

History of Architecture and Culture – 6

Lecture 1

Team 10

If we have to understand team 10 we need to wind our clocks back a little, towards CIAM which we studied in the previous episode. Previous semester. At the end of the 5th unit and 4th unit and the previous semester AR6502 history of architecture and culture 5 we saw that CIAM was founded in 1928 by a group of 28 European Architects. And it was organized by le Corbusier, architecture as a social art and it was a hugely influential moment at that particular of time. They had all the principles of modern movement and then if you could remember this thing Corbusier started to go less frequently 2 words CIAM meeting and there was all these really young people who started criticizing the movement itself and they wanted to come out of the movement itself and start another movement. Then another side came into the picture, Corbusier left CIAM eventually gave birth to team 10. So from this we will have team 10 often referred to as team X sometimes because X is the Roman numeral for 10. They were a group of architects who started assembling in July 1953 at the 9th Congress of CIAM and created a schism within CIAM by challenging its doctrinaire approach to urbanism. People of CIAM were there. So they broke away from CIAM giving a schism there, they broke away from CIAM and then they started team 10. The first formal meeting of team 10 was done in 1960 under the name of team 10. Although the number of people who were in team 10 constantly kept varying the core group consists of 7 of the most active longest involved participants. J. P. Bakema, Georges Candilis, Giancarlo Piretti, Carlo Azzano, Aldo van Eyck, Alison & Peter Smithson, Shadrach Woods. Yeah you can see the picture of 9 Congress CIAM. Although this team 10 had the seven important players who were the most important and the longest training people they also had a lot of other people who came and went as time passed by. Is the list of all the other people who were the part of team 10 at different points of time? People associated with Team 10. Team 10 call themselves as a small family group of architects who have sort each other out. Because each one of them has found the help of others necessary to the development and understanding of their own individual work. This has never happened earlier in architecture when Architects openly announced that ok I am not an individual I need some other people also who are fundamentally necessary for my development and my understanding of my own work. This is what team 10 people said to themselves. I need a

group of people so that they will help me out. And in this case people sort the help of each other, so there was mutually agreed group and everybody sort the help of each other for their own development and understanding personal individual work. The theoretical framework which team 10 announced came primarily only through teachings and Publications. It has a good amount of influence on the development of architecture throughout the latter half of 20th century. Mainly in Europe. Team 10 itself was formed as a result as a schism of CIAM. There was another division which happened inside team 10 which divided them into two major fractions. 1 fraction was new brutalism which was headed by the English Alison Peter Smithson. And structuralism which was added by Dutch Aldo van Eyck. Structuralism is a moment in architecture urban planning evolved around the middle of 20th century. It was a reaction to CIAM functionalism they called that CIAM had led to a life less expression of urban planning and CIAM ignored The Identity of the inhabitants and ignored urban forms. So just to create the identity of the people who are different in that particular area, structuralism objected CIAM functionalist ideas or rationalist ideas so they started their own movement to that. Brutalism is architecture which flourished between 1950-1970s its spawned as a result of modernist architectural movement which had linear Fortress like blocks often with a predominance of reinforced concrete construction. Team 10 people they came together in first place because of the mutual realization of the inadequacy of the processes of architectural thought which they had inherited from the modern movement as a whole but more important but each sense that the other had already found same way towards a new beginning. The entire team 10 ideology was to be against modernist movement and against CIAM because they thought that there were some processes which were inadequate in the modern movement which was not completely correct in the modern movement, and even though they thought that they have certain solutions about this problem they also realized that each and everybody else of the same group also had some or other ways towards new beginning solving the existing problem from which modernism had created. This is why they came together in the first place. In this sense team 10 is Utopian idea. But Unlike the previous moments team 10 was not Utopian about the future. They were Utopian about the present. Thus their aim is not to theories but there in was to build, because they believe that only through building utopia of the present be realized in Real world. For them to build as a very specific meaning and that the Architects responsibility towards the person whom he builds for towards the cohesion and convenience of the collective. Everybody here has to take the

absolute responsibility here. The person who is building and the person who is promoting and for the person for whom the building is built that was the idea of team 10. They believe that no abstract master plan stands between him and what he has to do. Only the human facts and the logistics of the situation matters. They had the very strong connotations of modernism and they highly objected to the strong imposing rules which modernism had and they say that, there is a master plan and we have to follow the master plan. They kept on saying that the modernist movement did not allow for human facet of looking at a project. This accepting a responsibility they were talking about peoples having responsibility. This accepting the responsibility requires another technique which they didn't have at that particular point of time which is working together technique in which each member pays attention to the other person in aspect to the capacity as he is able to-do. Because otherwise only one person will be control of the whole thing and the other person will be simply following what he does. Why this accepting responsibility for mutual growth happens only when each people get attention from the other people. That is what they projected, they believed that only in such a way that meaningful groupings of buildings can come into existence. Because they believe that building is a lifetime which has life and it has to be a natural extension of the other life form. If two buildings are placed next to each other they have certain relationship that relationship was very important for team 10. Whereas they claimed that the modernism did not give importance 2 relationship. Peter Smith son during team10 meeting says that, as to people who are interested in team 10, team 10 might ask a few serious questions, why do you wish to know? What will you do with your knowledge? Will it help you to generate the language of modern architecture it would again be worth inheriting? These are the questions which Alison Smith son ask for people who would be interested in joining the team 10. If the answer to this questions in the most expected manner they probably would be selected or something. but look at the quality of the questions. He ask that why do you wish to know what will you do with the knowledge? And will that. Knowledge help a person Re generate the language of modern architecture so that it would once again be inherited. He says that modern architecture as of now is worth inheriting. Due to certain knowledge to re-generate the language of present modern architecture it can become worth rating inheriting. In a sense team 10th was looselyorganized band of individuals. The composition of the group varied considerable through the years. The first meeting happened in 1960 and the last meeting had only 4 people. Therewas no such thing as movement of membership inside the team

10 because whenever they had the idea that ok let us invite that person and invite this person this find this kind of talk invariably resulted in discussions which most likely led to heated arguments most of the time. So because they were little parietic about whom they will be inviting for their meetings Because Allison says so they wanted people who joined Team 10 to be involved with them in that particular manner. So the discussion of who to invite itself will create so much of heated arguments. Team 10's history doesn't have a straight line and to draw a straight line from where it started to where it ended is highly impossible because the history is little scared, it is very difficult to restructure reconstruct the history. Because this group history challenge all conventional history of graphic because specific do not exist. Let's take a look at the picture here. This picture is like the play Brubeck ideogram which is drawn by Peter Smithson which shows a collection of points in time and space without any obvious hierarchy. They appear to be connected with a multitude of intersecting lines. This clearly represents the group itself, character of the group the almost equally unclear character and the time frame of the group's activities and the questions of the actual results of the group's meetings they are all represented with this little sketch over here. If you're critically look at team 10 it could be argued that the only product of team 10 as a group was its meetings. Because as a group they didn't create anything. They all created individually as Architects they started to work and they created buildings and structures and everything else but as a group the only product which did was their meetings. Where is get meetings all the participants up their projects on the wall and they had all the people sit inside the centre of the room, they were subjected, the exposed them self to, breathless analysis cuss criticism and complete Fearless criticism by the rest of the people. This was the only product that team 10 created arguably.

Works of Alison and Peter Smithson

Alison and Peter Smithson were some of the most important people in team 10 their reaction to the post war take on modernism in Britain was not worthy. Their approach also came to be known as brutalism. They instead of creating the symbols of community within a rationalistic framework they wanted architecture as the expression of community itself. They said break the rationalistic framework. If you don't want rationalistic framework to define what community must look like. we Don't want strict Framework created by logic rationality. They wanted the community to express themselves architecture should be an expression of the community itself

according to them.. They say that hierarchy of association is woven into a modified continuum representing the true complexity of human Association. We are of the opinion that hierarchy of human Association should replace the functional hierarchy of AthensChartered. Again they say the same thing here that the hierarchy of human Association is more important than the hierarchy of function. When modernism says that if you are building a new city the infrastructure, of the city representative buildings should be in the city core. Whereas Allison and Peter Smith son argued as for a city that dwelling is the important. Point for community. So that should be the core of the city itself, so they claim that this acknowledges that there is a gap between the formal representation of architecture and spontaneous human Association. So according to them these two must be together, they cannot be associated.

Brutalism

Let's take a quick look at brutalism. It is one of the fractions of team 10. Brutalism architecture style of architecture that flourished from 1950 to the mid 1970 spawned from modernist architectural movement. And already we saw that the typical examples were very linear, fortress like blocks often with a pre dominance of concrete construction. So Ideally what this style was, initially when they came about with best style they said that this is the style for government buildings, low rent housing building and shopping centre because after the World War II lot of countries where at terrible economy and they need to do lot of reconstructing because most of the countries where elaborated, they had deliberated cities, important cities had a lot of buildings that got destroyed due to war. Eventually what they did was they had to look for a kind of architecture that makes buildings become less expensive. So less expensive buildings that can be done at a faster rate so that is when the exposed concrete brutalism Idea came into picture. The word brutalism is not in its specific meaning. Actually it equates to huge building which are made of concrete at constructed between World War 2 and the end of 1970. But if this is the definition of the particular style the number of projects that this particular style the presence is styling. A lot of architects who were responsible for getting these kinds of buildings done did not like the name brutalism. They did not want to sound brutal while doing a piece of architecture. They called it functional and ethical and sometimes even hornets. Britta is not in the exact physical meaning of the actual word itself. So they did not like the name of the style in which they were following. The best known early works of brutalism architecture is

French architect Le Corbusier in his *Unité d'habitation* the secretariat building for Chandigarh. These are the buildings here. It falls clearly within the category of large buildings made of exposed concrete building and at the same time it gives like a fortress kind of appearance for government building and other for mass housing. But brutalism gained a considerable importance in momentum in UK mid-20th century. Because as I said it was right after the World War 2 and people were always looking for inexpensive construction. Designs and methods for low cost housing. It was always in need at that particular point of time. So the next 10-15 years saw a wide variety of brutalism architecture that sprouted all around the Europe and US. Many Architects chose brutalism style even when they had good budgets for the building. Because they appreciated the honesty, sculptural cultural quality of the building. And sometimes even the uncompromising Anti bourgeois nature of the style. They Called that the building was simple, functional and it had the honest expression of the materials that the buildings were using in that sense appreciated this quality and their kind of used even if they had the budget for the building. Brutalism was promoted as a very positive option for positive forward moving modern urban housing. But in practice what happened was many of the communities having features went into claustrophobic, crime ridden tenements. Rough coolness of concrete under damp and grey Northern Sky became a nice ore it's fortress like looking material which ones promised great security and which was actually promoting Anti vandalism in its advertisement. In such a bad state some point of time it was actually vulnerable to spray can graffiti. So the movement eventually lost its character because of all these things. What makes brutalist buildings? They are usually form with striking repetitive angular geometries , concrete is used predominantly revealing the true nature texture and sometimes revealing the texture of the wooden forms used for the in situ cast. Although in brutalist architecture most of the buildings are done with concrete not all brutalist buildings are concrete or and also not say concrete building is not a brutalist building. That is always there are concrete buildings and brutalist buildings and sometimes they might match also. Sometimes critics say that it is the Abstract nature of brutalism that makes the style little unfriendly and uncommunicated. Because it cannot become integrating and protective as its proponents intended to become. Because when you have large number of openings and when you have porous architecture there is lot of life in it and when there is very less opening concrete in it, the visual weight increases and it looks more like a prison than a residential building. And the amount of life that these kind of buildings propagate

is lesser and lesser. So that is when this kind of architecture becomes friendly. Brutalism is not concerned with the material as such but rather the quality of the material that is with the question. What can it do? And by analogy : There is a way of handling gold in brutalist manner and it does not mean rough and keep it means what is its raw quality? That is brutalism for your ladies and gentlemen.