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and Naef, one of the largest in Europe. The minutes taken by Schmidt record de­
bate over the theme of the next Congress, which Fitschy of the Belgian Group L'E­
querre proposed to be "Atmospheric Pollution," with subthemes of "CIAM Finances" and "Urbanism and Legislation." Le Corbusier objected to a focus on these "purely analytic" themes, noting that synthesis was the proper domain of architects, and ar­
gued for keeping the theme agreed to at the Brussels meeting in 1938, "Concrete Cases of Urbanization Following the Propositions of the Athens Charter." Ling sug­
gested that "Atmospheric Pollution" should be subordinated into the problem of "Air, Light, Space, Greenery," and pointed out that the problem of air pollution had al­
ready been extensively studied in England and the United States. He also mentioned
that the MARS group was working on a plan for the reorganization of London, and

![Sketch on back of copy of CIAM Statutes, probably by Le Corbusier, ca. 1939.](image)

suggested that "The Reorganization of Existing Cities" would make a good theme for the seventh Congress. After more debate, it was agreed that the theme of "Atmos­
pheric Pollution" would be one "Concrete Application Case" among several. 194

Hosted by the Groupe L'Equerre, the Congress was eventually titled "The Concrete Tasks of City Building," and scheduled for September 15–19, 1939, to be held during the International Water Exposition in Liège. In August 1939, however, Madame de Mandrot wrote to Sert and "her friends" in CIAM that she was resigning from the CIRPAC. She was critical of Giedion's attitude toward George Howe and felt it was time she retired. 195 With the governmental hostility toward CIAM in Germany, Italy, and the Soviet Union, limited support at best for Le Corbusier's many urbanis­
tic proposals, and now Howe's opposition to the formation of a CIAM group in the United States, the organization representing the avant-garde of modern urbanism was almost, but not quite, finished when the proposed sixth Congress in Liège was postponed indefinitely on September 7, due to the outbreak of the Second World War. 196
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The Functional City, 1931–1939

CIAM and the Postwar World, 1939–1950

CIAM as Propaganda: Sert's *Can Our Cities Survive*?

The first effort by CIAM to promote its urbanistic agenda in the United States was *Can Our Cities Survive? An ABC of Urban Problems, Their Analyses, Their Solutions: Based on the Proposals Formulated by CIAM*, written by José Luis Sert "and CIAM." It was published in the fall of 1942, almost a year after the United States had entered the Second World War in December 1941. The origins of the material presented in this book were the "Constatations" from CIAM 4 and the subsequent efforts discussed in chapter 2 to develop a publication for a popular audience setting out CIAM's urbanistic doctrines that underlay them. When finally published in wartime America, however, the entire context and potential application of this material had changed completely.

Like Giedion's praise of Rockefeller Center and Robert Moses's highways as models of urban reconstruction in his *Space, Time and Architecture*, Sert's *Can Our Cities Survive?* also appears to be appealing to proponents of a modern American urbanism, while at the same time retaining the support of Lewis Mumford and other idealistic opponents of the centralized metropolis. This may account for the book's curious vagueness about actual plans for urban reconstruction, as well as its lack of mention of the many planning efforts begun under President Roosevelt's New Deal. *Can Our Cities Survive?* seems to have been intended to create a semi­
informed audience for CIAM proposals, one with enough knowledge of urban de­
velopment to demand planning, but content to leave the specifics to the experts of CIAM. The sources of this approach may be found in the work of the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset, whose *The Revolt of the Masses* (1930) influenced both Henry R. Luce and Sert. In his analysis of modernity, Ortega argued that the rise of Fascism was closely linked to the overspecialization demanded by capitalist societies, which devalued the general historical and political knowledge necessary for good citizenship. This insight had led Luce to try to develop a "socially responsible" mass media that would stress the heritage of Western civilization and at the
same time promote American business and world leadership. Can Our Cities Survive? can be read as an effort by Sert, perhaps unknowingly, to adapt some of the same Ortega-influenced approaches used by the Luce magazines, such as Time, Life, Fortune, and Architectural Forum, to promote the cause of CIAM. In Sert's case the goal was not to profit but to gain support for the CIAM vision. As such, it differs considerably from the volume envisioned at CIAM meetings in Europe.

Yet the attempt to change the perception of CIAM from that of an avant-garde to an elite group of planning experts had a serious shortcoming. Whereas Lenin had successfully led a group of activist intellectuals to real power after the Russian revolution, by 1939 it was becoming clear that CIAM was less likely to achieve an equivalent role in urbanism, however that might be defined. While Sert's advocacy of CIAM and its position of urbanistic control by experts appeared to make sense in CIAM's changed circumstances, the problem remained that many of the still active members of CIAM did not in fact hold important positions in town planning in the larger and more powerful countries. Le Corbusier had yet to be given a major planning commission in France; Gropius, practicing in exile, had had only relatively small commissions since 1933; and Sert himself at this time was simply an émigré attempting to reestablish himself as an architect in New York. This situation must have raised questions about their claims to be urbanistic experts in the pragmatic context of American architecture and urban development.

Sert pressed on nevertheless, driven both by real conviction and by the awareness that a published book would greatly increase his chances of securing an academic post in the United States. Even before his arrival in New York, with Gropius's assistance he had begun in late 1939 to approach publishers about the CIAM volume, which was to be titled Should Our Cities Survive? Initial inquiries were not encouraging; Robert Crowell, a New York publishing executive, told Sert that the book seemed to be more an "argument or harangue, rather than a book that will inform the reader." Sert's response, still evocative of the language of the avant-garde, was that "although the book is based on analysis it must none the less contain a general line of action to make it interesting and useful, otherwise it would only be one research work more, in a country where they will soon have too many of this type." This seems not to have persuaded the Crowell executives. and by the end of 1940 Sert had approached Lewis Mumford about the possibility of writing the introduction. Though Mumford gave Sert a sympathetic hearing when shown a draft of the proposed CIAM text in December of that year, he was unwilling to write the introduction that Sert requested. As he wrote a few years later to his friend F. J. Osborn, the English Garden City advocate, "Did I tell you that Sert, a very fine man, had in accordance with CIAM instructions written his whole book, Can Our Cities Survive?, without a single reference to the functions of government, group association or culture in the first draft? For these progressive architects the whole life of the city was contained in Housing, Recreation, Transportation, and Industry. Mumford told Sert directly in a letter that though he thought the "Illustrated folio" Sert had shown him was "a very able piece of work," he found a serious flaw in the general outline which CIAM prepared, and which established therefore the main lines of the collective investigation and of the book itself. The four functions of the city do not seem to me to adequately cover the ground of city planning: dwelling, work, recreation, and transportation are all important. But what of the political, educational, and cultural functions of the city: what of the part played by the disposition and plan of the buildings concerned with these functions in the whole evolution of the city design. The leisure given us by the machine does not merely free modern man for sports and weekend excursions; it also frees him for a fuller participation in political and cultural activities, provided these are adequately planned and related to the rest of his existence. The organs of political and cultural association are, from my standpoint, the distinguishing marks of the city; without them, there is only an urban mass. . . . I regard their omission as the chief defect of routine city planning, and their absence from the program of the CIAM. I find almost inexplicable. Unless some attention was paid to this as
a field, at least, for future investigation, I should find it very difficult to write the introduction that you suggested.3

Mumford wrote to Osborn that after this “they [Sert and CIAM] have made a few pal­lid efforts to meet this criticism; but the lesson they failed to learn from [Ebenizer] Howard they are not likely to learn any more effectively from me,” and he still refused to give the book “the blessing of an introduction.”

After this setback Sert appealed to Gropius to see if the Harvard University Press would publish the book, as it was then doing with Giedion’s Space, Time and Architecture. Sert was concerned not only about advancing CIAM in the United States but also about the unreimbursed time and money that he had already put into preparing the book, and, as he wrote to Gropius, he hoped that “by publishing the book it could help me in finding a job in this country in the teaching field especially.” In October 1941 a contract was signed between the Harvard University Press and Dean Joseph Hudnut, acting “in the name of the CIAM,” for its publication. Hud­nut himself wrote the foreword. At Sert’s urging, the Bauhaus émigré Herbert Bayer, “who made the jacket for the Giedion book,” designed the dust jacket, with its collage view of middle-class workers jammed into a giant sardine can surrounded by aerial views of Moses’s new New York highways. Dumas Malone, then director of the Harvard University Press, told Sert “we aren’t so keen about the title,” so “Should” was replaced with “Can.”

After a year of preparation, Can Our Cities Survive? appeared in print in No­vember 1942. The entry of the United States into the Second World War complicated the production process: military censors forbade the inclusion of Sert’s illustrations of TVA dams and American steel plants, and almost all contact with European CIAM members and architectural magazines was cut off. Nevertheless, once the book finally appeared the Harvard University Press reported to Sert that it was selling well. Copies were distributed to members of the National Resources Planning Board, the Federal Housing Administration, the National Housing Agency (successor to the United States Housing Authority), and selected government officials, including Wallace K. Harrison, then serving as Deputy-Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs. Jacob Crane, one of the designers of Greendale, Wisconsin, and by 1942 Director of Urban Studies at the National Housing Agency, wrote to Sert that he planned to send an abstract of the book around the agency and that he believed it “should greatly clarify the whole subject of urban planning as far as the general public is concerned.” Hudnut announced that the book would become a Harvard School of Design textbook, and Richard Neutra wrote to Sert that he was attempting to get foundation support to have it placed in all high school libraries.

Yet the published text of Can Our Cities Survive? is an unsatisfying hybrid, part extended illustrated polemic and part would-be planning textbook. The book’s manner of presentation, which uses photomontage techniques and juxtaposes ex­amples of architecture with various kinds of photographs, cartoons, statistics, and images of industrial production and infrastructure, derives from both the GATCPAC group’s Barcelona journal AC and Le Corbusier’s Radiant City. It also reuses many of the illustrations from the CIAM exhibit for the Pavilion des Temps Nouveaux at the 1937 Paris Exhibition. Though it contains some effective photographs, visually it is less compelling than Giedion’s Space, Time and Architecture or the architectural publications of the Museum of Modern Art. Given the book’s stated purpose, it is vague about the actual work of CIAM, presenting only a few of the urban plans coded with the four functions prepared for CIAM 4, and including no texts of statements made at that event or later CIAM meetings. Only a few of the comparative plans are in evidence, and none of the talks at CIAM congresses are included. Little information is given about the actual workings or projects of the various CIAM national groups.

A number of projects by CIAM members are used as illustrations, though almost none are credited, not even the “Casa Bloc” in Barcelona designed by Sert himself with Torres Clavé and Subirana of the GATCPAC group. Perhaps this was done in the spirit of what J. M. Richards had called in a slightly earlier article in Circle “the principle of anonymity,” which he asserted arose where “unity of pur­pose allows the establishment of a unity of cultural language.” The projects used as illustrations—such as the Swiss CIAM group’s Neubühli (p. 61), Gropius’s Siemenstadt apartments (p. 67), Beaudoin and Lod’s Cité de la Muette, Arne Ja­cobson’s Bellavista Flats, Stonorov and Kastner’s Carl Mackley Houses (all p. 59), Yorke and Breuer’s “Garden City” of the future (p. 71)—Brinkman and Van der Vliet’s Van Nelle factory (p. 147), parts of Le Corbusier’s Radiant City (p. 89, 149), Van Tijen and Maaskant’s Plaslaan Apartments, Rotterdam (p. 151), Van Eesteren’s Amsterdam Extension Plan (p. 237), and even Gropiuss and Breuer’s Harvard urban design studio work (p. 213)—are all presented anonymously, as are Jones Beach State Park (p. 101), the RCA Building (p. 231), Albert Kahn’s Chrysler Half-Ton Truck Plant (p. 147), and Buchman and Ely Jacques Kahn’s 1400 Broadway and Bricken­Casino Buildings (p. 107).4

There are also some strange omissions: apart from the Yorke and Breuer proj­ect, little work by the MARS group is presented, such as the better-known works of Tecton, or Arthur Korn’s MARS Plan of London. This may be due to the difficulties Sert was having collecting material from the MARS group, but it is more difficult to understand why none of the work of Serge Chermayeff is included, as he was in the United States by 1940, and in regular correspondence with Gropius. Even stranger is the complete absence of work by the official American CIAM delegates, Neutra or Lonberg-Holm, or of projects by Stamos Papadaki or Ernst Weissmann, the latter initially one of members of the committee charged with producing the book. In fact
3.2 Four modern housing types: Beaudoin and Lods's Cité de La Muette, Arne Jacobsen's Bellavista Flats, and Stonorov and Kastner's Carl Mackley Houses; from Sert, Can Our Cities Survive? p. 59.

the only American CIAM architectural work presented positively was that of Stonorov and Kastner and of Gropius and Breuer. 16

As Hudnut's foreword makes clear, the point of Can Our Cities Survive? was not to advocate a modern version of the ideal city of geometric clarity and classical order, "an architecture having a basis no firmer than a logic of form and a reward no deeper than an aesthetic experience," but rather to link urban planning and design to "those processes by which material things are shaped and assembled for civic use." 17 The images thus can be read as suggesting how these modernizing processes are "inevitably" producing the constituent elements of the "Functional City," underscoring that the CIAM polemic was indeed a scientific response to these forces. By blurring the line between the work of CIAM members and projects like Jones Beach State Park, the book furthers the impression that CIAM was somehow in a position to direct urban development along lines already well established. Yet the book does not present much of the work of CIAM to confirm this impression. Though it is full of condemnations of slum conditions, which were commonplace by this time in books about American housing and urbanism, and it cites many statistics about density, traffic flow, and land use, which gives it the something of the character of books like Catherine Bauer's Modern Housing or Henry Wright's Rehousing Urban America, it lacks the specificity of those earlier texts. The dearth of specifics is especially notable when the book is compared with the enormously detailed documentation assembled for the 1929 Regional Plan of New York and ClAM as Propaganda: Sert's Can Our Cities Survive?
Environs or the various volumes in the Harvard City Planning series issued in the 1930s.

Can Our Cities Survive? does not discuss in detail any of the many public and private institutions then in the process of actually shaping urban development in the United States. Written at a time when the federal government was still in the process of developing and implementing a set of policies that would determine American urban development for decades, the book makes virtually no reference to them. Left unmentioned are urban policy recommendations of the National Resources Planning Board, the subdivision guidelines and other policies of the Federal Housing Administration, the decentralized Federal defense housing projects of Neutra and others, the Greenbelt towns (which were presented in the 1939 MoMA show), and the work of the Farm Security Administration, the client for a project by Vernon de Mars and Burton D. Cairns included by Alfred Roth in his The New Architecture of 1940. The work of the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), which was planning the clearance and reconstruction of huge areas as the book was being written, is discussed only to point out that at the rate it had been proceeding it would "take over two hundred years of reconstruction" to rehouse the nearly 25 percent of the city's population then living in Old Law tenements, and that therefore "something more than these official solutions is obviously required."

This dismissal of American "official solutions" is underscored by the few examples that are illustrated. A small aerial photo of Walter MacCornack's and Carl Feiss's Cedar Central Apartments in Cleveland (p. 37), an early public housing project, is shown as one of a series of examples of slum clearance schemes lacking necessary space around them, and William F. R. Ballard and team's Queensbridge Houses for NYCHA (p.39) is illustrated only to provide an example of bad site selection. Notably absent is any mention of Weinberg, Conrad, and Teare's Lakewood Terrace in Cleveland, a Neubühl-inspired public housing scheme that had been featured in both Architectural Forum and in the MoMA "Art in Our Time" exhibition.¹⁸

The indifference to New Deal urban developments evident in Can Our Cities Survive? is a major shift in approach from the early years of CIAM, and from Sert's own previous extensive involvement in "official solutions" to urban problems in Barcelona. Whereas previously CIAM had defined itself as an organization seeking to bend "the State" toward implementing a particular urban agenda, Can Our Cities Survive? seems more like an illustrated tract meant to mobilize mass opinion away from the then-current American governmental efforts to implement the urban strategies of the new architecture. The "something more than these official solutions" the book hopes to bring into being would seem to be widespread faith in the "Town Planning Chart" from the Fourth Congress (reproduced at the end of the book) and in the experts who created it. Rather than rely on "official" solutions, CIAM, through the voice of Sert, seems to be encouraging a belief in a set of abstract commandments about what constitutes sound city development, presented as transcendent rules emerging from the Zeitgeist, "a collective spirit capable of organizing community life to the lasting advantage of the many instead of to the immediate profit of the few."²⁰

Sert's attempt to use photos, statistics, and cartoons to create an American mass following for what would soon become known as the Athens Charter may seem quixotic today, but in fact the book was being directed at a "popular" American audience precisely at the moment when various large business organizations were successfully promoting a new metropolitan lifestyle of a different but related sort. By 1942 the power of such media to form social outlooks was already recognized; Wallace K. Harrison, in his wartime role as Deputy Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, wrote in March 1942 to Nelson Rockefeller about his efforts to counter Axis influence in South America, "We have the greatest propaganda media possible in the form of 'Time' and 'Life' and 'Fortune' who [sic] may be drafted to help us."²¹ Though the stance of the Luce magazines was obviously different in political outlook from Das Neue Frankfurt or AC, they too were at least indifferent, if not hostile, to earlier City Beautiful efforts at civic embellishment, and were also eager to see narrow city streets lined with technologically substandard urban dwellings demolished and replaced with better highways and parklike open spaces.

This convergence across the political spectrum in favor of a new urbanism, however, was not identified in contemporary reviews of the book. It appeared at a point where the deluge of planning proposals for "1945," as the year the war would be over was being called, was just beginning, and Can Our Cities Survive? probably seemed to be simply another book of same type. A review by Carl Feiss, designer of the Cedar Central Apartments which Sert had presented negatively, appeared in the newly founded Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians in October 1942.²² Feiss began the review with a half-hearted effort to assess the book's historical aspects, pointing out that "historical motifs . . . appear and reappear throughout an elaborate text," but added, "the book as a literary or scholarly effort is disappointing," comparing It unfavorably to Giedon's Space, Time, and Architecture. He found the use of illustrations better, "though rather obvious," citing as superior in this regard Alfred Roth's The New Architecture (which actually presented more recent American work). In general Feiss thought that Can Our Cities Survive? was "a mere appendix" to Space, Time, and Architecture, and he thought the historical material was better handled "in the works of Mumford [The Culture of Cities], Thomas Adams, Giedion, Hamlin, Bauer [Modern Housing], and several others." He confessed he was disappointed at the lack of a "clear exposition of the work" of the CIAM, adding, "We have been waiting with some impatience for a history of the CIAM and its affiliate or sister organizations, of which little has as yet been published in this country."²³
What little material is included suggested to Feiss that "our native architects were not participating to any large extent in the movement." He recalls that when the early Congresses were held while he was still a student, "no reverberation of these Congresses was to be felt either in the faculty or the student body of my school," nor did they receive "any important place in any American architectural journal of the period." He points out "there is no blame attached to this, but those of us who were not and are not among the initiate find it difficult to accept the enthusiastic claims as to the importance and success of the CIAM, without some further documentary evidence." Feiss concludes by mentioning Giedion's claim that archival material on the organization had been collected in Zurich, and says, "A catalog of such material would be invaluable to us in appraising the interests and the point of view as well as the accomplishments of the organization. Is one available?"

Feiss's question was answered in the next issue of *JSAH* by Giedion, who in "On CIAM's Unwritten Catalog" mounted a rambling defense of both CIAM and *Can Our Cities Survive?* In response to Feiss's complaint that the work of CIAM remains "both vague and esoteric," Giedion describes how CIAM developed a "questionnaire and standardized system of graphic representation" to study cities comparatively, but gives no further specifics, since CIAM had never found the means to tabulate and publish the results of these surveys. He then suggests that "it would have been helpful to have Mr. Feiss's constructive comments on these symbols and graphic representations," a part of CIAM barely mentioned in the book. Giedion continues by making overstated claims for CIAM research methods, saying "they have been extended to almost every field." He suggests that "they might, in fact be adopted with profit by architectural historians," as they "could confer together as to the most urgent unsolved problems in their field, and how these might be best attacked." Giedion finds "nothing esoteric or vague in CIAM procedure," and defends the organization's role in winning public acceptance for the new architecture, whose "modes of expression" are now "taken for granted and accepted nearly everywhere," though "there is still an attitude of scepticism [sic] on the part of the public and officials toward their use in public work." He defends CIAM as a place for "attacking complex present-day problems collaboratively," and asserts that "the founders of CIAM were also the founders of contemporary architecture." At the same time it "is no assembly of celebrities"; it remains small "in order not to lose its working power," but "its doors are open wide to young architects in a special kind of membership." He dismisses Feiss's wish to see a catalog of the material produced by the organization: "I fear that CIAM is not sufficiently interested in bibliography to undertake such a catalogue. Some day, perhaps, when historians wish more insight into the rise and course of contemporary architecture since 1928, they may consult our Zurich files which overflow with questionnaires, correspondence, and carefully in-
practices already in wide use in America by 1942. Under the New Deal large areas of American cities were prepared for “slum clearance,” and new housing projects influenced in varying degrees by the ideas of the Modern Movement were begun in New York, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, and other cities. When federal public housing efforts were shifted toward housing for defense workers in 1940, many other projects were begun across the country, some of them by CIAM members such as Neutra, Gropius, and Stonorov. Lewis Mumford’s review of the book in The New Republic in early 1943, while generally positive, reiterated the criticisms he had made privately to Sert over the book’s lack of attention to a potential “fifth function,” the cultural and civic role of cities, and it was this aspect of urbanism, rather than the “Functional City,” that would occupy CIAM for most of the next decade.

The New York CIAM Chapter for Relief and Postwar Planning, 1943–1945

After the publication of Can Our Cities Survive? in 1942, Giedion and CIAM sought to find a new direction for the group’s activities, shifting its agenda toward postwar reconstruction in Europe. These efforts resulted in the creation of the New York CIAM Chapter for Relief and Postwar Planning in 1943. For American members like Knud Lonberg-Holm, the goal in the 1930s had been to transform the entire American building process. They were far more interested in, as the title of Lonberg-Holm’s 1940 book put it, Planning for Productivity than in the creation of “architecture” as such. Like Buckminster Fuller, they hoped to make buildings as lightweight, demountable, and temporary as possible, believing that the traditional built fabric was itself an impediment to social change and better living patterns. Their position has been aptly described as a “consciously anti-aesthetic, productivist dogma disseminated through the commercial press.” They did not share the admiration Giedion expressed in Space, Time and Architecture for Rockefeller Center or New York’s Triborough Bridge as “symbols of modern times.” Instead, Lonberg-Holm sought to reorganize American building production from within organizations like the F. W. Dodge Corporation, where as the Dodge Corporation director of research he was able to bring to the attention of any architect or builder a full range of available choices for any type of building component.

For a short period in the United States in the 1930s there seemed to be a certain plausible convergence between the Fordist logic of large-scale capitalism, the replanning activities of “master builders” like the Rockefellers or Robert Moses in New York, and the goals of CIAM. Yet the CIAM desire to assume a controlling role in American planning efforts had met with little direct success in the United States. On the other hand, aspects of the CIAM agenda were appropriated for the populist, consumer-oriented modernism of the 1939 New York World’s Fair, organized by Moses, where Henry Dreyfuss’s “Democracy” and Norman Bel Geddes’s “Futurama” implemented some CIAM-like approaches in the service of a politically conservative urbanistic vision of remade American downtowns served by highways linked to commuter suburbs. It was this vision, more than CIAM’s, that came to characterize modern urbanism as it was actually implemented in the United States. During the Second World War, the need for a common front against the Axis led to cooperation between the previously antagonistic advocates of free enterprise and various forms of collectivism. The real differences in political outlook between the forces behind American urban renewal and the CIAM version of urbanism were blurred then and have remained unclear ever since. But while CIAM saw master-planning by “experts” as a necessary step to provide a better life for all, American urban renewal advocates like Robert Moses and his supporters objected to calling their highly coordinated, “top-down” efforts at urban reconstruction and control “planning” at all.

This unanticipated turn of events further confused the direction of CIAM, and it seems to have raised questions about its continuing status as an avant-garde in the new wartime atmosphere. While its internationalism seemed current, especially after the publication of Republican presidential candidate Wendell Wilkie’s One World in 1943, its earlier emphasis on planning, standardization, and urban reconfiguration based on the “four functions” of dwelling, work, transportation, and recreation had become so widely accepted that at a CIAM meeting called by Giedion early in 1943, Lonberg-Holm is quoted as saying that “the younger generation takes the point of view of the CIAM for granted.” This meeting, organized to discuss the topics, “Has CIAM reliably fulfilled its function?” and “How has it to be organized according to the changes in the world situation?” took place in February 1943. The minutes list the other attendees as Ernest Weissmann and Sert.

At this meeting Sert questioned whether CIAM had “really fulfilled its function” and asked whether any other international institution could replace it. Giedion, however, according to the minutes taken by himself, argued for continuity: “The collaboration and the capability to collaborate between different fields has to be learned. We believe in a certain continuity which does not mean stagnation. The CIAM of 1928 is historical but not those that then collaborated.” Giedion and Sert then went forward with organizing a revived CIAM. Weissmann, who had worked briefly in partnership with Sert on a New York apartment house project in 1939–40, wrote to Giedion a month later protesting that his remarks had been left out of the minutes of this meeting:

If you had cared to listen, you would remember that, among other things, I defined, or at least attempted to, why and how we are able to collaborate
between different fields," and that our common language is not a mysterious formula to be discovered, but simply the obvious aim of planning: to control man's environment for the benefit of the people. And when I say the people—I mean the people, and not the planners. And when I say benefit, I mean the achievement of a better life for the many and not the world some "planners" intend to force on the people.  

In place of Weissmann, Sert's new partner Paul Lester Wiener, a German-born American architect based in New York, began to attend these New York CIAM meetings. Le Corbusier seems to have introduced Sert to Wiener, mentioning in a letter of May 20, 1940, to Sert in New York that he could speak with Wiener about CIAM and "our friends in Rio." Wiener's father-in-law was Henry Morgenthau, Jr., secretary of the treasury from 1933 to 1945, and Wiener had developed connections with the U.S. State Department and designed the exhibits and interiors of the Ecuadorian and Brazilian pavilions at the 1939 New York World's Fair. Wiener and Sert formed a partnership which they called Town Planning Associates in 1941, just as Sert's brief partnership with Weissmann was ending.  

According to the Museum of Modern Art catalog, Two Cities, Sert and Wiener were commissioned in May 1943 by the Brazilian Airplane Factory Commission to design a new town around an airplane engine factory in the Baixada Fluminense area of reclaimed marshland twenty-five miles northwest of Rio de Janeiro. According to later recollections of Oscar Niemeyer, the commission was originally given to a Brazilian architect-engineer, Fernando Saturnino de Brito, who asked Niemeyer to do the architectural design. Niemeyer suggested to Wiener, then in Brazil, that he join them as a partner. After agreeing to this, Wiener returned to the United States and replaced Brito with Sert, and then suggested to the client that the Roberto brothers should do the architectural design. As published a few years later, the Sert and Wiener project, which they called the "Cidade dos Motores," or Motor City, was zoned using the CIAM "four functions" of dwelling, work, recreation, and transportation. It was an application of the Radiant City, and resembled Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret's plan for Némois. Its more elaborated "civic center" element may reflect Lewis Mumford's criticisms of CIAM urbanism when asked by Sert to write the introduction to Can Our Cities Survive?  

While the concept of civic center as a kind of CIAM "fifth function" would remain important to Sert and Giedion, and would eventually provide the theme of CIAM B, it does not seem to have been considered as important by other CIAM members during the war years. Gropius was concentrating his efforts at the time on a non-place-specific prefabricated housing system with Konrad Wachsmann and he made no mention of civic center design at a Harvard conference on urbanism held in 1942. From the same period, there is little in the writings of Neutra, Cher-
The New York CIAM Chapter for Relief and Postwar Planning, 1943–1945

The minutes then note that a "general discussion of the advisability of forming such a group" followed. Chermayeff advocated limiting the work to a few "clearly realizable" items; Weissmann doubted that "the former pattern of the CIAM would be applicable to the present situation," and suggested further meetings. Sert countered by speaking "in favor of organizing now and determining the exact form of the organization afterward [sic]." Nelson raised the dangers of planning for "the people in Europe who, he said, want to do the planning themselves." Moholy-Nagy stressed the international character of CIAM and its utility in setting standards. At Harris's suggestion, A. Lawrence Kocher then moved that the "group be organized for the purpose of carrying out the aims listed by Mr. Sert as they pertain to the postwar period." Weissmann then presented "a list of proposed objectives which Mr. Lonberg-Holm had prepared for another group but which Mr. Weissmann believed to be suitable for CIAM also." Chermayeff thought these objectives should be left to that other group, probably the American Society of Architects and Planners (later ASAP), which was being formed at the same time. Kocher's motion to organize on the basis of Sert's aims was then voted on and passed. After the group's attorney, Mr. Schattman, read the proposed Articles of Incorporation, Chermayeff moved that "CIAM for Relief and Postwar Planning be formed for the purpose outlined in the proposed Certificate of Incorporation."

Officers were chosen: Neutra, president; Lonberg-Holm, Sert, and Nelson, vice-presidents; and Harris, secretary-treasurer. Moholy-Nagy proposed that these officers be included in the Board of Directors, who were then elected. Those listed in the minutes are Giedion, Moholy-Nagy, Weissmann, Stonorov, Gropius, William Wurster (then Dean at MIT), Kocher, Hudnut, Chermayeff, Wiener, Mies van der Rohe, Chareau, and Wallace K. Harrison.

Two days later, Lonberg-Holm sent a telegram to Weissmann, now at the Division of Industrial Rehabilitation at the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Washington, asking if he "and Paul" (possibly Nelson) were coming to the next meeting on Sunday, saying he was "considering dropping CIAM as nonessential." Other CIAM members seem to have been dubious about the continuing value of the organization as well. On June 23, 1944, Sert replied to Gropius, saying, "I do not share your doubts on the possibility of the CIAM group duplicating the activities of the American Society for Architects and Planners." Sert stated that the new CIAM chapter was "a temporary CIAM formed in view of the actual emergency," while the "ASAP" (later usually abbreviated as "ASPA") was a permanent group "which will not be active until Fall at the earliest." The CIAM chapter, an international group, would "deal mainly with the problems of devastated areas outside this country" while "postwar planning in this country will, on the other hand, be the main concern of the ASAP; a "national group." However, members could belong to both.

The minutes in the CIAM Archives record that Gropius opened the meeting by recounting past CIAM activities and proposing "to reconnect the threads of activity broken by the war." Neutra and Giedion also spoke in favor of a revived CIAM, and Giedion read letters in favor of it from Emery and Papadaki. Sert then reviewed the aims known to the authorities who will have a say in relief shelter and postwar planning, "... it would be a mistake to try to revive it..." Gropius talked but said very little; he was pussyfooting, I believe. Soon everyone was talking and disputing one another. German was the native tongue of most of them but they were trying hard not to speak it here. In the heat of argument, a speaker would start suddenly in German but quickly switch to French when he discovered what he was doing, and couldn't say it in English. I couldn't see we were getting anywhere. After about 2 hours it came to an end. In my mind the meeting had been a flop. Then I saw Giedion hurrying toward me, smiling and almost dancing. He declared the meeting had been a success and gave me credit for it. Apparently he had been expecting a fight and thought I had had something to do in preventing it. I then decided that my strength in the situation had been my utter and obvious innocence, and that the disputants stopped short in their expressions in order to save me embarrassment. For a time I remembered the names of some of them but no longer.

The remainder of these "Aims" set out eight committees within the Chapter, which would (1) attempt to address issues of research on relief planning and postwar planning; (2) address the creation of new types of structures; (3) establish a steady flow of information among CIAM groups "as countries now occupied are liberated"; (4) establish close relations among CIAM groups in unoccupied nations, "such as those existing in Britain, North Africa, Sweden, and Switzerland," and reestablish contacts with the Soviet Union; (5) include members of different professions related to relief and postwar planning in the group; (6) establish a finance and sponsorship committee; (7) organize a permanent secretariat; (8) establish contacts in the USA and Latin America with other groups working on these problems.
The new CIAM chapter met again on June 25, 1944, with most of the same participants except Harrison and with Neutra presiding. The minutes note that the votes of Gropius, Moholy-Nagy, Mies, Hilberseimer, and Stonorov were delegated to Giedion, and the votes of Lonberg-Holm, William Muschenheim, Nelson and Theodore Larson were delegated to Weissmann. Three standing committees were formed, one on "Technical Housing Research," consisting of Lonberg-Holm, chairman, Henry Wright (not Clarence Stein's partner, who had died in 1936), Robert Davison, and Weissmann. The second committee was on "Programming and Planning," and the only members appointed were Sert, chairman, and Pierre Chareau. The third committee was the "Professional Groups Committee," to which were appointed Giedion, chairman, Hudnut, Rice, and Harris.68

The next meeting was also held at the New School, on July 15, 1944, with Chareau, Harris, Harrison, Lonberg-Holm, Sert, Wiener, and Weissmann, with Neutra again presiding. A committee of Weissmann, Nelson, and Larson presented a report on "Shelter, Relief, Rehabilitation of Housing, Rural and Urban Development." In the discussion that followed, the minutes note that "although relief and rehabilitation are looked upon as matters of expediency only, they are nevertheless of concern to the CIAM because of the likelihood that the patterns of temporary construction may automatically be perpetuated in the permanent construction to follow, temporary relief thus becoming a block to future planning." Harrison proposed that Wiener, Sert, and Lonberg-Holm be appointed to go to Washington "to discuss just what the CIAM Chapter can do that no existing agencies are prepared to do in planning for the rehabilitation of Europe," and the other participants agreed.69

With much the same membership, the New York CIAM Chapter for Relief and Postwar Planning continued to meet for the next several years. Harrison, however, resigned from this CIAM group at the end of 1944. Despite his later and initially cordial involvement with Le Corbusier in the design of the United Nations headquarters in 1947, he never rejoined CIAM.68

In November 1944 a news item in the New York Times reported on the New York CIAM group, under the headline "Architects form for World Project: New Group to Help Replan and Rebuild War Torn Cities Along Modern Lines." The article noted that "a well-known group of New York designers and city planners" had begun a postwar reconstruction effort to "put the imprint of our architecture and structural methods on rehabilitated war torn areas throughout the world." The article listed the officers and directors of the group and stated that it would work with the "eighteen groups of CIAM abroad" to increase awareness of American technological advances. Neutra was quoted as saying these new techniques would be of "inestimable value" in rebuilding the cities of Europe.66

In April 1945, near the end of the war in Europe, Neutra, still the president of the chapter, wrote to Papadaki that he had met with Lonberg-Holm to organize the next Congress, and added, "From my conversation with Weissmann in Washington, I felt again that he himself, Nelson, and Larson are in continuous touch with very important sources from which they draw information on what officially is, and is not being worked on at present. In other words, their suggestions, on what supplementations could be attempted on our part, or should be submitted as problems to the Congress, should be very valuable." After the end of the war in Europe in May, the Chapter met again on June 15 at the restaurant Le Canard Bleu. In attendance were Chareau, Giedion, Lonberg-Holm, Moholy-Nagy, Muschenheim, Nitzchke, Sert, and Weissmann, with the meeting chaired by Papadaki. A letter from Neutra was read concerning his participation in the first United Nations organizing conference in San Francisco in April 1945. He reported that "all matters important for our purposes" were being handled by the Social and Economic Cooperation committee chaired by Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar of India (then still under British control). He was invited to meet representatives of the foreign press, and described the history of CIAM and the new CIAM chapter. He also received a cable from Aalto mentioning his enthusiasm for cooperating and saying he was sending material from a joint Finnish-Swedish group.

Letters from Emery and Bourgeois were also read. The former was involved with reconstruction in Tunisia and noted the acute problem of "l'habitat musulman" in both the cities and the countryside of Algeria. Bourgeois reported that members of the Belgian CIAM group occupied "almost all the important posts in the reconstruction of the country." He listed the group L'Equerre in Liège, Stynen and Braem in Antwerp, and himself in Hainaut. Eggerickx and Herbosch were designing temporary housing, and De Koninck was involved in prefabrication. A new member, Wynants, who had spent the war in London, was working in the Ministry of Public Works.69

Lonberg-Holm presented drafts of the theme of the next Congress, "Community." Giedion reported that Nicolas M. Barroso of Mexico had contacted him with the idea of establishing a Mexican CIAM group, and Sert made a motion that "in the future any national group in the Americas wishing to join the CIAM should send pictorial documentation of the work done by its members," which was approved.

Despite the presence of Gropius, Neutra, Sert, and at times Giedion and a number of other talented émigré members, and the remarkable work of emerging American modern architects through the 1950s, the main centers of CIAM activity remained outside of the United States. To understand the postwar fate of CIAM one must first look at efforts to modify the basis of modern architecture, and then turn back to Europe and efforts at reconstruction.
The New Monumentality

In 1937 Lewis Mumford proclaimed “The Death of the Monument” in *Circle*, a collection of essays on modern art and architecture published in London. Mumford contrasted “renewal through reproduction” with the impulse “springing not of out life but out of death” to “wall out life and to exclude the action of time by carving monuments.” According to Mumford, only the “rich and powerful” sought this “static immortality... forgetful of the fact that stones which are deserted by life are even more helpless than life unprotected by stones.” Mumford found that “the classic civilizations of the world, up to our own have been oriented toward death and toward fixity,” and thus “the city, with its dead buildings, its lifeless masses of stone, becomes a burial ground.” Because monuments only had meaning in “death-oriented” civilizations, Mumford, like Frank Lloyd Wright, believed that “civilization today... must follow the example of the nomad.” Continuity for us exists, he asserted, “not in the individual soul, but in the germ plasm and in the social heritage.” He excoriated the “hollow” monuments of the past: the Lincoln Memorial, the Victor Emmanuel monument in Rome, even the New York Public Library (where he did most of his work), which he dismissed as “grand but overcrowded and confused... completely irrelevant to the living.” He concluded that “the very notion of a modern monument is a contradiction in terms: if it is a monument, it cannot be modern, and if it is modern it cannot be a monument.”

Mumford’s attack on monumentality encapsulates the prevailing attitude toward existing cities held by radical architects, planners, and some sections of the public in the 1930s, where the “dead” body of the traditional city was seen as a frustrating impediment to social change that must be swept away. This attitude would hold until some of the actual results of newer strategies of urban clearance and rebuilding started to become visible in the late 1950s. In the those same intervening years first Le Corbusier and then Giedion and Sert had begun to develop a new direction, which could only come about through face-to-face contact rather than through the new media of radio and television. Giedion believed its focus should be new, public finance community centers. His image of these community centers seems to have derived in part from his experiences of crowds in modern pavilions at the 1937 Paris Exposition and the 1939 New York World’s Fair. In “The Need for a New Monumentality” he invoked these fairs as “great spectacles capable of fascinating the people” with “waterplays, light, sound and fireworks.”

By 1943, at the same time that Giedion, Sert, and Wiener had begun to create the New York CIAM Chapter for Relief and Postwar Planning, Giedion, along with Fernand Léger and Sert, had been commissioned by the American Abstract Artists (AAA) group to contribute to a planned volume on the collaboration between artists, painters, and sculptors. Titled “Nine Points on Monumentality,” their manifesto for the first time introduced the issue of “monumentality” into discussions of modern architecture. Their decision to emphasize monumentality was a surprising departure from previous CIAM attitudes, where the concept had always been linked to the classical tradition that they rejected.

Giedion went on to develop the theme with more historical detail in his famous essay produced around the same time, “The Need for a New Monumentality,” where he attacked the “pseudo-monumentality” of the nineteenth century and argued that a new monumentality was foreshadowed by the spatial and plastic conceptions of modern artists such as “Picasso, Léger, Arp and Miró.” Such a new monumentality, however, had to flow from the “emotional life of the community,” which could only come about through face-to-face contact rather than through the new media of radio and television. Giedion believed its focus should be new, publicly financed community centers. His image of these community centers seems to have derived in part from his experiences of crowds in modern pavilions at the 1937 Paris Exposition and the 1939 New York World’s Fair. In “The Need for a New Monumentality” he invoked these fairs as “great spectacles capable of fascinating the people” with “waterplays, light, sound and fireworks.”

Giedion did not develop in detail the link between his New Monumentality and CIAM urbanism, but Sert took up this task in a companion essay, “The Human Scale in City Planning,” also commissioned by AAA at the same time. Clearly in the line of Le Corbusier’s earlier polemics for design in accord with the human scale, Sert’s essay emphasized the need to “plan for human values” and to design cities based on the compact neighborhood unit. In this essay Sert went beyond simply
restating Garden City thinking about neighborhood units; he also argued that pedestrian civic centers ought to be created. Especially in large cities, the "civic and cultural center constitutes the most important element... its brain and governing machine," and in it should be found university buildings, museums, concert halls and theaters, a stadium, the central public library, administration buildings, and areas especially planned for public gatherings, the main monuments constituting landmarks in the region, and symbols of popular aspirations." This conception of the civic center, of course, bears more than a passing resemblance to earlier Beaux-Arts or City Beautiful notions, but these parallels were not acknowledged by Sert.

Not coincidentally, Sert's essay was written as he and Wiener were preparing the plans for the Brazilian Motor City. In contrast to earlier CIAM projects like Stam and Schmidt's plans for Orsk or Le Corbusier and Jeanneret's for Nemours, the civic center element was here developed and presented with much greater architectural specificity, possibly in response to Lewis Mumford's comments when asked to write the introduction to Can Our Cities Survive? where he had particularly objected to CIAM's lack of focus on the design of buildings intended to house the political, educational, and cultural functions of the city.60

For CIAM the concept of the New Monumentality was more definitively presented in Le Corbusier's 1945 plan for the French town of St.-Dié, destroyed in the German retreat at the end of the war. Here he interpreted the concept somewhat differently from Sert and Wiener.61 In the St.-Dié plan, first exhibited with other work by Le Corbusier at Rockefeller Center, New York, in November 1945, the civic center—housing a theater, café, museum and, administrative buildings—was explicitly not an enclosed space like the one at the Motor City. Instead, in the St.-Dié plan the civic center is an open platform with freestanding buildings: a high-rise administrative center, a civic auditorium, a museum designed as a square spiral, a department store, cafes and shops, and a hotel.62 Giedion later called the proposal "a long stride from the enclosed Renaissance piazza," observing that the buildings were "placed in such a way that each emanates its own social atmosphere," demonstrating "a more dynamic conception of space" than traditional enclosed urban space.63 The placement and design of the buildings were governed by Le Corbusier's Golden Section-based proportional system, soon to be codified and published as The Modulor in 1948,64 as well as by Le Corbusier's intuitive visual judgments.65

These two unbuilt projects—Sert and Wiener's Brazilian Motor City and Le Corbusier's plan for the reconstruction of St.-Dié—both displayed a much greater focus than previous CIAM-related projects on the civic center element, and they emphasized its political role as a public gathering space. The two projects set the stage for part of the postwar work of CIAM, providing the conceptual basis for its uncertain efforts to remain an avant-garde movement in the immediate postwar years.
In May, Le Corbusier asked if Giedion could send him the publications from CIAM 2, 3, and 4, because he was "elaborating here a statue of urbanism (in inevitably difficult circumstances) which will make the theses of CIAM triumphant." 15

At the same time, Aalto had returned to Finland in October 1940 from his teaching position at MIT to fight in the "winter war" between Finland and the USSR. His trip to Switzerland in April 1941, where he discussed his plans for Finnish reconstruction, made a strong impact on Swiss architects. Giedion reported favorably on these ideas to Le Corbusier in a letter of May 14, 1941.21 During this same period in Switzerland, which was neutral although surrounded by Axis or Axis-controlled countries, Alfred Roth organized the other Swiss CIAM members—Hans Bernoulli, Hans Schmidt, Rudolf Steiger, E. F. Burckhardt, and Max Bill—for "reconstruction tasks." Both also prepared the Civitas publication series at this time, and in July 1941, Le Corbusier in Vichy for his cooperation in this effort, to which he agreed.19

Also at this time, Le Corbusier was able to renew the reconstruction program he had proposed before the occupation, publishing La maison des hommes with François de Pierrefeu (1891-1959).24 The book was the result of Le Corbusier's pre-Vichy involvement in a government study commission on housing with both de Pierrefeu, an editor of the syndicalist journals Plans and Préflde, and Giraudoux.24 He also published Sur les quatre routes intended to guide reconstruction "when peace takes over the roads."24 The four routes of the title were the highways, railroads, waterways, and air routes, and he used this new typological system to reposition his earlier urbanistic projects in a new system of diagrammatic linear organization. In November 1941, he decided to publish the Athenes Charter anonymously, in response to the growing hostility he felt from officials in Vichy, which caused him to leave there in January 1942. He had some of his comments elaborating on the points of the "Charter" rewritten by Jeanne de Villeneuve, Baroness d'Aubigny, but publication was delayed until 1943. During this time, he developed further plans for Algiers, but in June 1942, was also rebuffed in his efforts to promote his ideas there to the regime. He then "semi-clandestinely" established ASCORAL, which first met in 1943. Divided into eleven sections and twenty-seven committees covering all "disciplines concerned with the built environment," ASCORAL included Emery, as well as old associates Norbert Bézard and Hyacinth Dubreuil, and young new members, Roger Aujame, Gérard Hanning (1919-1980), and De Looze.24 Like Le Corbusier's initial conception of CIAM, ASCORAL was intended both to "establish a coherent doctrine concerning the built environment"25 and to promote CIAM urbanism to official clients and industrialists.

In the absence of any possibility of official patronage, ASCORAL's immediate efforts were publications, parts of a projected ten-volume series. After the publication of the Athenes Charter, Le Corbusier and ASCORAL wrote still other books on urbanism, Les trois établissements humains (The three human establishments) eventually published in 1945,26 and Manière de penser l'urbanisme (How to think about urbanism) published in 1946.22 The "three settlements" of the first title were based on concepts already developed by Le Corbusier just before the war: "radio-concentric" cities linked by "industrial linear cities" along transportation routes passing through the "rationalized units of agricultural production" in the countryside.

Before these appeared, Le Corbusier published his version of CIAM doctrines, initially with "CIAM-France" as the author, as La Charte d'Athènes in 1943, from the drafts he had prepared in 1941.22 Though the book was based on the "Constatations" of the Fourth Congress, the immediate inspiration had been his involvement with the reconstruction committee in Vichy, to be used as the basis for legislation governing postwar reconstruction.20 By publishing it with its 1941 introduction by Giraudoux, the book linked Le Corbusier and ASCORAL to the pre-Vichy era and paved the way toward its acceptance by the government after Liberation.22

Le Corbusier had first called the results of the Fourth Congress "La Charte d'Athènes" in Des canons, des munitions? Merci Des logis . . . s.v.p., the book issued to accompany his "Pavillon des Temps Nouveau" in 1937.23 Instead of the terse, quasi-scientific language of earlier versions of the "Constatations,"24 which cover a few pages, the text of the 1943 book is now a thick volume of Corbian rhetoric. Related to his articles in syndicalist journals of the 1930s, the text of the Athens Charter is an extension of the brief account of the results of the Fourth Congress he had published in The Radiant City under the title "Mobilization of the Land."24 It is organized into ninety-five points, with the points printed in red in the original edition.24 The Athens Charter keeps the same sectional headings, based on the four functions and the "Historic Parts of Cities," as the original "Constatations." In Le Corbusier's text, the first brief point on the city is expanded into an eight-point section called "The City and its Region," and what had been simply termed "Summing Up" is renamed as the more directive "Points of Doctrine." Much new material is added, and existing points are significantly modified, beginning with the first one. In the published "Constatations" in 1933 the first "Statement" from the Fourth Congress had read, "The city is part of an economic, social and political whole."24 In Le Corbusier's Athens Charter the same point reads "The city is only one element within an economic, social, and political complex which constitutes the region," and a second point not found previously is added: "Life flourishes only to the extent of accord between the two contradictory principles that govern the human personality: the individual and the collective."20 This emphasis on what his Communist opponents in CIAM like Hans Schmidt would probably have termed "bourgeois individualism" was not present in the "Statements," where individual needs are not mentioned, but was already evident in his talks given during CIAM 4.
In Athens Charter each point is accompanied by a half-page gloss, which often simply restates and elaborates on the point, sometimes confusingly, without defining any of the terms. For example, the commentary to the second point quoted above adds, "A plan is well conceived when it allows fruitful cooperation while making maximum provision for individual liberty, for the effulgence of the individual within the framework of civic obligation." In the absence of Le Corbusier and his associates' urban plans, which are the text's absent illustrations, the unnecessarily expanded verbiage of the Athens Charter weakens the force of the terse 1933 "Constitutions." Often it reads at best only as a series of platitudes, and at worst as a set of totalitarian commands. After its publication, Le Corbusier in 1944 informed Raoul Dautry (1880–1951), the Liberation Minister of Reconstruction and Urbanism, of ASCORAL's existence and its plans for reconstruction. With the end of the war nearing as the Germans were pushed out of France, it appeared that he and his associates might be given some important commissions. He reopened his office at 35, rue de Sèvres, initially with just two employees, Gérard Hanning and a young Polish assistant, Jerzy Soltan. In December 1944 he was the featured speaker at a large meeting in Paris called "The Battle of Reconstruction," where he stated, "Our subject here is the real estate of France, which should be the harmonious equipment of a civilization and, consequently, express the spirit of the time." He outlined the history of CIAM, and hailed its Athens Charter, "edited under the German occupation by the French group of the CIAM."

In the spring of 1945, as the war was ending, Le Corbusier was given the commission for two urban design projects, the plan for St.-Dié, and the reconstruction of the port of La Rochelle-La Pallice, the latter commissioned by Dautry, now the postwar Minister of Reconstruction and Urbanism. Neither was built: the St.-Dié scheme, for a town destroyed in the German retreat, was rejected by a broad local coalition that favored rebuilding the medieval town on an approximation of its prewar street plan. At La Rochelle the project apparently had little chance of being realized, and Le Corbusier did not appear in person to present it to the Mayor, sending Soltan instead. Despite its hostile local reception, the St.-Dié scheme became the centerpiece of the exhibition of Le Corbusier's work at Rockefeller Center in New York in November 1945. It took on an iconic value as an illustration of the application of both the Athens Charter and the CIAM version of the civic center. Shortly before, in the summer of 1945, Le Corbusier had been commissioned by Dautry to design a housing structure to demonstrate his urbanistic ideas, the first of his many large housing schemes to be actually built since the Salvation Army and Swiss Pavilion in Paris and the Maison Clarté in Geneva of the early 1930s. Based on ideas already set out in his numerous unbuilt projects and publications of the preceding fifteen years.
years, and anticipated in its slab form by the Swiss Pavilion and the slabs in his plan for Nemours and other projects of the 1930s, the “Unité d’habitation du grandeur conforme,” or “neighborhood unit of the proper size” was intended to be one demonstration element of what Le Corbusier envisioned as the total reorganization of metropolitan life. The site finally chosen was a 35,000-square-meter plot on the Boulevard Michelet in Marseilles, in a city for which Le Corbusier had already developed urbanistic schemes in 1943 and which he saw as a key link in a potential French linear city stretching to Paris and Le Havre.18

Begun in 1946 and opened in 1952, the rough concrete slab contained 337 duplex units. It was intended to maintain family privacy while still providing logement prolongé, or extended habitation, where collective services like daycare centers expanded the local environment of the individual beyond the private living spaces, much as in Swedish housing then under way. The container for these services provided by Le Corbusier and his team differed radically, however, from Swedish examples. Instead of minimizing the corridor spaces, as in a point block, they attempted to make the circulation paths collective spaces as well. The most notable of these was the interior “street in the air,” on the eighth floor, which included a hotel for guests and a projected major grocery store. With the building placed in a 3.5-hectare park, most of the site was also meant to be available for common recreational use.

Too much has been written about the Unité and its sculptural rooftop playground, designed in part by Blanche Lemco van Ginkel, to require additional comment here, except to note that it was strongly opposed by the mainstream of the French architectural profession. Despite attracting extensive international attention, it had less direct influence worldwide than bureaucratically reduced versions of the “tower in a park” like Stuyvesant Town, New York City (1943-1948) or its slightly later slab successors, despite the high prestige of the Unité among many architects in the postwar years.19 It is important to emphasize that the Marseilles Unité was a team effort that included not only Le Corbusier but also his associates André Wogenscky (b. 1916) and the engineer Vladimir Bodiansky (1894-1966),10 who established the ATBAT (Atelier des bâtisseurs) group as an interdisciplinary building research center in 1947, which produced the construction documents.21 ATBAT’s members would play a major role in CIAM in the postwar years. Members included Georges Candilllis, Alexis Josic, Shadrach Woods, and Blanche Lemco.22 A branch in French North Africa, ATBAT-Afrique, was established in 1949, directed by Candilllis, Woods, and Henri Piot, under Bodiansky’s overall guidance.

While the Unité was under construction, other French CIAM members pursued projects inspired by the plan of St.-Dié in the Saarland in the zone of French occupation in Germany. As Jean-Louis Cohen has documented, Jean Prouvé, who became the mayor of Nancy in 1945, recommended the creation of an “Équipe des Urbains” to replan destroyed German cities in the Saar. Directed by Marcel Roux, a former assistant of André Lurçat, the Équipe included ASCORAL member André Sive23 as well as Georges-Henri Pingusson and Edouard Menkes, a former assistant of Robert Mallet-Stevens. In 1948 Pingusson produced a reconstruction plan for Saarbrücken derived from the St.-Dié plan, portions of which were carried out, but a similar plan for Saarbrücken by Menkes was not executed; both were displayed at CIAM 7 in Bergamo in 1949. Marcel Lods and Gérard Hanning also produced a plan in 1947 for Mainz.24 Other major projects by French CIAM members in the immediate postwar years in France were Marcel Lods’s housing complex at Sotteville-lès-Rouen, which consisted of six twelve-story housing blocks and two schools,25 and Paul Nelson’s Franco-American Memorial Hospital at Saint-Lô. The bulk of the reconstruction work went to more conservative architects, however, such as Augusto Perret, commissioned to rebuild Le Havre, and once again Le Corbusier was unable to determine the direction of urbanism in his adopted country despite his strenuous efforts.26

CIAM, 1946–1947

Shortly after the end of the war in Europe, Giedion wrote to Le Corbusier from Harvard in response to his questions about the sixth Congress, “Let me know if you also agree that the sixth Congress should establish a Charter for world reconstruction, such as the charter of urbanism we made in 1933 in Athens.” He suggested that this Congress should continue the prewar series on “Application Cases” of the Functional City, and said he could not judge at the moment whether the Congress should be held in Europe or America.27 In July 1945 the Swiss CIAM group met at La Sarraz in what Steiger said was their first postwar meeting, the first since Bern in 1940. Le Corbusier spoke on the current situation in France, and emphasized the importance of the Athens Charter and ASCORAL. He had come to realize that “architecture is a religion,” meaning that the architect “should be idealistic and independent and not worry around politics.”28 Alfred Roth later wrote that Le Corbusier’s appearance at this meeting was unexpected, and that his failure to mention his own efforts to work for the Vichy regime and his criticism of Swiss “passivity and self-satisfaction” were not well-received.29

The world had been irrevocably altered by the Allied victory, and New York emerged as the world’s symbolic political center with the decision of the United Nations in February 1946 to build its permanent headquarters there. On January 20, 1946, Le Corbusier, as “President of the French Mission for Urbanism, Architecture, and Cultural Relations,” spoke to a joint meeting of the New York CIAM group and ASPA. He outlined the history of modern architecture, culminating in the founding of CIAM, and noted the creation of ASCORAL in 1942. He emphasized that “in France the atmosphere is quite different from what it was after World War I.”
A "wide public interest" had been awakened to the "problem of architecture." At the same time, the destruction of the war had produced "demoralizing living conditions." He explained his presence in America as the result of "the desire that we have to see and learn at this very moment from a country like America, where abundance reigns." 129

Le Corbusier was in New York as a member of the U.N. site selection committee, chaired by Dr. Eduardo Zuleta Ángel of Colombia. 130 The various other sites under consideration, which included San Francisco, Philadelphia, Westchester County (New York), and flushing Meadow in Queens, were bypassed after John D. Rockefeller, Jr., purchased a section of the East Midtown waterfront from real estate developer William Zeckendorf, and donated it for the U.N. Headquarters site in December 1946. 131 Wallace K. Harrison, who was then appointed the director of planning for the U.N. Headquarters, and Le Corbusier were two of the architects then appointed to jointly design the new headquarters in the spring of 1947. In his account of his participation in the site selection process and proposals for its design, U.N. Headquarters, Le Corbusier wrote, "In 1928, at the Château of La Sarraz, the CIAM was born. Real precursor of our United Nations, this Congress, having worked 20 years perfecting a doctrine of architecture and urbanism, harmonized what might be called the 'dissenters' of architecture and urbanism, worked 20 years perfecting a doctrine of architecture and urbanism. This doctrine is now established." 132 Other members of the Board of Design whom Le Corbusier suggested to Harrison for appointment were Aalto, Gropius, Mies, Niemeyer, Sert, Bodiansky, Eero Saarinen (1910-1961), Edward Durrell Stone, and Mathew Nowicki (1910-1950). The first three were not acceptable because Finland and Germany were not then members of the U.N., and Harrison rejected Saarinen and Stone on the grounds that they were not New York architects. Sert was rejected because Harrison considered him "more of a planner." Of Le Corbusier's candidates, Harrison accepted Niemeyer for Brazil, Le Corbusier for France, and Nowicki for Poland from this list, and added two other CIAM members, Sven Markelius for Sweden and Gaston Brunfaut (1894-1974) for Belgium. Harrison also nominated the other architects chosen for the Board of Design, from Australia (Gyle Soitleux), Canada (Ernest Cormier), China (Ssu-ch'eng Liang), USSR (Nikolai Bassov), and Uruguay (Julio Villalma), who were not CIAM members. For Britain, Harrison nominated Howard Robertson, who technically had been the first British CIAM delegate, although his inactivity in CIAM had led to his replacement by Wells Coates in 1932. 133

The U.N. Board of Design met forty-five times between February 17 and June 9, 1947, and finally selected Scheme 42G, which became the basis for the building then constructed. 134 After receiving the final report back in France, Le Corbusier wrote to Harrison on August 28, saying, "I think our report stands on solid footing since it is the very expression of the needs of the U.N. The same men continue, the mobilization of public opinion by the 'Academics' of America and Europe." He
While the U.N. was seeking a site, efforts were being made to organize CIAM groups in postwar Germany, which had surrendered to the Allies in May 1945. No recognized German group had existed since Gropius’s emigration to England in 1934. To formally set up a German CIAM group, Giedion met in 1945 with Werner Hebebrand (1899–1966), a former member of May’s team in Frankfurt and the Soviet Union; Ernst Neufert (1900–1986), who had studied at the Bauhaus and then directed efforts to standardize building components under the National Socialist regime;\(^{12}\) and Gustav Hassenplug (1907–1977), another former Bauhaus student who had worked both for May in the USSR and then for Neufert in Berlin. Richard Döcker (1894–1968) in Stuttgart and Hans Scharoun (1893–1972) in Berlin, who had not received any government commissions under the Third Reich, also attempted to form German CIAM groups at this time. Scharoun, a student of Häring, had continued to practice by putting traditional facades on private houses with complex plans and sections, and had been a member of a resistance group. He was appointed director of the building and town planning department of Berlin on May 2, 1945, after the Soviet occupation authorities had set up a new municipal administration. He then formed a “Planning Collective” to develop a new urban plan that would create an “urban landscape” based on neighborhood units organized by transportation routes.\(^{13}\)

Giedion did not publicize these CIAM efforts in Germany, despite the interest expressed by these German architects. He had been asked by the American military authorities to provide CIAM “regulations to govern the reconstruction,” which he refused to do, saying this should be left to the Germans themselves.\(^{14}\) In July 1947 Gropius was appointed a consultant to the American occupation government by General Lucius Clay, a month after the Marshall Plan for European Recovery had been announced. When Gropius arrived in Germany in August 1947 it was assumed he would take a major role in reconstruction, and in his public lectures and subsequent reports he argued that it was “the job of the reconstruction planners” to see to it that “the political corpse buried in Germany’s rubble” was not revived.\(^{15}\) To accomplish this he favored breaking up large cities into “neighborhood units” which he compared to New England villages, not clearly distinguishing between the diagram of a self-contained village and the political institution of the town meeting. To implement his program he called for new building legislation that would allow the redrawing of property lines, along with the creation of a strong central ministry of urban planning and the political institution of the town meeting. To formalize this he called for a rationalization of building methods, and also called for a resignation of building methods, although he was critical of what he termed Neufert’s “mechanistic and technocratic” approach.\(^{16}\)

Gropius’s actual power to act was unclear. He later said that General Clay had told him to “make me a plan for Berlin,” but he did not, and, according to his biogra-
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raper, he replied that “city plans were dangerously misleading if not made with great care.”\(^{17}\) This caution may have been connected to the complex political situation of the four occupying powers, which soon resulted in the partition of Germany between France, Britain, and the United States in the West and the USSR in the East. Gropius’s response to the challenge of German reconstruction seems to have been equivocal, and his own interest in working in Germany seemed slight. He said privately that “not only the material deterioration but particularly the social one is beyond description and is still going downhill.”\(^{18}\) Nevertheless, Gropius criticized Giedion for not making more efforts to advance a German CIAM group after Giedion failed to invite any interested German architects to CIAM 6 in the fall of 1947. On their part, Döcker and Scharoun responded to this in December 1947 by suggesting the formation of a new Berlin “Ring” independent of Giedion and CIAM, but Hugo Häring, who had also remained in Germany under the Third Reich, felt that premises for this did not exist. Häring was extremely hostile to Giedion, and wrote to Scharoun at this time that CIAM is closed within technocracy. Have you seen the project for the UN building in New York? The silo for the officials, the monument to the rationalist spirit—by now not even all that rational de facto, but rather merely a manifestation of the rational. CIAM is Le Corbusier and Giedion. Le Corbusier is the supporter of geometry. He is right as far as he is concerned, but this is not valid for us. Giedion is a Jew, a propaganda man, completely without conscience. Not long ago Hilberseimer wrote me that Giedion has published a book on Neues Bauen [Space, Time and Architecture], which represents the greatest forgery in history. The other CIAM members are nothing more than satellites orbiting around these two, or shadows. As far as I am concerned our work cannot grow in this space; rather, it will lose vitality or, on the other hand, this will lead to struggle and division. . . . If on the other hand the group is united with the intention of working together with CIAM, then leave me out, for I am no longer available to compromise.\(^{19}\)

*The New Empiricism*

In 1940, writing under the pseudonym "James MacQuedy," J. M. Richards, the editor of the British Architectural Review and a speaker at CIAM 6 in 1947, raised the issue of modern architecture’s lack of appeal to the “Man in the Street.” Richards wrote that modern architecture did not offer this person “any suitable alternative to the Olde Worlde styles that for many years have at least offered him the solace of suggestiveness.”\(^{20}\) He linked the issue of modern architecture’s appeal to that of political representation, citing the turn in the Soviet Union to neoclassicism, where
the "impressionable peasant" finds "palatial stone buildings decked with sturdy columns . . . more convincing evidence of the progress of the Five Year Plan than modern buildings of whatever quality." 48

In the postwar years these concerns about modern architecture's lack of popular appeal were by no means unique to Richards. The political strategy of the "Popular Front," inaugurated in France in 1934, which allowed Communist parties to form governing coalitions with other parties like the Social Democrats to resist Fascism, had quieted the hostility between Communists and other leftists that had been a major aspect of the politics of Weimar Germany. 49 Occurring after Soviet official policy in the arts turned toward socialist realism, this strategy had immediate effects on the architectural attitudes of architects and artists. Some, like the New York art critic Clement Greenberg, rejected outright any appeal to "mass tastes," and linked this to Leon Trotsky's rejection of the Popular Front strategy in general. Others, including the Swiss CIAM member Hans Schmidt, who returned to Basel from the USSR in 1936, looked for a middle road between their earlier avant-gardism and socialist realism. 50

In Switzerland an accommodation between traditional building techniques and details, usually in wood, and some of the attitudes and principles of the Neues Bauen began to be widely accepted in the later 1930s. The new approach was pervasive at the Swiss National Exposition of 1939 in Zurich, an event whose rhetoric and significance has been analyzed in detail by Jacques Gubler. 51 The populist direction of this tendency forced Swiss CIAM members either to choose this "Swiss way," which incorporated many of their earlier social and technical concerns within an appeal to national cultural solidarity, or to reevaluate the theoretical bases of their earlier avant-gardism. The Zurich-based Giedion, though accepting of the success of the newly formed firm of CIAM members Haefeli, Moser, and Steiger, whose Kongresshaus was the focal point of the exhibition, 52 chose the latter course, and in America developed the ideas of a modern synthesis of the arts evident in his promotion of the New Monumentality. It is likely that this new direction was related to discussions about monumentality already under way in Switzerland. 53

The accommodation between the new architecture and tradition that prevailed in Switzerland in the late 1930s was paralleled by similar developments in Scandinavia. The architectural language of the Weissenhof Siedlung had been both introduced and modified at Erik Gunnar Asplund's Stockholm Exhibition of 1930, which Giedion had hailed in the magazine Stein Holz Eisen in the same year. The Swedish CIAM group, led by Sven Markelius, Eskil Sundahl, and Uno Åhrén (1897-1977), who all signed, along with Asplund, Wolter Gen, and Gregor Paulsson, the 1931 manifesto of the modern movement in Sweden, acceptera (Accept), were among the leaders of a substantial modification of the Neues Bauen in a more popular direction. The new

3.6 Swiss CIAM members who designed Neubühl, a cooperative housing settlement in Zürich. From Alfred Roth, The New Architecture, 1940.

direction was evident in works of the later 1930s like Asplund or Sundahl's summer houses, where modernism was "softened" with the use of pitched roofs and wood, brick, and stone, but was also used in larger housing projects as well. As Sven Backström (1903-1992) wrote in the Architectural Review in 1943,
expected. The big windows, for example, were too effective as heat conduc-
tors. . . . It was difficult to settle down in the new houses because the “new”
human beings were not different from the older ones. . . . It was realized that
one had to build for human beings as they are, and not as they ought to be.112

This “Scandinavian modern” was hailed in the United States in 1939, after the
success of Markelius’s Swedish Pavilion and Aalto’s Finnish Pavilion at the 1939
New York World’s Fair,113 but it was not until after the war that its full effects in both
Britain and the United States began to felt.

Sweden remained neutral during the Second World War, and many of the Gar-
den City and Frankfurt-inspired town planning ideas elaborated there in the 1930s
began to be implemented on a large scale. Ahren, who had co-authored with sociologist Gunnar Myrdal the seminal Bostedsfragan som sasom socialt planningspro-
biet (The housing question as a social planning problem) in 1934, was appointed
head of city planning in Goteborg in 1933. Markelius was made chief of planning of
the Royal Board of Building in 1939 and director of the Stockholm planning com-
mieion in 1944. Supported by a powerful labor movement represented by the
Swedish Social Democratic party, which eventually also included representatives of
the country’s major industrial interests, their work took place within a large-scale
Social Democratic restructuring of Swedish society. New social programs included
the provision of a full range of daycare, collective workhouse, recreation, and meet-
ing facilities in systematically planned new housing developments linked by transit
lines to major cities.114

CIAM members Åhrén and Markelius and their colleagues contributed to the
formulation of these strategies and carried out large-scale planning schemes that
extended many of the approaches developed in Weimar Berlin and Frankfurt. In
1938 the Swedish CIAM group was joined by Fred Forbat, the Hungarian-born for-
mer associate of Gropius at Siemensstadt in Berlin, who came to Sweden in 1938 af-
fter having gone briefly with May to the Soviet Union in 1932 and then to Hungary in
1933. Around the same time, Lewis Mumford’s The Culture of Cities, translated into
Swedish in 1940, became influential as well.115

Much like Gropius at the same time, Åhrén argued in 1945 that planned,
village-like communities encouraged the formation of socially minded individuals
able to work together effectively: “If one wanted the opposite characteristic one
would recommend urban sprawl, which offers neither a natural collective context
nor social interests in common.”116 The architectural techniques in Sweden de-

dveloped to implement this goal differed from Le Corbusier’s. Instead of a modern
monumentality and the “heroic” use of materials, the emphasis was on pic-
turesqueness and variation, with the frequent use of brick and wood. Instead of
parallel high-rise slab blocks, the new housing estates usually had a mixture of low-
rise and high-rise buildings, often with pitched roofs and brightly colored red, yel-
low, brown, and gray facades.117 The “point block” type of freestanding high-rise
housing was extensively used, which like a conventional urban apartment house
centralized several (usually four) units per floor around a central elevator core, but
was now sited in the parklike surroundings called for by CIAM.118

By the postwar years, the Swedish version of modern architecture became a
major influence on architecture in Britain,119 with the postwar Labour government
attempting to create a “welfare state” somewhat like the Swedish one, the use of
“Swedish modern” was seen as its logical architectural expression. Many housing
and planning initiatives similar to those in Sweden were begun, such as the imple-
mentation of the New Towns program after 1946, a direct result of Abercrombie and
Forshaw’s 1944 County of London Plan and forty years of Garden City activity by
Frederick J. Osborn and others.120 Major urban clearance and rebuilding projects
sponsored by the London County Council and other local authorities were also be-
gun at this time.121

These efforts required that a suitable architectural expression be found. Clas-
sicism, though still having wide appeal, was associated with Fascism and Stalinism
and was usually viewed as antithetical to social and technical progress. Proponents
of the approach of Le Corbusier were many, and included prewar MARS members
like Berthold Lubetkin and Maxwell Fry as well as a group of young Architectural As-
sociation graduates that included Peter Carter, Alan Colquhoun, William Howel,
John Killick, and Colin St. John Wilson. It was around this time that extremely influ-
ential efforts were made to disclose Le Corbusier’s previously unacknowledged
links to the design methods of classicism. Texts like Liverpool professor Colin
Rowe’s “The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa,” written by a student of the Renaissance
art historian Rudolf Wittkower and first published in the Architectural Review
in 1947, decisively altered the understanding of Le Corbusier’s work. Most left-leaning
architects and local councils favored the Swedish route as a suitable middle way be-
tween Stalinist socialist realism and the “tougher” kinds of modernism soon to be
exemplified by the Unité, leading to the conflicts within the London County Council
Architects Department between advocates of Swedish-inspired “People’s Detailing”
and the AA-trained Corbusians.122

The Swedish tendency was finally given a more universal name in 1947 by
J. M. Richards with his “The New Empiricism: Sweden’s Latest Style” in the Ar-
chi­

projects by Markelius, Sture Frolen, and Ralph Erskine to illustrate the new direction. From his presentation, the specific features of Richards's "New Empiricism" were left as unclear as the kind of psychological strategies being used by Swedish architects, but this tendency to "humanize" modern architecture now had a name.

CIAM 6, Bridgwater, England, 1947

CIAM 6, the first postwar CIAM Congress, took place September 7-14, 1947 at the Arts Centre in Bridgwater, England, in Somersethshire some thirty miles southwest of Bristol. The month before the opening of the CIAM 6, in August 1947, India and Pakistan had gained independence from Britain, beginning the era of decolonization in the British and French empires which would continue over the next fifteen years, and which would profoundly alter global culture. Initial efforts to hold the Congress in New York in conjunction with the design of the U.N. Headquarters foundered on the issue of cost for the European members, and finally Bridgwater was determined as the site. CIAM, represented by Van Eesteren and Giedion, had made efforts to forge links with the International Union of Architects, which held its first postwar meeting September 23-30, 1946, in London, and an institutional connection existed between the two organizations until the end of CIAM. The high cost of transatlantic travel at the time meant that few North Americans attended besides Gropius and Sert, and those that did had not had major roles in CIAM before the war.

The hosts would be the British CIAM Chapter, the MARS (Modern Architectural Research) Group, now led by the editor (since 1935) of the Architectural Review, J. M. Richards. After the publication of the MARS Plan of London in the Architectural Review in June 1942, Abercrombie and Forshaw's 1944 County of London Plan, which called for a greenbelt around London and the planning of new satellite towns, was widely seen as having defeated its more radical, Soviet disurbanist-inspired predecessor. By 1947, Richards had been able to shift the direction of MARS concerns away from those of prewar CIAM toward his own interests in the aesthetic appeal of modern architecture to the "Common Man."

The CIAM 6 Congress agenda was prepared May 25-29, 1947, at a CIRPAC meeting called by Giedion in Zurich. Just before this meeting, the first CIRPAC meeting since 1939, Le Corbusier had written to Wogenscky that he saw CIAM metamorphosing into a "directing international spiritual organization for the built domain." He believed it was now "blossoming, in full triumph."

The Zurich meeting was attended by President Van Eesteren, Giedion, Bourgeois, Klutz, Léon Stynen, and Van Nueten from Belgium, J. M. Richards and Arthur Ling from England, Wogenscky and André Sive from France, Alvar and Mme. Aalto from Finland, Stam, Merkelsbach, and Jacob Berend Bakema (1914-1981) from the Netherlands, Rogers and Peressutti from Italy, Madame M. Schütte from Austria, Helena and Szymon Syrkus from Poland, Fred Forbat from Sweden, F. Kalivoda from Czechoslovakia, Josef Fischer (1901-1995) and Granasztol from Hungary, and fifteen Swiss CIAM members, including Max Bill, Haefele, Moser, Steiger, Hans Schmidt, and Otto Senn. CIAM group reports were given from Finland (Aalto), England (Richards), Czechoslovakia (Kalivoda), Holland (Stam), Poland (Syrkus), Belgium (Bourgeois), France (Wogenscky), Hungary (Fischer), Italy (Rogers), Switzerland (Steiger), Sweden (Forbat), Greece (also Forbat), and the United States (Giedion).

At this 1947 CIRPAC meeting Richards reported on MARS:

From the point of view of propaganda, the MARS Group now finds itself in a powerful position because members of the Group occupy key positions in many Government Departments and other influential organizations, and are able to play their part there in propagating CIAM ideals. For example, [Arthur] Ling is in the Town Planning Dept. of the ICC, [Gordon] Stephenson is chief technical officer to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, where [William] Holford is technical adviser as well as being the new Professor of
Town Planning at London University. [Frederick] Gibberd is town-planning adviser to one of the New Towns near London; [Leslie] Martin is deputy architect to the London, Midland and Scottish Railway; [Christopher] Nicholson is architect to British European Airways, and so on. MARS members are also on the staff of the Architectural Association School, in the Council of the RIBA and on numerous influential committees. . . . The MARS Group has a membership of approximately 95. . . . The Group is in touch with a recently formed Indian progressive architecture group called MARG, which might later be the basis of Indian membership of CIAM.\textsuperscript{75}

MARS after 1945 was a very different group than its prewar namesake. No longer a small avant-garde group, it had become a large clublike institution with many prominent members well within the mainstream of British architecture and town planning. As Richards defined the problem, MARS should not primarily be concerned with publicizing the principles of the Athens Charter, but should instead move on to examine "the impact of contemporary conditions upon architectural expression," and at the 1947 Zurich meeting he proposed this as a possible theme for the first Congress to be held after the war.

According to Frances Strauven's biography, Aldo van Eyck, the Dutch group responded with a counterproposal written by Jan Bijhouwer, Niegeman, and Stam calling to instead emphasize "the problem of housing, the state of housing, the housing shortage."\textsuperscript{76} Apparently a compromise solution was reached by using a memorandum from Lonberg-Holm and the American group, who had originally proposed the theme "Community Planning," which attempted to synthesize all the suggested themes.\textsuperscript{77} These were the MARS group's "architecture in relation to the common man," suggested by Richards; Giedion's "architecture and its relation to painting and sculpture," attributed to the Swiss group; and "units for planning of urban housing," suggested by the Swedish group, which was similar to a theme suggested by the Polish group on "Neighborhood Planning."\textsuperscript{78} Giedion's preferred theme was his own on "The Relation between Architecture, Painting and Sculpture,"\textsuperscript{79} which had developed from the notion of the "synthesis of the arts" and the New Monumentality.\textsuperscript{80} In contrast, the Swedish proposal pointed out that the term "neighborhood unit" signified different sizes in different countries, and proposed that the Congress attempt to "define all the units" used in planning urban housing, and use standardized symbols to show community functions.\textsuperscript{81} The British proposal was received with "some hesitation by other groups,"\textsuperscript{82} and the Dutch group under Merkelbach felt that all the proposals lacked "the influence of the younger generation."\textsuperscript{83} The American group memo by Lonberg-Holm stated that these apparently unrelated proposals "actually show a relationship when examined within the reference frame of industrialization." Lonberg-Holm proposed that the theme of CIAM 6 be the "impact of industrialization on: 1—planning (new standards of values in community development) 2—building design (new needs, requiring new means and new forms) 3—organization (need for integration of specialists in various fields).\textsuperscript{84} Richards's minutes of the Zurich meeting noted that the American title for CIAM 6, "Community Planning," was "rather too vague and all-embracing," so it was agreed that this Congress was more to determine "where modern architecture stood now in the various countries."

In the absence of consensus it was decided that CIAM 6 should have "the character of a preparatory Congress" for CIAM 7, and would reestablish the contacts among groups that had been broken by the war.\textsuperscript{85} Each national group would be asked to prepare a written and illustrated report on the architectural situation in its country, to determine to what extent "the ideas CIAM stands for" were being achieved, and to see what obstacles were hindering this. At CIAM 6 these reports would be given verbally by delegates who could then respond to questions.\textsuperscript{86} It was also decided that a new declaration "expressing the opinion of the CIAM on the present day situation and the tasks lying ahead" would be issued. The inability to agree on a theme was ascribed to "the inevitable result of the war," which had resulted in different needs in the various countries represented. At the Zurich meeting the CIRPAC formally declared that "the final aim of the CIAM is to facilitate the practical application of its principles in each represented country," to "give to the communities a truly human aspect," but added "we intend to enlarge the subject to include ideological and aesthetic problems.\textsuperscript{87}"

In a press release before the Congress opened, Richards reported that seventy architects were expected to attend, and noted that "among the well-known foreign architects" attending were Gropius, Le Corbusier, Van Eesteren, Giedion, Sert, and Josef Fischer, "city architect of Budapest."\textsuperscript{88} Absent were Farkas Molnár of Hungary, who died in 1945, and Helena and Szymon Syrkuś of Poland, who reported they were too busy with the reconstruction of Warsaw to attend. (Szymon Syrkuś, who was Jewish, had been apprehended by the German occupiers in November 1942 and spent the remainder of the war in the Auschwitz concentration camp.) Described in one news article about CIAM 6 as "Founding Fathers,"\textsuperscript{89} Le Corbusier and Gropius were now the focus of attention for CIAM. New members in attendance included Minette da Silva from India, Noel Moffett from Ireland, and Eugenio Batista and Nicholas Arroyo from Cuba, countries that had never before sent representatives to a CIAM Congress.\textsuperscript{90} Also present were two delegates from Argentina, Jorge Ferrari Hardoy (1914–1976) and Jorge Vivanco. There was a sense at this point that CIAM members would be shaping the postwar world: a caption in Architectural Forum depicting CIAM members at this Congress asserted that the "men around the table will direct rebuilding of dozens of cities, plan new physical patterns of whole nations.\textsuperscript{91}"

The proceedings began on September 7, 1947, with a CIRPAC meeting, where four commissions to discuss and report on different CIAM subjects were appointed.
CIAM and the Postwar World, 1939–1950

This procedure was repeated at all the postwar Congresses through CIAM 10, and grew to six commissions after the Bridgewater Congress. The first two CIAM 6 commissions were “I. Restatement of Aims,” chaired by Sert and a MARS member, Mark Hattan Thomas, and including Le Corbusier, Richards, Jacob Bakema, Fry, and others; and “II. Reorganization of CIAM,” chaired by Rudolf Steiger of Switzerland and another MARS member, Godfrey Samuel, and including Emery, Gropius, Bakema, Le Corbusier, and others. Commission III, “Programme for the Seventh Congress,” was subdivided into “IIIA Urbanism,” chaired by Le Corbusier and London planner Arthur Ling, and included Fischer, Emery, Van Tijen, William Holford, another London planner, and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt (1905–1983), then Director of Studies at the School of Planning at London University; and “IIIB. Architectural Expression,” chaired by Giedion, which included Richards, Sert, Bakema, Blanche Lemo, and the Dutch “youth member” Aldo Van Eyck. Commission IV, “Architectural Education,” was chaired by Gropius, and included Jane Drew, Krejcar, and Giedion.

At CIAM 6, Commission I issued the “Reaffirmation of the Aims of CIAM,” whose preamble noted the last ten years of struggle against Fascist domination during which “political, economic and social questions have taken on a new significance for everyone.” At the same time, “technical progress has been accelerated by intensive scientific research and the needs of war production.” The “Reaffirmation” noted how the “technique of planning” had also “moved forward as a result of the experience some countries have gained in socialist organization” (wording that was changed to “social organization” in Giedion’s published version). All these factors had resulted in an emerging “new conception of integrated planning.” The document then recounted the earlier history of CIAM, and noted that many CIAM ideas were now widely accepted on the basis of the Athens Charter. It then redefined the aims of CIAM as “to work for the creation of a physical environment that will satisfy man’s emotional and material needs and stimulate his spiritual growth.” This new direction of CIAM, moving away from a focus on the Functional City while still abiding by the ambiguous tenets of the Athens Charter, was in line with Le Corbusier’s effort to redefine CIAM as an organization concerned with giving “spiritual direction” to the shaping of the built environment, a position he had stated plainly in his letter to Wogensckeyer in 1947. Giedion also emphasized this theme when he described CIAM 6, saying, “The reunion at Bridgewater was a very moving experience. CIAM is not like the ordinary international conventions. It is doubtful whether anything like it exists elsewhere in the technical field. Perhaps the atomic scientists have started something of a like character, but the spirit is nearer to that of a revolutionary political society or perhaps nearer still to a religious brotherhood.”

Commission II, chaired by Steiger, in its report set out the new organization of CIAM. Three types of membership were defined, “active,” for architects and planners; “participating,” for other professionals and artists; and “associated” for other individuals who have shown themselves active in furthering the aims of CIAM.” CIAM was to be considered a working of local CIAM groups, “which may or may not be national groups.” Local groups would be admitted by the reorganized CIRPAC, now to be called the Council of CIAM. Each “Working Congress” would send delegates, one from groups with fewer than twenty members, two from groups with more. The Council’s function was defined as approving or nominating delegates, directing the “immediate work” of CIAM, representing the “principles of CIAM” in public activities, authorizing and safeguarding “the name CIAM,” appointing the administrative secretariat, and determining the date of the Working Congress.

The membership of the new Council of CIAM had been partly determined at the Zurich meeting in 1947. The press release issued by Richards after CIAM 6 indicated that Van Eesteren, now “honorary President,” was replaced as President by Sert, and that Helena Syrks of Poland had replaced Victor Bourgeois of Belgium as one of the vice-presidents, with Gropius and Le Corbusier continuing as the other two. Since it had been decided that the national groups should no longer represent their respective countries, any number of groups could now come from a single country. This seems to have been in part an effort by Giedion to resist the growing size and influence of the MARS group; in January 1947 Giedion had written to Sert, “We cannot accept the MARS group with its 100 members as the English group,” and added that for the same reason he and Van Eesteren were against “the fusion of ASPA [American Society of Architects and Planners] with Task [a Gropius-led group at the Harvard Graduate School of Design]” in the United States. One result of the decision was the formation of several French groups; in 1949 Le Corbusier wrote to Sert that these were a Paul Nelson group, a Marcel Iods group, which included Bodiansky, and “perhaps a Lurcat group” that he was unaware of. The proliferation of national groups required that the old CIRPAC, with its two representatives from each national group, be replaced by a new and smaller CIAM council.

The public proceedings at the Bridgewater Congress opened with reports from the national groups, with the MARS group dominating. ASCORAL reported on the Unité, but elsewhere on the Continent reconstruction efforts by CIAM members were still sluggish, except in Poland, where the Syruses were too busy with the reconstruction of Warsaw to be able to attend. From the United States, Neutra submitted a report on the situation in Los Angeles:

Once built, all is frozen for long, obnoxious amortization periods. Large areas, like the vast gridirons of the San Fernando Valley, one of the principal urban expansion areas of Southern California hastily developed by war speculation, will stay that way without heart and sense, for 30 years to come. The
question is: shall our postwar action again be without adequate preparation and coordination and shall one more certain opportunity be missed again? 

That Neutra—much like Theodor Adorno at the same time—could only see as “kitsch.” Neutra’s prescient remarks convey his architectural sensibility, caught between CIAM’s avant-garde dreams of social and physical transformation and the American reality. New Monumentality, they revealed how “popular aspirations” were moving and being reshaped by rough economic forces.

His remarks were not included by Giedion in his CIAM 6 report, and his appeal for a rational and mechanistic conception of progress towards an improvement of the human environment was ignored by Giedion’s commission on CIAM 6 on housing. And he responded to the Bridgwater questionnaire on “the impact of contemporary conditions upon architectural expression” by asserting that “CIAM knows that the tyranny of Cartesian commonsense has reached its final stage.” He hailed CIAM as the affirmation of a “new consciousness,” in which “grace is expressed in life as it is in art,” speaking of the work of Le Corbusier, Mondrian, or Brancusi. He concluded with the rhetorical questions:

Does CIAM intend to “guide” a rational and mechanistic conception of progress towards an improvement of the human environment? Or does it intend to change this conception? Can there be any doubt as to the answer? A new civilization is being born. Its rhythm has already been detected, its outline partly traced. It is up to us to continue.

The full discussion in Commission III.B on “Architectural Expression” took place as part of the “Preparation for the VIIth Congress” on September 12–13. Prior to this, the commission on Architectural Education chaired by Gropius had met, stating its guiding principles as (1) “That in an age of specialisation method is more important than information” and (2) “The 3 dimensional conception is the basic architectural discipline.” The report recommended that the “general education of all students” from childhood onwards include an “appreciation of three dimensional arrangement.” It also suggested that “methods of stimulating interest in visual expression in all the plastic arts is the basic discipline of architecture”; that historical study of the “whole background of a few works of art...is sufficient to equip the student with his own method of approach to the larger and more detailed questions of art appreciation”; and that “Even academic studies should be actual: the teacher must relate his subject to the prospects and the life actually confronting his students; and ways must be found of continuously relating theoretical studies to actual building experience.” To insure this, “every architectural teacher should have practiced architecture or worked in close association with architects.” The report insisted that “structure and design must be closely integrated at all stages,” and concluded by emphasizing the need for training in teamwork.

This meeting was followed by a session on the reorganization of CIAM and a visit to the Bristol Airplane Company’s aluminum temporary housing factory, where a group photograph was taken, followed by a reception sponsored by the British Council in Bristol. The next day, Friday, lectures were given by Gropius and Sert. Sert’s election as president may have been an indication that the earlier CIAM focus on the functional city was now to give way to Giedion’s new concerns about aesthetics, Sert’s about civic centers, and perhaps even Richard’s about the appeal of modern architecture to the “Common Man.” The lectures and the final commission session on “Architectural Expression” at CIAM 6 underscored this new direction.

Sert’s talk was a version of “The Human Scale in City Planning,” discussed earlier in this chapter. Gropius gave a highly generalized lecture on urbanism based on adobe, Georgian mansions on square miles of land with good accessibility by private rubber tires, have in the past constantly overtaken and interfered with premeditated planning, as represented by the county’s regional planning commission and the city’s recently and greatly revitalized planning department. We have lived and visited a goodly number of large cities around the globe, but we feel Los Angeles is of all metropolises the most unknown.

Neutra’s prescient remarks convey his architectural sensibility, caught between CIAM’s avant-garde dreams of social and physical transformation and the American reality. That Neutra—much like Theodor Adorno at the same time—could only see as “kitsch.” Neutra’s prescient remarks convey his architectural sensibility, caught between CIAM’s avant-garde dreams of social and physical transformation and the American reality.
on his recent trip to Germany. According to the published text, he began by insisting on the importance of planning for all income groups, which involved a coordinated effort to "repian society." He asserted that "land is not a commodity, to be traded in shops over a counter; although he added he was not in favor of "undermining the basic conceptions of property." He emphasized the importance of cooperative work, the dangers of overmechanization, and the new architecture's "new conception of space." He criticized the "misleading designation" of the "International Style," which he quickly equated with the classicism of socialist realism. He spoke in favor of decentralization into "neighborhood units to be built in the country." The "open spaces thus regained in the city" could then be used for parks, communal facilities, and a "basic net of traffic arteries." He concluded by insisting that the building of "community centers" connected to schools was more urgent in reconstruction than housing, "for these centers represent a cultural breeding ground which enables the individual to attain his full stature within the community."208

The next day began with two additional lectures, by Richards and by Giedion, who delivered a version of "The Need for a New Monumentality." Richards's talk was a detailed presentation on the subject of "architectural expression in relation to the architect's public." This was a further development of his interest in reception of architecture by the "Common Man," and his lecture was related to the questionnaire that had been prepared by Richards and the MARS group to gauge support for their new focus on aesthetics.209 Richards attributed this interest to his realization that CIAM's "ideals express themselves in an idiom which is by no means accepted or understood by the man in the street. . . . Modern architecture, . . . may be in danger of becoming an art of the kind that is appreciated only by connoisseurs of a private cult."210 This danger, of course, was the condition in the arts as a whole that
the New York art critic Clement Greenberg had set out to address in his 1939 essay “Avant-Garde and Kitsch.” Greenberg had concluded that what Richards called a “cult outcome,” kept in existence by a network of artists, dealers, patrons, and critics, was the only alternative to mass cultural “kitsch.” Without openly stating it, Greenberg seemed to see this art network as similar to a Leninist-Trotskyist radical vanguard. He rejected in art, like Trotsky in politics, the accommodationist strategies of the “Popular Front.”

CIAM, however, was not prepared to abandon its prewar commitment to a mass architecture, and found itself under pressure to adjust to popular tastes in the Popular Front political climate of the immediate postwar years. At CIAM 6 this became clear, as Giedion sought to promote the New Monumentality, and Richards looked to the Swedish model of what he had christened the “New Empiricism” as a way of steering between avant-garde and kitsch. In doing so he made it clear that he did not mean that the “Common Man” should actually “assist in the actual designing of buildings,” but that his “appreciation can be based on what already means something to him emotionally.” He wondered if architects could develop “our present idiom in a more human direction,” and asked whether the “use of familiar materials—even in a non-structural way” might achieve “more sympathy of texture as well as variety.” He also wondered if architects, “operating on the larger scale of the landscape designers,” might be able to “utilize old buildings—whatever their style or material—in their scenic compositions.” If so, he asked, “emphasizing thereby historical continuity of a town’s growth—is it possible to give the ordinary man on whose behalf the work is done a renewed sense that architectural art is something in which he can participate?”

Giedion’s response to Richards was not clear at CIAM 6, but an article he had published in 1947 in Plan, a new Swiss planning journal, addressed the issue without mentioning Richards by name:

Today in England behind all discussions lies the question, what does the “Common Man” want? How much do we have to respond to certain wishes? Are they legitimate? Are they naked atavism? From the outside one can hardly understand the intensity with which these questions are put on the part of painters, sculptors, architects and writers. . . . There are in France today more ingenious plans for city building than we saw in England. But if we ask what characterizes the mood of both countries, unfortunately in France at the moment it would be the ephemeral philosophy of existentialism, while in England on the contrary it would be the planning initiatives, which have prepared for almost every city a change in their form of life.

Richards’s and Giedion’s talks were followed by the Commission III.b sessions on “Architectural Expression.” The CIAM 6 documents list the membership of this com-

mission, chaired by Giedion, as Richards, Van Eyck, Sert, Bakema, Papadaki, Lemco, Granatszoi from Hungary, Fuchs and Kumpost from Czechoslovakia, Tunnard, and MARS members Coates, Kadleigh, Entwistle, Shand, Shepheard, and Kent. Giedion recalled that the debate “stirred the whole Congress,” and to Van Eyck it was “virtually a solar eclipse.” As Struven has pointed out, Giedion’s account in A Decade of New Architecture does not give a full picture. During the discussion the London planner and prewar MARS member Arthur Ling apparently countered Giedion’s views in favor of architectural expression, which prompted Van Eyck to speak in favor of them. In agreement with Van Eyck, Le Corbusier exclaimed “finally, imagination comes into CIAM!” adding, “I experienced a profound happiness when i heard Giedion demanding that we should place art at the summit of our preoccupations.”

CIAM 6 concluded with the issuing of the “Reaffirmation of Aims,” and the announcement of the new structure and membership. While press accounts of CIAM 6 were generally laudatory, in Plan, the Architectural Association student journal, a note of doubt was evident:

In the quiet eighteenth century air of Bridgewater it was difficult to see Le Corbusier and Gropius as products of our age; in that contradiction, the history of CIAM is expressed. . . . The prophets of La Sarraz are still with us; if their stature appeared to be diminished it was only because ten years of our own growth in the accelerated conditions of war have passed. Intellectually they still dominate our professional world, but the post-war period must be a period of total achievement, as well as prophecy.

At the end of the Congress another CIRPAC meeting was held, and Le Corbusier, as co-chair of the Commission on Urbanism, proposed that ASCORAL produce a “town planning grid” to systematize the study of town planning to be presented at the next Congress.

Although at an ideological level Bridgewater was clearly not a complete success, enough vitality was provided by the enthusiastic new members to keep CIAM alive for the next decade. Much of the enthusiasm came from the sense that the CIAM ideal of creating a better social world through physical interventions was now a world-wide issue, an idea that received impetus from the energy of modernizing forces outside of Europe, indicated by invitations to hold the next Congress in Ceylon, Cuba, and Canada.

CIAM 7, Bergamo, Italy, 1949

In contrast to the ambitious hopes for CIAM expressed at Bridgewater, the Bergamo Congress revealed that CIAM was not going to regain its prewar élan as an
avant-garde organization, apparently owing to internal conflicts within the organization. Officially, the second postwar Congress was to have had two themes, “The Athens Charter in Practice” and “Synthesis of the Major Arts.” The Congress invitation issued by ASCORAL in June 1948, however, mentioned only the first of these, now subdivided into two categories, “Planning” (Urbanisme) and “Aesthetics.” For the first category, the text explained that the Congress would examine a “cyclic ensemble of the problems of urbanism posed by contemporary society,” resulting in a “fan of themes.” These themes comprised “domestic equipment”; unités d’habitation and neighborhood units; “the town”—new, reconstructed, and extended;

3.10 Vincent and Honegger, apartments at Montchocly, Geneva; from L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui 8, no. 2 (February 1937): 50.

Le Corbusier’s “three human establishments” of agriculture, industry, and exchange; the national plan; and the continental unit.

From these directions, the general focus of CIAM 7 appeared to be a further extension of the ideas of Le Corbusier and ASCORAL. To make the members’ work engaging these vast themes comprehensible, ASCORAL offered the CIAM Grille (Grid). The Grid, proposed by Le Corbusier at CIAM 6, had been developed in the fall of 1947 by a team that included Le Corbusier and members of the ASCORAL group, including Dr. Pierre Winter, André Sive, Pierre Jeanneret, Vladimir Bodiansky, André Wogenscky, and Georges Candilis. It was a system for graphically organizing in-


formation about town planning projects on 21 × 33 cm (about 8 1/2 × 13 inch) panels, which could then be assembled into larger screens of up to 120 panels. The panels, coded by theme and function, could be assembled in different ways for comparative purposes, organized (in the Bergamo version) in a vertical or horizontal bands according to nine thematic classifications—environment, occupation of the land, constructed volume, equipment, ethic and aesthetic, economic and social influences, legislation, finance, stages of realization, and miscellaneous—and in vertical or horizontal bands corresponding to the four functions, with each of these given a color code (green = living, red = work, blue = cultivation of body and spirit, yellow
value of the CIAM Grid as a conceptual tool for urbanism and what appears to have decided. By March 1948, when the new CIAM Council, the new version of the CIRPAC, coup in February 1948 in Czechoslovakia had put that country firmly under Soviet control, while in Italy, the Communist party had also become a major force. This came to prominence in the 1960s, notably in the work of Aldo Rossi, a student of Le Corbusier and CIAM member since the 1920s, strongly advocated Prague as the place of the next Congress.

At ClAM 6, both the place and theme of the next Congress had not been decided. By March 1948, when the new CIAM Council, the new version of the CIRPAC, met in Paris, the sites of Prague and Bergamo, Italy, were being discussed. At Bridgwater, according to Sert, the Czechs "made such a fine show of their work" that they were then asked to investigate the possibility of holding the next Congress there, although Sert acknowledged to Giedion that "the situation is as you know, delicate." Both choices had political as well as cultural significance: a Communist coup in February 1948 in Czechoslovakia had put that country firmly under Soviet control, while in Italy, the Communist party had also become a major force. This caused the United States to back the more center-right Christian Democrats, who were elected in April 1948. In opposite ways, political developments in the two countries in 1948 heralded the coming of the Cold War which would begin a year later with the official division of Germany, the founding of NATO, and the proclamation of the People’s Republic of China.

At the Paris meeting the Czech representative, Josef Havilcek (1899-1961), did not attend and one Rajnis, an official of the Czechoslovakian Ministry of Information, came in his place. Helena Niemirowska Syrkus (1900–1982), a Communist and CIAM member since the 1920s, strongly advocated Prague as the place of the next Congress. She and her husband Szymon had offered their "Socialist Warsaw" plan for the almost totally destroyed city after the end of the war. This new master plan retained the functional zoning and new transportation routes called for in their prewar "Functional Warsaw" plan, but also proposed rebuilding the entire historic center of the city. This entailed reconstructing over eight hundred buildings in the Old Town destroyed by the Germans, including the exact replication of all of its palaces, castles, and churches. Believing that "urbanism signifies social purpose," the Syrkuses sanctioned this unprecedented act of historic reconstruction to repudiate the Nazi attempt to eradicate Polish culture. In 1947 the Syrkuses had also begun work on the Kolo Housing Estate there, a "neighborhood unit" adjacent to a prewar Zeilenbou scheme of their own design, whose slabs initially had some affinities to the work of Aalto; later parts of the complex were designed in a more socialist realist direction after 1949. Helena Syrkus’s advocacy of Prague was supported by the MARS member Godfrey Samuel, but a decision on the location of the next Congress was postponed until September 1948. In the interim, in Italy the Christian Democrats, assisted by covert American aid, won the April 1948 elections, and the decision was ultimately made to hold CIAM 7 in Bergamo, a medieval city fifty kilometers east of Milan, with the Italian CIAM group as hosts.

The postwar Italian group, which included Ernesto Nathan Rogers and his partners in BBPR, had focused its energies on a plan for Milan, the "AR Plan," submitted to a competition sponsored by Milan Commune in 1945. Developed by BBPR (the second "B" was retained in memory of one of the partners, Banfi, who had died in a concentration camp in Austria), Albini, Bottoni, Gardella, Gabrielle Muschi, Giancarlo Palanti (an associate of Albini and an editor of Casabella before the war), Marco Pucci and others, the plan was essentially a revision of the 1934 Milan master plan. It attempted to zone the Milan metropolitan area for decentralization according to the four functions, with special emphasis on new residential districts to the north, and advocated new highways and a third airport. At the same time it also called for the restoration of the old center. While the strategy of restoring historic centers within the context of overall replanning had never been rejected by CIAM, in the postwar Italian situation this aspect of urbanism assumed growing importance, and paradoxically it eventually helped feed the various reactions against CIAM that came to prominence in the 1960s, notably in the work of Aldo Rossi, a student of Ernesto Rogers.

After the "AR Plan" the Italian group turned its efforts to the design of the experimental "QT 8" district, designed for the Eighth Milan Triennale (1947), which was headed by Piero Bottoni. Given the dire housing conditions around Milan at the time, it had been decided to focus the Triennale "exclusively on housing." The QT 8, designed by Bottoni, Pollini, Pucci, and others, was to be an urban district with four "neighborhood units" on a site of 163 acres planned to house 3300 people. A mixture of housing types was projected: row houses and cottages for war veterans, two- to four-story apartment buildings of prefabricated units, and six- and ten-story slab blocks. A civic center, with a church, cinema, and daycare center was to be provided in the center of the site. The site planning was looser than the rigid rectilinear Zeilenbou blocks of the prewar Green Milan plan, though some of the slabs were still in parallel rows.
Planning who had commissioned the New Towns: Michal Kacvorowski, the Polish Minister of Reconstruction; Torres Bodet of UNESCO; and Adriano Olivetti, since the 1930s a leading patron of modern architecture in Italy. None attended, though Claudius-Petit sent a prepared statement. Poets such as Pablo Neruda, who also sent in a statement, were invited, as were artists such as Léger, Miró, Henry Moore (whose “Family Group” at Stevenage had just been completed), Picasso, and Isamu Noguchi, though of these only Noguchi seems to have to have actually attended.  

Response from CIAM members to the ASCORAL Invitation was not as great as might have been expected. Giedion complained of the “astonishingly meager” response to his request for projects, and as late as two months before the Congress told Sert, “We haven’t any idea what we can expect for examples of the CIAM Grilles for Bergamo.” Particularly unresponsive were the Latin American and North American groups, especially the architecturally productive Brazilian group. This was a disappointment, as Giedion had written to Niemeyer after CIAM 6 in 1947 regretting the absence of the Brazilian group there, and Sert had written to Giedion at the same time to say, “The Latin American groups will be more numerous in the coming congresses and every architect and many government figures are subscribers. I think we cannot continue to consider central Europe as the main field of interest for CIAM. Explanation of CIAM ideas both to east and west should be the basis for our program.” In Brazil, CIAM members were successfully pursuing a Corbusian-inspired approach in numerous projects. These included Lúcio Costa (1902-1998), Oscar Niemeyer (b. 1907), Gregori Warchavchik (1896-1972), and A. E. Reidy (1909-1964), all of whom but Warchavchik had been involved with the construction of the Brazilian Ministry of Education and Health building in Rio (1937-1943) with Le Corbusier. By 1947 these architects had a substantial body of work that could have been displayed at Bridgewater, much of which was published in the “Brésil” issue of L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui published at the same time.  

In April 1948 Giedion wrote to Brazilian architect-engineer Henrique Mindlin (1911-1971) regretting that it had been impossible to stay in contact with the Brazilian group. Mindlin replied that he had cabled Giedion during CIAM 6 but had received no answer, and that Stamo Papadaki had told him that “the Congress had decided against an increase in the list.” In the same letter, Mindlin told Giedion that none of the three Brazilian CIAM delegates, Costa, Niemeyer, and Warchavchik, wanted to organize the group. Giedion responded by appointing Mindlin “acting secretary” and adding Marcelo Roberto to the list of Brazilian CIAM delegates. A year later Mindlin wrote asking for advice on how to “vitalize Brazilian CIAM,” to which Giedion replied that Sert could probably advise him better. Sert wrote to Mindlin that the situation of the Brazilian group was not unique, and “many other CIAM groups are in a similar situation today.” He suggested that “nomination of a new...
delegate will have to be considered," since the situation was not good for the young members "that have their hopes pinned on CIAM and look forward to its directives." During this same time, Sert told Giedion that he had little confidence in anyone from the United States attending CIAM 7, specifically mentioning Lonberg-Holm, Breuer, Chermayeff, and Walter Sanders as unlikely to attend. New York architect Hermann H. Field did attend, however, as he had at CIAM 6. In general, the work shown at Bergamo was hardly representative of worldwide activity in modern architecture at the time — no projects of Mies, Gropius, Breuer, or Aalto were displayed, for example — yet the reasons for the selection of the work were not given.

CIAM 7 was held July 22-31, 1949, in a palazzo in the old "upper town" of Bergamo, organized by Enrico Peressutti and attended by around a hundred members. The Congress opened with introductions by the mayor of Bergamo and by Sert, followed by speeches by Bottoni and Sert. Bottoni invoked the memory of Italian CIAM members Giuseppe Terragni, a committed Fascist, who died after his return from fighting for the Axis in the USSR, and Gianluigi Banfi, the Italian-Jewish resistance fighter who died in a Nazi concentration camp, as part of the theme of "continuity" with the past being stressed by Rogers. Terragni's drawings were displayed at Bergamo and trips were organized to Como, site of his Casa del Fascio, and Ivrea, location of the Olivetti-sponsored model industrial town designed by F. Gini and Pollini, BBPR, and Bottoni. Bottoni's remarks were followed by Sert's, who explicitly held up the old medieval center of Bergamo as a "town of the human scale." He identified the contrasting "chaos of large modern cities" as that which the work of CIAM was in revolt against. This was followed by Le Corbusier's presentation of the "basic theme" of the Congress, the CIAM Grid. After expounding on the advantages of the Grid, he continued with the somewhat cryptic statement that "CIAM 7 will have as its object the drafting of a 'Charter of Habitat," a subject that had not been part of the program for the Congress agreed on in advance, but which would form a major part of the work of CIAM until 1956.

In the approximately thirty projects actually displayed at Bergamo, Le Corbusier's ideas were strongly present. The ASCORAL group presented his postwar urbanistic framework of the three human establishments, the "unit of agricultural cultivation," the "linear-industrial city," and the "radial-concentric city of exchange," which he had published in 1945 as Les Trois Etablissements humains. Other projects displayed included Le Corbusier's Buenos Aires Master Plan, developed in 1938 with Ferrari Hardoy and Juan Kurchan, and his plan for Izmir, Turkey. The Marseilles Unité was presented by the youth group of ASCORAL, led by Georges Candilis, who would later be a pivotal member of Team 10. Related works by French CIAM members were Pierre Jeanneret's plan for Puteaux, a "suburb of 40,000;" Lods's project for Sotteville-les-Rouen; and Menkès and Roux's plan for cities in the French-occupied Saarland.

From Brazil, A. E. Reidy's Pedregulho "unité" in Rio was displayed, one of the first built realizations of the curving slab apartment houses of Le Corbusier's Algiers projects, although Reidy himself did not attend, despite Giedion's efforts. Designs for a housing district in Rio de Janeiro by Flavio Regis were also shown. From Argentina, a housing district by Antonio Bonet in Buenos Aires was displayed, probably one designed in 1943 as part of the Le Corbusier, Ferrari Hardoy, and Kurchan master plan for Buenos Aires. Seven projects from the Italian group were presented: Bottoni and others' "experimental quarter," which was also the subject of a short film shown to delegates; BBPR's prewar tourist development plan for the Isle of Elba (1939); F. Gini and Pollini's plan for Ivrea; a regional plan for Naples by Luigi Cosenza; Giuseppe Samonà's study for the Porto Marghera quarter in Venice; a plan for Genoa by Luigi Carlo Danieri; and the hillside slabs of the Quartiere degli Angeli in Genoa by Albini, Gardella, and Palanti, a 1946 application of the Unités of Le Corbusier's prewar Nemours plan. Also on view on the Bergamo CIAM grids was...
a Paddington housing estate by MARS member Denys Lasdun, developed when he was with Lubetkin and Tecton; Gibberd’s Harlow plan, and a presentation of the Abercrombie County of London plan by Ernö Goldfinger of MARS. Merkelbach and the Dutch De 8 group presented the village of Nagele, a garden city with low-rise clusters of buildings on a flat site, and the Rotterdam Opbouw group presented a plan for the Pendrecht district, “a peripheral community,” explained by Bakema. The Swedish and Swiss groups presented one project each, a housing project at Rosta-Örebro and a plan for an industrial quarter of Geneva. The German group was represented by a project for turning bombed areas in Berlin into “green zones” by Vogler and Hassenpflug. Only one North American project was presented, a waterfront development scheme in Montréal by Ann Luke.

ClAM 7 was also where Sert and Wiener presented their plans for Lima and Chimbote, Peru, and Tumaco, Colombia. This work seems to have been conceived somewhat didactically, as a way of demonstrating the planning implications of Sert and Giedion’s concerns with aesthetics, popular expression, and civic centers. Their new emphasis on the civic center as a kind of “Fifth Function,” already evident in the Brazilian Motor City project, was clearly manifested in Sert and Wiener’s plan for the small industrial port of Chimbote, on Peru’s northern desert coast, commissioned in 1947 by the Corporación Peruana del Santa, a government organization modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority. The proposed new town of twelve thousand people was divided into neighborhood units of six thousand people each, and included an extensive circulation system for auto traffic.

The civic center plan at Chimbote was related to Le Corbusier’s St.-Die scheme. Instead of a series of isolated buildings focused on a high-rise administration building, at Chimbote a semienclosed central square was created. Reached from either an adjoining parking lot or a pedestrian “paseo,” it featured a large church, a bell tower, and a civic library and museum on pilotis. Adjoining this partly enclosed area were commercial buildings which themselves contained small courtyards. Instead of rejecting the tradition of the Renaissance square, Sert and Wiener described their civic center as “an attempt to bring the old and good tradition of the
Figini and Pollini, housing at Ivrea, ca. 1935, exhibited at CIAM 7.
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Six permanent CIAM commissions were formed at Bergamo: (1) "Putting the Athens Charter into Practice" subdivided into three subcommittees, "Urbanism"
(Le Corbusier), "Presentation Methods" (Van Eesteren, Steiger), and "CIAM Publications" (Sert); (2) "Mutual Collaboration of Architects, Painters, and Sculptors (Giedion, Richards)”; (3) "Architectural Education (Gropius in absentia, Rogers, Drew); (4) "Industrialization of Building (Coates, Hermann Field);" (5) "Legal and Administrative Changes Needed for the Implementation of the Athens Charter (Lods, Merkelbach);" and (6) "Reform of Social Programs to Facilitate the Development of Town Planning schemes (H. Syrkus, Emery)." With personnel changes, these commissions would last until after CIAM 9, when eight short-lived new commissions were formed for CIAM 10.

The two days of commission meetings were followed by two plenary sessions held on the third and fourth days of the Congress. The first plenary session was on "Applications of the Athens Charter," chaired by Le Corbusier. The discussion included Michel Ecochard (1905-1985), director of the Town Planning Department of the French protectorate of Morocco since 1946, and the Greek ATBAT member Georges Candilis, born in Baku, Azerbaijan. The discussion followed Le Corbusier’s introduction, in which he said CIAM would develop a "Charter of Habitat" at the Congress, without indicating very clearly what such a charter might be. Pierre Emery raised the issue of designing large green areas in hot countries without water, and Sert agreed that this was a problem. He suggested two solutions, both based on the work he was doing in Latin America: for large cities, the use of occasional tall (twenty-story) buildings to provide shadow in an otherwise low-rise (three-story) cityscape, and the use of covered passages for pedestrians and boutiques; for small towns “where the standard of living is lower” he suggested the use of small houses with small courtyards and a canal system, much as he had done at Chimbote. The discussion then rambled off in various directions, as the participants raised issues of density, "subterranean urbanism" (in the literal sense), and air pollution, apparently a special concern of the Belgian group. Wiener suggested that a commission be formed to study stages of development in the "less civilized" parts of the world. Georges Candilis brought up the "primordial importance" of terrain and suggested a commission to study various forms of land-use legislation. Bottini reaffirmed the necessity of mobilizing worldwide public opinion. Cosenza remarked that CIAM "is an opinion which runs up against powerful interests;" and gave the example of the new commuter railroad in Naples, built only for speculative purposes. At the end, the discussion was so diffuse that no general consensus emerged.

The other plenary session, held on the fourth day, was devoted to the theme "Report on the Plastic Arts;" and reflected Giedion and Richards’s efforts to push CIAM discussions toward issues of aesthetics. The questions under consideration attempted to clarify how a “synthesis of the arts” derived from a collaboration between artists and architects might occur, and to consider whether the “man in the street” was able to appreciate such a synthesis. Once again the session was a babel of divergent comments and Giedion admitted that it was impossible to summarize the results. When Giedion published an edited version of this session nine years later, he emphasized his debate with Helena Syrkus over socialist realism, and titled it "Architects and Politics: An East-West Discussion." The various responses included comments by the Brazilian delegate Flavio Regis that the question was badly posed, and Sert’s contention, later much expanded and altered in "Architects and Politics," that places of public assembly were where a synthesis of the arts ought to occur. Sert criticized the lack of such places in cities like New York, and said that it was CIAM’s task to define the spaces of such civic centers. He believed that the precise forms of artistic collaboration could not be determined in advance, however.

Syrkus, whose relationship to Giedion was friendly, had asked him to reserve an hour for her to “deliver a speech during the Congress concerning our struggle for Socialist Realism,” but she had to settle for comments during this discussion. Responding to the specific issue of whether the “man in the street” could appreciate the synthesis of the arts, she began by saying that CIAM lacked “a fair attitude to the people. Art belongs to the people and must be understandable by the people. It is false to believe art has nothing to do with politics. Each statement of the Athens Charter is political.” The people “do not yet have the understanding” of Le Corbusier’s work, and this is why...
It is realized in the USSR that we [CIAM] have fallen into a formalism. Formalism is born from the abyss created by the capitalists between art and reality, between "Dichtung und Wahrheit." Artists detached themselves from life and started to create art for art's sake. Real artistic revolutions have always been swept forward by social revolutions. ... The aim of a socialist realism is to raise the status of man, but there are many sorts of realism.

Syrkus allowed that the "formalism" of CIAM "was positive" in its early days; "it was a revolt." It made use of analytical methods, "which were also socialist methods." But its importance lessened as CIAM accepted the delusive and "regrettable capitalist notion" of the Existenzminimum, leading to a "sad difference" between what CIAM desired and proclaimed and what it could actually do. Now, "the countries of the East have come to the conclusion that we should have a greater respect for the heritage of the past." As an example, she cited the example of the rebuilding of Warsaw, where "in defending our national culture we also defend international culture. We of CIAM must revise our attitude; the Bauhaus is as far behind us as Scamozzi. It is time to pass from the Athens Charter into reality." 98a

Hans Schmidt, then still working in Basel before his later move to East Berlin, defended Sykus's position. Max Bill, another Swiss member, suggested that the question be analyzed by examining the actual work presented on the CIAM Grids, and he praised Le Corbusier's Unité and contrasted it favorably to a recent socialist realist mural in Basel by Schmidt, which he described as "academic and sterile" despite its revolutionary subject matter. Ernesto Rogers then responded to Syrus's comments by first crediting the wartime efforts of the peoples of Eastern Europe, but adding that he believed that "the people must be given the means to come near to art." 98b James Johnson Sweeney, of the Museum of Modern Art, made the point that the "common man," meaning, anyone not knowledgeable about art, is "found equally in all social classes," and quoted a recent comment of President Truman that "so-called 'modern art' [sic] is merely the vaporings of half-baked lazy people." Finally, after various additional comments, Giedion summed up by admitting that he would have liked to have more discussion of artistic means and praised Sweeney's candor about American taste. He then responded to Helena Syrus's comments:

We love the past, and it's well known that I had great difficulty at CIAM because I was for the past. But the modern historian, like the modern painter, doesn't gaze at the past. As I have seen, this is not the case in Russia, and I believe that if you could seat Mister Truman, a Russian, and even a fascist at the same table they would have absolutely the same taste when you asked them to consider the problem. Right now, when we're among friends, I think we need to speak absolutely frankly. Nevertheless, we don't just want a part-

Revolution: we demand a whole revolution. But it's not enough to ask for revolutions: we ask for what happens after revolutions.

In his publication of this exchange nine years later in Architecture, You and Me, Giedion rewrote his comments to read:

We have a love for the past. But the modern historian and the modern painter cannot reenact the past. ... [W]e can now see the whole of history as a single entity. ... [T]oday more and more we see our connections with the past and most especially we see that modern painting (now declared in Russia to be a form of bourgeois decadence) is deeply rooted in the past. ... We believe profoundly in a modern tradition. We believe that we are developing this modern tradition. We believe further that we should have no inferiority complex when accosted by the common man. 987

Giedion's alteration of his remarks in response to Syrus in his later English version obscures the considerable sympathy he still seems to have held for her position in 1949.

This discussion was the last time issues concerning the "common man's" receptivity to art were debated in CIAM, and after Bergamo Richards drifted away from involvement with CIAM, By lumping together the taste of all the modern "common men," Giedion was able to eliminate consideration of the issues raised by the New Empiricism from CIAM. Despite its continuing rhetoric of social engagement, CIAM's tendency after Bergamo was to be only a detached, self-appointed elite, becoming more and more removed from the forces shaping and responding to perceived mass tastes in the postwar era.

Yet it was also at Bergamo that CIAM began to make reference to the issue of urbanism for "the great majority of the world's population," who, as Helena Syrus and Pierre Emery's report on the "Reform of Social Programs to Facilitate the Development of Town Planning Schemes" put it, "could not normally carry out one of the four functions of urbanism, namely, work." They proposed that the theme for the next Congress should be "Applications of the Athens Charter and its consequences for social order," with special reference to the needs of "deprived populations." The committee assumed that the conclusion of this work would be a "long-term campaign" in an agency like UNESCO. 989 Syrus and Emery identified the following factors as the most important to study: (1) demographic movements and their control; (2) "brutal transformations" caused by new scientific discoveries that confront deprived populations with a new way of life; (3) control of the ground,
and underground; (4) control of the disposition of dwelling; (5) reform of legislation; (6) safeguarding the manifestations of a culture and the integration of these phenomena into an ethic conforming to the new way of life envisaged; and (7) preservation of biological equilibrium. The committee concluded by arguing that this study would be an "indispensable complement" to a "Charte de l'Habitat," which "would perhaps be the general theme of the next Congress." 190

Officially, CIAM 7 issued a resolution, whose seven points concerned (1) the dwelling, which should be oriented to the sun, quiet, and efficiently organized; (2) laboratories for research in new construction techniques; (3) scale, which should always be indicated on drawings; (4) land-use legislation; (5) unity of visual groups; (6) necessity of punctual automobile and pedestrian circulation; and (7) free disposition of the ground plane. 191 This resolution, developed under Le Corbusier's direction, does not appear to have been widely publicized. Overall, CIAM 7 was clearly not a success, and at the end eight delegates led by Peressutti—the others were Albini, Bonet (Argentina), Castelli, Gardella, Iriarte (Venezuela), Wogenscky, and Candilis—submitted an "Autocritique" charging that the participants were not well prepared and the program was overloaded, and that CIAM was in danger of "losing its working character." 192

Contrary to Le Corbusier's hopes, the Grid had not provided an organizing theme, and the discussion on the synthesis of the arts had only revealed the confu-
Gibberd, photograph of model of “The Lawn” point block, Harlow, shown at CIAM 7.

sion and underlying political conflicts behind CIAM’s effort to explicitly address aesthetic questions. The only future direction that offered any hope of regaining the prewar energy of the Congress seemed to lie in an effort to address the perceived broad material and emotional needs of “the greater number” of the world’s burgeoning population. Yet how to do so was not clear, nor would it become so in the remainder of CIAM’s existence.

“Concerning Architectural Culture”: Zevi’s Critique of CIAM

One of the most significant results of the unsuccessful Bergamo Congress was the critique of CIAM it provoked from Bruno Zevi, the Harvard-educated proponent of the spatial ideas of Frank Lloyd Wright. Author of *Ve150 un’architettura organica* (Towards an organic architecture, 1945) and the founder of the Association for Organic Architecture (APAO), Zevi’s “Della cultura architettonica: messaggio al Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne” (Of architectural culture: a message to the CIAM), published in his journal *Metron* in 1949, emphasized a line of criticism of CIAM which in a different way paralleled some of Haring’s observations to Scharoun noted earlier, and which would continue to be developed for decades after the end of CIAM.

Zevi began by observing that “modern architecture has lost a major battle in the postwar period” due to the inability of the “most active and intelligent architects” to organize “within the framework of international organs” like UNESCO. He also critically noted the absence of “the mass of the architects from the United States” in CIAM. For Zevi, this recognition of the “practical limits of CIAM” meant that it must deepen its “cultural substance.” CIAM “in the general feeling of modern architects” was bound to the “architectural mentality” of Le Corbusier and Gropius and the “historical perspectives and interpretations” of Giedion. Moreover,

The other branch of modern architecture, that which is no longer rationalistic, the movement which is called organic, or of human architecture, or of the New Empiricism, doesn’t have adequate representation in the CIAM and its cultural position has been defended by architects who entered the CIAM as proponents of the rationalist school ten years ago and have since undergone an evolution. An entire generation of young architects who have contributed to advancement of the modern movement, and all the adherents of the Wright school, have been more or less excluded. Why? The Congress of Bergamo must face this problem.

After noting Giedion’s many omissions in *Space, Time and Architecture*, particularly of most aspects of the Arts and Crafts movement and the work of Erich Mendelsohn, Zevi declared, “If the CIAM does not wish to become a nostalgic monument to the rationalist period, if it has deep in its heart, to quote Goethe, the problem more than the truth, then it must discuss these historical themes, which, however they may seem out of place in a professional meeting, are in reality most vital insofar as they help us to understand our origins, our predecessors, and thusly our historical function.” In conclusion, Zevi cited Alfred Roth’s Frank Lloyd Wright–inspired house for Madame de Mandrot in Zurich (1943) as opening a “new and distinct chapter” in modern architecture that he called “post-rationalism.” Zevi asserted that “points of contact between the Wright and Swedish schools are evident,” and continued,

Personally, each of us can feel that the block recently built by Le Corbusier at Marseilles is preferable to the works of the New Empiricism. But the CIAM as such cannot make such judgment without causing two great consequences: 1) first of all it would no longer control the New Empiricism, whose road is
without doubt full of difficulties and danger; 2) it would isolate itself from the current problematics of architecture, withdrawing into an ivory tower of the conquered past.  

Zevi's challenge was not directly taken up by CIAM, but for the next Congress a theme was chosen that reflected a more positive acknowledgment of the past than anything previously addressed by CIAM. But contrary to Zevi's wish for CIAM to discuss its own history, including the importance of the divergent and excluded "organic" architectures of Wright and Haring, CIAM under Sert and Rogers's influence turned to the issue of the pedestrian core in urban centers.

CIAM 8, Hoddesdon, England, 1951: The Heart of the City

Neither Bridgwater nor Bergamo, the first two Congresses held after the Second World War, had produced enough consensus to provide a unifying new avant-garde direction for CIAM. The effort to reposition CIAM as an organization aimed at working for creation of a physical environment to both satisfy "man's emotional and material needs and stimulate his spiritual growth" was only partially successful, as it soon became evident that some members still expected CIAM simply to continue its prewar pattern, while others began to demand radical change. Although CIAM 6 had created a new organizational structure for CIAM, CIAM 7 had revealed CIAM's inability to develop a shared and coherent agenda, foreshadowing the lack of coherence of most of the postwar Congresses.

At Bergamo, Le Corbusier had suggested that the succeeding Congresses should attempt to develop a "Charter of Habitat" to replace the Athens Charter, but this was not chosen as the next theme. Instead, at the end of 1949, CIAM president Sert wrote to Giedion that he thought the next Congress should be in England, to encourage the MARS group, "which, as you say, is the best and most active group in the Congress today." In his letter, Sert emphasized that he was interested in "civic center areas, which is apparently what the British Group wants to stress," but he admitted he did not know how accepting the MARS group's theme of "civic centers" would "fit into the main theme," the development of Le Corbusier's "Charter of Habitat." The "civic center" theme related not only to efforts then under way to create pedestrian centers in Dutch, Swedish, and British new towns, but also to concerns of the Italian group about historic town centers. Similar issues were also being explored in Sert and Wiener's urban master plans for Peru and Colombia. In March 1950, Sert told Giedion that he had convinced Le Corbusier "that the subject of the next Congress should be 'Civic Center,' and not the Charte de l'Habitat," and that Le Corbusier agreed that it should be held in London and organized by the MARS group.
This change of direction was not fully accepted by all the groups. At the April 1950 Paris Council meeting, attended by Le Corbusier but not Sert, Gropius or Giedion, a somewhat different agenda was anticipated for CIAM 8. According to the minutes, it was expected that the French architect Marcel Lods would present a special report on assembling land for public uses (libération du sol). Ernesto Rogers of Milan would present a "charter of education," and Pierre-André Emery of Algeria would prepare a preliminary report on the Charter of Habitat, to relate it to the theme of "Core" proposed by the MARS group. Correspondence between the Argentine group—J. Ferrari Hardoy, Antonio Bonet, and Amanco Williams—and Giedion at this time also reveals that this group was not enthusiastic about the theme of the Core being advanced by Sert and the MARS group. In a joint letter in September 1950, the three Argentine CIAM members pointed out that their geographical situation, different viewpoints, and different language rendered their connection to CIAM tenuous. Critical of the "more eclectic" recent Congresses at Bridgewater and Bergamo, they proposed themes for the next six CIAM Congresses as parts of the larger project of developing a Charter of Habitat.

This proposal does not seem to have been seriously considered, and by the spring of 1951, the "Charter of Habitat" had been placed on the same level as two other "secondary themes" for CIAM 8, one on architectural education and the other on structural techniques. Around the same time, the MARS group had established commissions to prepare for the Congress which mirrored those of the CIAM itself. These were on "Town Planning," chaired by Arthur Ling and Peter Shepheard; "Visual Art," chaired by Richards; "New Building Technique," chaired by Coates; and "Social Background of the Core," chaired by Jacquelin Tyrwhitt. Much of the actual preparation for CIAM 8 was then being undertaken by Tyrwhitt, a member since 1941, who had been appointed assistant director of MARS in 1940. She had met Giedion at CIAM 6, the first Congress she attended, and by 1948 was his assistant in preparing Mechanization Takes Command and other books. In 1948, the return of a war veteran required that she give up the directorship at the London University School of Planning, a position she had held since 1941, and she then took up a visiting lectureship at the New School for Social Research in New York. She also became a planning consultant, eventually forming a partnership with Wells Coates in 1950 to prepare the Town Planning Exhibition for the Festival of Britain.

In June 1950, Tyrwhitt attended a meeting of the American CIAM group with Sert, Giedion, and Lonberg-Holm in New York, where it was agreed that the MARS group's suggested title of "Core" was not "the happiest term for the theme" of CIAM 8. The MARS group was "to try to think of a new word," and eventually the title "The Heart of the City" was agreed upon. For this Congress, all pretense of systemization and quantifiable data collection was abandoned. Instead, the Core was viewed largely as the image of a built space, a place where the "sense of community" is physically expressed, and not as a place that could be scientifically analyzed in the manner of prewar CIAM Congresses. At the Congress Sert admitted that the subject had proved to be difficult to study, but added, "precisely because it has not been explored it becomes a CIAM subject." The choice of theme also reflected an awareness of the effects of urbanization, for as Sert put it, "urbanism has really become urbanization." He added, "we find that if we want to do something with our cities we have again to talk in civic and urban terms," and therefore CIAM "must tackle the difficult problem of the core of the city."

For the MARS group, the theme was relevant both to the design of pedestrian civic centers in new towns like Stevenage, where Gordon Stephenson had recently been able to introduce such an element only after much controversy, and to the issue of modern urban celebrations like the Festival of Britain, which opened two months before CIAM and ran concurrently with it. The theme was also relevant to the rebuilding of bombed city centers, such as the one being reconstructed at Coventry. According to the CIAM 8 invitation issued by the MARS group, the theme of "The Heart of the City" was to be taken from their observation that there was a need to consider another element beyond the four CIAM functions, "the element which makes the community a community," its "heart or nucleus." This theme closely recalled the portion of Sert's 1944 essay, "The Human Scale in City Planning," where he had argued that pedestrian civic centers ought to be created as part of urban replanning. To study the Core, the MARS group proposal identified five "scale levels" of community beyond the family: the village or primary housing group; the neighborhood; the town or city sector; the city itself; and finally the "metropolis or multiple city." The framers believed that each of these called for a "special physical environment" both to permanently express a sense of community and to provide a setting for more contemporary expressions. They defined this "sense of community" primarily as an awareness among the community members of interdependence, but did not identify any specific forms or types of common interaction and association. Instead, the proposal called for a consideration of the physical form and placement of "civic center" elements, viewed as universal entities.

Though it had been decided that CIAM 8 would once again be held in Britain, at the same time another effort was undertaken to revitalize interest in CIAM in the United States, where Sert had complained repeatedly about the difficulty of attracting members of sufficient stature willing to take on unpaid CIAM duties. This problem may have been due in part to the rejection of CIAM by important American practitioners like George Howe, who had resigned before the war over the issue of Giedion's readiness to speak for him, or Wallace K. Harrison, who had resigned at the end of 1944 and had refused readmission in 1947. Miles, though still listed in 1952 as a dues-paying member, had not been active in CIAM since 1931, and some
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of the most talented younger American modernists such as Charles Eames seem never to have been asked to join.

At the end of 1950, Gropius (who, one former student recalled, saw CIAM "as Corb's world") suggested to Sert that he add a number of American architects and planners to CIAM. Architects he suggested included Louis I. Kahn, Buckminster Fuller, I. M. Pei, Paul Rudolph, Ralph Rapson, Gyorgy Kepes, Hugh Stubbins, Carl Koch, Percival Goodman and Gropius's partners in TAC, along with planners Clarence Stein, Lewis Mumford, Catherine Bauer, Reginald Isaacs, Lloyd Rodwin, Garret Eckbo, and William Wurster. In the early months of 1951 Gropius continued to argue to Sert that CIAM should broaden its base by inviting figures active in planning and housing as well as architecture. In another letter to Sert, Gropius said that they should try to include not only planners such as Isaacs but also sociologists like Louis Wirth of Chicago, whose 1937 essay, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," was a prescient analysis of emerging social patterns in decentralizing American metropolitan areas. Sert replied that he was reluctant to send out letters of invitation because "our American group is completely dispersed" and he thought it would be "rather demoralizing for any newcomer." Nevertheless, Breuer, Chermayeff, Gropius, Guévrékian, Lonberg-Holm, Mies van der Rohe, Muschenheim, Rapson, Eero Saarinen, Sanders, Sert, Stonorov, Wauhsmann, Wiener, Weissmann, and Wurster continued to pay CIAM dues in the USA at this time. At CIAM 8, however, of these American members only Sert, Gropius, Guévrékian, Chermayeff, Lonberg-Holm, and Phillip C. Johnson (who had been asked to join by Giedion) attended, although some other Americans were also listed among "those who attended the Congress."

CIAM 8 took place July 7–14, 1951 at High Leigh, a country house converted into a meeting center in the suburban village of Hoddesdon, about twenty miles north of London. Giedion later described the venue as "that lonely Victorian mansion in Hoddesdon, not far from London though without rail connection to it." Delegates from twenty-two countries and an unknown number of members and students attended the Congress; the official CIAM press release noted that Sert, Giedion, Gropius, Philip Johnson, "director of architecture at the Museum of Modern Art, New York," Le Corbusier, Markelius, Van Eesteren, Vilhelm Lauritzen, Rogers, and Alfred Roth all attended. New members attending included Balkrishna Doshi (b. 1927) from India, Kenzo Tange (b. 1913) from Japan, Michael Scott from Ireland, and A. Neumann from Israel. The talks and commission sessions for delegates were interspersed with tours to the new prefabricated Hertfordshire schools being developed by Charles H. Aslin, to the Festival of Britain, and to the new town of Harlow, designed by Frederick Gibberd.

A proposed schedule issued in April 1951 by the MARS group still listed Emery as giving an opening paper on the "Charte de l'Habitat," and also noted that on the third day "Lewis Mumford is expected to speak." In both the proceedings of the Congress put together by Tyrwhitt and the later book based on the Congress, CIAM 8: The Heart of the City, nothing by Mumford is included and it is Sert's talk on the Core, later revised and retitled "Centres of Community Life," that opens the Congress. Sessions were also held on "The Historical Background of the Core," chaired by Tyrwhitt and featuring a talk by Giedion; "The Human Aspect of the Core," chaired by London planner Arthur Ling, with a talk by Le Corbusier and a presentation on the recently closed Peckham Pioneer Health Center by its director, Dr. G. Scott Williamsion; "The Core and the Arts," chaired by J. M. Richards, who also spoke; and "Architectural Education," which featured a talk by Gropius.

At the meeting of the CIAM Council at the beginning of the Congress, the six permanent commissions established at CIAM 7 were continued, with some renaming. The Athens Charter was removed from their titles, and the phrase "the Core" was added instead, so the first commission, chaired by Le Corbusier, became "Town Planning in the Core." It was also determined that "the official language of the Congress should be English" and that no translation would be provided. French-speaking members were told they "should, however, speak in French if they so preferred." At midweek during the Congress another Council meeting was held where modifications to the CIAM Statutes of 1947 were agreed on. Congresses were to take place every other year, with meetings of the Council and the delegates in the years in between. New CIAM groups were accepted from Germany, headed by Egon Eiermann (1904–1970); Denmark, headed by Vilhelm Lauritzen (1894–1984); and the United Nations (Ernest Weissmann and A. van der Goot). New "groups in formation" were accepted from Portugal, headed by Alfredo Viana de Lima (1913–1990); Israel, headed by A. Neumann; Vancouver, British Columbia, headed by H. Peter Oberlander; and Medellín, Colombia, headed by A. Mesa. The meeting was then expanded to include delegates, and Fred Forbat, representing the Swedish delegation, raised concerns about the CIAM secretariat whose precise nature the minutes do not make clear. At another CIAM Council meeting held on Friday, July 13, 1951, the Council asked that each group provide a list of its membership to the Central Secretariat (Giedion), but acknowledged that "the Council could not be aware of the methods of appointing new members in each group." Groups in formation would pay fees and attend the Congresses, but "only if good work were displayed" at the Congress would they be admitted to full membership. Each group was the responsibility of its delegate, who "has the duty to deprive of their membership anyone who works against CIAM," either by "intrigue" or "by doing work that is contrary to CIAM principles." It was also noted that many groups were not paying CIAM dues, and that warning letters would be sent.

At the same meeting, a new system of junior membership was established, which had been advocated to Giedion by the Dutch delegate Ben Merkelsch.
Student Delegates and Student Groups were to be attached to particular CIAM groups. Christian Norberg-Schultz of Norway, who had studied with Giedion in Zurich, was appointed as the first Student Delegate. In the absence of the Eastern European council members, Helena Syrkus (Poland), Josef Fischer (Hungary), and Josef Havlickè (Czechoslovakia), who were to be sent letters saying they were still considered members of the Council, three new council members were appointed “to serve in the meantime”: Lauritzen from Denmark, and two youth representatives, William Howell of MARS and Georges Candilis (1913-1997) of the Moroccan group, GAMMA. The minutes then noted that since 1953 was the twenty-fifth anniversary of CIAM, “it was agreed that the occasion of the next Congress would be a good opportunity to ‘hand over’ to the younger members.” This was the official beginning of the efforts to revitalize CIAM by turning it over to the “youth members,” efforts that resulted in the formation of Team 10 after CIAM 9.

Of the talks presented at CIAM 8, the most significant was Sert’s opening talk, titled “The Theme of the Congress: The Core” in the unpublished CIAM 8 proceedings. The published version, “Centres of Community Life” differs significantly from the manuscript version in the CIAM archives. In the unpublished version Sert did not connect the theme of the “Core” to CIAM’s continuing application of the principles of the Athens Charter, as he did in the published version. Instead, he emphasized the relevance of the theme in the context of postwar suburbanization. In both versions, however, he followed the MARS group proposal in stating that at five different levels of communal organization, from the village to the residential neighborhood to the town to the city to the metropolis, there should be a special physical environment devoted to expressing the sense of community: the “Core.”

In the talk as given at the Congress, Sert argued that in developing countries, the cores could be places where new technologies such as television screens would soon be available, and this could “put these people in immediate contact with the world.” People without access to radios could “listen to the loud speaker on the public square,” and “could see the images on the television screen,” which would enhance the importance of these places. In the published version, however, Sert followed Giedion’s arguments about community centers in “The Need for a New Monumentality,” justifying these Cores based on their facilitation of direct personal contact and discussion between people:

such civic centers would consolidate [democratic] governments; for the lack of them and the dependence of the people on controlled means of information makes them more easily governable by the rule of the few. The creation of these centers is a government job (federal, State or municipal). These elements cannot be established on a business basis. They are necessary for the city as a whole and even for the nation, and they should be publicly financed.

In the unpublished version of this lecture Sert had ended with a long quotation from the Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset on the deliberate, enclosed separation of the public square of the classical poles from the “geo-botanic cosmos” of the surrounding fields. For Ortega, this “rebellious field” of the square, “in which man frees himself from the community of the plant and the animal” is where he “creates an enclosure apart which is purely human, a civil space.” In the published version the same quotation begins the talk, and frames Sert’s summary of CIAM’s efforts to address issues of urbanism since 1928. Ortega, like Sert, believed that such a square was where the people would come together to interact in ways that would further democratic action. But the structure of the social space within which this interaction would occur be determined by a “natural elite,” an idea of central importance to Ortega, who believed that “elites are necessary.”

In his The Revolt of the Masses, Ortega had argued that the “demoralization of Europe” that had produced Fascism was the result of the decline of traditional elites and the rise of the “mass man,” a hedonist who takes for granted and sees as natural “the whole cosmos of modern life.” Ortega argued that such “mass men,” uninterested in and incapable of sustaining the structures of modern civic life, must be guided by natural elites functioning within a democratic system if Fascism is to be avoided. Aspects of Ortega’s view were widely accepted in postwar Europe seeking to avoid both Stalinism and American cultural and military dominance. By invoking Ortega in his opening address at CIAM 8, Sert seemed to be suggesting that CIAM ought to take such an elite role by working with powerful institutions concerned with shaping the physical environment. Ortega’s concept of natural elites clearly had parallels to Le Corbusier’s view of CIAM as an elite that could bring about social change by guiding physical interventions “for the common good,” and it could provide a continuing justification for CIAM as the avant-garde of modern urbanism. Yet the compromised acceptance of aspects of CIAM’s urbanistic strategies by those in power in the postwar years put the Congress in a vulnerable position. As its prerew ideas about the “Functional City” became commonplace, its position as a vanguard organization became doubtful.

This may have been underscored by the projects displayed at Hoddesdon according to the “MARS Grid,” a simplification of the CIAM Grid. Tyrwhitt had categorized the work according to the five scales of settlement described in Sert’s address, but the results as published were a strange smorgasbord of projects. There were no Italian projects, and again no work by Aalto. In addition to more work of Le Corbusier and Sert and Wiener, some of it already displayed at Bergamo, the other work included was a seemingly random mixture of Scandinavian, Dutch, Belgian, Swiss and British projects along with student work from Britain and the United States. Besides Le Corbusier’s, and Sert and Wiener’s projects, the only other designs from outside of Europe were a project by the new French Moroccan GAMMA group, Kenzo Tange’s...
Hiroshima Peace Center, and a Cuban project by Batista and Beale, which was not included in the publication from this Congress, *ClAM 8: The Heart of the City*.49

As illustrated in this book, the projects were not presented in CIAM grid format. The small plans, sketches, and photographs of architectural models that were provided gave almost no information about either the tectonic aspect or social context of the projects. At the smallest scale, that of the village, the projects were Nagele, a Dutch postwar new town in the newly created North-East Polder by Aldo van Eyck and other members of the Dutch "De 8" group,50 and a design by Norwegian architects Gegenbach and Møllø Christensen for a village center at Koisdal. At the next level of scale, the small town, there was a project for a core in Gustavberg, Sweden, by Olof Thunström (1896–1952), an associate of Eskil Sundahl. Under a subcategory, "core of an urban neighborhood," was a design by students of Serge Chermayeff at the Chicago Institute of Design for a new core as a "modular unit for a typical residential neighborhood." This project was specifically intended for the Lake Meadows high-rise slab project then being designed by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill on the South Side of Chicago.

The projects at the next scale, that of the urban sector, included a design for a "local center" by Pratt Institute students in New York, and a project by the Opbouw group for a "suburb of Rotterdam," the Pendrecht housing project, which had already been shown at CIAM 7 and would be shown again at CIAM 9. Also at the "urban sector" scale was a design for a suburb of Liège, Flemalle Haute, by the Belgian Groupe L'Equerre; a design for a core in a suburb of Oslo by the Norwegian group;48 and a scheme by Architectural Association students for putting the planned population of the new town of Stevenage on half the projected land area through the use of widely spaced high-rises. Two other projects listed as grids shown at CIAM 8, but

not included in the book, were a core for Marcel Lods's massive slab housing project at Sotteville-lès-Rouen and D. P. Reay and associates' core for East Kilbride in Scotland.

At the next scale, "core of a new town," the projects included were Gordon Stephenson's pedestrian center for Stevenage; Le Corbusier's core at St.-Didier; the core at Chimbote, attributed to Wiener and Sert; and the core of a rebuilt squatter settlement outside of Rabat, Morocco, by the CIAM group there, later known as GAMMA (Groupe d'architectes modernes marocains). This group, as Jean-Louis Cohen has documented, had been formed after Vladimir Bodiansky and Marcel Lods lectured in Casablanca at the invitation of Michel Ecochard in November 1949.
Ecochard, director of the Town Planning Department of the French protectorate of Morocco from 1946 to 1952, then sponsored the formation of what was first called the ATBAT-Afrique group, which included Georges Candilis, the Irish-American Shadrach Woods (1923–1973), and others. Much of this work was based on Ecochard's interest in rebuilding bidonvilles, or squatter settlements, by providing a new gridded infrastructure of streets and utility lines, and by building one-story courtyard houses based on an 8 x 8 m grid.42

Included in another subcategory, "search for the core of a city," was a set of same-scale drawings at 1:110,000 comparing the pedestrian cores of Paris, New York, Venice, and London, part of an effort by J. Alauvert, a sociologist at the French Ministry of Reconstruction, with Gobillot, to determine the "actual limits" of the Core of Paris. Along with these were drawings at 1:2000 showing building density, to identify areas "ripe for reconstruction" in Paris. This had originally been the only project listed at the scale of the "Metropolis." At the next level of scale, "the core of a city," the MARS group displayed D. E. E. Gibson and associates' plan for the rebuilding of Coventry, the much-heralded modern reconstruction of the picturesque medieval town destroyed by German bombing in 1940. Also in this category was Kenzo Tange's Hiroshima Peace Center, a park and memorial in the first city destroyed by an atomic bomb, which appears to be the first work by a non-Western architect shown at a CIAM Congress. Tange's scheme, which was completed in 1955, consisted of an Atomic Memorial Museum and flanking buildings sited in a Peace Park on a peninsula in the center of Hiroshima. 43 Tange was still quite young at this time, and the Japanese CIAM representatives at CIAM 8 were Kunio Maekawa (b. 1900), who had worked for Le Corbusier from 1928 to 1930,44 and Junzo Sakakura, who had worked for Le Corbusier from 1931 to 1936 and then designed the Japanese pavilion at the 1937 Paris Exposition. Tange worked for Sakakura from 1938 to 1942 before establishing his own practice after the war.45 Other "core of a city" projects were designs for urban cores in Switzerland, for Basel by Otto Senn and for Lausanne by Wilhelm Vetter; in Providence, by Harvard students of Gropius (Robert Geddes, William Conklin, Martin Sevely, and Ian McHarg);46 and projects for cores in New Haven by Yale students.

Two projects for cores in Colombia by Wiener and Sert were included, a project for Bogotá with Le Corbusier and another for Medellín. 47 In 1947, after the Colombian chairman of the United Nations Organization site selection commission, Dr. Zuleta Ángel, had met Le Corbusier in New York, he had invited Le Corbusier to two conferences in June 1947 on modern architecture and town planning in Bogotá.48 Le Corbusier, Sert, and Wiener seem to have begun negotiations to develop a master plan for Bogotá at this point, with Wiener being the intermediary for Town Planning Associates.49 A Colombian CIAM chapter was set up, with Jorge Gaitán as chief delegate; Sert wrote to Giedion that the group was "the best after Brazil."50
In Colombia the political situation of the CIAM architects was different from that of their prewar collaboration in Barcelona: instead of the close affiliation between GATCPAC and the ruling Republican party that had prevailed in Barcelona, at Bogotá Le Corbusier and Town Planning Associates were brought in as international experts to formulate “apolitical” urbanistic doctrines for the common good, and they avoided local political involvements. Their Bogotá scheme also emphasized different priorities than the earlier GATCPAC Macià plan for Barcelona. There the focus had been on organizing the city’s urban extensions according to the principles of the Functional City, while at Bogotá the architects’ emphasis had changed to the design of the civic center and to the detailed planning implications of the highway system. In the plan, the road network was categorized according to the “7V” system set up by Le Corbusier. V1, V2, and V3 roads were limited-access expressways with adjacent parallel service streets; V4 roads were local shopping streets, described by Wiener and Sert as “lines of intense neon lighting and night life”; V5 and V6 roads were service streets; and V7 roads were pedestrian greenways. The expressways were used to divide the city into thirty-five sectors with populations varying from 25,000 to 70,000, a larger population than for the neighborhood units of previous plans. Each sector would have a local “core,” with schools and other public buildings, and where the local (V4) shopping streets intersected with the (V7) pedestrian greenways.

The Bogotá project was categorized at the “core of a government center” scale in the CIAM 8 publication, along with the project for the new Indian provincial capital of Chandigarh by Le Corbusier, Pierre Jeanneret, and Maxwell Fry, and Jane Drew, who had recently completed the master plan for the new capital of the Punjab. This plan, based in part on earlier plans by Albert Mayer and Mathew Nowicki, also used the 7V system, and called for the creation of 800 x 1200 m sectors housing up to 20,000 people. Sketches and an early plan for Le Corbusier’s Government Center at Chandigarh were also presented.

Despite the new cultural issues raised at Hoddesdon by the presence of projects like Tange’s in Japan and those by Le Corbusier and his associates in Colombia and India, little was said about the new non-European context of this work. True, in the discussion session on July 9, Maekawa had remarked that the “core” in Japan had first developed around palaces and castles, and said the concept still suggested a “closed society” in Japan. Van der Goot complained about the omission in his remarks at a meeting on the last day, where he spoke as a representative on the United Nations. He said that the U.N. was interested in CIAM because it “has had and has a determining influence on the developments in the field of Housing and Planning.” At the same time, “most of its work has been concerned with Western world,” and “its role has been determined by the very best of European thought.” Yet he reminded the delegates that “the present day problems of Housing and Planning...are not limited to Europe.” Asia in particular, with its large share of the world’s population, “presents problems which are both more pressing, and infinitely larger in scale. The future of the world will depend on the extent to which it will prove possible to improve conditions in the underdeveloped areas.” In this light he was critical of CIAM’s “hardly applicable” preoccupations with the core, and suggested if it could redirect its work to include the problems of other regions of the world than the Western it “might gain in scope and effectiveness.”

The discussions, reports, and resolutions of CIAM 8, however, make it clear that the delegates did not approach Asia or the developing world as something socially different from the Western world. In the opening discussion Le Corbusier had made the comment that the “final question is how men group themselves, and why.” He argued that the job of architects is “to create a physical synthesis of the social life and basic economics” of an area. Bakema elaborated by saying that architects needed to attempt to “crystallize in some form” such elements of collective social life as do exist: “We must give physical expression to ideals in order to stimulate demand.” These remarks were followed by Giedion’s talk on “Historical Background of the Core,” in which he placed the concept in a Western tradition going back to ancient Greece. During the session on “The Human Aspect of the Core,” Gropius defined the problem as “creating demand” for what architects have to offer. He gave the example of Harvard students who at first found the “core” concept inappropriate. He discovered that “they had never seen such a thing” and were then “deeply impressed by Italian piazzas.” Richards had begun the discussion on “The Core and the Arts” by invoking “The Core as the repository of the group’s collective memory,” and as the place where “resides the personality that distinguishes one place from another,” which he connected to the need for planners “to see that old buildings have a proper relationship with new elements.” This was a sentiment shared by Peressutti, who remarked on how important it was “not to destroy such cores as we have.”

For the most part, the sixteen papers and two group discussions based on the Hoddesdon open sessions remained on a directive and somewhat abstract level. In one discussion Le Corbusier is quoted as asserting that “CIAM should not start by questioning the need for a core,” and he used a story of Honegger’s about North Africans not wanting to move into houses with running water because “the women no longer had a pretext for going to the well.” Van Eesteren is quoted as opening the first “Conversation at CIAM 8” by stating that the important question to ask was “where, within the urban complex, is the right place for the Core.” In response to Tywhat’s question about whether open marketplaces should remain in Cores, Le Corbusier replied that “theoretically it is not a center of the design of Cores, and that CIAM should work for the people of the
town, not the tourist.” Reay’s comment that the Scottish climate “makes it almost impossible for people to gather in the open air” was answered by Giedion’s invocation of the squares of Bloomsbury, adding “the important thing is that, even if the first things are small, they should be on the right spot.”

Among the contributions to the published volume, Neutra’s “A New Community Core in California” is notable. It is a presentation of his and Robert Alexander’s plan for the demolished site of a functioning, and by all accounts fairly vital, Mexican-American settlement called Chavez Ravine, which was to be replaced by a massive Los Angeles City Housing Authority project to be called Elysian Park Heights. The new project was to be a mixture of 163 two-story buildings and 24 thirteen-story slab blocks; the high buildings were justified in classic Corbusian terms as a way of creating urbanity while leaving the maximum possible amount of the site open. The community core of the new development was to be a large community hall facing a plaza, along with a “natural, bowl-shaped auditorium for thousands.” Other significant contributions included London planner William Holford’s detailed paper on “The Commercial Core of London,” which noted that despite supportive planning legislation, in rebuilding London “hardly any opportunities have been matched with an architectural skill of equal calibre.” Le Corbusier’s “The Core as a Meeting Place of the Arts,” which discussed his recent design work; Gropius’s “The Human Scale”; Ian McCallum’s “Spontaneity at the Core,” and the Swedish historian Gregor Paulsson’s “The Past and the Present,” which explained the need for the core from the viewpoint of human ecology.

For the later history of CIAM, the most significant parts of the CIAM 8 volume were probably Giedion’s brief discussion of Van Eyck’s Amsterdam playgrounds in “The Historical Background of the Core,” and Dutch representative Jacob B. Bakema’s often-quoted “Relations between Men and Things,” in which he suggested that rather than being a specific space, perhaps the core that they all sought occurred when the isolation of man from things becomes destroyed: in that moment we discover the wonder of relationship between man and things. That is the moment of CORE: the moment in which we become aware of the fullness of life by cooperative action. . . . For us in CIAM the relations between things and within things are of greater importance than the things themselves. One can express this awareness of relationships, and one can also predict how they may develop.

This emphasis on relationships rather than fixed forms began to open CIAM discussion to the ideas that Bakema and Van Eyck would contribute to Team 10, but were only barely present in the deliberations at Hoddesdon.

Though the definition of the Core remained vague, and numerous divergent comments were made in the open sessions and written reports submitted to the Congress, Tyrwhitt, Sert, Giedion, and Rogers continued to emphasize the “self-evident” need for a core in the published proceedings. CIAM 8: The Heart of the City concluded with a “Summary of Needs at the Core” by Giedion, which asserted that there should be only one main core in each city, and that the core should be secure from traffic. He also proposed that advertising in it should be organized and controlled, and that in planning it in cooperation with painters and sculptors, the architect should “employ contemporary means of expression,” including mobile elements.

In theme the “Heart of the City” Congress was the most significant of the postwar Congresses, one of the earliest efforts to discuss the issue of urban public space in the transformed circumstances of modern architecture after the war. It was perhaps the first expression of what would become major preoccupations with architect-designed public gathering places in the work of Victor Gruen, Kevin Lynch, and many others in the following decades. CIAM 8 can be seen as a reference point for the new forms of public space, including shopping malls, renewed downtowns, and theme parks, that came to characterize urbanism in the rapidly decentralizing cities of the 1950s and later. As the first Congress after the beginning of the Cold War, CIAM 8 was also part of the postwar CIAM effort to find some new basis for an architecture of social collectivity other than socialism, a result in part of the declining appeal of Soviet Communism in Western democracies by 1950; In combining the Italian and Polish groups’ focus on historic centers with Le Corbusier, Sert, and Wiener’s fascination with the design of new monumental cores, CIAM 8 suggested a basis for modern architecture going beyond the design of social housing, one that looked both backward to the classical tradition and forward to a later generation’s interest in reconstituting urbanity in late-twentieth-century cities.

In Search of “Habitat”: Sigtuna, Sweden, 1952

CIAM 8 had ended inconclusively, a Congress described by Giedion afterwards as only a “light background sketch for a future painting.” It had not attempted to produce the Charter of Habitat called for by Le Corbusier at CIAM 7, although the Dutch Opbouw group, represented by W. Wissing and Hans Hovens Greve, had offered a suggested outline of principles for it at Hoddesdon. Despite a postwar atmosphere favorable to modern architecture and town planning, in the six years since the end of the Second World War CIAM had been unable to regain its avant-garde role in Europe. At the same time it also appeared to be losing the participation of the Latin American groups. No member of these groups was represented on the CIAM Council, the new governing structure put in place after CIAM 6.