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Abstract

In 1952, the European Community of Steel and Coal (ECSC) invited applications from cities of member states to host the ECSC’s institutions and its future organizations. A range of small and internationally unknown cities located in border areas submitted their candidacies. However, after a series of exasperating and endless debates, the ministers representing the ECSC’s member states agreed to postpone the choice to a later date and to temporarily settle in the city of Luxembourg, while Strasbourg would host the European Parliament. Joined in 1957 by the European Economic Community and Euratom, the ECSC renewed its invitation in 1958, this time with the hope of establishing a permanent seat. Again several member state cities submitted applications ranging from elaborate packages including detailed urban schemes for the future European seat to tourist brochures published by the National Chamber of Commerce. From these applications, the image of a new urbanity emerged, in parallel to the existing city and inhabited by the newborn ‘European citizen’. During the same period, several architecture competitions expressed a similar interest in developing new urban and architectural models for a unified Europe, such as the 1954-55 Architecture competition for a European district near Saarbrücken, the 1956-57 Competition for the Place des Nations, Geneva, the 1957-58 Prix de Rome for a European Pantheon and the 1957-58 Hauptstadt Berlin architecture competition for the center of Berlin.

This dissertation studies a particular moment in post-war European history representing a crossroads in the relationship between urbanism and the nation-state. With the post-war crisis of the nation-state and at the same time a fast-changing European city, the discourse that developed around the question of a seat for the European Institutions raised a set of fundamental questions about the connection between cities and citizens at a European scale. A new notion of a
transnational European city emerged and developed based on three essential political and spatial concepts: the void, the network and the platform. They will form the structure of a research project looking across a wide variety of materials from protocols of the European institutions to sketches by individual architects.
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Introduction

DETERMINED to lay the foundations of an ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe,

RESOLVED to ensure the economic and social progress of their countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe.¹ (Treaty of Rome, March 25 1957)

Have we eliminated the barriers dividing Europe? No doubt, the architectures, landscapes and urban spaces of Europe’s internal national boundaries have changed since the early post-World War II European treaties. The dream of European unification had existed for centuries in different discourses and had been based on different driving forces from the wish for peace, the strengthening of a common religion and the advancement of economic prosperity to the building of a common defense mechanism.² Yet in the first decades after World War II European politicians and intellectuals revived the dream and gave it a new meaning.

In 1952, the newly established European Community of Steel and Coal (ECSC) invited applications from cities of member states to host the ECSC’s institutions and its future organizations. A range of small and internationally unknown cities, located in border areas submitted their candidacies. After a series of exasperating and endless debates evaluating the proposals, the ministers representing the ECSC’s member states agreed to postpone the choice to a later date and to temporarily settle in the city of Luxembourg, while Strasbourg would host the European Parliament. Joined in 1957 by the European Economic Community and Euratom, the ECSC renewed its invitation in 1958, this time with the hope of establishing a permanent seat. Again several member state cities submitted
applications ranging from elaborate packages including detailed urban schemes for the future European seat to tourist brochures published by the National Chamber of Commerce. From these applications, the image of a new urbanity emerged, in parallel to the existing city and inhabited by the newborn ‘European citizen.’ During the same period, several architecture competitions expressed a similar interest in developing new urban and architectural models for a unified Europe, such as the 1954-55 Architecture competition for a European district near Saarbrücken, the 1956-57 Competition for the Place des Nations, Geneva, the 1957-58 Prix de Rome for a European Pantheon and the 1957-58 Hauptstadt Berlin architecture competition for the center of Berlin. This moment forms the framework for a study of a series of urban schemes that were produced to visualize the dream of European unification and accordingly re-imagine the role of the city in the creation of a transnational infrastructure for a unified Europe.

Transnationalism as a term describing the heightened connectivity between people across national borders, had originally appeared in a 1916 article “Trans-National America,” by the American leftist Randolphe Bourne, which stated that the United States should transform into a cosmopolitan America accommodating immigrant cultures instead of forcing them to adapt to the Anglophilic culture. After World War II, the term received new meaning with the Treaty of Rome and from then on transnationalism became associated with the post-war efforts for European integration. Looking back today at the statement of the Treaty of Rome, one can recognize that instead of disappearing in a large field of sameness, border territories between nations are rearticulating and differentiating Europe’s spatial structure. Border territories challenging the right of existence of the nation-state now play a crucial role in structuring the European transnational socio-economic landscape. Nevertheless, recent studies such as the work of Italian urbanists Bernardo Secchi and
Paola Viganò and “After-Sprawl,” a publication by Belgian architect Xaveer de Geyter of urbanization tendencies in Europe have too easily discarded internal national borders as no longer relevant in a hyper-networked transnational world. These works had been preceded and strongly influenced by models for describing the European territory such as the Blue Banana (1989) and the Città Diffusa (1990).

In 1989, French geographer Roger Brunet recognized in a satellite picture of Europe a ‘blue banana,’ a dense urban area stretching from London to Italy over Belgium, Frankfurt, Munich and Paris. Brunet used the term to indicate what he saw as the economic backbone of the European Union and indicated an urban order of Europe that crossed national borders. Since this seminal text, the blue banana has become a widely accepted term to describe, analyze and criticize the European urban conglomerate at large. In contrast with the blue banana model, European urbanists have developed an interest in understanding the European territory as a dispersed urbanity or Città diffusa. Città diffusa or ‘diffused city’ is a term first introduced in 1990 by urbanist Francesco Indovina in a study of the urban development of the Veneto area in Italy, now widely used to describe the sprawled condition of the contemporary European urbanity. This newly ascribed status of the city has led to a lively discourse on urban sprawl in Europe, in an effort to develop new methods of research and design in architecture and urbanism that can respond to the specific demands of this contemporary type of urbanity.

In a more recent publication and exhibition of European urbanization processes titled “New Territories,” Italian urbanist Paola Viganó brings together a series of analyses on European territories, viewed in a series of fifty-by-fifty-kilometer squares. It is an attempt to represent the European urban territory as a ‘diversified’ and ‘interwoven’ dispersed condition in which ‘territories
of a new modernity’ are formed. The study is a search for scenarios in which the European city can incorporate dispersed forms of settlement. Viganó suggests that dispersion — whether thought as a spillover from the city to the countryside, or a more evolutionary view of a space that is constantly reorganizing itself, — can be seen as a territory in its entirety, thus also including more dense areas, based on the argument that the city-countryside opposition is non-existent and an impossible objective. In each of the studies incorporated in this publication, the dispersed territory reveals itself as highly complex and rooted in region-specific long-term histories. At the same time, these studies implicitly propose a European urbanism that is no longer looking at central cities or nation-based distinctions. Instead European space follows regional entities according to the stretches of their own limits, whereby a new European territory is constructed as a conglomerate of dispersed territories, replacing the notion of juxtaposed nations, with interconnected metropolitan centers. Can we then conclude that we have reached the final goal of a process to create European transnational space that had been initiated more than fifty years ago?

In his theory of transnational urbanism, political scientist Michael Peter Smith emphasizes the importance of anchoring transnational processes in nation-states, while at the same time transcending them, demonstrating that many studies of globalization too easily cancel out ‘national borders, boundaries and identities.’ Following Smiths’ approach, today’s European border territories do not appear to be without hierarchy or distinct spatial qualities. All the more intriguing is that extraterritorial space has developed in the form of international zones and districts most significantly at specific borders, where national and cultural spaces have never been entirely congruent. The process of Europe’s integration has not erased its internal borders. Instead of
disappearing, these borders have become laboratories for developing transnational forms of urbanism.

This dissertation examines the emergence of new forms of urbanism in post-war Europe by investigating the 1958 competition for a seat of the European Institutions. In the first decades after the Second World War, architects, urbanists and policy makers conceived and implemented a series of competitions for urban projects that would transcend national sovereignty (see Table 1). This profoundly influenced the reality and imagination of a transnational European territory. The competitions produced a distinct discourse on the relationship between the city and the territory in the early stages of European unification and formed a remarkable set of urban ideas within post-war urban practices and theories looking at the future of the European city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Competition for hosting the ECSC and future European organizations</td>
<td>Cities of ECSC member states</td>
<td>ECSC</td>
<td>Request for Qualification</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>Architecture competition for a European district near Saarbrücken</td>
<td>Architects from member countries of Council of Europe</td>
<td>Committee of ECSC and local politicians</td>
<td>Call for Urban Plan</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Institution/Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>Prix de Rome architecture competition for a European Pantheon</td>
<td>ENSBA Architecture students Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>Hauptstadt Berlin architecture competition for the center of Berlin</td>
<td>Architects and Urbanists Government of West Germany</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Call for Urban Plan</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Competition for hosting the ECSC, EEC, Euratom and future European organizations</td>
<td>Cities of ECSC, EEC, Euratom member states</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Request for Qualification</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: List of Competitions 1952-1958

In the 1952 search for a seat of the ECSC, a committee of experts made up of administrators from national planning ministries was charged with studying the submissions and assessing the possibility for hosting the European institutions. Early proposals by the cities of Metz and Thionville in France or Aachen in Germany were not considered seriously because of their insignificance and unsuitability as hosts for the European Institutions and eventually four member states submitted candidate cities. France's candidates included Strasbourg and Saarbrücken, Belgium proposed the city of Liège, the Netherlands sent in the candidature of The Hague and Luxembourg's submitted Luxembourg City (Fig i.1). Remarkable, three out of the four officially proposed cities were located close to the border region between Germany and Western Europe, suggesting that the more feasible location for the establishment of a European seat would be along border areas. Rather than a capital of Europe, the search was aimed at a non-representative and more infrastructural base of a
transnational order. On the other hand, the candidate city’s motivation for promoting themselves came from a much more prosaic point of view, using their candidacy as a lever to pull out of their peripheral position in their respective countries.

As part of its application, the city of Saarbrücken, capital of the Saarland which had been annexed by France during World War II, included elaborate drawings for a European district adjacent to the French embassy. Strasbourg, since 1949 hosting the Council of Europe submitted a candidature that was not fully supported by its inhabitants because of the still fresh memory of the Nazi presence in the city. Liege's candidacy had been promoted by a group of influential Belgian figures who emphasized its central location in the region of coal and steel. The Netherland's submission of the city of The Hague mainly aimed at proposing a seat for the European Court of Justice emphasizing the city's long tradition as a place for international meetings, while Luxembourg saw a great opportunity in European integration as its economy greatly relied on the coal and steel industries. The proposals submitted mostly focused on argumentation rather than detailed architectural designs except for the sketches submitted by Saarbrücken and were mainly characterized by immediate needs of economic development and the pragmatism of post-war reconstruction. By the early fifties, utopian urban and architectural visions had emerged that strongly influenced the results of the city applications for the seat of the European communities. In 1952, funded by Secretary of State George C. Marshall’s recovery plan for Europe, German journalist Karl-Oswald Schreiner and French painter Georges-Henri Pescadère completed ‘Bourg Blanc”, a vision for a cross-border transnational European center in Wissembourg, between the Maginot and Siegfried lines dividing France and Germany (Fig i.2). The plan countered much opposition, as it proposed that France and Germany would give up a part of their territory to provide a site for the project. However, it
touched upon an important aspect of the search for extraterritoriality, namely the intuition that border territories would become appropriate sites for building a European center. Earlier schemes such as the work of French planner Maurice Rotival had aimed at an ‘all-encompassing European concept.’ As the Secretary-General of the French delegation to the Allied Four-Party Committee, Rotival studied possibilities for European cities in a United Europe without national limitation (Fig i.3). Yet the schemes of the 1950s competitions revealed a new role for Europe’s internal borders. Borders, as long time locations of exchange between different European cultures, thus figured as prime locations for a European extraterritorial space.

In the 1952 debate on turning Saarbrücken into extraterritorial land, the geopolitical connotation of contested border areas emerged as fertile grounds for conflict resolution at the scale of Europe. In an article of the Saarbrücker Zeitung on June 25, 1952, titled “Why Saarbrücken?”, a journalist wrote that Saarbrücken should become the first step for a common European endeavor because of its geographical and political history. He argued that, since the Saarland region had such a long history of being contested terrain, the resolution for European and Franco-German reconciliation lies in changing the status of its territory. In 1954, a competition was held for the development of an urban plan for a European center in the Saarland. This led to proposals that ranged from capital schemes following the modernist tradition, to proposals that used the landscape as the structuring component. Although Saarbrücken was no longer a contender in the second round of applications of 1958, similar arguments regarding the suitability of transitional lands were present.

After a series of exasperating and endless debates, the ministers representing the ECSC’s member states agreed to postpone the choice for a permanent seat to a later date and to temporarily settle in the city of Luxembourg, while Strasbourg would host the European Parliament (Fig i.4). Joined in
1957 by the European Economic Community and Euratom, the ECSC renewed its invitation in 1958, this time with the hope of establishing a permanent seat. Again several member state cities submitted applications ranging from elaborate packages including detailed urban schemes for the future European seat to tourist brochures published by the National Chamber of Commerce. During the same period, several ideas competitions – organized by international organizations and architecture schools – expressed a similar interest in developing new urban and architectural models for a unified Europe, such as the 1954-55 Architecture competition for a European district near Saarbrücken, the 1956-57 Competition for the Place des Nations, Geneva and the 1957-58 Prix de Rome for a European Pantheon. From the 1958 competition for the seat of the European Institutions, I will focus mainly on the applications by Strasbourg, Luxembourg and Brussels for two reasons. First these three cities submitted the most substantial and detailed amount of materials as part of their application ranging from written essays to detailed urban and architectural drawings. In addition, they played an important role in the debates preceding, during and following the competition as points of reference and comparison in defining the criteria for a seat, as well as evaluating the proposals submitted.

**Peace without Peace**

On October 19, 1945, the English author and journalist George Orwell published an essay in the British newspaper Tribune titled “You and the Atomic Bomb” in which he reacted to the recent atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan:

> We were once told that the aeroplane had ‘abolished frontiers’; actually it is only since the aeroplane became a serious weapon that frontiers have become definitely impassable. The radio was once expected to promote international understanding and co-operation; it has turned out to be a means of insulating one nation from
another. The atomic bomb may complete the process by robbing the exploited classes and peoples of all power to revolt, and at the same time putting the possessors of the bomb on a basis of military equality. Unable to conquer one another, they are likely to continue ruling the world between them, and it is difficult to see how the balance can be upset except by slow and unpredictable demographic changes.\textsuperscript{15}

In the essay, Orwell uses the close link between the history of civilization and the history of weapons to argue that difficult and expensive weapons often lead to a legislature of despotism while ‘cheap and simple’ weapons enable the ‘common people’. With the atom bomb, Orwell predicts a ‘peace that is no peace’ allowing for a highly centralized police state to thrive and be in a ‘permanent state of cold-war with its neighbors’. With this statement, allegedly coining the term ‘cold war’, Orwell warned for an international situation that would threaten democracy and re-enforce a centralized, national sovereignty. Orwell’s prediction of the threat over democracy pointed at the very contradictory geopolitical position of the alliances that had been made during the war and especially for Europe. On the one hand nation-states were ready to give up part of their sovereignty in an effort to ensure peace. On the other hand, the threat inherent to the high political tension between the Eastern and the Western Block required the creation of a new centralized yet supranational entity at the scale of the large superpowers of the cold war: USA and USSR. In June 1947, two years after George Orwell’s article in The Tribune, US Secretary of State George Marshall gave an address to the graduate class of Harvard University, yet the speech was mainly aimed at European countries, inviting them to develop a plan for the reconstruction of Europe, to be funded by the USA. A major incentive for the Marshall Plan was the need to strengthen the ‘front’ against Russia and its communist regime. In his Harvard speech, Marshall called for the European states to reach an agreement regarding a recovery plan in order for the funds to come into effect. These
driving yet contradictory forces: cold war and defense versus economic prosperity, post-war recovery and eventually peace characterized the post-war period as a contradictory and fluctuating geopolitical condition in which individual nation-states found themselves as part of a larger system be it defense based, economy based or politically inspired.

**Visions of European Integration**

In the field of political science, the debate as described above forms part of an ongoing dispute among Euro-skeptics and Neofunctionalists. While the former renounce any existence of a European ideology, and explain the tendency to European integration as an opportunistic, economy-oriented collaboration that never attempted to abolish the power of the nation-state, the Neofunctionalists emphasize the importance of the European institutions as independent from the nation-state, with their own agencies and effects. This study of the 1958 competition aims to demonstrate that nation-states indeed did not intend to give up their powers, but rather that European integration efforts attempted to evade these powers. Since the strongest motor for European integration was the hope for economic prosperity, a new geographic model emerged that allowed for the coexistence of parallel identities, both national and transnational. As a result, the emerging transnational city allowed for symbolism and identity to be produced not by the political, but by economic interests.
In current debates among scholars of Europe’s political landscape regarding the underlying forces that led to European integration, a radical rejection of arguments based on geopolitics and ideology prevails. Most contemporary interpretations focus on mechanisms of economic progress and national security, which together form the Neofunctionalist movement. One of the largest dilemma’s in the European unification was and is the reconciliation of national sovereignty and international unification. The possibility of these two to coexist without clearly defining their respective authorities and political roles forms the base for Neofunctionalists to suggest that the European Union was from the beginning based on a strong belief in the persistence of the Nation-State. Therefore, they do not regard the European Union as more than an opportunistic, self-referential collaboration between powerful and less powerful national entities.

While contemporary historians of Europe believe that the idea of Europe is fairly recent and replaced a longer period of the territory of Christendom, the work by Swiss writer and an active European federalist Denis de Rougemont who extensively studied the formation of the idea of Europe throughout the last two millennia suggests a more complex history of ideology. Similar to most contemporary discourse on the subject, Rougemont’s work, mainly developed during the first decades after World War II rejected the determinism of environmental history, which described Europe as superior to other civilizations of the world because of its climate and topography. Rougemont formed part of a group of people promoting the European Idea and developing a discourse studying the development of a 'European Idea' over centuries. Starting with the Medieval Italian Poet Dante Alighieri’s *De Monarchia* published circa 1313, which proposed a universal monarchy where each nation would maintain its own individual legal system, *De Rougemont’s account moves through the centuries, touching different periods in which each time,*
ideas of Europe arise as a reaction to conflicts: between church and state, between different religions, between nations. In the seventeenth century, after the great discoveries, the reformation and the thirty years war, he describes how new efforts were made to restore order across the continent. This age knew four great plans, each by religious figures who connected federalism with Christianity. Each plan proposed judicial transnational tribunal, continent-wide economic action, and a common army. Moving from the 17th century strive for transnational unity based on religion to the 18th century struggle for social justice, Rougemont cites Count Henri de Saint-Simon’s Plan for the Organization of European Society suggesting the merging of French and British interests and the formation of a European Parliament. The 19th century saw many conferences on the subject of European Unification and peace in an age of industrialization some of which attended by the French writer Victor Hugo. Here we see how Victor Hugo’s intervention at the Peace Congress in Paris 1849 was the first to explicitly point out the necessity for a careful combination of the need for individuality of nations with the dream of a United States of Europe equivalent to the United States of America. Rougemont ends with three important moments in the first half of the twentieth century: the creation of the Pan-Europa Movement launched by the Austrian politician Richard Nikolaus von Coudenhove-Kalergi’s book Pan-Europa in 1923, the formation of a European Parliament by resistance group during World War II and the Congress of Europe at The Hague in May 1948 discussion issues of peace, prosperity, spiritual community and common defense, leading to the creation of the Council of Europe in May 1949 by the Treaty of London.

In a speech in Strasbourg on May 16 1949, French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman emphasized the need for a new political order and while recognizing the failure of utopian ideas over history, Schuman called for a new supranational constellation of nations:
Our century, that has witnessed the catastrophes resulting in the unending clash of nationalities and nationalisms, must attempt and succeed in reconciling nations in a supranational association. This would safeguard the diversities and aspirations of each nation while coordinating them in the same manner as the regions are coordinated within the unity of the nation. (Robert Schuman, 1949)

Schuman’s proposal of a supranational system was far-reaching and challenged the existing sovereignty of each nation-state, by calling for a high authority that would govern the nation-states like the regions in one nation-state. On May 9, 1950, Schuman delivered the notorious Schuman Declaration which would later become the base for the establishment of the European Community of Coal and Steel again (Fig i.5). The declaration further developed the idea of a supranational order, distinguished from international cooperation, by the establishment of a High Authority to be governed independently.

As previously discussed, contemporary debates in the field of political science questioned the role of the European Idea in the process of European integration. These debates centered on the tension between transnational forces such as Christendom or the distinction between a civilized Europe and the surrounding barbarism and the status of the nation-state. They challenged the assumption that the process of European integration was less inspired by a transnational ethos but rather by a national interest in strengthening domestic defense and economy.

Still today Neofunctionalists and liberal Intergovernmentalists have not come to terms as to what extent ideology has steered the efforts toward European integration. In an article titled Riding the AM-Track through Europe, or: The pitfalls of a rationalist journey through European integration, published in 1999 in a special section of Millennium: Journal of International Studies, German political scientist
Thomas Diez assesses the theories of Professor of Politics and Director of the European Union Program at Princeton University, Andrew Moravcsik. In his book *The Choice for Europe*, Moravcsik rejects those views that explain the European Integration process as a result of national security concerns, the power of federalist ideals or the skill of political entrepreneurs. Instead he argues that economic interdependence has been the primary drive for European nation-states to create supranational institutions in order to improve economic advantage. Diez argues that Moravcsik’s intergovernmentalist views on the European integration process as the result of rational compromises between governments based on national economic interests resulting in supranational organizations to ensure credibility are no longer sustainable when looking at empirical findings only. In the same journal, Moravcsik replies with a counter argument questioning the methodology proposed by Diez. This quarrel only exemplifies a larger struggle between Neofunctionalism and Intergovernmentalism as two competing theories of European Integration. While Neofunctionalism explains the integration process through the concept of spill-over, an idea that played an important role in Jean Monnet’s approach to European integration. Spill-over is a mechanism whereby a decision among governments to create an authority in charge of certain sectors leads to the extension of that authority’s responsibility into additional areas of policy regarding wages, taxation and exchange rates, thus creating a self-sustainable process of European integration. Intergovernmentalism on the other hand argues that the level and speed of the process of European integration is controlled by national governments based on the belief that integration at the European level was driven by domestic political and economic needs. By studying an important moment in the process of integration through the political and architectural debate on a seat for the European institutions, this study aims to clarify the driving and often conflicting forces in the decision-making process and attempts to offer a more layered view on the debate.
The Crisis of the Nation

In an interview with anthropologist Paul Rabinow on the changing political role of architecture in the 17th and 18th centuries, Michel Foucault argues:

"The city was no longer perceived as a place of privilege, as an exception in a territory of fields, forests, and roads. The cities were no longer islands beyond the common law. Instead, the cities, with the problems that they raised, and the particular forms that they took, served as the models for the governmental rationality that was to apply to the whole of the territory. There is an entire series of utopias or projects for governing territory that developed on the premise that a state is like a large city; the capital is like its main square, the roads are like its streets. (...) The model of the city became the matrix for the regulations that apply to a whole state. (Foucault, 1984)"

A well-regulated state was one that adopted a system as well organized and efficient as that of the city. However, while the hinterland of the classical polis knew no life but that of beasts and Gods, the outskirts of the state did not consist of lawless life but of another, equivalent system of regulation. Thus, as soon as the state became an instrument for controlling a vast territory, its borders turned to a reciprocal condition of otherness. This state of reversibility between one side and the other formed from the start a considerable threat to the state. In many ways, World War I was an outburst of the crisis of the state. Although the turn of the century had witnessed a new intensity in international relations, this condition of exchange and cooperation was accompanied by the rising power of nationalism. After World War I minorities pressured for their own states, while existing states were looking to expand. The nationalist impetus emphasized and expanded the easily
combustible incongruities - existing or pursued. As the British-Czech philosopher and social anthropologist Ernest Gellner has argued, nationalism can lead to war when the political boundary of a state fails to include all members of a nation or when the rulers of a political unit are not part of the nation’s majority, as in large empires. The events of World War I placed the 18th century construct of the nation in jeopardy and demonstrated how international and regional cooperation could overthrow national regimes. More recent theorists of nationalism such as the writings of Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger have further revealed the artificiality of the idea of a nation, constructed by invented traditions. In the period right after World War II, the desire to create a new system for governing the European territory that would replace the defunct constellation of nations and their often artificial borders therefore became deeply rooted and the question of how to redefine the relationship between individuals and their governing system ever more immediate.

In Right of Death and Power over Life (1978) Michel Foucault discusses the profound transformation that took place from Roman times until today in the privileges of sovereign power to decide over life and death of its subjects.

Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. (...) If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race and the large-scale phenomena of population. (Foucault, 1978)
In the transformation from the ancient ‘right to take life or let live’ to the ‘power to foster life if disallow it’, a new regime emerged in which a new relationship developed between the governing system and the individual. As Foucault demonstrates, in the 17th century, the new power over life evolved in two directions: the body as a machine as integrated in an economic order of efficiency and the body as the basis of biological processes of ‘propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity,’ leading to what Foucault calls a ‘biopolitics of the population,’ replacing the sovereign power of death by the ‘administration of bodies’ in a new era of ‘bio-power.’ Foucault’s theory of bio-power can be understood as a conceptual framework for understanding the development of capitalism, which needed the deployment of bodies in its production apparatus producing a new concept of power which is no longer based on classical political categories of territory or state. This new condition separates ‘government’ from state politics, or what Foucault calls ‘governmentality,’ a political system including a wide range of control techniques over a wide variety of objects from the individual to the biopolitical. Arguing that “The state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities” Foucault connects this new condition of biopolities to the diminishing power of the public realm and the increasing importance of the private sector in a neoliberalist society, where market mechanisms are dominant and state action is restricted. The Foucauldian concept of governmentality corresponds with societies where power is decentralized and citizens participate in mechanisms of auto-regulation and auto-correction. Foucault’s theoretical construct of bio-politics and governmentality sharpens our conception of the shifting relationship between citizens and states and helps explain the multi-layered condition where citizens of European nation-states are re-invented by the creation of a larger administrative system. The European institutions created after World War II can be considered from the Foucauldian point of view as
systems creating a new level of biopolitics across the European territory, thereby also generating a new kind of European self-regulating citizens.

*From the eighteenth century, the idea of perpetual peace and the idea of international organization are, I think, articulated completely differently. It is no longer so much the limitation of internal forces that is called upon to guarantee and found a perpetual peace, but rather the unlimited nature of the external market. The larger the external market, the fewer its borders and limits, the more you will have a guarantee of perpetual peace.* (Foucault, 1978)

While Foucault uses the theory of biopower to explain neoliberalist policies of the modern nation-state, German sociologist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas argues that the nation-state which had provided infrastructure for rational administration and the legal frame for free individual and collective action is disintegrating. Nevertheless, the idea of a nation is pre-political and describes ‘communities of people of the same decent’ yet who are not political organized. Moving to the question of European citizenship, Habermas discusses how the concept of national citizenship has historically been connected to the size of cities and city states. With the creation of the nation-state a new scale emerged in which the administrative and economic powers developed as a type of ‘system integration’ in parallel with the development of ‘social integration’ linked to values and norms. With the new scale enlargement from the nation-state to Europe at large, the question rises whether European citizenship can exist not only as political action across national borders but also as a new ‘consciousness of an obligation toward the European common weal.’ Currently, an increasing number of measures taken at the supranational level influence the lives of more and more citizens yet vice versa, citizens have no possibility of influencing these decisions. This democratic deficit is according to Habermas the reason for the crisis of Europe at the moment. In *The Crisis of the*
European Union: A Response, Habermas argues for the transition from an international to a cosmopolitan community in the European project. Here Habermas develops the argument that global capitalism can be reorganized beyond the nation-state at a supranational and global level by profoundly restructuring the European Union. Habermas states that a European citizenship can be enabled by allowing for a set of institutions that provide a platform for debates among citizens in order to gain mutual trust and civic solidarity.

By considering the diminishing power of the public realm and therefore the erosion of the concept of the nation-state together with the replacement of sovereignty with the Foucauldian governmentality or with Habermas’ Cosmopolitan European Community, we can understand the process of European integration as a layered process in which a more loose connection between states and citizens and a self-organizing neoliberalist society led to a condition of parallel systems. One the one hand the domestic, internal system of economic progress, on the other hand an external (international) market regulated by a ‘regime of multiple governmentalities.’ In what follows I will attempt to connect the parallel geopolitical condition of spaces of power with the actual spatial organization of a new transnational European city.

The Formation of a Transnational European City

The proposed urban schemes for the 1958 competition for a seat of the European Institutions were influenced by contemporary urban models yet at the same time reconfigured these models to
produce a new type of city. In what follows I will briefly describe the urban concepts that figured as precedents according to which the new transnational European city was modeled.

**New Towns**

An important precedent for the imagination of the transnational European city was the development of the New Towns Movement, referring to the towns that were built after World War II as a reaction to the over-crowded and polluted industrial cities and inspired by the Garden City Movement founded by Sir Ebenezer Howard at the end of the nineteenth century. Howard’s utopian idea of a city in which people would live in perfect harmony with nature led to the realization of several Garden Cities as an alternative to the towns of ‘foul air’ and ‘high rents,’ in the first decades of the twentieth century. The creation of garden cities such as Letchworth Garden City and Welwyn Garden City influenced the development of New Towns after World War II. Also in the plans for London after World War II, New Towns played an important role. In 1942, the Standing Conference on London Regional Planning commissioned the Greater London Plan, to be conducted under the direction of architect and urban planner Sir Patrick Abercrombie. In parallel, Abercrombie was hired one year later together with J.H. Forshaw, architect for the London County Council, to draw up a plan for the County of London. Being developed simultaneously, the plans complemented one another and formed one comprehensive whole; where the County of London Plan ended, the Greater London Plan began. The latter set forth four objectives: to stop city growth spatially and demographically, to lower residential densities, to accommodate the displaced population in new towns and to encourage economic growth in less developed parts of the nation. During the interwar period the population of the Greater London area had increased by two million people, while the London County Council and City of London areas had decreased by over half a
million, caused by an exodus to the suburbs and an influx to the city periphery from other areas of the nation. The Greater London Plan would displace over one million people to new and expanded towns in the suburban and outer country rings. The plan incorporated new roads and ten New Towns of 60,000 inhabitants each, which would help to maintain agricultural land for cultivation as well as countryside recreation and living, providing London with its proper place at a national and regional scale. Following these plans, a New Towns Committee was created to address the organization of these new towns, and prepared a study that resulted in recommendations for constructing new towns, eventually leading to the 1946 New Towns Act, immediately followed by the 1947 Country Planning Act. These developments led to the construction of 28 towns and exemplify the post-war belief in a decentralized regional model, in which multiple urban centers would coexist in larger territorial spatial structure. New Towns soon became a widespread idea in post-war reconstruction efforts and a point of reference for many large scale urban schemes under development at the time.

**Grands Ensembles**

By the mid-fifties the housing shortage in France became a pressing issue following a period of population growth and rural migration to metropolitan areas. As a reaction, French Minister of Reconstruction and Housing Pierre Courant passed a law in 1953 for government intervention in the construction of large housing projects, initiating the production of the *Grands Ensembles.* According to Courant's plan, bonuses and low-interest loans would be granted for housing units that corresponded to pre-defined housing typologies, the "plan-types". The Courant Plan aimed at the construction of 240,000 housing units per year and by the late 1950s the goal had been surpassed with the building of more than 300,000 units per year. The term *Grands Ensembles* first appeared in
an article titled “Les grands ensembles” by Maurice Rotival in June 1935 in the *l’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui* discussing public collective housing recently built in France. After World War II, the term returned in a 1953 article by then Director of Construction at the Ministry of Reconstruction and Urbanism Adrien Spinetta titled “Les grands ensembles pensés pour l’homme” and that same year the Courant Plan was announced.

Two important interpretations of the *Grands Ensembles* can be recognized: that of the geographer Yves Lacoste and that of the sociologist René Kaës. For the first, the grand ensemble is a living unit relatively autonomous formed by collective buildings constructed in a short period of time, in function of a global plan and containing more than 1000 housing units. This mass of housing units then relies on collective services such as schools, commercial and sociocultural centers. René Kaës on the other hand defines an architectural and urbanistic ensemble with collective infrastructure, similar to Lacoste's definition but adds that the completely new collective habitat responds to a new economic, technical and demographic situation and radically transforms daily life. In the study that follows we will discuss how Lacoste’s definition expanded by Kaës forms the foundation of the newly imagined European ensembles that promised to transform the social structure of a European community.

In 1959, the journal Urbanisme published the results of a study by a state-led commission of experts presenting a model for the construction of France's *Grands Ensembles*, stating that even if a project has all the components to be successful, its inhabitants could still be dissatisfied. Therefore the article proposed a model that would allow for the creation of a human community and at the same time ensure individual freedom. The study provided quantification and guidelines for collective facilities in mass housing projects. Proposing a grid of collective facilities, (later known as the Grille
Dupont), the article listed a wide range of ‘equipment’ ranging from sports centers to post offices. The proposed table of promised a systemized model whereby all entities from churches to sports facilities were listed under the same category as equipment for large housing estates. The assumption that a social coherence was dependent on spatially bounded areas linked the model to earlier concepts of garden cities, new towns and neighborhood units. As urbanist Gaston Bardet explained in the same article: "the city as it is conceived: a spot, an endless expansion of a central point, the city as it is: a cluster, a federation of communities."\(^{47}\) This new understanding of clusters rather than a radio-concentric urban model had appeared earlier in the discussions at the CIAM congresses (Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne). While the first CIAM congress in 1928 came up with three key functions for the city: “Dwelling,” “Working,” and “Recreation,” the fourth CIAM in 1933 in Athens added “Traffic” as a fourth function organizing the other three: “The fourth, that of traffic, should have only one objective: to bring the other three into effective communication with one another.”\(^{48}\) Starting in July 1953 at the 9th Congress of CIAM, Team 10 had voiced a concern with the functionalist grids that had been defined by CIAM in former congresses, stressing the importance of understanding how communities actually functioned rather than defining how they should function. According to Peter Smithson, a leading figure in Team 10, the absolute ideal would be less fixed; an open society that would discourage any form of centralized nation-city.

In an attempt to rephrase the modernist concept of the Functional City, Team 10 members Alison and Peter Smithson write:

"Our functionality means accepting the realities of the situation, with all their contradictions and confusions, and trying to do something with them. In consequence we have to create an architecture and a town planning
which – through built form – can make meaningful the change, the growth, the flow, the vitality of the community. 

While Grands Ensembles were an attempt to provide a more humane solution for mass housing, intentions and actual results diverted from one another. The ensemble was often misunderstood and interpreted de facto as a static composition of large scale volumes on an empty plane rather than the dynamic community oriented cluster as envisioned by Team 10.

Network Urbanism

As Mark Wigley argues in an article titled Network Fever, architectural experiments among CIAM and similar groups in the fifties and sixties renounced the grid as a spatial logic in order to give way to the web, turning movement in space to flow within lines. In 1938, American architect and futurist Buckminster Fuller wrote that traditional architecture should give way to a “world dwelling services network” based on the telephone network and in 1943, the March edition of Life Magazine published Fuller’s dymaxion map of the world, representing the planet in a non-hierarchical way and without a predefined center, as a singular network. The map served as the cover of the Greek magazine Ekistics for several years. Founded in October 1955 by C.A. Doxiadis and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt Ekistics emphasized the biological aspect of cities. In a book with the same title, Doxiadis elaborated his theory of 'ekistics' as a science of human settlements emerging from increasingly complex settlements. According to Doxiadis, urban growth tended to regional conurbations and eventually to a world-wide city which he called "ecumenopolis (Fig i.6, Fig i.7, Fig i.8)." His interest in hexagonal distribution patterns as a potential future of this urban/biological entity was influenced by Christaller's Central Place theory, originally published in 1933. This interest in the biological characteristics of the city, the use of distribution patterns as a design tool and the idea of a
dispersing world leading to a global city explained the important role of *Ekistics* in the dissemination of the use of patterns in architectural discourse of the period. This is the context of architectural debate in which the concept of a network-based cross-border European urbanism developed and can be understood, as a profound transformation from the functionalist grid, to the biological web.

Moreover, the idea of a transportation-based urbanism proved to be an appropriate tool in an era of the increasing need for adaptability to unpredictable change. Already during the interwar period, European architects started studying studied transportation infrastructure as the underlying spine of urban development. For the CIAM V meeting in 1937, the MARS (Modern Architectural Research) group’s own Town Planning Committee put together a contribution, titled “The Interpenetration of Town and Country, Example: London.” Its chairman, Hubert de Cronin Hastings, proprietor of the Architectural Press, was particularly interested in the recent revival of the concept of the linear city. The report analyzed London’s deteriorating urban fabric, demographic growth and suburbanization, and stressed the significance of a rapid growth in car ownership. Existing schemes such as Garden Cities, New Towns and Green Belts were described with a critical eye. Different velocities (pedestrian movement, local traffic, rapid highway traffic and air travel) would define urban form, by providing them with the appropriate transport system.

French transportation theorist and engineer Gabriel Dupuy, author of the 2009 publication *Urban Networks – Network Urbanism* proposes three criteria to evaluate early network thinking in urban proposals: the *topological criterion* indicating direct connections between nodes and the ideal of ubiquity; the *kinetic criterion* measuring instant and constant velocity without delay; and the *adaptive criterion*, which is the possibility to choose between connections, based on a fixed infrastructure allowing for a network that adjusts itself according to its users' needs. Through an investigation of
late 19th and early 20th century urban plans such as Baron Haussmann’s hierarchical network of infrastructure for Paris in 1867, Arturo Soria y Mata’s 1886 linear city plan for Madrid and Otto Wagner’s 1893 plan for Vienna, Dupuy describes a history of designing urban networks as an alternative for the urban planning tool of zoning. Using Dupuy’s three criteria of network thinking, I will investigate how the topological, kinetic and adaptive aspects operate in the development of a cross-border urban network. The discussion above demonstrates how network thinking in the context of urban theory allowed for an alternative to top-down urban planning, moving toward mechanisms of self-organization, an adaptive, flexible and driven by individual action challenges

**New Monumentality**

*The last hundred years have witnessed the devaluation of monumentality. This does not mean that there is any lack of formal monuments or architectural examples pretending to serve this purpose: but the so-called monuments of recent date have, with rare exceptions, become empty shells. They in no way represent the spirit or the collective feeling of modern times.*

In 1943, the New York Chapter of CIAM led by architects José Luis Sert, Fernand Léger and Siegfried Giedion published a manifest reconnecting the idea of monumentality to discussions of modern architecture. Since Lewis Mumford’s denouncement of monumentality in his 1937 essay “The Death of the Monument,” monumentality had been treated by the modern movement as a hollow attempt to connect the present to the past, linked to the traditional city with its ‘dead buildings’, to the ‘rich and powerful’ and to a classical beaux-arts tradition. In a reaction, Le Corbusier and afterwards Sigfrid Giedion and Josep Lluís Sert developed a theory of new monumentality, attempting to respond to popular needs: “art is still regarded as luxury, and not as the medium to shape the emotional life in the broadest sense (...) newly created civic centers should be the site for collective
emotional events, where the people play as important a role as the spectacle itself, and where a unity of the architectural background, the people and the symbols conveyed by the spectacles will arise. In “The Human Scale in City Planning,” Josep Lluís Sert further explained how new monumentality could be translated to urban design at the human scale. Beyond the idea of the neighborhood unit, Sert argued for pedestrian civic centers for public gathering, with monuments corresponding with ‘popular aspirations.’ Eric Mumford demonstrates how two important yet unbuilt CIAM projects interpreted the concept of ‘New Monumentality’: Le Corbusier’s 1945 plan for St. Dié and Sert and Wiener’s 1943 plan for Brasilian Motor City to be built North of Rio de Janeiro, a new town based on the motor industry. Whereas Motor City proposed an enclosed pace for its civic center, the plan for St. Dié presented an open platform holding public buildings and commercial facilities (Fig i.9, Fig i.10). The idea of non-confined large open spaces providing dynamic processes of social gathering will be used as a reference when looking at the urban schemes developed for hosting the European Institutions. The juxtaposition of social atmospheres, each emanating from a distinct public building, as Giedion would later describe the St. Dié plan appeared to become an influential element in the schemes to be studied in what follows. The design of civic centers would continue to be an important aspect of new town design by the modern movement in the next few years. At the CIAM 7 meeting in 1949, Josep Lluís Sert together with Paul Lester Wiener presented a plan for the Peruvian city of Chimbote (Fig i.11, Fig i.12, Fig i.13). Based on their vision for the city as a future industrial center Sert and Wiener developed a plan including housing for 12,000 inhabitants, in two residential units of 6,000 inhabitants each, connected by a network of roads. The plan included the placement of closed urban spaces in civic centers that would allow for personal contact and direct communication between inhabitants. In an attempt to reconstitute the Renaissance Plaza, the proposed civic centers were to provide the experience of the colonial main square. As appears from the civic center
typologies described above, post-war architects experimented with new schemes for public spaces in new towns to be constructed and thereby questioned the need for enclosing or opening up the collective spaces in search for a stronger connection between the city and its inhabitants.

This dissertation will investigate the urban schemes that accompanied the early stages of the post-war European Integration project and their role in re-imagining the post-war city in an increasingly globalized world. By studying design proposals, competition documents and the public debate on the one hand and the European political decision-making process and internal debates on the other, the research will discuss three fundamental concepts in the formation of a new transnational European city: the void, the network and the platform, which form the chapters of this dissertation. A first chapter will focus on the post-war pursuit of a neutral territory. In the search for an appropriate location, a debate emerged that searched for territories voided of national identity, sites that would be suitable for the creation of an extraterritorial European space. A second chapter will consider the idea of the European city at the regional scale, as a node in cross-border networks of transportation and communication, challenging the assumption that the European transnational city was to be realized in a central location. A renewed interest in accessibility and connectivity signaled the assumption that a transnational European space would be dispersed and would require the traveling of European citizens, information and services over large distances. The third chapter will look at the proposals at the most concrete level, investigating how the proposed urban schemes placed forward a new type of city based on the concept of platforms. In correspondence, reports, submissions, evaluations and meeting minutes produced as part of the 1958 competition, the term ‘platform’ figured as the preferred scheme for the new European city, offering space to host the growing political body of European integration in parallel to the existing city.
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Chapter 01: The Quest for a Neutral Territory

In the first decade after World War II, cooperation between European nation-states and their efforts to create cross-border political and economic entities to prevent future wars and ensure economic prosperity posed a challenge for the organization of the European territory. Discussions among foreign ministers and functionaries of three new international communities – the European Community for Steel and Coal (ECSC), the European Economic Community (EEC, also called the Common Market) and Euratom – centered around the problem of degrees and formats of European transnational integration. The debates culminated in the 1958 competition for a seat of the European Institutions, in which member states proposed candidate cities for hosting the three newly created European Communities. The reorganization of Europe’s geopolitical order thereby challenged existing European cities to reinvent their role in a framework that was no longer purely nation-based. The city as a national or regional center of industry, finance, culture and government did not supply the appropriate environment needed for a much larger system of transnational economies and governance. Yet at the same time, European nation-states refused to give up their sovereignty, and therefore also the existing role of their cities as loci for the production of national identity. This ambiguous challenge of incorporating both national and transnational identity led to the emergence of a city composed of distinct, clearly defined areas, each with its own economic, cultural and political role yet closely interconnected by transportation infrastructure.
1.1 The United States of Europe

In a “speech for the academic youth” at the University of Zurich, Switzerland on September 19, 1946, British opposition leader Winston Churchill formulated a solution for overcoming what he called the ‘tragedy of Europe’:¹

“I wish to speak to you to-day about the tragedy of Europe. This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and the most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the western world. It is the fountain of Christian faith and Christian ethics. It is the origin of most of the culture, the arts, philosophy and science both of ancient and modern time.”

Characterizing Europe as a geographical, racial, religious, moral and cultural entity, Churchill touched on the major motives in the discourse of creating a united Europe, which had been growing since the 19th century and found a new momentum in the aftermath of the Second World War. As the memory of horror and destruction was still fresh in people’s minds, Churchill described a terrifying vacuum in civilized Europe that required immediate action: “over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, care-worn and bewildered human beings gape at the ruins of their cities and their homes, and scan the dark horizons for the approach of some new peril, tyranny or terror. Among the victors there is a babel of voices; among the vanquished the sullen silence of despair.” To fill this void, Churchill proposed a new ‘regional structure’: ‘What is this sovereign remedy? It is to re-create the European Family, or as much of it as we can, and to provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe.’

By these words, Churchill expressed the beliefs of many at the time and forecast the rapid creation of international organizations that promoted overcoming differences and conflicts between individual nations. At the same time, Churchill did not envision Britain as part of this effort toward
European Integration and thereby differed from the more federalist point of view, which was embodied a few months later by the establishment of the Union of European Federalists. Churchill was cautious about the ‘continental’ federalist position in the process of European integration because of his own beliefs in the unification of ‘English speaking peoples.’\(^2\) Already in 1930 Churchill wrote:

\[
\text{We see nothing but good and hope in a richer, freer, more contented European commonality. But we have our own dream and our own task. We are with Europe, but not of it. We are linked but not compromised. We are interested and associated but not absorbed.}\]

Churchill had been instrumental in the creation of the United Nations when drawing up the Atlantic Charter in 1941 with US president Roosevelt proposing international collaboration in order to maintain peace and security. Based on this charter, 50 countries met in San Francisco at the United Nations Conference and signed over the creation of the United Nations four years later, in 1945. The idea of unification between nations as a warranty for peace was therefore not new, yet the debate around European integration centered on the extend to which this unification would be supranational.

On May 1947, in parallel and in line with Churchill’s unionist point of view, the United Europe Movement was created and although it argued for a complete unification, the movement did not favor supranational organizations but rather intergovernmental cooperation. The early years of post-World War II European integration were thereby immediately characterized by the inherent and profound conflict between the sovereignty of European nations and transnational power.
In June of the same year, several organizations for a unified Europe were created, including Rene Courtin’s French Council for a United Europe, the Christian-Democrat Nouvelles Equipes Internationales and the Socialist United States of Europe Movement, and by the end of that year, Federalist and Unionist organizations met at the International Coordination of Movements for the Unification of Europe Committee to discuss possible ways of collaborating toward a common goal. A few weeks later, on the first of January, the Benelux Customs Union between the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg came into force, which had been signed four years earlier by the three countries’ governments in exile in London in order to facilitate free trade and abolish custom duties. Furthermore, acting as a block, the three states together would stand stronger in Europe’s reconstruction efforts.

1.1.1 The Founding Fathers

Many political figures of the post-war generation realised that only a united Europe could secure a long-lasting peace. Konrad Adenauer, appointed the first Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949, can be considered one of the important figures in the advancement of post-war European integration, securing peace by binding the future of Germany to other Western European Nations through membership of the Council of Europe in 1951, co-founding the European Coal and Steel Community in 1952 and attaining membership of NATO in 1955. Following a foreign policy of “Westbindung” or integration with the West in reaction to the approach of the Social Democratic Party of Germany who aimed at an Eastern integration, Adenauer promoted binding the German state to the Western countries and especially France. This has been interpreted as a way to ensure future peace through common geopolitical ties between France and Germany, protecting Germany from itself. The Realist theory on the other hand argues that Adenauer’s plan was more self-interested, attempting to strengthen the weak position of Germany as aggressor. Tying
Germany to an integrated Europe would enable the country to regain power and maximize its strength. Joseph Bech, 17th Prime Minister of Luxembourg from 1953 to 1958, played a crucial role in the creation of the Benelux Union between the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg and later in the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community. As a citizen of a small and powerless state, Bech realized the importance of international cooperation for the purpose of stability and prosperity. Additionally, the British Prime Minister (1940-45 and 1951-55), former army officer and war reporter Winston Churchill, was convinced that a united Europe could guarantee peace and argued against nationalism.

Working behind the scenes, French political and economic advisor Jean Monnet promoted European integration by formulating the preliminary concepts of the Shuman Declaration of 1950, proposing a merger of heavy industries in Western Europe, which eventually led to the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community and from 1952 to 1955, Monnet became the first president of the ECSC’s executive body. Robert Shuman, French Foreign Minister from 1948 to 1952, himself published a plan on May 9, 1950 to build a joint control mechanism for coal and steel production in order to secure a peaceful Europe. After convincing German chancellor Adenauer of his plan, the governments of Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands also reacted, and not long after the six states signed the agreement for the European Coal and Steel Community in Paris in April 1951. Paul-Henri Spaak, a Belgian politician, filled many positions in international cooperation as the first President of the United Nations General Assembly (1946–1957), the first President of the Common Assembly of the European Coal and Steel Community (1952–1954), the first President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (then called the Consultative Assembly (1949-50), and as the second Secretary General of NATO (1957–1961). Spaak fulfilled a crucial role in formulating the content of the 1957 Treaty of Rome.
establishing the ECSC and was appointed president of the working committee preparing the Treaty at the 1955 Messina Conference by the six participating governments.  

1.1.2 Post-war International Cooperation

Following the end of World War II, as a result of the individual efforts of these political figures, but also driven by a collective urge for military security and economic prosperity, a number of European organizations emerged with the aim of achieving international cooperation in order to secure long-lasting peace.

After a series of preparatory treaties for international cooperation, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), promoting economic cooperation between European states, was established on April 16, 1948 by the sixteen countries that had agreed on cooperating in the framework of the Marshall plan to administer American and Canadian aid for the reconstruction of Europe after World War II. One month later, a meeting took place in The Hague, the Netherlands, which later became known as the Hague Congress. Chaired by Winston Churchill, the congress brought together 750 delegates including ministers, parliament members and other prominent political figures. In addition, a group of intellectuals including philosophers, journalists, church leaders, lawyers, academics and entrepreneurs actively participated in the congress. The congress recommended the creation of a European Deliberative Assembly and a European Special Council to further political and economic integration of European countries. An additional outcome of the meeting was the recommendation to adopt a charter of human rights and to create a Court of Justice to ensure the charter’s principles. Furthermore, the congress called for a political, economic and monetary Union of Europe and thereby strongly influenced the European Movement. The congress was instrumental in defining the future structure and role of the Council of Europe and led to a
series of subsequent treaties creating the Council of Europe, the European Assembly, the Court of Human Rights, and common institutions for industry, tariff and trade.\textsuperscript{13}

Not only political and economic issues formed a driving force for the sequence of treaties, also issues of defense became an important topic leading to the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which established a common military defense mechanism including the standardization of military technology and transportation infrastructure.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{quote}
The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

In this series of treaties, the aim for both military stability and economic prosperity played a central role, further promoted in the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951.

\begin{quote}
World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it. (…) Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

In a famous speech on May 9, 1950, French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, inspired by Jean Monnet, proposed integrating the coal and steel industries of Western Europe. Schuman presented a
proposal to create a new way of organizing sovereignty in Europe through a supranational community. Learning from the experience of two world wars, Schuman argued that justice could not be secured by the system of state apparatus alone. About one month later, six European countries (Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Italy, the Netherlands and Germany subscribed to the Schuman declaration. Following Shuman’s influential declaration, the Assembly of the Council of Europe approved the proposed plan in August 1950 and in April 1951 Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands signed the Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community.¹⁷ The supporters of the Coal and Steel community believed in a piecemeal European integration process and saw the treaty as a first step in a broader progression toward a common European Union. As the first international organization based on supranational principles the ECSC was created with the aim to expand European economies and rationalize industrial production.

During a meeting of the High Authority on August 10, 1952 Jean Monnet pointed out how coal and steel by nature formed connections between nations across their borders:

“See how the basin of Northern France stretches itself towards Belgium, bow the Belgian coal mines connect to the coal mines of Aix and of the Ruhr, look at the Campine divided between Belgium and the Netherlands, and the same coal divided between the Saarland and the Lorraine, the same iron between the Lorraine and Luxembourg! These resources which nature has turned into the essential industry of Europe, have been the place of the struggles between states and the initiatives of domination. By erasing the divisions which people have arbitrarily introduced, this natural basin of which they have fragmented the unity and limited the development, is to be recreated.”¹⁸
Since the coal and steel region of Europe crossed the borders between France and Germany, these industries held a symbolic value as elements that could strengthen a long-lasting peace between two states that had been longtime enemies. Yet more importantly, European nations feared that the scarcity of steel would allow for Germany to rebuild its dominance in the industry. In the negotiations preceding the Paris Treaty, it became clear that European nations were less interested in coordinated sectoral planning, but motivated by the need for access to resources that could support reconstruction efforts of national industries.\textsuperscript{19} Although in the end, the Treaty of Paris was a compromise between national governments, it did create supranational powers with a council of ministers that had to assent to policy measures by a High Authority from which decisions would originate. This High Authority would be given the power to fine firms and withhold transfer funds as tools to enforce following the newly established ECSC rules. The rules of the treaty included price transparency, management of investment, banning cartels, eliminating subsidies, transparent labor policy, standardized transport rates, establishing foreign diplomatic relations and taking measures in crisis situations through production quotas. In addition, a supranational European Court of Justice would look over disputes among member states, European institutions and private actors.

In May 1952, the ECSC treaty entered into force and French politician and initiator of the Schuman Plan, Jean Monnet was appointed as president of its High Authority, while Paul-Henri Spaak became president of the Common Assembly.\textsuperscript{20} Soon after, member states started a search for an appropriate seat for the newly created institutions. Jean Monnet recalls how the six governments were unable to reach an agreement on the location of the seat for the newly established ECSC even after eighteen hours of negotiation and eventually agreed on Luxembourg as a temporary solution until a decision would be made.\textsuperscript{21} The European Coal and Steel Community instantly became an influential political entity and within less than a year, in January 1, 1953, the ECSC levy, the first European tax came
into force (Fig C1.1).\textsuperscript{22} About one month later on February 10 1953, the six ESCS countries removed custom duties and quantitative restrictions on the raw materials coal and iron.

Beyond these the efforts of achieving European integration through economic cooperation, leaders of the European Movement continued promoting political unity. In March 1953, Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak, presented a draft proposal for the creation of a political European Community to Georges-Augustin Bidault, president of the ECSC Council, arguing for a community that would ensure human and fundamental rights, guarantee the security of member states against aggression, warrant the coordination of member states policy and create a common market.

After a period of consolidating the new transnational political order\textsuperscript{23} the Foreign Ministers of the six ECSC countries held a meeting in Messina (Italy) in June 1955 and agreed on the principle of economic integration and in May 1956 Spaak presented a draft for the community treaties establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) and the Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) to his ECSC peers. This document was approved in Venice shortly thereafter by the Foreign Ministers of the ECSC who decided to open intergovernmental negotiations on setting up the EEC and Euratom. In June of 1956, the Intergovernmental Conference on the Common Market and Euratom took place in Brussels, to negotiate the drafts of the treaties for both communities. The EEC would ensure a common market for Europe and establish economic integration, while Euratom would encourage efforts in developing nuclear power. Less than a year later, in March 1957, the six member states sign the Rome Treaties establishing the EEC and Euratom. On January 1, 1958, the Treaties of Rome entered into force. The EEC and Euratom communities were given a seat in Brussels, while the Parliamentary Assembly and the Court of Justice in Strasbourg became common to all three communities: the EEC, Euratom and the ECSC. Thereby the condition of a dispersed constellation of centers of power was an integral part of the early steps of the post-war
European project. In March that year, the European Parliamentary Assembly, replacing the ECSC assembly, was created in Strasbourg with Robert Schuman, the French foreign minister, as its elected president. The changes and enlarged scope of the new treaties manifested itself in different forms and media and the seating arrangement of the Parliamentary Assembly, changed in May 1958 to be no longer according to nations but rather according to party affiliation, exemplifies a profound change in the perception of the new state of European integration.

The executives of these newly established entities were called commissioners rather than High Authorities and were much less supranational than the ECSC in order to respond to reservations of some member states such as France over the power of the High Authority. The first formal meeting of the EEC took place in January 1958 at the Château of Val-Duchesse near Brussels. In June 1959, the EEC’s national fiscal administrations set up three working groups to review the feasibility of harmonizing indirect levy legislation and on July 20-21, 1959 seven countries of the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), namely Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, decide to establish a European Free Trade Association (EFTA). That same summer both Greece and Turkey applied for association with the newly established EEC and in September, the EEC starts negotiations for their association as an interim measure leading to full accession.27

1.2 Preconditions in Searching for a Seat for the European Institutions

The Treaty of Paris, 1952

In 1952, the European Community of Coal and Steel (ECSC) invited applications from cities of member states to permanently host the ECSC’s institutions and its future organizations. The ECSC’s member states submitted a range of small and internationally unknown cities, located in border
areas. Being less significant and with a less explicit national identity than state capitals, these border city candidacies catered to the reluctance of nation-states to give up their powers in favour of a larger power at the scale of Europe. For the same reason, the community’s member states failed to reach an agreement, each country being unwilling to consider other country’s candidate cities. After a series of tiresome discussions, the ministers representing the ECSC’s member states agreed to postpone the choice to a later date and to settle temporarily in the city of Luxembourg, while locating the European Parliamentary Assembly in the city of Strasbourg. Jean Monnet, who first conceived the ECSC in 1950, recalls that after 18 hours of negotiation \(^{28}\), no decision could be reached regarding the permanent seat of the ECSC, and at the suggestion of Joseph Bech, former Prime Minister of Luxembourg, the High Authority was established temporarily in the city of Luxembourg by default. Emile Hamilius, deputy mayor of the City of Luxembourg describes how the six governments of the ECSC decided to start working in Luxembourg on August 10, 1952 ‘out of laxness’, hoping they would reach an agreement on a definitive location a few weeks later. As they never succeeded in doing so, Luxembourg became the ECSC’s permanent seat. On August 10, 1952, the High Authority of the ECSC took office in the city of Luxembourg as its temporary seat (Fig C1.2). The temporary solution of 1952 by no means meant the end of the quest for a true home for the emerging Europe. Rather, the inadequacy of the temporary solution instigated a feverish sequence of consistently procrastinated deadlines for the establishment of a seat and fuelled a series of debates and speculations on the possibility of defining a location for hosting the European Institutions.

Within half a year of the foreign ministers’ decision, the European Parliamentary Assembly agreed on a new deadline for determining a seat within one year. \(^{29}\) In several European cities and regions, planners and architects continued to carry out studies for developing a suitable home for the
European Institutions. For the city of Brussels, the students of the architecture at the Ecole Supérieure de Saint-Luc designed an administrative district for the future integration of European organizations and their work was exhibited and presented to the ECSC in 1955.\textsuperscript{30} As briefly mentioned earlier, the city of Saarbrücken in Saarland, one of the official 1952 candidate cities, continued to be a site of speculation in the following years. After World War II the Saarland became part of the French occupation zone in Germany designated in 1946 as “French customs area”. Therefore the French government supported the idea of turning Saarbrücken into a host for the European Institutions in an attempt to avoid its return to German sovereignty. Saarland’s local government in its efforts not to be annexed by France promoted its own future status as a European extraterritorial district. In 1953, several prominent political leaders and planners of the Saarland formed a committee with the aim to organize a competition for a European district adjacent to Saarbrücken and announced the competition in June, 1954.\textsuperscript{31} The prize-winning submissions were promising in their ability to imagine innovating urban schemes for a future European district, yet political changes prevented further elaboration of the idea (Fig C1.3, Fig C1.4).

The Paris Accords of 23 October 1954 provided, in particular, for a European statute for the Saar under the auspices of the Western European Union (WEU). The French attempt at economic control over the Saarland was linked to the presence of large coal deposits in the region. However, at a referendum held on 23 October 1955, the people of the Saar voted against this European statute, and instead opted for the return of the Saar to the Federal Republic of Germany from 1 January 1957. Minister-President of the Saarland Johannes Hoffmann was in favor of the plan and envisioned an independent region that would host the European institutions. Nevertheless, despite the support of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the French Prime Minister Pierre Mendès-France, the plan was rejected in a referendum held on October 23 1955, with 67.7\% of the
voters against. When the Saarland eventually returned to Germany on January 1, 1957, France received as compensation the permission to extract coal from the Warndt deposit until 1981.

In the years following the 1954 debate over the Saarland, different locations kept being studied as possible seats for the European Institutions yet without decisive results.

**The Treaty of Rome, 1957**

With the Treaty of Rome in 1957, which established the European Economic Community and Euratom in addition to the already existing ECSC, a new wave of speculations for possible host cities ran through European newspapers and triggered a spontaneous competition among European cities for hosting the newly created institutions. Several cities announced their candidacies over the course of 1957 and by December that year, the six member states of the three European communities were ready to decide on a permanent headquarters.\(^\text{32}\) Since by that time both EEC and Euratom had settled in Brussels, five out of six member states were prepared to agree on the Belgian capital as the permanent headquarters of the European institutions; yet France opposed, unwilling to give up on Strasbourg. The 1957 culmination of optimism and vehement eagerness in creating a place where the European idea could flourish was thereby once more confronted with the impossibility of overruling national sovereignty. This breaking point once again revealed the inherent conflict between the post-war urge for European integration and the individual national governments’ reluctance to give up power, forming the base for a cumbersome, bureaucratic and politically convoluted process of choosing a seat for the European communities.
The Experts’ Mission

Following these events of euphoria and disappointment, the foreign ministers of the member states decided to appoint a committee of experts in the field of urbanism in January 1958, for advice on the city candidatures in order to provide a more profound underpinning for the decision on a seat for the European institutions. National leaders selected a committee of experts made up of architects and urbanists who filled administrative positions in their respective national governments: Head of the Committee Victor Bure, General Director of the Belgian Administration of Urbanism, Pierre Randet of the French Ministry of Reconstruction and Housing, Johannes Rossig of the German Ministry of Treasury, J.P. Thijsse of the Dutch National Planning Department, Cesare Valle of the Italian Higher Authority for Public Works, and Henri Luja of the Luxembourgish National Department of Urbanism (Fig C1.5).33

The ministers in addition put together a tight working schedule: Official candidatures submitted by cities of member states would be accepted until the deadline of March 31, 1958 and the committee of experts was to submit a report evaluating the candidatures by April 30. The deadline for a decision by the member states was set for July 1, 1958. The number of applicants per country was not limited; some were sponsored by national governments and some by individual cities, but all applications were submitted through their national government. In looking for a host location, the European organizations were not allowed to make a decision. Most of the experts were therefore involved in the decision making process beyond formulating an advice, both at the national political level of selecting and promoting specific cities and at the local level of preparing the proposed candidatures. The experts’ mission, as defined by the member states’ foreign ministers in a mandate of February 25, 1958 was to prepare a study of the candidatures presented for the installation of the communities to provide the ministers with a concrete evaluation of advantages for each location.34
Immediately after its establishment, the committee of experts became the target of a passionate lobbying campaign by national ministers, city representatives, architects and advocates of the European idea. At the first meeting of the committee of experts on March 10, 1958 in Brussels, the official submissions included Brussels, Luxembourg and the northern Italian cities of Milan, Turin, Stresa and Monza, and at the meeting itself, French representative Pierre Randet announced the official candidature of Strasbourg. At this meeting, the committee discussed its mission and decided to visit the candidature cities throughout March and April and to prepare a set of criteria for evaluating the proposals by the next meeting in Strasbourg. The experts agreed that their mission went beyond the scale of architecture and was to be understood from the broadest perspective of planning the territory at the scale of Europe at large. Moreover, although individual members of the committee questioned the principle of a single seat for all three European communities the committee decided not to challenge the idea of centrality. Following the experts’ first meeting, the list of candidate cities was expanded to include Varese, Paris, Departement de l’Oise and Nice. As planned, the committee of experts in urbanism visited ten candidate cities during the spring of 1958 in the following order: Strasbourg, Luxembourg, Milan, Monza, Turin, Stresa, Varese (Milan), Brussels, Paris, the Departement de l’Oise and Nice (see Table 2). In addition, the experts also evaluated The Hague, which only submitted its candidature as seat for the Court of Justice (Fig C1.6).

Throughout March and during their city visits, the experts in urbanism continued investigating the needs of a future European seat (including number of functionaries, offices and meeting rooms) and developing an elaborate list of criteria for evaluating the city candidatures in three categories: the scale of Europe at large, intrinsic city characteristics and the proposed location for a seat (Fig C1.7). At the scale of Europe, the list emphasized the city’s centrality and distance to the six capitals, its
‘European vocation’ and its access to international networks of transportation and information. At the city scale, the quality of the urban environment and the city’s capacity to host the European institutions were to be examined while the last category focused on details such as soil quality and the development possibilities for the terrain and its close connection with the existing city.\textsuperscript{38}

The choice of representatives of the committee of experts and their dependence on the decisions of national governments at different levels led to a contradictory mission: on the one hand to formulate an appreciation of candidate cities according to the principle of a single seat, and on the other to represent each member state’s national economic and political interests, which was inherently tending toward decentralization, resisting the idea of a single European capital. While nations such as Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands along with the committee members themselves criticized the single seat principle as unrealistic,\textsuperscript{39} geopolitical considerations at the level of the European continent and parts of Africa by European leaders such as Jean Monnet challenged the idea of a European capital itself.\textsuperscript{40}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key Proponents</th>
<th>Architects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{38}"

\textsuperscript{39}"

\textsuperscript{40}"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Proponent</th>
<th>Architects/Urbanists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg, Luxembourg</td>
<td>Protagonist</td>
<td>Joseph Petit, Luxembourgish writer, Victor Bodson, Minister of Transportation, Antoine Wehenkel, Luxembourgish politician, Jean Fosty, Political Journalist, Belgium</td>
<td>French architects René Coulon and André Crivelli for Luxembourg’s Kirchberg, Henri Luja, head of the National Urban Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg, France</td>
<td>Protagonist</td>
<td>Pierre Randet, French representative at the Committee of Experts, Pierre Pfimlin, Minister of Economy and Finance</td>
<td>Gustave Stoskopf, architect of the Departement du Bas-Rhin and Henri-Jean Calsat, French architect and urbanist Gustave Stoskopf (for Mount Sharrach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>Protagonist</td>
<td>Victor Bure, General Director of the Belgian Administration of Urbanism, Konrad Adenauer, first Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>Groupe Alpha: Theo Daens, Jean Gilson, Rene Piron and Alberto Vanderauwera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Antagonist</td>
<td>French president Charles de Gaulle Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (Pan-Europe)</td>
<td>French architects Robert Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Département de l'Oise, France</td>
<td>Antagonist</td>
<td>Industrialist Marcel Dassault</td>
<td>Henri Pottier, Jean Peccoux, Pierre Lery and Jean Tessier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice, France</td>
<td>Substitute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nice-based architects Georges and Michel Dikansky with Jeannine Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan, Italy</td>
<td>Substitute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gio Ponti and Pier Luigi Nervi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin, Italy</td>
<td>Substitute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a team of 45 architects and engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varese, Italy</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stresa - Monza, Italy</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague, Netherlands</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of Candidate Cities for the 1958 competitions and their respective proponents and architects.
1.3 The Candidates

Most candidate cities submitted one or more booklets meant to paint an impression of the city but also dissect it to demonstrate its suitability as a host for Europe. When compared, the booklets lay out the early results of post-World War II reconstruction efforts. The booklets included long lists of city ‘characteristics’ such as geographical location, infrastructure, accommodation, services, economic development and building inventories. However, the insertion of color printing, collage techniques, detailed architectural drawings, mappings and diagrams distinguished the applications of Luxembourg, Strasbourg and Brussels from the others. Based on documents submitted, correspondence among politicians and bureaucrats and press coverage, I have grouped the 10 official candidate cities in four categories (see Table 2):

1. Protagonists: the most probable host cities of Luxembourg, Strasbourg and Brussels
2. Antagonists: the critical proposals of Paris and the Département de l’Oise
3. Substitutes: alternative seats such as Nice, Milan and Turin
4. Appendices: secondary cities such as Stresa, Monza and The Hague.

Each city candidacy reflected a specific way of imagining the future of the European Communities. Examining each application in more detail reveals a set of presumptions about the spatial, geographic and political nature of Europe’s future urban form.
1.3.1 Protagonist Candidate Cities

Luxembourg, International Platform

In an attempt to maintain its already established position as a host for the European institutions, Luxembourg submitted several booklets, each with their own emphasis on specific aspects of being a seat for Europe. Using a strong rhetoric arguing for the city’s rooted European vocation; Luxembourg presents itself in four separate booklets as a seat for the European institutions, an international platform, a European city, and a place with a rich landscape, and architectural and urban patrimony. The booklet titled *Luxembourg, Siège des Institutions Européennes.* listed the ‘numerous’ reasons for considering Luxembourg as a seat for the European institutions: the city’s historical role as meeting grounds and transition zone between the Germanic and the Latin world, its multilingual population, its central location in Western Europe, its attractive climate of work, life and politics and the plans for a European ensemble on the Kirchberg plateau (Fig C1.8). In addition, the booklet listed the city’s ‘urbanistic data’ ranging from geography, climate and geology to hygiene, education and housing. A second booklet titled *Luxembourg, Plate-forme Internationale,* which had been published five years earlier, focused on the history of the city and country as an international meeting place and as a host for international agreements and institutions, and sketches the city as a crossroads of different cultures. A third booklet, published by the Mouvement Européen Luxembourg, collected a series of essays by prominent political figures such as the mayor, the prime minister and the minister of transportation, all demonstrating the city’s logistical and ideological fitness to the task. Lastly, a booklet titled *Paysages, Architecture, Urbanisme en Luxembourg,* depicted the city’s spatial characteristics, its monuments, typical townscapes, its bridges and surrounding idyllic landscapes (Fig C1.9). By submitting four distinguished perspectives on the candidature of the city, Luxembourg presented itself simultaneously as a place of European identity, as a host and platform
for organizations that lead beyond the country’s boundaries, and as a pleasant and picturesque background. These different concepts or characteristics of the seat for the European institutions proved to be a recurring theme in the different applications and the surrounding discourse. The candidacy of the city of Luxembourg promoted three important concepts as preconditions for establishing the future seat of the European Communities: the principle of dispersal, the city as a platform and the potential to establish a European ensemble in parallel to the existing city. Thereby a small, provincial and uninspiring city smartly turned its own weaknesses into assets as a potential center of the new Europe. Since it had been the seat of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) since 1952, Luxembourg promoted the principle of a dispersed model for the seat of the European communities. The chance that Luxembourg City would be found worthy to host all European institutions was slim, so in order not to lose the seat of the ECSC, the best option was to promote the idea that the seats would be distributed over several cities in Europe. In a statement recalling the exhausting negotiations of 1952, deputy mayor Emile Hamilius stated that the European seats should be distributed equally between the member countries of the community. Yet the support of a decentralized governance model was not unconditional and remained dependent on keeping the headquarters of the ECSC in Luxembourg. Additionally, Jean Fosty’s article in Luxembourg’s 1958 application titled “Plus d’Europe que d’Europes” argued for less disharmony, imbalance and dispersal, concentrating all parliamentary and non-parliamentary institutions in one location in a plea against Brussels, fearing that all seats would be relocated to Belgium. Instead Fosty proposed to keep Strasbourg and Luxembourg as the only valid hosts for any future European institution. Thus Luxembourg’s disadvantage of being a temporary and unconvincing choice for the ECSC became a subtext for promoting an attractive and plausible concept; the decentralized, dispersed organization of a homogenous European administrative system. In *Luxembourg Plate-forme Internationale*, part of Luxembourg’s 1958 candidature,
Luxembourgish writer Joseph Petit depicted Luxembourg as a crossroads of peoples and cultures, determined by its geography and location. Petit characterized Luxembourg as a blend of two populations: the roots of the Luxembourgish lie in both the Romanic culture in the west of the country that emerged in the 12th century, and in the Germanic group in the east to which its language belongs. In addition, he situated Luxembourg on the ancient trade route between north and south, between Italy over the Rhine on the one hand and over the valley of the Rhone and the Bourgogne on the other. He thus concluded that Luxembourg is a country of transition and international crossroads, an open platform where winds or influences of East and West, North and South can cross and mix and argued that its landscape, cities and monuments show this complex character: its capital evokes the Normandic style, its principal roads with stone houses evoke the French bourgeoisie, and its palace for the grand duke in Renaissance style resembles Flemish cities. In parallel, Petit compares Luxembourg’s landscapes to areas abroad: the country itself, with its valleys, deep forests, tortuous rivers, and farms surrounded with poplars and grain fields, resembles the Loraine landscape while the prolongation of the Belgian Ardennes with its castles resembles the Middle Rhine.

This led Petit to argue that Luxembourg is a country where the foreigner can find a place that reminds him of his home country within a small space and on hospitable ground:

“The Luxembourgish appreciates good cheer and happy feasts, he has the robust aspirations of the Flemish, he is a worker, practical, entrepreneur and sentimental like the German, but his love for individualism and freedom, his profound attachment to traditions and especially religious traditions, his artistic tastes resemble his large neighbor of the West towards which his soul is looking.” (p14)
Petit’s final argument points out that in international relationships, one element renders Luxembourg the most eminent of all hosts: its bilingualism, especially since it concerns the languages French and German. Petit describes how the bilingual Luxembourg has roots in both Romanic and Germanic cultures and finds itself at the ancient passage between north and south. Therefore, it is a land of transition and intersection, an ‘open platform’ where influences from different cultures can meet and mingle. Moreover, Petit argued that the country’s readiness for a multicultural identity can be found in its landscapes, cities and monuments. Within the country of Luxembourg, Petit distinguishes Normandic cities, French bourgeoisie houses and the Flemish renaissance palaces. In its landscapes he recognizes the valleys and forests of the Loraine and the hills of the Middle Rhine. Through these descriptions, the country of Luxembourg becomes 'everybody’s' land, open for any European to feel at home and re-shape its character.

Thereby Luxembourg did nothing but conform itself to the mission it had been assigned by its own geographic position in the heart of Europe. During the fifties, the number of inhabitants in the City of Luxembourg was around 60,000 and the capacity of office space at the disposition of the European institutions was limited. The possibilities of urban renewal in the city’s center were limited, which led the government to plan an extension to the city on the Kirchberg plateau, an agriculture zone across the valley.50

The European Vocation of Strasbourg

The booklet submitted by the city of Strasbourg titled, Strasbourg invite l’Europe (in German: Strasbourg Ladet Europa Ein) dedicated the majority of its pages to urban proposals for three different
locations and thereby invested the most heavily in a future vision for the city (Fig C1.10). Strasbourg had functioned as a host for the League of Nations since the early post-World War I years and in order to maintain its international status, the city re-imagined its urban structure in order to become an even more suitable host for Europe. The booklet submitted to the European experts contained photographs of the existing architectural patrimony, maps locating Strasbourg in an international network and three well-detailed urban proposals for the design of a new European quarter. As opposed to Luxembourg, Strasbourg did emphasize the importance of the principle of a single seat. A chapter in the booklet titled *La Vocation Européenne de Strasbourg* specified the reasons for Strasbourg’s vocation to be a center of Europe, being a crossroads and meeting point between civilizations, and a historic European center of printing. Simultaneously, the text argued that, as a border region between France and Germany, Strasbourg’s European vocation had been formed through the suffering of war. Supported by a declaration signed by Strasbourg’s government underlining its commitment to serving European integration efforts and proclaiming the city’s European vocation, the booklet contained three elaborate descriptions of possible European districts, at different distances from the center of Strasbourg: La Robertsau, 4km of the central station; Oberhausbergen, on the hills west of the city; and the Sharrach hill in the east. As the text specified, these proposals served as illustrations to show the possibilities of Strasbourg as a host. The city of Strasbourg had a long experience in hosting international institutions, such as the Council of Europe, and had developed formats to provide property and land where local legislation could be regulated to host international bodies. In the process that led to the establishment of the Council of Europe, as discussed earlier, a preparatory commission outlined a set of rules using the agreement between the United Nations and the United States as a model; the French laws would still be applicable in rooms, buildings and terrains of the Council, yet the Council would have the right to
edict their own regulations. An important aspect of the choice for Strasbourg as a seat was its symbolic meaning as a contested border territory:

“The great idea of a United Europe – but recently still considered as Utopian – today emerges from the realm of aspiration into the phase of practical realization.” “Strasbourg, that ancient city of European civilization, will henceforth provide a platform (…)”.63

The Council further agreed that “what had been a centre of disunity in the past, would (…) become the center of union for the future.”64

Strasbourg’s candidature strengthened the principle for a single seat by arguing that ‘we should continue building where we started.’ Since 1949, Strasbourg had hosted the Council of Europe65 and since 1952 it had served as the seat of the ECSC’s Common Assembly. On October 19, 1957 Strasbourg’s municipal government voted for a resolution66 stating that the security of the free people of Europe should be assured and new possibilities of economic and social progress should be made possible, that the grouping of European institutions should happen in one place and that the reasons for choosing Strasbourg as seat for council and assemblies of the ECSC and of the West European Union are still valid as a symbol of reconciliation and peace. In addition, Strasbourg emphasized its already existing advantage as a node in international transportation and infrastructure networks and its expertise in housing international institutions. Since the city had been criticized for its peripheral character and the French government was divided over supporting Strasbourg, there was little hope for Strasbourg to attract all European institutions. Therefore the city promoted the idea of continuing its status as parliamentary capital of Europe.67

Universal Brussels
Lastly, Brussels’ submission represented the most luxurious version of candidacy booklets. The large format document published by the Belgian government was placed in a socket and contained high-quality prints of detailed mappings and full bleed photographs (Fig C1.1). With only a minimum of text the document presented the current situation of the city and its future potential in a series of maps containing multiple layers of data on languages, coal and steel industries, traffic modes, housing conditions, international presence and building opportunities. The information had been composed by studies by a commission of experts from different Belgian departments and by Groupe Alpha, a team of architects and urban planners, who played a crucial role in dramatically transforming the city of Brussels from 1952 onward.58

The new social-liberal government elected in 1954 initiated a large scale modernization of the city to promote a European future for Brussels.59 Groupe Alpha’s regional analysis financed by the national government developed a new plan for a population increase to be housed in a conglomerate of the central city surrounded by a green belt and 13 satellite cities, following post-war model of the New Towns as discussed earlier (Fig C1.12).60 From an existing 1.3 million inhabitants, the projected 1.5 to 2 million residents of Greater Brussels were redistributed over an ‘inevitable yet guided’ city extension by creating new satellite towns (Fig C1.13). The guiding principle was to work with existing towns rather than creating artificial centers, which had already been proven problematic. Instead, the planners of Groupe Alpha selected towns based on their position in the transportation network, privileged position, or particular interest of the site. Groupe Alpha’s design transformed these existing towns by adding residential zones to existing commercial and cultural nodes.61 Already in June 1954, Brussels’ Palace of Fine Arts exhibited Groupe Alpha’s work on the future of Brussels in preparation of the Plan d’Aménagement under patronage of the Ministry of Public Works and Reconstruction. The exhibition presented the current state of Brussels, including history, city image,
inhabitants, housing and building stock, health questions, transportation, monuments and landscapes, economic factors, etc.

The highly detailed visualizations conveyed an in-depth image of a city that would be highly suitable as a seat for the European institutions. Each map provided a specific argument for Brussels becoming Europe’s host, including its location at the border between Germanic and Romanic cultures, in the center of the coal and steel industry, and as a central node in an international network of transportation and communication. Other maps pointed out Brussels plans for the future in housing, planning a series of satellite towns to absorb future demographic growth. A third series of maps represented the city’s wide range of available services, entertainment, etc. Lastly, a simple but convincing map presented different sites for locating the new European institutions, accompanied by a plan presenting a possible arrangement. Through its impressive format and convincing graphics, the booklet presented a highly elaborated proposal for the city of Brussels as a host that was in its totality oriented towards housing the European institutions.  

Like Luxembourg and Strasbourg, Brussels had traditionally served as a host for international institutions, such as the preparatory commissions for the creation of the EEC and Euratom since 1956. During the post-war years, Brussels had become a bi-lingual place of encounter for Flemish and Walloon communities. This special status as space of cultural exchange granted Brussels the legitimacy of becoming a center not only for Belgium’s own multi-cultural population but also for international institutions. The idea of Brussels as a European capital had been growing in the decade after World War II among both policymakers and industry and in 1954, Belgium’s Van Acker government had begun to actively promote Brussels as the host city for European institutions, an opportunity which would improve the country’s economy significantly. Moreover, the city presented itself as a contemporary metropolis undergoing a vast process of modernization.
A significant motor for Brussels’ modernization and the development of its regional transportation network was the Universal and International Exhibition (Expo 58), held by the city in 1958 on the peripheral site of the Heysel, one of the sites proposed in Brussels’ 1958 candidature as the new European district. It was not accidental that the date of the Expo 58 coincided with the second search for a seat of the European institutions. The 1958 expo promoted the idea of universal citizens and optimism in science and technology to improve general living conditions, to motivate the ambiance of collaboration and peace.

1.3.2 Antagonist Candidate Cities

The Parisian Axis

As a critique to the ongoing tendency of the European Communities toward a dispersed geography, several forces supported the candidature of Paris. While French president Charles de Gaulle supported Paris’ candidature, a power struggle raged among political figures in the fourth republic in supporting different cities as candidates. Additionally, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, an influential figure in the European movement and advocate of abolishing the state in favor of a united “Pan-Europe”, strongly endorsed the idea of Paris as the capital of a monumental, centralized Europe. On March 8, 1958, two days before the first official meeting of the committee of experts, the French newspaper Le Figaro published a statement by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Paneuropean Union and one of the leading voices of the post-war European movement. In the article, Coudenhove-Kalergi referred to the recent proposal of the Paneuropean Union to select Paris as the capital of Europe for geographic, historical and cultural reasons, presenting the city as the archetypal European capital and therefore the only city in Europe that could truly represent the European idea. However, by that time, the French government had already decided on its official support for the city of Strasbourg, yet unofficially Paris remained part of an internal debate between
French statesmen and local politicians. In this debate, the candidature of Paris became the center of a debate on the impossibility of a European capital, and was already compromised before its evaluation by the committee of experts for its potential to become a true European capital.  

Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Germany were against Paris’ candidature, fearing that the presence of the European institutions would be diminished, as it would be amidst numerous international institutions already in the French capital. Since 1946, Paris had been the seat for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which had been founded in 1945. Until 1958, the UNESCO was housed temporarily in the Hotel Majestic on the Avenue Kléber, after which the organization moved to its permanent headquarters on the Place de Fontenoy. Again the struggle between national sovereignty represented by their traditional capitals and neutral international governance led to the assumption of a dispersed network of locations for the European institutions, in order to avoid a central capital.

Therefore the search for a seat increasingly focused on the suitability of candidate cities as hosts rather than as capitals. This opposition to Paris’s candidature brought to the forefront the desire for a physically dispersed mode of operation for the European Communities. Yet for the city of Paris itself, little European idealism motivated its candidature, but rather the opportunity to strengthen its position and promote the development of the projected business zone of La Défense.

A Federal Capital North of Paris

Unlike Paris’ candidature, the proposal by the Département de l’Oise was based on the idea that a new capital would emerge from an undeveloped area disconnected from existing urbanized areas. Already in November 1957 the general council of the Département de l’Oise announced the candidature
Supported by industrialist Marcel Dassault, the Oise was situated closer to Brussels, Bonn and London and could be compared to the capital cities of Washington D.C., Canberra or Brasilia. In its first phase, the new district would rely on Paris’ infrastructure and transportation network including the Paris-Brussels highway, the international airport of Paris and the high-speed rail lines between Paris, London and Brussels and presumed England’s participation in European integration by the building of a tunnel under the English Channel. Architects Henri Pottier, Jean Peccoux, Pierre Lery and Jean Tessier proposed a ring road with an administrative district attached to existing cities of Senlis and Chantilly around forests and open spaces (Fig C1.14). The scheme existed of two essential parts: a zone grouping the ‘governmental ensemble’, the seats of the national delegations, embassies of non-member states, and in the periphery all private administrations, services, commerce etc. The second zone held neighborhood units for 26,000 each.

1.3.3 Substitute Candidate Cities

Three cities presented their candidatures for the seat of the European communities as an alternative to the more likely candidates. They put forward an explicit stance against the idea of a European capital and instead emphasized characteristics such as their infrastructural, climatic and economic advantages.

Nice: A Capital of Serenity and Independence

Nice’s candidature emphasized the city’s climate and atmosphere as a major advantage for hosting international encounters (Fig C1.15). As a member of the European Parliamentary Assembly, Nice’s mayor Jean Médecin put forward his city as geographically important, strategically located in proximity to the African continent. The city’s tourism industry, hotel infrastructure and international airport inaugurated in 1957 only 10 minutes from the city center with connection to all major
European cities, New York, Malta, Caracas, South Africa and North Africa, provided an attractive background for international cooperation.\textsuperscript{71} The text in Nice’s candidature stated that the seat of the European communities should preferably be located outside of existing national capitals to assure ‘serenity and independence (Fig C1.16).’ Arguing that sufficient space should be available for hosting such organizations, Nice’s application included plans for a European district in Vaugrenier, between Nice and Antibes, and for a new highway to be constructed to avoid the Estérel toll road.

“This cleared of national particularities, it (Nice) is not marked with these historic memories of these political, cultural or emotional traditions that might weigh in an awkward manner on decisions to be taken.”\textsuperscript{72}

Nice’s plead against hosting the European institutions in a national capital was a direct criticism to proponents of Paris’ candidature. Moreover, the city’s application presented itself as part of a region stretching from Cannes to Menton, promoting the Côte d’Azur as a place with international vocation, and for encounters between politicians, diplomats, painters, artists etc. with a booklet titled “Nice – Côte d’Azur est à la disposition des institutions Européennes.” (Fig C1.17)\textsuperscript{73}

**Milan: a High-Rise Europe**

In its very unique candidature, Milan proposed to house the European institutions in a new business district (Fig C1.18). During its post-World War II rebuilding efforts, the city transformed significantly with extensive high-rise construction mostly initiated by the private market. Milan’s candidature included a booklet titled Questa è Milano, featuring the city’s high-rise district on the city and promoting its modernized, metropolitan character. As a rival to Turin, Milan’s candidature emphasized its modern character, far from Italian ‘folklore’ or ‘imaginary arcadia.’ The candidature’s text stated that the seat for the European institutions could not be a national capital because of its
symbolic nature. As an alternative, Milan could offer a bustling economy of production and reconstruction in which private initiative played a key role. The city argued that the European Common Market, which had been created with the establishment of the EEC, could only flourish with the help of the private sector. Therefore, the institutions should be hosted by businesses in a high-rise district and should not be located in a national capital. Milan engaged in intensive reconstruction projects post-World War II and was in the process of establishing a vibrant business district. Milan’s proposal particularly emphasized the importance of providing large-sized buildings, in this case skyscrapers, as the most appropriate urban form for hosting the European communities.

The city offered a permanent seat for the European Economic Community in its new business center already under construction and submitted a photograph of a physical model representing a central axis between two skyscrapers and lower buildings on either sides. Another photograph showed a construction site with large office buildings and towers under construction. The city’s candidature also included a booklet in which one of the chapters explained that the city is moving from a monocentric urban structure to a city with multiple centers. The newly created center was given the title City (using the English word) and was mostly directed at business with modern transportation links, a heliport and a train station. Designed by “international and highly respected architects” the already present skyscrapers were presented as “emblems for an economic capital, a capital of work, at the continental frontiers, an expression of economic power and business.”

Supporting the proposal for hosting Europe in this new business center, Milan included detailed information about two skyscrapers in the new district proposed as temporary seats for the European institutions: the Pirelli Tower designed by Gio Pointi and Pier Luigi Nervi and the Velasca Tower designed by BBPR (Fig C1.19). From a longer term perspective, the planned business district, Centro Direzionale, would become the location for a new European seat (Fig C1.20, Fig C1.21). In addition, the candidature included alternative locations for an independent European district,
including 125 hectares in Chiusabella in the city’s periphery. In partnership with Milan’s candidature, the small Lombardic city of Varese also submitted a brochure featuring its lakes and mountains (Fig C1.22). Although Milan’s candidature was offered as an alternative to the more likely candidates, the local press was optimistic about Milan’s chances and reported extensively on the visit of the committee of experts. By connecting bigness to the European ideal, the envisioned urban scheme for a European presence took on the proportions of a capital. Yet at the same time, the size of the district itself remained modest and as such dependent on the presence of an existing European city.

**Turin: the City as a Host for Europe**

As Milan’s rival, Turin submitted a candidature that emphasized its accessibility with a booklet consisting only of text titled “Characteristics of the city of Turin, Candidate for the seat of the European Common Market, April 1958.” It contained nineteen chapters discussing the city’s suitability as a seat for Europe, ranging from the city’s characteristics ‘from the European point of view’ to the city’s religious groups and hotel availability. In the last chapter, the city proposes a terrain in the center of town that would ensure the full integration of the European institutions. Along with mappings of its air, train, electricity and road networks, Turin presented a map with possible temporary locations for the European offices, mostly in existing palaces, salons and theaters. In addition it proposed a new district and submitted elaborate design plans and perspective views for a future international airport. With its application, Turin attempted to compensate for its loss of status as national capital and to promote the building of new infrastructure such as the international airport and the Mont Blanc and Fréjus tunnels. It thereby smartly emphasized its already existing connectivity to international infrastructure networks and promoted a new European district as a node in the international network.
Although the city of Turin submitted a strategic plan for the creation of a new residential district of 20,000 inhabitants on the city’s periphery on existing agricultural land called Le Vallette, its proposal for the European institutions themselves deviated from the idea of a parallel city (Fig C1.23).

Commissioned by the Minister of Public Works, a team of 45 architects and engineers developed a proposal indicating possible sites for implanting the offices of the European Institutions within the existing city, in proximity of existing palaces and theaters, so that the European institutions would be completely absorbed within the existing city fabric. The locations for new construction promised building rights without height limitations and emphasized their central location and a total area of 3375 square meters.

1.3.4 Appendix Candidate Cities

Lastly, three cities presented their candidature without any aspiration to become the actual seat of the European institutions but rather to promote their touristic assets.

Stresa and Monza as Centers of Tourism in a European Landscape

While the Italian city of Stresa presented itself in the center of an air travel map, it mostly hoped to profit from a European presence in Milan or Turin and focused its application mostly on presenting a wide range of touristic attractions. The Italian city of Monza also presented a similar candidature. In a following chapter I will discuss in greater detail the role of landscapes and monuments in portraying an ideal setting for European Integration.
A European Court in The Hague

In addition, the Dutch city The Hague submitted a partial application to house the European Court of Justice. The city had been a seat for the League of Nation’s Permanent Court of International Justice (1922-1946) and the United Nation’s International Court of Justice since 1946. Promoting a decentralized model, The Hague supported Brussels’ candidature as the seat for the European institutions and proposed a site in the city’s periphery for establishing the court. 81

The documents submitted for the 1958 competition for a seat of the European institutions demonstrated a wide range of possibilities to host a new European entity within municipal boundaries and mostly relied on the assumption that the European institutions would not be centralized in one location but rather distributed over the European territory. Moreover, since many of the experts who would evaluate the candidate cities for the high authority of the European Communities were directly involved with the candidate municipalities, many of the program requirements appeared in the documents submitted. In particular, the idea of creating an accessible European district at a distance from the existing city, including not only official buildings but also housing and services for employees, emerged as the generally accepted scheme. Thereby a new form of urbanity emerged based on two poles: the historical heart on the one hand, and a new and re-imagined city on the other, one that was no longer connected to the national framework but rather a transnational entity.
1.4 Evaluating the Candidatures: The Vocation of the Territory

An important part of the Committee of Experts’ mission was to investigate the European Vocation of the proposed candidatures. Vocation here referred to the extent to which the European character was embodied, for each of the applicant cities. The term vocation, or ‘calling,’ was borrowed from the Christian tradition of a person being called by God to fulfill his potential. The idea of vocation meant the fulfillment of the gifts that have been received in service of the common good. Member of the Committee of Experts Pierre Randet had studied a proposal by French geographer Daniel D. Dollfus providing an ‘objective determination of the implantation of the optimal zone for the European capital (Fig C1.24).’ The proposal included maps of Europe indicating temperature levels, days of snow, days of rain per region and by overlapping them reached an ‘optimum location’ in the Loire et Cher region. In addition, Dollfus added maps of the connectivity of this location to national and international transportation networks and provided information about local monuments, landscapes and other attractions (Fig C1.25). Although the proposal did not follow the official procedure of the 1958 competition for a seat of the European Institutions and was eventually disqualified by the French planning authorities, it did signify the determinist view held by many of the official representatives involved in the search for a seat.

In a report immediately following the study of the ten candidature cities, the Committee of Experts further specified their evaluation of each city’s European vocation. The evaluation by the Committee of Experts was followed closely by the media speculating on which city would become the chosen one. According to the committee’s descriptions, a city’s vocation was mainly determined by its history of being a junction, connector, contact, crossing or fusion of civilizations. They assumed that European transnational space had been waiting in areas where multiple European national identities had existed simultaneously. The European project was only a matter of fulfilling this destiny.
The following fragments were taken from the experts’ report under the chapter of the European Vocation:

**Brussels:** Located at the junction of two large civilizations: the Latin and the Germanic, Brussels is traversed by the linguistic border between French and Dutch. It is the capital of a country in which the territory was long the theatre of an incessant mixing of races. Because Belgium is of reduced importance to become an autarchic country, it is particularly permeable to currents of thought and civilizations coming from abroad. Belgium is traditionally free-exchange, and has always been open to economic and commercial currents. Brussels is the birthplace of the BENELUX, the first experience of economic integration between European countries and the pre-figuration of the common market.

**Strasbourg:** After having been a place of contestation for a long time, Strasbourg aspires to become a connector. It is a place of contact between French and German cultures, manifested by the presence of two languages. The university has several institutes that study European issues. For 8 years, Strasbourg has been housing the Council of Europe, to which have been joined the Assembly of the CECA, integrated in the common assembly of the three communities and the assembly of the U.L.O.

**Paris:** It is superfluous to insist on the aptitude of Paris to the commerce of ideas and confrontation of diverse cultures, as to its possibilities of contact and crossing of civilizations. Remember that it has been chosen as seat of organizations such as OECE, UNESCO and temporary organizations such as OTAN and SHAPE.

**Nice:** This city has functioned as a passage place and a crossroads of races, a region of which beauty and climate attract many guests. Almost every month it is the seat of international reunions or congresses. It receives diplomats, statesmen and businessmen. The city has an original personality and is a hearth of cultures.
attracting artists and intellectuals from all countries. It is a window to the western Mediterranean and the African territories.

**Milan:** From ancient times, Milan has been a point of junction of civilizations coming from the north of Europe and from the Mediterranean. Under Domitien, who parted the Roman Empire in East and West, Milan became the capital of the Western Roman Empire. Milan exercises a great power of attraction in the politico-economic domain. Its people have developed increasingly important connections with other peoples. The city hosts a commercial fair where every year 13,000 exhibitors meet, as well as an Art Triennal.

**Turin:** The city’s vocation finds its origin in an ancient tradition, which has always favored the fusion of different people. The city was the first capital of Italy and conserved its character of a royal city, while it has adapted to modern economy.

**Stresa:** Stresa has been chosen several times as the seat for international conferences, political and academic. It is characterized by a traditional hospitality, many affinities with Switzerland and the exchange of ideas and experiences. The city hosts the Collegium Europaeum, an academic institution of languages and economies of different countries. It is a place of encounter for European youth and was one of the first cities that took part in the congresses of the Council of the European Communities.

**Luxembourg:** Starting with its princes, Luxembourg was engaged in large attempts of reconciliation, agreement and European integration. It is not an arbitrary land but the product of historic secular forces. In order to win over the national prejudices, it is indispensable to dispose of a place especially favorable for rapprochement. Its bilingualism is a precious instrument of reconciliation that finds its daily expression in Luxembourg. It is useful in services for administration but also in daily contacts. This gives Luxembourg its
international spirit and turns it into a platform for all currents. Thanks to this open spirit, the European Community for Coal and Steel found in Luxembourg in record time favorable conditions for its activities.87

Interestingly, the idea of a vocation appeared less connected with a deeply rooted European symbolism, but rather the opposite, with a lack of a clear national identity, and the ability to merge between different European nations and cultures. Thus an interest in a territory voided of national identity appeared to be the most desirable place for establishing a new European administrative center. The report of the Committee of Experts further argued that extraterritorial districts around the world could serve as examples for the European seat to be established, from the fully independent state of Vatican City, the international zones such as Tangier to zones that excluded certain sovereign rights, such as the Panama Canal Zone and military bases. Extraterritoriality, the principle where delineated physical places are exempt from the jurisdiction of local law was known in cases such as embassies, military bases and offices of and the United Nations offices in New York and Geneva.

Based on this conviction, the experts’ evaluation pointed to Luxembourg, Nice, Strasbourg and Brussels as the most interesting sites for establishing what they termed as a ‘European Ensemble.’

Even though the committee and European institutions had emphasized the importance of integrating the new structures with the existing city and avoiding segregation, the evaluation report revealed a clear preference for a separate and distinguishable ‘district,’ in conjunction with a relatively neutral existence.

Following the experts’ report, at a meeting of the Parliament on May 14, 1958,88 Parliament Member and Rapporteur on the topic of the seat for the European Institutions, Herman Kopf reported that no decision had yet been made about housing the two new European communities, the European
Economic Community and the Euratom. He indicated that those who have considered this question agreed that the organizations should not be separated for both political and technical reasons. He thereby also expressed the opinion of the ministers and presidents of the three communities, as well as the commission for political matters. In a reaction to Kopf’s report, European Parliament member and Italian Politician Natale Santero submitted an amendment arguing for giving the seat the character of a district, in order to give a sign to the people that ‘all could feel at home there,’ thereby continuing the preferences that had been expressed by the Committee of Experts. During the following months, the European Parliament continued discussing the political and juridical possibilities of such a European district and in a resolution of June 1958, the European Parliamentary Assembly officially expressed the wish that the place to reunite the European organizations would be a European extraterritorial district. In further meetings during 1958-1959, the Parliamentary Assembly continued to work out possibilities of what the actual extraterritoriality of such a district might mean and at a meeting of the European Parliament of June 21, 1958, Herman Kopf reported that the Commission agreed to declare the seat of the Parliament as a European district, while still allowing for the sovereignty of the hosting country. Thereby the idea of a district as a distinct administrative unit in a large urban system transformed to include its special status as a site of extraterritoriality.

On May 14, 1959, Kopf reported that the parliament had considered the idea of a European district and had expressed the wish that a district be formed, and that the Parliament had urged, regretted and begged for a decision but that the governments had been unable to agree on a location. District here appeared in the sense of a separate administrative unit, with a certain degree of independence from its surrounding context. Nevertheless and in spite of indecision, the ministers had taken to the idea of a European district and would start studying its possibility. This district was necessary in
order to assure the well-functioning of the Community, which could only be ensured when its institutions would be protected from the possibility of being damaged and when their extraterritoriality could be guaranteed, not only for persons but also for specific places. Kopf pointed out that the existing protocols of the European Community provided for the extraterritoriality of buildings and archives but that this provision would not be enough. On the one hand, parliament debates struggled with the question of surrendering sovereignty, referring to the possibility of a Headquarters District, such as the United Nations in New York. On the other hand, discussions reflected on the need for a political and symbolic meaning of a singular seat that would communicate a well-functioning and vital European Community, a district that would express the European idea of the Communities.

In October 1959, a report by a group named of the Commission of Political Affairs and Institutional Questions examined different examples of extraterritorial districts, such as fully independent states (Vatican city), the internationalization of zones (Tangier, Saar area, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan) and zones at a distance from certain sovereign rights (concessions in China, capitulations in Turkey, Panama canal zone, and military bases). Also this report mainly examined the problem of a vacuum of sovereignty, and used the term ‘district’ as a separate administrative unit in the prospect of a European federation.

In addition, the report indicated the symbolic meaning of a district and its concrete expression of the idea of the European Community, clearly distancing itself from the examples studied, since they were out of date and aimed at very different goals and showed more interest in the idea of a federal district. Because the commission did not think it necessary to create an independent sovereign state, the idea of a federal district seemed to offer a solution. The idea of a federal district was borrowed from the US and Australia, where it was used for an area that formed the capital of the federation
without belonging to any of the states. The report investigated examples where sovereignty was transferred by a member state to a federal state, such as Washington D.C., Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Caracas, Rio de Janeiro and Canberra. According to the commission, this was the most suitable form to guarantee independence. However, they questioned whether the current political situation in Europe would allow for such a radical measure. Therefore the report’s last chapter dealt with the possibility of less radical forms to transfer sovereignty such as privileges and immunities which had existed for centuries, with diplomatic representations limiting territorial sovereignty. The report noted that the United Nations (UN) statute allowed for the organization was able to meet completely independently and under all circumstances in full freedom. Its statute of headquarters district, established in 1947, was under control and rule of the United Nations yet the seat of the UN existed within the territorial sovereignty of the US. The report concluded that the European district was possible with the state retaining its territorial sovereignty, but the state would need to transfer execution of sovereign rights, or part of these rights.

In the debate on choosing the optimal location for the seat of the European Institutions, the district emerged as an appropriate model for a future transnational European city: a place that was voided of national identity and exempt from local jurisdiction, a clearly delineated district that could coexist with other spatial realities yet maintain its own independence.

---


4 The International Coordination of Movements for the Unification of Europe Committee took place on December 14, 1947.


7 In cooperation with Jean Monnet, Schuman wrote a governmental proposal for a supranational European community. The document was approved on May 9 1950 and thereby became known as the Schuman Declaration.

8 Belgian statesman Paul-Henri Spaak served as Foreign Minister and as Prime Minister of Belgium in the period after the Second World War. Immediately following the war, he promoted the unification of Europe through the European Community of Coal and Steel based on the belief that international treaties would be the best means to guarantee peace.
On March 17, 1948, The Western Union Treaty (the Treaty of Brussels) was signed by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The Treaty of Brussels contained a defense clause that led to the establishment of the Western European Union (WEU) at the 1954 Paris Conference.

The 16 countries were: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, the United Kingdom, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United States.

The Hague Congress took place from May 7 to May 11, 1948.

Participants of the Hague Congress included the founding member of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany Konrad Adenauer, Belgian Prime Minister and President of the United Nations General Assembly Paul-Henri Spaak, the United Kingdom’s Leader of the Opposition Winston Churchill, United Kingdom Parliament Members Harold Macmillan Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, French Minister of Defense Pierre-Henri Teitgen, French Minister of Veterans and War Victims François Mitterrand, former French Prime Minister Paul Reynaud, former French Prime Minister Édouard Daladier, former French Prime Minister Paul Ramadier, former Prime Minister of Belgium and President of the European League for Economic Cooperation Paul van Zeeland, Belgian Parliament Member Albert Coppé and founding member of the Movimento Federalista Europeo (MFE) Altiero Spinelli.

In July 1948, the French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault proposed the establishment of a European Assembly and a European customs and economic union. Five months later, in January 1949, France, Great Britain and the Benelux countries agreed to create a Council of Europe to be established in Strasbourg and in May of the same year, 10 countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom) signed the

14 In April 1949 in Washington D.C., 12 states (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, and the United States) signed the North Atlantic Treaty

15 On April 4, 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington

16 Taken from the Schuman Declaration, May 9, 1950

17 The Council of Europe Assembly approved the Schuman plan on August 26-28, 1950.

18 Translated from French by author. “Voici comme le bassin du Nord de la France se prolonge vers la Belgique, comme les charbonnages belges se raccordent aux charbonnages d’Aix et de la Ruhr, regardez la Campine partagée entre la Belgique et les Pays-Bas, et ce même charbon reparti entre la Sarre et la Lorraine, ce même minerai de fer entre la Lorraine et le Luxembourg! Ces ressources, dont la nature a fait industrie essentiel de l'Europe, ont été l’enjeu des luttes entre Etats et des entreprises de domination. En effaçant les divisions que les hommes ont arbitrairement introduites, il s’agit aujourd’hui de recréer ce bassin naturel dont ils ont morcelé l’unité et limité le développement.” Fragment of a speech by Jean Monnet, August 10, 1952, High Authority Meeting, in Joseph Petit, Luxembourg Plate-forme Internationale (Pierre Linden: Imprimeur de la Cour Luxembourg, 1953).


20 In parallel, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands sign the European Defence Community (EDC) Treaty in Paris on May 27, 1952.

22 The tax levy was the result of a decision on November 10, 1952 by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to grant Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands derogation from the “most-favoured-nation treatment”, to allow them to fulfil their ECSC obligations. See Jean Monnet *Mémoires* (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1976).

23 An agreement between the ECSC’s member states in March 1953 sets up the common market for scrap iron and on August 12, 1953 the ECSC and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) sign a cooperation agreement.

24 On January 1, 1958 the Treaties of Rome enter into force. The EEC and EURATOM Communities take office in Brussels. The Parliamentary Assembly in Luxembourg and the Court of Justice become common to all three Communities and the German head of the Office of Foreign Affairs at the Federal Chancellery Walter Hallstein is elected president of the EEC Commission. The then General Manager of the National Society of French Railways (SNCF) Louis Armand became president of the Euratom Commission and Belgian politician and member of the ECSC High Authority Paul Finet became president of the ECSC High Authority.

25 On April 15, 1958 the first Council regulation sets up German, French, Italian and Dutch as the official languages of the Communities.

26 On June 8, 1959 Greece applies for association with the EEC and in July 1959 Turkey does the same.

27 On September 10, 1959 negotiations for the association of Greece to the EEC start.

28 See Jean Monnet *Mémoires*, Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1976

29 See ad hoc meeting of the European Parliamentary Assembly on February 9, 1953, Paris, the fourth meeting of the constitutional commission, sub-commission for political institutions, editing
of Article 92 of the statute, seat of the institutions of the community, created by Mr Dehousse. (see Archives of the European Parliament). The meeting protocol determines that the seat will be decided by the Parliament within one year, counting from the date of the creation of the Chambre of Peoples. Each of the Chambers will decide with 2/3 majority of the members and to the law they will attach a protocol to be created by the European Executive Council and to determine the areas that stay under exclusive jurisdiction of the community.


32 By July 1957, the French Département de l’Oise north of Paris announced its candidacy while the French Ministry of Reconstruction and Housing commenced initial studies for Paris and Strasbourg as host cities. That same month the city of Strasbourg appointed French architect and urbanist Henri-Jean Calsat to undertake a study for locating the European institutions in the city, and by October 1957, the city presented the results in a booklet and an exhibition.


36 See meeting notes by Pierre Randet of March 11, 1958, First Meeting of the Committee of Experts, Brussels, Val Duchesse, on March 10, 1958 (Pierre Randet Archive)

37 See competition program created by the Committee of Experts: Commission des Urbanistes, Indication des institutions sur le nombre de bureaux, de salles de réunion, de fonctionnaires nécessaires pour leur fonctionnement (Pierre Randet Archive)


39 See personal notes by Pierre Randet and meeting notes by Pierre Randet of March 11, 1958, First meeting of the committee of experts, Brussels, Val Duchesse, on March 10, 1958 (Pierre Randet Archive).

40 See meeting notes by Pierre Randet, Entretien de Mr. Van Helmont, porte-parole de M. Jean Monnet, en présence de M. Vergeot, March 14, 1958.

The booklet text emphasizes the situation of Luxembourg City as a transition zone between languages and countries, and presents the historical role of the city, its geographic situation, its linguistic situation and its international spirit as reasons for choosing Luxembourg as the seat for the European Institutions.


In Luxembourg’s application of 1958, Emile Hamilius, Deputy Mayor of the City of Luxembourg described how, on the famous night of the conference in Paris, the six governments of the CECA could not agree on a definitive nor provisional chair of the CECA. In the ‘shadow’ and out of ‘laxness’, Hamilius accounted of the decision to start the works of the Community on August 10, 1952 in Luxembourg, hoping that a few weeks later they would be able to agree on a definitive location. But as the six were never able to find an agreement Luxembourg became the permanent seat.

When in 1954 the French and German governments agreed on recommending Saarbrücken as the new seat for the ECSC, the Luxembourgish delegation to the Benelux called for Belgium and the Netherlands to support Luxembourg against this recommendation. See Carola Hein, *The Capital of Europe: Architecture and Urban Planning for the European Union* (London: Praeger, 2004).

Jean Fosty’s article titled “Plus d’Europe que d’Europes,” stated clearly that a state cannot exist without a capital. Fosty argued for three founding principles: 1. The European interest comes before the national, regional or local interests; 2. Dispersion of European institutions has to be avoided at all times; and 3. The six states should consider other European states as possible seats.

49 Translated from French by author “*Le Luxembourgeois apprécie la bonne chère et les fêtes joyeuses, il a les aspirations robustes du Flamand, il est travailleur, pratique, entreprenant et sentimental comme l’Allemand, mais son amour de l’individualisme et de la liberté, son attachement profond aux traditions et surtout aux traditions religieuses, ses goûts artistiques l’apparentent à son grand voisin de l’Ouest vers qui regarde son âme.*”


51 See *Strasbourg invite l'Europe*, submitted by the City of Strasbourg to the Committee of Experts appointed by the European Communities (EAUG Fonds Calsat – 236.01.557) 1957 and Complement 1960.

52 See *Rapport de la Commission Préparatoire du Conseil de l'Europe*, July 13, 1949, Paris, XIII (Archives of the Council of Europe), stating that the project of agreement between the Council of Europe and the Government of the French Republic with regard to a seat for the council of Europe does not require specific comments and can be based on the agreement between the United Nations and the government of the United States, yet simplified and shortened.

53 See the Protocol of the *Conference for the Establishment of a Council of Europe*, St. James’s Place, London, May 3-5, 1949 (Archives of the Council of Europe) on Tuesday, 3 May.

54 See the statements of Italy, United Kingdom and others on the choice for Strasbourg, Protocol of the *Conference for the Establishment of a Council of Europe*. St. James’s Place, London, May 3-5, 1949 (Archives of the Council of Europe).

56 See Strasbourg invite l’Europe, Booklet submitted by the city of Strasbourg as part of its candidature for hosting the European Institutions, 1957 (Calsat Archive).


58 The members of Groupe Alpha were architects Theo Daens, Jean Gilson, Rene Piron and Alberto Vanderauwera.


61 See Groupe Alpha (Théo Daens, Jean Gilson, René Piron, Albert Vanderauwera), Les centres satellites par les architectes et urbanistes du groupe alpha, 1958.

62 See booklet submitted as part of Brussels’ candidature for the European Institutions. The booklet, in four languages was printed on glossy paper and placed in a cardboard socket, and the result of a collaboration of a commission composed of experts from different Belgian departments, takes into account a wide range of characteristics to be considered for a seat.

63 See Bruxelles, Carrefour du monde, (Genève: Éditions Générales S.A, 1958)

64 See Bruxelles, Capitale de l’Europe (Bruxelles: Syndicat d’Initiative de la Ville de Bruxelles, 1954) describing the results of a meeting between the Union of representatives of commercial sectors (food, insurances, banks, restaurants, middle class, tailors, department stores etc.), with Brussels’
mayors, discussing the role of the Syndicat in pushing Brussels as a seat for the European institutions, instead of Liege (which had been proposed in 1952).


66 In *Bruxelles, Carrefour du monde*, (Genève: Éditions Générales S.A, 1958), the mayor of Brussels, Lucien Cooremans describes how the city is undergoing major transformations, and has received a new, rejuvenated image.


71 *La Candidature de Nice comme Capitale Européenne*, p. 3, (Randet Archive).

72 Translated from French by author: “Dégagé des particularismes nationaux, elle n’est pas marquée de ces souvenirs historiques, de ces traditions politiques, culturelles ou affectives qui pourraient peser de façon gênante sur les
décisions à prendre." See booklet submitted as part of Nice’s candidacy as a seat for the European Institutions: *La Candidature de Nice comme Capitale Européenne*, p. 3, (Randet Archive).

73 See booklet submitted as part of Nice’s candidacy as a seat for the European Institutions: *La Candidature de Nice comme Capitale Européenne*, p. 3, (Randet Archive).

74 See booklet submitted as part of Milan’s candidacy as a seat for the European Institutions, 1958 (Randet Archive).

75 Milan proposes a preliminary seat for the European Institutions in several buildings including the Palais de Jurisconsultes, the Torre Velasca, the Villa Royale Monza, buildings along the Corso Europa and buildings of the new business center.

76 Milan’s 1958 candidacy included photographs of the Velasca tower and a booklet of the Pirelli tower with plan drawings, a descriptive text and model photographs (Randet Archives)

77 Milan’s candidacy included a statement that the city of Varese’s candidacy is complementary to the candidacy of Milan and attached a letter from the mayor of Varese to the mayor of Milan in support.

78 The Corriere Lombardo reported the visit of the experts and published the schedule including visits to universities, a museum, palaces, an evening theater show, site visits in the city, an evening ballet show, visits to a castle, the Velasca tower and a final meeting with the mayor.

79 See booklet submitted as part of Turin’s candidacy for the European Institutions: *Characteristics of the city of Turin, Candidate for the seat of the European Common Market*, April 1958.


81 The secondary seats such as Stresa, Monza and the Hague hoped to profit from European presence in larger candidate cities in their proximity. The Hague’s application to the European Court


85 See correspondence between Planning Authority officials as part of the Loire et Cher dossier, 1958, Pierre Randet Archives.


87 Translated from French by author.


89 See the Resolution of the European Parliamentary Assembly, of June 21, 1958.


91 See European Parliament, Report in name of the Commission of Political affairs and institutional questions, on the problems of a European district, by M. Hermann Kopf, October 1959
Chapter 02: Towards a Networked European Territory

Networks as systems of transportation and communication connecting urban nodes played a crucial role at many levels in the attempt to design a new transnational European urbanism. Both in political debates as in architectural discourse and eventually in the proposals themselves, the idea of a decentralized territorial organization of urban nodes emerged as the most appropriate scheme for a transnational reality that would secure both economic prosperity and international cooperation.

As Paul Virilio writes, mobilization and motorization took place in the evolution of the city from a central urban entity to a network. Virilio attributes this transformation to the defense mechanisms that have dictated urban form throughout history, moving from siege warfare in the fortified city to a war of movement with the development of mobile weapons. According to Virilio, this leads to a technological society founded on the logic of speed, or what he calls ‘Dromology.’ Virilio argues that in modern society, the speed at which something happens can also change its nature, whereby fast movement would dominate over slow movement. Whoever controls the territory possesses it. Possession of territory is not primarily about laws and contracts, but first and foremost a matter of movement and circulation.

Moving from the war of space (state of siege) to the war of time (state of emergency), and using the war model as a way to understand shifts in a post-war society, Virilio explains how speed itself would become a destiny, a form of progress. From the point of view of what Virilio calls the dromological revolution, the concept of the State also should be understood as the result of a transformation of geographical terrain into an artificially constructed field. The project of the state is thereby defined by the mastery over its dimensions. In this context of the increasing importance of speed as a fundamental principle of society, and the artificiality of the modern Nation-State control over the territory, the development of a transnational network of transportation and utilities,
focusing on increasing speed and efficiency formed an essential component of the de facto project of European Integration.

Both World War I and II had re-created the physical relationships between the infrastructures of European cities and states. Yet the re-deployment and adoption of a war-mechanism of infrastructure networks to a civic society was motivated by more than Virilio’s urban defense mechanisms. President of the United States Dwight D. Eisenhower, influenced by his encounter with the German Autobahn network as an army commander during World War II, recognized the potential of an interstate highway system as a necessary infrastructure for national defense. This led to the 1955 publication titled *General Location of National System of Interstate Highways*, mapping out a system of interstate roads published by the United States Bureau of Public Roads. The cultivation of cross-border networks stimulated an economic co-dependence that promised an alternative for conflicts created by territorial claims.

International cooperation in the development of Europe’s infrastructure had been initiated several times before World War II. In the 19th century, the French philosopher Claude-Henri de Saint Simon called for a European Parliament to develop large waterway projects across national borders serving the common European interest. The *Courses des Capitales* project, a transnational road completed in 1903 connecting Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin, Vienna and Madrid served as a backdrop for road races. In addition after World War I, engineers and politicians worked hard on adapting roads, railways, aviation, electric power, telephone and broadcast networks to the European scale.

"THE UNDERSIGNED, duly authorized, MEETING under the auspices of the Economic Commission for Europe, CONSCIOUS of the need to develop international road traffic in Europe, considering that it is essential, in order to establish closer relations between European countries, to lay down a
co-ordinated plan for the construction or reconstruction of roads suitable for international traffic. 1. Declare that they adopt the proposed road network described in Annex I hereto as a concerted plan for construction and reconstruction of roads of international importance, which they intend to undertake, within the framework of their national programmes for public works or within the possibilities of international financing.7

Signed in Geneva on September 16, 1950, the United Nations’ Economic Commission for Europe Declaration on the Construction of Main International Traffic Arteries established the foundations for a road network at the scale of Europe. The document stated that it is essential to coordinate construction and reconstruction of roads to make them suitable for international traffic in order to strengthen the relations between European countries. The Commission agreed on a list of 92 E-roads across the European continent and on a list of specifications defining road dimensions and characteristics according to different typologies depending on the different regions (whether flat or mountainous). The document also indicated that bypassing cities, towns and villages and ribbon development would be desirable and listed the necessary ancillary services for border crossings and rest points. A third annex to the declaration specified the road signs indicating the E-road: “This sign shall consist of the letter E followed by the designated number of the route in Arabic numerals. The colours of this sign shall be green for the ground and white for the inscription.”8

In May 1951 the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe recommended the Committee of Ministers to immediately create a body charged with preparing a treaty to form a European Authority of Transportation. Also road construction had been coordinated since 1948 by the International Road Federation, while the Organization of Civil Aviation and the Association of International Aerial Transportation oversaw international air transportation. Under the increasing pressure of transportation needs, the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe urged for an
authority that could make decisions powered by ‘the force of law’ with the aim to avoid over-equipment and frenetic competition and to facilitate investment. For air transportation, the assembly recommended avoiding heavy investment and work with existing agreements such as the floating stations in the North Atlantic. It imagined large international infrastructure projects of the calibre of the Suez Canal or the Mont Blanc Tunnel. These efforts to transfer authority over infrastructure at the scale of the European territory to a transnational body indicated the possibility for a more pragmatic and less ideological project of European integration.

2.1 Early Post-war Visions for a European Network of Transportation

Several European politicians who had been involved in large scale infrastructure projects at the national level now saw an opportunity to expand transportation networks beyond their national borders.

Edouard Bonnefous’s vision of an efficient international transportation network.

Through the discussions at the Council of Europe about the possibilities and the challenges for an international transportation network, the issue of efficiency emerged as a central theme. The efforts made by Edouard Bonnefous, President of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the French National Assembly and delegate to the Consultative Assembly of Europe, in promoting the establishment of a European Transport Council argued for a coordinated effort in order to reach a common system that would avoid another war and that would defend Europe against the Russians. In a speech on August 16, 1950 at the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Bonnefous listed the reasons for setting up a European Transport Council as a means of overcoming the immense destruction of the two world wars, unorganized competition of national and international means of
transportation, and over-equipment. The French politician recalled the words of President Roosevelt’s Secretary of State and Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. at the conference of Bretton Woods: one can organize transportation internationally without forgetting national interests. Bonnefous argued that the honor of a country is not incompatible with the international organization of transportation and that the pursuit of individualistic politics of rivalry would produce antagonism between countries, ‘paving the road for another World War.’ Bonnefous further referred to the words of Secretary of State and Treasurer of President Roosevelt, M Morgenthau at the conference of Bretton Woods:

“One can organize transportation internationally without forgetting national interests. There is no incompatibility between the honor of a country and an international organization of transportation. Pursuing an individualistic politics of rivalry is to continue competition that places one country against the other. It means ruin for all and paving the road for another world war.”

Pointing out that the 19 countries of Western Europe will import in the next few years railroad materials from the United States worth 490 million dollars, while at the same time the local European workshops of wagon construction have not been fully used. The proposition submitted by Bonnefous on the same occasion listed the deficits of national railway systems stating that in order to solve these problems one would have to move beyond the national system. Moreover, making the transportation systems more efficient would require an understanding that they are not ‘enterprises of fabrication that can adjust their production’ but rather ‘enterprises of delivery.’ The proposed measures to be taken all directed the existing networks toward rationalization and improving efficiency by placing the European railroad network under European control, suppress unusable lines, the electrification and equipment transfer, rationalization, harmonization, abandonment of preferential tariffs, liberty of transit, the improved transportation to and from
Africa, advance large projects with common interest, and the encouragement of international investment. Bonnefous argued that transportation networks were crucial during World War II in providing food to occupied countries while air travel allowed for the resistance to fight for liberation by attacking train stations. Hereby he seems to insinuate that the same networks will play a crucial role in the effort of peacekeeping. Looking at the example of the United States, Bonnefous concluded that the Transportation Act of 1920 establishing a common tariff system and laying out new lines was not sufficient for the 1929 crisis, while the renewed Transportation Act of 1940 avoiding abuse of competition provided healthy and secure travel conditions and the 1939 Civil Aeronautics Act allowed for an organized and methodic development of air travel. Looking at the American example formed an important factor in the decision making processes for building a European system of infrastructure networks, yet at the same time, European officials understood that the case of Europe was different due to the reluctance of nation-states to give up their sovereignty. As a result, the proposition by Bonnefous stated that the Consultative Assembly proposed the creation of a European Organization of Transportation not to administrate but to govern international transportation with the aim to achieve efficiency, best performance and financial equilibrium. The ambition of this organization is not political but rather economic, for the benefit of users, fabricators and travelers, and for the benefit of the defense of Europe. Nevertheless, contradictory to the proposition’s claims, the final purpose of the efforts to build an international transportation network were motivated not only by economic interests, but also by the desire to build the foundations for a long lasting peace and defend Europe against external threats.

In May 1951, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe debated the plan for a specialized European authority for transport and coordination of air transport as presented by Bonnefous. The assembly recommended to the committee of ministers to immediately convene a
conference in charge of preparing a project of treaty installing the European Authority of Transportation, based on the already existing international cooperation such as the Central Commission for Navigating the Rhine, international conventions for transportation of goods and passenger transportation by railway, the International Conference for the Technical Study or Railways, The International Road Federation established in 1948, and the Organization of Civil Aviation and the Association of International Air Transportation. This new intergovernmental Authority would put an end to current deficits, avoid over-equipment and exaggerated competition, facilitate investment and create a better use of national industries. In addition the assembly recommended including Switzerland and Austria, countries that were not part of the Council of Europe but played an essential role in European transportation because of their geographic position.

“Numerous are those (…) who, at the start of our Assembly, wanted to create a Europe by one declaration or one constitution. But realism has prevailed and instead of searching a unity in an intransigence that would have risked causing a fatal overthrow to our solidarity, we have chosen the less glorious route, maybe, but more efficient, of concrete realisations.”

With this statement the assembly argued for creating an authority that would be based on the existing international organizations by emphasizing the need for flexibility in order to ensure the success of the European cause.1617

In December of 1952, Raoul Dautry, former Managing-Director of the French State Railways18, advocated in the Revue d’Economic Politique for the reorganization of European transport. Dautry stated that Europe should learn from the American experience in transportation before coming up with solutions for international transport at the scale of Europe. The simple pooling of transport systems would not be sufficient and Europe should promote only those initiatives that aim at
increasing efficiency rather than projects that may move national difficulties to the European level. Like Bonnefoius, Dautry described the problem of unhealthy competition, such as the competition between road versus rail transportation, and the potential competition between a strong air-travel network and overland transport. Applauding initiatives such as the agreement between the SNCF (French Railways) and the German Railways for the joint use of 100,000 coaches and trucks, restricting the number of journeys without payload, and increasing the rolling stock productivity or the Mont-Blanc tunnel construction, Dautry argued that establishing a High Authority for transport is more urgent than a Customs Union or Currency Agreements. He also summed up the efforts that have been made so far, including the 1886 Berne Convention on the International Traffic of Goods by Rail replacing domestic laws with international law on train transport. The convention resolved a situation where three major railway networks consisting of fifty-eight thousand kilometers of mostly incompatible railways existed in Europe, each with its own standards, making cross-border railway traffic difficult, by laying down the foundations for a single European railway system developing a technical unit regulation system setting rolling stock standards for cross-border operations. In addition to this convention, Dautry listed the 1922 International Union of Railways, the 1945 European Central Inland Transport Organization and several others. These organizations, according to Dautry, had made significant attempts towards standardization and coordination but were limited in being able to tackle fundamental problems.

“That is why the proposal to create a European Transport Executive, which had been adopted by the Council of Europe’s Special Committee on Transport at the meeting chaired by Mr Bonnefoius in Paris on 9 February, immediately seemed as though it could successfully lead Europe towards better organization and coordination of its transport systems. (…) ‘Europeans’ should thus consider it a shame that the proposal was not discussed by the Strasbourg Assembly, as set out in the agenda for its third session this year.”
Promoting an operational approach, Dautry argued that in the field of transport, immediate action can and therefore should be taken.\textsuperscript{21}

**Maurice Lemaire’s strategy of adaptation.**

In a similar spirit, former head of the French National Railways and member of the Consultative Assembly Maurice Lemaire continued Bonnefous’ and Dautry’s argumentations with a report he submitted on September 24, 1952 to the Assembly on the establishment of a European Transport Office.\textsuperscript{22} Taking into account the political and economic developments - especially those of the European Community for Coal and Steel, which had placed great importance on the development of transport systems - the Committee on Economic Questions suggested the establishment of a European Council for Internal Transport. Its tasks would be to formulate recommendations for coordinating the three modes of transport, establish an order of priorities for investment, and formulate recommendations for financial equilibrium. Two days later, the Assembly convened and discussed the plan for a European Transport Council as presented by Lemaire.\textsuperscript{23} After a presentation by Lemaire, the discussion between Assembly members largely accepted Lemaire’s proposals yet strengthened a few central concerns. Mr. Darling of the United Kingdom pointed out that if merchandise and people are not able to freely circulate, if there is no means of communication between people, Europe would become a primitive economy, and reach a very low level of life. Therefore, he argued, both the prosperity and the unity of our peoples, depend largely on the efficiency and the price of transportation. M. Von Merkatz of the Federal Republic of Germany asked not to forget that in the meantime, the European Community of Coal and Steel had been established, which would need a new tariff structure. Therefore, he argued Lemaire's proposal would be the most suitable for the current situation. Nicolas Margue of Luxembourg posed that he could not imagine a better means to assure the unity of Europe than linking all the states and all the people
by truly European lines of transportation and lines of communication and pointed out that the issue of transportation also required thinking beyond the Europe of the six member states. On December 9 of the same year, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation decided to hold a conference of experts for Transport in Europe, the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT). One month later, in January 1953, the French Minister of Transport André Morice hosted a meeting in Paris with his counterparts from Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and Switzerland and they agreed to meet regularly. By June, the experts had submitted a report recommending the widening of scope of their meetings and in July, the OEEC invited the Belgian Government to hold a constituent conference with the responsibility to determine the status of a European conference of ministers of transport. In a meeting in October that same year, transport ministers of OEEC member countries, except Ireland, Iceland, and with Spanish transport minister signed a protocol establishing a permanent international body with headquarters in Paris and a council of ministers of transport to oversee development and improve internationally important European transportation lines.

In the lead up to the eventual signing of the protocol, Lemaire referred to the recent conference on Internal European Transport in Paris, with the recommendation of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe to create a European Transport Council. Lemaire posed that any attempt for European integration would require the appropriate transport arrangements, not so much in creating rather than adapting the existing networks to the European scale. Further, he argued that coordination between different modes of transport and within each mode, as well as tariff coordination are vital to lower costs, as well as to simplify, standardize and create common facilities. Lemaire called for building a common market for equipment as the only way of lowering construction and repairing costs, and using fewer raw materials. Relating to the problem of linking
road and rail, he suggests that in this case adopting the American model would be less desirable since American population density was much lower than the European one. The higher densities in Europe create friction between road networks and rail networks. The highly dense rail network that was superimposed on an existing road network has led to an unhealthy competition between the two. While railways offered better rates for mass transport, road transport offered flexibility for small and medium size shipments, therefore transshipment between road and rail should be improved as has been already done by using crates and freight containers.

Lobbying for the Revival of a Transnational Transportation Project

In March 1954, Paul Willem Segers, the Belgian Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the European Conference of Ministers of Transport, wrote a letter to the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe, Léon Marchal, expressing the wish to establish official cooperation between both organizations. A few weeks later, Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paul-Henry Spaak sent a letter to German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer proposing the revival of the European idea by increasing the responsibilities of the ECSC High Authority to include other sources of energy and transport.  

What is needed is for the Foreign Ministers to proclaim publicly their determination to give fresh impetus to the European idea by expanding the power and responsibilities of the European Coal and Steel Community. Such expansion could apply to all current forms of energy (electricity, gas and fuel) and means of transport (railways, inland waterways, and road and air transport). (...) The present situation seems rather favourable. I am struck by how much general support there is in Belgium for the idea of European integration.
Following Spaak’s letter, the foreign ministers of the Benelux countries issued a memorandum, encouraging the European Community for Coal and Steel to revive the efforts toward European integration on the basis of a common market and integration of transport and atomic energy. In the same month, the French government responded to the Benelux memorandum proposing multilateral agreements. In the area of atomic energy, applied research for the peaceful use of atomic energy should be organized by a common authority, which would also supervise the exchange of 'technicians and technical secrets'. In consideration of the growing development of thermal power plants, the ECSC's powers should be expanded in the field of conventional energy and a common fund should pay for research and development of prototypes in aeronautical engineering. Lastly, the document suggested charging the European Conference of Ministers of Transport with supervising overland transport through the harmonization of tariffs, construction of European through routes, coordination of investment, standardization of equipment and joint production of plant, while air transport should be coordinated in order to avoid national rivalries and over-equipment.

The development of these post-war policies for the creation of a transnational network of transportation and energy infrastructure indicated a significant shift of power from the sovereignty of a nation over the management of its infrastructure to a transnational system. Whereas the search for a specific location to host the European Institutions had not been able to give way to a European ideology, the debates centering on transnational networks in fact presented a more suitable stage for imagining a far-reaching transnational power grid to take over, and vice versa the coordination of transportation and energy networks between nations presented itself as a new tool to advance the European idea.

In a letter to Konrad Adenauer on April 4, 1955, Paul-Henri Spaak proposed the ‘revival’ of the European idea by extending the responsibilities of the ECSC High Authority to include other
sources of energy and transport. He insisted that the time had come to put the European idea back on the agenda. To give a fresh impetus to the idea, Spaak suggested that the Foreign Ministers announce expansion of the Community’s power and responsibilities to include energy sources such as electricity, gas, fuel, and transportation such as railways, inland waterways, road and air. The strengthening of the functional components of an integrated Europe could thus enlarge the power of an integrated Europe over individual nation-states.

As opposed to the grand ideas of the founding fathers of the European unification project, the pragmatic visionaries of a common Transportation infrastructure for Europe as described above kept their arguments and wishes at a very factual level lacking higher ideological impetus. Nevertheless, the project they envisioned would become the foundation of a far-reaching transnational network of transportation.

**2.2 Network Modernization and International Adaptation**

Different cities vying to become hosts of a transnational European city utilized these arguments in their 1958 candidatures for the seat of the European institutions, positioning themselves within networks of highways, railroads, airways and utilities. Each of these transportation types had its own reach and each application selected its own hierarchy of network nodes, but all applications thereby transformed the existing city to a node in a network. Transportation infrastructure and inherent travel distances came to play a major role in determining the suitability of a location for the seat of Europe. Cities were represented as nodes in a network of air, train and highway connections, electricity supply, water infrastructure, communication lines, radio and television waves.
During the early years after World War II, national infrastructure networks of roads, air traffic, rail and utilities grew beyond their state borders and started creating a cross-border, interconnected infrastructure system. From the 19th century and during the first decades of the 20th century, international organizations had started to emerge in an attempt to coordinate between specific infrastructure networks across national borders. However, the new developments were motivated by an ideological realization that a coherent infrastructure spine would improve the international relations within Europe.

Although transportation and infrastructure networks were in the process of renewal, the quantification of their parameters such as travel distance, time and frequency allowed for a certain level of reality and brought the future possibilities to a tangible level. Candidate cities included elaborate tables and graphs of quantified data of trajectories, travel times, distance, speed, frequency of travel along with statistics of other infrastructure such as sewage and public parks. In a contribution to Luxembourg’s application, Luxembourg’s Minister of Transportation Victor Bodson included a table with travel trajectories, daily linkages and travel times, thereby accurately quantifying the suitability of Luxembourg as the seat of the communities. Moreover, the minister emphasized the future improvements of these connections, He also mentioned existing and future roads and aerial connections, again including flight trajectories, monthly connections and flight times, and promised the construction of a large modern airport and the establishment of a heliport on the site of the new European district. This translation of the possibilities of future networks into quantifiable data allowed for a way to objectively compare different cities with one another, thereby offering the team of experts a useful tool in evaluating the different proposals. The tables and graphs added a scientific layer to the process of selecting a city and again reduced cities to manageable numeric lists of facts and figures.
A remarkably high number of networks were visually represented among the different city candidatures, mostly demonstrating the connectivity of the candidate city to an international network of transportation, electricity and communication. Three important modes of transportation were presented, each of which were undergoing an important transformation during the fifties: railways, roads and air travel, although present, canals and waterways formed a more minor part of the discussion. Through its post-war reconstruction efforts, Europe reinvented its image of modernity with the construction of new airports, improved electricity networks, modernized trains and roads. An abundance of imagery representing modern modes of transportation such as high-speed trains, airplanes and international airports filled the pages of different city applications. The interest in using international forces for modernization for the benefit of national politics became a leitmotif for most candidate cities. With the interest in coordinating large infrastructure works came the re-imagining of the European city as connected to a well operating network aimed at improved economic activity.

Not only at the scale of the international territory, but also from the perspective of specific cities, the adaptation of the urban structure to a larger network formed part of the imagined urban future. At the metropolitan scale, the city candidatures for a seat of the European Communities included proposals for improving the city’s accessibility through rail, water and road networks. Architect and urbanist Jean-Henri Calsat’s sketches for the city of Strasbourg of future road and rail networks and newly positioned train stations demonstrated the intention of city administrations to adjust their existing infrastructure to create better connections to international road, rail and canal networks. Calsat’s design for one of Strasbourg’s districts prioritized connecting the district to the national and international transportation network. In his former studies, Calsat had analyzed Strasbourg’s infrastructure for road and train networks, understanding that Strasbourg’s connectivity was
problematic and needed special attention. The proposal therefore included a proposed six-kilometer highway connection to Strasbourg, which connected to the European district by passing under the terrace of the central axis and the Building of European Institutions. The new bypass permitted in the south the connection to Switzerland and the international airport of Entzheim located 10 kilometers from the district, and in the north toward the European route 9, which connected the large international east, west and north routes. In addition to a 12 km highway to be implemented, Calsat prescribed additional infrastructure works to provide drinking water, electricity, gas, telecommunications (telephone, telegraph, radio and television) and a water purification station. A series of maps accompanied Calsat’s 1950 study for infrastructure changes, illustrating a new rail connection from Strasbourg’s central station to Kehl, the relocation of port activities, the deviation of the canal connecting the Marne to the Rhine, a new highway bypass on former city fortifications and new road connecting the city to the international airport of Entzheim.\(^3\) This demonstrates how the 1957 district proposal for Oberhausbergen fitted well in the longer term infrastructure changes for the Strasbourg metropolitan area, already striving for improved international communication and transportation and aiming for a networked urban structure connecting the city with other urban cores, preserving the open space between them and creating different functional zones within the urban fabric such as industrial, residential and recreational. The proposed urban schemes by candidatures of cities such as Strasbourg, Luxembourg, Brussels, Paris and Nice were very much guided by their connection to different modes of transportation, and the points of access to the regional and transnational networks, emphasizing the dependence of the envisioned European district on a much larger system of connectivity.
2.2.1 Waterways: channeling the European flow

Waterways formed a first international infrastructure network that grew significantly after World War II, stimulated by the various international authorities in charge with the construction of new canals connecting existing waterways, such as the Grand Canal d'Alsace, a fifty kilometer connection between Kembs and Vogelgrun providing access to a region stretching from the Rhine River to Basel and the North Sea. A newspaper article collected by French architect and urbanist Jean-Henri Calsat, while developing his urban schemes for a European district in Strasbourg, noted the importance of link between the Rhine and the Mediterranean Sea. The article pointed out that thereby the most important European water infrastructure connection passed through Strasbourg.

The construction of the Grand Canal d’Alsace, which began in 1932, was completed in 1959. International cooperation on waterways had been established from the 19th century, with the Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine. Canalization projects and the installation of new locks and dams strongly improved the water connection between industrial zones. A newspaper article in an Alsacian newspaper of 1961 discussed the studies by the United Nations’ European Economic Commission reporting that the experts of the commission have investigated the possibility of creating a 6000 kilometer canal throughout Europe, linking the Atlantic and the Mediterranean river systems. The article emphasizes that this new constellation would place Strasbourg in a crucial position. Based on Western Europe’s fluvial network, the canal would connect Northern Atlantic rivers and the Mediterranean with industrial zones in Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Ural and the Caucasian. The article continued by stating that such a water connection would be a highly important action in the creation of the European idea:

"Finally, if none of these solutions can be retained and if the State persists, in what concerns the waterways in a shortsighted policy, the Alsace would maintain its rights of priority: because it needs to finally enter, and for
the first time in its history, into a period of real creative development corresponding to its spirit of enterprise, to its geographic situation, to its economic vocation, because the link Alsace-Doubs-Saone would be the least expensive, because it would correspond the best with the imperatives of regional expansion, because it would be finally the most European, and maybe soon the most rentable from the economic point of view.”  

The article showed a plan indicating how the position of Strasbourg and the Alsace is logically central to systems at the scale of the European Common Market. The text argued that the proposed connection is technically the easiest and least expensive and promotes Strasbourg as a city that has metropolitan allures. As opposed to Germany, France does not have a regional metropolis along the upper Rhine and Strasbourg can play a central role in the new water network, more than other port cities such as Marseille, Rotterdam or Antwerp. The connection provides not only a new north-south link but also many points of junction currently unavailable. Strasbourg would thereby become the turntable for the north-south and east-west fluvial network in Europe. This text thereby placed the city of Strasbourg in the position of a platform allowing for flow, in this case water-based transportation, to occur as efficiently as possible and to allow transfer between different directions of movement. This role of the city was new and unexplored and became a major factor in the submitted architectural and urban proposals.

2.2.2 The Trans Europe Express

A second mode of transportation was the system of railroads which had developed all over Europe throughout the nineteenth century. Throughout the nineteenth century the total length of open railway lines in Europe countries had grown from 3870 km in 1840 to 200,000 km in 1900. The application by the city of Luxembourg for the seat of the European Communities included detailed studies and reports by the Ministry of Transportation and the railway companies regarding the railway transportation network, its accessibility and innovative machinery. In an article included in
Luxembourg’s candidature, Victor Bodson, Luxembourg’s Minister of Transportation evoked the geographic map of Western Europe, on which the small country of Luxembourg occupied the center, functioning as a node of primary railway connections. Moreover, the minister promised future improvements to these connections, referring to the recent electrification of the lines Luxembourg-Brussels and Luxembourg-Strasbourg-Bale and the network’s integration in the new Trans Europe Express (TEE) network, which replaced the former express lines. The same publication included an article on the modernization of railway connections in Luxembourg. The author, a local politician named Antoine Wehenkel listed how the railroad network, after having lost terrain during the world wars, replaced heavy steam trains with fast electric tracks and diesel, how long waits at customs were being replaced by visits of customs agents during the travel, and how great express lines such as the Malle des Indes, the Orient Express and the Nord Express were disappearing in the evolution from direct cars to direct trains. This way, lighter and faster trains were realized, together with more supple and frequent combinations. A major event on this track of progress occurred on June 2, 1957, when special trains started running between large European cities. These trains, the Trans-Europe-Express (TEE) offered a maximum speed and comfort. Also Wehenkel glimpsed into the future, promising night trains, which he called “real hotels on wheels”, ending with the hope that in this way, the train would attract again those who had abandoned it for the car. Luxembourg’s candidature thereby pointed out two significant changes to the European railway network during the early post-war period: the electrification of trains and the introduction of the Trans-Europe-Express international railway network.

Both modernization processes returned in other city candidatures such as Brussels’ elaborate map showing a network that combined the regular railway network with TEE trains and sea travel, including a graphic representation of difference in travel times between TEE and direct trains (Fig
C2.1). An accompanying text pointed out that the Belgian railway network, with 32 km per 100 square kilometers, was the densest train network in the world and that all great TEE lines run through Brussels, thereby strengthening Brussels’ claim of centrality not only in its geographic position on the map but also by its connectivity to transportation networks.

Likewise Strasbourg’s candidature included a study titled “Point de convergence de relations européennes” indicating new travel speeds and frequencies thanks to the electrification of French and German railways and the Trans-Europe Express.42 Most railway networks presented by different candidate cities were undergoing improvements at the time of the city candidatures, including electrification and improvement of transportation efficiency, travel speeds and travel frequencies.

While Strasbourg promised improving its train connection with Italy and Germany, Turin aimed to improve its connection with Paris and to electrify the Turin-Milan line. Not all cities were able to place themselves in the center of the railway grid. Nice for example presented a very dense grid but the city itself was only connected to the grid through Marseille (Fig C2.2). By defining specific parameters of the railroad transportation network, such as level of modernization (electrification), level of efficiency (TEE), density and frequency, the notion of centrality was redefined not only as a geographic position on the map but as the level of connectivity to the network.

After World War II, simple accords between railway administrations had evolved to intergovernmental agreements, such as the conventions on transport of merchandise, passengers and luggage by rail. The association Verein Deutscher Eisenbahnverwaltungen, which had been established in 1846 to improve the technical standards, through rates, international routings and custom regulations of railway companies in Germany and beyond, represented by the end of the 19th century more than eight railways in Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Netherlands, Belgium and
Russia. Yet most cross-border transportation had been arranged through non-governmental international organizations such as the International Union of Railroads, International Committee of Rail Transportation, the European Conference of Train Schedules, the International Conference of Merchandise Schedules and the International Union of Wagons, the latter of which created on May 1, 1951 an international ‘pool’ of 100,000 wagons half French, half German, carrying the mark of Europe.

By the time the 1958 city applications for the seat of the European Communities were submitted, most railroads in the world had switched from steam to diesel traction. With the increasing pressure of competing forms of transportation such as roads and aviation, the railway network that had weakened during World War II was modernized. Diesel locomotives, electric vehicles with an on-board generator powered by a diesel engine, were cleaner, more energy efficient, and required less maintenance than steam trains. Luxembourg City’s 1958 application included an article by the country’s Minister of Transportation, Victor Bodson, who evoked the geographic map of Europe as a network of railways in which Luxembourg occupied the center, as a node of primary importance for the directions Brussels-The Hague, Liege-Amsterdam, Treves-Coblence, Strasbourg-Bale and Longwy or Metz-Paris. He also emphasized the importance of the recent electrification of the lines Luxembourg-Brussels and Luxembourg-Strasbourg-Bale and their integration in the network of TEE (Trans Europe Express) trains. Interestingly, Victor Bodson had received the Righteous Among the Nations award by the Israeli Supreme Court for his role in helping hundreds of fleeing Jews during World War II to cross the Sauer, a border river between Luxembourg and Germany. Thus, Bodson’s interest in promoting cross border infrastructure networks may have been linked to his personal past. In the same application, Antoine (Tony) Wehenkel, Chief Engineer of the National Society of Luxembourg’s Railroads (Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer
Luxembourgeois) and community councilor for the city of Luxembourg, wrote two articles explaining the history and 1956 electrification of the railways, accompanied by a map. The map showed Luxembourg’s railway system with double tracks running as a spine through the country, continuing across the borders to Germany and France, while single tracks reached local destinations and crossed the border to Belgium. A second article by Wehenkel, in the compilation Ville Européenne, focused on the modernization of railway connections that had lost terrain during the world wars. Wehenkel illustrated the modernization process by descriptions of the new fast electric tracks and diesel that had replaced heavy steam trains, the replacement of long waits at customs by visits of customs agents during travel, and the disappearance of great express lines such as the Malle des Indes, the Orient Express and the Nord Express in the evolution from direct cars to direct trains.

2.2.3 All E-roads lead to Europe

Also the road network was undergoing a far-reaching transformation from a nation-based organization to a wide-reaching transnational transportation system. Most road maps presented by the different candidate cities presented networks of cross-border roads, mostly under construction or planned for the future. Strasbourg’s candidature included a map of the city located at the center of the E-road network, all represented as arrows toward Strasbourg (Fig C2.3). These cross-border E-roads had been planned from the beginning of the 1950s, aiming to connect major European cities over large distances and internationally coordinate road infrastructure and amenities. The architect behind Strasbourg’s unambiguous network map, Henri-Jean Calsat, had studied maps issued by the Federation Routière Internationale in May 1955 for countries such as Germany, Belgium and France indicating the planned E-road network, thereby representing not the actual state
of Strasbourg’s limited connectivity to international roads but rather a future network of well-connected European city-nodes.\textsuperscript{47}

Other candidate cities such as Nice, Turin, Milan and Brussels followed the same logic (Fig C2.4, Fig C2.5, Fig C2.6). Brussels’ candidature presented the E-road system as part of Belgium’s efforts through the Road Fund Act of 1954 to modernize the country’s road system in order to improve industrial and tourism infrastructure and place Brussels at its center, well connected to Belgium’s national airport.\textsuperscript{48}

The emerging necessity of the post-war city for new urban strategies to accommodate the masses required architects and planners to rethink the road networks. The development of international tourism, the rise of car ownership and long distance bus services fueled the emergence of mass mobility. Since the new mass mobility filled more space than the existing road infrastructure could swallow, a new system to allow a smoother and more controlled flow of people and things had to be envisioned.

At a time when national road networks were undergoing drastic transformations, the city applications in 1958 rendered their positions as pivots in a cross-border road system. Although this cross-border system was still under development, the cities presented maps depicting a dynamic, hierarchic and free-flowing system of international highways. The booklet titled “Strasbourg invite l’Europe,” submitted by the City of Strasbourg for the second application round for the seat of the European Committees in 1958, included a map locating Strasbourg in the center of a highway network.\textsuperscript{49} The network showed only cross-border European E-roads.\textsuperscript{50} Luxembourg’s map of the existing road system and its cross-border connections showed national roads running parallel to the country’s border and forming a relatively homogeneous network. Yet the new cross-border
highways revealed a different pattern. Instead of the evenly distributed network of internal roads, the cross-border network privileged the capital and those towns situated closest to the country's border (Fig C2.7). Thus the E-road network created a new condition in which capitals but also border cities became nodes in an international transportation system: one as the representative of the nation, the other as crossing points needed for international coordination of economic development, for increasing mobility of goods and people and for the well-functioning of this emerging transnational network at the scale of the continent.

An important precondition of this transnational road network was the development of the highway as a faster and smoother mode of road transportation, pioneered by Germany in the decade before World War II. A table of highway construction in Europe before, during and after World War II clearly demonstrates the peak of road construction in Germany between 1935 and 1940. Following the example of the 130 kilometer autostrada from Milan to Varese constructed by Benito Mussolini in 1924, Germany began construction on the Köln-Bonn Autobahn in 1929. During the Third Reich, Germany built 10,990 kilometres of highways as part of Hitler's promotional agenda. After World War II the autobahn became a model not only for the development of a roads network in Europe, but as mentioned earlier in this chapter, as an inspiration for the American Interstate Highway System.

The willingness of European nations to build a cross-border infrastructure network emerged from the belief that the 'freedom of the road' would provide a way to reach European integration. The car network offered more freedom and flexibility than traditional monocentric city-based public transport systems and created a new perspective from which to perceive the city itself.
From 1947 to 1949, European countries signed a series of road agreements to liberate commercial road traffic eventually reaching the Convention on Road Traffic, signed on September 19, 1949. One year later, under supervision of the United Nations Economic Commission in Geneva, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom signed the Declaration on the Construction of Main International Traffic Arteries, soon after joined by Austria (1951), Greece and Sweden (1952), Norway (1953), Portugal and Turkey (1954), Germany and Italy (1957). This declaration specified the routes and numbering system of the new E-road network, which would contain 22 main roads and 62 branches. In addition, the document included specifications of road services such as border crossings, roadside facilities, parking lots, first aid posts and emergency phones.

The freedom of movement agreements formed part of the Marshall Plan agenda, which considered a well-functioning transport infrastructure as a conditio sine qua non for the successful economic recovery of Europe. Correspondingly, individual nations took initiative, founding the European Conference of Ministers of Transport in 1953, which passed resolutions on the coordination and transnational use of road infrastructures. Although European countries committed to developing a highly efficient cross-border road network, national economic and political constraints quickly generated inequalities in the development of the E-network. By 1955, the E-roads were farthest developed in the Benelux, France, Italy and Germany, while the United Kingdom lagged behind with the lowest number of E-roads per square kilometer.

2.2.4 A ‘Common System’ through the Air

With the growth of commercial air travel, each candidate city also presented a map of air connections. Each city emphasized different parameters of air transportation but all of them quantified the connection to distance to airport, distance to destination, travel time, travel frequency,
correspondence to other modes of transportation, etc. In addition, the air travel network underwent a process of modernization, with the promise of new modernized airports, heliports and taxi-planes. Again the city candidatures presented a future image of well-connected urban centers to an international system of high speed air travel with modernized airports and daily connections to most important destinations in Europe (Fig C2.8). Although far from the actual state of affairs in most cities, their strong common belief in the future possibilities of such system reflected the importance of the underlying functionality and infrastructure of an integrated Europe. Although the network systems presented by candidate cities reflected a belief in decentralization and the coexistence of multiple centres, each city presented itself as most central. Interestingly, this meant that the specific position of a candidate city also redefined the reach of a unified Europe. While Nice’s Europe did not reach to the Northern parts of Europe but did include parts of North Africa (Fig C2.9), Milan’s Europe included the complete African continent, the Middle East and the coasts of the US and Latin America (Fig C2.10). Although Luxembourg and Strasbourg were poorly connected to European transportation networks, the airline maps submitted by candidate cities emphasized geographic centrality while ignoring concrete connections (Fig C2.11). Yet these ideal and projected representations of the air travel network reflected a belief in the potential of a smoothly operating system that would not be confined to restrictions of its physical or geographic context. While most network systems presented by candidate cities were still in the making and only represented a possible future, their quantification and the image they projected functioned as a driving force in promoting cities as suitable for a Europe that represented change, modernization, mobility and speed.

Next to road networks, the growth of passenger air travel after World War II figured centrally in the 1958 city applications. Thanks to military air transportation technologies, air travel had become a
rapid and comparatively safe mode of moving large numbers of passengers and considerable quantities of goods over large distances. Most applicant cities thus included maps indicating the connections via air to other cities in Europe and beyond. A map submitted by Luxembourg placed the of Luxembourg City in the center of a 800 km radius circle, demonstrating the city’s claim to the heart of Europe. The same map specified direct distances between the airport of Luxembourg and other primary European airports. However, the distances were not necessarily based on existing airlines to these destinations and were incongruent with travel times. The map thus showed not an existing air travel network yet a potential image of a future ideal network with Luxembourg in its center. Luxembourg’s 1958 application presented its airport as a project that employed advanced construction techniques of pre-constrained concrete to provide wider spans and as a site that benefited from optimal climate and weather conditions. It was not only air travel, but also airports themselves that underwent a process of modernization, adopting the island model that would allow for easy future expansion. During the 1950s, many European countries built highway connections between their capitals and main airports to create better links between both road and air networks.

Other cities that were already better connected in reality did mention travel times. A map submitted by the city of Nice mentioned its direct air connections with all major airports in Europe, thereby making every city in Europe accessible in one day. The Strasbourg package specified travel times by air to Paris (1 hour and 50 minutes), London (2 hours and 45 minutes), Milan (5 hours) and Ankara (13 hours and 15 minutes). Strasbourg capitalized on its daily connection to Paris, thus not only measuring the network by travel time per se, but also including frequency as an important factor of comparison. In addition, all maps drew straight lines between airports, even though it was known that airplanes did not fly in a straight line. Yet these ideal and projected representations of the air
travel network reflected a belief in the potential of a smoothly operating system that would not be confined to restrictions of its physical or geographic context.

As a whole, the submitted maps represented each network as radio-concentric with the applicant city in the center, since the goal was to show the city as the center of Europe and therefore suitable to become a seat for the European institutions. Yet when overlapping the maps, we can find the underlying hierarchies of well-connected cities. The overlapping of networks reveals a hierarchy in accessibility or potential accessibility not only of the applicant cities but also of cities that played an important role in the Europe of that time. In addition, the overlapping networks created a triangulated system in which member state cities participated, as opposed to those cities located at Europe’s extremes. Thus a less radio-concentric network emerged from the combined existing and proposed networks, showing triangles of preferred routes between the capitals of the six treaty countries, as well as England, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland and Spain.

The belief in the potential of air travel as a way to provide a well-connected seat for the European institutions was based on the assumption that the seat could only exist if it allowed a high level of individual mobility. The assumed network was a necessary component of this seat since it allowed for the institutions and its officials to move between member state capitals and the seat itself. Thus the proposed locations and the way in which they were represented did not aspire to become capital cities, yet satellite locations for transnational institutions to coexist and cooperate with national capitals.

The map submitted by the city of Nice included logos of national flight companies such as BEA, Swissair, KLM, SAS and others. This was a sign of the privatization process that had taken place in European aviation since World War II. Air technology had developed tremendously during the war
to accommodate military needs. By the end of the war, most air travel was military, much of it supported by the United States who provided ground facilities, communication and other air traffic services. During the war, the United States had developed its own air traffic network as a ‘common system’ of both military and civil transportation. Both systems were similar enough to allow for an easy switch from civil to military in case of war.\textsuperscript{54}

After World War II, European countries started to transform the military air transportation network into a civil one, by converting military aircrafts to civic ones, former military ground personnel, and using military airfields equipped with the latest technology. Private flight companies gained strength after the war, dominated in the early post-war period by the British airlines BOAC and BEA. In 1952, BOAC introduced its first passenger jet service, yet by that time, Air France, had already surpassed the British companies with a larger amount of passenger-miles and flight destinations stretching to France’s colonies. Other European airline companies also served to maintain the link with their colonies and created a network of European integration that stretched beyond the continent per se.\textsuperscript{55} Since Alitalia was formed only in 1957, its activities were more limited at the time of the 1958 city applications, explaining the less developed air transport networks present in the candidatures for Italian cities such as Stresa (Fig C2.12). Thus we can state that the connection of a seat for the European institutions to the network of civil air travel formed a crucial component of the visions for a transnational network of European institutions, connected to one another by multiple modes of transportation.

\textit{2.2.5 Wiring the European Territory}

Luxembourg’s 1958 application for the seat of the European communities included an issue of the magazine titled Modernisation Luxembourg, illustrating technological innovations within the country, not only in the field of transportation but also at the level of national utility systems such as
the electricity network (Fig C2.13). The magazine dedicated an article to the recent creation of a hydroelectric power station, which had been coordinated by the European Committee on Electric Power. The project, a large pumping station on the river Our in Luxembourg, had been constructed in 1951 in a joint effort of the Netherlands, Belgium, France and the German Bizone. Another hydropower project in the Austrian Alps, later entitled Interalpen, consisted of five plants, most of which were situated in the Voralberg, Tyrol, and on the Austrian Danube. The same issue displayed a map of the existing electricity network within the country of Luxembourg and connections with its neighboring countries, predominantly towards France. This map exemplified the completion of a process of nationalization of utility networks that had started during the interwar period, which saw the intensive accumulation and increase in scale of utility systems from local to regional and national. Not only nationalization but also internationalization of electric power lines across borders had been initiated from the first decade of the twentieth century onwards. By 1930, a significant number of European Countries was exchanging cross border power utilities. The sophistication of technology allowed for the integration of cities into national urban markets. What Stephen Graham calls the ‘patchwork of local utility systems’ transformed after the war into regulated centralized networks as subsidized markets. Graham contends that utilities during the post-war Fordist era disconnected from control at the urban level and moved to a national, centralized system.  

I argue that, although utility networks in the post-war era grew in scale, their enlargement was not limited to the boundaries of the nation-state. Important organizations such as the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) took responsibility over the distribution of Marshall Funds, of which the development of infrastructure formed an important component. The UNECE’s Committee on Electric Power (CoEP) aimed to tackle the shortage of power in Europe and study the possible implementation of international projects ‘as though Europe were but a single country. Regardless of political frontiers.’
Similarly new hydroelectric plants in Turin⁵⁸ and Luxembourg figured as examples of modernization in Europe’s utility infrastructure (Fig C2.14). The magazine included in Luxembourg’s application titled “Modernisation Luxembourg” celebrated local industrial architecture, showcasing the hydroelectric management of the valley of Sure and explaining the history and electrification in 1956 of the railway network.⁵⁹ The cover of the magazine featured industrial buildings and structures as emblems of modernization. The magazine combined promising imagery of a bright and international future of Luxembourg with maps of international road connections and power distribution. It featured the local airport, with photographs celebrating the modern-industrial architecture of its airplane hangar and a plan showing how the airport was connected to the city of Luxembourg. The magazine was flooded with imagery of a bright and international future of Luxembourg, with maps of international road connections and an advertisement in English for the national airline company. The ability of cities to modernize themselves thereby became a quality in and of itself and was emphasized in the majority of city candidatures, most explicitly by the city of Milan⁶⁰ and the city of Brussels. The latter presented a host of elaborate maps presenting overlapping networks of transportation, communication and utilities. This emphasis on highly developed infrastructure reflected Belgium’s interest in modernization. During the same year of Brussels’ candidature for the seat of the European Communities, the city had organized the world expo, in large to draw attention to the country’s modernization efforts and to drive the Belgian government’s economic expansion policy forward.⁶¹ Modernization itself became a selling parameter in the city candidatures whereby cities presented themselves as a driving force of large infrastructure systems reaching well beyond national boundaries.
2.3 Regions as Cross-Border Territories

After World War II architects and urbanists renewed their efforts in planning cities at the scale of the metropolitan region. The widespread combination of the regulation of international trade, the continuous increase in productivity, the corporatists, and interventionist states led to a rationalized spatial organization of city and region. National and international authorities more and more focused on planning these urbanized regions and as a reaction to urban sprawl and suburbanization, the urban region became the new planning unit. In addition, following the establishment of the European Union, new transnational regional structures and institutions emerged. Euroregions started appearing soon after the establishment in 1957 of the European Economic Community, first along the German-Dutch border and soon integrating the Belgian border landscape. These regions were designed to create a new ‘European citizen’ by strengthening cross-border community ties and erasing historically artificial division, sometimes even seen as the bottom-up approach for achieving European integration. These new regional urban areas would not have clearly delineated borders and sometimes cross national borders, such as the case of the Lille metropolitan region or Upper Silecia. Therefore metropolitan regions became the rival of political provinces, counties and departments.

As the chairman of the Integration Committee of Plan Europe 2000, a large scale urban planning study for Europe launched in 1969, English urbanist and town planner Sir Peter Hall studied patterns of urbanization in Europe, describing urban conditions and the quality of the urban environment according to different parameters. The study discussed the problem of suburbanization and sprawl in Europe and recognized the new regional form of urbanization, termed the ‘megalopolis.’

“large regions develop which are marked by urban settlement throughout, so that metropolitan core zones form a functional unity with the smaller and medium-size communities, interconnected by means of strong..."
The post-war trends toward decentralization challenge urbanization processes ‘since it outruns competence of political organs.’ Hall predicted that by the year 2000, we would live in a ‘continuous metropolis from Merseyside to Milan.’ According to British Sociologist Ray Pahl this new urban planning concept of the region had two purposes, the ‘efficient and socially inclusive redistribution of housing and service provision’ and ‘maintaining or developing a spatial and institutional order attuned to the changing spatial needs for a vigorously expanding economy.’ With this new concept of a cross-border region as the appropriate planning unit for the post-war European city, a different scale of approach to the design of cities emerged. The 1958 candidatures for a seat of the European institutions featured cities from this point of view guided by the idea that they would be part of a larger, cross-border urban system of high connectivity at a regional scale.

2.4 The City as a Transnational Agglomeration of Networked Communities

After the concentrated development of transportation networks providing the logistical support for the World War II machine, post-war efforts of local and international agencies to coordinate national transportation and infrastructure networks greatly improved the actual and perceived connectivity between cities in Europe. Urban networks evolved from fragmentary, ad-hoc infrastructure solutions to well-tuned, integrated, cross-border systems, thereby redefining cities as relative locations rather than absolute. As Albert Pope argues, the modernist city’s final result was the promise of a new subject, the ‘user’. Revisiting Michel Foucault’s theory of the production of social subjects as historically grounded and socially individuated, Pope proposes a fundamental relation between infrastructural form and the construction of urban subjectives. Pope’s argument
becomes highly relevant in the context of transnational European networks in raising the question whether the emerging cross-border transportation and infrastructure networks were developed as a base to produce a new ‘European Subject’ and thereby grew to be the base of the ‘European project’.

Whereas central cities traditionally had played a dominant role in representing the nation-state, the emerging power of the infrastructure network transformed the role of the city. Described earlier, pre- and post-war concepts such as the Grands Ensembles and eventually network urbanism accelerated a shift in conceiving the city as an urban field expanding from one central point to the city as an agglomeration of communities. Within this context, the discussion over creating a system of transnational networks redefined this conception to consider cities as nodes in a network of transportation and infrastructure.

During the decade immediately following the end of World War II, efforts to rebuild national economies, car ownership for the masses, urban expansion and the commitment to post-war reconstruction formed major challenges for the urbanism debate. The growing need of the post-war European city for new urban strategies to transport goods and accommodate the masses required architects and planners to rethink the way in which these masses would circulate between home, work and leisure. Since moving these masses of goods and people required more space than existing road infrastructure could support, urban design visions emerged that imagined a new system to allow for smoother and more controlled flows of people and things. These visions charged transportation systems with a radically different meaning between the city and its urban context. Following location theories of the time, transportation networks formed a tool to increase efficiency of movement of goods and people as a homogenous system across a neutral plane, differentiated by economical advantage. Location theories such as the model developed by the Prussian landowner
Johann Heinrich von Thünen considered the influence of transportation costs on location rent, or in other words, the impact of distance traveled and volume shipped on economic prosperity.\textsuperscript{69} German geographer Walter Christaller’s central-place theory added to this a hierarchy of different orders of central places: settlements that provide more goods and services would be considered higher-order central places. Assuming a homogeneous plane of constant population density and purchasing power, the movement between central places would be uniform in any direction.\textsuperscript{70} Expanding on the Thünen model, William Alonso developed a theory to explain variations in land use between cities. Alonso’s model defined a rent gradient for each land use type, explaining segregation between different areas in the city. These models assumed neutral and homogenous conditions that when applied to actual conditions would be slightly modified to take into account additional parameters. From this perspective, the networks that appeared in the 1958 candidatures for a seat of the European Institution enlarged the idea of location theory beyond national borders. At the transnational level, the networks were developed in order to maximize productivity and minimize cost. In order to do so and similar to the location theories described above, the existing territory was transformed to a neutral plane through which movement at the European level would cross.

\subsection*{2.5 The Singularity Debate}

These considerations of a web of nodes dependent on the efficiency of movement between them assumed a multitude of central places each with their own ‘raison d’être’, or in other words, a decentralized European territory.

In a series of personal hand drawn studies of the geopolitical situation on the Eurasian Continent, Engineer Pierre Randet, the French representative for the committee of experts in urbanism, in charge of studying the city candidatures and director of the Planning Department at the Ministry of
Reconstruction and Urbanism placed the question of a European seat in a larger context (Fig C2.15, Fig C2.16, Fig C2.17). Eight pages of hand sketched maps with notes and calculations studied the USSR as a constellation of urban nodes connected by lines of transportation and peripheral industrial zones. As Randet added in a note: the ‘federal axis (…) animates the geopolitics’, referring to the belief that a strong geographic structure would strengthen the political structure. The next maps focused on a new imagined constellation he titled the Federal Union of Eurafrika, connecting European and African states into one network of nodes and linear connections and suggested that the similar size and demographics of this new network to the existing Soviet network would create a desirable equilibrium. Randet further notes that Western Europe is threatened by Russia’s intention to take control over the Mediterranean and therefore the routes between Europe and Northern Africa are key components of strengthening Europe’s position. The current concentration of power in Europe is in Brussels and Paris, yet more and more the point of gravity will move to the Western Mediterranean. In a map of natural landscapes across Europe, Randet points out how the topography and the deserts can offer protection for Europe and European Africa. The final conclusion is a diagram summarizing the proposed future connections between Europe’s current center in Northwest Europe and the South creating a larger territorial network. Accompanying the diagram is a scribble of a figure being strangled at the neck. Randet’s amusing yet suggestive caricature expresses the general feeling of frustration faced by the European officials faced with building the new transnational political entity and giving it a physical structure. The idea that the ‘head’ of Europe concentrated in Brussels and Paris would be connected to the larger European territory only through a narrow bottleneck remained. The solution of decentralization formed a welcomed promise of escape from the geopolitical situation of an isolated and vulnerable center of power.
Not only political debates touched upon the strategy of territorial decentralization; also architects and urbanists developed urbanization models based on decentralization. Decentralization emerged as a desirable organizational concept in many national planning institutions. In 1947, the influential book by the French geographer Jean-François Gravier’s *Paris et le désert français* had revealed a huge gap between the gigantic aspirations of the Parisian region and the mediocrity of the regional centers of France, motivating Claudius-Petit, Minister of Reconstruction and Housing to lead an active planning policy to end the French disequilibrium. Already in 1950, Claudius Petit presented a document to the French Council of Ministers titled *Toward a National Plan for the Arrangement of the Territory*. In this document, Petit argued for a more efficient use of the complete territory of France and the redistribution of resources accordingly. Also the schemes for a decentralized city in Randstad, Holland of 1958 can be understood in this context (Fig C2.18). While Dutch policymakers invested much effort in reconstruction the country during the period immediately following World War II, population pressures in the Western region of the Netherlands prompted the decision taken by the Minister of Reconstruction and Housing in 1951 to create a commission in charge of studying the spatial situation in the area.

“When we think of the major metropolitan centres in other countries, we think of a built-up heart functioning as a city, a centre of growth and the focus of the entire complex of urban life. We cannot imagine the ‘Randstad Holland’ without a ‘green’ heart, encircled by a ring of cities with their own functions within the complex as a whole.”

The report of the commission supported a decentralized urban structure preserving the open green spaces between the surrounding urban nodes. They defined a minimum width of four kilometers for the green ‘buffer zones’ and on a larger scale, dedicated the open area in the center of a ring of cities for open space. The report named the central zone “Randstad” or literally translated “Edge City”, a
peripheral inhabited landscape to be preserved as the green heart of a larger metropolitan region. In a policy document concerning the industrialization of the Netherlands, the Ministry of Economy chose to reduce pressure on the Randstad and promote industrial development in other regions, based on the principle of spatial decentralization.\textsuperscript{73}

In March 1958, the French Ministry of Reconstruction and Housing produced a map titled “Centre de Gravité de la Population de l’Europe des Six”, mapping the center of gravity of the population of the six member states of the European Common Market: France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Federal Germany, Luxembourg and Italy. The map indicated the center of gravity on the border between France and Germany in the area of the Alsace, and formed part of the studies made by the French planning authorities to provide documentation in the debate over the seat of the European communities. These studies shifted between questions of centralization versus decentralization, depending on the trust in the increasingly sophisticated communication and transportation infrastructures developing throughout Europe. Although European officials assumed a single seat for the European institutions, the interest in accessibility and connectivity signaled the assumption that European space would be dispersed and would require the traveling of European citizens, information and services over large distances.

Like the city of Luxembourg, the French city of Strasbourg promoted the idea of spreading the European institutions over the territory, a concept that increased its chances of remaining the host of the European communities at least partially. In addition, Strasbourg had improved its position in the international transportation network since the Assembly’s president Robert Schuman and France’s Prime Minister Pierre Pflimlin obtained a daily air connection from Strasbourg to Paris. By the time of the conference for the establishment of the Council of Europe, Shuman had suggested Strasbourg as its seat for reasons of good communication and travel.\textsuperscript{74}
As discussed in the introductory chapter, the idea of the single capital had been questioned from the early formative days of different European Communities. The official report of the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held in Paris on January 6 and 7, 1958 communicated the decision to reunite the European organizations in one place, as long as it was realizable and in conformity with the dispositions of the Treaties. Thus, the choice for a single seat was compromised by practicalities. Although the expert committee members were convinced about a central location for the headquarters, some criticized the single capital principle, pointing out problems of centralization in Paris and the success of states with multiple capitals. While Carola Hein, argues that “The selection of a headquarters was potentially very influential, for if these new organizations grew into a genuine European government, the city that hosted their headquarters would become the capital of Europe,”75 Yet through analyzing the parliamentary discussions we can see how the idea of a capital had been jeopardized from its conception. Although discussions about the seat of Europe did indeed mention the idea of a capital of Europe, the search for the neutrality of a European seat overshadowed this idea.76 As Jean Monnet had emphasized in 1957,

“It is necessary, in my opinion, to avoid installing the European services in a grand capital, were the swirls of domestic politics would be felt. They need a maximum of serenity and impartiality.”77

The continuous tension between the persistence of the nation-state and in parallel the development of a European entity formed a fertile ground for the concept of decentralization to gain ground as the most appropriate geopolitical model of distributing power. The candidature dossier submitted by the city of Luxembourg in 1958 included a text titled “Plus d’Europe que d’Europes,”78 (transl: More Europe than Europes) which postulated a critique to existing tendencies of the European institutions toward disharmony, dispersal and imbalance. The article called for a higher goal of European integration that would transcend national and local interests. The author, Belgian Political
Journalist Jean Fosty stated clearly that a state cannot exist without a capital. Fosty argued for three founding principles: the European interest comes before the national, regional or local interests; the dispersion of European institutions has to be avoided at all times; and the six states should consider other European states as possible seats. In his article, Fosty boldly advocated the concentration of all parliamentary and non-parliamentary institutions in one location. According to him, it was preferable to stay with Luxembourg and Strasbourg and not find a new seat, in order to avoid contestation and rivalry. Finally, Fosty argued against defending the chances of Brussels or any other city in function of the national right or because ‘everyone should have something’ and he concluded: “Il est temps d'avoir plus d'Europe que d'Europes!” (transl: it is time to have more Europe than Europes) (p19)  

While Fosty’s view represented the view of the European Neofunctionalists as described in Chapter 1, the pragmatics and bureaucracies of decision making simultaneously compromised the utopia of a Europe without nations.  

This same view developed further after 1952 and became a geopolitical strategy across the European Administrative Entities. At a meeting of the young European Parliament on May 14, 1958, Nicolas Margue, Luxembourg’s Minister of Education, fiercely objected to all texts that assumed the establishment of a single seat. He emphasized that this principle of decentralized locations for the European institutions was accepted by the ministers in January on the condition that it was possible to implement and according to the determinations of the Treaty. According to Margue, the unity about the principle of the seat disappeared ‘as snow for the sun’ when the communities had to determine a place. He warned that "it should not be annexed by a random country, especially not a big one” and that "it would be problematic to unite Europe in one place and then tell the Russians: there you go, you can throw your bomb there, then Europe will stop existing”. Although his remarks evoked laughter from the Parliament Members, Margue continued that it should be avoided
to create a ghetto of functionaries, where people who meet in the office, also meet on the street and proposed the solution of a regional concentration. Based on the well-established transportation and communication infrastructure, he envisioned a network of institutions ”at several kilometers distance and even several hours of train travels from one site to another in which all advantages of an absolute concentration will be fulfilled, without creating disadvantages.” He concluded, reacting against running opinions, that it is not about a seat for institutions but about a capital for Europe, ”with all psychological effects attached” and insisted that Europe is not a fulfilled fact, but in the process of formation. In reaction to Margue’s argument, a parliament member from the German Christian Democrats, Henry Kopf, stated that he regrets to see that the postponement of a decision will not allow discussion about the unity of the seat to take place. He argued for a seat of the executive organs of the three communities in one city, but left a window open for the option for dispersal of the three institutions: the Court of Justice, the Investment bank and the European University. Kopf recognizes that the meeting of the European Community of Coal and Steel has been held so far in Strasbourg and that the city has been chosen as a meeting place for the Council of Europe since here all civilizations meet, yet he argues that there is a need to check whether the reasons for Strasbourg are important enough for the plenary sessions to take place here as well.

As a result of debates on the principle of a single seat and the simultaneous development of a new transnational network of transportation and utilities, the idea of a decentralized European territory emerged in which different European institutions would be dispersed over the different member states. The 1958 competition explored the potential of the post-war intensification and expansion of transnational infrastructure networks, based on the belief that the international coordination of these networks would form a sturdy economic base for European integration. These networks played a crucial role in the 1958 competition, as the basic justification for small, peripheral and marginal cities
to be eligible Candidate cities presented themselves as mere service nodes in a far reaching, decentralized transportation and utility network, thereby promoting the city as a node.

---
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Chapter 03: From Voids to Extraterritorial Districts

As I described in the introduction, the post-war architectural discourse had reintroduced the notion of monumentality as an important aspect of creating new civic centers and providing appropriate spaces for social gathering. This idea was unquestionably connected to reconstruction efforts after World War II in which cities were to be recreated together with their social and cultural connotations. This formed an opportunity for the architects of CIAM to develop urban schemes providing new types of public spaces that would allow for dynamic processes of social gathering.

Closely related to the idea of the civic center, the concept of the urban district played a central role in the development of urban schemes for the future European seat. By the fifties, the district as a separate administrative unit had entered the architectural debate among CIAM’s members leading to the creation of Team 10. Reacting to the *Grille CIAM* that had been developed by ASCORAL guided by Le Corbusier with the aim of creating a tool to compare different urban conditions and design schemes, the members of Team 10 and especially Alison and Peter Smithson countered the functionalist grid with an Urban Re-identification Grid presented in 1953 at CIAM 9 based on the principle of ‘human association’ and the need for identification between a community and its urban environment and structured according to four different scales of identification: house, street, district and city. Similar to the principles of Giedion and Sert’s New Monumentality, the proposed grid emphasized the importance of enabling stronger links between a city’s inhabitants and its urban spaces. According to the identification grid this required an embedded relationship between the four categories, rather than a segregated zoning system as had been promoted by the *Grille CIAM* of 1949.¹ Thereby the notion of the district became part of a more complete understanding of a multi-scalar urban system. With the proposals for a European seat, the idea of the district imbued new meaning as a more independent urban unit, with its own civic center, infrastructure, facilities and
monuments. Within these new districts, a new monumentality would replace the symbols and ‘dead buildings’ of the traditional city with a more ‘popular’ type of monumentality.\(^2\)

### 3.1 Monuments of a Transnational Europe

One year before the city candidacies submitted for the competition for a seat of the European Institutions, three important architecture competitions took place in which the idea of monumentality played a central role: The 1956-1957 competition for la Place des Nations in Geneva, the 1957-1958 Ecole des Beaux-Arts competition for a European Pantheon and the 1957-1958 competition for Hauptstadt Berlin. The three competitions clearly framed the debate between different ideas of a new monumentality for the post-war European city.

**The 1956-1957 competition for la Place des Nations in Geneva**

On August 15, 1956, the United Nations notified architects of the design competition for a Grand Ensemble adjacent to the United Nations’ Palace of Nations, originally built between 1929 and 1936 to serve as the headquarters of the League of Nations in Geneva. Deadline for submission was April 15 to May 15 1957, in an anonymous open competition open to all nationalities, architects, urbanists and engineers. Based on an agreement between the Republic’s Department of Public Works, the Canton of Geneva and the European office of the United Nations, the aim of the competition was to solicit ideas for the layout of the Place des Nations and the entry to the Secretary of the Palace of Nations in Geneva (Fig C3.1).\(^3\) In a preparatory meeting with representatives of the United Nations, the republic of Switzerland and the canton of Geneva, Chief of the Department of Public Works Mr. Dutoit noted that there is a common interest for both parties in improving the current situation which is incoherent, not esthetic and not functional in terms of circulation. Both an architectural and a landscape problem, the project went beyond the immediate functional needs of
the program and therefore an international competition would be appropriate (Fig C3.2). Adjunct Director of the UN European Office Mr. Palthey fully agreed with Dutoit’s opinion and emphasized the importance of providing space for the buildings of international organizations around the square. The competition area included the esplanade of the street in front of the palace. Approved by the International Union of Architects (UIA), the program indicated that the proposals had to ‘try to give a monumental aspect to the square according to its character as international center.’ The buildings were to be only public and administrative with an international function and circulation should provide for both international and local traffic. The brief added that ‘it is desirable to provide a monumental fountain of large dimensions.’ The Swiss government, responsible for the competition logistics, allocated 40,000 Swiss francs for maximum five projects and specified that the documents to be submitted should include a situation plan, elevations, two perspective views, and an axonometric of the ensemble, two characteristic details and an A4 text description.

The jury included the President of Public Works, Patrick Abercrombie, honorary president of the UIA in London, Eugène Beaudoin, Director of the Haute Ecole d’Architecture, Geneva and others, and decisions would be taken by majority. The competition rules were based on the international regulations for competitions in architecture and town planning which had been drafted by UNESCO in 1956. On March 30 1956, the UNESCO general conference issued draft recommendations to its member states on the regulations for international competitions in architecture and town planning. The UNESCO had started work on this draft following a recommendation it received in 1954 from the International Conference of Artists. The draft detailed how the competition should clearly define its type (for example whether open or restricted) state its purpose, the nature of the problem and the conditions to be fulfilled. The majority of the jury should be qualified ‘technicians’ and ‘persons of nationalities other than that of the country
organizing the competition.’ The document further listed the requirement for a fair compensation, protection of copyright and authorship rights, the publication and exhibition of the results and the collaboration with the International Union of Architects.  

A hundred and twenty three projects were submitted and the Jury decided in June 1957 to issued five awards and four special mentions with a unanimous decision for awarding the first prize to André Gutton, professor at the Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts and at the Institute of Urbanisme of the University of Paris. Following the announcement, the journal La Tribune de Genève published an article titled: “ Revolutionary Project of Urbanism. Toward the dismantling of the current Place des Nations and the creation of an ultra-modern International Quarter” (January 9 1959) describing how the current Place des Nations will disappear in favor of an international quarter, not only describing the design of the public spaces but also listing the new buildings to be planned, pointing out that the surface of the current square would be tripled by the new scheme by Gutton and listing the advantages of the new circulation scheme. In 1959, the magazine “La Vie Urbaine” published a full report of the results of the competition. The journal first provided a summary of the prehistory of the competition in which, following the design competition and construction of the Palace of Nations, UN officials attempted - without success – to develop the layout of the square in front of it with several projects including a design competition in 1936. The 1956 competition rephrased the competition program and drew international attention. The winning design proposed a careful choreography of a maze of pedestrian routes, a large scale interchange of local and regional roads, a dense lining of trees and an ensemble of public buildings bordering the open space (Fig C3.3, Fig C3.4, Fig C3.5). The proposal articulated a pattern of landscaping between the paths and two hexagonal high rise landmark structures. A perspective view, revealed the actual scale of the project, as a composition of large volumes and surfaces beyond the human scale, a scale gap even further
emphasized by a sketch of people in the square. The jury’s evaluation of the project commended the compositional greatness using the available space to the maximum inscribing the ensemble of the square into the surrounding greenery of the area. The precision and sensibility of organizing the volumes contribute to the dignity of the vision. The search for a pedestrian circulation in the middle of the square independent of the road traffic was desirable but the jury remarked that the proposed underpass had not been solved in the most appropriate way. The second prize winner Reiner Shell from Wiesbaden, together with Architects Moeller and Brinkmann proposed a more geometric scheme with a central roundabout (Fig C3.6, Fig C3.7, Fig C3.8). The jury praised this submission for its containment and rigorous composition. The monumental character of the square had been achieved by a simple figure, yet the proposed circulation could create new traffic congestion. The third prize entry by Architects Vico Magistretti and Mario Righini of Milan proposed a square organized by a central north-south traffic spine, a pattern of platform surfaces in the middle transitioning into a green area in the east and an edge of public buildings bordering the open space in the west (Fig C3.9, Fig C3.10, Fig C3.11). The jury noted that the very spacious composition connects correctly to the bordering neighborhoods, yet the ruptures between the buildings reduce the grandeur of the scheme and threaten its calmness and coherence of composition. A more utopian proposal by Hein Deinert from Munich received the fourth price, proposing a large raised circulation system hovering above a vast open space and bordered by an ensemble of public building blocks (Fig C3.12, Fig C3.13, Fig C3.14). Here the jury emphasized the monumental expression of this audacious ‘parti’ obtained by the plastic treatment of the square, the circulation and the parking. The plastic motif of a utilitarian character destined to support the circulatory system is very interesting yet can be debated with regard to the desirable dignity for a Place des Nations. Finally the fifth place was taken by Jaroslav Otruba from Prague in collaboration with Nadeje Otrubova with a more conservative plan of symmetrically patterned gardens with a few large structures bordering the
open space (Fig C3.15, Fig C3.16). The jury appreciated this scheme for its monumental dimensions, yet major circulation needs are neglected. During July-August 1957, the competition organizers reconsidered the program realizing that the square cannot be a traffic node, and therefore commission the winning architect André Gutton with a study of the possible options to relocate the traffic interchange with two platforms and two underground parking areas and allow for the design of a square where car circulation is secondary to pedestrian movement. The competition and its results brought forward a new concept of monumentality. Rather than looking for monumentality in the elaborate design of building facades, the proposed schemes and their interpretation by the competition jury set forth the possibility of creating monumentality out of well-arranged ensembles,\(^\text{12}\) platforms of open space in between repetitive arrangements of building slabs and the celebration of large scale circulation systems.

**1957-1958 Ecole des Beaux-Arts competition for a European Pantheon**

In 1957, Paris became the subject of the 1957-1958 “Prix de Rome “competition for a *Panthéon de l'Europe*, organized by the Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts. The Prix de Rome was a program that had been initiated during the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century as a competitive scholarship for art students to stay and study at the French Academy in Rome. The Ecole des Beaux-Arts followed the French Academy’s canons of architecture, emphasizing architectural drawing as the most important medium for representing architectural form. The Concours du Gran Prix de Rome tested the ability to create detailed architectural renderings.\(^\text{13}\)

The *Panthéon de l'Europe*’s program comprised scientific and cultural institutions connected with the European communities. The submitted schemes for symbolic and monumental buildings representing a new European identity underlined the strong French belief in Paris as Europe’s archetypical capital but as a purely conceptual competition, the submitted ideas remained at the level
of imagination. The competition brief stated that in recent years, nations started to understand the importance of international cooperation through organizations such as the OEEC, the ECSC and the Common Market and proposed to take this further and imagine a future organization for the diffusion of human knowledge where Sciences, Literature and Art would excel. The competition brief did not define a location for the Pantheon, yet requests a program of four components: the Hall of Enlightenment, for civilized thought and law, including a gallery, an amphitheater and meeting rooms; the Hall of the Sciences, Research and Discovery, including galleries and a smaller amphitheater and meeting rooms; the Hall of Literature, visual arts and music, including a library, galleries, a conference room, and a concert hall; and the Hall of Ethnography, Popular Art and Tradition, with a gallery, library and cinema. On March 3, 1958, while the European Committee of Experts in Urbanism were busy preparing their visits to the candidate cities for the 1958 competition of the seat of the European Institutions, the Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts announced the winners of a competition for the Pantheon of Europe. Since the jury decided not to award a first price (grand prix), two second prices were issued, one for Gérard Carton (Fig C3.17), student of M. Lemaresquier and C. Bach (Fig C3.18), student of Lemaresquier and Beaudouin. In addition a special mention was awarded to A. Menard (Fig C3.19), student of M. Leconte et Guillou.

Throughout 1957 and 1958, the school had organized several competitions with similar themes, such as the Competition for Monumental Art in 1957-58 for a Peace Pavillion in the International Exposition, the Competition for the Prize of Recognition of American Architects for a French Pavillion at an International Forum and the 1957 Andre Arfvidson Competition for A Commemorative Center for Peace. The winning schemes for this competition had in common the representation of an imaginary dramatic landscape and a geometric arrangement of large scale monumental structures housing magnificent programs with almost apocalyptic dimensions. The proposals imagined complete worlds disconnected from their context, introverted and complete,
megastructures providing spaces for all necessary services at multiple levels and presented formal exercises of hierarchy and monumentality providing architectural spaces for an isolated European civilization.

1957-1958 Hauptstadt Berlin Competition

Following the devastation of Germany after World War II, the country faced a long period of upheaval and reconstruction. In 1957, the government of West Germany decided to hold an architectural competition to rebuild the center of Berlin, including sections belonging to East Germany in an attempt to unify the divided city, merging the sectors occupied by the Soviet forces and the zone occupied by the allies. The re-unified Berlin would then become the German capital.\(^\text{14}\)

In 1958 the winners were announced with the first prize going to German architects Friedrich Spengelin, Fritz Eggeling, and Gerd Pempelfort, whose proposal entailed rebuilding the inner city of Berlin as a grouping of high rise building blocks surrounded by green spaces and separated by freeways (Fig C3.20). The more radical second prize proposal of Hans Scharoun, former director of the City Planning Commission and Wils Ebert put forward a new urban structure of dispersed building separated from one another by vast pedestrian spaces and underground parking lots (Fig C3.21). Vehicle access to the inner city was provided by a system of tunnels and freeways and the scheme appeared to be influenced by the post-war German urbanists who promoted the idea of the *stadtlandschaft* or city landscape, an ensemble of field of parks with curved streets and dispersed buildings.

Another second prize was given to Egon Hartmann (Mainz) and Walter Nickert (Gelsenkirchen). In addition, the jury awarded three third prizes to the offices of Gerhard Kern/Rainer
Rümler/Hans J. Schröder (Berlin), Bodo Fleischer/Hermann Kreidt (Berlin), and Peter and Alison Smithson (London) with Peter Sigmond (Hungary).

The Smithsons-Sigmond team proposed a scheme based on a complex mobility network and on the belief that the issue of mobility in post-war cities would demand physical patterns of connectivity. An upper level network for pedestrian paths and platforms of vistas to historical remains of Berlin would be connected to other movement systems at different levels by escalators (Fig C3.22). This arrangement would allow for change whereby each component of the system, from buildings to roads and services could develop independently from one another. Despite the wide diversity of the results of the Hauptstadt Berlin competition, a common approach between the different schemes could be recognized: the vastness of the open spaces and the dispersed layout of a new urban district.

Looking across the three competitions described above, an arch can be drawn between three approaches in the search for a new monumentality for the post-war city. A first category produced by the Geneva competition for the Place des Nations was a de facto monumentality achieved by manipulating the programmatic and infrastructural requirements and taking advantage of the need for massive regional circulation systems to create a local moment of monumentality. The second type of monumentality was yielded by a Beaux-Arts tradition of emphasizing the architectural drawing as the primary representation of architectural space. At the same time, the utopian schemes proposed seemed to deviate from the classicist Beaux-Arts doctrine and searched for more basic yet highly articulated geometries. As a result, the Pantheon schemes raised the question of a monumentality for Europe that would be highly detailed and specific yet different from the static monumentality that had been criticized by the modern movement. Thirdly, from the influential proposals of the Hauptstadt Berlin competition emerged a monumentality of vastness. Not the
specific form of buildings of objects created an image of identification but rather their vastness in and of itself. The schemes, at different degrees of dispersal and with different typologies of urban fabric, all reached an urban scale of an urban district at a massive scale, whereby the spatial organization between buildings, transportation infrastructure and vast planes of green and collective spaces would be as far as possible removed from the memory of a compact city.

3.2 The Formation of a European Urban District

In March 1958, in preparation of the visit of the Committee of Experts in Urbanism to the ten candidate cities, an intense lobbying campaign took place among national representatives and members of the committee. From the correspondence, meeting notes and reports collected by Pierre Randet, the French representative on the Committee of Experts in Urbanism for the 1958 competition for the seat of the European Institutions, the intrigues and conflicts between cities and nations emerge. During this period, Pierre Randet received a letter from the Former Minister of Reconstruction and Urbanism and member of the French National Assembly, Eugène Claudius Petit, who explains how he recently learned that Randet would be part of the group of experts charged with locating the ‘capital of Europe.’

“Perhaps the preparatory work for the choice of a location for the UN, that allowed Le Corbusier to master a sane method will help you in your task. Be aware that some persons are very interested in the question of a European Capital. Good luck my friend.”

In a memo by Randet with the French Cabinet Chief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jean Mille, in the presence of Eric de Carbonnel, Ambassador of France to the Saar Protectorate March 1958, Randet notes how Mille hands over a draft of the mission of experts in urbanism who were in
charge of evaluating the city candidatures. During the conversation, Mille emphasized that the aim was to choose a unique seat for the institutions of the European common market, the ECSC and Euratom, totaling 1200 to 1300 employees, which would increase quickly to 5000 functionaries, and in 10 or 15 years to 10,000. Mille summarized the probable candidates: Belgium proposes Brussels (a candidacy that the Germans seem to like); Italy proposes Milan and Turin; and France supports Strasbourg, although Strasbourg’s candidacy has not been officially announced. Randet had the impression that although Strasbourg would be promoted, the French government is divided between Strasbourg and Paris. In a meeting with Minister of Economy and Finance, Pierre Pflimlin, Randet describes how the French council of ministers considered both Strasbourg and Paris, but finally decided in favor of Strasbourg. Pflimlin explained how during a meeting in December 1957 of the Council of Ministers of Europe, the issue of the seat had been discussed. Since France could not accept the idea of Brussels as the seat, the council agreed to appoint a committee of experts and to consult the Consultative European Assembly. Pflimlin confidentially clarified to Randet that Paris would have zero chances because of the German opposition to a French seat and its possible failure would be hard to digest by the French, which could jeopardize the European cause. In the first years following World War II, the question of international cooperation between France and Germany had remained unrequited. The long term enmity that had existed between the two threatened to interfere with the European Integration project. In addition, the trauma of Germany’s role in World War II placed the role of the nation in a different position than that of other member states of the Common Market.

Meeting minutes by Randet of the committee of experts on March 11, 1958 in Brussels, and on March 10, 1958 in Château of Val-Duchesse in Belgium, summarized how the committee so far received the candidatures presented by Italy (Milan, Turin, Stresa, Monza), Luxembourg
(Luxembourg) and Belgium (Brussels). At the meeting, Randet officially proposed Strasbourg as the French candidate. The committee further discussed whether the experts should visit the cities, and whether cities should be evaluated intrinsically or relative to their position within the territorial complex. Randet described how a debate developed between the Expert Committee members Bure, Randet, Valle, Rossig and Liuja regarding the idea that what is currently called a host for the institutions in the future may be called a true European capital in the future. In addition, Randet remarked that the committee has not been asked to determine which city would be the best, but rather to describe the advantages that each location could offer. On March 14, Jacques van Helmont, spokesperson for Jean Monnet, met with Randet to deliver Monnet’s considerations regarding the seat of the European institutions which Randet listed as follows:

1. The principle of a single seat should not be questioned. The Court of Justice and the Assembly have very positive tasks and the court of justice has nothing to do with the international court of The Hague.

2. It is indispensable that the institutions of the seat be organized on a sufficiently vast terrain to receive all organizations that will group around them. Not necessarily a European district with extraterritorial privileges, but to make sure that the institutions form a solitary ensemble that does not interfere with national institutions.

3. Therefore, Monnet thinks the institutions should not be located in a capital. He envisions for example the creation of a city overlapping the borders of Luxembourg, France, Germany. Luxembourg and Strasbourg would be possible as well. Chantilly and Versailles next to Paris are also an option.
4. The criteria should consider not only the connection with European capitals but also with centers of population and economic activity. Not only consider the six, but also the continuation towards the East or Africa and not to neglect the world scale.

5. It is desirable to judge places not only for their current available infrastructure but also in terms of future infrastructure such as housing, airports, train connections etc.

In addition, Van Helmont conveyed remarks from Jean Monnet about each candidate:

1. The candidature of Brussels is related to elective considerations. In 1952, Van Zeeland made the Brussels candidature fail because of protest by the city of Liège. This is why the socialist party currently promotes Brussels, since it is forming their electoral platform.

2. Germany has well understood it is inappropriate to submit a candidature. Adenauer, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, is in favor of Brussels, but Strasbourg would be an option as well.

3. Bech, the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, wants to keep the ECSC in Luxembourg as it enlivens the city, but doesn’t necessarily wish to host all institutions.

4. The Italians are not in favor of Strasbourg because of the bad linkage between Strasbourg and Italy.

Van Helmont further argues that Paris will be considered a too important national capital and that the French representatives can offer the same argument for Brussels, which gives Strasbourg a good chance. Brussels would be not recommended since Belgium looks more voluntarily to the Atlantic
side rather than to the European side.\textsuperscript{16} The report by Van Helmont revealed apparent internal politics between member states and more importantly, the peculiar position of Germany, as a member of the common market, yet disadvantaged because of the events of World War II. The early attempts to integrate Europe were challenged by what was considered “The German Problem,” the question whether to support or suppress the rebuilding of Germany without enabling the country to cause a third world war. These considerations also influenced the debate of the seat for the European Institutions and while a German candidate city would not be acceptable, Adenauer’s views became influential in the decision process.\textsuperscript{17}

That same day, Randet learned that the Municipal Council of Paris had issued a resolution in favor of hosting the European institutions in Paris.\textsuperscript{18} The municipality would prepare a document indicating buildings for temporarily hosting the institutions, and a final location in the vast zone between the roundabout of La Défense and the Montesson, a plain allowing for 1000 offices, 5000 housing units, building of the Assembly and all necessary annexes.\textsuperscript{19}

One day later, Randet met with Eugène Claudius Petit, who expressed his surprise about the narrow mission of the experts, since he thought it would have been more desirable to allow the experts to suggest additional locations. Petit was also skeptical about the idea to create a new city next to an existing city, which would become too artificial, boring and too large scale. Referring to Le Corbusier’s UN project, where the architect, after calculating the program, decided to design one large building for the office functions and let the employees reside in the city. Randet answered that no European city except for Brussels can offer the kind of housing that New York can, and that the UN is only a kind of super-embassy of different member states, and he assumed that New York has never aspired to be a world capital, while in this case, the location could become a European district
if there was a federation of European nations in the future. Following this debate, Randet describes how “Claudius Petit seems a bit shaken”.

From this account of events towards the 1958 competition for a seat of the European Institutions, a few central topics emerged: Firstly, the concept of a single seat would become a leading principle for evaluating the proposals. Secondly, a careful consensus of preference for certain cities such as Brussels and Strasbourg appeared to be guided by larger political conflicts and challenges, Thirdly, the mission of the Committee of Experts could be seen from two different points of view: the more modest task of choosing a host for the European Institutions or the ambitious challenge to establish the foundations of a capital for Europe.

After considering all candidatures by the various cities, the Committee of Experts laid out two possible directions for hosting the European Institutions. In their final report, the Committee of Experts in Urbanism stated that it is not only a question of deciding upon which city will support the construction of the European Institutions: the question relates to planning a European territory at the scale of a united Europe. The first was hosting the Institutions, along with their employees and thus providing administrative buildings and housing. The second was more expansive, adding to this basic provision different organisms, including permanent representation of the six countries, professional organizations, syndicates, financial establishments, similar to the Grands Ensembles discourse I have described in the introductory chapter. In this second more expansive option, services in the tertiary sector would be necessary for supporting the new population. In either case, the Committee of Experts agreed that it should be avoided that the functionaries and their families will be segregated from other social groups. In the first option, this could be prevented by avoiding the grouping of housing in one neighborhood for European functionaries. Only administrative buildings, which need a vast surface and some representative residences, could occupy a single
location at the margin of the city, providing rapid linkages, while housing would be integrated into
the existing city. In the second option, the fusion with the existing population would be impossible,
but social zoning could be avoided by mixing the personnel from the Institutions with the additional
organisms and services to be housed here. The Experts noted that in order to achieve this
integration of different populations, spaces should be provided for urban activities of all varieties so
to enable the amalgamation of ‘people from all conditions and origins in the six countries.’ In any
event, even in the option of a separate European district, the Experts concluded that it should still
be possible for European functionaries to choose to live away from the district, in the
neighborhoods of the existing hosting city. The debate among the Committee of Experts regarding
the idea of a separate European district raised the question of the relationship between the new
European presence and the existing host city. From the debate emerged the assumption of duality:
on the one hand the existing city as part of a national geography and with citizens of a nation-state,
on the other hand the European facilities as part of a transnational system with functionaries that
would be citizens of a larger system beyond the borders of the nation-state.

3.3 The City as a Background to the European Spectacle

When looking horizontally across the 1958 candidatures for a seat of the European Institutions, a
pattern emerges among the submitted materials, despite their diversity. A few typical materials return
in many of the candidatures, each pointing at certain ways of representing the role of host city. They
range from booklets, tourist brochures and picturesque imagery, mappings of transportation
networks and promotional brochures of urban modernization, to specific urban proposals for
preliminary locations and permanent districts. All applicant cities submitted documents that
presented the city as an attractive background for its future European inhabitants. Most city
applications included images of surrounding landscapes, monuments, hotels, places of leisure, typical
street views and tourist attractions. The booklet “Luxembourg, Ville Européenne,” part of Luxembourg’s submission for hosting the European Institutions, made an attempt at branding the city with iconic drawings and photographs, emphasizing the bridges and sketches of their picturesque qualities (Fig C3.23, Fig C3.24, Fig C3.25) while Brussels included a nighttime photograph showing neon signage and busy nightlife of a street in Brussels, noticeably different from the other picturesque city images. While some cities emphasized surrounding landscapes, others capitalized on their historical monuments or characteristic street views. The materials submitted included landscape photography, Urban Icons, Streetscapes and Tourist Attractions:

Landscape Photography as a Background for the new European Presence

A photograph included in Nice’s candidature was subtitled: “Nice Côte d’Azur est à la disposition des Institutions Européennes” It presented an overview of the city of Nice seen from a hill. Framed by trees, the sea and the sky, the city is presented as a varied composite of monuments, beach, greenery, topography and roads: providing a multitude of options. Seen through this frame from a distance, Nice appears as a décor, a background image for a new European future to arrive (Fig C3.26). This representation of the existing city as a background can be recognized throughout the different candidatures, whereby the existing town is fully ‘at the disposition’ of a new European reality. These views of cities from a physical distance reappeared in almost all other candidatures, time and again transforming the existing city into a digestible, easy to grasp element in service of Europe. The frog’s perspective view of Varese seen from a Roman ruin, the bird’s eye view of Strasbourg’s fabric with a multitude of monuments alongside a densely bridged river, the aerial views of Luxembourg with its viaducts across different plateaus, its recognizable street grid and baroque monuments, an overview of Stresa at the lake, with its two main road axes and waterfront open spaces - all of these photographs aim for the highest level of legibility, emphasizing typical
landscapes, monuments and street views. These photographs are taken from a European point of view, interested in utilizing typical European identities yet at the same time distancing itself from regional differences. Aside from these overview images, another recurring image was the landscape in and of itself. Brussels’ candidature included a photograph taken inside a beech forest and a second one in a pine tree forest. The very recognizable image of Belgium’s forests evoked the experience of an individual finding solitude surrounded by the landscape, escaping from civilization. While the vehicle tracks in the first forest image still suggested the presence of civilization, the second photograph showed only soil, grass, shrubs and trees. Also here, a quest for solitude in the landscape was a leitmotif in different photographs submitted candidatures. Nice’s photograph inside a pine forest on a hill with in the mountainous Alps in the background (Fig C3.27), Milan’s aerial view of the Como lake surrounded by hills (Fig C3.28), Varese’s photographs of a lake surrounded by hills and a church tower, and of a sun setting behind a tree at the lake shore (Fig C3.29), Strasbourg’s image of a vineyard at the foot of a hill, and Stresa’s views of the lago Maggiore with its islands (Fig C3.29, Fig 3.30), all present typical landscapes of the city’s surroundings as places devoid of civilization, for the individual to contemplate.

Urban Icons

Also monuments and archetypical buildings such as hotels were featured as characteristic elements of the city’s image. Milan not only listed its most important villas as important components of the image of the city, but also offered one of them as a seat for the European institutions, with the possibility for constructing new buildings in the villa’s large domain (Fig C3.28). Three photographs presented views of the building’s façade, interior courtyard and a view from one of its balconies. Pictured as an unpopulated building, this monument was thereby presented as an open stage for future European activities to take place. Monuments presented by other cities included Varesean
churches and villas (Fig C.3.1, Fig C.3.2), Strasbourg’s cathedral, Luxembourg’s viaducts, Brussels’ Royal Palace, and Nice’s and Stresa’s promenade hotels. Each of these buildings functioned as icons for their respective city, as shown most explicitly by Strasbourg’s candidature featuring a cropped photograph of its cathedral.

**Streetscapes**

Not only city buildings but also the streetscape itself represented the candidate cities as enjoyable and picturesque sceneries for visitors and newcomers. Luxembourg’s candidature included a typical street view, a church in the background, a horse and a carriage, evoking a nineteenth century urban experience, presenting the city of Luxembourg as a quiet, picturesque city. Similar images were submitted by the other candidate cities, most of them including a church tower as visual landmark. These images presented the urban experience of the city as a composition of elements such as characteristic buildings, church towers, fountains and statues, thereby perpetuating the contemporary townscape theories. The typical streets of Nice, Strasbourg and Luxembourg, and the characteristic Italian piazzas of Varese and Turin, were presented void of people, as a silent background similar to picturesque landscapes of solitude (Fig C.3.3, Fig C.3.4). In the effort to produce an image of beauty as the city’s identity, these portraits aimed to lure and seduce the future European functionaries and to function as an environment for pleasant, esthetic and rich experiences similar to the picturesque landscapes. The choice for presenting the city’s urban spaces as a place for recreation and relief underlined the position of candidate cities as complementary to a new European reality. Contrary to these images of quiet urban sceneries were two photographs submitted by the city of Brussels, one presenting a partial view of Brussels Grande Place showing people wandering around a flower market surrounded by the square’s typical buildings, and another of a night view of the city’s principal shopping street lined by neon lights and signage. Rather than
focusing on building compositions, the flower market image presented an active urban event that characterized the central square, featuring people as principal participants. The shopping street night view emphasized commercial activity and the city as a modernized environment with a vibrant urban life that also exists after sunset. Thereby the Brussels candidature distinguished itself by emphasizing the period’s fascination with the urbanism of the New World, composed of infrastructure, commercial life and modernization. At the same time, the photographs still aimed to construct an image of the city of Brussels, in this case as a place of modernization and progress.

Tourist Attractions

Underlying the alluring images submitted by the candidate cities was a strong emphasis on tourism in and around their premises. The new European citizen was imagined not only as an official representative of a new integrated Europe, but also as a modern man looking for opportunities of recreation and entertainment. Varese’s candidature is the most explicit example of the reliance on tourism as most important attractor to the city, submitting only a tourist brochure as its application to be the seat of the European communities. Featuring a road map with important tourist locations in and around the city, Varese presented activities such as sailing and horse riding (Fig C3.35) and the brochure also branded the city as Città Giardino, a garden city rich with flowers in proximity to Italy’s northern lakes (Fig C3.36). These images revealed a view of the European citizen not only as a tourist but more specifically as an educated, civilized person looking for noble forms of entertainment. The list of activities presented by different candidate cities included sailing, horse riding, golf, skiing and mountain climbing. While the Italian town of Varese featured photographs of sailing, horse riding and a brochure titled “città giardino,” (garden city) emphasizing its flowery character between the lakes and its identity as a resort, using a quote by Stendhal to prove its beauty, Nice capitalized on its hotels at the beach and its facilities for golf, ski, sailing, and mountain
climbing (Fig C3.27). Milan’s candidature on the other hand included a map of tourist attractions in
1 hour drive proximity with sketches of significant monuments in the region and Brussel went even
further with photographs of the North Sea beach and historical towns in Belgium worth visiting.
Cultural tourism was much less emphasized, suggesting a certain degree of neutrality, offering
recognizable forms of recreation that did not emphasize the local character of the place, therefore
allowing for the European citizen to escape regional differences not only in office but also after
working hours.

The aspects of esthetic, recreational and tourist enjoyment as presented in the city candidatures
underline the principle of a host city. The host presents itself as a flattened background for a new
European citizen and institution to form its identity. It does not impose its local character but rather
offers it to the new European presence as a menu a la carte, to be consumed. The host city becomes
a compilation of esthetic, recreational and tourist components rather than a functional whole. It is
broken down and flattened out to best serve the new European urbanity. This process of hollowing
out seemed to be the appropriate way to create space for a new and different reality to develop.

3.4 Platform Urbanism

Mostly used in its French version, ‘plate-forme’ (literally translated ‘flat form’) means ‘diagram’,
scheme’ or the ground plan of a building. Thinking of a city as platform thus implied reducing the
existing city to a flattened space, to a schematic, preparatory base upon which a future city could be
implemented. In addition, the term ‘plate-forme’ was used to describe a raised plane of flat surface,
such as stages used for public speeches or the raised level for passengers to access trains. This
implied on the one hand a political role for the city as a stage for advocating the European idea, and
on the other a functional role for the city as a node in a transnational system of infrastructure
networks. Moreover, the possibility for multiple juxtaposed platforms to coexist offered an escape route for cities to serve their purpose as hosts for international institutions while at the same time maintain their position within the framework of the nation-state. Both at the urban and at the political level, the idea of the platform thus played a crucial role in the 1958 competition’s re-imagination of the city. As I have described in the introductory chapter, the idea of a vast open space connecting between the building components of new urban districts had emerged in different schemes developed by CIAM architects right after World War II. In these experiments of developing new types of collective spaces, the question rose to what extent the gathering spaces should be enclosed and to what extend would they allow for a new type of monumentality. Similar vast gathering spaces would re-appear in the 1958 city candidatures for a seat of the European Institutions, forming platforms for a new European community to gather and experience the European spectacle.

Although not all candidate cities submitted a design proposal for a new European district, the more prominent candidates hired architects and urban planners to compose new urban visions for their European districts. These proposals, which grew from the common imagination of national politicians, city governments and local architects and planners, placed a new type of urbanism on the foreground of the debate. Since the architects and urbanists behind the schemes were aware of the promotional role of their proposals, the urban models that emerged from them were designed as an imagination of possible future scenarios. The following pages will describe the urban schemes developed for the five city candidates who submitted architectural and urban design proposals as part of their candidature: Strasbourg, Brussels, Luxembourg, Paris and Nice. Considering the unequal quantity and quality of materials submitted, the following description will dedicate a more significant section to Strasbourg, followed by more succinct sections on the four other cities.
3.3.1 Strasbourg’s European Ensembles

As mentioned earlier, Strasbourg submitted the most elaborate design study for three different locations in the periphery of the existing city. The city had appointed Charles-Gustave Stoskopf, architect of the Departement du Bas-Rhin and Henri-Jean Calsat, who had been involved in Strasbourg’s urban planning since the early 50s to develop designs for three different sites. The design proposals included a large area in the greater region, an area close to the city and an inner-city site: respectively Oberhausbergen, Robertsau and Mount Scharrach. In a drawing on top of a regional map, Calsat investigated three possible locations, their respective expansion zones and their connection to transportation infrastructure including the airport (Fig C.3.37). The three possible sites were each indicated in a different color with a larger area around it colored in a diluted version of the same color. The expansion areas mostly covered low-density rural areas, which would be easy to develop and in the case of Robertsau even covered parts on the German side of the border. The location of a European satellite to the existing city of Strasbourg was also an incentive for Strasbourg’s future urban development. As a city that described itself as a regional metropolis of the Bas-Rhin department and a center of finance and education, Strasbourg found itself in need of more representational sites for public services, consulates and the European presence.

Since the early fifties, Stoskopf had worked on large scale housing projects, cité’s and grands ensembles in the area of Strasbourg. Henri-Jean Calsat had designed a city hall, theater and educational complex in the French city of Poissy together with architects Pierre Mathé et Florent Nanquette in 1936-1937, a general hospital in Brazzaville Congo in 1950-1954 and a postal office in Douala, Cameroun (Fig C.3.38). Having studied medicine at the Parisian Faculty of Medicine, Calsat was preoccupied by the problem of health both in projects in France and in the African Colonies. He believed that by combining advanced construction technologies with a well-informed
architectural design that takes into account both human needs and climatic conditions, buildings could provide healthier environments. Also at the scale of urbanism Calsat envisioned an integrated approach:

“Architecture and urbanism will be merged to inscribe themselves into space’ architecture will express the ideas preconceived by urbanism, while the exterior volumes will translate the interior life. Urbanism and Architecture will translate the demands of the programs conceived and realized by man, for the man of the future,”

Calsat had already studied possible locations for the implantation of public administration and in 1957 he had laid out desirable densities for Strasbourg and its surroundings. Choosing an appropriate location for a new satellite city to be built meant finding a non-urbanized area in reasonable distance from the city with the potential for easy connections with Strasbourg and the transportation network and an attractive environment. Exploring this potential, Calsat investigated the Oberhausbergen site with an initial sketch indicating different zones of the new European district: inhabitation, center, representational residences, heliport, existing towns, transportation and the district’s proximity to the airport, the host city of Strasbourg, its train station and the cities of Paris, Amsterdam, Germany and Basel (Fig C3.39). The location was to accommodate not only the initial opportunity of creating a satellite but also its potential for future expansion. Commissioned by the city, Henri-Jean Calsat had conducted a study of possible sites for public services which would be more appropriate for these regional cross-roads..

In addition, from a legal perspective the location of Oberhausbergen was supported by a letter of the head of Strasbourg’s legal department, Leon Kien, to Strasbourg’s mayor Pfimlin, mentioning the communal status of the site, covering four communes of the ‘groupement d’urbanisme de
strasbourg’ studied by Calsat and two communes requiring additional study. Kien indicated that construction permits had been granted and referred to an existing 16,000m$^3$ water reservoir and plans for a pump, an access road, a heliport, and a train station. Lastly he emphasized the importance of preserving the existing views and landscapes$^{29}$.

In a 1950 study for the French Ministry of Reconstruction and Urbanism, Calsat studied the population growth of Strasbourg. In general, his graphs indicated a steady rise from 1861 to 1946 with peaks in 1910 and 1936, yet a more specific graph distinguishing between different quarters of the city highlighted a decrease in the center and the old city of 8.4% and 16.4% respectively, while the peripheral areas of Banlieue and Neudorf underwent a large increase of 30.8% and 40% respectively. The process of suburbanization had clearly affected Strasbourg’s urban configuration and Calsat’s recommendations focused on urban expansion, improving connections between center and periphery, and in addition mentioning the importance of the future installation of the European assembly.$^{30}$ A 1957 preliminary programmatic study for the European district listed functions for the European administrative center including an assembly room, a palace, secretaries and peripheral functions, with in addition a palace of ‘information for the press, radio and television.’ This reflected a strong belief in the power of the media to sustain and stimulate the new transnational European community and seemed to be a conditio sine qua non for the autonomy of a European district. Beyond the administrative center, Calsat’s study recommended a city of 25,000 inhabitants for Strasbourg’s periphery (about 5 times the amount of the projected number of European employees) with residential quarters, commercial centers, restaurants, public services, hotels, schools, sport equipment and “pleasantness in green spaces.” Calsat called for special attention to circulation, internal and external as well as parking “necessary for the well-functioning of contemporary cities.”
While working on the design, Calsat had also prepared a general urbanization plan for the Strasbourg region, determining regulations for all communes included in the “Groupement d’Urbanisme de Strasbourg.” This plan regarded the city as one large ensemble and divided the metropolitan region in functional zones: residential, industrial and rural. In residential zones, constructions incompatible with health, security or tranquility were prohibited. The plan listed maximum building densities for each residential zone in volume of construction divided by total surface area. It specified that for Mittelhausbergen and Oberhausbergen, construction could not be authorized unless it followed the ensemble studies accepted by the mayor after advice from the Departmental Commission of Urbanism. For rural zones, the plan prohibited constructions that could attract an abnormal increase of public services and compromise the rational development of residential or industrial zones. Finally, for Strasbourg’s center, the plan proposed an “esthetic protection” so that all modification of places in the ancient city of Strasbourg will not be authorized unless a favorable advice has been given by competent services of the administration of Historical Monuments and Sites.

Oberhausbergen

In Calsat’s sketch on a topographic map for the Oberhausbergen site, the new district was drawn as a geometric figure largely ignoring contextual parameters such as existing infrastructure and topography, with its shape and central axis directed towards the center of Strasbourg (Fig C.3.40). The proposed design for Oberhausbergen was the most elaborate scheme of the Strasbourg candidature and included a wide range of large-sized buildings spread out over the terraces and slopes of the site. The Oberhausbergen district was located on a 600 ha plateau 5 km northwest of Strasbourg (Fig C.3.41). Thereby the new ‘satellite town’ presented itself as located within reasonable distance from the existing city, tightly connected to it by efficient transportation networks and
designed with a clear reference to the existing city (Fig C3.42, Fig C3.43). In the proximity of existing villages of the Bas-Rhin the envisioned European district in Oberhausbergen was situated on a hill overlooking the city of Strasbourg, the Black Forest and the plains of the Rhine. Protected from mist and receiving plenty of sunlight, the terrain was designed in terraces that covered an area of available land of 1000 ha or 2471 acres. The proposed design for the district did not mention specific characteristics of the existing agricultural terrains, or the urban arrangement of the surrounding villages. Only topography, climate and views played a significant role in characterizing the site and guiding the design. Therefore Calsat’s sketches and drawings presented a non-site specific geometric plan, with lines following geometric rules and symbolic radio-concentric arrangements rather than topography, landscape or existing urbanization (Fig C3.44). This clear disregard for the existing spatial condition of the site indicated an approach to the design of the European district that required clearing the place of any pre-existing content and relating to it as a clean slate, voided of its history.

Calsat’s programmatic recommendations for a European district in Oberhausbergen were based on his previous programmatic studies of the functional needs for a European district and urbanization studies of the Strasbourg region. Thus, Calsat’s proposal for the European district in Oberhausbergen created a programmatically autonomous district envisioning a community of European employees and citizens using modern transportation infrastructure, communication technologies and superior recreational facilities. This zoning strategy was reflected in the plan for the Oberhausbergen district, leading to large areas of clearly distinguished functions (representative, residential, services) and vast open space separations between them. Also the buildings themselves were designed at a monumental scale, such as the parliamentary assembly room, lit with zenithal lighting and organized so that it could be accessed from all points in the building (Fig C3.45).
The geometrically organized buildings followed a clear hierarchy, portraying the power divisions between the European institutions and national representations. The scheme was based on a series of tiled surfaces or platforms connecting the buildings to the circulation system. Henri-Jean Calsat’s plan for the site displayed an explicit geometry of radioconcentrically organized volumes and symmetry, emphasizing the centralized, representative role of the district and underlining the power distribution between Europe and its nations. The plan included an administrative building and meeting hall for each organization, structured by a radioconcentric fan around the central parliamentary building. The European institutions and assembly rooms were organized along a grand esplanade on the ridge of the hill, emphasizing the presence of the Palace of European Nations. The fan-shaped layout of the different institutions allowed equal access and views for executives to the central parliamentary building. Separate buildings were reserved for documentation and general services. Calsat located the “Building of European Institutions” at the south-east terrace, offering the widest view of the landscape (Fig C3.46), while a Palace of Presidency and a Palace of Europe, together with the “foyer of human contacts” rested on additional terraces connected with surrounding gardens. The Permanent National Representations occupied the slopes oriented to South and South-East, while a residential zone covered the northern part of the terrace. Around the hotels, additional residential quarters connected with schools and sports terrains. The sports ensemble included an artificial lake, golf terrains, horse riding terrains and dove hunting. As a conglomerate of representative functions, modern transportation infrastructure, contemporary visitor facilities, and residential zones surrounded by ample open and green space and recreational facilities, the new district formed a distinct autonomous entity, in contrast with the dense historical city of Strasbourg. After-work activities such as golf and dove hunting also suggested a district for an elite population, building its own autonomous community at a safe distance from the plebs.
The reception center occupied a central position in the ensemble, accessed directly from the parking lots or the heliport (Fig C3.47). The highway arrived at the district in a passage under the esplanade, accessing the assembly and leading to the reception center (Fig C3.49). The adjacent heliport connected to the reception center permitting visitors to rapidly access the different hotels (Fig C3.50). Other building functions such as residences of high functionaries, personnel housing, police, hospital etc. were located in proximity to the institutions and organized in neighborhood units. This plan emphasized the central position of the general assembly, surrounded by the European institutions, rather than vice versa, a central European representation surrounded by the different nations.

The design for Oberhausbergen displayed scale a gap between the human scale and the scale of the district, reflected in the organization of functional zones, in the size of its buildings and in the large open spaces between the buildings. The newly created satellite could only function if close and efficient connections to the existing city and to the larger region would be ensured. Calsat’s design for the Oberhausbergen hill therefore provided a scheme that was based on a fast and efficient highway connection to Strasbourg and the international transportation network. Borrowing part of the Autoroute du Nord provided by the Plan d’Amenagement de Strasbourg by deviating its route slightly to the West, the district would be within 6-minutes reach from center Strasbourg and the railway station. Another highway following the route of the Great Bypass, provided in the Plan d’Aménagement, would lead to the airport of Entzheim in less than 10 minutes. Also a new railway connection to the Paris- Strasbourg line could be easily implemented, by a branching of about 5 km, accessing the city from the North. In a pencil drawing on top of a regional map, Calsat colored future urbanized areas depicting the city as an octopus with tentacles reaching into the hinterland and even across the French-German border, incorporating German neighbor city Kehl. The drawing
highlighted the transportation system including a north-south and east-west railroad, a new highway crossing and circling the urbanized region, connecting the European district to the city and the airport. The drawing envisioned a highway belt around the city with urbanization tentacles allowing green zones to reach the city center, and infrastructure. Arriving by highway, cars would park in a central reception area connected with a heliport, information services, hotels and restaurants.

Henri-Jean Calsat’s design for a European district in Strasbourg eventually led to a spatial organization that was based on the platform as an organizing element. The platform took on different forms in this scheme, from the most literal form of a landing place for helicopters to an esplanade as honorary entrance, ramps for the underground parking lots, terraces for views to the surrounding landscape, stacked platforms for vertical zoning based on a vertical circulation system and finally large open spaces between the oversized buildings.

**Robertsau**

While striving for the creation of a programmatically autonomous satellite city built on a tabula rasa and maximizing accessibility by car, the internal organization of a European presence took the form of a strict geometry. Strasbourg’s proposal for a European district on the Robertsau site demonstrated the importance of geometry for the identity of the new European urbanity (Fig C3.51). The site, north of the existing council of Europe building (the former Maison de l’Europe), depended on the re-routing of the Marne-Rhine canal and envisioned a monumental axis ending in a circle of skyscrapers (Fig C3.52). Attached to the northern edge of the city, the district, located along the canal connected to local roads and to the existing city fabric. The buildings were organized in a geometry very different from the typical urban form of Strasbourg, with representative buildings arranged in a circular scheme connected by platforms and surrounding buildings placed on a grid with large fields of green between them (Fig C3.53). Studying the urban scheme for Robertsau one
can see how even in the closest proximity to the existing city, the designs for a European district strived for a geometric logic different from the known, allowing for the clear legibility of hierarchy, monumentality and symbolism (Fig C3.54). Calsat’s design for Robertsau presented a car-oriented scheme plugged into a new highway connection to the city of Strasbourg, with a split circulation system: the Building of the European Institutions hosting the Council of Europe, Executive Commissions, the Offices of the Presidencies and Parliament officials, the Court of Justice, the General Secretaries and services and annex activities was accessible from a roundabout through a large esplanade as honorary entrance while visitors arriving by car followed the ramps that led to underground parking (Fig C3.55). In addition, galleries around the parliamentary hemicycle dominated the European city with views to the Alsatian countryside, the Vosges and the Black Forest.

Mount Scharrach

Notably, Strasbourg’s scheme for Mount Sharrach, developed by Gustave Stoskopf, provided ample transitional space between a new highway network and the buildings within the district. Located 20 km west of Strasbourg, the headquarter building was placed at the top of the mountain with administrative buildings at the foot and residential zones closer to existing villages (Fig C3.56, Fig C3.57). The linear scheme covered about 400 ha and created a sequence of platforms accessing a series of buildings with surrounding district components nested into the existing topography (Fig C3.58). Thereby Sharrach’s platforms created a negotiating ground between regional and local, between national and transnational, and between site and ideal (Fig C3.59). However, the Mount Sharrach proposal did not seem to be at the center of interest, designed by a different architect, and providing little materials to fully understand the meaning of the urban scheme.
3.3.2 Europe as a Satellite of Brussels

The idea of a European district as a satellite to the existing city appeared explicitly in the Brussels candidature prepared by Groupa Alpha as discussed in chapter 1. The proposal placed specific ideas for the European district within larger urban plans for the Brussels metropolitan region, including strategies of zoning and the creation of new satellite towns (Fig C3.60). During the same period, Groupe Alpha was actively involved in national planning projects and the reshaping of planning models such as districts, commercial quarters, satellite towns etc. (Fig C3.61). Already in 1948, the Belgian Central Planning Administration had appointed Groupe Alpha to design a plan for the Brussels agglomeration. Groupe Alpha’s plan for Brussels added 13 satellite towns to double the city’s population by 1 million, strongly influenced by the contemporary discussion on new towns as described in the introductory chapter. The Brussels plan included a highway ring to limit urban growth and a green belt to provide recreational space accessible from the city center and traversed by a north-south industrial axis. However, unlike the British example of Abercrombie’s Greater London Plan, satellite cities were located closer to the center and inside the green belt. Groupe Alpha’s plan for Brussels questioned the idea of building satellite cities as autonomous centers. Using the garden city as design model, the proposed satellites were mostly attached to existing villages. As opposed to the high rise and collective housing models of French and British new towns, Groupe Alpha deemed the garden city model more fit as a habitat for European officials and businessmen, thereby promoting low density living. Groupe Alpha’s proposal for the European district included six possible satellite locations and elaborated a 45 ha plan for the site of Etterbeek, attached to an existing town at the south-east edge of the city and the preferred location of the Belgian government (Fig C3.62). Although the status of the submitted study for the 1958
competition was promotional and did not result in a formally adopted planning document, the scheme displayed important planning strategies imagining a type of urbanism different from the existing city and with the potential to become a model for future urban growth.

The scheme proposed a new ground level with underground traffic circulation systems and a series of buildings organized in a clear hierarchy. The main buildings of the district were interconnected by galleries and positioned on large tiled surfaces. Similar to the CIAM plans of St. Dié, Motor City and Chimbote discussed earlier, wide open spaces and a clear hierarchy in circulation promised to provide adequate transportation infrastructure together with tourism, cultural and recreational amenities to ensure a high ‘quality of life’ and a selective set of activities for the European elite, clearly distinguishable from the inhabitants of the existing city.

3.3.3 Luxembourg: Annexing the Existing City

The scheme developed by French architects René Coulon and André Crivelli for Luxembourg’s Kirchberg related to the existing agricultural plateau as a tabula rasa, an empty space to be filled with a scheme strongly based on the Beaux Arts rules of the ensemble. A central axis was bordered by platform surfaces connecting to large scale buildings and leading to a central building representing the new European community. At half a kilometer from the center of Luxembourg, this ‘virgin’ piece of land had become attached to the commune of Luxembourg in 1920 and was mainly used for agriculture and meadows (Fig C3.63, Fig. C3.64). The Kirchberg plateau with its 360 hectares formed about one seventh of the Luxembourg area. Chosen as a site for urban expansion, the area was expropriated and a plan for the area was designed by Henri Luja, head of the national Urban Planning Department who appointed Crivelli and Coulon to develop the design for the Western part of his master plan (Fig C3.65). 40 Although Crivelli and Coulon were working at the same time on the
progressive design of a Pavilion for the ECSC at the Brussels World Fair mentioned above, their plan for the Kirchberg did not seem to have the same ambitions.

The axis proposed by Crivelli and Coulon extended the bridge linking the existing city with the new district and the scheme applied a geometric pattern on the existing and very pronounced topography of the plateau. The 19th century Beaux Arts principles of monumentality not only applied to the central buildings but also to peripheral zones and an elaborate circulation network. This monumental approach required forgetting the former urban function and form of the Kirchberg plateau as agricultural grounds in proximity to the urban center of Luxembourg and instead imposed a rather uninspired scheme on an arguably empty site.

Henri Luja’s plan on the other hand had been based on a more complex understanding of future pedestrian and car circulation (Fig C3.66). The immense terrain between the city center and the airport, on the Kirchberg Plateau required good connections to the regional and the international transportation network, exemplified by a bridge connecting the district to the existing city. “This new district which a new bridge will link to the city center, is really the marvelous location one can only dream of.” Luja’s scheme was organized around a central platform with the principal buildings spread out over the site with wide open spaces between them. Since Luja was also vice president of the Conférence permanente pour l’Aménagement de l’Europe du Nord-Ouest, an organization that aimed to prepare regional projects for Europe, transportation networks played an important role in his plan for the Kirchberg. The separation of the district from the existing city allowed for the free development of infrastructure connections and the possibility to easily house 40,000 staff and families. Luja’s design included a wide range of programs from European organizations to housing, shops, schools and leisure. Luja’s preliminary studies included a historical map of the existing city showing the former fortress walls, emphasizing important buildings and monuments in dark and highlighting the elements that will
become important in the proposal for the new city, as extensions of the existing. The plan was based on a major highway connection to Germany paralleled by a local system of boulevards, which contradicted an earlier plan by the Administration des Ponts et Chaussées, which proposed a single urban highway. The new city district was about four times larger than the existing historical city of Luxembourg and included sports facilities, residential towers and a monumental administrative center. In addition, Luja’s plan proposed a parkway north of the site and a second, winding boulevard, linking sports center, administrative buildings and shopping center. The design left room for future expansion and provided a framework for international architects to fill in. Luja’s plan was maybe the most ambitious in size of all plans submitted and proposed a large ‘grand ensemble’ of housing units, administrative buildings and green spaces organized by a winding central axis and a tangential service road, whereby a civic center with sports arena would be located in the part closer to the existing city. This scheme turned the Kirchberg plateau from a quite agricultural plane to a field of new opportunities for a complete European city to take over, turning the existing city of Luxembourg into its annex rather than vice versa.

3.3.4 Paris’ Axial Extension

The French proposal for a European district in Paris promoted the idea of a parallel city organized according to its own organizational logic and clearly distinguishable from the existing city. The proposal submitted by Paris included a design by French architects Robert Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss who had designed the privately built Centre National des Industries et Techniques (CNIT) collaborating with Jean Prouvé for the extérior and worked on the planning of the La Défense district. In 1958, the State of France had created The Public Establishment for Installation of La Défense (EPAD) to manage and bring life to the quarter of La Défense. As part of this project, the The Center of New Industries and Technologies (CNIT) was built and first used in
1958 (Fig C3.67, Fig C3.68). The proposed district for the European Institutions in Paris was a linear scheme along an axis extending the historical Champs Elysées from the Louvre to the Arc de Triomphe and connecting an ensemble of skyscrapers with administrative buildings and housing (Fig C3.69). The 600 ha district was designed to host 100,000 inhabitants and was based on a design by the same architects for the La Défense area. The scheme included tiled surfaces to connect large buildings to the central road, presenting a linear scheme of buildings scattered across vast open spaces.

One of the perspective views submitted presented the European district on the background of the city of Paris with the Eiffel tower defining the skyline, clearly distinguishing the new district and its large scale organization with the more fine-grained fabric of the existing city. The new parallel city, designed as the completion of the Parisian axis thereby promoted a monumental representation of Europe as closely connected to the achievements of the French powers. Axes had been an important part of the Parisian urban fabric since the creation of the Champs Elysées, which had been established in 1616 by Marie de Medici to extend the axis of the Tuileries Garden and transformed by the end of the seventeenth century by landscape architect André Le Nôtre following the orders of Louis XIV. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Emperor Napoleon I ordered the construction of the Arc de Triomphe which was finally finished in 1836, thereby extending the axis of the Champs Elysées to the West and by the 1950s the La Défense area further west formed a new development project. Since the nineteenth century Haussmann Plan for Paris, axial design had played an important role in the reorganization of Paris’ urban structure, guided by principles of military control over the masses, hygiene and decongestion. Therefore the proposed plan for a European district as an extension of the “Axe Historique” seemed to suggest that the European idea was merely an extension of France’s glorious past of conquerors.
3.3.5 Nice’s Capital of Europe

The proposal by Nice exemplified the ‘second option’ as defined by the Committee of Experts: to create an autonomous entity by locating the European district at an equal distance of 15 kilometers from the cities of Nice and Cannes, at the seashore, connected to both neighboring cities by a highway and a railroad (Fig C3.70). The sketch, produced by Nice-based architect Georges and Michel Dikansky with Jeanine Robert included a central square surrounded by the European assembly, the Palace of Europe and an axis with buildings of the European Institutions and administrations, taking advantage of the sloping site to offer vast views to the sea. George Dikansky had designed a vast number of housing projects in Nice and along the Côte d'Azur since 1925 and collaborated with his son Michel since 1947. The district they developed was organized as a cul de sac, a dead end street signaling the intention to become a self-sustainable closed urban entity (Fig C3.71). Large official buildings were organized in a symmetric order and connected by tiled surfaces. The official European zone bordered the residential and delegation zones. Also the title “La Capitale de l’Europe dans les Alpes Maritimes” indicated an interest in creating an independent European capital located in the maritime Alps and therefore less dependent on the city of Nice as such.
3.3 Monumentality for a Transnational European City

In the process of characterizing the Transnational European City and its architectural qualities emerging from the materials studied above, we can summarize that the notion of monumentality played an important role in creating a new and different background for a transnational European social, political and economic system to develop. An important event in the formation of this new European monumentality can be found at the 1958 World Fair in Brussels.

New Monumentality at the Expo 58, Brussels

One month after the visits of the Committee of Experts to the 1958 candidate cities, the 1958 Brussels World Fair, also known as the *Expo 58* opened. *Expo 58* was the first world exhibition where supranational institutions were represented in a separate area, called the Mundial Section. The Palace of International Collaboration, the pavilions of the UN, ECSC, Benelux, OEEC and Council of Europe surrounded the square of international collaboration. The architecture of this international quarter of the expo was different from the usual world exposition building style using more advanced building techniques with light materials, such as hanging roofs, thin concrete shells and steel space frames covered with glass, plastic and aluminum. The OECD and Council of Europe were joined in one pavilion designed by Architect Karl Schwanzer who created a large space under a 75 meter long roof created by an arch spanning over the full length. The ECSC building by architects Eugène Delatte, Robert Maquestiau and André Crivelli relied on six steel porticos housing a coal mine inside. The ECSC pavilion celebrated the coal and steel industries as driving forces in the process toward peace and prosperity for the community’s member states. A steel sculpture inside the building held a triangular map of the coal and steel region emphasizing the fact that these basins crossed not less than eight different borders. Next to kinetic miniature models of the coal mine factories, the main feature of the pavilion was a complete 1 to 1 scale simulation of a coal mine with
wagons and coal miners. A Belgian Television report documented how crowds of overwhelmed visitors of all ages visit the installations (Fig C3.72, Fig C3.73, Fig C3.74, Fig C3.75). The ECSC pavilion seemed to represent a temporary version of the New Monumentality as discussed in the introductory chapter: a collective space providing an opportunity for communities to meet and identify with a common identity, a symbol for the masses promising a long lasting European peace and prosperity.

**The Indecisive Ending**

On June 23, 1958 the Parliament held a vote for the seat of the European Committees based on the report submitted by the Committee of Experts in Urbanism, resulting in a list of three, in order of preference: Brussels, Strasbourg and Milan. The council was scheduled to make a final decision on July 1, 1958, but because of a large absence of its members, the council eventually decided to maintain Strasbourg and Luxembourg as temporary locations and to add Brussels as a third provisional headquarters. (Fig C3.76) The indecisive ending of the decision over a seat for Europe may be considered symptomatic for a failing project. Nevertheless, the process of the search proved to be a very important opportunity to formulate the notion of a transnational European city.

As has been demonstrated, architecture played a crucial role in accelerating the building of a network that formed the base of the European integration project by not only giving form to a place for the institutions to exist, but also by expanding the possibilities of sharing and representing the idea of a truly transnational European city. This study has focused on the moment preceding the full fetched formation of transnational organizations. The architectural and urban schemes allowed for the European idea to exist simultaneously as an amorphic and theoretical problem, an administrative problem and as an ideological space, a place to build European citizenship. Through architectural and urban experiments, the amorphic concept of sharing networks became concrete, creating a body
for the idea to materialize and expand into a larger ideological and utopian space than what was initially conceived. Thus, architecture became an accelerator of the idea of a United Europe.

---
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Conclusion

This dissertation has studied the discourse on the changing image of the city that emerged from the 1958 competition for the seat of the European Communities (ECSC, EEC and Euratom). This particular moment in post-war European history represents a crossroads in thinking about the role of cities in the evolution of larger geopolitical systems. From the city as a central place where the socio-economic mechanisms of a nation-state converge, this turning point places the city in a broader perspective, as a platform on which districts are organized, connected to other districts by international networks of transportation, utilities and information. Eventually, the 1958 competition also did not lead to choosing a single seat. Not only because of the impossibility to reach a unanimous decision, but also out of conviction that a single seat could damage the chances for the European idea to survive, Brussels was added to the already existing constellation of Luxembourg-Strasbourg. On the one hand, this decision could be understood as a failure, but at the same time, it demonstrates that transnational European integration inherently challenged the idea of a centralized governing system, creating a conflict between the need for a European symbolism and the search for neutrality. After 1958, the European city was no longer viewed as a homogeneous, integrated entity, but rather a conglomerate of parallel realities, each with their own role within a transnational urban system. This transformation turned the city into a platform, a ‘flat’ space, a hub for highways and train tracks to plug into, a plane on which a community of European citizens could be formed, a coherent and identifiable ‘ensemble’ representing modernization, Europeanness and unification, an urban segment, distinct enough to provide the grounds for transnational urbanity to take place. The possibility of establishing an extraterritorial district functioned as one of the fundamental criteria for selecting a seat, allowing the creation of a place that would be exempt from local jurisdiction. While the competition organizers initially sought to incorporate the new presence of Europe in the existing
city, the competition brief eventually promoted a distinct urban district, organized as an ‘ensemble’ and different from the surrounding city for its extraterritorial status to be ensured.

Moreover, the committee of experts evaluating the submitted city candidatures identified for each application its ‘European vocation’, in other words, the city’s natural ability to host multiple national identities, to promote cross-fertilization of cultures and to provide the appropriate environment for an international European spirit to flourish.

Based on these prerequisites, the city candidatures produced the image of a transnational city where monumentality and collective space gained new meanings. The proposed urban schemes of several candidate cities envisioned large urban ensembles featuring a new type of monumentality, not presenting a particular national identity but rather celebrating a new European identity of international meeting and exchange. While the competition called for a seat that would remain neutral, meaning that it would not privilege specific nations, the brief did not ignore the need for symbolism and the representation of a European identity based on the mixing of cultures and internationalism. Therefore monumentality played the role of mediator between the symbolism of a unified European identity and the neutrality that would evade the representation of individual nations. The proposed urban schemes searched for a new monumentality, a term that had been introduced by the post-war modern movement, yet remained indecisive about the degree of symbolism and representational value to be attributed to the new collective European space. Spaces of collectivity played an important role throughout the submitted schemes: a line-up of oversized squares, plazas, promenades, galleries and cours d’honneur provided ample space for the new European citizen to be part of a larger collective European public (Fig c.1). These vast and vacant spaces were to provide platforms for a new European collective body to emerge. The planes between the buildings and the infrastructure were to provide opportunities for encounter between
the new European citizens and offer an experience of collectivity without confining the public in one centralized space. Different from the renaissance square or the enclosed civic centers that had been developed by the CIAM generation, these platforms for a European collectivity were to remain open-ended, and allow for a self-regulating group of European individuals to produce new spaces of power within a the Foucauldian ‘regime of multiple governmentalities.’ The new European citizen would be highly mobile, able to absorb multiple national identities and maintain a similar level of personal fitness, health, hygiene, education and culture at any given location.

The utopian vision of a unified Europe has had a long history of rise and fall. Its spatial imagination went from the shape of a conference room to the design of a global city. Since the Treaty of Rome in 1957 and the search for a seat of the European Institutions that had been launched in 1958, new ideas have proliferated about the way in which the European territory would be organized. The architectural discipline took upon itself the daunting challenge of ‘shaping’ Europe as a coherent space, a task formerly carried through by statesmen and monks. In a time when the modernist vow entered a stage of revisions and adjustments, the imaginations of a utopian European were characterized by a totalizing optimism. More than half a century has passed since the creation of the European institutions and European unity is undergoing a profound identity crisis. On the one hand new nations have joined, expanding the territory of the European Union. On the other hand, Europe's economy has weakened and euro-skeptics have gained ground. Looking from above, from the perspective of national governments and supranational institutions, Europe seems to have become a ruin of itself, where very little of the utopian European ideas of the mid twentieth century still exist. Conversely, a bottom-up view of Europe paints a different picture, with European citizens moving freely across the surface of the continent in a transnational economic and cultural realm.

The connection to place has not disappeared yet seems to have become disconnected from the
nation-state as a clearly delineated territory of national identity. Instead, the question of identity and identification appears to have shifted and fragmented back into ethnic regions that preceded the formation of the nation-state. European citizens have become more Catalan than Spanish, more Flemish than Belgian, more Croatian than Yugoslavian and at the same time this fragmentation of identity has reached a point of multiplicity.

In the fifties as well as today the explicit political discourse of a United States of Europe seems to have failed, but at the same time, the implicit and de facto practice of integration appears to be very much alive. Rem Koolhaas’ Office of Metropolitan Architecture has been working on such a pragmatic project with the Roadmap 2050 project, a plan to mitigate climate change by redesigning the European territory according to an energy-saving network of infrastructure. Commissioned by the European Climate Foundation, the plan envisions an 80% reduction in carbon emissions by 2050, and develops a power network linking alternative energy sources depending on where they are the strongest, in order to compensate for one another when necessary. A pragmatic solution for energy sources thereby turns into a new geopolitical project which OMA has called Eneropa, not very different from the 1950s network mappings I have studied. In Eneropa, regions are defined by their energy source, splitting Ireland and Britain into two parts: the western “tidal states” and the eastern “isles of wind.” On the one hand, the Eneropa map may be too provocative and anecdotal to make a change but behind the cheeky OMA façade may lie a more profound opportunity for the future of a European Union based on pragmatic projects rather than the great ideologies we apparently have left behind in the twentieth century.

At the global scale, Europe will have to come to terms with its image as the cute old world mostly relying on tourism and nostalgia. Nevertheless, the quiet, grey and bureaucratic processes that have led to the European Union may have yet to reach their fulfillment, be it not in the way it had been
originally envisioned. In 2002, Koolhaas proposed a new flag for the European Union displaying a ‘barcode’ of colored vertical stripes representing every European flag of the then 15 members. The idea behind the flag was to reflect the simultaneous unity and diversity of the European Union.  

The flag, although never adopted by the European Union, may have been a missed opportunity, an opportunity to rethink European space of difference, in which utopian ideas exist yet are counterbalanced by being grounded in ‘other realities.’ Not a utopia located in an imaginary location, but a ‘topos’ where the European Union finds its own spatiality, characterized by a coexistence of international, transnational and supranational space. More importantly for us as architects and urbanists, the potential of a pragmatic approach places our profession at the forefront of the future for a European Union. As I hope this work has demonstrated, rather than lingering in abstract concepts of linkages between, across and beyond the nation state, actual and precise measurements on the field have yielded much more significant results in which the spatial configuration of a cross-border European urbanism profoundly influenced the political field. The enlarged Europe will require complex spatial solutions that aim to bring into the world alternative yet pragmatic futures for a truly united Europe from the ground up.

---

1 As extensively described by Denis de Rougemont in: Denis de Rougemont, *Vingt-huit siècles d'Europe. La conscience Européenne à travers les tectes d'Hésiode à nos jours* (Paris: Payot, 1961).
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Fig C3.65 Plan for the Kirchberg Plateau by René Coulon and André Crivelli, Luxembourg, 1957

C3.66 Plan for the Kirchberg Plateau in Luxembourg by Henri Luja, 1957
Figures Chapter 3

Fig C3.67, CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958

Fig C3.68, CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958
Fig C3.69 Paris capitale de l'Europe, Robert Camelot, Jean de Mailly, and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958
Figures Chapter 3

Fig C3.70 “La Capitale Europeéenne” Nice, 1958

Fig C3.71 Proposed District for Nice, 1958
Fig C3.72 Still from a report on Belgian National Television of the entrance to the ECSC pavilion at the Brussels World Fair, 1958

Fig C3.73 Still from a report on Belgian National Television of the coal mine inside the ECSC pavilion at the Brussels World Fair, 1958
Fig C3.74 Still from a report on Belgian National Television of the coal mine in the ECSC pavillion at the Brussels World Fair, 1958

Fig C3.75 Still from a report on Belgian National Television of the ECSC pavillion at the Brussels World Fair, 1958
Fig c.1 View for La Cour d'Honneur in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg Candidature, 1957
Appendix A: Materials Submitted for the 1958 Competition for hosting the ECSC, EEC, Euratom and future European organizations, Organized per City
1. Luxembourg

Fig L01 “Luxembourg, Siege des Institutions Europeennes, March 1958”
1. Luxembourg

Fig L02 “Paysages, Architecture, Urbanisme en Luxembourg;

Fig L03 Black and White Photograph in “Luxembourg, Ville Européenne,” 1958

Fig L04 Aerial Photograph of Luxembourg's old city, 1958

Fig L05 Aerial Photograph of Luxembourg's old city, 1958
1. Luxembourg

Fig L06 “Luxembourg, Ville Européenne” 1958

Fig L07 Street View sketches in “Luxembourg, Ville Européenne” 1958
1. Luxembourg

Fig L08 Modernisation Luxembourg. Revue Mensuelle Internationale, Cover, N 23 – 24

Fig L09 Advertisement for Luxembourg Airlines, in Modernisation Luxembourg. Revue Mensuelle Internationale, Cover, N 23 – 24
1. Luxembourg

Fig L10 Roads Network Map in *Modernisation Luxembourg, Revue Mensuelle Internationale*, Cover, N 23 – 24

Fig L11 Hydroelectric Plant in Vallée de la Sure, in *Modernisation Luxembourg, Revue Mensuelle Internationale*, Cover, N 23 – 24
1. Luxembourg

Fig L12 Joseph Petit, *Luxembourg Plate-forme Internationale*, (Luxembourg: Pierre Linden, 1953)

Fig L13 “Carte des Distances entre l’Aéroport de Luxembourg et les Principaux Aéroports Européens,” 1958

1. Luxembourg

Fig L15 “Plan Historique de Luxembourg Ville & Fortresse par H. Luja

Fig L16 Sketch for the Kirchberg Location, Luxembourg Candidature, Henri Luja, 1957
1. Luxembourg

Fig L17 Plan for the Kirchberg Plateau by René Coulon and André Crivelli, Luxembourg, 1957

Fig L18z Plan for the Kirchberg Plateau in Luxembourg by Henri Luja, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S01 “Strasbourg Ladet Europa Ein” (Strasbourg invites Europe, 1957)
2. Strasbourg

Fig S02 Connections with Strasbourg, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S03 Network Map of E-Roads leading to Strasbourg, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S04 View of Historical Strasbourg, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S05 Collage of the Planned Buildings for the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S06 View of Robertsau, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S07 Plan for Robertsau by Henri-Jaans Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S08 View for a District in Robertsau, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S09 Henri-Jean Calsat, View of Robertsau, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S10 View for a District in Robertsau, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S10 View of Oberhausbergen, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S11 Collage for a European District in Oberhausbergen, Strasbourg invite l’Europe, 1957

Fig S12 Plan of the connection between Oberhausbergen and the historical city center of Strasbourg, Strasbourg invite l’Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S13 Perspective Drawing for a District in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l’Europe, 1957

Fig S14 Plan of the Oberhausbergen district, Strasbourg invite l’Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S15  Batiments des Institutions Europeennes, Schema Fonctionnel, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S16 View of Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S17 Le Hall Central in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S18 View for La Grande Terasse in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S19 Vue d'Ensemble in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S20 View for La Cour d'Honneur in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S21 View for La Salle des Séances in Oberhausbergen, Henri-Jean Calsat, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S19 View of Mount Sharrach, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S20 Plan for a European District in Mount Sharrach, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
2. Strasbourg

Fig S21 View of the Mount Sharrach District, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957

Fig S22 Plan of the Mount Sharrach District, Strasbourg invite l'Europe, 1957
3. Brussels

Fig B01 Bruxelles * Brussel * Brusselle * Brüssel, Brussels' Application for the Seat of the European Communities, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B02 Brussels Train and Waterway Transportation Networks, Brussels’ Candidature, 1958

Fig B03 Brussels Telecommunication Networks, Brussels’ Candidature, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B04 Brussels as a Crossroads, Brussels’ Candidature, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B05 Views in and around Brussels, Brussels’ Candidature, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B06 Views in and around Brussels, Brussels’ Candidature, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B07 Groupe Alpha, Satellite Cities, Brussels Candidature, 1958
Fig B08 Map of Brussels Expansion Areas, Groupe Alpha, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B09 Agglomeration Plan of Brussels, Groupe Alpha, 1958
3. Brussels

Fig B10 Proposed District for Brussels, Groupe Alpha, 1958
4. Paris

Fig P01 Paris capitale de l’Europe, Robert Camelot, Jean de Mailly, and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958

Fig P02 CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958
4. Paris

Fig P03 CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958

Fig P04 CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958
4. Paris

Fig P05 CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958

Fig P06 CNIT View 01, Paris, Camelot, Jean de Mailly and Bernard Zehrfuss, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N01 “Nice Côte d’Azur offre à l’Europe”, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N02 Map of Europe with Nice in the center, 1958

Fig N03 “Nice Côte d’Azur est à la disposition des Institutions Européennes.” Nice Candidature, 1958

Fig N04 “Liaisons Ferroviaires,” Nice, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N05 Nice road network, 1958

Fig N06 Nice air transportation network 1958
5. Nice

Fig N07 The Climate of Nice, part of Nice’s Candidature, 1958

Fig N08 The Climate of Nice, part of Nice’s Candidature, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N09 The Residential Equipment of Nice, part of Nice’s Candidature, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N10 Street View sketch of Nice, 1958

Fig N11 Black and White Photographs of Nice's landscape and golf court, 1958
5. Nice

Fig N12 “La Capitale Europeénne” Nice, 1958

Fig N13 Proposed District for Nice, 1958
6. Milan

Fig M01 “Questa è Milano”, 1958
6. Milan

Fig M02 Maps of International Road Networks leading to Milan, 1958

Fig M03 Maps of air networks leading to Milan, 1958
Fig M04 Milan black and white photographs of the Como Lake, 1958
6. Milan

Fig M05 “Nuova Sede Pirelli in Milano” Photograph of Model

Fig M06 “Nuova Sede Pirelli in Milano” Plan Drawings
6. Milan

Fig M07 Map of Milan indicating sites for hosting the European Economic Community, Part of Milan's Candidature, 1958

Fig M08 Photograph of Physical Model of Pirelli Tower area, Part of Milan's Candidature, 1958
7. Turin

Fig T01 “Gli Alberghi d’Italia – Annuario 1957” Turin, 1958

Fig T02 “Torino: La Vallette” by Gino Levi Montalcino 958
7. Turin

Fig T03 Map of Road Connections to Turin, 1957

Fig T04 “General arrangement of the plants of the A.E.M. and the C.E.B. with high tension network”, 1958
7. Turin

Fig T05 “Torino (Italy) – Capital of the Alps” 1958

Fig T06 Photograph of Turin Airport, 1958
Fig V01 “La Città Giardino” Photograph of the Piazza Monte Grappa 1958
8. Varese

Fig V02 “Varese – Un Endroit Fleuri Parmi les Lacs”, 1958

Fig V03 Map of the city of Varese and photographs of tourism activities, 1958
8. Varese

Fig V04 Photographs of Varese's landscapes, 1958

Fig V05 Black and White Photographs of the Landscape of Varese, 1958
9. Stresa

Fig ST01 Map of air network leading to Stresa, 1958
9. Stresa

Fig ST02 and Fig ST03 Black and White Photographs of the Landscape of Stresa, 1958