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Francesco Zuddas is a senior lecturer in Architecture at Anglia Ruskin University and has taught architecture and urbanism at the Università degli Studi di Cagliari, the Architectural Association, Central Saint Martins and the Leeds School of Architecture. His writings on postwar Italian urbanism and architecture, space and higher education, architectural pedagogy and the spatial implications of changing production paradigms to meet the knowledge economy, have appeared in AA Files, Domus, Oase, San Rocco, Territorio, and Trans, among others. His latest book is *The University as a Settlement Principle: Territorialising Knowledge in Late 1960s Italy* (Routledge, 2019).

**Abstract**

In 1973, Andrea Branzi, founder of Archizoom, wrote a short review of Ivan Illich’s book *Deschooling Society*. The review constituted the fourth of 27 “Radical Notes” he published in the journal *Casabella* between 1972 and 1976. While this was the only one explicitly to adopt the review format, Illich’s presence permeates the Radical Notes as a whole. They can be read as a coherent pedagogical theory, the practical output of which was Global Tools, a counter-school promoted by Branzi and other members of the Italian Radical Movement. Branzi approached the review as an opportunity to re-view, to look again at the theses of Archizoom. His review thus sheds light on an important moment in the story of the Radicals, adding a pedagogical component to the political, Marxist roots of their critique of the nexus of city, labor and capitalism.

**Keywords:** deschooling; education; Archizoom; Ivan Illich; radical architecture; Radical Notes; knowledge society.

**List of images:**

Figure 1. Andrea Branzi, “The abolition of school – Radical Note no. 4,” *Casabella,* no. 373 (January 1973).

[Full page image, please]

Figure 2. Archizoom Associati, I progetti si firmano. Competition panel no. 7 “Piano

Continuo per la Ricerca Scientifica” (1971). ©CSAC Università di Parma, Sezione Progetto.

[Image to fill full width of page, please]

Figure 3. Archizoom Associati, I progetti si firmano. Competition panel no. 8 “Piano Continuo di Parcheggi Residenziali” (1971). ©CSAC Università di Parma, Sezione Progetto.

[Image to fill full width of page, please]

Figure 4. Archizoom Associati, I progetti si firmano. Competition panel no. 6 “Piano Continuo per la Distribuzione dell’Informazione” (1971). ©CSAC Università di Parma, Sezione Progetto.

[Image to fill full width of page, please]

Figure 5. Archizoom Associati, I progetti si firmano. Competition panel no. 9 “Piano Continuo di Attrezzature Ricreative” (1971). ©CSAC Università di Parma, Sezione Progetto.

[Image to fill full width of page, please]

Figure 6. Archizoom Associati, I progetti si firmano. Competition panel no. 4 “Planimetria del territorio 1:10000” (1971). ©CSAC Università di Parma, Sezione Progetto.

[Image to fill full width of page, please]

Figure 7. Cover page of *Casabella,* no. 377 (May 1973), showing all those involved in Global Tools.

[Approx. ½ page, please, provided the image resolution is high enough]

Figure 8. Presentation of Global Tools, *Casabella*, no. 377 (May 1973).

[Approx. 1/3 page, please, provided the image resolution is high enough].

Radical Notes: Archizoom Re-Viewed via Ivan Illich

# Introduction: A long term strategy

“In effect the basic aim of a radical critic of institutions, whether scholastic or urban, is not to make them instruments of revolution but instruments in the hand of man, thereby enabling him to take a decisive step towards liberation from work.”[[1]](#endnote-1)

Reviewing someone else’s work is often a way to legitimize the reviewer’s own ideas, indirect, but effective. If this contrasts with a code of scholarly conduct that requires a level of objectivity in the act of assessment for the benefit of an ethically correct scientific community, it remains a fact that a review is a tool to establish alliances. Moreover, in cases in which the reviewer enjoys the liberty of choosing the author and work to review, the risk of disrupting ethical codes of practice might have to be intentionally overlooked, in a deliberate strategy of self-referential rumination capable of enabling more nuanced understandings, not only of the work reviewed, but also of the reviewer’s intellectual path.

In the January 1973 issue of *Casabella*, Andrea Branzi, founder of the architects collective Archizoom Associati, approached the task of reviewing a book of his choice – Ivan Illich’s *Deschooling Society* of 1971 – with exactly such a frame of mind (Figure 1).[[2]](#endnote-2) Branzi’s enthusiastic review of Illich’s impassioned critique of society’s institutions, and of the institution of the school in particular, constituted the fourth of 27 “Radical Notes” published in *Casabella* between 1972 and 1976.[[3]](#endnote-3) The only one to adopt the format of a review, this half-page text is crucial in understanding the objectives of the Radical Notes overall, as a project imbued with pedagogical intent. It also marks a turning point in the trajectory of the phenomenon that, in 1971, Germano Celant had christened “Radical Architecture” – a phenomenon that by 1973, after having been granted international stardom at the famous MoMA exhibition “Italy: the New Domestic Landscape,” was approaching the end of its early euphoric period.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Already in the first Radical Note, published in October 1972, Branzi had talked of a desire to set up a “long-term strategy” that could prove the validity of a radical revision of architecture, something that had so far been “met with silent smiles.”[[5]](#endnote-5) The second note, in November 1972, was clearly connected to the main theses that Archizoom had been developing since around 1969, about the condition of the city under capitalism. In it, Branzi warned once more against the “tacit belief that the city represents the highest and fullest expression of social culture.”[[6]](#endnote-6) A short discussion of the limited bibliography on the radical avant-gardes of the early 1970s followed in the third note, which summarized the common element in the strategies put in place by groups as diverse as Coop Himmelblau, Ant-Farm and UFO: the search for “a process of self-liberation of the individual from the rigid behavioural patterns found in current aesthetics and morals.”[[7]](#endnote-7)

With the fourth note the focus of discussion shifted more clearly to the problem of education and learning environments, with Branzi finding in Ivan Illich’s critique of the school and his call for alternative spaces and modes of learning the ideal ally for his thinking. Branzi’s choice of review exposed a pedagogic aspect inherent to the ideas of Archizoom, which became even more evident with the creation, also in January 1973, of Global Tools, a counter-school promoted by Branzi and other members of the Italian Radical Movement. The review thus sheds light on an important moment in the story of the Radicals and, in particular, of Archizoom, adding a pedagogical component to the political, Marxist roots of their critique of the nexus of city, labor and capitalism. More specifically, it shows the direct link between Archizoom’s most famous product, No-Stop City (1969-71), and the lesser-known design competition proposal for the University of Florence (1970-71), which emerges as an application of No-Stop City’s principles.

# Setting the Context: Response to the Italian Debate on the City in the 1960s

As narrated by its own protagonists and subsequent scholars, the Radical Movement in Italy was born as a reaction to some of the unquestioned assumptions that permeated the world of design and architecture in the 1960s.[[8]](#endnote-8) To understand, in particular, the critique that was elaborated by Archizoom it is necessary to consider the Italian context of the time and the type of architectural debate that developed during the postwar years.[[9]](#endnote-9)

Seizing on the growth of the tertiary sector as an opportunity to define a new form for city-territories, territories no longer centered on industry or conceptualized in terms of an urban/rural divide, architects produced a series of heroic large-scale schemes involving gigantic structures that were intended to house Italy’s burgeoning service economy. Projects for new business centers (Centri Direzionali), mostly unbuilt, filled the pages of mainstream Italian architectural magazines in the early- to mid-1960s.[[10]](#endnote-10) Labels such as “Città Regione,” “Città Territorio” and “Nuova Dimensione Urbana” emerged to describe the architects’ intentions.[[11]](#endnote-11) “Personally, we don’t identify ourselves with any of those formulas,” wrote Archizoom as early as 1967.[[12]](#endnote-12)

The euphoria over the prospect of free societies that could be enabled by better and more pervasive service infrastructures started to change focus toward the end of the 1960s, when it became clear that such scenarios required also the renewal of the educational bases of society. This was an awareness backed by influential international studies, such as Daniel Bell’s “Notes on the Post-Industrial Society,” also from 1967, which claimed that “[k]nowledge is the ganglion of the post-industrial society.”[[13]](#endnote-13) Bell signaled how, in the immediate future, economic competitiveness would increasingly depend on a nation’s capacity to go beyond the provision of services to create what he described as “knowledge-intensive quaternary sectors.” His article placed new focus on the reform and expansion of the higher levels of the educational system, claiming that “the university, which is the place where theoretical knowledge is sought, tested, and codified in a disinterested way, becomes the primary institution of the new society.”[[14]](#endnote-14) The 1960s were indeed marked by widespread attempts at reforming higher education across all advanced industrial economies.

Whereas the reform path in other nations translated relatively smoothly from policy to building – as proven by the many new university campuses built by the mid-1960s, especially in the UK, US, Germany, and France – the Italian response to the project of a knowledge-based society was more tormented.[[15]](#endnote-15) By the late 1960s, despite almost ten years of political debate, no higher education reform had been approved, and no new universities had been built. Italy went through 1968 with the old institutional and physical structures for higher education still in place, and it was not until 1970 that new ideas for these environments began to emerge. With the launch, in May 1970, of an international competition to design a new seat for the University of Florence, many of the “Italian city-territorialists,” as Reyner Banham called the advocates of the formulas recalled above (“Città Territorio,” “Città Regione,” “Nuova Dimensione Urbana”), found new ground to implement their ideas for an architecture aimed at improving higher education institutions and, consequently, at enabling an open society.[[16]](#endnote-16)

Submitting an entry to the competition alongside other Florentine radical collectives, Archizoom set themselves against the city-territorialists (they mocked them as “designers of roofs”)[[17]](#endnote-17) and found a testing ground for their most famous critique, which would be published a few months after the submission deadline in 1971 with the name of “No-Stop City.” Roberto Gargiani has explained how this theoretical project developed from 1969 onwards as a phased process based on a Marxist line of reasoning and aimed at the ultimate liberation of humans from the tyranny of work, the final outcome of a series of other “destructions” that, in sequential order, included the “destruction of architecture”, the “destruction of the object” and the “elimination of the city.”[[18]](#endnote-18)

A chronology of events between 1969 and 1971 helps to clarify the development of Archizoom’s theory. In December 1969, Archizoom published in *Domus* the “Discorsi per immagini,” which offered the first visual depiction of the world as a continuous urbanized surface, and started to question the role of the architectural project within such a scenario.[[19]](#endnote-19) A few months later, in July 1970 – two months after the launch of the University of Florence competition – the article “Città, catena di montaggio del sociale: ideologia e teoria della metropoli” (“City, Assembly Line of Social Issues”) appeared in *Casabella*.[[20]](#endnote-20) It acted as a sort of manifesto for the intellectual program set by Alessandro Mendini, the new director of the magazine, who helped to promote the polemic and subversive attitude of Archizoom and other radical groups.[[21]](#endnote-21) Imbued with Marxist rhetoric, Archizoom’s article put forward ideas that completely rejected the faith in architectural form promoted by *Casabella* in the previous decade, especially under Ernesto Nathan Rogers’ twelve-year directorship (1953-1965). Rogers’s intellectual shadow was still palpable in the introduction to Archizoom’s article written by Mendini’s co-director, Giovanni Klaus Koenig, a careful disclaimer that stated his disagreement with most of Archizoom’s points but justified their publication as the work of “the young generation of architects, who are more apt than my generation to theoretical ruminations on ideology.”[[22]](#endnote-22)

The central thesis of “City, Assembly Line of Social Issues” proposed that the existing architecture/city nexus should be understood as the outcome of continuous cycles of production and consumption that had turned the industrialized world into a gigantic, boundless factory. Saturated with the confident ideology proper to young graduates of the mid-1960s who were fighting against the political establishment, the article was heavily indebted to the ideas promoted by the Italian "Operaist” movement, founded by Raniero Panzieri and Mario Tronti.[[23]](#endnote-23) Representing one of the main extra-parliamentary challenges to the political status quo, Operaism dated back to 1961-62, when Panzieri and Tronti respectively founded the magazines *Quaderni Rossi* and *Classe Operaia*. Tronti was also the author of Operaism’s most important text, the book *Operai e Capitale* of 1966, in which he argued that capitalism had turned the factory into a state of mind and an organizational principle extending well beyond the walls of the building itself, to permeate the city as a whole.

Fronting the Operaists was the Movimento Studentesco (Student Movement), which had been active across Italian universities since 1963 and which, for its first few years, shared the Operaists’ conceptualization of the worker and the student as joint emancipatory agents in overcoming capitalism. However, after students and factory workers came together in the tumultuous events of the so-called “hot autumn” of 1969, the Operaists and the student movement started to adopt different routes that would eventually see them oppose each other. With the birth of two new magazines within the Operaist strand (*Potere Operaio* and *Contropiano*), and one within the student movement (*Lotta Continua*), mutual accusations saw the Operaists condemning the students’ concealed bourgeois values, while the students attacked the Operaists’ endless hermetic “treatises in which they [simply] talk among themselves and cite one another in the best ‘academic’ tradition.”[[24]](#endnote-24)

It was in 1966, the year in which Tronti’s book was published, that the Florentine Radical Movement in architecture became fully visible, with the exhibition Superarchitettura held in Pistoia, featuring the work of the two collectives Archizoom and Superstudio.[[25]](#endnote-25) Archizoom aligned itself with the Operaist track and its efforts to define an intellectual theory of the working class, in contrast to the more activist line championed by the student movement and *Lotta Continua*.[[26]](#endnote-26) In 1969, Manfredo Tafuri’s “Per una critica dell’ideologia architettonica” (“Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology,” later expanded in book form as *Architecture and Utopia*), published in the new journal *Contropiano*, pushed Archizoom closer still to the theses discussed by the Operaists.[[27]](#endnote-27) Tafuri argued that the growth of capitalism had compromised the traditional relation between architecture and society according to which the former acted as representation of the latter and was able to provide anticipatory scenarios for societal development. Deprived of this role, architecture became mere form, without utopia, and the city was reduced to an accumulation of elements that, at most, could aim to co-exist. The architect “as producer of ‘objects’” became “an incongruous figure” whose role was simply that of “organizing” the elements of the urban fabric as an extension of the more general cycles of industrial production.[[28]](#endnote-28)

Archizoom’s “City, Assembly Line of Social Issues” of 1970 took Tafuri’s argument to an extreme reformulation, developed especially in images representing the urban condition as a continuous interior made of floating objects on an infinite surface. Branzi had earlier specified that their objective was not utopia intended as the prefiguration of a better society; rather, they aimed to unveil “the real utopian aspects of reality itself.”[[29]](#endnote-29) Under capitalism, the city – for Archizoom – had been turned from a place into a condition, one that by the late twentieth century depended “on the supremacy of ‘tertiary’ activity over all other activities.”[[30]](#endnote-30)

Whereas, in the early 1960s, many Italian architects, from Carlo Aymonino to Giuseppe Samonà, Ludovico Quaroni, Aldo Rossi and the same Manfredo Tafuri in his early period as a practitioner, had debated the possibility of giving clear formal representation to a society based on tertiary activities and services, Archizoom rejected the very idea of any meaningful formalization. Their argument was that, once modernity had forced a shift from the past reality of tight-knit communities to the quantitative experience of the urban, with its ubiquitous services and pervasive infrastructure, there was no longer any sense in hoping that architectural objects could have an impact on society. Rather than focusing on the form of objects, what was needed was to enable the “free and open use of structures,” as Andrea Branzi put it in his second Radical Note from late 1972, just a few months before he brought Ivan Illich into the conversation.[[31]](#endnote-31)

# “Projects Must be Signed:” Towards No-Stop City

In March 1971, that is, between *Casabella*’s publication of “City, Assembly Line of Social Issues” and Branzi’s short review of Illich’s book, Archizoom published in *Domus* the article “No-Stop City: Residential Parkings, Climatic Universal System.”[[32]](#endnote-32) Here they offered a visual version of Tronti’s thesis of the city as a large factory, which they depicted as an endless, repetitive and artificial landscape modeled on the twofold logics of the factory and the supermarket, presented as “optimal urban structures [..], potentially limitless, where human functions are arranged spontaneously in a free field, made uniform by a system of micro-acclimatisation and optimal circulation of information.”[[33]](#endnote-33) The drawings expressed what Archizoom called a non-figurative language in which the only recognizable figures were some basic pieces of furniture such as tables, chairs and toilets, scattered according to a principle of organized chaos. Stripping architecture of its representational prerogatives, the plans, sections and perspectival views of No-Stop City were intended to act as a Trojan horse, exaggerating the existing condition of the city to the point of imploding it, turning the quantitative logic of the capitalist world into a liberating agent. “Freedom, as an end, becomes an instrument of struggle,” Archizoom concluded.[[34]](#endnote-34)

The competition for the design of the University of Florence was, then, an opportunity to take the strategy of No-Stop City further. The brief for the competition – the first in a series organized in the early 1970s physically to expand and restructure Italian universities – asked for the partial relocation of the 700-year old academic institution from Florence’s historic center to a peripheral site to the west of the city.[[35]](#endnote-35) Many of the Italian architects who took part in it, including Carlo Aymonino, Costantino Dardi, Vittorio Gregotti, and Ludovico Quaroni, seized on the competition as a chance to reiterate the large-scale architectural structures they had been drawing throughout the 1960s.[[36]](#endnote-36) Archizoom’s entry was a careful refusal of formalism or of any representational role for architecture. Their polemical stance was expressed directly in their entry’s title, “I progetti si firmano” – projects must be signed – which challenged the competition rules demanding anonymity. “Archizoom Associati” was written clearly on each of their panels, presumably in the belief that no project can actually be anonymous because it inevitably bears the formal signature of its author. The inclusion of their names meant that they were automatically disqualified.[[37]](#endnote-37)

As well as targeting the architectural profession’s stubborn adherence to formalism, Archizoom’s entry tackled the brief’s more general topic: the access to and distribution of information in an advanced capitalist society. Their entry was grounded in a critique of traditional understandings of education as a series of institutionalized protocols of information transfer, and they refused to equate learning with a fixed spatial container. Archizoom represented the new university as a series of superimposed surfaces that were drawn in a way not too dissimilar to the printed circuit boards of a computer. The aim was to show only the support infrastructure for continuous cycles of the production and consumption of information. The surfaces were labeled “Piano Continuo per la Ricerca Scientifica,” “Piano Continuo di Parcheggi Residenziali,” “Piano Continuo per la Distribuzione dell’Informazione” and “Piano Continuo di Attrezzature Ricreative.” These names indicated the ultimate coincidence of the main functions of human life, dwelling, leisure and research (a reclassification of Le Corbusier’s “four functions” of dwelling, work, recreation and transport), all understood to be part of an informational apparatus.[[38]](#endnote-38) Archizoom interpreted the exchange of information and the creation of knowledge as the result of the coincidence of conceptual pairs of opposites such as formal/informal, instruction/learning, order/randomness, the coexistence of which was shown in the drawings (see Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5). The continuous surface for the distribution of information, for example, proposed a scene of personalized and localized spatial appropriations that combined formality and informality (Figure 4). Through the juxtaposition of formal lecture-hall arrangements, convivial layouts based on a central table surrounded by chairs as in a seminar fashion, and single cells for individual retreat, this drawing declared the equivalence of different moments of learning that should be conceived not hierarchically, but as simultaneous and open-source.

By depicting this simultaneity, Archizoom’s drawings postulated a degrading of architecture from an apparatus claiming an ordering impact on people’s behavior to a neutral substratum. This marks the critical distance between their entry to the Florence competition and other projects of the 1960s that apparently shared a similar ethos. An example might be the celebrated project for the Berlin Free University by Candilis, Josic and Woods, which orchestrated freedom of learning in a carefully designed and sealed architectural machine.[[39]](#endnote-39) Archizoom’s Florence project rejected such machinery because, as they put it, “[w]e are seeking to propose not a new ‘form’ of the city, but rather a different way of ‘using’ it.”[[40]](#endnote-40)

The set of superimposed layers or surfaces was complemented by a 1:10,000 site plan that provided the summative representation of Archizoom’s argument (Figure 6). This plan placed a Cartesian grid over the competition site, and annotated it through a kind of Sudoku, a repeated pattern of numbers indicating housing, kindergarten, playgrounds, fuel pump, car parking, warehouses, commercial activities, secondary school, public offices, cultural center, church, hospital, hotel, cinema, and library. Only the last of these, the library, directly suggested functions traditionally associated with a university. No classrooms, auditoria, lecture rooms, departments, laboratories, or any other familiar academic spaces were included. Instead, a continuous horizontal surface of human inhabitation displaced the traditional localized apparatus of a university. In a society increasingly devoted to consumerism, one that had irrevocably unsettled a vernacular harmony of city and countryside, the only possible representation of learning was to posit it as ubiquitous, something that might enable constantly changing territorializations.

Archizoom showed learning as an open access service, claiming that there was “no formal difference between a productive structure, a supermarket, housing, a university, or a sector of industrialized agriculture.”[[41]](#endnote-41) It was under these terms, they proposed, that the shift from elitist to mass higher education might come about, a shift that was underway already with particular drama in Italy where, in 1969 – despite having no agreed reform of higher education – the government had passed a law granting unrestrained university access to graduates of any type of secondary school, thus massively enlarging Italian universities.[[42]](#endnote-42) Confronted with the prospect of higher education’s gigantism, Archizoom’s drawings were both a comment on the reality of higher education on the verge of becoming a mass phenomenon, and a hopeful vision for how to turn that reality into a possible alternative scenario, one set in contrast to the traditional hierarchical, top-down and paternalistic conception of learning.

The competition entry for the University of Florence was submitted in March 1971, coinciding with the publication of No-Stop City as a whole in *Casabella*. Also in 1971, Ivan Illich published *Deschooling Society*, arguably his most famous and influential book. There he developed theses that shared the general ethos of Archizoom’s proposal, as if the book were the alternative, written elaboration of the drawings for No-Stop City. However, the connection between Archizoom and Illich would only become explicit when, in January 1973, Branzi devoted his fourth Radical Note to a review of Illich’s book, which had recently been translated into Italian.

# Ivan Illich and the School as Paradigm

By the 1960s, Illich, a philosopher and Roman Catholic priest, had become an outspoken critic of modernity, which he attacked as a project of institutionalization and commodification of all human values, hindering individual freedom through the imposition of a code of standardized rules. His progressive ideas, in particular about issues such as divorce and birth control, led to an antagonistic relation with the Vatican that resulted in his enforced resignation from his post as vice-rector at the Catholic University of Puerto Rico.[[43]](#endnote-43) Illich’s reaction to this institutional repression was to establish his own anti-institution. In 1961, at Cuernavaca in Mexico, he founded CIDOC (Centro Cultural de Documentaciòn), a place originally offering language courses to missionaries coming to South America which over the years evolved into a stronghold for alternative thinking and education. CIDOC brought worldwide attention to Illich’s fight against the discriminatory logics of advanced industrial and technological societies – logics enacted through an oppressive and manipulative use of institutions such as schools, hospitals, and housing.

The outcome of seminars given at CIDOC, *Deschooling Society* was the first consistent formulation of Illich’s critique.[[44]](#endnote-44) For Illich, the school had a paradigmatic status within the wider phenomenon of top-down social engineering in which “medical treatment is mistaken for health care, social work for the improvement of community life, police protection for safety, military poise for national security […].”[[45]](#endnote-45) For Illich, the “schooled society” was one that had become addicted to an imposed worldview that obliterated any possibility for the free formation of individuals. The false consciousness brought about by the institution of the school itself was evident in its promotion of a hierarchy of credentials, and thus of social disparity, despite its promise of inclusivity. Rather than equal opportunity, the client-provider relationship between the individual and the institution served to widen the category of the poor to encompass “[all] those who have fallen behind an advertised ideal of consumption in some important respect.”[[46]](#endnote-46) Based on a process of cumulative achievement, each stage legitimized by the granting of a certificate, Illich lamented that schooling hampered the possibility of independent accomplishment.

A de-schooled society could be achieved only through education that valued learning as a personal activity, controlled by the learner. Alternative routes needed to be conceived, built on the acknowledgment of the dual nature of knowledge. On the one hand, knowledge derives from a set of data that each individual absorbs, as if into a personal archive. This kind of knowledge might more appropriately be called information or explicit knowledge; it can be transmitted through a teacher-student relation or conventional media such as books, instructions, etc. On the other hand, there is a dimension to knowledge that is based on the existence of an immaterial culture shared among members of a community. This dimension is what, in 1958, Michael Polanyi had named “tacit knowledge,” defining it as something that cannot be easily stored in a database.[[47]](#endnote-47) Tacit knowledge does not depend only on particular skills, but also on the existence of an environment for sharing that adds a level of informality to the formal mechanisms of learning. Illich’s plea for de-schooling meant defining the possibility for such an environment to exist.

An important part of Illich’s book distinguished between “convivial” and “manipulative treatment-institutions,” which he located respectively at the left and right ends of an institutional spectrum.[[48]](#endnote-48) The former were defined as those institutions that lend themselves to free use by individuals, such as telephone link-ups, subway lines, mail routes, public markets, parks, and sidewalks. Conversely, manipulative institutions were defined as those that shape their users by turning services into commodities. Existing schools were the paradigmatic case of this latter type because, as Illich put it, they “create a demand for the entire set of modern institutions which crowd the right end of the spectrum.”[[49]](#endnote-49)

In opposition to these manipulative institutions, Illich defined learning as essentially a convivial activity that depends on the unpredictable ways in which individuals interact with one another, and in which the teacher plays the role of a facilitator “concerned with helping matching partners to meet so that learning can take place.”[[50]](#endnote-50) For Illich, learning is not a product but a condition, one that can never be confined within any particular boundary, spatial or conceptual. The standard modern view of schooling as an obligatory activity that takes place within spatial compounds specifically defined as schools was anathema to him – it makes schooling an integral part of the general logic of an industrial economy based on concentrations of capital in space.[[51]](#endnote-51)

As Branzi clearly signaled in his review, it is this polemic, targeted ultimately against the modern industrial city and its social and economic logics, that brought Illich and Archizoom together. “Illich’s criticism deals with a strictly disciplinary field such as the school,” wrote Branzi,

but as he himself declares, the choice of such a field is only an instrumental matter […] for the fact is that this sort of analysis could be applied indifferently to other branches and to other forms with identical results: the army, the family, work etc. And, we wish to add, the town.[[52]](#endnote-52)

Branzi transferred Illich’s theses on the school to Archizoom’s more familiar territory of the city/capitalism nexus as a whole, translating Illich’s call for personalized rather than standardized and certificated paths of learning into one for the free use of space rather than the traditional fixation with the formal, aesthetic values of architecture. Illich argued that:

The alternative to dependence on schools is not the use of public resources for some new device which ‘makes’ people learn; rather it is the creation of a new style of educational relationship between man and his environment.[[53]](#endnote-53)

Branzi applied Illich’s ideas to the urban domain as a whole:

The battle to improve towns as they are at present is limited by having to operate on a body that is full of structural rather than social contradictions which no new equilibrium will ever manage to regenerate, a body that is too old to absorb a newly-conceived vision of existing and living.[[54]](#endnote-54)

Archizoom and Illich were in agreement on the fact that a totally different scenario had to be imagined that understood learning as a fundamental constituent of the city conceived as a network made of as many and varied institutions and spaces as possible. In this respect, Illich talked of “learning webs,” which extended to places such as restaurants, commuter trains and department stores, enabling an alternative learning environment that brought together four main sets of resources: things (physical objects), models (masters of a specific skill that could demonstrate how to practice it), peers (people with similar interests), and elders (experienced people providing criticism).[[55]](#endnote-55) In a de-schooled scenario, these elements would coexist in an expanded environment much wider than the compounds defined by traditional educational institutions. Within such a learning landscape, Illich described the library as an open source service for individual exploration, and as the last remaining fragment of an educational institution that had otherwise dissolved into a less physically recognizable arrangement. Not coincidentally, the library was also the only detectable element extracted from a traditional university that remained on the continuous informational surfaces projected by Archizoom on the Florentine territory.

# Global Tools and Radical Notes as a Review in 27 Episodes

The virtual encounter between Archizoom and Illich did not stop at Radical Note 4. The note, a reaffirmation of Illich’s ideas about a de-schooled society, acted as only the kick-starter for what should be seen as a sort of pedagogical program developed across 27 episodes. As such, it marked a new stage in the development of the Italian Radical Movement and introduced what we might now see as its swansong: Global Tools, the Radicals’ experiment for an anti-school. Founded in January 1973, when Andrea Branzi and other Radicals including Riccardo Dalisi, Superstudio, Ettore Sottsass Jr., Alessandro Mendini, Ufo, Zziggurat, Ugo La Pietra, and 9999 met in the editorial office of *Casabella*, Global Tools exposed the deschooling thesis implicitly contained within the Florence competition and No-Stop City, and shared by other members of the radical tendency (Figures 7 and 8).

Global Tools was created as a system of workshops that started in Florence and later migrated to other places around Italy. Originally defined as a “School of Popular Arts and Techniques,” it was organized around five themes that avoided the disciplinary classifications of traditional educational institutions: “Body,” “Communication,” “Construction,” “Survival,” and “Theory.”[[56]](#endnote-56) In the bulletins published during its few years of existence, between 1973 and 1975, “the city,” as the most dominant keyword of previous writings by Archizoom, was overtaken by “creativity.” The goal of Global Tools was to “stimulate the free development of individual creativity” by rescuing a “de-intellectualized man provided with archaic wisdom, allowing all possible consequences,” including even “the recovery of nomadism and the destruction of the city.”[[57]](#endnote-57)

This programmatic statement locates Global Tools within the trajectory of “destructions” originally articulated by Archizoom – the destruction of architecture, of the object, of work, and of the city. Reclaiming creativity was a way of demanding a different conception of work, free from the cage of waged labor and conceived as the individual possession of primordial skills – that is, globally valid, universal actions enabled by collective practice. In other words, Global Tools promoted an idea of education that empowered both the individual, allowing him/her to rescue his or her primordial abilities, and a community of learners, involved in constant experimentation in order to understand its relation to the wider environment. The individual should demonstrate a willingness “to renounce individualism and return to the ‘morality’ of the primitives, to collaboration, to the ‘community of artists’.”[[58]](#endnote-58) Refusing the status of a new Bauhaus or a new Hochschule für Gestaltung – paramount examples of institutionalized design education that ruled over modern architecture – Global Tools reconceived the pedagogy of design as being coincident with life itself, where life was understood according to a pre-modern definition that assumed a direct relation between instinct and action, without the mediation of the “project:” “We want to support the creativity of the authentic as opposed to the rampant creativity of the exact,” wrote Riccardo Dalisi.[[59]](#endnote-59)

Illich’s learning webs were reaffirmed in the intentions of Global Tools, which required the combination of the same four sets of resources: things, models, peers, and elders. In line with a wider ethos imported from the 1950s and 60s (think of Aldo Van Eyck’s work, or of Nigel Henderson’s photos of kids playing in Bethnal Green, London, used by the Smithsons to sustain their urban “re-identifications”),[[60]](#endnote-60) the anti-school of the Italian Radicals implied a need to learn from the social group defined as the traditional subject of schooling – children – in order to implode schooling and extend learning as a continuous lifelong experience: “This all comes under the more general perspective of continuing education which remains the only possible objective beyond the completion of institutionalized education,” wrote the initiators of Global Tools.[[61]](#endnote-61) One particular reference for the pedagogic program of Global Tools was an experiment led by Riccardo Dalisi with children from a peripheral neighborhood of Naples that was stricken by poverty and organized crime. The experiment enacted what Andrea Branzi called “teaching without any method or any specific purpose,” except that of stimulating spontaneous action in a deprived sector of Italian society.[[62]](#endnote-62)

These words of Branzi’s appeared in 1974, in the 13th Radical Note titled “Minimal Technology.” Clearly the short review of Illich’s book had extended its reach, and would eventually come to define the conceptual backbone of the Radical Notes project as a whole. As the practical manifestation of the ideas briefly introduced in Note 4, in Note 8 Branzi discussed Global Tools, calling it not a school, “since no one has anything to teach to anyone else, but a ‘system of laboratories’ in which it will be possible, through experimental manual activities, to recuperate creative faculties atrophied in our work-directed society.”[[63]](#endnote-63) This description connects Global Tools directly to Branzi’s review of *Deschooling Society*, in which he had written that Illich did not hypothesize “so much in terms of a flow-back towards general ignorance, just as we do not hypothesize a return to cave-life,” but instead proposed “a different system of spontaneous, creative, individual culturalization within society itself and not in the school.”[[64]](#endnote-64)

Illich remained an implied presence throughout the rest of the notes, even though his name reappeared only one more time in *Casabella*, in a short piece published in a themed issue of the journal titled “What School?,” from January 1976.[[65]](#endnote-65) By this time, Global Tools had disbanded, and the Radicals had dissolved into an array of scattered individuals, each embarking on new directions.[[66]](#endnote-66) Branzi himself had become much less optimistic about the prospects of “deschooling:” “The mental deformation that a school is capable of bringing about in an individual,” he wrote, “determines his mental and social behaviour almost to the point of shaping his anthropological characteristics. In this sense it is very difficult to defeat the school.”[[67]](#endnote-67)

Seen in retrospect, both this quote, and the constant invocation of creativity that can be found in the documents produced by Global Tools, are charged with premonitory value. As Beatriz Colomina states in her introduction to a recent volume that reviews the story of Global Tools, “one of the fundamental paradoxes of ‘Radical Pedagogy’ [is that] the avant-garde assault on institutions invariably produces new institutions, new forms of dogma that have to be undermined by another avant-garde.”[[68]](#endnote-68) The “avant-garde” that succeeded the Radicals and their pedagogic experiments – a celebration of “the creative class” that started in the early 2000s[[69]](#endnote-69) – has repositioned the discussion on exactly the territory that Global Tools and the Radical Notes had fought to avoid. This is the territory that, by advocating creativity, promotes a new economy and a new society apparently free from the cage of salaried labor only to enable, as critics have shown, a world of precariousness where creativity is not a liberating choice but an imposed destiny.[[70]](#endnote-70)

**Conclusion**

In the 1920s, Antonio Gramsci claimed the equivalence of politics and pedagogy, or rather, that politics is fundamentally a pedagogical problem. Society, he argued, can be reformed only by simultaneously overcoming old understandings of both politics and pedagogy, understandings still based on the confrontation of two opposing poles – the governed and the governor, the teacher and the learner.[[71]](#endnote-71) Five decades later, within a new postwar order where democracy had triumphed over fascisms, this problematic opposition still stood; considering politics and pedagogy as one and the same thing still held validity. By revisiting the trajectory that connects Archizoom’s University of Florence competition entry, No-Stop City and its written elaborations, the Radical Notes, and Global Tools, which are in turn all connected to the mindset of Ivan Illich, we unveil the complexity of a historical period characterized by heterogeneous intellectual exchange smoothly moving across the realms of politics and education. In this trajectory, Operaism can take on the identity of a general pedagogical project, and we are reminded that at the base of the problems of labor and of urbanized societies stands, fundamentally, an educational problem.

The Radical Notes helped to introduce Illich into the orbit of the Italian architectural circles long before a more well-known encounter would take place, in 1980, at a congress in Rimini to discuss self-build processes in architecture and housing. On that occasion, Illich entered into a closer dialogue with a group of Italian and international architects who, if they did not accept the label “Radical,” had all, at some point in their careers, accepted that of “anarchic” – figures that included Giancarlo De Carlo, Carlo Doglio, Franco La Cecla, Colin Ward, and John Turner.[[72]](#endnote-72) It was then that Illich started to speak explicitly about architecture, addressing it as the paradigmatic modern profession in its presumption to be able to diagnose the needs of people better than the people themselves.[[73]](#endnote-73) He thus reworded the connection that Branzi had made between schooling and the city as two instances of the same coercive mentality of modernity.

Mediating between the place of modernity’s origins, at least in architectural terms – Florence – and a stronghold built against modernity – Cuernavaca – Branzi fused the reviewed and the reviewer to put forward a message of hope for inverting, and thus trying to halt, the institutionalization of all human values. However, despite enhanced liberalization of learning pathways and the appearance of many options for mobility and lifelong learning, traditional schooling remains very much the sine-qua-non of education. More than forty years on, the words that Branzi used in 1976, calling on Illich’s support, seem to hold true: it is indeed difficult to defeat the school.
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