

2003 建筑教育国际论坛：全球化背景下的地区主义

2003 International Architectural Education Forum: Regionalism under the Trends of Globalization, Nanjing

东南大学建筑学院

School of Architecture, Southeast University

东南大学出版社

Southeast University Press

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

2003 建筑教育国际论坛:全球化背景下的地区主义/东南大学建筑学院编. —南京:东南大学出版社, 2004. 10

ISBN 7-81089-859-0

I. 2... II. 东... III. 建筑学-教育-国际学术会议-文集 IV. TU-4

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2004)第 062924 号

东南大学出版社出版发行

(南京四牌楼 2 号 邮编 210096)

出版人:宋增民

江苏省新华书店经销 南京工大印务有限公司印刷

开本: 889 mm×1194 mm 1/16 印张: 21.25 字数: 751 千字

2005 年 2 月第 1 版 2005 年 2 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1~1000 定价: 70.00 元

(凡因印装质量问题,可直接向发行部调换。电话:025-83795801)

2003 建筑教育国际论坛：全球化背景下的地区主义会议论文集

2003 International Architectural Education Forum: Regionalism under the Trends of Globalization, Nanjing



2003. 12. 10 – 12. 12

东南大学建筑学院 (SEU-ARCH)

School of Architecture, Southeast University, China

主办单位

Organized by



全国高等学校建筑学学科专业指导委员会

National Supervision Board for Architectural Education (NSBAE)



东南大学建筑学院

School of Architecture, Southeast University (SEU-ARCH)



国际建筑师协会

UIA



联合国教科文组织

UNESCO

此为试读, 需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Preface

Today we are living in an age of globalization and sustainable development. In this age, new technology and way of production has accelerated the economic growth that in turn also has given rise to people's concern and re-understanding of the regional culture, under the influence of the increasing globalization. Architecture is the joint effort of technology, way of production and regional culture; the creation of architectural space depends on the establishment of a far-sighted educational thought as well as an initiative, efficient educational system in architecture. Therefore, today's architectural education means the quality of spatial environment for the future of mankind.

In view of people's unprecedented concern on global architectural education, on 10th December, 2003, Nanjing International Forum on Architectural Education was held at Southeast University, Nanjing, People's Republic of China, aiming at finding the consensus on the present international education development of architecture and revealing the trend in the future architectural education. The 3-day forum was jointly sponsored by National Supervision Board for Architectural Education (NSBAE); School of Architecture, Southeast University (SEU-ARCH); the International Union of Architects (UIA) and UNESCO. The forum also organized special activities such as Thomas Herzog's Architecture & Technology Global Exhibition, Exhibition of Domestic Architectural Departments and Schools, the 2nd Jinyi Cup Chinese University Students' Architectural Work Exhibition and Awarding Ceremony.

As the one of the most important international conferences of its kind ever held in China in recent years, this forum received nearly 300 scholars, architects, planners and students, both from home and abroad. Representatives are from not only universities and institutions of architecture design on Mainland China, but also Hong Kong Chinese University and overseas universities such as National Singapore University and Seoul City University of South Korea. Among the distinguished guests are Mr Vassilis Sgoutas, former chair, UIA; Mr Richard Engelhardt, advisor, Cultural Affairs in Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO; Mrs Louise Cox, education director and vice president, UIA region IV; Professor Cary A. Hack, dean, School of Design, University of Pennsylvania; USA (PennDesign); Professor Thomas Herzog, Department of Architecture, Technische Universität, München, Germany; Professor Herbert Kramel, former dean, Department of Architecture, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Switzerland (ETH); Professor Yukio Nishimura, Department of Urban Engineering, Tokyo University, Japan; Professor Bill Hillier, chairman, Bartlett School of Graduate Studies, University College London, UK; Professor Volker Hartkopf, Department of Architecture, Carnegie Mellon University, USA.

With the theme "Architectural Education: Regionalism under the Trends of Globalization", this forum focused on the areas of architectural education such as the summarization and exhibition of the research results in various countries, the discussion on the trend in the new era, and the exchange of views on how to utilize the local culture, economy and resources. The participants benefited from this fruitful exchange of views particularly on issues such as the establishment of educational system with special characteristics, the interaction between architectural education and architecture creation, and how to cultivate excellent architectural talents with high proficiency,

broad academic vision and flexible social adaptability. In the sub-venues, the discussion was extended to topics such as the thought, theory and method in the education of contemporary architecture and planning, the results of architectural education reform, and the opportunities and challenges for regional architectural education under the trend of globalization and urbanization.

Thanks to the tireless work of my colleagues Professor Dong Wei, Ms Wang Xiangjun, Wu Jinxiu and other members of the Forum Organizing Committee, the cooperation of the authors and the support from Southeast University Press, the *conference Proceedings* will be published soon, which means that more readers can share with us the exchange results of this forum. We believe that the ideas, practices and analysis concerning architectural education in this book will undoubtedly provide people with an enlightening reference to better understand today's world architectural education, especially the current Chinese architectural education and its development.

Wang Jianguo, Professor and Dean of SEU-ARCH

目 录

Contents

国际背景下的建筑教育	(1)
Architectural Education in the International Context	
建筑教育的全球化	(11)
Globalism in Architectural Education	
UIA 教育政策和近期对于在亚洲和太平洋地区试行的 UNESCO-UIA 认证系统的教育经验	(20)
The UIA Education Policy and Recent Experiences Trialing the UNESCO-UIA Validation System in UIA Region IV, Asia And Oceania	
扩展亚洲遗产教育网络	(26)
Expansion of Asian Network in Heritage Education	
中国建筑教育发展走向初探	(27)
On the Latest Transition of the Architectural Education in China	
意想不到的教训:进行建筑和城市设计研究的方法及其影响因素	(32)
The Lesson of the Unexpected: How to Do Research in Architecture and Urban Design & Why It Matters	
未来的建筑教育	(44)
Architecture Education in the Future	
全球化背景下自下而上的建筑设计教育	(48)
Architectural Design Education in a Globalizing World Seen from Down Under	
设计工作室——场所之赋形及其教育方法	(60)
The Design Studio—The Formation of the Place and Its Pedagogy	
对中国建筑教育的再思索	(67)
Rethinking Architectural Education in China	
建筑中的全球化和地域化:当代孟加拉国的建筑师和建筑学生状况综览	(71)
Globalization and Regionalism in Architecture: An Overview of the Attitudes of Contemporary Architects and Architecture Students in Bangladesh	
在建筑设计工作室中为学生提供不同的学习方式	(79)
Accommodating Different Learning Styles in an Architectural Design Studio	
数码媒介和纸张媒介运用于“问题构成”过程的分析	(87)
An Analysis of “Problem Framing” Activities in Digital versus Paper Media	



信息时代全球化与地区化对建筑和规划教育的影响	(94)
The Impact of the Globalization and Localization on the Architecture and Planning Education	
在城市规则教学中应用信息技术	(99)
Aspects of Dealing with Information Technology (IT) for Educational Programs for Teaching and Learning of City Planning	
以互联网为基础的面向建筑学的工程咨询系统	(104)
An Internet-Based Engineering Consulting System for Architects	
韩国建筑教育调整——以课程教育为重点	(109)
Restructuring Architectural Education in Korea—Focus on Curriculum	
宋式建筑推行:宋《营造法式》多媒体教学研究	(115)
Deducing the Buildings in Song Style: A Multimedia Package on the Teaching of Song Period's <i>Yingzao Fashi</i>	
蒙古建筑教育	(119)
Mongolian Architectural Education	
适合性乡土建筑:意识形态、特性与建筑 ——云南玉龙纳西族自治县白沙乡玉湖完全小学扩建工程教学研究	(122)
Appropriating Vernacular Space: Ideology, Identity and Architecture—Yuhu Elementary School Expansion Project, A Pedagogical Design and Community Service Project in Lijiang, Yunnan, China	
走向可持续发展的乡土建筑——中国地域主义建筑教育与实践	(132)
From Iconic-vernacular to Sustainable-vernacular—Chinese Architectural Practice and Education in Regional Architecture	
中国建筑教育发展走向初探	(143)
On the Latest Transition of the Architectural Education in China	
中国建筑学博士生培养的思考	(147)
Reflections on China's Architectural Education at Doctoral Level	
走向整合与开放的建筑教育——东南大学建筑学专业教育改革的思路与举措	(149)
Towards the Holistic and Open Architectural Education—Educational Innovation of Architectural Specialty in Southeast University	
从 1:1 到 1:1 000——比例概念在建筑设计教学中的运用	(152)
From 1:1 to 1:1 000—The Application of Scale Concept in Architectural Teaching	
交流·融会·提高——建筑设计课中外联合教学的体会与探讨	(156)
Communication · Permeation · Improvement —Experience & Exploration on Joint-Teaching Program in Architectural Design Studio Between Chinese and Foreign Universities	
树立职业观念,加强素质教育	(161)
Strengthening of Career Senses and Quality-Oriented Education	
建筑教育:建造的失落	(163)
Architecture Education: The Losing of Construction	
浅谈加强我国建筑学专业学生技术素质的培养	(167)
Enhancing the Architectural Technique Quality	
建筑评论课的互动式教学探索和实践	(171)
Research and Practice on Interactive Teaching in the Course of Architectural Review	
浅析建筑理论教育的重要性	(173)
A Brief Study on the Importance of the Architectural Theories Education	
全球化与建筑学中的审美标准演变——对建筑美学教育的思考	(176)
Globalization & the Evolvement of Aesthetic Standards in Architecture—Reflections on Aesthetic of Architecture Education	

拓展·创新·互动——建筑学专业居住小区规划课程设计教学的研究与实践	(180)
Expand · Innovate · Interact—The Research and Practice of Teaching in Residential Quarter Planning Course Designs with the Department of Architecture	
对建筑设计课教学过程与方法的探讨	(182)
The Exploration on the Methodology and Process for the Architecture Design Course	
论研究生建筑设计能力培养的方法	(185)
About the Training Method on Graduate Design Ability	
建筑教育的选择:全球化与地区化	(188)
Alternative of Architectural Education: Globalization and Regionalism	
现代城市中高校老校区再发展的探讨	(191)
The Inquirement about the Development of Old Campuses in Modern City	
建筑学专业人才培养应走“双向”培养道路	(194)
The “Two Directions” Road of the Architect Education	
教与学的有序组织——建筑设计教学方法初探	(197)
Structural Strategy for Learning and Teaching—Study on Teaching Methodology of Architectural Design	
专题训练与综合	(203)
The Specific Practice and Integrated Practice	
景观规划设计教育在中国建筑教育中的地位作用 ——社会背景·行业需求·学科演变·专业教育	(207)
Education in Landscape Architecture & Its Position and Role in China — Social Background · Market Demand · Evolvement of the Subject · Professional Education	
构筑面向社会公众的规划教育平台	(211)
The Construction of City Planning Education Platform for the Public	
认知·架构·创新——对一种建筑教育新模式的诠释	(213)
Cognition · Construction · Innovation—Explaining a New Mode and Method of Architectural Design Education	
信息时代全球化与地区化对建筑和规划教育的影响	(217)
The Impact of the Globalization and Localization on the Architecture and Planning Education	
思维的转换——生态观影响下的创作思路及建筑教育	(221)
The Changing Mind— Design Thinking and Architectural Education in an Ecological View	
用信息技术诠释乡土文化——历史文化名城保护与建筑教育的和谐共振	(225)
Interpretation of Vernacular Culture with IT—Accordant Resonance of the Protection of Historic and Cultural City and Architectural Education	
以三份方案为例探讨建筑教育中立意的多元化	(229)
Discussions on the Multiculturalism of Intention in Architectural Education from Three Plans	
技术观的转变与建筑教育	(233)
The Change of Technological Concept and Architectural Education	
计算机三维可视化技术辅助建筑设计教学环境	(237)
Teaching Environment of Architectural Designing Aided with Computer 3-dimensional Visualization	
全息建筑与全息建筑教育——全球化背景下的必然趋势	(240)
Holographic Architecture and Holographic Architecture Education—Destination under Globalization	
从“动态小空间设计研究”谈学科交叉中的设计教学	(243)
Discussing the Design Teaching of the Subject Intersection in the “Kinetic Little Space Design and Research”	

信息时代的建筑设计教学——浅谈互联网在建筑设计教学中的应用	(251)
Architecture Design Teaching in Information Era—on the Application of Internet in the Architecture Design Teaching	
信息时代的“学”与“授”——对建筑历史课教学的几点思考	(255)
Learning and Teaching in the Age of Information—Some Thoughts on Teaching Architectural History	
GA 与信息时代的建筑教育	(258)
Generative Arts and the Architecture Education of Information Time	
“画”与“看”的思考——有关徒手和电脑的操作方式在建筑空间教学中的比较	(264)
Thinking on Drawing and Viewing—a Comparative Study of Freehand & Computer as Operating Mediums in Architectural Design Course	
更少还是更多? ——不仅是对我国建筑教育中数字化技术手段应用的反思	(267)
Less or More? —Not just the Problems about the Use of Digital Techniques in Our Architectural Education	
21 世纪中国建筑文化的创新与建筑教育	(273)
The Development of Architectural Culture and Its Education in 21st Century	
《建筑制图》网络课程建设	(276)
Net-education of Graphics of Architecture	
朴实与地方性特色的建构——以建筑设计为主线的课程群化整合构思	(279)
The Construction of Simple and Local Features—The Integration Conception of Curriculum Groups around Architectural Design	
地区性建筑如何可能?! ——全球化背景下的地区主义抗争	(282)
How Can the Regionalism Architecture be Possible?! — Regionalism Resistance in the Globalization Settings	
建筑历史教育与职业建筑师培养	(285)
Education of Architectural History and Training of Professional Architect	
“学院派”建筑教育的中国化进程——中央大学(东南大学)建筑渲染表现教学流变析	(288)
The Beaux-Arts' Indigenization in China	
— Analysis on the Pedagogical Progress of the Architectural Rendering Presentation in National Central University (Southeast University Nowadays)	
资源建筑的保护性发掘——古建筑测绘实习拓荒	(300)
Protective Exploitation of Resource Architecture—Reclamation of Old Building Surveying Practice	
我国的现代文物保护与人才培养	(304)
Modern Historical Relics Protection and Professionals Training in China	
建筑历史教育与古村落历史文脉延续的结合——结合太湖西山明湾、东村的保护实践	(307)
The Education of Architecture History and the Context Succeeding of the Ancient Villages	
— Example of the Protection of Mingwan and Dongcun in the Taihu Xishan Area	
注重地方建筑史的理论与实践——中国建筑史教学内容改革初探	(310)
The Theory and Practice of Emphasizing Local Architecture History—A Study on the Improvement of Teaching Content of Chinese Architecture History	
论建筑师的培养及建筑设计的企业再教育	(313)
Training of Architects and Continued Education in Design Company	
建筑师的创造力与艺术素质的培养	(320)
The Creativity of Architect and the Training of Art Quality	

国际背景下的建筑教育

Architectural Education in the International Context

瓦萨里斯·斯格塔思 Vassilis Sgoutas

UIA Past President

Greetings to all on behalf of the International Union of Architects. The fact that are present, here in this hall, representatives of government, presidents and office-bearers of architectural organisations, professors and eminent architects, testifies not only to the importance of the subject being discussed but also to the importance of Nanjing and China as a centre of reflexion on matters pertaining to architectural education.

That is why, when I was informed of this Forum, I decided that it was important that the UIA give its full backing to it. But the fact that this is no ordinary gathering means that there are “great expectations” from this Forum. This in turn places a heavy burden on all of us.

The UIA, with more than 100 member countries representing over 1.2 million architects, is dedicated to encourage and highlight quality architectural education throughout the world.

Architecture in an unequal world

It is true that we live in an unequal world. It is also true that architecture is being practised internationally on a field that is not level, a field where the “competitors” do not have equal means at their disposal—neither comparable education nor comparable technology.

The task to make education and the practice of architecture more equitable is not easy. The UIA, with whatever means at its disposal, tries to redress this imbalance, strongly believing that in this way it is promoting the quality of architecture and the real interests of all architects and students, wherever they may be. It is a Herculean task which must necessarily start with education.

But what is architecture in today’s world?

Architecture is not a commodity, as some would like it to be. Or, as former Technical Chamber of Greece President Kostas Liaskas very aptly said, architects, like all labour, are an “intelligent commodity”, a commodity that thinks and thus has an opinion. As such, its behaviour may not always be predict-

able. Systems such as the market economy always prefer predictable situations.

The practice of architecture, but also architectural education, are undergoing fundamental changes. Globalisation is affecting our profession at both the international and the national levels.

If we want to be pragmatic, we need to take into account the present-day facts of life.

What are these “facts of life”?

- The words “consumer protection” seem to have become the new Bible. This is often interpreted as meaning “get the most with the least”, therefore competition on fee scales and competition on ease of obtaining a degree in architecture.
- That the world is in a flux and that we are at the moment shaping our future. Because the future does not happen, we make it.
- That we have two worlds within which our profession operates, the real and the imaginary world. The imaginary world is the world of theory, of laws and regulations and of codes of ethics. The real world is the world of day to day architectural practice against big odds and in a sometimes vicious market economy with whatever little help from what is enforceable of the laws and with whatever crumbs are left of ethical considerations, where ethics is only that somebody else should not tread on your toes and not vice versa.
- That the forces of commerce are often stronger than the laws, especially in the developing countries. And often again, it is not laws that change market practices but market practices that eventually shape new laws.

It is unthinkable that we ever condone that the market shapes architectural education and that knowledge becomes subservient to commercial profit.

It is in this difficult context that we have to fight for our ideals. The truth is that architects work in a microcosm of world



happenings—political, economic and social. Architecture cannot be practised or taught in a political, economic or social vacuum.

We need to rethink the way we practise architecture, we need to rethink the way we are taught architecture. We need to continuously regenerate both our profession and our learning institutions. Only in this way can we progress.

Globalisation and the UIA

The UIA position on globalization is clear. Globalization of both professional practice and education cannot and should not be reversed, but we need to do our utmost to lead it in the direction that we think is correct for our profession and for the public interest, and also fair to all the countries—developed and less developed. One-way globalization makes no sense.

On professional practice, the UIA has, as we all know, made a significant impact. The UIA Professional Practice Accord, unanimously approved by all of our member sections is a huge step forward. It establishes, *inter alia*, norms that would go a long way towards a more equitable globalised practice.

The Accord is an advisory document that is the result of the co-operative endeavour of the international community of architects, coordinated by our member sections of the U. S. and China. It objectively establishes standards and practices that will best serve community interests, define what is considered best practice for the profession, and express the standards to which our profession aspires. It is now up to all of our member sections to have it ratified by their respective governments and to use it for the establishment of bilateral and multilateral agreements.

Validation

Architectural education is the cornerstone of our efforts to buttress the profession.

The UNESCO-UIA Charter for architectural education, approved by our 1996 Barcelona Congress, established a clear definition of scope and, more particularly, of what role the UIA can have in matters related to education.

On May 16, 2000, an Agreement was signed between UNESCO and the UIA to create the UNESCO-UIA Validation Committee for Architectural Education. I am convinced that this Agreement represents a major milestone for the UIA, and I consider it a very special moment for me to have been its signatory on behalf of the UIA.

Our mission is to bring uniformity to the validation of architectural degrees and also to set standards for architectural education. As was spelt out at the outset, “we need to approach

architectural education with the flexibility and dynamism dictated by social transformation and technological changes”. The preamble then goes on to stress that the technological boundaries of education must be widened towards “an architecture open to the contribution of the social sciences”. And later still in this Agreement, come in the human sciences as well.

The objective is clear. There is need to educate architects for the new role they have to fulfil. This must necessarily also include management and knowledge of finance.

We have set ourselves a daunting task which will mean much for the UIA. And we have started well.

The Committee, partly UNESCO-nominated and partly UIA-nominated, has been drawn from across the world. The initial document was approved by the 2002 Berlin General Assembly. It sets out principles and also a basic *modus operandi* framework.

The document provides for five regional committees. This was deemed a *sine qua non* for attaining the goals set out. The relative freedom with which these committees are intended to operate will, we believe, act as a means to incorporate the specific characteristics of each region, each country and each university. It would be disastrous to have a rigid system that cannot accommodate regional diversity or the “personality” and track record of each and every university. The rationale of the system is based on uniform standards but not identical curricula or identical detailed rules.

The validation document on hand is, under no circumstances, to remain a static document. It must evolve. For this to be meaningful, the decision-making structures must be brought on board, *i. e.* governmental agencies or accreditation agencies, depending on the country.

Our work might not have been so problem-free, were it not for the fact that we made it clear that we do not operate antagonistically to existing validation systems but in partnership with them. We have had the support of, for example, the Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA) and have had an initial exchange of intent with the RIBA. I made a point to open discussions with the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA). I also expressly went to La Habana in Cuba to attend meetings with officials of ACSA and EAAE (European Association for Architectural Education).

The parallel poles

It is obvious that the “UNESCO-UIA Validation System for Architectural Education” is the necessary parallel pole to our Professional Practice Accord. Education and Professional Practice are inextricably linked. With a firmly entrenched Accord

and a firmly entrenched Validation System, both truly international as only the UIA can do it, we can be masters of our own destiny and can work towards the global level playing field that we aspire to.

Education and professional practice are interlinked. Hence the importance of practical experience during the academic studies period and also the significance of collaboration between educators and practising architects to ensure a healthy relationship between curricula and job opportunities. Also to ease the assimilation by practicing architects of new theoretical knowledge.

The right to practise

The link between education and the right to practise is an area of concern in a great number of countries. Many strongly advocate that architectural education should be a prerequisite for the right to practise while others would agree with the flexibility offered by the UIA Accord giving the opportunity, under certain conditions, to other less qualified persons as well.

This "flexibility" could easily become an area of confusion if it were interpreted as being the "back door" to enter the profession i. e. that there is an alternative way of becoming a practising architect. We know that this is not so, and that such cases are exceptional and strictly controlled by the relevant regulatory bodies. This will need to be stressed whenever feasible.

What will also need to be highlighted is the way in which examinations, or other ways of accessing the right to practise, ought to be carried out. Clearly such examinations can, under no circumstances, be repeats of the university examinations, they cannot be "evaluators" of the standards of architectural education in a university, as this would fall within the remit of a validation system. They are, thus, generally more orientated, not towards the way architecture is learnt but towards the way architecture is practised.

The answer seems to lie in a "two-tier" system which is, to my knowledge, already in force in some jurisdictions. Individuals with the requisite architectural education sit only the second exam while the others also sit the first exam where they are assessed on subjects that traditionally form part of architectural education.

Adopting such a position would achieve the following two objectives:

1. Make it quite clear that individuals without a 5-year architectural education have something additional to prove and that they are, so to speak, special cases that will need to go through a testing supplementary examination procedure. In this

way education will remain the cornerstone for the right to practise.

2. Go some way towards addressing the issue of "culture". This is a very sensitive issue by virtue of the fact that, in contrast to health, safety and welfare, it is intangible, and hence so much more difficult to evaluate. It is my belief that a 5-year architectural course does go a long way towards giving a solid base to cultural sensitivities. It remains to be seen how to address this issue when it comes to assessing individuals who have not had a formal education.

The title "architect", as opposed to the right to practise, must remain, under all circumstances, non-regionable. As, has been clearly stated in the UIA Accord, one of the prerequisites for the use of the title is to be academically qualified.

Other disciplines

Architecture is a collaborative art. In the interdisciplinary teams that necessarily plan and direct projects and programmes, architects should have the lead role, they should be the first among equals, the *primi inter pares*.

What is the role of us architects in multidisciplinary projects? I strongly believe that it is in the best interests of society that we architects don the mantle of leadership. We are, after all, by our education, best equipped to be the coordinators or, let us not be shy in our use of words, we are best equipped to be the leaders of the team and thus to ensure the continuum of culture and the creation of the future we prefer.

Becoming leaders and coordinators of multidisciplinary teams cannot just happen by itself. Our education must groom us for this, because neither self-appointment or appointment by a client will make us the true leaders of the team. To be this, we must deliver. And in order to deliver, we have to have the knowledge. Hence the significance of the knowledge we acquire at our universities.

Scope of studies

It is important to secure as big a scope for the practice of architecture as possible. There is no point in having an equitable apportioning of the total global pie if that pie is continually shrinking. We must try to increase this total pie. We should aim for new outlets for our profession, for example the participation of architects in the design of public works such as bridges. For this to become reality, the process of change has to start with our teaching institutions.

In many universities, the training of future architects does not expand into fields outside the conventional architectural subjects. Architects are, however, needed in many fields of



competences.

I strongly believe that architectural education should cover as wide a spectrum of associated fields as possible. A healthy profession needs to have many specialities within it.

This has to be done in a forward-looking positive spirit but also defensively. I will illustrate this latter point with a real case. Approximately two years ago a letter came to the UIA from the Swedish Association of Architects informing us that an umbrella organisation had been formed in Sweden entitled "Sveriges Arkitekter". This umbrella organisation includes the Swedish associations of architects, of landscape architects, of interior architects and of spatial planners.

If this can be a pointer for our schools of architecture, should they not encompass the varied special fields that already exist and which are continually on the increase, given the tremendous diversification of our professional skills? Or should all these special fields become independent schools? It is, I believe, in our interests to opt for the former, the inclusive approach.

It is interesting to note that one of the aims of the UIA, and I am quoting from its statutes which were written as early as 1948, is "to develop progressive ideas in the fields of architecture and town-planning as well as their practical application for the welfare of the community".

Level of studies

The long-term objective of architectural education must be the betterment of the quality of life in the built environment. What do we mean by quality of life in the built environment? We mean architecture, we mean urban planning, we mean sustainability, but we also mean orienting studies towards intangible goals such as social equity and conviviality.

Intangibility is also our enrichment through education. It is the one thing that can never be taken away from us.

We are fortunate to be architects and to be able to design. Students must have ingrained in them that design matters. That it matters from an aesthetic, an environmental and a social point of view. And that it makes economic sense.

Curricula must also aim at increasing the range of capabilities of architects and in this way widen the professional scope of architecture thus countering the diminishing professional outlets.

We have let control of the building site slip from our hands. This has in turn led to a vicious circle. As we have, sometimes voluntarily, relinquished control of construction, because our mission was focused on loftier planes such as pure aesthetics, we no longer needed the technical expertise in our

everyday professional lives. We consequently demanded less building construction knowledge from our universities and so they did not think it necessary to offer in their course more than the "architectural market" required. And so the vicious circle was complete.

Gone are the days when the architect was the master builder, the person who totally dominated a project through a combination of design and construction skills, and whose authority was indelibly stamped on the building. Compare for a moment the two Paris Opera houses, the old one is known by its architect-Palais Garnier, the new one is not Opera Carlos Ott, it is Opera Bastille.

The answer can only come from a change in architectural education. I want to be quite explicit here. Not a change in orientation i. e. less emphasis on design. That would be a suicidal mistake. It has to be both design and construction, even if this entails more demanding studies. The world is competitive. Our formative years at the schools of architecture have to give us the ammunition to do our job properly, thoroughly and completely.

On the question of length of studies, the UIA is clear. We have adopted the 5-year study duration plus two years minimum until being allowed to practise, one of which could be in the middle of the course.

A deep understanding of materials is obviously a *sine qua non* for students in architecture. In former days this often meant that students spent time at carpentry or other workshops. Today this is much more difficult to achieve because of the huge range of materials and systems of construction available in the market.

What must, however, be done is to equip students, to the maximum possible extent, in order to allow them to have a deep understanding of what architecture can do for the preservation of our natural resources. Information technology has become the indispensable tool to allow students to reach the full potential of their capabilities in this as well as in all the other subjects forming part of their curricula.

Schools of architecture have not, in my opinion, been sufficiently involved in the problems of the disabled. There are, of course, many exceptions. It is crucially important that the designers and policymakers of the future become aware, during their formative years, of the need for an accessible built environment.

Finally, architectural education will never be complete without study trips. The delicate line where local parameters interface with global parameters will be so much more revealing when the horizons of students are broadened with tours and

exchange programmes. Student exchange programmes have been tried experimentally by the UIA and there is every likelihood that this project will expand.

A level playing field

Equal opportunities to access architectural education must be the sought after target. Internationally comparable education and technical know how are a sine qua non for equal opportunities. It is only when we will have achieved a level playing field for education, that we will see disappear in our profession what has been termed “defensive protectionism” or, in other words, artificial barriers such as language, residency etc.

The UIA is dedicated to achieving this level playing field. It will take time but every step forward counts and will help alleviate the unfairness where, to paraphrase George Orwell, “Every student is equal but some are more equal than others”.

We pin our hopes to a large extent, on the UNESCO /UIA Validation System for Architectural Education that I referred to earlier. It is a difficult task, but we are determined, with the help of all our member institutes, to advance towards the desired goal. It will be a different world for our profession when architecture will be taught to the same standards throughout the world.

A level playing field does not only mean equal opportunities for students. It also means universities with equivalent levels of teaching and equivalent means at their disposal. We know that globalisation and liberalisation of education have made possible the creation of schools of architecture of questionable standards, resulting in unfair “competition” and total confusion in the educational “market”.

Yet the advent of globalisation can be made to have positive results. What might otherwise become an ugly educational “free for all” and a shrinking role for the universities of high standard, can, and I feel optimistic that it will, enrich the teaching of architecture with global and regional values.

In order to help achieve this, the UIA, with its international mandate, imperatively needs to operate together with UNESCO, with national and regional institutes and of course with leaders of schools of architecture, such as have come together here.

We must also ensure that subjects entrenched in the curricula of some countries, but not in others, be included in the scope of schools of architecture, thus enlarging the spread of their remit. We must at the same time buttress our schools of architecture against any erosion of teaching programmes towards other faculties.

Research and technology

We know that creativity alone cannot produce the aimed for results in architecture.

Results, that is quality architecture, can only be achieved if we master our architectural ABC which includes technology and building construction. And that takes us back to Vitruvius’ three key words—strength, commodity, delight. Strength meaning construction, commodity meaning function and delight meaning pleasure or aesthetics. While it is obvious that technology is the basis of construction, we now know that in our present age, technological knowledge is absolutely indispensable in order to satisfactorily answer the requirements of function and also in order to produce the forms and designs necessary to implement our aesthetic vision.

In older days, learning technology meant learning a few techniques like stone or brick building, wooden windows, tiled or slate roofs etc. Now because of the speed with which technology is developing, the key issue is not so much to learn specific construction methods but to have the ability to “think structure”, to “think technology”. Some have it innate, Gaudi for example. Gaudi is a good example because his understanding of technology, unlike the engineers Nervi and Maillart who also produced aesthetically outstanding results, went beyond structure. It encompassed all the components of a building.

We know that technological development is at the basis of most radical changes in design approaches and architectural expression. The vaulted arch created an aesthetic revolution, so did concrete, so did glass, so is starting to do information technology.

But do we architects have the technological knowledge necessary for us to practise our profession in a way that we can implement our design capabilities to their full potential?

I am afraid that we are increasingly witnessing the existence of a technologically literate architectural elite and, at the same time an architectural underclass that is struggling to survive on limited knowledge. This situation clearly leads to huge firms and the sidelining of small practices.

At the international level, the situation is even more tragic. The technological disparity between developed and developing countries is huge. That is obvious. But it is also increasing, which is alarming. We need technology transfer, but we also need technology exchange because every region of the world, every culture can teach us something.

So what can the answer be?

It can only be a different approach to architectural educa-



tion, hence this Forum has such potential.

It is the remit of the schools of architecture, which produce the architects of the future, to educate students in such a holistic way that design and technology become one inseparable entity.

In former days design had always kept pace with technology. Today we have to redefine this relationship.

In architecture, a process of constant experimentation is necessary. Research is the basis for evolution, in all professions, in architecture too. Research is not limited to materials and methods of construction. It must also encompass the exploration of new theories of design. Research will thus become a tool for the advancement of our profession.

But who should do this research?

Clearly there is a role here for the schools of architecture especially in design-related fields. Teachers in particular, but also students, can play their part here, and in this way make for universities that will be breeding grounds for innovative ideas.

Research must be regarded as an inherent activity of architectural teaching. This statement has now been deleted from a UIA document after objections by some Region IV countries. Why?

It has been commonly accepted that the collaboration between industry and practising architects can lead to new ideas and new products. Take something for example, the 2.00 m × 2.00 m. lens (eye) on the facade of Jean Nouvel's Institute of the Arab World in Paris designed in consultation with St. Gobain, or the well-known lighting fixture with asymmetric pyramids for Fiat's Lingoto project which resulted from the working together of Renzo Piano with the Guzzini company.

But, should not these collaborative efforts also involve schools of architecture? Universities contribute to research in so many other fields, medicine for example. Why not in architecture also?

So the schools of architecture have a very definite mission in the "production of knowledge" and more specifically in the production of knowledge related to architecture, to urban and spatial planning, to the building industry and to all the environmental parameters that are so fundamental for any responsible project.

Continuing education

It is generally accepted that education never stops. In order to be up to date with technology, sustainability and other developments, architects need a lifelong pursuit of knowledge.

Initially this could be in the form of post-graduate studies.

But this does not answer to the notion of "lifelong education".

Lifelong or continuing education needs structuring. That is why the UIA solidly backs CPD i. e. continued professional development.

CPD programmes would focus, as the title suggests, on improving and enriching the professional capabilities of architects on such topics as urban planning, legislation, construction management as well as social and community considerations. It is deemed that this reeducation will better the final architectural product and also be to the benefit both architects and public.

Two questions arise. Who monitors CPD and how is this done?

Continued professional development clearly falls within the remit of the professional organisations of architects. They should have the primary role in guiding this system to the desired goals. But universities, also, are entitled to come into the picture. It remains to be seen what would be the input of academia.

Many ideas have been put forward as to procedures. A "points systems" where architects would receive credits for attending courses or lectures is one of them. Sitting exams is another. What is, in my opinion, certain is that attending and/or successfully completing courses will eventually be a prerequisite for continuing to have the right to practise. It has also been suggested in some jurisdictions that it would also be a prerequisite for membership of professional associations.

Sundry observations

Allow me now to refer to some points that are, in my opinion, of considerable importance.

— The brain drain

It is obvious that only internationally comparable education can counter this. It is incredible how much "expatriate" architectural talent there is. It would be so much more equitable if these same architects operated internationally but from home ground. The architectural brain drain would, in extremis, be acceptable if it were in both directions, but this is rarely the case.

— The use of the word "glocal"

Cacophonous as it may be, it does, nonetheless, reflect a real need, i. e. to combine global knowledge with local knowledge, to evaluate local architectural practices with regard to the global status quo and also to adapt global practices to local realities.

— Teaching staff to be in practice as well

As many as possible of the teaching staff should also be in-

volved in practical architectural work. This experience can only be enriching for the students.

— University facilities

The infrastructure of architectural schools can have a strong bearing on the quality of teaching. Infrastructure includes the design of campus buildings. The UIA has a Work Programme entitled “Educational and Cultural Spaces”. Its scope includes highlighting quality design in educational facilities.

— Student participation in university affairs

This will enable students to come closer to the decision-making level of their universities, thus making for smoother interaction with administration and staff. I can see great benefit all round if this attitude were adopted. Some universities have already done it.

— Open universities

Gone are the days when the number of students related solely to “production” needs. The right to education is unassailable. This can well mean that for some students architecture will never be their profession. While this could be a burden for subsidised universities, the pluses outweigh the minuses.

— Contacts with graduates and practising architects

The feedback and exchange that will result from contacts between graduates and students but also between graduates and staff will add a pragmatic dimension to studies. It should be encouraged. So should contacts with practising architects

Regional organisations

The work of the UIA and the work of the regional architectural associations is complementary. Hence it is important to establish close ties. It is in this spirit that cooperation with AR-CASIA on educational matters needs to be pursued. Our profession cannot afford the luxury of two organisations working independently on the same subject.

As the mission of the UIA is international, it needs the input of regional specificities. These are primarily given by the Region IV UNESCO-UIA Validation Committee but there can be no doubt that AR-CASIA, given its region know how can contribute substantially.

Academic portability

Architectural education has an international dimension. Once this precept is accepted, one begins to look for modalities for its implementation.

What is certain is that the potential for exchange at the

academic level and for the free movement of students, is tremendous. The mobility of teaching staff and students is obviously a key factor, but so is information technology. Distance is no longer a barrier.

At a recent conference of the presidents of French universities (CPU), it was even suggested that the international mobility of students should be foreseen in the curricula. It is a way, we believe, to bring students closer and thus make the world smaller.

The UIA believes in the portability of academic qualifications, not only after graduation but also for the intermediate years. International reciprocity must be strengthened. In order to achieve this in a meaningful way, it is necessary to encourage the mutual recognition of educational programmes and academic qualifications. Also to establish credit transfer systems. It is evident that the UNESCO-UIA Validation System for Architectural Education can have a major impact on all this.

The benefits will be many. Not least a deeper understanding of other cultures. A very tangible result will also be brought back by students to their home countries of new skills, additional technological knowledge and different ways of approaching design. The emphasis is not so much on better education but on different education. It is exactly these “differences” that enrich us.

Elevating standards of universities and at the same time facilitating student exchange will, in the long run, diminish the flight to universities in foreign countries of students with greater potential and greater financial capabilities. Let us face it. Home country education is indispensable, at any rate as a springboard. Can a student who has spent all his formative years in another country attain the necessary sensitivity towards local aesthetic and cultural values?

Finally a sad note. I am referring to the exploitation of students, so often witnessed in the architectural offices of developed countries. The UIA has made some first steps towards changing this totally unacceptable state of affairs.

Student competitions

There can be no way to underestimate the value of architectural competitions for students, and how stimulating it would be to incorporate architectural competitions—the national, regional or international—into the teaching agendas.

The UIA has led by example, by organising a number of international architectural competitions specifically for students.

Every three years there is a major competition associated with our world congresses. In congresses we have been holding international student competitions such as “Convivial



Spaces”, “Architecture and Poverty”, “Architecture and Water” and now “Celebrating Cities”.

What is particularly meaningful about these competitions is the fact that they are organised in parallel with identical competitions for qualified architects and, even more importantly, that they are broken up into regional entities i. e. one competition for each of our five regions—Western Europe, Eastern Europe and the Middle East, North and South America, Asia and Africa. Thus these competitions are, at one and the same time, both regional and international. We think that this is a good way to promote regional talent while preserving the international character of the competitions through a dual system of awarding prizes at the regional levels but also giving a number of global (grand) prizes.

It has been quite remarkable to witness the response of students and the quality of the entries.

Let me only mention that in the “Architecture and Water” competition there were 650 entries from over 60 countries of the world.

Interestingly, there was in many cases a positive response to these competitions from the teaching staff of the faculties of architecture. In some instances the UIA received group entries while in others the subject of the competition was included in the curriculum. This took the form of having a class competition and then selecting the best proposals for submission to the UIA, all expenses paid by the school of architecture.

The “Architecture and Water” competition was also a lesson for us at the UIA. Whereas the competition briefly referred to projects related to any type of water (sea, lake or river), a great number of the entrants focused on the environmental aspects of water i. e. water as a resource and what this means for architecture.

Architectural education is of public interest

That education is of public interest cannot be questioned. But is there anything particular about architectural education that makes it warrant special consideration with respect to public interest?

It is customarily accepted, as I have stated earlier, that of public interest are health, safety and also welfare. All of these are to a large extent tangible, therefore measurable. They are factors that could be deemed as not being adversely affected by competitiveness in the procurement of services.

But what about culture? Culture, and with it heritage, is inherent in architecture, but unlike the parameters of health, safety and welfare, it is intangible, therefore not measurable.

That is why education of the public becomes so crucial.

Culture is, of course, of public interest. We know, after all, that civilisations have survived through their culture, even when the countries concerned have lost their political and economic independence.

But architectural education is also of public interest. Because it is, arguably, the most important medium for highlighting cultural heritage.

We say “no” to the globalization of culture. Our built environment needs the presence of our several cultures and regional specificities. We will, otherwise, witness an increasing lack of identity and humanity in our cities. And we are fully conscious what this lack of identity and humanity entails. It entails a further diminishing of the quality of our lives.

The fact that culture is to a large extent intangible makes it all the more imperative that it be left in good hands. This is where education comes in.

It is not an easy task. We know that we cannot preserve all of the cultural heritage in our built environment. We need to continually find the balance between preservation and development. Cultural identity is not static. What we today cherish as cultural heritage was often deemed revolutionary when it was created. So we have to make way for the future without destroying the past.

We also know that, important as the preservation of our architectural heritage is, it cannot atone for lack of creativity. Schools of architecture have the onus of initiating students into the creative process that will find the delicate balance between development and preservation, in other words to reinterpret culture through contemporary architecture.

Education is undoubtedly our most far-reaching long-term project. It aims, not only to educate architects and future architects, but also to keep on elevating the architectural awareness of public opinion.

Concerning future architects, the UIA has embarked on a programme entitled “Architecture and Children”. The idea is, that children start learning about architecture from as young an age as possible—like with art or music. But that is not all. We strongly believe that the major objective of this programme is to make all future adults appreciative of architecture. Only in this way can we hope to have, one day, a truly educated public opinion.

Another way to educate public opinion is to give increased visibility to the work being done at the schools of architecture and to the contribution to society of universities.

Public policies must promote education more, and support very particularly the academic institutions that have reached a