

Chapter 3

Emerging Challenges for the Profiles of an Architect

The Third Chapter attempts a synthesis of all past discussions on the contemporary profile(s) of the architect, their spread in the European Area, the new conditions of professional practice and the labor market, the epistemological, legal and institutional background from which those profiles are emerging, the forms of collaboration schools have to redefine with the professional bodies, in local national and international level (i.e. Architects' Council of Europe). This synthesis will try to reveal the tendencies and the dynamics related to the recent developments in the profession of the architect, the particularities that characterize each region in Europe, and to discuss possible initiatives for the future in order to protect and preserve principles and values that the academic and the professional world would attribute to the profile of the European architect.

Introductory Synthesis by

Jean-Paul Scalabre, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Paris, France

Chaired by

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

To begin the first session I would just like very briefly to remind you of the relationship between the EAAE and the ACE (the Architects' Council of Europe) that we have been talking about here for the past two years, initially as a possibility and now, since our 7th Meeting in Hania last year, as a fact. The joint working party between the EAAE and the ACE has been set up and has had two initial meetings. I do not intend to dwell on this now because I intend to make it part of my President's Address on Tuesday, however the important thing is that we have two representatives of the ACE here this morning. Jean-Paul Scalabre, who represents their educational section, is going to give us a presentation, but before that I would like to introduce Adrian Joyce, who is the permanent Senior Advisor to the ACE in Brussels, and who will give you a little background and will introduce Jean-Paul.

Adrian Joyce, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Brussels, Belgium

For the Architects' Council of Europe this invitation marks a significant moment in our political life, and we are very grateful for the invitation we received from the EAAE and ENHSA to be here with you today. I am going to present an apology first: our President Marie-Hélène Lucas would dearly like to have been able to be here herself for this first formal encounter between the two associations, but her calendar did not permit her to travel at this time. For those of you who do not know the ACE is the professional representative organization of the architectural profession. The secretariat is based in Brussels and it was founded in 1990 on the shoulders of a previously existing liaison committee, which coincidentally and happily was founded in 1970. So representation at the European level for the profession has existed for the same number of years as the EAAE. The member organizations are the representative and regulatory bodies for the profession of all 25 European Union members, the three candidate countries and Norway and Switzerland. As such, we represent 450,000 practising architects and our main functions are twofold. One is to act as a kind of lobby for the EU institutions towards the European Commission, towards the Parliament and towards the Council of Ministers. The second is to bring together the member organizations in a network similar to your own where we can develop common ideas and make propositions and take positions on how the profession reacts to legislative developments at the European level. We have a number of working groups that deal with these subjects, and it is a great pleasure for me that Jean-Paul Scalabre, the chairman of our working group on education, was able to travel with us and be here today to deliver a paper following his reading of the proceedings of the past three years of your debates on the profile of the architect.

So without further introduction I hand over to Jean-Paul, who will tell you more about his own function in ACE and about his own background.

Emerging Challenges for the Profiles of an Architect

Jean-Paul SCALABRE

Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Paris, France

Introduction

First of all I would like to thank the EAAE and the ENHSA for the invitation to speak to you today and to present apologies from the ACE President, Marie H el ene Lucas for not being able to attend the meeting despite her strong wish to be here. As a representative of the ACE I am very pleased to be here and I hope to contribute meaningfully to the debate on this important question.

I am a French architect. I studied architecture in Paris at l' Unit  pedagogique n  8 in the seventies, under the direction of a great teacher, Bernard Huet whom I consider as my master. I live in Paris where I have a liberal professional practice. My main fields of activity are social housing and urban studies. I am also, as architect, an adviser for the French Ministry of Culture and for the Ministry of Equipment. I am a board member of the French "Syndicat de l'Architecture" that is a professional organisation and a Member of the ACE.

What is the ACE? The Architects' Council of Europe is an organisation, based in Brussels, whose Membership consists of the professional representative organisations of all twenty five European Union (EU) Member States and the three Accession States as well as Switzerland and Norway. As such it is an organisation that represents, through its Member organisations, the interests of over 450.000 Architects from Europe. The ACE was founded in 1990 following the coming together of two earlier representative organisations, and it has two main functions. One is to act as a kind of lobby near the EU institutions especially the European Commission in order to defend and promote architecture and architects. The second is to gather all its Member Organisations together by developing common ideas and propositions on professional issues.

My function in the ACE is to animate, as Chairman, the Work Group on Education. This group has been working on the following main topics:

1. Evolution of the Architects Directive (85/384/EC) into the new framework directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications.
2. The reform induced by the Bologna Process.
3. Professional practice and the training period that should, in the view of the ACE, complement the academic formation.
4. Relationship and cooperation with the EAAE, which has currently been established in the formation of the Joint Working Party between the two organisations.
5. Development of a European label regarding Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

Relationship between the Schools and the Profession

If we seek to fully understand the question of the new face of professional profile we have to examine the relationship between the place for education and the place for practice, between schools and what we can define as the profession.

The papers of previous meetings indicate that much debate on this topic has taken place within the ENHSA and the EAAE. About this important question I think it would be useful to have a retrospective look at the evolution of the profile of an architect from the XVII Century to the XX Century. We will find that the relationship between schools and the profession have been ever changing and problematic. It can easily be understood if we consider that it was and it is still a question of symbolic power and therefore a crucial matter for access to prestigious commissions. On the professional side, it was the King of France that ordered the establishment of the Academies by the professions in order to define standards of harmony and beauty in the main arts. The *école des Beaux Arts* created later had to follow the same classical taste. The school became the temple of tradition and had the tendency to violently reject any attempt at change or renovation. You will surely remember the Viollet le Duc case. This architect, who reinvented gothic architecture from a rationalist point of view, arrived at the *école des Beaux Arts* after his nomination by French Empress Eugénie. He had to face such a violent Bronca that he was compelled to resign and to create l'École Spéciale d'Architecture.

But from another point of view, if we look to the creation of the Bauhaus School in the nineteen thirties we will see that it was sometimes the schools that took the lead. It was imagined by Walter Gropius and his colleagues as a complete new arts and craft school that had the mission to develop a new approach to design in relation with the development of industry while, in the same movement, putting into practice the new aesthetic emerging from the avant-garde (De Stijl, Futurism, Dada, Constructivism etc.). The Bauhaus was the crucible of a new approach to design, especially in architecture that had a fundamental impact on the practice of architecture.

The May 1968 events in France seemed to be a revolution and I think that it was the case regarding architectural education. In Europe, the old academic system coming from the beaux-arts tradition began to disintegrate. New approaches to pedagogy and content appeared. Renovation came from the schools. It was the time when a new generation of architects looking to the reality of profession, tried to develop a critical point of view in order to find new values for architecture. Some years later, when this new generation of architects and of young teachers arrived into practice, the professional landscape began to change.

To resume this short summary we can say that relationships between schools and the profession varied a lot over time. During some period great personalities or groups of professionals had the main influence (remember that Le Corbusier was never a teacher), at other times, the schools had the main part in evolutions. There are, as always, some exceptions to this dichotomy, for example Louis Kahn who was a great professor and a great professional too.

I would like to come now to the current relationship between schools and the profession. The current situation of architecture, as I see it, can be interpreted as the generalisation of eclecticism, a constellation of attitudes and styles defended by a few architects fighting each other to be recognised in the great and changing world-wide consumption of

forms and images. But, as we say in French "the tree must not hide the forest" and the architectural professional practice happens to be more and more uncertain and difficult in a highly specialised and fragmented production systems. When the situation is so unstable, mistrust increases. The paradox is that every part of society asks for higher quality while practice of architecture is becoming harder, more complex and underpaid.

Schools may be frightened by a possible intrusion in their courses of the professional bodies asking for effectiveness and trying to restrict their freedom. The profession has the temptation to criticize a lack of realism in the school's curricula and a non-suitability of education to what is supposed to be the needs of the profession. On the one hand Schools seem to be destabilized by the frenetic movement of society; they lose their references and do not know what kind of future has to be proposed to the students. In addition, the architectural profession often seems to adopt a defensive position based on the fact that it faces the competition of non-architects in its own field of competence. For all these reasons it seems to me of great strategic importance to find the way to a new alliance between schools and the profession in order to build together a future for architecture and the architectural profession in Europe. We all need audacity and courage to go beyond fear and mistrust. The condition for that cooperation is mutual respect of each other's prerogatives.

We all understand why it is so important to think at the European level. It is there that new regulations are produced; it is there that common actions have to be developed. From that point of view the latest development in relations between the ACE and the EAAE, expressed in the creation of our Joint Working Party is extremely positive. We reinforce this partnership especially in the search for good management of our input into the implementation of the new qualifications directive. Its compatibility with the application of the Bologna process requirements has to be assessed. Other important topics have to be covered, including professional training and its corollary – the licensing procedure, collaboration for a European CPD label and the definition of the professional skills required to be attained at the bachelor degree.

The Bologna Process

This topic has occupied much of the time of the EAAE in recent years and has had a profound impact on universities across Europe. The profession has, maybe, been slow to wake up to the potential impact of this process. The ACE position on the Bologna Process is complimentary to the position of the EAAE and it shares the fundamental stance that the qualifications that give entry to the profession must be at least five-years full-time at third level.

The profession is concerned about the potential that the process will lead to the creation of a two-tier profession arising from the creation of a two cycle pattern by the Bologna process in university courses. The positive aspect is that it will support mobility of persons in Europe but the danger is to end up with a fuzzy definition of what is a bachelor degree in architecture permits the holder to do. This concern has, however, to be balanced against the need for assistance in architects' offices from qualified persons who are not fully qualified architects.

The profession is concerned at the possibility that a weakened and devalued profession will result from the process with persons holding bachelor degrees claiming that they

are competent to provide architectural services. This brings us to the heart of the topic in this session – the profiles of the architect.

ACE Work on the Profile of an Architect

The ACE has, in the recent past (2003), considered the profile of the architect in some depth. It had a Taskforce on the subject, Chaired by Claude Bucher (France), and it has published a reference document that is available on its website at www.ace-cae.org. The reflection at that time did not take account of the Bologna Process and the impact that it might have.

The profile of an architect is understood to mean what are the services (or competencies) that a fully qualified architect can deliver to his client. The reference document of the ACE starts by outlining the facts that bear on the profile of the architect (in fact on the profile of any professional) stating that external factors force a constant evolution in the profile. This seems to be acutely felt within the architectural profession and seems to be a factor that is provoking significant change at the current time.

The paper then outlines the 6 basic competencies that the architect must possess:

- Creativity especially in his design ability at different scale, his control of form and space.
- Capacity for synthesis in formalisation of social, cultural and political needs and requirements.
- Knowledge of cultural theoretical and technical history of architecture and urban design.
- Mediation and arbitrage between the different actors
- Capacity to lead and coordinate a team of specialists into a complex process of design and building
- Knowledge of codes of conduct and expression of ethic attitude and behaviour

It is interesting to see that this list does not contradict the list of competencies and skills that was discussed in Chania in 2004, although that list was longer. It brings to mind the 11 fundamental skills and aptitudes that are listed in the architect's section of the Qualifications Directive (and previously in Article 3 of the Architects Directive) and which have remained unchanged since they were first devised in the early 1980's. The Advisory Committee to the Architects Directive reviewed the list in the mid-1990's and concluded that there was no need to revise or change the list either now or at any time to come. I cannot resist taking the pleasure of reminding you of those fundamentals:

1. An ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
2. An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies and human sciences.
3. A knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
4. An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning and the skills involved in the planning process.

5. An understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
6. An understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take account of social factors.
7. An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
8. An understanding of the structural design, constructional and engineering problems associated with building design.
9. An 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 the climate.
10. The necessary design skills to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
11. An adequate knowledge of the industries, organisations, regulations and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into over-all planning.

The ACE paper goes on to identify the main fields of intervention of the architect comparing the traditional role of the architect as master of the full process to the emerging current complexity of regulations that means there is increasing specialisation in the profession. It recognises that it is unrealistic to expect that a single individual can be adequately informed of all matters that affect all types and scales of project that is built today.

The paper also discusses the fact that several competencies are being transferred to newer professions. It highlights three cases:

- Town-planning
- Client counselling and assistance
- Project management

The paper then sets down a number of new fields of practice that the Taskforce noted are being taken up by architects. These are grouped into a number of categories and there was some controversy about the grouping during discussions in the ACE. The Taskforce defended its paper saying that it was not proposing these new functions or "types" of architects to the ACE. Rather it was simply reporting on what it had found in the market place.

Those categories were:

- Architect-programmer
- Architect-town planner
- Architect-landscaper
- Architect- legal expert

- Architect-client assistant
- Architect-general contractor
- Architect-use management
- Architect-teacher
- Architect-building project manager

There are a number of other fields in which architects are employed and where their skills are valued, but they are outside the construction sector and so were not included in the ACE paper.

The ACE argues, in its policy work on the role of architecture in society, that there is a need to assure a wider understanding of architecture in the public and that a valuable way for this to happen is that persons qualified as architects do not pursue architecture as a career, but that they work in other fields such as politics, teaching, manufacturing, business consultancy etc... Therefore the ACE generally welcomes the diversity of roles that are open to architects at the present time.

Emerging Challenges for the Profiles of an Architect

I would like "d'entrée de jeu", as we say in French, to ask a question regarding the definition of who is an architect. Is there a contradiction between the high and complete level of competency expressed by the lists we just read and the necessity expressed of an acute specialisation? It seems to me very rare to find both in the same person. To clarify the discussion I propose a parallel with the film director. He is not supposed to be an all-knowing person, but his specific ability is to put into a coherent shape all the material given to him by all the specialists. To realise this task, he has to work with a small but essential number of tools such as acting direction, photography, sound and film editing. I think that this parallel between the architect's work and the director's work is more productive to enlighten the profile of an architect than the parallel with the conductor of an orchestra. The maestro is supposed to know all the score by heart and the musicians of the orchestra are supposed to play exactly in the way he wants. In architecture this kind of situation may have happened but is quite unusual. We all know by experiencing it that a project is a permanent fight and negotiation in order to develop and realise the design intentions. If the architect has a strong and sensitive architectural culture, he may succeed in the constant effort to make his project come to reality.

My statement is that there is a core that identifies architect's practice. This core is his knowledge of architectural design and his ability to maintain the quality of this design from the initial intention all along the building process. If we lose that idea and change the architect into a project manager or into a simple specialist of façade aesthetics we lose our identity as architects. That situation could explain the permanent difficulty for architecture to simply exist in day-to-day society and the fact that it is generally confined to particular prestigious programmes. We must assume the necessity of diversity and, at the same time, keep our identity as architects, it is a great challenge but it is vital for the sake of architecture as a social and cultural value of our common civilisation.

Returning to the central topic of the session, we can see that a fresh period of reflection

on the emerging profile of the architect is needed and that it would be useful to carry out this reflection in conjunction with the work of the ENHSA and the EAAB. Topics that need to be addressed include:

- What should the profile of a holder of a bachelor degree be and what kind of job is such a person supposed to be able to assume professionally? Is this person to be named architect, or shall we use another appellation such as assistant in architecture?
- Can we expect a deep evolution in the profile of the architect over the coming period of time (say 10-15 years)?
- What are the external factors that may prompt some changes to the profile of the architect?
- To what extent can (should) the profession and the schools respectively seek to influence the evolution of the profile?

We, in the ACE, do not have the answers to these questions, but we are aware of the urgency to deal with them.

Gleaning information from the proceedings of the previous meetings in Chania, it is clear that you have been addressing many of these questions in a more or less direct way, but with more of an eye for the educator's point of view. The ACE, conscious of the changing conditions of professional practice where the trust of the public in the professions has waned significantly and where the political powers have been attacking the traditional regulatory basis of the professions, has examined the question from a different angle. It is seeking to find how the profession can, from within and through active approaches, face up to challenges being presented by society.

In this respect much emphasis is being placed on the effects of de-regulation and on the possible benefits of the new approach to lawmaking known as co-regulation. The ACE argues that it is not de-regulation that is required to protect the public interest, but better regulation.

Another question deserving of attention is the question of diversity in the profile of the architect due to cultural or national differences within Europe. The ACE firmly believes that the diversity that exists within the profession is one of its great strengths and it has defended the non-harmonised approach to the education of architects since its foundation in 1990 and in its earlier forms at the time of the writing of the Architects Directive. It is therefore not advocating harmonisation. From my personal point of view, I would like to point out the fact that emphasizing diversity we forget the unity of European culture. The Italian architect Vittorio Gregotti wrote an interesting book on this topic (*Identità e crisi dell'architettura europea*, Einaudi 1999). He presents European culture as an archipelago made of different islands forming a whole. This is evident for those who look at European towns, European patrimony and European landscapes. This unity, emerging from diversity, is important to maintain in the cultural general entropy coming from globalisation. Enhancing diversity and leaving out unity may be a fault in this context..

From the papers that you have published, it can be seen that much discussion on harmonisation has taken place. The ACE has recently, due to the pressure of emerging legislation, begun to consider the concept of the "European" architect. It has not yet devel-

oped a clear picture of what this concept will involve, but it has made several observations on the current diversity in Europe (many of which were made in Lawrence Johnston's paper on the relationships between architectural education, internship and competence to practice):

- In some countries a licence to practice is granted to persons immediately after they graduate from third level education.
- Many countries require a period of practical experience to supplement the educational period before a person can practice.
- In some countries the title of architect is protected while the functions are not, in some countries both are protected and in some countries none are protected.

It is interesting to note that the ACE does not detect a direct relationship between these various situations and the quality of the built environment in the various countries but this is not a reason for jumping to the conclusion.

Conclusions

Speaking of conclusion I must admit arriving at the end of my intervention that it is very difficult to make a decent conclusion I am aware of the fact that we are faced with complexity and that professional profile of the architect is a great question that each generation asks at its turn. I will be satisfied with some short statements.

- The architect's profile must remain anchored to its original identity regardless of the increasing diversification and specialisation.
- It is the moment for a new partnership between European schools of architecture and the professional's bodies and associations to promote a European conception of the role of architects in society.
- We must stay aware of the fragility of our modern tradition regarding architectural art and practice, then defend and promote it by strengthening our school and professional associations.
- Let us keep in mind that we must think as European

Discussion

Chaired by

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you very much, Jean-Paul, for that very interesting and stimulating paper. Before I open up the discussion to the floor I would just like to make an observation. It was quite intriguing to hear in Jean-Paul's paper that the discussions which have been taking place in the ACE have almost an exact parallel to the discussions that we have been engaged in here over the past few years, and I think again that it is a very important celebration that we have come together to bring a greater sense of broadness while at the same time bringing a greater sense of focus to the issues that concern us all. I would now like to invite anyone who would like to make a comment, ask a question or add anything to the discussion, to do so.

Jordi Querol, Barcelona, Spain

I beg your pardon for taking the first word here, because I am not a director of a school. I am here in Crete as an *artiste invitado* for tonight, but I am also an architect and I teach at l'Escola Tècnica Superior d'Arquitectura La Salle in Barcelona. I think I am entitled to take the microphone because my CV begins in 1938, which I think represents enough time spent travelling around the world and gathering experience to be of interest to you. I have spent many years working for the government of Catalunya, I have taught architecture and now I work freelance with my son who is also an architect. I mention this because my office is a very small one, a very European office of just five persons, four architects and one technician, all but myself very young, one of whom is my son. So I know what is happening with young architects today. Because I think that, when we are in a forum of directors of schools, we should be talking more about what kind of architect we teachers, who are responsible, should be producing in order to provide the sort of architect that the market needs. If we act arrogantly – without of course intending to be arrogant – and produce intellectuals or professionals that the market simply disregards, then we are on the wrong track.

What kind of architect are we producing in our schools? Mostly, we are producing the kind of architect who, upon graduation can build an airport, a skyscraper, a city, a five-star hotel, any sort of big project, but does not know how to build a small house. I have seen this in Barcelona. They simply do not know. They do not even know where to start, where to put the air-conditioning, where to put the switches, what kind of walls they should design, what kind of windows, and how to put the windows in the walls. This is the sort of thing our young and very talented architects do not know how to do; and do you know what happens? Judging from what the young architects that are working with me in Barcelona say, the market is well aware of this. This is horrible, because the market is very clever: the market is as clever as the water that comes through an improperly designed

roof is horrible, and will go to another professional.

I am going to finish my intervention by telling you, the directors of Europe's schools of architecture, that we are still following the pattern of five years leading up to a grand project and then we finish off by putting the flowers on the right, or the flowers on the left. I am saying this metaphorically, of course. But the project, as the main focus of our training, from the first day to the last, has for too long been the way we do things. This is what is recommended, this is what we said in Barcelona in 1994, this is what the UIA says, this is what every book we read says, and this is why we are producing the sort of architects we are.

Here in Crete, because I am an independent architect, and because I am in touch with young architects in Barcelona, I am asking you to revise that philosophy. I do not mean that we should make a complete about-face, but simply begin to move a few degrees in a different direction. Which direction? The direction of more history of art: the architect must know what has gone before. We need more history of art in our schools, more construction, more installations, so that we continue to follow the line of the project as the main theme, but without neglecting these other things. These young architects, they finish their studies with a wonderful illusion, with a feeling that they are very gifted, but all they want to do is to do something astonishing, to win a prize, to become a Jean Nouvel in one year. And they are at risk of losing the market to the engineers and other technicians, who are there and are ready to do the things that the market knows we cannot do.

Jean-Paul Scalabre, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Paris, France

Just a point after Jordi's intervention. I think that there has always been a tension between art and construction in the practice and teaching of architecture. This tension is constitutive to the identity of architecture. I will just like to remind you of the Vitruvian triptych: commodity, solidity and beauty. So the problem is to keep the balance, to keep this tension at the right level. Perhaps we may criticise the actual situation, but I think this tension is the life of our art. I just wanted to make a small statement to complement your analysis.

Halldor Gislason, Oslo, Norway

I think that we must make absolutely sure that the schools of architecture never lose their critical position in society, because the designer is actually located between businesses and society. We are the interface between business and society, and we have to take that responsibility very seriously. And the schools of architecture have to support that, because if the professional body controls education, and especially the validation of the programmes, the critical position gets lost.

Ramon Sastre, Barcelona, Spain

We often, as Jean-Paul did, compare the profession of the architect to something else, to a conductor of an orchestra or the director of a film; but sometimes the difficulty is in defining who the other people are. If architecture is the film, who is the editor, who is the photographer? Are they other architects, or engineers? Who are these others? Because

that is the question. I understand that the architect is a generalist and is on top of some things, but sometimes it is not clear who is below. Often, I think, it is other architects or the same architects, which makes it difficult, because then you do not have a triangle with an apex, but just some things working together. This is what I want to ask you: who are you saying is below the director in the film?

Jean-Paul Scalabre, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Paris, France

Perhaps there is a misunderstanding, because I did not want to say that the architect is at the edge of the triangle. That is not my position. I think that the architect is part of the building process, he works within the economy. The architect is an actor, and there is no triangle. There is the financial-political power – the architect has always existed in relation to the man with money or political power. This is the main relation, because if you do not have this relation you do not build at all, and the analogy with the director is simply a comparison, and as the French say "comparison n'est pas raison", so you must not generalize too much.

What I wanted to say was that the architect is not the maestro; he is more like a director, involved in a process. And he is an important part of the process because he had the conception; he has the responsibility, which is very important, because he is the only one to take the responsibility even if his client does not want him to assume the formal conception of a building. And sometimes the client does not want the architect to do that, he only wants the architect to respond to the market, to make money, and the architect must respond to this task and assume the artistic challenge of his work in the specific conditions. And we all know that this is something very difficult. So what I wanted to say is that the architect is like a director, involved, like in Hollywood or in television, in one part of the process, but with his own responsibility, his own identity as the man who had the conception; Not only the façade but the whole conception, and to assume that in the building process the initial conception will be respected.

One of the big dangers is the fact that, in France, for example, but in other countries as well, architects have a commission to design the initial design and then they have no control over the actual building. But if they are out of the rest of the process then they lose their culture, their constructional culture, and they lose a lot of power of control. So this is a real danger. But I would like to say that in my opinion architecture is not a demiurge, he is not the big maestro, he is part of a system.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

A point crossed my mind as I heard this discussion developing. Sometimes as educators we may be inclined to think that the profession of architecture is a relatively straightforward business, insofar as that many of our students end up as professional architects, while at the same time some of our students decide to pursue careers in slightly different directions; and consequently within schools of architecture we have this dilemma, if you like, or at least this debate about the nature of architectural education and whether it is exclusively about preparing people for the profession of architecture. It may be preparing people to be architects, which is a slightly broader possibility. However, just to take the argument one step further, the profession also has a similar, or at least a parallel, but not identical dilemma, which is precisely what Jean-Paul was referring to: when

the professional architect is engaged to carry out a project for a client, there is also the dilemma of trying to fulfil his responsibility to society as a changer of the landscape and at the same time to give value to the man who is employing him. So there is an interesting kind of parallel discussion that might develop out of that.

David Porter, Glasgow, Scotland

I am from the Mackintosh School of Architecture in Glasgow. My contribution is really by way of a comment and a question, and it is a rather practical one about the EU Directive. Several months ago the Heads of the Schools of Architecture in the United Kingdom met in Bucharest; and after a great deal of free-ranging discussion rather like the one we have just had, we came to the conclusion that the EU Directive and its 11 points were actually rather sound and that one might actually return to this document that is now twenty years old. And there were two reservations in this. One is the notion of the years of study, because it talks about four years minimum full-time study and certainly in the UK we do not know what full time study means anymore, and certainly our students do not. Because if they are full-time they are working part-time somewhere else to be able to survive, so what we were thinking of is a minor modification, which would replace the notion of years of full-time study with that of credits, or hours of study over a period. So, where the directive to be amended, that would be a part of it.

In terms of content and after twenty years it still looks pretty good. It does not mention sustainability, however, and there are some aspects about the relationship of study to research; but these are rather small questions and our question really was the long-term status of that Directive within Europe, because there have been rumours that it was being revised and none of us at that conference really knew whether it was. There have also been rumours that it was going to be quietly dropped and would disappear. And so I have made a couple of suggestions of areas that might be looked at if it needs to be revised, but really my bigger concern is the long-term status of the EU Directive on architecture.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

David, I am going to ask Adrian Joyce to answer that question, because he is probably the person in the best position to reply.

Adrian Joyce, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Brussels, Belgium

Yes, there has been a lot of debate and confusion around the future life of the Architects Directive, and it has been a central matter of concern to the Architects Council of Europe for the past three years as it went through the co-decision process in the European Parliament. What has happened is that, at the request of the Council, the European Commission has proposed to abolish all sectoral directives and to incorporate their requirements into a single new Directive known as the Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive. This has happened, the Architects Directive is practically dead in the water in the sense that the Council and Parliament completed the whole co-decision process in May of this year and we are only waiting for translations into all 21 official languages before it comes into force. We expected publication in the official journal in July but it

has not happened and our latest information is that it would be some time in September. Once the Qualifications Directive is published, the Architects Directive lapses ten days later. It will be gone.

Told like that it is an alarming situation, but in our three-year fight we in the ACE have lobbied hard to ensure that the Commission stick to their word. Their objective was to rationalize the procedures for recognition of professional qualifications and in so doing to maintain exactly the provision in the previous and existing Directives. Their first draft did not do that and the ACE has lobbied hard and has won the battle to ensure that the Architects Directive's main provisions are preserved in the new Directive. And I can report definitively to you that that has happened. Therefore we do not need to be concerned about the main lines to do with the eleven skills and aptitudes with the minimum duration of studies but I would like to comment further on that. We do have one concern and that is that the Advisory Committee which we had previously, that brought together the profession, the schools and the national governments, is also abolished by the introduction of the Professional Qualifications Directive.

This is the point and I will emphasize it more on Tuesday when I speak to you again; this is the point that gives real urgency to the need for collaboration between schools and the profession. The new Directive only has a committee of national officials and that committee has the power to establish expert groups to advise it and we in ACE and through the Joint Working Party with the EAAE have sought to establish the credibility of our Joint Working Party as the place where properly mandated experts can sit in that expert group to ensure that the provisions of the Directive are maintained into the future, in the long term. We recently had a meeting with the Commission officials and we are confident that we will have a real voice in the long-term management of these aspects of the Directive.

To come back, David, to the two points you made, the four-year statement in my view is a hangover from the situation that occurred in 1985, and the Commission was itself ready to put forward in this qualifications directive a statement that the minimum duration would be five years. It was willing but it did not do it, and it did not do it because it feared that the Council or the national governments would not accept it, and so they decided not to make such a controversial issue at this time. We are conscious that in fact it was to reflect the German situation of the Fachhochschule, that in Germany, in effect are now all of five years duration. So revision to that Directive and to that particular item may happen in some future time, but at this moment the matter is not going to be reopened.

Your second point was to do with sustainability not being mentioned among the 11 criteria, nor research. I think it is a question of interpretation. And I also think that in the list, and I know you do not have the benefit of having it in front of you, you have item No 9 "an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with the internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate", which is only one aspect of sustainability, but it is a major one, and I think that you could look at the eleven and say "yes, it's there". And then you could have a debate about whether we should be bringing it more to the fore.

So this was a rather long-winded answer to your question; but, James, if I may profit by having the microphone, may I say that I was very sensitive to the intervention of your Norwegian colleague Dori, who intimated – and maybe you did not pick it up – that maybe the professional bodies want to tell you as Heads of Schools how to educate students.

Please do not take that home with you: we do not wish to do that. We wish to have an informed debate and dialogue between the schools as independent bodies, with their own ethical duties and responsibilities, as Dori said, and on our side we are a profession with the dichotomy of satisfying society's needs by delivering quality of life to the citizens of Europe while fulfilling our clients' requirements. So on both sides of the fence there are very sensitive issues and difficult matters to overcome, but we need to sit down together and debate these issues and look at this interface. You could say that we in the professional representative bodies are the business of architecture and that you are the educators in architecture, and we need to debate this interface; and I am looking forward to that debate taking place – well I hope it will be permanent – but certainly intensely over the next three to five years.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

As you can see I think that we are at a very, very important time and the initiative that established the Joint Working Party between the EAAE and the ACE could not have happened at a better time in many ways, and if it had not happened now we might have missed the opportunity of being in any way involved in the future of how Europe sees its architects.

Peter Gabrijelcic, Ljubljana, Slovenia

I am Dean of the Faculty of Architecture in Ljubljana. For me the main problem is that we are losing or have just lost our power on the level of urban design. There are a number of reasons for this, but the main reason is perhaps that while we were all educated under the formula of 'less is more', we are living today in a society that is less like a light, clean forest of pine trees but more like a rainforest, teeming with millions of species; A very complex world. And one that we do not understand: it is a new position and we are unable to react to it. We view the present situation as a crisis.

This is good, because if you have the feeling of a crisis you are aware that something is wrong in your understanding of life in your philosophical approach and that you may have to change your epistemological tools. Now to me, the urban designer – because I am involved in different stages and different levels of professional work: I am a planner, a designer, an architect and a Dean –, it seems that we have really lost the power on the level of urbanism because the old traditional town plans do not work anymore. We exchanged them for spatial planning systems, which finish with land use, and then we come directly to the architects' project on the site. But there is no longer anyone who is responsible, who has the power to manage such complex processes. And that is the problem: we have to develop not just architects but architect-urbanists or architect-urban designers, and we are losing that idea, because the urban designer today is more or less a negotiator between different interests, but after all he still has to have the feeling of a designer.

Because the temporary administrators who are in some way changing our position in our cities are not aware of the fact that the first duty of the mayor is to care about the future of the town and of the town landscapes, and they do not have enough background in the professional skills. I do not know how it is in your countries, but the position of town architect no longer exists. A town architect is not just a person: he is a profes-

sional who cares for the public interest and cares about form and ambience. We no longer talk about ambience, instead we talk about how there is no longer any contextualism and so on. I do not believe in it. Somewhere yes. The town architecture does not mean public architecture; it means that you have added new elements, unexpected, but with some knowledge; and somebody should be responsible for that. So we should create this intermediate position which is not a planner and is more than an architect, because its duties are so much more complex. This is what I am trying to uphold, and maybe the schools are the only environments today that are able to recognize these needs and to make politicians and society aware of them, because a good environment simply belongs to the people, like medicine or education. Thank you.

Jean-Paul Scalabre, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Paris, France

I think that you are right when you say that there is a feeling of crisis and that architects have lost their power in urban design; but I just wanted to say that the modern functionalist attitudes that are our tradition made no distinction between architecture and town-planning and urban design. Look at Le Corbusier or Josep Lluís Sert or others: there was no distinction, it was the same discipline. It worked for a time, but now it has failed. It was connected with an idea of progress, of modernity, and I think that in the current conjuncture there is a lack of doctrine. So I am turning to the schools, because I think we are at the same point we were at in the 70s, debating the relation between the old and the new, the separation of functions that was one of the dogmas of the modern movement – and we can see the collateral effects of that doctrine – our relation to landscape, which is a cultural value that is being progressively destroyed by modernity, and our relation with the new values that society has constructed, such as ecology and sustainable development. Everyone talks about these values, but in the reality of the process of how a town or a new modern city is produced, these values are completely rejected. So I think you are right, it is a fundamental problem.

Adrian Joyce, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Brussels, Belgium

Yes, the Architects Council of Europe has been very aware of these crises that are affecting the profession, and last year we published a book called *Architecture and Quality of Life* – I have a couple of examples with me – and that carried twenty one key messages for the 21st century from our organization, of which I have fliers and you are welcome to take them. Among the 21 recommendations or key messages we brought is one that I think has a parallel to the problems you have raised about the architect-urbanists and so on. We stated that as society at large and citizens in particular are both the clients and users of the results of our architectural services, it is imperative that public policies at all levels should strive to create an ethos within society that values quality in buildings and in public places.

Moreover it is important that awareness and the capacity to understand architectural values should be instilled as early as possible in the educational process, starting in kindergarten and continuing through all stages of formal education. That may seem to be an abstract answer to your question, but we are convinced that if there was a greater appreciation of architectural values in society at large the problems you have spoken about, where mayors and administrators are not open or able to communicate on these

crucially important issues, would at least be significantly diluted if not disappear entirely. So it is more that just a need to have architect-urbanists: we need a more informed society who can make more informed demands of our profession if we are to have quality in the built environment.

Dimitris Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I have been here since the beginning of these meetings and I now find myself in a difficult position because, as this discussion develops, I feel that I am out of context, since we are now again beginning to discuss the very things that we have been discussing for the past eight years, without taking into consideration that we have been discussing them for eight years now.

We are discussing them as if they are new issues. So to get myself out of this difficult position I will not make a speech, but will just remind you of four points that have been very deeply debated and discussed. And these four points are not related to the present discussion but to the context of this discussion, because this morning we had an introductory session, with no discussion, and certain things have been left over. For example, are we talking in the context of the EU and the Socrates programme? No, we are not. I will start, then, with the four points, not talking about them but just mentioning them. The first is that this is a meeting of the Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe, not in the European Union. This year, especially, it is very important to stress the point that Europe is not the European Union. Europe has at least two big countries that are not in the European Union – Russia and Turkey – and that are represented here. And this is not a minor point; it is a deep cultural point. In the past we had great trouble with this problem, great trouble indeed, and we must be very conscious of this. This is an issue that I feel very strongly about.

The second point is that we are not in the framework of the Bologna Process. In our statement, the Hania Statement, it was said that the framework is the Magna Carta Universitatum (the Bologna Declaration of the universities of 1988), then the joint declaration of European Ministers (very neat: the declaration of the universities of '88, of the ministers of '99, numbers are magical), the Salamanca Convention of European Higher Education Institutions and the Student – we have forgotten all about them – Gutenberg Declaration. So our context is the Universities, the Ministers, the Students. Then two years ago we said that that is not enough, that we have to include the profession so as to make the context complete. So it is not just the Ministers and the Bologna Process, it is that and it is beyond that. And dates and years are very important here. We started our own meetings in 1998 and the Ministers meeting was in 1999. Do not forget that. We – and I am talking here about the Meeting of Heads of Schools of Architecture of Europe, that is important – are one year ahead of them.

The next point is that when we are discussing architecture as a profession and the education of architects, we must remember that this is not just an abstraction: the question is the education of the architect in the University. Not the University in the strict statutory sense, the legal sense, but the university as a principle. By that I mean the university as a place where teaching and research are inseparable. The university as a place: whether the institution is a university or a free academy is not the point. The point is that we are talking about institutions that integrate teaching with research and that take a stance that is independent of all political authority and economic power. That was the decla-

ration of '88. An independent of political authority and economic power does not mean independent of society, on the contrary it means that these universities, these schools we are representing, have a direct relation to society. And they take the full direct responsibility for that. They do not refer the responsibility to ministers or to business. The responsibility is directly to society. That is why it was important for us to finish this framework by including the profession.

Now that is the context. For the past eight years we have been discussing two questions. One is what happened to the profession and the other is what happened to the university. My final conclusion from these eight years is that we are now at a historical turning point. That is not just a figure of speech. It is something that we have to explore in depth. We start from the beginning as if we had nothing behind us. But we do have something behind us. And what we have behind us is traditions, inherited traditions, not actual living. We have to take these traditions and make a new world out of them. So that is not just one year of discussions, the eighth year of discussions. It is the second or the third year now that we are in this predicament, or in this creative moment, whichever way you choose to look at it, and we are starting from the beginning again.

So that is how I see things, and why I said in the beginning that I find myself in an awkward position. If this is it, then we must find some way, perhaps create a committee, to go back to all these things, and take the new information that comes in from the profession and see how we are orientated in relation to that. We cannot go on like this. This is a turning point. We cannot just go on for the third or the fourth year of vague discussions. We have to raise the issues, and the issues are not "what are we going to do?", the issues are the right questions and the framework. That is my proposal.

Adrian Joyce, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE), Brussels, Belgium

Dimitri, it is always good to be reminded of the context, and I would just like to say that the Architects' Council of Europe is very conscious that the Meeting of Heads is more than the EU, but the Architects' Council of Europe is consciously EU because we are a politically motivated organization or a policy motivated organization and our main interlocutors are the EU institutions, and to be credible in the face of those institutions we must be truly representative but just at the EU level. It is a useful piece of information about the nature of our organization.

Arza Churchman, Haifa, Israel

I am Arza Churchman from the Technion in Haifa, Israel, and I have two semi-apologies. Number one, I have never been here before, so I found what you just said very interesting but I cannot relate to it, and number two, I am a small country that is not part of the European Union. But I want to make a few comments.

Number one, I feel that it is very important that we recognize that no one architect can do everything and can be capable of doing everything. You were talking about things that are missing in the students. It is impossible in five years, in seven years, in ten years, to educate people who can be experts in every single aspect of the architects' or the planners' or the landscape architects' work. And one of the issues that we are trying to deal with – and we have no solution, I do not know if anyone has a solution – is whether students should specialize in some particular aspect or whether we should give them a

basic infrastructure that allows them to specialize afterwards, when they go into practice.

Another aspect - and it is one of the things that was included in the Directive (and I am sorry that it has been done away with because I thought it was very good) - is the process in which decisions are taken and the extent to which the users are part of that process. One of the aspects of this process is sustainability. The problem of including sustainability is that while the word itself is in fashion now it probably will not be in ten years time, but its basic principle should always be in fashion and the essence of sustainability is not just the environmental aspect but the fact that the process integrates the economic, social and environmental issues in an historical and future-oriented frame. And these are the kinds of things that should continue to exist even when the word goes out of fashion. But one aspect that also requires an element of sustainability that is built in, but that does not necessarily come out in the definitions, is that of user participation. And when you talk about that new principle of quality, architectural quality, my question is who defines whether it is quality or not quality? And one of the aspects of the value of user participation is that the users should be part of the definition of whether something is a quality design or not.

Christopher Cross, Standing Conference of Heads of Schools of Architecture (SCHOSA), London, United Kingdom

Just a brief comment relating to what Jean-Paul said. I am concerned about the kind European double standard that has developed, because on the one hand we talk about harmonizing educational programmes and shared competences, and we want to share in educational programmes and have harmonization and have mobility so that students can move between different countries, but on the other hand we have different practice systems and different requirements for registration in different countries, and so forth. Now, Jean-Paul, you were saying that it is difficult to see how architecture directly reflects this. But in the longer term there is a protectionism in Europe, and if we want our students to be European, to think across borders and to be able to move across the different countries, then practice needs to do that as well. Many practices do find ways of doing this, but it is against difficulties, and I would have thought that the Architects' Council of Europe would be discussing this, because there is a limit to what you can do in the schools. Thank you.

Halldor Gislason, Oslo, Norway

I just want to remind you of the results we got about three years ago from a very good questionnaire we did here about the relationship between research, practice and education. What emerged was that the architecture schools have a very high percentage of professionals teaching, so actually the relationship between practice and education is incredibly strong in our field. It may be an informal arrangement, but about half of those teaching architecture are actually professional practising architects, and so we have professionals working directly with the students. The question is, how formal do we have to make this informal relationship? Are the teachers in the schools going to be working less as architects? I do not think so, because the architectural field is becoming much less stable, as you said, and therefore the links between research, the profession and

education are more unstable now than they were, say, thirty years ago. Should we make this relationship so formal that it becomes like an old marriage? I think that the relationship might be very good, but there might be some Euro-technical issues involved, and therefore I agree with Dimitris' comment about Europe.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I am going to bring this session to a close now; but, before I do, there are just a few final points that should perhaps be made. Lawrence Johnston passed me a little note just to remind me, when Jean-Paul was talking about the question as to whether the new BArchs or the BSCArchs would be allowed to practice architecture, that in the Hania Statement of 1999-2000 the Heads of Schools clearly said that in fact there was no possibility of somebody with a degree earned after three years of architectural education being entitled to practise and to carry on professional activities.

Just to finalize, I am conscious of the fact that, as Dimitri rightly mentioned, we do discuss the same things from time to time, and that we have been discussing some of these things for a number of years now. I suppose it is important to remember that here in the room today we have quite a number of people who are here for the first time. In fact, from what I see from the list, there are perhaps more newcomers at this meeting than ever before. Maybe the final point to make, since Ms. Churchman has raised it, has to do with the ability of the schools of architecture to deal with everything that architects are expected to know and be competent in, even in a five year period. As I said last year in my President's Address, I personally believe that architectural education is a fifty-year process, and if it is a fifty-year process we are all still students of architecture, and therefore the profession has just the same level of responsibility to continue the architectural education process as we have to start it.