El tema del internacionalismo tal como lo plantearon las vanguardias, te- nía noises, por lo menos dos moti- vaciones acerca de las cuales es útil llevar a cabo una reflexión para consta- parla con el sentido que ha adquirido actualmente la idea de internacionalismo. La primera consistía en una polémica con la historia en nombres del arte como expresión absoluta, antanómica, bajo la forma de la abstracción ge- mética y de la razón analítica. La segunda consignación era que el internacionalis- mo no se había fundamentado en la po- sición en la idea de lo nuevo y de la utopía como valor, en la construcción, en nom- bre de la técnica y del progreso, de un lenguaje de una sociedad sin clases eje- de la esencia del problema era el funda- mento de su expresión.

En exposición a estas ideas surgieron hacia la mitad de los años veinte lo que se re- gresaron "al orden", en los años treinta los nacionalismos tardíos de las arquitectu- ras de régimen, los Humanoids, postme- diados de algunas concepciones de arquitecto, la defensa de las tradiciones cons- tructivas locales, el tema de la modernidad. Todas estas posiciones tenían a su favor y fundamentaban sus proyectos como signos políticos e ideológicos contrapuestos a que no se usaron en la práctica eran convergentes en sus resultados disciplina- ries y menos en la arquitectura.

El internacionalismo volvió a hacer actos de presencia en la arquitectura en los años veintiocho como deslumbrante de las nuevas formas de proceso basado en las concepciones de productividad, de for- malización de los procedimientos de proyecto, de organización de la construcción en proyectos en el mundo del proyecto de los principios de la división del trabajo y de la especializa- ción productiva, pero también de la objetivación y de la eliminación de la fórmula del pensamiento como poder de la política e incluso contra la re- ducción de la concepción de la misma raciona- lidad funcional.

Esto segundo universalismo acróni- camente y recesivista dominó princi- palmente, por el pensamiento mient- er, como métodos de construcción y fundamentos convergentes respec- to al desarrollo de la sociedad de la pes- guea.

El internacionalismo que vivimos hoy en día es distinto, es, tal como se ha di- cho en reputadas ocasiones, el de los llau- mas materiales de las finanzas, de la in- formación y de la comunicación de masa, con sus respecti- vas leyes de comportamiento y consumo.

Hay quien opone que este sistema no ha sufrido tan radicales, si tan contundentes decesos que se espera que implique una defensa del bien colectivo e incluso una pro- gramación racional: y este es, por supuesto, negativo en extremo.

El propio internacionalismo, en este "valle todo" en ausencia absoluta de re- glas e ideologías, en la referente a la po- sibilidad de desarrollo de autenticas dif- erentes arquitecturas. La vista, la misma subjetividad se debilita como fuerza de diferenciación afectando muy negativamente al proceso para la construcción de la práctica artística de la arquitectura.

Incluso la cantidad creciente de obras interesantes que se han producido en el campo del arte con formas de diversidad coexistencia parece constituir una obliga- ción a la fundación de la auténtica diferen- cia, siendo como son inspiradas por la misma homogeneidad del mercado unifi- cado de la comunicación de masas en la que se ha producido una depositario de inversiones indiferencia.

En resumen, no obstante no podemos responder con cercanía concienciados en el con- senso del espíritu o volviendo a la loca- lidades y a las fragmentaciones dialectales en un nuevo marco en que se mantienen una independencia absoluta de sus condiciones de ocupe-
It is generally accepted that internationalism, as it was proposed by the avant-garde movements, responded to two main concepts. It may be useful to consider these concepts as a means to understand the meaning that "internationalism" has taken on nowadays. Firstly, internationalism led to a polemic against nationalism in the name of art as absolute, aesthetic characteristics of the problem was the principle of its expression.

In opposition to this idea, in the mid-twenties there was a call for a "return to order" in the arts, which was followed in the thirties by the late nationalism of the architectures of regimes—mainly National Socialist—and later by the neorationalist tendencies, the defence of the industrializing tradition, and the subject of Modernism.-ness. All of these positions had their own concepts and principles which, though of opposing ideological positions, were in fact consistent in their results in the discipline of architecture.

Internationalism was later replaced by functionalism. The emphasis on the new techniques of processes based on the concepts of productivity, formalization of the production of architecture, and the organization of labour. This involved in the world of projects concerning the principles of division of labour, productive specialization, objectivity of technique and formalization related to the role of the architect as a role against publicists and even against the frugal reduction of functional rationality.

Dominated above all by American theories, the functionalistic and neotechnical and neopositivistic internationalism was also based on converging concepts and principles applied to the development of post-war society.

The internationalism which we find today is different: it is, as it has been repeated many times, the internationalism of international architecture: it is the result of scientific and technical information and mass communications, with its own laws of behaviour and consumption.

Some maintain that such a system has become so ramified and diffuse, has come to be so continually mobile, that it is beyond any possible central control, which is perhaps its good thing, but it is also beyond any possible democratic control, any prospect of collective good or even rational programming, and this is certainly very bad.

In this situation in which all is possible without rules or ideology, the difficulty of establishing any authentic differentiation is evident for all to see. Subjectivity is weakened as a basis for differentiation and, as shown, this has very problematic consequences for the process of construction of the artistic practice of architecture.

Even the relative diversity of the increasing number of interesting things produced in the field of art seems to be an obstacle to the recognition of an authentic differentiation, guided as they are by the very homogenization of the unified market of mass communications which determines the process of invention of differentiated articles.

It is, however, impossible to seek an effective response to this difficulty through a return to the localism of dialectical fragmentation, and even less by resorting to the new nationalism which is now appearing. We see this not only in the regional independence movements which are arising in many parts of Europe and the Soviet Union, but also in the attempts to respond to the great complexity of the problem by seeking a place of discontinuity in order to isolate and solve the problems by trying to define boundaries and characteristics.

In the specific case of our discipline, there is no doubt that what has marked recent years is the strong interest in the context in all its different aspects of nature, history, monuments, preservation and reconstruction. In short, a dialogue has been set up with the existing reality, which is seen to have a profoundness of stratification that provide a place with a specific identity which should be used as a basis for all its mutations.

The architectural world has thus adopted the problem and worked on it; architecture has substantially mutated its own scale of values by placing at the centre of its procedures the awareness of the project as an intelligent way of occupying the critical distance from the context. It must be pointed out, however, that in the vast majority of cases the growth of the city and regional developments have moved in quite the opposite direction.

Indifferent to the places, to the historical structures, to the conditions of urban development, which they constantly violate even when the conventional rules are totally evident, the new developments are built and established according to the principles arising from the forms of internationalism mentioned above. These are modelled mainly, in an ambiguous identification of progress with consumption, on the standards and behaviours spread by the media mass as a form of reassurance and evidence of the state of progress of a social body.

This is above all the portrait of the governing laws which unify the urban periphery of the European cities. But even the consolidated historic centre is not abandoned by these principles, which we could define as guided atrophy: guided by alternative principles of development to those of the place itself.

We often find homogeneous housing areas without an internal hierarchy. Looking elsewhere, they progressively lose their reference to the identity of the urban centre, which was formerly the model of urban tissues and layouts during the progressive consolidation of those same peripheries.

Having lost the relations that linked them to the location as a source of material resources, raw materials, energy and manpower, the production and service industries seem to be voluntarily atrophied, insofar as they are functions which form systems with other similar functions in other distant parts of the planet, completely independent from the specific conditions of their location, and merely repeating a model of behaviour and operation.

Certainly, it is often a question of simple dispersion of locations due to the reasons of land prices and accessibility, but we must also emphasize the fact that there has never been a decisive detachment between land and construction. This is what has spared entire regions, landscapes and outer peripheries of urban centres, whose presence is now characterized, at least in Italy, by the main trunk roads and in general all the junctions where the opportunity for favouring development is greatest.

These urban buildings have completely lost the great power of spatial and social aggregation provided by the tradition of location of the large factories in the middle of the countryside near the sources of energy in the urban periphery near the sources of manpower: or at least the meaning of this power has been totally transformed.

We also find typologies of recent formation, immature developments which often appear as a rather shapeless system of aggregations, with wide buffer areas and vast service areas connected to large road systems, semiconcealed in the uncertain spaces of conurbations which, with an urbanistic pump in scale, give onto the historic natural landscape, dissipating it completely.

These landscapes, if this definition is still possible, are in a phase of rapid growth.
But I believe that this is no longer the case today. The phenomenon of atopicy has become clearly voluntouristic, which places it on an entirely different plane.

This atypical typology is made up of hypermarkets, toll roads, great service stations on the motorways, airports and their systems of car parks, junctions where different means of transport are interconnected, and industrial premises and showrooms along the roads leaving the city. We also find the residual spaces, the container parks, the areas for selling used cars or breaker’s yards, the spaces left between the great motorway junctions, the standard undeveloped green areas, the dumping grounds, the lands abandoned by agriculture. Unlike the great old markets, these atypical typologies have nothing of the sense of spontaneous and temporary aggregation which used to characterize these extramural spaces: on the contrary, they are controlled by strict internal laws of distribution and by equally strict laws of investment and profit. But these laws are in no way rooted in the places; they have no need of them, either in morphological terms or in terms of resources, because the present-day market is based on the idea of giving the user for a moment the illusion of belonging to another world which is more advanced and reassuring than that of his daily life.

The atypical buildings take on instead the characteristics of the industrial product with its law of consistent performance and recognizability as guarantees of the quality of the product and the safety of its use. In other words, in these atypical buildings the role of design of the industrial product has been extended to architecture, where they are inappropriate.

Somehow, for these non-places there no longer exist social tissues in which solidarity, contrast and a sense of belonging are consolidated. They have been replaced by the great universal void between the individual and the market, where the system to which the product refers is entirely abstract and apathetic.

Of course, this opinion may also be the result of our distortion of historical perspective. One may think that even these prefabricated buildings will in time, and against their will, take on a specific character and identity—at least not as far as they represent a historical moment and a relative spatial concept.

A proof of this interpretation could be the successful integration of some great monuments of the past which have been recontextualized with time or which have themselves created new architectural principles, though they have lost the original reasons for their erection; or the great territorial transformation performed in the colonies by transposing models of organization developed for totally different environments. This is what occurred in the Roman empire and the religious colonization of South America, to give just two examples. We could also see how expressively the modern atypical typologies have been portrayed in the images of the cinema (in a film such as Paris, Texas, for example), in the prophetic poetry of Allen Ginsberg, or in many contemporary paintings. It is therefore possible to take a positive view, as some authors maintain, and see them as authentically popular, even from the point of view of architecture. It would therefore be interesting to discuss whether, and to what extent, the architectural principles of identity and belonging, which are so popular among architects today, are compatible with the principles of atopicy; to consider whether it is possible to find some form of interconnection between them, and in what way the specific characteristics of atopicy can be articulated directly in terms of urban design, as has sometimes been attempted in the last twenty years.

Perhaps what makes us feel uncomfortable with these atypical typologies is primarily their lack of roots: regulate the vast open spaces which share their function, or rather to design such spaces as a principle form of interminable with the surroundings and with the land (their inevitable background and point of comparison), with their geographical and technical nature and with, or consciously against, the historical profoundness of their existence.

There is no doubt that atopicy could be interpreted as the sign of an inevitable mechanism of international interdependence which has a cultural, political and economic structure, a sign that has not yet found a meaningful spatial organization in the territory of architecture. This is an interdependence which still seems to involve control and domination, thus opposing the attempt of the existing community to ensure in the process of unification the maximum expression of their traditional values. This atopicy is still widely at the service of the brutal exploitation of the economic differences between social classes.

Could it move instead in the direction of solidarity, towards that "communicative public action" of which some philosophers speak? This is probably a naively optimistic interpretation, but one which is also dictated by an intimate necessity and, at least as a hypothesis, one which is perhaps able to transfer into the territory of architecture the destructive impact of atopicy, transforming it into a solitary dialogue, even with regard to the context.