Parallel Utopias: Pathological and Constitutive

NATHANIEL COLEMAN
University of Pennsylvania

> It will, indeed, be long before the world has been all colonized, and all its deserts brought under cultivation. But the radical question is, not how much habitable land is in the world, but how many human beings ought to be maintained on a given space of habitable land.
> Observe, I say ought to be, not how many can be.
> — John Ruskin, "Unto this Last," (1862), in *Unto this Last and Other Writings* (London: Penguin, 1985), p. 224

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I suggest that the imagination[1] of architecture is *always* in part utopian and thereby that all architectural projects, at least partially, image utopia. When utopia and architecture (or urbanism) are considered together, it is often to demonstrate that utopia is an imaging of the impossible, picturing the defeat of the project before it is even attempted. Franco Borsi, for example, suggests that "being utopian... means being distinctly 'out of it'."[2] Although this is a common diagnosis, there are other ways of looking at the relationship between utopia and architecture; these conceptualize utopia as central to the imagination of projects. For example, Lewis Mumford writes: "It is absurd to dispose of utopia by saying that it exists only on paper. The answer to this is: precisely the same thing may be said of the architect's plans for a house, and houses are none the worse for it."[3]

Mumford's characterization suggests that *Utopia* and the architect's *Plan* are both fictions that can be *generative* of reality. Ricoeur suggests that the function of utopia, external to any particular example, is the redescription of reality in all or some of its dimensions. The content of utopia, therefore, can be said to shift far more than does its basic function. This *crucial* and distinguishing characteristic of utopia, redescription of reality, is thought by Ricoeur to be *always* construed within a distanciated space of nowhere (a location shared with imagination and fiction).[4] This *nowhere* is less a physical no-place than a psychological position of distance facilitating criticality. Lynda H. Schneekloth, professor of architecture at SUNY Buffalo, who writes on architecture and utopia, is emphatic in describing *architecture as utopian*. She writes: "I argue that architecture is unredeemably utopian because of its fundamental activity of making and unmaking the material world in which we live; this practice always requires a vision of the good life."[5]

Assuming, for the moment, that Schneekloth is correct in asserting "that architecture is unredeemably utopian" and that it is so "because [its] practice always requires a vision of the good life," two concerns immediately come to mind. First, because the vast majority of constructed projects alter the real in ways supporting the negative view of utopia (widely held since World War II owing to the excesses of the Modern Movement), the prospect that *all* architecture is utopian begs for the establishment of evaluative criteria that makes possible distinction among *kinds* of utopias. Second, and related to the first, because individual visions of *some* good life, held by architects, planners, and governments among others are often imposed upon reality with little thought about the consequences (symbolic rather than economic) of implementation, principles particular to each of the two kinds of utopia ought to be elaborated that makes evaluation of projects possible before *any* can enter reality and alter it for the worse.

Elaboration of such principles will be attempted in two principal ways: first through the development of criteria for evaluating utopian projects as either *constructive* or *destructive*, and second via application of these criteria in the interpretation of two projects proposed as utopian. The criteria for such evaluation derive from Paul Ricoeur who believes that utopias always tend toward either the *pathological* or the *constitutive*. In terms of the architectural visions being discussed here, the *pathological* is *destructive* while the *constitutive* is *constructive*. With these two possibilities suggested by Ricoeur, utopia can be conceptualized as dual, neither *always* constitutive nor *always* pathological but rather as ever tending toward one or the other. Owing to which, Ricoeur describes utopia as having a "a positive and a negative side, a constructive and a destructive side, a constitutive and a pathological dimension."[6]

In consideration of building projects, pathological utopia may be characterized as, or as a demand for, total and immediate implementation with no concern for either existing conditions or the possibility that the project might be improved by partial implementation over time (thus there is no allowance for reconsideration of aims during the course of realization). Ricoeur writes that such projects are characterized by the "projection of frozen models which have be to immediately perfect,"[7] an evaluation mirroring the way the architecture of utopia is generally thought of. Accordingly, utopian projects such as these are escapist, demonstrating "a logic of all or nothing which ignores the labor of time,"[8] referring either to the impossibility of application or to an immediacy of application that renders alteration or improvement impossible. Whether these "frozen models which have to be immediately perfect" (that usually show a "preference for spatial schematisms"[9] are implemented or remain forever on paper, avoidance of the compromises that are *always* a function of realization is common to both. When projects remain on paper they become "a substitute for acting,"[10] "avoiding any kind of verification by concrete action."[11] When implemented, totalizing projects tend toward an attempt to image or construct conditions in which "everything is compatible with everything else;"[12] a condition to be brought about by the dissolution, or attempted dissolution, of all obstacles. The magical thinking that imagines (or attempts to construct) an obstacle free field for the realization of the new city or society is considered by Ricoeur to be "the pathological side of

utopia."[13] Tending toward the deformation of reality by submitting it "to dreams [including the delineation of] self-contained schemas of perfection [that are] severed from the whole course of the human experience of value."[14] This human experience of value could include memory, place identification, the desire for orientation made manifest through continuity and slow considered change, or, more generally, as the attachment of groups and individuals to the existing milieu in all of its aspects. Finally, this approach to action (or inaction, as the case may be) demonstrates "a lack of care for the first steps to be taken in the direction of the ideal city."[15]

A definition of constitutive utopia might simply consist of delineating the opposite of those dimensions that characterize it as pathological. Defined in this way, constitutive utopia could be characterized as a redescription of reality that remains ever flexible and open to the complexities and inconsistencies of implementation without surrendering its vision of the new society or city. Unlike the pathological utopia, the constitutive utopia would embrace action and practice including recognition of obstacles and incompatibility, as well as conflict between goals, as opportunities filled with possibility that could render initial schemes, with their tendency toward schematism, more dense and elastic, such that the result, implemented over time and open to reevaluation, might be constructed within history. Realization of the constitutive utopia might also be forever partial and imperfect and by so being remain attached to the whole course of the human experience of value. Such utopias may submit reality to dreams but with the possibility, not available to pathological utopia, that these dreams may enter and alter reality without deforming it — it is the very "imperfection" of the constitutive utopia, a result of its verification by concrete action, that allows it to remain a valid possibility.

What is emphasized by Ricoeur is utopia's role in opening up possibilities that could alter reality for the better. In its constitutive dimension, utopia establishes a condition during which "The field of the possible is now open beyond the actual; it is a field, therefore, for alternative ways of living"[16] In this view, architecture could be thought of as participating in the structuring of (new) institutions before these have become operative. Buildings and cities as settings of the social can at one and the same time image the social and provide settings for its elaboration. Such possibilities seem to be legible in Ricoeur's suggestion that "the shadow of the forces capable of shattering a given order is already the shadow of an alternative order that could be opposed to the given order. It is the function of utopia to give the force of discourse to this possibility."[17]

The second principal way in which the conception of utopia as having two tendencies will be elaborated is via interpretation of two monuments in Rome: Michelangelo's Campidoglio and Sacconi's monument to Victor Emanuele II (the Vittoriano). Each of these two monuments is proposed as exemplifying one of the two tendencies of utopian architecture.

AGE OF GOLD, UTOPIA, AND THE MYTH OF ROME

The *Vittorio Emanuele II Monument*[18] and the *Piazza del Campidoglio*[19] occupy different sections of the Capitoline Hill, the most important of Rome's seven hills for ancient Romans, as much as for later republicans, and Italian Nationalists.[20] My interpretation of these two constructions is based on how each draws upon a *Golden Age* (conceptions of Ancient Rome) set in a *past* that figures *ideal futures*. Ancient Rome, in addition to being a Golden Age, is posited as Utopia. *Utopia* is thus conceptualized here in terms of an *Age of Gold*. By doing so, I am suggesting that the retrospective and the prospective are bound in formulations of the *ought* and the *good life*. If ideal futures are thought through exemplary pasts, then utopia, in imaging the possible, may be thought to be both fundamentally conservative and bound to memory,[21] in addition to its radical role of redescription of reality. Backward glances toward a golden age are turned forward via the prospective nature of architectural projects. Nostalgia[22] is joined to orientation by situating the individual within the cosmos. Just as gazing back toward Paradise can be a means of organizing productive action in the present, the backward glance of nostalgia can be a means to establishing a critical locus for addressing current conditions, each forming a means for organizing thought about future action, or that action itself.

An idealized vision of *Roma Quadrata*,[23] the earliest settlement of Roman antiquity, became the model for provincial Roman cities and colonies.[24] Idealized remembrances of this original Rome developed into the basis for visions of Rome as utopia.[25] Ever since the ritual founding of the city, Romans (and others) have developed a mythological conception of Rome's earliest existence, a golden age of humble origins periodically appealed to as a means of *guiding* reform when practices become corrupt.[26] The mythic virtues of the early days of Rome have long been fertile territory for the imagination. Roman emperors, Augustus for example, Renaissance artists and humanists, as well as later nationalists, and fascists including Mussolini have all traded in the economy of Roman myth.[27] Rome thus becomes its own Utopia.[28]

Identification with ancient Rome by reform minded Italians increased in direct relationship to the growing desire, particularly during the nineteenth-century, for a unified nation state. Two principal models of Rome developed alongside the emergent desire for both reform and unification. The first model bases Italian purpose upon *Republican virtues*, the second envisions a *new Empire* as grand and influential as that of Caesar or Augustus.[29] The model of Republican virtue inspired Michelangelo and 19th-century reformers including Garibaldi, (who ultimately forged the re-unified Italian state). The model of Imperial Rome inspired Mussolini and Italian Fascism and appears to have motivated the designers of the Vittoriano monument (albeit, apparently, unconsciously).[30] In sum, an idealized vision of Roman antiquity,[31] especially Republican Rome,[32] is the *intended* model for the Campidoglio and the Vittoriano, each is in turn a model for the future, suggesting a possible destiny for Rome and Italy.[33]

Of all sites in Rome signifying its civilizing purpose, the Capitoline Hill[34] does so most emphatically. The Hill was not only the spiritual and civic center (as it remains today) of ancient Rome, it came to represent for Romans the very center of the universe.[35]

The Capitoline was selected, across the span of several hundred years, as the site for the parallel utopias of the Campidoglio and the Vittoriano, in an attempt to embody a similar secular and civic purpose while attempting to partake in the ancient and persistent status of the location. This purpose is founded upon the mythos of Rome generally, but even more specifically upon the particular content believed embodied in the Hill. The Capitoline is understood as a transmitter and representation of sacred, social, and political history. Though separated by centuries, both projects employ similar content in formulating a future via the past in present constructions, one resulting in a felicitous retelling of the city's virtues, while the other has resulted in an inapt attempt to recount the same mythic themes of the site. Whereas Michelangelo's Campidoglio is an optimistic representation of republican sentiment and deep commitment to the virtues and purpose of ancient Rome (he was even given the honor of being made a citizen of Rome on the Capitoline), the Vittoriano represents a confusion of Republican virtues presented in Imperial guise. If the first is constitutive, the second is distorting. What is most different about these two examples is how they interpret the myth of Rome as the basis for the immanent society that each proposes.

CONSTITUTIVE AND PATHOLOGICAL UTOPIA

In this paper, the Campidoglio is argued for as representing *constitutive* utopia, while the Vittoriano is argued for as representing *pathological* utopia. This consideration of parallel utopias located on the same hill facilitates an attempt to distinguish a place for utopia

in architectural imagination that goes beyond acknowledgment that the practice of architecture is *unredeemably utopian* because it always requires a *vision of the good life*. The Vittoriano and the Campidoglio both appeal to notions of Ancient Rome as a kind of paradisaical golden age that each interprets in an attempt to propose a setting for the good life, the specific results of which are neither equal nor of the same kind.

THE CAMPIDOGLIO AS CONSTITUTIVE UTOPIA

Michelangelo imagined the Florentine Republic (no longer existent by the time he designed the Campidoglio) to be a re-animation of ancient Roman virtues. The important symbol of the Capitoline as *topos* of these virtues was not lost to him. His project proposes a Utopian vision of Rome, the mythological basis of which is an idealized past to be reformulated in the future.[36] This can be read out of the structures in many ways: unity, diversity, simplicity and complexity, and the role of the corporeal individual in the initial conception and ultimate occupation of the site, most particularly expressed in the multiple paths open to bodies moving on and around the Hill and in and about the structures. All of this examples a certain individual will contained within a social context. The Capitoline via the Campidoglio becomes a model of secular virtue for cities, mediating between the Church, St. Peter's in the distance, and Roman antiquity, the Forum behind, while emphasizing the Hill's original status as *caput mundi*.

Michelangelo made a virtue of necessity in his conception of the Campidoglio by responding to and utilizing existing conditions and by emphasizing the Hill's symbolic and physical value for Romans (Rome, Italians, and the West). The Campidoglio can be said to be Utopian in that it is a model of urban perfection that remains an exemplary pattern for future attempts that have thus far never equaled the model.[37] The Campidoglio is constitutive of modern (civic and secular) Rome — it is the location of City Hall and other institutions. It images an idealized and possible Rome, becoming a setting for future conceptions of similar desires, while influencing attempts to represent civic and national beliefs in built structures elsewhere. For example, the United States Capitol is on Capitol Hill, the term capitol derives from the Capitoline Hill, and most state capitols in the United States are located on a hill. The word capitol records Michelangelo's emphasis of the Capitoline as the Campidoglio by tying it to ancient Rome, even as he fundamentally reinterpreted both history and city. Another aspect of the Campidoglio rendering it utopian, aside from it being an image of a potential future presented in its construction and occupation, is that Michelangelo's proposals were only partial and little completed under his direction and before his death. The complex was not fully complete for several centuries. The pavement — an image of the cosmos — was finally installed to Michelangelo's designs in 1940.[38] The implications of this, especially because we *know* the whole as Michelangelo's even though it was much altered by the time construction had ended, is that the model remains vital, generative, even constitutive, of future representations of the civic on a local, national and global scale. In sum, Michelangelo has played a role in construing ideal futures, with a specific model, in an open general way, allowing for interpretation and improvised occupation. That the Campidoglio does not allow for copying — the results of which are always doomed — is little indication that it is not constitutive; visions of the world as it might be, represented through architecture (among other arts), entails the imaging of conceptions about a possible future not yet realized such as Michelangelo, in part, patterned.

THE VITTORIO EMANUELE II MONUMENT AS PATHOLOGICAL UTOPIA

Constitutive utopia, then, is a model of the possible that exists within reality — it is responsive to the contradiction of action and the reality of constructing through time. While it may propose an ideal future, the project for a constitutive utopia always displays a remarkable sensitivity for human experiences and values. Although models for architectural utopia may be proposed via a schematic and pure geometry, these are but generative, never meaning to be fixed. Such, I would propose, characterizes the history, envisioning, process of construction, and occupation of the Campidoglio. On the other hand, the Vittoriano displays few if any of the qualities that have been attributed to the Campidoglio. What, though, specifically makes the Vittoriano distorting? Ricoeur, suggesting that pathological utopias can be identified by traits common to *all* such proposals, writes that these demonstrate the following: "A logic of all or nothing which ignores the labor of time, hence the preference for spatial schematisms and the projection of the future in frozen models which have to be immediately perfect, as well as its lack of care for the first steps to be taken in the direction of the ideal city."[39]

Ricoeur's shopping list of things not to be purchased if a constitutive utopia is the objective, is worth sorting out so that architectural and urban projects may be evaluated in terms of a reflexive *ought*. He writes that pathological utopias are made of "a logic of all or nothing." Such rigidity allows for neither re-evaluation nor reformulation. A project characterized by such a logic will be unresponsive to changing conditions over the course of its realization. In so being, "the labor of time" is ignored, revisions are not allowed for. This restriction against revision results in construction of projects that present a *model of the future that is frozen*. Because these kinds of projects are frozen and outside of time and the specificity of lived space, they are prone towards an easy implementation that most often necessitates "spatial schematisms" that tend to be general and abstract. Such projects, insensitive as they are to the ambiguities of desire and the value of the city as a configured pattern, demonstrate a "lack of care." Through total and immediate implementation these projects cannot be concerned with the emotional attachment of individuals to their setting as a space possessed by the collective. In this way, "the first steps to be taken in the direction of the ideal city" are abortive and generally doomed to establishing estrangement between individual and place by distorting what is familiar and orienting.

The modernization of Rome after Italian unification, Mussolini's further attempts to rationalize it during his reign, and even urban renewal in the United States are each examples of pathological utopias. The Vittoriano, because of its smaller scale and symbolic weight, serves as a microcosmic example of such larger scale distortions.

With the implication's of Ricoeur's list in mind, I hope to show how the conception and construction of the Vittoriano leading to its current presence on the south slope of the Capitoline Hill exemplifies *all* of the characteristics attributed to pathological utopia. The imposition of the Vittoriano into the fabric of Rome forever altered the size, shape and disposition of the Capitoline. This was effected through the destruction of ruins and structures that recorded the full extent of human occupation at this location. When the monument was constructed no time was given over to measure or record that which was to be demolished. Additionally, the tower atop the Palazzo Senatorio (one among Michelangelo's contributions to the Campidoglio) was no longer visible from Piazza Venezia or Via del Corso, thus obscuring a crucial figure that had long oriented Romans in their city. Finally, medieval neighborhoods were removed in order to provide access to the building site and the eventual monument. At the very least, the attitude of this monument in its conceptualization and placement as demonstrated above, exhibits "a logic of all or nothing which ignores the labor of time." Sad enough that no allowance was made for preserving that which was to be destroyed; worse yet, no time was set aside to study or document it. This, I think, aside from displaying a monumental arrogance, shows the degree to which the future, to be both made and transmitted by the Vittoriano, was projected as a frozen model intended "to be

immediately perfect." Such a total disregard for the specificity and significance of the intended location of the Vittoriano demonstrates not only a superficial understanding of the Campidoglio, or the Capitoline as symbol, but also an abstractedness of conception that is spatially schematic.[40]

The Vittoriano was originally envisioned to commemorate both Italian unity and Vittorio Emanuele II's role in establishing it. The desire for it was that it should embody and transmit the progressive values of an independent modern Italian state (including secularization and freedom). Yet, in consideration of the degree to which the Monument in both conception and realization is the result of an embodiment of the characteristics Ricoeur attributes to pathological utopia, it is fair to suggest that the whole demonstrates a distortion of the city as artifact and symbol. The same could not be said for Michelangelo's Campidoglio, which threads itself into the city and the memory of the city, reinventing the first while emphasizing the second.

In the whiteness of its stone, the Vittoriano is set apart from the yellowish tones and mellow travertine of Rome. The way in which it insinuates itself into the city and the Capitoline whilst standing aloof through its inaccessibility, renders it paradoxically a bombastic yet mute and distorted telling of the myth of Rome. Though Romans continue to recognize the Capitoline, especially as fixed by the Campidoglio, they are ambivalent about the Vittoriano. Many think it constructed, in fact, by Mussolini; others call it the "wedding cake" or the "typewriter." Few have any sense of its original purpose. It has become instead an over-large monument to the unknown soldier where human beings, in rare moments when present upon it, are but ornaments.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this paper has been to propose that utopia may be either *pathological* or *constitutive*. An attempt has been made to demonstrate that this is so by exemplifying the characteristics of each via two *models* on the same hill — one, a spatial schematism that projects the future via a *frozen model* in which the dissolution of all incompatibility and obstacles has been attempted, the other, owing to its complexity, is at one and the same moment a *model of* and a *model for*, remaining in its constructed reality responsive and ambiguous enough to be a setting for life *as it is* as well as for *how it might become*, thus allowing itself to be occupied in infinite ways.

Finally, the conservative and radical roles of constitutive utopia, exemplified here by the Campidoglio, are summed up by Ricoeur who suggests:

> [That] we can differentiate between "models of" and "models for." "Models of" look toward what is, but "models for" look toward what should be according to the model. The model may reflect what is, but it may pave the way for what it is not. It is this duality of faces that may be constitutive of imagination itself.[41]

NOTES

[1] *Imagination*, for my purposes, is understood much as described in the following: "Imagination," said Apollonius, "wrought these works, a wiser and subtle artist by far than imitation; for imitation can only create as its handiwork what it has seen, but imagination equally what it has not seen; for it will conceive of its ideal with reference to reality, and imitation is often baffled by terror, but imagination by nothing; for it marches undismayed to the goal which it has itself laid down." Apollonius discussing with Nilus and others representations of gods in Philostratus (2nd C. AD), *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, v. II, trans., F. C. Conybeare (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, (1989) 1912), pp. 77,79.

[2] Franco Borsi, *Architecture and Utopia*, Trans. Deke Dusinberre (Paris: Hazan, 1997), p. 10.

[3] Louis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (1922) (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 25.

[4] Among the many definitions of Utopia, three helpful ones have been proposed by Northrop Frye, "Varieties of literary Utopias," in *Utopias and Utopian Thought* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co), p. 26; Henri Baudet, *Paradise on Earth: Some Thoughts on European Images of Non-European Man*, trans. E. Wentholt (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, (1988) 1959), p. 32; and Frank E. Manuel, "Toward a Psychological History of Utopias," in *Utopias and Utopian Thought* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.), p. 70.

[5] Lynda H. Schneekloth, "Introduction," *Journal of the Society for Utopian Studies* 9/1 (1998), p. v.

[6] Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 1.

[7] Paul Ricoeur, "Ideology and Utopia as Cultural Imagination," *Philosophic Exchange* 2 (1976), 26.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 1-2.

[12] Ibid., p. 296.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Paul Ricoeur, "Ideology and Utopia as Cultural Imagination," *Philosophic Exchange* 2 (1976), 26.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 16.

[17] Paul Ricoeur, "Ideology and Utopia as Cultural Imagination," *Philosophic Exchange* 2 (1976), p. 24.

[18] (1885-1911), initiated by Count Guiseppe Sacconi and completed by others.

[19] (1539-1592), initiated by Michelangelo and completed by others.

[20] The Capitoline remains of symbolic and ideological importance for Italians, representing, in part, their sense of national identity and cultural purpose, especially as these are bound up with the genius of Roman antiquity.

[21] For Bachelard, as succinctly presented in his essay *The Oneiric House*, it is not the actual remembered that we long for, it is rather how people, places, things and events are *actually* remembered, even if never experienced that way in external reality, that charges what is longed for with nostalgia for an ideal past. In this way, the future is figured conservatively because, in Bachelard's terms, I look backward toward it. See Gaston Bachelard, "The Oneiric House," in *Architecture Culture: 1943-1968*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Rizzoli, 1993), pp. 111-113.

[22] Nostalgia derives from the Greek *nostos*, a return, combined with the Greek *algos*, pain, and *algien*, to feel pain. Together they denote an intense longing for home (which is analogous to womb and earth). The constructed home is as much the locus of nostalgia as the land of its location (more likely the *ideal* than the *existent* of either). Nostalgia is also a longing for some thing or some place distant in space and/or time representing happy circumstances imagined as continuing to exist in that place and/or age. Such nostalgia was common to thoughts about the location of Paradise prior to its replacement by Utopia. See, for example, Henri Baudet, *Paradise on Earth: Some Thoughts on European Images of Non-European Man*, trans. E. Wentholt (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, (1988) 1959), p. 32; see also John Delumeau, "Chapter 3: The Earthly Paradise and Medieval Geography," in *History of Paradise: The Garden of Eden in Myth and Tradition*, trans. M. O'Connell (New York: Continuum, 1995), pp. 39-70. See also Manuel and Manuel, "Sketch for a Natural History of Paradise," Daedalus, Winter (1972), pp. 83-128.

[23] As with much about Rome, *Roma Quadrata* resists easy explanation. for a description rich in complexity see Joseph Rykwert's, constructed via his readings of ancient sources: "*Quadrata*, then, is no guide to the shape of the primitive outline of the Palatine city, and offers no explanation, as a ritual term, of the way the *pomoerium* [a line drawn after or beside the town walls emphasizing them as sacrosanct] was drawn... Until the end of the Republic... the city would have been said to be *quadrata* in two in two ways its urban territory was divided into four districts, and its central— in constitutional, not geometric terms— areas of assembly of assembly were certainly consecrated and perhaps even geometrically regular (Rykwert, *Idea of a Town*, Cambridge: MA, MIT Press, (1988) 1976), pp. 98-99.

[24] For example, Rykwert writes: "Every town-founder was always a stand-in for Romulus: because every town, every foundation, was a re-iteration of Rome." Joseph Rykwert, "Preface to the Paper Edition," in *Idea of a Town* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, (1988) 1976). This was so even if the Rome these new towns were re-iterating looked nothing like the *original*. The ritual founding of these cities was the *same* as the founding of Rome— they were not so much representations of Rome as reenactments of its foundation.

[25] See Ronald S. Cunsolo, *Italian Nationalism: From its Origins to World War II* (Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger, 1990), p. 13. Note the following: "Petrarch once asked, "what is history, but the praise of Rome?"...Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) declared he would never advise deviating, in any human undertaking, from the venerable model provided by " his "*Romans in the Art of War* (Book 1)." Peter Bondanella, *The Eternal City: Roman Images in the Modern World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), p. 3.

[26] "[Rome] had durability and based position and power not so much on ethnicity as on Roman citizenship, available to all according to the dictates of political prudence, social peace, and good will. This daring experiment in an international system of law and order presided over by Rome was not easily forgotten... The Pope, the Bishop of Rome, was spiritually revered as the Vicar of Christ and by many of the devotees as the authentic political descendent of the Caesars... Bonaface VIII, Pope between 1294 -1303, frequently substituted the imperial dress and regalia for papal vestments "I am Pope, I am Caesar" was his characteristic explanation... [Mazzini believed that] Italy, with her third appearance following the Roman Empire and the Medieval Church, was to lead the world to brotherhood under God. The purpose of the new Italy was to bring about the liberation of all peoples and make possible their incorporation within a supra national order, which would promote perpetual peace and unlimited progress." Ronald S. Cunsolo, *Italian Nationalism: From its Origins to World War II* (Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger, 1990), pp. 9-11, 18.

[27] "Decisive in shaping Roman humanist views was their perception of the city not as a human community, not as a political society where classical notions of the *polis* and the ethico-political values of citizenship forged purpose and meaning, but rather as the capital, the *urbs terrarum orbis* (global city) and *arx omnium gentium* (citadel of all peoples) as Biondo said, citing Cicero. Sacred to both civilization and Christianity, Rome's foundation and destiny transcended human comprehension. Such an outlook meant that ritual, ceremony, and myth overwhelmed rational inquiry." Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press), p. 72.

[28] Stinger writes: "Poggio for instance, in his *De varietate fortunae* remarks that Rome once was so beautiful and magnificent that the ancients held it to be "*non urbem, sed quasi quandam caeli partem*" (not a city, but almost a part of heaven)..." Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press), p. 73.

[29] "At the core of the myth of Rome are two diametrically opposed models of political ethical behavior; a virtuous Roman republic defended by stalwart citizen-soldiers and ever vigilant guardians of public liberty, on the one hand; and a corrupted empire, on the other, whose citizens are occupied by an overriding lust for power, lust for wealth, or lust pure and simple." (Peter Bondanella, *The Eternal City Roman Images in he Modern World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), p. 4.

[30] Since the fall of Rome it has inspired universalizing movements, including the Roman Church that took up many of the social responsibilities left unattended by the demise of the Western Empire. Charlemagne, Napoleon, Mussolini and Hitler, among many others, were inspired by Rome. The United States of America is modeled upon Republican Rome, it has also been influenced by the infrastructural capacities of the Empire (among other qualities). Stambaugh writes: "Rome the religious world city is heir to Rome the political world city; it was *caput mundi*, 'head of the world.' In addition, the space of the city was conceived as a model of the world, and was so defined in foundation rituals." John E. Stambaugh, *The Ancient Roman City* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1988), p. 3.

[31] The seductiveness of Rome is evoked in the following description of its effect on its Renaissance occupants: "Diabolical, malevolent, sinful, and sinister, yet also civilized, splendid, miraculous, and holy— these were the alternate faces of Rome that stirred the fears and hopes, nightmares and dreams, of its Renaissance beholders. Just, too, as many strata of this palimpsest city loosened its inhabitants' grasp on present realities; so in the same way, did Janus-headed Rome, heir to the myths of its two-thousand-year past and divinely destined to a transcendent future, mesmerize its adherents with seductive visions of supernal glory." Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), p. 82.

[32] "In republican times it [Rome] came to encompass the whole Mediterranean world in a system of domination and made a Roman empire which provided a framework and cradle for much still shaping our lives today... To the very end of the story, Romans would look back sentimentally to the simpler days of the early Republic as the times when the Roman virtues were upheld by the independent small holding citizens... The Romans liked to congratulate themselves for following what they called *mos maiorum*—"the ways of our ancestors" would be a reasonable translation of this Latin phrase. They always showed a fondness for old traditions and liked to keep alive old ways of doing things... Roman power brought peace for longer periods to a larger area of the Mediterranean and Near East than ever before. Republican administration imposed order over many peoples and provided a common law. Many non-Romans who lived under Roman rule admired at least some of those who ran the system for their sense of justice, disinterestedness and the civilizing work they did...Classical antiquity became a myth of what civilization could and men ought to be. It is why, like their medieval predecessors, modern men too walk among the ruins of the great past and still find them amazing." J. M. Roberts, *A Short History of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, (1997) 1993), pp. 129, 131-132, 133, 155.

[33] A future as much universal as it is local, derived from the objectives of Roman common law, *Pax Romana*, and the Roman Catholic Church, each a model of virtue for the whole world— and imaged in these two projects.

[34] To have an indication of the degree to which the Capitoline (before Michelangelo's intervention and placement of the Vittoriano into it) figured in and figured the life of Rome and its perception of itself, see the two following short histories of the site: Alta Macadam, *Blue Guide: Rome and Environs*, Third Edition (London: A. & C. Black, (1985) 1975), p. 55; and Christo-

pher Woodward, *The Buildings of Europe: Rome* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), p. 80.

[35] Ackerman writes: "The ancient Romans moved the umbilicus mundi [naval of the world] figuratively from Delphi to the Forum, where it remained until medieval legend shifted it once more to the Campidoglio." James Ackerman, "The Capitoline Hill," in *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, Second Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1986) 1970), p. 169.

[36] Ackerman writes:"...the Campidoglio was a monumental symbol in which the haunting dream of ancient grandeur became concrete." James Ackerman, "The Capitoline Hill," in *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, Second Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1986) 1970), p. 160.

[37] Examples of such failed attempts include civic centers, such as Boston City Hall Plaza and Lincoln Center in New York. A more successful interpretation of the Campidoglio, though representative of corporate rather than civic values, is Rockefeller Center in New York.

[38] Stinger describes the Campidoglio as follows: "The enclosed unity of this sacred space— more like a room open to the sky than a city square— was underlined by the long access ramp and the balustrade, adorned by sculpture, which demarcated the front parapet. Visitors ascended to the Piazza del Campidoglio as pilgrims to the symbolic focal point of eternal Rome, *caput mundi*... Indeed the monuments potency is subtly enhanced by the optical effects of the obliquely positioned symmetrical palaces, which produce the anti-perspective result of compressing space toward the viewer rather than the illusion of spatial depth. The convex oval pavement, divided by an elaborate curvilinear grid into twelve compartments implies a cosmological symbolism. In fact, as Ackerman suggests, it evokes the legendary shield of Achilles, which was adorned by celestial signs, and was adopted by Alexander the Great along with the epithet *Kosmokrator* (ruler of the Universe). This title and the shield subsequently became emblems of the Roman emperors." Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), p. 262, 264.

[39] Paul Ricoeur, "Ideology and utopia as Cultural Imagination," in *Philosophic Exchange*, V. 2 (1976), p. 25.

[40] My interpretation of the Vittoriano is dependent on first hand experience; historical elaboration and deepening of my thought is indebted in particular to: Daniele Manacorda and Renato Tamassia, *Il piccone Del regime* (Roma, Armando Curcio Editore, 1985), esp. pp. 128-135; Luigi Barzini, *The Italians* (New York: Atheneum, 1964), esp. pp. 85-88; and Peter Greenaway's film *The Belly of an Architect*— which clearly images the Vittoriano as a pathological Utopia akin to those dreamed up but never realized by Boullée. My interpretation of the Campidoglio is dependent on first hand experience and is also indebted to the work of Ackerman and De Tolnay on Michelangelo.

[41] Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (1975), (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 311.