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SUMMARY
The purpose of the paper is to examine internationalization of collaborative urban design projects done by modernist architects. Internationalization of the concept of democracy was the most important historical fact after the Second World War, so we will try to understand the internationalization of the collaborative design (the case when many architects participate in a project) as a part of the process of democracy internationalization. This paper’s hypothesis is the following: since collaborative design method was regarded as a kind of democratic design method, this design method was mainly used by public sectors or public organizations in order to show a democratic urban space. The postwar period gives us the chance to discuss the collaborative design process, because this issue appeared at the beginning of CIAM conference and such an idea was originally developed by modern architects. To evaluate the collaborative projects of that period is very important, because since 1990's in the conditions of globalization.

In this paper we decided to discuss: 1) democracy and architect’s collaboration, 2) collective form designed by more than two architects, which are the objects of this study, 3) In order to understand appearances of democracy in urban landscape, we decided to use the typology of democratic regime by Lijphart, 4) By using the typology, we tried to understand typology of democratic urban landscape in terms of relationships among the participants, and appearances of architectural design in collective form. 5) We analyzed four types of urban landscape and discussed the features of each urban landscape. As the result, we were able to understand internationalization of democratic urban landscape and collaborative design methods. By the analysis, importance of traditional (regional) architectural concepts is raised when we design harmonious plural urban landscape in the time of globalization. Also the historical significances of the post war period projects is discussed.

1. Introduction
1-1. Democracy at the beginning of the 21st century
The term ‘Crisis of democracy’ is not a new term, but a repeated term. When we consider the series of wars after September 11, 2001, ‘democracy’ is a key word to understand what is happening in the world. Conflicts among different religious groups, between the rich and poor, difference of social classification etc. are still critical issues. From the beginning of the 20th century democracy has been regarded as the best social principle in the world, thus it seems that there is no country that deny democracy. The Second World War seems to have been won by democracy, but we have not achieved yet a genuine democratic world. Democracy is one of the most important words in order to understand the post war period.

We are able to see many collaborative architectural projects and urban design projects in that period (note1). Therefore this paper's hypothesis is the following: since democratic urban design method was regarded as a kind of collaborative design method, this design method was mainly used by public organizations in order to show democratic spaces. Since architectural expressions of a collective form represent accumulated ideas from
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participating architects, accumulated architectural idea shows a democratic aspect of the projects.

We try to understand the significance and features of a democratic society as seen within the collective form from that period by analyzing twelve collaborative urban design projects (note 2).

1-2. ‘Collaboration’ and architectural works in the Modern Movement

From the 19th to the 20th century, many kinds of organizations became to be larger ones. As a result, variety of locality and closed local societies were disappearing. Then association new modern society became important (note 3). When we work in an association, collaboration is called for. We will use the word ‘collaboration’ in this paper. According to Barnard, social scientist, ‘collaboration’ is the process where a job that cannot be performed by a single individual, but it will be performed by several individuals who cooperate.

Association is a typical social aspect in the modern times. Then, we arrive at a difficult question on understanding architect (‘s) works. To understand association we have to consider the relation between architect (s) and architectural work (s). We are able to see some possible relationship between architects and projects. We see the relation between an architect and his work. We can see four types of architectural works.

1) A building made by one architect;
2) A collective form made by one architect;
3) A project produced by more than one architect;
4) Multiple projects together which constitute a ‘collective form’ produced by more than one architect.

The main subject of discussion in this paper concerns projects of type 4. After the war, there was a movement to evaluate architectural works done by two or more architects. The movement of evaluating collaborative architectural works of the period was seen (note 5). We discuss following projects in this paper; Tapiola Garden City (Finland), The Re-Construction Project of Le Havre (France), The Lansbery neighborhood (The United Kingdom), Nagele (the Netherlands), The University of Liege (Belgium), The Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium), Hansaviertel (W. Germany), Markisches Viertel (W. Germany), Constitution Plaza (USA), Ciddad Universitaria De Mexico (Mexico), The Holiday villages of Languedoc province (France) and Six Monn Hill (USA) (see table 1).

2. Collaboration in the modern times

2-1. An history of collaborative urban design projects in the modern time

The 1920s is the period when the collective building projects by modern architects were developed in Weimer Republic and the Netherlands. Architectural concept of collaboration is seen in the movement in the Netherlands, such as the architectural group ‘De Still’ and Amsterdam school (note 4). The word ‘collaboration’ was hired by the CIAM congress first of all. At the same period, CIAM tried to achieve the development of architects’ collaboration. Le Corbusier and several architects discussed activities of the CIAM, and they described this ‘congress’ as being ‘collaboration’ or ‘working together’. The concept of architects’ collaboration appeared at the beginning of the 1920s (Sigfried Giedion, 1969). In Weimer Republic several collaborative projects were seen. Weissenhof Siedlung, Siemensstadt and the housing exposition of Breslau were typical projects.

It was the 1945 that Walter Gropius proposes an architectural concept of democracy in the manifest of TAC, standing for The Architects Collaborative. This architectural concept succeeds modern architectural movement before the war in Europe. Walter Gropius is a key architect who starts the architects’ collaboration, aiming a reconstruction of society after the Second World War. He shared the same architectural purpose with CIAM which started to make re-construction projects during the war (note 5) (Eric Mumford, 2000). His manifest of T.A.C. was the first concept that leads the collaborative architectural projects.

2-3 The aim of TAC

According to his remarks, he did not like “boss style architect office”, but he preferred more even and flat
organization (W. Gropious, 1945). He appealed for collaborating in the reconstruction of society and cities in the postwar period. He intended to organize an architects' group by teamwork.

He and his collaborators tried to create ‘Total Architecture’ which is concerned with the whole environmental development and demands' collaboration on the broadest basis. About the purpose of the group he said: 'The present casual way of solving problems of collaboration on large projects is simply to throw a few prominent architects together in the hope that five people will automatically produce more beauty than one'. Within the group (where all members were equal) they were willing to work concertedly but without losing their identities, and ‘give-and-take’ was regarded an important principle. In particular he insisted on recognizing personal freedom within the team, and regarded cross-fertilization of different minds as an important issue. To this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Twelve Collaborative Urban Design Projects in the post war period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tapiola</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Re-Construction Project of Le Havre, Le Havre, France</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Lansbery neighborhood, London, The United Kingdom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nagele</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The University of Liege</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hansaviertel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Märkisches Viertel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitution Plaza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cidad Universitaria De Mexico</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Holiday villages of Languedoc province France</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Moon Hill, New England, USA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
end, he also tried to include architects from different cultural backgrounds to help achieve cultural integration within the group (Walter Gropius, 1966).

3. Democratic urban landscape

3-1. A typology of democratic regimes

In order to start to discuss democracy, we decided to quote a typology of democratic regime made by Lijphart who discusses pluralism and democracy (note 6). He decided to use several pluralist societies such as the Netherlands and Austria where the people have different religious, languages and historical backgrounds, and tried to explain the advantages of the pluralist society. According to him, he clarified democratic societies into four typologies: ‘De-politicized Democracy’, ‘Consociational Democracy’, ‘Centripetal Democracy’ and ‘Centrifugal Democracy’. Considering the manifest of "TAC, Gropious’s idea includes plural solution, cooperative solution and architect’s independence. Therefore his opinion indicates comprehensive concept of the democracy that is defined by Lijphart.

3-2. Types of urban design organizations

We clarified the twelve projects into the coalescent organization or adversarial organization.

Type-A) Development body orders collaborator architects to design buildings in individual relation each.

Type-B) Development body asks a coordinator architect to organize a collaborator architects’ group. The collaborator architect gives architectural design directions to the collaborator architects. The collaborator architects make projects.

Type-C) Development body organizes a collaborative group to direct the urban design and the collaborative group gives architectural design directions to collaborator architects.

Type-D) Development body (ies) organizes an architects group to direct architectural design.

Type-E) Development body (ies) ask (s) an architect, who is called ‘chief architect’, to organize an collaborative group of architects. The chief architect directs the orientation of architectural design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Types of Collaborative Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of designing organization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects’ purposes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbol of models</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type—A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapiola Garden CityB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapiola Garden CityA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Universitaria De Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvain La Neuve Villes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ARC: Architect, PS: Public Sectors (housing associations, urban development companies etc.) The development organization sometimes consist of several smaller associations.
3-3. Type of urban landscape by architectural expression

In order to understand urban landscape, we decided to analyze the architectural expression of the projects. At first, we define the basis of architectural expressions that composing a collective form defining three kinds of architectural expressions. Table 3 shows relation between architectural expression and design organization.:

- a) Traditional (or regional) style (TS): Each architectural expression of collective form has to do with traditional building or regional building form.
- b) International style (IS): Each Architectural expression of collective form is tightly linked with modern building methods, using iron and concrete etc.
- c) One architect’s style (OA): An architect who has architectural identity in design makes architectural expression of each building within the collective form.

Each architectural expression makes a homogeneous urban landscape. By the combination of these three kinds of architectural expression, we are able to make four kinds of plural urban landscapes:

- d) Traditional (or regional) style + International style (TS + IB),
- e) One architects’ style + International style (IB + OA),
- f) One architects style + Traditional (or Regional) Style (TS + OA),
- g) International style + Architects’ style + Traditional (or regional) style (IS + TS + OA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Architectural expression of the Collaborative Urban Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous Architectural Expression in collective form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Traditional Style (TS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) International Style (IB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) One Architect’s own Style (OA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural Architectural Expression in collective form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Traditional Style + International Style (TS+IB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Architects’ Style + International Style (IB+OA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Architects own Style + Traditional Style (TS+OA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) International Style + Architects’ Own Style + Traditional Style (IS+ TS+OA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typology of Design Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adversarial Organization</th>
<th>Coalescent Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapiola Garden CityC</td>
<td>Lansbury The Architecture Style of the East End of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäkisches Viertel (International Modernism)</td>
<td>Tapiola Garden CityB (Regional Modern basing on Regional Tradition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Penn Center)</td>
<td>Tapiola Garden CityA (Regional Modern basing on Regional Tradition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Villages (International Style, Mediterranean Style)</td>
<td>University of Liege (International Style, Traditional Style, Organic Style, Modern Style, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidad Universitaria De Mexico (International Style, Ancient American Style)</td>
<td>Louvain La Neuve Villes (Anglo-Saxon, International Style, Old Louvain Style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Moon Hill (Gropious Style)</td>
<td>Le Havre (Perret’s Architectural expression)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: () in the matrix indicates the architectural expression(s)
Note 2: Tapiola Garden City A, B and C indicate each stages of urban projects in the project area.

4. Architectural expression in collective form

4-1. Urban landscape of democracy

We decided to replace ‘elite behavior’ by Lijphart by ‘design organization’, because we are able to distinguish how architects were able to works for the urban design projects. We are able to know whether the architects worked by Coalescental system.
a) ‘Depoliticized Democracy’ type of urban landscape
b) ‘Consociational Democracy’ type of urban landscape
c) ‘Centripetal Democracy’ type of urban landscape
d) ‘Centrifugal Democracy’ type of urban landscape

4-2. ‘Depoliticized Democracy’ type of urban landscape

Analyzing the projects in the typology of the ‘Depoliticized Democracy’ type of urban landscape, it can be noticed that all projects are conducted just after the Second World War. In the process of the project, we are able to see cooperative solutions among participating architects, because the participants shared the common purpose to reconstruct society from the War, therefore a strong architectural leader was necessary. This caused a homogeneous solution in the urban landscape. Auguste Perret shared his individual architectural expression with collaborator architects to produce a common architectural expression. W. Gropius showed his own house to the collaborator. This project was related to the regional house of New England, to the collaborator architects referenced his house to design architecture in the project. In Tapiola the collaborator architects shared modern architectural expression. In England the L.C.C., the development body for the Lansbery neighborhood, intended to show English town design for the England Festival.

We are able to see how these projects reflect the social attitude of the war period when strong unity of the people was called for by the governments. Collaborative attitudes related to nationalistic aspects made architects achieving homogeneous urban landscape by coalescent background.

4-3. ‘Consociational Democracy’ type of urban landscape

The urban design bodies hired at the projects of the Consociational Democracy type of urban design, regional architectural contexts and traditional contexts. Nagele and Louvain La Neuve represent the democratic political climate of the Benelux countries.

Nagele is the project in which the architects share an architectural movement. The participating architects shared the Dutch brick, long shape building and wider window, but designed individual architectural expressions. Louvain La Neuve is the campus city in which many monumental buildings on each corner of the streets represent individual characteristics. While along the streets, shared brick on the buildings’ facades shows a unity of the campus. Also each street side building has its own gentle individual expression. Modern architectural expression and regional expression are merged in the building design, and this architectural form shows a harmonious whole of the collective form.

4-4. ‘Centripetal Democracy’ type of urban landscape

The architectural expression of the international style within collective forms is seen in the ‘Centripetal Democracy’ type of urban landscape. Traditional (or regional) architectural expression is not seen in this type of urban landscape. Two projects, Märkisches Viertel and Hansaviertel in West Berlin, The Hansaviertel project had a purpose to show the power and successful story of capitalism to the East Side Countries. Berlin at the time was the city where the United States countries helped sustaining the urban system in order to show the presence of capitalism. Eventually to show the American way of democracy including capitalism must be a purpose of the project.

While in the USA, many urban renewal projects were conducted in the period, enterprising the capitalism. Constitution Plaza is a project of urban renewal at the time. Since the project was to build up business district, the buildings design had to show the demands of each client. Eventually the buildings have to represent ‘freedom’ of economy. While skyscraper type of building causes homogeneous projects appearance, the characteristic of the urban landscape was the result of modern building technology and economy. Among these three projects, a common issue is argued. Strong architectural expression and relation among the buildings are the problems of the projects. The ‘Centripetal Democracy’ type of urban landscape could represent the American capitalism easily.
4-5. ‘Centrifugal democracy’ type of urban landscape

Analyzing the projects in the ‘Centrifugal democracy’ type of Urban Landscape, we are able to see two architectural expressions, international style and traditional style, are together in the collective forms. Two architectural expressions were not merged, but independent each other. Adversarial situation between regional architectural expression and international expression are seen in this typology. A coordinator architect supervised each project, and gave the participating architect certain freedom of architectural expression, then architects could easily express architectural identity in design. The adversarial and plural solutions are results of the design process.

Liedge university hired coordinator architects, but he did not control the architectural expression. The Cidad Universitaria De Mexico is a project in which international style architecture and ancient architectural expression are used together in the campus. In the design process of Holiday Villages in Langdoc Lucion, the coordinator architect(s) did not give clear architectural direction, but organized design process and gave the directions of several architectural elements design, compositions and so on. Architects were allowed to express their individual architectural expression under the coordinator architect(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Typology of Democratic Urban landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban landscape (Urban landscape Type a, b &amp; c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalescental Organization Type-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial Organization Type-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: ( ) in the matrix indicate (type of architectural expression and the substance(s) of architectural expression).

5. Internationalization of democratic urban landscape

5-1. Internationalization of the ‘Centripetal Democracy’ type of urban landscape

Considering the ‘equality’ and ‘freedom’, which are the basis of democracy, these two concepts show the contradictory condition in urban landscape, because democratic ‘equality’ leads uniform urban landscape, on the other hand democratic ‘freedom’ leads freestyle of architectural design or individualistic characteristics of architecture. As a result urban landscape easily loses its coherent harmony. The urban landscape consisting of high-rise buildings by free architectural expression and homogeneous building shape, which are in common in the world cities, represent activity of economy of capitalism.

The same problem and similar urban landscape are found in the projects of Hansaviertel, Märkisches Viertel and the Constitution Plaza. We are able to say that these urban landscapes were the departure points of this type of democratic urban landscape.

As we analyzed the urban landscape in terms of democratic ‘freedom’ and ‘equality’, we are able to affirm that the homogeneous appearance of urban landscape of world cities is the result of international building method. This type of building has been used by the modern architects together with successful stories of democracy industrialization as well as domination of capitalism in the period of the Western countries, but this type of buildings and its accumulated urban design caused many urban issues. These projects, where even talented
architects at the time had participated, are the examples of a modern capitalism democracy city planning. Too emphasized architectural ‘freedom’ and ‘equality’ does not make a coherent collective form, and causes a problem: what we call ‘irreconcilable demands between freedom and equality, chaos’.

5-2. Regional (traditional) architectural expression in collective form in the modern time

In the period many urban projects hired regional design contexts in the urban design. Plural solution using regional architectural expression is a result of collaborative process of the collaborating architects. Collaborative process introduced pluralism in collective form design.

Traditional (regional) concept played an important role in the collaborative projects that achieved coherence as an urban landscape of pluralism, except for ‘centripetal type’ of urban landscape. Traditional expression was, for example, seen in the project of Cidad Universitaria De Mexico. According to a comment from a collaborator architects of the project, he wished to design by taking up unconscious minds of the Mexican people. This is a very democratic architectural design concept.

It was a contradiction that modern architects found democratic urban landscape in the traditional villages in which the modern architects did not pay attention a lot before the world war. Discovering the democratic aspect in the traditional villages lead architectural theory in the 1960s. At the same time, architectural expression of variety is also argued together with traditional villages. This is linked with pluralism, for example, Bernard Rudofsky, Fumihiko Maki, Denise Scott Brown (1965), C. Alexander (1964), and Colin Rowe & Fred Koetter (1975) or Robert Venturi (1968) afterwards. Village concept was regarded as a democratic method for plural urban design.

5-3. Democratic urban landscape in the traditional villages

Through the period, urban design had very serious problems accordance with the economy development, because huge urban development projects were on ward, and were criticized. No humanity in the projects was criticized.

It was a contradiction that modern architects found democratic urban landscape in the traditional villages in which the modern architects did not pay attention a lot before the world war. Discovering the democratic aspect in the traditional villages lead architectural theory in the 1960s. At the same time, architectural expression of variety is also argued together with traditional villages. This is linked with pluralism, for example, Bernard Rudofsky exhibited traditional settlements in the world by ‘Architecture without Architects’ in 1964 in New York. J. Sert considered urban spaces of the traditional villages in Spain when he designed architectural projects. Fumihiko Maki published a book on collective from in 1960 in the USA. Denise Scott Brown (‘The Meaning City’, 1965) and C. Alexthander (‘The city is not a tree’ 1964) are the important person who started discussion on the traditional city. Many architects and architectural scholars looked for plural solutions in urbanism. The flow of architectural theories relating to architectural pluralism are forwarded to Colin Rowe & Fred Koetter (‘Collage City’, 1975) or Rem Koolhaas (‘Delirious New York’, 1978) or Robert Venturi (‘Complexity and contradiction in architecture’, 1968) afterwards.

The set of contradiction concepts of plural and homogeneous, and coalescent and adversarial are components of traditional collective form in which we are able to see the same concept in the typography of urban landscape regime. The same components are seen in the democratic typology of Lijphart. These refuting factor make harmonious landscape is the final purpose of the democratic urban landscape, not chaotic contemporary urban landscape city in Japan.

6. Concluding remarks

Collaboration Design method is a remarkable feature in the modern architectural movement. W. Gropious showed the concept of collaboration just after the Second World War. After the war modern architects and public sectors conducted many collaborative urban design projects such as reconstruction projects, new town projects and
so on (note 7). Gropius's idea as well as CIAM’s initial intention came true by the public sectors conjunction with modern architects in the period in the Western countries (note 8).

Using the typology of democratic regime made by Lijphart we are able to affirm that many urban design projects represented democratic climate of the countries. Four kinds of urban landscapes showed democratic aspects in each country, but Anglo-Saxon style urban landscape (the ‘Centripetal Democracy’ Type of Urban Landscape), which is linked with capitalism, dominated in the world. Since ‘freedom’ and ‘equality’, which are the basis of democracy, are too emphasized in architectural design, urban landscape loses coherent whole together with architectural design. Internationalization of democratic urban landscape might have extended to the world cities together with capitalism as well as democracy, without considering regional democratic aspects (note 9).

While on the other hand, regional architectural expression in modern architecture or traditional architectural expression together with modern building design achieved coherent whole in a collective form, as the three types of urban landscape, excluding ‘Centripetal Democracy’ Type of Urban Landscape. Plural solution in urban design calls for regional (or traditional) architectural expressions. The significance of pluralism is raised here.

Lijphart published ‘Pluralism and Democracy’ in the 1970s when the USA tried to establish plural society (which W. Gropious had foreseen in 1945). The plural aspect in the USA of the period shows the same situation as contemporary globalization of the world. Pluralism as well as multi nationalism are remarkable features of the post war period, 1945-1970. Therefore we have to consider American pluralism of the period nowadays. Architects and architectural scientists found the architectural concepts and ideas of plural democracy in traditional villages. Comprehensive aspects of urban landscape are seen in the traditional villages and old cities. The plural concept ‘unity and variety’ that several South American university projects used at the period for the first time is very important fact in order to consider contemporary democratic situation in globalization (note 10). We want to emphasize the fact in the history of the urban design.

When we discuss urban design project in the time being, we are able to refer the urban projects in the Netherlands, a country of consociational democracy. Contemporary Dutch urban design projects show a consociational democracy type of urban landscape. Also urban renewal projects of Berlin are also important, because the projects contain plural solutions for the future.

In globalization the role of pluralism becomes a necessity in urban design as well as politics, environmental issues and so on. Forcing ‘democracy’ without thinking regional situation on regional condition is seen in many kinds of situations still nowadays. There is a way that we are able to get together with local aspects in ‘democracy’.

We have to look back again at the democracy of the Post War period, and consider regional conditions of each city. The collaborative urban design projects of the post war period as well as the manifest of TAC are the concrete examples to understand the departure point of democratic urban design and society.

Note
Note 1 : There are many kinds of collaborative building projects after the world war, for example : The United Nations Headquarter building, which is the most typical collaborative building project in the period. In Japan the MIDO group, consists of Kunio Maekawa, Jyunzo Sakakura and Jyunzo Yoshimura, is an architects group in the post war period that designed several public buildings. ‘The International House of Japan (1952)’ is a collaborative project by the group in Japan.

Note 2 : In order to understand design process, design methods and projects purposes we used architectural magazines, books cited in ‘Bibliography by projects from magazines’.

Note 3 : For example in the period of the Third Republic of France, railway network in the country, public education system and so on became to be a national system.

Note 4 : The irony was that Berlage made a lecture about the significance of the Amsterdam School for town planning at the first CIAM meeting, and his audience reacted contemptuously about his ‘serious’ architectural history. They did not want to know about his previous experiences of collaboration (Vincent
Van Rossem, 1996).

Note 5: Eric Mumford describes postwar reconstruction projects as follows: Gideon and CIAM sought to find a new direction for the group’s activities, shifting its agenda toward post war re-construction in Europe. We are able to know the idea for the post war period (Munford, 200, p.142).

Note 6: He studied democratic society in the 1970s. His research objects are the society of the post war period, thus we are able to use his theory for understanding history of the post war period. Also he deals with many kind of democratic society in the west countries as well as several third world countries. He concluded that the successful process of achieving democratic society by pluralism, rather than Anglo-Saxon model of society in terms of social stability.

Note 7: Architects and Artists in Europe went over to the United States before World War II. This movement is comparable with many European architects and artist went to the Soviet Union after Russian revolution in order to contribute to establish the communist state. A different point is the background of the architects and artists. The countries where the people had lived in did not allow the people to make works in freedom. They had to look for a place to express their idea without any restrictions. The United States at that time was an immigrant nation, thus the people who were chased by their own country went to the United States. Economical development of the United States was assumed to be a base, and the preparation for giving the new land to the architect from Europe was complete enough. This condition enchanted the architects and artists. Richard Neutra, Walter Gropius and Josep Luiis Sertwere (architects) and for instance artists: Arshile Gorky (1904-1948), Mark Rothko (1903-1970), Salvador Dali (1904-1989), Piet Mondrian (1872-1944), and Marc Chagall (1887-1989) emigrated in the United States during prewar days. After the war, it is foundation of the development of a rich art movement of the United States. Within the immigrant architects in the United States Walter Gropius develops an argument of democracy at which Western countries aimed at that time. We start the discussion from his opinion of democracy, because W. Gropius practiced the concept of collaboration of architects as analyzed in Chapter 3-5. Collaborative Design Method has a democratic shade.

Weimer Republic in which W. Gropius conducted many city-planning projects before the war was a centrifugal democracy country, his democratic architectural concept is linked to the democracy of the Weimer Republic. Siemensstadt is a good example in order to know his opinion for urban landscape.

Note 8: Collective form of the high-rise building of New York is the symbol of capitalism and democracy. For example a reporter at a world network TV reported that the city land space of Bombay, a city in India, is the result of democracy in a TV program. We were able to see collective form of white high-rise buildings in the report. The collective form of box buildings represents ‘democracy’.

Note 9: In South America, there is the example of the university city of Caracas (1953, Venezuela), which was designed by Carlos R. Villanueva and many collaborating architects. They designed the campus together (Kokusai Kenchiku, April 1955). The University of Tucuman (early 1950s) in the north of Argentina was designed by Horatio Carminos (the chief architect) and his design group (Kokusai Kenchiku, April 1953). Several Universities were designed by architects collaboration.
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戦後近代建築家による都市デザインの展開
－都市の協働設計の国際化－

北尾 靖雅*

本論は戦後の近代建築運動を都市デザインの視点からとらえ、近代都市デザイン運動を近代建築史において位置づける事を目的とする研究の一部である。本論では、近代建築運動のひとつとして、建築家のコラボレーションに着目した。建築家のコラボレーションは近代建築運動が押し進められたCIAMの結成時に提唱された概念である。特に、第二次世界大戦後、建築家が相互に連携を深め、第二次世界大戦後の都市の再建／復興の一翼を担っていた時代（1945～1970年）に行われた都市デザインプロジェクトのシステムやプロセスを分析するものである。特に、本論では第二次世界大戦後の西側諸国における民主主義の広まりを背景として、都市デザイン運動を民主主義の観点から考察を行っている。民主主義の世界的な広まりと協働による都市デザイン運動がどのように関連しているのか、そして、協働設計がどのような都市空間や都市形態を造り出されてきたのかを論じた。民主主義の社会をどのように都市空間的に表現したことかを明らかにすることを、本論では試みている。

そこで民主主義の形態に関して、社会学者のライプハルトは第二次世界大戦後の民主主義社会を4形態に分類している。この4分類の民主主義社会と都市デザインの方法や実現した都市空間の特質を本論ではまとめている。ライプハルトの民主主義社会のモデルを用いて、都市デザインのプロジェクトの特徴をとらえる事ができた。

以上の内容を論議するために、1）民主主義と建築家のコラボレーションの関係を議論した。2）建築家の協働により形成された都市形態に関して分析した。3）ライプハルトの社会モデルを設計プロセスに適用し、建築家のプロジェクトへの参加方法の観点から都市デザインプロジェクトを分析した。こうした分析から、4）民主主義の理念や理想を都市計画的に表現する手段として、近代の建築家たちが民主主義的な設計方法（プロセス）を用いて戦後の都市再建を押し進めていったことを議論し、さらに5）都市形態は民主主義の形態と比較した。その結果、アメリカ型の民主主義を採用する国や地域における協働設計において、都市空間を構成する建築デザインが自由化し、都市景観デザインが多様化する傾向があることがわかった。一方、オランダやベルギーなどにおける緩やかな民主主義を進める国における協働都市デザインにより、建築物はある一定のデザインの傾向を持つものの、全体として多様性が保証される、多様性と統合を実現する都市景観が形成されていることなど、民主主義の形態と都市デザインの間にある一定の関連がある事が把握できた。民主主義のひとつの現れである都市景観が戦後の民主主義国家の民主主義の形態を反映している事が明らかになった。以上の分析から、多様化の民主主義を目指したベネルクス三国の民主主義のモデルが多様性を指向する現代社会において、民主主義的な都市デザインを実現する可能性がある事を示した。

*本学助教授