

THE SIXTH SOUTH-SOUTH FORUM ON SUSTAINABILITY

Lingnan University Hong Kong, E-Lecture July 3rd 2019

Architecture and Geo Politics

Eka Swadiansa

principal@studio-osa.com

ACT 1: CIAM and The Genesis of Collective-ideals

It is remarkably ironic; how in the good way –one of the most devastating time in the human history- could have granted our world, the architecture world, one of its finest generation of architects. 1914-18 were the years of the World War I (WWI); an unprecedented event throughout the history of humankind. Our species had long witnessed warlords, tyrants, conquerors, dynasties of emperors came and gone. But never had before destruction spread out continually and simultaneously in the continental level. 1 year after Treaty of Versailles was signed to end the wars; The Communist International gathered in Moscow, and then the next year in Moscow and Baku. 1928, just 8 years after the founding of communist *Internationale*; 29 architects gathered in La Sarraz, 26 of which then signed the declaration that gave birth to *Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne* (CIAM), the first architect-*Internationale*?

Organized by Karl Moser (was 68 years of age at the time), and Sigfried Giedion (40) through the call of Le Corbusier (41); at least half of those participated in the event was already bare excellent worldwide reputation: Hendrik Petrus Berlage (72), Victor Bourgeois (31), Pierre Chareau (45), Sven Markelius (39), Josef Frank (43), Gabriel Guevrekian (36), Max Ernst Haefeli (27), Hugo Haring (46), Arnold Hoechel (39), Huib Hoste (47), Pierre Jeanneret (32), Andre Lurcat (34), Ernst May (42), Max Ludwig Cetto (25), Fernando Garcia Mercadal (32), Hannes 'Hans Emil' Meyer (39), Werner Max Moser (32), Carlo Enrico Rava (25), Gerrit Thomas Rietveld (40), Alberto Sartoris (27), Hans Schmidt (35), Mart Stam (29), Rudolf Steiger (28), Szymon Syrkus (35), Henri-Robert Von der Muhll (30), and Juan de Zavala (26). Another 3 delegates: Lazar Markovich 'El' Lissitzky, Nikolai Dzhemsovich Kolli (34), and Moisei Yakovlevich Ginzburg (36) were supposed to attend the congress and represent USSR but were unable to obtained visa. Putting the excellent portfolios embodied by each of these individuals aside; the fact that they would all made the effort to gather in the first place –especially under world war recovery time frame- was, in itself a remarkable course of history. Moreover the fact how in average, CIAM I participants were only aged 37.

Throughout the architecture history, CIAM was among one of the –if not the most- important movement of architects ever. Spreading throughout 11 congresses in 31 years life-span; the movement had become both fundamental and influential not only to the practices of their generation, but also to the development of theories taught to the many generations after. From 'style-technical discourses' on its founding congress, to CIAM II's minimum dwelling focus (Frankfurt, 1929), and CIAM III's rational land development focus (Brussels, 1930); the movement then shifted its focus towards urbanism, the unchartered realm where architects could no longer worked as individuals.

Meanwhile at the same time, the world entered the Great Depression period. 1933, President Roosevelt launched the New Deal (3Rs Acts) stimulus worth USD 500 million (in 1933 purchasing power scale). The world was facing economic turmoil! 1 year later, even in the fear of long-coming project famine, CIAM gathered once again. Supposedly held in Moscow; the rise of ideological tensions in

Europe –and perhaps also resulted from Le Corbusier’s proposal rejection on the ‘Palace of the Soviet’s Competition’- congress location was shifted to Marseille. Onboard *SS Patris II*; CIAM held its fourth congress on a cruise from Marseille to Athens, focused on the function of the city. Prior to CIAM IV, Le Corbusier; one of the most prominent symbol of the congress started to distance himself from the movement. A decade later he controversially self-published ‘Athens Charter’, his version of heavily self-edited proceedings of that particular congress. Nonetheless this ‘highly authoritarian-congress interpretation’ had since considered by many as one of the most important legacy of CIAM.

1934, at the same year with CIAM IV, Hitler took full control of Germany as *Fuhrer und Reichskanzler*. 1936 Mussolini agreed to Hitler’s terms and signed the Berlin-Rome Axis treaty. At the same year *Anti-Comintern* Pact was signed between Germany and Japan. The next year CIAM reassembled in Paris and executed their fifth congress on the focus of dwelling (war) recovery. At the same year Italy joint the Germany-Japan pact to form fully functional Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. 2 years later Inter War Period ended, World War II (WWII) ignited, with both Pact of Steel and *Tripartite* Pact formalized the integration of the Axis (and their colonial) military powers. The war then soon spread throughout 3 continents. While CIAM never really had the chance to properly test their new theories into realized projects. Many of its members fled Europe, taking refuge in the United States.

1943, in the height of WWII the Japanese government held the ‘Greater East Asia Conference’ in Tokyo to, perhaps, foster the formation of Co-prosperity sphere *Internationale*; of which arguably –like how the Communist *Internationale* in 1919-1920 then gave birth to USSR in 1922- hoped to pushed the founding of greater federation states i.e. East Asia Union/United States of East Asia. Meanwhile in the other side of the globe, in 1944, as the world war was about to be won; 730 economists from all 44 Allied nations participated in the Bretton Woods Conference in New Hampshire. The conference which was then became the launch-pad of Keynesian economy gave birth to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). At the time, the vision was clear. Learning from Treaty of Versailles failures; no country (or group of countries) should be blame for the war casualties, especially of its economic debts. Hence to prevent another world war from happening, IBRD and IMF were created as global joint-venture –an economic *Internationale*- to reconstruct world’s (post-war) economy; of victors or otherwise. The next year the World Bank was established.

2 years after the establishment of World Bank (and with it marking the beginning of Keynesian Economy), CIAM gathered in Bridgwater and launched their sixth congress focusing on the reaffirmation issue of the movement, operating under new president Josep Lluís Sert (45). Then on 1949 in Bergamo –just 4 years after the war ended, 16 years after the *SS Patris II* cruise- CIAM revisited their long overdue agenda and held their seventh congress focused on ‘the Athens Charter practices’. Prior to CIAM VII, the movement were back to its consistent cycle with: CIAM VIII’s city center focus (Hoddesdon, 1951), CIAM IX’s habitat focus (Aix-en, 1953) habitat focus, and CIAM X’s habitat focus (Dubrovnik, 1956); before then disbanded on 1959 in Otterlo, Netherlands.

ACT 2: TEAM X the Rebel, Reformist, or Purist-puppets?

Discussing TEAM X, one could never help quoting Shakespeare:

“Et tu Brute?”

Most core members of TEAM X were present in Aix-en's CIAM IX. Although their attendance were under the official capacity of their respective nationalities; Jaap Bakema (42), George Candilis (43), Rolf Gutmann (30), Peter Smithson (33), Alison Smithson (28), Aldo van Eyck (38), John Voelcker (29), and Shadrach Woods (33) were already considered by many as representation of 'CIAM's young guns'. First four on the list were then tasked to organize the next coming congress under the name of 'CIAM X Committee (CIAX)' which then eventually expanded to the full 8-member list with Bill Howell (34), and Gill Howell (29) came in later on, resulting to the formation of the 10-member CIAX. In 1956 when the tenth congress was held, the age of CIAX averaged 34. Under the growing tensions between the older and younger generation of CIAM; Bakema (45), Candilis (46), and Voelcker (32), were chosen along with non-CIAX Ernesto Rogers (50), Alfred Roth (56), and Andre Wogenscky (43) as CIAM 59 Ad Hoc Committee responsible for organizing the eleventh congress. In 1959 when the eleventh congress was held, the age of Ad Hoc Committee averaged 45. Thus it was becoming evidential how 59 Ad Hoc was created to 'neutralize' the young guns. However in the age of rapid changes where the creation of a new world played as mass media's major propaganda –in the time setting when Asian African Conference (AAC) was just held 4 years earlier and the first Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) 1st conference only a year away- CIAM's 3 decades old ideals stood no chance of survival.

Long-serving as an ultimate symbol for faint-hearted betrayal; at first glance, the infamous line from Julius Caesar's: “Even you, Brutus?” had seemed portrayed the perfect analogy. But on the second thought, one realized the fundamental differences between the two; of Brutus and TEAM X. Where Brutus was acting under his own self-interest, TEAM X was; like AAC and NAM, arguably fighting for new ideals. Hence all of these mishaps was not about Caesar and Brutus, but perhaps better understood as Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy* –of the Dionysian and the Apollonian- or rather the other way around. As clearly stated on its 1928 declaration, CIAM was working under its self-invented systems. It was the genesis of collective ideals of which perhaps, would later be best exemplified in the 1932 MoMA's International Style exhibition curated by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and world's first Pritzker Laurette: Phillip Johnson. Highlights of the statements from the original declaration were includes:

[From the preamble, paragraph 2] ... *The destiny of architecture is to express the orientation of the age. Works of architecture can spring only from the present time.* [paragraph 3] *They therefore refuse categorically to apply in their working methods means that may have been able to illustrate past societies ...* [paragraph 4] *Thus architecture must be set free from the sterilizing grip of the academies that are concerned with preserving the formulas of the past ...* [Point I. 2.] *The idea of “economic efficiency” does not imply production furnishing maximum commercial profit, but production demanding a minimum working effort ...* [Point I. 5. a.] *they demand of architecture conception leading to simplification of working methods on the site and in the factory ...* [Point I. 6.] *Following the dissolution of the guilds, the collapse of the class of skilled craftsmen is an accomplished fact. The inescapable consequence of the development of the machine has led to industrial methods of production different from and often opposed to those of the craftsmen. Until recently, thanks to the teaching of the academies, the architectural conception has been inspired chiefly by methods of craftsmen and not by the new industrial methods. This contradiction explains the profound disorganization of the art of building.* [Point I. 7.] *It is urgently necessary for architecture, abandoning the outmoded conceptions connected with the class of craftsmen, henceforth to rely upon the*

present realities of industrial technology, even though such attitude must perforce lead to products fundamentally different from those of past epochs.

Advocating the spirit of place or sometimes also referred as the sense of place; TEAM X was definitely the oxymoronic counter-balance of CIAM. Moreover both groups were also operated in contrasting formats. Where CIAM was organized in formal congresses with participants strictly representing groups of nationality (like in UN assembly or the Olympic Games), TEAM X meetings was more resembling family gatherings; informal but intimate, less bureaucratic hence often managed to touched deeper discourses, and most importantly only consisted of few 'inner-circle', allowing the organization of more fluid discussions. Another fundamental differences between the two was, where CIAM members were already 'big names' in the architecture scenery, TEAM X were 'only' consisted of mostly emerging practitioners. As the result; discussions generated in the meetings were often more practical and less utopian, and ultimately went further away from high level urbanism talks towards more technical architectural issues.

TEAM X 1st Meeting took place in 1960, just 1 year after the dissolution of CIAM on Bagnois-sur-Ceze. The meeting directly formed the team's inner-circle which consisted of Bakema, Candilis, van Eyck, the Smithsons, and Woods. Gutmann from the original CIAX was replaced by Voelcker in the 59 Ad Hoc whom in turn decided not to join the team, but then introduced Giancarlo de Carlo whom joined the team on 1966 and had since became one of TEAM X's most important member. In the year of its founding, core members' age were averaged 40. The first 10 TEAM X meetings were executed in just 7 years period. This shows how aggressive discourse-generation was attempted. 2nd Meeting on statement preparation (Paris, France/1961), 3rd Meeting on the team concept (London, 1961), 4th Meeting on *Team 10 Primer* publication (Drottningholm, 1962), 5th Meeting on urban infrastructure (Royaumont, 1962), 6th Meeting on *Royaumont* publication (Paris, 1963), 7th Meeting on TH Delft InDeSem Workshop (Delft, 1964), 8th Meeting's light discussions (Berlin, 1965), 9th Meeting on motorcar intervention (Urbino, 1966), and 10th Meeting on restatement on the team's convictions (Paris, 1967) marked the 'first-cycle' of TEAM X aggressive activities of which concluded in *Team 10 Primer 2nd* edition publication by the MIT Press, and participation invitation to the 1968 Milan Triennale which eventually hosted the 11th Meeting. Although maintained up to another 6 more meetings –the 12th Meeting on changing political conditions (Toulouse, 1971), 13th Meeting on TEAM X Cornell Workshop (Ithaca, 1971-72), 14th Meeting on matrix (conviction) formulation (Berlin, 1973), 15th Meeting on architectural responsibility (Rotterdam, 1974), 16th Meeting on participation and meaning of the past (Spoleto, 1976), and 17th Meeting on the future of TEAM X (Bonnieux, 1977)- formed the 'second-cycle' of meetings in much less-aggressive frequency. Presumably the 'slowing-down' of TEAM X was directly caused by its core-members career development; in particularly to Alison/Peter Smithsons' development of New Brutalism in the Great Britain, and Jaap Bakema/Aldo van Eyck development of Structuralism in the Netherland. Eventually the dissolution of TEAM X happened in 1981 after the passing of its central figure, Jaap Bakema.

Nevertheless CIAM was the Apollonian whom sworn oath to restore order; of which might be very loosely defined as the over-simplification of architecture – of design and construction methods. However it is equally important to always reflect genesis back to its time-context; that is to say, to analyze the external-conditions that revolved around the group's productive years. In CIAM's case, their generation was the product of Inter War Period whom witnessed the vast military industrialization enhancement and urged access towards fast-track civilization reconstruction methods. TEAM X on the other hand, was the Post War generation. The new generation that has the time-luxury to think deeper and touch intangible realms such as 'the Spirit of the Place'. During its development, many CIAM

members were forced to migrate across Atlantic in order to survive. Within TEAM X's golden years, the Cold War had just begun. But it was a proxy war where physical conflicts were far away from home. Thus TEAM X was definitely the Dionysian, the generation that brought chaos. Not necessarily by means of self-proclaimed apocalypse, but most likely as conditioned by the context of their time. Because ironically; as life becoming more ordered, people then have time to think about other things, chaos included. But does architects then condemned to act/react precisely as how they are pre-conditioned by the contexts of their time? Or had avant-gardes(ism) always been crafted milieu-less(ly)? Stood out from the CIAM-TEAM X epochs; Le Corbusier, the very man responsible for the founding of the congresses and whom had long gone before CIAX generation emerged might gave a third thought.

Villa Savoye (1929-31) played pivotal role in the curation of 1932 MoMA's International Style exhibition. It was, and undeniably is, one of the best representation of International Style – the most aggressive sub-style modern architecture could offer. The two, CIAM and International Style; were like the two sides of a coin. Le Corbusier's preceding *Five Points of Architecture* (1920s) completed his contribution to the style with solid manifesto. Of discourses and practices he became a prophetic figure to both the congresses and style. But he then changed his mind. Something in the war (WWII) made him change. 1947, the year Josep Lluís Sert took command of CIAM, Le Corbusier started to work on *Unité d'Habitation* in Marseille. 1950, he simultaneously started working on his *magnus-opus* Chapelle Notre Dame du Haut. 1952 and 1954 he respectively completed both projects. Displaying –bold, messy or rather honest look of unfinished concrete- he was suddenly an International Style advocate no more.

What came after were *Maison du Brésil* (1957), *Couvent de La Tourette* (1957-60), and his last unfinished legacy (portion of the) *Firminy Vert* (1964-1969). Through these few last works, it was becoming evidential how his architecture went even further-away from both CIAM and International Style. And as strange as it seemed; he then became (as latterly retrospectively proclaimed by Reyner Barnham) the father of Brutalism, inspiration to TEAM X. Le Corbusier was undeniably the master-guru of both CIAM/TEAM X; pioneer of both International Style and Brutalism. He was the Gemini of his time, an Apollonian and Dionysian at the same time. The man who introduced authoritarian-order and freewill-chaos to the architecture world. A purist who would not be dictated by the contexts of his age. A true avant-gardes who was consistently searching for meanings, who know not of fame-driven comfort zone, who had arrived at celebrity-stage but was brave enough to make radical change. Nevertheless he was the puppet master of two great movements.

ACT 3: GSD-UDC the Trans-Atlantic Crossover

Revisiting CIAM'59 one wonders how—such great group, or rather, if further referenced to the International Style collectively advocated by its widely influential core members; movement- could had been dissolved by group of young guns. Had Le Corbusier played such vital role; so vital that the group started to crumble soon after he abandoned Aix-en congress (CIAM IX, 1953)? But Corbusier had started to distance himself way before, presumably just after the war ended in Bridgewater (CIAM VI, 1947). He had even started developing many disagreement with other core-members as early as *SS Patris II* cruise (CIAM IV, 1933). That was precisely why he then published his own-version of Athens Charter. Hence even though Le Corbusier played such central figure; CIAM was definitely not a one-man-show event. Such explained why the group could have survived such intense formalistic relationship in more than 3 decades period. Therefore, could had the dissolution of CIAM been somehow deliberately engineered to achieved other means of goals?

The 'power distribution' practiced in CIAM could be traced way back to its founding year in La Sarraz (CIAM I, 1928). Back then, Le Corbusier had just started sketching Villa Savoye. Nonetheless he had already completed Maison la Roche 5 years earlier, so at the time he was already a super-star. However could his star be bright enough to attract —numerous other important figures in the field, whom mostly of his age (40s), hence were already became serious competitors to him and to each other- to attend the first congress? Probably not. Speculatively speaking, it might be Karl Moser (CIAM's first president, aged 68 on 1928) whom actually played 'the godfather role'. With Moser positioned as the man behind the scene, only then the scenes could make a lot of senses; successfully assembling another 2 dozens of finest architects from all over Europe, approximately 20-30 years younger than himself; with the addition of one very special senior participant from his own generation: Hendrik Petrus Berlage. Following the logic of this speculation, then Le Corbusier was conclusively Karl Moser's left hand (not the other way around); his free-spirited symbol. And to complete the formation, on the other side of the table there apparently be the opposite but equally important figure, Moser's right hand: Sigfried Giedion the administrator.

Sigfried Giedion was CIAM's first secretary general, and a good friend to Helene de Mandrot, the owner of La Sarraz castle where the first congress was hosted. Differs to Le Corbusier who had solid practitioner background, Giedion was a theorist. Hypothetically, with his 'formal position' as the second person in charge of the congress (after Moser, not Corbusier); it could have been him whom responsible in bringing in the other theorists to the group, most notably Walter Gropius in CIAM II (1929). Following the logic of the speculation, this could has been the caused to the many deadlocks took place in CIAM IV – the endless debates between the practitioners and the academia. Nevertheless Giedion had maintained good relationship with Gropius throughout his years in prewar CIAM, even after Gropius moved from Berlin to London, and then exiled to Cambridge-Mass. 1938, 1 year after CIAM V was held in Paris; Giedion escaped Europe through Gropius aid. It was such close encounter, just 1 year before the war broke. Supposedly with Gropius recommendation as the chairman of the Department of Architecture, Giedion was appointed for Charles Eliot Norton visiting professor position at Harvard University; before then transferred to the GSD and stayed for another 7 years. 1941, he published his first 2 years lecture materials in a book entitled *Space, Time, and Architecture: the Growth of a New Tradition* through Harvard University Press. Later the book became one of the most important theoretical works in the age of modern architecture. 1947, 2 years after the war ended, Giedion returned to Switzerland and became the headmaster of ETH Zurich. A year later he published another important book of his, *Mechanization Takes Command: a Contribution to Anonymous History* through Oxford University Press. He stayed in Europe for another 2 years before returning to the United States to teach at the MIT (1951), and shortly after Gropius retired, back to the GSD (1954-1956).

Walter Gropius had met Le Corbusier long before CIAM I. 1908 young Gropius (25) was working for Peter Behrens (40) for 3 years. Then there he had not only met Le Corbusier (21), but also Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe (22). Where Giedion was pure theorist, Gropius was great both as theorist and designer. But his drawings was not that good hence upon practicing he always relayed on collaborative works. His first successful collaboration happened on his first practice in Berlin with Adolf Meyer right after leaving Behrens. This practice however stopped operating just 4 years later when WWI broke. 1919, 1 year after the war ended, presumably through Behren's 'Neues Bauen-circle' recommendation; Gropius was appointed as the first Bauhaus headmaster in Weimar. This experimental school (of building) was a combination of architecture school, crafts school, and academy of the art; and later known as one of the best design school in the history; capable of assembling exceptional faculties which among others includes: Paul Klee, Johannes Itten, Josef Albers, Herbert Bayer, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Otto Bartning, and Wassily Kandisky. 1925, Gropius collaborated with Carl Fieger, and Ernst Neufert to design Bauhaus Dessau; the school that then exhibited in MoMA's 1932 International Style Exhibition alongside Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye, and Mies' Expo'29 German Pavillion. 1928, the year CIAM founded; Gropius left Bauhaus to started another collaborative practice. His position was replaced by Hannes Meyer, one of CIAM founder present in La Sarraz. 1929, Gropius participated in CIAM II presumptively invited by Giedion to among others strengthen the theorist faction while Le Corbusier invited among others Alvar Aalto for the practitioner faction. The three –Gropius, Corbusier, and Aalto; with the addition of Frank Lloyd Wright, were often considered as the father of modern architecture- with Giedion not necessarily included within the (modernist) circle, but rather as historian who had made important contribution in documenting as well as interpreting the movement. Meanwhile back at Dessau, 1930 Mies replaced Meyer. 1932, Bauhaus was forced to move to Berlin, before then completely closed down a year later.

1933 was the year Nazi Germany rose to power. As of Bauhaus and Mies, Gropius was also trapped in Berlin. 1934, through the aid of Maxwell Fry, Gropius fled to London. 1936, Harvard University founded its GSD by combining 3 of its majors: architecture, urban planning, and landscape architecture. 1937 Gropius migrated to the United States and appointed as GSD Chair of the Department of Architecture. At that same year Mies migrated to Chicago and chaired the IIT School of Architecture. Later on that year, as department chair, Gropius whom failed in persuading Fry to join him in the United States, invited his Bauhaus protégé Marcel Breur; whom prior to migration, soon set up collaborative office with him in Lincoln-Mass. The next year the 2 completed the famous Gropius House. In practice, the success of Gropius-Breur collaboration were extended for many years to come, until in 1946; Gropius moved to much larger architectural collaboration through the establishment of 'The Architects' Collaborative/TAC'; considered by many as one of the most respected architecture firm in the history of modern world. Academically, the Gropius-Breur collaboration had also been successful in educating excellent pupils; resulting to birth of GSD's exceptional next generation of architects which includes: Paul Rudolph, Eliot Noyes, Ieoh Ming Pei (1983 Pritzker Laurette), Ulrich Franzen, John Johansen, and Phillip Johnson (1979 Pritzker Laurette, and 1932 MoMA International Style curator). 1952 Gropius retired from GSD, and was replaced by Josep Lluís Sert.

Josep Lluís Sert first met Le Corbusier right after receiving his undergrad major. It was 1929 when he moved from Barcelona to Paris to work in Corbusier's office. The next year Sert returned to Barcelona and established his own practice, and enjoyed successful early-career for another 7 years while simultaneously co-founded GATPAC which later became GATEPAC; the Spanish branch of CIAM. Notable works during these years were Barcelona Master Plan (1933-1935), the El Garaaf week-end house (1935), and the Spanish Republic's pavilion at the Paris Expo '37 which then brought him back to Paris. Sert was also known to have close friendship with notable Spanish artists such as: Pablo Picasso, Joan Miro, and Alexander Calder; relationships which later fruited to numerous collaborative works. During these years, Nazi Germany were already building up tenses in Europe; started from the

propaganda war built around 1936 Berlin (Summer) Olympics, followed by aggressions to Austria (1938); an event which forced Sert to moved back to Barcelona. 1939 Nazi Germany invaded Czechoslovakia and Poland; WWII broke. That same year Sert exiled to New York, where he was accepted in the NYC Town Planning Association; the office which then gave him the chance to worked on numerous city Master Plans in Latin America. From here on Sert developed exceptional reputation as excellent theorist, designer, and even practitioner. He might not be arguably as good as Giedion, Gropius, or Corbusier in their respective expertise, but he was altogether 'the complete package'. After the war ended, he traveled back and forth across the Atlantic and eventually appointed president of CIAM in 1947; possibly through Giedion's recommendation whom also returned to Europe that same year. During these post-war years, CIAM was also arguably grew more and more American-centric. While maintaining presidency, Sert himself remained active in the United States; where he took visiting professor position at Yale University in 1952, and dean of GSD a year later to replace the retired Walter Gropius.

Sert's arrival in the GSD was instrumental. After undergone more than one and a half decades of Bauhaus, or rather, Gropius-centric curriculum; one of the most radical policy he made happened as early as 1954, just a year after resumed power when he brought Giedion and another great theorist: Eduard Sekler back to the school. His goal was clear; to re-establish not only critics, but also history courses scraped out under the previous regime. The best part was that Sert could, however, accomplished this goal without 'offending' Gropius whom were still at the time, very much influential in GSD moreover in the broader network of American academia. 1956, CIAX exhibited their power within CIAM X in Dubrovnik. At the same year –with numerous 'more senior post-Corbusier' CIAM members and protégés already migrated to the United States- through his pivotal position in the GSD, Sert orchestrated the 1st Urban Design Conference (GSD-UDC). Playing central role, Sert was supported by not one, but two godfathers: Walter Gropius, and Sigfried Giedion whom both figures presumably resumed Karl Moser's 'behind the scene-roles' in the first CIAM congress. The Giedion-Sert formation also indicated strong relation to CIAM; with the earlier played the congresses' central figure before WWII, and the later was at the time, an active president of the group. In another words, speculatively speaking, the presence of both Giedion and Sert in the conference had successfully transferred CIAM ideals from Europe (in particularly of the earlier French/Switzerland-centric) to the United States. Thus in 1959, as the Dutch/English-centric younger factions were breaking out of CIAM, there was no more reason to keep the congresses alive. That is to analogically saying; TEAM X had not really won the battle against the senior faction. On the contrary, CIAM was voluntarily disbanded.

Organized by Josep Lluís Sert (54), and Sigfried Giedion (68) possibly through the (symbolic) call of Walter Gropius (73); almost all participants in the event were of excellent worldwide reputation: representing Harvard University: Jacqueline Tyrwhitt (51), Charles Haar (36), Eduard Sekler (36); representing MIT: Frederick Johnston Adams (54), Gyorgy Keppes (50), Lloyd Rodwin (37); representing Princeton University: Robert Geddes (33); representing University of Michigan: William Muschenheim (54); representing the practitioners were policy makers: David Leo Lawrence (67), Charles Abrams (55); architect: Richard Neutra (64); planners: Ladislav Segoe (62), Edmund Bacon (46); landscape architects: Garrett Eckbo (55), Hideo Sasaki (37), and (independent) critics: Lewis Mumford (61), Jane Jacobs (40). In average, GSD-UDC 1 participants were aged 52. Spreading throughout 10 conferences in 11 years life-span; the annual conference series was always held in GSD under the following different focuses: 1st GSD-UDC on introduction to Urban Design (1956), 2nd GSD-UDC on defining Urban Design (1957), 3rd GSD-UDC on early case studies (1959), 4th and 5th GSD-UDC on localized case studies (1959, 1961), 6th and 7th GSD-UDC on intercity growth (1962, 1963), 8th GSD-UDC on social-politic-economic issues (1964), 9th and 10th GSD-UDC on design education (1965, 1966).

Following logic of the speculation, the GSD-UDC could be proven somehow 'more mature' than CIAM and TEAM X altogether. As conference series, in one hand GSD-UDC was less formal than

CIAM which was formatted as congress between groups of nation representatives (presumably like the UN assembly); hence it could paid more focus on content-related matters. On the other hand, it is also more formal than TEAM X's family meeting; hence it could set more solid roadmap and achieved more objective goals. Member backgrounds played the next important differences. CIAM were dominated by practitioners, of which in turn, presumably lacked of systematic thinking; characteristics which often embodied by academia. As the group was composed by numerous 'big players', along the way CIAM possessed very strong case studies. However in a time when systematic urbanism was still a new thinking –evidentially through the group theoretical works such as Athens Charter- the framework presented failed to materialize into systematic theories. TEAM X did however, tried to bridge the two realms (of practitioner and academia) by bringing in their discourses inside the campus domains; most notably through their 7th (TH Delft), 10th (MIT), and 13th (Cornell University) Meetings. But again, the formats of these meetings were set on workshop/book publication agendas more resembling sporadic events rather than holistic theory-making process. The Urban Design Conference however, was executed in a whole different level. As it was set upon annual agenda, and organized under 'one-roof system' with single definitive host: the GSD; the consistency of the conferences was notable through the repeated milestones achieved along the way, when: (i) 1959, just 3 years after its founding, the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urbanism was established to worked in parallel to the conferences but on more regular-continuous bases, (ii) The next year (1960), Harvard GSD established Urban Design program, the first in the world, and (iii) As the conference series was concluded on 1966, set of curriculum studies was already completed to fundamentally differentiate (thus define) Urban Design from other urban-related programs, especially to Urban Planning.

Non-technical issues also played important roles in pushing GSD-UDC's productivity rate. First there were the geographical and timeframe milieus. CIAM and TEAM X were both Eurocentric; but as the earlier was assembled during interwar period, it suffered a lot of setbacks throughout WWII. The fact that TEAM X was active throughout postwar period was an advantage, however with most senior experts and their protégés were already migrated across the Atlantic; discourses would presumably not have been debated up to their maximum potencies. As the 19th century Eurocentric world was shifting towards 20th century Americanism; GSD-UDC on the other hand was positioned on the right place at the right time. Generally speaking the conferences were a kind of 'distraction-free' from the events happened in Europe (or in this case anywhere else in the world) – 1956 Hungarian revolution, 1956-57 Suez Crisis, 1957 Afro-Asia People's Solidarity Conference in Cairo, 1961 construction of Berlin Wall and Belgrade Conference; with perhaps with 1962 Cuba Missile Crisis as the only exception.

Second there was the age-group factor. Participant average age of the first CIAM/TEAM X/GSD-UDC congress/meeting/conference in 1928/1960/1956 were respectively: 37, 40, and 52; to be furtherly concluded with CIAM and TEAM X as both founded by subjects who were at their 40s and GSD-UDC at their 50s. Speculatively speaking, the 2 different age-groups marked the different characteristics of the subjects on their founding years – with the earlier (the 40s) being less experienced, lack of systematic thinking, and more or less in needs of mass publicity; while the latter (the 50s) being fulfilled and settled, with careers that were already passing their golden period, therefore care less for recognition. Furthermore with the conference series already being proven to be in some ways as the continuation of the congresses; from 1928 to 1966 stretching almost in 4 decades period, the Urban Design Conference(s) could then been said as the true essence of (modern) movements, cultivated from a fully matured generation.