

Team 10, the French Context

Catherine Blain

Introduction

To date, there has been little investigation of the history of French post-war architecture and urban planning¹. That field is now being developed by several scholars interested by specific themes and productions. In France, however, there is still a lack of serious research on the history of Team 10 or even the post-war International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM, Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne)².

As an approach to such a study, it is useful to note that, in France, history of CIAM and Team 10 is often reduced to a single simplistic idea: the utter failure of the principles set forth within an emblematic document, the *Charter of Athens* written by Le Corbusier as a conclusion of the 4th CIAM congress (1933)³. Indeed, since the mid 1970, modernist architects, especially the ones close to the CIAMs and Le Corbusier or defending the principles of the *Charter of Athens*, have been blamed for all the ills of post-war architecture. As a result, their history was rapidly relegated to oblivion even before it had been more closely studied – as if the traumatic memory could be repressed or blotted out. The special issue of *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* of 1975 ('Team 10 + 20') was actually an elegant way of encouraging this attitude. But now, as the period is emerging from obscurity, this interpretation turns out to have been too simplistic.

Exploring this history more thoroughly, one might find it interesting to note two essential myths which are connected with the post-war CIAMs – and are also related, to some degree, to the earlier interpretation of the Charter of Athens.

The first is that of a generational gap, or, more accurately, serious differences in viewpoint on the theme of Habitat between the CIAM old guard (founding members, like Le Corbusier) and the young generation (the future members of Team 10, including Georges Candilis⁴). According to this myth, at Aix-en-Provence, the younger architects formulated their intention to go beyond the simplistic model defined by the Charter of Athens (the four functions), in search of 'a complex model more responsive to the needs of identity'⁵. The work of Peter and Alison Smithson (the 'Urban Reidentification' grid) and of the Moroccan and Algerian teams is often cited as an expression of this intention. But what do we really know about these works, within the context of the other projects presented at the Congress? Moreover, have we ever examined the philosophical framework in which these differences of opinion developed?

The second myth, which complements the first one, is that of the 'murder of the father': parricide being the only possible solution to the intergenerational crisis which peaked in Aix-en-Provence, at the 9th Congress (1953). This myth is supported by two emblematic documents: a group portrait taken at the end of the last CIAM in Otterlo (1959) and a pictogram sent by Le Corbusier to Bakema in 1961. In France, this idea is all the more poignant since Georges Candilis worked with Le Corbusier and ATBAT from 1946 to 1954. Then, it is almost as though the myth of the prodigal son had been merged with that of the parricide. For although the CIAM, established in 1928, was widely viewed as 'Corb's world' (according to Gropius), from a strictly French point of view, Team 10, emerging thirty years

later, could very well be seen as Candilis' creation. However, one might notice that he does not appear on the 1959 group portrait declaring the death of CIAM.

These two myths, as well as the idea of the failure of the Charter of Athens, are good entries to open a discussion on Team 10 in France. In order to review the broader history of post-war CIAM meetings and to investigate the work of their leading representatives, it is also important to note that their debate, like the pre-war debate, was fostered in part by a specific context. Therefore, to grasp this history, parallels should be drawn with the architectural and urban condition, with the following questions in mind: How did this production context reflected into the CIAM concerns? To what degree did it allow room for ideas that suggested new ways of thinking and building?

The CIAMs and post-war France (1945-1953)

In 1945, a ravaged France was emerging from war⁶. It was urgent to implement sweeping programs to deal with a shortage of urban housing, exacerbated by decaying housing stock and a large population influx.

The government stepped into the breach. The first act of the Ministry of Reconstruction and Urban Planning (MRU, Ministère de la Reconstruction et de l'Urbanisme, established in November 16, 1944) was to draft a General Reconstruction Plan and institute a National Fund for Housing Improvement. Then, in 1946, it published guidelines of the very first national Plan for Modernization and Amenities (Plan de Modernisation et d'Équipement de la France, called Plan Monnet⁷). Efficiency was the watchword in the implementation of this program. The MRU almost immediately set up task forces for various 'development and reconstruction projects in stricken municipalities', with housing as a major priority.

Of course, the community of French architects was quite attentive to the evolution of the discussion. This was especially true of the leaders of the Modern Movement, who had been prominent in the pre-war CIAMs, grouped around Le Corbusier.

'Corb's world'

In 1945, Le Corbusier was 58 years old, and his years of rage and rebellion, marked by emblematic projects and publications (including the Charter of Athens⁸), were part of the past. It was now time for him to act rather than theorize.

This was the message conveyed by *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, periodical to which Le Corbusier was a contributor, along with other 'great architects' like Auguste Perret, Michel Roux-Spitz, Jean Ginsberg, Georges-Henri Pingusson, Pol Abraham, Marcel Lods, Jean Prouvé and Pierre-André Emery⁹. Indeed, the first issue of 1945 declared the advent of 'the great era [...] animated by a new spirit of construction and synthesis'. It called upon 'designers and builders, architects and urban planners, workers and technicians, industrialists and investors' to implement 'logical, ingenious, sensitive, high-quality projects' which were to embody 'a perfect harmony between Time and Place'¹⁰.

This statement of ideals reflects the enthusiasm alive in the Atelier Le Corbusier which, in

1945, had been commissioned by Reconstruction Minister Raoul Dautry¹¹ to design a housing project in Marseille: the Unité d'Habitation. As a result of this commission, the office of Rue de Sèvres embarked on an era of intense intellectual activity. In addition to writing numerous articles and books¹², Le Corbusier designed a variety of projects — including some directly related to the reconstruction effort, like the urban plans of Saint-Dié and La Rochelle-La-Pallice (1945-1946).

This excitement was almost immediately paired with a spirit of international openness. Between 1945 and 1949, Le Corbusier and ATBAT (a multidisciplinary structure bringing together architects, engineers, and technicians, founded in 1947 for the purposes of the Marseille Unité project)¹³ welcomed a great number of young talents from all over the world. Among them were architects Georges Candilis and Shadrach Woods, Ionel Schein and Guy Rottier, Jerzy Soltan, André Studer, and Roger Aujame, and the engineer Nikos Chatzidakis¹⁴.

As we know, this fermentation eventually fizzled out: the Marseille Unité would for quite some time remain the only real accomplishment of the enthusiasm of 1945. The reasons for this failure were due in part to government guidelines set forth by the MRU for the construction (or reconstruction) of housing.

MRU recommendations

In the early years of reconstruction, the rhetoric of the MRU made frequent references to Le Corbusier's Charter of Athens. Yet, it is not obvious that this reference served to inspire 'well being' and 'beauty', 'harmonious and enduring works of Art'¹⁵ in the French landscape? In fact, the aims of the Ministry, which relied mainly on functionalist principles in order to set guidelines for building, were quite distant from the spirit of the Charter.

On one hand, in order to address the urgent need to build mass housing, the government adopted a policy of standardized models, so-called Buildings with no immediate purpose (ISAI, Immeubles Sans Affectation Immédiate). They were easy to build and, most importantly, inexpensive. Research for such models was based in part on work by Pol Abraham, a contributor to *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* who was in charge of the reconstruction of Orléans. Indeed, after having defined a set of modular building standardization rules in his book *Architecture préfabriquée* (1946), Abraham was involved in drafting a catalogue of prefabricated modules and assemblies for use in construction (*REEF*)¹⁶. Support for this trend also came from government-sponsored experimental competitions (CEX, Chantiers EXpérimentaux), first in Noisy-le-Sec and Orléans (1946) and later in Creil-Compiègne, Chartres, and Villeneuve-Saint-Georges (1949, won by Marc and Léo Solotareff). This experimentation went hand in hand with the appearance of new building techniques, like the Camus process which, in 1946, enabled the 'dry-assembly' of prefabricated components on site. A new generation of dockside cranes made it possible to handle larger pre-fabricated components (1949).

On the other hand, when it came to urban reconstruction, the main preoccupation of the

Ministry was sanitation, rather than re-thinking the urban condition. Moreover, as a general rule, urban planning tasks, like the housing construction contracts, were usually awarded to architects linked to the Beaux-Arts tradition, whose concerns were far removed from those of the CIAM. In fact, these architects design were mainly governed by the 'theory of composition' — what Georges Gromort described as a 'set of uncontested principles which can be applied to any type of building whatsoever, and is called for regardless of the type of construction being planned'¹⁷.

These attitudes prevailed throughout the 1950s, when the government instituted further measures as incentives for the construction of mass housing. The Loi Courant (April 15, 1953) is a good example. Intended to facilitate the construction of low-income family housing units (LOGECO: LOGements ECONomiques), this law instituted the use of catalogues of typical plans for single-family and multiple-unit dwellings (plans-types)¹⁸. It also launched two new Design-Build competitions, called MILLION and LOPOFA (LOGements POur les FAMilles), whose goal was to reduce the cost of housing construction. In addition, in the late 1950s, national legislation created a new framework for major development projects, classifying large parcels of land as 'priority urbanization zones' (ZUP: Zone à Urbaniser en Priorité, 1958)¹⁹.

Of course, a few of these reconstruction projects, awarded to Modern architects, stand out as exceptions. Auguste Perret's master plan for the reconstruction of Le Havre (1945-60) and Marcel Lods' project for the Sotteville-lès-Rouen housing area (1948-55) were often cited as good examples. So was Le Corbusier's Unité, which was indeed built in Marseille within the ISAI procedure (1945-1955).

However, in most cases, the MRU reference to modernism, or even to the Charter of Athens, served to legitimize a reductive functionalist approach and the repetition of normative designs. And this attitude, at the end, mainly engendered anonymous and monotonous complexes of towers and apartment blocks with very little connection to specific geographic contexts or ways of life.

Within the community of architects, this choice of direction immediately attracted criticism. Naturally, Le Corbusier and the other leading CIAM figures were among the first to speak out.

Already at the 1947 congress in Bridgewater, the CIAM had issued a statement 'reaffirming' its aim to 'work for the creation of a physical environment that will satisfy man's emotional and material needs and stimulate his spiritual growth'. In order 'to achieve an environment of this quality', its first task was to 'enrich the aesthetic language of architecture', to 'combine social idealism, scientific planning and the fullest use of available techniques' and 'to ensure that the highest human and technical standards are attained in community planning of whatever scale, from the region to the single dwelling'²⁰.

At the 7th CIAM congress, held in 1949 in Bergamo, the failure of the majority of the reconstruction projects to fulfill these aims was already generating frustration. Few French archi-

itects dared to express their dissent openly in front of their new Minister of Reconstruction and Housing, Eugène Claudius-Petit, who attended the congress. Their positions, however, were transparent in the selection of projects they presented, such as Marcel Lods' reconstruction plan for Sotteville-lès-Rouen or Le Corbusier's Unité d'habitation in Marseille²¹. Criticism became more audible during discussions about ASCORAL's *Grille CIAM d'urbanisme*, presented by Le Corbusier, Jeanneret, Bodiensky, Wogensky, Sive, Candilis and Aujame²². In fact, beyond its aspect of a multiple-purpose tool for the analysis, synthesis and presentation of projects, this grid invited field studies in order to compare different ways for the 'implementation of the Charter of Athens'...

At the same time, Georges-Henri Pingusson stepped forth to openly criticize the French reconstruction program, in the name of the Union des Architectes Modernes:

Faced with the ugliness of our public buildings, the misery of our suburbs and our villages [...], the art of our time should begin with urbanism. [...] Without urbanism, there cannot really be any such thing as architecture.²³

The (foreign) experiments in Habitat

In the early 1950s, experimentation in foreign countries came to release some architects, especially the young ones, who had been hemmed in their criticism of MRU policies. In France, the trend towards international openness was promoted by *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, which assigned itself the task of covering good examples of construction in Europe and abroad. The magazine had also become a forum for international debates, especially those of the CIAM. Two experiments stood out as the greatest sources of influence for the new generation of modern architects: Le Corbusier's plans for the new Indian administrative capital of Chandigarh, and works in Morocco directed by the French architect Michel Ecochard (1905-1985), who had joined CIAM at the Bergamo congress.

A change of setting

For Le Corbusier, the turn of the 1950's marked the beginning of another era. Already in 1949, after the completion of the design of the Marseille Unité, he had drastically changed the structure of his office by reducing his staff. Some team members, like Candilis and Woods, stayed close to him by moving to his technical structure, ATBAT, in order to supervise the construction of the Unité with Aujame and Rottier²⁴. But in the office of rue de Sèvres, it was really the start of a different design process. Subsequent commissions, like the Master plan of Bogota, the Maisons Jaoul, the Maison du Brésil and La Tourette Monastery, the Ronchamp Chapel and the other Unités d'habitation in Rezé-les-Nantes, Firminy and Briey (with Pingusson), were designed within a small group of close employees (like André Wogensky and Fernand Gardien) and some younger architects (like Rogelio Salmons and German Samper, Yannis Xenakis, Jacques Michel, Jean-Louis Véret and Balakrisnas Doshi). The real turning point, however, came in December 1950, when Le Corbusier was appointed as architectural advisor for Chandigarh. This mission, to build a capital city for

the new Indian republic, confronted the architect with an entirely different reality, quite distant from French values and concerns: the wealth and complexity of India's cultural and architectural traditions, on one hand, and, on the other, the overwhelming poverty of 'the greatest number' of Indians and the lack of building resources. This was a decisive encounter, which brought out the 'other Le Corbusier'²⁵, sensitive to the realities of the field. The impact of that encounter was immediately perceptible in his projects. The Master plan of Chandigarh, as well as projects like the Secretariat and Assembly buildings of Chandigarh (site supervised by Pierre Jeanneret), the Millowners building and the Sarabāi and Shodan houses in Ahmedabad (supervised by Véret and, later, by Doshi), quickly became models for young French architects.

This experiment with distant lands echoed the work of Michel Ecochard in North Africa, work which also raised questions about 'the greatest number'. However, the situation Ecochard faced as director of the Morocco Department of Urban Planning (1946-1952) was quite different from that encountered by Le Corbusier²⁶. Unlike the later, he had not been commissioned to design emblematic buildings or a brand-new capital city *ex-nihilo*. His task was to deal with the reality of an existing urban fabric and, more specifically, to solve the housing problems due to overcrowding and slum conditions. In response, Ecochard adopted a specific urban planning ethic, based on two essential precepts.

First: take existing structures into account. For Ecochard, knowledge of the social and physical characteristics of the field was prerequisite to any plan: 'the art of urban planning' laid in 'fitting into the reality'²⁷. Therefore, he recommended two types of field studies: on one hand, sociological and building surveys, used to shed light on the 'human groups' in 'all of their daily realities, be they pleasant or toilsome'; on the other, cartographic and statistical analyses, used to identify 'the city's fundamental tendencies', its vital fiber which 'never loses either its strength or its rights'.

The second aspect of Ecochard's ethic is his consideration for history and time. The architect distilled his approach as follows: 'seize a passing opportunity, take advantage of a fleeting moment of support. Then, waste time arguing'. This position led to an urban planning dialectic: on one hand, 'touch [the existing city] as little as possible' by 'limiting development to the large arteries vital to the city's life and growth'; on the other, define 'the size and armature' and study 'in the greatest detail' the housing projects in zones glazed for development.

Along with Le Corbusier's work in India, Ecochard's work in Morocco was greeted with enthusiasm by the architectural press and had an undeniable influence on the imagination of young French architects. In fact, these two experiments were quickly perceived as the antithesis of the methods fashionable in metropolitan France — those that Ecochard openly denounced as 'prescriptive formulas posing as modernism', mere mind designs or abstract schemes 'designed to an ideal and imposed on reality', providing only 'static solutions' to real problems.²⁸

French CIAM groups of the '50s: a scattered family

In the 1950s, these experiments had more than a theoretical effect on French modern architects. The most tangible impact was changes in its predominant figures, those gathered around Le Corbusier and *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* and, more specifically, scattered throughout Metropolitan France, Morocco and Algeria²⁹.

Among these figures were numerous architects, both young and older, interested in building elsewhere something different than the MRU's normative projects. Not all of them were interested in joining the CIAM congress. But for some, especially the ones who went to Morocco to work with Ecochard and ATBAT-Afrique (established in 1949 and placed under the spiritual guidance of Vladimir Bodiensky)³⁰, this change of scenery offered the opportunity to join the French delegation. Among these were Pierre Riboulet, Gérard Thurnauer and Jean-Louis Véret, who worked for Ecochard between 1949 and 1951 while still architecture students³¹. Also in this group were Georges Candilis and Shadrach Woods, who joined Jean-Jacques Honegger and the engineer Henri Piot at ATBAT-Afrique in 1951³².

For these scattered architects, the 8th and the 9th CIAM congresses held in Hoddesdon (July 7-14, 1951) and Aix-en-Provence (July 19-25, 1953) were important opportunities to exchange views and to consolidate the portrait of the new French CIAM family.

This portrait will be clearly defined in Aix-en-Provence in 1953. On one hand, there were four main intergenerational groups: ASCORAL (Le Corbusier, Jeanneret, Wogenscky, Chastenot, Dubuisson, Zehrfuss et al.), BATIR (Lods, Bodiensky, Menkès, Honneger, Arsène-Henry), CIAM-Morocco (or GAMMA, associating Ecochard with Bodiensky, Azagury, Candilis, Woods, Piot, Kennedy et al., of ATBAT-Afrique) and CIAM-Alger (Emery, Miquel). On the other, there were two younger groups, CIAM-Paris (Thurnauer, Riboulet, Véret, R. and E. Aujame, N. and P. Chatzidakis, Rottier et al.) and ASCORAL B.A. (Alaurent and Perrotet, Coulomb and Dufayard), as well as several individual members, like Jean Prouvé and André Sive.³³

The CIAMs of the new 'conquering generation'

From the French viewpoint, the Hoddesdon congress of 1951, prepared under the aegis of the British group MARS, marked the arrival of a new generation of architects, willing to contribute to the modern debate on habitat.

The theme of the Congress, 'the core of the city', was a highly charged subject. For many of those present, the 'core' (or the 'heart', depending on the interpretation³⁴), raised questions about the social dimension of architecture and urban planning. Consequently, it challenged the approaches to 'humanizing' urban life³⁵.

The 'humanization of urban life' (1951)

According to the report of the 8th CIAM³⁶, three grids were presented by the French delegation in Hoddesdon: one by Le Corbusier, and two others by Ecochard (CIAM-Morocco) and

by J. Alautent (sociologist from Paris). Considered together, they are emblematic of the new avenues being explored by French architects in their humanizing endeavor.

In the projects presented by Le Corbusier — the Master plan for the reconstruction of Saint-Dié (France) and the Master plans of Bogota (with J.-L. Sert) and Chandigarh (with Jeanneret, Fry and Drew) —, one might notice how the architect's attitude shifted as a function of context. More importantly, these projects revealed changes in Le Corbusier's sensitivity to human life. This was clearer in his oral presentation when, as he mentioned other built projects, he sought to articulate his personal criteria for a good 'urban center': a 'meeting place for the Arts,' the 'spontaneous theater' of 'the expression of human life', 'the expression of the collective spirit and mind of the community'³⁷.

The attention devoted to human life was even more characteristic of the contribution from CIAM-Morocco, about Rabat-Sale, a project for the development and extension of Rabat in the form of a 'satellite city of 40,000 inhabitants'. That project revealed partly the enormous work done by the Morocco Department of Urban planning at that time, based on surveys of daily life and studies of traditional architecture in several parts of the country³⁸. In fact, under the guidance of Ecochard, that Department had several outgoing projects, some in collaboration with ATBAT-Afrique. Master plans were being drawn up for Fès, Menkès, Safi, Port-Lyautey, Agadir and Casablanca, in addition to a series of designs for infrastructure in rural areas. And the 8x8 grid, an urban-planning approach developed by Ecochard and ATBAT-Afrique and based on analysis of Moroccan traditional habitat (including the *casbahs* and the *medinas*), was already proving its ability to construct 'different types of housing corresponding to different standards of living'³⁹ in several places: Rabat (Yacoub El Mansour district), Port-Lyautey (cleaning up a slum), Casablanca (Ain Chock district). Thus, at the time, Morocco was indeed a laboratory for experimentation with habitat⁴⁰.

The third contribution from the French was the 'survey of daily life' carried out in Paris by J. Alautent. It represents another offshoot of this reflection, more closely connected with urban sociology. The discipline was then in its infancy, developing under the guidance of Chombart de Lauwe⁴¹. The work of Chombart and his team, especially the surveys carried out in Paris beginning in 1949, focusing on habitat conditions as a key to understanding the social fabric of a large city, were to have a decisive influence on certain French architects. It is often said that this 8th CIAM congress was an important sounding board, responsive to new issues. One striking aspect of the French contribution was the aim to 'humanize' the approach, by conducting various field studies. Their tools were historic and morphological studies aimed at showing the complexity and diversity of existing cities, and sociological studies aimed at understanding daily life. As a result, their work (especially that of CIAM-Morocco) illustrated a truly innovative approach. As opposed to a reductive functionalism (which carved urban life into functional elements), it considered the different levels of the urban question (from village to metropolis) as parts of a whole. The task facing the planner was then to restore the relationship between these parts, by considering both their material and social aspects.⁴²

Although these ideas tacitly questioned the individual's relationship to the community, the research barely touched the surface of the problem, which would later become central to certain CIAM members, especially the youngest ones. They set out to understand 'what makes a community a community rather than an aggregation of individuals': that is, they reflected upon 'the vitality essential and necessary to society, especially in its individual and collective manifestations'⁴³. From the outset, this important theme elicited an ethnological or anthropological approach. It would become a central question at the congress of 1953.

The 'Charter of Habitat' and 'human right to habitat' (1953)

Being host of the meeting of Aix-en-Provence, which marked the 25th anniversary of CIAM, the French delegates were in position to play an important role in the debates. The event was organized by the ASCORAL group. Le Corbusier had then a great responsibility in the theoretical orientation of the congress, especially when it came to define its theme, 'The Charter of Habitat; the dwelling'⁴⁴, a clear response to the current concerns. But many other French architects contributed also to that meeting on an individual basis. During the congress, some of them were closely involved in commission work⁴⁵. They also oriented the debate by presenting nine grids over a global selection of forty contributions⁴⁶.

In regards to the contributions of the previous meeting, as well as to the historians ideas about the Aix congress, one might find most interesting to look closely to three of these French grids: the 'Moroccan habitat: housing for the greatest number' grid by CIAM-Morocco (GAMMA), the 'Bidonville Mahieddine' by CIAM-Algiers and the 'Analytic study of Boulogne-Billancourt' grid by CIAM-Paris. Because these grids served as the basis for the 6th commission discussion on social issues, which led to the formulation of the principle of a 'human right to habitat' (viewed as a permanent contract between society and the individual):

'Habitat must be an ongoing contract between society and the individual. The rights and duties expressed by the contract must be reciprocal. The consequences of this contract could be interpreted as a new concept: the HUMAN RIGHT TO HABITAT.'⁴⁷

The first two grids, well known by historians, were an accurate illustration of the value of the foreign experience for the renewal of French debate.

Considered in the light of the Hoddesdon contribution, the CIAM-Morocco's grid, 'Moroccan habitat: housing for the greatest number', is a more detailed illustration of Ecochard's approach, grounded in the idea of 'an absolute dependence between Habitat and Urban planning'⁴⁸. The grid was mainly built around an ongoing project conducted by ATBAT-Afrique: the reconstruction of Casablanca's 'Carrières Centrales' neighborhood, intended to replace a shantytown slum covering some 250 acres of land (100 hectares). But it is more than just a presentation of that project. Indeed, the panels divulged the specific design process: first, the consideration given to the findings of a field study (which included a survey of existing construction and precise information about the inhabitants⁴⁹); secondly,

the studies that defined the principles of the 'organized neighborhood'; and lastly and most particularly, the type of habitat that was developed — strips of housing connected by alleys leading to cul-de-sacs, referring to the traditional housing typology and built with new techniques, which combined concrete walls and prefabricated components.

In a way, an echo of that approach can be seen in the 'Bidonville Mahieddinne' grid from CIAM Algiers. Indeed, it presented findings from surveys on traditional or informal habitat (the *casbah*, the slum), considered as the basis for the elaboration of various types of habitat corresponding to a variety of lifestyles. But this work also stands on its own and deserves a more specific study⁵⁰.

Concerning the third grid discussed at the 6th commission, 'Analytical study of Boulogne-Billancourt' from CIAM-Paris, there is much to be said since, until now, it has been absolutely forgotten. This work was conducted by a young team of architects or related professionals who had worked either with Ecochard or with Le Corbusier and ATBAT⁵¹, and who were highly interested by the sociological surveys conducted by P.-H. Chombart de Lauwe. Because of these backgrounds and interests, their analysis of Boulogne-Billancourt (a town on the outskirts of Paris) had a specific aim: to study, 'from the perspective of daily life', the 'ongoing relationship existing between individual and collective space in the heart of the human community formed by the habitat'⁵². This analytical framework made an obvious link with the work shown by J. Laurent and CIAM-Morocco at Hoddesdon. On one hand, it referred to methods experienced by the urban sociologists in Paris; on the other, it sought to transpose Ecochard's approach to French metropolitan context. As a result, using historic and analytic cartography, photographic surveys and schematic drawings, the team brought out the essential characteristics of Boulogne: from its relationship to Paris and its built fabric (with an emphasis on housing and uses) to its social structure and daily life. This overview was meant to show that habitat was 'an integral part of the social structure' and, thus, that the role of habitat was to enable human beings 'to develop, to express personality, individuality and community instinct'.⁵³ It led also to a clear conclusion statement:

'Habitat: the meeting point between sociology and architecture. Suitable housing cannot exist in the absence of an organized environment.'⁵⁴

On many issues, the intentions of these three French grids, which revealed a particular attention to the realities of everyday life in both European and non-European contexts, concurred the ones of other contributions discussed in the 6th commission on social issues, like the two English grids, 'Urban reidentification' by P. & A. Smithson and 'Rechampton Lane Estate' by Howell, Marlin, Wentfield Lewis, Colin Lucas, Bailey, Auris, Killik, Partridge). For all that, could these grids justifiably be hailed as 'the expression of a new way of thought'?⁵⁵

To form a judgment, it would be necessary to survey the forty grids presented at the Aix congress. Already, the titles of the other French contributions, like 'Application of aluminum, Nancy' (Jean Prouvé), 'Experimental site: Aubervilliers' (André Sive) and 'Marly: Les

Grandes Terres' (Marcel Lods), hint that they were shaped by other criteria, and more closely related to the built reality. Therefore, it would be tempting to agree with the image of a meeting marked by two major tendencies, concerning the subject matter as well as the format of presentation. First, there was a pragmatic approach, presenting types of housing project underway, according to the *Grille CIAM d'urbanisme* of 1948 (structured on the basis of four functions). This was the case with the Lods grid, which reported on one of the first project in France based on the idea of 'the neighborhood unit'. Second, there was a more theoretical approach, using a redefined grids of 3 or 4 levels which suggested new analytical criteria. This was the case of the Smithson grid, which proposed a urban analysis based on four levels of association (*House, Street, District, City*). Likewise, CIAM-Paris, whose 'working method' incorporated a hierarchy of scales starting from the broad and general and narrowing down to the individual on both the horizontal and vertical axes, 'avoiding any arbitrary partitioning'⁵⁶. But can we then conclude that this second approach was provocative or subversive?

To answer that question, we have to go back to the preparatory discussions about the congress. An interpretation key is given by the debate concerning the theme of meeting, 'the Charter of Habitat'. One of the first aim of CIAM was, in fact, to define the term 'habitat', understood by many as a 'concept' located 'between urbanism and dwelling'⁵⁷. From the start, the idea was to refine the principles of the Charter of Athens and, thus, to encourage the groups to investigate the meaning of one of the four functions: the 'DWELLING function', 'the word DWELLING understood in the broadest sense', considered as an 'organized whole', including the home and its 'extensions', 'all that people organize and build for the purposes of dwelling'⁵⁸. Then, more interestingly, the problem was to define a 'method' which would enable the discussion and comparison of different researches on that matter. In order to avoid abstract presentations, the organization committee recommended anchoring the studies on reality, 'on practical examples of projects or buildings'⁵⁹. Yet, the problem was still to define the way such examples would be presented⁶⁰. It quickly became obvious that the four functions *Grid* of 1948 was not suitable for that purpose. A need for change had already been expressed by the MARS group in Hoddesdon: although they complied with certain general presentation directives, the group had already revised the horizontal titles as a function of four 'scales' of considerations. The next step, at Aix-en-Provence, was to put aside the 1948 grid. This idea was ratified in January 1953 by the 'ASCORAL memorandum', which clearly invited the groups to define a new grid of lecture: 'The organizers of CIAM 9 refuse not only to impose, but even to propose a presentation grid. Being premature, such a grid would necessarily be arbitrary, and thus liable to paralyze work within the groups. By allowing the groups to have total freedom, we can compare the representation styles each group chooses to adopt, and, on that basis, determine the valid functions of a definitive grid: the GRID OF THE DWELLING FUNCTION.'⁶¹

Thus, before the congress, the theoretical issue of that 'dwelling function' was already being explored to a great degree. Moreover, new ways of presenting contributions were

being devised. Indeed, the revision of the 1948 grid was attempted by the CIAM Committee in February 1953⁶², with a schema of three levels, corresponding to the themes 'way of life,' 'its material evidence' and 'technical implications'. Nevertheless, the freedom granted in Aix was still relative. Indeed, in order to facilitate the interpretation and comparison of the presentations, the groups were asked to 'respect' a 'Work Grid' which maintained three standards:

1. A panel size of 21 cm x 33 cm (8¼"x13"), including a column on the right for explanations;
2. An horizontal disposition of these panels, placed side by side (on 3 or 4 rows of height), and their organization according to column headings;
3. A color coding for urban planning charts, roads and highways, and 'architectural elements'⁶³

In light of these specifications, it appears that the young architects may have been the only ones to seize the opportunity for expression. This might be why their work seems to be a distinct departure from that of the older, more pragmatic groups who stuck to the format of the 1948 grid — either out of conviction, laziness, or lack of time. Moreover, to go beyond these differences, the various commission reports demonstrate a greater commitment to certain key ideas, such as: the 'essentially evolutive' nature of habitat, its (necessary) association with a given place and time, and, lastly, the 'right to habitat'⁶⁴ (as defined by the 6th Commission). Thus, according to Marcel Lods, it was urgent:

'to satisfy at last the essential needs [...] both spiritual and material, currently denied to most of the world's population: the possession for each of a dwelling in which he can live a normal life, a life of freedom and decency, a life of human dignity.'⁶⁵

Of course, one might wonder whether these reports really reflect the debates which went on between the 500 or so participants. Nevertheless, it seems clear that for many architects, especially the French, the identification of 'elements appropriate to a habitat grid' and the drafting of the Charter on Habitat had become the central issue for the CIAM. As Wogenscky explains in the French publication on Aix:

'The Charter of Habitat cannot define a single object. However, it can express universal and permanent goals of that object, intentions, and performances, excluding momentary material exigencies. In every era and under every sort of local condition, it is the duty of the Builder to create Habitats which are as close as possible to desired performances. To do so, the Builder applies his skill, sensitivity, and available technical and economic means, to the best of his ability'.⁶⁶

Epilogue. Future of CIAM, future of habitat

The analysis of the French contributions to the CIAM meetings of 1951 and 1953, place in a more general overview of the post-war context, brings to light many elements that deserve to be more examined closely by historians. Viewed within the French context, some re-

ceived ideas about the Charter of Athens, the post-war CIAM debate and the emergence of Team 10 appear to lose their accuracy.

In fact, the primary first myth about CIAM, that of a deep generational gap between members during the post-war meetings and an intergenerational crisis reaching its peak in 1953 loses its pertinence. This myth is, in any event, contradicted by Candilis' description of the Aix event in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* as 'a huge encounter between young and old, students and professors' who 'as peers, discuss, seek, and analyze' before bidding each other good-bye at a 'big party held at night on the terrace of Le Corbusier's Marseille building *La Maison des hommes*, lit up like a beacon in the night, indicating the path of true modern architecture to the young members of the CIAM'.⁶⁷

The preceding analysis of French contributions shows more precisely how many young and old CIAM members, having or not experienced foreign contexts or in the metropole, shared a common aim: to go beyond the simplistic functionalist model (defined before the war), in search of a more complex theoretical framework for the debate on habitat. What remains valid of the crisis myth that this need for a change was, indeed, expressed most clearly at the Aix congress, especially by grids of Moroccan, Algerian and Parisian groups. Concerning the second myth, that of the 'murder of the father' supported by the 'death of CIAM' group portrait of Otterlo (1959) and Le Corbusier's pictogram (1961), more investigation of the final meetings is required before conclusions can be reached. Already, to go beyond the strong image of that portrait, from which the French are absent, one should refer to another document, often considered as the founding text of Team 10: the Doorn Manifesto (or 'Statement on Habitat') written in January 1954 by young members in charge of the organization of the 10th CIAM congress, who vividly denounced 'urban planning considered and developed according to the terms of the Charter of Athens' and asserted their determination to 'reformulate the goals of urban planning'⁶⁸. Again, that document is problematic within the French context since a brief investigation shows that French delegates were not involved in it. Does this mean, therefore, that Team 10 was intentionally created without the French, or more precisely against its emblematic figure, Le Corbusier? Or does it simply suggest that history should be questioned further in order to truly understand the reasons why CIAM collapsed between 1953 and 1959?

The CIAM archives held at Foundation Le Corbusier reveal a debate that could be a starting point for further research. That debate, opened by the CIAM Council before Aix-en-Provence, concerned the 'future of the CIAM' or, more precisely, the 'retiring of the older generation' and 'passing of the torch' to the new 'conquering generation'⁶⁹. These questions had been raised during a special 'unofficial' session of the Council held in May 1952, by a Le Corbusier dismayed by the attitude of 'the old ones' at Hoddesdon ('too rigid in their viewpoint, especially on social issues'). At that time, some young architects had joined the Council: Candilis, Rogers and Howell were among them. Le Corbusier's address was directly concerning them. But feeling 'not ready to act alone', they asked that the 'old gard' remain to guide them (Howell) and to continue the 'natural evolution' of CIAM, already started by the 'intro-

Team 10, the French Context

duction into the Council of younger, more active members, who would replace the older ones' (Candilis). Agreeing to these demands, the older members had then proposed that the 1953 event would be 'a transitional Congress', where 'all doors' would be opened to youth (Le Corbusier) and where the older members, in order to maintain 'continuity' (Giedion), would form 'a cementing bond' (Van Eesteren).

This inner debate sheds a different light on the Aix congress. It certainly explains the arrival of a huge number of new figures into CIAM at Aix, people like the young architects V. Doshi, A. Neuman and R. Pietila⁷⁰. It also allows an understanding of the constitution of Team 10 as a part of that planned 'natural evolution'. In fact, at the conclusion of the 1953 event, this evolution was based on two major decisions: first, a 'young elite' was created within the CIAM Council (Bakema, Candilis, Howell, Emery, Lauritzen, Rogers, Steiner and Wogensky⁷¹); second, a group of young members was assigned to organize the next encounter (it included some Council members, like Candilis, Bakema and Howell, and other delegates, like Van Eyck, A. et P. Smithson, Voelcker, Gutman...).

In light of these facts, that reveal how the CIAM old guard tried to manage the transfer of authority to the new generation, one might be tempted to reconsider some received ideas about Team 10 and the Doorn Manifesto (the latter often presented as a declaration of war to the older members). The message sent by Le Corbusier to the 10th CIAM congress held in Dubrovnik in 1956 could be a philosophical framework for this discussion. Giving them his parting blessing, he wrote:

'Make the CIAM continue to thrive with creative passion and idealism; throw out the businessmen and the extremists. Good luck. Long live the CIAMS SECOND! Your friend, Le Corbusier'⁷²

¹ On this period, see the following books: Bruno Vayssière, *Reconstruction Déconstruction. Le hard french ou l'architecture française des trente glorieuses* (Ed. Picard, coll. Villes et sociétés, Paris, 1988), Danièle Voldman, *La reconstruction des villes françaises de 1940 à 1954 : histoire d'une politique* (L'Harmattan, Paris, 1997), Gérard Monnier (dir.), Joseph Abram, *L'architecture moderne en France, tome 2. Du chaos à la croissance 1940-1966* (Ed. Picard, Paris, 1999), Jacques Lucan, *Architectures en France (1940-2000) ; histoire et théories* (Ed. du Moniteur, Paris, 2001).

² An initial reading is supplied by *Rassegna*, n° 52 'The last CIAMs', Dec 1992 (see, in particular, the contribution of Jean-Louis Cohen, 'The Moroccan Group and the Theme of Habitat', pp. 58-67) and by the recent work of Eric Mumford, *The CIAM discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960*, MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass), 2000.

³ On the *Charter of Athens*, see the interesting analysis by P.-G. Gerosa, 'La déclaration finale du IV^e congrès des CIAM', in COLL., *Actualité de la Charte d'Athènes*, (actes du 2^e colloque sur la crise de l'environnement et de l'habitat, Couvent de la Tourette, L'Arbresle, France, 22-24 October 1976), Ed. de l'Institut d'Urbanisme et d'Aménagement régional, collection Urbanisme et Sciences Sociales, Strasbourg, n.d. [c 1977], pp. 27-103

⁴ In 1953, the group in charge of organizing the 10th CIAM was made up of Candilis, Bakema, Gutman, Howell, Van Eyck and Van Ginkel (later joined by P. and A. Smithson, Voelcker, Woods, Studer and Neuenschwander)

⁵ Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture, a critical history*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1980, p. 253

⁶ In 1945, in France, nearly 1.5 million apartment buildings were damaged and 5 million people were homeless or living in makeshift homes (according to *L'homme et l'architecture*, n° 1, July-August 1945, p. 14).

⁷ An executive committee was empowered to implement this program on January 3, 1946, with Jean Monnet as its chairman.

⁸ One should note that there were two

versions of this *Charter*: the first one, published under the name of CIAM-France in 1943 (Ed. Plon), and the second one, reviewed by Le Corbusier and published under his name in 1957. For a detailed analysis, see: Pier Giorgio Gerosa, 'La déclaration finale du IV^e congrès CIAM', in COLL., *Actualité de la charte d'Athènes*, actes du 2^e colloque sur la crise de l'environnement et de l'habitat, couvent de l'Arbresle (France), 22-24 octobre 1976, Institut d'urbanisme et d'aménagement régional, Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg, coll. Urbanisme et Sciences sociales, 1977, pp. 27-103.

⁹ In 1945, if these architects were involved in the supervisory committee of *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, they were also active in another periodical, *Technique et architecture* (directed by Auguste Perret), while encouraging the creation of *L'Homme et l'architecture*, whose editor-in-chief, André Wogenscky, would be Le Corbusier's apologist.

¹⁰ Pierre Vago, 'Un chapitre s'achève...', *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 1, 1945, pp.3-4. In this first post-war issue, AA, founded in 1931 and led by André Bloc (general director) and Pierre Vago (chairman of editorial staff), reaffirm his aim to be 'a forum for exchange open to all present-day tendencies with the exception of academicism'. In facts, it will be the main vehicle for the ideas of the Modern Movement, while the 'academic positions' were defended by other magazines, such as *L'Architecture française* or *La construction moderne*.

¹¹ Raoul Dautry, a fervent admirer of Le Corbusier, was followed as Minister by Francois Billoux (1946), René Coty (1947-1948), Eugène Claudius-Petit (Sept. 1948-Dec. 1952), Pierre Courant (January-May 1953), Maurice LeMayre (June 1953-Nov.1954), Roger Duchet (Feb.1955-1958), Pierre Sudreau (June 1958-1959) and J. Mazziol (April 1962 Pompidou cabinet).

¹² These writings include *Les trois établissements humains* (1945), *Manière de penser l'urbanisme* (1946), *Grille C.I.A.M. d'urbanisme : mise en application de la Charte d'Athènes* (1948)...

¹³ ATBAT was founded in 1947 by Le Corbusier, Vladimir Bodiansky (an engineer), André Wogenscky, Marcel Py

(with Jacques-Louis Lefebvre, administrator). On its history, see Marion Tournon-Branly, 'History of ATBAT and its influence on French architecture', *Architectural Design*, January 1965, pp. 20-23; Jean-Louis Cohen, 'The Moroccan Group and the Theme of Habitat', *Rassegna*, n° 52 : The last CIAMs, December 1992, pp. 58-67.

¹⁴ The agency 'black book' notes the nationalities and periods of employment of these staff members, in the order in which they arrived: Roger Aujame (1940-1949, French) and Edith Schreiber (1946, American, soon to marry Aujame), Georges Candilis (1946-1949, Greek), Jerzy Soltan (1946-1948, Polish), Ionel Schein (1946, French), Guy Rottier (1947-1949, French), Shadrach Woods (1948-1949, American), André Studer (1948, Swiss), and Pirko Hirvela (ATBAT 1947-1948, Finnish, soon to marry Chatzidakis) and Nikos Chatzidakis (ATBAT 1948-1956, Greek).

¹⁵ Le Corbusier, *La Charte d'Athènes*, Ed. Plon, Paris, 1957: point 92

¹⁶ See Pol Abraham, *Architecture préfabriquée*, Ed. Dunod, Paris, 1946. Abraham's research on prefabrication will find a conclusion at the end of the 50's, with the publication by the CSTB (Centre scientifique et technique du bâtiment) of a *Recueil des éléments utiles à l'établissement et à l'exécution des projets et marchés de bâtiments en France. R.E.E.F. 1958* (diff. facs, 1958-1961).

¹⁷ Georges Gromort, *Essai sur la théorie de l'architecture*, Vincent Fréal & cie, Paris, 1942 (collection of lectures from his theoretical classes at the Beaux-Arts school of Paris).

¹⁸ Ministère de la Reconstruction et de l'Urbanisme, *Logements économiques et familiaux, Plans-types*, 2 volumes: 1° Logements individuels, (single-family dwellings) 2° Immeubles collectifs (multiple-family dwellings), June 1953. It should be noted that these catalogues were produced with contributions from various architects, including R.O. Boileau, J. Fayeton, A.G. Heaume, J. H. Labourdette, M. Novarina, A. Persitz, A. Sive, J. Sebag and B Zehrfuss (for multiple-family dwellings), the Arsène-Henry brothers, J. Hébrard, M. Joly, Le

Corbusier, J. Prouvé and J. Royer (for single-family dwellings).

¹⁹ Other legislation on zoning and building passed in the 1950s includes: the 1954 *Code de l'urbanisme et de l'habitation* (1954), a *Règlement national d'urbanisme* (1955) and the *Règlement national de construction* (1955: this policy on mass housing would remain in effect until 1965). A number of agencies were formed to follow up on activities (SCIC, SCET, SEDES, and the 'Sociétés de développement Régional', etc.).

²⁰ 'Reaffirmation of the aims of CIAM, Bridgewater, September 13th, 1947' in S. Giedion (ed.), *A Decade of New Architecture - Dix Ans d'Architecture contemporaine*, Girsberger ed., Zurich, 1951 [2nd enlarged edition, 1954].

²¹ These presentations are mentioned by Eric Mumford, *The CIAM discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960*, MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass), 2000, pp. 180-187.

²² Drafted in Paris by the members of ASCORAL and adopted by the CIAM Council at Easter, this grid was published in June in a pamphlet entitled *Grille CIAM d'urbanisme; mise en pratique de la Charte d'Athènes* (Ed. De l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, Paris, 1948). It opened with the essay entitled 'Reaffirmation of the aims of CIAM' (see note 21).

²³ Georges-Henri Pingusson, 'Manifeste de l'UAM de 1949', in J.-P. Epron (dir.), *Architecture, une anthologie*, volume 1: 'La culture architecturale', IFA / Ed. Mardaga (avec le concours de la SCIC), Paris, 1992, p. 301. Note: UAM was founded in 1934 (cf. 'Manifeste de l'UAM', *Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 7, 1934, pp. 7-10)

²⁴ Thus the Unité d'habitation was the first work by Le Corbusier and ATBAT. Staff included: Vladimir Bodiatsky, consulting engineer, André Wogenscky and Jacques Lefebvre (architectural planning), Georges Candilis, Roger Aujame, Guy Rottier (site supervision). Charlotte Perriand and Jean Prouvé also worked on the project.

²⁵ See Kenneth Frampton, 'L'autre Le Corbusier', *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 249, February 1987.

²⁶ Trained at the Paris school of Beaux-Arts in the inter-war period (1925-31), Michel Ecochard began his career in Syria

(1932-42, city plan for Damascus), then in Lebanon (1941-46, city plan for Beirut). He directed the Morocco Department of Urban Planning from 1946 to 1952. See J.-L. Cohen and M. Eleb, *Casablanca, mythes et figures d'une aventure urbaine*, Hazan/Belvisi, Paris, 1998

²⁷ The quotations which follow come from Michel Ecochard's book *Casablanca, le roman d'une ville*, Ed. de Paris, Paris, 1955

²⁸ Michel Ecochard, *Casablanca, le roman d'une ville*, Ed. de Paris, Paris, 1955

²⁹ One should remember that these North-African countries were French at that time: Morocco being a protectorate since 1912 (became independent in 1956) and Algeria a colony since 1827 (war in 1954, independence in 1962).

³⁰ ATBAT-Afrique, a branch of ATBAT, was founded in Tangiers, Morocco in 1949 as an engineering firm. It then moved to Casablanca and took shape as a team of architects and engineers. From then on, ATBAT-Afrique would develop a number of habitat projects. See M. Tournon-Branly, 'History of ATBAT and its influence on French architecture', *Architectural design*, January 1965, pp. 20-23 ; J.-L. Cohen, 'The Moroccan Group and the Theme of Habitat', *Rassegna*, n° 52 : The last CIAMs, December 1992, pp. 58-67 ; J.-L. Cohen and M. Eleb, *Casablanca, mythes et figures d'une aventure urbaine*, Hazan/Belvisi, Paris, 1998.

³¹ After their degree in common, on a subject given by Ecochard (1952), Pierre Riboulet, Gérard Thurnauer and Jean-Louis Véret will pursue this foreign experiment: the first two working with Ecochard in Pakistan (University of Karachi, 1955-1958) and the last one as supervisor of the construction of the Ahmedabad projects for Le Corbusier (1952-1955). They established their own office in 1958, with Jean Renaudie: the Atelier de Montrouge (1958-1981). See Catherine Blain, *L'Atelier de Montrouge (1958-1981); prolégomènes à une autre modernité* (PhD, Paris 8 University, 2001) and 'Un atelier à Montrouge' (*Colonnes*, n°16-17, sept. 2001, pp. 14-19).

³² Georges Candilis and Shadrach Woods will come back to France in 1954, to open their own office in Paris with Alexis Josic (1954-1970).

³³ The detailed list of the groups is given by the archival materials of the 1953 congress kept at Fondation Le Corbusier [FLC]. A survey should be done for the 1951 congress.

³⁴ The theme of the 'core' would become that of the 'heart' when the acts of the congress were published. Cf. J. Tyrwhitt, J.-L. Sert, E. N. Rogers (ed), *CIAM 8. The Heart of the City ; towards the humazisation of urban life*, London-New-York, 1951 [2nd ed : 'Documents of Modern Architecture', Kraus reprint Ed., Nendeln, 1979]

³⁵ See S. Giedion's article 'The Humanization of Urban Life' (1951) — published in *CIAM 8. The Heart of the City* (1951); S. Giedion, *Architecture you and me* (1952) ; *Architectural record* (April 1952) ; *Das Werk* (Nov. 1952) and in S. Giedion, *CIAM. A decade of contemporary architecture - Dix ans d'architecture contemporaine*, 2nd enlarged edition, Girberger, Zurich, 1954

³⁶ J. Tyrwhitt, J.-L. Sert, E. N. Rogers (ed), *CIAM 8. The Heart of the City ; towards the humazisation of urban life*, *op.cit.*

³⁷ This theme recurs in various reports from the CIAM 8 — cf. Commission I Report, session of 9 July 1951. President, Le Corbusier [FLC D218/96]; Report from Commissions I and VI, 'Proposals on hearts' [FLC D218/119-120]

³⁸ In 1950, the Morocco Department of Urban Planning directed by Ecochard was divided into two sections. The first, the central unit, was itself divided between a technical section (chief architect, J. Maruret, and a team of architects: D. Beraud, M. Barzat, E. Mauret, etc., and draftsmen) and an administrative section. The second unit was a regional inspection department, with four branch offices: Casablanca (G. Godefroy, inspector; P. Mas, R. Pelletier and A. Nodopaka architects), Fès (J. Delarozière inspector, A. Degez and K. Hodel architects), Marrakesh (R. Duru inspector) and Agadir (R. Aujard inspector). For an overview of the outgoing projects, see *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 35, May 1951 'Maroc'.

³⁹ Michel Ecochard, *Casablanca, le roman d'une ville*, *op. cit.*, p.105. The grid, which includes streets and infrastructure (sewers, etc.) makes it possible to build a traditional dwelling (two or three rooms

Team 10, the French Context

and a patio). Using a variety of combinations, it is intended to be flexible enough to accommodate, in time, the creation of other types of housing (individual or collective).

⁴⁰ It is significant that, in parallel with the mass housing and re-housing policy, the Morocco Department of urban Planning was following up on other facilities, like the civilian hospital in Rabat and the Agadir city hall (a competition won in 1951 by Marcel Lods and L. Arsène-Henry, Bodiansky engineer, from ATBAT-Afrique). It was also in charge of a number of apartment complexes, in Casablanca (J.J. Honneger, J. Zevaco and P. Messina), Marrakesh (A. Courtois) and Menkès (J. Chemineau) — See *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 35, May 1951 'Maroc'.

⁴¹ See, in particular: P.-H. Chombart de Lauwe, S. Antoine, L. Couvreur, J. Gauthier and al., *Paris et l'agglomération parisienne*, PUF, Paris, 1952; Paul-Henri Chombart de Lauwe (dir.), *Famille et habitation*, 2 tomes (1° Sciences humaines et conceptions de l'habitation; 2° Enquête auprès des architectes), CNRS, Paris, 1959-1960. Note that this research, which was initially funded by the Musée de l'Homme and the CNRS, would also receive a grant from the Ministry of City Planning and Housing.

⁴² One should note that this attitude was promoted by the *Charter of Athens*, which considered the city as 'part of a social, political, and economic ensemble making up the region' (point 1) and, likewise, as a 'whole made up of parts' which must 'grow harmoniously' together (point 84).

⁴³ Comments from the Dutch (Bakema, Hovens Greve and Wissing), reported by J.-L. Violeau, *Situations construites 1952-1968*, Sens et Tonka, Paris, 1998, p. 34

⁴⁴ The sub-title was added at the February 1953 CIAM Council meeting 'to avoid any misinterpretation of the title'. See 'Compte-rendu de la réunion du Conseil CIAM tenue à Paris, 35 rue de Sèvres, le 15 February 1953' (by S. Giedion) [FLC D3 (2)328-331]. Attending the Council were: Le Corbusier, Giedion, Wogenscky, Gropius, Emery, Honegger, Candilis, Howell, Markelius, Rogers, Samuel, Steiner.

⁴⁵ The French members were implicated in three of the six commissions of the congress, whose composition were as

follow: 1° Urbanisme, section A (Le Corbusier and Sert chairmen, Aujame secretary); 4° Industrialisation (Coates chairman, Bodiansky and Lonberg-Holm vice-chairmen, Honegger secretary); 5° Législation (Lods and Ecochard chairmen); 6° Questions sociales (Emery and Candilis chairmen; members: A. and P. Smithson, Jill and Bill Howel, Thurnauer, Riboulet,...). They were also following closely the discussions held in commission 2, Synthèse des Arts plastiques (Giedion chairman, Tournon-Branly secretary, members: Auer, Bagnal, Bourgeois, Braeti, Chastanet, Coulomb, Gregotti, Haefeli, Laidlaw, Maisonneul, Richard, Sekler, Senn, Tamborini, Van Eyck, Vert, Voelcker, Wicker) and in commission 1, Urbanisme, section B (J. Bakema chairman).

⁴⁶ The nine French grids were: 'Bidonville Mahieddine' by CIAM-Algiers (P.A. Emery, L. Miquel); 'Moroccan habitat: housing for the greatest number' by GAMMA (Ecochard, Bodiansky, Candilis, Woods, Piot, Kennedy, Godefroy, Beraud); 'An analytic study of Boulogne-Billancourt' by CIAM-Paris (Thurnauer, Riboulet, Véret, R. and E. Aujame, N. and P. Chatzidakis, Rottier, Creswell, Le Lann, Raccoursier); 'Hygiene study' by Ascoral B.A. (Perrotet, Coulomb, Dufayard); 'Les Grandes terres, Marly-le-Roi' by M. Lods, J.J. Honneger, X. and L. Arsène-Henry; 'Experimental site: Aubervilliers' by André Sive; 'Application of aluminum in Nancy' by Jean Prouvé; 'Rouen, transformation d'un secteur de 25 000 habitants' by a group of students meeting with M. Sylvy; 'Etude: groupe Informations-Enquêtes' by Ascoral B.A. (J.P. Allain, M. Marcelli, J. Denieul, J. Laurent).

⁴⁷ 'CIAM 9 Aix-en-Provence. Commission 6 : Questions sociales' nd. [private archives; in capitals in the original]. Note that the 6th commission also defined four 'laws' — 'fundamental standards for the dwelling': 'I. The dwelling is an organic whole; II. The dwelling is made up of elements. III. The dwelling is an element within a set. IV. The dwelling evolves and is transformed rationally.'

⁴⁸ Michel Ecochard, cited by Georges Candilis in 'CIAM 9 Aix-en-Provence, July 1953. La Charte de l'habitat. Extraits des travaux individuels. Quelques extraits des

travaux des 6 commissions', *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* n° 49, Oct 1953, pp. IX-XII (with contributions from Bodiansky, Ecochard, Le Corbusier, Lods, A. & P. Smithson, B. & J. Howell). See also: Georges Candilis, 'L'habitat pour le plus grand nombre', *Techniques et Architecture*, n° 11-12, 1953, pp. 8-16.

⁴⁹ For a more detailed analysis of these field studies, carried out by Pierre Mass and Pierre Pelletier, see J.-L. Cohen and M. Eleb, *Casablanca, mythes et figures d'une aventure urbaine*, Hazan/Belvisi, Paris, 1998.

⁵⁰ On that specific contribution, see Zeynep Çelik, 'Learning from the Bidonville: CIAM Looks at Algiers', *Harvard Design Magazine*, feb 2003.

⁵¹ CIAM-Paris was founded as an outcome of the Sigtuna meeting of 1952, by Gérard Thurnauer, Pierre Riboulet and Jean-Louis Véret (who attended the meeting under the group name of 'Paris-jeunes'), former Corbusier and ATBAT staff members Guy Rottier, Edith Schneider-Aujame and Roger Aujame, Pirko Hirvela-Chadzikakis and Nicos Chadzikakis (engineer) and the anti-conformists Jean Le Lann, Paul Raccoursier and Denise Creswell (who had worked with Pierre Jeanneret).

⁵² Annotation by Pierre Riboulet to the document 'CIAM 9, Critique à propos du travail anglais', nd. [private archives] — In the margin of the text 'the work should not be based on a study of the functions, but rather a study of human groups and phenomenon of human relations', Riboulet wrote: 'Quite right. This was our intention in Boulogne. The neighbourhood would seem to be the best terrain for this type of study [...]. Without absolutely no doubt, this is one of the chief duties of the Charter. The ongoing relationships between individual and collective space in the heart of a human group make up the habitat. These relationships must be analyzed in light of daily life.'

⁵³ Jean-Louis Véret's manuscript notes on the Sigtuna Congress of 1952 [private archives]

⁵⁴ 'CIAM 9. Grille du CIAM-Paris. Introduction à l'étude d'une grille de présentation,' July 1953 [FLC F16/95-96]

⁵⁵ Alison and Peter Smithson, 'Collective Housing in Morocco', *Architectural Design*, January 1955, p. 2.

⁵⁶ 'CIAM 9. Grille du CIAM-Paris. Introduction à l'étude d'une grille de présentation,' July 1953 [FLC F16/95-96]

⁵⁷ 'MARS, Proposals for CIAM 9', 1952 [private archives; Cf. FLC- C24 : *Les documents de Sigtuna 1952*]. Among those who attended the Sigtuna meeting (Sweden, June 25-30, 1952): Tyrwhitt, Van Eesteren, Merkelbach, Van Bodegraven, Van Eyck, Bakema, Hovens Greve, Honneger, Roth, Schwartz, Suter, E.N. Rogers, etc.

⁵⁸ 'Programme du CIAM 9 à Aix-en-Provence. Lettre circulaire de l'ASCORAL', January 11, 1953 [FLC D3 (2)476-479]

⁵⁹ See 'Programme de travail pour le 9^e congrès CIAM, l'habitat', ns, nd [drafted by A. Wogenscky, discussed during the CIAM Council of May 1952] [FLC D2 (20) 323-325]; 'Programme du CIAM 9 à Aix-en-Provence. Lettre circulaire de l'ASCORAL', January 11, 1953 [FLC D3 (2)476-479]

⁶⁰ Cf. 'Programme de travail pour le 9^e congrès CIAM, l'habitat', ns, nd [A. Wogenscky, 1952] [FLC D2 (20) 323-325]; 'Programme du CIAM 9 à Aix-en-Provence' Ascoral memorandum, January 11, 1953 [FLC D3 (2)476-479]; 'Compte-rendu de la réunion du conseil CIAM tenue à Paris, 35 rue de Sèvres, le 15 February 1953' (par S. Giedion) [FLC D3 (2)328-331].

⁶¹ A memorandum circulated by Ascoral, January 11, 1953 [FLC D3 (2)476-479]. It was unsigned. However, at the time, the following people attended Paris meetings of the CIAM Council: Le Corbusier, Gropius, Giedion, Candilis, Emery, Honegger, Howell, Markelius, Rogers, Samuel, Steiner and Wogenscky. Note that, in 1952, Wogenscky had suggested that three primary 'vertical headings' be added to the grid: '1) the project's relationship to city development; 2) material needs; 3) spiritual needs.' The proposal was refuted by the 1953 circular.

⁶² 'Compte-rendu de la réunion du conseil CIAM tenue à Paris, 35 rue de Sèvres, le 15 February 1953' (by S. Giedion) [FLC D3 (2)328-331].

⁶³ The color charter was defined by Wogenscky in 1952: for functions (residences/yellow, open spaces/green, social services/blue, commercial services/

Team 10, the French Context

red) and arteries (major roads/red, secondary roads/orange, sidewalks/yellow) — See 'Programme de travail pour le IXe congrès CIAM, l'habitat', ns, nd (A. Wogenscky, 1952) [FLC D2 (20) 323-325]

⁶⁴ ASCORAL, *CIAM 9 (Aix-en-Provence 19-25 July 1953); Contribution de l'architecte d'aujourd'hui à la Charte de l'habitat*, Ed. Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, Paris, nd (c1954)

⁶⁵ Marcel Lods, 'Conclusion of the 5th commission', reported by Georges Candilis in 'CIAM 9 Aix-en-Provence, July 1953. La Charte de l'habitat...', *loc. cit.* (see note 49).

⁶⁶ André Wogenscky, introduction of ASCORAL, *CIAM 9 (Aix-en-Provence 19-25 July 1953); Contribution ...*, *op. cit.*

⁶⁷ Georges Candilis, 'CIAM 9 Aix-en-Provence, juillet 1953. La Charte de l'habitat', *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, n° 49, Oct 1953, p. IX

⁶⁸ Extract of the first version of the manifesto, untitled 'CIAM meeting, 28-31 janvier 1954, Doorn. Statement on Habitat' and signed by Bakema, Van Eyck, Van Ginkel, Hovens Green, Smithson and Voelker, published by *Forum* (n°7, 1959). The text is quite different in the second version, untitled this time 'The Doorn Manifesto', but unsigned, published by A. Smithson in *Team 10 primer* (Standard Catalogue, London, nd., 1965).

⁶⁹ The quotations which follow come from the note 'Conseil CIAM, mai 1952. Conseil extraordinaire et officieux' [FLC D3(1) 2-8]. At this meeting, organised by Giedion et held at Le Corbusier's office, assisted Gropius, Tyrwhitt, Giedion, Van Eesteren, Wogenscky, Markelius, Wells Coates, Samuel, Honegger, Steiner and three new members: Candilis, Rogers et Howell.

⁷¹ Detailed lists are given by the following archives: 'CIAM 9 : liste des membres des différents groupes et adresse des participants au congrès' [FLC D3 (6)1-35] and 'CIAM 9, Aix-en-Provence. 24 juillet 1953. Liste des grilles' [FLC D3 (3) 1-4].

⁷² The composition of the CIAM Council, elected during the general conclusion meeting of Aix, was published by Candilis in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* (n°49, juillet 1953, p. XI) : 1° Bureau : J.L. Sert chaiman, C. Van Eesteren honorific

chaiman, Le Corbusier et W. Gropius vice-chaimen, S. Giedion general secretary, J. Tyrwhitt secretary, J.J. Honneger treasurer ; 2° Members : J. Bakema, G. Candilis, P.A. Emery, W. Howell, V. Lauritzen, E.N. Rogers, R. Steiner, A. Wogenscky.

⁷³ 'Message de Le Corbusier adressé au 10^e congrès CIAM à Dubrovnik', 23 juillet 1956, 6 p. + annexe [FLC D3 (7)121-127]. The 10th congress was held in Dubrovnik, July 19-25, 1956, under the title 'Habitat. Problems of relations. First CIAM propositions. Constations and resolutions'.