



Colloque

# Les années 1968 et la formation des architectes. Perspectives internationales.

Mardi 15 mai 2018 / Mercredi 16 mai 2018

Cité de l'architecture, Auditorium / ENSA Paris-Malaquais, Amphi 2 des Loges

En France, dans le champ de l'enseignement de l'architecture, Mai 68 constitue un point d'orgue mais s'inscrit dans une perspective plus large tant du point de vue temporel (de l'après-guerre aux années 1970) que géographique. Les confrontations internationales ne manquent pas : les architectes voyagent, les livres et les idées circulent et l'enseignement de l'architecture est largement débattu. Le congrès de l'Union internationale des architectes en 1965 à Paris est ainsi consacré à la formation de l'architecte.

Ce présent colloque revient sur les formes que prennent les pédagogies en architecture hors de France, dans les années 1960-1970, au moment où différents facteurs contribuent à légitimer des changements de paradigmes de la théorie architecturale. Alors que les contenus s'ouvrent largement aux sciences humaines ainsi qu'aux expérimentations mathématiques et informatiques, des alternatives constructives émergent, notamment sur des thèmes tels que l'écologie, l'environnement ou la place de l'utilisateur.

En regard de l'exposition « *Mai 68. L'architecture aussi !* » consacrée à la bascule que connaît la scène architecturale française entre 1962 et 1978, ce colloque international permettra, au travers de contributions thématiques, de cartographier à l'échelle internationale une série d'expériences pédagogiques, d'évaluer dans quelle mesure elles ont formé des architectes prêts à embrasser la diversité des métiers de l'architecture ou, *a contrario*, à prendre des positions culturelles et politiques plus différenciées.

**Responsables scientifiques :** Anne Debarre, ENSA Malaquais ; Marie-Hélène Contal, CAPA ; Caroline Maniaque, ENSA Normandie ; Éléonore Marantz, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, Jean-Louis Violeau, ENSA Nantes.

**Organisateurs :** Cité de l'architecture & du patrimoine ; Laboratoire ACS, ENSA Paris-Malaquais ; Laboratoire HiCSA, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne ; Laboratoire ATE Normandie, ENSA Normandie ; Laboratoire CRENAU, ENSA Nantes.

Cité de l'architecture, Auditorium  
9h00 Accueil des participants

9h30 Ouverture du colloque

**Marie-Christine Labourdette**, Présidente de la Cité de l'architecture & du patrimoine  
**Corinne Tiry-Ono**, Cheffe du Bureau de la recherche architecturale, urbaine et paysagère  
Introduction : **Anne Debarre** (ENSA Paris-Malaquais), **Caroline Maniaque** (ENSA Normandie)

10h15 Tout est politique ?

**Panayotis Tournikiotis** (Ecole Polytechnique d'Athènes), président de séance

**Alessandra Ponte** (Université de Montréal), *IUAV Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, 1974-1980.*

**Jana Ndiaye Berankova** (Columbia University), *The common war on urban planning ? 1968 occupations of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris and the Technical University in Berlin.*

Pause

**Jasna Galjer** (Université de Zagreb), *Notes from Nowhere : 68 Moment and teaching of architecture as symptoms of critique in Socialist Yugoslavia.*

**Elisa Dainese** (Dalhousie University), *The "African Effect": Protest Movements and American University Curricula in the 1970s.*

Questions et débats

14h30 Circulation des idées, circulation des pratiques

**Nick Bullock** (King's College, Université de Cambridge), président de séance

**Emilia Kiecko** (Université de Wrocław), *Teaching architecture in Poland in the 1960s and 1970s.*

**Aino Niskanen** (Aalto University), *Finish architectural students – between Alvar Aalto and Karl Marx 1968-69.*

Pause

**Yahya Sepehri** (Université de Téhéran), *Changing in architectural design education in the national university of Iran in 1960s.*

**Christian Pedelahore** (ENSA Paris La Villette), *La Bauhaus centroamericana 1968-1978, la décennie radicale.*

Questions et débats

**Stanislaus von Moos** (Université de Zurich), *Learning from Las Vegas.*

---

## Mercredi 16 mai

ENSA Paris-Malaquais, Amphi 2 des Loges

9h00 Accueil des participants

9h30 Ouverture du colloque

**Luc Liogier**, Directeur de l'ENSA Paris-Malaquais ; **Fabienne Fendrich**, Directrice de l'ENSA Normandie

9h45h Nouvelles pédagogies

**Joaquim Moreno** (Université autonome de Lisbonne), président de séance

**Julie André-Garguilo** (Université Paris-Est), *De l'engagement social à l'industrie culturelle. L'Architectural Association School dans les années 70.*

**Mary Lou Lobsinger** (Université de Toronto), *Architectural Education and Electronically Facilitated Learning.*

Pause

**Luca Cardani** (Université polytechnique de Milan), *1964-1971 La contre-révolution à la Cooper Union School of Art and Architecture.*

**Luca Guido** (Université de Oklahoma), *Teaching organic architecture : The American school.*

Questions et débats

14h Ouvertures et croisements disciplinaires

**Judith Le Maire de Romsee** (Faculté d'architecture La Cambre-Horta), présidente de séance

**Debora Domingo Calabuig** (Université polytechnique de Valence, Espagne), *L'école d'architecture à Valence, Espagne, dans les années 1970 : enseignements croisés.*

**Nicolas Moucheront** (Université IUAV de Venise), *Giancarlo de Carlo à Urbino avant et après 1968. L'architecture de l'université et l'enseignement de l'architecture.*

Pause

**Pedro Bandeira** (Université de Minho), *School of Porto and the counterculture 1968-74.*

**Oscar Castro Andrade** (Université Technologique de Delft), *The pedagogy of the sands. The vocation of restarting the question as the creative ethos of the School of Valparaiso, Chile.*

Questions et débats

Conclusion : **Eléonore Marantz** (Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne), **Jean-Louis Violeau** (ENSA Nantes)

## Counterculture in “Escola do Porto” (1968-1974)

Pedro Bandeira

### Abstract

In his acceptance speech on the occasion of the attribution of a medal by *L'Academie d'Architecture de France* (Paris, 2010), Eduardo Souto de Moura described the first years of the course of Architecture at the School of Fine Arts of Porto (early 1970's), as being based on social sciences (sociology, anthropology, structuralism...), heavily influenced by a Marxist ideology. In such a context, the teaching of architecture was perceived as a synthesis of analytical disciplines, and *drawing* (as design project as well as a language) was undervalued or seen as reactionary. For many, it was nothing but a bourgeois practice which represented the ruling powers.

Portugal was going through the so-called “Primavera Marcelista” (1968-1970)<sup>1</sup>, the long wanted and hard transition from Estado Novo (New State) (Salazar's almost five decades long authoritarian regime) to the democratic Revolution in April 1974, led by the MFA (Armed Forces Movement). Even though there was still censorship in the years preceding the Revolution, there was no attempt to prevent the publication of the first Portuguese editions of “Civil Disobedience”, by Henri David Thoreau (1972), or Guy Debord's “The Society of Spectacle” (1972) (in this case because it was considered too dense, philosophical and, hence, harmless for the masses)<sup>2</sup>. Under the influence of May 1968, there was a vibe of contestation started by students, who fought for the restructuring of the university and the democratisation of education, and, quite brazenly, against the regime and war on the former colonies. This rebellion was at its peak in April 1969 at the University of Coimbra, where it generated an unprecedented academic crisis (demonstrations, students being suspended, arrested, schools being closed and a blatant boycott of exams). The photocopied translation of “On the poverty of Student Life” (Mustapha Khayati, 1966) circulated in the corridors of the university.

The Course of Architecture in Porto went through a similar period of student contestation, having been able to claim, even if briefly (1970-73), an educational “experimental regime” based on a teacher-student as equals system both at management and assessment level. This “experimental regime” was characterised by the lack of a structure based on school years, rather on behalf of a theme-based course organisation. There was continuous assessment and no register of absences. Far from being consensual, it was described as follows in a leaflet handed out to newcomers during the school year of 1973-74: “in architecture, there are no absences, not many classes, no teachers, no subject matters. During classes you talk to the available teachers”.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A period of democratic illusion attributed to Marcelo Caetano – the last president of the salazarist regime.

<sup>2</sup> See article “Realizar a Poesia: Guy Debord e a Revolução de Abril”, by Maria de Magalhães Ramalho, published in magazine *Flauta de Luz* #3, October 2015, p. 17-35.

<sup>3</sup> See Raquel Paulino's PhD dissertation *O Ensino da Arquitetura na Escola do Porto: Construção de um Projeto Pedagógico entre 1969 e 1984* (Porto, FAUP, 2011).

Described as a chaotic period, teaching happened between politics and practice, at the café table and the drawing board at the teacher's office.

### **The Survey/Inquérito**

The Modern Movement in architecture has always had much more space for expression in the Portuguese former colonies (Angola, Moçambique, Guiné) than in the metropolis under Salazar's dictatorship. There are two reasons that explain why "we never came to be modern": first, by keeping a certain neutrality during WWII, hence safeguarding its cities from the devastation which ravaged most of Europe, Portugal did not need to create new paradigms; second, the New State politics followed a romantic nationalism of fascist influence, aesthetically represented by the "Portuguese House" – a simplistic generalisation of popular architecture<sup>4</sup>.

Wishing to give "«national architecture» expression some sense"<sup>5</sup> the New State sponsored, in 1955, the initiative promoted by the National Union of Architects (chaired by Keil do Amaral), *Survey on Popular Architecture in Portugal*. The goal of the Decree-Law which legitimised the funding of the *Survey* showed some ambiguity: for one hand, the expectation of finding its own route towards the growth of Portuguese architecture, through close observation of the traditional example and solutions; on the other hand, it recognised "the evolving nature of architectonic solutions that naturally tend to adjust to its time, going along with the bettering of construction techniques and the evolution of aesthetic ideals"<sup>6</sup>. If this was the cue to legitimise the Modern Movement (also by recognising the "functionality" of popular architecture), the way to do it was to make the *Survey* the "real lesson with evident practical value to give modern architecture a Portuguese flavour"<sup>7</sup>.

This compromise between modernity and nationalist tradition (more evident in the "português suave" style) was also present on the Decree-Law which in 1957 reformed the architecture teaching at the Fine Arts schools: "the Fine Arts schools should take into consideration the value and the diversity of natural and ethical conditions, and of popular and erudite sources of artistic inspiration in the metropolis and overseas, without dismissing the fundamental unity of the Nation and its traditional mission"<sup>8</sup>. Still, this education reform will be seen as the late attempt to implement a modern and analytical way of teaching, of a formalist basis, which shall be harshly contested on the following decade when facing a social reality based on an extremely precarious way of living – one of the most significant lessons to draw from the *Survey on Popular Architecture in Portugal*.

### **Analytical Architecture**

---

<sup>4</sup> About this it would be interesting to begin by reading the article "O Problema da Casa Portuguesa" (1945), by Fernando Távora.

<sup>5</sup> Decree-Law No 40348, October 19, 1955, which legitimises the government's support to the Survey

<sup>6</sup> Idem

<sup>7</sup> Idem

<sup>8</sup> Decree-Law No 41363, November 14, 1957, Article 4, which promotes the guiding lines of teaching architecture at the Fine Arts School.

The architect and professor Otávio Lixa Filgueiras took part in the *Survey on Popular Architecture*, being responsible for the Trás-os-Montes region, in the north of Portugal. Around May 1968, he was responsible for a study unit named *Analytical Architecture* in the course of architecture in Porto. The unit consisted of asking students to do thorough mappings (scale 1:100 to 1:10) of old buildings in low-income neighbourhoods. Because they were highly demanding, these mappings implied learning how to draw (with Indian ink) and understanding several construction systems, but, possibly even more important than that, understanding the way these houses were lived in and owned. By using the representation of furniture and daily objects, these mappings could easily provide an anthropological view of the social condition of the people living in those neighbourhoods. Through some of the mappings we learn exactly how many people shared rented houses (and sub-rented), which revealed a heart-breaking social reality. For architecture students (almost always coming from “upper class families”), the demanding nature of this exercise included gaining people’s trust so that they could enter their homes. A few unexpected friendships sprung from this, which made it possible to overcome social differences.

The *Analytical Architecture* exercise, however, was not popular amongst the students, basically because the architectural thinking did not go beyond analysis. The urgency of a revolution was starting to brew among the students. Since they paid close attention to what was going on in Paris, they demanded more and more a pedagogical and political action plan.

Permanently conflicted with the School’s Board, the architecture students managed to put an end, in 1969, to the study plan from the so-called *Reforma de 1957/Reform of 1957*, in order to implement an *Experimental Regime* that excluded study units such as chemistry or physics, and favoured a thematic organisation (architecture, urbanism and construction) which paid more attention to social sciences. On the other side, they contested a teaching system based on a modern superficial and dated language, and unable to deal with the social reality of the world. It was under the scope of the *Experimental Regime* that the unit entitled *Theory and History* was created, also run by Professor Otávio Lixa Filgueiras, and whose methodology was the organisation of an atlas made of images collected from national and international press. The students used this opportunity to express their different concerns about the world. Topics such as future technology or science fiction went side by side with topics such as war, lack of housing, property speculation, pollution of rivers or gender discrimination, but, apparently, the increase of a political awareness did not seem to reflect on the practical side of the project. There was still no space for *drawing*.

## **SAAL**

In the early 1970’s and until the 1974 Revolution, either as a result of May of 1968, or its replica in 1969, whose point of origin was the academic crisis in Coimbra, the students of architecture of Porto, got even more involved in political issues, disregarding a disciplinary knowledge. According to several students, little or nothing was learned during the project’s course units. But there was yet another issue of ideological nature which consisted of seeing architecture as a “bourgeois practice”. They argued that it only seemed to serve the powerful and rich. Some of the students (like Manuela Juncal) took this to an extreme and chose to quit the course, even if temporarily, in order to infiltrate factories (textile industry) and raise union-wise awareness

among the workers. Other students, who were being chased by the police or had deserted from a war they were against, had to opt for exile. Drawing board practices or project exercises would hardly be able to respond to the actual anxiety until the Movement of Armed Forces went ahead with the Revolution.

Since the architect Nuno Portas was named Secretary of State for Housing and Urbanism, during the first government of a democratic Portugal, there was the chance to introduce *Processo SAAL* (The SAAL Process – local ambulatory support service) for social and cooperative housing. The scarcity of houses for families in need and those who had to come back from the Portuguese former colonies required urgent measures. The *SAAL Process* included several aspects, from massively building peripheral neighbourhoods to the mere infrastructuring of plots with the intention of self-building. Nuno Portas' proposal of getting architecture schools involved in the SAAL Process was enthusiastically received by the students in Porto, who already had deep field knowledge and a big proximity to underprivileged populations. There was finally a chance to do architecture by developing a practice committed to social matters.

The SAAL brigades in Porto, coordinated by Alexandre Alves Costa, had for reference the principle of “right to the city”, proposed by Henri Lefebvre as requirement for “a renewed humanism and democracy”. Against social segregation, the permanence of underprivileged populations at the centre of the city was claimed in Porto. This right implied, small-scale, sporadic interventions, to try to keep the same closeness and neighbourly relationships. The São Vitor neighbourhood, designed by Siza Vieira with the collaboration of student Souto de Moura, amongst others<sup>9</sup>, is a good example.

But not all of the people at the School of Architecture agreed to this kind of intervention because, to a certain extent, SAAL's houses still reproduced the bourgeois housing typology, that is to say, a single-family house with family kitchen on private property. Among the opposing voices was Professor Jacinto Rodrigues who wished for a revolutionary model based on a “social and cooperative republic” with social canteens. According to him, even before building new homes, one should choose to occupy derelict ones. He also stood up for a “population decentralisation through planning, which generates an urban polycentrism in small cities capable of harmonising the territory and demography”, following an idea of an “eco-development where water distribution, renewable sources of energy, agroecology and biodiversity would be connected to the eco-sustainability of the whole territory”<sup>10</sup>.

## Ecology

Before becoming a teacher at the course of Architecture in Porto, in 1975, Jacinto Rodrigues was exiled in Paris after being politically chased and having run from war. During his stay in France, he graduated in *General Sociology* at the Sorbone (1968) and had his *Master's Degree in Urbanism* at Vincennes, Paris VIII (1973), where he was Françoise Choay and Hubert Tonka's student. Benefitting from Paris centrality, he travelled around Europe (Germany, Austria, The Netherlands, England, Italy, USSR...), favouring visits to architectures of social and utopian

---

<sup>9</sup> The São Victor brigade was composed of Domingos Tavares, Francisco Guedes, Adalberto Dias, Graça Nieto, Manuela Sambade, Manuela Cabral and Manuel Borges.

<sup>10</sup> Testimony of Jacinto Rodrigues at the conference held on 26 November 2014, at CIAJG, Guimarães.

nature. Those travels allowed him to gather a collection of photographic slides which made an impact in the classes he taught in Portugal after the Revolution (those classes are still remembered by former students like the moment “architecture was no longer just a place in the books”). His classes addressed many topics: classical utopias; phalansteries; modern social housing; constructivism and decentralisation of soviet linear cities, theme for his Master’s dissertation published with the title *Urbanism et Révolution* (Paris: Éditions Universitaires, 1973), with a preface by Françoise Choay.

Another topic which deserved Jacinto Rodrigues’ attention was ecological thinking. The program of his unit entitled *Teoria e Prática de Investigação II/Investigation Theory and Practice II* (1975-1977) included the search for “concrete solutions for a society as an alternative to the dependency on imperialism”. Under the scope of this unit they studied renewable sources of energy, self-construction processes, soft technologies, recycling or even biological agriculture. While being a member of the *Grupo Autónomo de Intervenção Ecológica no Porto/Autonomous Group for an Ecological Intervention in Porto*, Jacinto Rodrigues organised, with the help of his students, the itinerant exhibition *Ecologia e Energias Livres/Ecology and Free Energies*, in 1975, which was organised outdoors in the centre of the city as to reach as many people as possible. His students recall yet another exhibition that Jacinto Rodrigues brought from Paris in 1976: it was the polemic<sup>11</sup> *Architectures Marginales aux États-Unis/Marginal Architectures in the USA* where, among other things, they showed the constructions of Drop City’s American hippie community. It should not seem awkward, then, that amongst the several practical exercises done in the context of his course unit, there were geodesic structures influenced by Buckminster Fuller. The practical component of the unit also helped promoting the construction of solar ovens, wind turbines, and, last but not least, a community garden, which was supposed to support the first macrobiotic and vegetarian canteen in Porto (at the school of Fine Arts). It also affected the project’s units. A group of students<sup>12</sup> proposed a plan where streets with no cars gave place to gardens; properties would not have walls allowing people to walk freely; there would be urban and community gardens, and we would live solely off the production of renewable sources of energy.

Regardless of the actual results or even of the credit students gave these exercises, they stimulated a new ecological awareness and were able to break with “traditional academicism” and the “passivity of the bourgeois school”<sup>13</sup>, by setting side by side intellectual work and laboratory practice. On the other hand, one might say that beyond the compromises which conditioned the Revolution and which would lead, in just two years, to the end of the SAAL process – for political reasons but also because it could not resist the pressure over land value (the interruption of the construction of Bouça Neighbourhood, by Siza Vieira, is a good example), utopia was still in our minds.

## **Insurrectional Organisation of Space**

---

<sup>11</sup> See *Encounters with the America Contreculture*, by Caroline Maniaque-Benton (Ashgate Publishing, 2001).

<sup>12</sup> The project named *Bacalhau de São Victor/São Victor’s Cod* included the following students: Mário Ramos, Fernando Barroso, Graça Nieto Guimarães and Maria de Lurdes.

<sup>13</sup> See article “Da teoria à prática na ESPAB/From theory to practice in ESPAB”, published in *Revista Alternativa* #1, February 1976.

Notwithstanding censorship in Portugal during the dictatorial regime, many texts of subversive nature were translated, some formally published, other photocopied in *Gestetner* machines (which schools used to have for printing tests) and distributed by students in a somewhat clandestine way. Fanzines like *La Reza di Conti* (1972), of situationist influence, quoted the *Treatise on Etiquette for the Younger Generations* by Raoul Vaneigem, but also authors like Trotsky, Wilhelm Reich or Gotthold Lessing, even if only to merely advocate: “let us be lazy in everything, except in loving and drinking, except in being lazy”.

Mário Ramos, a student of architecture initiated in 1970, has got in his archive some of these manifestos confirming the influence, even if discrete, of the Situationist International in the course of Architecture of Porto. Along with his colleague Fernando Barroso, they developed, in 1975, a project called *Insurrectional Organisation of Space*. This 5<sup>th</sup> year project was an anti-monument proposal that consisted of burying the ground levels of the main square in Porto (where the Town Hall, banks headquarters, newspapers and insurances companies are placed), creating, thus, a dysfunctional topography that erased parts of buildings. Critical of the city as mere representation of the establishment, Mário Ramos and Fernando Barroso, claimed an “anti-urbanism” based on the idea of play and celebration capable of re-qualifying everyday life. There was some sense of humour and irony in the proposal, but that did not mean it was taken less seriously. The time invested in technical drawings (plans, sections and elevations) was intended to grant a certain disciplinary legitimacy, whereas photomontages, organised as comics, displayed, by using an apparently “advertising” narrative, a close proximity to the situationist “détournement” language.

Because it went against the demanded pragmatism of the SAAL operations, Mário Ramos and Fernando Barroso’s *Insurrectional Organisation of Space* project was practically ignored, but, still, tolerated by the faculty. It was hard to see that their determination was not utopian, rather critical and libertarian. Coincidentally or not, the same year *The society of Spectacle* sold out its first Portuguese edition, Guy Debord declared being sceptic about the Portuguese revolution<sup>14</sup>.

## Conclusion

Between 1968 and 1974, the course of architecture at the School of Fine Arts of Porto went through several educational experiences that could be seen as “failures” in light of the uniformed patterns of the *Bologna Declaration*. At the time, the political situation submerged school in a rebellious environment where informality and chaos ruled. But, contrary to what would be expected, that did not demote students from thinking critically about the role played by architecture and the architect’s social responsibility.

In the words of Mário Ramos: “Today, almost past fifty years since those times of *celebration* between the late years of the decade of 1960 and the mid-seventies, I still recall that it was then, in a time of apparent disorganisation, that I chose the freedom to take a risk, to try, to do things I had never done before, and to make some mistakes along the way. I had the chance, then, to contact several European and American radical vanguards, which led me to choose paths which had little to do with traditional teaching in architecture schools, but which made me see it and

---

<sup>14</sup> See Maria de Magalhães Ramalho, “Realizar a Poesia: Guy Debord e a Revolução de Abril”, in *Flauta de Luz* #3 October 2015, p.17-35

think about it without any prejudice. I made my own choices and they helped me define who I am, by backing away from traditions, defining my own rules, and led me to a free and unpredictable way of thinking and being, in short, live life and not just exist. It was the contact with what seems to have *no* use whatsoever (poetry, cinema, music, art, wandering the streets, night's melancholy...), that allowed me to build my individuality along all these years, either as an architect, or regarding my affection towards others. Those years opened up my heart so that today, standing in an intimate shadowy corner, I could contemplate reality, where, and paraphrasing Shakespeare, 'madmen lead the blind', and still have enough peace of mind to doubt the truth. Beyond Good and Evil, I still think you should demand *everything* even the *impossible*, about tomorrow we shall see..."<sup>15</sup>

PB 12.04.2018

---

<sup>15</sup> Exchanged correspondence with the author in March 2018