

Architec(ul)ture: Towards a Participatory Architecture and Pedagogy

JEROME A. THAMANN
Miami University

Many Americans live most of their lives with little contact with doctors, lawyers, or accountants, but it is more difficult to imagine a person having little or no day-to-day contact with architecture.¹ People may see a doctor twice a year, have their taxes done once a year, and have an attorney draft a will once in their life, yet they will sleep, eat, work, govern, transact, learn, entertain, procreate, live – and die – in buildings. At first glance this relationship between the American public and architects may appear somewhat removed, but upon serious consideration the correlation is undeniable. Nonetheless, there are rumblings within the profession, academy, and society concerning the increasing irrelevance and distrust of architects. What lies at the heart of this? What can be done to reverse it? Is this disconnection justifiable?

It is time for a reevaluation of the way architecture is approached, taught, and practiced. What can we learn from other professions and disciplines that might aid architecture in bridging the gap between architects and society? What new methods of teaching and practice might improve the strained relationship? Does the rather apolitical and value-free ethical stance of architecture exacerbate this gap? Architectural pedagogy and curricula must never go unquestioned because so much is at stake in the culture at large.² We need to arrive at a core understanding of, and critically evaluate what is and isn't taught, understood, culturally and morally valued, and learned within the schools of architecture.

THE SOCIO-ARCHITECTURAL GAP

First we may begin by examining the disjunction of American culture and architects. This disjunction prevails at many levels, from the disenfranchisement of architects by engineers, project managers, developers, builders, etc. to the public's understanding of what architects are able to provide.³ Frankly, other professions and specialists have been better than architects at selling their own value, resulting in a common perception that

architects are the least important members in the design and construction process.⁴

As professionals, architects must learn to constantly prove their value to clients (rich and poor, public and private) in order to survive. Sadly, this is not often taught in any architecture schools – think of the uproar, “You want to commodify architecture?!” By continually ignoring the constraints of the business world and forgoing a basic understanding of how to provide clients a service, this is exactly what architecture schools have pushed themselves to – producing designers who only know how to provide a kind of “cultural capital” to rich esthetes who reify their cultural importance by patronizing expensive cutting-edge design.⁵ Garry Stevens states it directly, architects “seek a prestige... with the wealthy and powerful and with forms that suggest their earlier periods of dominance.”⁶ This self-imposed de-selection from most of the design opportunities in the nation today compounds itself into a more damaging public perception of architects. In short, architects have a difficult time truly understanding and connecting with the majority of people.

One doesn't need to search long to find examples of how entrenched the public misconception of what architects provide is. On several occasions, my father, a graduate of the University of Cincinnati's DAAP and a retired building and project manager consigned architects to simply “monument makers” – unnecessary players in all construction endeavors save artistic expression and narcissistic extravagance. In more ways than one, architects have prided themselves on this persona.⁷ As a result, architects are often viewed as recalcitrant and arrogant artists unaware of the reality that surrounds them, and this is an attitude historically all too frequently embraced by architects and their theories. It is no accident that Ayn Rand chose an architect to be the Objectivist standard-bearer in *The Fountainhead*.

The marginalization of the architectural profession and the increasing adversity and misunderstanding architects face in American culture today can be reversed if architects shed their elitist attitudes and embrace a more team-building professional role and a more community-minded, approach to their profession.⁸ In the words of Peter Buchannan, a kind of “depedistalisation” must occur before meaningful dialog between professional peers and clients can begin.⁹ To accomplish this, a return to the morally charged social idealism of the modernist era could help.

The reestablishment of public trust, professional importance, and moral voice must begin with architects’ education. If a student leaves school having never learned to communicate with, or understand non-architects, or the importance of their fellow human beings (whether rich or poor, designer or not), then it is doubtful they will learn these core values on their own later in professional practice. Architectural curricula can foster a cultural self-awareness and understanding of the relationship architects and their products have with society.¹⁰ This ongoing critical dialog should permeate all facets of architectural pedagogy, from experimentation, research, investigation, and professional training, but most importantly—the nucleus of architectural education, the design studio.

PEDAGOGICAL SHIFT

The design studio is perhaps one of the most praised and decried methods of teaching existing today.¹¹ Steeped in the Beaux-Arts model of the Master/Pupil relationship (which often devolves into a Master/Servant relationship)¹², the studio model of educating architects has proven to be a powerful tool in the formation of students’ attitudes and habits, often times with negative side effects that remain with students for the rest of their career.¹³ Architecture educators must strive to understand how the design studio affects the lives of future architects, who in turn, affect the lives of society at large.

According to Amos Rappoport, architects exist to serve society as “surrogates for users, delegated to do what users cannot, or do not wish to do for themselves.”¹⁴ Architects *cannot* view themselves solely as detached artists. As Paul Klee noted, “An artist can paint square wheels, but an architect must make them round.”¹⁵ Architecture directly serves pragmatic purposes; more importantly, it serves a broad public and culture—it is an unmitigated public and political act.¹⁶ Students and professionals should remember that they are in a position of *service*. Architects design for a large body of clients that reaches far beyond the signature on their paychecks; they are, as a profession, responsible for the health, safety and welfare of the whole of society.¹⁷ A greater understanding of, and genuine care for the world should extend far beyond the opinions of studio professors and students. Architects must learn to answer to persons other than themselves.

This maverick idea of cultural stewardship or the “social project” is not new in architecture.¹⁸ William Morris advocated that architects needed to discontinue pedaling social capital and commit themselves to bettering the working class.¹⁹ There is the litany of Bauhaus-era socialists from Hannes Meyer to Ernst May, and yet these architects’ attempts at improving the welfare of the poor working class are quickly dismissed. In contemporary times, socially concerned architects such as Hasan Fathy and Samuel Mockbee are too often treated as footnotes in architectural discourse. Architects who have striven to make significant inroads to a more sustainable design ethic, like Buckminster Fuller and William McDonough, are met with similar treatment.

It seems architecture often points to such Modernist disasters as Pruitt-Igoe and the crippling critique of Jane Jacobs’ *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* as justification to not venture into the realm of social activism or speak out on moral and political issues. However, the failure of early modernism’s attempts at social architecture lies not in the fact that socially responsible architecture is a utopian pipedream, but in the supposed ideal of a new universal language couched in the methods employed to design the buildings.²⁰ These methods were formulated in schools, are still learned in schools, and steeped in an insular vacuum of social elitism—fostered by the pervasive sense of the artistic genius that is nurtured in studio.

Essentially, architects are taught to design from within—that innovative, good design is an individualized, intuitive process, rather than an analytical or participatory one. Architects, particularly while in school, design countless critically unexamined solutions with an air of certain genius without ever poking their head out their window to see what the world might actually think of their designs. When designing the *Villa Radieuse* workers’ housing, Le Corbusier was confounded by workers’ reluctance to adopt his designs. Rather than ask a worker what they would like, Le Corbusier suggested that workers be taught to like what he instinctively knew as the best design for their patterns of living.²¹ This sad reality has not improved. As a student, I was suddenly stunned by the absurdity of this situation. I was once displaying a school design to my mother-in-law, a teacher, who in sheer disbelief asked, “You designed a school and never *once* came to a teacher for advice?” Indeed I had not, nor were any teachers at the final review—just two architecture professors and my tired studio-mates.

This attitude is inculcated in architectural pedagogy. Both the Beaux Arts and Bauhaus traditions of architectural education are founded on the same basic principle, that architects are trained to be experts who eschew any inclusive design process where all parties’ inputs are equally valued in favor of a sort of detached, positivist design method that hinges on the lone expert’s “unitary perspective.” As Sherry Ahrentzen illustrates, this macho perspective grows only more elitist when com-

pounded with the fact that architects typically design only for those in power, ignoring the voice of the disenfranchised and also reinforcing a kind of patriarchal “Marlboro Man myth” about architects.²² This perspective grows only more elitist when compounded with the fact that architects design mostly for those in power, ignoring the voice of the disenfranchised.²³ This inward-looking mind-set continues in the contemporary academy; when asked if humanitarian outreach had begun to make its way into architecture schools, Cameron Sinclair, founder of Architecture for Humanity, responded, “I don’t think that they have even started.”²⁴

It’s time to shed the poisonous air of solo genius that has been coupled with a pervasive moral agnosticism since the collapse of Modernism and embrace pedagogy of teamwork and mutual respect.²⁵ An understanding of, and compassion for, people both in and out of architecture and the established power structures must be instilled in future architects. If the architectural profession is going to remain relevant to society and make a meaningful positive impact on American culture, it must embrace an overdue stance of multi-disciplinary integration in the design process. We should jettison the meaningless “value-free” expression of today’s trendiest architectural theories and return to a profession of social activism.²⁶

The roots of architecture’s cultural atrophy lies primarily within its insular and morally void pedagogy, and a critical examination of possible improvements should be made. In doing so, it is imperative that the academy step outside its heretofore narrow bounds and examine how similar disciplines teach future practitioners and how these practitioners and their services are received by the public. One such successful model is the field of historic preservation.²⁷

A NEW MODEL

Historic preservation, much like architecture, began in America as an outlet for upperclass reification and cultural hegemony – wealthy socialites politicking for the preservation of homes and monuments of famous rich men.²⁸ Yet it has quickly moved into the realm of astute grassroots cross-cultural activism while maintaining a constant state of critical self-reflection and social response.²⁹ Unlike architectural theory, which has been likened to a “theoretical cul-de-sac” that lacks a meaningful “culturalist perspective,”³⁰ contemporary historic preservation theory is rooted in a dynamic, non-ethnocentric and non-power-based understanding and interpretation of culture, – one that is aware of the roles the built environment and cultural traditions of various groups play in both the individual and collective thoughts and identities of a society.³¹ Educators such as Linda Groat have been calling for architects to act as “cultivators,” or someone who would “derive her essential character from relations with and among other people,” and study *not only* aesthetic or technical concerns of the built world, but the

interwoven “meanings that these physical artifacts have within a given culture or cultures” as well.³² While architectural theorists mull over the possibility, historic preservation and its myriad hosts of practitioners energetically generating, disseminating, and applying cultural understanding with a refreshing, inclusive-minded approach.³³

The desire to understand our cultures and serve society in an integrated, team-building fashion can be found in the National Council for Preservation Education’s *Standards for Historic Preservation Degree Granting Graduate and Undergraduate Programs*. In this document, NCPE requires that programs not only provide coursework in “the history of the designed environment” and “the history and theory of preservation,” but also specialized coursework in six key components: design, technology, economics, law, planning, and curating. Within the component of design, a program should tackle issues of “appropriateness, restoration, rehabilitation, in-fill, exterior and interior concerns at a variety of scales, and their effect on buildings, neighborhoods, communities and landscapes.”³⁴ In addition, NCPE strives to foment a pedagogy of integration and cooperation that recognizes the importance of the “plurality of disciplines;” programs are to provide “experience in and engender respect for [the] interdisciplinary nature and the recognition that preservation focuses on cooperative work.”³⁵

Overall, historic preservation programs are succeeding in this mandate. What is interesting to note is who is not considered a team player when it comes to professional cooperation. At the 1998 Annual Preservation Trades Network Conference, the one profession that was repeatedly mentioned as antagonistic and aloof was architecture.³⁶ As architecture sees an increasing amount of its professional scope fall within the realm of historic preservation (estimated at over 50%), it is wise that the profession become more comfortable in its inclusive environment of team building.³⁷

In addition to the diverse interdisciplinary approach of historic preservation, a definite spirit of public responsibility and outreach are evident. As a student of the Building Preservation and Restoration Program at Belmont Technical College, not only did we work on intensive individual and group projects, but were actively encouraged to offer aid to outside groups and individuals in the area. Students formed a loose collective that offered pro-bono building analysis and advice as well as elected a representative to the department’s student position on the executive board of the local preservation society.

Architectural curricula would stand to gain a wealth of professional and social credence if they co-opted much of historic preservation’s approach to education and society. Essentially, architectural pedagogy must become more grounded in the stuff of the ordinary, not in an abstract, morally-void, postmodern or deconstructivist fashion, but in a manner that recognizes a need for teaching future architects the necessity of

understanding the demands of buildings, the people who use them, and the social structures they operate within.³⁸ As seen in the preservation movement, the distinction between architecture with a capital *A* and architecture with a lower-case *a* must cease if architecture is to gain any broad cultural relevance or reconnection between the realm of artful criticism and the mundane demands of people concerned with everything from economics to social justice.³⁹

REFORMULATION

Socially and professionally conscious curricula would entail four elements. First, a palpable team-building, interdisciplinary approach to design would be present. Working as a team reduces the design heroics that only foster a sense of competition and arrogance among students. A successful program encourages students to take classes outside architecture's narrow bounds, like history, sociology, business, and psychology, in addition to including a strong non-architect presence throughout the length of the course—people who question assumptions and aids in more informed decision-making regarding their area of expertise. Additionally, greater effort should be made to educate non-architects about design, whether it is through increasing courses offered to non-design majors or mandatory student participation in college-wide student organizations.

Secondly, architecture departments might require their faculty to do research that would not only aid in the understanding of the importance and impact architecture has on society, but also aid in disseminating design innovations to the professional body. This would assist students in acquiring an increased amount of knowledge regarding the world in which they will build and the people they will build for, and it would also reduce the amount of unproductive competition and secrecy currently hamstringing the profession.⁴⁰ Research into Post Occupancy Evaluation, human behavioralism (a new venture into *architectural psychology?*), design innovation, new technology, and current social, political, and economic trends are just a few key topics worth further study.

Third, a greater importance is placed on service learning and practical experience building. The defeatist attitudes many architecture students assume from constant pressure and critique as well as the uncertainty of their careers upon graduation can be overcome.⁴¹ A "culture of optimism" could be cultivated when students move from creating untested ideas manifested only on paper (therefore easily dismissed) to successfully designing built objects, or simply seeing their activity and output, whatever it may be, directly affect a neighborhood or group, thereby generating a reservoir of positive experience and creating confidence in their own abilities.

Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly, architectural pedagogy must thrust itself into the messy realm of ethics. Architects and architectural pedagogy must find their moral voice if they ever hope to live up to their calling as leaders. This means architecture should constantly examine what it produces (or what it could produce in reaction against oppressive systems and constructions) and how these products will affect society.

REEXAMINING THE CDC

Perhaps one of the best ways of producing this reformulation is for NAAB to mandate the creation of a Community Design Center (CDC) in every architecture school, one that is a non-profit, university accredited, government-sanctioned, design organization, modeled off the CDCs existing in small numbers in the US.⁴² Historically, CDCs have been with us for decades in minute numbers, operating on the periphery of the architectural curriculum and in varying degrees of student involvement and social interaction. However, these new Community-University Joint Design Centers (CUJDCs) would create a standard CDC found in each accredited architecture program, and offer a wide range of services that assist people usually ignored by the profession, as well as providing a better education to tomorrow's architects by allowing students prolonged and *direct* involvement with people and in places normally far-removed from the college campus and students' cultural comfort-zones.

In addition to architecture students and recently registered architects staffing the CUJCD, students and professionals from allied professions and non-related fields such as business, accounting, sociology and history could be represented in the CUJDC, providing the needed support in understanding and critical analysis of trends and undercurrents within the cultures and economies the centers find themselves working. Furthermore, this blending of multiple disciplines and organizations in a diversified educational environment would foster a highly productive and dynamic crucible for learning as proven by Miami University's Center For Community Engagement, where students are thrust directly into the social and political fabric of Cincinnati's Over-The-Rhine neighborhood, working with multiple non-profit organizations on projects varying from low-income apartment renovations to socially aware agit/prof artistic installations in a collective effort to empower the neighborhood.⁴³ My personal experience of providing architectural services to a local organization dedicated to providing housing for Cincinnati's urban poor have been motivating as well as eye-opening; nowhere else have I gained such direct and visceral understanding of people and ideas I have previously not been exposed to. The results of such an institution as the CUJCD would benefit private citizens from all classes and cultures, and governments, as well as the profession of architecture. The CUJDC would be instrumental in proving to the public the fundamental importance of good design and

professional architectural services as well as providing them with the same. This can happen in a variety of ways.⁴¹

The CUJDC could offer free public lectures and exhibits regarding design, local architecture, and urban planning. In essence, the CUJDC would function as a marketing tool for design awareness and activism. The CUJDC would aid the profession in demonstrating value in architecture and the services architects provide, thereby rescuing the profession from its current marginalization by increasing the relevance and import of architects through the introduction of the power of good design to the general public.

Furthermore, the CUJDC would function as a meeting place for open forums regarding upcoming public works projects such as bridges and courthouses, and private development like stadiums and highrises. Citizens could learn about, offer critique of, and become more enfranchised in the design of their surroundings, informing the CUJDC of what might encompass a better, more responsive counter-scheme to the proposals presented.

The effects of this facet of the CUJDC could be far-reaching, as Brussels' *Atelier de Recherche et d'Actions Urbains* (ARAU) proved to be in the 1970s. Staffed primarily by students, the ARAU was successful in "its demystification of the architectural affair" by organizing, informing, and presenting alternative design schemes to proposed urban projects; the citizens of Brussels became educated and fully aware of the designing of their city. The social design activism of the ARAU created a public invested in their surroundings that resulted in ending the "policy of clandestine urbanism" perpetrated by those in a position of economic and political power (who were largely responsible for most of the architectural failures in the city). As a result, the urban planning of Brussels became more democratic, where design decisions were made and approved by an informed public.⁴⁵ This effect could snowball into serious cultural change within the profession as well. By actively seeking out an audience regularly passed over by the *haute culture* of architecture and making the benefits of quality architecture more visible to a population of people who are rarely introduced to design (such as the working class and minorities), a more diverse group of people might enter the profession upon realizing its ability to empower themselves and their community.⁴⁶ This would be a boon to the profession as groups previously distanced from architecture begin to seek out the professional help of architects.⁴⁷

Students working at the CUJDC would receive college credit for a multitude of design services. This could include aiding the walk-in public with small project code review (providing the necessary permit drawings and documentation); and limited design service (from drafting, review, and full-scale design) like porches, bedroom additions, small business etc. for people who typically fly under the radar of traditional design firms because they can not afford to hire a designer. In addition, students

would engage in large-scale schematic design of possible counter-schemes to projects that could possibly have detrimental effects on a neighborhood or community as well as documenting instances where architecture has improved the quality of life. The benefits of these exercises would include the fostering of greater understanding of client relations and respect for the diverse cultures and traditions of the neighborhoods.

As an added bonus, the improved public exposure of architecture to non-architects would increase a professional's chances of gaining paying projects through networking at the CUJDC.⁴⁸ Another benefit to society would be the creation of a continually expanding group of philanthropic individuals and active volunteers. People who freely give their time and money to charitable causes continue to do so and continue to be active in community life. Social recluses (isn't that everyone in studio?) tend not volunteer or donate money at all.⁴⁹

Finally, this new architectural volunteerism could effect perhaps the most profound opportunity the CUJDC could afford society—widespread, government-sponsored design projects. Students and their mentors would work together designing city bus stops, park benches, garbage cans, etc. For the cost of the physical maintenance of the CUJDC, a government could reap untold savings in a multitude of areas while reawakening America's civic commitment to design in public works projects.⁵⁰

It is time for architecture to stop waiting around for the next artistic epoch and begin tending to its own relevance and pernicious "thunderous silence" on moral issues.⁵¹ This needs to begin at the root of how architecture is created. The tool most effective in this change is architectural pedagogy. If change is to be affected and effective, the academy, the profession, and most importantly the people they all serve should engage in a meaningful critical dialog with each other. The results would be powerful and vital.

NOTES

¹ ...or even more specifically, the products of architects. Numbers figured by Edward Mazria in his research regarding the profession's responsibility for the lionshare of energy consumption calculate that architects are responsible for 77% of all nonresidential buildings, 70% of multifamily buildings and 25% of single-family construction. See Christopher Hawthorne, "Turning Down the Global Thermostat" *Metropolis*, 23/2 (October 2003): 149. See also: Edward Mazria, "It's the Architecture, Stupid!: Who Really Holds the Key to the Global Thermostat? The Answer Might Surprise You." *Solar Today* (May/June 2003) 48-51.

² Thomas Dutton, "The Hidden Curriculum and the Design Studio: Toward a Critical Studio Pedagogy" *Voices in Architectural Education*. Thomas Dutton, ed. (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991): 165-168.

³ Anthony Ward, "The Suppression of the Social in Design: Architecture as War" *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices* Thomas A. Dutton and Lian Hurst Mann, eds. Pedagogy and Cultural Practice, vol. 5 (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1996): 48-49.

- ⁴ Robert Gutman, "Redesigning Architecture Schools" *Architecture*, v. 85 n. 8 (August 1996): 88. See also: Thomas R. Fisher, *In the Scheme of Things: Alternative Thinking on the Practice of Architecture* (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2000): 27-38. For direct comparison of how much architects are paid in relation to other professions see: Katherine Kai-sun Chia, "What's an Architect Worth?" *Architectural Record* 182/3 (March 1994) 32-35. See also: Thomas Fisher, "Who makes What And How We Might All Make More" *Progressive Architecture* 76/12 (December 1995) : 49-53, 95.
- ⁵ Garry Stevens, *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998)
- ⁶ C. Richard Hatch, ed. *The Scope of Social Architecture* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1984): 3.
- ⁷ One need not look too far for evidence of this. Philip Johnson, "impatient with the idea that architecture can improve humanity" and looming large on the cover of the widely read *Time Magazine*, stated that architecture was for making "beautiful buildings" and served "no other purpose." Robert Hughes, "Doing Their Own Thing: U.S. Architects: Goodbye to Glass Boxes and All That" *Time* (January 8, 1979): 52-59.
- ⁸ Andy Pressman, AIA, "Practice Matters" *Architectural Record* 188/5 (May 2000): 75-76.
- ⁹ Peter Buchanan, "What is Wrong with Architectural Education? Almost Everything" *Architectural Review* 185/1109 (July 1989): 24-26.
- ¹⁰ Hatch, *The Scope of Social Architecture*. 3-10.
- ¹¹ Aaron Koch, Katherine Schwensen, FAIA, Thomas A. Dutton & Deanna Smith, *The Redesign of Studio Culture: A Report of the AIA Studio Culture Task Force* (Washington DC: American Institute of Architecture Students, 2002), and Ernst Boyer & Lee Mitgang, *Building Community: A New Future for Architectural Education and Practice* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1996).
- ¹² Thomas Dutton, "The Hidden Curriculum and the Design Studio": 171-172.
- ¹³ Stevens, *The Favored Circle*, 196-201.
- ¹⁴ Amos Rappoport, "Anniversary (Jubilee) Issue of JAE" *Journal of Architectural Education*, 40/2 (1987):
- ¹⁵ As quoted in Witold Rybczynski, *The Look of Architecture* (New York: The Oxford University Press, 2001): 12.
- ¹⁶ Mary McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism" *Assemblage* 8 (February 1989): 23-59.
- ¹⁷ Joseph A. Demkin, AIA, ed. *The Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice: Student Edition*, 13th Edition. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002): xxii-xxiii.
- ¹⁸ Thomas A. Dutton and Lian Hurst Mann, "Modernism, Postmodernism, and Architecture's Social Project" *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices* Thomas A. Dutton and Lian Hurst Mann, eds. Pedagogy and Cultural Practice, vol. 5 (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1996): 2. For further in-depth evidence of modernism's socially-committed element, see two exhaustive books on European housing societies of the early 20th century: Richard Pommer and Christian F. Otto, *Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) and Nancy Stiebler, *Housing Design and Society in Amsterdam: Reconfiguring Urban Order and Identity, 1900-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998)
- ¹⁹ Anthony Ward, "The Suppression of Social in Design: Architecture as War" *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices* Thomas A. Dutton and Lian Hurst Mann, ed. Pedagogy and Cultural Practice, vol. 5 (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1996): 31-35.
- ²⁰ Tony Schuman, "Forms of Resistance: Politics, Culture, and Architecture" *Voices in Architectural Education* Thomas Dutton, ed. (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991): 5-6. See also: Charles Jencks, "The Rise of Postmodern Architecture" *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 7/4 (1975): 10-13.
- ²¹ Le Corbusier, *The Radiant City*. Trans. Pamela Knight et al. (New York: The Orion Press, 1967): 146. See also: Philippe Boudon, *Lived-in Architecture: Le Corbusier's Pessac Revisited* trans. Gerald Onn (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1972).
- ²² Sherry Ahrentzen, "The F Word in Architecture." *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices* Thomas A. Dutton and Lian Hurst Mann, eds. Pedagogy and Cultural Practice, vol. 5 (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1996): 71-118.
- ²³ Michael Pyatok & Hanno Weber, "Re-learning Design in Architecture: An Alternative Education Confronting Change" (Unpublished): 5-7.
- ²⁴ Effie Bouras, "Cameron Sinclair: Bridging the Gap" interview with Cameron Sinclair, *Crit*, 56 n. (Fall, 2003): 39.
- ²⁵ Architectural pedagogy could stand to learn a great deal about the possibilities of non-confrontational, non-end-product-driven social creativity and inquiry from the work of Alfonso Montuori, who likens a richer, collective creative process to the playing of jazz music – music both open, improvisational and scripted, as well as individual and collective. See: Alfonso Montuori, "Reflections on Transformative Learning: Social Creativity, Academic Discourse, and the Improvisation of Inquiry" *ReVision* 20/1 (Summer 1997): 34-37.
- ²⁶ Kenneth Frampton, *Labour, Work and Architecture: Collected Essays on Architecture and Design* (London: Phaidon Press, 2002): 8-19.
- ²⁷ Unless otherwise noted in this paper, Historic Preservation, as a field of endeavor, refers to the myriad of theoretical approaches to the topic: building conservation, preservation, restoration, adaptive re-use, rehabilitation, etc.
- ²⁸ William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: the History and Theory of Preservation in America*, Revised Edition (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997): 28-30. In addition, this book serves as an excellent survey of the field.
- ²⁹ See Jukka Jokilehto, "International Trends in Historic Preservation: From Ancient Monuments to Living Cultures" *APT Bulletin*, 29/3-4 (1998): 17-19, Philip Cryan Marshal & Robert J. Cagnetta, "Building Craftsmanship, Capacity, and Relationships: the Preservation Trades Network" *APT Bulletin*, 33/1 (2002): 43-45, and Ronald Lee Fleming, "Preservation and Enhancement: Do We Have The Right Balance?" *Historic Preservation News*, 34/1 (Feb. 1994): 4, 29.
- ³⁰ Linda N. Groat, "Rescuing Architecture from the Cul-de-Sac" *Journal of Architectural Education*, 45/3 (May 1992): 138, 144-145.
- ³¹ For an excellent example of the field of historic preservation's dedication to understanding culture, see National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins.htm>
- ³² Linda N. Groat, "Architecture's Resistance to Diversity: A Matter of Theory as Much as Practice" *Journal of Architectural Education*, 47/1 (Summer 1993): 3-10.
- ³³ Recently the Historic Preservation Act was revised in order to recognize that a greater number of disciplines is "key to the responsible practice of historic preservation", see the Federal Register 62/119 (June 20, 1997).
- ³⁴ National Council for Preservation Education, *National Council for Preservation Education Standards for Historic Preservation Degree Granting Graduate and Undergraduate Programs*. <http://www.uvm.edu/hispres/ncpe/ncpestds.html>.
- ³⁵ *ibid.*
- ³⁶ It was of some pleasure to see a lone architect stand up during an open forum on the topic and proclaim that she recognized the antagonism within the industry and had come to the conference precisely so she could learn what to do to bridge the gap.
- ³⁷ David G. Woodcock, "Historic Preservation Education: Academic Preparation for Practice" *ATP Bulletin*, 29/3-4 (1998): 24.
- ³⁸ Michael Tomlan, "Historic Preservation Education: Alongside Architecture in Academia" *Journal of Architectural Education*, 47/4 (May 1994): 187-196.
- ³⁹ Hatch, *The Scope of Social Architecture*, vii.
- ⁴⁰ Amos Rappoport, "Anniversary (Jubilee) Issue of JAE"
- ⁴¹ Reed Kroloff, "How the Profession is Failing the Schools" *Architecture*, 85/8 (August 1996): 92-93.
- ⁴² *The ACSA Sourcebook of Community Design Programs at Schools of Architecture in North America* lists only 36 university affiliated and 23 independent programs across the United States. See John M. Cary, Jr., Assoc. AIA, ed. *The ACSA Sourcebook of Community Design Programs at Schools of Architecture in North America*. (New York: ACSA Press, 2000): 111-120.
- ⁴³ For more information on Miami University's Center For Community Engagement, see its website: <http://www.fna.muohio.edu/cce/>
- ⁴⁴ Thomas R. Fisher, *In the Scheme of Things: Alternative Thinking on the Practice of Architecture*: 11.

⁴⁵ Maurice Culot, "ARAU Brussels" *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 7/4 (1975): 22-25.

⁴⁶ Mubarak S. Dahir, "Why the Profession Still Fails to Attract Minorities" *Architectural Record*, 183/7 (July 1995): 32-33.

⁴⁷ "A White Gentleman's Profession?" *Progressive Architecture* 75/11 (November 1994): 56.

⁴⁸ Pressman, "Practice Matters": 75-76.

⁴⁹ Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001): 117-122.

⁵⁰ Thomas Walton, "Pride and Stewardship: Renewing the Mandate for Design Excellence in America's Public Realm" *Places*, 9/2 (1994): 4-19.

⁵¹ Whitney M. Young, Jr., "Keynote address to the National AIA Convention." (Summer 1968).