

Rome: a very special, extraordinary, very weak, very difficult normal city

LUCIO VALERIO BARBERA¹

Abstract: Rome is an inadequate city of a modern, small and relatively recent central state, which, however, has found the national foundation on the myths of the city to affirm politically the unitary values that poetry and art had brought out as possible and shared. But Rome, as guardian of supranational myths, is itself two-faced. To fully understand the nature of the modern city grown in Rome in the last one hundred and fifty years, we could compare, for once, the rise of the modern nation called Italy, to the formation of modern South American nations, rather than to the realization of the main historical nations of Europe.

Keywords: Rome two-faced city, formation of Rome capital, modern nations of South America, spontaneous city.

Introduction

Rome Capital of Italy was a political project drafted very slowly with leaps, ambiguity, rethinking and uncertainties over many centuries of its cultural and political history, but then quickly achieved from 1871 to the Second World War. In those seventy years, it corresponded to the development of a functional, social and representative project – that is, administrative, urban and architectural – whose efficiency and value, in its various phases, depended on the political and cultural identity of the unitary state and on the strength of the central government. Considered within a broader framework and with the necessary scholarly detachment now possible, the creation of Rome as the Italian Capital in Europe constituted, between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the largest undertaking of urban invention and construction of a functionally *new and specialized city* – the political and administrative capital of a great new

1. The present text by Lucio Valerio Barbera deals with the problem of modern Rome. It was produced as a part of research program on the critical European Capital cities.

country – even if its success has been very partial, often unsatisfactory, from many points of view, in many moments of its still short history. The fate of Rome, as secular Capital of Italy, a great modern city, in the last decades seems to have been getting out of the central government's attention, for whose institution it was nevertheless conceived. The civic conscience of the Italian populations seems to have already excluded the thought and the image of Rome, Italian Capital Town, from every possible design of a better future. It is therefore time to openly discuss the role of Rome in the coming decades, or in the next century if we have the temerity. A bit of “academic coldness” will overcome the veils of political and cultural involvement. The very cogent problem, on which the fate of Rome depends, is the future of the unitary Italian State as we know it. It seems almost as if Camillo Benso Cavour's two projects – first the Northern Kingdom of Italy (1859), and then the unitary one (1861), i.e. North and South together – are again an alternative to each other. In fact, Rome Capital of Italy has been a controversial political project up to 1870, then it was quickly realized from 1871 to the Second World War. In those seventy years, the building of a secular modern Capital in Rome corresponded to the development of a functional, social and representative project – that is, administrative, urban and architectural – whose efficiency and value always depended on the degree of political and cultural strength of the shared identity of the unitary State; and on the power degree of the Central Government.

Today, the project of an autonomous or semi-autonomous North seems to be moving towards some kind of realization while the South of Italy seems to reveal a political identity more compact than suspected after 150 years of unity within the Italian State, notwithstanding the great differences between urban and agricultural territories of Southern Italy. North and South will probably find an agreement, calibrating the distance between themselves, competitively calculating costs and benefits of their possible new agreement. And in the hiatus between the two Italies the isolation and loneliness of Rome will be accentuated. This reflection intends to launch a new intellectual, technical, interdisciplinary, challenging debate on the destiny of the city of Rome, beyond the traditional interpretative tools, providing also comparative arguments with other old Capital cities of modern Countries that lay in comparable stresses, testing the

transferability of possible new urban development scenarios to other case study, supporting unpredictable and unexpected, feasible elaborations.

Rome, a two-faced city through History: imperial-christian, christian-secular, glories-ruins, legal-illegal

Between 1871 and the First World War,² the Italian Capital city in Rome was intended to be and seem a modern, secular town, different from the ancient city. Thus, the modern Rome was literally and ideologically superimposed onto the papal city while heavily using its old urban axes and monuments and deliberately invading with alien urban models the agricultural spaces and the noble gardens laid within the ancient city Walls.³ First was the time of the “Turinese” regular grid for the new neighbourhoods of Esquilino, Testaccio and Prati di Castello, realized within the Roman Walls or close to the Leonine Walls; then it was the time of the “French”, star-shaped system, imposed on the new neighbourhoods outside the Roman Walls: Prati delle Vittorie, the districts outside the Porta San Giovanni and, lastly, the Piazza Bologna neighbourhood. Quintino Sella (the Minister of Finance who after the Unification of Italy provided the financial resources for the building of the new Capital town) from 1875 sat both in the Italian Parliament and in the Rome City Council. Thus he “was the political director of the operation”⁴ and the rapporteur, in 1881, of the first special law that established the contribution of the State to the Public Works for the realization of the Italian Capital town in Rome (a first amount of Italian £50 million). Sella promoted also the idea of the Secular Rome as the Capital town of Science and Culture, but after about fifteen years only few of his projects had succeed and at the end the whole Sella’s cultural project for Rome was only partially successful. That’s why the Sella’s project for Rome is still considered a valid program to be implemented for a positive future of the Rome of today.⁵

2. Gianni Accasto, Vanna Fraticelli, Renato Nicolini, *L'Architettura di Roma capitale 1870-1970*, Golem 1971.

3. Italo Insolera, *Roma Moderna*, Einaudi 1962 (2011).

4. Fernando Salsano, *Quintino Sella ministro delle Finanze. Le politiche per lo sviluppo e i costi dell'Unità d'Italia*, Il Mulino 2013.

5. Walter Tocci, *Roma. Non si piange su una città coloniale*, goWare 2015.

The modern Rome is certainly a complex and difficult town; from its history and its present, Rome radiates the identity of a multi-levels two-faced city; on the one hand it is the seat of universal, historical, and supra-historical or meta-historical myths; on the other hand, it is an inadequate central city of a modern, small, relatively recent State, which, however, precisely in those myths of the “Roman Urbs” – in fact – found the national foundation for the unitary values that poetry and art had brought out as shared modern myths.

Its eternal values are Roman and Imperial, on the other hand they are Christian, with all the irrepressible continuity of vital and mortal contradictions between the two categories and the real and apocryphal intercourses between them.⁶ But the myth of Glorious, Secular Eternity radiated by the imposing presence of the monuments of ancient Rome contains in itself its most corrosive contradiction, the sense of eternal decadence which we cannot shirk – and that Giulio Carlo Argan put in limelight in a memorable sentence.⁷ It is a sense of decadence which we can not shirk and from which we do not subtract our higher culture; so that the sense of defeat, of ruin coexists with that of an intellectual, ideological nostalgia, which, however, has been able to generate momentum of civil and political passion, you never know how much fleeting for vanity and how much for deception.

Rome, a historical, geographical destiny: an infrastructural hub between Northern and Southern Italy

At the same time, also the national project of the Italian Capital in Rome is a two-faced one: on the one hand, it has generated a rushed

6. Demonstrated by many legends and falsifications, as for the correspondence between Paul and Seneca (not to speak of the Donation of Constantine); see, for instance Moreschini C., Norelli E. 2010, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol. 1, p. 405; G. Röwekamp, *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature*, p. 462: “A supposed secret correspondence between Paul and Seneca is first attested by Jerome (vir. ill. 12; see also Augustine, ep. 153.14) and was considered authentic down into the 15th c. The content of the fourteen letters is philosophical and of little theological importance; they contain primarily manifestations of friendship.”; Mitchell D., *Legacy: The Apocryphal Correspondence between Seneca and Paul: The Apocryphal Correspondence between Seneca and Paul*, Xlibris, Corp.

7. In a well-known quotation of the art historian and former mayor of Rome Giulio Carlo Argan: “Rome is an eternal city, because its decadence will never end [...] Rome has been in decline forever, or almost: it is almost two thousand years that it lives in the memory and regret of its past, but until the capitalist bourgeoisie took possession, Rome was able to decay with dignity and even with style. I do not know a city that knows how to get worse better than Rome.”

and – once – pretentious Capital, inadequate in its functioning and in its modern symbolic values, questioned even today; on the other hand, the same project has invented the main territorial node of the unitary State, that still works with the greatest possible – for us Italians – efficiency: the natural and indispensable national-level infrastructural hinge between North and South.

Perhaps, Camillo Benso Cavour – the “weaver” of the Italian Unity – referred to this when he said that Rome was indispensable to the unity of Italy after the expedition guided by Garibaldi called “i Mille” (The Thousand). Cavour, a practical, pragmatic, positivist man, thought that to go from Florence to Naples without passing through Rome meant wandering in the desert of the Apennines. So Rome was indispensable for the unity of Italy as an infrastructural node, which at that time was perhaps even more necessary than today. But even today, some experts would remind us that the frequency of fast the trains passing at Rome connecting North and South, in some hours of the day is greater than the frequency of the Rome subway metropolitan trains. Thus, from the infrastructural point of view the project for a modern Rome succeeded to the point that the rail and motorway hub of Rome could hardly be abandoned even if the functions of the Italian Capital in Rome were partly vanished or dismissed.

Rome, one century of demographical, economic and spatial transformation 1871-1971 – The political interpretations of the Italian Capital Town

Between 1871 and the end of the Second World War, Rome has grown eight times (from 212,000 to 1,651,000 inhabitants, i.e. about 1,450,000 inhabitants), while Milan has grown four times (from 290,000 to 1,274,000 inhabitants, i.e. about 984,000 inhabitants) and Naples twice (from 489,000 to 1,010,000, or about 520,000 inhabitants), almost in line with the average growth of the Italian population that, in the same period. But in wider span of time, Rome has grown thirteen times in just over a hundred years. And the province of Rome, which like that of Milan, corresponds more realistically to the actual contemporary metropolitan area, has more than four million inhabitants settled in what was the great, rarefied space of the Roman Countryside (Campagna Romana) with a real growth of almost twenty times since 1871. Considered

in the broader European framework with the scholastic objectivity necessary and possible today, the realization of the Italian Capital town in Rome represented, between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the largest, functionally new and specialized city (a Capital Town!). An urban event without possible comparison in our continent, even if its success has been very partial, often unsatisfactory. Somehow, then, contemporary Rome can be considered the largest modern new city in Europe, perched in the nest of the oldest one. One cannot be surprised, then, by the growing of an international, scholarly interest for the form and the genesis of the urban fabrics of the modern Italian Capital town and for the public and private housing prototypes designed and realized in Rome between 1871 and 1960. Indeed they are considered rare models in terms of typological innovation and urban quality based on an idea of modern and however still traditional urban lifestyle, allowed by a mixed-use and compact city, still made for pedestrians, not only for cars. (In this respect refer to the scholars gathered around Conference of New Urbanism – US – and to the last theoretical works of Daniel Solomon and Jean Francoise Lejeune). Anyhow, modern Rome bears the signs of a new, complex town, grown according to the indispensable thrust – and financing – of the Government's will, who somehow “pillaged” the historical values of the antique town to be represented by the whole city, by then intended as the secular “spiritual” centre of the new nation. In this vision the controversial monument of “Vittoriano”, superimposed to the fatal Capitol Hill, in its turn was intended as the secular, spiritual *crown* of a city – using the nomenclature of Bruno Taut⁸ – that wanted to be the secular spiritual centre of a united nation: the maximum rhetorical accentuation of the new national spirit. The competition and the attrition with the Papal tradition of the city were glaring. Many are the anecdotes referred to the anti-papal attempts of the urban design of the Italian Capital in Rome. Well known is the fact that the streets of the first new neighbourhood, Prati di Castello, were traced in a way to never be looking at St. Peter's Dome; as much known is the intentional overturning of the city general plan along the Via XX Settembre-Via Nomentana axis, away from the Papal town. Finally, in the fascist time Benito Mussolini,

8. Bruno Taut 1919, *Die Stadtkrone* (The City Crown).

who initially did not love Rome, was afterwards convinced – probably at first by Armando Brasini and Margherita Sarfatti and then by Marcello Piacentini – to make his own symbolic self-portrait out of the new Rome urban architecture: a new archaic myth synthesizing the Italian Capital town as an indivisible, symbolic, political art work. Even after World War II the great debate on the new, “democratic” Master Plan of Rome was still a fierce discussion about the identity of the Italian Capital city conceived as a symbolic organism representing in its whole – not only in its institutional places – the new, democratic climate of the nation. The two major urban projects discussed and planned during the Sixties, the Asse Attrezzato (SDO, the Oriental Central System, never realized) and the “Progetto Fori” (Roman Forums Project; only partially realized) for the Historic Centre, were imposing programs potentially, directly or indirectly involving and transforming the Capital city in its entirety. However, in the moments of greatest thrust – in the Umbertine period or in the Fascist era – the realization of the Capital project and its maintenance required huge amounts of capital. Large public investments were made and private speculations were equally large, in which the Church (Via Nazionale, etc.) participated directly or indirectly.

Rome; the genesis and the planning difficulties of a modern, two-faced Capital town

Since 1871 a primary concern of all the Italian governments was to make the new capital a socially well-controlled town, hopefully more than the other Italian towns. Before the Urban Planning Bill of the 1942 the first act of the city planning in Italy was to establish the boundaries of what should be considered, planned and treated as a town. Outside the Town boundaries lay the Countryside, a space governed by custom and spontaneity. Moreover, until 1961 in Italy a law against the urbanisation was in force; it forbade immigrating to big Towns from the Countryside or from minor Urban Centres. Both the more important Master Plan of Rome before 1942, the Master Plans of 1909 and of 1931, were conceived for the construction of a city whose physical boundaries and social structures were controllable. A difficult task in a New Capital Town whose realization attired hundreds of thousands of construction workers from the economically depressed regions around Rome. As a

direct consequence there was a growing number of people working in town but living outside the perimeter of the Town Master Plan⁹ in areas where their settlement was entrusted to their own spontaneous initiative. At the same time an important number of poor families were expelled from the town both as consequence of the modern “beautification” of the old historical centre and of a sort of moral purification of the new Capital town. One cannot be surprised if in 1931 a recommendation was issued by the Rome Governorate’s Assistance Office suggesting that: “agricultural workers, generic workers and the unemployed on the one hand, families of irregular composition and bad moral precedents on the other, could be transferred to the land owned by the Governorate in open countryside, not visible from the major road arteries where they would be allowed to build their houses with the materials left by the demolition of parts of the old town”.¹⁰ In the fast-growing emergencies of this wide and irregular outskirts of the Capital Town, the Rome Governorate tried some public intervention without much relief; moreover during the II World War a new, distressed multitude reached the Roman area from the Southern Regions, directly run over by the battlefronts.

Therefore from its beginning – but especially during the fascist age – a two-faced social and urban condition characterized the Italian Capital Town: inside the urban limits the dignity of the urban scene had been well designed and produced and, after all, well preserved. It included the buildings for the Public Institutions and the housing for the administrative and professional bourgeoisie. Outside the boundaries of the planned city a spontaneous and semi-spontaneous scattered city (the new *borgate*) was produced by/for the poorest classes and by/for the old and new immigrants and workers, including approximately half of the population living in the Roman area. In the while from 1942, in force of the new Urban Planning Bill, the separation between the Urban Area and the Countryside was cancelled. The Municipalities became responsible for the planning, the safeguard and the management of the whole municipal territory. But, as always, such a strong, progressive,

9. Italo Insolera, *Roma Moderna*, Einaudi 1962 (1993), p. 127, p. 154, *passim*.

10. Paola Salvatori, *Il governatorato di Roma: l'amministrazione della capitale durante il fascismo*, Franco Angeli 2006; ACS, MI, Comuni, b. 2162, report of the director of social services, 12 December 1929; Giuseppe Talamo, Gaetano Bonetta, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-273. Italian original quotation: “operai agricoli, [...] i disoccupati [...]; e la maggior parte degli operai generici, nonché, famiglie di irregolare composizione e di precedenti morali non buoni, che non sarebbe stato opportuno introdurre in ambienti sani”.

enlightened change could not easily match with the reality. Thus, even some decades later, when the new General Master Plan of Rome (1962) concerning the municipal territory as a whole was approved, the official and the un-official systems of producing the urban settlements, continued to prosper side by side, each according to its own stabilized procedures, because they both were (and still are) based on strong, albeit very different, economic structures. The only difference was that the un-official system simply had become “illegal”! Thus, in this historical frame, we can affirm that in Rome even the unauthorized, illegal or semi-illegal urban fabrics can claim a historical root absolutely “consubstantial” with the idea of Rome as a Capital city. Only in 1980 a Regional Law addressed for the first time the problem of tenure prospecting the issue of property titles to the residents of the illegal *borgate*. “The provision became fully effective in 1985 with the approval of the new national legislation, the so-called “Concono edilizio”, that gave individuals the possibility to fully legalize their properties in ex-change of a fee”.¹¹

Nevertheless also today Rome is experimenting all the functional difficulties of its two-faced social and urban identity, notwithstanding the effectiveness of the Planning Bill of 1942. Rome still supports the central function of the State with its historical values, its modern beautifications of the historical centre, its theatrical perspectives, its infrastructures; on the other hand, especially around and beyond the Grande Raccordo Anulare (Great Ring Junction) a semi-autonomous, semi-legal widely scattered city is spread out, made of very low density settlements, though crucial for the political leadership of the city, (given the number of votes), almost completely self-managed and regulated. They include at least two categories of spontaneous or semi-spontaneous settlements usually called “O Zones” and “Toponyms”. The newest spontaneous settlements, the “Toponyms”, are more than 70 and occupy a territorial surface of 1.900 ha. Today they are called “self-managed Consortiums” (consorzi di autogestione) – which seem to be born, at the beginning, from an impetus of participation, then transformed into pyramidal organizations often of not clear or even obscure leadership, who dominates immense metropolitan sub-regions.

11. Alessandro Coppola, *Evolutions and permanences in the politics (and policy) of informality: notes on the roman case*, “Urbanistica Tre”, n. 2, 2013, p. 25.

The Italian Capital Town in Rome; the irresistible, simple genesis of a decline

Looking back at the last five decades, today is very simple to understand that the decline and even the obfuscation of the national importance and prestige of the Italian Capital Town in Rome followed, in a parallel and contrary path, the rise, the success and the stabilization of the institutional regional system in Italy. In fact, when, at the very beginning of the Seventies, the process of transformation of the institutional asset of the unitary State started and the Regional Governments were established, the major projects and programs for the Italian Capital town – the Asse Attrezzato (SDO, Oriental Directional System), and somehow also the Central Archeological Area – began vanishing away, being continuously re-negotiated and postponed. Indeed, after the Second World War, the Republican Constitution decisively attenuated the importance of the Italian Capital Town in Rome in favour of the re-emerging historical, local identities, too long and too artificially compressed by the idea and the weight of an authoritarian, unitary State which, at the end, had dragged the Country into the Second World War disaster. By then Rome had already lost almost all the artificial, rhetorical significance as “spiritual centre” of a modern, secular new nation. After the Second World War, the historical Roman and Christian myths, living in the stones of Rome, definitely untied the specious bonds deliberately imposed to them by the “political architects” of the modern unity of Italy. We can say that from the political point of view, today the Italian Capital town in Rome is only intended as the functional modest constellation of seats of the central government headquarters, scattered and encamped in the prestigious rooms of a unique and meta-national, cultural “locus” of the Western Civilization. By the million of people, both Italian and foreigner, who visit Rome, the “modern Rome” is generally considered only a vast – perhaps welcoming – campsite for structures of short term hospitality. Besides, Milan, after a decade of momentum culminating with the 2015 International Exposition but far from been concluded, has become “another city, in full, surprising development” – some observer affirms. Even Naples, notwithstanding its secular problems, like Milan is able, when necessary, to realize urban improvements with surprising efficiency acting as a strong modern city naturally generated from a very deep,

continuous, autonomous root in history and in its territory: compare, for example, the rather short time for taking the decision to build in Naples the new Directional Centre – realized in the Eighties – with the heated debate that, from the Sixties to the early Nineties, consumed and finally destroyed the idea of the “Asse Attrezzato” or SDO (Oriental Directional System), never realized in Rome. Today it is considered natural that the headquarters of the dominant political parties are well settled in the North; once all the national political parties crowded together in Rome establishing their headquarters, if possible, in prestigious seats. Rome, a modern Capital Town, “not to be a town for workers”, as Quintino Sella established from the beginning, owes its surprising number of non-EU citizens to the low or very low quality of productive activities existing in town and in the about area. The project of a modern Italian “civilization” – as perhaps Kant would have said – moved decisively towards the Italian Regions. Which benefit of governments elected with a much more effective electoral system than the central government’s one. Any regional governor gives his stamp to his mandate, lives in direct contact with the population and with the productive regional system; on the other side the central government, almost continuously submitted to the scrutiny of a wavering parliament, proportionally elected, unlikely can last more than a third of the electoral mandate. Moreover, as it can clearly be seen in our very time, the composition of the parliament reflects in a more and more strictly way the political prominence of the strongest groups of regions. In this situation almost completely waned the possibility of a central government allocation of the huge financial resources to solve the growing problems of a town of 2.8 million people, not anymore loved as the indispensable representative core of the nation. Time by time, already appear almost silent signs of the will of dissolving of the main functions of the Italian Capital Town in Rome: in 1996 the Giovanni Agnelli Foundation published a study¹² that imagined the de-localization of some national functions out of Rome, in other Italian towns. Closer to our days we can recall more politically founded hypothesis to move some important ministries to Milan and to Naples and some very concrete attempts to remove from Rome part of the fundamental information

12. Marcello Pacini, (ed), *Un federalismo dei valori Percorso e conclusioni di un programma della Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli (1992-1996)*, Edizioni della Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli, 1996.

programmes and offices of the State Radio Broadcasting Organization (RAI) that had a strong role in the in the definition of the pre-eminence of Rome as the Italian Capital Town. The Italian Capital Town, until the second World War invoked at every public and collective level as heir of the Roman Splendour , now at any regional and popular level is baptised: “Rome, the great Burglar”.

To freshly understand the nature of the modern town grown in Rome during the last one hundred and fifty years, we could compare, for once, the rise of the modern nation called Italy, to the formation of the modern nations of South America rather than to the making of the main historical nations of Europe. This exercise must not be intended as a sort of scientific blasphemy, but as a historical check directed to add to the history of modern Italy, a contextual component, for too long neglected. The South American independent nations were adventurously formed between 1810 and 1830; the Kingdom of Italy was adventurously formed in 1861. Not coincidentally the three wars that brought Italy to its political unity are called Independence Wars and not Unification Wars (as, on the contrary, can be said the wars Bismarck wanted to ignite for the formation of the modern German State). Not coincidentally Garibaldi, decisive co-protagonist of the Italian Independence, had in South America his training as a revolutionary leader. From 1859 and 1861, the Italian new political project dramatically – and adventurously – changed three times. The original project, sponsored by France, forecast a small and rich Italian Kingdom of North Italy (capital Town in Turin), a Kingdom of Central Italy under French influence (capital Town in Florence), the survival of the Kingdom of Naples under the old French Bourbon Dynasty (Capital town in Naples). Rome and a small environment should be left to the Pope, whom could be given the honorific title of president of a sort of Italian federation. One year later, following the nervous and unsatisfactory military events, the most part of the North regions and Tuscany were annexed to Piedmont. Soon after, the romantic, republican and “South American” adventure of Garibaldi in the South of Italy – with the open design to win Rome and destroy, once for ever, the Papal Kingdom –, pushed a reluctant King of Piedmont to confront his military power with the Garibaldi’s one in a friendly show up. All the

Italian South was absorbed in the still uncertain Italian kingdom. The Capital town was moved to Florence. Rome was left to the Pope. Ten years later, when Napoleon the Third abdicated, the republican dream was achieved by the new King of Italy: the Capital town was moved to Rome. As already recalled, Quintino Sella, the powerful finance minister, affirmed: Rome “must not be an industrial city” and was not a city of workers. Rome, whose symbolic fascination was called to sustain the new kingdom, could not have a modern, productive future. So, we dare say that the two-faced town born in and around Rome in modern time, is somehow – we could say: structurally – similar to a former Colonial¹³ Capital town: an illegal or semi-legal or very low quality city squatted around and within the formal structures and landmarks of a Capital of feeble economy. In Rome, during the small economic recovery – that all Italy is experiencing – the GDP is growing less than the national average, just as in the 2008-2010 crisis, its GDP fell more than national average. Today Rome is a town of 2,8 million people. Due to the governmental inattention and to the weakness of its economy, the social fabric of modern Rome is being infected by the creeping evil of the mafias: old mafias from the South in the central Town, new local mafias in the outskirts. On the other hand the tourist activities assault the historical centre with the same low quality and abrasive attitude that we can more clearly see in Venice. However the tourist activities today help the families of the local bureaucratic bourgeoisie to partially recover, with B&B and similar low level activities, from the crisis that subtracted about 20% of their income. Socially Rome is panting, the central government very forgetful, the We need to start thinking about modern Rome as a very difficult, very weak, unique, extraordinary, otherwise normal city.

13. Walter Tocci, *Roma. Non si piange su una città coloniale*, goWare, 2015. “The two great architectural historians Leonardo Benevolo and Italo Insolera have used the term ‘colonial city’ in different contexts to underline the rapid development without sedimentation, as the capitals of the developing countries that have become the largest cities of the world in a short time”. Leonardo Benevolo, *Roma da ieri a domani*, Laterza, 1971. Italo Insolera, *Roma. Immagini e realtà dal X al XX secolo*, Laterza, 1985, pp. 368-370.