ITALY: THE MAP AND THE CITY

Urbatecture:
Opulent Urbanism

Mary Lou Lobsinger
University of Toronto

In 1979 Manfredo Tafuri chose the neologism *urbatecture* to describe the large infrastructural projects Italian architects produced in the early 1960s.[1] *Urbatecture, la città territorio, la nuova dimensione, la città regione* - Reyner Banham's megastructure was a later filiation - were all rubrics termed to characterize the turn from architecture as object to the merging of architecture with, as the Italian's put it, the instruments of town-planning.[2] Tafuri deemed this architectural fantasy "one of the more fruitful attempts to weld the private dimension of the concept of *house* to the overall urban continuum."[3] The house within an urban continuum and the individual within the collective as a social-political fiction *urbatecture* was imagined distinct from the physically static proposals of modernist utopias. In the early 1960s the city as urban continuum was described as a system of elements performing as a coherent whole in dynamic communication. Here communication was vaguely defined as unconstrained thus unpredictable exchanges of information between heterogeneous variables; from automobiles to consumer demographics, that might effect the system's organization. Ideas about communication from population mobility, new highway networks to gestaltist notions of legibility frequently were underwritten by Marxian declarations about the need to integrate and equilibrate the relation between the city of consumption and its surrounding productive territory. In the early 1960s Italian architects turned to economic and communication theories, to American and British town-planning models, to support projects that dispensed with architecture for or dispersed architecture within networks of communication. For a brief optimistic moment the idea of the traditional city was supplanted by the *City* as a continuum of responsive elements within a complex dynamic.

This re-calibration of architecture to the scale of the city and the re-dimensioning of the city, as a geographic territory was one way architects responded to the dramatic transformations of Italian cities, particularly of Milan, Turin, Genoa and Rome during the late 1950s and early 1960s.[4] In brief, unprecedented prosperity, the so-called economic miracle, had uprooted the agrarian and tradition based society and thrust it into an accelerated state of modernization.[5] In less than ten years Italy had become an industrialized nation.[6] Not only had the numbers of migrant laborers grown but also whole populations were in migration across the country, most intensively from poverty stricken areas in the south to wealthy northern industrial cities. These factors along with the rise of a newly affluent middle class brought about abrupt socio- cultural change that wrought havoc on cities and their surrounding countryside. Spurred on by necessity and lawless land speculation the outskirts of population swollen cities grew without apparent order. Factories and housing incoherently mingled as surrounding settlements were absorbed into the immense spread of the city's periphery. This phenomenon was termed *la nuova dimensione* or the new dimension.

In contrast to this new reality the official postwar model for urban expansion and community building had under the auspices of the INA-Casa program promoted the idea of the city as an entity surrounded by distinctly characterized quarters. Based on assumptions about the stability and homogeneity of communities and social life these quarters now proved inadequate in confrontation with a mobile, and in part, newly moneyed mass consumer society. On one hand the isolation of the quarter severed the worker-family from participation within city life reinforcing polarized social and economic ghettoes. On the other hand the physical mobility of the new bourgeoisie was viewed as a potent and untapped economic resource. Moreover this uneven urban development disaggregated into center and periphery writ large the problem of the *mezzogiorno*, that is, the economic disequilibrium between southern and northern Italy.[7]

As a consequence of these economic and social transformations the predominant architectural preoccupation of the 1950s, that is architecture as iconic object imbued with communicative potential, was thrown into doubt. Architecture as language implied that the relation between form and content was unambiguous. The notion of an architectural expression of language as *dialect*, of porches, brick or stuccoed walls and sloped roofs borrowed from vernacular architectures or the British new empiricism to signify community values were by the late 1950s recognized as phantom idealizations that proffered a nostalgic view of Italian life.[8] Architects and urbanists dissatisfied with the definition of architecture as an isolated linguistic fact began to think of architecture as merely one of myriad interacting

parts within a continuous urban dynamic. For architects *la nuova dimensione* rendered irrelevant both the object-fixated debates of the 1950s and the social configurations represented in the closed city of quarters and replaced them with the conception of architecture as an open work and the city as a continuous environment in the process of becoming. The urban environment as an open work allowed for the perception of "real content" through its *way of forming* an urban system as totality.[9] Within a system-forming urban environment architecture was called upon to visually and functionally integrate the disparities wrought by the economic miracle and to facilitate the "merging of emergent social orders within a dynamic economic equilibrium."[10]

LA NUOVA DIMENSIONE: 1959

At a meeting of the *Istituto Nazionale Urbanistica* in 1959 architect-urbanists Giancarlo De Carlo and Ludovico Quaroni argued for a conceptual shift in architecture debates from the concern with language to its visual impact within the complexity of the new dimension.[11] They argued that in the future the city and country would be indistinguishable; traditional permanent and representational urban elements would be replaced by administrative and service functions fulfilling transient needs as determined by market demand.[12] They surmised that social and technological progress had rendered the inside and outside, the city and country indistinguishable. The historic city had become a relic of the past. Furthermore, they claimed that humans now experienced simultaneously a plurality of points of view. The rise in mobility changes in workforce migration patterns and the emergence of new mediums of communication made for a new visual reality and for ephemeral relations to this reality. What's more De Carlo and Quaroni declared that urbanism had been subsumed within architecture.[13] Given this, the task faced by architects was to discover the means for architecture to perform at the scale of planning.[14] They clearly had models in mind. Presented at this important meeting of the *I.N.U.* were examples of new British Town design and Kevin Lynch's theories on the legibility and adaptability of the urban environment.

But what exactly was *la nuova dimensione*? Was it evidence of a pathological condition where urban sprawl pressed forward to alleviate the congested city thereby ravaging the surrounding countryside?[15] This prodigious expansion of the city formed a continuous urban field intermittently interrupted by agglomerations behaving heterogeneously without integration into a larger whole. For some such as, De Carlo's proposal for *la città-regione* or the Roman *la città territorio*, the attributes of the new dimension were characterized positively as representing the organic emergence of a new city form. Here the precarious evolution of *la nuova dimensione* was viewed as

the organic growth of an informal system of interdependently adapting and mutating elements. The system was in a permanent state of transition.[16] Some architects argued that in contrast to the values associated with the closed, hierarchical and formal presuppositions of the traditional city the decentralizing tendency of this new city form reflected a transformation toward more democratic relations in the political and economic spheres. The architect's task: rather than designing to quell chaos they should seek to implement the latent potential within and nurture the emergence of temporary orders. Thus *la nuova dimensione* had a socio-political implication. Architects argued that the problem of dimension and form would resolve itself organically within a future determined by consumer-producer needs and desires. But how was one to proceed from the description of a condition to a method of design and to architecture at the scale of the new city? The challenge for architects and urbanists was to discover a means of conceptualizing and developing, as they put it, the *Project*. According to the Roman group supporting *la città territorio* the task for town-planners and architects was; "

> to provide a few guiding principles . . . which will make it possible
> to direct, and to bring about, the future development of the city
> along progressive lines . . . following the progressive impulse
> which under lies the modern movement."[17]

Between 1959 and approximately 1964 architects and urbanists examined the notion of the new dimension at interdisciplinary conferences, in journals and by means of funded studies. The primary architectural evidence for the concept was the invention of the program for the *centro direzionale* (directional or business center). Although never adequately defined the *centro direzionale* referred in general to urban equipment or *attrezzatura urbana* intended to support the service sector or the process of *terziarizzazione* (becoming a service oriented society) in anticipation of the needs of a future affluent society.[18] The evidence of the impact of this within architectural discourse rests almost entirely upon results of the national competition for the *centro direzionale* (C.D.) for Turin. Turin, the wealthy northern city, home to FIAT, Lancia and the headquarters of the French owned Michelin industries, provided a perfect test case for not only had the arrival of immigrant laborers nearly doubled its population in the 1950s but the city was also viewed as an epicenter in the advance of the Italian economy.

Following closely the mandate set out in the *Piano regolatore generale* (P.R.G., the General Regulatory Plan) of 1959 the competition brief stated that Turin should aspire to realize its future as an "aperture that pierced through and integrated Piedmont into the European territory."[19] The objective of the directional center was to advance economic prospects by linking the city to the region and, in anticipation of a unified European economy, to equip the city to par-

ticipate fully in an internationally integrated economy.[20] The competition brief underlined the imperative to "keep up with the systemization of both Italian and foreign cities in the evolution of urbanism" by emphasizing the need to strengthen relationships between multiple means of transportation, that is between railway stations, the airport, heliport, bus stations and a proposed new subway system. In short, the competitors were asked to synchronize movement from the historic center to the periphery and from the new business center to the territory beyond.[21] As a nexus of mobile communication the new directional center would facilitate and promote the exchange of economic, social and cultural information. It would perform as a center of gravity for the everyday functioning of the city.[22] In visual terms it would represent "la nuova City della nuova Torino", the new City of the new Turin.[23]

The site of the former national railway workshops, adjacent to a secondary railway station of Porta Susa and within vicinity of the historic center, was chosen as the location for the new directional center. Thus the relics of Turin's early industrialization, an abattoir and the railway works, were to be replaced by projects programmed to house institutions, companies, state offices imagined to serve the needs of economic growth, that is, the advance of capitalism. Most of the competition proposals expressed the imperative to integrate the city and the territory by means of multiple forms of movement. In some of the more spirited projects transportation interchanges, elevated expressways and pedestrian skywalks competed at plus 10 to 15 meter levels. Typically a monumental form such as a parking silo or office tower was used to visually anchor the transportation node. Overall, the interventions overwhelming ignored the dense fabric and grid-based structure of Turin's historical center for systems of ramps, expressways and an architecture alternatively described as container-like or skeletal in form.[24]

The top awarded project named Akropolis 9 was proposed by a team lead by urbanist Ludovico Quaroni.[25] The scheme divides the site into three separately areas corresponding to the competition call to zone for cultural, residential and hospitality, and the business centers administration programs. The supporting text describes the center as composed of fourteen towers each of 120 meters tall. The towers sit on terraced platforms located 20 to 25m above grade. According to the architects the platforms house six levels of parking and are designed to visually mediate between the acropolis and the plane of a public park below. The public park, a flat expanse extending between all zones, is traversed by a partially mechanized pedestrian way. Diagrams illustrating the viability of proposed new traffic routes show that the existing east-west streets have been raised over a slightly depressed new north-south expressway. By virtue of its scale and these transportation networks the center is isolated from the surrounding neighborhood. Nevertheless the diagrams underline the priority of efficient traffic routes connecting the C.D. to the city and extending its reach into the territory beyond.[26] In terms of its immediate visual impact the center conjures the organizational gestalt of an American Central Business District (C.B.D.); an image that the architects most certainly aspired to achieve.[27]

Second prize went to a proposal called Biancaneve e i sette nani authored by a team lead by architect-urbanist Giuseppe Samonà; the director of the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (I.U.A.V.).[28] This proposal organizes the site into a series of built terraces comprised of stacked slabs 80m deep and 650m long. The horizontal approach makes for a container-like architecture where open plan interiors were to allow for temporary programmatic distributions - termed nuclei - to form according to necessity. The architects argued that the project would be contextual because the low, dense site strategy and over all scale bares some resemblance to Turin's continuous built fabric. The long forms and shaky-hand perspective sketches evocatively recall visionary sketches by F. L. Wright and prompt a gestaltist interpretation of the project as a whole; as a structural totality without specificity. The architects claimed the project would make a visual connection to the historic center and furthermore, that its efficient channels of traffic communication would stem the destruction of the historic center due to automobile traffic. Concern for the preservation of the historic center signals an important aspect of the new dimension. In the late 1950s the deterioration of historic centers of cities such as, Milan, Venice, Turin and Rome due to increased traffic and other pressures such as tourism demanded that architects and urbanists consider alternative means to accommodate the new modes of circulation that arose alongside economic prosperity.[29]

Third prize was awarded to a team proposal lead by urbanist Giovanni Astengo.[30] The scheme by the Operazione 70-1970 team was composed of towers and office blocks with galleries and pedestrian walks poised at 27.5 and 76.5m above grade. The architecture shares some affinity with Le Corbusier's Unité de Habitation while the urban organization responds to existing block formation of the city. Beneath a speedway elevated to plus 33 meters secondary transportation networks connect subway, trains, and buses below the extant street level.

Many of the merit awarded schemes were authored by up-and-coming architects. For example, a project by the Badeba team lead by Carlo Aymonino organized the site into a north-south regional transportation axis and an east-west city axis with the stated aim to facilitate uninterrupted speed for automobiles. The architecture consists of two autosilos or stackable car park towers located at either end of the site and a vaguely defined regional administration building. A

representation shows the project montaged within an expansive view of the city and indicates that its monolithic scale, undistinguished in detail, would be alien to the homogeneous low-rise fabric of Turin. Notwithstanding this visual evidence, the architects claimed the proposal to be a neutral armature open to all possibilities that would never represent a single formal language.[31]

If the merit award winning projects employed strikingly different forms they replayed similar themes in their written arguments. A familiar refrain found in almost all entries is the promise of increased vehicular speed through the city and ease of access to the center and its parking. In many cases the architects framed the arguments for their "urbatectural" interventions in terms of the imagined potential to contribute to economic growth and as aspiring to supply the visual equivalent of wealth and prosperity. For example, the design team for *Toro Seduto 12* argued that high-speed roadways slicing through the site would allow at least 180 cars to exit the area in less than 25 minutes. Furthermore, they make as a point of emphasis the fact that their scheme efficiently feeds cars into a multi-level parking plinth at the south end of the site.[32] *Toro Seduto 12* is composed of a double looping super-elevated highway appended with built nodes. It is an unabashed citation of Kenzo Tange's project for Tokyo Bay of 1959-60. The architects of *L'ingranaggio* declared their aim to re-equilibrate the economic system by means of their urban intervention. Here a repeated element forms a spine that travels across the site implying its endless extension into the city or territory. The architects contended that smaller elements adhering to the tips of the spine would mediate with local urban fabric adapting to new circumstances and changing needs as the spine traveled across the city and beyond.[33]

The architects of *Incentivo 1970* predicted that their proposal would function to decentralize and redistribute the activities of the city to new poles situated throughout the city and territory. This strategy of dispersal was aimed at motivating the market and thought to invert the centripetal development of the traditional city. This well-repeated notion - to invert centripetal development - would be achieved through the development of a new rapid transit system.[34] The architects made no effort to disguise the conflation of architecture as instrument for the future economic and social health of the city; the name *Incentive 1970* refers to Turin's ten-year economic plan. The design team for *Locomotiva 2* proposed a monumental and austere cube they describe as "architecture at a metropolitan scale", an "architecture radically urbanized".[35] The cube is intravenously fed by a road system intended to allow for the movement of cars to and from the new center and into the territory beyond without ever slowing down. The raised cube houses the civic center amenities and sits atop a large parking reservoir. It is not surprising that the object-like

building bares some resemblance to the Boston City Hall nor, as with many schemes, the architects conjure an experience imagined comparable to driving along Boston's elevated highways. The new Boston government center was a popular precedent with Italian architects because it offered a bold strategy for urban revitalization within an historic context.[36]

Evident in this summary description of competition projects is a reliance on non-Italian urban and architectural references. The significance of this commerce in ideas and forms demands a fuller discussion not possible in this short paper. Suffice to note that the experience of an accelerated modernization, advancing neo-capitalism, the onslaught of mass culture and urbanization compelled Italian architects and urbanists to look beyond the confines of their architecture culture and the discipline of town-planning for solutions elsewhere. Of particular interest were research and built works from countries where mass urbanization had been under way since early in the century. For example, Kevin Lynch's writings provided some Italian architects with fresh ideas to approach design and analysis capable of contending with the latent potential of a dynamic urbanization.[37] Lynch's notions of legibility, imaginability, environmental adaptability; gestalt psychology and systems theory, or precedents such as Louis Kahn's plan for Philadelphia, Geoffrey Copcutt's new town of Cumbernauld and Kenzo Tange's large scale proposals for the Bays of Boston and Tokyo provided ballast to underpin speculations on how architects might harness the latent potential of *la nuova dimensione* and nurture the emergence of new social relations within this dynamic urban transformation.

The appeal of gestalt and systems thinking was in part based on the notion that they were non-instrumental and interdisciplinary means of organizing complexity. In different ways both theories argued that a momentary comprehension the whole environment - a totality without closure - was possible. Totality without closure evaded the reification and instrumentality of rational systems and mechanistic thought and thus updated what was thought to be a critical flaw within modernist urbanism. For example, the exponents of *la città territorio* argued that their proposition avoided the trap of modernist utopian proposals because it was neither an instrument of equality nor was it causal rather it was an organism propelling integration.[38] To think the city as a system of interactive elements collocated by the viewer-user was one way of understanding the complexity of reality while systems thinking offered a method thought to decrease environmental complexity and allow for increased differentiation.[39]

From the gestaltist point of view reality was understood and made palpable through the immediate visual impact of the object within its environment. For example, that *Akropolis 9* might have the legibility of a C.B.D., an American business district, and thus commu-

nicated not only a sense of wealth and prosperity but also lent coherence to the urban environment. What's more adherence to this visual mode of communication suggested that *unmediated* reality was both an individual and shared experience. The idea of direct and instantaneous experiences of reality was particularly attractive to those who viewed positively *la nuova dimensione's* potential for enabling democratic relations. In theory gestalt might work against the reification of the social, thus the constraints of traditional social forms as reinforced in the quaint city quarters of the early 1950s. Furthermore, the assumed dynamic between gestalt and a systems based design seemed a convincing means of eliding the problematic representational axis of meaning-form-content so provoked by the optically embedded and linguistically situated architectures of the 1950s (neoliberty or neorealism). Gestalt theory thus aligned with systems and process oriented design methods proposed visual organization as a mode of communication without closure.

The urban environment as a system was based on the interdisciplinary idea of the self-regulating organism. It found a methodological equivalent in the notion of the plan as process. As we have seen it was most frequently realized in two architectural types, that of the permanent urban frame or a more transitory connective fabric (road systems with integral built forms or other design interventions). In either case, architecture performed as a structure to frame events or as punctuation. Following Lynch the arterial highway as node and network was thought to release "new potentialities of function and markedly enhance the adaptability of the whole system."[40] The forms of this adaptable organizational system were nascent within the existing conditions of *la nuova dimensione*. Whether it was mere urban sprawl or an indicator of future wealth the approach to cure was homeopathic, more of the same but in controlled measures.

In 1962 there was a literal counterpart to the notion of the system. The stretch of *l'Autostrada del Sole* between Naples and Milan had been completed.[41] Here the physical expression of integrated information exchange relied on mass mobility offered by the car, on the pendular movement of commuters and on the completion of the trans-national highway to its final destination of Turin. FIAT among other automobile related industries had since the mid-1950s lobbied for the highway arguing that it brought the north and south geographically closer and thus could perform as an instrument to equilibrate economic imbalances. The roadway would equilibrate uneven development, stem the disorderly growth of urban peripheries and alleviate congested historic centers it also might nurture and promote a new kind of citizen. For some it became the means to integrate the mobile subject of a mass consumer society into an accelerated system of exchange. The most compelling evidence for this argument is the *Autogrille Pavesi*. These bridges over the highway de-

signed for dining and shopping are evidence of the dramatic transformation of Italian society into a mobile and affluent society with the means to commute and the leisure time to travel. Whether in transit for business or vacation the autogrille was also indicative of deeper changes. Given the centrality of food, family and *paese* in Italian social life the success of the Autogrille indicates that life had irrevocably transformed.[42]

In conclusion, the most persistent message accompanying the various manifestations of *la nuova dimensione* was the desire to tap the latent potential within an emerging urban dynamic and thus to anticipate new urban and social forms. The experiments in structure, form and scale of intervention were viewed as a means to ameliorate the imbalances between the city and country, between northern and southern Italy and between existing and emerging classes. These notions flourished briefly and not without criticism during the early 1960s. Critics leveled their skepticism at several interrelated aspects.[43] First it relied all too much on foreign examples such as the French Grande Ensemble or on research based on the American megalopolis when in fact the circumstances of Italian cities and their geographies were substantially different.[44] Second, the uncritical up-take of the directional center programme based on the anticipated expansion of the service sector as the ground for architectural form was for some untenable. Paolo Ceccarelli declared that it revealed a lack of understanding of the conditions of architecture within the machinations of "neo-capitalism". He argued that architects should neither presume the expansion of the service sector as intrinsically related to the development of the economy nor assume that it entailed revolutionary potential for architecture or urbanism.[45] The enthusiastic acceptance of the effects of capitalism at this stage was uncritical and naive. Following the "exaltation of a few service and business functions" the role of architectural form in representing the new conditions, in particular its ambiguous scale, neither of urbanism nor architecture, emptied out architecture as a project for, as the Italian's put it, the Plan.[46] Architecture was merely an equivocal container of undefined programmes driven by "the Plan" and the plan was to propel economic development.

The third aspect was the over-valuation of the potential for non-prejudicial communication. For some critics this assumption deferred the problem of architectural language.[47] Furthermore, the "attention to visual communication aimed at a densely stratified mass public" was regressive and relaunched the old problematic of architectural form in gestural expressionist terms. Architectural expressionism proffered an excess of communication or environmental saturation the upshot of which would be incommunicability rather than communication.[48] Furthermore, what was the difference between this new international utopia and the claims made by the proponents of the

modern movement? The pursuit of the architectural equivalent to *la nuova dimensione* spawned architecture of containers, skeletal structures underwritten by an exalted view of technique and business with a purported revolutionary aim: to equilibrate social and economic structural imbalances. The obverse side to this utopian mandate was the cynical view of the directional center programme: to reconcile the contradictions of capitalism made evident in the city and to integrate the city and the subject into the advanced capitalist system of consumption.[49]

NOTES

[1] The term urbatecture was first coined by Bruno Zevi in "L' urbatettura di Jan Lubicz—Nycz," *L'architettura. Cronache e storia* 121, 7 (November 1965), 422-423.

[2] Reyner Banham, *Megastructures. Urban Futures of the Recent Past* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976), 64-69. Banham's discussion of *La città territorio* is somewhat misleading as he confuses protagonists, however, he does hit the mark on an important aspect, that is, la città territorio viewed in political terms as a "salto culturale". To understand the political commitment see for example, Marco De Michelis and Marco Venturi, "Il Centro direzionale di Bologna: il gestione del problema urbano nel P.C.I. *Contropiano* 3 (1968), 669-678.

[3] Manfredo Tafuri, "Mainlines of the Great Theoretical Debate over Architecture and Urban Planning 1960-1977," *A+U* 100 (January 1979), 140.

[4] In the third chapter of my dissertation, *Antinomies of Realism: Italian Architecture 1956-1972* I discuss Italian architects response to the transformations of Italian cities in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Note that cities such as Turin nearly doubled in size during this period.

[5] Paul Ginsburg, "The 'Economic Miracle', Rural Exodus and Social Transformation, 1953-63," *A History of Contemporary Italy. Society and Politics 1943-1988.* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), 210-253.

[6] The physical and social effects of this transformation have been succinctly documented in Italian films from that time such as Pierpaolo Pasolini's *Accatone* or *Mamma Roma*, Luchino Visconti's *Rocco i suoi fratelli*, Dino Risi's *Il sorpasso* or Michelangelo Antonioni's trilogy; *L'eclisse, L'avventura*, and *La notte*.

[7] The mezzogiorno refers to the south of Italy.

[8] Manfredo Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture, 1944-1985* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1989), 54-55.

[9] Umberto Eco, "Del modo di formare come impegno sulla realtà," *Il menabò* 5 (1962), 223.

[10] Giorgio Piccinato, Vieri Quilici, Manfredo Tafuri, "La Città Territorio. Verso una Nuova Dimensione," *Casabella continuità* 270 (December 1962), 18.

[11] "Il Volto della Città," *Urbanistica* 32 (December 1960), 5-8; Luciano Semerani, "Il Volto della Città," 247 *Casabella continuità*, (1960), 48.

[12] *Urbanistica* 32: 8.

[13] Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture, 1944-1985*, 72.

[14] *Urbanistica* 32: 6, 8.

[15] See the proceedings from the ILSES conference at Stresa in January 19-21, 1962. *Relazioni del seminario la nuova dimensione della città-La città regione. IV. ILSES.* (Milan: 1962)

[16] Ibid, 185. Also see Francesco Tentori, "La Città Territorio," *Casabella continuità* (July 1964), 50-54.

[17] Piccinato et al., "La Città Territorio. Verso una Nuova Dimensione," vii.

[18] Paolo Ceccarelli, "Urbanistica 'Opulenta'," *Casabella continuità* 278 (August 1963), 6.

[19] Vittorio Rigotti, "Il piano regolatore generale di Torino 1959, article 15," *Atti e Rassegna tecnica della società degli Ingegneri e degli Architetti in Torino* 3 (March 1960), 101. See the competition announcement in the supplement to the *Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica.* May 28th 1962. Also see the review of the competition results in M. F. Roggero, "A proposito del concorso per il nuovo centro direzionale di Torino," *Atti e Rassegna tecnica della società degli Ingegneri e degli Architetti in Torino* 5 (May 1963), 226.

[20] Mercato Europeo Comune (MEC) the early precusor to the EU (European Union). See references to MEC in *L'architettura. Cronache e storia* 94, 4 (August 1963), 235. See the competition statement accompanying the entry "Biancaneve e i 7 Nani", *Casabella continuità* 278 (August 1963), 9.

[21] Roggero: 223.

[22] Rigotti: 137.

[23] Roggero: 223. Note the use of English terms as a indicative of the cultural shift. English terms, job evaluation or standards for example, borrowed from American studies in economics and the sociology of work began to increasingly appear in the literature.

[24] For a critique of architecture as container see Alberto Samonà "Alla Ricerca di un metodo per la Nuova Dimensione," *Casabella continuità* 277 (July 1963), 51-53.

[25] See *Casabella continuità* 278 (August 1963), 16-19. The *Akropolis* team included Ludovico Quaroni with Mario Bianco, Gabriella Esposito, Roberto Maestro, Sergio Nicola, Antonio Quistelli, Nello Renacco, Aldo Rizzotti and Augusto Romano.

[26] The proposal for underground rapid transit was rejected in the early 1960s and to this day the city of 1.5 million including the suburbs remains without one.

[27] See Roberto Giuducci, "La democrazia delle città," *Pirelli* (February 1964), 81-90. For Ludovico Quaroni's observations on the American city the proceedings from the seminar *Urbanistica conversazioni ai moderni utopisti* held at the University of Naples, Istituto di tecnica urbanistica, 30 May 1959, (Rome, 1959).

[28] The Biancaneve e i sette nani (Snow White and the Seven Dwarves) team included Giuseppe Samonà with Nino Dardi, Emilio Mattioni, Valeriano Pastor, Alberto Samonà, Luciano Semerani, Gigetta Tamaro, and Andrea Vianello Vos.

[29] To understand the new interest for the preservation of the historic city see Antonio Cederna's articles such as those found in *Italia Nostra* from the late 1950s onward.

[30] The team Operazione 70-1970 included Giovanni Astengo, Gianfranco Fasana, Giuseppe Abbae with Bernardo Secchi of Società TEKNE (Olivetti associated). Note Astengo formerly of Turin taught town-planning at IAUV and had worked on the postwar planning of Turin.

[31]The team Badeba composed of Carlo Aymonino, Maurizio Aymonino, Baldo De Rossi, Franco Berlanda, Fausto Battimelli. See *Casabella continuità* 278 (August 1963), 28. "L'unico edificio che può prevedersi in maniera più definita e con maggiori possiblità di espressione architettonica è la futura sede dell'Amministrazione Regionale."

[32]The designers of Toro Seduto 12 (sitting bull 12) included Glauco Gresleri and Giorgio Trebbi.

[33]The designers of *L'ingranaggio* (gear wheel or figuratively, a mesh) included three members of AUA (Architetti Urbanisti Associati), Rome, Vieri Quilici, Giorgio Piccinato, and Manfredo Tafuri with engineer Pietrenzo Piazzo. *Casabella continuità* 278 (August 1963), 38.

[34]Incentivo 1970 (incentive) *Casabella continuità* 278, 34-35. The team included Michele Achilli, Guido Canella, Lucio Stellario d'Angiolini, Virgilio Vercelloni with technicians Daniele Brigidini e Giulio Daolio.

[35]Locomotiva 2, *Casabella continuità*, 278 (August 1963), 48-51. The team included Gian Ugo Polesello, Aldo Rossi and Luca Meda.

[36]Proposals for the new Boston City Hall were well-known to and influential upon Italian architects during this period. Interview with Professor Marco De Michelis, Venice, Fall 1999.

[37]Kevin Lynch, "Environmental Adaptibility," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 24, 1 (1957), 16-24.

[38]Enrico Fattinnanzi, Manfredo Tafuri, "Un'ipotesi per la città-territorio di Roma. Strutture Produttive e direzionali nel comprensorio Pontino," *Casabella continuità* 274 (April 1963), 35.

[39]Systems theory was available from a wide variety of sources ranging from the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* to Umberto Eco writings on popular culture, TV and avant-garde art. The description of a system is here borrowed from Martin Jay. *Marxism and Totality. The Adventures of a concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley, Ca: The University of California Press, 1984), 484.

[40]Lynch, 17.

[41]See Enrico Menduni, *L'Autostrada del Sole* (Bologna: Il mulino, 1999)

[42]Ginsborg, 248. "Thus the 'economic miracle', by linking rising living standards with accentuated individualism, seemed to fulfill the American dream. It had introduced a new model of social integration to Italy."

[43]See for example, Aldo Rossi "Nuovi Problemi," *Casabella continuità* 264 (1962) reprinted in *Scritti scelti sull'architettura e la città, 1956-1972* (Milan: CittàStudiEdizioni, 1997), 175-192; Paolo Ceccarelli, "Urbanistica 'Opulenta'", 5-8; Manfredo Tafuri, "La Nuova dimensione Urbana e la Funzione dell'Utopia," *L'architettura Cronache e storia* 124 (February 1966), 680-683.

[44]Rossi, 183.

[45]Ceccarelli, 5.

[46]Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia. Design and Capitalist Development* trans. B. La Penta (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976)

[47]Tafuri, *La nuova*, 683.

[48]Tafuri, *History*, 73; *La nuova*, 683.

[49]Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia. Design and Capitalist Development*.