

THE DILEMMA OF TEACHING THE INTANGIBLE

Rodrigo Queiroz

The first two articles in this issue approach distinctly the teaching. "The professional speech and teaching in the formation of the architect and urbanist in São Paulo: 1948-1962" by Taiana Car Vidotto and Ana Maria Reis Goes Monteiro, approaches the almost simultaneous changes in curricular structure of FAU and professional assignment of the architect and urbanist, which reverberate in architectural education and the profession in other regions of Brazil. Sara Miriam Goldchmit, Maria Cecilia Loschiavo dos Santos and Luciene Ribeiro dos Santos, authors of "Odiléa Toscano: visual design, public spaces and education", trace the plural profile of this teacher who has dedicated 26 years to the Visual Design disciplines at FAU, and have a consistent work in the areas of illustration and mural.

These two articles are thinking about the intricate relationship between teaching and learning of an activity identified by its personal character. Within the building design of teaching two informations are necessary for a first approach of the exercise: the place and the function, which has a detailed version of in program. We could say the binomial "place / program" is for architecture as well as the binomial "genre / theme" is for painting or for sculpture, if we restrict, of course, its academic component, which also presupposes the theme as meaning necessary for its interpretation and the gender as index of your classification.

Beyond the awareness about place and the function of the building, learning about project considers the study and the incorporation of projective procedures often translated in schematic forms, more conceptual, almost codified, or more literal, as diagrams in which the spaces are organized by functional areas. The specialization of the project from drawings or three-dimensional approaches, allows the understanding of the idea as a formal concept in which it is possible assimilate the first decision of the author, as a starting point from which you can follow to the next steps of the project.

At the university, the project is the result of a dialogue between the author and his interlocutors. The teacher has to conduct relations between the interpretation of specific informations, the use of analytical instruments and the presentation of possible solutions, due to the reflection on precisely of the informations and instruments.

The simple synthesis between the binomial components "place / program" is not enough to measuring the pertinence of the project as a language. The development of a first resulting formal argument of strict interpretation of the

program and the characteristics of the place makes the project, often, the ordinary combination between the elements necessary for its own justification.

However, we must consider that the project is also the intangible transformation of the concept in image. If the formal concept relies on the logic and the reality to be justified, the image comes from a creative process, often empirical and subjective. Thus, it is distressing to persistent pedagogy based on contradictory attempt at rationalization of subjectivity. It is a teaching model condemned of the status of hostage of a language whose appearance belongs, of course, to the field of art and not the reason. As much as modern pedagogy repress the authorial form, all projected form brings its authorial charge, be it modeling, be it characterized by an original gesture.

The modern constitution, characterized, even today, from manipulation of a formal grammar already incorporated into the architectural design process and the student's imaginary as a way that is exempt of the necessity of justify itself as language, because it is a disciplinary way so paradoxically "naturalized" which seems to dispense with any argument to justify it.

Faced with the modern not as a rupture, but as tradition, teaching the project still seems to insist in assigning a judgment of logical value to an illogical thinking process and why not, irrational. More complex than give a pedagogical structure to learning about a sensitive work is to assign a value to the result of this work. I am talking about assessment. It is common that control of this process corroborates in quantitative factors such as the requirement of graphic elements needed for adequate understanding of the project and its development. Often, part of the evaluation criteria is based on the verification of graphic elements. However, believe that the quality of the project can be checked from a purely quantitative answer is a mistake.

It is normal to student frustration that has all the required elements and still receive a rating below his expectations. This happens due to mistake to measure or evaluate with quantitative instruments the result of an intellectual exercise translated into a form. These quantitative elements are fundamental and necessary for communication and further evaluation of the project, but not enough.

There is a blind spot in the constant attempt to systematize learning about a skill that develops from a knowledge that, despite operating on a concrete base, is a consequence of a particular reflection, intangible. The moral brake inherited of modern movement eliminates any evidence to suggest an avoidable authorial

license, falsely understood as undesirable subjection to architecture as looking like a image. In this sense, confront architecture as a language and find mechanisms to discussion about this in studio for its adequate understanding is one of the urgent challenges of architecture teaching.

With this more authorial editorial, alternative to the usual review of all articles, I fulfill my period as Editor in Chief of Revista Pós. I appreciate the support and dialogue of Lina Rosa, Paola Santos, José Tadeu de Azevedo Maia and especially of Prof. Maria Lucia Caira Gitahy, and I wish a good job to Prof. Leandro Medrano, new Editor in Chief of Revista Pós, which certainly perform this function with absolute competence.

Good reading.

Rodrigo Queiro
roqueiro@usp.br