

**Giancarlo De Carlo and the postwar modernist Italian architectural culture: role, originality and networking**

Luca Molinari

It is rather difficult to introduce the figure of Giancarlo De Carlo in the realm of the postwar Italian architectural culture, because on one side De Carlo is still an active presence within the Italian debate (his recent *Domus*' articles are the demonstration of an original point of view) and on the other side the uniqueness of his position, as it is always presented by the historians, should be soon confronted with a real, in depth archival research. As we all know every author, even the most open-minded, likes to play with his story, to preserve and to construct a topical passage of his intellectual and professional path designing an heroic vision for the next generations. I don't think that Giancarlo De Carlo played a lot with it, but at the same time I believe we should go beyond the apparently individualist and autonomous position of De Carlo, as it is often presented, by confronting it with a series of networks and actors that could help us to examine his role and the originality of his position.

#### 1968

In 1968 De Carlo was invited to organise the XIV Triennale in Milan, one of the most important and prestigious cultural events. It was to be occupied by a crowd of students. Giancarlo De Carlo, at the peak of his career, decided to face the crowd alone and to start a debate with the students. The title of the Triennale exhibition ironically represented its own destiny: *Il grande numero* (The great number) – it turned out a large number of people intended to squat and destroy parts of De Carlo's project.

But at the same time 'The great number' represents the core of the theoretical research of De Carlo during the 1950s and 1960s and one of the most original contributions within the Italian context. The exhibition was partially organized around the works of a group of designers he invited such as Arata Isozaki, Aldo van Eyck, Op 't Land, L. Chadwick, A. Gutnoff, Archigram, Alison and Peter Smithson, G. Kepes, R. Giurgola, S. Woods, UFO, Hans Hollein. The exhibition ideally symbolizes the network of a leader who does not want to be a leader; of an individual within a group of individuals. The destruction of the XIV Expo symbolizes the loss of a chance for the Italian architectural culture and the defeat of the cultural pre-eminence of De Carlo within the Italian and Milanese context versus the antagonistic position of the emerging, neo-rationalist and marxist-structuralist young designers and theoreticians such as Vittorio Gregotti, Manfredo Tafuri, Giorgio Grassi, Massimo Scolari and Aldo Rossi (who will organize the XV Triennale on the *Tendenza*).

#### Italy 1950-1968

Around 1968 Italy has reached the peak of a fast and dramatic metamorphosis which involved the whole country. As Paul Ginsborg says in his 'History of the contemporary Italy': 'Italy in the mid-1950s was still an under-developed country. Its industrial sector (..) was limited both geographically, being confined mainly to the north-west, and in their weight in the national economy as a whole. Most Italian still earned their living in the traditional sectors of the economy (..) In 1951 the elementary combination of electricity, drinking

water and inside lavatory could be found in only 7.4% of Italian households. Agriculture was still the largest sector of employment (with) 42.2% of the working population in 1951 (..) In less than two decades Italy ceased to be a peasant country and became one of the major industrial nations in the West. The very landscape of the country as well as its inhabitants' places of abode and ways of life changed profoundly'.<sup>1</sup>

I give you some data:

Gross domestic product 1951-58 5.5%, and 1958-63 6.3%;

Industrial production doubled its level of production;

Common Market: exportation 23% in 1955, 29.3% in 1960, 40,2% in 1965;

Italy refrigerator production: 1951 18.500, 1957 370.000, 1967 3.200.000, largest producer in Europe after USA and Japan;

From 1950 to 1970 pro capita income grew more rapidly than in any other European country: from a base of 100 in 1950 to 234,1 (France 136, GB 132);

Increasing of domestic durables: 1958 12% owned a television in 1965 49%

1950 to 1964 the number of private cars rose from 342.000 to 4.67 million and motorcycles from 700.000 to 4.3 million.

Between 1951 and 1971 the location of Italy's population underwent a revolution: 9.140.000 Italians were involved with dramatic consequences due to the level of population of the Italian cities with an increase of the 30-40% as well of the 70-80% in the immediate hinterland. The same period lived a catastrophic change in the landscape and cityscape of the Italian peninsula. Many of the historic centres of the Italian cities and towns were modified irreversibly, their suburbs grew as unplanned jungles of cement and hundreds of kilometres of coastline were ruined. Italy became in that period a unique example of a developed European country split between the resistance of the traditional contexts and the rush into modernization, showing a series of social and urban phenomena which will affect Europe in 1960s and 1970s.

I am introducing these elements because I believe it is rather impossible to focus on the postwar Italian architectural culture, when we consider the debate within the late CIAM congress, without considering the anomaly of post war Italian process of modernization. The uniqueness of a series of themes debated in Italy in that period such as tradition versus modernity, the role of preexisting conditions, continuity, human scale and some of the architectural works produced could only be related to the particular Italian context between mid 1930s and the end of 1950s.

The Italian architectural elite developed an ambiguous, and twofold attitude toward these conditions: in short, a retreat in the design process, modern style as an image of a new modernity, or the attempt to focus on new conceptual and operative tools to face the increasing quantity of the social and economical phenomena.

### **Giancarlo De Carlo's role and positioning within the modernist networks**

De Carlo kept an eccentric position in relation to the traditional networks frequented by the Italian modernist architects. De Carlo is strongly individualist, and politically he is an anarchist and attends the anarchists' meetings after the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> World War<sup>2</sup>. In a certain way De Carlo personalized the increasingly individualization which characterized all the modernist Italian networks after the end of the war. De Carlo followed an eccentric path that linked anarchy as personal view world, modern architecture as a theoretical, living horizon and the Einaudi group at Bocca di Magra as group of cultural relationship (Elio Vittorini, Italo Calvino, Levi, Albe Steiner, Cesare Pavese, Franco Fortini, Vittorio Sereni, Marguerite Duras, and Carlo Bo, writer and rector of the University of Urbino who became from 1951 his main customer).

During the 1940s and 1950s, the role of De Carlo within the modern architectural networks is mainly focused on the Milanese scene, especially in relation to the key figure of Ernesto Nathan Rogers. Founder and member of the BBPR architecture firm, one of the main leaders of the modernist Italian group MSA (Movimento Studi per l'Architettura), member of the CIAM since 1936 and member of the CIAM council since 1946, director of *Domus* from 1946 till 1947, Rogers represented the 'good-father' of De Carlo at the beginning of his career and at the same time a good friend and adviser.

Rogers introduced him in the *Domus* circle in 1946. De Carlo wrote his second book in 1947 in the series on Modern architects directed by BBPR. Rogers presented De Carlo at the CIAM Congress in 1952 and De Carlo accompanied him as his junior partner during all the meeting in the 1950s (the first, fundamental one is the 'mythical' meeting in La Sarraz in 1955 when De Carlo met the other members of the emerging Team 10). Rogers will introduce him to the MSA in 1948 and De Carlo will be the vice-president during Rogers' chairmanship in 1950-51. Rogers invited De Carlo to be part of the board of *Casabella-continuità* in 1953 until 1957 when De Carlo left again. presumably Rogers presented De Carlo at the Triennale where he later edited the exhibition on the 'Architecture without architects' in 1951 and the 'Mostra di urbanistica' in 1954. Most of the members of Italian CIAM and MSA were teaching at the School of Venice directed by Samonà, where De Carlo started teaching in 1954.

I would like to focus on three seminal events to evidence the progressive construction of an original point of view which could describe the contemporaneously individualistic and collaborative role of De Carlo:

1945-47: the two books he edited on Le Corbusier and William Morris

1953-1957: the board of *Casabella-continuità*

1959: the Otterlo CIAM conference

Each of these three events deals with a personal definition of the Modern Movement, of its nature and scope, on its crises and value in relation to the new phenomena issued by the changes in the postwar world. The core remains continuously the active and living role of Modern architecture and at the same time the contrast to every experience of formalism and 'stylistic naturalism'. Modernity is seen as a living process, as a methodology applied to reality which eventually leads to formal results.

By the end of 1950s' De Carlo has definitively exceeded the complex and problematic master-disciple relationship with Rogers and at the same time he has absorbed a series of design and conceptual experiences that gives account of his position within the Italian and the international contexts.

#### **Some biographical notes on Giancarlo De Carlo**

Born in 1919 in Genova, De Carlo spent his childhood in Tunis where he lived and studied until 1937. He then went back to Italy. In 1943 he graduated in Engineering at the Politecnico of Milan, after which he moved to the Faculty of Architecture. From 1943 to 1945 he actively participated in the *Resistenza* movement (Movimento di Unità Proletaria, MUP) and met Giuseppe Pagano. In 1945, a few days after the end of the war, Rosa and Ballo Publishers, an anarchist Milanese publisher, started a new series of publications involving Giulia Veronesi, Albe Steiner, Paolo Grassi and Luciano Anceschi. De Carlo edited for the same series a collection of writings of Le Corbusier and his wife Giuliana translated Frank Lloyd Wright's 'Architecture and Democracy'. In 1948 De Carlo moved from the Faculty of Architecture of Milan to Venice together with Ignazio Gardella, and in 1949 he finally graduated. Between 1949 and 1950 he worked with Franco Albini and, in 1951, he opened his own office.

#### **The first event 1945-1947: La casa dell'uomo / la casa per l'uomo / la misura dell'uomo**

After the war De Carlo mainly focused on the works and writings of Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright and William Morris. Why?

Browsing through the texts he wrote at that time we can point out some key concepts which represent an interesting starting point in his development and which also overlap with the themes carried out by Rogers with *Domus-la casa dell'uomo* and Elio Vittorini with *Il Politecnico*.

As De Carlo wrote on Morris

*'Morris insegnando che l'architettura non può essere dissociata dalle condizioni sociali e morali dell'epoca a cui appartiene restituì all'architetto la coscienza della sua missione tra gli uomini. Col suo lavoro e con l'esempio della sua vita egli mostrò come fosse necessario per chi voleva costruire per l'uomo, essere vicino all'uomo, partecipare dei suoi problemi e delle sue sventure, lottare al suo fianco per il soddisfacimento delle sue esigenze morali e materiali. (...) E' questa parte dell'insegnamento di Morris che costituisce il fondamento etico del movimento moderno.'*<sup>3</sup>

At the same time De Carlo's interest for Wright's organicism represented, not necessarily a formalistic reply to Functionalism, but rather the way how to come to terms with and to give theoretical shape to the construction of a modern, human-size environment.

In the same year Rogers added the subtitle 'La casa dell'uomo'(the house of man) to *Domus*, originally conceived by Giò Ponti as the magazine of the moderate style of Modernism. 'The house of man' became a new metaphor for the reconstruction of a different, modern way of living and thinking in Italian society. As Rogers wrote in his first essay: 'A magazine can be an instrument, a filter for establishing the criterion of choice.(..) It is a matter of forming a style, a technique, a morality as terms of a single function. It is a matter of building a society.'<sup>4</sup>

The magazine became an instrument for a radical revision of the values and tastes of the Italian society.

Rogers' illusion that the revolutionary spirit of the *Resistenza* had imbued the Italian society and gradually changed it, followed and influenced the theoretical structure of the magazine. 'The house of man' immediately appeared on the main cultural horizon, as a metaphor of the humanistic utopia of modern culture. As Rogers wrote in his first leading article: 'A house is no house if it is not warm in winter, cool in summer, serene in every season, receiving the family in every harmonious spaces. A house is not a house if it does not contain a corner for reading poetry, an alcove, a bathtub, a kitchen. This is the house of man.(..) I want to have a house that may look like me (in better aspects): a house that may look like my humanity.'<sup>5</sup>

In 1947 Elio Vittorini, one of the most interesting Italian writers after the war, edited the weekly magazine *Il Politecnico*, with the economic support of the Einaudi publishing house, and the political patronage of the left wing parties. Vittorini introduced a new form of journalism of a high, cultural level, combined with an advanced attention to the visual and social message. For the first time in Italy great attention was given to the graphic lay out of the magazine and to the use of illustrations to draw the reader's attention into the different articles. The graphic structure experimented by Abe Steiner in *Il Politecnico* strongly influenced the Italian magazines. The editors of the *Politecnico* included artists and writers from different backgrounds. The review published works of Carlo Bo, Guido Piovene, Ernesto Rogers, Eliot, Pasternak, Eluard, Auden and Saba and, at the same time, interesting reports on the social and political conditions in Southern Italy, the FIAT, the economical crisis and the International situation. In the same period *Domus* introduced a different, and more expressive use of its illustrations and graphic art.

Eventually, the political election of april 1948 ended an illusory, short phase of the political life of the country based on a 'governo di unità nazionale'. It meant a new phase influenced

by the cold war and strong ideological oppositions. Rogers was fired by *Domus* and *Il Politecnico* soon closed. But in Rogers' opinion there remained the necessity of a magazine as an ideological support for the Modern Italian networks mainly based on the group that worked with him during the *Domus* period (Giulia Banfi, Marco Zanuso and De Carlo). At the same time the theme of 'The real man, the man's size' became a fundamental point of discussion in the post war modernist Italian context. It was an attempt to exceed a rigid and mechanical vision on Functionalism and at the same time to build a link between society and Modern architecture, that was considered to be too elitist and too far removed from society.

During the IX Triennale of 1951 Rogers and De Carlo edited two small but enlightening exhibitions: Ernesto Rogers with Vittorio Gregotti, Lodovico Meneghetti and Giotto Stoppino designed and edited a room entitled 'La misura dell'uomo' and De Carlo organized a section on 'Architecture without architects' as an ideal follow-up on the former, fundamental exhibition on 'Rural architecture' curated by Mario Pagano in 1936. Both exhibitions dealt with the theme of humanity of modern architecture and on the necessity to create a different link between society and modernity.

In those years Giancarlo De Carlo gradually shifted his theoretical vision from architecture to the *Urbanistica*, a different vision of the city. Within this vision the core of the problem was the great number and the quality of quantity within the new architectural programmes. In 1954 De Carlo curated another exhibition for the X Triennale dedicated to the 'Urbanistica'. The core of the exhibition was constituted by three movies that he directed together with Elio Vittorini and Lodovico Quaroni, in all of which we find the same themes. The main focus of the movies is always the common man and the city as a cradle of growing complexities. At the same time we can evidence a criticism on modernism as a technocratic approach to complexity, a criticism on modernism as a rigid, deterministic methodology against the comprehension of reality and its phenomena, a criticism on modernism as a new academic formalism.

One year later De Carlo was asked by Rogers to become part of the editorial board of the new *Casabella-continuità*.

#### **The second event - Casabella continuità**

In 1953 Ernesto Nathan Rogers, adding the subtitle *Continuità* to the Italian architectural magazine *Casabella*, introduced one of the most important topics of discussion in the post war international architectural culture. *Continuità* summarized a complex ideology progressively theorized by Rogers in close relationship with parts of the Italian and International modernist scene after the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war. But before going into this a short overview of the main meanings given to these key words during the 1950s.

### 1. historical awareness

- *Continuità* as an 'historical awareness' of the modernist experience:

*Continuità* as continuity with the previous experiences. This is the basic significance; *Continuità* is a motto that underlines the new life of *Casabella* and the continuity with the *Casabella* of Pagano and Persico.

### 2. the modern tradition

- *Continuità* as an ambiguous defense of the work of the Modern masters and as idealist continuity with the experience of the avant-gardes:

The 'legacy' Rogers expressed is a statement of continuity with the masters' work as well as with the tradition of the Modern Movement.

Rogers, following the 'traditional' enunciation stated by Hitchcock-Johnson and Giedion during the 1930s, reinforced this ideal, hierarchical structure re-introducing the concept of 'mannerism' as an act of continuity with the work of the masters for the younger generations.

*Casabella-continuità* presented the masters' work as *exempla* of a 'living' methodology. The articles on the contemporary works of Mies van der Rohe ('Classicità di Mies van der Rohe'), Gropius/Tac ('Un opera di Walter Gropius nelle preesistenze ambientali di Atene'), Le Corbusier ('Il metodo di Le Corbusier e la forma della cappella di Ronchamp'), F.L. Wright and Alvar Aalto tried to strengthen the vision of the Modern Movement as a living process submitted to an inner, natural evolution.

At the same time the individuation of a *continuità* meant the individuation of a history, of a tradition of the Modern Movement. From 1946 BBPR directed a series of books titled *I maestri dell'architettura moderna* which introduced in Italy, for the first time, monographical publications on the works of European and Italian authors from the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the postwar period. The enlarged publication on the Modern Movement focused on the works of Morris, Olbrich, Garnier, Mackintosh, Perret, Hoffmann, Boito and Henry van de Velde. It was even further expanded in *Casabella-continuità* through some essays and monographic issues which Rogers commissioned to some of the younger members of his editorial board (Gregotti on Behrens, Rossi on Loos, Grassi and Canella on the Dutch School, Gregotti and Rossi on Antonelli, E.N. Rogers himself on Perret and Van de Velde).

### 3. methodology and tool

- *Continuità* as methodology that could be individually applied in relationship with the different preexisting conditions;

*continuità* as an ideological tool capable of bringing together tradition, context and modernity:

The definition of a historiography of modernism ran parallel to the definition of *Continuità* as

a methodological approach. Rogers tried to achieve an open methodology that considered tradition as a form of 'historical awareness', and the preexisting conditions not as a limit to be avoided but as the main sources for the contemporary designer.

#### 4. the magazine

*Casabella-continuità*, born under these ideological conditions, and basically conceived by Rogers as a magazine of tendencies, supported the work of the masters of the Modern Movement on one side, and the new Italian design on the other. The polemics that emerged from the issues of *Casabella-Continuità* clearly showed the problems generated by the re-examination of the legacy of the Modern Movement after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, with the call both for an oecumenical internationalisation and for a re-discovery of the national and regional characters. The debate was moving between the definition of the modern style as a statement of a new, modern world and the design process as an expression of a methodology based on a strong ethical consciousness.

*Continuità* and *crisi* (or *continuità* and *discontinuità*) embodied the dramatic dichotomy between an elitist dimension of the Modern Movement and the radical cultural, social and economic change that was sweeping the Western world, that was employed by Rogers as the terms and the borders of an ineluctable antinomy where the methodological characters of the Modern Movement should be reframed.

In mid-1951 Maurizio Mazzocchi, owner of the *Editoriale Domus* and of the magazines *Domus* and *Casabella*, invited Ernesto Nathan Rogers to be the director of the new *Casabella* after a silence of five years. His strong international connections, a relevant role in the post-war Italian culture and a good relationship with advanced Italian industry suggested Rogers as the proper director for a new international architectural magazine. Rogers created with *Casabella-continuità* an ideological umbrella able to embrace the theoretical debate and design mainly expressed by the Italian CIAM group, the Movimento Studi per l'Architettura (MSA), and the School of Architecture in Venice, where the CIAM Summer School was carried out from 1954 to 1956, and where an important part of the modernist designers were teaching (from Belgiojoso to Albini, De Carlo, Gardella, Samonà and Quaroni).

The first issue (n° 199) was published in the fall of 1953, the editorial board was composed by Giancarlo De Carlo, Vittorio Gregotti and Marco Zanuso, with Julia Banfi as secretary. The editorials by Rogers set the rhythm of evolution of *Casabella* signalling the changes and the debate within the editorial board. Thus Rogers' editorial direction (and not so much Marco Zanuso, Giancarlo De Carlo and Julia Banfi who came from the first *Domus*' experience) also became a fundamental 'school' for two generations of Northern Italian young architects like Vittorio Gregotti, Aldo Rossi, Giorgio Grassi, Gae Aulenti, Luciano Semerani, Francesco Tentori and Guido Canella, who would be considered in the 1960s and 1970s to be among the most influential architects in Italy.

It is important to underline that the use of the term *Continuità* is mainly related to the first phase of the magazine from 1953 to 1959; *Continuità* is a fundamental element of the discussion among Rogers, De Carlo and Gregotti and, after De Carlo's resignation in 1957, it would be used less, although remaining one of the main references of the theoretical architecture planned by Rogers.

Around the concept of *continuità* there were not only two different interpretations of the postwar Modern architecture but also a generational opposition between Rogers, critical guardian of the Modern Movement which was he redesigned as an alive, changing process, and De Carlo, supporter of the generational intolerance that considered the end of pre-war rationalism as a prerequisite to radical reform.

In March 1957 De Carlo wrote his last article for *Casabella* 'Una precisazione' (A clarification) which is the tip of the iceberg of a long, private discussion between Rogers and De Carlo from 1953 to the end of 1956 on a series of themes moving from the difficult relationship between him, as a critical voice within the group, and Rogers' 'guardians' like Gregotti and Banfi (as they were represented by De Carlo) to the organization of the magazine, and most of all to the theoretical nature of *Casabella*.

De Carlo contested Rogers' conservative vision and his use of the term *Continuità* as 'ambigua faccia della conciliazione' of the contradictions within postwar Modern architecture. Instead he supported a contradictory and polemic approach to problems in order to open up Modern architecture to reality. De Carlo conceived crises as a perennial, positive state and condition. *Continuità* became for De Carlo the motto of Rogers' identification with the magazine and the narrowing of a larger debate on Modern architecture and its role in post war society.

#### **The third event - CIAM-Team 10 and Otterlo 1959**

The same situation, naturally, occurred within the CIAM congresses with Rogers, Giedion and others of the elder generation supporting *continuità* as a basic concept to define an unbroken tradition of Modern Architecture and the arising Team 10 dealing with a critical exceeding of the Modern Movement.

*Casabella-continuità* pointed out the 'anomaly' of post-war Italian design and its different relationship with the use of history, publishing BBPR's Museum of the Castello Sforzesco in Milan, Casa alle Zattere by Gardella in Venice or Casa d'Erasmus in Turin by the young Gabetti and Isola which was immediately considered as an expression of a return to 'Liberty' as main visual precedents. An 'anomaly' which was also immediately pointed out by Banham in *Architectural Review* as a 'retreat from Modern Architecture' in a violent polemic with Rogers on the Italian Neo-Liberty<sup>6</sup> and which anticipated the controversy with the

Italian architects during the Otterlo's meeting<sup>7</sup>. We could consider the CIAM Otterlo meeting in 1959 as an important borderline between two different phases in the history of *Casabella-continuità*.

At the same time Otterlo showed a personal, independent position of De Carlo who presented one of the four projects of the Italian group (with BBPR, Gardella, Magistretti). Next to this he presented his statement entitled 'Memoria sui contenuti dell'architettura moderna', by which he closed a phase that started with the books on Le Corbusier and William Morris, opening a new period of researches, projects and relations. In his *Memoria* De Carlo stressed the idea of the definitive crisis of Modern Movement and CIAM giving his personal view on how to overcome this.

Firstly he described the two main conceptual areas of the Modern Movement as core and essence of the problem. A first group composed of William Morris/Arts and Craft, the school of Chicago, Berlage and Behrens, Loos and German rationalism, who tried to elaborate new theoretical tools to face the new, modern condition and who see style as a consequence. A second group composed of Art Nouveau, Wiener Secessionism, Futurism, Expressionism, Neo Plasticism and Le Corbusier who looked to the creation of an 'autonomia della forma', and where all formal innovation arised from an individual intuition of reality. Method versus Style.

The second, basic point of discussion is De Carlo's vision on the city as the core of the contradictions, problems as well solutions. The *Urbanistica* becomes the place where all these issues are elaborated.

What seems to me very interesting is the contradictory relationship between the architecture produced by Giancarlo de Carlo echoing the Italian context (see Comasina houses and Casa Zagaina Cervignano in relation to the contemporary works of Albini and Gardella) and the originality of his theorization which will be an important contribution to the Team 10 discourse. De Carlo reflections on the human scale, on the big number, on the design process as 'architettura partecipata' (attended architecture)(de Carlo started the first experiments in 1955 at Bocca di Magra as a direct consequence of his cultural and anarchist views), just like the Italian debate on tradition, preexisting conditions, on national and local architecture, all this will be part of De Carlo's contribution to the international modernist debate and even more so to the Team 10 discourse.

Of the same period the Campus Design proposal for Urbino reflects the intensive exchanges and the debates: in the *Collegio del colle* we could notice the consequences of the reflections on the human scale as well on the connecting spaces (spazi di relazione) theorized by the Smithsons. And at the same time the language experienced in those projects moves

between a reflection on Francesco di Giorgio Martini's architecture, Le Corbusier's *Maison Jaoule* and the early works of James Stirling showing a different generational attitude towards modernism and history as well a mature personality.

**Giancarlo de Carlo and the postwar modernist Italian architectural culture: role originality and networking**

<sup>1</sup> Paul Ginsborg, *A history of contemporary Italy. Society and politics 1943-1988.*, Penguin Books, London, 1989, p.210-211

<sup>2</sup> On the relationship between architecture and anarchism, See: Angela Mioni, Etra Conie Occhialini (eds.).

Giancarlo De Carlo. *Immagini e frammenti.*, Electa, Milan, 1995, pp.2-5; Franco Buncuga. *Conversazione con Giancarlo De Carlo. Architettura e libertà.*, Eleuthera, Milano, 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Giancarlo De Carlo. William Morris, pioniere dell'arte sociale, in, *Domus*, n.211, 1946

<sup>4</sup> Ernesto Nathan Rogers. Programma: Domus la casa dell'uomo, in, *Domus*, n.205, 1946

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, p.1

<sup>6</sup> Reyner Banham, *Architectural review*, no.747, April 1959; Ernesto Nathan Rogers, *Casabella continuità* no.228, 1959

<sup>7</sup> Ernesto Nathan Rogers, *I CIAM al museo*, *Casabella continuità*, no.232, 1959