

CALL FOR PAPERS

Colloquium

THE “1925 MOMENT” : LE CORBUSIER.

Urban planning, architecture, painting, “decorative arts”, publishing.

Paris, week of December 15, 2025.

Presentation

« Un moment n'est pas long ; un instant est encore plus court ».

Article « Moment », dans *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers par une société de gens de lettres. Mis en ordre et publié par M. Diderot et M. d'Alembert*¹.

In 1925, at the International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts, Le Corbusier (with Pierre Jeanneret) presented a work that he described as “a total synthesis of all [his] research”, but also as « a paving stone in the midst of the decorative arts »² – the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau –, what we have chosen to call the “1925 Moment” can be more broadly considered as a fundamental space-time in the work and thinking of the multifaceted architect and his Atelier. It was the culmination of fifteen years of research into architectural, urban planning, decorative, pictorial and editorial issues, and consequently also a new beginning for the artist, who was enjoying growing renown in France and beyond, and was beginning to amend or revise his principles: a turning point³. This pivotal moment marks a time of sometimes contradictory research, when equilibrium and movement towards new programs or theories are in dialogue. It has no strict chronological boundaries, but rather shifts according to the object analyzed or the analysis itself, like circles variably defined by the branches of a compass; commonly associated with a “New Spirit” (“Esprit Nouveau”)⁴, this

¹ “A moment is not long ; an instant is even shorter”. Cited by Françoise Balibar, Philippe Büttgen, Jean-Pierre Cléro, Jacques Collette et Barbara Cassin, « Moment, instant, occasion », *Trivium* [En ligne], 15 | 2013, published online on December 9, 2013. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/trivium/4638> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/trivium.4638>

² Letter from Le Corbusier to his parents, February 9, 1925. Fondation Le Corbusier R1(6)197.

³ Renée Houde, « La théorie de la bascule », in Martine Lani-Bayle (Dir.), *Les bascules de la vie*. 2005, 2-84273-487-4.hal-01245649, p. 36-47.

⁴ See, in particular, *L'Esprit Nouveau. Le Corbusier et l'industrie 1920-1925*, Zürich, Berlin, Strasbourg, Paris, Ernst & Sohn, 1987 ; Claude Garino, *Le Corbusier. De la villa turque à l'Esprit nouveau*, La Chaux-de-Fonds, Idéa : l'Os du crocodile, 1995 ; Ducros Françoise, *"L'Esprit nouveau" : le purisme à Paris, 1918-1925* : Grenoble, Musée de

moment multiplies its incarnations and interpretations, crossing them to find different characterizations. An “intellectual revolution ?”⁵ A “conceptual moment”⁶ ? A “paradoxical”⁷ moment ?

It is this “1925 Moment”, at the heart of which Le Corbusier acts and thinks, that we wish to question and explore in this centenary year of the International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts, during which several events dedicated to the Exhibition itself or to manifestations of what was later called “Art déco”⁸ have been and will continue to be held. Here, we wish to go beyond the event, without denying the consequences it engendered⁹, by looking specifically at the movements of an artist and his multi-disciplinary work, and the dynamics that accompanied them, ran through them or upset them over a “period of time”, a “fertile”¹⁰ moment.

Thirty-eight years after the Exhibition “The New Spirit. Le Corbusier and Industry 1920-1925” and the publication of its eminent catalog, we wish to continue some of the fundamental reflections that were carried out at the time by broadening their scope, developing the subject of study, and updating the results, thanks to contributions from researchers in various disciplinary fields. The numerous studies published since then on issues beyond the question of industry or the New Spirit obviously constitute other points of reference. Therefore, any new research or reinterpretation of a theme already studied will find its place within this conference, which aims to be interdisciplinary, as was Le Corbusier's work, and international, as were his production – « the planet as a construction site »¹¹ – and its reception. Preference will be given to presentations offering cross-disciplinary approaches and avoiding case studies, unless these allow for a decompartmentalized analysis, with the whole taking precedence over the fragment.

Grenoble, 7 octobre 2001-6 janvier 2002. Collab. de Serge Lemoine, Carol S. Eliel, Françoise Ducros et al. Paris ; Grenoble : Réunion des musées nationaux, Musée de Grenoble, 2001.

⁵ To echo the question posed by Stanislaus von Moos en 1987, itself inspired by the writings of Robert Musil. Stanislaus von Moos, « Dans l’antichambre du ‘Machine Age’ », *L’Esprit Nouveau. Le Corbusier et l’industrie 1920-1925*, op. cit., p. 15.

⁶ Pierre Rosanvallon, *Le moment Guizot*, Paris, Éditions Gallimard, p. 26.

⁷ To echo the « third paradox of the aesthetics of the new » (« troisième paradoxe de l’esthétique du nouveau ») analyzed by Antoine Compagnon, in *Les cinq paradoxes de la modernité*, Paris, Seuil, 1990, p. 12.

⁸ *Les années 25 : Art Déco/Bauhaus/Stijl/Esprit Nouveau*, Paris, Musée des arts décoratifs, 3 mars-16 mai 1966. Voir Élodie Lacroix, « Qu'est-ce que l'Art Déco ? », dans *Élégance & modernité : l'illustration au temps de l'art déco*, catalogue d'exposition, sous la direction de Christophe Didier et Catherine Soulé-Sandic ; avec la collaboration scientifique d'Élodie Lacroix, Strasbourg : Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg, 2025, p. 11-17.

⁹ « A piece of time, the event is also a creator: it creates the time that follows its accomplishment, it creates relationships and interactions, confrontations or phenomena of consent, it creates language, discourse. We can also say that it creates light because it suddenly reveals mechanisms that were previously invisible ». « Morceau de temps, l'événement est encore un créateur : il crée du temps qui suit son accomplissement, il crée des relations et des interactions, des confrontations ou des phénomènes de consentement, il crée du langage, du discours. On peut encore dire qu'il crée de la lumière parce qu'il révèle soudain des mécanismes jusque-là invisibles ». Arlette Farge, « Penser et définir l'événement en histoire », *Terrain* [En ligne], 38 | 2002, mis en ligne le 06 mars 2007. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/terrain/1929> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/terrain.1929>

¹⁰ In *Laocoon ou Des frontières respectives de la poésie et de la peinture (1766-1768)*, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing states that the « instant fécond » or « instant prégnant » is not the most extreme or climactic moment, but the one that gives free rein to imagination.

¹¹ Jean-Louis Cohen, *Le Corbusier. La planète comme chantier*, Textuel, 2015.

During this colloquium, presentations may focus on:

-The concept of “moment,” its definitions and conditions. Le Corbusier's perspective and discourse on this “Moment 1925,” his own and that of others.

Without ever excluding Le Corbusier from the discussion, the notion of “moment” itself may be the subject of interventions, particularly if these interventions allow us to question its definition by linking it to the object of analysis. Furthermore, if Le Corbusier proclaims the advent of a “great era”¹² and offers in 1925 an overview of the “last quarter of a century” – “Witnesses” (“Témoins”) – as well as a first autobiography – “Confession”¹³ –, we may wonder how he judges this ‘present’ in all its plurality¹⁴, how he views it and how he fits into it: is it a “propitious” or decisive moment? A point of rupture or equilibrium? A moment of transition or connection? A moment of tradition or innovation? A moment of foundation? A moment that is beginning or ending? A moment destined to last? A moment of revolution? Similarly, we can ask ourselves what Le Corbusier sees or does not see, or even does not understand, in order to better grasp the issues of the time and how he addresses them or not.

Here, we hope to go beyond or deconstruct the sometimes caricatural view of an artist in radical rupture with certain actors or certain positions in order to better reveal the nuances, tensions, and even contradictions of his work and his thinking. As Catherine Chevillot states about sculpture in the early 20th century: “Within the space of these apparent oppositions, unexpected convergences may emerge and new perspectives for analysis may develop”¹⁵. The theoretical foundations and developments of the architect-thinker may also be discussed here. Finally, beyond the analysis or discourse produced, studies focusing on the forms and means employed by Le Corbusier in this context are welcome.

-Le Corbusier's work and professional situation (artistic and intellectual) in the mid-1920s.

The first half of the 1920s saw the birth of the Rue de Sèvres atelier, the partnership with Pierre Jeanneret, the theoretical conception of “contemporary” cities, and the construction of a workers' housing estate and so-called purist houses, plastic expressions of the machine age. In 1925, both names appeared equally on the invitation cards and in the Exhibition Report. As for the articles that appeared in the press on this occasion, they demonstrate that the architect was undoubtedly a central and now established figure of radical French modernity¹⁶. In the second half of the decade, in an unprecedented move, the

¹² *L'Esprit Nouveau*, n° 1, octobre 1920.

¹³ Both published in *L'Art décoratif d'aujourd'hui* in 1925.

¹⁴ We are familiar with his views on the « flourishing » of « engineering aesthetics » in contrast to the « painful regression of architecture ». Le Corbusier-Saunier, « Esthétique de l'ingénieur. Architecture », *L'Esprit Nouveau*, n° 11-12, January 1921.

¹⁵ Full quote : « Within the space of these apparent oppositions, unexpected convergences may appear and new perspectives for analyzing the period may develop » (« Dans l'espace de ces oppositions apparentes peuvent apparaître des convergences inattendues et s'élaborer de nouvelles perspectives d'analyse de la période »). Catherine Chevillot, *La sculpture à Paris ; 1905-1914, moment de tous les possibles*, Éditions Hazan Bibliothèque, 2017, p. 8.

¹⁶ “We know the importance Le Corbusier gave to standardization, with the house becoming a ‘machine for living in’. In opposition to radical utilitarianism, the principle of the standard house, there is a tendency to safeguard what has been called ‘the rights of the superfluous’, to maintain everything that tears modern man away from automatism” (« On sait quelle ampleur Le Corbusier a donné à la standardisation, la maison devenant la “machine à habiter”. En opposition avec l'utilitarisme radical, le principe de la maison-type, on constate une tendance à sauvegarder ce que l'on a appelé “les droits du superflu”, à maintenir tout ce qui arrache l'homme

studio welcomed two women under different conditions and for different missions, heralding a new relationship with women, as well as several “young” architects, often Swiss, reflecting the international dimension of this agency, which did not bear the name. Le Corbusier's work, theories, and programs evolved with, among other things, a stronger application of Taylorist principles or an openness to larger-scale and more complex programs.

Thus, first of all, in the relative continuity of the latest *Rencontres de la Fondation Le Corbusier*¹⁷, the studio as it was organized, operated, and developed specifically in the mid-1920s, but also the modalities of professional and intellectual collaborations within and outside the studio, sometimes invisible, such as Paulette Bernège¹⁸, could be explored. Furthermore, the realities (programmatic, intellectual, institutional, political, and social) in which Le Corbusier thought and acted can be analyzed, as this period saw the emergence of many of his major paradigms (“invariants,” “building-villas,” “architectural promenade,” “Five Points of Modern Architecture,” architectural polychromy, “standard locker,” “new ways of sitting,” etc.) and develop the programs that the studio had the opportunity to tackle.

Then, Le Corbusier's work in all its diversity, whether theoretical or applied, and his methods and processes, could give rise to papers that we hope will avoid a monographic approach in favor of a cross-disciplinary reading, relational (between works) or trend-based (in connection with the idea of “moment”). Here, presentations of original research on architectural elements, methods, processes, techniques, and materiality are strongly encouraged, as several recent works have, for example, questioned the white monochromy of the facades of purist houses and revealed the use of “stone-colored” coatings or polychromy. Reflections on movements within Le Corbusier's work itself and questions about the concordance between discourses and actions are also welcome.

-Modernity-modernities: controverses, debates, terminology, polysemy.

On several occasions, the architect described the difficult conditions in which he worked at official events, such as the 1925 Exhibition, and the hostility he faced in a France he considered blind – “eyes that do not see...” (« Des yeux qui ne voient pas... ») – and whose “unpleasant spirit [...] weighs heavily”¹⁹. Paul Léon's criticism of his proposals, for example, more broadly stigmatizes the positions of “very modern”²⁰ artists and architects. Thus, in the

moderne à l'automatisme »). Paul Léon (sous la dir.), *Rapport général, Exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes de 1925, section artistique et technique*, volume XIII, Larousse, 1927, p. 53.

¹⁷ « L'envers et l'endroit de l'atelier du 35 rue de Sèvres de 1924 à 1965 ». XXIIèmes Rencontres de la Fondation. Paris. December 5 and 6, 2024.

¹⁸ Elise Koering, « Architecte ménagère. Une nouvelle experte de l'habitat des années 1920 », *Source(s)* (Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg). Numéro thématique sur les « Femmes expertes », 2016, p. 103-117.

¹⁹ Letter of Le Corbusier to the Chief of Staff of the General Commission of the International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts, May 27, 1925. Archives of the Fondation Le Corbusier A1-5-1.

²⁰ “An incident has just occurred at the Exposition des Arts Décoratifs, causing a stir in interested circles. Messrs Fernand David, general commissioner of the Exposition, and Paul Léon, director of the Beaux-Arts, were visiting the ‘modern French embassy’ last Saturday: they were still in the vestibule, built by M. Mallet-Stevens, and on whose walls the architect had placed two decorative panels, one by M. Fernand Léger, the other by M. Robert Delaunoy (sic.). The two official visitors severely criticized these two panels, which, given the personalities of their authors, were understandably very modern in style, and expressed their unfavorable opinion loud and clear. [...] ordered the removal of the panels by Messrs. Léger and Delaunoy” (« Il vient de se produire à l'Exposition des arts décoratifs un incident qui causa un vif émoi dans les milieux intéressés. MM. Fernand David, commissaire général de l'Exposition, et Paul Léon, directeur des Beaux-Arts, visitaient samedi dernier l'ambassade française moderne : Ils en étaient encore au vestibule, construit par M. Mallet-Stevens, et sur les murs duquel l'architecte avait placé deux panneaux décoratifs, l'un de M. Fernand Léger, l'autre de M. Robert Delaunoy (sic.). Les deux visiteurs officiels jugèrent sévèrement ces deux panneaux, de tendance très moderne, on le conçoit, étant donné

middle of the decade, particularly in France, Le Corbusier crystallized the debates around modernity and embodied an alternative, a path that some considered deleterious, a “scandalous figure on the Parisian scene”²¹, while others considered heroic²².

This colloquium will therefore be an opportunity to examine the debates and controversies in which Le Corbusier was involved, or in which he found himself embroiled despite himself, both in France and abroad. They will also be able to question the terms or concepts of “new”, “modernity”, “anti-modernist”²³, “modernism”²⁴ or “functionalism”, in an era when many claimed to be “modern” while, according to Jean-Louis Cohen, Le Corbusier “most often sought to avoid associating the adjective ‘modern’ with the noun ‘architecture’”²⁵ as evidenced by the title of his manifesto *Vers une architecture (Towards an Architecture)*. In this context, it will be interesting to examine how Le Corbusier defined himself and how he was defined, described, understood, or misunderstood by others (French and foreign, commentators and creators—architects, decorators, writers, or, without being exhaustive, painters—close and not so close, etc.). We could also study Le Corbusier's relationship with, among other things, “neo-traditionalism,” vernacular architecture, and regionalism, given that historians consider the 1930s to be the period when his poetic sensibility truly blossomed. Similarly, reflections on the notion of “style” and the way in which the architect rejected it will have their place here²⁶, as will those concerning the body or the making of a modern man (and

la personnalité des auteurs, et ils exprimèrent tout haut leur sentiment défavorable. [...] donnèrent l'ordre de retirer les panneaux de MM. Léger et Delaunoy »). « Un incident très commenté aux arts décoratifs », *Excelsior*, 1^{er} juin 1925, p. 1-2.

²¹ Jean-Louis Cohen, *L'architecture au futur depuis 1889*, Phaidon, 2012, p. 128.

²² “The lucidity of Le Corbusier's designs and the perfectible nature of his excellent achievements give me confidence. I have the distinct feeling that he is on the right track, one that leads somewhere far beyond the Exhibition, fruit baskets, and fans” (« La lucidité des conceptions de Le Corbusier, le caractère perfectible de ses excellentes réalisations, tout cela me donne confiance. J'ai le sentiment très net qu'il est sur la bonne voie, celle qui mène quelque part, très loin de l'Exposition, des corbeilles de fruits et des éventails »). Francis Jourdain, « L'Exposition est close : Les résultats », *Le Bulletin de la vie artistique*, année 6, n° 22, novembre 1925, p. 494-495.

²³ According to Antoine Compagnon, the antimoderns are “moderns at odds with modern times, modernism or modernity, or moderns who were so reluctantly, torn moderns or even untimely moderns” (« les modernes en délicatesse avec les temps modernes, le modernisme ou la modernité, ou les modernes qui le furent à contrecœur, modernes déchirés ou encore modernes intempestifs »). Antoine Compagnon, *Les antimodernes, de Joseph de Maistre à Roland Barthes*, Paris, Gallimard, 2005, p. 7.

²⁴ In *L'Architecture française*, published in 1938, Marie Dormoy defines “three trends” in French architecture after the 1914-1918 war: “classical architecture,” “modernist architecture,” and “academic architecture” (p. 138). “Modernist architecture is led by Le Corbusier. The author of numerous important theoretical works, Le Corbusier built relatively little, but each of his works is an affirmation, almost a declaration of war. They are more plastic than constructive, the structure almost always hidden behind large flat surfaces. In this way, he affirms his theory that ‘architecture is a learned, correct, and magnificent game of volumes assembled under light’” (« L'architecture moderniste a pour chef Le Corbusier. Auteur de nombreux et importants ouvrages théoriques, Le Corbusier a relativement peu construit, mais chacune de ses œuvres est une affirmation, presque une déclaration de guerre. Elles sont plus plastiques que constructives, la structure étant presque toujours dissimulée derrière de grandes surfaces planes. Par là il affirme sa théorie que ‘l'architecture est un jeu savant, correct et magnifique, des volumes assemblés sous la lumière’ »). p. 140).

²⁵ Jean-Louis Cohen, *Architecture du XXe siècle en France : Modernité et continuité*, Hazan, 2014, p. 62.

²⁶ “... ‘principles’ and not ‘style’, the difference is important” (« ... ‘principles’ et non ‘style’, la différence est d'importance ») writes Yannis Tsiomis in « L'art décoratif d'aujourd'hui et ‘la loi du Ripolin’ », dans *L'année 1925. L'esprit d'une époque*, Sous la direction de Myriam Boucharenc et Claude Leroy, Presses Universitaires de Paris-Nanterre, 2021.

woman), an “energetic, skilled, healthy” figure who “keeps a cool head and shows rigor”²⁷. This colloquium should also provide an opportunity to explore in detail the concepts and terminology coined, borrowed, or misused by the artist over the years, such as “standard” and “type” in order to deconstruct and refine chronologies, but also to question the meanings he gave them within an international context.

Finally, discussions may also continue on the content and form of Le Corbusier's publications, such as the magazine *L'Esprit Nouveau*, which the curators of the 1987 Exhibition deemed to have a “traditional and even banal graphic and typographic image”²⁸, again in an international context.

-The roles of Le Corbusier and his circles. Networks, exchanges, dissemination.

In the mid-1920s, Le Corbusier boasted of participating in the emergence of “an absolutely new, unprecedented architectural phenomenon”²⁹; at the same time, he painted, wrote, published, edited, exhibited, designed, built, and prophesied... Between 1918 and 1925, he published five books defining his theories in fields as diverse as painting, urban planning, architecture, and decorative arts. Between 1920 and 1925, *L'Esprit Nouveau*, an “illustrated international review of contemporary activity”, set itself the goal of “helping people understand the spirit that animates the contemporary era; helping them grasp the beauty of this era and the originality of its spirit; demonstrating that this era is as beautiful as those of the past in which we would have liked to have lived. To show the unified spirit that animates the research of the various elites of our society”³⁰. At the Salons d'Automne, the Bauhaus Woche, the Galerie Druet, the Salon des Indépendants, the Galerie de l'Effort Moderne, the International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts in Paris, in Stuttgart, Frankfurt, and Turin, he exhibited his paintings, publicly expressed his ideas, and disseminated his plans for modern housing and cities through various means, including photography. His network expanded, his relationships grew stronger, and his clientele increased. As evidenced by the archives preserved at the Fondation Le Corbusier, the decade, and perhaps even more so its midpoint, was a crucial time for building a diverse and international network, with Le Corbusier not hesitating, for example, to seek out players in the world of machinery to help him realize his work. The financing and publicity of his built and written work thus followed a modern capitalist logic. Furthermore, it seems that sculptors and painters (and perhaps gallery owners) were more prominent than architects among the major figures in his artistic and social circle. However, while groups of French architects began to form before 1925 (such as the G.A.M. and then the S.A.M.³¹), the second half of the 1920s saw the creation of groups of modern architects, including the International Congresses of Modern Architecture, founded in 1928, in which Le Corbusier would play an important role.

In addition, Le Corbusier's relationship with the press, particularly the professional press, and the publishing world in general, took on a new dimension at this time. Recent studies have begun to demonstrate the major role played from 1925 onwards by Christian

²⁷ Hermann Hesse, *Le loup des steppes*, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1927 (trad. française Alexandra Cade), Calmann-Lévy, 2004, p. 232.

²⁸ Stanislaus von Moos, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁹ About the houses in Pessac. Letter from Le Corbusier to Marie-Charlotte Amélie, May 26, 1926. Archives of the Fondation Le Corbusier R1(6)125-126.

³⁰ *L'Esprit Nouveau*, n° 1, 1920.

³¹ Léna Lefranc-Cervo, *La Société des architectes modernes (1922-1946) : stratégies professionnelles et postures intellectuelles d'un réseau d'architectes*, thèse de Doctorat, Université Rennes 2, sous la direction d'Hélène Jeannière, 2024.

Zervos and Jean Badovici, and more broadly by Éditions Morancé, in defending and disseminating his urban planning, architectural, and furniture designs³². The aim here would be to take a broader look at how his thinking and work, whatever its form, were disseminated and how his ideas were presented.

These two days will therefore provide an opportunity to observe how the architect conceives his position and mission within the world of machinery and which circles he enters. How does he proceed? Which channels does he use? Does his network overlap with others? Which actors and types of actors are part of his world at this particular time? According to what logic and with what degree of permanence? But also, what role does Le Corbusier wish to give himself, and what are his strategies for disseminating his ideas and his work? Are the two always compatible? What processes or modes of representation are put in place? Is his stance original?

-Reception, interpretations, and historiography.

"For me [...] all of today's architecture, the architecture that history will record [sic], the sacrosanct architecture that will make mankind happy, is the triptych of Oud, Le Corbusier, and Gropius, which our century will remember so that it may one day be blessed"³³.

During this colloquium, which we wish to be open, we eagerly hope that the question of reception, immediate or delayed, national and international, as well as that of the historiography of this Corbusian "1925 Moment" will be explored.

The impact of the magazine *L'Esprit Nouveau*, the book *Vers une architecture (Towards a New Architecture)*, and the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, for example, in countries as diverse as the USSR, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Sweden, and Japan, is concrete. Already studied for certain geographical areas, these "aftermaths" remain to be explored for others, within an approach that echoes that of the analysis of Le Corbusier's influences. We would like the variety of artistic and intellectual fields explored by Le Corbusier to be taken into account here in order to show how his work, in all its expressions and dimensions, provokes reflections, reactions, interpretations, and even appropriations³⁴ by actors of all faiths and nationalities, some of whom may distort its substance to the point of sometimes misrepresenting it. In this context, the study of the modalities and actors involved in these transfers to a geographical elsewhere will also be welcome.

Finally, very early on, various actors, including researchers, took up the complex issues raised by Le Corbusier and his collaborators in their reflections on the New Spirit and Purism, or attempted to analyze, using various methods, his project positions, his spatial "inventions," his pictorial designs, his furniture production, and the reception of some of his achievements³⁵. This colloquium will thus provide an opportunity to propose a

³² Théo Koenig, *La diffusion et la réception du pavillon de L'Esprit Nouveau de Le Corbusier en France entre 1925 et 1930. Mécaniques de diffusion et de réception d'une œuvre d'avant-garde de l'architecture moderne à l'Exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes de 1925*, Mémoire sous la direction d'Elise Koering, École Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Strasbourg, juin 2025.

³³ « Car pour moi [...] toute l'architecture d'aujourd'hui, celle que l'histoire l'enregistrera [sic], la sacro-sainte, celle qui rendra l'homme heureux est le triptyque Oud-Le Corbusier-Gropius, que notre siècle retiendra pour pouvoir la bénir un jour ». Letter by Jean Badovici à J.J.P. Oud, September 21, 1925, August 1930. Archives J.J.P. Oud, N.A., Rotterdam B53-88.

³⁴ One might think of Le Corbusier's "Pas la peine de se gêner..." to Antonin Raymond.

³⁵ These include, but are not limited to, Jean-Louis Cohen, of course, but also Tim Benton, Philippe Boudon, Luisa Martina Colli, Beatriz Colomina, Françoise Ducros, Françoise de Francieu, Giuliano Gresleri, Stanislaus von Moos, Carlo Olmo, Francesco Passanti, Danièle Pauly, Gilles Ragot, Bruno Reichlin, Arthur Rüegg, Nancy Troy or Françoise Will-Levaillant...

historiographical approach to Le Corbusier's "1925 Moment" in order to incorporate a reflective and critical view of the approaches implemented over the last fifty years.

These topics are provided for informational purposes only. Proposals for papers may address other issues or questions as long as they are related to the stated theme.

This colloquium will be held over two days in Paris.

Presentations may be given in French or English.

A publication is planned following the colloquium, the terms of which are still to be determined.

Schedule

Call for papers launched: July 2025.

Proposals submitted: September 12, 2025.

Proposals accepted: September 26, 2025.

Colloquium: week of December 15, 2025.

How to submit proposals for papers

Proposals for papers should be no longer than 2,000 characters, including spaces, and should include a title and a short biography of the speaker (no longer than 500 characters, including spaces). The originality of the research and the issues addressed should be clearly highlighted.

The document sent must be named as follows: LAST NAME-First Name_Moment1925.

Proposals must be sent before September 12, 2025 to the following two addresses:

benedicte.gandini@fondationlecorbusier.fr

elise.koering@strasbourg.archi.fr

Organizing Committee

Bénédicte Gandini (Architect-historian, Fondation Le Corbusier).

Elise Koering (Lecturer in Architectural History and Cultures, ENSA Strasbourg, UMR 3400 ARCHE—University of Strasbourg-ENSAS. LACTH-ENSAP de Lille).

Scientific Committee

Raphaële Billé (Assistant Curator at the Musée des Arts décoratifs de Paris), Olivier Cinqualbre (Honorary Curator at the Musée Nationale d'Art Moderne-Centre de Création Industrielle-Centre Pompidou), Rossella Froissart (Director of Studies at the École Pratique des Hautes Études. Historical and Philological Sciences Section), Bénédicte Gandini (Architect-Historian, Le Corbusier Foundation), Elise Koering (Lecturer in Architectural History and Cultures, ENSA Strasbourg, ENSA Strasbourg, UMR 3400 ARCHE—University of Strasbourg-ENSAS. LACTH-ENSAP de Lille) and Gilles Ragot (Emeritus Professor at the University of Bordeaux-Montaigne).