ANNIE PEDRET

TEAM 10:

an archival history

TEAM 10:
AN ARCHIVAL HISTORY

Annie Pedret

TEAM 10:
AN ARCHIVAL HISTORY

After World War II, a young generation of modern architects directed a series of challenges and critiques at the methods and aims of modern town planning they were being expected to implement by the founding members of CIAM (International Congress of Modern Architecture). Their call for a wider and deeper agenda and a more rigorous adherence to the founding principles of modern architecture resulted in the formation of the splinter group, a loose association of architects known as Team 10. The group is credited for bringing about the demise of this important institution for the promotion and debate of modern architecture.

This account recuperates the lost history of the emergence of Team 10 from CIAM in the period between 1947 and 1959, how it was represented in the early 1960s, and echoed in one way or another ever since. Telling the story of early Team 10 thinking shifts the importance of the group from its better-known projects of the 1960s and '70s to the more theoretically vigorous period of the 1940s and '50s. This "other" story of the details of the debates about the future of town planning reveals the ruptures and continuities between the CIAM generations, Team 10 members themselves, and reveals a more extensive critique of developing modern architecture at mid-century than has hitherto been recognized.

Offered here is a framework for understanding the principles that allowed this diverse group of young modern architects to come together, introduce a new set of values for developing architectural modernism at mid-century on which architects have based their work ever since. As a micro-institutional history, this history also functions as a case study for understanding the role played by representation for both establishing and changing, existing ideologies, institutions, and power structures.

Annie Pedret is an Associate Professor at the School of Architecture, University of Illinois at Chicago.

For Royston Landau

scholar, mentor, and friend

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

We have very fortunately the work of our spiritual fathers to build on. We hate them, of course, as all spiritual sons hate all spiritual fathers, but we can't ignore them, nor can we deny their greatness.

(Philip Johnson[1])

To tell the story of Team 10 as it emerged from CIAM (International Congress for Modern Architecture) after World War II, is to trace both the rise of a splinter group and the demise of an important institution for the promotion and debate of modern architecture. This story can be portrayed as an archetypal battle of sons overthrowing their fathers, an institutional history of postwar CIAM, a chapter in the history of modernism, and an intellectual history of the critical reevaluation of the methods and aims of architecture and town planning at mid-century. What is clear is that the discussions about the future of modern town planning polarized CIAM membership roughly along generational lines. On one side were the founding members of CIAM, leading modern architects led by Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius, and Josep Lluís Sert. On the other, an emerging third generation of modern architects led by Dutch architects Jacob B. Bakema and Aldo van Eyck, Greek-born architect Georges Candilis, American architect and urban planner Shadrach Woods, and British husband-and wife team Peter and Alison Smithson[2] informed by the thinking of second generation architects Alfred Roth and Ernesto Rogers from Switzerland and Italy, and Swiss architectural historian Sigfried Giedion. The story of the emergence of Team 10 from CIAM has been portrayed as one of "revolution" and "rupture," but it is also one of continuity of principle, shifting priorities, and divergent methods which characterized CIAM from the start. This is a history of the first auto-critique of modern architecture from an institutional point of view, which ensured the continued relevance of modern architecture at mid-century.

The story

The story of Team 10 as it is commonly understood goes something like this: an international group of young architects came together between 1953 and 1956 to form the loose association of architects known as Team 10, allied by their dissatisfaction of CIAM as an institution and their functional approach to modern town planning which proposed a rational method of dividing towns into autonomous areas by the four functions of dwelling, work, recreation, and transportation. In 1956, the executive branch of CIAM asked a group of these younger members to organize CIAM 10. The core members of Team 10 were Alison and Peter Smithson, Aldo van Eyck, Jacob Bakema, Georges Candilis, and Shadrach Woods. Other members were assigned a more tentative status: the Italian architect Giancarlo De Carlo, the Swedish

3 Peter Smithson, London, to
Jacob Bakema, 20 June 1954,
Folder CIAM 6, 7, 8, 9, vd4,
Bakema Archive, Nederlands
Architectuurinstituut, Rotterdam,
hereafter cited as BAK.
4 Reyner Banham, "CIAM,"
in Encyclopedia of Modern
Architecture (New York: Harry
N. Abrams, 1964), 73.
5 Kenneth Frampton, Modern
Architecture: A Critical History
(London: Thames & Hudson; 1980),
271.
6 Manfredo Tafuri and Francesco
Dal Co, Modern Architecture, vol. 2
(New York: H. N. Abrams, 1979),
345, 347.
7 Giorgio Ciucci, "The Story of
CIAM and the Myth of the Modern
Movement," Casabella 463/464
(November–December 1980), 118.
8 Alison Smithson, ed. Team 10
Primer (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT
Press, 1968), 2–3.
9 Banham, Encyclopedia, 73.
10 Charles Jencks, Modern
Movements in Architecture
(Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor &
Doubleday; 1973), 302.
11 Tafuri and Dal Co, Modern
Architecture, 349. The "crude
poetry" likely refers to Reyner
Banham's description of the New
Brutalism in his article "The New
Brutalism," Architectural Review
118 (1955), 355–61, and The New
Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic? (New
York: Reinhold, 1966).
12 Frampton, Modern Architecture,
271.
13 Max Risselada and Dirk van den
Heuvel, eds., Team 10 1953–81: in
search of a Utopia of the present
(Rotterdam: Nederlands
Architectuurinstituut, 2005), 11.

architect and urban planner Ralph Erskine, the Latvian-born architect Jerzy Soltan, the Spanish architect José Coderch, and the young British architect John Voelcker. Team 10 continued to meet until 1977, and declared the end of the group on the occasion of Bakema's death in 1983. Team 10 is best known for the projects of its various members of the 1960s and 1970s. The first book about the group, Team 10 Primer (1962, 1966, 1968), was written by self-appointed chronicler of the group, Alison Smithson, and remains the key text about the group.

A radical tenor was assigned to the group by Peter Smithson when he declared, on 20 June 1954, that "the Revolution is accomplished."[3] British historian, critic, and journalist Reyner Banham echoed and amplified Smithson's revolutionary sentiment when he referred to the young CIAM generation as making a "clean break" with CIAM's Charter of Athens (1943) and "revolt from mechanical concepts of order" at CIAM 9, followed by the "direct challenge presented to the established members by the young radicals of Team-X." By the end of CIAM 10 he declared, "CIAM was in ruins and Team-X stood upon the wreckage of something that they had joined with enthusiasm, and – with equal enthusiasm – destroyed."[4]

Since then Team 10 has been portrayed by historians as "dissenting from the ruling authority of CIAM," having produced a "decisive split" that came at CIAM 9 when this generation "challenged" the four functional categories of the Charter of Athens.[5] The Italian historian Manfredo Tafuri described the Smithsons in similarly hostile terms as belonging to the generation that can be credited for the "unrest of the so-called Generation of Angry Young Men" and Team 10 as "attacking alienating functionalism" with their call for a more humanistic modern architecture.[6] Italian historian, Giorgio Ciucci, echoed this militant vocabulary to describe the "young members of Team X" who brought about "a clash" that brought about the collapse and end of CIAM, and "attacked" the homogenous picture of the Modern Movement.[7]

While historians and chroniclers of Team 10 agree that the group coalesced around their shared dissatisfaction with CIAM's planning method of the functional city, there is less agreement about what Team 10 proposed in its place and which members made the crucial contributions. According to Alison Smithson (1962), Team 10 came together because of "a mutual realization of the inadequacies of the processes of architectural thought."[8] Banham characterized Team 10 thinking as intending to replace the "large-scale diagrammatic generalizations" of CIAM with an approach that favored "the personal, the particular, and the precise."[9] Charles Jencks identified the primary issue of Team 10 thinking as being their desire to "re-establish the basis for urban identity."[10] Tafuri, meanwhile, focused on what he called Team 10's "new humanism," which he described as their confrontation of society's mass production through a "sort of crude poetry from the powerful and confused forces involved."[11] Frampton describes the dissatisfaction of the Smithsons, Van Eyck, Bakema, Candilis, Woods, Voelcker, and William and Gillian Howell with the "modified Functionalism of the old guard – with the 'idealism' of Le Corbusier, Van Eesteren, Sert, Ernesto Rogers, Alfred Roth, Kunio Mayekawa and Gropius." The "critical drives" of Team 10, Frampton describes, were "to find a more precise relation between physical form and socio-psychological need."[12] More recently, Max Risselada and Dirk van den Heuvel examine Team 10 through contemporary theoretical frameworks of art, media, sociology, and the "production of the city."[13]

Histories of Team 10 tend to emphasize the contributions by the group's British members. Charles Jencks creates this impression by singling out the Smithsons as introducing "new ways of thinking" about modern urbanism through their notions of "urban re-identification" and "human associations."[14] Frampton concurs by portraying Aldo van Eyck as being an important "outsider" who, with his attack on the roots of alienating abstraction of modern architecture, joined the "essential pluralism" of mainstream Team 10 thought as it had been developed by the Smithsons. He further emphasized the role of the Smithsons by suggesting that they were responsible for replacing CIAM's four functions of the city – dwelling, work, recreation, and transportation – with more "phenomenological" categories – house, street, district, and city – at CIAM 9.[15] Recent scholarship begins to redress the British bias in the historiography of Team 10 by acknowledging the "specific position and contributions of the later Team 10 participants" and the national contexts from which they emerged.

An "other" story

This is another story of Team 10. It shifts the focus of the group's history from their better-known period of the 1960s and 1970s to their more theoretically intense period of the 1940s and 1950s; from their projects and buildings to their thinking; from highlighting the contributions by some of its members to including contributions by some that are not even considered to be members of Team 10; from examining Team 10's rupture with CIAM to taking into consideration continuities with CIAM; from emphasizing the overt differences in approach among Team 10 members themselves supported by continuity of principle and their shared commitment to being modern architects "first and foremost."[16]

The theoretical position developed by younger members was deeply indebted to the intellectual groundwork of CIAM members before and during World War II. In 1928 the founders of CIAM clearly announced that "the destiny" of modern architecture was to express the "orientation of the age."[17] Alison Smithson echoed the same aim for Team 10 in different words. Orientation of the age became building towards society's "realization of itself" by being "Utopian about the present."[18] The theoretical groundwork for what would become associated with Team 10 had been developed during the war. A key text for the group was Alfred Roth's *The New Architecture*,[19] a fundamentally anti-formalist stance that argued in favor of taking into consideration locality, topography, site, climate, local materials and culture, history, and regional and national planning.[20] Sigfried Giedion's fear of the effects of mechanization on postwar life, attitudes, and instincts in *Mechanization Takes Command* echoed throughout the discussion in the first congresses after the war,[21] was echoed by Aldo van Eyck's call for greater balance between imagination and reason at CIAM 6 which also leaned heavily on a similar argument by Giedion in *Space, Time and Architecture*. John Voelcker's Zone project (1953) and the Smithsons' Berlin Hauptstadt project (1957–8) at once were modeled on and critiqued Le Corbusier's conception of modern towers-in-the-park urbanism presented as the Ville Radieuse (Radiant City) at CIAM 3 (1930).

The younger CIAM members introduced and used the discussions at CIAM to develop their own theoretical and conceptual tools: The Smithsons' notion of the "doorstep" or "threshold" informed Van Eyck's notion of the "in-between," which bore a conceptual semblance to the Smithsons aesthetic strategy of the "cluster"; Bakema and the Dutch group Opbouw introduced

[14] Jencks, *Modern Movements in Architecture*, 305. His understanding of Team 10 is based on two documents, both produced by the British members of Team 10: Alison Smithson, ed., *Team 10 Primer* (London: Standard Catalogue, 1966), 43; and "Draft Framework 5 of CIAM X, December 1954," *Arena* 81, n. 893 (June 1965), 13.
[15] Frampton, *Modern Architecture*, 272, 276.
[16] Peter Smithson to Jacob Bakema, 20 June 1954, BAK, vd4.
[17] CIAM, "La Sarraz Declaration" [1928], in *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-Century Architecture*, ed. Ulrich Conrads (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964), 109–13.
[18] Alison Smithson, *Team 10 Primer* (London: Standard Catalogue, 1966), 1; (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1968), 3.
[19] Giancarlo De Carlo in conversation with the author, 17 July 1998, Milan. Alfred Roth, *The New Architecture* (Zurich: Girsberger, 1940).
[20] Ibid., 7–8.
[21] Sigfried Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command: A Contribution to Anonymous History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), 3–4.

22 CIAM, "La Sarraz Declaration,"
109.

the "visual group" and "identifying device," and the "relationship between things"; and the notion of "evolutive frameworks" replaced the static premise of the CIAM grid. This new vocabulary reflected a profound shift in priorities of the modern architecture promoted by CIAM before the war: from economic efficiency, rationalization, standardization, existence minimum,[22] and the disavowal of history, to totalities, integration, relationships, neighborhoods, communities, socio-geographic differentiation, identity, and history; from physical needs to spiritual aspirations, from idealism to reality as it is, from top-down rationalist methods to more empirical bottom-up processes, from universalism to a modern architecture that existed in a particular physical, social, and historical context, a postwar modern architecture that was based on the core values they could agree on: particularity, integration, and change. This was a modern architecture with postmodern values.

Approach

There is no definitive event, document, project or building that marks the beginning of Team 10. Team 10 as a subject is an evolutionary story from individual contributions to a collective formulation. Depending on how the story is framed, the beginning of Team 10 can be traced as far back as the dissatisfaction with the functional city by the Dutch CIAM members before the war at CIAM 5. Team 10 evolved through a series a beginnings: from the contributions of various individuals at CIAM 6, 7, and 8, to theorizing and coalescing these individual contributions around the concept of "habitat," to projecting their ideas in architectural terms at CIAM 9 in 1953, to the emergence of Team 10 as a group in 1954, to the triumph of Team 10 at CIAM '59 at Otterlo, to Alison Smithson's attempt to represent and historicize the importance of the group in the *Team 10 Primer*. Thus, it is not surprising that histories of Team 10 cannot agree about the date the group was established. The closest document of consensus that exists, "Statement on Habitat," was written before Team 10 was recognized as such.

The premise for this investigation is that there is no overriding methodology applicable to all situations. There are only individual methodologies which are determined by the nature of the subject and sources being examined. The nature of this subject – an "other" and early history of Team 10 thinking – is diverse, indeterminate, in flux, and simultaneously diachronic and synchronic. Team 10 consisted of an international and intellectually diverse group of modern architects who came to CIAM with different experiences of the war, modern architecture, and CIAM. They came with different formal strategies, methods of work, and interpretations and approaches to dealing with the complex realities they were expected to address. The heterogeneity of the contributions and the members of the group adds to the difficulty of historicizing this early period of Team 10. The Swiss CIAM group members Rolf Gutmann and Theo Manz and Dutch CIAM members introduced the notion that architects ought to aim at achieving totalities and entities; Bakema emphasized the importance of relationships between things, and between human beings and things, as being more important than the things themselves; members of the British MARS Group (Modern Architectural Research Group) were concerned with particularity of socio-geographic integration; Van Eyck questioned the legitimacy of the tradition of Western dualistic thinking; Dutch CIAM members foregrounded the synthetic nature of "daily life" – neighborhoods, communities, identity, change over time, and the effect of speed on urbanism; Candilis and Woods introduced the need to

address local culture and traditions; and Ernesto Rogers and Italian CIAM members argued for the inclusion of history and culture as necessary considerations for modern architecture. The future Team 10 members joined CIAM at different times and had different experiences within CIAM: Bakema and Van Eyck made their first appearance at CIAM 6, Candilis at CIAM 7, and the Smithsons, in an official capacity, at CIAM 9.

The distinction between the generations is accurate only in the loosest terms. The older generation consisted mainly of the executive CIAM members, born in the 1880s.[23] The younger generation comprised members born in the 1920s.[24] Complicating the characterization of the critique of CIAM in generational terms were architects born between these two generations. Some of these in-between or second-generation architects, such as Georges Candilis, Jacob Bakema, and Ernesto Rogers, allied themselves with the younger members but were more committed to the institutional continuity of CIAM.[25] Rogers led the critique of the role of history in modern architecture and Bakema was sympathetic to continuity within CIAM, but also championed a reassessment. The second-generation CIAM member Josep Lluís Sert agreed with the critical assessment of the younger members but allied himself politically with the "elders." For the purposes of this account, the second generation members are assigned to being in one or other group according to their critical position vis-à-vis CIAM and its method of modern urban planning.[26]

Lastly, the group itself was loosely structured and the composition and status of members of the group changed continually. The structure of the group was more familiar than hierarchical, as had been the case for CIAM:

> Team 10 functions without chairman, secretary, or any bureaucratic structure . . . our idea was to be totally different from what had gone before . . . functions naturally in the manner of a real family; accepting in the beginning that when its cohesive energy died, it would die. As part of this deliberate policy no archives were kept by us . . . therefore documents that survive were kept for ideological reasons and or family connective reasons as one keeps mementos of emotional ties . . . a moth eaten leaf, some postcards, are mementos of La Sarraz.[27]

Jerzy Soltan, Geir Grung, Ralph Erskine, and José Coderch, who Alison Smithson considered to be members of Team 10, only began participating in Team 10 at or after the first meeting organized by Team 10 at Otterlo, Holland in 1959, but were not CIAM members, or involved in laying the theoretical foundations of early Team 10 thinking. Other CIAM members who were involved in setting down the conceptual framework for what would later become Team 10 thinking were not considered part of Team 10 or acknowledged for their contributiuons: notably Italian architect Ernesto Rogers, British architects William and Gillian Howell, Swiss architects Rolf Gutmann and Theo Manz, and Dutch architect Sandy van Ginkel.

Finally, the formative period of Team 10 happened in a period of flux. Positions were being developed through a reiterative and repetitive process in which members influenced each other. Theoretical statements and formal propositions were often inconsistent. The critique of CIAM occurred over a long period of time, and its conceptual foundation had already been established long before Team 10 was recognized as a group. There had been tension and disagreements in CIAM throughout its history. Particular

[23] Le Corbusier (b. 1887); Sigfried Giedion (b. 1888); Walter Gropius (b. 1883).
[24] Aldo van Eyck (b. 1918); Shadrach Woods (b. 1923); Peter Smithson (b. 1923); John Voelcker (b. 1927); Alison Smithson (b. 1928).
[25] Ernesto Rogers (b. 1909); George Candilis (b. 1913); Jacob Bakema (b. 1914).
[26] A more critical and nuanced investigation of Ernesto Rogers, J. L. Sert, and Jacob Bakema in the framework of this generational divide remains to be written.
[27] Alison Smithson, foreword to *The Emergence of Team 10 out of CIAM* (London: Architectural Association, 1982), 4.

28 The Jaqueline Tyrwhitt Papers
are part of the CIAM archive, at
the Eidgenössische Technische
Hochschule, Zurich, and at the
British Architectural Library, Royal
Institute of British Architects:
Manuscripts and Archives
collection, London. Tyrwhitt papers
relating to Patrick Geddes are at the
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.
29 Alison Smithson, *Team 10
Meetings, 1953–1984* (New York:
Rizzoli, 1991).

opposition to the functional city surfaced at CIAM 4 and was taken up again by the Polish architect Helena Syrkus and Dutch and Italian CIAM members at CIAM 5. This opposition continued with the critique of the CIAM and the CIAM grid by Italian members at CIAM 7, and others by the Dutch CIAM members Lotte Stam-Beese and E. F. Groosman, the British CIAM members, the Swiss architect Theo Manz, and representatives of the Swiss Groupe Bâlois and Georges Candilis who, among other things, drafted an alternative organizational structure for CIAM 10. These criticisms gained momentum after the war within CIAM at large, but particularly among future Team 10 members: Jacob Bakema, Aldo van Eyck, Georges Candilis, and Italian CIAM members – all questioned CIAM planning methods and began proposing alternatives at CIAM 6, CIAM 7, and CIAM 8.

Team 10 thinking was not accessible through written proclamations, or manifestos, or publications. There is no Team 10 authored building or project, nor is there an archive for Team 10. The source materials for this investigation came from numerous collections at the CIAM archive in Zurich, the office archives of various CIAM members, and interviews. The archives of the various CIAM members themselves differed in the degree to which they were ideologically driven. Sigfried Giedion's archive, secretary-general of CIAM before and after the war, was decidedly self-conscious about its contents, as was the pragmatic archive of the Smithsons who apparently limited their Team 10-related material to two boxes in which, according to Peter Smithson, a document could only be added when another one was removed. The archives of less well-known architects, like the Dutch architect Romke de Vries, and high-profile CIAM members who were less engaged or invested in the CIAM discussions, such as the British architect Erno Goldfinger, were idiosyncratic, but less self-conscious. At the other end of the spectrum was the inclusive, systematic archive of the CIAM secretary, Jaqueline Tyrwhitt. As acting secretary of CIAM from 1951 until its dissolution, Tyrwhitt collected and collated documents with the intention, it seems, of providing as complete a record as possible. Her archive is a particularly rich source for understanding the full spectrum of the discussions that took place, and the differences between how events were represented in the informal and formal documents and revealed how CIAM, either by a lack of understanding, or willful intent to edit out positions that did not support its methods and ideology, omitted and suppressed contributions of its younger members and criticisms of CIAM.[28]

Similar strategies were employed by Alison Smithson who exhibited a similarly high degree of ideological control over the content and image of Team 10. She crafted her own account of Team 10 by ignoring and omitting some contributions while highlighting others, and devising an epistemological structure for the discussions that deviated from the one discussed at the meetings. She edited and compiled three monographs about Team 10: the *Team 10 Primer* (1962, 1966, 1968), which is the key text about the group, *The Emergence of Team 10 out of CIAM* (1982), a less-known compilation of documents published by the Architectural Association in London, and *Team 10 Meetings, 1953–1984* (1991) which have formed the basis of our conception of the group ever since.[29] Alison Smithson's accounts failed to represent the richness of the critique of modern architecture within CIAM. This was due in part because she was the latest of the core members of Team 10 to join CIAM in 1953 and was thus unaware of the discussions that had preceded her, and in part because her accounts were self-interested, lacking a critical apparatus and the benefit of historical distance.

The nature of the archival sources raises another methodological issue. Documents – even the most objective ones – do not have a transparent relationship with the reality they represent. Documents contain the concepts and obsessions of their producer and obey the rules of writing peculiar to their genre. Thus, sources are constructions that require historians to be attentive to the author and their intent. Moreover, documents reveal the awareness that certain individuals had of their role in shaping the social production and reproduction of the institution.[30] The assumption of this investigation is that there is a greater chance that an author's ideological guard will be down in less formal documents such as handwritten notes of meetings, personal letters between members, drafts of minutes and reports, and contributions by individual CIAM members that were not included in the official CIAM reports.[31] Next in the hierarchy of documents were official memos and official reports circulated between members, and then published books by CIAM which were tainted by their mandate to promote a certain kind of modern architecture.

The discussions in CIAM were oral. Thus with the exception of the audiotapes of the discussions at CIAM '59, unedited primary documentation for Team 10 does not exist[32] and the archival documents in these archives were already, to greater and lesser degrees, representations of what had occurred. The oral nature of the discourse and its representation is further complicated by the multilingual nature of CIAM and Team 10. Particular words, such as "habitat," "habitation," "dwelling," and "*logis*" carried different meanings and connotations in different languages. In this multilingual setting, translations caused delays in understanding and provided opportunities for slippage in meaning and reception. To complicate the linguistic landscape further, new words – such as "threshold," "doorstep," "choice," and "daily life" – were introduced to the discussion which carried very particular meanings for their authors, sometimes represented an entire personal theory, and whose meaning changed over the course of this formative period.

This more complex story with its contradictions and alliances, and continuities and ruptures, exists in the documentary crevices of CIAM and Team 10 – contributions that were ignored, suppressed, or omitted from publications and official reports, contributions by members who would never be associated with Team 10 but made important contributions to the group's orientation, the discussions that occurred at meetings between official congresses by the CIAM executive and national CIAM groups (MARS, Opbouw, De 8), and examining sources with questionable authoritative status. The method employed here also required going to the edges of the subject – examining the critiques of the functional city within CIAM before the war, the alternatives for modern architecture being theorized by founding CIAM members during the war, the institutional and discursive context from which these new values emerged, and the role played by personality and circumstance in the fate of a particular discourse or position.

This investigation assumes that an institution cannot be explained in terms of so-called collectives, but as social institutions formed by "the decisions, actions, and attitudes etc. of human individuals."[33] This study resists homogenizing Team 10 thinking. Instead it identifies individual contributions and the diverse, tentative, and complex nature of these debates, while also trying to find hints of the principles that bound the various approaches within the group. This study is Bourdieuian insofar as it acknowledges that particular intellectual change emerges from a collective field of exchange and is

30 Roger Chartier, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 43.
31 Publications by CIAM include *Die Wohnung für das Existenzminimum* (Frankfurt am Main: Englert und Schlosser, 1930); *Rationelle Babauungsweisen* (Stuttgart: Julius Hoffmann, 1931); *Logis et loisirs, 5e Congrès CIAM Paris, 1937: Urbanisme* (Bologne-sur-Seine: L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, 1938); J. L. Sert and CIAM, *Can Our Cities Survive? An ABC of Urban Problems, Their Analysis, Their Solutions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942); Le Corbusier and ASCORAL, "Programme du 7ème Congrès CIAM: Grille CIAM d'Urbanisme. Mise en application de la Carte d'Athènes" (Bologna: L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, 1948); J. Tyrwhitt, J. L. Sert, and E. N. Rogers, CIAM *8: The Heart of the City: Towards the Humanisation of Urban Life* (London: Lund Humphries, 1952).
32 Audiotapes of the CIAM '59 meeting at Otterlo, the Netherlands, are in the Bakema Archive, Netherlands Architectuurinstituut, Rotterdam.
33 Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, vol. 2 (London: Routledge, 1966), 98. Quoted in Anthony Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 94.

determined by a complex set of factors such as personality, circumstance, institutional structure, and the quest for power.

The approach of this investigation is Foucauldian insofar as it focuses on discourse as a useful way for examining complex historical situations. As an investigation of intellectual linguistic production – of the development, dispersion, and persistence of ideas and their material evidence – it is aligned with the cultural approach to intellectual histories of *mentalités* of the Annales School. Following in the tradition of *mentalités*, I consider the task of the historian to be to rediscover the originality of each system of thought found by eliminating a priori definitions or labels and addressing the subject directly, in all its complexity and totality. This investigation has a great affinity with later Annales historians Roger Chartier, Carlo Ginsberg, and Lucien Goldmann, who examined a historical reality by investigating beliefs, representations, and values, and the factors that mediate the dialectical relationship between the objective conditions of human life and the ways in which people narrate it. In a manner similar to Ginsberg and Goldmann, this study investigates the role of individual and collective agents in determining the values and representation of the collective psychologies of CIAM and Team 10.

A leitmotif that runs through this account is the subject of the presentation method to be used at congresses, referred to as the "grid," "CIAM grid," or "grilles," parallels the important intellectual and epistemological changes occurring in CIAM. This history of the grid from its introduction at CIAM 7 as the epistemological framework for the Functional City to its abandonment and CIAM '59 reflects the changing priorities for modern architecture within CIAM. These priorities favored the empirical over the rational; a lack of boundaries over categories; static two-dimensional Cartesian grids to frameworks that could accommodate change over time.

This history is organized chronologically. Chapter 1 provides the necessary context of the discussions in CIAM from its first congress in 1928 to its last congress before World War II. It examines CIAM's founding principles, the increasing idealism of CIAM as Le Corbusier took over its agenda, the rise of the functional city as the method of choice for planning the modern city, and the increasing dissatisfaction with this method at CIAM 4 and CIAM 5. Moreover, it examines the thinking about a "new" modern architecture that was articulated by CIAM elders during the war in publications such as Can *Our Cities Survive?* (1942) by Sert, *La Charte d'Athènes* (1943) by Le Corbusier, *Mechanization Takes Command* (1948) by Giedion, and in particular *The New Architecture* (1946) by Alfred Roth. These were the theoretical foundations for the alternative methods proposed by the younger CIAM members after World War II. This brings to the surface debates and contributions at the first three CIAM congresses after the war, which were left, for the most part, unreported in CIAM and Team 10 publications. As modern architects were committed to responding to the conditions of the times, it is necessary to understand how both the founding members of CIAM and its newest younger members perceived the changed social, political, cultural, architectural, and institutional conditions in postwar Europe.

Chapter 2 examines contributions by CIAM's newest members at the first three postwar CIAM conferences. The first postwar congress, CIAM 6, reveals a membership coming to terms with a changed Europe and a changed status for modern architecture. This is followed by an examination of the critiques of the CIAM grid as a method of presentation, and the particularly sharp

critique by CIAM members against the rupture from history in the model of CIAM's functional city at CIAM 7. The CIAM 8 congress examines the conceptual differences between the historical model of the "core" by CIAM's founding generation and the more organic conception of the core by the younger CIAM architects. At this time, these contributions by individual members were not understood as a collective expression of dissatisfaction and hence were not included in official CIAM reports. Viewed together, however, they reveal the emergence of a profound critique of CIAM, its methods, and the idealist and rationalist values on which it was based.

Chapter 3 investigates how the critique of CIAM's town planning methods that occurred in a more fragmented and tentative way at the first three postwar congresses began to coalesce around the notion of habitat, discussed theoretically at a meeting held at Sigtuna, Sweden, in 1952, and were embodied in projects presented at CIAM 9. The notion of "habitat" discussed at the Sigtuna meeting represented a new set of values for modern architecture that had been seeping into CIAM since CIAM 6. The values embodied by the term were given architectural form at CIAM 9 and became the basis for evaluating the projects presented at CIAM 9.

Chapter 4 traces the details of the most intense period of theoretical development in early Team 10 thinking between 1952 and 1954. During these years the younger architects consolidated into a loose association of the "likeminded" and began to articulate an approach to the planning of the modern city that differed from CIAM's functional city. During this period a group authored a memo that can in hindsight be regarded as the foundational document for Team 10 even though it would take several months before the group would be recognized as such. This chapter traces the micro-politics at work in the development of the debates between the young CIAM members that almost threatened to dissolve the group before it was even formed, to reveal the messy, contingent, and interactive way that the Team 10 agenda coalesced around an agreement of principle and differences in approach and emphasis about present-day life.

Chapter 5 examines the protracted demise of CIAM as an institution between 1956 and 1959 and the way in which a group of its younger members, who were now recognized as Team 10, continued to develop the new values of differentiation, integration, and change in terms of their concepts of "cluster," "identifying device," "relationships," "mobility," "growth and change," and "habitat." Finally, the coda speculates on the importance of the Team 10 critique to the history of modern architecture and its relevance to contemporary architecture.

Chapter 6 discusses how Team 10 was represented and how its members read Le Corbusier and Patrick Geddes, and analyzes the transformation in modern architecture and how different elements of modern architecture were transformed, and by what means.

The critical reevaluation of architectural modernism between the 1940s and '60s has been "the central thrust of every book dealing with the vicissitudes of modern architecture during the post-World War II period"[34] and a period of "intense questioning"[35] of every aspect of modernism: its rationalism, universalism, anti-historicism, formalism, analytical methods, and the validity of its institutions.[36] The early history of Team 10 thinking provides details about this shift between modern and postmodern values from an institutional

[34] Joan Ockman, review of author's manuscript for publisher, August 2009.
[35] Ockman, *Architecture Culture*, 13.
[36] Asger Jorn, "Arguments apropos of the International Movement for an Imaginist Bauhaus, against an Imaginary Bauhaus, and Its Purpose Today" [1954], in *Architecture Culture*, 173.