

**The Beast within the Beauty:
the Political Function of Architecture**

6 May 2005

By:
Kristin A. Smith

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Literary Review and Research.....	2
The Identity of Architecture.....	2
Architecture as Art: The Power of Aesthetic Value.....	5
Philosophy of Architecture.....	5
Political and Social Value of the Aesthetic.....	6
Architecture as Art – Aesthetic Appeal.....	14
Political Propaganda.....	17
Brief History and Discussion of the Architecture.....	20
The Market of Trajan.....	20
The Baths of Caracalla.....	21
The Roman Colosseum.....	24
The Rockefeller Center.....	25
The Paradigm of the Contemporary Shopping Mall.....	29
The World Trade Center.....	30
Comparison and Analysis.....	33
Social Function.....	33
Entertainment Value.....	38
Political and/or Individual Glorification.....	44
Political Propaganda.....	46
The Economic Impact of Architecture.....	49
Conclusion.....	49

Architecture is a medium to which we are all accustomed. It has become routine within our daily lives. Yet, what is not commonly understood is the impact that architecture can have on our lives. Architecture exerts socio economic impact on the community. This paper will explore both the benefits and detriments that society experiences as a result of the impact of architecture. Architecture is discrete in nature and serves a specific role to a community. This is representative of its functional value. However, the value of architecture that this thesis is going to address focuses on both the tangible and intangible function aspects; the motive behind the design; the political benefit to authoritative figures within society garnered from the establishment of monumental structure and the social and entertainment value of the structure and its design. This thesis will explore the extent to which the social and political values (aesthetic, ethical and social/political) of architecture are prevalent in both ancient and modern super structures. The goal that I have regarding the conclusion of this thesis is to uncover the connecting themes of function, design and value that link ancient Roman architecture to that of the modern day.

Literature Review and Research

The Identity of Architecture

To gain a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the influence and power of architecture, one must understand the aesthetic of architecture as an art form. Pevsner¹ understood architecture as “buildings designed with a view to aesthetic appeal.”

Aesthetic appeal often implies beautiful; however, designed beauty becomes a work of

¹ Nikolaus Pevsner: German-born architectural historian and critic. Considered to be the founding father of the academic discipline of the history of design in England.

art (Harries, 16). Architecture is clearly the product of design, and would therefore be classified as designed beauty, which would ultimately imply that it is a work of art.

Architecture is a prominent, but not highly publicized art form. What are the key identifying features of art? What is the illusion of architecture that would classify it as art? The following characterization of art identifies key elements of art that are applicable to architecture as well:

1. The aesthetic object should not mean but be
2. The aesthetic object should present itself as a whole
3. The aesthetic object demands aesthetic distance
4. The aesthetic object promises to put us at one with ourselves (Harries, 16-17).

Aesthetics are said to be a synonym for the “philosophy of art.” The philosophy of art is the idea that there is a deeper significance to a work of art – the purpose for its creation. To address the philosophy of a subject matter is to understand the intention of the artist². Architecture as a form of art attempts to address humanities deepest concerns (e.g. religion, philosophy, politics, heritage, etc...) Architecture reaches out to and connects with the individual in a variety of ways as well as on multiple levels of understanding.

Citing the authority of Aristotle, the work of architecture, like every work of art is “a world within a world, complete, integral, whole; a world where there is no contradiction.” It has been observed that architecture has an empowering connection to the sacred (Harries, 17-21). This theory prompts the question as to what is considered to be sacred? Religion? Power? Wealth? Nature? These are all issues that have been addressed in the form and function of architectural structures throughout the ages. All structures are

² Artist is a broad term used, for the purpose of this thesis, as a synonym for architect. Architecture is a work of art and therefore the architect is also an artist.

created with an initial purpose and ultimate goal. Architecture has a profound impact on the viewer, a deeply rooted effect that wrestles with the idea of worldly ethics and social principles. It is the aesthetic value and medium of architecture (as a form of art) that portrays the artist's worldview. Architecture allows one to view the world through the eyes of another. Art (architecture) communicates in a language that is unspoken and unique to the world of art. It presents a message through aesthetic detail and imagery.

The history of building has primarily revolved around two separate and distinct poles: one marked by the house and the other by the temple or the church [a comparison being drawn between the public (political) and the private]. The first is relatively private, and the other public. However, churches, temples and political architecture in general have traditionally been privileged, as witnessed by the expenditure of labor and wealth (Harries, 20-21). Works of architecture are represented by the traditional building prototype; however, architecture as a form of art illuminates the vernacular of building – adding the element of life and establishing individuality and personality. Architecture translates and communicates a message to its viewers, an attribution to the unique power held by architecture.

The aesthetic function of architecture operates on two different levels: the message that it communicates and the way in which it impacts the community as a whole. Architecture, as a form of art, is created with feeling and emotion and is intended to communicate a message or idea to the viewer. As a result, the viewer participates in the work by transmitting a sense of themselves into the aesthetic beauty. This message touches the individual on a personal level, stirring feeling and invoking emotion.

The idea of ethics is also applicable to the function of a structure and its impact on the community around it. Is the structure beneficial or detrimental to the community? Does it have a positive or negative impact on its patrons? How do the people react to its existence? What is the political benefit associated with the establishment of public structure? These are all questions that address the ethics of architecture.

The aesthetic function of architecture is also considered to be a public function (the political architecture i.e. churches and temples). Sacred and public architecture provides the community with a center (Harries, 18-19). This center serves as a source of common ground on which members of society can meet and come together in a shared purpose. Individuals gain their sense of place in a history and in a community by relating their dwelling to that specific center. Thus the center becomes the focal point of the community. It helps to service a commonality that binds together the people by providing the illusion of unity and togetherness. A communal center adds strength and focus to the community. It provides added awareness of personal individuality and diversification within the community. It also provides a means for communication among the people, fostering a camaraderie that will allow the people to band together to achieve a common ambition.

Public architecture (also labeled political architecture as they are one and the same) is an established architectural source that is self-consciously employed to help forge a new community. It is the forgone conclusion and intention the public/political³ architecture will serve an essential communal and ethical function. Sacred architecture establishes a precedent for all architecture in that it is the ideal source of a communal center (Harries,

³ For purposes of this thesis public and political architecture are used interchangeably. Public architecture is a synonym for political architecture as they are the result of political action established for public purposes.

17-19). A center cannot be freely laid down, but must be experienced. The very viewpoint of architecture is to let us take leave from the everyday, only to return to it with eyes more open and a greater awareness of what matters. Architecture has a social function: it calls us out of the everyday, recalling us to the values presiding over our lives as members of a society. It beckons us toward a better life, taking us a bit closer to an illusory ideal.

One task of architecture is to preserve at least a piece of utopia. Inevitably, architecture leaves a sting; awakening utopian longings, filling man with dreams of another and ultimately better world. Dreams of a better life are inseparable from the ideal of the good life, which also entails dreams of a better home/dwelling (Harries, 20-25).

The work of art points out to humanity new paths and things of the future. This addresses the aesthetic and ethical value of architecture. Architecture is seen as the master art that draws the others out of isolation. It is the power of architecture that nurtures a community and fosters its growth, promoting harmony, prosperity and peace.

Architecture as Art: The Power of Aesthetic Value

Philosophy of Aesthetic Power

Architecture is a very powerful and expressive form that serves a variety of utilities. However, it is power that has preyed upon architecture in its infancy, cultivating it to great heights of economic status and wealth. Architecture has provided political leaders with a physical means by which to exert control over the masses. Whether few or many,

society as a whole has fallen victim to the captivating power that is provided by architecture.

Political and Social Value of the Aesthetic

There is significant research regarding the philosophy and value of architecture as an aesthetic medium and dominant form of art. Max Weber⁴ has suggested that one may best define and understand the modern state of architecture in terms of its successful utilization of force and dominance within a specific territory, whereby this force is either directed outward to protect given political institutions against foreign aggressors or inward to stabilize the prevalent order of a social institution (Koepnick, 29). Architecture can be utilized as both a physical and/or theoretical cornerstone within society around which one can build and stabilize itself. It is a medium in which all members of society can establish common ground, finding a point of focus and working towards a shared goal.

As Weber noted, architecture can service a dual purpose within an established society. Architecture has both political and social value. The physical element of architecture may be used as a source of protection and distinction -- providing physical bounds that define a political state. The aesthetic element of architecture ultimately promotes political glorification. Architecture is a physical manifestation of political power, wealth and prestige. Throughout history and extending into modern times, people have stood in awe, struck in amazement of the magnitude of political architectural structures. They in turn impress upon the populace the grandeur and power of the government. Architecture brings glory and honor to political rule, established a monument that reigns throughout the whole of history.

⁴ Max Weber – sociologist (German; 1864-1920) is best known as one of the leading scholars and founders of modern sociology.

The second purpose that architecture services within society is that of social stabilization. Architecture is used as a means to create social order while exerting and maintaining control over a community. The key to political success is maintaining social reform and establishing peace among the people, as it is the people who hold the true power of any given nation. In order to establish power, one must bring pleasure to the people fulfilling both their needs as well as their desires. One goal is to cultivate peace and prosperity among the people (or at least provide the illusion of), ultimately favorably promoting the political rulers who are credited with establishing this peace and prosperity. This is imperative for establishing and maintaining social control. The political leaders are a reflection of the people, and vice versa. The people reflect the state of governing leadership as well as the extent of its control. It is the power of the people that allows for the empowerment of the government. Thus it is in the best interest of the political leadership to provide for and promote peace while servicing prosperity and success (of both the individual and the nation as a whole). A key method of accomplishing this feat is through the utilization of architecture – a key resource of power.

Political leaders have turned to the positive imagery associated with aesthetic resources in order to counterbalance negative repercussions of social fragmentation and redefine the contours of communal and/or national identity. Architecture serves as a common focal point within society – a common tie that can bind people together and combat fragmentation. It fosters the gathering of common goals and interests. It establishes social decorum and facilitates socialization among the people, eliminating separation and division. Walter Benjamin states that the aesthetic experience can be viewed as a means by which to reduce social complexity and institutional abstraction; a formula to overcome

the loss of the sacred, uncontested meaning, and to reinstate stable networks of social interaction (Koepnick, 29). It brings together society with common unity and purpose.

Traditionally political campaigns and national leadership have not been viewed with expressive enthusiasm or optimism from public opinion. Society is hesitant to commit itself to the leadership of another, and understandably so as it is a risky proposition. This is true of almost all people of all nations throughout history in its entirety. There is no perfect government nor is there a cure-all solution to finding favor among the people. Political rule seeks to find favor and establish a virtuous reputation among those with whom its fate awaits judgment... the people themselves. However, the lingering challenge is to find and establish the best means by which to please the masses. A very successful method that has been used by many focuses on the appropriate⁵ utilization of the aesthetic value of architecture. Architecture provides a means by which one is able to exercise social control. This is accomplished by providing a common gathering place with a theme applicable to all members of the population. Which in turn, draws the people together with a common, shared goal or interest. Entertainment is another method that is commonly used to service pacification and provide a source of pleasure to the people. Entertainment value is also a significant attribution of political architecture.

Martin Jay has also made important contributions to this critique. He argues the following: Any discussion of the aestheticization of politics must begin by identifying the normative notion of the aesthetic it presupposes. For unless we specify what is meant by this ambiguous term, it is impossible to understand why its extension to the realm of the political is seen as problematic (Koepnick, 30). Political rulers and governing bodies

⁵ The appropriate utilization of the aesthetic value of architecture was for the promotion of political leadership. This was an indirect campaign; a form of political propaganda from which only the political parties would find benefit.

have long abused the power and control that encompasses the aesthetic value(s) of architecture. Entertainment and social pacification have been abused as a method of instituting social order among the people per the benefit of control for the government. The ability and capacity for critical thinking and logical reasoning is a liberty amongst all. The clarity becomes clouded as it is overcome with a distorted view of the pros and cons of the political leadership. The promotion of pacification among the masses through entertainment media and venues depicts a false front of political benefits to the people, communicating the message that the government is working for the good of the people. The theory behind this is relatively simple; the government sees the opportunity to create (essentially bribing through falsification of truth) favor amongst the people through raising and establishing architectural structures whose primary function is to provide benefit to the people -- created by and for the people. The government seizes an opportunity to create and fulfill the need and desire of the people while simultaneously promoting their personal political campaign agenda.

Martin Jay has maintained the following aesthetic incursions upon the political:

- A. Judgmental Fallacy: Confuses aesthetic judgments with moral or political judgments. Aesthetic politics induces us to evaluate political facts and actions according to genuinely aesthetic categories to transcendental principles of form, beauty or sublimity.
- B. Pragmatic Fallacy: Produces illegitimate equations of political action and artistic practices. It presents the political leader as a God-like genius who generates the very kind of rules, norms and principles according to which his actions ought to be evaluated.

C. Representational Fallacy: Images, rather than language, visual distractions rather than rational arguments, operate as the main catalyst of political legitimization and social integration (Koepnick, 30).

Judgmental fallacy is prevalent among political architecture. People attribute the aesthetic value of a structure to the value of the political rule or governing party. The people are deceived into drawing a direct connection between the positive imagery and beneficial value of architecture as the result of actions of the government. Thus the government finds itself to be valued under the same categorization with the structures that they created for the people; if the public works of the government are done in the best interests of the public, then the government must be working in the best interests of the people. The people view architecture as physical evidence of the good of the government, however false and misleading this assumption may be (hence the presence of political propaganda.)

Pragmatic fallacy is the underlying justification of political architecture. One who commissions and builds such monumental structure desires to be remembered for their leadership strength and power of rule along with attributions made to their God-like qualities. The notion of pragmatic fallacy is directly supported by the above equation which results in the ability to assume that architecture establishes a direct connection to political leadership and social control. Political leadership and social control are key characteristics that belong to political rulers, governing bodies, and those who can afford such luxurious displays of aesthetic power via architectural mediums.

Representational fallacy is communication through imagery. It is the overpowering attribution of the aesthetic value of architecture that is utilized as a primary means of

communication. The aesthetic values of political architecture communicate unique messages to its viewers. The primary message being one that addresses the good works and public interest of the government; filling the people with the false notion that the government agenda will ultimately benefit the people. The people are induced to self impose a positive opinion of the form of political rule based upon the aesthetic appeal of political architecture. Consequently the opinions of the people are skewed as a result of the presentation of a false front of political propaganda presenting false attribution that is representational of its campaign. By raising architecture in the interest of the people, political leadership issue is stating that they are one of the people and are working in the name of public interest.

The message presented by political architecture establishes a direct correlation between aesthetic appeal and political campaign. Thus, art has been transformed into a political propagandistic tool of mass communication. However, this message is based on false pretences in that the people are led to believe something that does not reflect the truth in its entirety. The aesthetic appeal of architecture is a basic form of political propaganda. Political rule is falsifying the truth by presenting a front that portrays a message that alters reality, concealing hidden motives and objectives that are detrimental to the public and beneficial only to authoritative figureheads. This message works for the government and against the people. The truth is hidden behind closed doors – doors that are masked with aesthetic appeal and what is perceived as good intentions.

There are many positive and negative connotations and social effect that surrounds the use of architecture for political intent. A positive attribute is that political architecture is utilized and enjoyed by the people. Simply stated, it is the people who benefit from its existence. Political architecture, whether private or public in nature, almost always

provides public service in either one portion or in its entirety. The service of use is provided for the masses to take advantage. This public utilization adds entertainment value to the structure. The people seek these aesthetic structures because they desire to be entertained. Entertainment is provided by means of both aesthetic appeal as well as the physical function of the structure that caters to its purpose and use (*i.e.* library, museum, theater...).

Public architecture services a social function as well. By providing a place for public gathering and social interaction, the architectural structure is viewed as a social focus and point of reference for society. People gather for a common purpose, seeking a goal that may be defined by the structure itself. Architecture is enabled with the ability to house this goal and facilitate a means by which individuals are able to gather and come together in the physical as well as in idea and thought. A physical gathering is not limited only to a meeting in body, but rather it fosters a gathering of the minds. It is these public points of reference that enable individuals to come together with a shared vision and interact with one another to more clearly define and achieve the matter at hand.

This form of public interaction can be perceived to be potentially dangerous and an eminent threat to political rule. A coalition in thought (of the people) is a dangerous proposition for any government. It threatens the rule and authority while undermining political power. As a result, it is beneficial for the government to exert a degree of control over these meetings along with establishing some influence over the events/actions of the masses. By creating public structures, the government provides the people with place to meet within the confines of a controlled environment. This control is exerted through political manipulation.

In this respect, political architecture serves a dual function. First it provides the people with a place to gather and facilitates social interaction. Secondly, and conversely, it provides political leadership with a means to control public gathering and maintain an element of social order. It appears as though both parties would be satisfied by such antics. The people being pleased at being provided a haven in which they are allowed a degree of freedom in expression. Social interaction allows the people to openly communicate with one another on a personal level, discussing any or all matters at hand. As previously stated, this freedom exerts a potential political threat. However, with political architecture being established to house these social gatherings, the government has indirect control over the people. This allows for political control of the environment in which the people gather. The purpose of the building (i.e. mall, bathhouse, marketplace...) also plays a role in the level of control of the government. This purpose carries over as being the source for which the people gather and becomes the main focus of social interaction. The government is able to maintain a level of social control within the confines of political architecture.

The foremost con, resulting in negative impact to the people is the socio economic control that the government is able to attain via political architecture. The aesthetic value of architecture (attributed to architecture as a form of art) exerts a level of social control. It is the message that the aesthetic value of an architectural structure communicates that levies this unique form of control. Political architecture portrays wealth and power in a very impacting form. This physical portrayal of prestige is very intimidating to those who are considered to be lesser in status (this would account for almost any viewer or patron of the arts). This intimidation factor can result in fear and a feeling of inequality. Fear is an element that permits the governing rule to maintain control and establish power over the masses.

Architecture as Art – Aesthetic Appeal

There is an uplifting value to the aesthetic appeal of political architecture. The grandeur, wealth and power that is portrayed in political architecture can foster a feeling of national pride and patriotism amongst the citizens who can claim ownership rights and privilege of this public architecture. This claim to ownership instills a sense of national pride among the citizens which can then morph into political loyalty and allegiance. This is the driving goal of the government. Political architecture with aesthetic appeal provides a way in which national leadership can 'earn' the loyalty of the people. This revival of patriotism promotes government campaign and establishes positive opinion of rule among the citizens. Political architecture promotes national pride from which both the government and the people benefit.

Walter Benjamin maintained that art fairs much better if it remains autonomous, not involved in politics (Koepnick, 32). In the economist paradigm, politics corrupt the pure aesthetic and intrinsic value of art. It attaches to the aesthetic value social issues generated in respect to a specific political stance. Government uses art to help further and promote its campaign. The intent of political rule can be, and often is reflected in the art of the time. Subsequently, the art form that receives much attention from political leaders and authoritative figures is architecture. Architecture is utilized as a communication tool by which the government is able to communicate policy in a very positive light. The people are very receptive to this method of communication because ultimately it is the people who benefit from these types of political endeavors. It is the people who enjoy the daily use and benefit from political structure and development.

Such is the politics of the aesthetic – simple in form but complex in nature. Why is it that architecture has become the key means by which the political world has come to dominate the aesthetic world of art? In short, architecture is a means of gratification to the people that results in a physical manifestation of the power and domination of the political. One views political architecture with amazement of the luxury and opulence of power and wealth; the result of the undeniable ability of the government. Architecture is very diverse in that it can host a variety of meanings, both direct and indirect. For example, specific political structures can symbolize the spirit of a nation – *e.g.* the Palace of Versailles, the White House, etc... Other politically based structures serve to bring fear and intimidation into the hearts of many, sending a distinct message referencing the severe repercussions awaiting those who oppose the government – *e.g.* the Tower of London, Alcatraz, etc... The power of these structures and the effect that they have on the masses is arguable but undeniable. Such is the logic behind political structure and architecture.

In order to understand the power of the aesthetic value of art/architecture – utilized by the political – one must understand the very grounding of the political action as defined within the concepts of autonomous power and resolute leadership as an ideological personification of aesthetic power (W. Benjamin). It marshals the tools of post autonomous art and image making in the hope of removing former standards of valorization and legitimation and of glorifying expressions of power as aortic presences. The aesthetic value of political architecture defies normative discourses and critical evaluation; it presents the preconceptual articulation of virtualistic power and masculine resolution as the exclusive media of political action and integration (Koepnick, 53). Political architecture represents a fallacy as to the value and merit of the government. . It portrays political leadership in a different form - one that is void of flaw and error. The

aesthetic value of political architecture is nothing more than political promotion and propaganda, skewing the facts and altering reality.

The display of aesthetic power by means of utilizing political architecture to remove discourse from the arena of politics altogether and exchange it for enactments of powerful leadership, subordination and communal renewal (Koepnick, 85). By providing a location for social gathering, architecture allows for individuals to come together in a common location for a predetermined purpose. Political leadership has control of location, and as a result is able to exert a strong influence over its purpose and use. The power of the aesthetic along with the extended and controlling arm of the government demands submission and subordination from the people. In this way, the government is able to maintain its powerful leadership and superior control.

Aesthetic politics transfigures given structures of power through strategic appeals to sense perception, through an affective rhetoric of immediacy and total presence. It calls for awe and submission, not for normative debates and/or moral criticism. Architecture, as a form of art, is a practical expression of power over nature (Koepnick, 85-97). The aesthetics of architecture plays to the subconscious – penetrating the individual deeper than surface value. The overwhelming power of beauty and strength stirs in one an awe that transcends reason. Logic is not present in beauty; one does not analyze what is underneath the surface. The awe and fear that is inspired in so many as a result of the grandeur and magnitude that becomes political architecture is powerful enough to overcome critical reasoning and subdue one into internal submission.

Political Propaganda

W. Benjamin noted that resolute leadership embodies the most distinguished form of aesthetic expression (Koepnick, 98). Powerful leaders portray their authority through dictating means. One of the most powerful methods that have been utilized throughout the ages is the principle and presence of architecture. Architecture provides a platform for aesthetic expression. This aesthetic value can be a very powerful tool of communication. It expresses ideas such as wealth, superiority and dominance; instilling fear and demanding submission. Consequently, architecture has become a primary method of the propagandistic promotion of one's self; specifically political leadership and governmental rule.

Community revival and spiritual renewal is a key factor in the success of a political régime. The power of leadership lies with the people. Great leaders know this and cater to serving the needs and desires of the people. The people hold the power of a nation. Finding means to revive the spirit of the people helps to ensure the success of political leadership. Thus it has become the focus of many great leaders to provide and promote communal revival. Political architecture provides a means to achieve this reviving of spirit. By providing a community with a point of reference, a place where people can gather, one brings a new sense of oneness to the masses. All members within society experience this newfound spirit of togetherness. The political benefit results from public gratitude ultimately residing with positive attribution to the founding authority figure. Political rule benefits from community pride; the stronger the pride the greater the strength of leadership. Architecture is a means by which to create or restore communal spirit, and build strength and power of political rule.

Art as architecture is a form of political propaganda that is executed for the masses; penetrating all social classes within the community. Architecture, as a form of art, is a very powerful and persuasive means of political propaganda. However, in order for it to be effective, it must be applicable to all members and classes within society. The purpose of political architecture is one of duality. On one hand, political architecture is created to appeal to the people. It provides a visual communication between the elite and common social classes, reducing social stratification. On the other hand, political architecture is a method in which the government is able to maintain social and economic control. Monumental art (i.e. the categorization of a majority of political architecture) represents the medium par excellence by which politics succeeds in penetrating the entire social life with its political imperatives (Koepnick, 101-102). It is through the aesthetical value of political structure that leadership is able to extend a controlling hand over the populous amid simultaneously reinforcing popular opinion regarding the political campaign.

The cult of creative leadership, the ideology of war, the monumental conception of art: all three work in tandem in any given government in order to give political action the seductive appearance of great politics; to endow the political with existentialist relevance. Naturalizing given power structures, not the least of all patriarchal family and the subordination of women, the veneration of idealistic beauty thus yields aesthetics of submission and obedience (Koepnick, 102-104). People desire (idealistically) to stand behind and support the governing bodies of the nation in which they live. They are proud to call that land their home and would fight for its continued existence. It is the power of the people to elect those who they feel best serve and meet their needs as the leader(s) and future of their nation. The people hold much power, and while the political leaders may initially benefit from this power, they also grow fearful of it. Thus they strive to

) pacify and appease the people. Monumental architecture, as a political tool, addresses this need. It fulfills the needs of the people while promoting the leadership and those in authority. It serves to pacify rebellion and provide entertainment value. The entertainment value of architecture is another form of positive attribution to political leadership. All parties find validity with the political establishment of monumental architecture. Such began the revolution of political architecture as a form of aesthetic art – drawing those around it and affected by it into submission.

Brief History and Discussion of the Architecture

The Market of Trajan

The Market of Trajan is a product of the Trajan Forum. Marked by an imposing sculpted column, the Forum of Trajan was among the largest, latest, and most impressive of the imperial forums. The Market of Trajan was a three-floor, semicircular complex that was built during the early second century BC. This market was the forefather to the modern day shopping mall. The market had space for 150 shops, selling everything from imported fabrics to Eastern spices. Recent scholarship has confirmed that the long Roman fascination with pubs began here, with taverns lining the street outside the market. Part of the vast structure housed public administration offices and a stock exchange. The ground floor and first floor rooms of the markets are home to an impressive, if crumbling display of sculpture from the imperial forum, including two colossal torsos of Nerva and Agrippa and part of a frieze of a griffin ("Trajan Forum," 2).

The structure complex was constructed on the slopes of the Quirinale hills, situated to provide space for the Forum of Trajan. The constructed area consists of six levels connected by a series of steep staircases: in the three levels of the upper area there are the Great Hall and Central Body which unwind between Via Biberatica (from *bibier*, 'beverage') and the back area (today's Tower of the Militia Garden); in the three lower area levels there are the Great and Small Hemicycle going down toward the Forum floor which are divided with other means of entrance. The Great Hall was probably used for official ceremonies, alternatively with the Basilica Ulpia and the spaces in the Forum of Trajan. Realized in the classic Roman *taberna* style (piers and lintels in travertine with

upper windows for light) the vaults relieve their mass onto the side surroundings. The system of the corridors on the first and second levels insure ventilation and light. Both the Large Hall and the Central Body were probably offices, destined for the head of the nearby Forum. Other, more reserved rooms could have served as security safes for the senators (rooms in the Great Hemicycle) ("Trajan Markets," 2-3).

The Forum of Trajan was utilized as a splendid area of representation for public ceremonies. In the late epoch, exedras behind the lateral porticos were used to host poetry readings and conferences. Court hearings and ceremonies for the freedom of slaves were probably held in the apses of the Basilica. The library was probably used as a sort of historical archive of the Imperial Roman state and also conserved Republican annals.

Trajan understood that there was a need for more forum space. In order to fulfill this need he commissioned the Market of Trajan to be constructed. However, Trajan did more than simply provide more space for the business of Rome; he constructed at the same time, a monument to himself, and to the glory of the Empire ("The Emperor Trajan and His Forum," 1-7).

The Baths of Caracalla

The Baths of Caracalla, the second largest baths complex in ancient Rome, were built between 212 and 219 A.D. by the emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, better known by his nickname Caracalla ("The Baths of Caracalla in Rome," 1-2). The Baths of Caracalla

covered 27 acres and could accommodate 1,600 people at a time. As well as the bathing facilities, the complex included meeting rooms, gymnasias, walkways, gardens, at least two libraries and a public stadium ("The Roman Occupation," 1-2).

By the 3rd century A.D. the Romans had built many baths, in Rome and elsewhere, and had acquired great skill in designing functional, fully integrated complexes. The water supply and drainage system, in particular required careful planning to ensure an adequate flow to and from the numerous hot and cold basins: it has been calculated that the baths used 15-20,000 cubic meters of water per day. The baths were fed by a branch of the Aqua Marcia aqueduct, which brought pure water to Rome from springs in the hills near Subiaco, over 90 km away. The water flowed into a huge cistern, divided into 18 separate chambers for easy maintenance and with a total capacity of 10,000 cubic meters. From here it went by gravity flow through pipes underneath the gardens to the main building ("The Roman Occupation," 1-2).

In architectural terms, baths were buildings or rooms built specifically to provide facilities for communal or private washing and bathing. Bathing has been part of religious practice as ritual purification since early times. Bathing has also been considered important to health and comfort in some societies, notable those of the ancient Greeks and Romans and those of the West in modern times. Bathing also serves a social function, as in ancient times and today in countries such as Turkey, Iran and Japan ("Baths," 1).

Public baths were open to all, and subsequently took on a communal character. They became places to meet, talk and socialize as well as to wash. Gradually they became bigger and more lavish, with rich patrons supporting public baths as status symbols and

as a means of garnering public support for their political ambition. The citizens of Rome were able to carry out their ablutions in magnificent splendor, the like of which had never before been experienced by ordinary people, but which was later surpassed by the efforts of following emperors as they strove to outdo each other with huge, richly endowed bathing complexes ("The Roman Occupation," 1-2).

The public baths became central to urban Roman life. They were among the first buildings to be erected in any Roman settlement, and even the smallest of towns would have had at least one. Indeed, the fact that the empire was so well provided with bath houses, together with the social nature of bathing in Roman society, meant that some wealthy citizens did not feel the need to build private baths in their own homes at all. Those who did often used them as much for entertaining guests as for simple personal hygiene ("The Roman Occupation," 1-2).

The public baths were used by all sections of society. Those who could not afford to hire an attendant to scrape away the dirt and oil from their bodies with a sickle-shaped strigil did it for each other. For the urban poor and unemployed who often gathered in the baths in the afternoons, the baths were sure to provide a welcome respite from the dirt and discomfort of daily life in the empire. The baths were also open to both men and women, although respectable Roman women would not have attended the mixed sessions that were popular for a period in Rome. The emperor Hadrian eventually ruled that there should be separate bathing sessions for the two sexes, with women attending in the mornings and men later in the day ("The Roman Occupation," 1-2).

The Roman Colosseum

The Colosseum was originally called the Flavian Amphitheatre after its builders, the emperors Vespasian and Titus, both of the Flavian family. Construction began around 70 AD in a low-lying area between the Palatine, Esquiline, and Caelian hills that had once formed the pond of Nero's Domus Aureus. The amphitheatre probably came to be called the "Colosseum" because a colossal statue of Nero once stood near it ("The Colosseum," 1).

The Colosseum was completed in 80 AD and seated more than 50,000 spectators. Its opening was celebrated with 100 days of games in which thousands of animal and gladiators were killed. Occasionally the Colosseum was flooded in order to stage small naval battles, though these more commonly took place in large basins, called naumachias, that were specially dug for that purpose. The emperor had his own entrance to the Colosseum, and from his private "box seat" he decided the fate of defeated gladiators.

The floor of the arena was wood covered with sand. Beneath the floor was a maze of passageways, and temporary holding pens for the animals. A hand-operated elevator was used to raise the animals from the basement up to the arena floor. The walls of the subterranean passageways can still be seen today, although the Italian government had decided to re-floor the Colosseum ("The Colosseum," 2).

For all its beauty, the Colosseum is also a marvel of ergonomics and efficiency. It is estimated that 50,000 people could enter and be seated in fifteen minutes. The reason for this is that the Romans invented tickets and assigned seating. Before a game, a spectator would pick up a ticket which had a number that corresponded to one of the seventy-nine

) entrance arches which all had numbers above them (the eightieth arch was for the emperor). The ticket also had a level, and a seat number. Senators had reserved seats with their names carved in the base (some can still be seen today). The basic design of the Colosseum and the ticket system is still used today for many gaming events, from bullfights in Spain to baseball games in America(“The Colosseum,” 2).

The Colosseum was used regularly for almost 400 years, and has suffered through earthquakes, neglect, and the pillaging of popes who took its marble for their own buildings (“The Colosseum,” 3).

) The people benefited from the entertainment that the Colosseum provided, enhancing their daily lives. Political rule benefited from the gratitude of the people – thankful for the entertainment offered to them.

The Rockefeller Center

The Rockefeller Center is not a building, but a social and intimate urban space. Comprised of 14 buildings by 1940, Rockefeller Center’s public spaces are as impressive as the buildings themselves. Rockefeller Plaza is a many-leveled pedestrian space surrounding a skating rink in winter, an outdoor café in summer. Channel Gardens rises on a slope to Fifth Avenue. Rockefeller Center’s buildings are cast in limestone, aluminum and glass. The seventy-story RCA building (now GE) is the centerpiece, a slender soaring mass that carries one’s view on an endless ride up (“Rockefeller Center”, 1).

The sumptuous 5,874 seat Radio Music Hall (1932) is an Art Deco⁶ delight. Designed as a palatial entertainment center affordable to the general public, it was opened on December 27, 1932. The opulence of the foyer stunned theatergoers during the depression. It has a ceiling 60 feet high and drapes extending from ceiling to floor, ornate mirrors, and long, slender chandeliers (“Rockefeller Center”, 1).

The Rockefeller center provided an escape from the ordinary for the people. They were able to shed their mundane and stressful lives and step into the halls of wealth, luxury and opulence. The people came to the Rockefeller center to be entertained and find a means of mental escape from day-to-day living. The Rockefeller Center continues to play a key role in the identity of New York, and attracts many tourists and visitors even today. The Rockefeller Center encompasses the spirit of New York City.

In the presence of a weak bull market, Rockefeller was assuming control; he would not allow himself to be passive. His name, the embodiment of all that was mythical about the American dream – rags to riches to inconceivable wealth – was the testament to nineteenth-century enterprise. Rockefeller’s position in regards to the construction of the center was as follows:

“...while prime consideration is this enterprise must be its financial success, the importance of a unified and beautiful architectural whole must constantly be kept in mind and attained, to the fullest extent possible comparable with an adequate return on the investment.” (Balfour, 195-213).

The Rockefeller Center has always received a great deal of attention from all kinds of critics. The record presents a wide spectrum of attitudes, values, and changing

⁶ The Art Deco style is reference to the aesthetic value of the hall and reflective of the contemporary style of the era.

perceptions. The most revealing reaction during the Center's formative period – up until World War II – came from several very different people:

Ralph Adams Cram represented the old order in grand style. He was the most esteemed practitioner of Gothic architecture in America, having pursued the style almost unswervingly throughout his life. He believed it to be philosophically the most appropriate style to the sustenance of religious and academic life of the culture. Cram believed that the Rockefeller Center embodied the arrogance of wealth that would destroy the city:

“Astounding as is this creation viewed as a contribution to the once great art of architecture, its psychological implications are even more revealing. Here is the apotheosis of megalomania, of a defiant egotism...”

He believed that in the very existence of this architectural rebel of a structure that human values were being debased. He believed that the Rockefeller Center was the product of the condition of the culture. Architecture is merely a symptom of the sickness, and even in such awesome circumstances his heroic view is undiminished:

“...this is great architecture for it is the function of this art adequately to express in visible form the very soul and essence of a time...”

Cram held an impressive regard for the power and influence of architecture (Balfour, 213-14).

Le Corbusier, an expert of European style, was more generous and receptive to the style and presentation of Rockefeller Center. He showed distinct enthusiasm for the spirit of the structure, more than for the architecture itself:

“Consider the most recent skyscraper, Rockefeller Center. It is rational, logically conceived, biologically normal, harmonious in its four functional elements, halls for the entrance and division of crowds, grouped shafts for the vertical circulation (elevators), corridors (interior streets), regular offices.”

Le Corbusier found Rockefeller Center to be a “machine aged temple”: “Already in New York, Rockefeller Center affirms to the world the dignity of the new times by its useful

and noble halls.” There is a paradox in Le Corbusier’s pleasure in American technology and disdain for the Center’s architectural detail. The architect of L’Esprit Nouveau were self-proclaimed champions of rationalism and social revolution. The architecture of commercial America was technologically advanced and as pragmatically functional as was needed to do a job and make a profit. Even the decoration was a function of advertising taste and value. In contrast, the new architecture in Europe was romantic functionalism in which all was artifice and decoration, untested socially or economically (Balfour, 215-17).

Not all critics shared a common view that the Rockefeller Center was in fact a cultural center and representative of society. The initial doubts expressed by Fredrick Lewis Allen stemmed not from the shapes of the buildings but from false claims, particularly the claims that Rockefeller Center would be a cultural center:

“Cultural center? Let us not deceive ourselves. The same logic which is forced Mr. Rockefeller to build a commercial development, which dictated to him the erection of skyscrapers instead of planning a charming urban retreat, which compelled him to go on with his project even though Manhattan was overbuilt, will compel the managers of Radio City to make the best of “Roxyism.” They will be operating on a huge sale in an expensive location and will want to earn dividends.”

Allen dealt with the critics by stating the following:

“... the real answer to Mr. Mumford and the other architectural critics who cried aloud with rage... is that they hoped for too much... An embodiment of American progress and city planning? That would be very nice if attainable. But the first essential, was to save... investment from disaster.” (Balfour, 217-19).

.....

“This immense enterprise, daringly conceived, prosecuted with the aid of vast wealth, based upon the optimistic values of boom times, proliferating skyscrapers containing office space which in time of Depression it seems as if we should never need, mass producing quick and easy entertainment for millions, looking with a hard eye to profit, yet talking meanwhile of education and the promotion of the arts – is it not, in more than one way representative of our social order and of a particular state of stage of advancement in our American civilization?”

Allen was sanguine and prophetic about the reasons for its success:

“Rugged individualism? This is 20th century organized large-scale operation; regimentation, if you will: a characteristic manifestation of an era in which, if big things are to be done, they apparently must be done either by a multimillionaire, a super corporation, or a government.” (the political uses of architecture)
To Allen, the Rockefeller Center symbolized the mainstream of the metropolis of the western world (Balfour, 217-19).

All the critics in the 1930s were linked by a common bond of accepting spirituality as an essential quality of great architecture. Never were they in any doubt that architecture has meaning. Further, they took for granted that great buildings, and there was never any doubt that Rockefeller Center was a great building, should be judged in terms of comparative humanity. Within such concerns, Fredrick Lewis Allen appears in retrospect to have had the fullest sense of the architecture and its significance. Perhaps this was because his interests were much broader than mere architecture. Judgment in such matters can never be absolute, and for the architectural critics dissatisfaction or satisfaction apparently was based on the variance between the object judged and a personally held poetic vision or sense of rightness. Where that vision was merely architectural, the critic was prone to be distracted by detail and less able to enter fully into the spirit. Allen was not so limited (Balfour, 225).

The Paradigm of the Contemporary Shopping Mall

The Southdale Shopping Center, located in Edina, Minnesota, was the first totally enclosed shopping center in the nation. In 1952 its developers, the Dayton family, long established Minneapolis department store merchants, commissioned the architecture firm

Victor Gruen & Associates to create a new form designed to reflect and serve changing patterns of suburban living. The master plan combined elements of the village green of European city centers, and of elegant arcades and gallerias, in a constant temperature controlled enclosure. When Southdale opened in 1956, it included 72 stores and was anchored by two major department stores, all arranged in a two-level design around a brightly lighted center court. It offered free parking, and its 5,000 parking spaces were grouped into lots, well marked by clever symbols to aid in locating one's own in the sea of cars. Not only did the Southdale Shopping Center fulfill the vision of its creator as a center of commerce and of social life for suburban residents, it also fueled suburban growth and became a much-imitated model ("Southdale Mall," 1).

Malls have ever since been the domain of the middle class, and through continuing development, malls can vary in design from being bargain-basement to the height of luxury. They represent a populist influence on the city's retail. Politicians and planners use malls as lures for the middle class of society (Grossberg, 1-7). Malls are an infusion of residential, cultural and artistically-pleasing elements combined for entertainment purposes.

The people are grateful for the entertainment and social interaction provided by the indoor shopping mall. Retail also witnesses much benefit from the enhanced publicity provided by the shopping mall.

The World Trade Center

The Twin Towers of the World Trade Center were more than just buildings. They were proof of New York's belief in itself. Built at a time when New York's future seemed

uncertain, the towers restored confidence and helped bring a halt to the decline of lower Manhattan. Brash, glitzy and grand, they quickly became symbols of New York (Johnson, 1).

The World Trade Center was conceived in the early 1960's by the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Development Association to revitalize the seedy radio row dominated by electronic stores. Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman David Rockefeller, founder of the development association, and his brother, New York governor Nelson Rockefeller, pushed hard for the project, insisting it would benefit the entire city (Johnson,1).

In 1962, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey began plans to build the center. Minoru Yamasaki and Associates of Michigan were hired as architects. Eventually Yamasaki decided on two huge towers. Critics charged that a modern monolith would rob New York of character, ruin the skyline, disrupt television reception, and strain city services. However, this project was approved and construction began in 1966 (Johnson, 1).

The north tower was opened in December 1970 and the south tower in January 1972; they were dedicated in 1973. They were the world's tallest buildings for only a short time, since the Sears Tower in Chicago was completed in May, 1973. However, the towers were ranked as the fifth and sixth tallest buildings in the world as of September 11th, 2001. Four smaller buildings and a hotel, all built nearby around a central landscaped plaza completed the complex. The mall at the World Trade Center, which was located immediately below the plaza, was the largest shopping mall in lower Manhattan. The six basements housed two subway stations and a stop on the PATH trains to New Jersey.

Some 50,000 people worked in the buildings, while another 200,000 visited or passed through each day. The complex had its own zip code, 10048 (Johnson, 2).

The Twin Towers (a.k.a. the World Trade Center) have been as controversial as they were tall. When the final design plans for the Trade Center were unveiled in January, 1962, the next day's editorial presciently declared: "Their impact on New York, for better or for worse, economically and architecturally, is bound to be enormous." The impact has indeed been all that and more. First a financial white elephant, the complex became immensely profitable and has delivered on its promise to help rejuvenate Lower Manhattan. As a global symbol of New York, the Twin Towers were as identifiable as the Eiffel Tower, the Capitol dome or the Roman Colosseum are of their respective cities. But, as the project evolved, it also developed into a major factor in turning public attitudes against large-scale development, ambitious public works, and even against the government itself.

The Trade center project was widely denounced as a supreme example of self-glorifying monumentalism on the part of unaccountable, autonomous public authorities. Lingering resentment over its perceived excesses continues even today (Cohen, 2-12).

The World Trade Center bolstered the identity of New York City as well as of the US in general. It became representational of the power and authority of the US; a symbol of the social status and superiority of the US in comparison with the rest of the world.

Comparison and Analysis

The fundamental premise of architecture is that architecture equals wealth and power. The following system of equations show an analysis of how the combination of wealth and power results in political leadership and social control. Thus as a result of direct reasoning, architecture⁷ results in superiority in status and control.

$$\text{Architecture} = \text{Wealth} + \text{Power}$$

$$\text{Wealth} + \text{Power} = \text{Political Leadership} + \text{Social Control}$$

$$\text{Architecture} = \text{Political Leadership} + \text{Social Control.}$$

Social Function

It is clear that architecture serves a significant social role within a community. Political architecture can serve as a focal or reference point, to which all members of society can relate and orient themselves. These structures instill and re-enforce social and political values; they bring people together for a common purpose and shared vision. These structures are designed to be utilized by the masses and are built to establish the sense of community, building up community pride. Architectural structures represent the social and political values of the community in which they reside.

What is the thought and rationale that stimulates the desire to create such monumental architecture? Addressing the fundamental idea behind the design. The key aspect to the development of these buildings (political architecture – encompassing all of the aforementioned structures) is power and wealth. Ultimately these architectural giants are the physical manifestation of the megalithic egos of the individual and/or government that

⁷ Architecture in this context refers to the megalithic structure of public (political) architecture. It does not refer to private or small-scale structure.

commissioned their design. Architecture erected for the betterment of the people is the result of political wile and campaign scheming. Why would a person and/or political régime commission and fund such monumental structures if there were not an ulterior motive that was not obvious to the public eye? The logic in such action is that there is reaped reward with multiple benefits to the founding authoritative figure. Architecture, created for the people and utilized by the masses, represents the opportunity to extend an added element of social control that the government has levied upon the masses. By creating a public gathering place, the leadership now has expanded and diversified its authority and political power amidst the people.

This additional control is comprised of mental and physical components. The mental aspect of imposing control is derived by the sense of political propaganda to which social architecture serves is a source. The initial impression of such structures is that they were created specifically as a method to bolster public welfare by providing a source of entertainment. Attribution for such initiative is reflected primarily upon the individual holding political power. Such positive political reinforcement fosters the false impression that political leadership has the number one priority of working for the people – promoting social growth and economic prosperity. Such is the false impression that political architecture can cast upon the public eye. It creates an artificial aura of goodness that has been bestowed upon the governmental rule based upon a perceived act of pure generosity.

The result of this false perception is that the political campaign has falsely bolstered the public support in their (the government's) favor. This is both misleading as well as being a form of cheating the public. Social architecture masks the true face and motives of the ruling party and establishes a forum for political propaganda. Essentially the government

) is compromising the people's ability to formulate unbiased opinions. The people are giving away their support based on misleading facts. This is an indirect form of political fraud and could be construed as false advertising. The people are misled into providing their support without knowing the facts about who or what they are supporting.

The physical component of social control provided by architecture is the result of the structure itself. The philosophy of such control is that it is easier to control a group of people when they are all gathered in the same place versus when individuals are dispersed and gathering in private and away from public eye. As a result, political leadership found benefit to social architecture. It establishes a gathering place for a community – offering a shared point of reference for the people. This allows for ease in control of the people. By providing the masses with a place to gather with a common purpose, the people are being brought together at their own free will. They are unknowingly allowing themselves to be controlled, with their free will being dictated by political rule. From the political perspective, social architecture allows for an effortless means to better manage and control the population⁸.

These architectural structures have been established based on political interest of social control in both ancient and modern cultures. One example from ancient Roman culture is the Markets of Trajan. The markets were developed by the emperor Trajan, and were designed to service multiple social functions (ranging from public markets and pubs to political offices and stock exchange). It was here in these markets that the people were prompted to gather to transact their daily business. These transactions provided for day to day business dealings as well as the exchange of ideas and opinions. By confining

) ⁸ Political architecture in the modern sense includes structures such as the World Trade Center, the Rockefeller Center and the contemporary shopping mall.

such transactions to one common place, the element of social control was established and levied upon the public who were unaware of its negative repercussions.

Trajan was able to extend indirect control over the actions of the masses. He provided them with a place to gather and transact daily courses of business. By containing and confining such social interaction to a common area, Trajan facilitated a means to expand his control of the actions of the people by providing and confining public social interaction. The people were grateful for having such a place to gather and conduct business. They attributed this privilege to Trajan – thus bolstering his social standing and political campaign. He won over the popular opinion of the people while simultaneously being able to expand his physical and mental control of the public that he claimed to serve.

The Market of Trajan is considered to be the forerunner to the modern-day shopping mall. The concept of the shopping mall is derived from the desire to enhance social and communal development. The establishment of an indoor shopping facility was thought to offer the people with a better means by which to facilitate and expedite retail transactions. The indoor shopping center was created to appease public desire and social demand. The indoor mall is shopping made easier. They provided shelter from the weather and offered consistent climate control. The indoor mall also made retail outlets more accessible by locating them in close proximity to one another. Shoppers were now able to service multiple needs with ‘one stop shopping.’

It is not only the public that benefited from the development of the indoor shopping center, but the retail community witnessed significant profit as well. By gaining control over the environment in which the public interacted, the retail industry profited by

gaining some measure of control over consumers. Prior to retail businesses being centrally located within the confines of a controlled environment, consumers were forced to travel substantial distances for individual needs. With the advent of the indoor shopping center, consumers could now service multiple needs under one roof. While this benefited the consumers, retailers benefited from the expansion of the consumer market. Having a vast consumer market in one setting allowed retailers to access a broader range of the consumer market. One might go to the mall for a certain item, and exit with much more than what they planned on purchasing. This benefited the retail industry. The retail industry had gained control over the consumer. Previously the biggest challenge to retailers had been establishing an initial relationship by coaxing the consumer into the store. This challenge no longer existed. Retailers could easily get people into their stores and offer them a large variety of what they desired. Marketing was made easy in that retailers were now able to promote their products within the store and the shopping center as well. The indoor shopping center provided retailers a forum in which to expand their control over consumers. By gathering the public in a common place, retailers could now monitor public patterns and exploit consumer weaknesses. With one common retail market, it was now more feasible to create false needs and facilitate desire within the public. Retailers developed the ability to play off one another to promote products and lure the public into believing that they must have the latest and greatest style. In essence, the indoor shopping center allowed the retail industry to formulate an environment in which they were able to control the consuming public.

The indoor shopping center catered to another social function in that it provided the public with a place for unrestrained social interaction. An indoor shopping center is not limited to being a commune of retailers. It is a place for individuals to meet one another and gather for a common purpose. The indoor shopping center facilitates social

interaction. People gather here not only to shop but to be with one another as well. Indoor shopping facilities provide entertainment to the public. Shopping has transformed from being a necessity to being a form of entertainment and self-gratification. This is a result from the formulation of the indoor shopping center.

Entertainment Value

There are two distinct types of entertainment value that are associated with architecture: aesthetic and function entertainment. The aesthetic entertainment value of architecture is derived from the idea that architecture is a form of art. It adds depth and dimension to the world around it. It provides insight into issues that are relevant to society and communicates with viewers on an individual basis. The aesthetic element of architecture allows patrons to connect with the structure at a deeper and more personal level. Art speaks directly to an individual, and consequently that individual becomes involved with the work⁹. Art is the language of individuality – a physical manifestation of creativity and expression. Art is a method of communication; holding a message for the viewer, engaging them in the masterpiece. There is a silent language that shadows the aesthetic face of architecture; one that addresses every person differently. The aesthetic element of architecture adds dimension and purpose to the structure, giving it a life unto its own.

The second type of entertainment value that is present in architecture is the primary function for which it was established (*i.e.* functional value). A building is defined, in basic terms, by the purpose for which it was created; the need that it fulfills - its essential niche in society at large. The entertainment value of a given structure is a part of the aura that draws people to it. There is always a need in any given society for entertainment.

⁹ Art here is used as a synonym for architecture as architecture is a distinctive and powerful form or art.

) People long to be entertained. As long as there is a continued need and desire among the people, structures will continue to be erected to fulfill this longing and thus appease the people. People are entertained when their minds are consumed by something other than their daily living. Architecture can open one's mind to new ideas and experiences, taking them away for worldly affliction and tragedy.

However, there are ulterior motives in providing a means of entertainment for the people. Fulfilling people's desire to be entertained, in part, brings satisfaction and gratification to the masses. This can then be translated into false feelings happiness, contentment, and false euphoria. Why would the political leaders wish to provide the people with a false sense of pleasure? The logic here is simple: those who are experiencing this pleasure will ultimately attribute its source to those who made it possible... the political rule. This positive attribution to the government (or individual depending on the circumstances) increased the popular opinion among the patrons. Bringing entertainment through methods of architectural establishment is a way of giving back to the people. This act of "charity" can be classified as a gracious act of giving back to the people and is filled with public recognition.

) A second benefit of providing entertainment to the people is that the entertainment consumes their minds, canceling the negatives associated with daily living. People who are oppressed are more inclined to rise up against their oppressors (most often political leadership). However, with the positive reinforcement that entertainment offers, the people are less likely to focus solely on the negatives and are able to escape from their daily strife. They are to transform themselves and lead different and better lives. They take on a new identity that reflects the positive imagery provided to them. This benefits

political rule because the people no longer find the need to rise up against the government because they no longer feel as though they are oppressed.

The architectural structures of ancient Rome were heavily influenced by entertainment value. The respective individuals that commissioned the building of such monumental structures did so with the goal to facilitate a platform from which to bring entertainment to the people... all while outdoing their predecessors. Every new building endeavor had to be bigger and more luxurious than the one built before it. Each authoritative figure, of whom the building was representative, had to be known as the greatest and the best. The aesthetic value of these structures grew more and more elaborate as time passed. Today, these ancient ruins still provide entertainment value to patrons as a result of their magnificent aesthetic works of art. They are truly one of a kind.

The Baths of Caracalla are an example of a public structure that was built to bring entertainment and provide daily release to the citizens of Rome, encompassing all social classes. Bathing was a ritual among the people of Rome (in modern day we might find this experience comparable to dining out). People attended baths not only to cleanse themselves, but to socialize with their fellow citizens. The baths served as a place of public gathering, and were not exclusive to any one class. All were welcomed, and all attended. The Baths of Caracalla not only housed multiple bathing facilities, but were the site of libraries, gardens, and public recreation areas as well. People came here to be entertained and to escape from the hardship and turmoil of daily living. Bathing became a form of daily release. Baths had been a Roman tradition since the establishment of the society. The Baths of Caracalla were by far the biggest and the best of all that had been built to date. This massive structure was erected by Caracalla to outdo and belittle all those who had come before him. He desired glory, fame and recognition for his public

works. This is what he achieved – the baths stand today as a monument to his rule. He established good will among the citizens of Rome who held him in high esteem because of what he had given them. He provided all citizens with a sense of equality because all citizens were openly welcomed at the baths.

The Markets of Trajan provided the people of Rome with a particular genre of entertainment that only retail can give. This form of entertainment can be directly compared to that of today's shopping addiction. A popular catch phrase is “retail therapy” - the sense of gratification that one receives from the shopping experience. The Markets of Trajan afforded this luxury to the citizens of Rome just as the indoor shopping mall provides this for modern society. Both the markets and the mall became a staple within their respective cultures. People would flock to them not because they desperately needed to shop, but rather because they desired to be entertained. Trajan was glorified because he was first able to establish this unique form of entertainment within Rome. The markets established a form of entertainment that all could actively participate in. Even though all citizens may not have been able to afford the daily purchases, they still flocked to the markets to participate in the social activities. Both the Markets of Trajan and the modern day shopping mall not only offered the service of retail therapy, but also provided a place for people to gather. These structures facilitated social interaction within their given cultures, ultimately bringing the people together and reducing the social stratification within the culture. The people of today are experiencing similar effects afforded to them by the malls as did the ancient peoples of Rome via the entertainment value of the Markets of Trajan.

The Roman Colosseum is infamous today as being a place of entertainment. The Colosseum was created with the sole purpose being to provide a place of entertainment

for the people. People flocked to the Colosseum for one-hundred straight days upon its initial opening to be entertained... day in and day out. It was said that the heart of Rome was the Colosseum. The Colosseum was host to a variety of games that mostly consisted of individuals (gladiators) fighting and ultimately one would perish. The Colosseum brought an escape to the people of Rome; providing entertainment and an alternative to daily boredom. Who was to benefit from this happiness? None other than the emperor of Rome. He was the reason for their happiness and they glorified him for it. The Colosseum was built for the people; to bring entertainment to all. However, the Colosseum was also built so that all of Rome would find satisfaction with their leader and would increase the popular opinion of their ruler. As a result, political leadership was able to fortify their authority and increase power and dominance. Both leader and people benefited from the Colosseum.

The Colosseum not only provided functional entertainment, but aesthetic entertainment as well. The architectural magnificence of the Colosseum left all to marvel at its opulence. The Colosseum resonated within the citizens of Rome, and those reverberations are still felt by society today. The Colosseum is still entertaining people, as many travel to marvel at its luxury of the aesthetics. It has become a very popular tourist attraction. Its overpowering aesthetic value speaks to all who can witness its magnificence. The heart of Rome still beats in the Colosseum, hundreds of years after the last crowd gathered to participate in the games of Rome.

The World Trade Center provided both aesthetic and functional entertainment value to its patrons. The World Trade Center's aesthetic value originated from its sheer size and grandeur. It became a symbol of New York. It was the aesthetic symbol of global modernization. There were many forms of functional entertainment within the World

Trade Center. Over 50,000 people would pass through its doors on a daily basis and for a variety of reasons. There were multiple venues of entertainment that were housed within its walls such as shopping venues, public transportation, public entertainment, art display, global commodity exchange. People would come here to be entertained. It also provided a means of social interaction, not only for the citizens of New York, but for cultures all over the world. Ultimately, the World Trade Center was a center that housed the transaction of world commerce.

The Rockefeller Center is comparable in regards to entertainment value to that of the World Trade Center. The magnitude and modernity of the structure itself provided its patrons with aesthetic value. People stand in awe at the ability of architects and the wealth and 'largess' that Rockefeller himself afforded such a building. The Rockefeller center is also host to many different forms of functional entertainment, both indoor and out. It has its own retail facility (comparable to both that of a mall and the Markets of Trajan) and its own outdoor arena. People visit to be entertained, and thus the Rockefeller Center has become a symbol of entertainment that has affected many within the world culture of today. When one enters the Rockefeller Center, one enters a world different from their own. They experience luxuries that are not available in daily living and become a part of something greater than themselves. They are able to leave the outside world behind and participate in a new world. Such is the effect of the Rockefeller Center.

Political and/or Individual Glorification

Architecture, in its simplest and purest form, is a universal symbol of wealth, power and prestige. It is the physical manifestation of power that is made possible by wealth.

Architecture is a luxury that requires substantial funding, and has thus become a playground of the rich. The greater the aesthetic value of architecture, the greater the wealth of that structure and the greater the cost and expense to its establishment. An example of this luxury is the Baths of Caracalla. The goal of Caracalla when creating the baths was to outdo all those who had come before him. He wanted to create the largest and most magnificent baths that would reflect his rule. In other words, he wanted to be known as the richest and the most powerful ruler when compared with his predecessors. He wanted the citizens of Rome to remember him as such. He desired his name to live on in history as being one of the greatest rulers of Rome; remembered for his great contribution to the people of Rome.

Architecture serves as a communication tool in that it represents the wealth and social status of its commissioner. Architecture speaks to those who will listen. It tells the story and ideals of its creator. It is representative of that individual's life as well as their achievements. Architecture brings honor to its commissioner. People revere it and stand in awe of its existence, paying tribute to the authoritative figure which it represents. It brings a form of glory that one can only aspire to achieve. It is a public representation of a person's life. It represents their good works and public contributions to society. People live on through their architectural creations, and the patrons of the structure live the lives of those who have gone before them. People are remembered for centuries to come because of the structure that they created (or commissioned to be built). Monumental

) architecture is a method of establishing immortality among the mortal. For people will come and go, but their works of structure will remain as a tribute to their existence.

This goal of achieving immortality was reflected in all of the emperors and rulers who commissioned great works of public architecture. They wanted fame. They desired that their name would resonate through the whole of history; to live for generations to come – if not physically but than metaphorically. This is the effect that these rulers ultimately achieved. Their names linger, even today. They are being remembered in the history books for their contributions to the people of Rome. Students today study the great works of these ancient rulers.

) This same theory applies to those who commission the great architectural structures of today. These individuals (such as Rockefeller) want to be remembered for generations to come for their works and contributions to society. And they will. They will be remembered for their influence on society – their power and their wealth. Monumental architecture allows the individual to leave a footprint upon the face of society.

) Architecture can also be utilized as a form of intimidation. The magnitude of a structure reflects the power of the nation/people who built it; a physical manifestation of the strength of the nation. The World Trade Center was an example of this physical intimidation factor that is attributed to architecture. The World Trade Center is reflective of the power and wealth of the United States of America. Its sheer size depicts its dominance over opposing nations. It portrayed the United States as being a focal point of the world (also reflective of the attitude of American society); the center of world culture and commerce. This dominance is reflected in other American architecture (the

) Rockefeller Center is another example of the physical manifestation of dominance and power).

The Roman Colosseum is another example of architecture as power. The sheer magnitude of the Colosseum was analogous to the magnitude of the Roman culture and the power of its empire. While the citizens of Rome lived for the Colosseum, outsiders feared its existence. It struck fear into the hearts and eyes of many. One would be overwhelmed by its size alone. It portrayed the strength and ambition of the Roman culture. It was also the physical manifestation of the wealth of Rome and the power of its leaders. The Colosseum served to empower the people by allowing them to feel secure in strength and ability while knowing that they dominate over all.

Political Propaganda

) Architecture, both as a form of art and within the structure itself, has become the embodiment of political propaganda. Political propaganda is an effective form of advertising and campaigning for the government or figurehead of authority. Political propaganda depicts a skewed representation of political action and policy. It can spin a false light on an event or portray the government in a light different from its own. It builds up the image of political rule in hopes that it will sway public opinion and cause the people to provide their support for the campaign. In essence, political propaganda is a form of false advertising on behalf of the government. People tend to believe what they see, even if it differs from the truth.

) The Roman Colosseum was the result of political propaganda. Political leadership desired to win the hearts of the public over whom they were oppressively establishing rule. To do so, they built the Colosseum as a retreat for the masses and offered them one-hundred days of games as a celebration of the positive attributes of the political leadership (who, in reality, was a tyrannous oppressor). People sought to escape their daily lives and they found refuge in the heart of Rome – the Colosseum. The masses glorified the government for their benevolence and good will. However, the Colosseum was a false depiction of the face of the government. The government was not good, but rather evil in design and desire. They sought dictatorship and through the use of the Colosseum were able to buy the support of the public. The people thought they were presented with the facts of the government's intentions but rather they were being led astray as a result of political propaganda.

) The Markets of Trajan are another form of political propaganda. The people thought they were benefiting from the actions of political leadership, but they were the victims of ulterior motives and social undermining. The political purpose of the Markets was to confine all retail transactions and social interaction so that the government could monitor and dictate what transpired in the halls of the markets. Advantage was being taken of the people in their naïve ways. Although they did find benefit from the promotion of a confined retail market, they were losing social liberty in freedom. The confinement was akin to imprisonment in that it was authoritative leadership that held ultimate control and established a mild form of dictatorship amidst the people. The people willingly allowed this to happen (although unaware of the negative repercussions) because they believed that political rule was working for their benefit and promotion of retail. Political leadership painted a false front to conceal their ulterior motives and political agenda.

) The World Trade Center is also the result of political propaganda. The social community in which the World Trade Center was built adamantly opposed its intrusion. They did not want such modern structure invading their otherwise private community. However, the government solicited its development based upon the good that it would bring to the wider community. The people bought into the propaganda and allowed for the World Trade Center to be built. While the community fell under the impression that the World Trade Center was beneficial to the community and the result of optimistic government policy, the motives for the development from the perspective of the government were somewhat different. They sought to control World Commerce and create a megalithic sky scraper (or two as it turned out to be) that paid tribute to the strength of New York's commercial powers. The true benefit resided with the governing leadership of New York, and not with the members of the community.

) Political propaganda is a source of concern when scrutinizing political works of architecture. There is always more to a structure than meets the eye. One must be aware of hidden motives and underlying objectives of political leadership. There is never complete benefit to the people, but rather the majority of the benefit is geared towards the commissioner of the structure. It is the greed of the political powers that result in the commissioning of monumental structure. These structures exert a variety of socio economic impacts upon the community, both physical and intangible. One must be aware of the multiple dimensions that encompass the personality of architecture to fully appreciate its magnificence and beauty. Architecture is art, and is a cornerstone around which society has established itself.

The Economic Impact of Architecture

Architecture builds a bridge that spans and connects the social classes and brings communities together. While there are a variety of negative impacts that are associated with the presence of political architecture, architecture, as a whole, is a profitable contribution to a community. Individuals benefit because they are given a means to interact with their fellow citizens. They are provided entertainment and an escape from the monotony of daily living. They are allowed the freedom of expression. Political architecture offers the people a place to engage in business transaction where both parties benefit from obtaining what they need or desire.

The community as a whole benefits from contributions that result from political architecture. It promotes growth and forward, modernistic thinking. It spurs the community into development. It adds new dimension to the community, as well as revenue. Political structure can help by increasing the quality of life, improving the way that people live and the conditions in which they live. It provides the community with an outlet – freedom of expression as a community. Political architecture brings a new sense of identity to the community and reinforces community pride. It can bolster the spirits of the people within the community and benefit the state (and as a result, political leadership benefits from the increased moral and support of the people).

Architecture is an important part of our daily lives. One should not just take it for granted but understand its significance. Its values impact us as individuals as well as the community as a whole. While there is much added benefit as a result of political architecture, one must not be so naive as to assume that there are no

community/individual sacrifices or negative impacts that are also associated with political architecture. To understand architecture, one must first understand the values and implications with which it is associated. The identity of a community can be reflected in the aesthetic value(s) of its political architecture. Architecture, as art, communicates a sense of the individuals that it represents. We are a product of our environment; an environment that is created through political influence and not the mutual interests of a diverse, democratic community.

Works Cited

- Balfour, Alan. Rockefeller Center. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1978.
- "Baths." MSN Encarta. 4/4/2005.
http://uk.encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761577185/Baths.html
- Cohen, Roger. "World Trade Center – History Commentary." Great Buildings Online. 4/7/2005.
http://www.greatbuildings.com/buildings/World_Trade_Center_History.html
- Grossberg, Deborah. The Architect's Newspaper. 2/2005. The Architect's Newspaper, LLC. 4/7/2005.
http://www.archpaper.com/feature_articles/02_05_mall_city.html
- Harries, Karsten. The Ethical Function of Architecture. London: The MIT Press, 1997.
- Johnson, David. "World Trade Center History." Infoplease. 4/7/2005.
<http://www.infoplease.com/spot/wtc1.html>
- Koepnick, Lutz P. Walter Benjamin and the Aesthetics of Power. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
- "Rockefeller Center." Daniel's Manhattan Architecture. 4/19/2005.
<http://users.comkey.net/daniel/rocka.htm>
- "Southdale Mall." Minnesota History Topics. 4/7/2005.
http://www.mhs.org/library/tips/history_topics/72southdale.html
- Taylor, Rabun M. Roman Builders: A Study in the Architectural Process. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- "The Baths of Caracalla in Rome." InfoRoma: the Rome Experts. 4/4/2005.
<http://www.inforoma.it/feature.php?lookup=terme>
- "The Colosseum." History of the Colosseum and Forum Romanum. 4/6/2005.
<http://www.iei.net/~tryan/h-colfor.htm>
- "The Emperor Trajan and His Forum." Trajan's Column. 4/6/2005.
http://www.stoa.org/trajan/introductory_essay.html
- "The Roman Occupation." Roman Bath Houses. 4/4/2005.
http://www.channel14.com/history/timeteam/snapshot_rom_bath.html

“Trajan Forum.” Imperial Fora. 4/6/2005.

<http://www.weekendaroma.com/guideddet/foriimperiali.htm>

“Trajan Markets.” Imperial Fora. 4/6/2005.

<http://www.weekendaroma.com/guideddet/foriimperiali.htm>