

DEREK LINSTRUM

EDUCATION FOR CONSERVATION

In 1849 John Ruskin published that great work, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, one of the most influential architectural books in the English language. It was a daring action for a relatively young man, who was not an architect, to present what he called "those large principles of right which are applicable to every stage and style" of the "distinctively political art of Architecture". In the chapter called "The Lamp of Memory" Ruskin laid down two duties "whose importance it is impossible to overrate; the first, to render the architecture of the day, historical". And the second duty laid on us was "to preserve, as the most precious of inheritances, the architecture of past ages". At no time since 1849 has the latter been so widely proclaimed as it is today as a desirable, indeed obligatory, professional duty; and yet it surely cannot be divorced from the first duty, and education for the one cannot exclude consideration of the other.

Conservation is bound to be, in some respects at the mercy of fashion but I was surprised recently to hear that an appeal for financial help had been turned down because, it was said, it would have been easy five years ago *when conservation was fashionable*. That statement can be interpreted in several ways, and I would like to think it means that conservation as a principle has been absorbed into practice as an understood and recognised element. Indeed, that ought to be the most important consideration when discussing education for conservation. I think it is true that in most countries we have passed a certain stage of special pleading, but I am not certain we are all going down the right road. If I may refer to Ruskin once again, may I repeat his words to a group of citizens who had sought his advice about the style in which one of their public buildings should be designed. In that scathing, reprimanding manner of which he was a master, he told them "You know there are a great many odd styles of architecture about;

you don't want to do anything ridiculous; you hear of me, among others, as a respectable architectural man-milliner; and you send for me, that I may tell you the leading fashion; and what is, in our shops, for the moment, the newest and sweetest thing in pinnacles". When we look at conservation as it is practised today in some places, by some people, we can see the results of what I think of as the fashionable treatment. It may be something with an apparently serious, historical, archaeological, academic significance, which clearly advertises the fact that the building has been conserved by an expert although it is not always easy to understand the statement it is making; or it may be the over-precious, skilfully cosmetic presentation of a building's outer face as interpreted by a personal and idiosyncratic practitioner - a respectable architectural man-milliner. Yet it is commonly accepted that all the current tendencies are in the direction of conservation in the widest sense of the word; and if that is so it represents a new professional responsibility for which the professions have not been adequately prepared.

However much one would like to see the formulation and adoption of common international values and criteria in the treatment of historic buildings, it must be acknowledged that attitudes are bound to be conditioned by cultural and personal backgrounds. This was made apparent to me a few years ago during one of the weeks I was teaching at ICCROM when the students were asked to visit a ruined nymphaeum at Genazzano, built probably from a design by Bramante at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and requested to make outline proposals for its treatment. It is a picturesquely overgrown ruin in a valley, close to a stream and within sight of the old hill city of the Colonna family. Exactly the subject for an English romantic, and in my own mind I thought how I would do little except consolidate the ruin where necessary and unobtrusively weatherproof the exposed top surfaces of the masonry. I thought how I would make the approach from the end further from the city, so that a visitor would enter the nymphaeum along a slightly overgrown grassy walk through the ruin, in the arches of which would be framed the city and the castle of the Colonna on the summit. Then he would climb the bank at the end and arrive back at the entrance to the city. It would be a complete experience, relating the ruin to the landscape, and drawing in the city itself. The solution was so obvious and inevitable; or so I thought.

However, the reports and suggestions produced some shocks. An American student who had already had experience of work on an archaeological site decided that access to the ruin would be by means of a lift. From the top of a bank overlooking the ruin, a bridge would be built out until it

was over the centre of the building, and then a lift would take the visitors down so that they were deposited on the grassy walk between the arcades. The grass would be replaced by paving, and the entire ruin would be covered with a light metal structure roofed with corrugated yellow plastic. This was not quite how an English romantic would have seen the solution, but it was a serious proposal, influenced by an archaeological background. Another proposal was made by a Jordanian with experience of restoration and reconstruction in Jerusalem. He displayed a drawing showing how he intended to rebuild the ruin. There were to be three large domes over the three bays, supported on massive stone vaulting, which meant the more or less total rebuilding of the structure, and the whole was to be faced with coloured marbles. But why do that? he was asked. Because he proposed to rebuild it as it was. But how did he know how it had been? Surely, it was obvious. Such arcades supported vaulting, and vaulting supported domes. It was all so obvious and inevitable. There were other ideas about the treatment of this ruin, although no one quite suggested the solution which, *to me*, had appeared obvious and inevitable. Then there was a delightful student from West Africa who proposed the ruin should be consolidated and left as it was, but he would have cleared away all the grass and creeping plants, replacing them with plastic grass to reduce the maintenance costs, and surrounding the whole with a fence to keep visitors out. Again, it was not the treatment that an English romantic would advocate, but each of these three students was clearly seeing the problem in the light of his own experience and the examples around him in his normal work. Can anyone's visual and cultural criteria be valid in a different culture? Obviously, the Genazzano experience had shown that there were, to say the least, different approaches depending on one's background.

Yet a certain amount of rationalisation would identify which countries in the world share a common culture with similar building types and materials. Ex-colonies in Asia, Africa and America are obviously culturally linked with the European countries which first colonised them, and they usually share the same language and many ideas. My own work during the last ten years has attempted to strengthen the connections between conservation in England and such countries as Australia, Canada, USA and South Africa; there has been a steady flow of practitioners from these countries to my Institute in York, and I have been privileged to lecture in many universities in the British Commonwealth. The setting up post-graduate courses in Sydney and Johannesburg is not only encouraging; it also provides an opportunity for mutual help in the use of teaching material and the exchange of research findings. But if it is agreed that there is a need to educate for

conservation, two questions must be asked; 1, what shall we teach, and 2, when shall we teach it?

If I may speak about the situation in the United Kingdom, we have undergraduate schools or departments of architecture in thirty-three universities and polytechnics, and an opportunity to undertake full-time post-graduate study in conservation at three universities. In addition, there are part-time post-graduate courses in four centres. It might be said that the need to set up post-graduate training is principally because of the failure of undergraduate education in the past to prepare architects to understand and treat old buildings, and so it is pertinent to ask how well students are trained today for conservation work in practice. My attempt, which is based on two questionnaires sent out in 1973 and again in 1976, may not be perfect; but it gives some useful information and provides a general picture. Basically, the questions asked were:

1. Do you incorporate conservation problems in your design programmes? If so, are they related to planning, to the design of infill buildings, or to the reuse of old buildings? In which year of the course are they undertaken?

2. Assuming such programmes are based on a real situation, are the students required to make their own investigation? Do they make surveys of any existing buildings? Are there links at all with any requirements to make measured drawings or with the study of architectural history?

3. Is traditional building construction included in your course? If so, are the students required or encouraged to study methods of construction and the behaviour of materials in existing buildings?

4. Do you include lectures on conservation (e.g. legislation, economics, methods of consolidation and repair) in your course? if so, in which year?

5. In which year's programme do you include the study of architectural history?

About 75% of the schools replied that they included conservation programmes in their studio programmes; but it is not possible to make general conclusions about when they took place. Some were in the early years of the course, some were options in the second year, and some came in at a relatively late time, in the fifth year. Nor can I comment on the nature of these programmes, since although specimens were requested, none arrived. The replies to the question about surveys and measured drawings suggested that 65% to 70% did measured drawings; some did surveys as well, some did surveys alone. But my question about how or whether these were linked to the teaching of architectural history, or to a real situation which

was also a part of a design problem, was not really answered. The answer to my third question, about the teaching of traditional building construction, slightly surprised me. Most schools replied that they taught it; but I think we would need to have clearer definitions here. It is doubtful if many schools teach what I understand by traditional construction and a knowledge of the capabilities and limitations of the materials, although I doubt if any are quite in the extreme situation of one student, who wrote in answer to an examination question that traditional building construction was the alternative to prefabrication. Nor was there much evidence in these answers to use in assessing how many schools studied constructional methods and the behaviour of materials in existing buildings. Very few schools seemed to include anything about conservation techniques; six said yes, and three referred to options, but the response was lukewarm. The question about history brought such complicated replies that they are difficult to summarise; but it appeared that it was taught in the first and second years in all cases, and in most in the third year. Very few claimed anything more than this, or suggested that history was closely (or at all) linked with other teaching and exercises. Nor was it clear how history was taught, or by whom.

One school only gave a reply as definite as "the short answer is that no formal and exclusive lectures, studies, or studio programmes are carried out in this field"; and there is an impression from this rather superficial investigation that at least 75% of undergraduate schools in the United Kingdom have an element of conservation in their programmes. But -an element; what is that? And should conservation be regarded as an element? I would prefer it to be thought of as something integral in the whole range of architectural education; and I see allied questions about by whom it should be taught, and indeed one might question if it *can* be taught. What is it? I would define conservation as a professional responsibility for existing buildings and their environment, and I willingly accepted the idea long ago that this responsibility extends far beyond individual buildings to embrace whole areas of urban buildings, villages, countryside etc. There is nothing new in that idea, and it is almost platitudinous to refer to it; but this definition surely means that conservation is not a finite element but an all-pervasive responsibility cutting right across architectural and urban design. I see it as a responsibility for the treatment of ruined monuments, of inhabited monuments, of buildings converted for another use, of relatively humble buildings capable of satisfactory use, of existing buildings in a new environment, of new buildings in an existing environment. I see it as being based on "understanding" of, even "love" of, buildings and their physical and human environment; and as it becomes an integral part

of each professional responsibility, it ceases to be something one can consider *simply* as a taught subject.

Now, if considered in this way, I begin to view with some scepticism the apparent fact that at least 75% of the schools in the United Kingdom include an element of conservation in their programmes. From my own observations as a visitor, I find some of the exercises set are curiously lacking in a perception of the wider, more exciting interpretation of conservation as a realistic, everyday problem. I see some sort of measured drawings being made without any supporting evidence of an investigation of the elevations as part of a *building* with three dimensions constructed of real materials. What a wasted opportunity. I see the same sort of village study being made, based on visual criteria, such as our Local Government offices have now generally perfected as part of the work of designating a Conservation Area; very good, but how often is this extended as the context in which to place new buildings which must be designed one day. Again, how often is the conversion and extension of an existing building taken as a major design subject? Yet this is one of the most stimulating problems an architect can have, one demanding imagination and understanding which might very well be beyond most undergraduates but one that should be introduced in its complexity of values and consideration that have to be balanced.

If we are seriously preparing students for a professional responsibility which is going to include work on and around existing buildings in their environment I suggest the following are essential ingredients:

1. *Recording*. The making of a measured drawing should remain a central, fundamental exercise since this is the basis of an architect's work on a building; but preparation is needed. Why is one making such a record? What are the essential parts to record? What are the alternative methods of recording? How do they compare in cost and usefulness? How are such drawings used, since that must dictate how they are made? Complementing this exercise, one needs to learn how to make a report, how an inspection should be organised, what one is looking for, and how the results should be set down.

2. *Building performance*. An inspection and investigation for recording automatically leads to an investigation of the structure of the building and the way in which it has succeeded or failed to perform its function. The structural faults can usually be explained only by a knowledge of the traditional methods and materials of building, which are demonstrated in the building itself. Equally, an investigation of the environmental performance

of the building, the effect of wall thicknesses, types of roofing, ratio of window to wall, ect. is valuable, especially when the economical use of the building over a long period has to be regarded as crucial to its future.

3. *Assessments*. These are of three types, a *visual*, concerned with an individual building's contribution to a larger group, in colour, form and outline, or the effect of a group within a larger context; b. *historical*, partly based on the evidence of the fabric, partly on documentation; and here it is necessary to understand the importance of accuracy, of recognising when the subject is undisturbed, of understanding the evolution of the building, and of the sources of information used in research; c. *potential*, which needs to complement the visual and historical assessments with an imaginative approach to an improved continuous use, or to a reuse which takes account of cost expenditure and return. On all these counts I suggest the professions are weak generally, not least because of the deficiencies in training. Our criteria are imprecise, and there is a flimsiness of foundation and too great a subjectivity generally in many assessments made.

4. *History*. I make no apology for returning to this, because without a good sense of history it is not possible to undertake any of the three previous responsibilities satisfactorily. A building cannot be recorded or investigated fully if there is no understanding of why and how it was built in that form, how it was used, what constraints there were at the time, what influences from other buildings of other countries were affecting it. Nor can visual, historical and potential assessments be made without a sound understanding of the detailed changes in the design of the building components. Now history should be taught, and by whom, is a subject I cannot expand upon in this paper, but I believe it should be all-pervasive, just as it is in fact. In the midst of life we are in history, and it is surely self-evident that hardly any building can be isolated from its historical context. Designs which fail to recognise this are both doomed and damaging from the beginning.

5. Indeed, the fifth and last category of these essentials in professional responsibility for existing buildings and their environment is *design*. Taste and design are as necessary in conservation work as in new commissions, whether we are considering the presentation of an ancient monument and its site, the rehabilitation of an existing building, the design of a replacement building in a Conservation Area, or the improvement of a group of humble houses in an unexceptional neighbourhood. Since conservation is concerned essentially with continuity of life, it implies necessary changes too in many

cases; but this offers great opportunities to a brilliant and knowledgeable designer.

Now, if we take these interpretations of conservation and consider if, or in what degree, they are included in undergraduate education, I suspect that an honest answer would be that conservation plays relatively little part. Yet it cannot be realistic to ignore it at the present time, when many government policies, and a general public preference, recommend it in varying degrees. Conservation is big business, with urban rehabilitation on prestigious sites. Conservation is work for large practices in many countries, and it is likely to be the mainstay of many for the next few years. Conservation is work for the large developers, now that comprehensive redevelopment of city centres is unfashionable.

But in all this lies a danger. Naturally, the building professions have responded and adapted to undertake this often unfamiliar responsibility; but if we consider the five essentials I have listed we might come to the conclusion that things could be better. The general standard of work on old buildings, whether one refers to straightforward restoration, adaptation or new design, is far from reassuring. Too much, in spite of good intentions, is uninformed, insensitive, and lacking in understanding; and one senses too often the generally flimsy basis on which many decisions have been taken, the lack of realisation of the quality of the buildings, and the ignorance of correct or traditional detailing even when good sources are available.

Personally, I would like to see a greater co-ordination in undergraduate teaching, and it seems that conservation as a central idea, a unifying, pervasive theme might achieve such a result. It is not separate from, or an alternative to, good new design; they are both parts of the whole, but until this is acknowledged in education conservation remains firmly in the post-graduate category. Assuming a necessity and a perceptible demand for some form of post-graduate education, what form will be most convenient? More than thirty years ago the then Director of my Institute in York identified a need for refresher courses, mid-career, call them what you will, in which information could be given and there was an opportunity for an exchange of information, experience and gossip. It was, I think, an excellent formula, though obviously limited because of the relatively short time, normally five days. Nevertheless, over the years these courses have been a valuable means by which a greater knowledge of conservation (not only that, of course, but now I am confining myself to conservation) could be acquired by a very large number of practitioners. Similarly, the one-week course organised annually by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings has usefully

made available their ideas on repair techniques to many architects, builders and clerks of works. The success of these short courses in York confirmed a need for longer training courses, which was answered for a few years at the Institute of Archaeology in London until its unfortunate demise in 1969. The gap was filled by two full-time, one-year courses at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh and my own Institute in York, and by a different pattern offered at Manchester, a university which has long had a reputation for its studies in vernacular architecture. More recently a number of part-time courses have been set up at Leicester, Liverpool and London; and only last year one was launched at Bristol with a more popular and wider appeal. This is the situation at present in the United Kingdom, one which offers a wide range of short courses and seminars, regularly at York and occasionally elsewhere, backed up by a choice of part-time and full-time. It would however be misleading to suggest that everything is perfect. Post-graduate education demands serious commitment which is not always possible when the course-member is also engaged in practice and elects to undertake a part-time form of training. Full-time education necessitates considerable financial and personal sacrifices, but because of that the level of hard work and dedication is high. Nevertheless, the numbers on such courses are inevitably representing a very small proportion of the building professions.

My final comments are offered as a result of having spent ten intensely interesting and fruitful years as Director of Conservation Studies in the University of York. I have always emphasised the importance of a strongly practical basis to post-graduate education. Nothing is easier (or more enjoyable) than to talk endlessly about philosophies and ideas; but nothing is more frustrating to people from practice who have already identified what they are seeking from their studies (and this can apply even to a one-week long course). Indeed, it was because we believed that the course-member should play a positive role that we took the decision to make a requirement (unless there were exceptional circumstances) of a minimum of four years experience after qualification or graduation. This eliminates the perpetual student who cannot face up to the real world, and it means that course-members can build on their own experience. We believe the course is of far greater value to them at that stage, when they can often offer valuable contributions of their own as well as taking part in discussions based on real experience. They are able to make fuller use of the advice and experience obtainable from the visiting lecturers, and they are able to collaborate in working out what are often individual courses of study built around the programmed seminars, lectures and visits.

If one tries to analyse the basic elements desirable in a post-graduate

course, I think they are the same as the five I gave earlier; but obviously the emphasis is different from an undergraduate course, and to them must be added a much greater study of techniques and a new dimension, that of management. A post-graduate course, unlike an undergraduate, is not a taught course: it is an enlargement of experience, which needs to be organised at a realistic, practical level. It must be of direct value in the course-members' future careers, and I regard ours at York as a direct service to the building professions rather than an academic course. For that reason, we use a different standard of assessment for candidates than we do for those who apply to do research for a higher degree. So far as possible, I steer the dissertation subjects away from philosophy or purely historical research towards realistic studies of situations and materials. I include as many site visits as possible, meeting as many active architects, planners, conservation officers and craftsmen as we can; and I ensure that during the year there will be an opportunity to experience the tools and materials of the mason, joiner and plasterer. On the whole, we have decided against group work on a project. It takes up more time than its value justifies, and it is too easy for participants to find themselves doing what they know most about.

We have always believed that the role of the resident staff is primarily tutorial, and that the teaching must be contributed from outside by those who are actively engaged in practice and as up to date as possible. Normally there are visits from around sixty architects, planners, craftsmen and technical specialists each year, and many remain in touch with some of the course-members and help with expert guidance during the preparation of their dissertations during the third term. Valuable as post-graduate courses are, I believe they fall short of their full potential if they are not set in a wider context. It is debatable how far there can be interaction with an undergraduate school; theoretically the undergraduates should benefit, but I cannot see any real advantages for the post-graduates in such a situation. Our own belief in York, which we have been able to put into practice, is that active full-time research should be undertaken simultaneously with post-graduate studies. This forms a source of detailed investigation and information which can be incorporated in the teaching as a continuous contribution.

The supervision of research with a conservation content is the joint responsibility of my colleague, the Director of Research, and myself. This has great advantages; in the first place, I learn a lot, but much more important is the opportunity the course-members have for contact with active research. The results can be transmitted to them at intervals, and there are endless opportunities for informal exchange of information. Depending on the subject of the research (which is all sponsored), we find the circle of

people involved in the Institute's work is always increasing. During the last few years we have worked on a number of subjects centred on the re-use or fuller use of existing buildings, and on the problem of under-use of upper storeys in historic town centres: we have issued reports on these and on the study of the criteria used in designating Conservation Areas. We have published a bibliography of the literature of conservation, and will shortly be issuing a report on how conservation policies work in Local Government. Our important research on paint and colour in the eighteenth century will be available in 1982, and we are at present preparing a report on the recording and conservation of historic gardens and landscapes. All this illustrates how active research reinforces teaching and helps to maintain close contact with the professional world; so does practice, and in our Institute we also have an architectural project office as well as a photogrammetric survey unit.

If this paper has concentrated in the later section on my own work in York, it is because that is where my fullest experience of education for conservation has been gained. I have been privileged to teach elsewhere, in the United Kingdom, at ICCROM, and in many countries overseas; everywhere I have found a growing activity in conservation work and a lack of trained professionals with the knowledge to undertake it, but a number of centres now exist and it is on their experience that future educational proposals should be constructed. Nevertheless, in conclusion I would like to stress again my strong belief that the past is a part of the present. Obedience to Ruskin's two duties, "to render the architecture of the day, historical" and "to preserve ... the architecture of past ages" are not dichotomous, but a joint responsibility to the future. The one is as necessary as the other, as our educational priorities have yet to acknowledge.

NOM: DEREK LINSTRUM - Directeur du Département de la Conservation, Institut des Hautes Etudes d'Architecture, Université de York - Royaume-Uni.

THEME: PROFESSION

TITRE: UNE FORMATION POUR LA CONSERVATION.

RESUME:

S'il convient de considérer la conservation comme une nouvelle responsabilité de notre profession, il faut en même temps admettre l'importance de l'influence des traditions culturelles et des origines de chacun sur la formation des diverses attitudes en la matière. Il est toutefois possible, moyennant une certaine systématisation, de classer les pays par zones culturelles ayant des types d'architecture similaires et utilisant les mêmes genres de matériaux; ce qui nous amènerait à prévoir la création d'un certain nombre de centres de formation de spécialistes de la conservation, reliés entre eux de manière à permettre des échanges de connaissance et une aide réciproque.

Mais que faut-il enseigner, et quand? L'auteur donne un résumé du contenu des réponses à deux questionnaires envoyés aux écoles d'architecture du premier cycle au Royaume-Uni et essaye d'en déduire la place faite à « la conservation » dans les programmes. Suivent des suggestions relatives au contenu essentiel d'un enseignement de cette discipline: 1) Documentation; 2) Pratique de la construction; 3) Techniques d'évaluation; 4) Histoire; 5) Conception d'ouvrages originaux. Ces différentes matières sont examinées d'une manière assez détaillée et en rapport avec les travaux de conservation entrepris à l'heure actuelle par de nombreux architectes non-spécialisés.

L'auteur se préoccupe ensuite des études du deuxième cycle et au-delà, en se fondant sur l'expérience acquise à l'Institut des Hautes Etudes d'Architecture à l'Université de York, mais en se plaçant dans un contexte plus généralement national. Il se pose la question d'une formation à plein temps ou à temps partiel et celui du choix du personnel enseignant, tout en dégageant les besoins respectifs des élèves des deux niveaux et en soulignant la nécessité d'un enseignement pratique au niveau du deuxième cycle. Le système préconisé comme représentant l'idéal comporterait différents cours théoriques de courte et de longue durée, alliés à des programmes de recherches subventionnées, des travaux de documentation et des travaux pratiques de conservation. En conclusion: les différentes professions portent une responsabilité collective vis-à-vis des générations à venir, elles doivent préserver

ce que le passé contient de meilleur et — pour citer John Ruskin — « rendre historique l'architecture contemporaine »; deux tâches qui, comme ne l'ont pas encore admis ceux qui arrêtent l'ordre des priorités dans notre enseignement, sont aussi nécessaires l'une que l'autre.

NAME: DEREK LINSTRUM - PhD, FSA, RIBA - Director of Conservation Studies, Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies, University of York - United Kingdom.

SUBJECT: PROFESSION

TITLE: EDUCATION FOR CONSERVATION.

SUMMARY:

Conservation must be seen as a new professional responsibility, but it must also be accepted that attitudes are bound to be conditioned by cultural and personal backgrounds. Yet a certain amount of rationalisation would identify which countries in the world share a common culture with similar building types and materials; and this would suggest a number of linked centres of education for conservation which would provide an opportunity for mutual help and the exchange of research findings.

But what should be taught, and when? This paper summarises the results of two questionnaires sent to undergraduate schools of architecture in the United Kingdom and attempts to assess to what extent "conservation" is included in the curricula. It then suggests that the essential ingredients in such education would be: (1) Recording, (2) Building performance, (3) Assessments, (4) History and (5) Design. These are considered in some detail and related to the conservation work undertaken today in many general (and not specialised) practices.

The paper then turns to postgraduate education, drawing on the experience of the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies in the University of York, but setting this in the UK context. The alternatives of full-time and part-time training are considered, and the manner in which such courses should be staffed. The different requirements of undergraduate and postgraduate students are identified, especially emphasising the practical content required by the latter. The ideal pattern suggested is a combination of short and long courses, closely linked with sponsored research, recording and practice; and the final message is that the professions have a joint responsibility to the future — to preserve the best of the past and (in the words of John Ruskin) 'to render the architecture of the day, historical', the one is as necessary as the other, as our educational priorities have yet to acknowledge.

NOMBRE: DEREK LINSTRUM - PhD, FSA, RIBA - Director de Estudios de Conservación, Instituto de Estudios Avanzados de Arquitectura, Universidad de York - Reino Unido.

TEMA: PROFESION

TITULO: EDUCACION PARA LA CONSERVACION.

SUMARIO:

La Conservación debe ser considerada como una nueva responsabilidad, y las diversas actitudes que se observan, están sujetas al condicionamiento que imponen los antecedentes culturales y personales. Sin embargo, un breve razonamiento nos llevaría a identificar países que en el mundo comparten una cultura común, con tipos de edificios y materiales de construcción semejantes. Se sugiere para estas áreas de cultura común, la creación de centros de educación para la Conservación vinculados a través de programas de apoyo mutuo e intercambio de experiencias.

¿Pero qué es lo que debe enseñarse, y cuándo? Esta ponencia sintetiza los resultados obtenidos en dos encuestas realizadas en las escuelas de arquitectura del Reino Unido, e intenta evaluar la extensión de los conceptos de Conservación incluidos en las diversas curriculas. Opina después, que los elementos esenciales que deben integrar un programa de educación en Conservación son: (1) Documentación, (2) Experiencia en edificación, (3) Técnicas de evaluación, (4) Historia y (5) Diseño. Todos estos puntos se analizan con cierto detalle, en relación con el trabajo de Conservación que se realiza hoy en día, en la práctica generalizada, que no siempre es especializada.

La ponencia se ocupa después, de la educación a nivel de posgrado, aludiendo a las experiencias del Instituto de Estudios Avanzados de Arquitectura en la Universidad de York, considerando el contexto cultural del Reino Unido. Las alternativas de adiestramiento a tiempo completo o a tiempo parcial se analizan, junto a la manera de elegir al personal docente. Se identifican los requerimientos distintos, propios de estudiantes a nivel de licenciatura y a nivel de posgrado, haciendo énfasis en la necesidad de trabajo práctico para los segundos. Se sugiere como esquema ideal, la combinación de cursos cortos y largos vinculados con investigación subvencionada, documentación y trabajo práctico. El mensaje final va dirigido a las diversas profesiones, que tienen una responsabilidad compartida hacia el futuro, para preservar lo mejor del pasado, y (en palabras de John Ruskin) « para hacer histórica la arquitectura del presente »; lo uno es tan necesario como lo otro y así tendrán que reconocerlo los estudios de prioridades educacionales.

Имя : ДЕРЕК ЛИНДСТРОМ, Доктор Философии

Директор Курса Консервативных Наук, Институт Передовых
Архитектурных Изучений, Университет города Йорка, Англия.

Предмет : ПРОФЕССИЯ

Название : ОБУЧЕНИЕ НАУКЕ СОХРАНЕНИЯ

Краткое Описание :

Науку о сохранении нужно рассматривать как новую профессиональную ответственность, но нужно также согласиться с тем что различные подходы к ней должны быть обусловлены культурным или личным прошлым. Но, несмотря на это, некоторая часть рационализации помогла бы устансвить которые страны мира имеют общую культуру с одинаковыми типами домов и материалов; это бы подало мысль к организации центров для обучения науке о сохранении связанных между собой и которые доставили бы возможность изысканий.

Но чему нужно обучать, и когда? Настоящее сообщение резюмирует результаты полученные при помощи двух опросных листов посланным двум довыпускным школам Великобритании. Вопросы пытаются определить до которой степени "сохранение" включено в программу обучения.

Они об'ясняют, что главные составные части такого обучения должны быть следующими: 1) Записи, 2) Архитектурные достижения, 3) Итоги, 4) История и 5) Проект. Все это рассматривается в детали и связано с работой по сохранению, которая предпринимается во многих общих (а не специализированных) отраслях.

Сообщение потом переходит к обучению после выпуска, на основании опыта Института Выдающихся Архитектурных Наук Йоркского Университета, но переводя это на английские понятия. Рассматриваются альтернативы тренировки длящейся или целый день или пол-дня и ищется способ по которому нужно будет выбирать персонал для этих курсов. Определяют различные нужды студентов до и после выпуска и в особенности подчеркивается практическая сторона нужная этим последним. Идеальным примером может служить комбинация продолжительных и коротких курсов с субсидированными исследованиями, записями и с практикой; окончательный вывод будет состоять в том, что профессии имеют общую ответственность по отношению к будущему - сохранить лучшее имевшееся в прошедшем и, по словам Джона Раскина, "сделать архитектуру наших дней исторической" т.к. таковая будет так же нужна как и другая, факт с которым наши воспитательные приоритеты должны будут согласоваться.

NOME: DEREK LINSTRUM - Direttore del Dipartimento della Conservazione, Institute of Advanced Architecture - University of York - Gran Bretagna.

TEMA: PROFESSIONE

TITOLO: EDUCAZIONE PER LA CONSERVAZIONE.

SOMMARIO:

Sebbene la Conservazione debba essere vista come una nuova responsabilità professionale, bisogna tuttavia riconoscere che le attitudini verso questa disciplina sono destinate ad essere condizionate dalle tradizioni culturali personali e generali. Eppure, mediante una certa razionalizzazione si potrebbero identificare quelle nazioni nel mondo che abbiano una comune cultura, degli edifici simili per tipi e materiali. Ciò contribuirebbe alla creazione di un certo numero di centri di formazione per la conservazione, in grado di fornire un aiuto reciproco ed uno scambio dei risultati di ricerca.

Ma cosa dovrebbe essere insegnato e quando? Questo saggio riassume i risultati di due questionari inviati ad alcune scuole pre-universitarie di architettura in Gran Bretagna e prova a valutare fino a che punto « la conservazione » sia inclusa nei curricula. Suggestisce poi che gli ingredienti essenziali in tale formazione siano: 1) Registrazione; 2) Pratica della costruzione; 3) Valutazione; 4) Storia; 5) Progettazione. Queste materie sono considerate dettagliatamente e messe in relazione con il lavoro di conservazione intrapreso oggi da molti architetti non specializzati. L'autore si rivolge poi alla formazione post-laurea, sulla base dell'esperienza dell'Istituto di Studi Architettonici avanzati dell'Università di York, ma ponendola nel contesto della Gran Bretagna. Vengono considerate le alternative dell'addestramento a tempo pieno e parziale, insieme alla scelta del personale insegnante. Vengono identificati i diversi requisiti degli studenti pre- e post-universitari, enfatizzando la necessità dell'esperienza pratica richiesta per questi ultimi. L'esempio ideale suggerito è una combinazione di corsi a breve e lungo termine, strettamente uniti da una ricerca responsabilizzata, documentazione e lavoro pratico di conservazione.

Per concludere: le professioni hanno una doppia responsabilità verso il futuro: preservare il meglio del passato e (citando le parole di John Ruskin) rendere « storica » l'architettura odierna, poiché l'una è necessaria come l'altra. Purtroppo tali priorità formative debbono ancora essere riconosciute.