

Chapter 7

Emerging Challenges for Collective Actions in Architectural Education

In this Chapter an attempt is made for a synthesis of the discussions and suggestions made during the previous days with the ambition to draw useful and constructive conclusions, as well as to generate a framework of agreements on the various themes and on collective ways forward.

Chaired by

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

Closing Debate

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

This is the last session of the conference, and it has become a tradition that the last session every year is dedicated to a fairly free debate amongst ourselves on this event and the events that will follow. I opened the introductory session by explaining to you what the concept of this meeting was, and I said that what we were trying to do in this event was to provide an opportunity to review what we have accomplished during the last three years. Three years, because it is only during the last three years that we have been able to publish all the debates and the discussions that were developed during the framework of the previous meetings, and thus we had a body of material that could be read and reflected upon as a basis for making proposals.

The idea was that those who read the texts would reintroduce, in a more composite and more articulated way, the different themes that were raised during previous discussions. So the question that we have to deal with in this session is whether and to what extent we achieved this goal and whether this will allow us to structure a kind of new concept for the next events, assuming that you think that we have to keep this meeting alive and active. I do not want to start with my views, which are very critical of the way in which we have achieved these goals, so I would like to ask my colleagues to contribute to this reflection upon what we have accomplished in this meeting and what direction we should be moving in next. I do not know where to start: maybe my fellow chairmen James Horan and Per Olaf would like to begin. Ah, Per Olaf says James should start because he is the President – we cannot argue with that, so I will hand over to you, James.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

This morning I made reference to the fact that I believe that this meeting had been exceptionally valuable, and that the level of debate and the depth of discussion was of a very high calibre. Part of the reason for this, I think, is because this meeting has been structured around the notion of review; and reviewing what you have been doing and being a little self-critical and self-aware can be hugely beneficial in assisting where we go from here.

Each year at the end of the Hania meeting there has been a discussion about whether we will ever come back to Hania again, whether we need to come back and discuss the same issues over and over, or what we should actually do about the future. At this stage I can only comment on this from a personal position. I was talking to Aart Oxenaar, from the School of Architecture in Amsterdam, last night and for some reason we got involved with the discussion of things to do with religious processions in European cities. You may wonder what the devil that has to do with architecture, but the procession that he was describing to me, which occurs in Holland from time to time, is one where they move three steps forward and then they walk two steps back, and then three steps forward and so on. This I think is a good metaphor for the type of process in which we are engaged. Not only does it allow you to make progress slowly, but it allows you to observe your surroundings while you are making that progress. And the process of making those two steps backwards may, in fact, be even more revealing than the three steps forward.

This, I believe, is the fundamental underlying structure of what the Hania meeting does. You could be deluded into thinking that no progress has been made whatsoever, but on distant analysis a very clear progress is taking place. The fact that we take the time to consider and to reconsider the same issues allows a depth and a maturity to influence and affect our decisions. The world of architectural education, in my opinion, is an ongoing and gradually changing process, and there will never be a definitive answer to any of the questions we raised. I believe that the most important thing is to raise the questions and the calibre and quality of the question is what leads to possible directions and conclusions. This meeting this year in Hania has been specifically valuable in that form of introspection into our own activities and the work we have done so far.

I do not know where we go tomorrow, but I have an idea. I know Per Olaf as the new President also has an idea about where we go tomorrow. The important thing is that we allow ourselves the possibility of meeting and interacting; because certainly, in the years that I have been coming here, each year as I have gone away I have felt a sense of enrichment and greater understanding, but not necessarily of having any specific answer. It reminds me of the philosophy student who for the first time is made aware of a whole series of philosophical issues and who said "Before I studied this philosophy stuff I was confused. Now I am really confused, but at a much higher level". That is where we are going: let's see what we have to say to assist this journey.

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

First of all, I hope to welcome you back next year. I think it is important that we continue this mission and that twenty years from now it will be clear from a certain type in architectural education history that this meeting was very important. So please try to come back, and also try to persuade other schools to join us. I have been here for about a week now. I took part in the previous workshop, and I have participated in all the things that have been going on here in these last days, the review of our ideas about the curriculum, changes, the profession, and the assessment, which produced three books. I think we all agree that these three books have a certain type of quality and they are important for us in one way or another. We have also had an opportunity in these three years to run the thematic network, which gave another kind of precision related to these books or to this meeting. So, since this is a kind of summing up, I think that we can probably say that we have some sort of a base to work upon. If we believe that, the question then is how we interpret that material further and what elements in the material have inspired us or otherwise; and certainly some things in the meetings have come up very clearly.

One thing is that we can continue to discuss the Bologna declaration. We discussed that, and some said that it is over, while others said that it is not. At the same time, however, we have lived with it for so long that we at least all have an awareness of where we stand towards it and that each individual institution has adopted its position in relation to this. It is great that it will go on, and it is great to have established the sort of framework in which we are going to discuss this further, if that is necessary. So then we go back to how we interpret it.

There is one other thing that is very clear, and that is that we have established our relationship with ACE: we have agreed that fruitful engagement between the two institutions or associations is going to go on, and we further discussed the direction of that work.

That work is complex; we have all agreed that we have to go into it in some way or another, and not remain on the sidelines, so that is a thing that will be going on throughout the year. The question, then, once again, is how we interpret this material further. We have stated, or it has come up within the ideal profile, that we can read certain images related to different types of architecture, related to different types of architectural culture within this. And in some way we have also enunciated the profile per se, although we have debated a bit about the wording of it; but the fact that schools have the capacity to show an identity is fruitful. Of course we can drive that discussion further, to what these identities are, how profiled schools are, how this is related to the programme and so on, which in many ways I think would be a very interesting and inspiring process since it will add further precision to what we really are interested in. In other words, we cannot distance ourselves from the programme or the system that we are using, but should use this to bring out what kind of school this is, what it produces and the inspiration for it to produce what it wants to produce.

Another challenging thing here is whether, as has been debated several different times, it is true that all schools are going to go through a set of transformations. If the schools that we represent are not safe, if they are threatened with attack, different kinds of attacks, then the interesting issue arises of how we discuss the profile related to the idea of change and to the idea of flexibility that has come up. Quite a few things have been discussed in this regard; and if we put them all together there is quite a complex body of material for us to handle if we are to enable these schools to resist change. I do not mean that they should be old-fashioned, in the sense of not having the capacity to listen to what is going on, but they must be able not to change just for the sake of changing. They must have a sense of where the student is in all this, as I mentioned this morning.

Another rather tricky bit, which I think that sooner or later we should get to grips with, although perhaps not next year, is how we put all the information we have, including our own accumulated knowledge and experience, everything that we have amassed within ourselves, into an architectural argument – how, in other words, we transform that information into a three-dimensional attitude. That then leads us directly back to the ideal of the method of teaching, and so on; but after all since we are responsible for architecture, how do we then transform that vast amount of information into the three-dimensional attitude or three-dimensional expression which is our goal?

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

James ended with a sentence that I would like to use as a starting-point: "I am still confused, but at a much higher level". I just want to bring us down a level or two. I think we are flying a little bit too high, reaching heights that just do not touch our clients, who are the students, so perhaps it would be a good thing if we focussed more on our clients. That is the first thing. The next thing is that we are facing a large challenge, and my question is – and I asked it in the Workshop on Architectural and Urban Design Education about teaching – whether the goal of our teaching is to produce an architect or people who are able to think in architectural dimensions. I think that it is very important that we think about our profession, which is changing. Does the client, who is paying, really demand quality architecture? What the client wants, at least in Germany, and wants it fast, is a building that has huge dimensions and costs nothing, and if the quality of the architecture is good then that is an added bonus. We have to think about this, and

whether there is a sort of fire in architects that is just demolishing architecture. So Per Olaf may be right when he moves on to a very high level, but I think that we have to come back down to the ground.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I think that the main problem is that the changes are so fast and the context in which our discussion takes place is different every day. This is why it is interesting to see that this debate, even if it appears at first view to be repetitive (that is to say, it repeats the same themes), is totally different as the context changes. When I came here I thought that even in the framework of the synthesis we were repeating the same issues. What I saw was that the discussions we had three years ago, which you can see in the first book, and the discussions we have had here now are totally different: other arguments, different content and, I can say, different level. So I think that this inquiry, which every year will define where we are and where our school is mapped within this European framework, will become something very useful. James had an idea, which we did not apply, but I feel obliged to mention it, that the participants coming here should complete a small questionnaire, which could be promptly processed and the results distributed here. I think that this would be very useful for all of us, and not only for newcomers.

At the first meeting, I remember, we discussed Bologna, which had not happened but was about to; today, we say that Bologna is our framework so we do not have to discuss it. It is a different world, and a totally different framework of discussion. So I really appreciate what you say, because I feel strongly that we must become a little more operational in these meetings and produce information which will be updated so that people leaving here will have the feeling not only that they attended or participated in or assisted a debate between Heads of Schools of Architecture but also that they absorbed some operational information that could be useful in their decision-making over the next year.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I certainly do not want to take up valuable time which might be given to my Irish colleague, but there is one thing that I feel I must say in response to the last speaker. He has articulated very clearly the position of someone who comes here for the first time; but, to reinforce what Constantin has said, because of the changing environment we are all newcomers each year. The situation changes so rapidly that we need to be updating our information about each other extremely quickly, and therefore you may appear in your own mind to be here for the first time but what you are experiencing is just as new to the rest of us who have been doing it in a changing environment.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

I was going to begin with something about information and data and things like that, which we have already started to cover, and I take the point of data going out of date very quickly; but I think there is another level that we also have been trying to work at. I think there have been a number of themes that have emerged in our discussions over the last few days where it is not immediately obvious how we are to proceed with them but that have nonetheless come forward as issues that we have to deal with. And just

for the sake of a couple of minutes of discussion I would say that these issues fall into three categories.

There are ones that are within and between schools, which have to do with curricula, with programme structure, with transparency of purpose and all that, how we document our diversity, and also issues that go beyond these introverted issues, issues that have to do with access to architectural education, the kind of diversification within architecture education that might be generated by having to adopt a slightly more creative social agenda as we turn to face the different way in which education has to shape itself in the future.

The second sort are the new relationships that have emerged within and between institutions now that architectural education does not have a safe place in most large institutions any more. There are different criteria being brought to bear, and most of us I suppose are trying to see how we can both retain the coherence of architectural education and advance it. Put us into a position where we can actually engage in a transformational process within architectural education as well.

The third one is really the relationship that we have talked about already between schools and professional life; and I think that what has come out very clearly here is not just the business of dealing with ACE and so on, which is the level of institutional relations, but also the fact that there have been new models of relationship spoken about in our midst, ones where the boundaries, the strict boundaries, and the institutions of the profession on the one side and the education institution on the other are changed. And we have identified that as a series of opportunities for education as well as a series of challenges.

These things have emerged quite strongly in my memory of our transactions; but I just want to finish by saying that I think there is something to be learned as well from what is being said and repeated. The need for information, also the need for a perhaps more elaborate structure to our meetings, so that some parts have to do with information-giving and some with opportunity for discussion around certain themes, workshop type sessions that might allow us to pursue things in smaller groups but in greater depth. And I would suggest that we actually do invite advance contributions from people, that we do actually go and ask people to write papers in advance as a kind of lead for that part of our meetings. These are operational things. I am very conscious that the point has been made that the quality of our discussions has changed significantly over the last few years, and as a consequence of that I think that our expectations for these meetings are rising, and I think we are conscious that we still have the opportunity to make another leap at the level of discussion that we can have here.

Hansjoerg Hilti, Vaduz, Liechtenstein

I would like to go on with the theme that our colleague from Regensburg brought up. I think I feel exactly the same way although I am more of an old-timer than a newcomer. I was here for the first few days, and I thought that we would never go into themes, but this touches me. For example, yesterday morning I found it very interesting when Chris talked about the social aspects of the white man who is an architect and things like that; but it remains there, we cannot discuss it. Just think about it: we are all heads of schools, we all have problems in our schools, with our curriculum, with our professors, and if we could have more chance to talk to one another here, not only at the coffee table, but in

small sessions, ten people at a time, to talk over each other's problems (and everybody has more or less the same problems) and to really exchange information much more directly than what we do in these sessions, I think that I would enjoy coming to Hania much more. I do not know if others feel the same way, but for me personally I do not need too many books or posters out there explaining the average of the curriculum from all schools of Europe: I would like to exchange this information much more directly, and not only at the coffee table or in the bar of the Kriti hotel, which is where I was sitting last night, beside Aart, when we discussed these matters and exchanged information; and I think that if we did that many more people would attend the discussions instead of hanging around the city.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Many of them do attend the event. I do not think that they are walking around the city, or at least not at this moment. The programme is structured so that each session is followed by one and a half hours of discussion. The problem seems to be not that there is no discussion, because there is, but that it is not the kind of discussion you expected. Is this something that is related to the way that we structure the group? Do you mean that the group is too big to have meaningful discussion, or do you think that there are other reasons that do not permit this? In this regard I would like just to inform the newcomers that in previous years the idea of the discussions was organised on the basis that we split the group into smaller sets, and we asked them to divide into groups of twenty to thirty persons; but as we grew and the number of participants reached 100, that meant that we would have to have at least three groups for discussion in that scale, which would mean three different spaces and three sets of recording devices, which became too costly. So that is why we left only this room for debate and discussion. This may well be a problem, and we may have to see how we can manage to have smaller groups.

Halldor Gislason, Oslo, Norway

I think we have had a long and very interesting conversation. I am no longer a newcomer, and I want to say that in the beginning I believed that architecture was a kind of a unified enterprise, but from being here – far more than from being in the schools – I have realized that architecture is a multiplicity, a very interesting multiplicity; and I remember that we were saying that on the first day we were here. At the same time we are probably not representative of it, because for one thing we are in the majority white Europeans, and even though we represent Europe there are lots of other types of people, and in any case we represent the type of school, not the students.

I have been thinking that if, as we hear, the Directive is gone, then the quality evaluation of the programme will shift, and government legislation on acceptance into the profession may or may not come. These issues are, I think, located in a multiplicity of levels at the moment, and the only way to operate in a multiplicity is to operate on all the levels. And it is very difficult to operate in one location in architecture – and I do not mean Hania – because architecture somehow slips away. I think that architecture as a multiplicity is fantastic, because I have no problem with construction or software or whatever; I think it is fantastic how rich architecture has become. But my feeling is that in modernism there was this one ideology, and in around 1975 this ideology began to slip away, first amongst

the students and then in other issues; and my observation is that really the only thing we should be looking at (because I am not particularly concerned about curriculum and Bologna and things like that: there are all those people who are running education to do that, and hopefully many of them do it) is the location of the architect in society. This means the philosophical and political position of the architect in modern society, because that is how we operate, all – how many was it? – 450,000 of us.

We work as a kind of an interface between business and society. My favourite analogy at the moment is the journalist, because I think the journalist in modern society is in a very similar situation, and I have discussed this question with friends. You may have all the freedom of speech you want, but you still have a responsibility to the society that you are writing for, you have responsibility to your editor and you have a responsibility to yourself, to your own conscience. And I have been at these meetings when we are looking at the statistics, and they were really interesting to me. I have disseminated them widely, and I thank you for them because I have been using them in my home school to fight for certain issues in my programme. I think that it would be really great if we could spend some time on this ethical-political position.

Gunnar Parelius, Trondheim, Norway

This is a tentative thought, for the next meeting, about how to ask questions. I am bit lost as to whether we have decided which way we should be going; and I think the way to handle that is to ask the right questions in the right way. In a lot of the things that we have looked at, we have fallen into the way of treating questions only by reacting to demands from others. We do that in a lot of ways, because we have the obvious demands from Brussels and Bologna and so on, and all these questionnaires on how to harmonise, and all these things that only respond to how it is best to adapt to demands. So I was accusing people of thinking only of how to adapt to the market as well, when this is not just a question of adapting: we have to ask ourselves what do we need to do more than just adapt? What are the things we need to do to develop diversity again? Because if we only adapt, then we do not really harmonize, we merely sink into some kind of schematic thinking that others make for us.

We need to take an active approach and ask questions about what do we do in addition to these demands. This is not an easy question to ask, and I do not want to be unfair to anybody here, because I think a lot of us want to think like this. How to do it is a very difficult matter, but still I want to try to force the questions in this direction and to find ways of doing it. It might be that having prepared speeches and papers on different subjects and ethics here could be wrong, or it could be a very good way of asking how we tackle this situation, how, when there is a market, we attack and play with the market and not adapt to it.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

What you are saying, I think, is very interesting, and is part of a discussion that we have actually had in the past but have never managed to follow through on. One of the issues I remember raising on a previous occasion, as a methodology to deal with the type of question and answer that you are talking about, that I think might be worth while considering as a possibility, is identifying an issue, finding two or three people who take very

definitely opposing or different views of that issue and asking them to prepare short position papers for presentation, which would become the basis for a general argument. And maybe we have reached the stage in our discussions here when that methodology could be very usefully employed.

Simo Paavilainen, Helsinki, Finland

I am also a newcomer, although our school has had a representative here before me. I come from the Helsinki University of Technology, Department of Architecture. I want to congratulate the organisers on the feeling that you have here; it has been very familiar, very relaxed, and I have enjoyed it very much. I think that it is better if this group is not divided into different workshops, because I think that this group is small enough to discuss together, and if we were divided we would become different groups and we would not be such a big family anymore, which is such a very nice idea. Yesterday it was said that teaching and the schools have to have mobility, intensity, competitiveness, excellence, and so on. I think that that is less important than trying to discuss what the essence of our teaching should be when the times and the situations are always changing, what the lasting, unchanging core of our teaching should be. This is a little unclear for me now, when all we are talking about is changes and mobility and so forth. I hope that next time we can discuss architecture and what we ought to teach and what we can leave out.

Herman Neuckermans, Antwerp, Belgium

I was going to respond to what was said before, but in fact it links up with what our colleague from Helsinki has just said. We have heard some people advocating small groups, and others one large group. We have been working in recent years in one group, but before that we worked in small groups. The new element here is that we have more and more newcomers, and I do not know whether the old-timers are always willing to repeat all the things that they have discussed over and over in the past; we have had some serious reactions about that. So maybe – and this is just a suggestion – either before the next meeting or at the beginning of the next meeting you could ask for topics in which people have a common interest and identify them at the first session or through the newsheet, and structure the meeting in this way. That might solve the problem and allow people to discuss the subjects they are particularly interested in, without having to try to squeeze them in between other things.

That might also solve another issue that I feel a little bit uneasy about, which is that the whole thing is becoming more and more unilaterally English. This is not a problem for me, I can understand and speak English; but I think that we have a French component that maybe feels more at ease in a framework of small groups, which would not of course be purely French-speaking but where they could debate in French and somebody who is comfortable in English could report on it afterwards. That could perhaps solve two things, the common interest of small groups and the issue of language. That is an idea to keep in mind.

Mati Rautiola, Tampere, Finland

I can speak Finnish as well, so shall I? This is just about our last chance to make a com-

ment on this occasion, and I would like to open my mouth a little bit too. My name is Mati Rautiola and I also come from Finland, like Simo, but from the Tampere School of Architecture, from the department of Juhani Katainen. I would like to get back to the matter of messages for future meetings. For next time, when I will no longer be a newcomer but a second-timer, I would really like to support the proposal made by the representative from Regensburg. I think that it would be very interesting to look at the specific cases and even the practical solutions of different schools, to hear about staff numbers and finances and the kinds of problems we all have at the moment – that would be very interesting. Not to talk about these things all the time, but to hear some answers to these problems.

Another thing that is on my mind is that maybe it would be possible to have a short review of what has been done over the eight and now nine years, and what has been decided, and what topics have been covered, and what results have been achieved. A very short historical review of what was done on the publications as well. That is something that was on my mind, thinking about the future.

Another thing I was expecting to hear about on this occasion, and that maybe we could reflect upon in the future, is that architects are fighting new professions, or, to put it another way, there is a new dimension in the profession. We did not touch on that too much, and maybe we could come back to that matter a little bit. That probably will not change the overall picture of the architect's profession, but it might bring together some new and very interesting, albeit marginal, new interventions in society and in the professional field. I would also like to say that I would personally be very interested in touching on not only the architect's working environment but the substance of what we are dealing with: what the future challenges are and how they will be reflected in the work of an architect and what kind of architecture we will finally be getting in the end.

Juhani Katainen, Tampere, Finland

This is my 8th time here. It has been a pleasure to be here; and although it is very difficult to recall all eight years, I can assure you, as you know yourselves, that this is a friendly place and you learn a lot, although sometimes we are driven distracted going here and there. I want to go back to the Quality Directive, and my reason for doing that might sound a bit bureaucratic but is not; it is like the Bologna process; it is the process which is now ahead of us. We had a wonderful show by Adrian Joyce about the structure, and we have a joint committee, and that is fine – but it is not enough. I hope that new schools and new heads here go home and start thinking about the dimensions of this kind of activity that is happening right now in Europe.

We hear that if an architect wants to go to another country he has to register with the proper bodies and pay insurance, and so on. This is an on-going process: we agreed at one time that if you get a proper education as an architect you are free to go anywhere in Europe, but things are not so simple. So this is something to reflect on, and I suggest that we not leave it for next summer, because one year may be too long a time to leave it, but that some smaller groups and individuals who are interested in this matter could maybe exchange their opinions via e-mail, maybe via our council members, and collect different thoughts and different views. This is what happens when we do not have an advisory committee, we have no one working on such issues, and we do not have anyone to stand up and say these things aloud and be understood. So that is my intervention and thank you very much for everything.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Maybe I could say a few words on what Constantin said in the introduction. A number of us were invited to meet in Brussels in May to consider how we would structure the Hania meeting and there we decided to try an overview of what we had done and achieved over the previous three years; and in that day's discussion we looked at the options, we looked at workshops, we looked at new subjects, more questionnaires – I can see you shuddering at the thought of more questionnaires –, and we decided that that was not the purpose of the 8th meeting. What Constantin, Maria and the committee have to do is report back to the funding directorate as to what we have achieved, and we have achieved much. So I take part responsibility for the way the events of the last three days have been structured, because that was a necessary format to review what we have achieved.

Although it has not been ideal, and it may have been bewildering for newcomers, I think it has been successful and that we have achieved what we set out to do in May; and maybe next year, if we have a meeting next year, it will have a different direction. Those of you who look back at the proceedings will know that my particular interest is in the profession, education, young people's mobility and architects' mobility across Europe; and we have spent a considerable number of years gathering information, which was reported through the sessions. I can tell you that since September 2003, much of it is already out of date; and, as James said, the scene changes so quickly by the time you send an e-mail it has changed again. But that information is available and if people want to update and tell me the latest situation I will be happy to do that as a volunteer.

A number of you in the room were on the advisory group for the old Directive – Juhani, Leen Van Duin, myself, James; we all served on two sub-committees to the old Directive Advisory Group. One, chaired by James, was about the formation of new school of architecture courses; the other, chaired by John O'Reilly, which I served on, was about formation and training, particularly practical and professional training. There is a wealth of information available that came out of those groups, and I would urge, whether it is to Adrian or to the EAAE, that we do not lose sight of that knowledge and that experience, because it is extremely valuable. Adrian cited some fifteen publications, not all of them I have to say mind-bogglingly important, and so I would argue that we should filter out those documents that are a real help and of constructive assistance to newcomers, to existing schools and indeed to schools that feel that they are under threat from an institution or from a government.

I will cite some examples: we talked earlier this week about cultural diversity, heritage and exchange, and there is an interesting little clause in one of the recommendations of those guidance notes that recommends that each school's external examining body has another architecture professional from another member state, in order to engage in the richness and cross-fertility of each school's output. And when I read that I decided to put it into practice. I will give you an anecdotal experience: at Queens, an external examiner is appointed for three to five years; he can, if he wishes, leave after one year, but the normal period is three to five. So I invited the following people – I am going to drop names here and I hope that I am not going to embarrass them – I invited Professor Peter Hoofner from Germany to be one of our external examiners, which he did with the richness of his career and his architecture, and he engaged with the students; he was succeeded, I am pleased to say, by Richard Foqué, who I met here in Hania in 1998 and

invited him – a tremendously dynamic man who helped the students and helped me and enriched the diploma; and Richard was succeeded by Prof. Clavor Harris from Finland, who is still serving. So over those fifteen years our school in Belfast, in Northern Ireland, was enriched through that exchange, and I find it invaluable. And you can all do it. It is there, and it is possible for you to do it. Maybe some of you already do.

There are other points that I wanted to make, and one of those concerns something that is in the new Directive that Adrian mentioned. It contains a strong, and indeed an enforced recommendation that professionals engage, demonstrably, in Continuing Professional Development (or CPD, for short). And that is not a threat: it is a tremendous opportunity, and I will explain to you why. We have a labour market that may be depressed in some member-states, and may be buoyant in others. I have found that in some circumstances our discipline of architecture has been eroded by other people (not mentioning any specific discipline), but we suddenly find that architects were reporting to people called Project Managers. Who were they? They were not trained. They were people who put themselves into a position of power, and who got on the client's side and suddenly they were spending millions and millions of sterling and had no clue what architecture was about. But they had got the client's ear. And so together with the Royal Society of Ulster Architects I put together a joint programme to train architects to be Project Managers. We have run it for five years, with thirty architects each year, so that now we have 150 people who can help change that market, because they are Project Managers who are knowledgeable about architecture, and if the domain of general practice shrinks they can add to their career development by moving into new fields. So take advantage of that. It is in the Directive, and each of you in your own regions know the pressure – some of you were talking earlier about urban planning and losing it to other people –, so get in there and help the architects become what the market wants, and it will make a big difference.

Jean-Claude Groussard, Marseille, France

Je ne voudrais pas que cette session se termine sans qu'il y ait au moins une intervention en français. Je m'en excuse pour ceux qui n'entendent pas le français. Je rappelle que c'est l'une des deux langues qui ont permis de créer cette association et que la plupart des textes fondateurs ont été rédigés en français et en anglais. Et je remarque – c'est la première fois que je viens ici mais mes collègues l'avaient déjà remarqué précisément – que l'ensemble des débats s'orientent vers l'usage exclusif de l'anglais, ce qui pour les francophones, qui sont assez nombreux dans cette salle – peu de français, je le remarque, mais beaucoup de francophones – peut poser un certain nombre de problèmes de compréhension, d'autant que les Anglophones ne prennent pas toujours le temps de parler lentement. Seuls les francophones parlent anglais lentement, et je remercie Chris Younes pour la clarté de son intervention hier.

Le fait, donc, que l'anglais soit la langue unique utilisée dans cette assemblée peut poser un certain nombre de problèmes de compréhension, à la fois de compréhension générale mais aussi de compréhension sur les termes utilisés, parce que nous n'utilisons pas toujours les mêmes termes quand nous parlons du projet, du design, de la présentation, etc., et il peut donc y avoir des contresens. Je pense que ce serait intéressant d'envisager d'une manière ou d'une autre la possibilité d'avoir soit des traductions simultanées soit une autre forme de traduction qui permette, sinon de comprendre, au moins de com-

prendre l'essentiel. Je sais que c'est un débat qui a eu lieu à plusieurs reprises ici. Je voulais le reposer parce qu'on en a parlé entre nous et je sais que je ne suis pas le seul à avoir eu des difficultés cette année. Donc, voilà, je le soumetts à votre appréciation. Je voulais aussi profiter de cette fin de session pour vous faire part d'une information.

Peut-être que vous avez constaté qu'il n'y avait pas beaucoup de représentants des écoles d'architecture françaises. Je peux vous donner deux explications à cela. La première c'est que peut-être le problème de la langue, et cela rejoint ce que j'ai dit tout à l'heure, empêche un certain nombre de collègues de venir ici, avec vous. Mais surtout la principale raison c'est que l'enseignement de l'architecture en France a franchi une étape extrêmement importante au cours des derniers mois puisque le processus de Bologne est rentré pleinement de fait, va être appliqué pleinement à partir de la rentrée prochaine, puisque l'ensemble des textes officiels de la réforme des études d'architecture en France a été publié au cours de l'été. Donc la mise en œuvre de ce nouveau programme nécessite une mobilisation extrêmement importante de toutes les équipes pédagogiques des écoles d'architecture françaises, et des directeurs, et que la rentrée va être une rentrée extrêmement importante et difficile pour tous puisque nous allons tous mettre en œuvre de nouveaux programmes. Donc je pense que, cette année, cette difficulté particulière justifie le fait qu'il n'y ait pas beaucoup de directeurs d'écoles françaises parmi nous.

Je voulais vous donner cette information et surtout vous dire quelle est l'importance pour les études d'architecture en France d'avoir mis en place l'ensemble de ces textes, d'avoir mis en place cette réforme et cette nouveauté que tous les enseignants attendaient depuis trente ans. Nous avons enfin créé le doctorat en architecture. Doctorat en architecture qui doit s'appuyer sur des laboratoires de recherche dans les écoles, bien évidemment. Je rappelle que l'an dernier à Marseille nous avons débattu de la question de la recherche dans les écoles d'architecture européennes, nous avons débattu de la recherche en architecture, et que cette première réunion va se poursuivre à Lille – cela à été annoncé dans le calendrier – au mois de novembre prochain. Donc c'est une étape extrêmement importante qui va certainement permettre aux écoles françaises de tisser des liens avec les écoles européennes pour partager des projets de recherche et travailler sur le doctorat en architecture. C'est une nouvelle importante que je souhaitais vous donner avant la fin de cette session. Je vous remercie.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Alors, je dois répondre à cette intervention en français. D'abord je voudrais vous remercier pour les informations que vous avez transmises sur la question de la réforme en France, et je voudrais vous donner quelques informations de notre part qui concernent plutôt la sensibilité que nous avons en tant que conseil, en tant qu'organisateur de cet événement. Il y a cinq ou six années on avait reçu le même écho de votre part, c'est-à-dire des francophones, d'installer pour nos discussions un système de traduction simultanée. A cette époque on n'était pas dans ce bâtiment. On était dans une autre qui est juste à côté. Nous avons demandé à une compagnie d'apporter d'Athènes le système de consoles, et nous avons payé beaucoup beaucoup d'argent pour cela. Ce que nous avons constaté un beau jour c'était que le traducteur traduisait les interventions anglaises pour lui-même, car personne ne portait les écouteurs.

ture, et j'ai alors proposé que, si c'était possible, pour qu'on puisse soutenir la présence de la langue française dans cette réunion, ils nous fournissent deux ou trois traducteurs qui pourraient assurer la traduction, et que nous aurions payé de notre côté leurs frais de déplacement et de séjour. Malheureusement on n'a eu aucune réponse de leur part. Le troisième effort que nous avons fait en tant qu'organisateur c'était que, l'année passée étant l'année de la francophonie et étant donné qu'il y avait un Bureau de la Francophonie à l'ambassade française à Athènes, je me suis adressé à la dame qui en était responsable en lui disant, écoutez, chaque année la réunion des directeurs perd beaucoup avec la possibilité, avec la capacité d'expression des français qui y participent, parce que la barrière linguistique pose des problèmes et on ne profite pas de la présence des français dans cette salle. Malheureusement même cette piste non plus n'a pas donné de possibilités opérationnelles pour qu'on puisse arriver aujourd'hui à une solution au problème. Notre quatrième effort, que je voudrais juste mentionner, c'était que cette année-là, quand on a eu la discussion avec Chris Younes par téléphone, je lui ai dit que voilà, ça pourrait être une occasion de commencer une nouvelle pratique où les français peuvent parler français et on essaiera de faire une traduction simultanée pour ces interventions. Nous avons donc demandé qu'il y ait ici une quarantaine de casques qu'on pourrait utiliser, et après on a cherché quelqu'un qui puisse faire la traduction. Mais pour des raisons que Chris connaît mieux que moi cela n'a pas passé. C'est une question de symétrie alors. On a conscience de ce problème. Et je ne sais pas comment on peut le résoudre du côté financier.

Dimitris Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

We do have a language problem. That is definite, but to call it a French-English problem shows a lack of historic sensitivity. In this part of the world, and I mean from India to Britain, there have been up to now 4 international languages, three of which are still being taught in many European high schools: Greek, Latin, Arabic and English. True, the French language applied for the job, but – sorry, friends – it failed. So my suggestion is that if we do not stick to English then we go to the second candidate, which is Arabic. If you do not like the Arabic option, we can go to one of the three languages taught in most European high schools – Greek, Latin and English. That is my point.

Emmanuel Amougou Mballa, Bordeaux, France

Juste deux secondes. Je vais essayer de parler très rapidement. Je peux le dire en anglais, tu le sais très bien, mais je le dis en français pour continuer dans le symbolique, parce que justement on oublie toujours d'utiliser la langue française. Mais je voulais juste suggérer ceci: qu'on pourrait faire quelque chose de très simple, c'est-à-dire que les communications qui sont données auparavant en anglais ou en français peuvent être traduites et des photocopies du texte dans leur langue distribuées aux participants qui doivent en avoir pour qu'ils puissent après s'engager dans la discussion.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Mes amis qui parlent français. C'est aussi difficile pour nous, les Irlandais, de parler français que de parler anglais, parce que l'anglais c'est la deuxième langue en Irlande. For those of you who do not speak French, I am saying that it is equally difficult for us Irish, because

English is our second language. I do think, though, that our French colleagues have identified a fantastic opportunity. The beginning of the discussion today identified the fact that there are areas of interest where certain schools need to obtain information, and the possibility of smaller groups was mentioned as a way to do this. One of the suggestions which I think we should consider, and I will talk to my new president about this, is the possibility of having small groups that can discuss some subjects in their own language – French, English, Italian, German, it does not matter. The difficulty is that, unfortunately, and historically, the language that most people can use to communicate with each other in this room in is probably English; but I would invite the speakers of French, the speakers of Italian, the speakers of any other language here in the room to offer their assistance to the council in translating decisions and documents so that we can circulate them and have the discussion in your language – but you have got to make the contribution. *Merci beaucoup!*

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

I am not going to intervene in the language discussion. We will try to do our best, we know that there is a problem, especially in the written part, and we have already stated during this meeting a way to improve that; so thank you anyway for bringing it up, but I will not discuss that further.

I think it is very clear that the EAAE will continue to update its knowledge and information, as a base that we can all refer to, and we would like to assure and keep that base alive. Whether you are a newcomer or have been to several meetings, I think there is also a critical issue related to the way we now have the material you can read, and there is no longer the excuse there was four or five years ago. I know we are all busy, but the preparation for each one of us going into the meeting is, I think, also very important. Of course it is important that we feed you with information that is precisely related to the meeting, but many of the questions that have been brought up today are sort of rooted in the books that we have already done.

Therefore I think that yes, information is very important, and it certainly has to go on; but at the same time, and due to the very fact of our success, we also have to put up another type of agenda with a different ambition. Therefore I think (and Kealy suggested, although I have not thought any more about it), that there are certain aspects of these three or four days that will just be related to information, that we can inform each other of what has been going on, and that we have settled that part. Then if we find that we can introduce different topics that have another type of interest beyond that of simple information, that I think will be fruitful to take back to our own institutions. Discussions, in other words, that are not necessarily directly related to specific problems, but that build up another type of knowledge or another type of experience that we share with each other away from the problems that we have in our own institutions. This, I think, is certainly possible. It may be organised in the form of a good lecture on these different topics, or as colloquies in small groups before starting, and so on. So maybe we will take this opportunity to look into this sort of thing.

Apart from this, I would like to thank you again for a fantastic event, to congratulate you on the way that we are producing results – and I do not think that we are producing slowly at the moment, I think we are going quite fast – and invite you all to come back again next year.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

As we are very close to the end of this Meeting, I would like to express to you the sincere thanks of the organizers for your presence, for your participation, for your positive spirit in this event and for your creative contributions to the debates that we have had during these past days. More specifically I would like to thank the colleagues who helped us at the preparatory meeting in Brussels to structure the content and the logic of this meeting: Lawrence Johnston, Loughlin Kealy, Johan Verbeke, Juhani Katainen, Joaquim Brazinho, Mac Popescu, Kees Doevendans, Roger Liberloo, Stefano Musso and Gunnar Parelius. I hope that we have accurately translated the spirit of that meeting, which was really very fruitful and very operational. I would also like to thank all the people who have worked here all those days to support us technically and with the coffee breaks and everything else. I think that we owe them a very sincere vote of thanks, especially to Dimitris who was really an all-purpose handyman on the technical assistance side of this event. Also I would like to thank the secretary of the EAAE, Lou Schol, who was the heart of this preparation, and Laura Koniordou, who was her contact in Greece for the preparation of the meeting; and I would also like to thank the EAAE council for their support and the confidence they gave us to organize such a complex event. Thank you very much.

To the memory of Professor Fernando Távora

Manuel Nicolau Brandao, Porto, Portugal

The not really unexpected but no less brutal news of the death of the architect Fernando Távora arrived on Saturday 3 September 2005. He was 82 years old. More than our former teacher, and the only office master that I have ever had, he was, as you may know, one of the most important persons in Portuguese architecture in the 20th century. He participated in different projects events and in important inquiries and surveys about traditional Portuguese architecture in the mid 50s and so incorporates and synthesizes its simplicity in language and its strength and clearness in principles, seen through a very high level of cultural and modern knowledge. But most of all, and this is why we think it is important to give this announcement here, he was a great teacher. He symbolized the spirit of a school in Porto where there is a very special way of teaching, and transmitted it in the same way in his own office as in his classes for about 50 years. He was always in a very good mood and had a very good sense of humour, I may say, and was happy to pass on his experience, his knowledge, his concepts, encouraging the new students to follow their own ways without any kind of crystallized patterns and restraints. He was the academic and the academic teacher. He was the master, our master. Thank you, Fernando Távora.

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

I propose we have a minute of silence in remembrance of Fernando Távora.