 09:30 | Introduction to the issues of the Survey |
| 10:10 | Presentation of the results of the Survey |
| 10:30 | Coffee Break |

       Workshop 1 11:00 – 13:30
       Discussion Group 1 / Discussion Group 2

13:30    Lunch

**Session 2 15:00 – 18:30**
**The Education of the Architects in the Framework of the Bologna Declaration. Tendencies, Issues, Criticisms and Responses**

| | |
|---|---|
| 15:00 | Introduction to the issues of the Session. Keynote speeches on the Bologna declaration Follow-up Process |
| 16:30 | Coffee Break |

       Workshop 2 17:00 – 18:30
       Discussion Group 1 / Discussion Group 2

| | |
|---|---|
| 19:00 | Keynote Speech on Architecture and Architectural Education |
| 20:30 | Dinner |

**Monday 3 September 2001**

**Session 3 09:30 – 13:30**
**Bologna Declaration and Architects Employability in the European Labour Market**

| | |
|---|---|
| 09:30 | Introduction to the issues of the Session UIA + Other Prof. Bodies Keynote speeches |
| 10:30 | Coffee Break |

       Workshop 3 11:00 – 13:30
       Discussion Group 1 / Discussion Group 2

13:30    Lunch

**Session 4 15:00 – 18:30**
**The Diversity of Architectural Education in Europe and the Convergence Dictated by the Bologna Declaration**

| | |
|---|---|
| 15:00 | Introduction to the issues of the Session Keynote Panel |
| 16:30 | Coffee Break |

       Workshop 4 17:00 – 18:30
       Discussion Group 1 / Discussion Group 2

| | |
|---|---|
| 19:00 | Keynote Speech on Architecture and Architectural Education |
| 20:30 | Dinner |

**Tuesday 4 September 2001**

**Session 5 (Plenary) 09:30 – 13:30**
**How will Schools of Architecture proceed in the light of the Bologna Declaration?**
**Proposals for Actions and Strategies**

| | |
|---|---|
| 09:30 | Introduction Keynote panel |
| 10:30 | Coffee Break |
| 11:00 | Plenary discussion, proposals and decisions |
| 13:30 | Lunch |

**Closing Plenary Session 15:00 – 17:30**
**Conclusions, Statements and Perspectives**

18:00    Excursion in the Region and Farewell Dinner

# Profile: Politecnico di Milano

Interview with Antonio Monestiroli, Politecnico di Milano, Faculty of Architecture, Campus Bovisa Milano, Italy.

This interview with the Dean of the Faculty of the Architecture at Politecnico di Milano - *Professor Antonio Monestiroli* - is the second interview in a series of "Profiles" of European schools of architecture, which will be published in the EAAE News Sheet.

The first "Profile" was brought in the EAAE News Sheet # 58, where Professor Leen van Duin talked about the Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, the Netherlands.

The conversation between Professor Antonio Monestiroli and EAAE News Sheet Editor Anne Elisabeth Toft took place on 2 November 2000 during the 18th EAAE Conference: *Architectural Strategies and Design Methods.* The conference was held at TU Delft, the Netherlands between 1 and 3 November 2000. Professor Antonio Monestiroli was invited to participate as a keynote-speaker in this arrangement.

Antonio Monestiroli has had an architectural practice in Milan since 1967. From 1970 and onwards he has been professor at the Faculty of Architecture at Politecnico di Milano. He is an honorary member of the Faculty of Architecture at Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Antonio Monestiroli graduated in Architecture from Politecnico di Milano, Italy (1965). He was a professor at the Faculty of Architecture at G. D'Annunzio in Pescara (1973-1976) and at IUAV in Venice (1984-1986). He was Pro-Rector at Politecnico di Milano (1991-1994) and Director of *Dipartimento di Progettazione dell' Architettura* (1988-1994). Antonio Monestiroli was curator of *Il Centro Altrove: Periferie e Nuove Centralita nelle Aree Metropolitane,* for the Triennale of Milan (1995). He has participated in various (inter)national design competitions and his works have been published in both Italian and foreign architecture magazines. His publications include *L'Architettura della Realtà* (1979) and *Casa dello Studente a Chieti,* the second with Giorgio Grassi (1980). He was Director of *QA - Quaderni del Dipartimento di Progettazione dell' Architettura del Politecnico di Milano* (1990-1995). Since 1999 he has been a member of Accademia di San Luca of Rome. Antonio Monestiroli has been Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Campus Bovisa Milano since 2000.

Politecnico di Milano, Faculty of Architecture, Campus Bovisa Milano, Italy, was accepted as a new member school at the EAAE General Assembly on 5 September 2000.

The Faculty of Architecture has already changed its organisation to concur with the directives of the Bologna Declaration.

**The Politecnico was founded in 1863 by a group of university people, scholars and entrepreneurs belonging to prominent Milanese families. Could you please tell me about the background of the Politecnico and the Faculty of Architecture?**

The Politecnico was founded long before the Faculty of Architecture. This faculty was not established until after World War I around 1920, and then it took place first of all on the initiative of a small group of prominent architects and engineers. It had, however, for several years been possible to study architecture in Milan, but this took place exclusively at academies of fine arts and as a natural consequence the teaching was founded on a Beaux-Art tradition. The need for and wish to establish a faculty of architecture that could offer a more technically oriented teaching of architecture – and thereby also in many ways a more up-to-date and relevant teaching – arose concurrently with the changed conditions of the profession and a beginning Modernism. Milan was already in the beginning of the 20th century a dynamic industrial city, and there were a large number of competent and new-thinking architects who felt attracted to the city.

The Faculty of Architecture developed into a faculty with a very strong technical tradition, and even today most students at the faculty take their point of departure in construction when they design. This is of course to a large extent a consequence of the fact that the faculty is part of Politecnico di Milano. In the Netherlands you see how similar conditions manifest themselves at the Faculty of Architecture at TU Delft.

After World War II there were a number of distinguished international architects in Milan, who all left their mark on the faculty and its

development - Gio Ponti, Ernesto Rogers, Franco Albini, and others. These artistically talented architects took part in the softening of the very technical, but also somewhat rigid expression that otherwise set a fashion at the faculty. Focus was very much now also on architecture as a poetic statement.

At the same time these architects incorporated inspiration and knowledge from a number of related fields – among others philosophy.

Ernesto Rogers was a close friend of Enzo Paci, who was a professor of philosophy in Milan. Through Enzo Paci Ernesto Rogers became aware of the phenomenology which became of significant importance to his architecture and his teaching at Politecnico di Milano. Eventually a very important and dynamic specialist environment arose around Ernesto Rogers and his teaching. This environment took its starting point in a phenomenological understanding. Among students from this environment can be mentioned Aldo Rossi, Guido Canella, Vittorio Gregotti. Incidentally, these were all later behind the well-known *Casabella Magazine*.

**Is the phenomenological influence special for the Faculty of Architecture at Politecnico di Milano or was there a similar development at other Italian schools?**

The two main schools were then as now the school in Milan and the school in Venice. There was and still is a constant exchange of professors between these two schools. For instance, both Ernesto Rogers and Aldo Rossi taught at both schools. Therefore, I wish to say that this "culture" or influence is special for these two Northern Italian schools. The school in Rome, which is also a large and essential school of architecture in Italy, is very different. The professional tradition in Rome is to a larger extent attached to the classic academic tradition than is the case at the two previously mentioned schools. This classic "culture" and its architectural expression had its rise during the Fascism in Italy.

The school in Rome has as the other two schools a reputation for employing a large number of acknowledged international architects, but basically there is a distinct professional or "cultural" difference between the Northern Italian and the Central Italian schools. (Rome and Naples). Generally you can say that the Northern Italian schools are technically oriented where the schools in Southern Italy are to a larger extent deeply rooted in an arts academy tradition.

In Italy there are only three polytechnic universities - Politecnico di Milano, Politecnico di Torino and Politecnico di Bari. The schools in Milan and Turin are in many ways related. The study contents of the teaching are almost identical and the institutions are run very alike. So I think that there are more similarities than differences between these two schools. Politecnico di Bari is a young institution that was established less than 10 years ago. The school, which is located in Southern Italy, primarily appeals to engineers, even though the school also offers teaching in architecture. It will not be wrong, however, to say that this faculty of architecture is not as highly esteemed professionally as the faculties in Milan and Turin.

**Which teaching method is practised at the Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano today?**

The conditions of architecture are at present very complex. This is of course a consequence of the still increasing complexity that characterizes our time and our society. Today the design process itself therefore depends more than ever on a large number of different disciplines that did not necessarily have to be included earlier to the same degree. Today our profession demands that we have both a broad knowledge within a number of sporadic areas, and that we have a specific and thorough expertise within a limited field.

There is a sort of contradiction between vastness and profundity. Today it is very difficult to imagine the existence of a design discipline that is both vast and profound in all its different aspects. And today it is indispensable to recognize that this discipline is divided into many disciplines that work together in the definition of an architectural project.

At Politecnico di Milano we attempt to relate constructively to the above complex of problems. The complexity – and the seemingly inconsistent relationship between breadth and depth in the discipline – is taken into account as important parameters of the way we organise our teaching.

First of all, we offer a wide range of courses, the function of which is to introduce the student to a number of theoretical disciplines – mathematics, physics, building technology, science, architectural history, etc. So the students have scheduled course activities every morning.

In the afternoon the students participate in a more long-term project work – we call it a "workshop" – which includes participation of a number of students as well as teachers. The workshop is a place where things are produced. A place in which teachers and students work together on a project. There are many teachers present and all disciplines within our profession are represented. Our hope is that the students in this specific situation will experience – and thereby realise – the complexity of the profession, as it unfolds in connection with the development of a project.

In the three-year study programme we have planned (cf. the Bologna Declaration) there are two workshops each year; architectural design and interior design during the first year, architectural design and restoration during the second, architectural design and urban design during the third. Thus, over three years of intense work students will have a direct experience of architecture through design practice. This experience will represent a solid foundation for their training.

This is how we look at the first-level degree; a degree that contains all the properties of the craft of the architect, which can then be refined and studied in depth on the second level. With the first-level degree the student should know the phenomenology of architectural design, its aims, the materials it uses, its methodology. These types of knowledge will permit the student who takes a degree in the first three years to begin a period of professional internship or apprenticeship, during which it is possible to continue studying, completing two more years to obtain a specialized degree. In these two years the studies concentrate on a deeper knowledge of the problems of design, which may move in different directions: from urban planning to the design of a building, from interior architecture to restoration of existing buildings. The specialized degree can also have to do only with questions regarding the history of the city or of architecture, or questions related to the technical construction of the city. What is important, however, is that the level of investigation of the problem should be of high quality and in close connection with the problems of architectural design.

The difference between the three-year basic education and the specialized degree has created a lot of discussion at the faculty. We have all agreed, however, that the three-year basic education should lead to a three-year degree. The education ought to really be a *basic*

*education,* in all senses. It must allow the student to know in substance what we might call - *the body of architecture.*

I should like to add that, in my opinion, we have until now only had good experiences with the new structure.

**Do the students only work in groups?**

Yes, they work in groups of two or three students. I personally think that it is a good thing that there are more students working on a project or complex of problems. In this way a discussion arises – and this discussion will at best motivate the individual to reflect and argue his or her architectural points of view. I think that it is very important that the student learns to communicate his or her points of view – to conceptualise his or her proposal.

**How is information technology (IT) - for instance CAD - included in the teaching?**

We have now finally included IT in the teaching. It did not, however, happen until two years ago, and we still have some problems in integrating it properly in the teaching. It is also difficult for us to recruit teachers who are able to teach IT. At the faculty we have at the moment 10 young assistants who teach CAD. There are about 200 computers at the faculty. They are used in connection with the "workshop" project work. So, the students do not take courses in CAD but use the computer directly in connection with the project development. In Italy CAD is only now really in the process of being integrated in the architectural environment.

**What is the teacher/student ratio at the faculty?**

The students are typically distributed and gathered every year in ten units of about 50 students. If there are 500 students occupied with a workshop project, there will typically be about 50 teachers who are more or less involved as supervisors. Of this number about 10 will be professors or associate professors. Each professor has 5 to 6 young assistants, however. This makes it possible to have this fine teacher/student ratio. All the disciplines of the profession are, as mentioned earlier, represented in the selection of teachers. There is, however, a good deal of replacement in the

group of assistants. The assistants are typically employed for 1 to 2 years. This is also the reason why a large part of the permanently employed staff's work is to structure, organise and make strategies for the teaching.

**Do the permanently employed staff at the faculty continuously evaluate the education - and how do the teachers avoid teaching their students "formulas" and/or "strategies"?**

This is a very interesting and important question. Every two months we have a big session or display where the student's works are presented. During the first week we are going over about 500 students' work. We do not, however, only look at the finished projects, but also at the work in progress. There will be about 50 teachers present who, together with the students, discuss the work presented. We also invite relevant guests to these session, so that they can enrich the discussions with their points of view and critique. We typically invite representatives from public administrations, institutions, museums, etc.

At the faculty we have had many and long discussions about how best to prepare our students for the vast complexity of our times. We have, as earlier mentioned, tried to take our starting point in exactly this complex of problems in connection with the organisation of the new three-year basic education.
We are always trying – through our teaching, our questions and discussions – to challenge the individual student. It is important that he or she learns to be critical, to include various points of view and to angle his or her material in relation to the many disciplines of the profession. It is equally important that the students develop an understanding of society and its complexity.

When I was a student myself - about 30 years ago – teaching was very different. At that time all the disciplines were separated, and so it was the individual student who was responsible for creating the synthesis.

**Please tell us more about how the students' work is assessed!**

As I mentioned before the evaluation actually takes place continuously as we at displays every other month discuss the project in progress. This is also why it is easy to give the final evaluation or critique because we as teachers are

already acquainted with the project – and its development. The final evaluation takes place once a year. The individual student works on one project a year. So, the students at the faculty of architecture in Milan have made five (5) projects before taking the final examination from the school. In addition to these five projects they make an additional project before they finish their studies with a Diploma Project.

**Are there more male than female students at the Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano?**

I think there is more or less the same number of female students as there are male students. However, I know that many female students are attracted to the Faculty of Industrial Design, and I actually think that there are more female than male students at that faculty. I don't know the reason, though!

**What about the number of female professors – are there many female professors at the Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano?**

No, there are hardly any female professors.

**Do you know why it is so?**

No, I don't, but I think that women – at least that is how it was earlier – to some degree rejected educations and jobs that are technically oriented. Traditionally men have always dominated the technical occupations. Perhaps it will change in the future.

**Does the academic staff at the Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano participate actively in school politics?**

No, I'm afraid not. That is a big problem. Many teachers here do not participate in the common school political responsibility. In my opinion this is due to the fact that most professors have their private architects offices in addition to their teaching. They simply do not have the energy, the time and the resources to wholeheartedly commit themselves to school politics and day-to-day running of the school. In my opinion, however, the institution suffers by this. In the same way there is a division between teachers who are engaged in research, and teachers who are dealing with the school's management.

I myself am an unusual case as I used to be a researcher and became manager. Normally people isolate themselves in their own little ivory tower.

As dean of the faculty I have a group consisting of 8 professors with whom I have a close cooperation on the management of the faculty.

**To which extent does Politecnico di Milano adjust its teaching to the continuous changes within the profession and in society?**

The relationship with society and a given context is in my opinion very important parameters for architecture. That is how it has always been and this is the way it is today. I think that Politecnico di Milano has the advantage that the institution is the framework for many different disciplines. The complexity of the school to a large extent reflects the complexity of society. Our school has a direct contact to the profession as it looks outside the institution.

**Does that mean that there is for instance a direct cooperation between Politecnico di Milano and the industry?**

Yes, there are definitely cooperation and mutual interests – especially between the engineers here at Politecnico di Milano and the industry. We are, however, still a government institution, but I would think that within the next year Politecnico di Milano will be changed into a private foundation. These years the development here in Italy is going in the direction of more and more public institutions being changed into private foundations.

**How will this change influence Politecnico di Milano?**

That is, of course, the question you ask yourself and which can worry you. It is necessary that you closely consider advantages and disadvantages. The problem is whether research can remain free. We will have to select our sponsors carefully.

**Why do all these changes from public institutions to private foundations take place just now?**

A lot of people feel that the solution to social problems is privatisation. The general attitude is today that public institutions would function better and more efficiently if they were privatised. I think it will be hard to stop this development.

**Has the Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano, established any kind of educational cooperation with other schools of architecture, and if so which ones?**

The faculty has an extensive network. The many contacts and cooperations with other schools are among other things reached through the Socrates- and Erasmus programmes. Our students travel a lot – it is not unusually for them to spend one or more terms at another institution. We have particularly fine contacts with the faculties of architecture at TU Delft and the Spanish schools in Madrid, Valencia and Barcelona.

Unfortunately, it is difficult for us to admit foreign students here in Milan. This is due to the fact that we do not have nearly enough rooms in halls of residence and youth hostels. This is a general problem in Italy. It is far too expensive for young people to move away from home while they are taking an education.

**What is the primary agenda for you and your faculty in the near future?**

I hope, of course, that the faculty will develop in a positive direction, and that the teaching will bear fruit. That is my superior goal. I hope that our school can contribute with something – not just internally but also externally – for the city of Milan. I hope very much that we here at the school will be able to develop projects and proposals for the city. Projects that will raise new discussions about the city, the role of the city, and life as it is for the people of the city.

I would very much like to point out the importance of architecture for us as human beings. I think that the history of architecture and of our cities allow us to hope that it is possible to think about construction of the city as an artwork, as a form that represents a culture of living. I am convinced that architecture is, above all, a matter of social awareness! ■

## Re-integrating Theory and Design in Architectural Education / *Réintégration de la Théorie et de la Conception dans l'Enseignement Architectural*

19th EAAE CONFERENCE, 23-26 May 2001

Gazi University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Department of Architecture, Ankara, Turkey

# Report

François Claessens, Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture, The Netherlands

The city of Ankara set the stage for the latest EAAE-Conference, which dealt with the dilemma of a supposed gap between the theoretical discourse of academics and the empirical approaches of designers in architectural education. The questions that where set out for this conference were directed at exploring teaching methods and pedagogical strategies that must make possible a re-integration of theory and design, in order to close the gap again.

The papers were organised according to three sub-themes, one for each day: Architectural theory for architectural practice; Teaching the integration of theory and practice; Re-conciliating education and practice. For each day the paper presentations were structured in three sessions, each session starting off with a presentation of a keynote speaker. Although the structure of the conference was clear, the coherence in paper presentations was hard to find in most sessions. This made it hard for participants, moderators, and audience to develop a serious in-depth debate. This absence of concord was not due to the organisation of the conference – which was professional and more than adequate - or to the quality of the individual contributions - which was in general of a high standard -, but was the result of the great variety and diversity of interpretations of and approaches to the subject, and the questions of this conference presented in the individual papers.

Nevertheless, if one listened carefully one could distinguish two general but radical opposite voices within all of this polyphony. These two positions can best be illustrated by the lectures of three of the keynote speakers. The first position represents a generally accepted, and I think leading, view within contemporary architecture that has been circulating since the arrival of post-modern thought. P. G. Raman, who advocated the 'weak theory' - a term borrowed from the Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo - against the grand narratives in architectural thinking, best articulated this position. Like the 'flaneur' of Benjamin, the architect in our age wanders through the world and can pick up fragments of ideas, no matter where they come from, to be used as motives for his work. Today, the architect can just as easily be informed by history as by nature or art, which allows for heterogeneity, the keyword of post-modern thought.

A voice against this more or less relativist point of view was raised by two other keynote speakers, John Habraken and Christopher Alexander. Both attacked the still persuasive avant-garde ideology in architecture. This ideology of artistic freedom and self-expression leads to form-making as a goal in itself and creates a total self-referential architecture. According to Habraken this ideology was already introduced during the Renaissance, brought to a climax by modern architecture, only to be continued during the post-modern era. Both Habraken and Alexander therefore try to avoid the use of the term 'architecture', which is in their view too related to this avant-garde tradition, and instead they prefer to talk about 'built environment'. Habraken argued for the autonomy of this built environment; something that is already there. Architecture is not something that has to be invented over and over again; it is more about the discovery of and learning from existing buildings and structures and the rules that govern them. Architecture is then not so much about invention of the object of design, but about the definition of it – that is the role of theory. Practise already knows; it is just a matter of explaining the present reality. Theory, according to Habraken, is more about asking questions – that is what defines the academic freedom. It is about formulating concepts about reality.

In contrast to the realistic position of Habraken, the appeal of Alexander to architects' moral responsibility seemed rather idealistic. His attitude towards 20th century architecture was more aggressive. Modern architecture, Alexander lectured, had produced miserable forms which it tried to justify by elevating them so that people would accept them. The pluralism of today has only made things worse, because as a result we are not able to decide anymore what a good and what a bad building is. And as a consequence we are also not able to judge the work of students any more. Everyone is good, in his own way. The prevailing dogma in contemporary architecture is that there

is no such thing as better. Our architectural culture is therefore desperately in need of criteria. And for Alexander the ultimate criterion to decide on the good or the bad of a building is whether it represents your soul or not, whether it is more or less a living structure. This argument raised a lot of questions with the audience, which he was unable or unwilling to answer or discuss more in-depth.

Alexander demanded a radical change of our profession, its institutions and educational system. According to him, the gap between design and building is too big. In order to be able to design a good building, one should by experience know how to build – one should have done the work of a craftsman, a carpenter, a bricklayer, etc. His own practice therefore functions more as a building office than as a design studio. For Alexander the bad demon in architecture is the division of labour in building practice between design and building – between intellectual and manual labour. The question is, however, if the reintegration he proposes is possible by only changing the profession and its institutions, without at the same time changing the socio-economic structure - of which the profession is an integrated part. At least at this point he seemed rather stuck in past time idealism. Therefore, although Alexander's performance was impressive, he gave the impression of a lost soul, someone who was out of touch with his audience. Maybe Alexander felt the general disagreement and uneasiness at the conference with his position, because after the second day he left for Istanbul, and did not join the conference on the last day and at the final session – which was a pity, as his presence would certainly have contributed to a more lively and interesting debate, which he had already proved during the first two days. Instead, he only left a letter to justify his absence - a letter that was significantly only addressed to his 'Turkish friends'.

Were there any other substantial conclusions to be made after three days in Ankara? As Necdet Teymur concluded in the closing plenary session, maybe the question of the conference was problematic. Do theory and design really need to be re-integrated? Are they not already integrated? Do they not imply one another? The real question of

the conference should then have been; How are they interrelated? The problem with contemporary architecture is, however, according to Teymur, that we borrow concepts from other disciplines, instead of working on the continuation and development of our own professional language. As a result, this conference came up with almost as many definitions of theory as there were participants. Maybe that is a general characteristic of contemporary architectural culture that a professional debate is no longer possible, because we lack a general vocabulary, a charred language. What is left are individual discourses, or at most local debates amongst tribalised ideological groups – as John Habraken so rightly put it.

One could, however, also wonder if the theme of the conference – *bridging the gap between theory and design* – was more a problem related to a typical Turkish situation. Since in Turkey academics are not allowed to practise architecture – or at least earn a living from it - the gap between theory (academic profession) and practice (design profession) in this country is institutionalised. This institutional separation also leads to another remarkable phenomenon, namely that academic positions in Turkey are mainly held by woman, which explains the high rate of female Turkish participants in the conference. As I learned during this conference, male architects choose a career in practice rather than at the university because of the rather low wages for academics in Turkey. As a result teaching in Turkey is a woman's job. So the institutionalised gap in Turkey between theory and design represents at the same time a socio-economic gap between the sexes. But at least in Turkey women are well represented in academic life, something that still cannot always be said of universities in the Western world. The value of these three days therefore surpassed the official theme in many ways, which in the end determines the success and quality of any conference. ■

## Re-integrating Theory and Design in Architectural Education / *Réintégration de la Théorie et de la Conception dans l'Enseignement Architectural*

19th EAAE CONFERENCE, 23-26 May 2001

Gazi University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Department of Architecture, Ankara, Turkey

# On the Different Kinds of Looking at the Architectural Theory

Dr. Augustin Ioan, Bucharest, Romania

*Theoria suggests a perspective upon an extensive territory, from a significant distance (…)*

Richard Rorty[1]

The present text is an attempt to bring into matter the connection between architecture and the philosophy of space[2], while defining the theory of architecture for the purpose of Ankara's 19th EAAE Meeting.

Architecture in theory and practice on the one hand, as well as philosophy of space on the other, shall be submitted to study in order to shape the nowadays stage of the mutual relations between those fields, thus allowing subsequent propositions of alternatives to the present state of things. Therefore, I shall comment upon a few hypostases of the eye cast upon things, in order to establish the precise type of contemplative consideration theory implies. Subsequently entering the territory of architecture, I shall try to determine its fortes as to acquiring knowledge related to architecture (the making, the optimization of the process, the recurrent feature of algorithms, the assuming of the tenets), so as to get eventually to setting its limits in terms of experimenting and inventing. To conclude I will try to identify the (re)sources for a new transfiguration at the level of the interface between philosophy and architecture, this change having given grounds to expectations for almost a decade now, ever since the deconstruction has worn out its potential informing of the architectural change.

**Gaze**

Seeing and being seen, in terms of spatiality, are the two visibility items generating the public site, for as long as this mutual examination (or its possibility) lasts. On the other hand, the visibility excess in the treatment of arts (particularly architecture, most relevant in this context), associated by certain researchers to the discovery of the perspective during the Renaissance, has been severely exposed to the criticism of theorists and philosophers of phenomenological descendant arts these last few years. Language has itself more numerous and detailed terms associating knowledge to eyesight than to any other sense. The terms I propose here are: *Visibility* (observation), *to gaze, overseeing/surveillance* and *contemplation*.

*Visibility* is to be treated in broader philosophical terms, as a human being's potential to introduce one's own self in relation to the others. *Visibility* implies process (as it is not an immutable gift, but a temporary and fluctuant one), context (as it is a relation between inner meaning and appearance, between the individual and the species, etc.); it ultimately is a pre-conditioning to *being seen by the Other*. Visibility is the *obviousness* of things. One can only see what is already visible ("always/already", as Heidegger once said), or that which becomes visible through a deliberate act of "clearing", of liberating; or, on the contrary, an act of occulting that which had already been visible, precisely to render the space to what is wishfully brought to visibility (again). In order to complete this perspective, one must however acknowledge that the eyesight does not operate on a neutral field in its area of influence, but on one that is already standing out, since visible, unlike the rest. In other words, the gaze operates on what is already standing out, invisible yet, although visible[3] through the narrow disclosure of veils. Thus what we are dealing with here is a halfway encounter of the potential object of gaze and the actual one.

Science claims, not without reason, to have extended our capacity of examining things that submit themselves to our potential gaze, through the optical technologies. Nowadays we can see in infrared, in ultraviolet, through radar or sonar, or even through radio telescopes. With the IT technologies we can now shape and thus bring to visibility geometrical figures inconceivable otherwise, like the fractals for instance, or we can draw graphs of mathematical functions inviting to such visualization. Visual models, no matter how approximate and temporary, render intelligible through visualization the structure of the small or of the big universe. By gazing, we assume reality.

There are, however, in this visualization field, ways of singling out or focussing upon details of what we actually see, thus amplifying the visibility of one thing as compared to the others, even on the very territory of visibility itself.[4] But, since *gaze* and *gazing* became almost common terms in fine arts analysis, insisting on the meaning of these

terms will undoubtedly prove its usefulness further in the economy of the text.

In *The Concise Oxford Thesaurus - A Dictionary of Synonyms* (Oxford: OUP, 1995, 322) *to gaze* is defined as "stare, look fixedly, gape, goggle, stand agog, watch in wander, ogle, eye, take a good look, contemplate"; or "[to] look with curiosity or wonder, look intently" in *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (Oxford: OUP, 1966, reprint 1992, 392); or "[to] stare vacantly or curiously; now usu., look intently or fixedly (…) look fixedly at, stare at" in *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: OUP, 1993, 1069). *Gaze* has *gawk* as a synonym, while the noun means "fixed look, intent, look, gape". The etymology of the word is unknown, but it is probably derived from the medieval *gawe* (cf. ODEE) or *to gaw* (cf. NSOED), which most likely explains its synonymy with *gawk*.

One must acknowledge that the provided definitions evidently differ significantly in the meanings they lay out. To look fixedly and vacantly might even imply absence of any intention of actually seeing, possibly denoting an instance of auto-hypnosis or of abstraction from any contingency, if not day-time dreaming. "Watch in wonder", another provided meaning, rather refers to the effect that looking at something amazing has upon the one casting the look, and is more likely a definition of an "aggression" of the visible on the viewer. *To see* is a passive form under the circumstance: the viewer receives without actually choosing, falling a prey to the visibility of the world; while *to gaze* seems to suggest "an auctorial intent", directing the eye and using it as a tool in investigating the visibility offer: thus *to gaze* becomes in Romanian that "look intently" in the NSOED definition prior quoted, or "take a good look" in the first definition, the one provided by COTDS.

*Gaze* is the agent look here, insisting on the thing it fixes upon. The mutual exchange of intense looks between at least two human beings is an event which, once inscribed in space, leads to the meta-morphosis of a place into a public site. The other manners of looking at things are evaluated as compared to it, and the diversity it institutes is disconcerting.

*Surveillance*, on the other hand, is an eye cast from a higher level, controlling the visibility field. This extraction from among the viewers who, by their crossing each other, sustain in terms of events the public site, this extraction from the horizontal mutual visibility field among humans is the first sign of establishment of a univocal relationship. The one looking around from among his peers does not have the overall perspective which surveillance provides. He is no different from his peers in terms of gazing and being gazed at. Even the private space he can gaze at is but a form of

controlling nothing more than his own visibility: I allow the others to gaze at me or not. But the one casting the eye from a higher level (or from a privileged position, like for instance Bentham's panoptikon), controlling the others' visibility to his privileged viewing point, manages to get the whole picture but oversees the detail, the gaze-individuals. Having the possibility to survey (to see the whole picture, with or without being seen) is to Foucault the proof of the efficiency of punishment. Once the inequity generated by the surveillance from a higher level spatially inscribed, it becomes a means of instituting and maintaining the social hierarchy, control, domination - power, in a word.

Surveillance also means excessive vigil, meaning added to the one mentioned above, that of strength giving. The light that was always lit in Stalin's Kremlin was the sign of such an exceeding vigil, of the perpetual surveillance of the public space that the power exerted: the individuals indulge in sleep, suspending the watch over their own selves, while the power does not: its watching the others is ceaselessly ubiquitous.

*Contemplation* is a form of casting an eye in abstraction of the contingent ("and the closed eye opens within", as said once the Romanian poet Mihai Eminescu) where the inquisitive intention of the interrogative agent is missing; contemplative life is the opposite of the active life. Contemplation is a special manner of looking at things - "view with attention" (ODEE, 208) - which requires a buffer-space ("space for observation" in Ibidem) and moreover the temple which it actually holds within ("religious meditation" in Ibidem). Its composed origin (*con+templum*) gives way to speculation regarding the analogy between contemplation and what ecclesia does in the sacred space. The act of being together in a temple - together *with* the temple - is a special type of gaze. The debate on the topic of the sacred space shall perhaps lighten somewhere else the mechanisms of this eye cast from the temple towards gods, through the agency of the sacred icons.

### Theoria or the gaze "from above"

*Theoria* is an activity that, according to some researchers, has something to do with the gods, in its own turn (see Kagis McEwen), inscribing perhaps to spatiality a relationship with them. The theorist examines the object of its study (theory is "observed practice", as one of my teachers in Cincinnati used to say, although without any intent of commitment implied, on the contrary; lack of passion, of clenching, and some detachment from the world are recommended to the theorist. Anyway, his friends, as well as his enemies, recommend him to give up practice and confine himself to "philosophizing" upon it. Theory thus becomes a buffer-space between existing practice

(the "observed" one) and the future one (therefore "informed").

However, the purpose of theory is not to substitute or undermine practice, on the contrary: to "cut out" and make public/accessible subroutines of making architecture as observed and quantified in existing works. But during this process, theory sets out on the idea - false, on my belief - that we can also explain and quantify other things besides the honest and decent professing of architecture. In Rorty's understanding of the term, *theoria* fails to grasp the detail, the texture of the surface it contemplates from high above and far away, and moreover, it looses touch with the reality it strives to describe and regulate afterwards. The issue of the theory of architecture is therefore that of proving to be, most of the times, a normative activity which, mediating between (old) practice and (new) practice and parasitizing on its active and committed feature, thus delaying its experimental reflexes. Contemplation is a peripheral gaze, cast from above, and not at all committed, or at the very heart of events. Or this "limit" of theory being true, the following consequences are also true, as a result:

a. Theory is a must in teaching architecture as a *practice average* (a counterfeit of the long ago abandoned activity of learning and acquiring a profession through a term of apprenticeship in some "master"-'s workshop). In other words, theory establishes and institutionalizes on a long-term basis the "optimal" practices, those having a recurrence potential.

b. Theory of architecture is useless in explaining or predicting vanguards or masterpieces, therefore having no determinative role in the renewal of the architectural language.

What might seem to be a handicap of theory, when thus formulated, does not make it less useful in the institutionalized study of architecture, as I said before, where the mistaken conception of theory as a false domain, a parasite of practice, still persists; theory acquires a "heroic" aura in the process, and being unable to explain one's own creation while in class (when it is valuable, or at least exists), or how a new one can be open possibilities, this becomes the living proof that "art" itself can not be acquired through learning. It "is" an (al)chemical attribute of one's own genes (or worse, gonads). A certain rudimentary and naive feature as compared to the cultural aspects of the profession are thus celebrated and recommended to students in the name of the conservation of the "artistic sense" which might atrophy when too thoroughly cultivated. Those teaching theory courses are held in contempt as a group which is not allowed access to the "inspired" dimension of the profession and unsatisfied with their own existences, therefore being able to induce false necessities on students (reading of the "canonical" texts as well as of the last theoretical and philosophical news; historical study of one's own domain and of its nature and relation as compared to the other domains of art, culture, society). This group does nothing else but to turn the student away from his ultimate goal, that of "creating". It is not at all by fortuitous chance that the subjects relying on verbalized language when circulating information or interpretations on architecture are held in contempt in such an environment, as well as other activities like reading and writing - as exterior to architecture and therefore useless -, not to mention rhetoric (logic of argumentation, if not limpidity of a course actually being deliberately ignored, as "infiltrating agents" of theory). A "real" architecture professor does not talk or write, but draws. On the line, emphasizing the breach between the two languages is a distinctive sign among "board" architects, precisely because they do not cling on to reading.

In doing this, the partisans of teaching practice without any theoretical grounds throw in the abyss the very need for them in a university environment, out of an error of - *horribile dictu!* - logic. If it is true that the architectural "making" (i.e. the actual designing, which is but one of the infinitely branched aspects of architecture) can not be taught, then the workshops in an architecture school consistent to this perspective should be abandoned. Their place should be occupied by the apprenticeship in offices. Or few of the teachers supporting this "pure and harsh" perspective against theory ever thought of bearing the logical consequences of their own point of view: this would have meant for themselves to "theorize" and then set to practice the very consequences.

The "practice" schools I know about actually adopted an intermediate position: part of the time spent in school (fraction measurable in semesters, if not years) is devoted to "practice" in designing workshops and construction sites, at the end of the university studies or half-way through. Such an approach is meant to give the student the time to set some distance as to the knowledge acquired in years past (which is critical, in a optimistic perspective), as well as to create at least a "reality effect", an appearance of immediate connection to current architectural activity implying routine and attrition.

As an intermediate area between social sciences and practice, the theory of architecture most obviously exceeds the boundaries of a definition of architecture centred on the evidence of the already built structures only. It becomes an anthropology

domain and allows information by the most various sources. On a "superior" level, information is provided by concepts borrowed from philosophy, esthetics, and literature theory. In the "middle" area, by anthropology, various types of history, sociology, psychology (nowadays psychoanalysis, even furiously), and their derivatives and conjugates. In the "lower" area, by science, by technology suiting its domain or not (although this distinction is difficult, in the context of the nowadays fluctuations: computers and, with it, the cyberspace and the VR have already become, or are about to become as peculiar to architecture as building technologies). Obviously, there are secondary influences exerted on architecture theory which manage to penetrate the main flaw of (re)sources almost without any awareness on the side of those practising theory (now that's an oxymoron!). One finds it hard to establish a direct relation between poetics courses and architecture theory, that is between poetry and architecture; still, they exist and have their own influence area and practitioners of both (John Hejduk and Louis Kahn, for instance).

Thus positioned, theorists populate by their contemplation a no man's land, as a matter of fact, or, more precisely, they are "in the middle of nowhere". Philosophers hold in contempt the theorist's "contamination" of some ontological field exterior to the thin air of philosophy itself, in absence of which it is impossible for the theorist to address the domain of which he practices the theory. A philosopher cannot be asked to "test" or try to prove a statement on some level other than the field of logical founding, as the French reaction to the accusations A. Sokal brought in his famous book; on the contrary, he is entitled to borrow concepts from any other domain and (ab)use them under the shelter of allegory, metaphor or reinvesting with a meaning other than the one accepted in that domain. It is allowed to flatten the main sense of a concept stranger to philosophy, but, on the contrary, it is forbidden to ask it to the philosophy using such "recovered" concepts or making statements regarding that domain (science, language, anthropology, architecture, etc.). It would thus seem that there is no other relation between philosophy and the other ontological domains except a subordinating one. Therefore a philosophy of architecture could be but a pare-philosophy.

Moreover, the practitioners of that domain refuse his "citizenship" (although they sometimes reluctantly grant him a "transit visa" limited to the university environment, accusing him of not being really imbued with the "mysteries" of the profession, which only long-term practice, not contemplation or "philosophizing", can reveal. But on the other hand, the theory does not take any pleasure in the association with an activity that is so prac-

tice-"contaminated", therefore so deprived of "intellectuality" and "humanism".

### Philosophy ↔ Practice

At some point on the interface between domains, an active minority is experimenting a mutual transfer of information which should not be in need of any contemplative middle-person refusing its acting in the name of an intellectual superiority and of the supposedly privileged condition of "spectator" of theory. This is also seen as a "domestication" and transforming into tenet, if not vulgarization, of philosophical concepts. Or, just on the line, the ones interested to see if "testing" some concepts transferred from one domain into another proves to be fertile are the ones who actually work. What exactly is this domain boundary positioning? Briefly: *the avoiding of theory as a compulsory stage* between existing and future practice on the one side, that is between strongly auto-reflexive architectural practice and philosophy (or in the case of sacred architecture, theology).

These proceedings are not unknown to artists. In a minor form as compared to what is going on at the interface between philosophy and arts, esthetics call it a turn to "unwantedness". The transferring from one domain to another, through the very gesture of changing context, produces something new and unexpected. This often occurs inside the very domain, when a concept or a method is old enough to be considered "out of fashion" or to have been simply forgotten.

Philosophy represents a privileged domain for architecture and vice versa, I dare say. In architecture, certain people - unable to choose between philosophy and practice - have decided to take both, abandoning the buffer area of theory. Bernard Cache, Cristopher Alexander, Daniel Libeskind or Peter Eisenman are practitioners *and* philosophers of architecture at the same time. On the other side, Heidegger uses space and location (not to mention the temple and the little house) as strong arguments in his philosophy; that, and the influences exerted by other phenomenologists already created a branch of contemporary philosophy called "critical regionalism" by the one who also drew up its "manifesto" (K. Frampton). Walter Benjamin's *"Arcades Project"*, recently published in English[5], is a philosophical exploring of architecture in general ("dream houses", street-town, archways and passages), that is mainly of the 19th century Parisian one. Derrida himself was brought to the point of actually committing himself to the architectural designing act (this exceptional cooperation between the philosopher and the architect is documented in *Chora L Works* by both Derrida and Eisenman).

Philosophers designing architecture? And why not? After all, others have done it before, without intending to or actually managing to set into practice the concepts of their own philosophy: Jung, Wittgenstein, Steiner. I am not about to discuss here the results of this transgression of the boundaries between philosophy and the practice of architecture. I am only acknowledging that nowadays, more than ever before, there is an almost violent immediacy in the relation between the two domains. This requires at least a research on the causes of this new attraction which makes philosophy and architecture reviews to publish together[6], for instance, or some philosophers to draw *chore* on a given territory. Nowadays, some of the objects produced by architects (alone or in a team with other experts, such as philosophers, or poets, or musicians) are explicitly designed to become objects of the philosophical inquiry as well. I confess my fascination of this alternative, marginal way of being an architect, not only through reflection on one's own profession, but mainly through the most active commitment to its changing. ■

**Notes and References**

1. In *Contingenta, ironie si solidaritate* (Bucuresti: ALL, 1998), p.167.

2. In an oral and incipient form, the text here has been the object of a lecture I held in Collegium Budapest on the 18th of May, 2000. As a consequence of the questions I have been asked by people hearing my lecture, I have tried ever since to lighten my point of view and set it to debate through putting it down on paper, as it concerns, I repeat, domains other than architecture too.

3. We also say what is opaque, but it is only because opacity is a form of visibility maintaining, however refusing access of the gaze "within".

4. I shall not go further, in spite of the almost Noica-like temptation to do it, speculating a subtle link between the excess of visibility/gaze and blindness, or between "blind" and "clear" which "to stare" might suggest; it probably is rather an analogy between the way in which the almost blind tries to distinguish things in the mist surrounding him: thus the one looking intently institutes a relation between the object of his exam and the rest, similar to the one between the barely-visible object and the almost unvisible background in the retina of the "blind".

5. Walter Benjamin *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999). See, for instance, the comments of T. J. Clark on the relation between the philosopher and the 19th century Parisian architecture in the review he dedicates it in the *London Review of Books*, on the 22nd of June, 2000, pp. 3-9.

6. Journal of Philosophy and the Visual Arts is such an example of inter-reign, but the edition on complexity published together with Architectural Design (Complexity-Architecture/Art/Philosophy) by AD Academy Editions in 1995 is absolutely remarkable in terms of project and of substance.

# Architect and Top-politician

Interview with the US Ambassador to Denmark, Richard N. Sweet, FAIA, 6 October 2000

For the past ten years the US Ambassador to Denmark, Richard N. Swett, has tried to bridge the gap between architecture and public policy in the USA.

Richard N. Swett was the originator and co-organiser of the international conference "Design Diplomacy: Public Policy and the Practice of Architecture", which took place in Copenhagen, Denmark, from 6 to 9 September 2000.

A large number of architects and decision-makers from the USA and Europe participated, and the conference was greatly favoured by the press.

During the conference in Copenhagen Richard Swett stated:

*The profession has in the past taken specific stands on social policies that have influenced legislative policy makers. Still, little is known about the relationship between design and public policy and how architects can influence it. What we do know is that architects must be prepared to do more. Because of our singular focus on aesthetic design without regard to social issues, because we have turned our noses up at the more "mundane" or administrative aspects of our profession, and because we have narrowed our leadership responsibilities to avoid liability rather than expand them to gain influence, we have seen our roles as leading visionaries in society follow a diminishing path. It is time to change our perspective.*

The Editor of the EAAE News Sheet Anne Elisabeth Toft and Assistant Editor Troels Rugbjerg met Richard N. Swett at the US Embassy in Copenhagen. The conversation took its starting point in the above statement.

**Do you think that architects make good leaders?**

Not right now! But that's what I am trying to change! (laughs)

**How can architectural and urban objectives form a sound public policy?**

I think that we need problem-solvers in the public policy creation arena. People who are looking creatively at problem solving and who are not looking at problem solving from a narrow - either case-history perspective - or a perspective that does not engage in a more open and creative approach. Most public policy, whether it is Danish public policy or American public policy, comes about by the traditions of the members of the Government. In a country like Denmark where the traditions incorporate design as a "quality of life" issue and not just an "aesthetic" issue you see those qualities and those aesthetics incorporated in the policy decision-making process.

If you go to a country like the United States which has a very legal foundation upon which its government policies have been built it is much more of a case history approach. It has a narrower empirical approach that once the case has been stated it doesn't allow for a very broad exploration to

compare it with other cases, to compare it with broader ideas that might exist somewhere farther out on the horizon.

My sense has always been that we need leaders who are actually courageous enough to look for the second or third scheme, so to speak.

In architecture when you are in the design development phase you are not looking at just one scheme - you are looking at two, three, sometimes even four schemes. However, we don't do that in the creation of public policy.

I have tried to make architects understand that they have something to contribute to this process and that they can make the people who are currently in the process realise that they are making very narrow decisions - especially in the United States.

**How do you make use of your education as an architect in your present position as US Ambassador?**

Well, you can ask the staff! (laughs)

I have implemented project management practices that architects use. We organise teams around

activities more consistent with how an architectural office works than how the State Department or an embassy works.

There is a lot of cross-sectional interaction here at this embassy just like in an architecture firm. When you are taking a problem from design to construction documents you are dealing with a whole variety of disciplines. At times you need all these disciplines to work together simultaneously.

When I came to this embassy in 1998 I found it very vertically structured. There was a typical hierarchy. Everybody in their own silos were working away at their own projects, but if you take those silos and spread them out you begin to see that the things some people are doing actually overlap with things that other people are doing. There is an opportunity to broaden the interaction and the networks and therefore the impact of those activities.

I can give you one example - we deal with a lot of human rights issues and we feel this is a very constructive issue with which to engage with the Danes. We often have three or four different sections working on an issue that might in most embassies only be considered the responsibility of one. In that way we have flattened the structure of the office and interconnected our different responsibilities. It helps us to see more broadly how our expertise can be beneficial to moving a particular issue forward.

**It is our impression that a large number of European schools of architecture have difficulties in developing and observing a conscious political line. What is in your opinion the reason for this?**

You can take your experience with the European Schools of Architecture and you can apply that same relationship to my experience with the profession in the United States. I think the profession is politically very immature - just as you have stated in your own way that some of the European Schools of Architecture have not developed their political understandings. The profession is not necessarily as sophisticated as one would like it to be. However, I think it is more sophisticated here than in the United States.

**Do you think that we within the architectural education can do anything to develop the leadership qualities of future architects?**

Absolutely! I think that when schools of architecture choose their students they often look at their portfolios more than they look at the personalities or the characters of the students. They don't think about the broader context when they are selecting their students. I strongly believe that professional schools need to develop not only good designers but also good leaders. The profession needs good leadership because an architect in an office is always leading a team. He or she is also interpreting the needs of a client and has to do that in such a way that *that leadership* again creates the best solution for all people involved.

We need to admit this as a profession and we need to qualify it in some way - I wouldn't say institutionalise it - I wouldn't say organise it - but someway it needs to be recognised. And it needs to be part of the professional education. When students are chosen I think those qualities is important as well.

**So, how do we as teachers avoid teaching our students our "formulas" or our "strategies"? How do we develop their individual approach?**

I think you actually do have to teach them some basic "formulas" or "strategies". However, you should always give the students the latitude to experiment and to question if these "formulas" and "strategies" are fully developed or if they could be improved upon. I actually think this has more to do with *attitude* than it has to do with practice!

**Do you think that it is important that the Rector of a school of architecture tries to create a strong profile for herself or himself, the academic staff and the school?**

I think it is important to create a strong profile. I am not sure if it should be the *individual* or the *idea* that has the strong profile, though.

I will use a "tennis analogy": I believe very strongly that in order to communicate and to progress through communication it is sort of like learning to play tennis. If you hit the ball over the net and there is no one on the other side it just kind of drops and ends by the fence and you walk over and you get it and you hit it back and it just drops again. You *need* something to hit that ball against whether it is another person or a backboard. Without that backboard you don't get the practice that will enable you to improve. I think that *person* or that *idea* I mentioned above serves as the backboard.

What is critical is that you *teach* in such a way that people can take and improve upon your ideas.

A backboard just hits the ball back, but a person can put a topspin on the ball and give instruction, etc. - and that is what I think we have to continue to promote in the discussion, that *the backboard* is but the base of knowledge as we know now. You need to build from there and improve upon that.

I think that is the challenge of a leader, to give people the freedom to take an idea and improve upon it.

**We would like your advice on how we can change things and how we can learn to act more politically.**

Architects have some wonderful qualities. They are great problem solvers; they look at a problem from very different and creative angels. I think they also have very high ethical standards.

How you justify a solution is based on the quality of the decision and the quality has to be ensured by integrity and ethics, etc. The minute you throw politics into the conversation, many architects - at least in the US - think that you have already in some way damaged your end product. They don't realise that solving people's problems is really a political act. When you have two people and they cannot reach an agreement on how to design their house - *that is a political issue!*

And you have to understand and try to figure out how to build coalitions by political arguments in order to move one or both of those people towards a decision. That is all politics, but architects don't like to talk about it in those terms. They like to think that it is the aesthetics that moves the client to decide, that it is the design that compels. However, those things are all political because it is solving people's problems. I am trying to make the profession understand that this is really an important aspect of architecture, and that there is no reason to feel that we have cheapened ourselves by admitting that it is political. I would rather find some way to elevate the definition of politics so that people begin to understand that to solve people's problems using political judgements is all right, so long as they are ethical, consistent and they have the integrity that the profession has always looked upon itself as having with regard to aesthetic decisions.

Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe (The International School and The Bauhaus) are two good examples of architects that really thought that they could change the world by means of architecture. The one element that they were missing, though, was the element of politics.

What they were creating was an individual's vision of how that "revolution" (cf. Le Corbusier; *Vers une Architecture* ) should take place and they didn't really obtain the approval of the masses. However, a good political leader understands that *that vision* has to have the support of the community. It is a little bit different, and an architect would argue it is a little bit diminished because all of a sudden it has to appeal to the majority of the people. They have to understand the value of persuading the majority of the community and they have to support that as part of the process.

Aalvar Alto was an Internationalist, but he incorporated Finnish traditional architecture as well, and he has had a much more enduring and accepted style because the inherent qualities of the Finnish folk vernacular muted the very hard and stark planes of the International Style. I think that he in his own way is a good example of how that mixture was accomplished successfully.

I think it would be a very interesting study to find out what came first - a change in architectural style or political revolution! You can see from all the different periods of architecture that their changes were coexistent with social or political revolutions of some sort or another. One of the examples was of course the International Style, which came with the Industrial Revolution of the 20th Century. I have always been interested in the geo-political sociological conditions that are operating at the time of the artistic and architectural changes. What I have learned is that events do not happen in a vacuum. They are often interdependent.

**From a political point of view, what is the biggest challenge facing today's architects - is it a matter of sustainability and/or durability?**

I would say that sustainability and durability are subsets of the biggest challenge. The biggest challenge is how do architects make a mark in this world as leaders where they can bring about sustainability and durability!

**Architects used to play an essential part in society, for instance during the Renaissance. What went "wrong" and how can architects get to play a larger political role in society today?**

I keep coming back to King Christian IV *(Danish king who lived 1588-1648)*. Every building that I look at that's worth looking at here in Copenhagen carries his monogram. I read in the history books that he almost bankrupted the country as he was

building these buildings; but look at what he left behind!

It seems to me that there is a value in that which instils a tremendous amount of civic pride. He understood this, but do we understand it today?!

I don't think we do and I think this is why this debate that we are having is an important one.

**Which direction do you think architecture will take in the future?**

It is difficult to say. In an age of information technology I think that architecture will become more eclectic. We are becoming so integrated that it is very difficult to retain the old classical approach to architecture. Design is becoming much more of a variety of elements. Professionally this is really one of the big challenges that we have to deal with; *What is the architectural language of this time? How do we express ourselves?*

I think that Denmark and the Northern European countries have found an expression that is quite representative of the Scandinavian ideal. I think you can identify that fairly quickly anywhere you see it. The United States has a much more difficult challenge because it is a very heterogeneous society. The problem is how to represent the African-Americans as well as the Asians as well as the Europeans, etc. all rolled into one society. How can America identify itself in those terms?

I think this is one of the struggles that the US has always had and will always continue to have because I think that architecture is part of helping any society to find its identity and giving itself a place in this world.

**Could you please amplify this?!**

In the US the different communities still retain a lot of identity and they will retain even more identity in the European continent than elsewhere in the world. There will be some blurring and I think that is inevitable. One can call this "globalisation", "the information age", etc. but I think that whatever we call it, it is causing a great deal of anxiety in the world right now.

However, I think we will always retain our identities. I think that the architect has a better opportunity of understanding what that identity is and I think the leader who gives his or her constituency a feeling of "place" and the security which comes with that is going to have the greatest success.

So, in politics today the sense of "place" is a very important concept because so many people feel uprooted. Immigration and Nationalism are - if not above the surface - lurking just under the surface in Europe. Even in Denmark, where the Euro referendum was voted down for nationalistic reasons, Danes are discussing limiting who gets to come into the country to fill jobs that are being made faster than the country can fill them with people who are already here.

These are all very important questions that come down to identity and identity is connected to this idea of "place".

**You studied architecture at Yale. Was there an especially important source of inspiration there, for instance a professor?**

Yes, there was! His name is Alec Purves. He taught an undergraduate course which I took. It was the summer of 1977 and the course was on the architect's engagement in the community.

As my project I identified and tagged along with an architect in Boston who was designing a mixed-use project in the north end of the Italian section. It was a senior housing project on the upper floors and a retail or commercial project on the ground floor. It was a project that I was fascinated by because I saw this architect very successfully and meaningfully engage with a whole variety of clients - from the senior community that would ultimately be housed in the housing portion to the businesses that were very concerned about the fact that this might not work very well.

You have to remember that this project was developed more than 20 years ago. At that time it was not common to make mixed use projects in the USA. Therefore, the project met with resistance and lack of understanding. Especially in the US we tend to separate our communities by zoning laws that separate residential from commercial uses. I think that has been a very bad historical decision.

Anyway, I tagged along with this architect and I found his activism - not as a designer - but as a leader in that community most fascinating. I later wrote a report on this which received a very good grade. The most important part of this experience was, however, that this experience touched me in a way like nothing I had studied previously. It made me understand that architecture is a way of engaging socially, providing leadership and yet helping people to realise their dreams. Architecture does this in a way that I hadn't found in other professions or ideas that I had explored as a student at

**Biography**

Richard Nelson Swett was born in 1957 in Lower Marion, Pennsylvania, USA. He was educated as an architect at Yale, and has among other jobs been employed in one of the largest architectural offices in the US. Richard Swett has designed single-family houses and apartment houses. He has furthermore been occupied with alternative energy and is a contributing author to the book "A Nation Reconstructed. A Quest for the Cities that can be". Richard N. Swett is in the process of writing another book that is expected to be published in 2001.

In the private sector, Ambassador Swett's range of business experience also encompasses project management, corporate management, project development, and finance. For several years he has operated a consulting firm doing business in the United States and Eastern and Central Europe. He is a licensed architect in several states. Richard N. Swett has been active in politics for over 10 years. In the world of politics he is considered to be a major talent with a unique sense of politics. He is a member of the Democratic Party, and he was among the youngest members ever of the US Congress. Richard N. Swett was only 33 years old when in 1990 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives' 2nd Congressional District of New Hampshire, and he was the first Democrat in 78 years to win a congressional election in the 2nd district of this Republican stronghold. Richard N. Swett is a strong supporter of Bill Clinton and Al Gore, whom he actively supported during their election campaign in 1992. In 1998 President Bill Clinton appointed him Ambassador to Denmark.

Even though the Republican George W. Bush has been elected president, Richard N. Swett will continue his work as Ambassador to Denmark until July. 2001.

Yale. This was one of several instances that affected my career choice.

**Please tell us briefly about your political career and why you went into politics!**

I started out as an architect, obviously, and I went into development and particularly housing development. I was always very interested in socially oriented projects. I felt a desire to concern myself with social conditions. This has been a guiding principle for me. As I got into the development side I talked to my farther who was living on the East Coast. He was at that time working in the alternative energy field developing alternative energy power plants. I was open to his ideas and I had a dream that it would be great and very meaningful to me to create a community that was designed to be self-contained, to create its own energy, to conserve that energy in a way that optimised the efficiency. I wanted to design a community from an architect's perspective that allowed it to thrive, incorporating residential and commercial activities within that same community. This was to be done in a way that was environmentally sound, economically possible and architecturally beautiful.

I went to the East Coast to start out by learning how these alternative energy power plants worked and to fulfil a dream of working with my farther. We worked together for five years and I learned very quickly that to design a community from scratch is a very costly and time-consuming endeavour.

Alternative energy plants that were combustion oriented were still very environmentally controversial. A great deal of political agility was required to be able to articulate the positive reasons for allowing a wood-chip boiler to operate as opposed to making a windmill or something that was perceived to have less impact on the environment. All these experiences heightened my political awareness.

Besides, I was married in 1980 to a woman whose family was very political, so I was also exposed to politics through them.*

As I matured I came to recognise that there were lots of similarities between how I approached making decisions in the architecture and development world and how I felt politicians or leaders in our communities should be making **those** decisions.
I think that the catalyst was an individual who was my congressman back in 1990. He was running for re-election. I didn't feel, however, that he repre-

sented the political process or me very well. But nobody dared oppose him, as he was a very imposing figure. I tried to convince people to run against him, but no one would. Finally I came to the conclusion that - *well, if this matters to me enough, I should run!* I did - and I won. ∎

* Richard N. Swett is married to Katrina Lantos Swett.

**Sources:**

Swett, Richard N.: *Executive Summary, "Design Diplomacy: Architecture's Relationship with Public Policy"*. (02.10. 2000).

Høi, Poul: *Swett fra Copenhagen.* Berlingske Tidende, 29.01. 2000.

Weirup, Torben: *Mere magt til den gode arkitektur.* Berlingske Tidende, 18.07. 2000.

Evert, Eigil: *Vor mand i København.* Børsens Nyhedsmagasin nr. 5, 08.03. 1999.

www.usembassy.dk

You can find further information about Ambassador Richard N. Swett on the homepage of the US Embassy.

**www.usembassy.dk**

## "Register now!" Final interdisciplinary thesis projects for architects and civil engineers

CLUSTER (**C**onsortium **L**inking **U**niversities of **S**cience and **T**echnology for **E**ducation and **R**esearch) links eleven major universities of technology with advanced research and higher education of engineers, scientists and architects in Europe. Subject to approval by their heads of departments, these programs involve the following CLUSTER universities where architecture and civil engineering are a matter of final degrees (thesis, diploma):

- UPC Barcelona
- EPFL Lausanne
- TU Eindhoven
- Politecnico di Torino
- KTH Stockholm
- TU Darmstadt
- TU Karlsruhe
- Univ. de Louvain-la-Neuve

The aim of our program is to offer a platform encouraging an interdisciplinary approach to problems for which monodisciplinarity is incapable of providing a satisfactory solution. It is intended to enrich the program by inter-university and inter-cultural exchange and confrontation among staff and thesis students.

**Three programs are offered for 2001-02:**

- EPF Lausanne: Swissmetro (Eurometro) – the station and interface for a rapid underground transportation system (500kmp.h.) in a semi-vacuum,

located 70 m below the main station square of Lausanne.

- UPC Barcelona: Tunnel H orta, metropolitan motorway under the Collsirola Hills connecting Barcelona to its Hinterland; mouth of the tunnel or toll station or petrol station or a bridge.

- TU Eindhoven: program in preparation

Each of the three programs accept 6-7 teams of two (an architect and a civil engineer). In order to open up the "tight circle" of CLUSTER universities we decided to accept 1-2 teams from non-CLUSTER universities based on a portfolio, a letter of the candidates' motivations and a letter from their heads of school (Deans) ready to support this exceptional interdisciplinary and inter-university thesis program (deadline August 30, 2001).

We suspect that very few of the current Socrates programs have as much interchange potential. Thesis students are at the verge of going professional, assistant-teacher or researcher. Faculty members are involved in guiding, discussing and evaluating their university's most crucial deadline: the final thesis, diploma and accreditation.

**Some of the basic conditions. The basic framework is the following:**

- Candidates will receive their degree from their home-university as usual.

- Candidates are free to choose where to do their thesis project, either in their home university or in the hosting university which issued the program and where they will be tutored.

- The final juries will differ; in case the project is accomplished in their home university one delegate from the issuing university will be member of the jury; in case the project is accomplished in the hosting university one member of the jury will come from his home-university.

- Each program issuing university will organize a mandatory 3-4 day-course and site inspection in October 2001 for all accepted teams.

**For further information, please contact either:**

sastre@ca1.upc.es
or
peter.vonmeiss@epfl.ch
or
c.h.doevendans@bwk.tue.nl

## CAHIERES THÉMATIQUES

Architecture
Histoire/Conception

Discipline
Visèe Disciplinaire

*Les cahiers contiennent une contribution
des auteurs suivants:*

- *François Andrieux*
- *Philippe Boudon*
- *Jean Pierre Boutinet*
- *Séverine Bridoux*
- *Jean Claude Burdèse*
- *Jean-François Chevrier*
- *Jean-Pierre Chupin*
- *Laurent Devisme*
- *Gérard Engrand*
- *Manuel Gausa*

- *Ghislain His*
- *Jean-Claude Ludi*
- *Sylvain Malfroy*
- *Caroline Maniaque*
- *Josep Lluis Mateo*
- *Bruno Queysanne*
- *Dominique Rouillard*
- *Guy Rumé*
- *Sven Sterken*
- *Daniel Treiber*
- *David Vanderburgh*
- *Frank Vermandel*
- *Frédéric Yvan*

## Architectural Information Management

29-31 August 2001, The 19th eCAADe-Conference, Finland

The 19th eCAADe-conference will be held in Finland in the end of August 2001.
The conference presents CAAD-related scientific and research papers, but it also acts as a forum to present project reports of ongoing educational topics. The special aim of the eCAADe 2001 conference is to concentrate on a modern and near-future architectural design project and building project infor-mation and knowledge.

What kind of information, knowledge and data are architects working with, and how are they managing it?

### Important Dates

Abstracts, before 1 March 2001. Notification of acceptance, before 15 April 2001. Reduced conference fee, before 15 May 2001. Final papers, before 1 June 2001

### Further Infomation:

Helsinki University of Technology (HUT), Department of Architecture
Otakaari 1 X
02150 Espoo
FINLAND

                http://www.ecaade.org

### Site to visit:

http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cas/fnart/archweb_frames.html

## Project Leaders/*Chargés de Mission*

**DARMAILLACQ-CHARDONNET**, Sabine
(STOA)
147 Rue Leon Maurice Nordmann
F-75013 Paris/FRANCE
Ecole d'Architecture Paris-Malaquais
F-75006 Paris/FRANCE
    tel  ++33/1.43310004
    fax  ++33/1.43310004
    sabine.chardonnet@wanadoo.fr

**VAN DUIN**, Leen
(Guide and Meta-university)
Delft University of Technology
Faculty of Architecture
Berlageweg 1
2628 CR Delft/THE NETHERLANDS
    tel  ++31/15.2 785957
    fax  ++31/15.2 781028
    l.vanduin@bk.tudelft.nl

**HARDER**, Ebbe
(EAAE Prize)

**MABARDI,** Jean-François
(Summer School)
Université Catholique Louvain
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-La-Neuve/BELGIQUE
    tel  ++32/10.234949
    fax  ++32/10.234949
    Jean.Mabardi@tvd.be

**SPIRIDONIDIS**, Constantin
(Heads' Meetings)
Université Aristotelienne de Thessaloniki
Ecole d´Architecture
Bte. Universitaire 491
GR-54006 Thessaloniki/GREECE
    tel  ++30/31.995589
    fax  ++30/31.995583
    spirido@arch.auth.gr

**TOFT,** Anne Elisabeth
(News Sheet)

---

### Thematic Coordinators

**HANROT,** Stephane
(Research)

**MICHIALINO,** Paola
(Urban Issues)

**VOYATZAKI**, Maria
(Construction)

---

### New Member Schools

**University of Prishtina
Faculty of Architecture**
Serbia

**Reinisch Westfälische Technische
Hochschule Aachen
Fakultät für Architektur**
Germany

**School of Architecture
Edinburgh College of Art/
Heriot Watt University**
Edinburgh, UK

**Politecnico di Milano
Facolta di Architettura;
Campus Bovisa**
Italy

## Council Members/*Membres du Conseil*

**HANROT,** Stephane
Ecole d'Architecture de Saint-Etienne
1, rue du Buisson
F-42000 Saint-Etienne/FRANCE
    tel  ++33/4.774.23542
    fax  ++33/4.774.23540
    stephane.hanrot@st-etienne.archi.fr

**HARDER**, Ebbe
Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts
School of Architecture
Holmen
1433 Copenhagen/DENMARK
    tel  ++45/32.686000
    fax  ++45/32.686111

**MICHIALINO,** Paola
UCL
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve/BELGIQUE
    tel  ++32/10.472421
    fax  ++32/10.474544
    michialino@arch.ucl.ac.be

**NEUCKERMANS**, Herman
(EAAE/AEEA President)
KUL-Dpt. of Architecture
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIQUE
    tel  ++32/16.32 1361
    fax  ++32/16.32 1984
    herman.neuckermans@
    asro.kuleuven.ac.be

**POPESCU**, Emil Barbu
(Treasurer)
Head of Department
Institute of Architecture Ion Mincu
Str. Academiei 18-20
Sector 1
70109 Bucarest/ROUMANIE
    tel  ++40/1.3139565
           ++40/1.3155482
    fax  ++40/1.3123954

**TOFT,** Anne Elisabeth
Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C/DENMARK
    tel  ++45/89.360232
    fax  ++45/86.130645
    anne.elisabeth.toft@a-aarhus.dk

**VOYATZAKI**, Maria
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Architecture
Department 5
GR-5400 Thessaloniki/GREECE
    tel  ++30/31.995544
    fax  ++30/31.458660
    mvoyat@arch.auth.gr

---

### New Council Members

**HANROT,** Stephane

**MICHIALINO,** Paola

**VOYATZAKI**, Maria

---

### Sécretariat permanent

EAAE/AEEA Secretary
**SCHOL,** Lou
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIQUE
    tel  ++32/(0)16.321694
    fax  ++32/(0)16.321962
    aeea@eaae.be
    http://www.eaae.be

EAAE Calendar
*AEEA Calendrier*

*2001*

01 – 04 **09** | **4th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture** <br> Chania/Greece | *4° Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe* <br> *Khaniá/Grèce*

---

**Contributions to EAAE News Sheet**
*Contributions AEEA News Sheet*

Contributions to the News Sheet are always welcome, and should be sent to the editor, who reserves the right to select material for publication. Contributions might include conference reports, notice of future events, job announcements and other relevant items of news or content. The text should be available in French and English, unformatted, on either disk or as an email enclosure. Deadlines are announced in the News Sheets.  ■

*Les contributions au News Sheet sont toujours bienvenues. Elles doivent être envoyées à l'éditeur, qui décidera de leur publication. Contributions d'interêt: rapports de conférences, évenements à venir, postes mis au concours, et d'autres nouvelles en bref sur la formation architecturale. Les critéres à suivre sont: Les textes doivent être en Français et en Anglais, en forme d'un document de texte non formaté, qui peut être attaché à un e-mail ou être envoyé en forme d'une disquette. Les dates limites sont publiées dans chaque bulletin.*  ■

---