Why and How 'To Do Science'?
On the Often Ambiguous Relationship between Architecture and the Social Sciences in France in the Wake of May '68

Jean-Louis Violeau

Is it necessary to recall that the humanities in general and sociology in particular have experienced a veritable glory hour in France, lasting one entire decade, from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s? Perhaps paradoxically, this is better remembered outside France. The period, beginning around 1966, was the heyday of structuralism, with the publication of Les Mots et les choses, with Roland Barthes' response to the Sorbonnard Raymond Picard via his Critique et vérité, and with Lacan publishing the first volume of his 'Écrits'; it ended in 1974, once the shockwaves of the oil crisis became overbearing. Paul (Jean-Pierre Léaud), interviewer for l'IFOP (Institut français d'opinion publique [French Institute of Public Opinion]) can still be called to mind, for example, in Godard's 1966 'Masculin Féminin', chatting up Madeleine (Chantal Goya) as an undercover agent of sociology, oscillating between a question about democracy and commenting 'I like how you boogie'. And so here you are today, looking at a forty-year-old issue of the journal of the 'Internationale Situationniste' which reproduced a double-page of the lifestyle magazine 'Lui', presenting the panoply of the 'modern man' of the period; the first volume of the works of Marx in the édition de la Pléïade by Gallimard well situated in the midst of all the household goods and other symbols of consumerism of the 1960s. From a certain point of view, the convergence that took place in France - and elsewhere - between architecture and social sciences, shall we say a structuralist-Marxist convergence, profoundly lacks originality. This convergence was merely an ephemeral inscription into the pace of

the dominant intellectual mood. But this does not prevent the encounter in architecture, as much as in other intellectual universes from being active underground, despite the disappointments and even the disillusions, and despite the voluntary silence about the mutual fertilisations that could have blossomed.

The beginnings of architectural research in France after May '68

Around the time of the 'events' of May '68, the 'architectural research' in France posited itself as a direct challenge to the education of the 'Beaux-Arts', to the latter's insulation from academic disciplines, in particular from human and social sciences, and the absence of a critical dimension required by any 'scientific' approach.[1] Once the 'Beaux-Arts' education `was dismantled, the question regarding the legitimacy of theory was formulated in the course of the creation of a new pedagogical project with, in particular, the recovery of research as a motor of renewing knowledge, and as a key strategy of resisting the downgrading of the profession. The state therefore put into place incentive policies, regularly issuing calls for projects and generously financing architects and researchers. These policies came at a time in which the architects and researchers were already struggling with the architectural object, and demanded the setting up of a framework for an 'architectural research', a task primarily directed to sociologists.

CORDA (Comité de la Recherche et du Développement en Architecture [Committee for Research

and Development in Architecture]) was founded on the 10th of February 1972, following a directive of the Minister of Cultural Affairs, Jacques Duhamel, expressing the wish that architecture 'embrace research which presents rigour in its methods, wholesomeness in its demands and is efficacious in its results'. This was the founding moment. At that time, Philippe Boudon, Bernard Lassus, Nicole and Antoine Haumont as well as Henri Raymond participated in the preliminary discussions. While the work of Henri Lefebvre, via his students - including Henri Raymond, Nicole and Antoine Haumont, already mentioned above - would clearly mark the start of architectural research, his great rival, Paul-Henry Chombart de Lauwe, was held out of the way. In a biographical interview with Thierry Paquot in the 1990s, de Lauwe stressed the existence of many disagreements with Lefebvre (and sometimes even invoked the 'theft' of concepts): 'two parallel routes which never had the opportunity to rejoin'.[2] Moreover, he has remarked with some bitterness that he had been deliberately sidelined from the introduction of humanities in architectural schools after '68: 'the architects of the Communist Party were generally opposed to me, like certain researchers of the non-communist left, not because of my political ideas, but under the influence of two or three amongst them who have spoken nonsense about my so-called functionalism or humanism'.[3]

The creation of CORDA arose from the initial decision of Edmond Michelet, Minister for Cultural Affairs, in December 1969, to put in place an architectural research sector integrating the institutions concerned.[4] As a result, a ministerial commission presided over by mathematician André Lichnerowicz[5] was charged with elaborating propositions, submitted in 1970 and spelled out in an official memo in 1971 (the official foundation of CORDA). Supported by the new Institut de l'environnement [Institute of the Environment], created in 1969 around several former members of the Bauhaus in Ulm, Claude Schnaidt the most prominent among them, CORDA

began to function with a certain administrative flexibility. It thus contributed to creating an 'environment' for researchers, embracing, in numerous occasions, foreign experts and exchanges, translating fundamental works, aiding the publication of research and publishing a specialist journal, and last but not least, supporting, in collaboration with the Plan Construction,[6] architectural experimentation and its evaluation.

The year 1974 marks therefore a turn for French research with the launch of CORDA's first general call for tenders, aimed at specifying and outlining the field of the nascent architectural research.[7] The call was articulated in four sub-programs: theory, epistemology, education and architecture; operational processes and architectural conception; the integration of architecture in its environment; the system of production by social users of architecture. The experts solicited to select the research projects included Joseph Rykwert and Manfredo Tafuri, as well as personalities external to the proper architectural environment such as Michel de Certeau. 1974 is also the year in which an important seminar took place, 'Histoire et théories de l'architecture' ['History and Theories of Architecture'], at the Institut de l'environnement. In the columns of the 'AMC' journal,[8] Olivier Girard, employing irony, summarises rather faithfully the problems that already fracture this nascent universe:

Success is so distant and yet so close in the competition. Work can be communicated, but much remains unsaid. Attention! Who will replace the demiurge-architect? The historian or the semiotician? The sociologist somewhat misses the point. At the Parisian level, and in veiled words, the combat regarding the heritage of the architecture of May '68 endures. The lawyer brought the whole family together. After the exile years '69-'70-'71 it is for everybody a return to the elitist abode. And the hopes for integration at the University have a new figurehead: 10-15 years after the Sorbonne, the

Beaux-Arts discovers LACAN.

Does one accept, following Olivier Girard, 'the death of the architectural avant-garde, to prepare the advent of an avant-garde about architecture'? But instead of an institute combining the teams, dispersion was preferred, with the scattering of teams of researchers within the educational collectives of the young Unités pédagogiques (UP) created in December 1968, and primarily within the Parisian UP 1, 3, 6 and 8. Contractual research was thus the solution for this disintegrated space of knowledge.

'Doing science'
Understandably, the texts of the first calls for tenders were premeated by this wish 'to do science' and by a symmetrical resentment of the feebleness or supposed failure of the architectural 'concepts', of the lack of rigour of certain borrowings from other disciplines. Subsequently, the guiding text that opened the second call of 1976, was explicitly named 'Des concepts rigoureux et de préférence architecturaux' ['Rigorous and preferably architectural concepts'], and was presented as a 'call for what is necessary to carry out, in any domain, a substantial research'. Here, the 'vague' concepts or, once more, the borrowings that are rarely 'sufficiently reflected and argued'[9] are deplored. From its very first call for tenders - which resembled a guide for the diligent-little-researcher - CORDA already insisted on the elaboration of concepts ('one says elaboration and not just definition') and took care of the disassociation of 'the scientific concept (or object), and the ordinary concept (or the empirical object)' by encouraging the candidates to 'overcome the obstacle that is constituted precisely by concepts and objects of common language (and common sense)'.[10] It could hardly be more explicit about a proclaimed requirement of 'scientificness' which here essentially subscribes to the Bachelardian ideal of epistemological rupture (which was, after all, the explicit basis of 'architecturology', the structuralism-inspired project carried out by Philippe

Boudon) and 'catches up' with the 'logical' and 'scientific' revolt which, paradoxically, was associated with the symbolic revolution of May '68.

The first teaching program of the UP6, for example, launched in July 1969, was dominated by numerous and dense courses in construction and humanities. These courses were convincingly articulated, referring precisely to the scientific ideal in order to justify the refusal to teach architectural design.

A constituted architectural knowledge does not exist at the moment; what exists is only fragmented knowledge. A scientific approach that allows the integration of the different theoretical knowledges in the project does not exist either. At this moment, it is impossible, therefore, to have specific teaching in design [...] the task of architecture teachers will no longer be only the transmission of a certain professional 'know-how' (corresponding to the practice in the design studios) but to carry out a research about the problems of design starting from a scientific basis.[11]

Q.E.D... The guidelines of the first calls for tenders express the difficulties of dealing with the idea of independence; an identity quest that in its extreme forms of expression may even be called pathological. Thus, CORDA's fourth call for tenders (1980) - which in the meantime had become the Secrétariat de la recherche architecturale [Secretariat of Architectural Research] - included both expressions of approval[12] and the first critical reports on the beginnings of architectural research, notably with regard to linguistic analogy. The call expressed the regret that architecture theory still seems to fall short of the hypothetical epistemological rupture which was supposed to found it, after having successively yielded to the modes of 'evolutionism borrowed from biology, to the theory of perception borrowed from Gestalt psychology, to the cultural models inherited from anthropology and sociology, and to the linguistics'. And it affirms anew 'the need of

architectural teaching to be founded on consistent knowledge' in order to surpass the 'impressionistic discourses copied from other disciplines', knowing that 'the most urgent problem of architecture theory' remains 'its capacity to formulate its own proper concepts'.[13]

Some tormenting or even existential doubts are thus expressed, correlated to the wish 'to do science'.[14] Besides, since the very first call for tenders of 1974, it is possible to identify an equivocation which directs certain architect-practitioners to pretend that their own conceptual work is itself research. A first call for projects stressing that a research should be incorporated in a vast field of reference (hence beyond strict questions of personal nature or of opportunity) should depart from a 'problematique', and has to generate results that can be extrapolated: notably, it has to challenge 'the particular importance that [in the milieu of architects] is given to the notion of studies carried out with a view to future realisation (situated or not), the demands of a client (at least potential client) and above all concerning an empirical object as much as an abstract one (space)'.[15] And in 1980, after several years of efforts and three calls for tenders, it was still necessary to repeat that research is 'distinct from material production' and that it does not 'directly compete with it as such'.[16] It is difficult to escape this aporia... and we are still faced with the same conundrum in 2007, for the worse and (sometimes) for the best.

Architecture and social science: a policy of action?

What has happened in the meantime to social sciences and to sociologists? After all, their arrival in architecture was long-awaited but soon disappointing, without doubt disappointing because the expectations were too high. In 1974, CORDA's first call for tenders specified that 'many young architects expect from the fourth sub-program, "Système de production et usages sociaux de l'architecture"

["System of production and social usages of architecture"], a renewal or an enrichment in the preparation and in the exercise of their profession';[17] by the end of the 1970s, the relationship was already dissipating. Only a few years beforehand, the contribution of sociologists had been perceived as a way to respond to doubts about the status and the very condition of the architect; increasingly, several sociologists discerned a desire to escape into the sociological discourse: a desire to flee from the responsibilities of architects and from the risk of the project.

In their own respective ways, the sociologist Henri Raymond and the architect Bernard Huet, these two 'companions of interdisciplinarity', have stipulated, when interviewed in the mid-1990s, the content of this turn and how it disappointed those searching to establish the junction between architecture and sociology. Huet surely recalls the 'abuse', but also a symmetrical 'reaction', 'just as stupid, as this infatuation and appeal en masse to the sociologists', generating a situation 'very difficult for both parties'. He accused the social sciences of having 'changed the object a little' and of not having 'exhausted the object they had commenced to explore', and consequently, having 'confined themselves, at a given moment, to themselves'. Meanwhile, 'among the people who were more open to architecture, some have completely lost their identity and have little by little become hybrids, neither architects, nor quite sociologists, somewhat a historian, etc'. This disillusion affected many architects as well, 'withdrawing into the practices of the Project', undoubtedly 'because the questions had been incorrectly posed'. But, to conclude, 'something is now over': 'now, an architect no longer makes a Project and pretends to ignore ... not the user, because he [the architect] still ignores him ... but he cannot pretend to substitute himself for the user nor for the project manager. This type of architect no longer exists', said Huet.[18]

Henri Raymond, on the long road towards architecture,[19] recalled with nostalgia the beginnings of UP8, 'a time in which intellectual production had the upper hand over project production', situating the 'fracture at the moment in which Ciriani enters the School, following some aberration of the managers, the architecture professors!'. Ciriani therefore 'literally demolished the School because he understood with his ruse, with his viciousness, it must be said, that the period would be one for Studios, for the Project, for the charismatic architect, for the master, the chief, etc. So, all this was smeared with a humanist vaseline about which I will not go into further detail as it is not worth the effort... All this, naturally, in the name of man, of progress, etc. But at the end, well, vaseline is vaseline, and it is a fact that Ciriani has concretised, not produced, but crystallised the architects' wish to make projects, something Bernard Huet, at the time, did not do. Therefore, in a certain sense, the story of the UP8 is nothing other than the rather explicit story of contradictions in the field of architecture between 1970 and 2000'. A decade after having granted us this interview, Raymond does not hesitate to complete the assault in an autobiography that he recently published: 'Ciriani is the prototype of the architect totally incapable of understanding, for example, that people prefer really dumb buildings over his type of realisations, simply because the sight of these buildings reassures them. […] one should teach the architect not to annoy the world.'[20]

These two interviews describe a general turn;[21] it is not a coincidence that this turn paralleled the complete self-obliteration of political activism: the numerous retrospective testimonies that we have collected suggest that the sociologists have indeed been assimilated, more or less explicitly, to the leftist universe of the French architects-intellectuals. Perhaps, with the mourning of the loss of militant hopes, this generation had suddenly understood that it had real difficulty in affecting the social; moreover, this generation realised that it

was a great hubris to believe that it had such power - precisely what it contested in the positions of some of its predecessors, Le Corbusier to the fore! Subsequently, sociologists appeared as 'obstructionists' and no longer as collaborators, resources or supports. Similar to the leaders of the former sectarian groupuscules, often described by witnesses as repressing personalities, possessing a powerless severity and a sterile dogma, the sociologists were depicted as an 'obstacle'. It was a chronological coincidence, surely, that the arrival of the social sciences at architectural schools preceded by a few months the 'events' of '68, but a significant coincidence because the witnesses willingly associated the sociologist with the ideological line and idelogical censureship, and with the perpetual call to militancy.

Bernard Huet, regretting this burden, spoke of a 'misunderstanding', 'because the architects awaited their salvation by sociology, and the sociologists, in return, were tempted to accept a discourse in practice even though they had always forbidden themselves to do so!': 'the sociologists, like many people at the time, could not support the demiurge side of the architects'; 'unfairly to many of the architects', 'they accused in fact the architects of being accomplices, even though they were not responsible for all the policies taken... '. That said, while 'the average sociologist passed his time in teaching a lesson to the architects', the accusation of the architect-accomplice (of association with Power, with Capital, with the technocracy and with the triumphant multinationals) has hence not been only the privilege of sociologists. But it remains plausible that certain sociologists, eagerly addressing such a hot 'object' as this milieu preoccupied by self-analysis, were tempted to simply look for what they already wished to find there: the critique that sociology had already begun to formulate, repeating the discourse of disdain and the 'self-hatred' that - a part of - the profession already held, reinforcing therefore the effect of censure. This is clearly manifested in the

first publications at the time on the 'profession' of architects, including a special issue that the journal 'Esprit' dedicated to those doubts and questions.[22] Paul Chemetov,[23] who described himself accurately as a forerunner (in the professional practice within the AUA rather than in his side-activity of teaching) of the embracement of sociology, noted this drift off-course. From a shared position that 'architecture cannot be nourished within architecture alone', there remained little after '68; 'something entirely different has happened' - the human sciences have 'erupted not as substantial nourishment for architecture, but as hate of architecture'.

I was in the Plan Construction [of which he was first counsel, then, in 1982, vice-president] *and most humanities that were included* [in the Plan] *hated architecture, hated the risk it represents... Philosophically, architecture, in the Popperian sense, is a figure at risk, a fallible figure. That does not mean that it is always bad and erroneous...* [...] *architecture is nothing but an experience, a practice, but an essential one for making the City. The Project is a fundamental tool for making the City - the Project, with its risks, rather than the statistical attitude. Sociology is very good. I am pro anthropology; I am in favour of everything... But, at a given moment, one must construct!*

Were there two views, completely different though directed at the same object, architecture, two views that cohabited without encountering one another? Could these two views be represented by the two readings of Pessac, one articulated by the architect Philippe Boudon,[24] the other, separated by only a few years, by the sociologist Jean-Charles Depaule?[25] The first reading, from the postmodern perspective of the 'open work', noted the success of Le Corbusier's neighbourhood and supported all the appropriations and reformulations which had taken place, the second underlined the failure of an architecture rapidly transformed by dissatisfied inhabitants.

Disillusion or integration?

The nadir of this story, finally, is that following numerous disappointments, even the formerly zealous partisans of the arrival of sociologists finally returned to more distrustful and sceptical positions towards the contribution and the role of sociologists within the teaching of architecture. And it is even more than distrust or scepticism that Christian Devillers expressed in 1992 in an article published in the issue of 'L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui' dedicated to Henri Ciriani, a point of view 'Sur l'enseignement de l'architecture' ['On the Teaching of Architecture'].[26] The presence of these 'exterior' disciplines, Devillers claimed, was merely a fashion which did not require sustenance. He further discerned 'one of the main causes of the current malaise of architectural education' in 'the absurd egalitarianism' of the pedagogical responsibility. Pierre Granveaud, an admirer of Bourdieu-Passeron's 1964 'Héritiers',who introduced Bourdieu and Passeron to the Beaux-Arts before '68, and who was for a long time active within the 'Cahiers de la recherche architecturale', also returned during the course of an interview to those misunderstandings without placing the blame on the sociologists alone: having started his studies in the 'unconscious consciousness of a young man of eighteen, for me, it was the ideal craft that mixed art and society: how was this mixture achieved and for whom?'.[27] This sentiment was 'quite shared' at the time, he recalled, noting especially that all those questions were 'neither placed on the table, nor studied'; 'therefore, I think that it was what we wanted'. That said, he too evoked the experience of 'fascination' lived 'with all the spontaneity of '68, where, in the small schools, the masters had to disappear as masters', 'all architects are nitwits, all the professors are nitwits, etc. Therefore, one opens the path to others... ':

I *think, to conclude, that this entry* [of the human sciences into architecture], *that could have been very beneficial, has not been so, in my opinion. I have the feeling that it had instead damaged the*

teaching of architecture as such - and the teaching of the risk that the project represents - during a long period. All this, in order to return to the project, but in its least satisfactory form with the centre stage given to the most formal projects possible, without a reflection on foundation, on necessity... There were in these schools, all of a sudden, people who did sociology for sociology, linguistics for linguistics, informatics for informatics... these teachings were constituted in autonomous sections, all, to my feeling, making weak sociology, weak informatics, weak history, etc. And that is why the School of Architecture, it seems to me, has to be focused on the fabrication of space, of the project.

That being so, as Huet signalled in his conversation, it is equally necessary to recall that this sociological knowledge has been integrated as a competence by a generation, as a 'determining influence', in the architectural practice, notably in the conception of dwelling.

Completely integrating this knowledge into his conception of a project - in his habitus as it were - the architect would have forgotten sometimes to question it. Olivier Girard recognised this,[28] signalling a reciprocal retreat of everyone into his traditional domain:

At the moment the architects allowed themselves a certain autonomy of thought, they [the sociologists] *no longer had, it seems to me, much to offer.* [...] *Finally, this first contribution would nonetheless have lasted for ten years, well... Good. They* [the sociologists] *have become a bit repetitive. They wanted to have recourse to outdated statements. The habitat pavillonnaire* [the suburban house]*, the reflection on domestic usage, on domestic social usage, on the place of the house - the architects have integrated this, and then, well, this always remains very important, but it is now a given. One knows this. One works on this when making dwellings. And I believe that they have not really continued working by start-*

ing from the way in which architecture evolved in reaction to this first contribution on usage. Therefore, they have all, to a certain extent, gone back to their roots.

In fact, while discussing practice and construction, a good number of architects of this generation have realised that stacking cells, with a front and a rear, a dissociated private and public realm, resolved none of the urban problems, and that a good dwelling, well-conceived but isolated, was only an ineffective palliative. Additionally, a paradox was created: it is precisely at the moment that the threshold in particular and the intermediate spaces in general have disappeared from the realities of the French ZUPs (Zone à urbaniser par priorité [Zone Designated for Priority Urbanisation]), at the moment that the boundaries of the private home have been neglected, at the beginning of the 1970s, that the terms for designating these transitional spaces have proliferated so much in the architectural theory enriched by the contributions of the social sciences.[29]

It could also be suggested that architects welcomed the sociologists when they were confronted with crucial problems, with the downgrading or even the survival of their profession, and once these problems were partially and temporarily solved, the architects became disinterested, or started avoiding the sociologists, like bad memories, preferring, for example, the company of philosophers and aestheticians who gave a meaning to the buildings that they had begun to realise, and who spoke about their work and not about the usage or such trivial questions... Bad memories that also break the silence, not to say the *omerta*, that veils today in France the adhesion of a number of architects of that generation to an 'architectural postmodernism' as it was defined during the 1970s, a moment embodied by the contribution of sociologists to the recent history of architecture. Certain sociologists, though disparate in their interests, do not repress today the memory of this formal furrow ploughed in common with the architects.

Marion Segaud, a close disciple of Henri Raymond, recalled, in a 2007 text about her forty-year experience in teaching and diverse cooperations, that 'the anthropology of space in France had accompanied the postmodern movement and its declared aim to contest Internationalism by returning to the local dimension, as well as taking taste into account, and returning to the common sense'.[30] Finally and more trivially, the historian of practices and usages of dwelling Roger-Henri Guerrand has brought up,[31] somewhat bitterly (like numerous other teachers of history or the human sciences who had worked within architecture schools), that in a general sense, as they are absorbed by their studios, the architects simply put an end to their reading effort:

The accumulating [research] *reports have served no one, except for certain sociological tribes... there is the report and there is the communication of the report. You know well that architects don't read. Some do read, but for the most part they don't. Intellectuals are rare amongst architects. They don't know how to write and they don't read, just like artists. When painters speak about their paintings, they speak monstrous nonsense. One can never grant credibility to the discourse of painters about their work - it does not hold. For architects, it's practically the same. People like Huet are very rare.*

Bernard Huet explained this withdrawal of architects from the Project - acknowledging that he no longer knows precisely what the sociologists working within his School teach - by the difficulties encountered in the research posed by 'interfaces', by elements of mediation between sociological knowledge and the Project. And it was up to the architect to propose some trajectories throughout this interview:

- That the sociologists are not only situated on the side of the social demand, but especially between command and demand;

- That one questions, in a general manner, the form

within the framework of diverse social phenomena, since the essence of a society consists also in producing forms: social, legal or aesthetic;

- That one privileges history as an ideal transversal instrument to incorporate sociological knowledge into architecture;

- That one tries to construct the banal and that the sociologists ceased, before so many others, to be fascinated by non-banality, like Henri Lefebvre 'fascinated by the twaddle of Bofill';[32]

- That one suspends the utopian interest in the new, that one works on the window of the bathroom or the autonomous technical installations rather than on the introduction of demotics;

- That one attaches oneself at last to the taste of writing a new 'treatise' that would take advantage of sociology teachings, knowing that the Vitruvian categories, if they are set out in the same manner in each era, recover each time different realities and articulate themselves each time differently.

The ferrymen and the points of passage

In the course of this discussion, it becomes clear that while Bernard Huet declared to have lost his illusions, he has not lost interest in the contribution of the social sciences in general and sociology in particular. Thanks to this vivacity and this never-diminished curiosity (no matter what he has said about this himself), Huet exercised a true influence on the majority of the teachers coming from humanities with whom he has worked alongside throughout his career. This was well known, and Henri Raymond confirmed it in the autobiography cited above. Another 'disciple', but unrecognised or at least not yet officially acclaimed, the great demographer Hervé Le Bras, abundantly admitted his debt to Huet throughout a series of biographical interviews that he recently granted to the young sociologist Julien Ténédos. This friendship began in

Vincennes, the 'experimental university', the intellectual crossroads of the moment, where Jacques Lichnerowicz, the son of the mathematician whom we evoked at the beginning of this article, followed courses like many of his study-comrades in architecture. Le Bras, a graduate of the polytechnique seduced by the social sciences, was invited to Vincennes by the mathematician Marc-Paul Schutzenberger. Le Bras thus taught informatics 'without having at his disposal one single computer', introducing the teaching of music and informatics, law and informatics, art and informatics, 'in summary all that already existed *and informatics*'.[33] And it was Jacques Lichnerowicz who invited him one evening to meet Huet, who was at that time 'founding an architecture school on the ruins of the former Beaux-Arts and who was looking for a mathematician to take care of the teaching in the future school'. Associate Professor at the beginnings of the UP8, Le Bras discovered 'a complete discipline demanding remarkable capacities for synthesis'; he was interested to the extent of being prepared to consider 'becoming an architecture student'. And then he developed a friendship with Huet and Albert Flocon 'who have showed me the importance of spatialisation and the multiplicity of representations'; he put together research projects and discovered a very open environment, open and curious because of the uncertainties that still traverse it:

As the schools of architecture depended on the Minister of Culture and not on the one of National Education, the teaching methods were far more free. I gave, for example, a course on the means of verifying whether reality could exist: the students had to prepare the plans of a device which would allow approaching reality and fabricating it. Some would make a dark room, some Foucault's Pendulum, others would learn to calculate with an abacus. The inspiration for such teachings came directly from the Bauhaus; Albert Flocon-Mentzel, one of the last surviving Bauhaus students, was part of the team. I followed a course with him on interlaces and hexaflexagons, these curious sets relevant as much to art as to maths. [...] These four years showed me that science was produced in the midst of an informal network of initiates that had nothing in common with the heavy hierarchies, the commissions and committees, the small leaders and other presidents of current institutions. The natural hierarchy connected me with Chomsky via Schutzenberger, to Kandinsky via Flocon, to Louis Kahn via Huet.[34]

So here they are, the ferrymen but also the 'interfaces', whose disappearance Huet regretted even more, these susceptible points of passage in assuring the transition of knowledge from the social sciences to the architectural discipline. And this limit of hypothetical 'interfacing' with the Project was far from concerning only sociology. In the interview dating from 1995, and especially in the one dedicated more particularly to teaching (1996), Huet in fact reproached the disciplines that were supposed to serve architecture:

- Engineers who did not give the means to transfer knowledge to architects, turning around the object without ever entering it;

- Sculptors who preferred making 'installations' in the corridors of the School rather than learning to handle colours and drawing from models;

- And finally, in a manner perhaps even more incisive because it touched one of his own domains of preference, art historians who taught the history of architecture, stigmatising the disastrous influence of private turfs and 'disciplinary lobbies'.

Roger-Henri Guerrand mentioned pure and simple 'abductions' by sociologists and people from humanities in general, obtaining power and appropriating the architectural object in the void of the foundation ex nihilo of the UP, principally outside Paris.[35] The interest did not consist of simply combining disciplines but of achieving a synthesis

of superior quality; Bernard Huet noticed via his experiences the rather quick appearance of a limit and of an artificial discourse 'glued' onto the Project, an artificial discourse which subsisted thanks to its claims of 'cross-fertilisation':

The cultural models, like typology, are nothing; they cannot make architecture, they cannot even make space, they cannot even make an apartment... 'they' create nothing... Therefore, this knowledge has to be accompanied by a work on the objects themselves since, in fact, the Project manipulates objects and is not a simple discourse.

Nevertheless, the time was right for 'theoretical practice', as one said at the time; architectural research and architectural project were supposed to feed one another. A theoretical practice sometimes so literal that it posed new problems. A letter from Anne Hublin, a sociology teacher at UP1, addressed to 'AMC' and published in issue 35 (December 1974) about the project of a group of students of Bernard Huet composed of Druenne/ Leblois/ Moreau/ Depaule for PAN 5 [Programme Architecture Nouvelle],[36] contested the translations and the sometimes 'savage' borrowings of architects in their projects. Consequently, disciplinary and political arguments intertwine, as well as theoretical conflicts within the milieu of sociologists close to architects:

Architecture consumes more and more sociology. But which sociology? The sociological demand of the architect is generally limited. One wants sociology on top. Most often, on top of a spatial, morphological, constructive model, already conceived and elaborated into details, a cultural model is placed. That is to say that the gratuitousness of the aesthetic proposal would be substituted by a social foundation. [...]*[T]hus, a new sociological product appeared, very handy for the architects, and well reassuring for all, a new sociological product called the 'cultural model'.* [...] *The disciplinary transpositions certainly constitute an interesting heuristic*

method. But in any case this conceptual patchwork cannot provide a useful working base for the integration of sociological and architectural interests. [...] [The cultural model] *plays the role of a machine to conserve social relationships. It is an active reproducer of social relationships. A concrete ideology.* [...] *Are the intellectuals the watchdogs of bourgeois society? Do they work, voluntarily or involuntarily - but objectively - on the conservation and the reproduction of models for a society of exploitation?*

Faulting sociologists, despite everything, for not having sufficiently questioned the way in which their discourse was utilised - if not 'instrumentalised' - blaming them equally for their ambiguities, for their hesitation between a false neutrality and the temptation of prescription, Bernard Huet regretted more profoundly the quality of the exchanges that have characterised an epoch, a moment. He notably regretted his collaboration with Henri Raymond - the summer seminars and the project of developing an 'architectural history of society', considering that these exchanges could only be fruitful within the frame of interpersonal collaborations and mutual interests: 'In general, we were always demanders and we were sent a "sociologist at our service" while there, it was him [Henri Raymond] who had encouraged the presence of architects and attempted to give their story a place in the department of urban sociology in Nanterre. It did not last but I think that it has been very, very important'. The extent to which his thought was marked by his collaboration with Henri Raymond and his mediation with Henri Lefebvre was felt throughout the interview. This influence is evident in the concept of 'cultural models', and also in this idea of 'switching' between command and demand,[37] or even in the references to Pierre Francastel which, although they might have appeared personal, have also been fed by these affinities and this cooperation.[38]

It is the irony of history that the architect Christian Devillers attempted to define this ideal pedagogical

program, this mode of cooperation in 1974, in the first issue of 'Architecture d'aujourd'hui' that Huet directed alone and which was significantly titled 'Recherche + Habitat' ['Research + Habitat']. The definition of type (a notion deified in that period, described simultaneously as an abstraction of spatial properties common to a class of edifices, and especially as a structure of correspondence between a designed or constructed space and the differential values attributed to it by social group) precisely conveys this new synthesis between architecture and social sciences that was welcomed by Devillers.[39] All this in an issue in which Henri Raymond took a large part, subscribing to this fertile logic of mutual contributions. Three years later, in 1977, in an issue of 'Communications', the sociologist picked up the reflection where Devillers had left it, precisely defining this 'substitution' which Huet nostalgically evoked as an uncompleted intellectual project: the type, as structure of correspondence, designates in fact 'the only effective, obvious communication, of which architecture presents us a history: the communication between the principal and the designer'.[40] From there arose Henri Raymond's entire project, consisting of questioning, finally, how this 'necessary substitution that, in a society such as ours, would result in the transposition into architectural space of spatial relationships that are implied by the type, and why this substitution is in certain cases missing?'.[41] And how and why the principal and the architect, though refering to the same thing, 'they do not speak - or rarely do - about the same object'?

The stake effectively was to resolve this profound aporia born out of the common questionings and claims, but if the working program was not able to deliver all the fruitful outcomes that were envisaged, this had to do with the institutionnal conditions. It is in fact evident that the French situation of architectural education, at the margin of the university, has certainly played a role in this, the lack of institutional stability explaining that the exchanges within the universities subsisted only as long as personal

collaborations lasted. The Institut de l'environnement, created to reinforce the bonds between the fragmented schools, has nevertheless worked, through its Centre de recherche en sciences sociales on this bringing together of architects and sociologists and undoing certain incomprehensions by the means of seminars or publications. Beginning in 1970, Christian Gaillard and Monique Eleb, for example, carried out a study about the entrance of social sciences into architecture schools, already stressing these limits and incomprehensions in the title 'Le savoir et la provocation' ['Knowledge and provocation'], which hardly diminishes the doubts and difficulties related to this cooperation.[42] The 'Cahiers pédagogiques' regularly reverberated the echo of those attempts. The fifth issue (1975), for example, attempted to clarify the complex notion of 'need', a notion at the very heart of numerous mutual incomprehensions that the architects recalled throughout our conversations, sometimes forgetting they had asked at the time for some 'recipes' that the sociologists refused to deliver.[43]

The sixth issue opened with a triple interrogation which clearly manifests the doubts of the sociologists themselves: 'must one, can one, speak of architecture, and how should one speak about it?'. If a demand is posed to the sociologist, must he then 'restrict himself to the teritorry pre-defined by the architect?'. Can he offer a true contribution and 'not just tricks or diversions?'.[44] In this introductory text composed by Jean-Charles Depaule, the sociologist ends up interrogating himself about the 'imperialist' desires of his discipline and announces his will to construe a 'naive inventory of educational practices' practiced within the UP for several years.[45] Five years later, in a presentation about the education at UP3 [settled in Versailles], the same Depaule still searched for a middle ground: that of architecture as a sociological object, that of a social practice, that of the architectural work replaced each time at the moment of a production process. In brief, searching for a middle ground in order to escape

the false alternative of opposing on one side 'the radical critique prodding the unhappy consciousness of architects and architecture seen as a pure ideological production or a transparent agent for the domination of class',[46] and on the other side the sociologists who have lent themselves 'with application and without too much questioning, to a conception of the role of social sciences in their liberal or technocratic versions, where space is perceived, in an integrating vision, as the immediate equivalence to the needs that those sciences were supposed to render explicit'.[47]

'The piano movers who attempted to push the walls'

Hence it cannot be unilaterally affirmed that the sociologists were themselves not, at a certain moment, interrogated about their educational practices. Nor can it be denied that architects have advanced a certain distance down the road, allowing fertile debates to emerge.[48] In summary, without doubt Huet and many of his colleagues miss the 'wild-west' period of the UP in which everything had to be reconstructed, and the period in which journals such as 'AMC' or 'Architecture d'aujourd'hui' spoke as much, if not more, about the actuality of the schools and of research as about the results of competitions, building sites and inaugurations. In 'Les aventures spatiales de la raison', Henri Raymond's testimony on this cooperation, he recalled with nostalgia the early 1970s when he frequented 'a *milieu* in which the passion for architecture was only equated by the complete negation of all actual possibility of any architecture whatsoever', identifying it with 'piano movers who would attempt to push the walls to let it change place', with students who continually questioned their teachers, including Raymond, 'about our promises, our hopes: to reinvent an architectural education while looking forward to reinventing architecture'.[49] This story continues today: a group of 'young' sociologists, accompanied by some former pioneers,[50] has decided forty years later to set up an annual seminar to reassemble the memory of these

sometimes stormy bonds, under the title: 'Des sociologues chez les architectes, 1967-2007: histoire(s) d'une rencontre' ['Sociologists amongst the architects, 1967-2007: history(ies) of an encounter']. It is the inheritance that makes the heir, as Pierre Bourdieu used to say.

Notes

1. See in this context our thesis carried out under the direction of Monique Eleb and Jean-Louis Cohen and published in Éditions Recherches in 2005 under the title *Les architectes et Mai 68*.
2. Paul-Henry Chombart de Lauwe, *Un anthropologue dans le siècle* (Paris: Descartes & Cie, 1996), p. 95; see also pp. 60, 80 and 93-94.
3. Ibid. pp. 198-99.
4. In 1966, a commission of cultural affairs and of artistic patrimony was created around Eugène Claudius-Petit with a think-tank dedicated to architecture.
5. It was at Clermont-Ferrand during the Occupation that Lichnerowicz, guided by Henri Cartan, met Jean Dieudonné, Charles Ehresmann and Laurent Schwartz, the kernel of what would become the collective Nicolas Bourbaki. Since the mid-1950s, André Lichnerowicz had actively participated, with Jacques Monod and Jean-Louis Crémieux-Brilhac and Etienne Bauer of the Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique [Commissariat of Atomic Energy] and close to Pierre Mendès-France, in the group that prepared the colloquium of Caen (1956) which contributed to the revival of French research under De Gaulle. In the mid-1960s, Lichnerowicz participated in the works of the Commission d'étude des enseignements littéraires et scientifiques [Study Commission of Literary and Scientific Education] established by Christian Fouchet to accompany from January 1965 until early 1966 the application of his reform. Other participants included Lichnerowicz's colleagues from the Collège de France Jules Vuillemin and Fernand Braudel - the former would withdraw from the commission after the first meeting - Georges Vedel of the faculty of law in Paris, Robert Flacellière, the

director of the Ecole normale supérieure, and scholars of all disciplines (including young Michel Foucault). Later, from 1975, André Lichnerowicz would be one of the advisors of the publisher Autrement and in particular of the collection 'Mutations', at the side of Jacques Attali, Henri Atlan, Jean-Michel Belorgey, François Bloch-Lainé, Jacques Le Goff, Serge Moscovici, Claude Olievenstein and Joël de Rosnay.

6. Founded in 1971, Plan construction et architecture [Construction and Architecture Plan] has an interministerial vocation, coordinating various research programs on urban development, construction and architecture. Multi-year programmes are implemented through subsidised research projects, field demonstrations and pilot projects, as well as via actions directed at promoting innovation.

7. A call for tenders with significant success: 220 projects were submitted, of which 95 originated from the institutions of architectural education; half of the 50 commissions were received by these institutions. See J.-P. Lesterlin, 'La recherche architecturale', Dossier: recherche scientifique et prospective urbaine, *Urbanisme*, no. 157 / 158 (1977).

8. See *Architecture-Mouvement-Continuité*, no. 34, July 1974.

9. 'Texte d'orientation; recherche architecturale', call for tenders 1976, DGRST / Secrétariat d'Etat à la Culture, Direction de l'Architecture, CORDA, archives EAPV, p. 1.

10. 'La recherche architecturale; texte d'orientation', call for tenders, March 1974, reproduced in *Cahiers de l'a. d.r.i. 1*, no. 3-4, éd. UP1 (October 1981), pp. 53-64, here: p. 60.

11. 'Objectifs des étudiants et enseignants architectes et plasticiens groupés autour de l'appel du 10 janvier 1969', éd. UP6 (July 1969), p. 23.

12. 'A true intellectualisation of the design work'; 'the research has provided an exit route for French architecture from its provincial ghetto'; 'a fertile decade'... See 'Consultation de recherche: théorie et projet architectural', call for tenders 1980, reproduced in *Cahiers de l'a.d.r.i. 1*, n°3-4, éd. UP1 (October 1981), pp. 21-27, here: pp. 21-22.

13. Ibid. p. 21 and p. 24.

14. Thus, this question is absolutely significant: 'can it [architecture theory] be constituted as an autonomous discipline or must it content itself with being a tissue of discourses introduced into the specific field of architecture, but with the concepts borrowed from other disciplines?', ibid. p. 24.

15. 'La Recherche Architecturale; texte d'orientation', p. 55.

16. 'Consultation de recherche: théorie et projet architectural', p. 23.

17. 'La recherche architecturale; texte d'orientation', p. 64.

18. Interview with Bernard Huet, Paris, January 1996.

19. Interview with Henri Raymond, Paris, February 1996.

20. Henri Raymond, *Henri Raymond, paroles d'un sociologue. Vers une histoire architecturale de la société*, conversations with Jean-Pierre Frey (Paris: L'Harmattan, coll. 'Villes et Entreprises', 2006), p. 220.

21. This 'turn' was common amongst teaching architects, but could also be observed in other forms in the planning administration and in the construction industry. We think, for example, of the testimony of Bernard Hirsch, one of the pioneers of Cergy-Pontoise, who opened the chapter in his book, dedicates to sociologists, with this very severe diagnosis: 'Before May 1968 [NB: one can well ask why he chose this date!], the sociologists didn't have the reputation of agitating destructors that they have acquired today [in 2000]. It was, on the contrary, a fashionable corporation and not a single team of urbanism could keep its reputation if it didn't include a set of sociologists'. The problem, as the author notes, is that the expectations have been too high: 'I imagined [...] that [they] would offer a better equilibrium and would replace the moroseness with the joy of life'. Nothing less. See Bernard Hirsch, *Oublier Cergy… L'invention d'une ville nouvelle, 1965-1975* (Paris: Presses de l'école nationale des ponts et chaussées, 2000), Ch. XXVI, 'Relations avec les sociologues', pp. 146-49.

22. See in particular no. 10, 'L'architecte, l'urbanisme et la société' (Paris, October 1969), with contributions by Jacques Lautman, 'L'architecte et l'état', pp. 408-22; Raymonde Moulin, 'Avons-nous besoin d'architectes?', pp. 389-406; Marie-Françoise Fichet, 'Féaux et manda-

rins', pp. 519-26; and Claude Soucy, 'La ville et ses contradictions' ; *Esprit*, no. 10, Paris, October 1969, pp. 503-16.

23. Interview with Paul Chemetov, Paris, October 1994.

24. Philippe Boudon, *Pessac de Le Corbusier* (Paris: Dunod, 1969).

25. J.Ch. Depaule, L. Bourg, P. Pincemaille, 'Pessac', Centre de recherche, d'architecture, de construction (RAUC), unpublished, 1970. For a retrospective report of the works of Jean-Charles Depaule on these questions of popular appropriations, on the 'savages of architecture' or the 'Sunday architects', as he calls them, see, from the same author, 'Savoirs et manières de faire architecturaux: populaires versus savants', in Monique Eleb and Jean-Louis Violeau (eds.), 'Savant, populaire', *Les cahiers de la recherche architecturale et urbaine*, no. 15-16 (Paris: Monum - Éditions du patrimoine, July 2004), pp. 13-28.

26. *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 282 (September, 1992), pp. 9-11.

27. Interview with Pierre Granveaud, Paris, April 1996.

28. Interview with Olivier Girard, Paris, July 1996.

29. This raised the issue of a genealogy of the notion of 'intermediate space' for the architect and anthropologist Christian Moley, one of the protagonists of this French story of relationships between architecture and the social sciences in the aftermath of '68. See Christian Moley, *Les abords du chez-soi, en quête d'espaces intermédiaires* (Paris: Editions de la Villette, 2006).

30. Marion Segaud, *Anthropologie de l'espace. Habiter, fonder, distribuer, transformer* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2007), p. 25.

31. Interview with Roger-Henri Guerrand, Paris, April 1996.

32. It is notably in 'Le temps des méprises' that Lefebvre cites as an example his 'friend' Ricardo Bofill: 'he constructs and he has the imagination of a concrete utopianist. [...] Each in his own way, Ricardo Bofill with the 'Cité de l'espace' and [Constant] Nieuwenhuis with 'New Babylon', turns around this determination of a new unity that would bridge the separation between architecture and urbanism and that would be in the scale on which one is able to work and produce'. See Henri Lefebvre, *Le temps des méprises* (Paris: Stock, 1975), pp. 246-47. This example has nevertheless left its mark on Lefebvre and ten years later, in December 1986, in one of his last interviews given to an architectural journal, in *AMC* (no. 14 [new series], pp. 6-9), he again returns to it, evoking once more Constant, Bofill and his 'Cité de l'espace' like a dream of totality where space and the social would be finally reconciled through 'something which is neither the free-standing house, nor the accumulation of people in housing estates' (p. 8), briefly evoking the 'megastructure', the old utopian dream of architects.

33. Hervé Le Bras, *Entre-deux pôles. La démographie entre science et politique*, conversations with Julien Ténédos (Montreuil: éditions aux lieux d'être, coll. 'entretiens', 2006), p. 18.

34. Ibid. p. 19.

35. The publication in 1992 of the article of Christian Devillers, cited above, coincided not only with the elaboration of the Frémont report, but also with the first wave of tenureships in more than twenty years. The author worried that due to this 'lobby of exterior disciplines [...] more powerful than ever, and close to the central administration', that 'the actual project of tenureship will place the practicing architects in an inferior institutional position, at risk of remaining dependent on temporary contracts. He therefore did not see any need, and even perceived a danger in giving permanent positions to the teachers that he calls 'exterior'; 'by cutting them from their roots and their academic legitimacy, one grants them a marginal position and a strong probability of sclerosis, all this by giving them perfectly illegitimate power over the institution of architectural education'. Therefore it is necessary 'to give permanent positions only to teachers who cannot receive such positions elsewhere, that is to say teachers in architecture and in the internal disciplines of architecture'.

36. Published in *AMC*, no. 34 (July 1974).

37. In 1986, in the already quoted interview given to *AMC*, Lefebvre outlined the problems posed by the 'immense distance [...] between the social demand [that Lefebvre persisted to see as the demand for a 'new space'] and the command by the authorities' [contenting them-

selves with archaism or technological instrumentality], identifying in this distance the cause of numerous problems with contemporary urban space (p. 7).

38. In 1975, during a study day organised on the 24th of February by the Centre de recherche en sciences humaines (Centre for Research in Human Sciences) of the Institut de l'environnement, Henri Raymond proposed a research program in sociology related to the thinking of Francastel by adapting his work to art and architecture. See Henri Raymond, 'Architecture et société', (pp. 55-60) p. 57, in 'Sociologie-Architecture', *Cahier Pédagogique' no. 6, group 'Sociologie*, (Paris: Centre de recherche en sciences humaines, Institut de l'environnement, 1975).

39. See Christian Devillers, 'Typologie de l'habitat et morphologie urbaine', *Architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 174 (July-August, 1974), pp. 18-22. In this article, Devillers recalls his graduation from UP8, demonstrating once again the fertile symbiosis that took place at that moment between schools, research and journals, including the project of disseminating research work that Huet undertook at *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui*.

40. Henri Raymond, 'Commuter et transmuter: la sémiologie de l'architecture', *Comunications*, no. 27, 'Sémiotique de l'espace', (Paris: Seuil, 1977), pp. 103-11, here: p. 106. On the following page, Raymond defined the 'commutateur' ['switcher'] as 'the term which institutes, at the commanding side, a certain set of specific social - spatial relations and which mutually institutes, at the side of the architect, specific homologous relations'.

41. Ibid. p. 111.

42. Christian Gaillard and Monique Eleb, 'Le savoir et la provocation', pp. 13-26 in *Espaces des sciences humaines. Questions d'enseignement en architecture*, (Paris: Centre de recherche en sciences humaines, Institut de l'environnement, 1974).

43. In her foreword, Monique Eleb noted that 'the classic demand addressed to humanities, as it is habitually formulated, implies that one can establish an exhaustive list of needs and that it is possible to directly translate them to the level of the architectural conception'. This question provoked an uneasiness amongst sociologists who 'don't have an immediate answer' and who refuse to move towards a solution. Knowing that 'if the notion of need is inadequate to give an account of what should be addressed by other notions, we only replace the problem'... In brief, one has anyway difficulties to avoid these aporias and incomprehensions... without challenging the notion of 'need', one cannot escape the aporia (pp. 3-4). See Monique Eleb (ed.), *Besoin(s). Analyse et critique de la notion*, 'Cahier pédagogique', no. 5, group 'Psychology and Space' (Paris: Centre de recherche en sciences humaines, Institut de l'environnement, 1975, second semester).

44. Jean-Charles Depaule, 'Avant-propos', in 'Sociologie-Architecture', *Cahier Pédagogique*, no. 6, group 'Sociologie' (Paris: Centre de recherche en sciences humaines, Institut de l'environnement, 1975), pp. 5-6. In this issue, Jean-Claude Barthez also examines this notion of 'need' and 'the reticence of sociologists to venture into the minefield created by the demands of architects', remaining, in the best case, mere 'voyeurs' of architecture, and in the worst case, critics... In conclusion, Barthez holds onto the 'cultural model' as a possible way out, as 'concept-intermediary'. See J.Cl. Barthez, 'Les sociologues et la demande des architectes', ibid. pp. 7-16, here: pp. 12-13.

45. A series of seminars were held throughout the year 1976-77 at CERA (heir to the Institut de l'environnement), under the direction of Depaule and Mazerat, addressing the controversial notion of 'cultural models', preparing the ground for a publication of CERA in spring 1977.

46. 'Radical critique' that was, by the way, the natural penchant of Krier and Culot, the architects who directed the *Bulletin des AAM*, the journal in which Depaule published this text.

47. Jean-Charles Depaule, 'La sociologie dans l'enseignement de l'architecture', *Bulletin des archives d'architecture modern*, no. 17 (1980), pp. 17-21, here: p. 17. Depaule reveals here his references, including the analysis of Greek space by Jean-Pierre Vernant, the Kabyle house by Pierre Bourdieu, the work of Henri Raymond with the research on the suburban house as a system of differences, as well as the book *L'enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien regime* by Philippe Ariès.

48. A good illustration of such a debate can be found in

the same issue of *AAM*, in the annex to the article of Depaule (pp. 20-21), in a debate between the teachers-researchers at Versailles (Catherine Bruant, Jean Castex, Jean-Charles Depaule, Philippe Panerai, Michèle Veyrenche).

49. Henri Raymond, *L'architecture, les aventures spatiales de la raison* (Paris: C.C.I. / Centre G. Pompidou, coll. 'alors:', 1984), pp. 12-13.

50. Véronique Biau, Christophe Camus, Olivier Chadoin (coord.), Isabelle Grudet, Gérald Houdeville, François Lautier, André Sauvage, Jean-Louis Violeau. The call for contributions can be found on the website of Laboratoire Espaces du ravail (LET / ENSA Paris-La Villette), www.let.archi.fr.

Acknowledgements

Biography

Jean-Louis Violeau is a sociologist, researcher at the ACS (Architecture-Culture-Society) laboratory (CNRS UMR 7136 AUS / Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Paris-Malaquais) and a regular contributor to AMC-Le Moniteur architecture. His books include *Situations construites* (Sens&Tonka, 1998, 2nd ed. 2005); *Quel enseignement pour l'architecture?* (Editions Recherches, 1999); *Entre voisins: Dispositif architectural et mixité sociale* (L'Epure, 2000, with Monique Eleb); and *Notre histoire. Europan à 20 ans* (Archibooks, 2007). His doctoral dissertation, *Les architectes et Mai 68* has been published from Editions Recherches in 2005.