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PLUS: News from Yakutsk, Mecca,
New York, and the island of Surat Thani...

Societies without change aren't authentic; they're just dead.
January 1, 2006

14° 20' N, 108° 29' W
Quemado, New Mexico
A log cabin at the edge of Walter De Maria's Lightning Field (1977) is a way station for modern-day pilgrims eager to see lightning dance between the 400 polished stainless-steel poles the artist laid out in a grid, stretching one mile by one kilometer in the New Mexico desert. The installation's ordered footprint contrasts with the surrounding natural environment; its rationality reminds visitors that ever since the machine forcefully invaded the American garden, there is no "natural" landscape. Similarly, the seeming rusticity of the Quemado log cabin belies other regional histories. The "Land of Enchantment" (emblazoned on the New Mexico license plate) was also home to the first detonation of the atomic bomb, at Trinity Site on July 16, 1945, which is today preserved as part of the White Sands National Monument. De Maria's fusion of science and landscape yields a kind of techno-pastoral sublime that suggests the peaceful deployment of technology to harness not only nature's potentially destructive power, but man's as well.
thing wrong? And, if so, what? Thermometers, insulin meters, ovulation sticks, or online quizzes might help. It is
easy for doubt to invade. Is this malaise from home or work?
It is hard to separate the two: family life, that is, home work,
compounds with and amplifies the bodily effects of paid
work. Where does work end? Where does the inside become
the outside? Such elisions are often unspoken, insidious,
and creeping. Unruly privileged bodies are rejoined to the
dispossessions that make the outside. The materials, prod-
ucts, and forces which assemble to form the inside are not
fully contained there, just as the fantasy of a fully protec-
table biocitizenship is never realizable. The physical accumu-
lations that make up the inside are conjured in immense investments
that stretch out along commodity chains to factories in Dhaka,
or along the petroleum corridor to Cancer Alley in
Louisiana, or along agribusiness itineraries to the lives of
migrant laborers in California’s Central Valley. In fact, the
closer the inside is examined, the more tangled with dis-
investments, the more latent with uncertainty, the more inter-
connected and deadly it becomes. Look closely and the inside
dissolves into contingencies just at the moment it is rein-
forced.

The privileged, cosmopolitan inside, then, is about both
expulsion and capture. Not only is the luxury of the inside
physically crafted by dispossession elsewhere (and sometimes
even an elsewhere close by), not only has the production of
this inside been generative of enormous alterations to the
entire planet, with pollution clouds as large as countries and
oceans stripped of life while their levels rise in climatic
shifts, not only has this privileged built environment been
assembled out of new chemicals that have repopulated the
molecular atmosphere and permeated the micrological
crevices of living-being, but also the unruly effects of this
containment — its exposures of both affluence and abandon-
ment, of investment and withdrawal — have themselves also
become grist for reconstructing the inside and managing
biocitizenship. Sickness needs drugs, destruction requires
rebuilding, wastelands provoke development. Exposure and
the inside carved in endless embrace.

Michelle Murphy is an associate professor in the History
Department and the Women and
Gender Studies Institute at the
University of Toronto. She is
the author of Sick Building
Syndrome and the Problem of
Uncertainty: Environmental
Politics, Technoscience, and
Women Workers.

I’ve heard about . . .
(a flat, fat, growing
urban experiment)

What the people of Stateless had in common: not merely the island
itself, but the first-hand knowledge that they stood on rock which
the founders had crystallized out of the ocean — and which was,
forever, dissolving again, only enduring through a process of con-
stant repair. Beneficent nature had nothing to do with it; conscious
human effort, and cooperation, had built Stateless . . . the balance
could be disturbed in thousands ways . . . All that elaborate
machinery had to be monitored, had to be understood . . . . It had
one undeniable advantage over all the contrived mythology of
nationhood. It was true.

— Greg Egan, Distress

Foreword

The contemporary city’s developmental tools manifest the
tyranny of tightly scripted, deterministic procedures — plan-
ning mechanisms based on predictability. The city’s entropic
growth and densification are driven by preset and invariable
geometrical projections. Urban morphological transforma-
tions are supposed to follow closed scenarios that cannot
deviate from the preprogrammed representations on which
they are based. Thus the cartography of the city’s becoming
is fettered by a mode of production that sees the future as
already written. Everything yet to come is spelled out in
advance and tightly locked up by that forecast.

The contemporary (European) city is formatted under
Windows, unable to access the programming source codes —
its Linux.

There is no reason to believe that the “everything under
control” operating modes that condition the production of
urban structures are capable of reflecting the complexities
(the intertwining of issues and relational modes) of a mass
media society, where the multitude of citizens is gradually
taking over the republic’s centralized authorities.

The city’s making suffers from a deficit of democracy
and the abuse of tools that date back to a time when the
reason of the few presided over the destiny of the many.
The city's very constitution is impermeable to the social shifts brought about by the dilution and fragmentation of informational and productive mechanisms. Free market space was constructed in terms of social control, and the contemporary city retains and reveals the stigmata of that construction.

Can we envision something totally different: urban structures driven by human contingencies? Can we work out adaptive scenarios that accept unpredictability and uncertainty as operating modes? Can we write the city based on growth scripts and open algorithms porous to a number of realtime inputs (human, relational, conflictual, and other data) rather than trying to design an urban future formatted by rigid planning procedures?

THE SOCIAL AND TERRITORIAL CONTRACT

I've heard about is a fractal structure made quite literally of contingent secretions. Its architecture is based on the principles of random growth and permanent incompletion. It develops by successive scenarios, without the authority of a plan. Its physical composition renders the community's political structure visible.

The proliferating, corallike network is constituted of both imported raw materials and local materials that have been recycled, synthesized, and polymerized, resources arising from the animal and vegetable species that inhabit it. Operating anthroposophically, it generates modes and vessels of exchange and flow.

I've heard about recognizes and builds on an ever-emerging, shifting, and, above all, fragile sociality. Growth is based on negotiations between neighbors and other residents, and is at the same time subjected to collective constraints of accessibility and structural contradictions. Section by section, the raw materials of the inhabitants undergo necrosis every 10 years in order to avoid an overly permanent occupation and an attendant sense of individual ownership (the early cycles will be more aleatory).

I've heard about does not eradicate the preexisting city but rather forms a sedimentary deposit over it.

I'VE HEARD ABOUT...

1. Rumors

I've heard about something that builds up only through heterogeneous and contradictory scenarios, something that rejects even the idea of a prediction of its form of growth or future typology.

Something shapeless grafted onto existing tissue, that needs no vanishing point to justify itself, but instead embraces a quivering existence immersed in a real time vibratory state, in the here and now.

Tangled and intertwined, it seems to be a city, or rather a fragment of a city. Its inhabitants enjoy its immunity because they are both the vectors and the protectors of this complexity. The multiplicity of its experiences and forms is equal to the apparent simplicity of its mechanisms.

This urban form does not depend on arbitrary decisions or the control of its emergence exercised by a few, but rather comes out of the ensemble of its individual contingencies. It ceaselessly subsumes premises, consequences, and an ensemble of induced perturbations. Its laws exist in the substance of the place itself, with no input of memory.

Many different stimuli have contributed to the emergence of I've heard about, and they are constantly reloaded. Its existence is inexorably linked to the end of grand narratives, the objective recognition of climatic changes, a suspicion of all morality (even ecological), the vibration of social phenomena, and the urgent need to renew democratic mechanisms. Fiction is its reality principle: What you see before your eyes conforms to the true urban condition of I've heard about.

Does it have a moral law or social contract that could extract us from reality, protect us from it, or prevent us from living there? No. The neighborhood protocol of I've heard about does not escape the risk of being in this world. The inhabitants draw sustenance from the present, instantaneously, without a time lag. The form of the territorial structure draws its sustenance directly from the present.

I've heard about also arises from anguishes and anxieties. It's not a shelter against threats, or an insulated, isolated place, but remains open to all transactions. It is a zone of emancipation, produced so that we can keep the origins of its founding act eternally alive, so that we can always live with and reexperience the beginning.

Made of invaginations and knotted geometries, life forms are embedded within it. Its growth is artificial and synthetic, owing nothing to chaos or the formlessness of nature. It is based on very real processes that generate the raw materials and operating modes of its evolution.

The public sphere is everywhere, like a pulsating organism driven by postulates that are contradictory but nonetheless true. The rumors and scenarios that carry the seeds of its future mutations negotiate with the vibratory time of new territories.
It is impossible to name all of the elements that comprise I've heard about, or to perceive in its totality, because it belongs to the many, to the multitude. Only fragments can be extracted from it.

The world is terrifying when it is intelligible, when it clings to some semblance of predictability, when it seeks to preserve a false coherence. In I've heard about, it is what is not there that defines it, that guarantees its readability, its social and territorial fragility, and its indeterminacy.

2. Neighborhood protocol

The urban structure I've heard about is an inhabitable organism (colorplate 1). It develops by means of adaptive, transitory scenarios in which the operational mode is uncertainty. It is written based on growth scripts and open algorithms that remain permeable not only to human expressions (expressions of individuality, relational, conflictual, and transactional modes, etc.), but also to the most discrete data, such as the chemical emissions of those who inhabit it. This biostructure makes visible human contingencies and their negotiation in real time. Due to its modes of emergence, its fabrication cannot be delegated to a political power that would deny its exchange procedures and design its contours in advance, either through mnemonics or coercion.
5. Nanoreceptors - 1. Nanoparticles (NP) are used to capture and detect the presence of a chemical substance in a particular atmosphere. 2. Nanoreceptors can be induced, making it possible to "sniff" the chemical state of the human body. 2. Functioning like pollen, they are concentrated in the bronchi and attach themselves to the blood vessels, making it possible for them to detect traces of stress hormones carried by hemoglobin. As they come into contact with this substance, the membrane of the NP dissolves and releases molecules that are rejected by the respiratory tract, and detected using cavity ring-down spectroscopy (CRDS). This optical analysis makes it possible to measure the density of airborne molecules. 3. Consequently, the nanoreceptors keep the Fiab informed of the ambient stress level.

6. Swarm intelligence, 1. Term designating a form of behavior characterized by the absence of central control or overall architecture. On the basis of simple rules for individual behavior, swarm intelligence makes it possible, for example, to understand and simulate cloud phenomena, that is the behavior of clusters of individuals in movements that are reactive to obstacles and avoid all collisions, whether between individuals or with the geographic features through which they travel. 2. By extension, said of a human society that adapts a biotrusture as a social protocol. The citizens of such a biotrusture are both individuals of a swarm (including the Fiab) and creatures who write the rules in the hope that the Fiab will better carry out the task assigned to it, the production of an indeterminate inhabitable structure.

2. Biocitizens
2.0 The mere pact of being present in the biotrusture confers citizenship rights. This is a general principle.
2.1 Consequently, the nature of the contract is territorial.
2.1.1 Citizens may appropriate a space, extend and transform it, and then destroy it.
2.1.2 Citizens of the biotrusture agree that their requests (for growth, transformation, repairs, etc.) be submitted to the influence of the chemical stimuli of the multiheap.
2.2 The protocol for exchanges between citizens and the biotrusture is freely renewable. It is cancelled if the citizen leaves.
2.3 All citizens are ipso facto owners.
2.4 All rules apply to citizens as long as they reside in the biotrusture.
2.5 For operating instructions and departure procedures (USE, a.o).

1. Self-alienation
1.0 Citizens agree to become part of a particular social body so as to share physiological information.
1.1 These presychic stimuli constitute the second type of inputs, that is, the internal.
1.2 These stimuli arising from the chemical secretions of the multitude of bodies affect the construction logic of the Fiab. They are the vectors of its shared reality.
1.3 "Harvesting" takes place through the intermediary of nanoreceptors dispersed throughout the confines of the biotrusture and inhabited by the citizens. 1.3.1 The nanoreceptors' lifespan is 14 hours. Once this time frame is over they automatically deactivate and are eliminated by the organism.
1.3.2 The anonymity of chemical data is a general principle.
1.4 Visitors to the biotrusture disturb its equilibrium by the mere pact of entering its atmosphere.
1.5 Biocitizens are agents making up a reticular mode of political organization. The resulting unstable equilibrium produces a social mode for which the neighborhood protocol is both a precondition and a condition.
1.6 The indigenous behavior is comparable to a kind of collective intelligence called swarm intelligence. 1.6.1 The chemical interface with citizens, that is, the Fiab, infuses, amalgamates, and contractualizes this political biochemistry.

4. Biopolitics
4.0 The social structure conforms to the territorial structure.
4.1 Creative individualism is a general principle.
4.2 Cohabitation is not based on static principles but rather on a constant interaction between citizens, noncitizens, and the biotrusture.
4.3 No one may oppose the arrival of a new citizen and the resulting growth. This is a general principle.
4.4 In the same way, no one may oppose the voluntary departure of a citizen, or invoke a protocol rule against a citizen or a group to demand their departure.
4.5 Each citizen is free to choose their degree of participation and involvement in the life and growth of the biotrusture.
4.6 Citizens have access to the data that condition the evolution of the biotrusture in all its social aspects. They may propose a modification on the local, metlocal, or overall level, and submit it to the multitude by means of the electronic networks running throughout the structure.

4.5.1 Accessing the data means interacting with the structure and being statistically recorded.
4.5.2 There are no preconditions for access to the database.
4.5.3 The database is a reactive interface: it serves simultaneously as a data bank of all entered proposals, receptor of individual feedback, and space where the induced growth can be visualized.
4.5.4 The resulting ensemble of feedback is transmitted to the Fiab.
4.5.5 The ensemble constitutes the city's morphological script.
4.5.6 Individual proposals via the networks can be made at any time. They are freely voluntary and not occasioned by any predetermined program.
4.6.1 In any proposal, the elements of a situation are brought together on an experimental basis. Proposals are speculative tools.
4.6.2 A proposal may be submitted anonymously via the biotrusture network. The collection of individual feedback in electronic form is a general principle.
4.6.3 A proposal is an operative tool. It can only be applied dynamically. This makes the movement a precondition of the social experience.
4.6.4 A proposal is also a biopolitical tool. It cannot be formulated in a way that implies a delegation of political power in any form. This is a general principle.
4.7 The collection of feedback makes it possible both to judge the pertinence of the proposal and to call for its adoption or rejection. However, approval and disapproval are not the only possible results in this mechanism. The absence of feedback by more than a third of all citizens renders the proposal null and void.
4.7.1 Nevertheless, no proposal can be permanently rejected. Its reformulation is considered a legitimate renegotiation with the biotrusture.
4.8 Any proposal may be presented in two forms simultaneously, one constitutive and permanent, the other experimental and temporary.
4.9.1 Any proposal dismissed in its constitutive version but temporarily approved can be applied on an experimental basis for a period to be defined in the proposal itself. The biotrusture is to be consulted again at the end of the experiment.
4.8.1 A group of citizens may choose the manner in which to put an approved experiment into practice. By definition, this will require specific growth.

4.8.2 In this case and only in this case, the experiment and the rhizomes thus generated can be rejected or made to be by the residents of these rhizomes.

4.8.2.1 The preceding is valid as long as these rhizomes do not overturn any general principles.

4.8.2.2 The concept of a rhizome extends beyond its physical existence.

4.9 Because of the social and territorial modifications implied in any proposal challenging one of the basic principles, in order to be adopted (see Open Source 4.1) such a proposal must be reappraised on two occasions, stated the same way as the original proposal.

4.10 To be approved, a proposal must be shared by a relative localized majority at a time (t).

4.11 A relative localized majority is composed of a group of (n) citizens living contingently.

4.12 The structure as a whole, and of all of its subgroups is by definition a set of relative localized majorities.

5. Open source

5.0 Open source is a political and geographic tool.

5.1 To recapitulate, the Feb's construction behavior is generated by a growth algorithm which itself is the result of the malleability of the two inputs, the chemical and the electronic. See [Entropies, 1.6].

5.1.1 All citizens may access the source code upon establishing residence in the biosphere. The source code contains the operating rules: the growth process and the transactional rules. General principles can only be modified under the restrictive conditions defined in point 4.8.

5.1.2 The accessibility of the Feb's source code makes it possible to avoid the implicit pitfalls entailed by its very existence. See [Anomalies, 8.6].

5.1.3 The modification of the source code within the framework of transactions provided for requires an -proposals. The implementation of the code modifications thus decided is the only way the Feb is to be reprogrammed.

5.1.4 All operating rules, no matter what kind, can only be understood as variables (environmental, social, and construction) modifiable via collective proposals. They are approved electronically and are chemically perturbed – see [Self-organization].

5.1.5 Reprogramming of Feb that violates this principle or one of the general principles challenges the very structure of society.

5.1.6 If this hypothetical step is taken, the Feb ceases to function in terms of construction and repairs. It becomes deactivitated, a residue of the structure.

5.1.7 Nevertheless, following a prolonged deactivation the citizens may reinitialize the Feb's parameters. By exercising this option they return to the Feb heard about neighborhood protocol.

6. Uses

6.1 The dimensions of the structures and their growth along X-X-Z coordinates depend directly on their localization and the structural limits of the arborescence.

6.2 A new citizen may adopt one of two residence modes: "Entropic," which consists of negotiating growth with the structure. "Nomadic," which consists of borrowing an abandoned cell. In
both cases, the \textit{Year} is to carry out the transformations.

6.3 The economic transaction of production/transformation takes place through the purchase of a "time credit" allowing the utilization of the \textit{Year}.

6.4 A time credit may be acquired in exchange for demanded services, like being a production mode of transaction contractualized with the biostucture.

6.5 All citizens are obligated to develop a three-story habitable space comprising an underground cellar and an attic above the ground floor, no matter how small. Flat, single-story residences are prohibited. This is a general rule.

6.6 The first phase of residence is nomadic. A cell is developed using a residence kit. This includes, among other things, a light, polymeric envelope that adapts to the morphological configuration of the empty cell. See (Processes).

6.7 Citizens are completely free to modify, transform, or adapt this initial envelope or even to solidify it with the material of their choice. Note that only vertical walls are permanent. The \textit{Year} can modify and procreate horizontal structures (ceilings and floor). Any use of these cells is allowed, for private or public use or services.

6.8 The transformation of a residence for a different use is negotiable with the adjoining cells. A new mini-neighborhood protocol is drawn up.

6.9 This mini-neighborhood protocol serves to define the ensemble of shared social elements. The duration of the validity of this contract depends on the effective and corporal presence of the signatory parties.

6.10 When they leave a cell, citizens are obligated to return it to its original state, or, in other words, to destroy all of the permanent structures they have erected during their residence. An explicit agreement honored by the new resident of a transformed cell makes this requirement null and void.

7. Scripts

To recapitulate: the structure's morphogenesis is driven by collectively reprogrammable Years. Thus the details of the construction algorithm are only provisionally valid.

7.1 The Year's general principle is structural maintenance.

7.1.1 The \textit{Year} infers local structural constraints from the data furnished by the information network that runs through the biostucture.

7.1.2 A structural inability to respond to a request leads the \textit{Year} to emit (and possibly itself process) a request for supporting growth.

7.2 Available natural light and energy resources are taken into account in the processes of growth by local aggregation and secretion. Growth is particularly facilitated in the structure's convex regions and density is limited by diminishing energy.

7.3 The algorithm of the \textit{Year}'s movements is described in terms of two levels of abstraction of the reticular structure: wire frame representation and its combinatorial graphing.

7.4 Citizens' requests for growth and maintenance and requests for structural reinforcement (support) originated by the \textit{Year} are specialized by the electronic network. Emitted in one place, they are distributed along the topology of the reticular structure in a gradient whose intensity grows over time.

7.5 The \textit{Year} acquires requests through these intensity gradients transposed into the preexisting combinatoric graph of the neighborhood.

7.6 The primacy of structural maintenance leads the \textit{Year} to constantly inspect the structure. The gradients linked to requests and the chemical stimuli respectively act as drift factors and disturbances in this inert.

7.6.1 The \textit{Year}'s current technological limitations make a phased movement algorithm necessary. During this movement, the \textit{Year} uses a virtual Ariadne's thread anchored in a rare point in the biostucture.

7.6.2 The impossibility of even a relatively short-term plan introduces an aleatory element into the \textit{Year}'s algorithm for spontaneous movement.

7.6.3 The \textit{Year}'s regular coverage of the entire structure is ensured not despite but because of this aleatory element in the movement algorithm.

8. Anomalies

8.1 The \textit{Year} is directly affected by the vibrations produced by the superimposition of two types of stimuli. See (Entropies).

8.2 Consequently, their heterogeneous combination disturbs the construction algorithm and engenders topological, aesthetic, and structural disturbances.

8.3 These aberrations, deviations, and atavisms, the disorders generated by the \textit{Year}'s morphological speculations, are intrinsic to its operation.

8.4 There are several types of morphological pathologies:

- Malformations due to deficiencies, cysts, cankers, protruberances, occlusions, etc.
- Degeneration due to necrosis, erosion, fishes, dehiscences, etc.

8.5 These malformations modify the nature of the constructed incisions and alter the definition of familiar geographies.

8.6 Nevertheless, the only malformations the \textit{Year} seeks to repair or deprogram are those that endanger the stability of all or a part of the biostucture.
AFFECTIVE SUBSTANCES

I remember...

The island of Utopia, which in its middle part, where it was the broadest, extended for some 200 miles, and then progressively shrank.10

I remember...

That the Paris Commune represented the only realization of revolutionary urbanism, attacking, on the ground, the petrified signs of the dominant organization of life, recognizing social space in political terms, never believing that a monument can be innocent. . . . The whole space was occupied by the enemy . . . . The dawn of an authentic urban planning, created in the areas left empty by that occupation. That's where what was called construction then and which we call by the same name today began.11

That liberal space was constructed in terms of social control, and that the contemporary 20th-century city retained all the stigmata of that.12 That the reason for the crisis of European civilization and its imperial practices consists in the fact that European virtue—or really its aristocratic morality organized in the institu-

tions of modern sovereignty—cannot manage to keep pace with the vital powers of mass democracy.13

I remember . . .

That we could no longer live in a white rectangle, on a blank sheet of paper, but in regions, in passing, open and closed. . . . That there were places that were completely different, counter-spaces, heterotopias, that only children know and master: the attic, the têpe, the parents' big bed. . . . places of drift, the unknown, fear and myth.14

That modern lodging was a place to which undesirable guests practically never had access. That the "toxic people," as they were called then, were supposed to keep out, and with them, if possible, bad news as well. That this lodging was nothing but an ignorance machine or an integral instrument of defense, where the basic right of nonrespect toward the exterior world found its architectural pillar.15

That at the beginning of the past century, everything was going well, and then once again the walls became porous, the chairs flexible, the floor rubbery, and it was necessary to go forward. It was a vicious circle. The more the house progressed, the more one had to advance at one's own pace, to find a new apartment. . . . to accept the speculations of the electronic brains about time, light, morals, food . . . From now on they were condemned to progress.16

That the verticality was assured by the polarity from the basement to the attic . . . that one always went down the stairs to the basement, that one went up and down the stairs to the bedroom. . . . that but that one could only go up the steeper stairs to the attic. . . . When I return to my dreams of these attics, I never go down again.17

I remember . . .

That the search for a unit of a movement already under way had become a prerequisite.18

That nostalgia had become a weapon.19

That only an ethico-political articulation—which was called ecology—was plausible. It was invented step by step between three ecological domains, the environment, social relationships, and human subjectivity.20

That the question of time and of determinism was no longer
limited to the sciences alone, at the heart of Western thought since the beginning... subsequently no one confused science with certitude any longer, or probability with ignorance. 21

What had to be absorbed was, specifically, the production of locality, or, in other words, social machines that had to create and recreate identities and differences understood as local... as in a regime of heterogenization.22

Rimbau's “Music of the Swarm.” 23

That in the real world, which no longer exists, it was more important that a proposition be interesting than real.24

I remember... That the idea of a necessary mediation, a kind of social contract, was essentially based on a juridical conception of the world, as elaborated by Hobbes, Rousseau, and Hegel. For Spinoza, on the contrary, forces were inseparable from a spontaneity and a productivity that made their development possible without mediation, that is, their composition. They were elements of socialization in and of themselves. Spinoza thought directly in terms of “the multitude” and not individuals, in a conception... of physical and dynamic composition in opposition to the juridical contract... Bodies were conceptualized as forces. As such, they were defined not only by their random encounters and collisions (state of crisis); they were defined by relationships between an infinite number of parts making up each body, which already characterized that body as “a multitude.” 25

I remember... That in the end the whole system evolved over time toward a paradoxical and spontaneous increasing disorder, without ever reaching a state of equilibrium.26

That even at that time an artwork was not considered an artwork anymore if it was situated outside all relationships, outside of any context. That we presuppose precisely that the artwork had to situate itself within these relationships, but even before situating it in these terms, as a precondition we had to define these same relationships.27

Roma Macchiata: The Stain of White

Early on in Bernardo Bertolucci's 1970 antifascist film Il Conformista (The Conformist), the main character, dressed in a suit, walks alongside a retaining wall inscribed with the words from Rea Garretti Divi Augusti, Emperor Augustus's list of achievements while princes of the Roman Empire. The wall is part of the Piazza Augusto Imperatore, which surrounds the Mausoleum of Augustus, a ruin in the Campo Marzio, alongside Via di Ripetta, which runs parallel to the Tiber River. In 1916, during the height of Italian fascism, excavation of the mausoleum and the concomitant relocation of the emperor's Ara Pacis, or Altar of Peace, were completed according to Vittorio Ballio Morpurgo's design. This included liberating the mausoleum from attached inhabitation, building new palazzi to enclose a new piazza, and constructing a retaining wall to support the plaza upon which Morpurgo built a new pavilion to house the restored Ara Pacis. This iconographic program, intended to posit Mussolini as the new Augustus, is still explicitly spelled out on the façades of the 1930s palazzi featuring “images of shepherd boys tending their flocks, robust peasant mothers dangling fascist babies,” and “young girls carrying baskets of fruit or husks of grain.”29 In scripting this ancient site according to their own political rhetoric, the fascists attempted to laminate their illegitimate regime with the glory of a former dictator who had achieved a sustained peace and transformed Rome from a city of brick to one of marble. This history of the Ara Pacis Museum site was the political and historical stage onto which Richard Meier entered in 1995 and from which his controversial, yet ultimately conformist, museum finally emerged 11 years later.

In his essay “The Emperor and the Duke: The Planning of Piazzale Augusto Imperatore in Rome,” Spiro Kostof thoroughly outlines the history of fascist interventions on the site: “To Mussolini ancient Rome meant Imperial Rome and Imperial Rome was encapsulated in the name of Augustus.”30 The fascist planners and archaeologists developed a precise vocabulary for their transformations of the post-Risorgimento (unification) city into the Third Rome with terms such as isolamento (isolation), diradamente (pruning), valorizzazione (valorization).