

CREATIVITY and REALITY

THE ART OF BUILDING FUTURE CITIES

P R O C E E D I N G S



Edizioni Nuova Cultura

Architecture and Construction Ph.D. DRACo | Dottorato di Ricerca in Architettura e Costruzione
Coordinator Dina Nencini

Quadern two | Proceedings of *1st IConA International Conference on Architecture*
“Creativity and Reality. The art of building future cities”
with the sponsorship of DRACo | Dottorato di Ricerca in Architettura e Costruzione

1st IConA
International Conference on Architecture
“Creativity and Reality. The art of building future cities”
December 18-19 2019, Rome, Piazza Borghese 9
www.iconaconference.com
organization@iconaconference.com

Organizing Committee

Francesca Addario
Enrico Marani
Alessandro Oltremarini
Giorgio Quintiliani

Copyright © 2020 Edizioni Nuova Cultura - Roma
ISBN: 9788833653112 - DOI: 10.4458/3808

Dottorato di Ricerca in Architettura e Costruzione
Dipartimento di Architettura e Progetto
Sapienza Università di Roma



1st ICONA

International Conference on Architecture

December 18-19 2019 | Rome

CREATIVITY and REALITY
The art of building *future* cities

edited by

Orazio Carpenzano | Alessandra Capanna
Anna Irene Del Monaco | Francesco Menegatti
Tomaso Monestiroli | Dina Nencini

Editorial Coordination

Francesca Addario | Alessandro Oltremarini

Curators

Orazio Carpenzano *(Director of DIAP, Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Alessandra Capanna, Anna Irene Del Monaco, Dina Nencini
(Sapienza Università di Roma)

Francesco Menegatti, Tomaso Monestiroli *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Organizing Committee

Francesca Addario, Enrico Marani, Alessandro Oltremarini,
Giorgio Quintiliani *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Honour Committee

Maria Argenti *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Carmen Andriani *(Università degli Studi di Genova)*

Lucio Valerio Barbera *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Alessandra Capuano *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Daniel Comsa *(Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism UAUIM)*

Armando Dal Fabbro *(Università IUAV di Venezia)*

Alberto Ferlenga *(Università IUAV di Venezia)*

Cherubino Gambardella *(Università degli Studi della Campania L. Vanvitelli)*

Liu Jian *(Tsinghua University of Beijing)*

Martha Kohen *(SoA DCP University of Florida)*

Jean-François Lejeune *(University of Miami School of Architecture)*

Gino Malacarne *(Università di Bologna)*

Bruno Messina *(Università degli Studi di Catania)*

Carlo Moccia *(Politecnico di Bari)*

John Murphy *(University of Texas San Antonio)*

Raffaella Neri *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Margherita Petranzan *(Director of Anfione e Zeto. Rivista di architettura e arti)*

Wendy Pullan *(University of Cambridge)*

Franco Purini *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Matteo Robiglio *(Politecnico di Torino)*

Piero Ostilio Rossi *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Xing Ruan *(Shanghai Jiao Tong University, UNSW Sydney)*

Brent D. Ryan *(Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge)*

Antonino Saggio *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Andrea Sciascia *(Università degli Studi di Palermo)*

Ilaria Valente *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Scientific Committee

Matteo Agnoletto *(Università di Bologna)*

Giulio Massimo Barazzetta *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Bruno Bonomo *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Renato Capozzi *(Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II)*

Domenico Chizzoniti *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Nancy M. Clark *(School of Architecture University of Florida)*

Alessandra Criconia *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Sedef Doganer *(University of Texas San Antonio)*

Massimo Faiferri *(Università degli Studi di Sassari)*

Paola Favaro *(UNSW Sydney)*

Luisa Ferro *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Antonella Gallo *(Università IUAV di Venezia)*

Paolo Genovese *(Tianjin University)*

Anna Giovannelli *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Cristina Imbroglini *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Mohammad Arif Kamal *(Aligarh Muslim University)*

Martina Landsberger *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Vincenzo Latina *(Università degli Studi di Catania)*

Angela Lombardi *(University of Texas San Antonio)*

Giovanni Marras *(Università IUAV di Venezia)*

Marco Mannino *(Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria)*

Marina Mihaila *(Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism UAUIM)*

Antonello Monaco *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Pisana Posocco *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Enrico Prandi *(Università degli Studi di Parma)*

Sara Protasoni *(Politecnico di Milano)*

Manuela Raitano *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Antonio Vito Riondino *(Politecnico di Bari)*

Antonello Russo *(Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria)*

Nicola Santopuoli *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Leone Spita *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Fabrizio Toppetti *(Sapienza Università di Roma)*

Ettore Vadini *(Università degli Studi della Basilicata)*

Federica Visconti *(Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II)*

Shaoming Lu *(Shanghai Jiao Tong University)*

Zhou Zhengxu *(Tsinghua University of Beijing)*

Institutions

A.A.School of London, United Kingdom
Aarhus School of Architecture, Denmark
Abdullah Gul University, Kayseri, Turkey
Abia State University, Uturu, Nigeria
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multa, Pakistan
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Svitzerland
ENA Rabat, Morocco
FAUP, Portogallo
GUtech Halban, Oman
Instituto Superior Manuel Teixeira Gomes, Portugal
Intercultura Consult, Bulgaria
Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest, Romania
Islamic University of Indonesia, Indonesia
Keio University, Japan
Khalifa University, Masdar Campus, United Arab Emirates
KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm
Lodz University of Technology, Poland
Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, Italy
Özyeğin University, Turkey
Politecnico di Bari, Italy
Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Politecnico di Torino, Italy
Sapienza Università di Roma, Italy
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China
Tianjin University, China
Tsinghua University, China
Uganda Martyrs University, Nkozi, Uganda
Universidad de Lima, Perú
Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Ecuador
Università degli Studi della Basilicata, Italy
Università degli Studi di Brescia, Italy
Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italy
Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italy
Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy
Università degli Studi di Pavia, Italy

Università degli Studi di Sassari, Italy
Università degli Studi di Trieste, Italy
Università della Calabria, Italy
Università di Bologna, Italy
Università di Padova, Italy
Università di Pisa, Italy
Università IUAV di Venezia, Italy
Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria, Italy
Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy
University of Arts, Tîrgu-Mureş, Romania
University of Brighton, United Kingdom
University of Texas, San Antonio, USA
University of the West of England, United Kingdom
Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University, China

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

DAY ONE | 18 december

PLENARY SESSION CREATIVITY AND REALITY

Opening Ceremony **Anna Maria Giovenale**
Dean of Faculty of Architecture, Sapienza University of Rome

Opening Speech **Orazio Carpenzano**
Director of Department of Architecture and Design, Sapienza University of Rome

Lectures **GIORGIO DE RITA** *Secretary General of CENSIS*
MARC AUGÉ *Ethnologist and anthropologist*

Interlude *speaker* **Anna Irene Del Monaco** *ICoNA Curator*

Lectures **RUBEN OTERO** *Drucker Arquitetos Associados | Brazil*
JOSHUA BOLCHOVER *Rufwork Architects | China*

Discussant **Alessandra Capanna** *ICoNA Curator*

1st PARALLEL TABLES *PT 1.1 | PT 1.2 | PT 1.3*

DAY TWO | 19 december

2nd PARALLEL TABLES PT 2.1 | PT 2.2 | PT 2.3 | PT 2.4

PLENARY SESSION THE ART OF BUILDING FUTURE CITIES

Renato Masiani

Senior Deputy Rector, Sapienza University of Rome

Lecture

LUCIANO VIOLANTE *Judge, Politician and Academic*

Round Table

speaker **Dina Nencini** *ICoNA Curator*

Giovanni Maria Flick *Jurist, Politician and Academic*

Orazio Carpenzano *Director of DIAP*

Margherita Petranzan *Director of Anfione e Zeto*

Franco Purini *Emeritus Professor Sapienza*

Lucio Valerio Barbera *Full Professor Sapienza*

Alessandra Capuano *Director of PhD School*

Antonino Saggio *Full Professor Sapienza*

PLENARY SESSION CREATIVITY AND REALITY

speaker **Francesco Menegatti** *ICoNA Curator*

Lectures

PIER VITTORIO AURELI *(Dogma: Aureli + Tattara)*

RAFFAELLA NERI *Full Professor Politecnico of Milan*

Final Round Table

speakers **Alessandra Capanna** and **Dina Nencini** + *All Chairs of Parallel Tables*

Closing Speech

Orazio Carpenzano *Director of DIAP, Sapienza University of Rome*

Abstract Selected:
158 Authors
121 Contributions
51 Institutions

Abstract Received:
252 Authors
196 Contributions
73 Institutions

drawing by
Luigi Savio
Margagliotta



INDEX

x *Opening*

- XII Creativity and reality.
The project and the eternal becoming of Rome
Orazio Carpenzano
- XX City Makers and Culture Industry.
Supply and Demand for contemporary architects
Anna Irene Del Monaco

XLVI *Lectures*

- XLVIII An apparent paradox
Marc Augé
- LII Future, creativity, technology and ethics
Giorgio De Rita
- LX An apology of Creon
Luciano Violante
- LXX Cities, globalization and the pandemic
Giovanni Maria Flick
- LXXXVIII The art of building future cities
Round Table

CXLII *Full papers*

- XXX Creativity and reality. The row form in architecture
Francesco Menegatti
- XXXVI Creativity and memory
Tomaso Monestiroli
- XL Creativity and Reality. A way of resistance
Dina Nencini
- CII Platforms: architecture and the use of the round
Pier Vittorio Aureli and Martino Tattara
- CX Incremental Urbanism: Ulaanbaatar's Ger Districts
Joshua Bolchover and John Lin
- CXXVI Three urban projects. Tribute to Antonio Monestiroli
Raffaella Neri
- CXXXVI Working in vulnerables areas
Ruben Otero

discussants:

Giovanni Maria Flick | *Jurist, Politician and Academic*

Orazio Carpenzano | *Director of DIAP*

Margherita Petranzan | *Director of Anfione e Zeto*

Franco Purini | *Emeritus Professor Sapienza*

Lucio Valerio Barbera | *Full Professor Sapienza*

Alessandra Capuano | *Director of PhD School*

Antonino Saggio | *Full Professor Sapienza*

speaker:

Dina Nencini | *Associate Professor Sapienza*



Dina Nencini - Welcome everyone, I will make very brief presentations of our guests, especially for the foreign participants. The first speaker is Professor Giovanni Maria Flick, President Emeritus of the Constitutional Court, former Minister of Grace and Justice and magistrate. He graduated from the Cattolica in Milan and he is Emeritus professor of Criminal Law. The invitation concerns his most recent book *Elogio della città?* in which Professor Flick asks a fundamental and very concrete question, especially for us architects, that is to say if it is possible to overcome the condition of the city as a place of fear. Of course, the competence of an excellent personality that we have the considerations of having here with us opens up very important reflections, but I would leave the word to Giovanni Maria Flick.

*The English version
of the essay
is edited by the
Conference Team*

Giovanni Maria Flick - I recently published an essay entitled *Elogio della città?* in which I elaborated a reflection concerning the possibility of identifying a path

to pass from the traditional *city of fear* to what we could call the *city of joy* and what can be the support that the law and the jurist can possibly offer to a path with that purpose. I start from a very concrete and contingent premise. I was struck last spring by the fire of the Notre-Dame spire and by the worldwide participation in an event of this type (general commotion, world-view, promise of offers which then did not follow). A week later, near Foggia, in one of the many fires in the illegal slums, a man employed in the seasonal tomato harvesting died. Traces of his ashes were found the next day, cleaning up the remains of the fire. Of course it was not a kind of news that moved the world but at least the local dissent should have recorded, perhaps with greater force, the dissent in the face of a type of housing or settlement that determines this type of consequence. This is the first aspect that struck me.

The second aspect that is concerns the cultural, social, economic and political trauma is connected with the fall of the Morandi bridge. I am familiar with the city of Genoa

and therefore I lived that story with participation. And, therefore, I began to reflect by carrying out a speech that I have been developing for some time, once my institutional commitments have been concluded, on the meaning of the Constitution and its relevance, with respect to these issues. Why am I talking about the Constitution?

I have been working on the Constitution for nine years and I firmly believe in its value; I am aware of the limits that can be found in it after seventy years from the historical moment in which it was promulgated; I am also aware of the great responsibility of politics, that is all of us, in accusing the Constitution of no longer being relevant. While in reality there was no implementation, or has been minimally implemented. I am convinced that a reading or even a rereading of the Constitution, by making some institutional changes – of which it is not appropriate to speak here – could give to this important historical document the possibility to face another seventy years and, above all, to solve some of the problems that you have placed at the center of today's debate: *creativity* and *reality*, how to build the cities of tomorrow.

The first indication concerns article 9 of the Constitution: the first paragraph deals with the importance of development and promotion of culture. The Republic has the duty, as it is the duty of all of us, to protect the artistic, historical and cultural heritage, that is our past as a premise for the protection of the environmental heritage, therefore of our future. The Republic protects the historical and artistic heritage and the landscape. You know better than me the problem of landscape protection. The environment was not yet a theme heard in 1946-47, while the text of the Constitution was being on. The attention and interest around this theme have gradually grown and constitutional jurisprudence and doctrine have always interpreted the reference to the landscape not only according to an aesthetic meaning but above all attributing to it a global meaning that consider individuals and how they are relate to it.

For example, from this point of view, it seems necessary and appropriate to read article 9 in correlation with another fundamental principle of our Constitution, placed in the premise. That is, the recognition of inviolable rights and the duties of political, economic and social solidarity, not

only referred to the person as an individual. The city is one of the first, if not the first social formation, the first aggregation of people to live together. Thus, the discourse of the fundamental rights in cities translated into more concrete terms becomes the *right to the city*, the *right to the right city* for all those who live there. In this string of fundamental principles article 3 of the Constitution places equal social dignity as the objective of coexistence that is a condition to pursue equal social dignity, taking diversity alongside equality, including the formal aspects. The right to diversity is essential to grow, to develop, to realize one's own personality. Too often and too easily diversity is perceived as discrimination among other things in contrast with another constitutional provision: the article 10 that recognizes to foreigners as citizens the same rights even beyond what the international conventions provide about the foreigners' reception such as the asylum right and even beyond what the Constitution perhaps did not foresee when it was written: that is to say that migration would become a mass phenomenon.

Migrations concern the relationship between person and city. The refusal of the other is not justified; the article 10 of the Constitution was written when Italy was not a country of immigration, but a country of emigration due to hunger. Our constituent fathers had the courage to recognize the equality of foreigners in the face of fundamental rights, to recognize a fundamental law of nature: *it is not the bread that goes where there is hunger; but it is hunger that goes where it is bread*, and this further appens when the social media, the communication and the network offer to all a general panorama of immediate perception of these situations. It seems to me an act of courage to write in the Constitution the fundamental rights of all, both of Italians and of foreigners. Despite those unacceptable statements ("Italians first") which absolutely do not find correspondence in the Constitution and that contrast an essential condition in the context of the city, because in the first formation that is the first social aggregation – I am thinking of article 2 – there is the guarantee of all inviolable rights.

This highlights a very important problem: the tendency we have, especially we jurists, to bureaucratize everything. The first twelve articles of the Constitution which are the

premises, the fundamental principles – as the Constituent Assembly calls them – lead to this risk: seeing the problem of the relationship between the unity, the centrality and the respect for the positions of autonomies essentially as a game of powers, responsibilities and competences. The landscape, the territory, the environment are three aspects of a single reality, of the relationship between the person and what surrounds him. The environment shapes man, and man who shapes the environment. The distinction is fundamental to examine the various problems and the various aspects because it becomes an occasion for confrontation. I lived this experience in particular during my nine-year commitment at the Constitutional Court, when for example in the matter of protection of cultural and artistic heritage the distinction between protection and enhancement of cultural heritage was discussed as a problem. What is restoration? Is it protection or is it enhancement? Because if I don't restore cultural heritage then they are destroyed and therefore no longer exist. There is a very important difference in terms of relationships, responsibilities and money management. If it is a question of protection it's up to the State, if it is a question of valorisation it's up to the Regions.

We are used to building wonderful legal architectures to avoid liability. A significant example is the story of Eluana Englaro: we have managed to transform the problem of the “end of life”, a human drama, into a legal conflict. Although on a different level we are in the same conditions. The basic indication of the constitutional text concerns the equal dignity and in the current context we have two very big problems that hinder the equal dignity. The first is *presentism* that is the fact that globalization is leading us to live only in the present. “What do I care about the past, I wasn't there! And what do I care about the future, I won't be there!” Discourse like this leads on the one hand to abolish the right to memory and, to the past, to the conservation of the artistic and cultural heritage, and not only that. In this period, for example, I am dealing with the archeology of extermination, the archeology of work. To understand how work is evolving is interesting to analyze and review what remained of the first industrial settlements, how people lived and how they worked. For example you can visit Fossoli, the rice mill of San Sabba.

Sunday I was near Bologna to commemorate a massacre in the gullies of the hills that has passed over in silence: one hundred and ten people killed by the Nazi-fascists after the roundups. A monument represented by some stones is the only thing left. Presentism leads us to forget, to ignore the importance of memory. Who forgets the past is condemned to repeat it, and I don't see how we can plan the future if we don't have the past in the present. It is written on the entrance to the Dachau Concentration Camp, while in Auschwitz there is that other obscene writing that work makes you free, but only to die.

Three emblematic and worrying examples of inequalities emerge and affect our cities; they make the discourse on the city deeply ambiguous. There are many more but three are particularly current and scary. The theme of anti-Semitism and racial hatred in general which is pure hatred and ignorance is making a comeback. Besides anti-Semitism, another fundamental issue is gender equality. We were very pleased that a woman was elected to the presidency of the Constitutional Court, who largely deserved it: for too long the fifteen members were only men. We started with one woman, then another who replaced the first, then three, now the president is a woman. I believe that once a woman can be elected president of the Constitutional Court without having to shoot fireworks for joy it will mean that our country has become a country where equal opportunity rights apply. The discourse of gender equality – yesterday the Head of State reminded it in his good wishes to the so-called high offices – is still very present and is based on another matrix: the possession. The phrase “the woman is mine and I do what I want with her, so if she leaves me I can kill her” belongs to the subculture German thesis *Kinder Küche Kirche* as children, church, kitchen. Femicide is at the end of the path of inculture.

The third dramatic inequality profile is the one of migrant. The two decree laws apply to all of them as legislative measures adopted last year equate security and immigration; that is to say that migration is a matter of insecurity. They were only repealed after a year and after a lively political discussion. All this finds fertile ground for cultures considering the city the city as a social formation which forgot that the first reason why social formations

matter is not the relationship between central and local powers, the division between local powers, the affirmation of a contrast between center and periphery. Once there was someone discussing about the peripheries of the Empire, now someone arguing maliciously about of the empire of the peripheries; we could indulge in this type of speech...

I come to the topic that interests me: if we look at history, it teaches us a lot on the topic of social formations. I have tried in this book to follow the path of the biblical city, which is a very deep life lesson. It moves from the city of violence, Enoch, the city of Cain; passes through Babel and the tower, the city of pride; it continues with the city of the exploitation of the foreigner, Sodom; it until arrives to the city of profit Jerusalem which is the emblem of ambiguity, the great harlot and the bride of Christ. They are the two realities of the city fighting each other. The position of Jerusalem seems particularly emblematic to me: the only city where on Fridays the *muezzin* calls Muslims to pray in the mosque; on Saturday the *shofar*, the horn calls the Jews to the synagogue; on Sundays the bell calls Christians to church. On Mondays however a lot of people deposit their religious objects, take the Kalashnikov and start shooting again. This is the reality, the ambiguity and the contradiction of the city. In this reflection a series of observations by Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini, who described the fear for the city helped me a lot. The city was fundamentally born as an expression of fear, and therefore of closure, of defense, of rejection. Just think, a few days ago we celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the transfer of the walls from the outside of the city to the inside of the city even with the longitudinal division of the streets: on one side the barred windows, on the other the life that goes on. What can be done to address the issue of the future city in a situation that foresees, it seems to me in 2050, that eighty percent of the population will live in the city and no longer in the countryside?

I put aside the situation of the historic Italian city, the Italian urban context, for a moment – postponing further considerations – . In the general context, approaching the cities means to look at individual aspects and not their overall assessment, which is what then creates fear.

Cities develop their esthetics, a beautiful city; their

economy. Cities can develop in places for meeting and cultural exchange, not just for trade; cities can develop the discourse of the environment. They are the place where we can try to respect the basic pact between man and nature; and then we have a whole series of concrete problems: the mobility, culture, health, and so on (togliere “the”). Those issues are also independent from each other. We should distinguish common roots to interpret cities. I believe that these roots – and perhaps we jurists have a lot to learn in this sense – is the idea of the common goods: the city is perhaps the first important expression of a common good.

The city of everyone, the *right city*, the city that overcomes ghettoization, both the rich’s and the poor’s ghetto, the city that overcomes the drama of the decline of Rome which Giulio Carlo Argan mentioned several times.

The other example I wanted to address is Venice. Venice is dying. Cities can die because they are occupied, destroyed or forgotten as affected by collective Alzheimer. So I believe that for architects and for the law of the city it is a question of facing a new perspective that from a constitutional point of view, according to principles, reaches the basic discourse: how to build the city of the future? The fundamental recipe is to bring the person back to the center of the city. And work on a new law and on a new culture. Leon Battista Alberti said: “The architect is not the one who accumulates stones, he is the one who has an idea and realizes it”; or to the Calvino’s dialogue that all of you will certainly know in *The Invisible Cities*, between Marco Polo and the great Khan. The latter wants to know everything about the arc but Marco Polo keeps talking about the stones until the great Khan gets impatient and says “Why are you talking to me about the stones? I want to know about the arc” and Marco Polo replies to him “Look, the idea of the arc is realized through the stones”.

Leon Battista Alberti tells us that the architect is the one who puts in order, who gives a language to the stones, and therefore translates the language of men and the relationship between the common space, the space usable by all, into the language of stones, the *agorà*, and the private space. This is a titanic undertaking, but I believe it is already a lot that we are dealing with it. The last town planning law is from 1942; the perspective is to work on a

new law on architecture, on the profession of architecture which recovers this constitutional dimension and on a new law on the city, the *right city*, which is both rich and poor and where the problems are solved would be crucial. This is not the illusion of the Smart city which solves everything with technology; the technique is absolutely necessary but the technique leads to two important risks.

The first risk is that the city will be run by those who have a lot of money and would not so much deal with resettlement operations for example of a suburb as of business and real estate speculation. Marx in Paris and Villari in Naples immediately after the unification of Italy already warned about it (Marx as regards the Haussmann operation on the boulevard, Villari for the first city plan of Naples) “Please, pay attention! We are planning large avenues, large buildings, beautiful things in which the poor will be reduced more and more to live in basements, in increasingly narrow basements”. The second risk concerns the awareness of how we devour spaces: the concrete covers everything. The sprouting of a series of legislative initiatives on the regeneration of the city is welcomed. But be careful because the regeneration of the city can become an illusion: it can become euphoria. There are, it seems to me, about twenty law program on regeneration and some seem more valid in this sense. I don’t want to make propaganda, but there is a bill by Ferrazzi and others which sees the problem of the regeneration of the city according to a double aspect: we recover the structures of the past instead of continuing to occupy land. On the other hand however let us remember that it is not enough to reconstruct and put the extras dressed as gladiators or gondoliers and Venetian doges. Regenerating means rebuilding a social, cultural and artisanal fabric, but which is the today’s craft, not a masked craft. It is a very complex and difficult speech but it is a speech that at least it seems to begin to take shape.

What is the hope behind this discourse? The idea of a city that is a common good belonging to everyone the *right city*, where mobility, culture, health, exchange and trade open up a more human panorama; a city where the person returns to the center. This discourse in Italy would require a more specific and different evaluation because there is the problem of the historic city that is an historic urban fabric

present in many small cities with remarkable identity skills which perhaps it would be necessary to try to respect and carry on. Let us not delude ourselves, it will certainly not be metropolitan cities that will defeat megalopolises, but perhaps metropolitan cities are an indication of the need to look at the urban fabric of our country and its peculiarities. This is the wish that I make to architects and that before I do to myself as the beneficiary of the architects’ product.

Dina Nencini - I am very grateful to Mr Flick for this important lesson and for his open and constructive thinking. From the image that Luciano Violante left to us of Aeneas as an architect – Aeneas in a certain sense is a refugee arriving on the Lazio coast and, at the behest of Octavian who wants that Virgil write the celebration of the empire, he becomes the Rome’s father – let’s move on to the positive image of a city that is open and fair, welcoming, inclusive, precisely more human, in order to be realized for the need of collaboration between political and cultural forces. Architects on their own cannot transform reality or rather through images, and the form’s invention can guide their visions. Indeed, the solitude of the architect is another very effective image today. I therefore pass the word to Professor Lucio Barbera, full professor of Architectural Design at La Sapienza who was PhD coordinator in Architectural Composition and also Councilor for Culture of the Municipality of Rome. Currently he is chair holder of the Unesco Chair in “Sustainable urban quality and urban culture”.

Lucio Valerio Barbera - I had prepared some slides that I will not show why the conversation moved in another way, but I will tell you about them, also because you are almost all architects and therefore the younger ones, who may not know some things that I will describe, will perhaps be tempted to know them. I would start from a sort of paraphrase, a camouflage of a famous book written by an important and well-known French aesthetic philosopher, Jacques Rancière. The title in Italian reads *Il disagio dell’estetica (The discomfort of aesthetics)*. Jacques Rancière will not be hurt if I continue to paraphrase the title of his book by bringing before you *the discomfort of*

architecture: the discomfort of architecture compared to the problems of the city. Many of you, especially the older ones, will remember the social charge of the architectural project during the post-war period, the optimistic utopian charge of the 1960s, the idea that the architect could imagine the city of the future within a dimension of possible intervention never seen before. And then the decline of this vision, of this hope, and yet the rise at the same time, almost as a counterweight, as a retaliation, of the affirmation, at times stubborn, at times even violent, with respect to the reality of the city, of the autonomy of architectural research. An autonomy defended more and more strongly until, in my opinion, the transformation of reality, of society, of the city, the increasingly frequent mutations weakened this defense as well. The first slide that I would show you would be the New Topography of Rome by Giovan Battista Nolli (Nolli Map) of 1748, a very famous map of Rome, the first scientific map, made according to the rules of geometric triangulation. Nolli's Map is a beautiful document. I believe that today in the world there are at least twenty institutions, not only Italian, many in other countries, especially in France and in the United States, which study exclusively the Nolli Map. Also at Roma Tre University, an interdisciplinary study center on historical-economic studies, with the help of some architects, is verifying with great accuracy, or perhaps has already verified, what Nolli, a Lombard architect (at that time it was also said *geometra*), very precise and very avantgarde for what concerned the detection systems, has deviated in the measurements from the modern systems of verification of reality. And then, in this research center, they redesigned the Nolli Map according to the GPS, evaluating the hundredths of a degree of deviation from the Nolli drawings. But they redesigned it without a soul. We all know that Nolli's Map is extraordinarily beautiful but, contrary to what some art and city historians think, it is also a social and economic document; it is the social and economic representation of power relations, of the distribution of classes in an extraordinary city such as Rome at the end and at the apex of its modern history, modern understood in the classical sense, therefore medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, eighteenth century. The

public spaces, the streets, the squares, are represented in continuity, as if they were made of the same spatial material: the interiors of the churches, the courtyards of the princely palaces, the small courtyards of mansions, which, evidently, were considered by Nolli himself and by his clients certainly homes of respectable people, who deserved to be represented with their private spaces as part of the urban fabric: professor Flick spoke of *common goods*. This is where the extraordinary nature of the Nolli Map lies. Furthermore, the spatial continuity returned in the map is also hierarchical, because that of 1748 is not a very progressive state, it is a consolidated state, rich in tradition. Nolli's Map is a perfect social and economic radiography of the Rome of those years. The system of churches which are designed as if they were squares, the collective spaces in which one enters and exits quite freely, represent a public space that emanates power. The same happens for the large noble palaces, and it happens for a myriad of houses, the one that would grow later in the nineteenth century with the name of Generone, that is the artisans who slowly transformed themselves into professionals, into *professionals at the service of*. Then there are areas of the map, instead, in which the buildings are drawn completely dark, dark spots that correspond to two categories of spaces, not yet urbanized, therefore empty lots, but dark. But even the buildings of the parts of the city that do not have the social dignity of all the others, for example, the whole area built around the Augusteo, which, being overlooking the port of Ripetta, was an area of ill repute, have no characterization, they are only pure volume. So, the Nolli Map is an absolutely perfect X-ray. And I believe that even those who do not consider it from this point of view are fascinated by it as something no longer achieved, a document that today would be included in the group of *big data* because it includes everything: society, the economy, social stratification. Among other things, the map shows a list in which, one by one, the things represented have a name and a surname. Sometimes the name and surname is *the parish of*, but it means the presence in the fabric of ecclesial power over the city, as well as *the family palace*, and so on. The Nolli Map of 1748 remained a valid document to present Rome almost until 1870, because in

the Nolli Map only Piazza del Popolo is missing, which was designed in the French period, but was built in 1816-18, and therefore is not included. But Piazza del Popolo we find it in a map that seems to retrace, indeed resume, the tradition of the organic vision of the city introduced by Nolli, but which in reality betrays it. And it is the map of Letarouilly of 1849-50, in which Letarouilly, in a somewhat casual way, in my opinion, does nothing but exactly copy the Nolli map by adding the few things that have been done, and does not indicate the source, but in the signature there is a map designed by Letarouilly. In reality, Letarouilly has other intentions, it sees the city in a totally different way: it is connected to the Nolli Map, because... it is so beautiful, so well-known, and for a Frenchman who comes to fill himself with cultural glory in Rome it is impossible not to have as a reference to understand the city that map. But he no longer cares about the social fabric of the city, the power relations, possible exchanges, the intertwining that can be imagined by reading Nolli's map; he is interested in the city as a monument containing monuments. Two years later there is a second edition of the Letarouilly Map, in which all the special attributes indicated in the Nolli Map, the palaces, churches, large public or private spaces, which represent the articulation of power in the city, disappear: there remains a map made up of numbered silhouettes and each number corresponds exclusively to a delightfully academic perspective drawing, in which he illustrates to foreigners, but also to Italians, the most significant works of the city, those that are worth knowing. The social city, the economic city, the city of social conflicts in the Letarouilly Map has disappeared, has gone into the background. Nolli in making this map had been helped by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, especially on the occasion of the second edition, smaller, precisely of his beautiful map. What does Piranesi draw from the Nolli Map? I believe that Piranesi was attracted by the fact that Nolli's Map also contains ancient architecture, its fragments, its monuments abandoned in the green space, an antiquity that is present but nevertheless not architecturally determined, except as ideas launched like rafts of a great shipwreck. This is the part of the Rome of his time that interests him and on which he *builds* the Campo Marzio. Piranesi, who will become a

more famous architect than Nolli, guided by the charm of the ancient city and the nature in which it was immersed, invents another city, innovative, fantastic, an idea that has taught European architects for centuries how to design vision of architecture starting from the reality of the past. But if I could, today, I would have explained myself better by resorting to music: let's imagine that we are going back to the eighteenth century, at the time of Piranesi and Nolli, and being in France. A musician Jean Paul Egide Martini and a poet Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian composed the song *Plaisir d'amour* (1785) for the queen of France, the unfortunate Marie Antoinette. I always listen to the version sung by soprano Elisabeth Schwarzkopf. That famous song represents the ancient nature of music and its history. But I like to think of being able to integrate the piece by Marini-Florian in a collage together with the interpretation that a group of Jazz musicians led by Jacky Terrasson, proposes of that song and which bears the same title *Plaisir d'amour*, performed by modern musicians with a clear and respectful approach, but with an innovative, free and aware touch.

Dina Nencini - We would listen to Professor Barbera for a long time, he always has many things to tell us. However, I can take advantage to identify an important aspect, which is the ability of architecture to represent something that goes beyond the physical character of the city. And the reference to Nolli is very significant. Thanks again to Lucio Barbera and I pass the word to Alessandra Capuano. Also a brief biography of her: Alessandra Capuano is full professor of Architectural Design at the Faculty of Architecture of the Sapienza University of Rome, President of Teaching Area 1, coordinator of the Doctorate in Landscape and Environment and of the International Master Erasmus "Architecture Landscape Archaeology". She has been national coordinator of various PRIN including "The city of care and the city's care".

Alessandra Capuano - The speeches that preceded me draw attention to very important issues. On the one hand, the *right to the city*, a concept that evokes the commitment of some French philosophers, not only Jacques Rancière just mentioned by Professor Barbera but, first of all, Henri

Lefebvre; on the other hand, the timeliness of the Nolli plan, which refers us not only to the concept of *big data*, i.e. the amount of significant information regarding a phenomenon, but to values that go beyond numbers, which are not easily measurable and concern, instead, the sphere of the symbolic, of the imaginary, a fundamental part that is frequently totally missing in the contemporary city.

Fifty years have passed since the publication of Henri Lefebvre's famous book *The Right to the City*, of which we have recently returned to talk a great deal, especially because in the contemporary debate there is a need to introduce the political dimension into urban transformation strategies, which cannot depend only on functional and material aspects, on pain of great impoverishment. Instead, it is necessary to bring the problem of the modification of cities back into the sphere of representativeness. This conceptual sphere was fully present in Lefebvre's well-known text, which emphasizes that the city should correspond above all to a system of meanings, where the scientifically identified standards of the habitat coexist with the sphere of the dream, that is, of the imaginary, which, together with the aspects that concern health and nature, bring the presence of man back to the center of attention. The rights of citizens, to which Professor Flick referred, are fundamental, but they must also be able to find correspondence in the quality of urban spaces. This need is actually invoked by opposite political-cultural fronts. It is an absence of which Marco Romano, an urbanist and historian who, unlike Lefebvre, is a convinced liberalist and who understands the city as a work of art. Therefore, Lefebvre attacks the fact that today's city has become above all a place where the value of exchange prevails, and is therefore no longer understood as a work but as a product, as an environment linked to trade, exchange and purely economic issues. If we want to heal the wounds of some disasters that the modern city has caused, we must therefore recognize the ethic values and beauty, entities that are not easily measurable; our anxiety to normalize everything, in reality, does not combine well with the idea of a city that must instead return to "fly high".

There is no missing in the contemporary world of attractive examples of cities that have not lost this vision;

unfortunately I must say that in Italy we do not have great examples in this sense, but in recent decades Paris, certainly, has done a lot of effort, during the different political and cultural seasons, to represent itself according to a strategic and innovative vision. But also cities like Copenhagen and Hamburg have been able to renew their image both on a functional and material level, as well as on the one of lifestyles and a new representation of the city. Without lingering too long on this aspect, I close by recalling Colin Rowe, famous Anglo-Saxon architect, theorist and critic who later emigrated to the United States, who said that the city is a composite, multiform, heterogeneous place, a concept too pervasive to become obsolete. He also argued that utopia is a necessary idea, and that therefore it must continue to be a hope for the future, without surrendering to the scientific certainties that modern society prescribes. An idea that was also shared by Antonino Terranova who, in his book *I mostri metropolitani* (Metropolitan Monsters), indicated Paris and Barcelona as cities capable of putting into play an imaginary potential, a form of art-architecture capable of expressing and representing profound instances in which man has not only pleasure, but the need to recognize himself. Therefore, when we work on our cities, responding to necessary instances such as sustainability, soft mobility, and all those issues that we are dealing with today, and that are deeply necessary, we must pursue them not only with the idea of solving technical problems, of introducing new lifestyles and new ways of living in the city that are attentive to people's needs, but above all we must offer that degree of imagination that is essential to dream and be able to recognize ourselves in them.

Dina Nencini - Through the references to the two texts by Lefebvre and Marco Romano, emerge the important question of the economy, of the financial dimension in the urban destiny. As Giovanni Maria Flick mentioned earlier, the smart city is a city that can be implemented in economically strong contexts, so we have to reflect about the actual possibility of implementing it as a model because most areas of the planet are living hard economic conditions. I want to turn it over the word to Margherita Petranzan, designer and architect, owner founder of the

Petranzan-Bovo Office since '74. She designed public housing and other important design themes. From 2004 to 2016 she taught as a lecturer at the Politecnico di Milano, she is a member of the bipartisan association for the quality of public policies named "Italiadecide" and in 2012 she was appointed to the presidency committee of the same association. In 1988 she founded the architecture and arts' magazine *Anfione and Zeto* that she still directs with the collaboration of Massimo Cacciari, Edoardo Benvenuto, Giacomo Mazzariol, Adolfo Natalini and others, and since 1992 she has been editor in chief of the philosophy magazine *Paradosso*.

Margherita Petranzan - What interests me mostly is to ask a question, which are implicit in the speeches already heard and which it should be raised.

Today we live in the mutant city, a reality that changes continuously and paradoxically without break. Until 50 years ago, but also until 30 years ago, the city organized itself with more quieter rhythms, thanks to the help of all those who professionally tried to contribute to its functioning. This is no longer the same case: we are moving very quickly from industrial to digital and the dominant technology has become digital. There is no negative argument in all this, but I would like to understand what happens to professions like ours, how should we propose and present ourselves? President Violante and Professor Flick have tried to propose provocations and answers, but the profession of the architect is an extraordinarily necessary profession. I am proud of my profession, but today I believe it is impossible to deny it, because not only we are responsible for the man's house in the world, but we should realize that we have a decisive role, not only for the construction of shape but also for how we propose men's living, men's life in the city. Our proposal cannot be indifferent, because it belong to us: it is not possible to think that man does not organize himself in cities also according to social conflict, because the city, among other things, is the result of social conflict.

I propose another provocation: is the city the site of the conflict or will it be the site of a possible positive outcome? I believe that the city is the seat of social conflict, and that it

continues to be and that, necessarily, it will have to be as I said. Babylon and Jerusalem have always been antagonists but they coexist, no one cannot prevail either; if one of them prevails probably the relationship of the social and political structure becomes critical and we enter in an absolutism concept. I don't think that it can be ok.

However, as architect, I remember the very wise words of a great contemporary architect, Mies van der Rohe, and of a great contemporary philosopher and thinker, Jacques Derrida, who died at the end of the twentieth century. Mies van der Rohe said to his students "Remember that architecture is not a mere question of forms, nor of functions; architecture is the authentic spirit battlefield", a spirit of a particular era, but also an individual spirit. The architect have to understand that he has a fundamental role within the social structure, and that cannot afford to be just a technician, and not even to carry out – perhaps flawlessly – only a scientific discourse. The architect has an important function of staying through all disciplines to know them and to ensure that his knowledge is concretely filled and of working hard in order that architecture becomes the authentic spirit battlefield.

I want to close by reading what Derrida said, and I ask if there is anyone who thinks it is possible today to think differently. Derrida said – Peter Eisenman also said it – that an architectural work as opposed to a classical painting, a sculpture or even literature, does not imitate anything; it is perfectly presence, referring only to itself, even if men and the gods inhabit it. Therefore, architecture is the fortress of the metaphysics of presence. An architectural work does not imitate anything, it is always the same. We can strive to find something important in a work and build a sort of alibis, but it really does not imitate anything. It is, therefore, the fortress of the metaphysics of presence.

So when someone says "Deconstructive architecture will be done" generally the first reaction is "Well, then it is no longer architecture, it is something else, because architecture is present in the reality, that is to say, in stone, in economics, in politics, in culture". For me this is the hard reality of our profession, always.

I have enough experience to believe it. I rode with great difficulty not only the profession of the architect but

also the profession of reflecting on this role, through the construction of an architecture magazine, very difficult to set up and manage, that I continue to carry on because I believe. There is a need for the architect of being at the forefront in all situations. I believe this, but is it the same for you? It will be like this? Or will this figure disappear and will it be relegated to the academy? I would like a lot to hear Franco Purini's opinion.

Dina Nencini - Thanks Margherita for your contribution to the round table, always precise and punctual. Thank you for having further solicited our reflections on the figure and the role that the architect can, perhaps still have in the transformation of the city.

Now I want to turn it over the word to Franco Purini to whom you raised your final question. I will also introduce him briefly: he is Emeritus Professor of Sapienza, academician of San Luca and of the Academy of Drawing of Florence, full professor in architectural and urban composition at the Faculty of Architecture of Sapienza until 2012. Author of numerous works, including the most recent Torre Eurosky in Rome. Master of designed architecture presented in national and international exhibitions. Author of numerous books including *Composing architecture* translated into several languages.

Franco Purini - In this short talk, I propose a possible category that can clarify something about the issues that are being faced. I define this category as *peripheral totality*. It simply means that when you look at the plan of a city you can see that the relationship between the historic core and the parts built after the Industrial Revolution, the latter not only prevails but in such a consistent way that makes the historic core itself absolutely minority, sometimes almost invisible.

This peripheral totality almost coincides with the whole city. In order not to go too far, it seems to me that four thematic areas on which to reflect emerge. The first of these consists in identifying the various types of periphery, which is usually generalized. It is in fact rather difficult to find studies on the various seasons of cities that have seen the rise of different suburbs, each with its own characteristics.

In fact, there is a periphery born with the Industrial Revolution, another one that rise up at the beginning of the twentieth century, another after the First World War, than another after the second conflict – the neorealist periphery –, and yet the periphery of the 167 Law. There is a public suburb, made up of public housing and a private suburb. There is a periphery of the petty bourgeoisie, another for the average one and yet another for the large one, just as there are popular settlements ranging from the hamlets to the neighborhoods of the two seven year olds of the INA Casa. It is therefore necessary to classify the forms in which the periphery has expressed itself by progressively identifying those that are now historical.

The second area of research concerns the fact that the periphery is not built in a void, but on a system of tracks – roads, paths, small settlements, isolated houses, fields limited by borders – layered on different sites. A system that is constituted as a historical text, which gives the periphery built on it an identity and often an extraordinary complexity. It is enough to retrace the neighborhood mentioned by Alessandra Capuano, the Tiburtino by Mario De Renzi and Saverio Muratori. It lies on a suggestive intertwining of pre-Roman and Roman streets alongside the remains of aqueducts of which few, even among architects, are able to recognize and follow their potential in the existing modern design of the settlements. Discovering that the suburbs are born on a complex terrestrial writing made up of paths, remains of monuments and previous inhabited places is something that belongs to a part of the city – the suburbs in its various forms – that in the collective imagination has been ignored or completely underestimated when it is an integral part of urban memory.

The third theme is the recognition in the suburbs of higher units than the neighborhoods through architectural interventions, on which now I do not have time to dwell. On them it would be necessary to intervene by endowing them with their recognisability. In practice, it is a question of proceeding with the architectural perimeter of a series of neighborhoods placed in direct relationship in order to prefigure micro-cities in the big city. I think that many of the “Evils of Rome”, as Vicar Ugo Poletti defined them in 1974, would heal better and sooner if seven or eight

of these entities, autonomous but related to the others, were identified by a series of urban facilities that do not exist today or that are insufficient. It has always been said that the suburbs are a dormitory city, a condition not yet overcome, which can however be overturned precisely by equipping these units made up of several districts in something more decisive than the metropolitan centralities proposed by the General Regulatory Plan of the 2008, practically left on paper except for one or two. The micro-cities of which I speak, I believe, can give life to a dignity of urban living adequate to the metropolitan dimension of Rome. In some of these new units there will be a show venue, in other spaces for sports, in still others a shopping center or tertiary activities. Today these appearances are casual, linked to the logic of private speculation, with a role that is either excessive or completely marginal.

The fourth theme – Aldo Loris Rossi spoke of it with great conviction a few years ago – is summed up in proposing a progressive replacement of the peripheral urban fabric, of its excessively compromised parts, which therefore cannot be consolidated, now unable to be adapted to current regulations. Even the suburbs – there are many of them – which from the urban point of view have become uninhabitable, should be demolished like certain obscure building canons.

Let's think, for example, of anti-seismic structures, which construction in past decades did not foresee; energy consumption, which in many cases cannot be reduced because it is not possible to intervene on the building; the difficulty of inserting lifts where they do not exist due to the size of the stairs. On many peripheral architectures it is not possible to work on.

Dina Nencini - Thanks to Franco Purini. The four questions he asks us further relaunch the debate and I hope they are collected by those who have not yet spoken.

I give the floor to Nino Saggio, who is full professor of Architectural and Urban Composition of Sapienza and founder-director of the series of international books *La Rivoluzione informatica in architettura*. He has developed three major fields of research: the first concerns the relationship between information technology and

architecture, the second concerns the study of contemporary architecture, in particular the Italian rationalism, the third concerns urban and architectural design. Three projects are under development in Rome, the *Urban green line*, *Il Tevere cavo* and *I territori più incontaminati*.

Antonino Saggio - Today I published a post on Facebook that was successful, I write: "We are at the end of architecture or almost; architecture today hardly interests anyone anymore and architects are not interested in particular anymore, which I recently discovered". As I said, the post was a success and a lot of comments. Also at this moment I am live on Facebook, since we have the technology, and we are in 2019: I speak to my friends of this Facebook group, and I speak to you at the same time (here is the link for who is interested in the intervention <https://bit.ly/33Ddb1V>).

The first thing I wanted to say is that the speech that struck me most in the last two years was by Senator Emanuele Macaluso, because perhaps, having passed the age of ninety, he now says things as they are. He said: "All the evils of this country derive from the rupture of the relationship between politics and culture", a fundamental cornerstone and a very simple concept. If politics no longer has the construction of a horizon of meaning and meaning, politics becomes nothing more than a daily compromising attitude and becomes the abandonment of every horizon of meaning. If culture is separated from politics, culture becomes self-referential, it becomes pure academicism, it becomes an accumulation of specialized knowledge that does not have the ability to affect and create horizons. So it is precisely in the rupture of this bond that one of the fundamental evils of this country lies, a rupture that took place progressively and slowly, but – I would say – almost inexorably. I cannot say anything significant before the President of the Constitutional Court, but we have no doubt that that fundamental document, our Constitutional Charter, was created within the framework of a very strong and effective relationship between politics and culture.

Let's take a step forward. So if culture is by no means a self-referential notional accumulation of information, what is it? What definition can we give of culture? I believe

that culture is the ability to create orientation, the ability to indicate roads and paths. And how do you do this? The image proposed to us by president Luciano Violante: having a layering and a knowledge of the past that can be physically kept on one's shoulders, but at the same time having the light of the future. It is this orientation capacity that is the institutional task of culture and it does so with these tools. What is all this for? It serves to change the world. The world must be constantly modified, the laws must be constantly modified, because without this we are unable, in fact, to equip the world with the skills it needs, to face new challenges, to face new crises.

I will not speak at all about my main area of work which is, as has been mentioned, the impact of new technologies in the world; but today I would only talk to you about the concept of landscape, because it is structurally linked as much to politics as to culture and also because one of the fundamental aspects of this city of the future is played out there. Without making a long history, the landscape is an Italian invention, it is an Italian creation; the landscape arrives at a certain moment in the history of culture and arrives in Siena with the frescoes of the Good Government between 1338 and 1339. Before there was no landscape. The landscape is not a physical entity: the landscape is the capacity, precisely cultural that becomes political, because it is shared by a society, to see publicly shared aesthetic values. The landscape is the cultural and social and therefore political sharing of an aesthetic vision of the world, which becomes so important that it is the one present in the frescoes of the Good Government in Siena that is a sort of litmus test of these concepts. This is also why we think first of all of the landscape as a Tuscan landscape, because it was born there. But from that landscape to today we have had the cultural capacity to elaborate dozens of other landscape ideas, which also have the same characteristic of being shared, and to create culture, and to create an overall vision. This is crucial to understand. English helps us a lot in this; English helps us with the language, because it uses this suffix: *scape*. *Scape* means vision, and how do the British explain this concept? Simple, they use this suffix *scape* and put in front of it what is needed every time: they say *landscape*, *industrialscape*,

cheepscape, *moonscape*, etc., etc., precisely to indicate the idea that this shared vision, which creates culture, society, shared value, evolves into time and it's not always the same. This does not mean that we do not have strategies to preserve the classic Tuscan landscape; obviously we have them, but in the same way we can have strategies to understand the vitality of some – so to speak – peripheral areas. The whole world that knows Italy knows the world of landscapes of the INA Casa, the peripheral landscape formed in the 1950s that has enormous value because it is a shared and social landscape. And at the same time today we have the possibility to think through new categories about the future, about the future we operate.

There is a fundamental concept that comes from information technology to today's world: "the center is where the action is". There are no longer fixed and static centers, the center is where we have the ability to emanate action and action today is also closely linked to the principles of information and a city of information, which we cannot fail to keep in mind and on which we cannot but play our role.

Dina Nencini - Thanks Nino Saggio. You focus on the importance of technologies and how they directly involve us in every moment of our life by changing the perception of space.

The time has come for the conclusions that Orazio Carpenzano will make. I will also make a brief presentation to him. In addition to being director of the Department of Architecture and Design, he is the coordinator of the Doctorate of Theory and Design, he has carried out research on the interactions between dance, sound, architecture and motion capture and motion graphics technologies. He is currently involved in the construction of the Fellini museum in Rimini and in the transformation of the after-work and theater of the Sapienza University of Rome.

Orazio Carpenzano - With respect to the intentions of the conference, the interventions of the round table did not show complete adherence, but they certainly expressed a wide overlap of interest.

The first thing I would like to point out, which came to mind while Giovanni Maria Flick was speaking, is the title

he gave to another of his books, a book on the Constitution, which I think is *The Constitution as a coexistence manual*. The city is *a manual of coexistence*, if it were not so it would not be a city; a manual of coexistence implies, in its undercurrent, the idea that there is a conflict. The city is a territory of conflict, just as society is a territory of conflict. And with respect to these conflicts we architects are ambassadors – some professions are more so than others – of the attempt to balance them.

The other question stressed by Franco Purini that seems absolutely decisive to me is the following one: do cities express a purpose? Where is the city going? Is it possible to understand where the cities go? I would say that the answer he gave, which I fully agree with, can be reposed as it follows: the city is a territory where stories, traditions, adventures that are partially causal and partially random are made. And that the architect, within this map, in which these two circumstances must coincide, does not have many alternatives other than that of setting provisional stakes that serve to define the circumstances with respect to which the social culture of the moment is expressed; after which the architect must also be willing to move them when the cultural variable changes. And in this sense, the history of cities has told us that some substantial shifts have taken place. The first and greatest, which was also mentioned by Flick, was to consider the city as a place to be defended from the terrifying nature. Thus, the walls meant a space of security against the indeterminate, against the unknown, against what was outside; then we saw that the situation was reversed when the city discovered, also through modernity – one of Franco Purini's obsessions, the famous primitive hut – that nature could instead become the place from which to draw the laws and rules for groped to put conflicts on a level of coexistence. And therefore this is a very important fact that we cannot lose sight of, and it is perhaps the fact that also brings together the relationship with new technologies, that is, with that great adventure of which we need to exercise a very strong intellectual domination, because otherwise the prospect is that the product of our ingenuity will begin to exert a boomerang effect on us, that is, it will feed more and more of our body in order to exercise its power over us.

The question that I was concerned with was another, the question of presentism, which is an absolutely decisive question. Yesterday Giorgio De Rita explained it perfectly, saying that this individual – poor individual – who today deludes himself to solve all his problems, needs to recover a two-faced head and to look in the two main directions along which all the trajectories flow, that lead to existence, to the present: the past and the future. Of course, the past and the future are two forms of unusual memory, because, if we think about it, the exercise on the future, the one expressed by the great visionaries, is an exercise that very often was nourished by a very simple principle, which was that of observation, of a profound observation of the past. The principle of observation, which also inserts the thought of Maturana and Varela into our minds and affirms “Everything said is said by an observer, otherwise it is not”, it is a principle that we have lost, and that is why – as Nino Saggio said – who broke the pact between culture and politics broke. Politics needs to rush, to explain things that deserve deeper reflection and longer decantation, and they don't have time to tell the story, and they don't even have time to try to plan this reality by projecting it onto a future; they only have time to tell what happens now. And this is the drama that highlights Luciano Violante's wonderful intervention, that is, the reasoning that goes in depth and finds issues that almost always tend to demolish, to pick the clear identity of differences, of types; depth always traces much lighter nuances than the divisions we want to make to clarify our ideas better. And then, at this point, it happens that this is to the advantage of those who tend to simplify, to say that there is black and white and that there is no variation of identity, but that there are individual identities, and who are therefore forced to looking at reality not with a single perspective, but with parallel optical cones, which assign different perspectives to each of the things; which are exercises, among other things, that contemporary painters have begun to do. I suggest a painting, in this sense, which is beautiful, painted by Franco Sarnari who worked in the Scicli group. And here I finish and conclude. Why the complex story fails so that some how wants to embrace the dimension of the past and project itself towards the future? Why is it failing

today? Because at this moment it has a serious difficulty: he cannot organize the story of this complexity, it cannot organize it. There are very few who are at work to try to assemble, around these strenuous researches that we carry inside the university, which last years of desperate work, which make us belong to a story, because each of us knows that here is *pro tempore*, but within a story. There are very

few who think they are in a story. Editing this story requires – as Purini said – a project. It is a project that we must begin to consider, that is, the project of how architecture manages to enter society, to be appreciated for what it is, to explain to people what it is for, its necessity as Margherita Petranzan said; because we cannot tell ourselves that we are needed, we need someone to recognize it.