Cities across Nations

ElsVerbakel, Princeton University/Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

Abstract
Since the Treaty of Paris (1951-1952) the European city has transformed significantly under the influence of geo-political changes, economic expansion and socio-cultural shifts. In the decades after the Second World War, architects, urbanists and policy makers conceived and implemented a series of competitions for transnational urban projects which profoundly influenced the reality and imagination of a borderless European urbanism. The competitions produced a unique discourse on the relationship between architecture and territory in a globalizing world and formed a distinct set of ideas within postwar urban practices and theories looking at the future of the European city. This discourse on transnationalism from the architectural point of view served as an important vehicle for the postwar project of European integration. In the search for a European peace after the Second World War, architectural visions emerged that promised to provide a no-man´s land of international cooperation. Four competitions took place from 1952 to 1958:
- 1952: Cities competition for hosting the ECSC and future organizations (competing cities: Liège, Luxembourg city, The Hague, Saarbrücken, Strasbourg)
- 1954-55: Architecture competition for a European district near Saarbrücken
- 1957-58: Prix de Rome architecture competition for a European Pantheon
- 1958: Cities competition for hosting ECSC, EEC, Euratom and future European organizations (competing cities: Brussels, Luxembourg, Strasbourg, Paris, Departement de l´Oise, Nice, Milan, Monza, Stresa, Turin, The Hague)
The projects submitted for these competitions promoted visions of political solidarity transcending nations and re-connecting regions. However, they faced a contradiction between on the one hand the representation of a European identity, and on the other the manifestation of a neutrality to prevent all possible conflict between nations. Therefore border cities, territories that had never fully belonged to one nation or another became popular sites for experimentation.

Introduction

In the first decade after the Second World War, 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 newborn 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 no longer purely nation-based framework. 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 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. In correspondence, reports, submissions, evaluations and meeting minutes produced as part of the 1958 competition the term 'platform' figures as the preferred model for the European city, offering space to host the growing political body of European integration in parallel to the existing city. 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 for a future city to be implemented. In addition, the term 'plate-forme' was used to describe a raised plane of flat surface, such as stages used for public speech or the raised level for passengers to access trains. This implied on the one hand a political role for the city as 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 a host for international institutions yet 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.

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':[i]

"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 believes of many at the time and forecast a fast process of newly born 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. In parallel and in line of Churchill's more unionist argument, the United Europe Movement was created in May 1947 and although it argued for a complete unification, the movement did not favor supranational organs but rather intergovernmental cooperation. The early years of postwar European integration were thereby immediately characterized by the inherent and profound conflict between the sovereignty of European nations and transnational power.

1.2　Preconditions in Searching a Seat for the European Institutions

In 1952, the European Community of Coal and Steel (ECSC) invited applications from cities of member states to 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 exasperating and endless debates, 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.

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 a European district. Already half a year after the foreign ministers' decision, the European Parliamentary Assembly agreed on a new deadline for determining a seat within one year.[ii] In several European cities and regions, planners and architects continued carrying out studies for establishing a European district. The city of Saarbrücken, 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 European district in an attempt to avoid its return to German sovereignty.

The 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 (Hein 2004, 67-92).[iii] The prize-winning submissions were promising in their ability to imagine innovating urban schemes for a future European district, yet political changes such as France's rejection of the EDC (European Defense Community) in 1954 and the Saarland's citizens' vote against its Europeanization and in favor of its return to Germany in 1955 prevented the further elaboration of the idea. Also Paris as a host for the European institutions was often-debated and became the subject of the 1957-58 Prix de Rome competition for a Panthéon de l'Europe, 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.

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. Already in July 1957, the French Departement 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 planner Henri-Jean Calsat to undertake a study for locating the European institutions and already by October, the city presented the results in a booklet and an exhibition. One month later, also Turin announced its candidacy and by December that year the 6 member states of the 3 European communities were ready to decide on a permanent headquarters. Since by that time both EEC and Euratom had settled in Brussels, 5 out of 6 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 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 postwar urge for European integration and at the same time the individual nation-states' reluctance to give up power, which formed the base for a cumbersome, bureaucratic and politically convoluted process of choosing a seat for the European communities. In January 1958, the foreign ministers of the member states decide to appoint a committee of experts in the field of urbanism for advice on the city candidatures in order to provide a more profound underpinning for the decision on a seat for the European institutions. 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 members of the appointed committee of experts were bureaucrats closely connected to the national political system including advisors to the ministers of urbanism and heads of national departments of urbanism.[iv] 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. Most directly involved in preparing plans for two candidate cities were the Belgian representative Victor Bure for Brussels and Luxembourg's representative Henri Luja for the city of Luxembourg. The experts' mission, as defined by the member states' foreign ministers in a mandate of February 25, was to prepare a study of the candidatures presented for the installation of the communities to allow the ministers a concrete evaluation of advantages for each location.[v] 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.[vi]

On March 8, 1958, two days before the first official meeting of the committee of experts, the French newspaper Le Figaro publishes a statement by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Paneuropean Union and one of the leading voices of the postwar European movement.[vii] In the article Coudenhove-Kalergi refers to the recent proposal of the Paneuropean Union to select Paris as the capital of Europe for geographic, historical and cultural reasons, presenting Paris 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 and at the first meeting of the committee of experts on March 10 1958 in Brussels, the official submissions included Brussels, Luxembourg and the North-Italian cities 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.[viii]

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)[ix] 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. 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 ability of hosting the European institutions were to be examined while the last category focused on details such as soil quality, the development possibilities of the terrain and its close connection with the existing city.[x]

The choice of representatives of the committee of experts and their dependence on the decisions of national governments at different levels thus 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, inherently tending toward decentralization, resisting the idea of a European capital. While nations such as Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands but also the committee members themselves criticized the single seat principle as unrealistic,[xi] geopolitical considerations at the level of the European continent, including parts of Africa by European leaders such as Jean Monnet challenged the idea of a European capital itself.[xii] As a result, 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.[xiii] Therefore the search for a seat increasingly focused on the suitability of candidate cities as hosts rather than as capitals.

1.3 Platforms and Networks

As planned, the committee of experts in urbanism visited 10 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. In addition, the experts also evaluated The Hague, which only submitted its candidature as seat for the Court of Justice.

Based on documents submitted, correspondence among politicians and bureaucrats and press coverage, I have grouped the 10 official candidate cities in four categories:

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. Going over each application in more detail reveals a set of presumptions about the spatial, geographic and political nature of Europe's future urban form.

The 1958 city applications for the seat of the European communities positioned 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. 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.[xiv]

A remarkably high number of network maps was submitted throughout the different city candidatures mostly indicating the connectivity of the candidate city to an international network of transportation, but also the availability of other infrastructure systems such as electricity and communication networks. Three important modes of transportation were presented, each undergoing an important transformation during the fifties: railways, roads and air travel.

While 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 but also statistics of other infrastructure such as sewage and public parks.[xv] 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.

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, Milan's Europe included the complete African continent, the Middle East and the coasts of the US and Latin America.[xvi]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.[xvii] 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.

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. This meant that cities were no longer conceived as individual systems of circulation but rather urban conglomerates part of a much larger regional system. The unit of the region as a new focus of planning the city implied that each city by itself would fulfill a specific function in a much larger constellation. This idea of specialization very much served the model of urban districts existing in parallel: the historical host city and the new and ultra-modern European district.

1.4 Cities as Hosts

With the rounds of city candidatures for the European Communities both in 1952 and 1958, candidate cities presented themselves as the most appropriate hosting environments for receiving the European Communities, and thereby placed themselves at the background. While many candidate cities submitted proposals for hosting the European in a clearly delineated district in the urban periphery, some cities imagined the presense of the European Communities as dispersed within the existing urban fabric. Although, the city of Turin submitted a strategic plan for the creation of a new residential district of 20000 inhabitants in 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. Commissioned by the Minister of Public Works, 45 architects and engineers collaborated and worked out a proposal indicating possible sites for implanting the offices of the European Institutions, spread out over the city, in proximity of existing palaces and theaters, a complete absorption within the existing city fabric. The locations for new construction promised building rights without height limitations and emphasized their central location (3375 square meters) .

In a memo by Pierre Randet with Cabinet Chef of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Mille, in the presense of Mr. de Carbonnel, Ambassador of France on 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 common market, the ECSC and Euratom, totaling 1200 to 1300 employees, which would rise fast to 5000 functionaries and in 10 or 15 years even 10000. Mille summarizes the probable candidates: Belgium proposes Brussels (a candidature that the Germans seem to like). Italy Milan and Turin, France takes the position of Strasbourg although the candidature has not been officially announced. Randet noted that he got the impression that although Strasbourg would be promoted, the French government is divided. In notes from 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 explains 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 explains to Randet that Paris would have zero chances considering Germany's opposition and its possible failure would be hard to dgest by the French, which could jeopardize the European cause. In a letter from member of the National Assembly, Eugene Claudius Petit writes a letter to Randet where he explains how he recently learned that Randet would be part of the group fof 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 taks. Be aware that some persons are very interested in the question of a European Capital. Good luck my friend."

Meeting minutes by Randet of the committee of experts on March 11 1958 in Brussels, and on March 10 1958 in Val Duchesse, summarize how the committee so far received the candidatures presented by Italy (Milan, Turin, Stresa, Monza), Luxembourg (Luxembourg) and Belgium (Brussels). Randet officially proposes Strasbourg as the French candidate at this meeting. The committee further discusses whether the experts should visit the cities, and whether cities should be evaluated intrinsically or relative to their position within the territorial complex. Randet describes how a debate developed between Bure, Randet, Valle, Rossig and Liuja regarding the city that currently will be called a host for the institutions in the future may be called a true European capital. In addition, Randet remarks 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, spokesperson for Jean Monnet, Mr. van Helmont meets with Randet to deliver Monnet's considerations regarding the seat of the European institutions:

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 theinternational court of The Hague.
2. It is indispensable that that the institutions of the seat be organized on a sufficiently vastterrain to receive all organizations that will group around them. Not necessarily a Europeandistrict with extraterritorial privileges, but to make sure that the institutions form a solidaryensemble that does not interfere with national institutions.
3. Therefore, Monnet thinks the institutions should not be located in a capital. He envisions forexample 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 Parisare also an option.
4. The criteria should consider not only the connection with European capitals but also withcenters of population and economic activity. Not only consider the six, but also theprolongement 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 interms of future infrastructure such as housing, airports, train connections etc.

In addition, Van Helmot conveys remarks about each candidate:
1. The candidature of Brussels is related to elective considerations. In 1952, VanZeeland made the Brussels candidature fail because of protest by the city of Liege. This is whythe 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 is infavor of Brussels, but Strasbourg would be an option.

3. Bech wants to keep the ECSC in Luxembourg that enlivens the city but doesn't necessarilywish to host all institutions.

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

Van Helmont further argues that Paris will be considered a too important national capital andthat the French representatives can offer the same argument for Brussels which givesStrasbourg a good chance. Brussels would be not recommended since Belgium looks morevoluntarily to the Atlantic side rather than to the European side.

In their final report, the Committee of Experts in Urbanism state that it is not only a question of the choice of a place destined to support the constructions but first of the city on the territory in which it will be located, before considering the architectural level, the problem is a matter of the largest perspective of the planning of the territory at the scale of Europe.[xviii] The experts describe two possible concepts of hosting: hosting only the Institutions proper, with its employees and thus providing administrative buildings and housing versus adding to this basic provision different organisms: : permanent representation of the six countries, professionalorganisms, syndicates, financial establishments, etc. In addition, it would require services inthe tertiary sector necessary for supporting the new population. The two possibilities can be summarized as: implantation in the hosting city or creating a European ensemble supported during its period of grown by an existing city. In any case, it should be avoided that the functionaries and their families will be segregated from other social groups. In the first hypothesis, this can be prevented by avoiding the grouping of housing in the same quarter for the functionaries. Only administrative buildings, which need a vast surface and some representative residences, could occupy a location in the margin of the city, providing rapid linkages. In the second case, the fusion with the existing population is impossible but, social zoning can be avoided by the mixing of personnel from the Institutions with the additional organisms and services. To this goal, it is necessary to provide spaces for urban activities of all varieties in order to allow for amalgamation of people from all conditions, and origins in the six countries. This does not exclude the possibilities for the functionaries to choose to live in the hosting city.

1.6 The Transnational European City in a Globalizing World

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 and eventually of globalization at large, by not only giving form to a place for the institutions to exist, but also by expanding the possibilities of sharing and visualizing the idea of a truly transnational European city. The architectural and urban schemes allowed for the European idea to exist both as an amorphic and theoretical problem, an administrative problem and as an ideological space, a place to build European citizenship. By employing architectural and urban designs, 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. As a tool for promoting ideology, architecture offered a tool to manifest power. Furthermore, the first few decades after the end of the Second World War became a period in which globalization and building a world that would overcome borders between nation-states became the preferable modus operandi. Globalization in the guise of European integration therefore became a conscious project where economic cooperation was not the goal but rather a tool to reach a political utopia.

ElsVerbakel – Bio

ElsVerbakel, founding partner of DermanVerbakel Architecture is a lecturer in architecture at Technion Institute of Technology and currently completing her PhD in Architecture at PrincetonUniversity. She has taught architecture and urban design at Columbia University, Princeton University, Pratt Institute, the University of Leuven and Bezalel Academy. She has published several books on urban design including *Constellations: Constructing Urban Design Practices* (2007), *Cities of Dispersal*(special issue of AD Magazine, 2008) and *In Search of the Public. Notes on the Contemporary American City* (2013). In 2003 she was a J. Clawson Mills Research Fellow at the Architectural League of New York where she prepared the exhibition*Urban Life. Housing in the Contemporary City*.Els' research and design work has been published internationally in magazines such as AD Magazine (UK), Lotus (IT), Oase (NL), Archis (NL), Block (IS) and others. Els obtained a Masters in Civil Engineering and Architecture from the University of Leuven (Belgium, 1999), a Postgraduate in Urban Design from the Polytechnic Institute of Catalunya (Barcelona, 2000) and a Master of Science in Architecture and Urban Design from Columbia University (New York, 2001). She was born and grew up in Belgium, has lived in Barcelona and for six years in New York before moving to Tel Aviv.

[i] Speech by Winston Churchill on September 1946, Grupo de Investigación GOBERNANZA GLOBAL Y UNIÓN EUROPEA. 2013.accessed on March 5.http://www.unizar.es/union_europea/files/documen/Winston_Churchill-_Discurso_en_.pdf

[ii] See the ad hoc meeting of the European Parliamentary Assembly on 9 february 1953 , Paris, Archive of the European Parliament, Strasbourg

[iii] Hein, Carola. 2004. The Capital of Europe: Architecture and Urban Planning for the European Union. London: Praeger

[iv] The experts included Pierre Randet, ContrôleurGénéral au Ministère de la Réconstruction et du Logement; Dr. Johannes Rossig, MinisterialdirigentimBundesministeriumfür den WirthschaftlichenBesitz des Bundes; Prof. J.P. Thijsse, ConseillerGénéralUrbaniste au Rijksdienstvoor het Nationale Plan; DottoreIng. Cesare Valle, Presidente di Sezione del ConsiglioSuperiore di L.L.P.P., Professore di Urbanisticapressol'Università di Roma; Victor Bure, DirecteurGénéral de l'Administration de l'Urbanisme (head of the committee), Henri Luja, Architect Urbaniste au Service d'Urbanisme de l'Etat.

[v] See Rapport du ComiteEuropeend'Experts en Urbanisme, Bruxelles, le 30 avril 1958, Archives of the European Parliament, Strasbourg

[vi] See meeting notes of early March 1958 by the French representative of the committee of experts, Pierre Randet with French ministers and city representatives (Pierre Randet Archive).

[vii] see Le Figaro, 8 march 1958, "Seule des grandesvilles du continent, Paris Veritable Capitale de l'Europe, declare au Figaro, le comte de Coudenhove-Kalergi," (Pierre Randet Archive)

[viii] 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)

[ix] Commission des Urbanistes, Indication des institutions sur le nombre de bureaux, de salles de reunion, de fonctionnaires necessaries pour leurfonctionnement (Pierre Randet Archive)

[x] See Rapport du ComiteEuropeend'Experts en Urbanisme, Bruxelles, le 30 avril 1958, Archives of the European Parliament, Strasbourg

[xi] 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)

[xii] see meeting notes by Pierre Randet, Entretien de Mr. Van Helmont, porte-parole de M. Jean Monnet, en presence de M. Vergeot, 14 march 1958

[xiii] see meeting notes of March 1958 by Pierre Randet(Pierre Randet Archive)

[xiv] See newspaper articles collected in the spring of 1958 by French architect and urbanist Jean-Henri Calsat

[xv] See Randet archive

[xvi] See Randet Archive

[xvii] Hein, Carola. 2004. The Capital of Europe: Architecture and Urban Planning for the European Union. London: Praeger

[xviii] Report of the Committee of European Experts in Urbanism, Brussels, April 30 1958