

Modernism and History: Essays in Honor of Eduard F. Sekler,
Harvard University Press, 1996

**Between The Crusader's Jerusalem and Piranesi's Rome:
Conflicting Ideals for the City**

By Alex Krieger

Greater Los Angeles today encompasses 4,500 square miles and continues to spread out, social traumas and natural disasters notwithstanding. To see it in its entirety would require a trip on the space shuttle; it is beyond our human capacity on earth to experience it whole. This unsettling realization presents a substantial problem for the various disciplines engaged in urban design who still operate on the presumption (or faith) that it is possible to envision, interpret, comprehend and portray the city holistically. As the city's boundaries, and characteristics, expand so does the distress over this loss of comprehensible form and the desire to reconstruct it, if but conceptually. I shall rely on two well-known depictions of cities -- a late-15th century woodcut of Jerusalem based on the travels of a group of German Crusaders, and Piranesi's fantastical late-18th century engraving of Imperial Rome -- to illustrate this predicament. Studying these two images [fig. 1, 2] will help illuminate the contradictory notions that we harbor about the contemporary city and how to plan for its maintenance.

For many today the very notion of *planning* cities -- which seem so impervious to planning -- seems naive. It is, therefore, important to begin by reviewing the troubled relationship between the modern architect and modern city planning.

At the beginning of this century, architects welcomed and championed the emerging discipline of city planning. Rational planning seemed the city's only hope of surviving its chaotic nineteenth-century transformations. If the modern home was to be, as LeCorbusier declared, a "machine for living," then the city would be conceived to operate as efficiently as modern industry. As modernism bloomed such a Cartesian vision -- unencumbered by sentimentality or folk-lore, seeking reason and precision on behalf of an emerging (and desired) classless society -- focused for a moment upon the city; urbanism abstracted into rational systems needing to be planned. It is doubtful that Descartes had urban design in mind in declaring the need for "...certain and simple rules such that if a man observed them accurately, he shall never assume what is false as true." (1) Yet turn-of-the-century advocates for a "city scientific" harbored similar goals for planning. No less than Hausmann's successor as the Prefect of the Seine, Eugene Henard, declared himself to be, first, a municipal engineer. (2)

At mid-century, still, there was rhetoric from architects about the inseparability of planning and architecture, though planners were no longer so sure. City planning and architecture were parts of a continuous process declared Shadrack Woods in the *Team X Primer*. Yet a few sentences later, Woods concluded that "Planning remains abstract until it generates architecture." revealing an attitude that increasingly grated city planners as they shifted away from physical plan-making to matters of public policy and resource allocation. (3)

Today, near the end of the century, few architects would disagree with Woods' statement, or even give planning as much credit as he did. Only a handful of architects do not yet accept what seems so obvious: that whatever the activity of city planning is, it requires less vision or science than political savvy, and in any event, is done not by designers but by others. Whether one dates the origins of the split between architecture and planning to the post World War II urban reconstruction efforts, to the public authorities invented by Robert Moses, to the regional planning associations of the 1920's and 30's, to the diagrams of Ebenezer Howard and his many garden city disciples, to the critics of Daniel Burnham's City Beautiful, or to Baron von Hausmann's legislated Parisian boulevards, the split seems irrevocable!

It seems irrevocable because we accept as natural a split between the "art" of building and the "systemic" nature of planning; between instinct and reason, values and policy, between

"design" and a "sociological, economical, technological, psychological, ecological, science" which is how it became fashionable to describe city planning a generation-or-so ago. Yet, one of my favorite descriptions of architecture is Joseph Hudnot's, who called it "the outward frame and envelope of a communal life." (4) But was he in fact speaking of architecture or of city planning? If we cannot easily identify the discipline for which his words seem most appropriate, how can the disciplines be so irrevocably split?

During the 1960's and 70's (heady days for planning, as the 1980's were for architecture) conscientious students of architecture felt compelled to continue post-professional studies in planning. Urban design, as an endeavor of mediation between public policy and architecture, first flowered as a distinct discipline then. The design of individual buildings seemed somehow ineffectual or worse, self-indulgent. Planning was how "societal values," as they were then called, could be best addressed and change implemented; "implementation," along with "process," were important words of the day. (5)

But if anything seems ineffectual today -- mired in bureaucracy, in public hearings, in citizen advisory boards, in environmental impact studies, in ordinances, policies, guidelines, court proceedings -- it is city planning. And today's students of architecture are rarely inclined to pursue city planning, except perhaps out of fear about diminishing prospects of employment, or the decreasing authority of the profession of architecture.

That is, however, not to say that architects are not interested in the city. On the contrary, today's practitioners -- and students -- are passionate about the city, about urbanity and "cityness," far more in specific ways than their generational predecessors. As passions tend to be, however, theirs is often very focused and, dare one say, sentimental. What these passions are producing are buildings rendered wonderfully urbane; buildings that acknowledge neighbors and are knowledgeable about predecessors; buildings that seem to be *about* the city. Our cities certainly need such buildings. After half-a-century of addressing cities primarily as systems, it is exhilarating to walk through any architectural school and see (with apologies to Aldo Rossi) not so much the architecture of the city on display, but the urbanity of the new architecture being rendered.

Yet can we shape the city entirely of buildings that look urbane -- entirely of *buildings*? It is an illusory urbanity that is often rendered and built. It is an urbanity of microcosms vaguely familiar in outline or style, with each building presuming to encapsulate or recall all of urbanity (or simulate the presumed complexities of urbanity) rather than acting as a contingent fragment of a larger and more complex - urban order. It is an urbanity desperately trying to recapture the ancient clarities of homogeneous fabric, purposefully sited monuments and venerable civic iconography. All of this is, understandably, a reaction to the absence of such clarities in much of the modern city.

For lovers of cities, one of modernism's worst sins and most problematic abstractions was its insistence that the city was foremost an entity of reason, to be examined as an amalgam of systems rather than a set of domains. The *form* of the city (like of the form of individual buildings) had to be, the argument went, the result of analysis and programming. Form could not be addressed *a priori*, autonomously, or with aesthetic insights. Those who adhered to the idea of the city as "logic" and as "inevitable consequence" -- both planners and architects -- thus rejected the tool of precedent. Reliance on precedent would, they feared, return the design professions to the ill-conceived academicism of an earlier and no longer pertinent era.

Giedion, along with Sert and Leger, had pointed out the difficulties of precedent in their 1949 essay, "Nine Points on Monumentality:"

"The buildings of perennial power, the acropolis...the Gothic cathedrals...the Renaissance churches and the exquisite scale of 18th century squares...cannot help....[They] are dead for the moment...frozen temporarily in an icy atmosphere, created by those architects and

their patrons...[who] misuse eternal names by robbing history....Modern architecture [and urbanism] has to go the hard way!" (6)

Given the dangers of misusing monumentality, Modern architects chose to deliberately disregard precedent. And, in any case, the new monumentality would clearly lie in the rationality of the skyscraper, the superblock and the highway, not in the archaic church spire or city square. [fig. 3]

During the 1950's and 60's obscure and at first muted voices began to lament the loss of regard for traditional urban form. Henry Hope Reed pleaded for a "Golden City," which was for him -- as for Leon Krier today -- best represented by Washington D. C. Reacting to urban renewal Christopher Tunnard argued in a book entitled *The City of Man* that "Those who have abandoned the quest for beauty have thrown away the most important tool for arousing interest in city planning." Colin Rowe began a sustained and seemingly contradictory campaign to champion modern architecture -- principally that of LeCorbusier -- while rejecting the urban projections of modernism -- again, namely of LeCorbusier. Kevin Lynch dared publish a book called: *The Image of the City*. Edmund Bacon diagramed a lot of old cities in his book, *The Design of Cities*. Jane Jacobs reminded us all that cities were places not diagrams. And, across the ocean, Also Rossi published *The Architecture of the City* -- not the 'planning' or 'crisis' or 'sociology' of the city but the *Architecture* of the city -- in which he unabashedly declared the city to be an artifact and necessarily a work of art. (7)

Thus a belief gradually reemerged the while a complex set of systems, the city was also a complex artifact: an array of space, form and figure; of district, path and node; of street and square, fabric and monument, of a past still vibrant and useful. Such insights were propelled by new theories questioning the narrowness of the Modernist's vision. They were reinforced by the continuing joy experienced by tourist and professional alike in the shape of the pre-industrial city. In the United States, in particular, they were a reaction to the very palpable shortcomings of several decades of urban renewal proceeding ostensibly on the basis of performance standards without self-critical theories of urban form.

Robert Venturi's desire for "messy vitality over unity," for "complexity and contradiction" seems today like the rebellion of a long-repressed memory. Among others, Venturi exposed the mid-20th century paradox which assumed that form followed only analysis (thus banishing the vagaries of style) while actually providing an architecture -- and urbanism -- of one style regardless of its appropriateness to specific culture or locale. (8)

Venturi's call for "messy vitality" and a new "urbanistic whole" pointed him, and especially his followers, to traditional urban fabric. With an expanded urban memory, so liberating at first, came many admirable proposals for maintaining historic centers and for rethinking the organization of suburban regions. Not surprisingly, a new longing for stable principles also arose; no longer based on objectivity or rationality, as it had been a decade-or-two earlier, but on returning to "roots." Hordes of populists, new-classicists, preservationists, neo-traditionalists, and other guardians of venerable civic virtues spawned unto the metropolitan landscape. A century after the heyday of the City Beautiful era, a new and equally conservative movement espousing restoration, monumentalization and beautification has emerged. Having failed as planners, or perhaps having unwittingly unleashed the uncontrollable forces of rational planning, architects have again turned to iconography if not, indeed, to clothing.

Here I must invoke one of the most remarkable statements made by a leader of the City Beautiful movement, a statement preposterous yet not entirely dismissable: "Beautiful and clean cities attract desirable citizens and real estate values increase. Clothes don't make the man," Loring Underwood said in 1910, "but they come pretty near making the city." (9) Viewed in Underwood's terms, the post-Modern architect became a kind of seamstress using the traditional city as a pattern book from which to fashion a "new-urbanism". (10)

With this situation in mind, let me return to Piranesi's Rome and the Crusaders' Jerusalem, and attempt to clarify why the ideality of the latter should be giving way -- in our minds, as it is in the streets -- to the inevitability of the former.

Piranesi made the engraving, entitled the *Ichnographia*, in 1757. First published in the *Il Campo Marzio dell' Antica Roma*, of 1762, the fourth and final volume of the monumental *Antichita Romane* begun in 1755, it was his final creative interpretation of the planning, building and decorative design genius of Imperial Rome. Piranesi had set out to reveal - by exaggeration - the fertility of insight to be found in archeology. Robert Adam, to whom the engraving is dedicated, called it "...the greatest fund for inspiring and instilling invention in any lover of architecture that can be imagined." (11) The use of the term "imagined" is significant. This was *not* a labor of earnest reconstruction.

In his own introduction to the *Campo Marzio*, Piranesi wrote:

"I am rather afraid that parts of the Campus which I describe should seem figments of my imagination and not based on any evidence: certainly if anyone compares them with the architectural theory of the ancients he will see that they differ greatly from it and are actually closer to the usage of our own times. But before any one accuses me of falsehood, he should I beg, examine the ancient (Marble) plan of the city ... He should examine the villas of Latium and that of Hadrian at Tivoli, the baths, and tombs and other ruins outside the Porta Capina and he will find that the ancients transgressed the strict rules of architecture just as much as the moderns....it is part of man's nature to demand license in creative expression " (12)

Beginning with the exaggerated Roman buildings in the first volumes of the *Antichita*, and continuing with the partial depictions of the city (such as his reconstructed plan of the Forum Romanum), which were inspired by the surviving fragments of the ancient *Severan Forma Urbis* engraved on marble slabs, (of which the *Ichnographia* was imagined to be a lost part), Piranesi was reinventing Rome on the basis of a polemical translation of ancient design principles made suitable for modern times. [fig. 4] He was challenging the architects of his generation.

A different kind of challenge is presented by the woodcut of Jerusalem, from Hartmann Schedel's *Liber Chronicarum*, published in Nuremberg, Germany in 1493. It is illustrated by Michael Wolgemut and Wilhelm Pleydenwurff, neither of whom ever saw the Holy Land. Based on an unusually well documented account, *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctum*, published in 1486, of a German pilgrimage in 1483, the image emphasizes the assumed idea, rather than the physical reality, of Jerusalem. (13) There is no indication of the quartered Roman gridiron, or of the *cardo* or *decumanus*. The remarkable precision of the woodcut in labeling Solomon's Temple, in identifying the historic city gates and in rendering the three sets of city walls built successively by Herod, Simon Maccabaeus, and Agrippa does not extend to the depiction of the overall urban form. This form is treated far more symbolically; Jerusalem as the center of the worldly universe, city of the holy *axis-mundi*.

While not a new kind of depiction, it was a kind of radicalizing of a faith. Prior crusader maps, dating back to the twelfth century, frequently used the medieval symbol for the habitable world; a 'T' separating the three known continents within an 'O', to illustrate Jerusalem. [fig. 5] Conversely, 'T-O' maps of the world would use a small cross within a circle to locate Jerusalem, generally at the intersection of the lines of the 'T'. The holy city and the center of the world had always been somewhat interchangeable, as the oldest surviving depiction of Jerusalem, in the form of a mosaic map of Palestine on the floor of a 6th-century church in Madaba, Jordan, clearly shows. [fig. 6] It is the elimination of the 'T' in the Nuremberg Chronicle view that is significant and would prove authoritative. Just a few years later, in 1517, the Turks under Selim took possession of Palestine and destroyed much of Jerusalem. It would take almost seventy more years for a more accurate map of Jerusalem, Christian von Adrechom's *Urbis Hierosolyma*

Depicta, published in Cologne, Germany in 1584, to receive wide distribution in Europe. (14) [fig. 7]

What can we glean from these two depictions? Consider the following points of contrast:

In turning to a Classical past, Piranesi was seeking inspiration for action appropriate to his day; his rendering was a challenge to uncritical lovers of Classical ideals. The German engravers, in contrast, seemed intent on comforting pious readers that the Holy City was just as they imagined it to be.

The Jerusalem of the Nuremburg Chronicle attempts to embody a (longed-for) collective will. It is unmistakably hierarchical about its one center. Piranesi's *Ichnographia* is a stupendous display of conspicuous individual wills, and of many centers of interest.

In the hands of Piranesi Imperial Rome becomes an unruly collection of coherent fragments and appears unplanned. Holy Jerusalem shows the most ancient of plans, concentric rings emanating from an *axis-mundi* heaven-bound.

The implication of the Jerusalem woodcut is that the city has always been and will always remain the same; its heroic stasis belying the history of frequent conquests and rebuilding. Rome's Campus Martius suggests an impossible tension among competing parts, perhaps even anarchy. The engraving itself seems to pulsate and change patterns as one studies it.

Rome, like its empire, shows no boundaries; it could be continued endlessly, to everywhere. Jerusalem is a bounded place, sacred, finite, and distinguishable from anywhere else on earth.

Finally, Piranesi seems to be amplifying and intensifying a potential urbanity. Wolgemut and Pleydenwurff are imposing an ideal order upon their imagined city of cities.

How can we not harbor a sympathy for such a portrayal of Jerusalem; a city upon the hill? It is the urban equivalent to a child's drawing of a house with a centered door, two upper-story windows beneath a pitched roof, and a chimney billowing benign wisps of smoke. Several millennia of urban memories assure us of the inherent correctness of the crusader's depiction, which no amount of Piranesian imagineering will diminish. [fig. 8] But if we look about us -- look, say, at greater Toronto or Atlanta or the outskirts of historic Boston, or the most infamous of edge cities, Tyson's Corner in Northern Virginia -- do we not see more parallels with the *Ichnographia*? Are these environments not as boundless and multi-centered; as conspicuously wasteful, redundant and eccentric; as "un-master-planned" and just as potentially chaotic, as Piranesi's Rome?

For this reason alone the Jerusalem of the Crusader's imagination still comforts and intrigues us -- even though it is for us, as for many Crusader's or for that matter contemporary Houstonians -- an illusory comfort. We can look to downtown Houston and feel assured that it is a proper city -- one with a center -- but we can then turn 180 degrees and see the competing city along the perimeter highway loop. Although the latter may geometrically encircle the center, it is in few significant ways dependent on that center, except for a comfort it gives us about acceptable civic typology.

To activate the center of Houston requires programmed events, not the exercise of age-old rituals, but the invention of spectacle. How alive and, indeed, how temporarily alive, Houston must have seemed as lasers projected unto the city's skyscrapers celebrated the Texan Sesquicentennial in 1985. It was reported that more than a million Houstonians abandoned their cars and invaded the incoming highways - on foot! - to watch their city come alive as it has not done in the decade since.

What harm is there in continuing to believe in the Crusader's Jerusalem? Perhaps none, if we wish to concentrate on what constitutes a diminishing aspect of today's city, or on temporary events. As always we need inspirations for urbanity, but these should reflect phenomenon endemic to our own cities -- conditions which irrevocably take us further from the Crusader's Jerusalem and a bit closer to Piranesi's Rome. Stated another way, how can we counter our fears

about an ever diminishing urbanity without succumbing to pure sentiment? It may be that we need to unravel our anxious, complex and sentiment-laden feelings about the imminent dissolution of community by seeking the potential in the following:

1. *The ubiquitous presence of urban habits, values and institutions*:. It is difficult to accept contemporary society as being ubiquitously urban; here and everywhere, as Frank Lloyd Wright expected of his Broadacres. (15) Wright envisioned an omnipresent, technologically sophisticated, countryside. This was not meant to be. The city's revenge upon Wright was to make itself ubiquitous. But when an experience is virtually universal, as urban (if not urbane) culture is today -- the source of most daily perceptions regardless of location -- it is difficult to isolate and universalize its essence.

In distinguishing the modern city from either the Enlightenment "city of virtue" and the Victorian "city of vice," Carl Schorske labelled it "beyond good and evil." (16) He might have been tempted to conclude that it was "beyond place," as many contemporary social critics are declaring. Three decades have passed since Jean Gottman coined the corridor of urbanization stretching from Boston to Washington D. C. as a "Megalopolis." (17) The conceptualization of a 400-mile long city is what seemed stunning then, though contiguousness remained part of the equation. But the mega-bits of electronic data which continuously link the fortunes of New York and Tokyo today, and which are monitorable from an isolated ranch in Montana, are oblivious to adjacency. Does this mark the end of civitas?

Paradoxically the separation of knowledge gathering from geographical contiguousness vindicates the Piranesian determination to depict place. Harvard Square cannot yet be faxed. Existing somewhere, and *not* everywhere, it remains distinguishable from the homogeneities of our metropolitan landscapes. We will crave place more, precisely as it becomes a scarcer commodity; to compensate for the frightening "space of flows" which is Manuel Castell's haunting label for the information highway. (18)

2. *Uncentered Urbanity*. At the end of the 19th century, there existed a great fear of urban collapse, of the industrial city becoming so consolidated, congested, and pathological that it would cease to function, like a black hole caused by a dying star. The response to this fear was legislated disaggregation, assisted by advances in mechanical mobility. A century later, we see the results of this response -- the city has exploded and dispersed. The "galactic metropolis" is how the geographer Pierce Lewis refers to the contemporary urban region, where, so it seems, people come from miles around to spread out. (19)

Indeed, greater Los Angeles hardly evokes an *axis-mundi*, the sign atop the Hollywood hills aside. Like the Crusaders, however, for whom the sacred city of Jerusalem could only be imagined in an idealized form, we continue to invest in a particular city form. The implications of Los Angeles frightens even its planners. Thus, defying all expectations, defying even its own reputation as the most polynucleated of cities, it has recently grown a tall downtown. [fig. 9] A fragment of a real downtown is nearby, and without fanfare serves the day-to-day needs of the Latin and Mexican communities. However, it is largely invisible from the freeways and so it cannot suffice. Is this new cluster of tall buildings in horizontal Los Angeles solely the motivation of commerce, or is something else also at play? There are few genuine economic or technological reasons for such concentration. Perhaps human nature demands centering. Perhaps the vertical forests of our downtowns satisfy that need, reintroducing, at least symbolically, the pleasures of overlap and proximity.

3. *The constancy of urban incompleteness*. In some respects the prevalent imagery in what is euphemistically referred to as the "new urbanism" seems closer in spirit to eighteenth-century landscape painting than to contemporary urban design, except its subject is not bucolic prospects but urban scenery. It remains unsatisfactory because it ignores what Baudelaire -- and Dickens

and Manet and Dostoevsky and Engels and Dos Passos, to mention only a few -- recognized a century or so ago: that the modern city transforms more rapidly than do its inhabitants. (20) Indeed, watching Haussmann at work, Baudelaire came to understand one of the central dilemmas of modern life, which is that places no longer outlast their inhabitants. All modern city-dwellers outlive the city of their birth, just as Baudelaire had outlived the Paris of his childhood. Thus the endurance of form can no longer be a principal pre-condition for the endurance of place.

The most disquieting aspect of the contemporary city is its propensity for change; demolition and rebuilding not a consequence of plagues or wars but as an engine of progress. Radical change can even become an occasion for nervous celebration. Standing amidst a crowd of thousands, waiting for the implosion of a building not yet 30 years old -- its unabashed modernity once hailing a post-war economic resurgence for Boston -- one could not help but recall Nathaniel West's *Day of the Locust*. [fig. 10,11] In West's novel a crowd of citizens whose vicarious lives bring greater and greater confusion about the juxtaposition of illusion and reality, begins to riot at a movie premiere. The author's protagonist has been gathering material for a monumental painting to be entitled "The Burning of Los Angeles," but the novel ends as the riot expands, the painting not needing to be painted after all. (21)

The roar of the crowd as the implosion began was perhaps more chilling than the sound of the dynamite or the sight of the collapsing building. (22) Is it not hypocritical to preserve that which is deemed old while demolishing what has not yet achieved the status of age? This is one example of an image of urbanity permeated by an old ideal. The "old" Travelers Insurance Company Building in Boston has no status in the Crusader's Jerusalem. With such a dislocation of Frederick Jackson Turner's Frontier Hypothesis from a matter of geography (get thee West, young man) to a condition of disposability and reconstruction, even preservation (a recent hope of the city) may eventually become obsolete for lack of any structures of sufficient age to preserve. In those "Edge Cities," which Joel Garreau wishes us to believe are the next iteration of urbanism, will any of the buildings remain long? (23) Is not the highway interchange -- without which there can be no edge city -- the monument most likely to endure?

4. *The Middle State Ideal*. I have been referring to "the city" or to "urbanity" where it would perhaps be more accurate to refer to "suburbia." What we call *the suburbs* is precisely the new form of city that the western world has been consciously building for two centuries. A legacy of the Age of Enlightenment, this new city aspires equally to social conceit and rural virtue, to empiricism and romanticism, to logic and intuition, the mind and the spirit. What Karl Marx criticized as the "idiocy of rural life," what Rousseau vilified as the "artificialities of over-civilization" were both to be avoided by inhabiting the margins between these extremes. The risks inherent in creating this middle landscape - the risks of destroying the geographies against which the advantages of occupying the middle might be measured -- have become manifest only with the successes, not the failures, of suburbia. (24)

The new town of Las Colinas, Texas is described by its advertising brochures as positioned "in the center of the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area, ... in the central time zone almost exactly between east and west coasts of the United States." (25) At the center, maybe, but outside of both Dallas or Fort-Worth; how convenient and alluring, desirable for both bustling business and domestic tranquility! Is it any wonder that Las Colinas grew even during Texas's recent economic downturns?

A flight over Las Colinas -- its proximity to the Dallas/Fort Worth Airport is another oft-mentioned virtue -- reveals an Arcadian *Ichnographia* worthy of a suburban Piranesi. Las Colinas has no observable boundaries. It seems to be about competing interests and selected points of intensity. Although the product of the most advanced ideas in land subdivision, it seems unplanned. Its points of stasis seem barely to rest on its "lawned" earth. Like Piranesi's imagined Rome, Las Colinas embodies and amplifies values intrinsic to its culture. How wrong Engels was about London, it is in twentieth-century Las Colinas, not nineteenth-century London (and perhaps

second only to the Rome of the *Ichnographia*,) that we see how "human society has been split into its component atoms." And at Williams Square, the town's "grand new urbanizing landmark," the forums of theocratic Rome have met their high-tech mercantile equivalent. [fig. 12]

5. *The authenticity to be found in the present:* A common refrain among contemporary urban observers is that the city is increasingly inauthentic -- a simulacrum or tableaux of real (read, older) cities. (26) Whether it is the shopping mall as an inadequate substitute for the traditional street, the festival market place as a bastard version of the bazaar, or even the protected historic district which is stifled and ultimately diminished by the well-meaning but mediocre efforts at adjoining design contextualism, these critics have much evidence at their disposal. Yet, the pessimism which accompanies this charge of inauthenticity -- because everything appears degraded and, therefore, cannot be real -- seems self-defeating, if not cynical. Jean Baudrillard, the French critic operating out of the tradition of Baudelaire and Sartre, observes that this unsettling perpetual present, where things seem free of history and are thus hard to value, is precisely what is authentic about modern life, and by extension, the modern city. (27) His interpretation seems, at least, to offer a way to embrace the present as something other than an impoverished version of the past.

6. *The City of Permanent Weightlessness:* Fumihiko Maki speaks of Tokyo as "a city without heaviness" where "lightness prevails" (28) He recognizes this as a long-standing condition of urbanity; a delicate, palpable balance between stability and change, and with his architecture he seeks a contemporary expression for this lightness. At Williams Square, the symbolic public space of private Los Colinas, this condition is addressed inadvertently. At the center of the space a monumental sculptural grouping of bronzed mustangs races across an abstracted western landscape. The American desire for stasis *and* mobility is brilliantly present; fleeing mustangs as the sole inhabitants of the town square. [13] Yet, nearby, impatient for a history, Las Colinas has planned for itself an immediate need for preservation by building a Spanish Style Mission as the principal feature for its main shopping center. Is not the persisting memory of the Crusader's Jerusalem at least partially to blame?. The ideality of its conservative ambitions to maintain a "golden age" still haunts us, and has led to the construction of a *faux* mission; could a proper southwestern town exist without one?

At Las Colinas, the two-hundred-year-old desire for a boundless middle state *and* a stable, centered place are not understood as contradictory. Perhaps they need not be, and here is where the Rome of Piranesi's imagination serves as a useful counterbalance to the Crusader's Jerusalem. The engravers of Crusader Jerusalem were devoted to restoration, not necessarily of a particular point in history, but of an age-old idea of urbanity. Inspired by archeology, Piranesi was ultimately interested in modern urban problems. His imaginary city of urban fragments tends not towards homogeneity and sameness, (as most rapidly expanding urban peripheries today) but towards the co-existence of different places, districts, historic interpretations, and even architectures. His depiction was radical for its day; surrounded as we are by the improbabilities of the Crusader's Jerusalem, it remains pertinent for our own. In the *Ichnographia* we see that which was untenable for the medieval mind; the possibility of multiple Jerusalems. We might see similar possibilities within the sprawling metropolis, if we could only overcome the Crusader's insistence that urbanity comes in a singular form.

Alex Krieger is a Professor in Practice of Urban Design Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Principal, Chan Krieger & Associates, Architects.

Footnotes

1. Two excellent studies on the emergence of modern rationalism during the seventeenth and eighteenth century 'Age of Enlightenment' are: Carl L. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1932; and Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, The Free Press / Macmillan, Inc. New York, 1990.
2. On the emergence of a planning discipline see Anthony Sutcliffe, *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914*, Reinhold Press, 1981; and *Royal Institute of British Architects Town Planning Conference*, London, October, 1910, Transactions, RIBA, 1911. On the career of Eugene Henard see; Peter M Wolf, *Eugene Henard and the Beginnings of Urbanism in Paris, 1900-1914*, France, International Federation of Housing and Planning, 1968. On the use of the term "city scientific" see George B. Ford, "The City Scientific", *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference on City Planning*, 1915, pp. 31-39.
3. Shadrack Woods, statement made in 1961 and recorded in: Alison M. Smithson, ed., *Team X Primer*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1968. p.105.
4. No one tried harder, or with greater eloquence, to stem the split between architecture and city planning than Joseph Hudnut, the first dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Design; re-organized under his direction to portray and instill the value of collaboration among all of the design disciplines. See his collected essays entitled *Architecture and the Spirit of Man*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1949.
5. For excellent contemporaneous polemics of planning as process see; Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning", *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. 31 no. 4, November 1969; John W. Dyckman, "Societal Goals and Planned Societies", *JAIP*, Vol. 32 No. 2, March, 1966; Robert Goodman, *After the Planners*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1971; Allan D. Heskin, "Crisis and Response: A Historical Perspective on Advocacy Planning", *JAIP*, Vol. 46, No.1, January, 1980.
6. Sigfried Giedion, Fernand Leger, Jose Luis sert, "Nine Points on Monumentality," 1949. Reprinted in *Monument and the City*, *Harvard Architecture Review*, Vol. 4, 1984, pp. 62-63.
7. Henry Hope Reed, *The Golden City*, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1959; Christopher Tunnard, *The City of Man*, New York, Scribner's, 1953; Colin Rowe & Fred Koetter, *Collage City*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1978; Kevin Lynch, *The Image of the City*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1960; Edmund Bacon, *The Design of Cities*, New York, Viking Press, 1974; Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York, Random House, 1961; Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City*, (originally published in Italian in 1966) New York, Opposition Books, 1982.
8. Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, New York, Museum of Modern Art & Doubleday, 1966.
9. Loring Underwood, *American City*, Vol. 2 No. 5, May 1910, p.214.
10. "The New Urbanism" is a phrase associated with a group of architects/urban designers-- led by Andreas Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Peter Calthorpe -- committed to restoring the use of traditional principles of urban organization and form, particularly to address the problem of metropolitan suburban sprawl. For a good overview of the movement, and the book which popularized the name, see: Peter Katz, *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994.
11. Robert Adam as quoted in: John Fleming, *Robert Adam and his Circle in Edinburgh and Rome*, London, 1962, p.167.
12. Piranesi as quoted in John Wilton-Ely, *The Mind and Art of Giovanni Battista Piranesi*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1978, p. 76.

13. see Kenneth Nebenzahl, *Maps of the Holy Land: Images of terra Sancta through Two Millennia*, New York, Abbeville Press, 1986. p.63.
14. Ibid. pp.9-11 & 62-91. See also: Eran Laor, *Maps of the Holy Land*, Amsterdam, Meridian, 1986 and Z. Vilnay, *The Holy Land in Old Maps and Prints*, Jerusalem, Rubin Maass, 1966.
15. In his various arguments on behalf of his *Broadacres* Frank Lloyd Wright would declare that it would have to be "Everywhere or Nowhere," a subtle reference to Thomas Moore's *Utopia*. See the special addition of *Architectural Record* (April, 1935) devoted entirely to the unveiling of the first Broadacres Plan.
16. Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture*, New York, Alfred A. Knof, 1980, see in particular the chapter entitled "The Ringstrasse, Its Critics, and the Birth of Urban Modernism."
17. Jean Gottmann, *Megalopolis: the Urbanized Northeastern Seaboard of the United States*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, 1961
18. Manuel Castells, *The Informational City*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1993, p.350.
19. Pierce Lewis, "The Galactic Metropolis" in R. H. Platt & G. Macinko, eds. *Beyond the Urban Fringe: Land Use Issues of Nonmetropolitan America*, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1984, pp.23-49.
20. Baudelaire was among the first to articulate the idea that the most endemic characteristics of modernism was its transience. See Charles Baudelaire, *Paris Spleen*, (translation by Louise Varese), New York, New Directions, 1970. For a twentieth century extension of Baudelaire's perception see Jean-Paul Sartre, "American Cities," in *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, London, Hutchinson Publishing, 1955. See also Marshall Berman, *All that is Solid Melts Into Air*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1983.
21. Nathaniel West, *The Day of the Locust*, (1933) New York, New Directions Publishing, 1962.
22. Witnessing the "implosion" of the early 1950's Travellers Insurance Company skyscraper in Boston in 1987. It was destroyed to make way for a bigger, newer -- but more historic-looking -- office building.
23. In the sub-title to his widely-read *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier*, Joel Garreau makes a direct connection between Frederick Jackson Turner's famous late-nineteenth century "Frontier Hypothesis" and the current phenomenon of large-scale node development around the periphery of major cities. Garreau is saying that while they are a new kind of urban/suburban prototype, the instinct for building "Edge Cities" is a very old one in American culture. We have similar expectations for edge cities as Turner had for moving West and starting anew. *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier*, New York, Doubleday, 1991.
24. A substantial literature has emerged around the theme of a "middle landscape." For its literary and cultural origins see Leo Marx's seminal, *The Machine in the Garden*, New York, Oxford, 1964. For contemporary manifestations and criticisms see Peter G. Rowe, *Making a Middle Landscape*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1991.
25. The new town of Los Colinas real estate promotional brochure, circa 1987.
26. See both Michael Sorkin, ed., *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, New York, Hill & Wang, 1992, and Peter Calthorpe, *The Next American Metropolis*, New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1993. Hardly kindred spirits, their respective critique of the contemporary city are strikingly similar (though not their solutions).
27. Jean Baudrillard, *America*, (1986), translated by Chris Turner, London, Verso, 1988.
28. Fumihiko Maki, "The Roof at Fujiwara," *Yale Perspecta*, No. 24, New York, Rizzoli, 1988, p.108-120.

Illustrations

1. Ichnographia, engraving by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, 1757.
2. Jerusalem, woodcut from Hartmann Schedel, *Liber Chronicarum*, 1493.
3. from Gideon
4. Piranesi
5. T-O map
6. Madaba Jordon
7. Jerusalem, from Christian von Adrechom, *Urbis Hierosolyma Depicta*, 1584.
8. City upon a hill AK slide
9. Los Angeles postcard
10. Boston demolition
11. Boston demolition
12. Las Colinas aerial
13. Las Colinas