I would like to thank Bülent Tuna, the President of your Chamber of Architects, and Prof. Dr. Haluk Pamir, Dean of your Faculty of Architecture here at the Middle Eastern Technical University (METU), help open this important conference. As the Executive Editor of the Journal of Architectural Education, I join with Jack Pringle, the past-President of the RIBA, and Adrian Joyce of the Architectural Council of Europe, to speak on the theme of this gathering, “Continuity and Change in Architectural Education.”

It is particularly appropriate for us to meet on this topic, in this elegant building, on this historic site. Here, in the reinvented landscape of this campus honored by the Aga Khan Award, and in this landmark Brutalist building designed by Behruz Çinici, on what was once the arid rise and fall of a humorless countryside absent vegetation, we can register the conflation of the continuity and change. These are not abstract academic ideas; here they are tangible, visceral, and haptic. The remaking of this once-naked topography is now a verdant small city of over 20,000 students and faculty. We are immersed here in the melding of cultural traditions uninterrupted, and the simultaneous desire for that which is new and provokes. The buildings, gardens, landscape, and carefully constructed views, that comprise the home of The Faculty of Architecture, is living history. We find here preserved what was once an avant-garde Western architectural ethos along with the traditions of Ottoman and Persian gardens. As we speak today, in this complexly constructed place, we enjoy to fruits of the highest form of artifice – a topos of
civility that daily demonstrates the seamless conflation of continuity and change in culture and in architecture.

As the Editor of the *JAE*, published by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture in the United States, I have been asked to speak on “the regulation of academic environments and on the history of the interactions between *JAE*, and the American architectural academia.” The latter part of this task, addressing the relation between the *JAE* and American architectural education is by far the easier task, particularly in relation to the topic of “continuity and change.” Amidst the rapidly changing landscape of architectural discourse and practice that we all have witnessed during the past few decades, in North America and around the world, it is increasingly difficult to distinguish between that which is worth continuing and that which is need of change. It is in no small part that because of this, my Editorial in the first issue of the *JAE* for which I was responsible as the new Executive Editor, is titled: “*Plus ça change, plus ça change*.” We, in our discipline, live amongst a feast of words and a heretofore-unknown proliferation of images. They lie, piled high on the table before us. The question is how does one sort through these words and images? How do we make from this a feast of words and images worth eating? And no less important, who is invited to this table to share in this feast?

Architectural journals, such as the *JAE* and *Mimarklik*, published by your Chamber of Architects, have a responsibility to help us sort through these difficult questions, to help frame them, and place them politically, culturally, and ethically.

While professional magazines for architecture and landscape, such as *Mimarklik*, have existed since the 19th century, the practice of publishing academic journals for architectural educators,
particularly of the blind peer-reviewed type such as the *Journal of Architectural Education*, is relatively new. Founded in 1946, the JAE is the oldest continuously published journal of its kind in the world. Moreover, it was begun at a critical moment, not only for US-based educators, but internationally as it was part of a much larger phenomenon – the shift from “mass communication” to “mass media.” The two are different not in degree, but in kind. This is no small thing. In the post-war environment, particularly in the west, we witnessed not only the rise of new technologies developed during WWII, but also more importantly the rise of the phenomenon of what the French cultural critic Jacque Ellul termed “the technological society” – which is also the title of his book on the topic. Indigenous cultures all over our planet, after 1945, began an incessant decline, giving way to the rise of a technique-driven civilization. The ‘why” of a thing soon became far less important than the “how.” Once the how was developed, only then was the question of “for whom” asked. This is the rise of “technique.” Unlike technology, which is as old as is artifice, “technique” is a self-replicating mechanism. The lifeblood of this machine is what Ellul and the philosopher and social critic (and mentor of mine) Ivan Illich called the invention of “need” wherein operations, materials, and methods are developed independent of cultural specificity. The rise of the International Style (that Johnson, Hitchcock, and Mumford canonized in their 1932 exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and the post-war invention of the muti-city, multi-country architectural office such as SOM, HOK, are all children of this same mother.

To continue this mechanistic analogy, architectural journals such as the JAE, or *Architectural Research Quarterly* in the UK, are closer to barometers than they are to GPS devices – they seem less to direct than to measure, offering more a reflection on, rather than direction to, architectural
discourse. They do not “regulate” so much as they monitor, and at their best, provide critical insight and cultural grounding for the incessant production of digitally self-replicating objects, invented independent of place or people. Until very recently, this has always been the nature of architectural discourse. Since Vitruvius, and probably before, it is only when architects come to a place in their work, an impasse that cannot be resolved through design alone, that they turn to writing, often in conjunction with design. Architects write to respond to a question, a help resolve a problem, or to redress a wrong.

Until recently, architectural educators, whose work is grounded in the discipline of architecture, operated somewhat parallel of the strictures of practice as the academe, at its best, is a place wherein ideas and methods are invented and tested – where pure research is fostered, open-ended questions are entertained, to expand our knowledge. Historically, we have provided this service. This too is changing. In universities across this ever-flattening globe, Colleges of Architecture such as the one here at METU, invariably are at or very near the bottom of the list of money raised from external granting sources. This places ever more pressure on architectural education to partner with industries to find substantial funding sources, not in the tens of thousands but in the tens of millions of dollars. If one thinks that this is just the natural course of things, then there is little to concern us here. Yet, all funding comes with costs, hidden and not so hidden. When the building industry provides funds to promote “sustainable architecture,” when software companies provide deeply discounted advances in digital software to sate the insatiable appetite of the burgeoning digitati, or when one of the many armatures of the military industrial complex funds a project or research, there is a cost. In accepting these funds in support of academe, the “why” of architectural design, the “how,” and even the “for whom,” must inevitably be affected.
Academic journals, quite unlike professional magazines, have the opportunity, and I would argue the responsibility, to act as the barometers of these trends, asking the uncomfortable questions, offering insightful critiques of that which most commercial magazines fear not.

In the United States, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) has something called the Knowledge Committee. Laudably, every year they award firms or individuals who, ostensibly, help raise awareness of issues, helped expand or publish knowledge of issues and trends fundamentally important to the body politic of our profession and our discipline. Yet, it is critical not to conflate expanding our discipline’s knowledge base with the proliferation of information. Similar to the difference between “mass communication” and “mass media,” the two are different not in degree, but in kind. This is what led me, and my editorial board, to devote the entirety of the first issue of the JAE for which I was responsible as its new Executive Editor, the September 2007 issue, to the theme of architectural design as Scholarship, research, and inquiry. This issue marks the 60th anniversary of the ACSA’s publication of the Journal of Architectural Education and, not coincidentally, the 150th anniversary of the American Institute of Architects.

The Alabama Polytechnic Institute published the first issue of JAE on behalf of the ACSA, which at that time listed thirty-six member-schools. Today, approximately 120 schools of architecture comprise the ACSA. The first issue of JAE, edited by Turpin Bannister uncritically embraced the scientific method and advancements made in the materials and methods of building technologies developed during and since WWII. Moreover, it was the first of several issues to focus on the role and definition of architectural research in relation to academe and the profession. While Bannister (not to be confused with Sir Bannister Fletcher), attempted to
establish, among other things, a brief history of academically based architectural research (1927-1947), in “The Architect Looks at Research,” Walter A. Taylor explored what may lie ahead. In particular, he interrogated the potential relation of, for example, a newly created U.S. Government agency formed under the aegis of “The National Science Foundation Act of 1946,” (known internationally today as simply the powerful NSF) to potential research in schools of architecture. Taylor, then the American Institute of Architect’s Director of Education and Research, limited the scope and focus of architectural research to new developments in materials testing and to the “how” and the “what” of materials and methods of construction – assiduously avoiding the “why” of things. And while Taylor argues for “advancing knowledge,” the goal of his department was information sharing “to report findings according to their merit and immediate usefulness to the architect,” largely focusing on the requirements of “shelter” and “human occupancy” in accord with the broader goals of CIAM in a post-war culture. Taylor concludes his four-part program for “The Dissemination of Findings” with a call for increased collaboration among government, universities, private research laboratories, and the AIA with the proviso: “The success of the above proposed program of research in and for the architectural profession will depend to considerable extent upon the interest, initiative, and cooperation of the schools of architecture.” Yes, ostensibly the future of the American architectural profession was, apparently, the responsibility of the schools – of the discipline. Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.

Since 1947, the “medium” increasingly has become the message. While the number of “traditional” journals and magazines has dwindled in the United States – Architectural Forum, Progressive Architecture, Architecture, and Design Book Review to name only a few – other
well-known avenues have opened and expanded both the opportunity and the nature of architectural discourse and practice. Never before have there been more analog and digital outlets for publishing in this discipline. Yet, just as history has taught us that less is not always more, neither is more, per force better. The proliferation of monographs, boutique journals, web-based publications, and the blogosphere reflects rapidly shifting values within the culture of our discipline that demonstrates daily the difference between, to paraphrase Francis Bacon, the unfettered access to free speech, and having something to say. Distinguishing between the two is a nettlesome proposition.

As the JAE begins its seventh decade, its editors and Editorial Board will continue to provide a singular opportunity to architectural educators and to those who operate around academe’s periphery – to publish well-vetted articles directed to the core audience of architectural educators: those who teach design as practice, as history, as theory, and as criticism. In response to this, the JAE Editorial Board has changed the two general categories under which most manuscripts are submitted. It is this change that largely prompted the focus of the current theme issue and the other three theme issues forthcoming in Volume 61. The designation “Scholarship of Design” replaces “Scholarly Articles,” and what were once called “Design Articles” are now “Design as Scholarship” The reasons for this shift in nomenclature are several. By marking one group of articles as “scholarly,” and the other not, sends precisely the wrong message at precisely the wrong time in our discipline’s trajectory. Moreover, it reflects the JAE’s Editorial Board’s desire to acknowledge that scholarship and inquiry are not limited to the long-standing rigors of the scientific method promoted in this journal’s first issue. Similarly, we need to move beyond the discursive limits of our discipline, adopted from strictures of late nineteenth- and
early twentieth-century art and architectural history. This is, in part, why the cover of this issue is white, without images. We chose this “White Album” look, (with apologies to The Beatles and Apple Records) not to inflate the importance of its content, but rather to signify a change of direction for the journal that parallels transformation in architectural education already in motion.

Articles published under the rubric of “Scholarship of Design” cover a wide range of topics – history, theory, criticism, representation, the techniques of construction, professional practice, etc. “Design as Scholarship” articles must demonstrate an exploration of innovative buildings or projects ranging from academic-based studios, to installations and exhibitions. The key schema that binds and by which these varied submissions are judged, is how well they explore critical issues in contemporary design, practice, education, and discourse. The JAE seeks work that demonstrates architectural design as a distinct mode of critical inquiry, adding to the discipline’s body of knowledge. Moreover, to create a datum for more vigorous dialogue and debate within the limits of a quarterly publication, the Book Review section (re-named “Reviews”) is expanding to include critiques of buildings, projects, installations, exhibitions, web sites, and symposia, in addition to documents.

Yet, as much as we try to bring things together in a cohesive manner between the covers of our journal, architectural discourse may never have been quite as broad and balkanized as it is today. We operate amidst incessantly emerging new materials and methods, a robust array of innovative digital software and hardware, combined with the concerns of architects who in good conscience provide basic services to victims of the vicissitudes of disasters – natural or human-made – in an
economically flattened and environmentally warming world. If all architecture is political and all politics is local, how can the architect’s productive task take root in local soil while using techniques of design and production disconnected from time and place?

The *JAE*, as should any serious academic journal, must document these events and provoke responses. In North America, the pressures of the profession to further instrumentalize the discipline is once again as pervasive and Mr. Taylor put it six decades ago in the first issue of the *JAE*. Yet, for the discipline to be any use at all to not simply the culture of architecture, but to culture, it must maintain a degree of autonomy that permits it both critique and propel architectural production – both design as scholarship and the scholarship of design. *Plus ça change, plus ça change.*

In several periodicals of late, academic and professional, the death of architectural theory has been either enthusiastically celebrated or simply referred to as a “given.” There seems to have been a death in the family without so much as a proper viewing of the body or a burials service. More ironic still, many of those who have written on the death of theory are those who continue to practice architectural theory. Can anyone wonder why the influence of ideas coming out of schools, independent of applied technologies, registers little with those fully engaged in practice, fully disengaged from academe?

Continuity in architectural education is demonstrated in several ways. In the studio, as architectural initiates involves themselves in the making of architecture, they enter into an
anamnesis, a remaking through memory – the intent of which is to reveal a more perfect condition, placed within the cultural space we construct through praxis. The place (or as Aldo Rossi put it, the locus) of this anamnesis is the activity of constructing, i.e., primarily building and drawing. Through these constructions, the speculative architectural project emerges as the recorded history of the coincidence of imitations (of actions) and invitations (to action). Within the discipline of architecture, all activities of making present the opportunity of leaving a trace of the conceptual making (disegno interno) within the representations we construct (disegno esterno), thereby creating a mimesis of the architectural project at hand.

The place of architectural speculation that should be at the core of any viable academic journal. Architectural speculation is not limited to drawing and building alone. When we consider the possibility of building architecture that presents a memory of the making (internal and external) within the aspect of its form and the structure of its space, the mimetic capacity of an architectural project, independent of utility yet placed within human actions, is further extended and enhanced. Deep within the activity of architecture is the locus of its double. And while it may appear that in the end all we achieve is crafted form, it is its double that persists. It is through architecture and its double that we mediate those universals that substantiate our place in the world. We do this through a disciplined practice, and through the careful practice of our discipline. This is what we – the educators, practitioners, and scholars of architectural production – bring to the table. The key question of how does one balance continuity with change remains an open question. So too is the no less important question of who is invited to the table. Who participates in this feast of words and galaxy of images that comprise the discipline of architecture today. These are the kinds of open-ended questions that journals such as the JAE,
and Faculties of Architecture such as the one here at METU, remain responsible to ask. For we are the barometers of continuity and change. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*