

## path to school education, architecture and academic exchanges

Angelo Bucci  
2017

---

The educator [Anísio Teixeira]

At the bottom of the shaft.

There it was, as if it was an accidental fall in the elevator shaft of a building in Rio de Janeiro, which found the body of the greatest exponent of education in Brazil. It was 1971; Teixeira would be seventy-one years later in that year. The scene is a tragic theater act the harbinger of dismantling the framework of public education that is consummated in the following years.

The circumstances of Anísio Teixeira's death still await in hope for clarification. The official version never coincided with the perception of family and close friends of what really happened. The fact that would only come to light more broadly and consistently in the year 2012, when the opening of the work of the National Commission of Truth (Comissão Nacional da Verdade), CNV. That year, on November 6, the detailed eleven page memorial on the case was referred to Gilson Dipp, then coordinator of the CNV, taking charge of the investigation. The memorial - signed by Carlos Antonio Ferreira Teixeira, Teixeira's son, Haroldo Borges Rodrigues Lima, great nephew, and João Augusto de Lima Rocha, organizer of the book "Anísio em Movimento" published in 1990 and republished by the Senate publisher in 2002 - exposes the chronology of events that took place that year in 1971 from the 11th of March, the date of his disappearance, to March 14, the date of his burial, showing many contradictions and inconsistencies in the official version. It also displays the press coverage, which, since then, called into question the hypothesis of an accident. The authors of that memorial, for the reasons given, believe in the possibility of death by torture. For them, the body would have been deposited in the building elevator shaft at Avenida Rui Barbosa, Botafogo, to conceal the crime. The main elements that support their hypothesis are the following: [1] there is no record or witness who had seen, Anísio Teixeira arrive in the building where he would have an accident, as per the official version, on the 11th of March; [2] the report, which would have been made by General Sizen Sarmento, saying Anísio was detained on the March 12th, the day after the alleged incident, in the air force for questioning; [3] that the body had been removed from the pit before any criminal investigation; [4] that the body could not have crossed through the beams just above the bottom of the shaft where it would have been found; [5] three witnesses were present at the autopsy — Afrânio Coutinho, academic, and Domingos de Paula and Francisco Duarte Guimarães Neto, both anatomical pathologists — and report that the coroner described the injuries as incompatible with the hypothesis of a fall; [6] three other doctors who didn't watch an autopsy but were at necropsy room while the body was still there — Francisco Duarte Guimarães Neto, Djalma Chastinet Contreiras and Fernando Sepúlveda corroborate the version of murder. The case received prominent attention in the work and final publication of the CNV [Chapter 2, item F, pages 79 and 80]. However, the results could not be conclusive because of the lack of autopsy report, the CNV requested the exhumation of the remains and that they be examined by the Forensic Medicine Institute of the Federal District (Instituto de Medicina Legal do Distrito Federal), which was not until by the deadline for actions CNV stipulated in December 2014. The fact is that it is still not known exactly how Teixeira died.

Let us return to the life of the educator which is the subject here.

A Natural of Caetité, five hundred kilometers west of Ilhéu in Bahia, Teixeira graduated in law from the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro) and soon after, in 1924, became Secretary — General Inspector — of Education of Bahia (Secretário — Inspetor Geral — de Ensino do Estado da Bahia). In 1925, he traveled to Europe to get to know the French public education system. In 1927, he visited the United States with the same purpose. Two years later, in 1929, would return to the US territory to graduate with a Master of Arts from Columbia University in New York. At that time, he met John Dewey, the distinguished philosopher and professor, at Columbia, and most likely by Dewey himself, took stock of the system of public schools which then forged in Detroit, were the called platoon schools. Indeed, in the 1920s, the force of the industry in Detroit put the city in the center of the scene. In this case, a troubled scene, marked by conflicts of class, both racial and ethnic. Here, the construction of an urban school system and the public was the result of struggles for rights of both workers and teachers. Each with their respective organizations, the Detroit Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Teachers. They fought for child labor, defended it as a quality that was considered emancipatory education, debated on public spending on school, discussed-appropriate content and educational activities; thought on the role of the school institution in society. They were aware of precedence. Either to refuse them, as ward-based education, or to partially adopt them, because it is always critical, as is the case of the Gary-System in Indiana and the Chicago system. The process of this construction is richly described in the book “The Rise and Fall of an Urban School System, Detroit 1907-1981”, Jeffrey Mirel, Michigan Press, 1999. The author even writes of John Dewey’s intersections of thought with the construction of the education system in Detroit. There are parallels with concepts published in “The School and Society,” a book that Dewey had launched in 1900. There are also links with the Gary-Plan from Indiana, of which Dewey assessed positively in his official report. In other words, there were common points between Dewey’s thought and the formation of the urban public school system in Detroit. Although they were not central. Anyway, it was through the philosopher that Anísio Teixeira met the education system that would mark his work for the rest of life.

Why and how did Detroit’s schools make such an impression on him? By the force of synthesis it represented. Undoubtedly, the main achievement of that historical experience was the synthesis, to the point that it was possible to understand it in a diagram. Even before, and regardless of being any building. I refer to the diagram which clearly shows how the proposed system responded very well, not only to teaching goals but, also to economic demands and efficiency, which were crucial issues in this industrial city. The strategy of this synthesis gains strength in its extreme simplicity: the children are divided into two numerically equal groups that alternate in the spaces in order to optimize the use of the built structure or, doubling the occupancy if you will. Note, there are two groups of students, for two groups of spaces designed to correspond to two groups of complementary activities. We will return to this later. The arrangement of shifts, or hours, is perfectly consistent with the same scheme. That is where their greatest advantage comes from because the classes are alternated at different times in the same spaces. It is precisely why they are organized into a group called platoons. Insufficient baptism for such elaboration. In fact, an unfortunate term even in the military sense, that would eventually lead the critics of the time to an easy image: regiments of children as platoons of poor workers’ kids. A negative image that critics of that model made use of as camouflage for their real motivation: class conflict. That is what was used to obfuscate the immense achievements and latent potentiality of that clear design for urban public education. It was just that which would prevent the adoption of the same system in New York.

Evidently, Anísio Teixeira was not in line with those criticisms. On the contrary, he clung to the potential he saw in that system as an engine for their own appropriate responses to the Brazilian context. Indeed, he would dedicate himself to it until the day he died.

His relationship with that American university was not casual or episodic. If on the one hand, John Dewey’s pragmatism had a great impact on their formation, on the other hand, the work of Brazilian educator would not pass unnoticed to the institution. So much so that, in 1963, he would receive the Medal of Honor from Columbia University and the very next year after being impeached as president of the University of Brasilia, he would lecture as a visiting professor in the same American university.

The architect [Hélio Duarte]

In 1973, still in shock from Anísio Teixeira's death and under the immobilizing weight of the same political context, Hélio Duarte decided to publish "Escolas Classe - Escola Parque" The book is a remarkable tribute to the educator — reissued in 2009 under André Takiya's organization, brings the excellent essay by Hugo Segawa and the interview granted by Hélio Duarte to Euler Sandeville in 1985 — whose death Hélio Duarte credited an unfortunate accident, as he stated in that interview.

Helio Duarte was born in Rio de Janeiro in 1906, he graduated from the School of Fine Arts (Escola de Belas Artes) in the same city in 1930. In 1935, he transferred himself to Salvador, Bahia. In 1944, he moved to São Paulo. While his Brazilian geographical route is almost the opposite of Teixeira, they would meet.

[[placeholder]]Helio Duarte was already in São Paulo when, along with Diogenes Rebouças, he developed the project of the Centro Popular de Educação — Escola Carneiro Ribeiro — opened in 1950 in Salvador. By that time, in fact since the end of 1948, the School Agreement (Convênio Escolar) between the city and state of São Paulo is already established, and he had a short, but decisive, participation in the agreement which was created to design the network of schools and related equipment. That is, it is precisely in the Convention foundation that originates the Department of Buildings in the city of São Paulo (Departamento de Edificações da Cidade de São Paulo), EDIF, who inherited that initial scope - school network and related equipment - soon to expand to the buildings of health and from there, just one more step to all other public buildings. In addition, the School Agreement is coincident both in time and in many of its authors — in the case of Eduardo Corona, Roberto Tibau, Oswaldo Corrêa Gonçalves and Ernest Carvalho Mange — with the founding of the School of Architecture of the University of São Paulo (Faculdade de Arquitetura da Universidade de São Paulo), FAUUSP, 1949.

Yes, the architecture scene in São Paulo, you have the impression that everything was defined at that time lapse between 1948 and 1952, or expanded mode from 1943, taking as a starting point the foundation of the IAB, and in 1954, having as a framework the inauguration of Ibirapuera Park. Hélio Duarte participated as co-author of the IAB headquarters project.

For almost five years Helio Duarte signed several projects, during which was the School Agreement until it was shut down in 1952. It is during this period that he delves deeper into the concepts of education, always guided by Anísio Teixeira, whom he called simply Dr. Rieux in reference to the narrator-character of Albert Camus in the novel "The Plague." Their designs keep constant attention and fidelity to the principles brought by the educator, elaborated from platoon schools, in the form of "Escolas Classe - Escola Parque." His educational projects acquis is outstanding and embraces all levels from group school to university campuses. At the same time, his professional activity has always been allied, since 1938, with an outstanding academic career, especially as a professor at FAUUSP, since the school's founding in 1949 until his retirement in 1977, with an interval due to their itinerancies, between 1953 and 1967 by São Carlos, Ceará, Bahia, Brasília.

The School Agreement emerged in São Paulo's effervescence period and was, as it turned out, a fruitful event with consequences of the utmost importance. Moreover, there are subjects from that period that are still waiting to be better understood. One is that the result effectively implemented by the School Agreement activity was lower than predicted in its five-year plan. The end of the first five-year period coincided with the celebrations of the fourth centenary of the city of São Paulo, in 1954. An episode to be studied in order to understand to what extent the construction of Ibirapuera Park had an impact on the budget for other public buildings such as the school's partnership network.

At any rate, Hélio Duarte resigned from the agreement in 1952. It is possible that he already carried from there, some frustrations regarding the discrepancy between what was predicted in design compared to what actually occurred in that economic, political and administrative conjuncture. Other adversities came, Segawa reports the misfortune of their participation in the controversial reopening of the architecture faculty of Brasília UNB in 1967, when it fell to him the thankless task of reopening the architecture course shortly after

its closure by the events and protests that followed cassation in 1964, its third rector, who was just Teixeira. Besides, his final period in FAUUSP seems to have been marked by an atmosphere of isolation and melancholy, although some major work has been accomplished. It was a discouraging time for the school. It had its teacher and students persecuted, and it functioned in a hostile environment for architecture institutions, such as contests, debates, exhibitions, publications and the university itself. But on the other hand, there was no justification towards the extent and importance of Hélio Duarte's work as an architect or a teacher. It was in this manner that, by the end of his life and considering the disenchantment tone of his interview in 1985, frustrations gained more space.

And yet, it is that same period in 1973, when he was completely dedicated to FAU, that he writes the text that marks the culmination of his career as an architect and teacher. Work in honor of Anísio Teixeira. It is a book of great importance, where the reasoning of the educator gains extraordinary emphasis and special sense regarding architectural thought. Helio Duarte accomplished something remarkable because he exposes the thoughts and strategies of Teixeira through diagrams that make livable for everyone the scheme that the educator glimpsed in public schools in Detroit. Undoubtedly, Hélio Duarte successfully accomplished his two goals for this publication: [1] the tribute, and especially [2] bring closer the ideas of the architecture teacher. His text provides a clear glimpse on how Aloísio Teixeira solves his most ambitious equation - yes, the great ambition of a generous and modest man - creating conditions for the implementation of an educational system in his country that could ensure "quality education accessible for all". The precedence of Detroit was, in fact, crucial for him. The division of students into two groups, as adopted in platoon schools, enabled the possibility of overlaying two concurrent schools in parallel: one that 'instructed' by the triad reading, writing and counting, called 3 R's or writing, reading and arithmetic, with one teacher in each room, homeroom. Anísio called this the Class Schools. The second model 'educated' through a program enriched by literature activities, geography, art, music, crafts, domestic science, theater, physical activity; it was called enriched program, with several specific teachers for each subject or activity. This second model, Anísio Teixeira named Park School. Both models would be combined in order that, for every four class schools, one would be a park school, able to host all students from the four class schools. Alternating shifts between morning and afternoon ensured that all spaces would be used throughout the day in order to make the best use of public equipment. It was arithmetically conceived according to the ideal number of students per class, 500 students per class school, four class schools combined with a park school, displaying a capacity of 2,000 students. Systemic view.

In the last paragraphs, dedicated to the book completion, the text of Hélio Duarte shows a disenchantment tone, although it was not this message that the author wanted to convey. Instead, he had clearly worked to end with a message of hope - but he could not smooth his obvious disappointment. One gets the impression that he actually wanted to believe in Dr. Rieux, the true character of Camus literature when he quotes him at the end of his conclusion: "To state quite simply what we learn in a time of pestilence: there are more things to admire in men than to despise." Yes, he sincerely wanted to believe, but could not devise how. Perhaps he felt a failure similar to the one he sensed regarding his version of Aloísio Teixeira's death. Maybe he had already inferred that the version he wanted to believe in did not match the absurdity of the fact. And observe that at that time - when his book was published, in 1973, and also during the interview granted in 1985 - there was no other version, except for someone so close to the educator's family that the last could share its well-founded suspicions.

In the end, it is sad to realize that the feeling that prevailed in the fruitful life Hélio Duarte was a frustrating disappointment. This persisted in such a way that, during the interview of 1985, when asked what the result of schools as neighborhoods cores was, he answers in one word: "none."

And we were back to the bottom of the shaft.

Duality [that they represent]

But there is another way, and this is the main reason for this text.

There are no words for the brutality against Anísio Teixeira, whatever is the outcome of the clarification work on the circumstances of his death. I say this as a caveat to what comes next, and it is only said as a way to look for another possible way and not to mitigate the malice of a possible crime. For I believe, after all, that the man's life was not entirely contained in that dead body. The work of a man is a legacy that embodies, in each piece, a part of his existence. Thus, one could redo - and also update - the formulation of his dreamed Class Schools - Park School from a simple diagram recorded by Helio Duarte. This diagram condenses lives since the struggle of Detroit workers. It is noticeable that it would not be possible or it would be much more difficult to do it without the valuable work of Hélio Duarte.

From this report, it is possible to see that Teixeira and Hélio Duarte worked together as if they worked side by side. From the perspective of FAUUSP, it is almost possible to confuse them, since they merge into a very special kind of unity that exists only in the vibrant and complementary coexistence of two inseparable components: the duality. Here is a founding concept for this activity that already and undoubtedly displays the duality in its name: archi-ecture. The two fields of knowledge - man and nature sciences - merge into a single word to name, and also to make it possible, the activity of designing the world in which human activities unfold. Duality is presented by different actors as relevant in each historical context: art and technique, theory and practice, form and function, subject and image and so on. In the case of our two protagonists, the educator embodies the method - to use a duality evoked by Anísio Teixeira himself when, regarding John Dewey, he talks about how we learn - as an architect, the subject. The first, as an idea, maintains the power to be open to several possible embodiments; while the second, as indeed has the beauty of crystallizing ideas or life itself in what is built. Someone that holds collectively matured principles and thus tends to be accepted as data, without requiring its contextualization to each new circumstance; for that reason, the notion of authorship usually has no relevance. The other requires a careful consideration of the context and situation to be capable of performing. Here, authorship is an important notion for two aspects: intrinsic responsibilities and giving the matter a specific human form. Warning: one does not exist without the other.

In fact, it is possible to recover from human works the ideas that generated it and, although it is too obvious to be mentioned, it deserves to be stated for the following reasons:

1. The ability to read on a building the life or ideas of those who built it opens the possibility of universalization in two ways: [1] crystallized ideas emerge alive and free from the process of moorings and circumstances of where they were created, and they can get other configurations in other building projects; [2] the eyes that look mirror part of one's own cultural universe on the object or building - Anísio Teixeira reading of the platoon schools is an example, exchanges - and thus see through the object other possible propositions. Or, in a word: designs.
2. The building of FAU, scenery of our everyday lives and also the environment in which exchanges with UNI Siegen unfolds in Brazil, is the best example of how the crystallized ideas in a building can cross arbitrariness of decades, as they were awaiting the possibility of flourishing in other time. That building is an excellent example of how an educational idea can gain greater permanence through an architecture that can translate it clearly and thus not be extinguished prematurely.
3. The case of EDIF and Unified Educational Centers (CEUs), as shown below, demonstrates how this careful remaking task can be successful and update, from remnants and fragments, the dream idea for public education in Brazil. In this example, there are two sources for this 'projective archeology': the buildings of the EDIF acquis and the book-tribute written by Helio Duarte.

Alexandre Delijaicov [public affairs]

Alexandre Delijaicov graduated as an architect in 1985 at the Faculdade de Belas Artes de São Paulo (Faculty of Fine Arts of São Paulo). Then, between 1986 and 1992, he collaborated with Paulo Mendes da Rocha. In 1992, he was approved in a public recruitment examination and started his civil servant career in the City of São Paulo as an architect in EDIF. In parallel, he developed robust academic activity. He earned a master's degree in 1998, and a Ph.D. in 2005 both by FAU, where he entered as a professor of design in 2000. Since 1992, his work as a designer architect has been exclusively dedicated to public facilities projects. It is also in this period in the early 90's that, through the Master Degree, that he begins a formal and systematic research, which he has developed without interruptions up to the present, "the rivers and the design of the city", using São Paulo as a case and application study. This research has unfolded into the proposal of the Metropolitan Waterway Ring, with a doctorate entitled 'São Paulo, metrópole fluvial: os rios e a arquitetura da cidade' (São Paulo, river metropolis: the rivers and the city's architecture.) It is a celebrated work, also internationally, for the dissemination and the interest it arouses within and outside universities. It is a theme that matches the architect perseverance. On the one hand, the extent of research requires from the author a superhuman commitment regarding the organization of information and production of proposals for projects and, in parallel, advocacy for the causes that are his reason and purpose; on the other hand, due to the consequences and ramifications that such extension allows, it paves the way for engagement of numerous other researchers, architects, and students who consider Alexandre Delijaicov a reliable guide and inspiration for academic aspirations. In time, this study has been a highlight in the three government spheres, i.e., municipal, state and federal government. In the international academic world, it has been studied at Princeton, Harvard, TU Delft, University of Buenos Aires and other universities.

Alexander Delijaicov has merged method and matter: his famous descriptions of the set of public equipment distribution logic in the city, state, and country, demonstrate a systemic view; his eloquent speech is defending the public architect dedicated to education and design.

The architect profile, even if only briefly described, is necessary to keep within the scale the fact that comes next. For it was precisely this person that, luckily, had an ambitious plan for schools on the outskirts of São Paulo. In 2001, during the office of Mayor Marta Suplicy, João Sayad as Secretary of Finance, the protagonist of the episode was Fernando Haddad, finance undersecretary in the municipality of São Paulo. He was the one to believe in EDIF and created the opportunity to maintain the mature educational proposal in public service since the creation of the School Agreement - which marked the rapprochement between Anísio Teixeira and Hélio Duarte - giving credit to the architects of that public office, coordinated by Alexandre Delijaicov. André Takiya - Head of Architecture Projects Technical Section and, not coincidentally, Hélio Duarte's book reissue organizer - and Wanderley Ariza - then Director of Project Technical Division - were his closest collaborators. EDIF responded to the demand with a speed that would be impossible if it was not for a coincidence: the Squares of Social Facilities were mature and ready to be implemented. They had just received the model of the design produced by the mythical Francisco Triviño - the model maker born in 1926 in Spain and author of emblematic models such as the Rino Levi proposal during the contest of the city of Brasília in 1956 -. It was a setting that aligned quite well with that government action plans for the area of education. The EDIF architects were able to demonstrate in that occasion how they honored knowledge that was born there and that had been matured for more than fifty years. Yes, it was a lucky event because the encounter between Fernando Haddad and Alexandre Delijaicov was preceded and succeeded by so many threads of independent events alongside one another, which seems to be no chance of it happening again with the same effectiveness.

From there, in a very short term, they implemented forty-five CEUs projects, of which 21 were built. The proposal has a clear relation to the concept of Class Schools - Park School, through the remarkable maturity that was given to it when drafting the concept of Equipment Squares in the 90's, when the EDIF was directed by Mayumi Watanabe Souza Lima, architect and teacher. She was also a teacher of Alexandre Delijaicov in 1982 in Fine Arts.

Importantly, in the view of EDIF architects, CEUs project is composed with a rich - in the sense that the whole city was already set up and running - pre-existence. They no longer considered only the educational equipment, as in the initial scope of the school partnership. Instead, they took into account the expanded scope that had been taken over by the department: in addition to [1] education and also [2] culture, [3] Sports [4], health [5] assistance and social promotion, [6] green and environment and [7] urban security, to name only the main ones among seventeen municipal departments. Thus, compared to Class Schools - Park School, the program had gained complexity in a city that had become much more complex. One of its most notable aspects is that CEUs would benefit from the distribution of pre-existing equipment structure. In other words, to a certain extent, the following analogy would be possible: the pre-existing fulfill the function of class-schools [the instruction or the three R's of reading, writing and counting] while CEUs are equivalent to park-school [educating: place the subject in the world by opening dialogue channels through theater, film, orchestra, library, sports, internet access; finally, educating the citizen]. There, in the 1940s, as here, in the year 2000, one thing - class schools or pre-existing - one cannot exist without the other - the park schools or CEUs.

It turns out that such pre-existence, except in the eyes of EDIF trained technicians, tend to occupy an invisibility field. The inability to see is also the central theme, in which case it is a real theme that is not dimmed by routine or by habit. No, the poorest areas of the city become invisible first because of prejudice and contempt. We also lose the names of places; all hidden under generic names, as is the case of the word outskirts, used to coat under one mantle of indifference a major part of the city. The problem is that in a general plan, the inability to see pre-existence leads to misinterpretations: as if it were possible to start a new city every time as if the children were no longer there, almost all, in one way or another, at school. In the specific plan, among architects dedicated to the project, not seeing is much more serious because it incapacitates the subject in his craft. We will get back to the topic later.

Siegen [exchanges]

Maria Aparecida Perez was Secretary of Education of the City of São Paulo between 2001 and 2004. She was the head of the Secretariat at the time of the 21 CEUs implementation built in that office. She had a Degree in Social Sciences at USP, and after her term in office, she entered the doctoral program in Social Pedagogy at the University of Siegen, Germany. She concluded her thesis "Inclusão Social Através da Educação: um estudo do programa CEU na cidade de São Paulo" ("Social Inclusion Through Education: a study of CEU program in São Paulo") in 2010. Her advisor at that university was Bernd Fichtner, Professor of the Faculty of Education. That is how the experience of CEUs arrived in Siegen with the ballast of twenty-one units built and the legitimacy of a doctoral thesis done by the former Secretary of Education of São Paulo, head of the project. Three years later, she proposed an exchange and academic research program lasting four years between UNI Siegen and FAU. Alexandre Delijaicov was the teacher responsible for FAU. The Faculty of Architecture of the UNI Siegen responds to Professor Ulrich Exner. In this episode, Bernd Fichtner and Ulrich Exner represent the educator and the architect.

In all respects, the arrangement for the exchange could not have been better. But in this process, there is little to be narrated. Just a few notes deserve mention. Firstly, risks. Risks are necessary to a university that deems itself as part of a joint international structure. The first risk is opening up for dialogue without being sure of the result because we enter the field of means - according to John Dewey, the means are fractions of ends - hence, the need to create chances to be relevant in the next time. A school, regardless of the education level, is always intended to bet its future on its own students. The exchange students, and especially in the case of a school of architecture that gives the opportunity for productive interaction, open an acceleration channel of renewal processes and updating of the two institutions involved. The second risk lies in human conflicts between agents operating administrative systems in each institution. For each open dialogue in this particular format of academic exchange, there are a series of bureaucratic procedures subject to approvals, funding releases and all obligations resulting therefrom. Ulrich Exner took on a battle; when he decided to

lead, on behalf of his school, an exchange program with FAUUSP. Other risks, such as an agenda committed to four years in advance and all the incidents are inevitable. It is remarkable the enthusiasm of Ulrich Exner with the project; it becomes clear when the measurement basis is the interest level of that school's students and teachers. This is the case, for example, of Professor Götz Stöckmann, responsible for three annual exhibitions in UNI Siegen and that already considers to dedicate one to Brazilian architecture. Undoubtedly, if the means are fractions of ends, the outcome of this exchange program promises to honor the courage of Bernd Fichtner and Maria Aparecida Perez proposal and academic generosity of Ulrich Exner and Alexandre Delijaicov. To date, thanks to the support from CAPES and DAAD - institutions that support research in Brazil and Germany, respectively - as well as teachers trips from both schools, twenty students from Siegen did an exchange program at FAU, while twelve Brazilian students were in the reverse route. They are thirty-two young students-architects that, justified by public education theme, are inserted in another cultural context and experience the feeling of estrangement crucial to the renewal of the two contexts. In fact, one made in favor of what is to come. We are still in the stage of fractions moving towards the ends. I await beautiful proposals to be conceived by some of these thirty-two young people which were transformed by their experience.

Back to the specific plan of trained architects, those that can see pre-existence, the only way to train people who stands in front of a public building or the ruins of what was a school with sufficient provision to get interested and have time to look at it carefully searching for signs that allow to rebuild the idea of teaching that was practiced there and then consider it or refuse it while conceiving something new. It is a simple process, no secrets.

I believe it is through this process that the still obscure death of a man will not give out his entire life. Anísio Teixeira. This is also how the dismay of another man cannot cover up the greatness of his own work. Hélio Duarte. That a child in a school in São Paulo - could be Siegen - shows no evidence of knowing about the lives that were committed to ensuring the best learning accessible to all, this is wisdom and lightness; this is an ideal of architecture, which we should know how to carry with us.