

**Introduction**

Max Risselada

At first glance, the organization of a 'congress' devoted to the ideas and works of Team 10 seems to be a contradiction in terms. As we know, Team 10 members abolished the concept of a congress at the moment they distanced themselves from CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne), the body to which they had belonged. Team 10 held 'meetings' after establishing itself as an independent entity at the Otterloo Congress in 1959, meetings that continued to be held until 1981, when, along with the death of Jaap Bakema, these gatherings came to an end.

Team 10 meetings had nothing in common with CIAM congresses, at which only 'delegates' were invited to put forward their arguments, where everything complied with a pre-determined format and where participants, separated into committees, worked with materials that were reduced to diagrams and compressed into *grilles*. Such strict procedures alienated many younger members eager to be part of, and to intervene in, the new reality presented at these congresses.

Team 10 meetings had no chairman. Projects brought to these gatherings were presented 'as is', rather than being forced into a given format; forms and dimensions were determined by the subject or project in question. Above all, differences and conflicts were not ignored but openly discussed, sometimes even in Team 10's communications abroad.

In this context, it is worth noting that the proceedings and results of the 9<sup>th</sup> CIAM congress, held in 1953 in Aix-en-Provence, were never published. CIAM had no wish to expose the polemic character of this meeting, at which conflicts between an older and a younger generation had surfaced for the first time.

Our meeting in Delft is not based on a productive urge to intervene. Team 10 is history to us. Time has converted alienation into reality; it has created a distance and, in so doing, has allowed the myth of Team 10 to prosper. It has to be said that Team 10 members themselves also contributed to the genesis of the myth, through the way in which they communicated their range of ideas in the media and, even more so, through teaching.

Consider, for example, the Smithsons' contributions to *Architectural Design*, a periodical that, for some time, apparently gave them the freedom to express their every thought. Or the articles that they published in the Dutch magazine *Forum* from 1959 to 1963, the period in which Bakema and Van Eyck were part of the editorial staff.

Note, too, that the myth grew larger as studies on Team 10 were published, many of which were based primarily on existing literature and interviews with surviving members, and rarely if ever supported by archival research.

## Introduction

The main issue is how to choose a coherent body of Team 10 members to be studied, knowing that the composition of this group had already been the subject of many internal discussions during preparations for the meetings they organized. A review of the list of participants and the correspondence available reveals a nuclear membership that Alison Smithson liked to call the 'inner circle' – a denomination not undisputed, however.

To avoid the difficult issue of who was and who was not part of the nucleus of Team 10, we have chosen a formal point of departure. We believe the nucleus of Team 10 should comprise those individuals who were officially appointed to a committee to organize the 10th CIAM congress, held in Dubrovnik in 1956. The idea that took hold following the 9<sup>th</sup> CIAM congress in Aix-en-Provence was that a younger generation should organize future CIAM congresses. The composition of this organizational committee is telling: Jaap Bakema (Netherlands), George Candilis (France), Rolf Gutmann (Switzerland) and Peter Smithson (England).

Although they were members of the younger generation, Bakema and Candilis had contributed to all post-war CIAM congresses and could be seen, therefore, as mediators. Gutmann, along with many Swiss colleagues, had worked from a central and neutral position in Europe to help rebuild a war-torn continent. At the 1951 congress in Hoddesdon, Gutmann had made an important contribution to discussions on 'The Core of the City'. As the only newcomer in the group, Peter Smithson had expressed his views for the first time in Aix in 1953.

Soon after the appointment of these four, the organizational committee was informally expanded at the suggestion of Peter Smithson. Joining them were Howell, Van Eyck and Van Ginkel – members of the so-called Doorn group – Alison Smithson (England), Voelcker (England), Woods (United States), and Studer and Neuenschwander (Switzerland). The latter three worked in the North African CIAM groups in Morocco and Algeria, which were still French protectorates at the time. The presence of these new members further reinforced the exclusively Dutch/English/French character of the CIAM 10 Committee.

There is, however, an exception to our formal argument. In view of later developments, we have added Italy's Giancarlo de Carlo to the nucleus. Although, according to many sources, he was not active in Team 10 until after the Otterloo Congress (1959), he was involved in practically every subsequent meeting, and he organized meetings at Urbino (1966) and Terni (1976). Even more relevant was his initiation of the only public event involving Team 10 members, the 1968 Milan Triennale, which was devoted to a theme characteristic of both CIAM and Team 10: 'The Large Number'. De Carlo was also present at crucial moments prior to 1959; he attended the congress in Aix (1953) as a 'youth member' and – quite relevantly – a preparatory meeting for the 10<sup>th</sup> Congress at La Sarraz (1955), which he

attended with Ernesto Rogers. As De Carlo later reported, this was the first time that Team 10 members who were prevented from meeting with the Council discussed and critiqued one another's work: plans they had brought with them and hung on the walls while waiting. This type of informal analysis would be a determining factor at future Team 10 meetings. (Keep in mind that in those days, only officially appointed delegates were permitted to enter the room where propositions for the congress were put forward.)

An unsolved mystery is the absence of the officially appointed Swiss Team 10 member Gutmann. In light of what we know, we can surmise that little need existed for post-war reconstruction in a country that had been neutral during the war, a situation that may help to explain his absence.

A second reason for our initial focus on the youthful nucleus of Team 10 is the inclusion of these architects, at the beginning of their careers, in active national CIAM groups led by older, pre-war colleagues who were intensely occupied with the reconstruction of their countries. It was in these national groups that the younger members developed the new ideas that united them at international meetings. The main countries in which active CIAM groups of this kind operated were England (MARS group), France (ASCORAL), the Netherlands (8 and OPBOUW) and Italy (MSA in Milan). There was no such group in Germany, owing to the pre-war departure of many veteran members of CIAM. Franco ruled in Spain, and post-war reconstruction was not an issue in the Scandinavian countries. Possible links with groups from the Eastern Bloc countries – such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia – became irregular and difficult after the commencement of the Cold War in 1948.

In our view, relationships that developed within the separate national CIAM groups and factions mentioned above – whose members forged links, often while assuming opposing positions – were crucial to the growth of individual members and vital to developments that occurred within Team 10 both before and after 1959.

Understanding such developments requires an insight into architectural culture as it took shape in the countries concerned during the period of reconstruction and its aftermath. To structure the information and subsequent discussion on the culture of architecture at that time, we selected four themes for discourse at the congress:

1. Communication within both CIAM and Team 10, and the manner in which media and educational institutions are instrumental in disseminating ideas.
2. Contacts with and relations to the arts – high and low – and other cultural phenomena both Western and non-Western.
3. Cognizance and incorporation of knowledge of the social sciences into ideas and proposals for the urban project.

## Introduction

4. Influence and assimilation of planning instruments, building production and the development of new technologies and materials.

We constructed a 'grid', with the countries involved on one side and the four themes for discourse on the other: a framework that supports the entire congress. It not only offers us the opportunity to position invited speakers in relation to one another, but also determines the way in which we have structured the two-day symposium.

The first day is plenary, with introductory lectures on both the main theme of the congress and the various national contexts in which CIAM and Team 10 members operated.

The second day is devoted to lectures on the four selected themes, which together form the patchwork of the grid. We have grouped these themes into two parallel sessions, each presided over by two chairs.

- *Art, the Everyday and the Media*, presided over by Hilde Heynen and Jos Bosman
- *Sociology, Production and the City*, presided over by Deborah Hauptmann and Max Risselada

Each session combines two interrelated lectures, followed by a discussion. At the end of these sessions, participants will attend a final plenary meeting presided over by Stan von Moos.

The name of the congress, 'Team 10 between Modernity and the Everyday', not only implies the presence of ongoing tension between modernity and the everyday, but also suggests that Team 10 deliberately positioned itself, in various ways, within the space between these two timeless concepts.