

and others to public buildings, neighborhood units, and examples of “the core of the town.”²³ Although relatively few of Giedion’s CIAM examples of this latter element were ever built, in differing ways aspects of Sert’s concept of the core began to be realized in actual projects at this time. Suburban shopping centers by Pietro Belluschi, Morris Ketchum, and (eventually) Victor Gruen and I. M. Pei began to apply the core concept to the rapidly decentralizing American metropolitan areas of the 1940s and early 1950s. Soon afterwards Pei began designing Modernist mixed-use pedestrian central-city projects for developer William Zeckendorf in Denver, Washington, D.C., Montreal, and other cities. Sert sought to have Pei teach at the GSD at this time, but Pei was too busy with practice to do so;²⁴ Gruen was invited to speak at the first two Harvard urban design conferences. Writing in 1961 about “The Shape of the American City,” Sert and Tyrwhitt suggested that “perhaps some of the newer shopping centers give an idea” of what “well-designed meeting places” might be like, and the Seventh Harvard Urban Design conference (1963) was focused on the theme of “The Shopping Center as a nucleus of inter-city activity.”²⁵

Within CIAM, however, Sert’s advocacy of the core concept as central to CIAM urbanism was beginning to be questioned by Team 10, who rejected the functional basis of CIAM urbanism and derided the Harvard-based CIAM “professors,” as the Smithsons described Gropius, Sert, Giedion, and Tyrwhitt in 1955.²⁶ Instead of the four functions, Team 10 proposed that “human association,” examined within a “field” on a “scale of association” organized by Patrick Geddes’s Valley Section, be the basis for analyzing projects presented at CIAM 10.²⁷ Geddes’s diagram of the relationship of communities to their environment was used by the Smithsons as a way of shifting the focus of CIAM from functionally based urban reorganization toward more intangible planning goals intended to foster a closer relationship between human activity and its surroundings in nature. The terms they used were intentionally broad, to encompass the multiple realities represented in CIAM, which by this point had groups of members from over twenty countries in Europe, North America and the Caribbean, Asia, and French North Africa. Team 10 was suggesting here the replacement of the functional terminology of CIAM, based on a set of categories that had emerged out of prewar working-class political movements, by a set of terms based on direct experience that they saw as more relevant from their standpoint as postwar