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ABSTRACT

During the reign of Benito Mussolini (1925–1943), Italian architects reevaluated the purpose and direction that modernism had taken in Italy, reorienting its previous focus on progressive, functional architecture for the masses to include political propaganda for the state. From the Novecento, Rationalist, and Futurist movements, the Regime chose designs that referred back to the stark monumentality of Imperial Rome. This thesis argues that despite such constraints, Italian architects managed to find innovative solutions and novel forms for representing Italian fascist rhetoric, producing a great deal of individual variation within the architectural schools with which they were associated. Support for Mussolini’s empire rested on popular mythologizing about the former Roman Empire and the belief among Italians that the nation and its people were destined to revisit its glory. The propagandistic forms designed by Italian architects employed by the state, as I argue, reflect this understanding as to the role of classical heritage in the present and the place of individual innovation. The principal evidence for my claim is the architecture and urban planning associated with the aborted *Esposizione universale* of 1942 (colloquially known as E42). The state used this suburban network of exhibition halls to display the supremacy of contemporary Italian culture by making reference to classical Roman antiquity and to a lesser extent the monumental forms of the Renaissance. My study investigates the ways in which the architects of E42, in seeking to integrate the masses on a personal level with the political ideology of the state, referenced Roman antiquity and the Renaissance, thereby visualizing connections between Mussolini’s empire and the successful authoritative governments of Italy’s past. I provide a detailed assessment of E42 and the various architectural schools competing for state sponsorship in order to demonstrate that the production of Italian fascist visual culture was contingent to a greater degree than has previously been acknowledged upon the notion that the state fostered some measure of individualism in artistic design.
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INTRODUCTION

Planning for the 1942 World Exhibition in Rome instigated the production of a new suburban center EUR (Esposizione Universale Roma), or E42 (Esposizione 1942), which was designed to convey, formally and symbolically, two thousand years of Italian national, regional, and individual identity. The exhibition spaces contained within E42’s palaces (Palazzi) displayed state support for transforming popular art and archaeology into a culture for the masses. By championing unilateral appreciation for the accomplishments of the Italian people, the E42 complex strengthened the group mentality toward national and regional unity among Italian citizens. Forming part of the ancient Roman port city of Ostia, the complex had both permanent and temporary exhibition structures. E42 stood both as a provisional exhibition for the 1942 display of Italian culture and as strategic propaganda machine fueled to expand the city of Rome to the coast by means of its permanent structures. The regime perceived this expansion as propaganda for connecting Mussolini’s empire to ancient Rome, the latter of which, at its apogee, controlled most of Europe. Fascist Italy fostered a culture that looked toward an idealistic future at the same time as it glorified the idealistic Roman past.

In 1935, Giuseppe Bottai, then governor of Rome, proposed the idea of hosting a World Exhibition event in Rome to display the strengths and achievements of Italian civilization. Mussolini quickly saw this as an opportunity to strengthen popular support for the fascist cause and to display the vitality and potential of the fascist political system to the world. Despite Mussolini’s annexation of Ethiopia in 1935-36, the general policy of appeasement by the French and British governments of the mid-1930s, in an effort to keep “peace for our time,” accommodated the demands of the fascist regime and other

---

1 “World Exhibition Rome”
3 Ibid., 393.
4 Neville Chamberlain (Prime Minister of England) read the following statement after returning from the 1938 Munich Conference, in which Hitler agreed to cease his demands for territory, permitted the annexation of the Sudetenland (Czechoslovakia): "My good friends, for the second time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honour. I believe it is peace for our time...Go home and get a nice
totalitarian governments of Europe. In June 1936, as part of this policy, the International Exhibitions Bureau in Paris approved Mussolini’s proposal for Rome’s sponsorship of the 1942 World Exhibition.⁵

Although many scholars regard E42 as the "triumph" of the Rationalist group of architects, the complex’s chief architect, the Rationalist Marcelo Piacentini, borrowed many characteristics from other domestic and continental architectural movements. Piacentini’s style is often identified as a median between the progressive architecture of the Gruppo 7 and the International Style of Le Corbusier and Walter Gropius and the traditional, classicized architecture of the Novecento Italiano. The other rationalist architects involved with the project Giuseppe Pagano, Ettore Rossi, Luigi Piccinato, and Luigi Vietti brought their region’s heritage and architectural history into the making of E42.⁶ Although the extent of their individual involvement on each building’s design remains unclear, scholars note Giuseppe Pagano and Marcello Piacentini worked closely together on the urban plan and assumed a somewhat shared role in the project’s overall supervision. Besides the predominant Rationalist influence on the project, several architects forming part of the peripheral architectural movements of Italian modernism took part in the planning of E42. Giovanni Muzio, a Novecento Italiano architect, took part in the deliberation and planning of the complex, imbuing E42’s structures with traditional influences, which strengthened Piacentini’s direction toward his devised “simplified neoclassicism.” Another architect involved, Giuseppe Terragni, influenced highly by the International Style of the German Bauhaus movement, reinforced the progressive quality of E42’s forms. This helped differentiate the overall style of the buildings from the pure neoclassicism of the Novecento Italiano and characterized E42 as an amalgamation of traditional and modernist architectural trends. E42 synthesized the major art movements of Italy into a collective project, which represented Italian culture of the past, present, and the project, idealistic future.

E42 remains an intricate project, whose symbolism, derived from its urban plan and formal sources, imbues the whole with social, political, and religious meaning. E42 reinforces Italian religious identity and the regime’s relationship with the Vatican by including the church SS. Pietro e Paolo and making various references in its urban plan to the unity of state and religion. Its social implications rely on E42’s reinforcement of national and regional identity, supported by its grand displays of popular culture and historical legacy.

In this paper, I discuss the final fascist urban planning project E42 and its legacy to Modern Italian architecture as a work that adapts aspects of Italian national, regional, and individual identity; that unites contemporary with historical architectural trends; that honors the accomplishments of Italian history; and that directs Italy toward the future as a successful modern empire. Despite the political constraints placed on Italian architecture, architects managed to find innovative solutions and novel forms for representing Italian fascist rhetoric, producing a great deal of individual variation within the architectural schools under which they were associated. Through E42, this thesis will explain the effects of political rhetoric on Italian fascist cultural identity and the active roles individual architects took to direct Italian modernism toward a mixture between progressive and traditional architectural forms.
i.i THE URBAN PLAN

Just as the Emperor Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire looked to Constantine and ancient Rome for artistic inspiration in the middle ages, Mussolini and the fascist regime assimilated the values of Augustus Caesar and the early Imperial Roman Empire to justify their rule over early twentieth-century Italy. In an effort to represent Roman influence, the E42 complex utilizes Roman axial geometry to create even boundaries and parcel space according to Roman urban planning models, such as imperial fora (Fig. 1). The complex arranges the buildings themselves in pairs to create focal points on cross axes, whose relative positions devise symbolic dichotomies and comparisons in function and meaning. Its main longitudinal axis runs from the Olympic Stadium to Piazza Marconi, where a truncated obelisk stands in tribute to Gugliemo Marconi, a Nobel-prize winning scientist credited with the invention of the telegraph. The use of the obelisk as a commemorative vehicle recalls the Imperial legacy of Roman emperors, who brought spolia obelisks to Rome after various expansion expeditions. In addition to being an ancient Roman practice, obelisks also reference the Papacy and Italy’s cultural ties with the Vatican. In the Renaissance and Baroque, reigning Popes used obelisks as visual markers to guide religious pilgrims through Rome’s religious attractions, enhancing the scenic journey toward the Vatican. Mussolini and the fascist regime understood Church support would help legitimize the empire in the eyes of the predominately Catholic Italian population. They, therefore, sought to assimilate traditional Church practices with Fascist indoctrination to ease the popular transition to fascism. Mussolini, for example, looted an obelisk from Axum during his 1936 annexation campaign in Ethiopia and installed it at Piazza Porta Capena on the western outskirts of Rome, where it remained until 2005.7

When conceptualizing this new suburban center, the regime understood the importance of conveying the Church’s authority as part of the grand display of Roman history and civilization. The

---

avenue leading from the Church of SS. Pietro e Paolo perpendicularly bisects E42’s main axis—the Via Cristoforo Colombo—and guides visitors to the Central Archives building. This pairing seeks to unite Church history with national history as a united front of Italian culture; united, as they were, since antiquity. Likewise, a second cross axis runs from the Palazzo dei Congressi, the complex’s convention center, to the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana, a monument dedicated to the nation’s accomplishments after the 1861 unification of the autocratic Italian city-states. Together, these structures present a metaphor for the unification of regional identities under the national umbrella. Since the Palazzo dei Congressi accommodates a large gathering, the axis connecting it to the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana represents the unification of regional identities under a collective national identity.

The main longitudinal axis, the Via Cristoforo Colombo, begins at the southwestern end of the complex at the Olympic Stadium and runs north toward the piazza Marconi, eventually becoming the Via dell’Impero in Rome (fig. 2). Mussolini’s 1932 design for the space surrounding the Colosseum included the construction of the Via dell’Impero, an avenue connecting the Colosseum, the Altare della Patria (Altar of the Fatherland), and Piazza Venezia, where he often gave speeches and held rallies. This avenue runs alongside the ancient Roman Fora and the Market (or Forum) of Trajan, which, enhanced with iconic portraits of Roman emperors, provided an appropriate backdrop for Mussolini’s own ritual displays. The avenue offered a unified imperial statement in support of the fascist state by restoring ritual context to the area formerly used by Roman emperors for their triumphal parades. Historian Heather Hyde Minor argues that the avenue is symbolic for Fascism’s seizure of power in Italy. These ritualistic displays of power, the ancient Roman maps and propagandistic photomontages that lined Rome’s main avenue during Mussolini’s reign, became a metaphor for Mussolini creating a path and legacy for himself wherever he went. Although in recent decades the city changed the street’s name to Via dei Fori

---

8 The new avenue opened the same year as the 1932 Mostra della Revoluzione Fascista. The construction of the avenue greatly aided Mussolini’s rhetoric and association to Imperial Rome, as his speaking platform in Piazza Venezia directly overlooks the bulk of the grand ancient Roman monuments.

Imperiali, the monuments still survive and visitors to Rome continue to bring offerings to the statues of Julius and Augustus Caesar. In addition to its propagandistic function, this direct connection to Rome’s cornerstone of imperial monuments reinforces L’EUR’s purpose as a satellite city for Rome’s western expansion to the sea and is emblematic of Mussolini’s imperial program.

The complex references the layout of the Forum of Trajan (located on Via dei Fori Imperiali), an intricate market center built in the second century after Trajan’s campaigns in Dacia (Fig.3). Like E42, the Forum emphasizes the accomplishments of its leader and therefore stands as a metaphorical ‘triumphal arch’ for empirical order and Roman victory. The Forum also features a tall commemorative column, which not unlike an obelisk in its function presents imperial victories in Dacia as a national accomplishment. Marconi’s obelisk functions in the same way, in that it presents the intellectual wealth of the state under its current leadership. E42 extends the city of Rome to its ancient coast, by means of a political and cultural center, which harkening back Italy’s ancient Roman past connects E42 to the cultural foundations laid by the Catholic Church in the Renaissance and alludes to the projected, idealistic future with its modernist stylistic forms.
i.ii. THE BUILDINGS

The eight main buildings that compose the bulk of the E42 complex run from northeast to southwest along its main longitudinal axis from the INPS buildings to the Olympic Stadium (fig.1). For the purpose of my discussion, I will examine the following buildings: Palazzo del INPS (fig.4), the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana (fig.5), the Palazzo dei Congressi (fig.6), Museo Nazionale Preistorico Etnografico (fig.7), the Museo delle Tradizioni e Arti Popolari (fig.8), the Church Santissimi Pietro e Paolo (fig.9), Archivio Centrale dello Stato (fig.8), and the Museo della Romanità (fig.10) in the order they appear on the urban plan and according to their relative positions on the cross axes running perpendicular to the main road.

At the northeast end of E42, the two hemispherical INPS buildings (fig.4) around the Piazza Marconi recall the embracing arms of Bernini’s colonnade for St. Peters Basilica (fig.5), as well as the oval configuration of the ancient Roman Colosseum. In the fascist fashion of approaching earlier forms with innovative solutions, the facades of the INPS buildings use a series of horizontal ribbon windows to convey elevation and delineate negative space, instead of traditional colonnades and entablatures. Since E42 sought to recall the grandeur of ancient Rome, its architects borrowed many antique designs for their plans. The INPS buildings feature sculptural reliefs depicting the allegories of Genoa and Venice, which salute the successful autarchy of the Italian Renaissance city-states (fig.6). It is also important to note the prevalence of sculptural relief in antiquity and its revival in the Renaissance, furthering the connection between the present Italian empire and the authoritative governments of Renaissance and Imperial Rome. The buildings are also important for their impact on social reform. Mussolini instituted the INPS social security reform, which originated the first Italian pension system for retired workers. This system promoted the fascist regime as a ‘by the people, for the people’ government, which through the installment of such welfare programs sought to restore the former bureaucratic functions of ancient Roman society.
The *Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana* (fig.7), arguably the most notable building at E42 and colloquially known among scholars as the “square Colosseum,” features a repeating arcade on all four sides and a six-story elevation. A glass atrium fills its interior and opens to the sky (fig.8). This kind of construction references ancient Roman villa types which also feature atria as part of their design, but on a much smaller scale. The piazza immediately surrounding the building features twenty-eight statues in classical proportion, personifying themes of civilization, such as agriculture, astronomy, history, industry, and politics, and four over-life-sized equestrian horsemen (fig.9). The horsemen, casting off their armor beneath their rearing horses, follow the Greco-Roman convention of the heroic nude. Although some scholars identify the equestrian statues as *dioscuri*, the figures surrounding the *Palazzo* do not possess the usual iconography of skullcap and toga. I would argue that the figures instead refer to Roman legions or the *equetes* class, the ancient Roman cavalry with their armor at their side, ready for battle.

The *Palazzo dei Congressi* (fig.10), the convention center of the complex, continues the smooth, unarticulated travertine walls characteristic of all the buildings at E42. Like the *Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana*, which resembles the Colosseum, the *Palazzo dei Congressi* with a portico temple front and a prominent dome resembles the layout of the ancient Roman Pantheon (fig.12). The facade of the *Congressi*, with its sixteen columns and receded glass doors, brings to mind the portico temple facades of Greco-Roman design (fig.13). Despite these obvious references to antiquity, the style of the building itself is very modern and innovative. Its architects clearly perceived the present as predicated upon a past that was not disassociated from modernity. Instead of a true dome, the building joins four glass lunettes to create its hemispherical shape, letting in much more light than the central oculus of the Pantheon (fig.11). *Congressi* resolves the awkward transition between the Pantheon’s temple façade and its rotunda by using a square base to support the dome of the *Congressi*. This method borrows upon the building tradition of Byzantium and the Late Italian Renaissance, in which pendentives anchored a circular or
elliptical dome to a square base. The function of the building is concerned with relating regional identity to nationalist cause, the repercussions of which I will discuss later.

Two L-shaped buildings, the Museo Nazionale Preistorico Etnografico (fig.14) and Museo delle Tradizioni e Arti Popolari (fig.15), that flank the Piazza Marconi mirror one another both in meaning and form. Each building features a two-story facade with colored marble columns on the top story and travertine pillars on the bottom. Architects fashioned the columns from a green marble resembling the chipollino marble used in antiquity for temple structures. This choice of indigenous materials for this project intended to emphasize Italy’s independence from the rest of the world (at least up to this point). Despite its classical features, Piacentini and his architects also integrated new design forms. Instead of using classical vaulting techniques, for example, the structure utilizes a simple flat, rectilinear ceiling for its top story, continuing the austere monumentality suggested by the square pillars on its bottom story. The use of these pillars correlates the idea of form following function. The pillars support weight more effectively than columns, which explains their presence on the bottom story: form from function.

The Complex also addresses religious identity in part by recalling Italy’s historical relationship with the Vatican. The Church of SS. Pietro e Paolo (fig.16) on the grounds of E42 identifies the Church as central component of Italian identity and cultural history. Its centralized orientation and design also evoke those aspects of the Pantheon, but its namesake dedication to St. Peter and the fenestration on the dome clearly point to St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome (fig.17). Facing directly across from the Central Archives, architects and city planners provide a statement for the integration of secular and religious history into one, unified representation of Italian culture at E42. By including the church in the complex the fascist regime maneuvered politically to forge an alliance with the Catholic Church, and to present its figurehead Mussolini as proprietor and protector of both secular and religious matters.

---

10 It is not known whether the Palazzo dei Congressi uses ‘pendentives,’ or curved triangular segments, to attach its dome to the rest of the structure, but the construction is similar to structures, which do use pendentives. An example would be the Church of Hagia Sophia (6C) in modern-day Istanbul.
The building across from the Church, the *Archivio Centrale dello Stato* (fig.18), serves a similar role in preserving the nation’s foundational history, emphasized with its dominant masculine forms. The building, like the Museum of Roman Civilization, uses Doric columns to relate the masculinity of history and Mussolini’s central role in safeguarding and preserving the history and cultural identity of the Italian peninsula. The elevated platform podium of the building references ancient Greco-Roman temples (fig.13), whose tall staircases permitted access for practitioners, as well as physically and symbolically elevating the status of the building.

A huge portico (fig.16), formed from the union of the two L-shaped buildings of the *Museo Nazionale Preistorico Etnografico* and the *Museo delle Tradizioni e Arti Popolari*, marks the transition from the center of E42 at the Piazza Marconi to the *Museo della Civiltá Romana* (fig.20). A counterpart to the Museum of Italian Civilization, the Museum of Roman Civilization was separated from the rest of the complex by means a long avenue leading from the Piazza Marconi. The museum obviously stands as tribute to the accomplishments of ancient Rome and seeks to educate visitors to L’EUR on the importance and impact of its civilization. The building was based on Roman stone masonry designs and its monolithic colonnade, uniting the two sides of the building and also flanking the entrance (fig.21), references the Temple of Amun-re at Karnak, Egypt (fig.22). Although the architects of E42 refrained in general from using classical orders, they used them sparingly for making specific statements. The museum, for example, features monolithic Doric columns, which symbolize a masculine history, dominated first by the emperors of Rome and now by Mussolini. The objects housed in the museum made their original debut at the bimillenium celebration of the birth of the emperor Augustus in 1937, but it was not until the museum opened at L’EUR that the objects found a permanent home. The interior of the Museum displays objects in its various exhibition rooms according to age and period, which creates a sense of chronology and continuity between exhibits. It houses a large-scale reconstruction of ancient
Rome, which collectivized archaeological excavations of the time into a unified representation of Roman history.\textsuperscript{11}

The state of Italian architecture in the early twentieth century is best defined as a composite of tradition and innovation. Since the regime supported the renewal of Italy under the scope of a new Roman empire, its artistic forms (the main vehicle for the dissemination of politics to the masses) reflected the ideology of the fascist state. While harkening the past with the use of a simplified neoclassicism, Marcelo Piacentini and the progressive architects working on \textit{E42} sought to display Italy’s historical supremacy in society and architecture.

\textsuperscript{11} Mussolini’s zeal for ancient Rome and his personal idol Augustus Caesar created an influx of state-sponsored archeological projects.
iii. THE STATE OF THE LITERATURE

Although several architectural scholars cite E42 as an example of Italian fascist architecture, few if any focus on it exclusively. Most scholars recognize E42 in terms of its contributions to Italian modernism and fail to address its importance for focusing the haphazardness of Italian architecture into a compromise between past, present, and future. In 1961, George Mras described the eclectic nature of Italian modernism in his important essay “Fascist Italian Architecture: Theory and Image” as “fascist relativism,” a term he used to account for the tendency of Italian architectural practice to support both traditional and progressive forms. He ascribed this tendency to the inherent duality of Italian politics, which persistently seeks to reconcile the cultural accomplishments of the past with the nation’s goals for the future, synthesizing both tradition and innovation in its rhetoric and building programs. Although Mras mentioned E42 in his general discourse on the relationship between art and politics in the fascist state, he failed to provide an assessment of the building plan, its sources, and any biographical information on its architects.

Denis Doordan addressed the effects of Italian fascist political culture on the development of modern architecture in his 1983 article “The Political Content in Italian Architecture during the Fascist Era.” Doordan argued that the regime established a political and aesthetic ideology grounded in individual expression, which in turn demonstrated the range of possibilities for the collective challenge of codifying fascist visual culture. Doordan briefly examined the political and social implications of E42, but, like Mras, he failed to analyze the complex and its structures. In fact, his only protracted discussion of E42 concerned the competition for the design of the Palazzo della Civiltà by architects associated with the Rationalist movement. In a later book, Building Modern Italy: Italian Architecture 1914-1936, Doordan examined E42 as part of the submission of progressive architecture during the later years of fascist architecture to the “reactionary historicism” of state neoclassicism. I consider E42 as the culmination of this progression toward “neoclassicism” not because the regime preferred classicism over the avant-garde, but rather because the pseudo-Roman forms at E42 proved effective for evoking the idea
of imperial expansion and Rome’s appropriation of its ancient borders. I have also built upon Emily Braun’s understanding of the development of populist art in fascist Italy in her recent volume on Mario Sironi. E42 signaled this return to mass appeal through the appreciation of historical legacy and, by successfully adopting innovative aesthetic responses to traditional architectural forms, it effectively conveyed the past, present, and future of Italian visual culture.

In “Exhibiting the Mussolinian City: Memories of Empire in the World,” an important essay dating to 2000 that focuses exclusively on E42, Ann Notaro considers the complex as a highly politicized example of modern urban planning and architecture. Despite her focus on E42, however, she neither examines the various buildings that comprise the complex nor offers biographical information on the architects responsible for its formal style and planning. She focuses much more on E42 as an exhibit, rather than as a complex of permanent structures designating the expansion of the empire and the evolution of the preferred style for fascist building programs. Finally, although she recognizes E42’s importance to the construction of Italian fascist identity, she does not consider the extent to which the fascist slogans Italianità and Romanita contributed to the discourse on the complex.

In his 2007 article “Constructing Fascist Identity,” Jan Nelis introduced the relevance of the terms Romanita and Italianità to Italian fascist identity. For Nelis, E42’s relationship to classical architecture was a function of ‘the aesthetization of politics,’ by which the past serves as an example for the future, but only to the extent that “past glories are surpassed by those of the [projected] future.” Mussolini sought to promote his empire as an innovative and progressive political entity for future generations. He used Rome to promote the longevity of the Italian race and to argue on behalf of an Italian empire. Nelis briefly cites E42 as part of the Via del Mare, with which the regime strengthened its claims for the expansion of the empire and its entitlement to Rome’s ancient coast. Although he failed to consider E42

---

12 The “indigenous art” for the masses emerged through the mural tradition of Renaissance Italy, whence painters used symbolism to convey religious and political messages to the illiterate masses. This is effectively conveyed at E42 not only with the inclusion of museums for housing popular art, but the neoclassical quality of the complex’s architecture, reinforces the idea of cultural continuity and tradition.
as a permanent complex, Nelis described how fascist symbols filled the collective memory of the masses and created a sense of community that the regime harvested for its imperial cause.

Secondary sources confirm that Italians welcomed E42 at the time of its construction. Notaro cites Giuseppe Borrelli De Andreis, the secretary of the *Instituto Nazionale di Urbanistica*, who wrote in 1940.\(^{13}\)

>[The effect of E42] is that of adding a new, modern and beautiful quarter to the cold city, extending it toward the sea... the imperial city which should be the document in stone of fascist civilization in centuries to come...not a new satellite, but a new star, as great as the old one, not simply a quarter of Rome, but a new Rome, a modern one with the same characters of monumentality and universality so as to perform the imperial function she has today.\(^{14}\)

The program’s main opponents were those architects and urban planners involved in propagating traditional architectural forms. Chief among these were members of the Novecento movement, who regarded Piacentini’s work on E42 as a travesty of classicism. One such opponent, Ugo Ojetti, editor of the *Casabella* architectural journal, specifically criticized Piacentini’s progressivist interpretation of classical forms at La Sapienza and E42. Ojetti recalled the historical successes of traditional Italian architectural forms, their impact to international architectural theory and the frequency with which the “column and the arch” has been quoted throughout architectural history. Singling out ancient Roman monuments in particular as having stood the test of time, Ojetti argues that contemporary Italian “fads,” such as Rationalism, will eventually die out, leading to the restoration of the column and arch to Italian

---

\(^{13}\) Established in 1930, the National Institute of Urban Planning served to promote the construction and study of Italy’s urban centers. Borrelli De Andreis served as secretary for the Institute’s 1940 administrative board of directors. Although the Institute was probably subsidized under fascist protocol, E42 was for the most part regarded as a positive effort to promote Italy’s historical legacy domestically and abroad. E42’s main opponents included those individuals for the preservation of traditional forms of architecture, such as the Novecento movement, or those involved strictly in progressive architecture, to whom E42 remained an outdated monument to Classicism. The following critics failed to notice that E42 as a synthesis of historicism and progressive; the marriage of innovation and cultural continuity.

architecture. In contrast to these authors I point to the popular success of Rationalism, a movement that integrated modernism with tradition and that reached a wider audience than either the Novecento or Futurism. Piacentini, a central figure in the Rationalist movement, builds upon the Italian classicizing tradition and clearly refers to the past in his architectural forms. His style, however, is nevertheless distinctly modern. E42 must thus be considered as a critical part of Italian modernism.
E42’s main architect Marcello Piacentini, although typically associated with the Rationalist movement, drew inspiration for his unique forms from peripheral architectural movements, namely the Novecento, Futurist, and Internationalist styles. His *stile litorio*, or ‘simplified neoclassicism’ borrowed from his traditionalist contemporaries of the Novecento Italiano, but he refined the forms as to eliminate classical orders and ornamentation. Piacentini himself agreed, “The fundamental and permanent principles of architecture must be found in our cities and our past,” but that architecture must be adapted for their times and relate to the generations they represent. For these reasons, Piacentini did not simply place a column and arch in his designs, but modified these forms to remind the viewer of traditional infrastructure, without actually using such hierarchies and orders. His structures are thus austere, balanced, and monumental buildings reminiscent of Roman architecture, but without the ornamentation and symmetry associated with classical orders. Piacentini adopted these tenets from the International style of architecture, typical of the German Bauhaus movement, which emphasized architectural forms predicated from both the function of the building and the inherent qualities of materials. Unlike other building projects of the time, E42 acted as a “blank canvas,” with which to create a new city not built upon the facades of earlier times, but rather one that referenced the cultural achievements of its mother city, Rome. Early plans for E42 reflected advanced urban planning ideas for the temporary buildings, while the permanent structures maintained the monumentality of Roman precedents. This conveyed the idea of classical architecture as timeless in quality, and which, surviving

---

15 Founded in 1922, the Novecento movement, or “call to order,” rejected the avant-garde of the years up to 1918 for the traditional forms of the Renaissance. Although the Novecento artists contributed some works to the state building program, the forms were not radical enough to inspire innovation and renewal, and, therefore, could not effectively support political rhetoric. The Novecento movement continued the convention of identifying periods of art and architecture by centuries, associating itself with the Renaissance (*Cuattrocento* and *Cinquecento*) and the Baroque (*seicento*).


17 The purpose of the building determined the materials used.

18 This refers to the Baroque practice of reusing earlier facades in reconstruction. The building itself was new, but the facade was kept uniform with the rest of the block for generations. Mussolini and the fascist regime wanted a new city that could project both an idealistic future, while retaining a sense of pride for the achievements of past Italians civilizations; a city that moved forward, while still paying reverence to its foundations in the past.
for two millennia, appropriately accommodated present and the utopian future generations of Italy to come.

The Rationalist movement spawned in 1926 Milan as a compromise between the traditionalist forms of the Novecento and the radical, industrial architecture of the Futurists. It sparked an interest in the geometric forms of classical architecture, but it also integrated progressive architectural solutions and modern-day materials. The international economic sanctions placed on Italy’s imports following its 1935 conquest of Ethiopia greatly affected the nation’s ability to construct tall buildings. As material resources such as steel and iron became increasingly scarce, architects turned to traditional and indigenous materials for their constructions, including marble and travertine. The integration of indigenous travertine and marble into E42 compounded its nationalist associations. One can argue then that fascist architecture in Italy was formally and materially linked to political action and political theory. Like other Italian architectural movements, the Rationalists sought state-sponsored projects, for which they found innovative solutions for representing Italian fascism.

Many of the same Rationalist architects involved at E42, such as Pagano, Foschini, and Piacentini contributed to an earlier urban planning project involving the renovation of the University of Rome’s campus (fig.23 & fig.24). In 1935, the regime commissioned Marcello Piacentini to direct the renovation of Rome’s historic university campus La Sapienza to communicate Roman regional identity. Studies of the campus reveal stark similarities to E42, including the use of a Roman axial plan; indigenous materials marble and travertine; the severe Italian modernist style; the use of monumental forms; and the absence of classical orders and architectural hierarchies. Fascism appealed to the Rationalists because the active transformation of political order presented an opportunity for a cultural revolution as well, for which they sought to establish Rationalism as its foremost architectural movement. Scholar Denis Doordan agrees that while the use of traditional forms seems antithetical for a modernist approach to architecture, the
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public viewer never associated progressive architecture as antithetical to the traditionalist values of fascism; many indeed shared the perception that Futurism had prepared the way for fascism.\textsuperscript{20} The Rationalists borrowed from tradition to stake their claims for cultural longevity, but they also adapted to modern times: “There is no incompatibility between our past and present. We do not want to break with tradition; it is tradition that transforms itself, and assumes new aspects, though few recognize it.”\textsuperscript{21} The situation differed in Nazi Germany. Unlike the Italian fascists, the Nazis adopted traditional forms for their official state style and promoted propaganda that stigmatized progressive and innovative architectural solutions as part of the negative dogma against the former Weimar Republic.

In addition to the economic sanctions placed on Italy, which limited the availability of construction materials for architects, Mussolini’s reluctance to adopt a state style contributed to the creative license given to artists and the fruition of variety and individual expression. Since most architects sought state sponsorship, each individual architect presented his own architectural interpretation of fascist ideology. Architects confronted the relationship between form and meaning, which, given the environmental concerns of the construction site and the materials available, led to the design of buildings infused with both political and cultural symbolism. One example of form following function is Giuseppe Terragni’s 1939 Casa del Fascio (fig. 25) for Lissone. The fascist party sponsored an extensive building program for its affiliates in every Italian city. The case (“houses”) integrated party affairs into the existing cultural fabric. These new buildings, with their characteristic monumentality and unarticulated surfaces, stood out against the embellished Renaissance and Baroque facades of Italian cities. Using a glass grid-work facade instead of the traditional stone masonry, the Casa del Fascio symbolically conveyed the limited boundary between the fascist government and the masses; one that did not hide in the illustrious palaces of Italy’s former kings, but rather related to and


communicated with the masses on a more intimate level.22 In the architectural journal Quadrante, architect Terragni described his choice of building materials for the Casa del Fascio in terms of the underlying metaphor between art and politics: “Fascism is a glass house into which all can look gives rise to this interpretation... no encumbrance, no barrier, no obstacle between the political leaders and the people.”23

The Rationalist architects Giovanni Guerini, Ernesto La Padula, and Mario Romano incorporated a similar motif into their design of the Palazzo della Civiltá Italiana, which as a “square Colosseum” with a central glass core, reflected the same principles of transparency and communication between the governing authority and its constituent body (fig.8). Likewise, the Palazzo, the tallest structure of the complex, appeared as a tower, dominating the urban landscape just like bell towers of Renaissance cities. The Casa del Fascio also featured a tower as part of its design, which in the context of the Italian building traditionally symbolized communal identity. The inscription forged on all four sides of the Palazzo emphasized the idea of communal identity and called for a united effort from all Italians, past and present, to continue Italy’s historical supremacy in the arts and intellectual advances: “A people of poets, artists, heroes, saints, dreamers, scientists, navigators, and immigrants (fig.8).”24

Nearly two years after the proclamation of the Italian empire in 1936, work began on the World Exhibition and the unveiling of a new city-center for 1942. Exhibitions mounted by the fascist regime to promote the political order were not entirely new. Before E42’s conception, the regime staged several exhibitions, or mostre, to solicit unilateral endorsement for the fascist cause and to create a cultural phenomenon aimed to assimilate fascist practices with traditional Italian values. One such exhibition, the 1937 Mostra Augustea della Romanità elevated the birthday of the Roman emperor Augustus to the
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22 IBID., 123.
24 Un popolo di poeti, artisti, eroi, santi, sognatori, scienziati, navigatori, transmigratori (trans. Masha Ciampittiello). The “transmigratori,” loosely translated as “trans-migrants,” might refer to the first trans-Altantic telegraph successfully completed by Marconi. Another interpretation considers it a reference to the emigrants of Italy oversees. Either translation is acceptable.
status of a national holiday. This bimillenium celebration drew parallels between Mussolini and
Augustus and forged the new Italian empire as Imperial Rome’s legitimate successor. The Mostra called
for the archeological excavation and restoration of the Mausoleum of Augustus, beside which Mussolini
left an inscription to commemorate his efforts at liberating the structure from the “darkness” of the
surmounted Renaissance structures:

In this place the hands of Augustus fly through the air, where afterwards the
Mausoleum of the emperor of the ages is extracted from the darkness and
Mussolini renewed the scattered fragments of the Altar of Peace, having been
destroyed, with more splendid buildings that express the joined virtues of
humanity.²⁵

Many archeological objects featured at the bimillenium celebration found a permanent home
at E42. This initial exhibition in 1937, a rough prototype of the permanent installation at the
Museo della Civiltà Romana, displayed its objects in a similar fashion, which emphasized
Imperial Rome and the primacy of the Augustan legacy.

Another exhibition, the 1932 Mostra sulla Rivoluzione Fascista, codified common visual motifs
for symbolically representing the fascist order. The fasce, for example, the symbol of the strength of
unity and comradeship became a crucial aspect of fascist iconography and the basis for converting
fascist emblems into architectural forms. The architects working on the Palazzo del Esposizione, the
building housing the 1932 Mostra, adorned the building with a false facade featuring four monumental
pillars for representing the fasce (fig. 26). The verticality of the pillars emphasized the strength and
resilience of the fascist order. These austere, monumental forms emphasized submission above all else
and propagated the importance of the fascism for keeping order and civility among the masses. The idea
of submission paired with the fasce resurfaced at E42, where four nude Roman legions and their rearing

²⁵ Hunc locum ubi Augusti manes volitant per aura postquam imperatoris mausoleum ex saeculorum tenebris est
extractum aeraeque pacis disiecta membra relecta Mussolini dux veteribus augstii deletis splendidioribus viis
aedificis aedibus ad humanitatis mores aptis orandum censuit anno MDCCCXL A.F.R XVIII; trans. Masha
Ciampittiello.
horses flank the four corners of the piazza of the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana (fig.9), representing the Fasci di Combattimento, the paramilitary group inciting the fascist revolution shortly after World War I. In addition, the statues, based on the Roman equestrian type, referenced the fasce used by Roman lictors to suppress the Plebeian masses before the formulation of the Tribune of the Plebs. These weapons became the symbol of the authoritative power of the regime and the etymological source of the term ‘fascism.’ This interpretation makes more sense than the statues’ present identification as dioscuri. Mussolini referenced the Roman lictors as a metaphor for the strength and perseverance of ancient Rome and its relationship to fascism in his war dairy from World War I: “Roman is the Lictor, Roman is our organization of combat, Roman is our pride and courage.”

The statues at E42 presented a very modern, psychoanalytical concept: the whipping of the horses with the ideological fasce symbolized the suppression of man’s primal instincts under law and civilization. Ancient Roman equestrian statue-types commemorated the military victories of emperors and statesmen. E42 adopted generalized “roman youth” models to symbolize the Juventus (“youth”) and idealistic future strength of the empire. While ancient types featured the figure on horseback and at gallop, the figures of the E42 equestrians alternated between saluting and whipping (allegiance and submission); the equestrian type, nevertheless, referenced ancient Rome and the figural poses emphasized Mussolini and fascism’s central role in ancient Rome’s revival. The statues are a perfect example of the central aims of fascist art: traditional in form, but modern in meaning.

Much like the Italian fascists, the Nazi regime in Germany also held rallies to correlate political ideas and cultural motifs. The regime sponsored art exhibitions to establish the official state style and to denounce the progressive and individual-driven art of the former Weimar Republic. The largest of these exhibitions was a three-day parade event for the consecration of the House of German Art (fig.27).

---


27 The equivalent of the volksmeinschacht movement of Nazi Germany. The importance of the German youth relied on its ability to perpetuate the German empire and Nazi ideology. The regime’s youth group, the Opera Nazionale Balilla, emphasized the importance of physical strength and patriotism. Italy targets the youth culture, though not as drastically as Germany’s Hitler Youth.
Referred to as the “Days of German Art,” 1937 the event called for the restoration of traditional nineteenth-century forms and themes to German art as the official state style. The shared political orientation between Italy and Germany, some aspects of the “New Objectivity” movement, which the Nazis denounced as “degenerate”, appear in the plans for E42. Specifically, the Rationalists endorsed the simplified geometric forms and transparent building surfaces favored by the Bauhaus, which operated during the period Hitler dismissed as “the fourteen-year junkyard.” The Nazis discredited the concept of art as the work of the individual expression, emphasizing its role for communicating the interests of the community and the ideals of the *volksgemeinschaft*. The monumental German House of Art, rendered with classical orders and proportions, established the acceptable architecture for the Reich thereafter. Paul Ludwig Troost’s building, with its composite Doric pillars and channeled rustication epitomized the resurgence of traditional architectural forms in Germany.
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29 IBID., 219.
E42 AND ITALIAN CULTURAL IDENTITY

E42 codified visual motifs for representing the authority and wealth of the Italian state and promoted Italy’s autarchy and longevity as a modern empire. Although the start of World War II forced the cancellation of the 1942 event, E42 stands as a testament to an era aimed at the revival of Italy’s cultural identity. The use of urban planning and architecture to convey themes of supremacy and authority stems from antiquity, whence the dynastic legacy of Roman emperors relied on commemorative building programs. As Vitruvius wrote, “The majesty of empire is expressed through the eminent dignity of its public buildings.”

Since Mussolini regarded himself the heir to Augustus Caesar’s legacy and the Pax Romana (Roman Peace), he sought to create an urban center that would assimilate fascism to the glorious Imperial Roman past. The founding of new cities, too, harkens back to the Roman colonizing tradition and the Roman practice of assimilating the cultural practices of their conquered territories. By closely identifying the new political movement with existing cultural customs of Italy, Mussolini and the fascist regime solicited unilateral support for their political campaign. The regime not only promoted national identity as part of its cause, but it also continued the tradition of regional identities from pre-unification Italy. The theory of Romanitá, or the enduring ‘Roman spirit’ of the Italian people, plays a key role in fascist propaganda. By propagating the belief in the supremacy of Roman civilization, the regime legitimized the new Italian empire as part of the authoritative legacy of Imperial Rome. E42 utilized the theory of Romanitá through its subtle references to the Greco-roman architecture, namely the use of Classical motifs, and by the inclusion of a museum dedicated to Roman civilization. This belief in the primacy of location as reflecting the culture sustained within is discussed by prominent art critic Ugo Ojetti his 1933 publication letter to Marcello Piacentini “Anchora Le Colonne e L’Archi” in the architectural review Pegaso. Ojetti criticized Marcello Piacentini’s expansion and renovation of the University of Rome campus, La Sapienza, claiming that Piacentini’s designs did

---

not reflect the regional identity of Rome, but were rather the product of “northern inspiration.”

He goes on to criticize Piacentini’s Roman heritage, arguing it is more important for something to be Roman and Italian before it is considered new and modern. Ojetti quoted La Doctrina del Fascismo (the fascist manifesto), in which Mussolini exalted the column and the arch as emblems of regional Roman and national Italian identity. Scholar Denis Doordan agrees that most of the progressive and innovative Italian architecture stems from Northern Italy’s close correspondence with continental Europe, whereas central and southern Italy historically remained invested in the nation’s traditional customs and architectural forms.

The indigenous fascist rhetoric of nationalism, the theory of Italianità (“Italianness”), promoted collective identity common to all Italians from the time of unification in 1861. Through this emphasis on nationalism, there resulted a stronger collective action toward the development of the modern Italian empire begun in 1936. E42 is unique in part because it seeks to address all three components of Italian cultural identity: regional, national, and individual. It served an essential role in underscoring the new political regime’s concept of the Italian people. Italians historically identify themselves as divided between their dialects (regional hometowns) and their country, which, until to 1938, was united for a mere seventy-seven years. In Italy, distances as little as twenty kilometers place lingual and cultural barriers between their residents. The fascist government successfully promoted the active participation of the masses in forging fascist Italian empire by harkening back to Italy’s past successes under authoritative governments, Imperial Rome and the regional city-states of the Renaissance, and by encouraging the masses to join the fight.

---

CONCLUSION

The complex E42 offers an opportunity to study the development of modern architecture in congruence with the development of a political revolution and how addressed aspects of Italian cultural identity and played a very visible role in constructing Italian visual culture. Through it, one can understand the frame of mind with which architects combined aspects of national, regional, and individual identity (of the artist) in a unified image of Italy’s past, present, and projected future civilizations. Marcello Piacentini devised his own signature style within the framework of Rationalism. Scholars often refer to Piacentini’s work as ‘simplified neoclassicism,’ predicated upon classical forms, such as the arch and column. However, as I have argued, Piacentini was a Rationalist supporting both tradition and innovation, offering reduced architectural forms to their basic stencil, referencing the past, but emphasizing a timeless and therefore transient quality. Ugo Ojeti ridiculed Piacentini forms as “conceptualized in allegiance to the right angle and naked walls.”

The geometric angularity and monumentality of E42’s buildings and urban plan referenced Roman architecture, but the absence of classical orders universalized the forms uncharacteristic of one particular time or age and applicable to all generations of Italian heritage.

Unlike the Nazi Regime, Mussolini did not mandate an official state style, but rather left artistic notions and solutions to the individual mind. Mussolini claimed, "Art belongs to the individual. The state has only one duty: not to undermine art, to provide humane conditions for artists, and to encourage them from the artistic and national point of view." This produced an incredible amount of variation for representing fascist political rhetoric amongst and within Italy’s main architectural movements Rationalism, Futurism, and the Novecento. Despite Futurism falling-out of favor after World War I, its progressive ideas were adapted in the construction of many Rationalist projects, which possessed both traditional and innovative characteristics. Furthermore, if Italy was to become a main player and survive

34 Emily Braun, Mario Sironi and Italian Modernism: Art and Politics under Fascism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2000), 1.
in Europe’s quest for modernism, it had to adapt its architectural trends and forms to contemporary currents. For this reason, architects forged E42 in stone with the hopes that the complex, even after the dissolution of fascism, would emerge unscathed by time and weathering as an emblem for the survival of the fascist cause. There appears to be no stigma left at E42 from fascism’s collapse and the restoration of the Italian constitutional republic. After the war, Rome’s special city commissioner Virgilio Testa completed the unfinished areas of E42’s urban plan and instigated a major restoration effort in anticipation of the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome.\(^{35}\) Even if E42 never debuted in 1942, the Olympic Games revived the city center and brought tourists to its exhibition halls.

The complex commanded the masses to expand Rome toward the sea, encouraging the growth of the empire and the longevity of the Italian civilization and race. In response to the economic sanctions placed on Italy in 1936, E42 presented an image of Italy’s autarchy and self-resilience as a new empire, which, in fulfillment of its former glory (Rome), strove successfully toward an idealistic future. The use of travertine, marble, and the green stone resembling the *cipollino* marble used on ancient structures affirmed Italy’s economic independence. A reference to the autarchic city-states of the Renaissance, the sculptural reliefs on the INPS buildings strengthened the historic association between autocratic Italian governments and their people. Furthermore, as I noted, the use of glass in the *Palazzo della Civiltá Italiana*, a structure standing for national identity, imparted the metaphor of unobstructed communication between government and the masses. Its glass interior stands for the ‘hallowed interior’ of the centralized bureaucracy of fascist Italy, a government that wished to be perceived by its constituents as both accessible and reliable (fig.8).

The 1942 World Exhibition instigated the production of a new suburban center, which formally and symbolically represented two thousand years of Italian identity. The exhibitions and rallies staged in 1942 included state events and parades as part of the propaganda program. In order to garner public

support for the fascist cause, the regime masked these political demonstrations as significant cultural events, integrating the fascist order into the individual, regional, and national Italian cultural revolution.

My thesis sets the stage for further research at E42 as it contains a basic formal analysis of the structures at the complex, which future scholars can cite in their discussions on the ideological and formal concerns of fascist art. In my research endeavors, I have encountered scarce mention of E42 and its influence over the construction of fascist visual culture and Italian modernism. I hope my thesis will provide a basis for explaining the multi-faceted nature of Italian fascism, as a political current, which promoted both tradition and innovation.

E42 remains a viable monument for studying the complexity and eclectic nature of fascist art. My recommendation to scholars researching E42 includes further investigation of the primary sources of criticism and/or support for the complex, as well as those by contemporary Italian scholars. When I visited E42 in the summer of 2010, I witnessed a major restoration effort commissioned by the Beniculturali organization, a sector of the Italian government dedicated to the preservation of historical monuments and cultural heirlooms. This furthers my claim of E42 as an Italian monument, rather than a fascist one. The complex is not stigmatized by World War II and end of the fascist order in any way and remains one of Rome’s patrimonies to architecture and urban planning. In order to assess the impact of the monument to later generations, one must assess the opinions of its modern-day residents. When I visited Italy, I communicated with many individuals in the central and southern regions who attest Mussolini and the fascist movement as a positive effort toward establishing Italy as a modern power. Unlike the Nazi movement, fascism still enjoys support in Italy today, and many Italians regard Mussolini’s reign as a glorious time in Italian history. In order to be impartial, scholars involved in the study of Italian fascism ought to include these opinions on fascism in their discourses.
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Figure 13. Marcus Agrippa. Maison Carree. 16 BCE. Nimes, France. Reproduced from ARTSTOR.
Figure 14. Marcello Piacentini, Museo Nazionale Preistorico e Etnografico, 1938-56. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from www.pigorini.beniculturali.it

Figure 15. Museo delle Tradizioni e Arti Popolari, 1938-56. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from GoogleEarth.
Figure 16. Arnaldo Forsini, Santissimi Pietro e Paolo. 1939-1955. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from ARTSTOR.

Figure 17. Michelangelo Buonarroti and Giacomo della Porta. Dome of St. Peter’s Basilica, 1546-90, Rome. Reproduced from ARTSTOR.
Figure 18. Archivio Centrale dello Stato, 1938-42. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from (above) www.romarepubblica.it and (below) www.acs.beniculturali.it.
Figure 19. Portico from Piazza Marconi to the Museo della Civiltà Romana, featuring contemporary art exhibition, 1938-56. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from Roma.it.
Figure 21. Marcelo Piacentini, Entrance way to *Museo della Civiltà Romana*, 1938-52. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from www.museocivitaromana.it

Figure 22. Entrance way to Temple Complex of Karnak in Thebes (Modern Luxor), Middle Kingdom (2055-1650 BCE) Limestone. Egypt. Reproduced from ARTSTOR
Figure 23. Marcello Piacentini (main architect and urban planner). Portico Entrance; University of Rome: La Sapienza, 1932-1935. EUR, Rome. Reproduced from Mimoa.edu; photo credit Evan Charkoff.

Figure 24. Marcello Piacentini (main architect and urban planner). The Library; University of Rome: La Sapienza, 1932-1935. Rome. Reproduced from unicaroma2010.it.
Figure 25. Giuseppe Terragni, Casa del Fascio, 1937. Lissone. Reproduced from ARTSTOR.
Figure 27. Paul Troost. *German House of Art*. 1937. Munich, Germany. Reproduced from ARTSTOR.
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